THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF NICOLAS DE CLAMANGES; A STUDY IN THE REPERCUSSIONS OF THE SCHISM AND THE CONCILIAR MOVEMENT.

Thesis submitted for the
degree of M.A. by
Margaret H. Bell.

May 1948.

BELL

S Y N O P S I S

of

M.A. THESIS

To be submitted by M.[redacted]. Bell

The life and writings of Nicolas de Clamanges; a study in the repercussions of the Schism and the Conciliar Movement.

The object of the thesis is to reconstruct the life and intellectual development of Nicolas de Clamanges (c.1360-1437), a French ecclesiastic and writer, as an illustration of the reaction of an individual to the crisis in the Church.

Chapter I deals with his education and early career at the University of Paris, where he was in the forefront of the early French humanist movement, and his reputation for scholarship and latinity led to his being drawn, as a literary stylist, into an active part in the events of the schism, firstly on behalf of the University and thereafter as an official at the Avignonese Curia. Chapter II follows his fruitless and interrupted career at Avignon and his attempt to reconcile faith in Pope Benedict XIII with obedience to King Charles VI of France, a matter of some difficulty, since the two authorities were in conflict. This position was, after an acute crisis, resolved by his

abandonment of official life. Chapter III is largely concerned with his reactions to developments in the Church and State during the following period of his retirement, and Chapter IV with the last twenty years of his life, which were spent in Paris, and in particular with the uncompromising interpretation which he put upon the events of the schism, in the unpublished Commentary on the book of Isaiah. In Chapter V an examination of his conception of society shows that in reaction to contemporary anarchy, he supported the inalienable authority of the Pope in the Church and the King in the State, and reveals some important points of contact with the early Reformers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

The life of Nicolas de Clamanges, a French ecclesiastic, fell in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, - a period of great social, political and spiritual disorder in France. The Church was discredited and divided and the powerful monarchy built up in the preceding centuries was shaken by a series of staggering disasters. Nicolas, although famous as the author of a very frank dissertation on abuses in the Church, the 'De Ruina et Reparatione Ecclesiae'[1] has been rather surprisingly neglected by historians. A certain amount of work was done in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but only on the main events of his lifetime, the very earliest notice being a few lines in Trithème,[2] in 1485, which were constantly repeated till 1609 when Hieronymus Drouart prefaced his edition of one of Nicolas' works by a short 'Vita'.[3] Lydius in his

---

1. Published by Coville in Le Traité de la Ruine de l'Eglise et la Traduction française de 1564. Paris, 1936.

2. J.A. Fabricius, Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica ..... in qua continentur de Scriptoribus Ecclesiastias ... Jo. Trithemii ... Liber. Hamburg, 1718.

3. Magistri Nicolai de Clamengiis ... De lapsu et reparatione iustitie, liber unus. Eiusdem auctoris vita, cum indice librorum. Paris, 1609.

edition of the 'Opera Omnia', 1613,[1] gives a fuller account, largely based on a not very critical study of the letters. Launoy,[2] Du Boulay[3] and Hermant[4] in their general histories give accounts which are very valuable on specific points, because the authors had access to documents which are no longer available. In addition, they present, without authentication, what had become a traditional version of Nicolas' activities. At the end of the nineteenth century, Voigt[5] made a fairly thorough research into Nicolas' humanist work, but his treatment of the subject is general, and by no means impartial. The first person to treat Nicolas as an individual was Coville, who in 1934 and 1935 published two books on the fourteenth and fifteenth century humanists,[6] and in 1936, edited Nicolas' most famous work,

---

1. Opera ..... Omnia, ed. J.M. Lydius. Leyden, 1613.

2. J. de Launoy. Regii Navarrae Gymnasii Parisiensis Historia. 2 vols. Paris, 1677. pp. 558-580

3. E. du Boulay, Historia Universitatis Parisiensis. 5 vols. Paris. Vol.V. p.908.

4. J. Hermant, Histoire du Diocèse de Bayeux. Caen, 1705. pp.369-75.

5. Voigt, G. Die Wiederbelebung des Classischen Alterthums oder das erste Jahrhunderts des Humanismus. 2 vols. Berlin, 1880. vol.II. pp. 353-358

6. A. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col et l'Humanisme en France au temps de Charles VI. Paris, 1934. Recherches sur quelques écrivains du XIVe et du XVe siècle. Paris, 1936.

the 'De Ruina Ecclesiae'.[1] Coville, with his rare knowledge of the period, wrote penetratingly and always attractively, his work is, however, suggestive rather than final, since, although he collected a few valuable pieces of evidence from the Papal Archives and other documentary sources, his study of the letters was not very thorough, and his discussion of Nicolas' interests necessarily incomplete.

Thus, Nicolas' life has not been fully told, and no study has been made of the development and content of his thought. The chief source of information for this is, of course, his own work, including the unpublished 'Expositio super Ysayam' and the letters, which also give, what is rare in the case of a medieval writer, a complete and vivid picture of his character and his daily preoccupations. He emerges as a person of great charm; somewhat incongruously torn by anxiety for the fate of Christendom and worried by the state of his own health, he was generous and sensitive, and possessed of a happy gift for friendship.

Having a strong sense of the fundamentally spiritual purpose of society, he attributed the progressive disintegration ~~from~~ which Christendom was suffering, and which seemed to presage the imminent break-up of the social

---

1. Coville, Traité.

structure, to disorder in the spiritual sphere, that is, to the schism and the various attempts which were made to bring it to an end. As a priest, and a Frenchman, his attitude was strongly influenced by both the papalist tradition in the Church and the traditional claims of the French monarchy to a quasi-spiritual authority. His two allegiances were, consequently, not easily reconcilable. The solution to this problem, which his conception of the structure of society seems to imply, is the measure of the extent to which the Church had become discredited during the schism.

Nicolas' character was too individual for his reaction to be a typical one. He was constitutionally incapable of partisanship, and, consequently, unfitted for the active life. In his preferred retirement he developed a system of thought which was highly original in the fifteenth century, although it has certain elements in common with the theories of the sixteenth century Reformers. Lacking a party creed which could carry him without embarrassment through all the predicaments raised by the ecclesiastical crisis, and, suffering emotionally as well as intellectually from the progressive deterioration of the situation, his experience of the schism, and reaction to it, provide a striking

example of the impression that these great events could make on the life of an individual.

Note. The Latin form of names is given only where I have not found the name in French.

CHAPTER I

EDUCATION AND EARLY CAREER IN PARIS. c.1360-1397.

The first period of Nicolas' life falls into two parts. For the years before the appearance of his earliest surviving work in 1387,[1] information is very slight. There are a few casual references in his later writings,[2] his name appears twice in the Chartularium of the University of Paris,[3] and Du Boulay records one further item,[4] but he scarcely emerges as an individual personality. Nevertheless, some idea of his activities during these years can be gained from the reconstruction of the milieu in which he was living, the course of his formal education and the development of the particular interests which were the source of his later reputation. In the following ten years, when he was becoming a person of some note, his career can be traced in greater detail, since in addition to official and other records, there is a considerable amount of material in his own writings, and particularly in the letters.

---

1. 'Laudatio Franciae et Universitatis Parisiensis', published by H. Denifle in the 'Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis' 4 vols. Paris, 1889. Vol.III, Appendicula p.xxxi. Denifle seems to be perfectly justified in attributing this treatise to Nicolas.

2. Nicolai de Clamengiis, Opera Omnia, ed. J.M. Lydius, Leyden, 1613.

3. Chart. Univ. Paris. III.pp.282, 452.

4. C. Egasse du Boulay, Historia Universitatis Parisiensis, 6 vols. Paris 1665-73. Vol.IV. p.976.

I. Nicolas was born in the village of Clamanges,[1] some ten miles south-west of Châlons-sur-Marne, in the Champagne. His family name was Poilevilain[2] but both he and his maternal uncle, who was known as Pierre de Clamanges,[3] adopted the current fashion of styling themselves after their place of birth. Nothing is known of his forbears, but it is possible that some trace of them may be found in the Nicolaus Poilevilain[4] and Johannes le Poillevillain[5] who lived in Paris in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries respectively. Nicolas' marked sympathy with the agrarian poor[6] suggests that his family may have been farming people, perhaps of the

---

1. A. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col et l'humanisme en France au temps de Charles VI, Paris, 1934. p.82. note 7 refers to Bibl. Nat. Latin. 3127. xvi.

2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III p.452, IV no.1716.

3. Ibid, III p.259. note 34; Opera ed. Lydius. Ep. xxvii.

4. A. Molinier, Obituaires de la Province de Sens. (Recueil des historiens de la France, Obituaires tom I.) 2 vols. Paris. 1902. vol.I p.451. Coville's reference to this work in Gontier et Pierre Col, p.12. note 5, is inaccurate.

5. A. Molinier, Op.Cit. I p.442; A.J.V. Le Roux de Lincy et L.M. Tisserand, Paris et ses historiens aux xive et xve siècles. (Histoire Générale de Paris, vol. XXIII) Paris 1866. p.355. list a Jean Poillevillain who was probably the same person, among the bourgeois of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.

6. Vide infra pp. 143-4; 212-3.

same class as the Charliers de Gerson.[1] Lydius deduced from Nicolas' applications to influential friends on behalf of his young brother and his nephew, that his family was of humble origin;[2] this argument is, of course, inconclusive, but there is nothing to show that they were anything else, and there is indeed, an unauthenticated but not unlikely suggestion that they had servile connections.[3]

The exact date of Nicolas' birth is not known, but it was almost certainly between the years 1358[4] and 1364,[5] and probably in 1360-1, since he would normally have been nineteen

---

1. Descriptions of Gerson's family are given by A.L. Masson in Jean Gerson, Sa Vie, Son Temps, Ses Oeuvres, Lyons. 1894. pp.79-84 and J.L. Connolly in John Gerson, Reformer and Mystic. (Univ. de Louvain, Recueil des travaux publiés par les membres des Conférence d'Histoire et de Philologie, 2me série, 12me fasc.) Louvain, 1928. Chap. II. pp.16-33.

2. Opera ed. Lydius, in his 'Vita Nicolai' (without pagination).

3. Coville, in Gontier et Pierre Col, p.92, suggests that Nicolas may have had some sort of relationship with his great friend, Nicolas de Baye, who was born a serf. A. Tuetey makes no mention of any such relationship in his Notice Biographique in vol.II of his edition of the Journal de Nicolas de Baye, Greffier du Parlement de Paris, Paris, 1885,8.

4. He could hardly have been over thirty-five in 1393, when he refers to himself as 'natuque junior'. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.I.

5. He said in 1408, that he had spent 'maiorem meae aetatis portionem' at the University (Ibid. Ep.XLII) but, he is known to have been away from Paris for twenty-two years, that is, the eleven years of his childhood, before he went to the University, and the eleven years between 1397 and 1408 (vide Chap.II). He could not have spent more than twenty-two years at the University unless he had been born by 1363-4.

or twenty when he was licensed in April 1380.[1] He makes no reference to his parents, or to any of the events of his early childhood, but he is known to have had at least one sister,[2] who married and had a son, a brother very much younger than himself,[3] and perhaps another brother nearer

---

1. Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. p.976; Coville, in Gontier et Pierre Col p.82, suggests that Nicolas' birth took place about 1355, claiming that twenty-five would be the normal age for him to receive the license, but this does not seem to be the case, since the customary age of nineteen to twenty years, was progressively reduced throughout the fourteenth century. (H. Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages (1895). Ed. F.M. Powicke and A.B. Emden. 3 vols. London, 1936. vol.I. 462-3). Nicolas began his studies in such early youth (vide p. 5) that he is unlikely to have been so far behind the normal schedule.

2. Mentioned in Opera ed. Lydius. Ep. CXXIII.

3. There are several references to this 'fraterculus' in his letters, i.e. Ibid. Ep. XXVIII, C, CXXVIII; A. Coville, Recherches sur quelques écrivains du XIVe et du XVe siècle, Paris, 1935. pp.296-7, a previously unpublished letter, and in an unpublished letter of Jean de Montreuil, Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.103r^{o}. Coville, Recherches p.295, discusses his identity, and concludes that he might be either Pierre de Clamanges, bachelor in Theology in 1416 (Chart. Univ. Paris. IV. p.322) or Etienne de Clamanges, Provisor of the College of Navarre under Charles VII, who was assumed by J. de Launoy, 'Regii Navarrae Gymnasii Parisiensis Historia' 2 vols, Paris, 1677, vol.II. p.558, to be Nicolas' brother, and who might easily be identical with the second Etienne mentioned by Coville, a cursor in the Faculty of Theology in 1452 (Chart. Univ. Paris. IV. p.737). It is perhaps most likely that Pierre was his brother, who went young to Paris in 1398, (Bibl. Nat. Latin 13062. fol.103r^{o}; Recherches p.296-7; Opera ed. Lydius, Ep.XXVII), and was seeking a benefice (Ibid. Ep. CXXVIII), probably about 1416, when Pierre is listed as a bachelor, and that Etienne is the nephew (Ibid. Ep. CXXIII) for whom he appealed for a 'bursa grammatica' about 1414.

his own age.[1] Not quite so close a relative, but still 'fidelem amicum, mihique sanguine proximum',[2] was Regnauld des Fontaines,[3] who, though probably younger than Nicolas, was to be a great support to him at a critical period.[4]

Nicolas' home life, of which so little is known, was at all events of very short duration. At the age of eleven, the young Coleçon left Clamanges to pursue his studies in Paris.[5] It was perhaps, in recollection of his leave-taking

---

1. The Humanist Cardinal Galeotto Tarlati di Pietramala refers in a letter to Nicolas to 'consanguineum tuum', who carried the letters of the University to the Pope in 1394. (Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum, Amplissima Collectio, ed. E. Martène et U. Durand, 9 vols, Paris, 1724-33. Vol.II. col. 1545 C.) Strictly this should mean 'your brother', but the word has also the wider meaning of a 'relative'. (Lexicon Totius Latinitatis, J. Facciolati, Aeg. Forcellini et Furlanetti, Pavia, 1864).

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep. XLVII.

3. Ibid. passim; Launoy op.cit. II. pp.925-6 gives a short biography.

4. Vide infra pp. 117; 125-6.

5. Opera ed. Lydius. Ep. XLII. 'Nam quando primum ad urbem illam praeclarissimam atque a laribus patris, ad illud vestrum inclytum perveni studium, Alter ab undecimo numdum me coeperat annus'. Letter to the University of Paris. Coleçon, the diminutive form of Nicolas, is the name by which he seems to have been known in early years, and under which he features for the first time in the Chartularium. (Chart. Univ. Paris. III p.282).

that, years after, he wrote "Mothers always grieve and weep copious tears when their sons set out for the army or the University, but Fathers are well-pleased, knowing that at home, their children would have no opportunity to attain the honours to which they aspire."[1]

Thus in 1370-1, he came to Paris, a proud and resplendent city, not then very much changed from the earthly paradise "illud fecundissimum declivum Parisius, cui ab Excelso concessum videtur terreni vices genere Paradisi,"[2] which Jean de Jandun had praised in 1323[3] as the centre of the universe, whose inhabitants were renowned for their moderation in all things, including size![4] Raoul de Presles was, during these years, tracing with pride the great city's history from the time of its foundation by the son of King Priam of Troy.[5]

It seems likely that Nicolas went to Paris in the first place to enter the College of Navarre, Saint-Geneviève, as

---

1. Opera. ed. Lydius, Ep. XIX. "Solent muliebriter matres dolere lachrymasque ubertim profundere dum liberi aut militiam proficiscuntur aut ad litterarum studia mittuntur. Patres autem propter speratum honorem vel gaudent eos abesse, scientes illos iuxta se talia adipisci non posse."

2. Paris et ses historiens p.56.

3. Ibid. pp.45-79. 'Traité des Louanges de Paris'.

4. Ibid. pp.54-7.

5. Ibid. pp.99-115. Description de la ville de Paris from Book V. Chap.25 of Raoul's translation of 'De Civitate Dei'.

one of the twenty grammar boys,[1] 'grammatici' for whom the College provided a weekly stipend of four solidi each. The senior members of the community were thirty 'artistae' with six solidi, and twenty 'theologici' drawing eight solidi a week.[2] No other students were taken at this date, but fifteen 'beneficiarii' were sustained on the fragments left over from the meals of the 'bursarii'.[3] The students of all ranks were probably housed together,[4] so that from early

---

1. Opera ed. Lydius. Ep. XLII.
   It is nowhere explicitly stated that he went straight there, but his connection with the College makes it probable, since the ranks of the Arts students and Theologians were usually filled by promotion, (Launoy, op.cit. I. p.28) and the constitutions laid down a detailed geographical distribution which favoured the Champagne (Ibid I. pp.29-30), in keeping with the tradition originated by the College's foundation in 1304 by Queen Joanna of Navarre, wife of Philippe le Bel, who was Countess of the Champagne in her own right. (Ibid I. pp.7-13).

2. Launoy, op.cit. I. 22.

3. Ibid. I. p.25.

4. Queen Joanna's will (Launoy, op.cit. I. 7-13) stipulated that the Grammatici were to have their own building, consisting of a hall, dormitory, kitchen and 'alias officinas', and that the artistae and theologici should also be separately housed. (Ibid I. p.11). The executors did not mention this provision in the constitutions issued in 1315 (Ibid. I. pp.21-39), when the college actually came into being, either because it had been fulfilled, or because they had decided, as they were empowered to do, not to put it into force - probably the latter, since the constitutions of 1321, enacted by Philippe V, decree that 'sicut Domus dicta est una, quod unum solum ingressum seu portam habeat.' (Ibid. I. p.53).

youth, Nicolas was in close contact with some of the most influential men in the University, and indeed, in Paris, - the Theologians of Navarre. All his life he honoured the memory of the peaceful and friendly atmosphere in which he grew up in 'illam pacatissimam domum in qua una mente, uno animo, una amicissima fraternitate vivebatur,' 'illud egregium collegium .... mira pace et tranquillitate florentissimum.'[1] Till 1397, Nicolas was normally resident at the College of Navarre,[2] that is, during the formative years of his life, in which his most important friendships were made, and his chief interests developed.

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep. XCIV, written 1412-3; the history of the College is given by Launoy, op.cit. vol.I; vol.II consists of a series of biographies of famous students.

2. An unpublished letter of Jean de Montreuil shows that he had been living there up to the time when he left Paris. "dimisso pervenerabili honestissimoque illo de Navarra collegio ... curiam illam ... adiisti." Bibl. Nat. Latin 13062. fol.32r°. The only positive indications of intermediary absences are in Chart. Univ. Paris, III p.452, when it appears that he had been away from Paris during the winter of 1382-3 (vide infra pp 24-5) and in Opera ed Lydius. Ep. VIII written 1394-7, where Nicolas mentions 'duas peregrinas' which he had recently made. Presumably these were not, in fact, the only occasions on which he was absent from Paris during all these years.

The 'Grammatici', among whose ranks Nicolas lived for about four years, had their own master, a 'Doctorem in Grammatica, bonae vitae et sufficienter instructum in Grammaticalibus' who was to instruct them 'non solum in scientia, sed etiam in conversatione laudabili, honestate vitae et moribus caritative et fideliter ... verbo pariter et exemplo.'[1] In accordance with the rules drawn up for their discipline, the boys wore long black gowns[2] and went bareheaded;[3] they were never allowed to go out alone, but if occasion arose, in the company of a 'bonum puerum socium, non suspectum.' They were required to know, and recite the Hours of the Virgin and the Vigils of the Dead and were not allowed to speak 'in alio idiomato quam latino' even among themselves. Their studies were no different from those ordinarily pursued in Grammar Schools,[4] that is, they were instructed in the rudiments of the latin language, 'in primitivis scientiae Grammaticae.'[5]

---

1. Launoy, op.cit. I. p.22. In 1373, Guido Guerin was 'Primarius Grammaticorum'. (Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. p.975).

2. Launoy, op.cit. I. p.32.

3. Ibid, I. p.44. (Confirmation of the Constitutions by Pope John XXII).

4. Ibid. I. p.32. 'Item quod diligenter audient lectiones, materias et usus et talia secundum ordinationem cuiuslibet, prout est in scholis Grammaticalibus consuetim.'

5. Ibid. I. p.44. (John XXII).

When he was about fifteen, in 1374-5, Nicolas became, in the normal course, a student in the Faculty of Arts of the University,[1] and now, in his own College, he came under the discipline of the 'Magistrum in Artibus, idoneum et expertum', and a different, though very similar set of rules.[2] Unlike the Master of the Grammar boys, the Master of the Arts students was not responsible for the whole of their education; his function was to supplement the Arts courses of the University lecturers, and he was accordingly required, 'per iuramentum', to hear the students repeat their lectures, which they were exhorted to do 'pacifice' and to answer such questions as they might put to him.[3] Every fortnight in winter, and every week in summertime, disputations were held, in which one student, forewarned two days in advance, had to resolve a 'quaestio' propounded by the master.[4] The other students were bidden to listen 'sine omni protervia et clamore', and the master to help the student resolving, and at the end, to indicate which solution seemed to him to be the 'sanior et verior'.[5] Except when there were disputations,

---

1. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.282.
2. Launoy, op.cit. I. p.22.
3. Ibid. I. pp.33-4.
4. Ibid. I. p.33.
5. Ibid. I. p.34.

the master lectured for one hour each day on a book selected by the students. It was apparently necessary to require him specifically to show no favouritism, but to teach 'omnes fideliter, affectione cuiuscunque nationis vel personae simpliciter circumscripta.'[1]

The Arts course normally lasted five years,[2] and students at the College of Navarre were obliged to complete it in seven, on pain of forfeiting their places, which penalty was also incurred for obtaining the licence 'de gratia.'[3] By the fourteenth century, the Faculty of Arts had adopted the practice of the Higher Faculties, of dividing the course into two parts,[4] of which the first, comprising Grammar, the Old and New Logic and part or whole of the De Anina,[5] probably took four years. If at the end of this time, a student was successful in the 'Responsions' which were held in December by each nation for its own candidates, he was allowed to proceed in the following Lent to the B.A. examination, or Determination, after which he became a bachelor, was entitled to wear the 'cappa' and began to give cursory

---

1. Ibid. I. p.34.
2. H. Rashdall, op.cit. I. p.462. There is a full account of the Faculty of Arts, pp.439-471.
3. Launoy, op.cit. I. pp.32-3.
4. Rashdall, op.cit. I. p.450.
5. Ibid. I. p.443.

lectures.[1] Nicolas probably reached this stage in 1379, his fourth year.[2] He then began to study for the license in Arts, for which a one year course of Aristotelian Metaphysics was prescribed.[3] Having fulfilled all the requirements, Nicolas received his license from the Chancellor of St. Geneviève in 1380,[4] and incepted in the following May.[5]

Thus the official Arts course was in no sense a literary one. There are, however, some indications that students of more liberal interests were not denied an opportunity to pursue their studies in a wider field. Works not included in the syllabus, such as the Politics, Economics and Rhetoric of Aristotle[6] and at least some of the latin classics were certainly read and studied. In fact, in his Principium in Cursum Bibliae,[7] written in 1374,[8] d'Ailly, who was by no

---

1. Ibid. I. pp.452-5.
2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.282.
3. Rashdall, op.cit. I. p.443.
4. Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. p.976.
5. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.454. note 10.
6. Rashdall, op.cit. I. p.447.
7. Published by L. Ellies du Pin in his edition of the works of Gerson, Johannis Gersonii ... opera omnia. 5 vols. Antwerp, 1706. vol.I. col.612-6.
8. L. Salembier, Le Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly, Tourcoing, 1932. p.368.

means a humanist, although he had a wider and more direct knowledge of the classics than most of his contemporaries in France, gives an extraordinary list of the studies he would expect to find 'in primo scole philosophorum ingressu',[1] not only Priscian and Aristotle in fact, but at least some of the works of Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, Fulgentius, Horace, Orosius, Juvenal, Seneca, Terence, Sallust, Sidonius, Cassiodorus, Quintilian, Livy, Martial, Homer and Macrobius.[2] Although this seems to indicate some interest in the classics at the University, outside the compulsory syllabus, its significance is not, in fact very great. The extensiveness of the list, particularly when it is taken in conjunction with the truly formidable studies which d'Ailly ascribes to the Mathematicians,[3] suggests that he had included everything he knew. Again, he does not say that he would expect to hear lectures on these works, and indeed, it is known that for at least a decade, there were no humanist teachers in Paris.[4]

Not very much is known of Nicolas' masters at this stage, but it appears that he was at some time taught by his uncle, Pierre de Clamanges, since in recording his death,

---

1. i.e. Arts. He mentions three other 'scole', Mathematics, Civil and Canon Law, and Theology.

2. Listed in that order in Gersonii ... opera I. col.612.

3. Gersonii ... opera, I. col.613-4.

4. Vide infra p. 35.

Nicolas wrote 'memorque tum consanguinitatis, tum diuturnae secum in studio educationis, debitas extincto lacrymas profudi.'[1] Pierre later became a famous doctor, but he must have been a Regent Master of Arts for at least the compulsory two years after he was licensed in 1370[2] and probably for longer, since his name appears on the Rotulus of the Faculty of Arts in 1379.[3] Nicolas may very likely also have attended the lectures given as a newly qualified Regent Master by Pierre Pialley de Dierrey,[4] a future Master of the College of Navarre,[5] and distinguished figure in the University, with whom he later became friendly.[6] He was licensed under a certain Johannis de Roncuria, twice Rector of the University.[7]

After 1381, Nicolas was himself a Regent Master, and he probably continued to be Regent for a lot more than the

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep. XXVII.

2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.259. note 4.

3. Ibid. III. p.255

4. Ibid. IV. passim.

5. From 1395 (Launoy, op.cit. II. 905, 908) or perhaps 1404 (Ibid. II. 906) till 1411 (Ibid. II. p.908).

6. Coville, Recherches p.289. Nicolas appealed to Jean de Montreuil on his behalf in one of the previously unpublished letters given p.289.

7. Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. p.969.

compulsory two years, and he is known to have lectured in private up till the time when he left Paris in 1397. At the same time he passed straight into the Faculty of Theology[1] where, as an 'auditor', he had to attend lectures on the Bible for four years, and on the Sentences of Peter Lombard for a further two.[2] At the College of Navarre, there were many rules regarding behaviour even for the 'theologi'. They were to dress suitably and, like the others, to wear the tonsure,[3] observe term[4] and not to stay out at nights.[5] Dining 'in camera' and the entertainment of guests were the subject of detailed regulations,[6] chiefly designed to ensure that the college should not be put to any extra expense, or its servants to unnecessary trouble.

It was probably during the early 1380's that Nicolas first came under the direct influence of Pierre d'Ailly,[7]

---

1. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.452.

2. Rashdall, op.cit. I. p.474.

3. Launoy, op.cit. I. p.29.

4. Ibid. I. p.31. 'Item, ut vagandi tollatur omnis occasio, a festo Sancti Remigii usque ad festum sancti Johannis Baptistae, nullus scholaris villam exeat sine causa rationabili. i.e. 1 October - 24 June.

5. Ibid. I. p.31.

6. Ibid. I. pp.29-30.

7. Salembier, op.cit. is his most recent biographer.

whose lectures he must have attended. D'Ailly had for some time been the outstanding personality of the College of Navarre, of which in 1384 he became Master.[1] Nicolas had the treatest respect and affection for d'Ailly, and the influence of his master upon him during this period is difficult to over-estimate. It was, for instance, probably from d'Ailly, who was a brilliant exponent of Nominalism,[2] that Nicolas absorbed this philosophy. Unlike his fellow-student and friend Gerson,[3] Nicolas does not, however, seem to have had any great interest in, or aptitude for, Scholastic Theology, which should have been the chief subject of his attentions. Thus although he completed his six years term as an auditor in 1386, and was 'admitted' as a cursor, that is a bachelor,[4] in which capacity he was obliged to lecture in Theology, he never took the Master's degree.[5] And so his

---

1. Launoy, op.cit. I, 81; II, 468; Salembier, op.cit. p.66 says he took office 'vers 1383'. He was Master of the College till 1389 (Launoy, op.cit. II. p.905).

2. Salembier, op.cit. pp.293-8. Nicolas' nominalism is most apparent in his attitude to the General Councils, for instance in the Disputatio supra Materia Concilii and the first Collatio to it, (Opera, ed. Lydius, pp.61-76.)

3. He does not seem to have been an intimate friend of Nicolas. The nine letters addressed to him in Lydius are all rather formal in tone. His life and character are described by Masson, op.cit. and Connolly, op.cit.

4. Chart. Univ. Paris, III. p.452.

5. Although the Constitutions of the College of Navarre obliged Theologians to graduate as bachelors within ten years, on pain of losing their 'bursae'. (Launoy, op.cit. p.34, there seemed to be no statutory limit to the time taken over the final degree.

formal education came to an end.

Even before this time, Nicolas' tastes were carrying him away from his theological studies. The two great interests which were to dominate his life, ecclesiastical politics, and the study of the classics, were already developing, and imperiously demanding his attentions. In both these spheres he was now gaining valuable experience.

While the earlier intellectual activity of the University had settled into a routine of Aristotelian studies, its pretensions to act as a political force had increased out of all measure, and during the schism, it took a more active part in European politics than it, or any other university ever had done, or would do again. The years between the outbreak of the schism in 1378 till 1383, when the University was silenced for a time , were particularly exciting ones in Paris, and Nicolas, full of youthful passions and enthusiasms, was easily kindled by the momentous events which were taking place so near to him. He later claimed to have detested the schism above all things, since boyhood 'ante omnia a puero semper exhorrui',[1] and he was, apparently, sufficiently well-favoured in high places to be conspicuously close to the centre of University affairs, even from his early youth 'hiis dum agerentur pene semper interfui, ut non audita tantum, sed visa, scribere michi liceat, aliis forte non ita.'[2]

1. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.II.
2. 'Laudatio Franciae', Chart. Univ. Paris. III. Appendicula p.xxxii.

That this was so, was probably very largely due to the influence of d'Ailly, who did much to secure his pupil's advancement.[1] Till 1395, d'Ailly was one of the most important leaders of University policy, and Nicolas must have been greatly stimulated, not only by contact with his speculative and constructive intellect, but by his activity and his prominence in church politics.

With the news of the election of Urban VI[2] reached Paris, it was unsuspectingly accepted, as it was throughout France;[3] the University sang a solemn 'Te Deum'[4] and in June 1378 sent off a 'rotulus',[5] which Urban in fact, never received,[6] but on which Nicolas' name is quite likely to have appeared. When therefore, the election of Clement VII followed, Charles V who was disposed to welcome a French Pope, had to exercise a considerable amount of diplomacy in effecting the conversion

---

1. Vide infra pp. 49-50.

2. The fullest account of the events of the schism is given by M. Valois, La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident, 4 vols., Paris, 1896-1902. (Vol.I deals with the years from 1378-1385). The documents relating to the part played by the University are in Chart. Univ. Paris. III. The account given here deals only with the happenings in which Nicolas could be supposed to have a more or less direct interest.

3. Valois, op.cit. I. pp.94-6.

4. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1605.

5. Ibid. III. no.1606.

6. Ibid. III. no.1612.

of the country to his obedience.[1] Not till 16th November, after much parade of examining evidence and seeking advice, did he make an order for the publication of the new election,[2] and even then, the University, unconvinced that it was in error, proved disinclined to make the authoritative statement in his support which Charles expected.[3] The general body of the clergy was less intractable, and on the 15th May 1379, Charles secured the denunciation as schismatics of all who refused obedience to Clement.[4] Thus encouraged, the king specifically invited the University to declare its allegiance to the Avignonese Pope,[5] adding ominously 'si vous le metez en reffus ou delay, vous nous ferez desplesir.'[6]

Even so, the University was still unable, in a great assembly at which Nicolas' uncle Pierre de Clamanges was present[7] to reach unanimity among the nations, so the Rector,

---

1. Valois, op.cit. I. pp.112-3.
2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1614.
3. Ibid. III. no.1616.
4. Valois, op.cit. I. pp.136-7.
5. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1623. 24 May 1379.
6. Valois, op.cit. I. p.137.
7. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1624.

as was constitutionally correct, refused to conclude, and it was left to the Master of the College of Navarre,[1] Simon Fréron, to announce to Charles on the 26th May, the adherence of the University to Clement.[2] The English and Picard nations, who were the backbone of the opposition, staunchly refused to attend a meeting at Vincennes on the 30th at which Charles insisted on hearing this avowal from the University itself, and the English nation further refused to subscribe to the roll which was sent to Clement in October.[3] Nicolas, as befitted a young member of the French nation, subscribed, petitioning for a benefice in the gift of the Bishop of Châlons,[4] which, in view of his insufficiency at this date, it is not surprising to observe that he did not get. Typical of the boldly independent attitude of the University was the proposal of one of the masters to introduce the schism as a subject of debate among his students, which he was prevented from doing only by royal intervention.[5] Charles was, nevertheless, so much disturbed by the failure of Clement to gain more widespread recognition in Europe,[6] and by the unwonted

---

1. Simon Fréron was Master of the College of Navarre from 1361, (Launoy, op.cit. I. p.72) till 1381 (Ibid. II. p.895), when he was succeeded by Jean Laurent de Chavanges, who held office till d'Ailly became master in 1384 (Ibid. I. p.81.)
2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.1626.
3. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1633.
4. Ibid. III. p.282.
5. Valois, op.cit. I. p.140. Autumn 1379.
6. Ibid. I. p.317.

opposition with which his own policy had been met in Paris that, before he died on 16th September 1380, he made an unexpected concession. Although he continued to proclaim his personal faith in the Avignonese Papacy, he recognized the ultimate authority of a future General Council.[1]

The violent feelings roused by what was regarded as the insolence of the University in refusing to accommodate itself to the royal wishes, broke forth in the attack of the Provost of Paris on the University delegates at the funeral of the King.[2] The University was loud in its complaints and strenuous in its action for redress,[3] and finally succeeded in securing a very severe sentence against the Provost, Aubriot, from the Parlement de Paris.[4] Nicolas approved, even in the face of the unfortunate man's tearful pleadings, of this just severity, necessary he thought, to maintain the prestige of the University. 'Est autem ab Universitate alienissima hec mollis crudelitas, crudelisque misericordia.'[5]

From this outstanding success, the University gained confidence to show a greater measure of independence from the somewhat disorganized minority government of the late king's brothers, than it had ever dared to do under the steady

---

1. Valois, op.cit. I. pp.326-7.
2. Ibid. I. p.335.
3. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1454.
4. Valois, op.cit. I. p.336.
5. 'Laudatio Franciae', Chart. Univ. Paris. III. Appendicula p.XXXV.

rule of Charles himself,[1] and on the 20th May 1381 went so far as to conclude in a General Meeting, that the summoning of a General Council would be the most effective means of ending the schism.[2] D'Ailly was the first and most important exponent of this theory,[3] which however, roused the bitter hostility of the princes. In fact, the distaste of the princes for the proposal was so well known, that the Bishop of Paris, although obliged to condemn Aubriot, thought it safe to make, at the same time, a definitive pronouncement condemning as heretics and schismatics all who did not recognize Clement VII.

In its new mood of confidence, the University could not allow this to pass, and on 15th June, a great debate was held in which it was finally decided, after much heated discussion, that as long as the schism lasted, it should be no offence to refuse to recognize Clement VII.[4] This continued insubordination so far provoked the Duc d'Anjou, then the strongest of the princes, that he imprisoned one of the masters, whom he apparently regarded as responsible. The University, not to be intimidated, accordingly suspended all lectures,[5] and Anjou was eventually obliged to release his prisoner, exacting

---

1. Valois, op.cit. I. pp.337-8.

2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1637.

3. Valois, op.cit. I. p.340. note 1. gives reference to P. Tschackert, Peter von Ailli, Gotha, 1877. Appendix 36.

4. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1639.

5. Valois, op cit. I. p.343.

however, the condition that the University should adhere to Clement VII, and should cease to advocate a General Council.

Feeling was now so high in Paris, that numbers of the dissident masters, including the Rector, departed to join Urban VI in Rome.[1] Soon afterwards, the Urbanist Chancellor of Sainte-Geneviève, Josse Ghisil (who had conferred his degree on Nicolas) was deposed by his Abbot,[2] which order being ineffective, his formal deposition was pronounced by Clement on 28th February, with the annulment of all examinations held at Saint-Geneviève since the beginning of the conflict,[3] (which would include Nicolas' licence). In July 1382, the exodus from Paris was swelled by the majority of the English nation, who had refused to yield over the position of Ghisil,[4] and in November, the minority, whose powers of resistance were thus much reduced, was compelled to submit.[5]

Now it was the turn of the Princes to become over-confident. They returned after the successes of the Roosebeke campaign in Flanders, determined on reprisals, and let their armies loose in Paris.[6] Investigations and proceedings against

---

1. Ibid. I. p.344; Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1640.
2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1641.
3. Valois, op.cit. I. p.346.
4. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1468.
5. Valois, op.cit. I. p.348.
6. Ibid. I. pp.364-5.

the Urbanists were started, and the University, which had already, in March,[1] interceded for the people of Paris, made other supplications on their behalf in the winter of 1382-3, 'tunc universitas saepius adivit regem et dominos duces ad supplicandum pro illis de villa, qui erat in maxima turbatione et afflictione.'[2] This violence was, however, not without its effects and in October 1382, the sending of a second roll to Clement VII was decided upon by the Rector, the Faculty of Arts, (with the exception of the still recalcitrant English nation), and the Faculty of Theology.[3]

Nicolas' name does not appear on this 'rotulus', which was sent in February 1383,[4] because, as he reported in 1387, he was away from the University at the time, lecturing, 'in remotis partibus scholis regeret.'[5] It looks as though he too, had found it convenient to remove himself from Paris during the disturbances. He gives no further indication of his whereabouts, but in a letter written eleven or twelve years later, he says that he had never been nearer to Italy than he was in Paris.[6] It is, perhaps, most probable that

---

1. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1465.
2. Ibid. III. no.1477.
3. Ibid. III. no.1647.
4. Valois, op.cit. I. p.366.
5. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.452.
6. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.IV.

he was teaching boys in a Grammar School somewhere in the North of France.[1] At all events, his absence was probably not longer than a few months, since he seems to account these years as part of his University career.[2]

The total collapse of the opposition of the University was marked by its being forced to adopt a new text to be taken to Clement with the roll of Supplications.[3] Thus, at the cost of impoverishing the schools, the Princes had obtained their desired result, the end of resistance, and of discussion of the legitimacy of Clement VII.[4] For a period of seven years following this defeat, the University took no further part in the history of the schism.

In spite of all the excitement of these disturbed and violent years, not all of Nicolas' time was devoted to the crisis in the church. His second, and perhaps at this

---

1. He must have been lecturing in Arts, but the only other University in Northern France, Angers, had no regular Faculty of Arts till 1432 (Rashdall, op.cit. vol.II. p.159), and the famous schools of Chartres had quite abandoned the humanist tradition. (M. Clerval, 'Les Ecoles de Chartres', Chartres, 1895. Mem. de la Soc. Archéologique de l'Eure et Loir. tom.11. Books 6 & 7, pp.357-452, deal with the Fourteenth to Sixteenth centuries).

2. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.XLII.

3. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1650, old text, no.1651, new text, dated 26 February 1383.

4. Valois, op.cit. I. pp.366-7.

period his greatest interest was a much more original one - the study of the classics, which although it was unfashionable and unremunerative,[1] exerted for him an irresistible attraction, 'mira supra modum delectatio, quae meum vehementius animum ad illa studia impellebat, imo rapiebat, atque ab aliis multis studiis non placitis abducebant.'[2] He became one of the group whose activities constituted the remarkable but ill-sustained humanist movement in late fourteenth and early fifteenth century France.[3] To this group belonged the men who were, throughout his life to be his most important friends and correspondents, Gontier Col, 'inter omnes

---

1. 'Laudatio Franciae', Chart. Univ. Paris. III. Appendicula p.xxxi. 'Accessitin quibusdam, ut arbitror, inopiae metus, justus fortassis, si in studio remunerationis ex sorte tererent tempus suum.'

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.IV.

3. The most attractive account of the humanist movement in Coville's Gontier et Pierre Col. Valuable general discussions are also given by A. Thomas, De Joannis de Monsterolio, vita et operibus, Paris, 1883; G. Voigt, Die Wiederbelebung des Classischen Alterthums oder dag erste Jahrhunderts des Humanismus. 2 vols. Berlin, 1880, vol.II. pp.334-59, and by Coville in "Histoire de France' ed. Lavisse, 9 vols., 1900-10. vol.IV. 1. pp.399-420. V. Le Clerc's Article in the 'Histoire Littéraire de France' vol.XXIV, 1862 pp.1-602 (Discours sur l'état des Lettres en France au Quatorzième Siècle) reprinted separately in 1865 as 'Histoire littéraire de France au quatorzième siècle' 2 vols, does not touch on the humanist aspect.

mortales fidelissimum, sincerissimum, integerrimumque amicum', royal secretary and secretary to the Duc de Berri, the most learned of the Princes, his brother, Pierre Col,[2] Jean de Montreuil,[3] another royal official with whom his relations were close for many years, although they seem to have cooled somewhat when Nicolas' interests changed, Nicolas de Baye,[4] a scribe in the Parlement de Paris, one of his most intimate friends in later years, the ill-fated young Jacques de Nouvion, whose promising official career was cut short by his early death in 1411,[5] Jean de Piedmont and Jacques de

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.VI.

2. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col, and A. Le Duc's 'Gontier Col and the French Pre-Renaissance', New York, 1918. (Reprinted from the Romanic Review, vols.VII and VIII).

3. A. Thomas, op.cit. discusses his contribution to the humanist movement.

4. A. Tuetey gives a long biographical introduction to his edition of the 'Journal' vol.2.

5. Coville, Recherches pp.175-207. Article by N. Valois in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes, 63. (1902-3) pp.233-62. 'Jacques de Nouvion et le Religieux de St. Denis'.

Boury, both also younger men, Jean Muret,[1] his particular friend at the Avignonese Curia, and Gèrard Machet,[2] later a most distinguished master at the University of Paris.[3]

These people were all of an intense intellectual curiosity and though they were chiefly preoccupied with the classics, they were also interested in science, and indeed, in all knowledge. The Col brothers, for instance, had a curious urge for long-distance travel,[4] gratified in the case of the strange

---

1. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col pp.154-167.

2. Chart. Univ. Paris. IV. passim.

3. Letters from Nicolas to all these men (except Pierre Col) have survived. They were not, of course, the only humanists; others were the Italian Moccia, Pierre de Manhac and perhaps Laurent de Premierfait, who certainly had many contacts with the group, although he seems to have belonged more properly to the school of court translators. It is impossible to draw a hard and fast distinguishing line, but orators like Jacques Legrand and Courtecuisse, Guillaume Fillastre, a theologian very learned in Mathematics, d'Ailly and Gerson, who were primarily theologians, although they had other interests, and the poetess and moralist Christine de Pisan, do not seem to have been imbued with anything of the humanist spirit. The short discussion of the humanist movement which follows is merely an attempt to indicate the nature of Nicolas' interests and the sources of his reputation.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CX. Nicolas reminds Gontier of his early aspirations. 'Memini siquidem ante annos plurimos ex te audisse, nihil tuo animo delectabilius quam si totum tibi liceret orbem peragrare, mores locorum, ritus gentium, situs urbium, iura regimum cognoscere ...'

Pierre.[1] Although they were all interested in different degrees in the ending of the schism, some of the group were pleasure-loving and worldly, or at least secular in outlook. Gontier Col, a rich and extravagant bourgeois with a wife and at least four children was not, for all his virtues, by any means beyond reproach as the head of a household.[2] He, his brother Pierre and Jean de Montreuil were strenuous in their defence of Jean de Meung's '<u>Roman de la Rose</u>' and the pleasures of the senses, against the attacks of Christine de Pisan and Gerson, who, they suggested, as a woman and a theologian, were unlikely to have sufficient experience to enable them to appreciate its value.[3] Gontier and Pierre Col and Jean de Montreuil belonged to the 'Cour Amoureuse', a literary society founded in 1400, allegedly 'à l'honneur des dames.'[4] Even the sober Nicolas de Baye, a model civil

---

1. <u>Ibid</u>. The subject of Ep.CX is the return of Pierre from a long travel. Coville, <u>Gontier et Pierre Col</u>, pp.188-9 discusses what is known of his voyage.

2. Coville, <u>Gontier et Pierre Col</u>, pp.60-71. Accusations of Jean de Montreuil against Gontier at a time when the two friends were in bitter disagreement. Jean voices the complaints of Gontier's wife.

3. A. Le Duc, <u>op.cit.</u>, p.51. note 42 quotes from a letter from Gontier to Christine given in C.F. Ward, <u>The Epistle in the Romance of the Rose, and other Documents in the Debate</u>. Thesis of the University of Chicago. 1911. (Not available in the British Museum) p.29.
M.J. Pinet, <u>Christine de Pisan</u>, Paris, 1927 (Bibliothèque du XVe siècle. vol.35) pp.74-8 similarly summarises a letter from Pierre Col to Christine, given in Ward, <u>op.cit.</u> pp.56-76.

4. A. Piaget, <u>La Cour Amoureuse dite de Charles VI</u>, Article in <u>Romania</u> vol.XX (1891) pp.417-454; and '<u>Un Manuscrit de la Cour Amoureuse de Charles VI</u>', publication of a document in <u>Romania</u> vol.XXXI (1902) pp.597-603.

servant, who spent the last years of his life in a comfortable house in the Cloister of Notre-Dame, delayed taking Holy Orders until he was well advanced to middle age.[1]

Like the rediscovery of the works of Aristotle, the rediscovery of the latin classics aroused fierce emotions, and very characteristic of the humanists was the violence of their quarrels over literary matters. Jean de Montreuil was twice involved in bitter disputes with the Italian Ambrogio de' Migli[2] between 1397 and 1400, firstly over the respective merits of Virgil and Ovid[3] and secondly over the consistency of Cicero.[4] So high were the feelings raised, that when Gontier failed to support Jean as he had expected, he too became involved in the battle, and Jean spared no

---

1. Journal de Nicolas de Baye, Notice Biographique by A. Tuetey p.XXX.

2. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col, pp.117-121, discusses Ambrogio's origins. Accounts of the quarrels are given by Coville (ibid. pp.121-139) and by A. Le Duc, op.cit. pp.58-65.

3. Ampl.Coll. II. col.1423-6. Ep.LVIII from Jean de Montreuil to Nicolas.

4. Ampl.Coll. vol.II. col.1427. Ep.LIX from Jean de Montreuil to Nicolas; Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.92r°, unpublished letter from Jean to Nicolas fulminating against the heresies of Ambrogio.

pains to blacken his character as only an intimate could.[1] Nicolas was appealed to on both sides, and it was probably through his good offices that the quarrel was finally ended.[2] Before long, Jean was supporting Gontier and Pierre Col in the almost equally bitter controversy against Christine de Pisan and Gerson over the 'Roman de la Rose.' By this time however Nicolas was away from Paris, and he seems to have had no part in it, but in any case, his temperament was quite different, and he was never personally involved in any such dispute. Although he occasionally had differences with friends on literary questions, his attitude in such cases was never dictated by passion.[3] In this respect he had less in common with the great Italian humanists than had some of his friends.

It is difficult to judge the achievements of the group since, as its members were not professional men of letters,

---

1. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col pp.63-5 gives a translation of a 'libellus' of Jean de Montreuil from Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.113-114r°; Bibl. Nat. Latin 13062. fol.55r°, 103r° unpublished letters of Jean to Nicolas.

2. A. Le Duc, op.cit. Appendix D. pp.83-6, gives the text of a letter sent by Gontier to Ambrogio from Tours Ms 3° fol.60, which is a close adaptation of the letter which Nicolas wrote in Gontier's name, and suggested that he should send. (Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.VII) Le Duc pp.87-93. gives the Lydius text with variant readings from Bibl. Nat. Lat. 3127. fol.13r°-14v°.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius Ep.X, XXIII; Bibl. Nat. Latin 13062 fol.16v°. unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil.

like the translators employed by Charles V, Nicolas Oresme, Pierre Bersuire, Raoul de Presles, Denis Soulechat, and a host of others[1] - but for the most part, officials at the royal and princely courts, engaged in by no means nominal duties, their output was very small, in fact the only two who are at all adequately represented, are the two least active, Jean de Montreuil and Nicolas. Copious official documents in French[2] attest to the assiduity of Nicolas de Baye[3] and Gontier,[4] but give no indication of their classical proficiency. The one latin document of Gontier's which survives[5] is a

---

1. The work of these men is discussed by Voigt, op.cit. Vol.II. pp.341-4; G. Lanson, Histoire illustrée de la littérature française, 2 vols. Paris, 1923. Vol.I. pp.116-121; Paris et ses historiens pp.412-5; L. Delisle, Le Cabinet des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale (Nationale) 2 vols. Paris, 1868. vol.I. pp.38-43; and a fuller account in 'Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V'. 2 vols. Paris, 1907. vol.I. pp.82-119. Leclerc, op.cit. Histoire Littéraire, XXIV. pp.255-6.

2. Almost all the humanists wrote a certain amount in French, in which the dispute over the Roman de la Rose' was conducted. Nicolas alone, claimed that he could not write in French. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIV. 'Si vulgari dixeris, quomodo in eo scribendi genere me dices edoctum, quod necdum attigi.'

3. 'Journal de Nicolas de Baye, Notice Biographique p.vii.

4. Ampl.Coll. vol.VII. col.479-530; G. Besse, 'Recueil de diverses pièces servant à l'histoire du roy Charles VI. Paris, 1660. p.94.

5. Ampl.Coll. vol.VII. col.467.

literal translation of what he would have written in French, and is quite without pretensions to style. Jacques de Nouvion's account of a mission to Rome,[1] though it hardly justifies his friends' extravagant praises of his good qualities,[2] is better, and his unusually confident and frequent use of the Ablative Absolute, a construction little favoured by most medieval writers, gives his Latin an approach to classical terseness. None of these men, however, had a style rivalling that of Nicolas for purity, sonority and vigour - even Jean de Montreuil, who was in some respects more thoroughly imbued with the humanist spirit, falling far short of his achievements in these respects.

Gontier, Jean de Montreuil and Nicolas de Baye were keen collectors of classical manuscripts and Gontier possessed at least one very rare work, the Letters of the Younger Pliny.[3] Jean is known to have shared with Nicolas

---

1. Published by A. Valois in an article 'Jacques de Mouvion et le Religieux de St. Denis'. Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes no.63 (1902-3) p.233. Relation de Jacques de Mouvion. pp.240-262.

2. Letters of Jean de Montreuil. Ampl.Coll. vol.II. col. 1411-2. Ep.XLVIII; Coville, Recherches p.185 quotes from an unpublished letter of Jean de Montreuil to an unidentified correspondent (Bibl.Nat.Lat. 13062 fol.47) in which Jean refers to Jacques as 'longe meo vehementior Nicolao'. Nicolas' appreciation is in Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.LXIX.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXVIII, Nicolas asked him to get the manuscript copied for the Pope; Jean de Montreuil's collector's zeal is apparent in his own letters. (Amp.Coll. vol.II. Ep.LXIV, LXVI, LXXV); a list of Nicolas de Baye's manuscripts is given in Tuetey's edition of the 'Journal' vol.II. Inventaire des biens. pp.lxxvii-xcuii.

(de Clamanges) a most scrupulous care for purity of text.[1]

Gontier, Jean de Montreuil and Nicolas appear to have been the innovators and leaders of the movement, but how far their inspiration was original, and how far it was due to Italian influences is still a matter of some doubt.[2] Probably the Italian movement was, in fact of the first importance, since although the direct contacts of the humanist group with Italy and even with the Curia at Avignon seem all to have been in the last decade of the fourteenth century,[3] the presence of Italian elements in France cannot have been without effect, in spite of the fact that the visit of Petrarch to Paris a generation earlier seems to have had

---

1. Jean - Ampl.Coll. vol.II. Ep.XXXVIII.
   Nicolas - Lydius, op.cit. Ep.CIX.

2. Lanson, op.cit. I. pp.116-121 thought that the movement was essentially nationalist. Voigt, op.cit. II. pp.335-59, that the absence of Italian influence (except in the case of Jean de Montreuil) meant that it was not really humanist at all; and Arthur Tilley, in an Article in C.M.H. VIII 'The Renaissance in Europe' p.782, that Nicolas was the initiator of an independent humanist movement. On the other hand, Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col pp.143-86, seems to emphasize the Italian contacts, and J.E. Sandys, A History of Classical Scholarship to the end of the Middle Ages, 3 vols., Cambridge, 1921. Vol.II. p.165 states that the early stages of the revival of learning in France were mainly marked by Italian influence.

3. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col. pp.143-86.

no immediate result.[1] Again, the origins of the movement cannot be found in the traditional patronage of by the royal and princely houses[2] or in the studies of the University of Paris, neither of which were in any sense humanist. Nicolas' own opinion on the question is clear. He regarded himself as the independent pioneer of the humanist movement in France. He not only does not recognize any debt to the Italians, but was obviously, till considerably later, surprisingly ignorant of Italian literature.[3] He attributed his eloquence to no living master, but to his own efforts alone, although he modestly protested 'I couldn't possibly agree that I had no masters at all in this subject, indeed I had many, study, usage, practice, and constant attentive reading of the masters, with perhaps some degree of natural aptitude.'[4]

---

1. He was friendly with Bersuire over a long period of years, and spent much time in his company in Paris. L. Pannier, Article on Bersuire in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes no.33. (1872) pp.325-354. 'Notice Biographique sur le Bénédiction Pierre Bersuire'.

2. Delisle, Le Cabinet des Manuscrits, I. pp.18-71 gives a general account of the growth of the royal and princely libraries in the times of Charles V and Charles VI, and in Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V, I, pp.1-137, a much fuller account of the royal library. Voigt, op.cit. II. pp.337-9 seems to do less than justice to the interest of the princes in the arts.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.V. Nicolas' knowledge of Petrarch must have come later.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.IV. 'nequaquam consenserim nullos omninos me Magistros in illa percipienda habuisse, multos sane habui, studium, usum, exercitium, assiduam attentamque lectionem auctorum eloquentium, cum aliqua forte ingenii aptitudine.'

Gontier and Jean were however, his close friends and companions in study. Each was inclined to be jealous of his attentions to the other,[1] but Nicolas was most deeply attached to Gontier, whose temperament was more congenial, although he was perhaps the less accomplished. Of the three, Nicolas certainly had the greatest learning, the best Latin style, and the highest reputation; Jean de Montreuil, in spite of Voigt's partiality[2] is never acclaimed, and makes no claim to be, the leader of the group. The importance of Gontier is difficult to define, but was undoubtedly very great. Although his classical equipment was probably very much inferior to that of Nicolas, he may, by his love of the classics and encouragement of the studies of his younger friends have very materially helped to originate the movement. Jean said that it was Gontier who first advised him to devote himself to the classics,[3] and

---

1. Bibl. Nat. Lat. 13062. fol.50r°. Jean confesses having opened a letter from Nicolas to Gontier, much to the latter's annoyance, and makes his excuses; Lydius, op.cit. Ep.XXVI Nicolas answers Gontier's complaints that he wrote more often, and better letters to Jean.

2. G. Voigt, 'Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums oder das erste Jahrhunderts des Humanismus', Berlin, 1830. vol.II. pp.347-52. p.347. 'Der erste rechte Humanist in Frankreich bei dem Zündende Funke des italischen Geistes zur Flamme gediehen ist Jean de Montreuil.'

3. A. Thomas, 'De Johannis de Monsterolio, vita et operibus', Paris, 1883. p.80. publishes part of a letter from Jean to Gontier from Bibl. Nat. Lat. 13062. fol.115r°. 'Qui me primum in Abbatisvilla, anni bis duo eo circa sunt effusi, monuit ut studerem? Quis verbo pariter et exemplo indidit occasionem. Gontherus.'

Nicolas claimed to owe him a great debt of gratitude,[1] which might mean the same thing. His tastes are illustrated by the valuable presents he made to the Duc de Berri, his patron, with whom he was obviously in full accord - a beautifully illuminated manuscript[2] and a 'Bien Grande mappemonde, escripte et historiée.'[3]

In investigating the source of Nicolas' reputation for latinity, his achievement can only be judged from his writings after 1387, since nothing earlier in date seems to have survived. However, by this date his style was already formed and the features which had made him famous must already have been present for some years, so it is perhaps not entirely unfitting to discuss the nature of his particular accomplishments in the period of their development. It is, of course, possible that in early youth his writings may have borne signs of a more emancipated humanism. He is known to have consigned certain of his works to the flames in the process of editing his writings later in life,[4] and it is probable

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXVI 'tua in me ingentissima inenarrabilique beneficia.'

2. L. Delisle, Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V, Paris. 1907. vol.II. p.238.

3. Ibid. II. p.254.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.CX 'mea cepi scripta ab annis ferme XX edita recensere, mecumque sedulo librare iudicio, quae flammis, quae posteritate digna videatur.' Strictly speaking, since this letter was written about 1415, his earliest writings could not be included on this occasion.

that his humanist exercises perished on some such occasion.

Nicolas gives a very interesting account of the discipline by which unaided, he acquired his highly unusual degree of skill. The keen delight in the classics, which compelled him to devote a large portion of his time to their study presumably enabled him to overcome the difficulties of the subject, which, he says, intimidated some who were attracted to it 'nonnullos autem ipsa ingressu primo difficilis atque ardua et a suis nundum calcata semita exterruit, suasitque reverti.'[1] His innate appreciation of true eloquence, and his natural feeling for style, led him to study the speeches of Cicero rather than his dissertation on eloquence '<u>De Oratore</u>',[2] which, under even such enlightened Italian teachers as Vittorino da Feltre and Barzizza became one of the chief latin text-books, whose precepts were to be illustrated by passages from the speeches.[3] Nicolas recognized the value of the rules laid down by Cicero and Quintilian, most of which, he says guardedly, he understood,[4] but he found the study of

---

1. <u>Chart. Univ. Paris</u>. III. 'Laudatio Franciae.' Appendicula p.xxxi.

2. <u>Opera</u>, ed. Lydius. Ep.IV.

3. W.H. Woodward. <u>Vittorino de Feltre and other Humanist Educators</u>, Cambridge, 1897, p.220.

4. <u>Opera</u>, ed. Lydius. Ep.IV. 'Absit ut negare velim esse optimum artem ipsam artisque praecepta ignoscere, quae me quoque apud Ciceronem et Quinctilianum legisse confiteor, magnaque ex parte compraehendisse.'

the speeches themselves, much more useful. "I can undoubtedly and without qualification assert that the study of the speeches of Cicero has been much more profitable to me than the study of his principles."[1] Thus, he does not observe with any degree of exactitude Cicero's rules on the rhythms of the clausulae,[2] and he certainly drew no such scientific conclusions from the speeches, as have been made by modern investigators of the subject.[3] Nevertheless, his prose is pleasing to the ear, and in his more ambitious works, he usually manages to avoid the feeble beginnings and endings of Medieval Latin.

His style, though it falls far short of the formal resemblance to Cicero achieved by Barzizza[4] or Guarino[5] and lacks the careful classical vocabulary of Bruni[6] and the grammatical correctness of Salutati,[7] , is nevertheless,

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.IV. 'Hoc certissime verissimeque adstruere audeo legendis Tullianis orationibus, quam legenda ipsius arte longe plus me eloquentia profecisse.'

2. Cicero, De Oratore Bk.III. XLIV-XLIX. Loeb Classical Library 'De Oratore' vol.II. London, 1942. pp.173-187.

3. L. Havet, Article on 'Prose' in Grande Encyclopédie vol.XXVII. Paris. 1887-1902. p.804.
H. Bornecque, Les Clausulae Métriques Latines, Lille, 1907. (Travaux et mémoires de l'Université de Lille. Nouvelle sér.1. Droit, lettres. fasc.6.) somewhat modifies his own earlier work 'La Prose métrique dans la correspondance de Cicéron.' Paris, 1898.

4. Gasparin: Pergamensis clarissimi oratoris epistolarum liber.' Revtlingen, 1482.

5. Ampl.Coll. Vol.III. cols.855-876. Epistolae.

6. Leonardus Aretinus, De Studiis et literis, Paris. 1642. Treatise in form of letter.

7. Salutati Epistolae nunc primum in lucem editum. Florence, Cologne, 1741-2.

varied, vigorous and personal. It is by no means a classical style, although he has adopted many Ciceronian usages - antitheses, long lists of words, diminutives, the prefix 'per' and rhetorical questions in particular, but these he employs, not with the calculated balance and control of the classics, but in torrents. He is often repetitive and almost always long-winded, but he realizes the value of an occasional short sentence, and though he never achieves Cicero's 'dagger' effectiveness, his style is relieved of monotony.

Nicolas' grammar is not always correct by classical standards; he overworks the verb 'to be' and other auxiliary verbs, and is extremely cautious in his use of the Ablative Absolute, while his constructions are loose, and lacking in the complementary logic and balance of the Ciceronian period. He occasionally uses medieval words, and occasionally an incorrect form of a classical word. On the whole, however, his vocabulary is good, and it is very extensive.[1] He is not always clear, and can be both pompous and turgid, but he has a wide range, and achieves real and varied effects in many different styles, the pathetic, humorous, grandiose, didactic, declamatory and argumentative, and in the straightforward narrative.[2]

---

1. These remarks are based on a comparison of Nicolas' vocabulary with that of Cicero, of which a complete list is given in L. Laurand, '<u>Etude sur le style des discours</u> de Cicéron'. Paris, 1927-30. vol.III.

2. <u>Opera</u>, ed. Lydius. <u>passim</u>.

There is, however, an indication that his style was more deeply impregnated by humanist influences than was his mentality in his love of the traditional metaphors and allegories, the Ship of State, the 'Petri navicula', the filial relationship of the King to the Church, the sun and the moon, and above all, the sick body, and also in his over-frequent and burdensome citations of the great authorities, the classics, the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the horde of Commentators on all three.[1] These medieval characteristics seem to become increasingly marked as he grew older, it is quite probable that they were considerably less apparent in his earliest work.

His style was in every way a suitable one for its time, slow and discursive, grandly ornamented, sonorous and rhythmical to a degree which, since it was the reflection of intense humanist studies, had not previously been achieved in medieval times, but the sophisticated and allusive quality of classical prose was quite beyond his reach, as it has been beyond the reach of all stylists since the fall of the Empire.

It is by no means surprising that in perfecting such a style, Nicolas had acquired an exceptional knowledge of the classics, as the remarkable display in Epistola V alone sufficiently proves. He was even acquainted with works which were not known in Italy for some time to come, but of

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. passim.

which rare manuscripts existed in France, to be avidly seized upon at a later date by the Italian collectors. Among these were the works of Persius, Cicero's letters 'Ad Familiares', the 'De Oratore', and some very rare speeches, such as 'Pro Archia'. It is possible that he used the complete text of Quintilian, which was not known in Italy till the time of Poggio.[1] His classical quotations come chiefly from Cicero, Quintilian, Sallust, Virgil, Terence and Juvenal, and less often from Seneca and Ovid, but his knowledge included a formidable list of lesser writers, and he was sufficiently familiar with the classics to distinguish between the Romans and Italians proper, and the great African and Spanish writers of the Silver Age. The knowledge of Greek literature displayed in Epistola V might almost lead one to suppose that he was acquainted with the originals. It is, in fact based on a very careful study of the comments of Latin writers, chiefly of Quintilian in the '<u>Institutio Oratoria</u> Book X,[2] but also of Cicero, Horace and Virgil. Both Nicolas and Jean de Montreuil liked to use an odd Greek

---

1. Voigt, <u>op.cit</u>. II. pp.357-8; Poggio found many manuscripts unknown in Italy, in French monasteries and libraries, which he visited during the Council of Constance. (Voigt, <u>op.cit</u>. I. pp.245-6). One of the places where he made a successful search was Langres, where Nicolas later lived for some years, but where actually he complained of the shortage of classical literature. (vide infra p.93).

2. Quintilian '<u>Institutio Oratoria</u>' Loeb Classical Library, London, 1936. Vol.VI. Chaps. 1, 2. pp.13-91.

word,[1] but their knowledge certainly went no further.[2]

One of the most interesting aspects of the humanist movement was the influence of the classical conception of the civic man.[3] We have no written evidence of Nicolas' own conception of the place of man in society at this early date, but later, one of his most fundamental conceptions was of man's obligation to direct his life, not primarily in his own interest, but in that of the community.[4] He would certainly at this time, have accepted Cato's definition of the orator as 'vir bonus, dicendi peritus,[5] and it seems that even in youth he was conscious of the obligation to use his uncommon

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XVIII; Ampl.Coll. II. Ep. of Jean de Montreuil. no.XXXIX.

2. Gregorio Tifernas, (1414-61), the first Greek scholar of the Renaissance, was at the French court from 1457-9, and did some lecturing in Paris. He made little impression in France, and even in Italy had a very uncertain livelihood after the death of his patron, Nicolas V in 1456. (Article by L. Delaruelle "Une vie d'humaniste au XVe siècle" in Mélanges d'Archeologie et d'histoire, vol.XIX (1899) Paris and Rome pp.9-33.

3. H. Baron, Cicero and the Roman Civic Spirit in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance (Reprinted from the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library vol.22. No.1 April 1938) Manchester 1938.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XCCII. 'Quid enim potest homine esse abjectius aut contemptibilius, qui sibi soli se natum putat ... qui nullum iuvat, nulli subvenit.' (Vide infra p234).

5. Quoted by Quintilian in the Institutio Oratoria Book XII.

talents to the common good. Thus, although, unlike some of the members of the group, he was not by temperament, particularly well suited for the active life,[1] he undertook to play his part both in the revival of the classics, and in the healing of the schism.

II. During the last ten years of his life in Paris, the milieu in which Nicolas was living was unchanged; he was still resident at the College of Navarre[2] and moved in the same humanist circles, but he was now beginning to play an individual part in affairs. His earliest surviving work, an unfinished treatise belonging to the year 1387, most of which has been published by Denifle under the title

---

1. Vide infra pp. 75, 126.

2. Vide supra p. 8 note 2.

of 'Laudatio Franciae et Universitatis Parisiensis'[1] is almost certainly his first attempt at controversial writing. He gives a picture of the tortures of uncertainty he endured before he overcame his diffidence,[2] and undertook to report, as faithfully as possible, the efforts of the University in the 'causam fidei.'[3] He was worried about the interruption to his other work, and saw before him the prospect of arousing on the one hand, the mortal hatred of his adversaries, and on the other, perhaps only ridicule from the rest. However, he finally decided that his private

---

1. Chart.Univ.Paris III. Appendicula pp.xxix-xxx. Denifle discusses his reasons for ascribing the treatise to Nicolas, although it is attributed to Gerson in the Ms. The evidence of style alone is sufficient to justify his thesis. According to Denifle (Ibid. p.xxviii) the treatise occupies fols.194-204 in Bibl. Nat. Latin 15107. Its publication has been incomplete and somewhat fragmentary:-

   Chart. III. Appendicula pp.xxxi-xxxvii (fols.194-7) No.1557 (fol.201, preceded by a summary of the contents of the end of fol.196-201). In spite of the statement on p.xxvii, above mentioned, this appears to be the end of the treatise, since on p.xxxvii, note 5, referring to this extract Denifle writes 'finem tractatus necdum finiti ibidem invenies.'

   Short quotations from the treatise are also given by Denifle in Auctarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis 2 vols., Paris, 1894. vol.I. p.607, note 4 (fol.196); Chart. Univ. Paris.III. no.1522 (fol.195^{b}); and Ibid.III. p.xxxvii note 5 (fols.199 and 199^{b}).

2. "Laudatio Franciae," Chart. Univ. Paris. III. Appendicula p.xxxii.

3. Ibid. III. p.xxxi.

work would have to give way to public duty, and that he must put the more prolific virtues of the active life before the greater attractions of contemplation. Trusting in God, he embarked on his task, 'et hac spe fisus, inexplorato prius mari me committo.'[1]

It was, he said, the consideration of the contemporary poverty of the University in virtuous and learned men, such as used to abound in France that had inspired him to write, and he felt that by so doing, he was discharging not quite fruitlessly, his debt of gratitude to the University 'cui totum me debeo.'[2] He deals with the legendary splendours of the past[3] and then proceeds to illustrate how, even in recent years, the University has preserved its integrity. He discusses the Blanchart[4] and Aubriot[5] cases very shortly, but with high praise for the virtuous severity with which the culprits were treated, and finally comes to the proceedings

---

1. Ibid. III p.xxxii.

2. Ibid. III. pp.xxxi-xxxii.

3. Ibid. III p.xxxiii.

4. Ibid. III p.xxxiv, Salembier, op.cit. pp.63-72 gives an account of this case. The documents are in Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1504-1522.

5. Ibid. III p.xxxv; an account of this case is given by Valois, op.cit. I. pp.336-9, 342. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1454 is the protest of the University to the King.

against de Montson, which in fact, constitute the main subject matter of the treatise.[1]

Jean de Montson, a Dominican preacher, had been over-zealous in his attacks on the unorthodox but popular doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, to the great indignation of the University, which zealously and consistently upheld this dogma some four centuries before it was incorporated into the Catholic faith.[2] The episode aroused a great deal of excitement in Paris, and the Faculty of Theology took the most violent exception to de Montson's tenets on this, and other subjects, d'Ailly, who actually took the case to Avignon in the following year, being one of the chief prosecutors.[3]

Nicolas shared the common indignation to the full. He clearly assumes that the Dominican error is both obvious and ridiculous and consequently makes no serious attempt to discuss the issue. Even his statement of the facts, in spite of its animation and vigour, is frivolous, and full

---

1. Ibid. III pp.xxxv-xxxvii; No.1557. A brief summary of the issue is stated by Rashdall, op.cit. I. pp.550-1. All the relevant material is in Chart. Univ. Paris III. Nos.1557-1583.

2. An oath to defend it was exacted from candidates for Theological degrees in 1497 (Rashdall, op.cit. I. p.551 and note 2). The dogma was finally incorporated by the Constitution 'Ineffabilis Amor' on 8 Dec. 1854. (The Catholic Encyclopedia, 15 vols. & Index, New York, 1907-14. vol.VII. p.674).

3. Salembier, op.cit., pp.72-7, discusses d'Ailly's part in this affair. Two of his works written in the course of the prosecution are listed on p.369; they are speeches made before Clement VII, and the consistory trying the case.

of crude irrelevancies. He opens his account with a description of the chief actor, including the pun on his name which delighted all medieval controversialists, 'vir corpulentioris staturae, sed animi humiditate ingentior, boatumque grandem habens, ita ut sibi montuoso et sonoro non fortuito cognomen accessisse opinari possit.'[1]

His treatment of the subject indicates that he was not viewing it primarily as a theologian, but, in conformity with the principles expressed in his opening paragraphs,[2] as a passionate supporter of the integrity and learning of the University. What emerges most clearly from the treatise is the enormous importance which he attributed to learning in the national life, and to the University as its chief custodian. 'Nullubi enim quam in Gallia veriorem, integriorem, sincerioremque fidei professionem reperies. Istius autem que alia potior causa fuit, quam praeclarum illud orbis iubar, Parisiensis Universitas?'[3] Consequently, he took the decline in learning, by which he presumably meant classical learning, very seriously, 'Etsi ad rem dolor hic meus frustra sit, doleo tamen, et iacturam hanc in Galliam totam incidisse egre fero.'[4] His

---

1. Laudatio Franciae, Chart. Univ. Paris III. Appendicula, p.xxxv.

2. Ibid. pp.xxxi-xxxii.

3. Ibid. p.xxxiii.

4. Ibid. p.xxxi.

energetic treatment of this subject suggests that he had some aspirations to improve the situation, while his style, already formed and recognizable, though marked by a certain youthful facetiousness, and the abundance of classical quotations with which the treatise is adorned, prove that he had already dedicated a large part of his own energies to the study of the classics.

It was probably at least partly due to the influence of d'Ailly that Nicolas gained his early experience of University affairs as a spectator, and it is quite likely that he was responsible for the first recorded official position with which Nicolas was accredited. This provides an early instance of his rather surprising capacity for business and administration. In 1391, the management of the small Collège de Mignon,[1] founded in 1353 for twelve

---

1. There is no history of the Collège de Mignon. The outline of its development is as follows: In 1343 Maistre Jean Mignon, King's Clerk and Councillor etc ... bought several adjoining houses near the Abbey of St. Germain des Près, (J. Dubreul '<u>Le Théatre des Antiquitez de Paris</u>', Paris, 1612. p.702) which he planned to found as a College for twelve scholars, preference being given to members of his own family, but he died in 1348, before the completion of the arrangements, leaving their further management to his executors. (M. Félibien, '<u>Histoire de la ville de Paris</u>' ed. G.A. Lobineau, 5 vols., Paris, 1725. vol.I p.595). However, they were negligent, and it was not till 1353 that the College was finally founded by a nephew, Michel who was also a royal secretary, (H.Sauval '<u>Histoire et recherches des antiquités de la ville de Paris</u>', Paris, 1724. vol.II p.377) on the order of King Jean I (C.M.G. Bréchillet-Jourdain, <u>Index Chronologicus Chartarum pertinentium ad historian Universitatis Parisiensis</u>, Paris, 1862. p.149. no.DCXLIX), to whom appeal had been made. (<u>Ibid</u>. p.148 no.DCXLVIII). After successive attempts at reform in the early sixteenth century had failed, the College was finally, in 1584, handed over by Henri III, and with the approval of Gregory XIII, to the Order of Grammont. (<u>Ibid</u>. p.400, no.MMCIII).

students, was assigned to him on Monday the 31st July by the Parlement de Paris, pending judgment in a case which the King's 'Procureur' and d'Ailly, as King's Almoner,[1] brought against 'Maistre Cosme Courtillier, 'soy disant maistre des escoliers Mignon.' Nicolas was to receive the rents and make the necessary repairs, of which proceedings, he was subsequently to render account. Maistre Cosme was also ordered to account for his administration, and finally, after the necessary investigations, the court was to deliver its verdict.[2] Unfortunately, no record of the Court's decision seems to have survived, but in any case, Nocolas' office was evidently only a temporary one.

These were, however, unimportant ventures in comparison with the part which Nicolas was to play soon after the University resumed its active interest in the schism at the end of 1390. The election of Boniface IX in 1389,[3] almost immediately after the death of Urban VI[4] had demonstrated the strength of the Urbanist party, and thus seemed to postpone indefinitely the ending of the schism,

---

1. Salembier, op.cit. D'Ailly was Almoner from 1389 (p.82) till 1395 (p.90).

2. Félibien, op.cit. vol.IV p.544; Jourdain, op.cit. p.193, No.DCCCLXXII. This episode is not recorded in any of the accounts of Nicolas' life.

3. Valois, op.cit. II. p.159, 9th November.

4. Ibid. II. p.157. 15th October.

which had had every appearance of being not too far removed at the time of Charles VI's magnificent reception at Avignon by Clement VII, less than a fortnight before the new election.[1] In the following year, a specific stimulant was received in the form of an embassy from the King of the Romans, requesting for French intervention in the cause of unity, and appealing in particular to the University to exert itself to save a situation which was becoming desperate.[2] Thus, having in seven years recovered from the alarms of 1383,[3] the University again entered the arena. Its first attempts to persuade the King to consider the cause of 'union', as opposed to the victory of the Avignonese Papacy, were singularly unsuccessful,[4] but, partly as a result of the failure of his own Italian plans, and partly because his illness placed him at a disadvantage, he allowed envoys carrying letters from Boniface to be received in 1392.[5]

---

1. Ibid. II. p.152. 30th October.
2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III no.1660.
3. Since 1383, its only action in the schism had been the sending of a rotulus to Clement in 1387 (Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.452).
4. Chart. Univ. Paris. III.no.1661.
5. Chart. Univ. Paris. III.no.1664.

It was soon after this that Nicolas, for the first time took upon himself an individual part in ecclesiastical politics. He addressed a personal appeal to King Charles VI, now entering into manhood, to exert all his influence towards the reformation of the Church and the healing of the schism, which had now divided it for fifteen years. He apologizes for his presumption in daring to offer advice, since he was a young and unknown man with no special qualifications to recommend him, but excuses himself on the grounds that 'zelus ardencior domus Dei ... me ad hoc aggrediendum, dux, monitor, impulsorque est.'[1] It is fitting that this, Nicolas' earliest published letter should be devoted to the schism, which was to dominate his life from this time forward. The letter is also a minor landmark in the history of French humanism; it is probably the first in which the King is addressed in the singular, according to the classical usage which Nicolas seems to have re-introduced into France.[2]

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.I.

2. Voigt, op.cit. II. p.350. claims this distinction for Jean de Montreuil. 'Er ist im Frankreich der erste der Päpste und Fürsten in Klassischen Singular anzureden wagt', referring to Ampl. Coll. vol.II. Ep.XIX, written in 1404-5. Actually there are several earlier instances among the letters of Jean de Montreuil, II and II, written in 1394-5 being the earliest. It is noticeable, however, that whereas Jean always addressed the Popes in the singular in personal letters (Ep.I, XIX, XXXI) he very often used the plural as a mark of respect to other persons (Ad quemdam episcopum, IV, X, XX, XXI, XXV, XXVII, XXXVIII, LV, LXI, LXV; Ad Antonium de Chalant, IX; Ad episcopum Cameracensem XIV; Ad Cardinalem de Florentia LXXIV; and to Charles VI, LXXI) Nicolas was consistent in his invariable use of the classical singular in personal letters, whatever the rank of the recipient.

A real change in Charles' attitude which took place about this time, was marked by his appointment on 28th January 1394 of counsellors to discuss ways and means of ending the schism with University delegates.[1] The University had now fully recovered its confidence and took its assumed responsibilities very seriously. A ballot was organized in the convent of the Mathurins, and over ten thousand masters and students individually deposited therein their conclusions on the best method of restoring unity to the Church. Fifty-four masters examined these documents and drew up a general statement which showed that the University had totally abandoned the notion of securing the victory of Clement VII by the 'voie de fait', and was now preoccupied more or less objectively with the cause of union. The most popular ideas were firstly cession, secondly compromission, and thirdly, a General Council.[2] During 1393 - 1394, Nicolas was one of the majority party at the University, whose preferred policy was that of cession, which, of the three 'vias', seemed to be the easiest to enact and the least likely to arouse controversy. The legitmacy of the Avignonese Papacy was, of course, not questioned by the University at this stage; it was in no way brought into dispute by the 'tres vias', which were based on the totally different principle that the

---

1. Chart. Univ. Paris. III no.1676.

2. Ibid. III no.1678.

true Pope should be prevailed upon to consent to relinquish his position in the cause of ecclesiastical unity.

Even Charles VI now gave up all hope of a triumph for the Avignonese papacy by the 'voie de fait', as the reply which he sent to a communication from Boniface IX sufficiently indicates.[1] However, at the beginning of February, he left Paris to go on a pilgrimage, and the University delegates were unable to get any satisfaction from the royal counsellors deputed to confer with them,[2] since the Duc de Bourgogne, their chief supporter among the princes was in Flanders.[3] The University, not to be distracted from its purpose decided on the 26th February, to communicate its conclusions directly to the King, by letter.

It was in the composition of this letter that Nicolas had his first important official duty. According to the Religieux de St. Denis, the subject-matter was drawn up by d'Ailly, Gilles des Champs and other learned men, but Nicolas was called upon to exercise his now renowned eloquence on behalf of the University in putting it into form, 'sed Nicolaus de Clamengiis ... Tulliana facundia singulariter pollens ..... eam coloribus rethoricis

---

1. Valois, op.cit.p.410.

2. Chart. Univ. Paris III no.1682. The chief source of obstruction was the Duc de Berri.

3. Valois, op.cit. p.412.

exormandam suscepit.'[1] In this letter, dated 8th June, the University, claiming to have reached its conclusions 'non sine spiritu sanctu, ut credimus, interventu', recommended the 'tres vias', cession, compromission or a General Council, in that order of convenience and efficiency.[2] Nicolas' success in this literary effort was such that, within a year, he was employed in writing in the name of the University a series of eight more important letters on the schism.[3] Thus, although his interest in the schism may have been spontaneous, it was, in fact by reason of his humanism that he became actively involved in the course of events.

It is not perfectly clear how far Nicolas was responsible for either the subject-matter or the style of the communications in the name of the University. In the case of the first letter, to Charles VI, it is explicitly

---

1. Chronique du Religieux de St. Denys, ed. M.L. Bellaguet, 6 vols. 1839-52. vol.II. p.100, 130.

2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1683; Du Boulay, op.cit. vol.IV. p.687.

3. Only the six most important are mentioned in this section, that is, one to Charles VI, one to the Cardinals of Avignon, and two each to Clement VII and Benedict XIII. The three letters of lesser importance which are not mentioned in the narrative of events are exhortations to the University of Cologne, (Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.704-5) the Bishops of France (Ibid. pp.712-3) and to the King of Aragon (Ibid. pp.719-20) to do everything in their power to promote the healing of the schism. A complete list is given with the rest of Nicolas' works in Appendix I. pp.271-2.

stated that he merely put it into form,[1] and it is probable that this is true of the other letters also. It seems moreover, that on two occasions at least, he was not responsible even for the wording which was finally employed. Abbé Combes has shown that in the case of '<u>Coegit me</u>', for which Nicolas' draft has survived, very little of his original phrasing was, in fact used,[2] although his argument, and even the construction of the sentences are exactly followed. A comparison of the two versions seems to reveal no divergence of opinion. In the second place, the Sorbonne manuscript gives a version of '<u>Quoniam Patre Beatissime</u>'[3] so different from the text published by Du Boulay[4] as obviously to represent a different draft. In this, the last of the letters written by Nicolas, there is some slight reason to suppose that a difference of opinion with the University was in fact involved,[5] but even if this was the case, there is nothing to suggest that the question arose over any of the earlier letters.

---

1. Vide supra p. 54-5.

2. A. Combes, '<u>Jean de Montreuil et le Chancelier Gerson</u>' (Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale no.XXXII) Paris, 1942. Appendix III p.625 collates the two versions.

3. Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne. Ms. Latin. No.633. fol.105 col.2 - 112. col.2.

4. Du Boulay, <u>op.cit</u>. IV. pp.740-7.

5. Vide infra p. 56-7.

It is probable that when Nicolas wrote this first letter, he actually held the office of Rector of the University,[1] that is, during the 24th March - 23rd June 1394 term. There is no official record of who held office during these months, and though it has been commonly ascribed to Nicolas,[2] the letters written in the name of the University, the traditional basis for his claim, are far from providing a conclusive proof, since only the first was written during his supposed term of office. Moreover, he did not, as Denifle indicates was the custom,[3] signify

---

1. "Laudatio Franciae", Chart. Univ. Paris. III, Appendicula p.xxxiv, Nicolas praises the constitution of the University which, referring to the Greeks and Romans, he calls a monarchy ruled by wise men, the rectors.

2. This is one of the points on which writers who have mentioned Nicolas appear to have been most unanimous, but the only evidence which is ever adduced is the writing of the University letters. Lydius, 'Vita Nicolai' (without pagination); Launoy, op.cit. II. p.560; J. Hermant, Histoire du Diocèse de Bayeux, Caen, 1705, p.369; Gersonii ... Opera vol.I. Gersoniana. p.xxxix; H. von der Hardt, Magnum Oecumenicum Constantiense Concilium, 7 vols., Frankfurt, 1696-1742, vol.I. pt.2. p.72; W. Cave, 'Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum historia literaria', 2 vols., Oxford, 1740, vol.II. Appendix, p.117; Voigt, op.cit. vol.II. p.353; J. Schwab, Johannes Gerson. Eine Monographie, Würzburg. 1858. p.128. The same thing is repeated by Anton Simon in 'Studien zu Nikolaus von Clemanges', 1926. (Not in the British Museum, but available in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris).
This list is not exhaustive, but gives an idea of the persistence of the tradition. Many of these authors place his term of office in 1393.

3. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.617. note 1.

on the rotulus of 13th December[1] that he had ever been Rector, and his position on the list is not such as to suggest that he had any claim to priority.[2] On the other hand, according to Leclerc, poverty was one of the conditions of priority;[3] Nicolas' position on the list is obviously not based on his merits, for he was more illustrious than any of those who were placed before him,[4] but it is quite likely that his need was less, since the entry after his name indicates that he was already, in some degree, provided for.

Coville decided against the authority of tradition on the ground that Nicolas himself made no allusion to such an honour.[5] In Epistola XLII however, in which he is defending himself before the University on a grave charge, in recalling his long association with the University, he says 'Me prima praeterea pene dicam Elementa, me ad honorem illum quem amplissimum habet, invitum licet ac renitentem extulit.' This is certainly not very specific, but in view of the fact that he never attained the University's

---

1. Ibid. IV. no.1716.

2. He is twelfth, out of twenty-five.

3. V. Leclerc, Histoire Littéraire, vol.XXIV 2nd edn. 1865. 2 vols. vol.I. p.298.

4. There is no record of their activities in Chart. Univ. Paris vols.III or IV.

5. 'Gontier et Pierre Col' p.83.

highest academic honour, the doctorate, it is difficult to see what construction can be put upon the words 'honorem illum quem amplissimum habet' other than the Rectorship, and the phrase 'invitum licet ac renitentem' seems to bear this out in a very typical manner. There is, of course, nothing unlikely in his having held this office, since while the length of the University courses was very long, the Rector's term of office was only three months,[1] so that most of the outstanding students must have served at some time during their prolonged stay in Paris.

The University delegates were not finally received by the King till the 30th June, after the Duc de Bourgogne's return, when they again took the opportunity to advocate the views expressed in their letter.[2] Even now, however, they received no direct answer. The King, upon whom apparently Nicolas' eloquent style was wasted, ordered the translation of the letter, and, as he could not reply at once, the delegates were asked to return later to hear his decision.[3]

Meanwhile, a copy of the letter to Charles was sent to Clement, with an enclosing letter, dated 17th July, also written by Nicolas, exhorting the Pope, unless he could think

---

1. Laudatio Franciae, Chart. Univ. Paris.III. Appendicula p.xxiv.

2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1686.

3. Ibid. III. loc.cit.

of a better plan, to choose one of the three 'vias'.[1] An almost identical letter (but not one of Nicolas' nine) invited the Cardinals to do their duty in the ending of the schism. Charles also wrote to Clement personally and in no unmeasured terms. These communications were not without their effect, and at one time, the unhappy Pope did, apparently, contemplate abdication, since he was losing not only French support, but also that of his own Cardinals, some of whom seemed to be won over by the earnest proposals of the University;[2] among them Pierre de Luna, who had been Papal legate in Paris since 1393.[3] Here Nicolas must have made his first acquaintance, by sight and reputation, if not personally,[4] of the man who was to play a part of immeasurable importance in his life. Pierre had shown himself to be a partisan of union and had approved of the idea of cession, even on

---

1. Ibid. III no.1690; Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.699-700.

2. Valois, op.cit. II. 427.

3. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1673.

4. Nicolas' reflections on Benedict's character, written immediately after his election to the papacy suggest either personal acquaintance or perfect familiarity with his reputation. '... tuae denique innatae benignitas, suavis humanitas atque mansuetudo, qua te in genera universis tam pusillis quam maioribus facilem, affabilem, familiarem praebes.' Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.II.

occasion, going so far as to blame Clement VII for his intransigeance, and letting it be known that if he were elected to the Papacy, he would sacrifice his position at the first instance in the interests of the unity of the Church.[1] In fact, his sympathetic attitude to the University movement had been so well known, that on his return to Avignon, his relations with Clement were somewhat strained for a time, and Pierre appears to have considered retiring to Aragon.[2]

Clement was greatly displeased by the turn that events were taking[3] and was, in particular, irritated by the letters from the University which, according to a report circulated in Paris, he had stigmatized as 'malae et venenosae.'[4] The University was anxious to lodge a protest against this evil interpretation of its virtuous intentions, but Clement died suddenly on the 16th September,[5] before the communication prepared by Nicolas[6] to meet the situation had been sent.

---

1. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1673.
2. Valois, op.cit. II. p.424.
3. Valois, op.cit. II. pp.426-7.
4. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1693.
5. Valois, op.cit. II. 428.
6. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1693; Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.701-3.

The timely death of Clement saved a good deal of controversy in Paris. The University delegates had not been summoned to hear Charles' answer to their suggestions, till the 15th August and then, as their protagonist, the Duc de Bourgogne was away from Paris, they were curtly told to leave the question alone, and not to interfere.[1] This was a provocation which the University was not prepared to endure, and it accordingly employed its perennial last resource, a suspension of lectures.[2] Peace was only restored when the death of Clement brought to an end the alliance of the French monarchy with the papacy.[3]

The King and the University were now agreed on the necessity of postponing an immediate election, and a letter from the University, dated 23rd September, and written by Nicolas, was sent to the Avignonese Cardinals to this purpose.[4] It was not received before the Cardinals went into conclave on the 26th September, but in any case, their refusal to read a communication from Charles to the same effect, which did actually reach them before the conclave was closed,[5] shows that they were in no mood for negotiation. On the

---

1. Ibid. III. no.1691.
2. Ibid. III. no.1694.
3. Valois, op.cit. II. 428-9.
4. Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.711-2.
5. Valois, op.cit. III. p.11.

28th September Pierre de Luna was elected as Benedict XIII,[1] the efforts of the successful candidate himself having had, as Valois shows, a by no means negligible influence on the result.[2] An unpropitious sign was that Benedict had demurred against, though he could not refuse, the oath taken individually by each Cardinal before the election, to the effect that if elected Pope, he would resign at the request of a majority of the Sacred College.[3] However, he speedily made every effort to recommend himself to the French court. This in fact was scarcely necessary, since the news of his elevation had been welcomed, as renewing all the hopes which the precipitacy of the Cardinals had disappointed.[4]

---

1. Valois, op.cit. III. p.16.

2. Ibid. III. pp.13-15.

3. Ibid. III. p.14; J.B. Christophe 'Histoire de la Papauté pendant le XIVe siècle', 3 vols. Paris, 1853. vol.III. Pièce justificative no.5, p.480, gives the text of the oath. 'Nos omni et singuli .... cardinales congregati pro electione futura, in conclavi .... promittimus et juramus .... quod absque fraude, dolo et machinatione quibuscunque ad unionem Ecclesiae .... quantum in nobis erit laborabimus fideliter et diligenter .... etiamsi assumptus fuerit ad apostolatum, etiam usque ad cessionem inclusive per ipsum de papatu faciendum, si dominis cardinalibus qui nunc sunt vel erunt in futurum de iis qui sunt nunc vel majori parti praedictae videatur expedire.'
Only three of the twenty Cardinals 'se non subscripserunt.'

4. Valois, op.cit. III. pp.18-22.

Charles VI sent d'Ailly to congratulate the Pope,[1] and on the 23rd October, the University despatched a message of welcome written by Nicolas, in which it expressed its extreme satisfaction with the new election, since Benedict's promises in the past had given every reason to hope that he would put a speedy end to the schism. The letter drew his attention to the fact that the schism could be most satisfactorily healed by his own sole cession, without the waste of time on negotiations with Boniface, adding that he would thereby acquire great merit, the blessings of God, and the gratitude of men.[2]

Although Benedict took no immediate action, there was no discouragement in France. In spring 1395, a national council of the French clergy in Paris also pronounced in favour of cession,[3] and drew up detailed plans[4] to be communicated to the Pope by a great embassy of the three Dukes which set off for Avignon in April, full of the highest hopes of success.[5] Gontier Col was in the party as a secretary, and it is to his account of the negotiations that

---

1. Valois, op.cit. III. p.24.
2. Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.713-6.
3. Valois, op.cit. III. p.34.
4. Ibid. p.41.
5. Ibid. III. p.44. i.e. Berri, Bourgogne and Orléans.

our knowledge of the proceedings is due.[1] The University delegates carried another letter by Nicolas, to Benedict,[2] hastily sealed on the very day that they left.[3] This contains another and even more explicit exhortation to Benedict, and informs him that although the University did not wish to decry the other two 'vias', cession seemed to be in every way the most suitable, and honourable means of ending the schism, 'aptior, melior, praestantiorque vel expedientior.[4]

This letter, the last of those written by Nicolas on behalf of the University is remarkable for the number of its quotations, which had been very sparingly used in the earlier letters; they are mostly biblical, but he includes several passages from the Latin Classics, three from Cicero, one from Juvenal and one from Virgil, an unusual proceeding

---

1. His journal is published in Ampl. Coll. VII. Col. 1479-528.
2. Du Boulay, op.cit. pp. 740-7.
3. Valois, op.cit. III. p.46 note 2. 14 April.
4. This is a typically medieval use of the comparative instead of the superlative.

in addressing the Pope.[1] It is possible that there was some divergence of opinion between Nicolas and the University over the text of this letter. The style of the text given in the Sorbonne manuscript, more imaginative and metaphorical, less matter-of-fact, and very slightly less aggressive in tone than that of the published version, encourages the view that the manuscript may provide the text of Nicolas' letter, which the University perhaps thought fit to make a shade more vigorous, and to prune a little.

---

1. Voigt, op.cit. Vol.II. p.350. says of Jean de Montreuil 'Auch war hier gewiss noch niemand darauf verfallen dem Papst in einem sendschreiben die Beispiele der alten Geschichte zur Nachahmung vorzuhalten, ihn aus Cicero und Seneca zu Belehren.' However in this, as in so many other things, Jean comes only second to Nicolas.

2. A comparison of the concluding sentences illustrates the subtle, but very slight difference between the two.

Sorbonne Ms.fol.112 col.2.	Du Boulay IV. p.747.
Denique vestram Beatitudinen certo scire volumus, si quod fortassis urgentius aut asperius a nobis dictum est, non tam propter vos id esse dictum, quem satis ad rem voluntarium non magnis stimulis egere quam propter partem contrariam quam negligentius nimis diu torpentem excitari oportuerat altiori voce.	Sed id scire volumus vestram Beatitudinem quod si quidquam urgentius fortasse dictum est, non tam propter vos dictum esse, quem satis voluntarium non multis egere scimus stimulis, quam propter alteram partem quam fortasse remissiorem et torpentem excitari oportebat altiori voce.

It is possible that Nicolas, like d'Ailly, who had been generally suspected of partiality for Benedict XIII since the time of his mission to Avignon in the autumn of 1394,[1] was disposed to treat the Pope with greater respect than the University could approve. The fact that '<u>Quonian Patre Beatissime</u>' was the last of the letters written in the name of the University may be significant in this respect.

However, the personal letter[2] written by Nicolas to Benedict at about the same time indicates that even if his thorough-going acceptance of the legitimacy of the Avignonese papacy led him to adopt a slightly more respectful attitude than that of the University, which was now beginning to discredit the rights of either Pope, he was still an ardent exponent of the 'via cessionis'. He begins with a high-flown passage full of classical allusions, goes on to remind Benedict that the essence of papal duty was to be the 'servus servorum Dei', and exhorts him to end the schism in an enthusiastic and elevated tone which suggest that he

---

1. Feeling was raised against d'Ailly when Benedict appointed him Bishop of Le Puy on 2 April 1395 (Valois, <u>op.cit.</u> III. p.70), culminating in hostility when 2 years later he was made Bishop of Cambrai (Valois, <u>op.cit</u>. III. p.150).

2. <u>Opera</u>, ed. Lydius. Ep.II.

believed in the possibility and the desirability of Benedict's abdication. His warm recommendation of d'Ailly as a fit helpmeet for the Pope in the difficult matters ahead of him, and the abundance of superlatives employed in his description of his master's virtues are a sufficient indication of d'Ailly's influence on him. 'Virum litteris eruditissimum, fide, prudentia, probitate, vigilantia, commendatissimum et zelo unitatis Ecclesiae ardentissimum ... virum utique, ut breviter dicam, te tuisque moribus dignissimum ... hunc in pacis consiliis adhibe particem, in laboribus consortem et in negotiis omnibus adiutorem.'[1] Nicolas was much annoyed, and not unreasonably so, when this letter was "corrected or rather corrupted" by one of a group of friends at Avignon to whom he sent it, to be forwarded to the Pope, and by one moreover, who was not qualified to teach him anything on the subject of style. He complains that the letter was finally submitted to Benedict XIII in such a state as to make its writer appear ridiculous.[2] It is evident, from the events of the next few years, that his fears in this respect were exaggerated.

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.II.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.III. One of his friend's objections had been that he had addressed the Pope in the singular, another, that his praise of d'Ailly was excessive.

The style of the letters written by Nicolas on behalf of the University to Benedict and to the Cardinals, so much impressed the Italian humanist Cardinal Galeotto Tarlati di Pietramala[1] that, after seeing them, he wrote to Nicolas, presumably in 1394, complimenting him on his latinity, and expressing the utmost surprise that such culture should exist outside Italy.[2] Nicolas was obviously much pleased, but pained that a compliment to himself should have involved an aspersion on his native land.[3] Thus, his reputation for latinity, already high in Paris, reached Avignon.

The University letters and Galeotto's testimony, which go to prove that Nicolas' style was unique in France, are not the only indications of his achievement in the field of learning. Specific evidence of the respect in which he was held by his friends, Jean de Montreuil for instance, does not come till after he had left Paris, and there was, consequently, occasion to write to him,[4] but

---

1. Raised to the Cardinalate by Urban VI, he fled from the Pope at the end of July or early in August 1386, after appealing in vain for the six Cardinals imprisoned by Urban, against whom he, and his companion, the Cardinal of Ravenna issued a violent diatribe on 8th August. The two soon after went to Avignon where they were admitted among his Cardinals by Clement VII. (Valois, op.cit. II. p.118).

2. This letter is published in Ampl.Coll. I. col.1545.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.IV, V.

4. Vide infra p.102.

there is the evidence provided by the short-lived revival of learning in France, while a few passages in his own letters are very significant. He says with typical understatement that although he was far from suggesting that he had restored the art of eloquence, he could without boasting claim that his own part in its revival had not been entirely to the discredit of his country.[1] Again, although at the time when Nicolas had been a student, there had been no humanist teachers in Paris,[2] in 1394 he wrote that there were often lectures, both public and private on the Rhetoric of Aristotle and Cicero, and that there were always courses on Terence and Virgil.[3] His own lectures seem to have been in private, to groups of friends and younger students.[4]

---

1. 'Absit autem, ut me reparatorem velim iactare perditae in Gallicis regionibus artis oratoriae, sed neglectae et intermissae iacentis et sopitae in tenebrisque diutius sepultae, possum me sine iactantia non ad patriae dedecus, ad ignominiam, excitatorem quoddamodan dicere.' Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIX.

2. Vide supra p. 35.

3. 'Vidi ego in studio Parisiaco sepe Tullianam publice legi rhetoricam, sepe item privatim, nonnumquam etiam Aristotelicam, poeteque summi et optimi Virgilius atque Terentius illic etiam sepe leguntur.' Chart.Univ.Paris. III. Introductio p.xi. This is Denifle's reading from Bibl.Nat.Latin 3128 fol.18. The version given by Lydius, Opera, Ep.V. is corrupt.

4. Vide infra. p. 71-2.

In addition to his accomplishments as a stylist and a teacher, he was held in high respect as a moralist, philosopher and general mentor. His transparent integrity, combined with great learning, made his advice and approbation valuable to all kinds of people, while his attractive and kindly personality gathered around him a vast number of acquaintances, whose importunities were somewhat of a trial to him, since he was both troubled by his inability to give all his suitors the consideration they required, and slightly resentful of their presumption. In a letter written to Jean de Montreuil after he had left Paris, he gives a vivid picture of the endless whirl of activity which, he felt, would be imposed on him if he returned, as indeed it had been in the past. "They will all ask me to see them often, and consider themselves affronted if I do not oblige. They will implore me to approve of their modes of life, even if I've only seen them once or twice, and have not pursued their acquaintance. If I go on seeing them, one will ask me to read history, another poetry, a third, to expound the art of Cicero, claiming that I read such and such for you, offering me much, and putting up with more, but, finally, seeking my friendship only in their own interests, and not at all in mine ..... And then, if I refuse to undergo the labour of making all these visits, you, and the rest of my familiar friends will come rushing to me, at home, and absolutely compel me to lecture,

collecting a crowd of students round me as if I were a Master, as you will remember, used to happen when I was there."[1]

He was not only honoured, but relatively prosperous; his fame and success had brought him at last, not one, but several benefices. He appears at the end of 1394 on the rotulus sent by d'Ailly to Benedict XIII, appealing for a Canonry in Châlons Cathedral, although he was already in process of acquiring (noscatur obtinere) a chapel near the High Altar in a new part of the Cathedral there, and also one of the University Chapels, worth in all, thirty pounds parisian annually.[2] By the 10th July 1395, he was a canon and deacon of St. Cloud,[3] and before he left for Avignon, he had acquired yet another benefice, a canonry at St. Pierre de Lille, where he was a colleague of Jean de Montreuil.[4] It is not known how long he held these benefices; he was still collecting reserves from the University Chapel in December 1401,[5] but there is no further record of any of the others,

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIX. This seems to imply that he was not in fact a Regent Master, giving University courses, at this time.
2. Chart. Univ. Paris. IV. no.1716.
3. Ibid. III. p.452. note.10.
4. A. Thomas, 'De Joannis de Monsterolio', p.86, gives a reference to an unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil to Galeotto, Bibl. Nat. Latin. 18337, fol.63r°
5. Valois, op.cit.III. p.271 note 1 gives a reference to Bibl. Nat. Titres Scellés de Clairambault 32, fol.2391. It was worth twenty pounds parisian annually.

beyond the fact that he had apparently relinquished them all by 1408.[1]

Although none of Nicolas' writings in the years 1395 and 1396[2] seem to have survived, he was probably much preoccupied with the cause of the schism, which was soon to bring his years in Paris to a close. By 1397, Benedict XIII, whose election had been so gladly and so hopefully received in France, was in a more precarious position than ever Clement VII had been. The embassy of the Dukes had utterly failed, and the circumstances of its failure had greatly embittered feeling against the Pope. He had been unwillingly compelled to divulge the text of the oath taken in conclave,[3] but had refused to observe it when the Cardinals supported by the princes, had officially made their request for his abdication.[4] His refusal naturally brought the negotiations to an abrupt close.[5] The second Council of Paris, in August and September 1396 decided to have recourse to the desperate expedient of withdrawing obedience from the Pope, if one last

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XLV. vide. infra p.122 note 5.

2. It was probably during these years, or early in 1397 that he made the 'duas peregrinas' mentioned in Ep.VIII (Opera, ed. Lydius). It is quite likely that they were business or official visits of some kind, since he refers to excessive weight of affairs.

3. Valois, op.cit. III. p.47. Vide supra p 63 note 3.

4. Valois, op.cit. III. p.62.

5. Ibid. III. pp.64-7.

embassy failed.[1] This embassy was sent in June 1397, to inform Benedict that if the schism were not healed by the 2nd February 1398, he would no longer have the power to raise taxes, or to confer benefices in France. Benedict did not appear greatly impressed, and Boniface IX, when the envoys proceeded to lay their case before him, in Rome, openly declined to consider cession. Collusive action was suspected.[2]

Yet at this critical, and apparently most unpropitious moment, Nicolas accepted office at the Papal Curia, which was offered to him, unsolicited, by the Pope. It is possible that Benedict had learned something of Nicolas while, as Pierre de Luna, he had been acting as Clement VII's Legate in Paris in 1393-4, but in any case, the eloquence of the University communications had no doubt attracted his attention, although he could scarcely have found their contents palatable. Benedict might also have heard more in Nicolas' favour from d'Ailly, the Cardinals who had come into contact with Gontier Col, or perhaps from Galeotto di Pietramala himself.

---

1. Ibid. III. pp.104-7.

2. Valois gives an account of this embassy, Ibid. III. pp.117-122.

On 16th November 1397, Nicolas was nominated a papal 'Scriptor',[1] and he was soon afterwards provided with a canonry at Langres.[2] To take up a routine official position was quite against his inclinations and all the persuasions of his friends were required to persuade him to accept the office at the Curia - to convince him that he would be competent to fulfil it, that he would not lose his freedom, and that his fragile health would not suffer. However, he was greatly impressed by the spontaneous kindness of Benedict XIII in making this unsolicited provision for him,[3] hopeful of being able to do some good and perhaps, tired of the honourable but hectic life he was leading in Paris, so finally, at the end of 1397, or very early in 1398, he left for Avignon,[4] where he already had a considerable circle of acquaintances.

Superficially, this may seem an unexpected move after his eloquent advocacy of the University policy of the 'via cessionis', but actually it was not Nicolas, but the University, and the French government who had changed their ground, when, in despair, they assumed, in the policy of the subtraction of obedience, that neither Benedict nor

---

1. Valois, op.cit.III. p.270. n.4. gives a reference to Arch. du Vatican. Reg. 322 (fol.30r°), which records that the nomination had not been solicited either by Nicolas or by his friends.

2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.454. note 10. gives a reference to Arch. du Vatican. Reg. 322 (fol.91b).

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIV.

4. Ibid. Ep.XII. Nicolas had been in Avignon some time before the death of Galeotto in Spring 1398.

Boniface were true Popes. Nicolas had advocated the voluntary cession of the Avignonese Popes in the interests of union, after the manifest failure of the 'voie de fait', but there is no indication that either then, or at any other time of his life, he doubted their inalienable legitimacy. Even in these early years, he doubtless viewed the proposed subtraction of obedience with distress, as gratuitous wickedness which could have no effect on the legitimacy of the true pope. His recommendation of d'Ailly in the letter of 1394-5 indicates that he believed that the assistance of right-minded persons could promote the cause of union, and so his unwilling acceptance of the office offered to him by Benedict was not only in keeping with his character and his principles, but it was in no respect inconsistent with his University career.

CHAPTER II.

OFFICE AT THE AVIGNONESE CURIA. 1397-1408.

When Nicolas arrived at the Curia, the great palace at Avignon, 'illam denique egregiam domum',[1] 'illamque domum celeberrimam'[2] built, as he thought, from the spoils of the church,[3] had not yet been completed for fifty years. Benedict XIII lived, as his predecessors since the time of Benedict XII had done before him, in one of the seven great square towers, the 'Turris SS. Angelorum', where the papal treasure, and the library were also housed.[4] Some alterations and much redecoration were undertaken both by Clement VII[5] and by Benedict XIII,[6] but times were too

---

1. 'Expositio Super Ysayam.' Bibliothèque de l'Arsénal, Manuscrit no.137, fol.23.

2. Ibid. fol.156v°.

3. Ibid. fol.23; 156v°; 95 col.2, 'palatinumque domicilium incredibili oppressione universalis ecclesie contra domini beneplacitum construxerunt.'

4. F. Ehrle, De Historia Palatii Romanorum Pontificum Avenionensis, Rome, 1890, p.700, note 3.

5. F. Ehrle, Historia Bibliothecae Romanorum Pontificum tum Bonifatianae tum Avenionsensis. tom.I. Rome, 1890. [Bibliotheca dell' Accademia Storico-Guiridica. vol.7] pp.665-6. (tom.II of this work never appeared).

6. E. Müntz, "Notice sur quelques artistes avignonnais du pontificat de Benoit XII" in Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France, pp.111-120. Paris, 1886. pp.114-5.

unsettled for any great schemes to be made. Three hundred officials received their 'prebendae' in the Curia, that is, lived in the Palace,[1] but the scriptors do not seem to have been among their number.[2] Nicolas had his own house or lodgings outside the vast fortress,[3] and must thus have enjoyed some measure of independence. The Cardinals too had their 'livrées' in the town, great palaces where they kept state only a little less imposing than that of the Pope himself.[4]

The Avignonese papacy had always been remarkable for its prosperity,[5] and this continued to be so even under the troubled pontificate of Clement VII.[6] After Benedict's reform of the rather confused financial system, money became even more plentiful,[7] and the high rate of wages for which Avignon had always been famous was fully maintained.[8] The presence of the Popes, who were great

---

1. E. Müntz, "L'Argent et le luxe à la cour pontificale d'Avignon" in Revue des Questions Historiques, Nouvelle série. Vol.22. (1899) p.41.

2. Ibid. pp.36-41, gives six fourteenth century Registers of personnel.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXVI.

4. Müntz, "L'Argent et le luxe ..." p.43.

5. Ibid. p.13.

6. Ibid. p.18.

7. Ibid. p.20.

8. Ibid. pp.29-30. Varying from 40 florins a year for a laundress, to 300 for the Chancellor.

patrons had attracted some of the finest craftsmen in Europe, gold and silversmiths, jewellers, painters and embroiderers.[1] The famous Avignonese embroidery was used profusely, not only on church vestments and other clothes, but for furniture, hangings and coverings of all kinds and even on saddle-cloths for the horses.[2] Benedict himself was a great patron of the jewellers, ordering a multitude of chalices and other vessels,[3] and ~~even~~ on one occasion, a fine gold harness set with eighty-one enamelled plaques for his mule.[4] Magnificent fêtes were held for important visitors,[5] but even in normal times, the whole of Avignon ministered to the Pope and the mighty Cardinals, and life was spectacular.

It was also cultured.[6] Benedict was not only a Doctor of Laws with an agile and subtle mind, but had in addition, a keen and enlightened interest in the classics, as his development of the papal library alone, sufficiently

---

1. Müntz, "Notice sur quelques artistes avignonnais," pp.111-5.
2. Müntz, "L'Argent et le luxe ... " p.391.
3. Müntz, "Notice sur quelques artistes avignonnais," p.112 , and note 1.
4. Ibid. pp.111-2.
5. Müntz, "L'Argent et le luxe..." p.395.
6. Müntz, "L'Argent et le luxe..." p.405.

shows. The library continued, of course, to be mainly ecclesiastical in character, but many of the scholastic philosophies and biblical commentaries which had made up the collection of Urban V were eliminated; the manuscripts of St. Thomas Aquinas, for instance, were reduced from about a hundred to a mere dozen. At the same time, the classical section was greatly expanded;[1] we know of one rare manuscript which was actually acquired through the good offices of Nicolas. The librarian asked him in the course of conversation, if he had ever seen a copy of the letters of the Younger Pliny, and, remembering Gontier's text, Nicolas felt safe in affirming that his friend would have a copy made 'non modo libenter, verum etiam glorianter'.[2] Not only the Latin classics, but the Latin works of the Italian humanists Petrarch, Boccaccio and Salutati were represented in Benedict's collection, and even more remarkably, Dante's Divina Commedia in Italian.[3]

As his librarian, Benedict had appointed a man of

---

1. M. Faucon, La Librairie des Papes d'Avignon. 2 vols., Paris, 1886. [Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. fasc. 43]. vol.I. p.85.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXVII.

3. Faucon, op.cit. I. p.85.

whom he was particularly fond, Franciscus de Rovira,[1] a secular priest, and, according to Nicolas, who knew him well, a keen lover of letters, although he was not himself a great stylist.[2] Under his administration, the papal library developed for the first time into something more than a private collection; it became a curial library, accessible to scholars and high officials of the court as well as to the Pope and his intimate friends.[3]

Several of the Cardinals also are known to have had humanist interests, for instance the Italians, Nicolas Brancaccio, the brothers Thoma and Bonifacio degli Ammanati[4] and Nicolas' friend Galeotto di Pietramala, and three French Cardinals, Pierre de Thurey,[5] Amadée de Saluces[6] and

---

1. Ehrle, Historia Bibliothecae, p.739. This was one of the few exceptions to the usual practice of appointing Augustinian Hermits. (Ibid. p.741).

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXVII.

3. Ehrle, Historia Bibliothecae, p.126. cf. Similar development of the royal library in the time of Charles V.

4. Verses addressed to these three by Moccia are listed by Coville in Gontier et Pierre Col, p.238, and notes, 1,2,3.

5. Addressed in verse by Moccia, Ibid. p.242 and note 3.

6. Correspondent of Jean de Montreuil (A. Thomas, op.cit. p.35-6); Addressed in verse by Moccia (Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col, p.242 and note 3).

Antoine Chalant.[1] It seems however most likely that the keenest humanists were the group of which Galeotto was the leader, and which was composed of less august personnages, among them Nicolas, his friend and colleague Jean Muret,[2] the Italian poet Giovanni Moccia, and Laurent de Premierfait, all minor officials at the Curia.

The centre of the Curia was, of course, the Pope himself. Of noble Aragonese family, his pride, his will and his courage were inflexible, but his manner could be disarmingly gracious and he was of a quite unscrupulous resourcefulness in diplomacy. Nicolas shows him to have been both indulgent and affectionate,[3] but he seems, at the same time, to have been too self-contained and too subtle to inspire great personal loyalty in his followers. To Nicolas, whom loved,[4] he was however, a shining example to a wicked

---

1. Correspondent of Jean de Montreuil (Ampl.Coll.II. Ep. of Jean de Montreuil no.IX), A. Thomas, op.cit. p.36, notes 5 and 6, gives references to 2 unedited letters addressed to him by Jean.

2. Nicolas was corresponding with him before he went to Avignon. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.VIII.
A. Thomas, op.cit. p.38, thinks that a letter of Jean de Montreuil's bemoaning Nicolas' loss, and recommending him to a friend at the Curia, may be addressed to Muret. (Ampl.Coll. II. Ep.LX).

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIV. 'quantum enim me Pontifex ille amore dilexerit, quam benigne, quam suaviter, quam indulgenter tractaverit, longum ess et dicere.'

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CIV 'me enixe et chare diligebat.'

generation, Christ's Vicar on earth and the most acceptable to God of all mankind;[1] this confidence in Benedict's legitimacy and his virtue was a factor of the first importance in shaping the course of Nicolas' life.

One of the most outstanding figures at the Curia, was a somewhat incongruous one - Benedict's Spanish Confessor and at this time his staunch supporter, the great Mendicant preacher, Vincent Ferrier.[2] Remarkable for his virtue, sincerity and his burning eloquence, he made a great impression on Nicolas, who rejoiced to have known so saintly a man, and claimed to have had experience of his miraculous 'gift of tongues'.[3]

At first, Nicolas was happy at Avignon; he had many friends, and the most powerful of them, Cardinal Galeotto,

---

1. 'Expositio super Ysayam.' Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal no.137. fols. 4v°, 29v°, 32v°, 36v° and passim. (Vide infra p. 199).

2. A short account of his life and work is given by A. Bayle '<u>Vie de St. Vincent Ferrier</u>', Paris, 1855, a more comprehensive and detailed history by H. Fages in '<u>Histoire de Saint Vincent Ferrier</u>', 2 vols. Paris, 1901.

3. <u>Opera</u>, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXIII is a description of the powers and personality of St. Vincent Ferrier. Bayle, <u>op.cit.</u> p.89, suggests that his 'gift of tongues' can be explained by the fact that he spoke a type of Provençal dialect which could be understood equally well in Spain, Southern France and Northern Italy. This would not, however, account for the fact that, according to Nicolas, even Germans had immediate comprehension of his speech.

had done much to smoothe his official path, presenting him to the Pope, by whom he was most graciously received, and commending him to the Cardinals. He had repeated in person the request for Nicolas' friendship made in his first letter, and had demonstrated the sincerity of his avowals by introducing his new friend to his own circle, and showing him round his library,[1] in the 'livrée' of which some few traces still remain in the street which bears Galeotto's name to this day.[2] Even the irksomeness of regular routine work, to which, with all a humanist's fastidiousness, he had claimed to be unable to discipline himself,[3] was mitigated by Benedict's consideration and indulgence.[4]

From the time when the project of Nicolas' taking office at the curia had first been broached, there had, however, been one dissentient voice. Jean de Montreuil was certainly not among the friends who had persuaded him to go to Avignon, and no sooner had he arrived at the Curia, than Jean wrote to him questioning the prudence of the move, and in spite of

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XII, an appreciation of Galeotto written after his death.

2. Or at least in 1907. F. Digonnet, Le Palais des Papes d'Avignon, Avignon, 1907, p.335, note.1.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.IV. 'nec affectus et passiones animi ad diversa trahentes atque impellentes pro arbitrio possum regere atque frenare'; also Ep.XIV.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIV. (Vide supra p. 82 note 3.).

the fact that Nicolas was 'ut facile tibi est' prolific in his explanations, announcing ominously 'Ditiores hinc aliqui, multique pauperiores redire visi sunt, meliores a me nulli.'[1]

Indeed, before many months had passed, Nicolas himself had conceived a great distaste for the whole machinery and personnel of the Curia. Even his unqualified admiration for Benedict XIII did not blind him to the fact that grave abuses had been introduced into the papacy by the unwarranted extension of their privileges by earlier popes, a result, he thought, of their overweening pride and irresponsibility, as being answerable to no man.[2] He disapproved entirely of the centralized system of taxation which was ruining clergy and people to the benefit of the papacy alone,[3] and of the corruption which had destroyed all ecclesiastical justice by converting it into a source of revenue, recognizing with distress how gravely this abuse penalised and hampered the poor, whatever the merits of their causes.[4] No disinterested observer could have failed to be impressed by the contrast between the magnificence of the Curia and the poverty and dilapidation of many of the town and village churches

---

1. Unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.32r°. 'Versanti mihi frater ... '

2. 'De Ruina et Reparacione Ecclesiae,' Latin text published by Coville in Le Traité de la Ruine de l'Eglise et la traduction française de 1564, Paris, 1936. pp.111-156. p.117.

3. Ibid. Chapters 6-9, pp.118-20.

4. Ibid. Chapters 10-12, pp.121-2.

throughout France.[1] He disapproved of the relations of earlier Popes,[2] particularly of Clement VII,[3] with the secular princes, and highly commended Benedict's uncompromising refusal to be moved by their interference and their violence.[4]

Again, to Nicolas, whose whole life so far had been spent in the open society of the University of Paris, where intellectual pre-eminence was the chief, if not the only claim to consideration, the strict hierarchical system at the Curia must have been doubly trying. He, whose popularity and success had previously been disturbing to his own modest nature[5] was now obliged to conduct himself in conformity with his humble official position, to restrain his speech, and to mask his feelings,[6] all of which was quite foreign

---

1. H. Denifle, La Désolation des Eglises, Monastères et Hopitaux en France pendant la guerre de Cent Ans. 2 vols. Paris, 1897-9: vol.I. Documents relating to the middle of the fifteenth century. Vol.II. pt.2. Denifle's discussion of conditions in the decade before the death of Charles V.

2. 'De Ruina', chap.18, Traité, pp.125-6.

3. Ibid. Chap.42. p.149.

4. Ibid. Chap.42. p.150.

5. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIX. (Vide supra p. 71-2).

6. It was actually in connection with the princely and royal courts that he wrote 'qui in lingua et fronte animum gesto, qui rudis et parum Curialis, adulari, insidiari, vento pascere, tempore servire nescio, qui ridere dentibus, plaudere gestibus, ulnis amplecti, facetiis uti non novi'. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIV. He thought that the Papal Curia was less corrupt, but that all courts suffered from similar defects.

to his essentially straightforward and candid nature.[1]

His severest criticisms of the Curia were directed against the Cardinals, whom he had quickly learned to hate with great bitterness. stigmatizing above all their intolerable pride and cupidity. They, whose office was originally one of the most menial in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, had, he said developed into fit models for the maker of an image of pride 'superbi simulacrum'; they had become accustomed to call Bishops 'episcopellos' and to treat Archbishops and Patriarchs with only a little less contempt.[2] Their cupidity was having disastrous results in the Church, since their fantastic pluralities, even up to four hundred benefices, fostered simony,[3] while the very occurrence and prolongation of the schism was to be attributed to their greedy self-interest.[4]

Till the end of 1398, the sacred college was made up of the twenty Cardinals who had elected Benedict.[5] Of

---

1. Unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.102v° 'Verum tota ferat ...' Jean looks forward with pleasure to 'spiritus illius candidissimi veras audire voces.'

2. 'De Ruina'. Chap.13. in Traité, pp.122-3.

3. Ibid. Chap.14-5. pp.123-4.

4. Ibid. Chap.16. p.125. 'Quis nesciat feram, truculentissimam, omnia exterminantem consumentem, profligantem sectionis scilicet scismata horrendam pestem per nequitiem Cardinalium in Ecclesie gremium invectam, fertam, anctam, propagatam, inveteratam.'

5. F. Ehrle, 'Aus den Acten des Afterconcils von Perpignan,' (publication of documents) in Archiv - für Litteratur-und Kirchen Geschichte. V. (1889) p.401. These documents contain lists of Cardinals at various different dates.

their number, many were related either to Benedict's predecessors in the papacy, or to secular princes; nine of the thirteen French Cardinals were noblemen.[1] Most of these great ecclesiastics were ambitious and worldly, few if any noted for their piety. The lower ranks of curial officials, also, Nicolas mentions with distaste. In spite of all his condemnations, he insisted that the Curia, far from being more corrupt than the princely and royal courts, was less so,[2] however, when one considers what he thought of the secular courts,[3] this praise is faint indeed.

To increase his dissatisfaction, Cardinal Galeotto died at Vienne in Spring 1398,[4] greatly to the distress of his humanist friends; Muret, Moccia, Laurent de Premierfait and Nicolas all wrote elegies,[5] none of which, unfortunately appear to have survived. The humanist circle at Avignon seems never to have recovered from the loss of its leader.

---

1. F. Duchesne, Histoire de tous les Cardinaux Français de naissance, 2 vols. Paris, 1660. The Cardinals of 1398 appear in vol.I between pages 578 and 716.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep. XIV.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XVIII.

4. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col, p.178, says that Galeotto died in 1398-9, but it must have been early in the year, since it was evidently before Nicolas fell ill. Nicolas reports the death of his friend in Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.XII.

5. Ibid. Ep.XII.

Thus Nicolas had already been disillusioned by life at the Curia, when circumstances combined to give him a few years' respite. Benedict's relations with the French court had been steadily deteriorating throughout the spring and summer of 1398 and the threatened subtraction of French obedience was becoming increasingly imminent. Nicolas, who saw the only prospect of ending the schism in a meeting between the Popes, apparently strove to avert the break by letters to the great, including one to Charles VI himself,[1] but his efforts were, not surprisingly, to no avail. The subtraction of obedience was made on the 27th July;[2] it was not till the 1st September however, that it was published on the bridge at Avignon, by a herald accompanied by a special Royal Commissioner who warned all French priests to return to France on pain of losing their benefices. Seventeen rebel Cardinals abandoned Benedict and crossed the Rhône to Villeneuve on the following day, and a great exodus of curial officials of every rank began.[3]

Thus it happened that the Papacy and the French monarchy, to both of which Nicolas owed obedience, came into direct and open conflict. Nicolas' position was further

---

1. These letters have not survived, but Nicolas refers to them in Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIII and XVII.

2. Valois, op.cit. III. p.189.

3. Ibid. III. p.191.

embarrassed by the fact that the revenues from his benefices in France, which probably constituted the whole of his income, were menaced. Nicolas' account of how he came to leave the Curia is not very explicit. In the early summer of 1398, he had fallen desperately ill of plague, which had been rampant in Avignon since the previous autumn, but which he had escaped by a characteristically conscientious obedience to his doctor's orders. However, when the epidemic began to slacken, he neglected his precautions, and so became a victim. His life was despaired of, his death rumoured, and one young friend, an attendant of Moccia, wrote an elegy forthwith.[1] However, he was saved by the continual ministrations of Benedict's own Majorcan doctor, whom the Pope had sent to tend him.[2] Just as he was beginning to recover, he was provided with the Treasurership of Langres Cathedral,[3] where he was already a canon.[4] While still convalescent, he hastily

---

1. Nicolas gives a report on his illness in Opera, ed. Lydius. XVI. He gives the name of the young man as Appulus Lucas.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXVII.

3. Ibid. Ep.XVI; Valois, op.cit. III. p.271. note 1. gives a reference to Arch. du Vatican. Reg. Avenion. XXVII. Benedicti XIII. fol.191r°, dated 22 June 1398. This corrects Coville's statement, Recherches, p.285, note 4 that Nicolas held the treasury from 1397 (referring to the Matricule of the Chapter at Langres).

4. Vide p.75,note 2.

acknowledged the elegy, and left Avignon, to be received into his new benefice shortly afterwards.[1] Coville has interpreted this to mean that he left Avignon at the end of June, or early in July,[2] but the reason which he himself gave for his departure, that the situation in Avignon was becoming menacing,[3] would seem to indicate a considerably later date.

Since the Pope was not prepared to cede voluntarily, an attempt was made to compel him by force, to do so; on 5th September, Marshal Boucicaut, with his armed bands, launched a vigorous attack on Avignonese territory.[4] Nicolas' statements suggest that he narrowly escaped the attack 'me inde saeva tempestas abripuit'[5] and 'cum recenti illius loci naufragio cum morbo pariter exemptus, ad hanc urbem incolumis evasi.'[6] It seems on the whole most likely that he did not leave Avignon till after the publication of 1st September,[7]

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XVI. He felt obliged to make reply to the elegy 'ne laudes illas viderer silentio amplecti.'

2. Traité, p.36.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIV, XV.

4. Digonnet, op.cit. p.339.

5. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIV.

6. Ibid. Ep.XV.

7. Convalescence from an illness so severe as his had been could certainly have lasted for two months.

and that he was not uninfluenced by fear of losing his newly acquired benefice.

Although Nicolas had thus obeyed the royal decrees to the detriment of his obligations to the Pope, whose excommunication of the King of France he deprecated and ignored, on principle, he had the greatest possible objection to the policy of subtraction, which, he believed, could have no effect on the powers granted by God to the Pope. He still believed voluntary cession to be legitimate, but his opinions had undergone a distinct change from the days when he had exhorted Benefict to perform his duty to the Church, regardless of the procrastinations of Urbanist policy.[1] He no longer regarded the single cession of Benedict as a possible solution to the problem of uniting the Church, since, he now said even if the Avignonese Pope had been able to reconcile his own following to such a course, the position of the Roman obedience had still to be considered. Nicolas believed that the only practicable resource was to secure a meeting between the two Popes, which essential meeting could only be hindered and prevented by the French policy of subtraction[2] - yet another point in its disfavour.

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.II, and the letters written in the name of the University (vide supra p. 64).

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XVII.

His earlier opposition to the subtraction of obedience had not passed unnoticed in France, and on his return, he was, as he reported to the Pope, made the victim of an unpleasant amount of persecution for his unpopular views.[1] It is possible that he did not go straight to Langres from Avignon,[2] but his movements cannot be followed in any detail. Very soon after he had left the Curia, and perhaps before he settled at Langres, Nicolas wrote a long letter to Benedict,[3] explaining the situation in which he was placed, in a tone which is neither humble nor apologetic, and asking for advice. Despite his faith in the legitimacy of Benedicts' right to the Papacy, there was, apparently, no question in his mind of an immediate return to Avignon, a possibility which he does not so much as mention, although a letter written only slightly later shows that he regarded his absence as a purely temporary exile.[4] The problem which occupied his attentions when he wrote the letter to Benedict XIII was a less fundamental one. He was in some doubt as to whether he was obliged on principle, to continue to criticize the subtraction of obedience in his writings. This, he said, he could only

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XIII.
2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XIII is not place-dated, and the persecution to which he refers obviously took place before he went to Langres. Vide Infra p. 96.
3. Ibid. loc.cit.
4. Ibid. Ep.XIX.

do to his own great personal risk, and, whereas he was ready and willing to suffer persecution in a case of absolute certainty, the disagreement of learned men on the subject of the schism gave him misgivings. He protested that if he were in error in adopting this attitude, it was through ignorance and not through mental blindness, but he shrank with repugnance from the idea of emulating those who, with insane self-confidence, tried to impose their own judgments on others. He then proceeded to discuss the evils resultant from the subtraction at some length, and finally brought the long letter to a conclusion with a not particularly well-chosen exhortation to Benedict to do all that he could to promote union, and meanwhile, to endure his misfortunes as an exercise in virtue.[1]

Nicolas was, in fact involved in the dilemma in which all French ecclesiastics were placed, as a result of the extension by the Kings of France of the ordinary prerogatives of monarchy into a quasi-spiritual sphere, which was irreconcilable with the rights of the papacy when the two were in disagreement. Unlike some of his compatriots, Nicolas had not a sufficiently closely defined conception of the obedience owed to each, to afford a rule of conduct, consequently, throughout life, he was to find himself in a series of awkward situations, in which his actions do not

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XIII.

always seem to be perfectly consistent with his theories.[1]

If Nicolas' position seems somewhat equivocal on this occasion, it was no more so than that of d'Ailly who also had done his best to avert the subtraction, but in the last resort, regretfully accepted it.[2] There was really nothing that a person of Nicolas' minor importance could usefully do at the Curia when relations between France and the Papacy had been broken off, and for whatever reasons, his mind was quite made up on the subject of remaining away from Avignon while the subtraction lasted. There is no reason to suppose that his own explanation of his obvious disinclination to continue the controversy in writing, was any other than an honest one. Although his apparent indecision and lack of self-confidence sound strangely unconvincing in this context, they were features of his very individual character; the argument that to attempt to impose one's opinions on others was to be guilty of a pride akin to insanity, reappears in a letter written several years later, without any reference to his personal action.[3] Although under certain circumstances he had no objection to expounding his own views with a great deal of vigour, he was not by

---

1. His theory of the relationship between the King of France and the Church is more fully discussed in Chapter V.

2. Salembier, op.cit. p.155.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XVII.

temperament an effective partisan or controversialist, even when he had full confidence in his own opinion. It is not clear what was his decision on the subject of his moral obligation to expound his views, but it is perhaps significant that during this period, his writings are for the most part devoted to the general state of the Church rather than to the Schism in particular.

Nicolas' own friends, at least, were relieved to hear of his escape from the twofold danger of Avignon, and Jean de Montreuil wrote in delighted anticipation of seeing him ... 'etsi diu nimis desideratissima carere tua sinisti presentia, presertim posteaquam bis ab orchi vestibulo, quo tecum multos anxietate traxisses, nobis incolumis redditus est.'[1] However, the two apparently did not meet before Nicolas went to Langres.[2]

He was delighted by his reception here, and settled down very happily into what was evidently both an honourable and a fruitful benefice 'praeclare autem et fructuose atque honorifice mihi in hac urbe divina providit clementia.'[3] He was in better health, and much comforted by the thought

---

1. Unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin 13062. fol.102v° 'Verum tota ferat ... '

2. They had not met when Nicolas wrote Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XVI, his first letter from Langres.

3. Ibid. Ep.XVI; Ep.XIX 'beneficium liberum et valde honestum in Ecclesia huius urbis habeo.'

that, in accordance with the divine plans, he had been siezed from the jaws of death, and provision made that he might return not 'inops et vacuus' to his native land. He had a pleasant house of his own, and a modest competence which more than satisfied him, since living was fortunately very cheap 'vilissimo pretio universa veneunt.'[1] He proudly invited Jean de Montreuil to visit 'mea regna',[2] and it was perhaps, after some such visit that Jean wrote to another friend in enthusiastic terms '... me scito illum singularem et electissimum virum de Clamengiis visitasse. Quo cum degere paulominus est quam cum angelo conversari.'[3]

Since his duties were nominal[4] and he was under no other obligations, Nicolas now felt that he was able, for the first time, to lead the peaceful literary life he had always wanted.[5] The only drawbacks were the climate, which he did not find very healthy, particularly in winter,[6] and an acute shortage of books.[7] However, neither of these

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XIX; Ep.XVIII '.. ita oeconomus sum, hoc est custos aut incola domus propriae.'

2. Ibid. Ep.XX.

3. Ampl.Coll. II. Ep. of Jean de Montreuil, XLIII.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XVIII 'Bonum me esse scito oeconomum, et talem quidem oeconomum qualem thesaurarium, ut enim verbo thesaurarius, non re vel thesauro ....'

5. Ibid. Ep.XIV. 'Sine me, quod semper optavi ... legendi praeterea et subinde scribendi officio, dum fas fuerit, indulgere.'

6. Ibid. Ep.XIX.

7. Ibid. Ep.XXXII.

was serious enough to make it difficult for him to refuse Jean de Montreuil's demands that he should return to Paris, and various attempts which were made to draw him into official positions at the royal and princely courts[1] '... nec solum lectioni in loco isto tranquillius vaco, verum etiam stylo, Nam quamvis parvi sunt ponderis que litteris mandare valeo, magna mihi tamen est voluptas illa conscribere.'[2]

Gontier[3] and Jean de Montreuil[4] both tried to supplement his reading matter, but finally he found himself thrown back, for the first time on the serious study of the Scriptures, 'sed consolatur me sacrae litterae, ad quos tandem post oratoriam poeticamque lectionem, me confero.'[5] Presumably he had to rely very largely on the Chapter library, which would have been almost exclusively ecclesiastical in character, since he obviously had not discovered the classical treasures which Poggio later unearthed at Langres.[6]

It was perhaps partly as a result of his studies in the Scriptures during this period that his preoccupations gained a new solemnity. He was already beginning to reproach

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XIV (written on the occasion of a visit to Châlons) and XIX.

2. Ibid. Ep.XIX.

3. Letter of Nicolas published by Coville in Recherches, p.309.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XX.

5. Ibid. Ep.XXVIII.

6. Vide supra p. 42 note 1.

Jean de Montreuil with triviality and levity, disparaging his studies as unsuitable to his years, and urging him not to put forth mere 'folia verborum'[1] but to engage on some serious work, and even Jean's suggestion that he should go to Paris, so that they might read 'Moralia' together, seemed insufficiently sober to him, 'iam tempus est ut alteri lectioni, utiliori ac salubriori incumbam, quae priscas me doceat vanitates exuere.'[2] These and other reproaches Jean supported as he might, but he refused to be impressed, 'Desine ergo a me que non possum, et ut verius dicam, que nescio aut que scribere non iuvat prestolari.'[3]

Nicolas now viewed the situation in Church and State less with hope than with forebodings for the future, and in spite of the material blessings which he enjoyed, and which gave him such real satisfaction, the prospect of impending ruin destroyed his happiness and peace of mind 'merito in Domino gaudere deberem, nisi gravissima Reipublicae vulnera, quam perire videmus, et funditus everti, gaudium omne ab animo excluderet.....'[4] In 1401, he develops for the first time a conception which was later to be of fundamental importance in his interpretation of the events of the schism and the destiny of humankind - the idea of divine retribution and the active affliction of Church and State as

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.X. (written from Avignon).
2. Ibid. Ep.XIX.
3. Unpublished letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl.Nat.Latin 13062. fol.103r°, 'Plures sunt et pretii digniores ....'
4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XV.

a punishment and a purification for sin.[1]

This was one of the most prolific periods of his life; he not only engaged in extensive private correspondence, but addressed important letters offering exhortations and advice to the great, and composed longer works in the form of treatises. It was probably during Summer 1399 that he was asked by d'Ailly to write for him 'consolatoriam aliquam epistolam super Ecclesie desolatione quam nostri vident oculi.' Nicolas complied in a rather short letter, written he says, 'in sterili mentis arena', but concluded by offering to deal with the subject at greater length if it were required, 'si quid ad hanc rem pertinens melius habes, mihi vicissim communicare non graveris.'[2] Apparently d'Ailly did request a fuller treatment, because Nicolas now preceeded to discuss the subject of the corruption of the church in the treatise for which he is chiefly known, the 'De Corrupto Ecclesiae Statu' or more properly 'De Ruina et Reparacione Ecclesiae', written at the end of 1400 or early 1401.[3]

He exposes the corruption and cupidity of every rank of the clergy, exempting by name from the general condemnation,

---

1. 'De Ruina' in Coville's Traité. The same theme reappears in Ep.XVII (Opera, ed. Lydius) written in 1402.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXIX.

3. De Ruina, chap.17. Traité. p.125. Nicolas says that the schism had lasted almost twenty-three years. Coville discusses the date and origin of the treatise, pp.35-43.

only Benedict XIII and d'Ailly himself.[1] He adds somewhat perfunctorily 'Absit denique ut alios quamplures titulatim in Ecclesia preferentes censoria velim nota respergere', but insists that the majority of the evil doers is so vast that many of the good and simple are drawn by the general scorn of righteousness into bad ways, 'vix inter mille unus reperiatur qui id quod sua professio exigit sinceriter faciet.'[2] He concludes that the Church's suffering in the schism is its own desserts for its loss of humility, and ends with an invocation to Christ to afflict it still further, that by the extirpation of the decadent stock, the vineyard might be saved.[3] A comparison of this work with d'Ailly's treatise on the same subject 'De squaloribus Ecclesiae Romanae' or 'De Reformatione Ecclesiae'[4] illustrates the difference in outlook between the two men. D'Ailly's is evidently the more speculative, the more inventive brain, but his vision, though the more optimistic, was perhaps the less realistic and the less profound of the two.

A second treatise, also the outcome of earlier correspondence, was addressed to Gerson; this was the 'De Praesulibus Simonaicis' stigmatizing clerical simony, more

---

1. 'De Ruina'. chap.39. Traité, p.144.
2. Traité, chap.39. p.145.
3. Ibid. chap.43-8. pp.151-6.
4. De Reformatione Ecclesiae ed. W. Weissenburger. Basle, 1551.

culpable than the sin of Simon Magus, who was, after all, only a layman, as the source of all the evil in the Church.[1] These treatises, though perfectly orthodox in the early fifteenth century, when all serious Churchmen fulminated against clerical abuses, were in later centuries repudiated by the Catholic Church, and read with enthusiasm by the early Protestant reformers,[2] a result which would have staggered the author.

Nicolas' active interest in the classics and his preoccupation with style were not, however, entirely submerged by these more serious considerations for some years to come, at least till the end of the Avignon period. He continued, in spite of his reproaches, to correspond with Jean de Montreuil on questions of style,[3] and to be regarded by his friend as the great authority on latinity. Jean de Montreuil twice at least, sent him works for correction and criticism.[4]

Nicolas' literary activity was, however, not entirely uninterrupted. In October or November of 1400, the plague came to Langres, with the result that half of the canons,

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius, pp.160-6, the outcome of Ep.IX, written from Avignon,on the corruption of Bishops.

2. Vide Appendix I. p.255-6.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXIII; Ampl. Coll. Letters of Jean de Montreuil, Ep.XV; unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil published by A. Thomas, op.cit. p.102.

4. Letter of Jean de Montreuil published by A. Thomas, op.cit. p.30; unedited letter, Bibl. Nat. Latin, 13062. fol.34v°, 'Audiveram et fama fuit .... '

Nicolas among them, withdrew from the town. With several canons and other friends he went to Faverolles, a village almost surrounded by woods, some eight miles removed from Langres. Here they passed the time as pleasantly as possible, hunting, hawking, exploring the countryside on horseback, visiting the villages from which they drew their revenues, and interviewing their bailiffs.[1]

Probably even before this, Nicolas had become involved in a dispute with the newly arrived Dean of the Chapter, Henri de Savoisy, a member of that turbulent and powerful family to which Charles de Savoisy, leader of many famous raids on English coasts and shipping also belonged. By 1401, there was a law-suit between them;[2] it is not possible to tell what was the point at issue, but it is evident that Henri had encroached in some way on what Nicolas regarded as his manifest right. The suit took up much of his time in 1401, and severely curtailed the correspondence in which he took such pleasure, but he apparently felt it to be a point of honour to resist the aggression, 'pacis amicus et litium fugitans, malo tamen iis aliquantisper impediri, quam sinere mea apertissima iura, contra propriam conscientiam, deperire.'[3]

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXIV. This is the only occasion such sports are mentioned in Nicolas' letters, but from his casual reference, one can only assume that this was not his first introduction to them. He presumably always travelled on horseback.

2. This suit is mentioned in four of Nicolas' letters, Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.XXI, and Coville's Recherches, p.297, 306 and 309.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXI.

He was obliged to engage the services of two legal advisers, at great cost, and sustained only by his confidence in the legitimacy of his cause, but in spite of everything, his case was prejudiced by the evil machinations of his enemies, who contrived 'tamquam patroni et advocati' to circumvent the tribunal, 'dici non potest ... quanta in meam perniciem, veritatisque obnubilaccionem machinas, cautelas, cavillaciones, frivolas protelaciones, versutissimas insidias excogitaverunt.' Nicolas was naturally unwilling to allow justice to be thwarted in this manner, and appealed for aid to Gontier, whose family was powerful in Sens, whither the case had been taken.[1] It is possible that it was finally taken to Paris, since Nicolas is known to have made at least one visit during this period.[2] His activity in the case was probably ended by 1402, and though the upshot is unknown, Nicolas gave up both his canonry and the Treasurership in 1404.[3] Perhaps personal experience had combined with observation to give him his very low opinion of ecclesiastical justice. Nicolas' discomfiture in 1401 was great, his plan of life was disrupted by the suit, and in addition, during the winter, he was

---

1. Letter published by Coville in Recherches, p.306.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.XXXII, is written from Paris.

3. Coville, Recherches, p.286, note 4, refers to the Matricule du Chapitre de Langres. Bibliothèque de Langres, no.54. On fol.25 Nicolas' name has been erased from the list and replaced by that of Hugo de Spina.

incapacitated by rheumatism, 'gravis ac diuturna impotencia reumatice raucedinis,'[1] from which he suffered a good deal in the moist air of Langres.[2]

By 1402, the manifest failure of the subtraction of obedience was beginning to react in favour of Benedict,[3] and Nicolas, as he always did when there was any prospect of a good result, rejoined the conflict. In this year, he wrote a very long letter to Charles VI, pointing out that the subtraction of obedience, against which he had unsuccessfully tried to warn him, had been a dismal failure, and indicating the restitution as the first, and essential step towards unity in the Church.[4] The fulfilment of his wishes was, in fact, precipitated by Benedict's escape from Avignon to Châteaurenard on the night of 11th-12th March 1403.[5] During May the papal court was established in complete liberty in the Abbaye de St. Victor at Marseilles,[6] and the restitution of French obedience followed on the 30th.[7] The

---

1. Letter published by Coville in Recherches, p.309.
2. Vide supra p. 97.
3. Valois. op.cit. III. pp.257-79.
4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XVII.
5. Valois, op.cit. III. pp.325-6.
6. Ibid. III. p.371.
7. Ibid. III. p.339.

Cardinals completed the formalities of their submission some six weeks later.[1]

The exact date of Nicolas' return to the curia is not known, but it is most likely that with characteristic respect for the royal edicts, he did not leave Langres before June 1403. There is no trace of him at Avignon before the summer,[2] although he is known to have proceeded directly there,[3] before joining the personal attendance of the Pope. A letter to his young friend Jacques de Nouvion, written the day after his arrival, recounts how, after settling his affairs at Langres, he had set out, and had reached Avignon after a safe journey, by way of Lyons and Vienne, entertained on part of the journey by the gruesome tales of a fellow-traveller.[4]

During the years 1403-8, Nicolas communicates very little of his activities. It may be that his correspondence continued unabated, but that he preferred to omit from the edition of his letters which he prepared, the evidences of a connection which was to end with the severest crisis of his life. At the same time, it may be that owing to pressure

---

1. Ibid. III. p.344, i.e. 16th July.

2. Coville, Recherches, p.249, note 5, refers to the Vatican Archives. His first signature in Summer 1404 seems to be in Vatic. Reg. Aven. no.308 (Ben.XIII. t.XXXI) fol.11ro, 17th June, at Marseilles.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXIII.

4. Ibid. loc. cit.

of business or to discretion, the letters written at this time were fewer and less interesting than many written before and after. The small number of those that have survived,[1] and their almost invariable shortness and triviality, make it very difficult to reconstruct the events of his life, or his reactions to the important developments in the schism which were taking place. There is, however, some very interesting information in the letters of Jean de Montreuil.

Nicolas probably for the most part followed Benedict in his peregrinations round the Riviera coast, but he also spent a certain amount of time in Avignon, where the Pope had a good deal of business,[2] although he never, after his escape, returned there himself. In Avignon, and possibly elsewhere, Nicolas lived with his friend Muret,[3] who had probably, like most of the curial officials, been away during the subtraction of obedience, and returned during the course of the summer.[4] It is to be supposed that he returned to his routine duties, writing letters and signing entries in the papal registers, and that he again enjoyed

---

1. There are 10, Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXIII - XLII.

2. Digonnet, op.cit. p.359.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXVI.

4. Coville, Recherches, p.156. note.3. Muret had been provided with a benefice at Le Mans by 13th May 1398.

the intercourse of his friends at the Curia, including the now aged Moccia, and Franciscus the librarian. Thus his life was probably much what it had been before, except that there was now the added variety of constant changes of scene and quarters, and an increased intensity of atmosphere. For two years, there was perfect co-operation and a closer degree of friendship than ever before between Benedict and the French royal house.[1] There seemed every prospect of the meeting between the two Popes, in which Nicolas had such confidence being arranged, and opinion, both at the Curia and in France, was hopeful.

Nicolas had joined the attendance of the Pope at his headquarters in Marseilles by the middle of June 1403.[2] Soon after, the Duc de Berri arrived on a mission, followed by d'Ailly, who, early in September pronounced an eloquent discourse congratulating and commending the Pope. In November, Gerson also came to Marseilles, and in the same spirit praised Benedict's virtues, abstaining altogether from offering advice on the ending of the schism.[3] Nicolas must have been much gratified by these public utterances, and happy in the opportunity for discussion with his old

---

1. Valois, op.cit. III. p.362.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.XXXIV, XXXV, both written at Marseilles may date from this visit.

3. Valois, op.cit. III. pp.345-9.

friends. He and Muret, with the rest of the Curia moved to Tarascon in December, for the Christmas celebrations. Here the Duc d'Orleans came to meet the Pope,[1] and Gerson again joined the Curia, to preach before the Pope and his court on New Year's Day a sermon which, however, subtly different in tone from his previous utterance, was disquieting in its emphasis on zeal, and its eulogy of the part played in the Schism by the University.[2]

On the occasion of this visit, Nicolas was asked to discuss with Gerson and Muret the advisability of forwarding to Benedict a letter addressed to him by Jean de Montreuil, who had sent it to Nicolas for consideration in conjunction with the other two.[3] The three critics found the letter highly unsuitable, and it was Nicolas' painful duty to have to communicate this judgment to the author, a duty which he performed with characteristic kindness and tact.[4] Jean de Montreuil's reply to this letter exists. He expostulates against Nicolas' advocacy of moderation in such a desperate case, and concludes with a significant piece of advice on

---

1. Op.cit. III. p.354.

2. Ibid. III. pp.417-8.

3. Ibid. III. p.350. note 1. Valois says 'Gerson et Nicolas de Clamanges arretèrent au passage une lettre addressée à Benoit par Jean de Montreuil', but this was evidently with Jean's permission.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXVII. This incident is reminiscent of the occasion on which Nicolas himself had been sufficiently ill advised to forward to friends in Avignon a letter intended for the Pope. (Vide supra p. 68).

Nicolas' own affairs, 'Si amicis deferre vis et simul complacere, cogita de reditu.'[1]

Practically the whole of 1404 was spent by the Pope at Marseilles, where he again established himself in the Abbaye de St. Victor. The death of the Duc de Bourgogne on the 27th April having left Benedict's devoted supporter the Duc d'Orléans paramount,[2] he succeeded in re-establishing all his rights in France intact.[3] He then proceeded confidently to open negotiations with Boniface IX, and when the Roman Pope, who was already dying,[4] declined to arrange a meeting on the ground of ill-health, Benedict took advantage of the opportunity to embark on an active and aggressive policy. He had thus been able to win over some of the Italian cities, and in order to prepare for a campaign which was planned to end in his own triumphal entry to Rome, he set off for Nice at the beginning of December, and travelling by easy stages arrived on the 21st.[5] Nicolas was delighted with the town; the mild climate suited his constitution, and he felt sufficiently light-hearted to write a glowing description

---

1. Unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil, Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.38v°, 'Non vacat tuis extensius ... ' written on the 25th January.

2. Valois, op.cit. III. p.367.

3. Ibid. III. pp.363-6.

4. He died on 1st October 1404, after refusing to forbid the Cardinals to proceed to a new election. Valois, op.cit. III. pp.375-7.

5. Ibid. III. pp.390-400.

'velut jocularium' to Jacques de Nouvion. The season had been so mild that a second crop of grapes had ripened, an offering of which was made to Benedict on Christmas Day. Nicolas wrote that Nice was quite the most agreeable town that he had visited in his travels with the Pope, 'locus iste valde amoenus est, et pro hyberno potissimum tempore peroportunus: nec locum mihi ita acceptum Princeps sacerdotum hactenus ingressus est.'[1]

From now onwards, however, Benedict's position deteriorated fast. Having made his plans, he set sail for Genoa, where he landed on the 16th May 1405. On the 27th June, he reported to Charles VI that the 'intrus', Boniface's successor, Innocent VII was systematically opposing all attempts at union, and appealed for aid.[2] Charles was, however, nervous about the renewal of the policy of the 'voie de fait', and he held back the support upon which Benedict was relying,[3] so that in October, the Pope had to fall back to Savona.[4] During the course of the year, feeling in France turned severely against Benedict, papal taxes[5] had been suppressed,

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXIX.

2. Valois, op.cit. III. p.405.

3. Ibid. III. p.409.

4. Ibid. III. p.415. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.XL, was presumably written from here, although the place is given as Scion in Lydius, either on the occasion of this visit, or on Benedict's subsequent sojourn, from 24 Sept. - 23 Dec. 1407.

5. Papal taxation was particularly strongly resented in France. Even Nicolas had the greatest objection to it. 'De Ruina', Chap.4-9. Traité, pp.117-121.

and there was talk of a new cession. St. Vincent Ferrier, who had returned to the Curia at Nice in 1404, to try and persuade Benedict to resign in the cause of union,[1] left again in Autumn 1405, after a year of unsuccessful endeavour.[2]

For Nicolas too, however agreeable some aspects of life at the Curia might be, the ending of the schism was becoming an increasingly hopeless prospect. There is an indication that he was already preparing for the time when he should leave the Curia in the agitated correspondence which he maintained with Jean de Montreuil throughout 1405, on the subject of a new benefice for himself.[3] He had apparently given up, or lost, the Canonry and Treasurership at Langres, in 1404,[4] and Jean de Montreuil, as a royal secretary, was exerting all his efforts to secure from the King a canonry

---

1. Bayle, op.cit. p.132; Valois, op.cit. III. p.411. He preached at Genoa in July 1405.

2. Bayle, op.cit. p.136.

3. Nicolas' half of this correspondence has not survived, but the letters of Jean de Montreuil give a fairly full account. Ampl. Coll. II. Ep.XIII, XV, XVI, XVII. Unedited letter, Bibl. Nat. Latin, 13062. fol.50r° "A pridem me nosci ...', he says 'tecum pro cantore pepigeram.'

4. Coville, Recherches, p.286, note 4, refers to the Matricule du Chapitre de Langres (vide supra p.104 note 3.); A. Combes, Jean de Montreuil et le Chancelier Gerson. Paris, 1942. [Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale, no.XXXII] p.194 and note 4, p.206, note 1, expresses the belief that Nicolas held the Langres benefice at least till 1412, because there are letters of that year written from Langres. All the evidence seems to be against him: the Langres document, Nicolas' explicit statement in 1408 that he only had one French benefice, and the fact that he had another reason for going to Langres in 1412. (Vide infra p.122. note 5; p.151.).

and the precentorship of Bayeux for his friend.[1] Nicolas was much discouraged by the delays in effecting the resignation of his predecessor, Jean de la Coste, who had been elected Bishop of Chalon-sur-Saône on 5th April 1405, but Jean refused to give up the struggle, and by the end of the year, the benefice fell to Nicolas. Jean at the same time advised Nicolas to apply for a ten-yearly dispensation from residence at Bayeux,[2] which advise he may have taken, since there is no evidence that he ever lived at Bayeux, although he continued to hold the benefice till the end of his life.

Having made these arrangements, Nicolas was actually deciding, during the last months of 1405 and early 1406, to give up a useless position at the Curia, when hope of peace in the Church was renewed by the belief that Gregory XII, newly-elected to succeed Innocent VII, was prepared to accept the 'via cessionis',[3] and negotiations to secure a meeting between the contestants were renewed.[4] Nicolas

---

1. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col, p.85, note 3, assumes that it was the benefice at Langres which Jean de Montreuil had been instrumental in securing for Nicolas. This error is discussed at length by Abbé Combes, op.cit. pp.185-8. The letters of Jean de Montreuil leave the question in no doubt.

2. Letter of Jean de Montreuil, Ampl. Coll. II. Ep.XII.

3. Valois, op.cit. III. pp.481-9.

4. Ibid. III. p.493.

therefore decided to postpone an immediate departure, 'biennio ante illud tempus (i.e. when he actually left) inde discedere constitueram, nisi de unione Ecclesie per contendentium congressionem spes ingesta, illam meam digressionem aliquantisper suspendendo retardasset.'[1] However, neither Pope was really prepared to meet the other, and prospects of bringing the meeting about were soon seen to be very small.

In autumn 1406, a visit from Gerson and d'Ailly was expected at the papal curia, now removed to Nice, but no embassy arrived before the Council of Paris opened on 17th November.[2] The somewhat peevish tones in which Nicolas wrote to Gerson, complaining that constant changes of plan were making French levity a laughing-stock[3] suggest that he was greatly disappointed by their failure to appear at this critical juncture, and perhaps exacerbated by the comments of his Spanish and Italian colleagues.

The same letter gives a vivid picture of life in this curious travelling curia, to which the Pope was becoming increasingly inaccessible. Because there was plague at Nice, where he had been staying, Benedict had established himself with a few of his people in a fortress overlooking the sea, at some distance from the town, and was refusing to see the rest of his staff. The Curia, apparently not similarly

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XLV.
2. Salembier, op.cit. p.195.
3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XLI.

troubled by fear of infection, was taking a holiday, 'ferias itaque agit nostra curia, propter Pontificis absentiam.'[1]

Nicolas' position at the Curia was now becoming ever-increasingly artificial. The failure of every endeavour to arrange a meeting between Benedict and any one of the Roman Popes, had completely alienated French support, and correspondingly French threats of a second subtraction of obedience, did not serve to recommend the nation at the Curia. Thus, Nicolas, and his French colleagues found themselves excluded from the secret councils of the Pope, 'confiteor me secretarium fuisse, sed ita secretarium ut maioribus essem secretis sequestratus.'[2] At the same time, on at least one occasion pressure was brought to bear on him by the Cardinals, to use his influence on behalf of the Pope, in a case which was being tried before the Parlement de Paris; this Nicolas utterly refused to do, saying that he would rather abandon the papal service.[3] His dissatisfaction with the entire situation was expressed in a letter to Jean de Montreuil written from Savona,[4]

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XLI.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XLII.

3. Ibid. loc. cit.

4. This letter has not survived, but it was presumably written between 24 Sept. and 23 Dec. 1407, when Benedict was staying at Savona.

and Jean was somewhat at a loss in trying to offer him comfort 'sed quid per deum atque hominum fidem, frater, scribam, cum in rebus profecto quicquam boni elicere Homeri nesciret ingenium.'[1]

By the beginning of February 1407, a new subtraction of obedience had become almost inevitable; this time Benedict was prepared to do battle, and the situation was very tense. Ordinances pronouncing the neutrality and liberty of the Gallican Church had actually been drawn up and dated on the 18th February 1407,[2] although they were not published for over a year. Similarly, on the 19th May 1407, Benedict had secretly drawn up a bull excommunicating in general terms whoever should withdraw from his obedience,[3] evidently a prepared rejoinder to any hostile action on Charles' part. Tension was now very high, as the preparedness of each party sufficiently indicates.

Nicolas' friends in Paris warned him that an explosion was imminent, and were pressing in their demands that he should leave the Curia. Jean de Montreuil wrote to give him his opinion, that the situation had passed out of control and that he could only injure and afflict himself to no purpose, 'res enim eo perducta est, quod verba perderentur, opera frustra essent ... ' He strongly advised Nicolas to abandon the Curia, and to act upon his

---

1. Unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.101v° 'Impulit me tuis moeris de Savone ....'

2. Valois, op.cit. III. p.495.

3. Ibid. III. p.515.

own frequently expressed scorn of courts, 'Age igitur age frater predilecte, et quod tam crebris repetitionibus litteris quondam tuis inest, de fugiendis spernendisque curiis exegere, quas tu laberintum merito voces et pariter naufragium.'[1] Regnauld des Fontaines also 'hortatu, precibus, vivis interdum vocibus vehementiori instantia' did his best to persuade his friend to dissociate himself from Benedict.[2]

Nicolas however, still felt obliged to support, in his distress, the Pope from whose hand he had received so many benefits.[3] Thus, although he might have taken warning from his experience in 1398, he refused to return to Paris, but contented himself with appealing to Jean de Montreuil in the name of friendship to do what he could for him in the time of trouble.[4]

By February 1408 however, Nicolas' position at the Curia had become so profitless, either to the Pope, perpetually engaged on his secret plans, or to himself, that he returned to Genoa,[5] leaving Benedict and the Curia

---

1. Unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.39r° 'Ne verearis neu pudeat ... '
2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.LIV, Nicolas recalls his persuasions
3. Ibid. Ep.XXXVI. 'Tu scis, me negare non posse quin ab illo cui servio Pontifice, mihi fluxerint multa commoda.'
4. Ibid. Ep.XXXVI. 'per legem te amicitiae obtestor, ut quae ad amici salutem pertinere videris tempestiva oportunitate, insinuare non omittas.'
5. Ibid. Ep.XLV. 'Notum satis est, imo vero apud universos qui Romanam eo tempore Curiam sectabantur, vulgo notorium trimestri me ferme spatio priusquam infaustae illae litterae Parisiis innotescerent ex curia illa excessisse, in urbe lanva constitisse', also Ep.XLIII.

at Porto Venere, pursuing their fruitless negotiations with Gregory XII. The news of his 'eruptionem .... e Babilonia' was a source of great delight to Jean de Montreuil, who wrote him a congratulatory letter, concluding optimistically 'perpulcre libertatis tue via latere reperta.'[1]

It is possible that Nicolas did not, at this stage, intend to make a complete break with Benedict, since he remained at Genoa for three months, employing himself in writing verse in praise of the town,[2] and in condemnation of the Schism,[3] apparently unmindful of the warnings of his friends. It was, perhaps, during these months at Genoa that he wrote a moral story 'Historia cuiusdam rei mirabilis' or 'De Raptoris, Raptaeque Virginis lamentabili exitu,'[4] in which he sets out to indicate that under certain circumstances God would pardon suicide. It is an unpleasant tale, but, he says, a true one; it is somewhat reminiscent of the horror stories told to him on his way to Avignon, all of which he retailed to Jacques de Nouvion as true, and edifying.[5]

---

1. Unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062, fol.50v° 'Eruptionem tuam e Babilonia ... '

2. 'Descriptio et laus urbis Ianuae', published by Coville in Recherches, p.256-9.

3. 'Deploratio calamitates Ecclesie', published by Coville in Recherches, pp.261-4.

4. Published under this title by J. Hommey in Supplementum Patrum, Paris, 1684, p.508. Coville discusses the story, and its many translations and adaptations in Recherches, Chap.V. pp.208-52.

5. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXIII. (Vide supra p. 106).

Probably also in this period was his attempt to get some of his French benefices (apparently he still held more than one) permuted for foreign ones; he was successful in getting a prebend at Cambrai.[1] This was, perhaps, designed as some kind of safeguard in case he should be deprived of his French benefices, which in fact, nearly happened. There is, however, no reason to suppose that he was contemplating permanent residence abroad.[2]

He was much distressed over the state of the Church, but with characteristic caution, carefully omitted all specific mention of the subtraction of obedience[3] - and advisedly, since it happened that his letters to Regnauld des Fontaines and others, were intercepted, and were later made the basis of charges against him.[4] At the same time, he was evidently ill-informed on the subject of the latest developments,[5] which is not perhaps surprising, since

---

1. This incident is not very clear. Nicolas was subsequently accused of attempting to charge all his benefices for foreign ones, (vide infra p. 122) and in his defence says, obviously with reference to attacks which were being similarly made on d'Ailly 'nec prebendam quis Cameracensem possit pro altera regni obtinere, quin de maleficio sit in regnum suspectus.' Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XLIII. Nothing further is known of this benefice.

2. Vide infra p. 125 note 2

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XLIII, 'nulla omnino de subtractione obedientiae mentio habeatur, imo nec verbum subtractionis sit scriptum.' This is the only explicit recognition of a sense of discretion which pervades all his letters. (Vide infra p. 141).

4. Ibid. Ep.XLIII.

5. Ibid. Ep.XLII. Vide infra p. 121.

communications between Charles VII and Benedict seem to have been extraordinarily slow. On the 12th January 1408 Charles wrote to inform both Popes that, if union were not arrived at by the 24th May, France would become neutral,[1] that is, there would be a second subtraction of obedience. Benedict apparently did not receive the royal letters till the middle of April,[2] and when he made reply, on the 18th, it was to enclose the bull of 19th May 1407, excommunicating whoever should withdraw from his allegiance.[3] There was a great outburst of rage in Paris when the contents of these missives became known and on the 15th of May the Parlement de Paris, by royal order, published the decrees defining the liberties of the Gallican Church,[4] thus incurring ipso facto the penalties prescribed in the papal bull. The bull itself was ceremoniously torn asunder at a great public assembly attended by the King and princes on the 21st May.[5] Great feeling was aroused against all who were in any way connected with Benedict, and it was rumoured that Nicolas had composed the offending bull, or at the least that he had

---

1. Valois, op.cit. III. pp.597-8.
2. Ibid. III. p.605.
3. Ibid. III. p.606. Vide supra. p.116.
4. Ibid. III. p.608. Vide supra. p.116.
5. Ibid. III. p.611.

known of its existence and had failed to divulge it.

It was not until Nicolas, still at Genoa, received letters from the University informing him of the publication of the bull, and the charges against himself in connection with it, that he set out for Avignon on his way back to France, although, as he ruefully remarked, his safety would have been better assured in Genoa.[1] However, he had finally arrived at the fixed determination to leave the Curia for good, and never again to return, even if French obedience were restored to Benedict XIII.[2] Immediately on his arrival at Avignon, he addressed a carefully reasoned letter to the University of Paris, appealing to the masters to defend him according to their experience of his merits. He reminded them of his long connection with the University, which had nourished him from his tenderest years, and drew their attention to the fact that his distinctive and well-known style was utterly dissimilar to that of the bull, testifying moreover, in no uncertain language to the fact that he had never even seen or heard of the documents he was alleged to have written. 'Nunquam visu, numquan auditu, numquam verbo aut ullo scripto, fama vel rumore aliquo, aliove

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XLV.

2. Ibid. Ep.CIV. 'certa fixaque definitione in animum inducens, nullo umquam rursus implicari servitio, etiamsi illi Pontifici cui servirem .... obedientiam ..... restitui in regno isto contigeret.'

quolibet notitiae signo quicquam de litteris illis antea persensi, quam per litteris a vestris.'[1]

After making this appeal, he immediately left Avignon, and passed through Lyons[2] on his way to Langres, where he arrived not many days later. He had now heard of further charges against him, that he had been distressed about the threatened subtraction as a grave scandal to the kingdom, that he had tried to have all his benefices changed for foreign ones, and that he had reported that the Patriarch of Alexandria, Simon Cramaud, was planning the election of a third Pope.[3] He made his defence in a letter to Regnauld des Fontaines.[4] He claimed that he had studiously omitted all direct reference to the subtraction, and that his fears for the Church could not, therefore, be proved to be anything other than general. As to the second charge, it was no evidence of guilt to have secured a foreign benefice, and in any case, he had never asked to have all his benefices transferred, only some of them.[5]

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XLII. His defence is based on his character and his style, both well known. He does not mention the fact that he had left the Curia before the publication of the bull.

2. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col, p.85, continued from note 4, p.84) refers to Bibl. Nat. Latin, 3127. fol.54.

3. These charges were based on statements in letters of Nicolas which had been intercepted. (Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XLIII).

4. Ibid. Ep.XLIII.

5. He is soon after this (Ep.XLV) claiming to have only one benefice in France 'unicum in regno habeo', presumably the prebend at Bayeux which he held till death. It is perhaps, possible that he was deprived of others.

The statement about Simon Cramaud was, he said, based on a public rumour, for the authenticity of which he could not be held responsible. He was obviously surprised that his countrymen should believe such evil things of him, when he himself felt that by all his labours, he had not deserved ill of them, and his merits were, in fact, recognized elsewhere. He explained that he had left the Curia three months before the publication of the bull, and claimed to have behaved throughout with a scrupulous regard for French interests.[1]

Nicolas had not, even yet, apparently, realised the intensity of feeling against him. The accusations of his enemies were universally accepted, he was menaced with deprivation of his French benefice, now apparently his only one, with imprisonment exile, and even death, but the charges against him were not openly made, and he suffered as a result, from being unable to clear himself publicly.[2] Evidence of this persecution exists only in Nicolas' own letters,[3] and it seems probable that no positive action was taken against him,

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XLIII. 'Avertat Deus a me tantam dementiam, ut aliquid in regem vel regnum sceleris admiserim, nec usque ad illum temporis articulum me vivere permittat ...'

2. Ibid. Ep.XLV.

3. The letters dealing with this crisis are, Ibid. Ep.XLII-LII.

but that for some time he was a very unpopular character and the object of many angry threats. He may possibly have exaggerated the actual danger of his position, for he was of a timorous nature, but the enormous impression made upon him by this crisis indicate that he had been very seriously alarmed.

He was obliged to flee from Langres, and lay hidden for some time, since although he was by no means silent in his retreat, he took the precaution of concealing his whereabouts.[1] He appealed for help to his personal friends, Gontier,[2] Regnauld,[3] Jacques de Nouvion[4] and the rest, and to influential acquaintances such as Evrard Moriset, Secretary to the Duc de Berri,[5] and Jean d'Arconval, tutor to the King's son, the Duc de Guienne.[6] To Gontier,

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XLV. is written, he says 'in loco sine nomine'; Ep.XLVI-LIII are not place-dated.

2. Ibid. Ep.XLVI.

3. Ibid. Ep.XLVII.

4. Ibid. Ep.XLV.

5. Ibid. Ep.XLIX.

6. Ibid. Ep.LII. It is noticeable that Nicolas omitted five of the letters written at the time of this crisis from the manuscript of his letters which was made under his own supervision, and corrected by himself, i.e. XLVII, XLIX, L, LI, LV. (Vide Infra Appendix I. p. 273).

he confided sadly that he had no fear of exile, since he would certainly be better treated than he was in his native land, and had in fact been promised great things in many countries for his services.[1] However, he did not intend to leave France unless he had to,[2] and he made the most strenuous efforts to retrieve his good reputation. He was tireless in issuing requests and instructions to his friends,[3] asking to be kept accurately informed of any change in his position,[4] and answering fresh charges as they arose.[5]

He is next discovered at the Carthusian monastery at Valprofond.[6] He may have sought refuge there immediately after his flight from Langres, but his silence as to his whereabouts might equally well mean that for some time he had no settled headquarters. By the time that he was

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XLVI. 'Multae plane aliae sunt patriae quae .... me iamdudum et nuperrime ad se magnopere trahere studuerunt, non parva tam in commodis quam honoribus promittentes ...'

2. Ibid. loc.cit. '... numquam voluntas animum subiit ad alias quascumque nationes, quibuscumque aut emolimentis, aut honoribus propositis gratia illic vitae transigendae demigrare.'

3. Ibid. Ep.XLVII, XLVIII, XLIX, L, LII.

4. Ibid. Ep.LI.

5. Ibid. Ep.LX, is his answer to accusations that he had drawn up a list of the Pope's enemies.

6. Ibid. Ep.LIV-LVII were written here.

writing openly from Valprofond, the danger was past. In a comparatively short time, the exertions of his friends and the evident validity of his defence must have cleared him from suspicion, since he is soon refusing the persuasions of Regnauld to take up an official post in Paris,[1] writing most light-heartedly to thank Jacques de Nouvion, who was on a mission in Germany, for a gift of knives,[2] and before long, even addressing a dissertation on clemency to the young Duc de Guienne.[3]

This experience, coming at the end of his irksome and fruitless career as a papal secretary, confirmed Nicolas in his determination to withdraw from practical affairs, and never again to become involved in either the papal, or any other Curia. He did not abandon his allegiance to Benedict XIII, whose legitimacy he never questioned, and if, in his obedience to the decrees of Charles VI he appears to have failed in loyalty to the Pope, his failure was more apparent than real. He had realised finally that he was powerless to do any good at the Curia, while his experience of life at Langres had proved that he could make a real contribution to ecclesiastical affairs as an independent writer.

---

1. Ibid. Ep.LIV.
2. Ibid. Ep.LVII.
3. Ibid. Ep.LVI (Vide infra. p. 146).

CHAPTER III.

RETIREMENT AT FONTAINE-AUX-BOIS. 1408-17.

Nicolas' stay at Valprofond was not a very long one,[1] and probably before the end of 1408 he had established himself in the Augustinian Priory of St. Madeleine[2] at Fontaine-aux-Bois, where he spent the next eight or nine years.[3] Here he lived in complete retirement, having, after the events of 1408, no further ambition to take part in public affairs.[4]

He was more than contented, by its contrast with his previous environment, with the pleasant wooded countryside round Fontaine. There really was a fountain, and a river, 'vicinus amnis', and in the spring, when the birds were

---

1. There are only four letters from Valprofond, Opera, ed. Lydius. LIV, LV, LVI, LVII.

2. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col, p.85. note 1. identifies Nicolas' place of residence. Fontaine was some twelve miles from Provins.

3. Twenty-seven of the seventy-five letters written during this period are not place-dated. However, there is no internal or other evidence to suggest that they were written elsewhere, and whereas it is possible that this was the case, it seems much more likely that he omitted the place because his friends knew perfectly well where he was.

4. The crisis of 1408 was still vivid in his memory in 1416. 'Supra Materia Concilii', Opera, ed. Lydius. p.78.

singing, the meadows full of flowers and the flocks in the fields promised an abundance of milk, he found it all very agreeable, and on one occasion, was moved to pen the most graceful of his surviving efforts in verse to invite a friend to make him a visit, and to share these pleasures.[1]

There is no specific mention in his letters of either the priory or his fellow-canons, but it is evident that his residence with them was both happy and spiritually profitable. In the 'Expositio Super Ysayam', written towards the end of his life, he refers affectionately to the rule of St. Augustine 'dulces constitutiones patris Augustini',[2] although in general, he finds very little to praise among either the regular or the secular clergy.

It may have been early in this period that he took Holy Orders. This subject is only once mentioned in his letters, in 1411, when he refers to a certain Johannes de Maraya as having been his instructor in the duties of the ministry and the celebration of the mass.[3] This Johannes

---

1. 'Ad sui visitationem incitatio' verse included in a letter to Gérard Machet, Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXVI. A completer and more accurate text is published by Coville in Recherches, p.272.

2. 'Expositio Super Ysayam'. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal Manuscrit. no.137. fol.89v°. col.1. He also commends the Carthusians (ibid. fol.62), a comment on his reception and life at Valprofond.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXIX.

was probably about ten years younger than Nicolas, since he entered the College of Navarre in 1382,[1] was licensed in Arts in 1391,[2] and became a Master of Theology in 1405.[3] The irregularity of ecclesiastical practice makes it impossible to reach any very definite conclusions from these scanty details, but it is perhaps most likely that Nicolas took Orders between 1408 and 1411.[4]

---

1. Launoy, op.cit. II. 912.

2. Ibid. I. 99.

3. Ibid. I. 208; Chart. Univ. Paris. IV. no.1823.

4. The disparity between the ages of the two men makes it at least improbable that Jean should have been instructing Nicolas before he left Paris for Avignon at the end of 1397, though not perhaps impossible, since although the Third Lateran Council had required 'aetatis maturitas' before ordination, (Conciliorum Sacrorum Collectio Nova ... ed. Mansi. Venice, 1778. Vol.22. col.218. Chap.3 of 3rd Lateran Council) it had been necessary under Gregory IX to provide that the 'regimen ecclesiae' should be given to no one under fourteen years of age (Corpus Juris Canonici, vol.II. col.106. Decretals of Gregory IX, Book I. tit.XIV. Chap.3) and the Constitutions of the College of Navarre made provision for priests not only among the Theologi and the Artistae, but also among the Grammatici (Launoy, op.cit. I. 30). It seems most likely that Nicolas took Orders after the crisis of 1408 had decisively turned his mind into religious channels.

He probably took part, with the other canons in the regular religious life of the community, the daily celebration of the mass and the saying of the seven canonical hours. A series of prayers to be said before each canonical hour, and three 'aliae orationes ad Deum'[1] in which he prays, very characteristically, for strength to overcome ill-health[2] and other weaknesses and to be made profitable to God's service through the pursuit of the true wisdom,[3] have survived in the Sorbonne manuscript.

There are some indications that although it was not an essential part of the canon's office he did a certain amount of preaching, either in the Chapter or in some of the churches served from the priory. In one of the prayers he petitions for the power of moving speech 'zeloque fidei ardentem efficiat linguam meam ad proximorum edificationem'.[4]

---

1. Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, Manuscrit no.633. fols.151-154v^{o}.

2. Ibid. fol.152v^{o}. col.1. 'Da ut corporalem fortitudinem quam mihi tribuisti, ad te custodiam ....'

3. Ibid. fol.153v^{o}. col.2. .... 'infunde mihi desuper donum scientie et discretionis, ut nullis circumveniar astutiis Sathane, sed scientia discernere spiritus, si ex te, vel ex maligno sunt .... Doce me in scientie desiderio non curiosa sectari, non supervacua querere, illam que inflat horrere scientiam, illam vero que edificat et ad te ducit, diligere. Discam per te, non plus quam oportet sapere, sed sapere ad sobrietatem ....'

4. Ibid. fol.153. col.2.

he had moreover a great reputation for eloquence, 'ex eius ore dulcior melle fluit oratio',[1] and his style has a certain oratorical quality which would certainly lend itself well to declamation. Actually only one of his sermons seems to have survived, an address on the Holy Innocents which is also in the Sorbonne manuscript,[2] but it is very unlikely that this was, in fact, unique. The 'De filio prodigo' published by Lydius as a treatise,[3] is probably the expanded version of a sermon; its opening words are 'Audite o poenitentes, sermonem de fratre vestro' and the style throughout is strongly suggestive of a spoken address. Again, the treatise 'De fructu rerum adversarum'[4] appears to be addressed to preachers, since it contains a definition of their duty, and indications how to perform it successfully by bringing the people into a right frame of mind. Lastly, his tone in recommending the duty of preaching to his friends[5]

---

1. Letter of Martin V's Chancellor to Henry V of England in Foedera, conventiones, literae et cuiuscunque generis Acta publica inter Reges Angliae et alios ... ed. T. Rymer. 2nd edition. 20 vols. London, 1704-32. Vol.IX. p.546.

2. Bibl. de la Sorbonne. no.633. fol.149. 'Nota est tiranni Herodis, ... '

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.109-121.

4. Ibid. pp.132-143.

5. Ibid. Ep.LXXIII, LXXIV. 'De Studio Theologico' in Spicilegium: sive collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae bibliothecis delituerant. ed. L. d'Achery. 3 vols. Paris, 1723. Vol.I. pp.473-80.

would be unsuitable in one who had never, himself, undertaken it. The life of preaching, in the manner of Christ, he placed far above that of the mere scholastic, 'Quae potest vita perfectior esse quam Apostolorum: et numquid in publico studio legere iussi sunt?'[1]

It is, on the other hand undeniable that Nicolas sometimes gave advice which he did not feel obliged to apply to himself; on one occasion for instance, he fulminates against the procuring of Papal dispensations to allow non-residence, 'quam ob causam nomen tenebas officii, si officiari nolebas'[2] - surprisingly at first sight, since he was guilty of the same sin himself with regard to the canonry at Bayeux. However, the explanation is probably that whereas the friends whom he exhorted in this fashion, held the cure of souls, he himself did not, a circumstance which may also have excused him from following his own precepts on the subject of regular preaching.

However, it is obvious that his religious duties were so much part of a routine, that he did not find it necessary to mention them. They were evidently not irksome to him, since he only ever complained in the Spring, when his health was often affected[3] by the long exacting services,[4] and the

1. 'De Studio Theologico', Spicilegium, Vol.I. p.479. col.2.
2. Ibid. p.479. col.1.
3. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.CXI, to his doctor Jean Lelièvre.
4. Ibid. Ep.LIX.

'salsos cibos' of the Lenten diet.[1]

His time was now very largely at his own disposal, and although he was principally engaged in serious studies and writing, he also had a good deal of time for his friends. He was not very far removed from Paris, so he was able to keep up the extensive and often light-hearted correspondence which formed his chief relaxation.[2] These letters give a vivid, and attractive picture of his personality, timid, torn by anxieties for the spiritual and material well-being both of his friends and of the nation, and more than a little inclined to sententiousness, but peace-loving, affectionate, considerate, and, on occasions, nicely humorous.

He received with pleasure and gratitude the presents which his friends sent him, books,[3] aromatic spices,[4] and figs,[5] which were particularly welcome at the end of Lent.

---

1. Ibid. Ep.CXVIII.

2. Ibid. Ep.LXXI. 'maximum namque mei otii meaeque solitudinis mihi levamen est, cum ore ad amicas absentes non liceat, scriptis saltem, colloquium habere'; he was generous in not expecting his busier friends to write as often as he did himself. (Ibid. Ep.XCVI).

3. Ibid. Ep.CX, CXVII.

4. Ibid. Ep.LXXVIII.

5. Ibid. Ep.CXVIII.

He was even more delighted to make[1] and to receive occasional visits, which relieved the monotony of his very regular life, and gave him the opportunity for much pleasant conversation.[2] He was constantly worried and preoccupied with his friends' affairs, and was always ready with his advice, sometimes even before it was asked.[3] For the younger members of his own family also, he was very solicitous, exerting all his efforts to secure a benefice for his young brother,[4] the 'fraterculus' whom many years before he had recommended to Gontier and Jean de Montreuil, and a bursary at the College of Navarre for his sister's son.[5]

Nicolas de Baye, Regnauld des Fontaines, Raoul de la Porte, Gérard Machet and Jacques de Boury are the friends to whom most of his letters were addressed, but this is not an entirely satisfactory indication of the extent of his

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XLIV, early in this period, he made a visit to Paris, and saw all his friends except d'Ailly, who had just left.

2. He evidently received many visits from Nicolas de Baye. Ibid. Ep.LXXXII, CV, he is looking forward to seeing his friend; Ep.LXXVIII, he accepts his excuses for not making a visit; Ep.CXXVI, he regrets that Nicolas de Baye had stayed such a short time 'magnam mihi tua visitatio consolationem attulit, maiorem profecto allatura, si paulo morosius tecum colloqui ..... licuisset'; Ep.CXXIX, CXXX, Nicolas apologises for having left Fontaine, when he had arranged to meet de Baye there. He invited Gérard Machet to visit in Ep. CXIX and CXVI, and looked forward to exchanging visits with Muret in Ep.LXXVI.

3. Ibid. Ep.LXXIX, LXXXV.

4. Ibid. Ep.CXXVIII. Vide supra p. 4 note 3

5. Ibid. Ep.CXXIII. Vide supra. p. 4 note 3

circle, since the few letters to Gontier which remain, prove that the two men were still the closest of friends, in fact they were obviously so friendly that their letters were purely informal,[1] unlike some of the long correspondence with Nicolas de Baye.[2] Again, after 1408, there is no mention of Jean Muret, to whom, after their close contact during the difficult days at the Curia, Nicolas was very much devoted, and with whom he surely kept in contact, although he had gently declined Muret's offer to secure for him a benefice at Le Mans, so that they might pass the rest of their lives together.[3]

He made many new friends, among them the Italian Jean de Piedmont, whose praise of his style greatly gratified him,[4] Pierre Cauchon,[5] later notorious as the judge of Jeanne d'Arc, Jean des Temples[6] and Martin Talayero.[7]

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep. XCI, CIX, CX, CXVII. In an early letter, Nicolas explains that the lack of formality in his letters to Gontier is a testimony of his affection. Ibid. XXVI.

2. Of the 26 letters to Nicolas de Baye only half can be described as chiefly personal, although many of the others contain personal references. Ibid. LXXVIII, LXXIX, LXXXIII, LXXXIV, LXXXV, LXXXVII, LXXXVIII, CIV, CV, CXXVI, CXXVIII, CXXIX, CXXX. (vide p. 140 note 3).

3. Ibid. Ep.LXXVI.

4. Ibid. Ep.LXVI.

5. Ibid. Ep.CXX.

6. Ibid. Ep.CXXII.

7. Ibid. Ep.LXIV, LV.

Peace-loving and conciliatory as he was,[1] there were however some disturbances among his friendships. One friend, an appointment with whom he had been obliged by the turbulence of the times, to break, was much annoyed,[2] another to whom he had written jocularly was offended, and wrote in angry protest,[3] to Gérard Machet, with whom he had almost lost touch, he was suddenly and joyfully reconciled.[4]

His relations with Jean de Montreuil, with whom he had been for so long on intimate terms seem to have been broken under the most unfortunate circumstances. Up till 1409-10 there was no change in their relationship.[5] In 1411, however, a great mutual friend, the young Jacques de Nouvion to whom both Nicolas and Jean were most deeply devoted, and for whom they had expected a brilliant future,[6] died suddenly at Bologna,[7] Jean, as one of the young man's

---

1. In an unedited letter, Jean de Montreuil describes him as 'minus contumeliosus'. Bibl. Nat. Latin, 13062. fol.50r°. 'A pridem me nosci frater .... '

2. Ibid. Ep.CXXXI. (Vide p. 166).

3. Ibid. Ep.CXIV, CX.

4. Ibid. Ep.CVIII.

5. Unpublished letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin, 13062. fol.6v°. 'Querimoniae tuae ... '

6. An unpublished letter of Jean de Montreuil gives the best idea of the intimacy of the three men, and Gontier. Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.50r°. 'Apridem me nosci...' Vide supra p.33. note 2.

7. Coville, Recherches, p.202, discusses the date of his death.

executors, promised to repay to Nicolas a sum of money which was owed to him, but instead of doing so, he began to make excuses, alleging that the property had not yet come into his hands, and that his own poverty prevented him from discharging the debt.[1] Coville thought that there was sufficient reason to make a somewhat severe accusation against Jean, - that it was in fact, in order to purchase on his behalf, a famous Bolognese manuscript of Cicero which he had for a long time covetted, that Nicolas' money had been forwarded to Jacques.[2] The last of the letters to Jean de Montreuil published by Lydius is a rather pompous exhortation to charity and almsgiving, probably written in 1412.[3] It seems to contain nothing personal, but perhaps the subject-matter is suggestive. It is noticeable that, contrary to his usual tactful custom in addressing moral reflections to his friends, Nicolas does not add an apology to the effect that he knows them to be superfluous.[4] Later than this is one last letter published by Coville;[5] it is a very curt note, probably written in 1413, in which

---

1. Unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.152v°. 'Tuli nunc usque patienter ... ' Jean was considerably irritated by Nicolas' failure to write to him.

2. Coville, Recherches, p.205-8.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XCII.

4. One example, in a letter to Gontier, Ibid. Ep.XCI is referred to infra p. 153.

5. Coville, Recherches, p.301.

Nicolas blames Jean for the deterioration of their relations, and says that it is in his hands to remedy the situation. Apparently the debt was still owing.

The greater part of Nicolas' time was, however, spent, neither in religious duties, nor in trifling with his friends, but in serious study and writing, which he now regarded as far more valuable than active participation in the great affairs of Church and State. In fact, he had come to regard the wickedness of courts and factions with unrelieved horror, and had formed the conviction that men must, for their own salvation, withdraw in the body as well as the mind from any interested part in the public life of the community. His whole attitude is summed up in one sentence in the 'De Egressu Babylone', 'Quis sanus, ubi omnes insaniunt habitare non exhorrescat?'[1]

Nothing, however, could have been further from his intentions than that any man should sever his connection with society, in order to indulge in private study for his own sole pleasure; this he regarded, as less than human. 'Sane quis talis est, cum humanitatem exuerit, non tam homo ille censendus est, quam fera crudelis.' In withdrawing himself from the factions and turmoils of the active life, the hermit, or dweller in retirement was placing himself under an obligation to employ the disinterested insight which

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. p.175.

he obtained, for the good of his fellow men. All his studies were to be undertaken in consideration of the public benefit, to which he thought it was the constant responsibility of the enlightened to devote themselves.[1]

Thus to Nicolas, the true object of study was not 'scientia' but 'charitas',[2] and it was no longer from necessity but from preference that his studies were chiefly religious. If, however, his interests had changed, his enthusiasm was undiminished; the Scriptures and the Fathers now inspired in him the delight he had formerly derived from the classics. 'Tandem illic ad sacri canonis investigationem Sacrorumque doctorum mystice ac salutariter illum exponentium, magna me aviditate contuli, quae nunc pene sola de gratia Christi me lectio delectat.'[3]

Impelled by a sense of urgent obligation and confident in his good intentions, Nicolas discharged his duty to the community to the best of his ability, and at the end of this period, when he was recalling the unremarkable results of all his exertions, he had no regrets, 'nequaquam tamen haec fecisse me poenitet aut poenitebit.'[4]

He wrote continuously, treatises on moral, ecclesiastical and national subjects, and a long series of

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXXII.

2. 'De Studio Theologico', Spicilegium, I. p.478. col.2.

3. 'Supra Materia Concilii Generalis' III. Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.78-9; also Ep.CXVII.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXXXVII.

letters on public affairs, obviously destined to be communicated by the recipients to a wider audience, as occasion arose. Nicolas explicitly invites Gerson to make use of two of his letters in sermons to the King and court, adding that by the expression of his views, he felt that he was discharging his own duty to the country.[1] All five of the letters addressed to Gerson[2] in this period are similarly formal in tone, and may have been written with this object in view. The same applies to about half of the surviving letters to Nicolas de Baye,[3] who, as Secretary to the Parlement de Paris, was also in a position to give them an important circulation. He distressed himself, as his friends were inclined to think, unnecessarily, with public affairs, but when after a long stream of doleful epistles, Nicolas de Baye tried to divert his mind to more cheerful subjects, Nicolas was considerably irritated, and excused him only because he knew that his intention, though misplaced, had been kindly, 'ad doloris mei mitigationem velut remedium.'[4]

---

1. Ibid. Ep.LXIII. 'Quod Patriae debeo in tanta eius calamitate, plene exsolvam, ad te semel adhuc haec scripta dirigere voluii'; also Ep.LXI.

2. Ibid. Ep.LVIII, LXI, LXII, LXIII, LXVIII.

3. The following letters to Nicolas de Baye are almost completely impersonal, Ibid. Ep.LXXX, LXXXVI, LXXXIX, XC, XCVII, CI, CII, CIII, CXXVII. (Vide supra p. 135 note 2).

4. Ibid. Ep.LXXXI.

It is curious, after all his anguish, and his high-sounding intentions, to observe how very guarded and cautious his writings are, particularly in comparison with the later 'Expositio Super Ysayam', which is uncompromising in tone, and specific in its subject-matter, whereas in the Fontaine writings, Nicolas almost invariably contented himself with generalities. This caution was, however, by no means unnecessary. His own experience in 1408 had shown him that even private letters might easily fall into the hands of his enemies,[1] with the most embarrassing and even dangerous results - hence his constant preoccupation with the honesty and diligence of the carriers.[2]

Again, Jean de Montreuil, who had for years been tireless in exhorting Nicolas to place his person in a position of security, was emphatic in his advice that he should not only keep away from the danger area but that he should totally abstain from the expression of views which might get him into serious trouble.[3] That, within the limitations imposed by these conditions, Nicolas fought unceasingly to uphold just standards, at a time when violence

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XLIII.

2. Ibid. Ep.LXXVI, C.

3. Unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.6v°. 'Non est ... quod habeas hesitare ... nisi tamen, malignandi materiam, quod absit, et longe absit, emulis preberes scriptionibus loquutionibusve suspectis aut abitu quoquo loco de quo posses sinistre notari ..... '

and selfish ambition were everywhere triumphant was no inconsiderable achievement for one who was naturally timid, and a lover of peace above all things.

Nevertheless, although this appears to have been one of the most prolific periods of his life, the restraint which was imposed upon his expression of opinion makes it difficult to define his position in the two great issues of the times, the early conciliar movement, and the civil war in France. 'The Expositio super Ysayam', which gives a consistent and unrestrained account of the views he held in 1423-6, is helpful up to a certain point in elucidating his opinions, since it is likely that the ideas expressed therein in a developed form, were already taking shape in his mind.

Perhaps the most impressive single piece of evidence of the restraint Nicolas was exercising in his writings is his very marked concentration on civil affairs during the next few years. Twenty of the seventy-five letters written at Fontaine deal with national disorders, only six with any aspect of the Church. This strange proportion is, of course, not exclusively due to Nicolas' desire to avoid the dangerous subject of the schism, which was uppermost in his mind; the whole of this period was, in actual fact, one of acute crisis in France. After the murder of the King's brother, Louis, Duc d'Orleans, on the 23rd November

1407, by his own cousin, Jean, Duc de Bourgogne,[1] the princes no longer manoeuvred for control of the government, they skirmished, and after 1411, actually fought for it, and fought so bitterly that each party in turn, appealed to the English for aid.[2]

The only effective power in the land was brutal and anarchical - the dreaded armed bands, who roved the North of France pillaging and destroying, killing friend and foe alike, either wantonly or in hope of plunder. The country people were the chief sufferers, since they were denuded of defences of any kind. They were forced to flee to save their lives, leaving their fields and their little property to be looted; they lost their animals, and were unable to till their fields, and the whole countryside consequently fell into dilapidation and ruin.[3] Nicolas, living in the country, and perhaps coming from country people, was deeply affected by the intolerable sufferings of the innocent peasantry 'homines innocentissimi agricolae', at the hands of the ravaging soldiery, who carried off their belongings not in their hands, on their shoulders, or even on horseback but in carts, 'quibus tota

---

1. Histoire de France, ed. Lavisse. Vol.IV.1. (by Coville) p.331.

2. Ibid. p.337.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XCVIII.

pauperum suppellex, cuncta vasa atque utensilia .... exportantur ...' For these helpless people in their disaster, he shows more sympathy than for any other class of the community. They were, he said, the foundation upon which society was built,[1] and he was indignant that they should be thus tortured to satisfy the boundless ambition of worthless and self-seeking men.[2]

In the 'Expositio Super Ysayam', he repeatedly states that the civil war in France, and in fact, all the disorders since 1408, were in direct retribution for the expulsion of Benedict from the Papacy.[3] During the Fontaine period, he makes no such extreme judgments, but he obviously already believed the sufferings of the Church to be the result of sins in the spiritual sphere, and probably the idea that the chief of these had been the persecution of Benedict was already asserting itself. In a letter to the College of Navarre he wrote 'frustra igitur pacem petimus temporalem, qui spiritualem nobis testamento Christi relictam proiecimus',[4] and in 1415, he stated his conviction

---

1. 'De Lapsu et Reparatione Justitiae', Opera, ed. Lydius, p.49, 'Destructa autem agricultura, necesse est mature destrui totam politiam, fameque et inedia consumi; also Ep.CIII.

2. Ibid. Ep.LVIII, LXIII.

3. 'Expositio super Ysayam'. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.4v°. 'a veri summi pontificis obedientia discessionem, quam omnium malorum radicem esse non dubito,' also fol.29v°, 36v°, 95v°, 121, 157, 161v°.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.LXXVII.

that if the schism in the Church were to be healed, civil divisions would speedily come to an end,[1] which suggests that he saw the two forms of disorder in the relation of cause to effect. The point about Benedict begins to emerge in a statement in a letter to Gérard Machet probably written in 1412, that 'iure ac merito haec patiuntur, quia peccavimus in fratrem nostrum, hoc est in Dominum Jesum Christum.'[2] Lastly, he repeatedly attributed the civil disorders to the lack of justice, and to deviation from the ways of God,[3] while his extravagant reference to 'ineffabilia peccata nostra'[4] almost certainly has its origins in the cardinal sin of having withdrawn obedience from Benedict.

There is no doubt, however, that although his conception of the force of rebribution developed considerably during this period, his feelings were much less absolute than they became at a later date, since they were still conditioned by hope of an eventual restoration of obedience to the Pope, and of peace to France. He did not think that this would come about through the exertions of mankind, but that France would emerge purified by suffering from her chastisement at the hands of 'illa clementissima benignitas.'[5]

---

1. Ibid. Ep.CIII.
2. Ibid. Ep.LXVII.
3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.LXVII, LXVIII, LXXVII, LXXX, LXXXVI, XC, XCVII, XCVIII.
4. Ibid. Ep.LXXXVI.
5. Ep.LXVIII, also Ep.LXXX, LXXXVI etc.

In the sphere of practical politics, his only hope for the restoration of order was in the accession to power of a prince strong enough to suppress the selfish warring factions, and to rule impartially in the interests of the community. In this period, he pinned his hopes on the future strengthening of the monarchy under the Dauphin, Louis de Guienne, as earlier he had appealed to the young Charles VI,[1] and as later he was to call upon Philip of Burgundy[2] and Henry V of England.[3]

He wrote to the Dauphin in 1408-9 commending the princely virtue of clemency,[4] and soon afterwards, sent to his own friend, Jean d'Arconval, the young Duke's tutor, a long discussion on the boy's education, which, Nicolas thought, was being neglected by the Princes. He hoped that the future King might be trained to take his responsibility to the country seriously, and to avoid the excesses which had destroyed his father's health, and by thus denuding France of her true ruler, had laid the country at the mercy of self-interested factions.[5] However, the Duke not only turned out to be an unpleasant and vicious young man, but he died prematurely in 1415, unlamented, since he was

---

1. Ibid. Ep.I. vide supra p.52.
2. Ibid. 'De Lapsu et Reparatione Justitiae', pp.41-59, is addressed to Philippe, vide infra p 184-5.
3. Ibid. Ep.CXXXVII, vide infra p. 167. There is an almost comic similarity in his addresses to all four.
4. Ibid. Ep.LVI.
5. Ibid. Ep.XCIII.

'moult plein de sa voulenté plus que de raison'[1], and his manner of life had been such that 'estoit aventure qu'il vequist longuement'.[2] He was succeeded as Dauphin by the King's fourth son, Jean, Duc de Touraine;[3] there is no evidence that Nicolas ever had any hopes for his reign.

In 1410, on the eve of the outbreak of real civil war, Nicolas addressed an 'Oratio' to the Princes, appealing to them in the name of France, to spare the country.[4] However, all attempts to avert the crisis failed, and in 1411, fighting broke out in earnest between the Burgundians and the Armagnacs.[5] In his treatment of this subject, a somewhat hazardous one, Nicolas was again obliged to exercise great caution. He stigmatized the factions and the Princes in general, never mentioning either party by name; it might therefore seem that he was totally unbiassed, and regarded both with equal detestation. His opinions at a later date however suggest that, although he may have hated the vices of each faction equally, he was not, in fact, neutral.

---

1. Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris, ed. A. Tuetey, Paris, 1881. p.66.

2. Verdict of Nicolas de Baye, quoted by Tuetey in the Journal d'un Bourgeois. p.66. note 3.

3. Histoire de France, ed. Lavisse. IV. 1. p.371. The Duc de Touraine died in 1417, and the future Charles VII, the King's fifth son, became Dauphin.

4. 'Oratio ad Principes Galliarum'. Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.169-174.

5. Histoire de France, ed. Lavisse. IV. 1. p.337.

After 1418, he was undoubtedly in sympathy with the Burgundians, and he had presumably been so for some time beforehand, since he was able to live in considerable honour and prosperity under the Anglo-Burgundian rule whereas many of his Armagnac friends lost their lives in the course of the triumphant Burgundian entry into Paris in 1418.[1] Again, years before this, in the early summer of 1412, the year preceding the Armagnac seizure of power, when the Fontaine area, which lay uneasily near to Paris was made insecure by the constant ravages of the armed bands, Nicolas withdrew to Langres,[2] which was not only on the very border of Burgundian territory, but was almost surrounded by an arm of land reaching up on its Western side, so that the connection with the rest of France was made only by a narrow corridor to the North. Here he remained till the disturbances of 1413 were over. Thirdly, Nicolas originated in a part of the Champagne very close to Burgundy,[3] so that he may have had a traditional attachment to the ducal house. His allegiance is more likely to be based on some such factor than on any consideration of policy, because although Philippe le Hardi had been the protector of the University,[4] he was also the bitter

---

1. Vide infra p. 173.
2. Vide infra p. 150-1
3. Vide supra p. 2
4. Vide supra p. 54, 62.

opponent of Benedict XIII, and his son and successor, Jean sans Peur was the chief supporter of John XXIII.[1] It is therefore, possible that Nicolas had always had a certain connection with the Burgundian faction, but if so, he was in political, as in ecclesiastical affairs, a somewhat unconventional partisan; he was presumably not, in any case, an active one.

By 1411, when civil war broke out in earnest, Nicolas was so far from being optimistic about the future, that he regarded peace between the princes as not only impossible, but even undesirable.[2] He believed that since the tribulations which the country was suffering were a just punishment for its deviation from the ways of God, into intolerable luxury, cupidity and lawlessness, the last thing that could be desired was that peace and prosperity should be restored, which would, as they had done in the past, merely foster folly and vice. This is a repetition in a different form, of what he had said about the state of the Church and the possibility of its reform in 1400-1.[3] Church and State were two aspects of human behaviour, and when human standards were corrupted by ease and luxury, the dilapidation of both institutions was bound to follow; the Church, as the custodian of spiritual standards, was the

---

1. Valois, op.cit. IV. passim.
2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.LXXX.
3. 'De Ruina et Reparatione Ecclesiae', Coville's Traité, pp.151-6. (Vide supra p. 100-1).

first to be affected, but the State itself could not exist without justice, which was the observance of the laws of God.

Although in general Nicolas discusses the state of France on this rather elevated plane, he made one important practical proposal at an early state in the disorders, before the total disintegration had set in - for the regulation by royal decree of the conditions governing the maintenance of private armies.[1] This suggestion, although sound in theory, really begs the question, since it was to a temporary disintegration of the royal authority that the anarchy of the reign of Charles VI was due.

In 1411, Nicolas had some personal experience of the ravages of the armed bands, and, wishing to avoid a closer acquaintance, he left Fontaine to seek a refuge in some more secure locality.[2] He does not mention where he went, and he was obviously not away for long. In Spring 1412, the Fontaine area was again menaced, and this time more seriously. Nicolas wrote to Nicolas de Baye, saying that, although he hoped to be able to remain at home till Pentecost, when they had probably arranged to meet, disorder was increasing, and one of his recent visitors, Gérard de Rouen had been set upon and robbed by bandits, who left him

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.LVIII.

2. Opera. ed. Lydius. Ep.LVIII.

his horse, only because it was lame.[1] By Summer, the situation had become intolerable, and he removed to Langres where he stayed for about a year,[2] presumably on account of continued disturbances round Fontaine.

Even here however, he was subject to constant alarms. He had little or no hope that the Peace of Auxerre would be observed,[3] and when the short lull that followed it was marked by a grave plague and further disorders, Nicolas was by no means surprised. God was merely varying the punishment.[4]

The adjoining Duchy of Bar was meanwhile invaded and ravaged by the Duc de Lorraine, and the troops sent to oppose him brought even worse devastation to the region. Nicolas feared that if the Duke were to be victorious, he would proceed to attack France itself,[5] but since early in 1413, he was in fact on his way to accompany the King to the siege of Bourges,[6] it seems that Nicolas had misinterpreted his intentions, obviously open to some doubt.

---

1. Ibid. Ep.LXXXIII.
2. There are four letters written from Langres during 1412-13. Ibid. Ep.LXXXIX-XCII.
3. Ibid. Ep.LXXXIX. The Paix d'Auxerre was made in the second half of August 1412. (Histoire de France, ed. Lavisse, IV. 1. p.338).
4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XC.
5. Ibid. loc.cit.
6. A, Calmet, Histoire de Lorraine, 3 vols. Nancy, 1728. vol.II. pp.676-7.

At the same time, the country was full of unrest, sedition, and inter-class hatred, and Nicolas, of forbodings for the future, 'Taceo de seditionibus motibusque popularibus, de quibus est non tenuiter metuendum de odio et simultate ordinum atque statuum huius regni, inter quos nullus omnino amor est, nulla connexio ....'[1] As far as Paris was concerned, his fears of sedition were fully justified, for in Spring 1413, the city was terrorised by the 'Journées Cabochiennes',[2] and Nicolas, informed only by rumours, was tormented by anxiety for the safety of his friends. His relief, when he eventually got good news, was so great that he wrote to congratulate Nicolas de Baye,[3] Jean d'Arconval[4] and Gontier[5] on escaping with their lives. Gontier's house in the Rue Vieille du Temple had indeed been sacked during the raising of a subsidy for the English war by a commission dominated by Cabochians,[6] but Nicolas comforted his friend for the loss of his property in his own characteristic strain, assuring him that, as he had a good official position, and enjoyed the King's grace,

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XC.
2. Coville, A. Les Cabochiens et l'Ordonnance de 1413. Paris, 1888.
3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.LXXXIV, LXXXVIII.
4. Ibid. Ep.IC.
5. Ibid. Ep.XCI.
6. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col, p.22.

he would not have to worry about providing for his wife and children. He proffers the example of Job's fortitude, advancing, by a curious process of analogy, the positive merits of few possessions, men fight better without too much armour, for instance, and run faster when not encumbered by spoils, while ships even sink if too heavily laden. He concludes, tactfully, that he has addressed these words of encouragement to Gontier, not because he thinks that his friend stands in need of such moral support, but in the hope that they may be of help to someone 'minori sapientiae splendore perfusus.'[1]

During the summer, Nicolas was able to return to Fontaine, but the Paix de Pontoise, of August 1413, did nothing to remove his misgivings about peace without justice,[2] and in the autumn, he was urging upon Nicolas de Baye that the Parlement de Paris, in which he served, should not only do formal justice in private suits, but should foster justice in a more general way in the nation at large,[3] not a very hopeful prospect.

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.XCI.
2. Ibid. Ep.XCVII.
3. Ibid. Ep.XCVIII.

In contrast with this mass of comment on civil affairs, Nicolas' writings on ecclesiastical politics are very few, and till 1414, they suffer equally from being phrased in the most general terms. Between 1408 and the Council of Constance there are three letters to Raoul de la Porte, written in the course of 1411, of which two are concerned with the duty of preaching[1] and the third with a discussion on the merits and demerits of good and bad bishops.[2] There is also a treatise 'De Novis Celebratibus non Instituendis' written between 1412 and 1413, an argument against the institution of further feast days, since Sundays and other holy days were already being improperly observed.[3] If anything else were written, it does not appear to have survived.

There is no direct treatment of the subject of the schism, and no reference to Benedict XIII either by name, or as Pope. Again, there is no contemporaneous reference to the Council of Pisa, which deposed both Benedict and his rival, Gregory XII, and by the election of a conciliar Pope, Alexander V, inadvertently gave to the Church, not unity, but a third line of contestants. There is no mention of

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.LXXIII, LXXIV.
2. Ibid. Ep.LXXV.
3. Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.143-60.

the election to succeed Alexander in 1410 of the notorious ex-Condottiere Balthasar Cossa, whom he later sigmatized as 'abhominandum ydolum desolationis, quo nichil viderunt secula execrabilius,'[1] nor of the Council of his obedience held in Rome in 1412-3. In 1415, however, Nicolas refers contemptuously to this gathering, and tells a story of how the Holy Ghost had expressed its displeasure by appearing in the form of an owl, which story he had received at first hand from a friend who had attended the opening session, at which this interesting event occurred.[2]

That Nicolas was quite early in this period successful in dissociating himself in men's minds from Benedict XIII, is proved by the fact that he was twice, before the Council of Constance, invited to take office at the Curia of the conciliar Popes. The evidence for the first occasion, which does not appear to have been previously noticed, occurs in an unpublished letter from Jean de Montreuil,'si libitum tibi foret at Romanam Curiam declinare, sensi ab eo qui litteras apostolicas de assumptione novissimi summi pontificis ad apostolicatum regi ac dominis regalibus hoc attulit, tete ibidem visurum atque recepturum ut unquam.'[3] The invitation

---

1. 'Expositio super Ysayam.' Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. No.137. fol.104v°, col.2.

2. 'Disputatio supra Materia Concilii' II, Opera, ed. Lydius. p.75.

3. Unpublished letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin, 13062. fol.6v°. 'Querimoniae tuae ...'

must have been made either by Alexander V or by John XXIII, in 1409 or 1410; a reference earlier in the same letter to Nicolas' personal safety[1] suggests that it was the former. If he accepted, Jean added, his enemies would be utterly discomfitted, 'nisi mea tamen fallat estimatio, inimici tui te egerent si non dixerim timerent, non tu eos quoquomodo.'

The evidence for the second occasion occurs in one of Nicolas' letters to Nicolas de Baye, 'scribis Legatum Apostolicum tecum egisse ut me ad Curiam Romanam rursus adeundam adhorteris.'[2] This has been interpreted as an invitation from Benedict XIII,[3] but actually it seems much more likely to have come from John XXIII. The date of the letter is known to be 1414-15, 'ante annos ferme septem curia ipsa excessi,' but, at this time, the only Apostolic Legate in Paris was Alamanno Adimari, Archbishop of Pisa, sent by John XXIII in Spring 1414 to clear up certain difficulties before the opening of the Council of Constance.[4] He would certainly have come into contact with Nicolas de Baye before, on the 15th January 1415, he finally took his

---

1. Vide supra. p.141. note 3.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.CIV, which gives the obviously corrupt reading 'curiam humanam'.

3. By Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col. p.233.

4. Valois, op.cit. IV. p.218.

his leave of the Parlement.[1] Again, the phrasing of Nicolas' own statement that he had decided never to return to the Curia 'etiamsi illi Pontifici cui servirem, quique me enixe et chare diligebat, obedientiam restitui in regno isto contigeret',[2] bears out that, on this occasion, he was considering an offer from another Pope. Both these offers were refused, but the fact that they were made is testimony to Nicolas' continued good reputation as a stylist, and to the success of his policy of discretion.

Nevertheless, it is clear that there had in fact been no change in Nicolas' attitude to Benedict XIII; his faith had been shaken neither by his unhappy and unsatisfactory experience of life at the Curia, nor by the grave charges which were made against the Pope. Although this belief in Benedict is nowhere explicitly stated during this period, as it is in the Commentary, it is implicit in a letter written in 1408-9, in which he carefully refers to Benedict as 'quem Pontificem vocari prohibent',[3] and is borne out by his attitude to the Council of Constance.

The uncompromisingly hostile attitude to the Council expressed in the Commentary[4] obviously represents a

---

1. Ibid. IV. p.258.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CIV.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.LV.

4. 'Expositio super Ysayam.' Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.29v°, 161v°, 177v°. Vide infra p. 203-4

considerable development on his contemporaneous opinion, which was essentially opportunist. He did not consider for a moment that the Councils had the power to affect the spiritual authority of the true Pope, but he entertained some hopes that an end might be put to the wickedness of the schism by a return to the true fold, through the recognition, or even the re-election of Benedict. His view was in fact, the orthodox Catholic one, that the existence of a Council is legitimate only by reason of papal sanction.[1]

His attitude to the conciliar movement in this period can be defined from his detailed discussion of the Council of Constance, but nothing is known directly of his contemporary reaction to the Council of Pisa, although it is perhaps an indication of Nicolas' attitude to the earlier Council, that it seems to have broken his intimacy with his greatly honoured master, Pierre d'Ailly, who took a leading part in the activity of the Council, and was one of the chief supporters of the conciliar Popes.[2] With Gerson, Nicolas was still corresponding in 1411, but not apparently, as late as 1414.[3] It is, of course, possible that in both cases

---

1. J. Wilhelm, "Councils" in The Catholic Encyclopedia, 15 vols. New York, 1907-14. vol.IV. pp.423-35.

2. The last letter to d'Ailly is Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XLIV, written in November 1408. Nicolas had paid a short visit to Paris, and was disappointed to miss d'Ailly, with whom he had hoped to commiserate on the subject of their persecutions. The letter is very friendly in tone.

3. The last letter to Gerson is Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.LXVIII, probably written about 1411. Like all the letters to Gerson, it is formal, and almost impersonal.

further correspondence has been lost, but it seems on the whole, more likely that Nicolas' disagreement with them was too acute. He may have been thinking of d'Ailly and Gerson when, in 1412-3, he declined to be drawn into a discussion on the schism, saying, 'Desiste, rogo, in illam abyssum me trahere in qua penetranda acutissimorum cerno hominum tenebrescere ingenia.'[1]

By Autumn 1414, when the Council of Constance met, Nicolas' confidence had so far returned, that he not only discussed the nature of the limitations of conciliar authority with considerable freedom,[2] but, although he was still mindful of the events of 1408,[3] he seemed almost disposed to return into action, even stating, in a letter to Nicolas de Baye, that nothing could be more agreeable to him than to serve the Church effectively, 'nulla alia me putarem me foelicius natum, quam si aliquid possem pro Ecclesia fructuosum agere.'[4]

He regarded this council as the last hope of saving not only the unity of the Church, and the Kingdom of France, but the very existence of Christendom, threatened with utter destruction at the hands of the Moslems, 'imo vero

---

1. Ibid. Ep.LXVI.

2. 'Disputatio Supra Materia Concilii Generalis.' Opera, ed. Lydius, pp.61-79.

3. Ibid. p.

4. Ibid. Ep.CIV.

non parum timendum est, nisi hac vice pax obtineatur, ne tandem regnis per bella desolata, Christianitatem a Mahumeticos etiam pluribus ex partibus graviter oppressam, matureque proculdubio longe gravius opprimendam. Pace autem Ecclesiae habita, facile omnia sedantur.' Consequently it was of the highest importance that the whole Church should make a supreme effort to achieve success, 'maxima ... instantia, ardentissimo studio, cura intentissima.'[1] As a nominalist he believed that the Council existed only as a conglommeration of persons; its personnel was therefore of supreme importance, since no good result could ensue from the activities of the ambitions and selfish churchmen who usually dominated such gatherings. Nicolas was passionately interested that Godly and disinterested men, who alone would be susceptible to the leadership of the Holy Ghost, should be sent as representat~~ives~~. To Nicolas, the importance of the Council was heightened by the fact that he believed that, if it could bring unity to the Church, the civil war in France would soon be brought to an end[2] - a vital consideration, since the English invasion was imminent, and he was agreed with Nicolas de Baye in believing that the total destruction of France must follow, unless the princes, who were at that moment negotiating at St.

---

1. Ibid. Ep.CII. Vide infra. Chapter IV for the development of his idea of divine retribution inflicted by the hand of the 'Mahumetici'.

2. Ibid. Ep.CIII.

Denis, could be brought to unite against the common enemy.[1]

However, all his hopes were disappointed, the council acted in a most arbitrary manner, and Nicolas cautiously, but firmly, indicated his doubts about the rectitude of its proceedings. In 1415-16, he held a most interesting controversial correspondence on the functions and efficacy of the Council with 'quisdam scholasticus Parisiensis' whom, unfortunately, it seems impossible to identify. He was a great friend of Nicolas, and held official position, but had not, apparently, gone to Constance. Nicolas denied the allegation that he wished to constitute himself as 'diffinitor aut iudex' of the Acts of the Council, but he could see no reason to believe in its infallibility, and seriously doubted the wisdom of instituting so many revolutionary decrees, unsupported by any valid authority, particularly after the experience of the Council of Pisa.[2] Nicolas was not, in fact, interested in constitutional changes, but only in the recognition of Benedict.

---

1. Ibid. Ep.CIII. 'Adsentior aestimationi tue amicorum optime, qua aut coelesti miseratione pacem mature inter nostros Principes componendum memoras, pro cuius ineundo foedere celeberrimus apud Sanctum Dionysium conventus agitur, aut miserandum videri impendere nobis exitium.' These negotiations were part of the preliminaries to the Treaty of Arras (23 February 1415). They took place in October 1414, but, the Religieux de St. Denis, reports, without result, op.cit. V. pp.446-8.

2. 'Disputatio supra materia concilii.' Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.61-79.

In 1416, after the submission of John XXIII, and the resignation of Gregory XII, he wrote at length to the Council itself, exhorting the Fathers to pursue their work of reform, and warning them not to proceed precipitately to a new election. He goes on to protest with great vigour against a policy which he can hardly be brought to believe that they have adopted, the disqualification from re-election, of the three papal contestants, a quite unwarrantable restriction, he says, on the freedom of choice of the Holy Ghost.[1] This letter is, in effect, a plea for the re-election of Benedict XIII, although no reference is made to him throughout. In tone, it is conciliatory and respectful. Nicolas opens by excusing his audacity in writing, and refers to the Council, 'caetum vestrum gloriosissimum ac sapientissimum,' in tones of the utmost respect throughout, - an indication that he still entertained some hope that the Conciliar Fathers might be brought to end the schism in the way that he suggested. This seems to have been his last hope of the Council, and it too was, of course, disappointed.

Nicolas regarded the achievement of the Fontaine period with considerable complacency, saying in 1416, that he had written more valuable work here than in the whole of the rest of his life. 'Plus tamen (ut opinor) profeci

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXII.

quam tota anteacta aetate in studio Parisiensi .... quam in ceteris omnibus locis, in totaque cetera vita.'[1] Not only this, but he had also, during the early years of the Council of Constance, recast and edited his earlier work, consigning to the flames such as were unworthy of the attentions of posterity.[2] Some of his earlier humanist work may have been destroyed in this way.

The five moral treatises[3] which have survived had presumably been written by this time, though the general nature of their subject matter makes them very difficult to date. The 'De Filio Prodigo' , the 'De Fructu Rerum Adversarum' have already been mentioned in connection with Nicolas' interest in the subject of preaching. Both the 'De Egressu Babylone' and the 'De Fructu Eremi' are letters recommending the life of retirement and solitude. Of this attitude, the more lively Jean de Montreuil, who, like Nicolas de Baye, enjoyed the atmosphere of court life,[4]

---

1. Disputatio supra Materia Concilii Generalis III. Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.78-9.

2. Ibid. Ep.CV .... 'mea cepi scripta ab annis ferme XX edita recensere, mecum sedulo librare iudicio quae flammis, quae posteritate digna videantur ... '

3. The separation of these 5 treatises is a somewhat artificial division, since one appears to be an expanded sermon, (De Filio prodigo. vide supra p. 131) one was definitely written as a letter (De Egressu vide Appendix I. p. 265). Two of the remaining three were also the outcome of correspondence. (De fructu eremi and De Studio theologico).

4. Unedited letter of Jean de Montreuil. Bibl. Nat. Latin 13062. fol.98v°. 'Multis graviter ...' Jean protests against Nicolas' condemnation of court life, and continues 'sciret tamen Nicolaus alter verbis similiter sonantibus, uberibusque sententiis protinus respondere.'

could not entirely approve; after reading the latter work, he wrote to Nicolas, beginning, somewhat deceptively, 'Quis tecum, vir eruditissime, dissentiat? immo quis non conveniat, ubi tu eremi sive ruris vita animi tanta delectatione commendas?,[1] he then proceeds to show that the life of solitude could not be for everyone, 'qui ederet sacra, quis regeret imperia ....?' and concludes by wishing Nicolas 'Sana mens in corpore sano'!

The most ambititous and the finest of the moral works is the long 'De Studio Theologico'[2] addressed to Jean de Piedmont, a dissertation on the nature and value of true learning. He condemns the sophistry of unproductive studies and insists that theological learning is without value except as a preparation for the life of preaching. These treatises, in which he was not obliged to suppress any of his thought, are refreshingly direct in comparison with some of his writings during this period.

When Nicolas had finished the editing work, we find him writing to Gontier, asking him to get a batch of 'opuscula' copied, and begging him, with the utmost concern, to be sure to get a really good scribe, painting in moving terms the havoc played, particularly in a work with any pretensions to style, by the careless copyist. Nicolas

---

1. Ampl.Coll. II. Letters of Jean de Montreuil. no.LXII.
2. Published by Luc d'Achery in Spicilegium, I. pp.473-80.

invited his friend to keep one copy for himself, but implored him, if he had not time to correct it carefully, to send it back, and he would gladly perform that service himself.[1] Nicolas obviously had a very proper idea of the importance of a pure text.

He probably also edited the main body of his letters about this time, since those later in date seem to have survived by chance, being in no way representative of his preoccupations, as the total omission of any mention of the upheavals of 1418 indicates. However, the inclusion of several letters some years later in date in the manuscript made under Nicolas' supervision, and corrected by himself, which is now in the Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Medecine at Montpellier, shows that work on the manuscript could not have been finally completed for some years.[2]

It is very noticeable that although Nicolas' religious studies had entirely superseded his interest in the classics, he was still a self-conscious stylist, proud of his achievements and his reputation, and careful to express himself as effectively as possible.[3]

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CIX.

2. Vide Appendix I. p. 273-4.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.LXVI. contains a discussion of his views on humanism. It is addressed to Jean de Piedmont, not, as Nicolas informs him, his first Italian admirer 'nonnulli iam admirati sunt ante te Itali'.

Meanwhile, no progress had been made towards the settling of civil strife in France, and the Princes had, consequently suffered the annihilating defeat of the Agincourt campaign. The English soldiery were, however, less savage, and better disciplined than the French armed bands, and Nicolas began to entertain some hopes from the Anglo-Burgundian alliance. At the same time, its success was the source of a double inconvenience to himself, which in fact, brought his long residence at Fontaine to a close. In Spring 1417, the Burgundian armies were prowling about outside Paris,[1] waiting for an opportunity to force an entry, and Nicolas was again obliged to leave Fontaine. Two letters[2] to Nicolas de Baye apologizing for his absence at a pre-arranged meeting, indicate that it was about the time of Easter. The two apologies, both apparently dealing with the same occasion, suggest that Nicolas de Baye may have been irritated with his friend, and understandably so, since he himself had not been discouraged by the disorder which Nicolas pleads. It would be sad if the 'Deploratio Amici', miserably bewailing the loss of a friend which follows immediately after the others, but is tantalizingly addressed 'Ad N'[3] were the third of this series.

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXXVII.
2. Ibid. Ep.CXXIX, CXXX.
3. Ibid. Ep.CXXXI.

In the same year, Basse-Normandie fell to the English,[1] and Nicolas thereby lost his only means of support, the revenues from his benefice at Bayeux.[2] They could only be recovered by a special concession on the part of Henry V, to whom, with this end in view, Nicolas wrote a characteristically tendentious letter, recommending the kingly virtue of justice, with special reference to justice in dealings with the Church.[3]

Chronic disorder now made it impossible for Nicolas to remain at Fontaine, and he was in very severe straits as a result of the loss of his revenues. His next step is an unexpected one nevertheless. He went to Constance, where he enlisted the help of the Conciliar Pope, Martin V, in the matter of his benefice, and was actually reappointed a papal scriptor. A first letter to Henry V was sent, on 25th February 1418 by the Chancellor of the Curia, Philippus Medalia, who recommended Nicolas as being attached to the service of the Pope 'Domini Nostri Papae Martini Quinti Secretarius', and as a man of high repute for learning, eloquence and probity, 'vir quidam eximiae probitatis splendore venerabilis ... cuius fama, nuncia veri, tum vitae honestate, tum scientiarum fulgore, tum sermonis praecipue Elegantia ... per universam curiam Romanam et omnem Galliarum atque Hispaniarum oram diffusa est'. He appealed

---

1. Histoire de France, ed. Lavisse, IV. I. p.374.

2. R. Postel, Siège et Capitulation de Bayeux en 1417. Caen, 1873.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXXXVII.

to the King not to let so worthy a man, through no fault of his own, suffer want in his old age.[1] On the 14th April, Martin himself repeated the request that Nicolas might be allowed to enjoy the revenues from his benefice, describing how he had laboured 'abundanter et fructuose' in the cause of the schism, and describing him not only as his 'secretarius', but also as 'familiaris'.[2]

There is no other record of Nicolas' presence at Constance, and nothing to confirm the evidence of these letters, which nevertheless, seems to be conclusive. He would certainly not have been friendless at the Council, and he may have met there the old friends with whom he seems to have lost contact, d'Ailly, Gerson and Jean de Montreuil. Coville suggests that Gerson may have used the 'De Ruina et Reparacione Ecclesiae' at the Council, since a corrected version of the treatise was found among his works, and published in the earliest editions.[3] It was this version from which passages praising Benedict XIII and d'Ailly have been expurgated, which was the only one known till Coville published his edition of the complete text in 1936.

This episode is perhaps the most peculiar in the whole of Nicolas' life. He did not regard Martin as the

---

1. Rymer, Foedera. IX. p.546.

2. Ibid. p.577.

3. Coville, Traité, p.48. The treatise was originally written for d'Ailly. Vide supra p. 100.

legitimate Pope, and referred to him some five years later, in terms of the bitterest disapproval.[1] His feeling had doubtless by this time been intensified by Martin's gratuitous repetition of the excommunication of Benedict XIII, nevertheless, it seems impossible to explain Nicolas' action other than in terms of opportunism. He could only get the recommendation which he required, and to which he probably felt that he was entitled, from Martin, who, on his side, perhaps hoped to win over, a not inconsiderable ally. However, although Henry was disposed to be gracious, and the Pope's request was granted, Nicolas was by no means prevailed upon to abandon his secret faith in Benedict. He did not have to remain in Constance for very long, but it was probably not till after the Burgundian seizure of power that he returned to Paris. The city was now desolate and ruined, and many of his oldest and closest friends had been killed in the Burgundian attack, but he himself was able to live till the end of his life, peaceably and honourably, if sadly, on his now secure revenues. His ten years of retirement had had their effect.

---

1. 'Expositio super Ysayam.' Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.29v^{o}, Nicolas, listing the conciliar Popes, concludes, 'Guido de Columpna Constantie tandem subrogatur, qui Martinus etiam nunc dicitur. Ista est absque dubitacione abhominacio desolacionis stans in loco sancto.' This probably applies to the whole line rather than to Martin specifically. (Vide infra p.205).

CHAPTER IV.

CLOSING YEARS AT THE COLLEGE OF NAVARRE 1418-1437.

The date of Nicolas' return to the College of Navarre is uncertain, but it was undoubtedly between Summer 1418 and 1423. There are no letters that can be definitely ascribed to this period, and the historian of the College, Launoy, does not give a very clear picture; at one time he implies that Nicolas had returned even before the Burgundian capture of the city,[1] and at another, that he came back to the College about 1422.[2] The first date may be ruled out, since Nicolas was in Constance in Spring 1418,[3] and would have been most unlikely to return to Armagnac Paris, and to a College of pronounced Armagnac sympathies, during the crucial months of the early summer. It is probable that he followed in 1419 or 1420, when the College was beginning to resume its activities after the savage attack of 1418, the 'annus calamitosissimus', when in the course of the recapture of Paris by assault, the Burgundians had sacked the College, and cruelly ill-treated and dispersed

---

1. Launoy, op.cit. II. pp.924-5.
2. Ibid. I. p.129.
3. Vide supra p. 167-8.

its inmates. Launoy, following Juvenal des Ursins, records that the library alone escaped from the destruction,[1] but in the Religieux de St. Denis' graphic account, the College is not spared even this final horror.[2] Juvenal's account is probably the correct one, since it is used by Launoy, and Delisle records that the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were 'la plus belle époque de la bibliothèque du Collège de Navarre.'[3]

The ruined College did not recover its former prosperity until the time of Louis XI,[4] but it was not long before some kind of corporate life recurred. Within a year or two, the masters and their students, who had been entirely scattered, were beginning to reassemble 'ut potuere',[5] and by 1421, the College of Navarre, having presumably been purged for good of its Armagnac elements, was, through the

---

1. Launoy, op.cit. I. p.126. 'Cum Burgundiones potiti sunt urbe, diripuerunt hoc collegium, omnia ad vastitatem reduxerut, excepta Bibliotheca. Sodales omnes, partim verberati, partim caesi, partim fugati .... '

2. Religieux de St. Denis, op.cit. VI. p.234. 'violenter ingressi sunt, studencium cameras confregerunt et spoliaverunt in parte, in libraria libros etiam auferentes et scolares multis afflixerunt injuriis ... eos ... finaliter ad carceres regis ignominiose traxerunt cum ceteris mancipandos.'

3. Delisle, Cabinet des MSS. II. p.254.

4. Leroux de Lincy et Tisserand, Paris et ses historiens. p.169. note.3.

5. Launoy, op.cit. I. p.128.

activity of its most eminent members, recovering a certain position in the University. By 1421, the renowned Aegidius Carlerius was re-establishing his earlier prestige as a great lecturer on the 'Sentences'.[1] Guillaume Evrard, a young friend of Nicolas, and at this time a bachelor of Theology was elected Rector of the University in October 1421, and again in December 1422,[2] and in 1422 he distinguished himself as the University delegate to the Council of Amiens.[3] In the same year, the College was able to be honourably represented in the funeral cortège of Charles VI.[4]

Nicolas had almost certainly returned by this time, to lend his assistance, and his reputation, in the restoration of the College, apparently with some success, as Launoy reports that 'pietatis et eruditionis sua fama implevit sociorum solitudinem et detrimenta instauravit ac resarsit.'[5] He doubtless felt that here, at last, was work which drew him from his preferred solitude, with perhaps, the added attraction of a refuge in Paris from the

---

1. Ibid., loc.cit.
2. Du Boulay, op.cit. V. p.920.
3. Launoy, op.cit. I. p.129.
4. Ibid. I. p.128.
5. Ibid. I. p.129.

depredations of the roving armed bands which were making life in the undefended villages and hamlets of the countryside even more dangerous than urban life with all its hazards.[1]

Although Gontier and Pierre Col, Jean de Montreuil, and Nicolas de Baye had all succumbed in 1418-9,[2] and d'Ailly[3] and Gerson[4] were both away from Paris, he was not without companionship. The Master of the College, Raoul de la Porte,[5] was a friend of long-standing and a constant one, despite the fact that Nicolas had expressed himself very strongly on the subject of his strife with Regnauld des Fontaines over the Mastership in 1412-3.[6] Raoul's claims had eventually triumphed, and his long tenure of office lasted until his death in 1438,[7] thus covering the whole period of Nicolas' second residence at the College.

---

1. 'Expositio super Ysayam.' Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.91. col.1. Vide infra p.212-3.

2. Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col. p.229.

3. Salembier, op.cit. p.360.

4. Masson, op.cit. p.301.

5. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.LXXI-LXXV, XCV are addressed to him.

6. Ibid. Ep.XCIV to Regnauld des Fontaines 'Etsi utrumque diligo, magis tamen tranquillitatem illius domicilii quam ambos, diligo.'

7. Launoy, op.cit. II. p.923, 925.

Only four friends among the 'sodales' are mentioned in the very scanty and uninformative correspondence which has survived from this period,[1] Guillaume Evrard[2] and Simon de Bergères,[3] men very much younger than himself, and a Jean Daigny of whom there seems to be no other record, but who was probably a Master at the College, since Nicolas in writing to Simon, refers to him as 'fratri majori tibi.' The fourth friend is an even more indefinite figure; unnamed, he was evidently also a Master and a neighbour of Daigny's, since Nicolas asks to be remembered to 'carissimorumque preceptori vicino suo',[4] a charming phrase which suggests that although he had outlived most of his own contemporaries, he had affectionate feelings towards the young scholars among whom he lived.

The only other person mentioned in Nicolas' letters is his connection Regnauld des Fontaines,[5] elected Bishop of Soissons in 1423,[6] with whom it seems however, that he

---

1. Only seven letters have survived. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXXII-CXXXVI, and two letters in Coville's Recherches. p. 315-7.
2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXXXVI is addressed to him. He was a noted figure in the University in the early fifteenth century (Chart. Univ. Paris, IV, passim).
3. Two letters addressed to him are published by Coville in Recherches, pp.315-7. Ibid. p.314, Coville discusses what is known of his career.
4. References to these last two men occur in one of the letters to Simon. Coville, Recherches, p.317.
5. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXXXII-CXXXV are addressed to him in this period.
6. Chart. Univ. Paris. IV. p.421. 8 January.

had a disagreement soon after this date.[1] Nicolas may also have had the society, at least during part of his stay at the College of Navarre, of his 'fraterculus', now grown to manhood, and his nephew, probably still a student in the early 1420's, to both of whom he was very much devoted, although no letter addressed to either has survived.[2]

The College itself, which he had loved so much in the past for its atmosphere of tranquillity and friendliness was still to him 'domum dilectam'[3] and perhaps even in its decay, still preserved that quality of peace which appealed so strongly to him.

Like the College of Navarre, Paris itself was sadly changed since the splendid days of Nicolas' youth. The proud and brilliant city, so recently a shining light to all Christendom, 'ante paucissimos annos non solum Galliarum, sed totius fere ambitus quo Christiana religio protenditur, lumen ..... insigne',[4] was now become an illustration of the text in Isaiah 'civitatem sublimem humiliabit'.[5] There was no prosperity, the city was full of the ruins inflicted

---

1. Vide infra p. 182

2. Vide supra p. 4 note 3

3. Letter to Simon de Bergères published by Coville in Recherches, p.317.

4. 'Expositio super Ysayam', Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.90.

5. Ibid. fol.135v°.

in the Burgundian assault of 1418, and the temper of the people, inured, by the disorders of the times, to hardship and sudden death, was illustrated in the cynical 'Danse Macabre'[1] with which the Cemetery of the Innocents was decorated in 1424.[2] The surrounding countryside had become so unsafe from the ravages of the armed bands, and even from wild beasts, that many of the peasants had moved into the depopulated city 'vacuam et desolatam et ruinis quotidianis afflictam',[3] bringing their flocks, which they drove out to the fields daily, to the sound of sheperd's horns,'passim greges accubant armentaque versantur, que cum cornu sonoro matutino agros educunt.'[4]

It is not known whether, when Nicolas returned to Paris, he resumed his earlier teaching and lecturing activities;[5] however, it would seem that at least till 1425, he was too much occupied with other work to have had very much time for this. Either at his return, or soon after it, he was appointed to the fairly remunerative Provisorship of the College,[6] in accordance with the regulation that

---

1. Leroux de Lincy et Tisserand, Paris et ses historiens, pp.276-281.

2. Ibid. p.283.

3. 'Expositio Super Ysayam.' Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, no.137, fol.93v°.

4. Ibid. fol.90.

5. Vide infra p.177-9 for his changed attitude to the classics. It is possible that he might have lectured in Theology.

6. Du Boulay, op.cit. V. p.908. refers to Actis.Nat.Gall. for evidence of this fact, which is not mentioned by Launoy.

'sit in dicta Domo deputatus aliquis scholaris, probus vir, curam et administrationem Domus et scholarium predictorum gesturus, qui duplicem Theologi bursam habeat pro labore, qui Provisoris officio sen Magistri fungatur',[1] not perhaps, a very easy job, when the College was in so dilapidated a state, but one that suggests a keener grasp of practical affairs than one would have supposed that Nicolas possessed. He held the provisorship only till 1425,[2] when he relinquished it, perhaps on account of the ill-health from which he is known to have suffered about this time.[3] Again, the monumental Commentary on Isaiah, written, apparently at considerable speed, between 1423 and 1426 must have taken up a large proportion of his time during these years.[4]

Nicolas, however, evidently gave a good deal of thought to the state of learning in the University, and his comments indicate a profound dissatisfaction with the wordy, superficial debates, and the flashy rhetoric which had taken

---

1. Launoy, op.cit. I. p.20. This office was, of course, distinct from that of the Master of the College, which was the position occupied by the Master of the Theologians.

2. Du Boulay, op.cit. V. p.908. He is referred to as Antiquus Provisor Navarrae on 8 April.

3. 'Expositio super Ysayam'. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.156.

4. Vide infra pp. 188-9

the place of the pursuit of wisdom and eloquence. Religious studies, he said, should bring forth, not logical subtleties, or highly-coloured oratorical efforts, but 'simplex ac nuda veritas'.[1] He now no longer believed in the value of a prolonged study of the pagan classics, either for their subject matter, or for the acquisition of an artificial or rhetorical flow of language. Nevertheless, he still regarded a Latin style, persuasive in its simplicity, as the correct medium for communication, as opposed to the ingenious mechanics of the latest school of dialecticians, and consequently, to him, the early study of latinity was the fundamental basis of true understanding. He complained, on the one hand that this basis had been superseded by dialectic 'iam proh dolor! ... de sola dyalectica iam celebriter ac publice legatur',[2] and on the other hand, that Theologians were giving themselves over to the study of the pagans, and seeking there for wisdom, to the total exclusion of the Scriptures, 'omisso canone sacre scripture, ad fabulosa et poetica toto studiose conferunt.'[3] This

---

1. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.174v°. 'in ecclesia Christi vel in doctrina sacri eloquii nec subtilia philosophorum acumina invenienda sunt, nec colorata oratorum ornamenta, sed simplex ac nuda veritas,nec colorum fucis illita, nec sophisticis argutiis obumbrata.'

2. Ibid. fol.66v°, and fols. 84, 119v°,

3. Ibid. fol.217v°, and fol.3v°.

latter criticism is an indication that humanist studies were now well-established in Paris, a result which was, to a large extent, due to his own early efforts in this sphere.

Not only the studies, but the teachers displeased him; Nicolas deplored the unworthiness of the vain and magnificent masters who rejoiced 'inaniter', in the large numbers of their auditors, and 'ocio torpentes', spared themselves the trouble of imparting anything of value.[1] Such masters, 'reprobi doctores', he numbered with 'heretici, scismatici, pseudo-prophetae, pseudo-pontifices, scribe, pharisei', and others of like kind, as the gateways of Hell, 'porte inferi'.[2] At the same time, he recognized that all the Universities of in France, but particularly the University of Paris, were suffering an exceptional calamity, in that the danger of the roads deprived students of freedom of access.[3]

Not very much is known of the events of Nicolas' life at this period. It is to be supposed that most of his time was spent in the College of Navarre, where the chief discomforts he suffered were probably from the periodical shortages of wine and grain which afflicted the

---

1. Ibid. fol.149.
2. Ibid. fol.178v°.
3. Ibid. fol.66v°.

city, between rarer intervals of glut and plenty.[1] However, he is known to have made at least one excursion to Provins,[2] a small town near Paris, which was a place of considerable importance in the middle ages, and was often used as a headquarters by the Duc de Bourgogne.[3] There is no evidence to suggest other movements, but he may also have visited Chartres, or Bayeux where he still held a benefice.[4]

Such facts as have come to light, go to support the impression of his good reputation and comfortable circumstances. His relations not only with the Burgundians, but also with the English were evidently good, since in 1421, when he was again engaged in a lawsuit, he was able, for the second time, to engage the good-will of Henry V. It is not very clear what was in dispute, since Du Boulay, who gives the only account of the matter,[5] merely records that he was involved 'de Praepositura Normanniae in Ecclesia Carnotensis', against a canon of Chartres, Jacques de Templeune.[6] Nicolas' case was apparently laid before the

---

1. Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris, 1405-49, ed. A. Tuetey. Paris, 1881. passim.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXXXVI, and the two letters to Simon de Bergères in Coville, Recherches, pp.315-7, were written here.

3. L.F. Bourquelot, Histoire de Provins, 2 vols. Paris, Provins, 1839, 40. Vol.I. pp.71-92.

4. Vide infra pp. 229-30

5. Du Boulay, op.cit. V. p.908. referring to 'Actis Curiae'.

6. He is mentioned as a canon in Clerval, Les Ecole de Chartres, p.433, and in Souchet, J.B., Histoire du diocèse et de la ville de Chartres, 4 vols. 1866-73, vol.III. p.331.

King, perhaps on one of the two occasions on which he visited Charles in 1421, on one occasion as a barefooted pilgrim,[1] on another to install an English garrison.[2] The result was that Henry recommended the Parlement de Paris, before which the suit was to be heard, to pronounce in Nicolas' favour. However, the Parlement still preserved a measure of independence, and refused to give any judgment at all, 'ob certas causas', perhaps connected with the fact that the case is said to have concerned the liberties of the Gallican Church.[3] Clerval gives 1424 as the date of this incident,[4] which may mean that the case had, for lack of a definite judgment, dragged on for some three years, or may, perhaps more probably, be due to an error, since his information came from an early compilation of notes on the documents.[5]

One can imagine that the acute agitation, the indignation and the necessity for constant attention to his interests which had tortured Nicolas in his first lawsuit,[6]

---

1. Abbé Bulteau, Monographie de la Cathedrale de Chartres, 3 vols. Paris, 1887. p.150. This was on the 15th August.

2. Ibid. loc. cit.

3. Du Boulay, op.cit. V. p.908.

4. Clerval, op.cit. p.480.

5. Ibid. p.x.

6. Vide supra.p. 103-4.

recurred, and were perhaps even magnified, in what sounds like a more important case. Although the outcome of the suit is not known, the fact that there is no further mention of Nicolas at Chartres is probably significant. It is possible that Nicolas had had some sort of papal provision, and had been in residence here since 1418, returning to Paris only after he had failed to establish his position, perhaps because the Ordinary Collator had succeeded in reasserting his rights.

Further evidence of Nicolas' attachment to the English cause seems to be provided by two rather enigmatic letters written to Regnauld des Fontaines in 1423. The two men were apparently in opposition on some political issue, unspecified, and Regnauld had written twice, urging that such differences should not be allowed to affect personal relations, but to this Nicolas irascibly refused to agree.[1] The clue to the dispute seems to be that Regnauld was an extreme and active Dauphinist,[2] while Nicolas almost certainly objected to the part he was taking against the government.

In these early years, Nicolas' attitude was evidently the more popular one, if the generous judgments passed on

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXXXIV, CXXXV.

2. La Chronique d'Enguerrand de Monstrelet, 1400-1444. ed. Douët d'Arcq. Paris, 1857-62. 6 vols. vol.IV. Regnauld is mentioned three times in 1421 alone among the supporters of the Dauphin.

Henry V by both the Religieux de St. Denis and Juvenal des Ursins are any indication of general feeling.[1] Paris at least, was strongly Burgundian, and the University, in particular, had hastened, with an eagerness which French historians find it hard to excuse, to recommend itself to the English;[2] thus Nicolas was obviously but one of the many who believed that Anglo-Burgundian rule offered the last hope of peace and good government in France.

Nicolas' prosperity and good reputation are again borne out by the fact that, on the 8th January 1424, he was able to offer 'suis sumptibus' a 'lautissimus' banquet to the newly-elected Bishop of Châlons; for this munificence he was thanked in the following year by the French nation

---

1. Juvénal des Ursins, op.cit. p.567. 'de haut et grand courage, vaillant en armes, prudent, sage et grand justicier, qui sans acception de personne, faisoit aussi bonne justice au petit que au grand, selon l'exigence du cas: il estoit craint et reveré de tous ses parens, subjets et voisins: ny oncques prince ne fut plus suffisant pour conquester et acquerir, et aussi garder ce qu'il avoit conquis, comme il estoit.' Religieux de St. Denis, op.cit. VI. p.480, 'magnanimus, valens in armis, prudens, sagax, magnus justiciarius .....'

2. Jourdain, "L'Université de Paris à l'époque de la domination Anglaise" in Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Nouvelle série. Paris, 1870. tom.VI. pp.86-114.

of the Faculty of Arts, which entertained the Bishop on the anniversary of Nicolas' feast.[1]

Even his opinions, in two works belonging to the first years of this period do not seem to have been marked by the unrelieved pessimism which was their salient characteristic, shortly afterwards. Although he viewed the state of France and of Christendom with extreme disquiet, he did not, even yet, regard the situation as quite irretrievable. It was soon after the murder of Jean sans Peur, at Montereau on the 20th September 1419,[2] but probably before the conclusion of the Treaty of Troyes,[3] that Nicolas appealed to Jean's son and successor, Philippe le Bon, in the 'De lapsu et reparatione justitiae.'[4]

This important treatise was not originally written for Philippe, and so, was almost certainly not composed in Paris, but it was probably not more than a year or two old, since Nicolas refers to it, in his dedicatory letter[5]

---

1. Du Boulay, op.cit. V. p.908, refers to Actis Nat.Gall. His benefice at Bayeux was obviously more than enough for his own support. (Vide p.229-30).

2. Histoire de France, IV. 1. pp.382-5 gives an account of the events leading up to the murder.

3. 20-21 May 1420. Ibid. p.386.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.41-59.

5. Ibid. pp.37-40.

as 'libellum quendam 'De lapsu atque reformatione patriae ipsius'[1] per me nuper editum.' The treatise consists of of twenty-two chapters of detailed analysis of the disordered state of France, whose principle cause, he believed to be the loss of justice, that is, the abandonment of the strict code of behaviour which had prevailed in the past, in favour of luxury and license ... 'ex illo coepit tempore pro ratione voluntas regnare, pro gravitate lubricitas, pro diligentia, vanitas'. The stream of new taxes had made the princes intolerably arrogant, and had fostered sedition and domestic strife. Irritated by the dangerous ineffectiveness of the monarchy, Nicolas continues to the effect that if the King did not fulfil his office, which was to preserve peace and concord in the land, he was no king, but a tyrant, 'tolle a Rege iustitiam, Rex esse desinit.'[2] He appeals to Philippe as the country's last hope 'Tu unus es in quem bonorum omnium pacemque et Justitiam sitientium vota suspirant ... Tu regni decus et tutela, salus, spes atque stabile fulcimentum.'[3] The specific proposal for reform that Nicolas makes, in conclusion, is the summoning of a States-General, the traditional French resource in times of crisis, with the perennial justification for conciliar

---

1. Ibid. p.37. A different form of the name from that under which Lydius has published the treatise, and it is usually known.

2. Ibid. p.53.

3. Ibid. p.42, also p.49.

action 'congruum nempe esse videtur, ut in ruina vel periculo universale, universale etiam quaeratur auxilium, et quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus probetur'. The purpose of the gathering would, he says, be to discuss the defects of the three orders and their remedy, under the guidance of 'sapientes aliquos ad hoc exordinibus ipsis instituendis'.[1]

A second work, the 'Exhortatio and resistendum contra Mahometicos' is an open letter, beginning 'Cogunt me, o Principes incliti et viri militares vosque religionis ceteri professores'. It was unpublished when Launoy drew up his list of Nicolas' works,[2] but was shortly afterwards edited by Baluze in the Miscellanea,[3] with the two letters to Simon de Bergères,[4] from a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Colbert. It seems likely that all three belong to approximately the same date, that is between the end of 1418 and the middle of 1423. The Exhortatio appears, from its contents, to have been written about 1420. It is a warning to the Princes and the Christian world of the 'immanissima pericula' with which they were menaced, followed by an exhortation to enter into immediate combat with the Moslems, as the only means of arresting the awful destruction at

---

1. Ibid. p.59.
2. Launoy, op.cit. II. p.580.
3. Stephanii Baluzii ... Miscellanea, 3 vols. Lucca, 1761-4. vol.III. p.111. col.2.
4. Ibid. III. p.112, col.2-113 col.1.

their hands which would otherwise follow. 'Ista sunt bella Dei, exercitus Christi, acies fidei, ubi pro suae legis integritate, fideique intemerata conversatione contra diabolicum dimicatur exercitium.' Although he had on previous occasions made reference to the Moslem danger, this is the first indication that the subject was, to him, assuming serious proportions. Both these works are written vigorously and clearly and are practical in tone. None of the suggestions he made were adopted, but they were, nevertheless, well-considered, concrete and constructive, although they were hardly of such a nature as to gain serious consideration from the princes.

The 'De lapsu' and the 'Exhortatio', seem however, to have represented Nicolas' last desperate hope, for the salvation of France and Christendom. His whole attitude is very different by 1423, when he began the 'Expositio super Ysayam'[1]; this, the longest and most ambitious of Nicolas' works, ~~and~~ embodies his whole interpretation of the history of the schism and his conception of its significance.[2] In

1. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. Manuscrit no.137.

2. Coville was the first person for centuries to examine this manuscript, of which he gives a brief but valuable survey in Chapter IX of the Traité. pp.91-106, indicating that it was worthy of closer attention than he had been able to give it. He quotes a number of extracts reflecting Nicolas' views on the schism and the state of France, but he makes no mention of the apocalyptic interpretation of events which gives the work its significance, and is, in fact, its chief purpose. (For a description of the manuscript, Vide infra. Appendix I. p. 261).

contrast to his apparently comfortable and honourable daily existence, the outstanding characteristic of his thought was now a passionate despair unrelieved by any touch of hope.

It can be established from internal evidence that the Commentary was written between 1423 and 1426.[1] It was evidently started before Nicolas had heard of the death of Benedict XIII,[2] which became known in France in summer 1423.[3] On fol.36, he says that the schism had begun 'ante annos xlv', which would mean that he was writing in 1423-4. The section immediately preceding this was obviously written a little later, since on fol.29, he says that it was now the forty-seventh year after the schism, that is, 1424-5. Fol.65v°, where he refers to the sack of Marseilles by the King of Aragon (which took place in November 1422)[4] as 'necdum triennio lapso', was probably written in Summer 1425, and fol.103v° presumably not long after, since he mentions a battle against the English, (which must be the battle of Verneuil on 17 August 1424)[5] as 'nuper in adventu'. This

---

1. This question is briefly discussed in the Traité. p.96.

2. He refers to Benedict as still living on fol.4v°.

3. There is some doubt about the actual date of Benedict's death, but Valois (op.cit.IV. pp.450-3) concludes that it was either on the 29th November 1422, or the 23rd May 1423.

4. A. de Ruffi, Histoire de la ville de Marseille. 2 vols. Marseilles, 1696. vol.I. p.256.

5. Histoire de France, ed. Lavisse, IV.

evidence all occurs in the first half of the treatise, but there seems to be nothing in the latter pages to indicate a later date. In any case, Nicolas expected a great calamity in 1427-8,[1] and it seems most unlikely that he would have continued his work after 1426.[2]

The Commentary starts with a short preface explaining the importance, and indeed the necessity, for understanding the works of the prophets, and of Isaiah in particular. Nicolas then proceeds to examine the book verse by verse, and very often phrase by phrase.[3] The 'Expositio' further appears to be divided into ten books, each with a few lines of introduction, but there is no break in the text. This was a vast undertaking, and one which was, in fact, too great for Nicolas' strength; it is unfinished, covering only forty-seven chapters of the Book of Isaiah,[4] and Nicolas

---

1. 'Expositio super Ysayam'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.126. (vide infra. p. 217).
   fol.90, he refers to this as 'in tribus annis'.

2. Vide infra. p.217

3. Not always strictly in Biblical order, for instance there is extreme confusion in his treatment of Chapter 9, most of which is given twice over (fols.42-9), and in Chapter 22 he begins in the middle, arriving at the beginning some time later (fols.117-121v°).

4. Vide infra, Appendix I. p.261

records in the middle that he had been obliged to give up work for some months 'propter turbines nos graviter et jugiter concussientes',[1] probably ill-health.

Nicolas' object is to draw from the Prophecy its fullest possible significance, that is, the literal interpretation, on which, however, he placed small importance, and every possible allegorical application. He usually offers several,[2] signifying his preference for one bearing on modern times.[3] Very often, when carried away into a particularly long explanation, he remarks that it is now time to pass on to other subjects 'sed tempus est ex hac digressione, in quam nos prophete verba non impertinenter ut arbitror aliquantulum evagari comperunt, ad propheta reverti.'[4]

---

1. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.156. The whole of Nicolas' remarks on this subject are quoted by Coville in the Traité, pp.94-5.

2. Ibid. fol.90v°, 'multas habet Damascus interpretationes.'

3. Ibid. fol.11. 'In superiorem visionem egit propheta de peccatis Juda et Israel, hoc est si litteram sequimur duarum et X tribuum. Si autem ad spiritum vivificantem verba convertimus, due ut dictum est notantur ecclesie latina videlicet et Greca', and 133v°.

4. Ibid. fol.5, also fol.49, 'Sed ne magnitudo explanacionis in immensum progrediatur illa nunc silentio premere satûis duximus', and fol.149 'De mistico intellectu multa possent tangi satis utilia, sed consulendum brevitati est .... '

The Commentary does not provide a consistent and systematic interpretation of the persons and nations in the book of Isaiah, but, for the most part, Juda represents the Latin, and Israel the Greek Church, 'Ergo per Judam sive Jacob latinam debemus ecclesiam accipere, prout iam in superioribus me dixisse memini, per Israel vero Graecam'.[1] On occasion, however, Israel can signify the Catholic Church[2] and the Greeks be represented by the Moabites, 'Moabite Grecos respiciunt'.[3]

Egypt usually signifies France, for which deduction Nicolas thought that there was every justification,..'plures autem cause sunt atque legitime propter quas solet per Egiptum Gallia figuraliter accipi'. The reasons he gives for making it, however, though numerous, are not, perhaps, entirely convincing; the first was 'ex conformitate regionum' and the second 'ex fertilitate fruguumque copia' which both enjoyed in times of peace. He follows this with five other reasons of a similarly compelling nature.[4] The interpretation is carried to surprising lengths, as when the mention of horses in Egypt strikes him as an interesting parallel to France 'in quo abundare solebant equi et quadrige', and thus leads him on to various spiritual

---

1. Ibid. fol.75.

2. Ibid. fol.2v° 'Israel ... interpretatur sive ille hebreus populus, sive catholicus accipitur.'

3. Ibid. fol.35v°.

4. Ibid. fol.94vo.

interpretations of horses.[1] Again, when the Lord entered Egypt on a swift cloud,[2] the 'nubem levem' of the Vulgate, became for Nicolas, Gallic levity, ... 'Gallicanam levitaten, de qua ab omni evo per celeberrimos auctores Galli sunt culpati.'[3]

The two tribes which left Jerusalem and descended into Egypt, signify the transfer of the Roman Church to Avignon in the time of Clement V,[4] but only a little further on, Pharaoh must be understood to represent Benedict XIII.[5] The conquering Assyrians are interpreted throughout as the English, Henry V being the 'regem fortem quem Egiptivis, id est Francis, dominaturum, dominus ipse pollicetur'.[6] Babylon usually meant Rome, but the 'civitatem sublimem' which the Lord would humble, written, as Nicolas remarks, with reference to Babylon 'ad litteram' also signified 'figura tenuit' Rome, the Church of Jerusalem, Constantinople or Paris.[7]

Although some of these parallels seem far-fetched and over-ingenious, his interpretations are for the most part, not outrageously strained, since the writings of the

---

1. Ibid. fol.190.
2. Isaiah. XIX. 1.
3. 'Expositio'. Bibl.de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.99v°.
4. Ibid. fol.156v°.
5. Ibid. fol.157.
6. Ibid. fol.101.
7. Ibid. fol.135v°.

prophet were sufficiently appropriate to contemporary conditions to be simple of application. Thus Nicolas escaped many of the incongruities which appear in the works of the Joachites, and indeed of most medieval commentators, even one so sensible as Pierre Bersuire.[1]

The style of the 'Expositio' can scarcely be separated from its contents. It is discursive, formless, repetitive and sometimes even incorrect, but it is nevertheless a most fitting vehicle for Nicolas' gloomy utterances. It has great sincerity and considerable dramatic effect, and the total absence of the subtleties of conscious stylistic effort, only heightens the impression of urgency which he succeeds in creating. It is for the most part, clear, though there are portions where, perhaps as a result of ill-health, both the style and the subject-matter are confused and unimpressive, for instance, in the pages before folio 156, where he records that he had had to observe a pause, the work having proved above his strength, and again towards the end, where he writes with markedly impaired vitality.[2] Among his favourite figures of speech are the famous statue in the

---

1. Petri Berchorii opera omnia, 6 vols., Coloniae Agrippinae, 1730-1. Opus Reductorii Moralis, Chap.III. p.3. 'Allegorice per Adam principem vel praelatum magnum intelligo; per Evam uxorem eius, aliquem consiliarium et collateralem ipsius assumo; serpens autem inferiores Ballivos denotat; pomum vero vetitum substantia mundi designat.'

2. Chapters 36-8 (fols.189-201v^{o}) and the last few chapters, in particular.

book of David which had a head of gold and feet of clay, the body divided against itself, the doctor and the sick body, and a variety of animal similes.

Although it seems from internal evidence, to have been written in a very short time,[1] it is obvious that Nicolas' studies in the book of Isaiah must have extended over many years. In fact he refers in the 'Expositio' for definitive statements on two verses, to letters written years earlier; one, to Raoul de la Porte, about 1411,[2] the second appears not to have survived.[3] In the letter to Raoul, Nicolas asks his friend, who had contact with learned men and works, to write something to supply his lack of commentaries on the Scriptures, indicating that Isaiah was his favourite prophet 'inter omnes prophetas, ille mihi maxime placuit.'[4]

His own commentary, heavy with quotations and citations, is in itself, testimony to a lifetime of study. There are

---

1. Vide supra p. 188-9.

2. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.14. refers to letter to Raoul de la Porte. (Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XCV).

3. 'Expositio', Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.46v^{o}, he says 'hanc litteram ante annos aliquot in quadam epistola incidente occasione iuxta illa que modo dictanda sunt de tribus policie ordinibus secundum nominum interpretationes exposui.' Unfortunately there seems to be no trace of what sounds like an interesting letter.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XCV.

a surprisingly large number of references to Greek and Roman history, to Alexander, Anthony and Cleopatra, the famous law-givers and philosophers,[1] and even to Jason,[2] but there seem to be no quotations from the pagan writers, and no reference whatsoever to the poets. There are very many quotations from the Fathers, among whom St. Jerome and St. Augustine[3] seem to be his favourites, and from the apocalyptic writers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries,[4] but vastly the greater number are from the Scriptures, and particularly from the prophet Jeremiah.

In the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah, Nicolas saw a bitter message to his own times; it was now too late for a warning. The ' Expositio' is in fact, not an objective commentary on the book of Isaiah but, as its name suggests, an exposition of its significance, an application of the prophecy to contemporary Christendom. The change in tone from the 'De Lapsu',[5] which is not more than four years earlier, is most remarkable. He had now, not only given up all hope of reformation, in either Church

---

1. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fols. 65, 100v°, 101, 102, 141, 141v°, 151v°, 152v°, 181v°, 235.

2. Ibid. fol.171v°.

3. Vide infra. p. 233, 246.

4. Vide infra. pp. 219-23.

5. Vide supra. pp. 174-6.

or State, but he believed that the sins of Christendom had incurred an imminent and inevitable judgment at the hand of God. There is no trace of the doubt and reticence which had been so characteristic of his writings in the past, presumably for the reason that the 'Expositio' could have been intended only for very private circulation, since, had it been widely known, its unorthodoxy would undoubtedly have incurred ecclesiastical censure and various penalties which it would have been quite out of keeping with Nicolas' character, to risk.[1]

Nicolas gives a consistent interpretation of the history of the schism, of which the fundamental thesis is the inalienable legitimacy of Benedict's right to the Papacy. The argument is not, of course, presented in any sort of consecutive order, since the disjointed method of a verse by verse commentary precludes a logical sequence, although it leads, in Nicolas' case to so much repetition that his views are in no kind of doubt.

His reading of events up to the beginning of the schism shows no advance on that expressed in the 'De Ruina' in 1401 - the primitive church, having fallen from grace

---

1. Vide infra p. 208-9.

by the loss of its spiritual values in overgreat prosperity, had become utterly depraved and worldly[1] even to the extent that the Papacy itself left its time-honoured and sanctified seat in Rome and removed to Avignon to further its connection with the secular princes.[2] He does not explicitly repeat that the schism was appointed as a punishment for the sins of the Church, but presumably only because this was self-evident, and he was now preoccupied with its results rather than its cause.

From this point onwards the hardening of his opinions, and greatly increased confidence in his judgments are very apparent. The schism, he said, had come about in a manner which left no room for doubt; after the death of Gregory XI, the election of Clement VII had been preceded by the turbulent and invalid election of Bartholomeo, Archbishop of Bari, 'sicque execrabile illud in ecclesia Christiani conflatum est scisma'.[3] This was the worst of all the schisms that

---

1. Ibid. fol.5v°.

2. Ibid. fols.23, 95, 156v°, 157.

3. Ibid. fol.29v° 'post mortem Gregorii xi velut alterius Ozie, Cardinales Romae constituti, Bartholomeum Barrensem Archiepiscopum per popularem seditionem, vi atque oppressione elegerunt, quem Urbanum nominaverunt. Deinde Roma egressi, Fundosque profecti, Roberto de Gebennis concordi consensu et motu proprio cursus elegerunt, quem Clementem septimum vocari decreverunt sicque execrabile .... '

that had ever been, and undoubtedly the sign given by St. Paul to the Thessalonians of the imminent desolation of the Church, and the second advent of Christ in judgment.[1]

Nicolas stigmatizes the part played by Charles V in precipitating the schism 'an non praeterea ibidem ecclesie desolatio scismatisque radicatio per precipitem Karoli quinti determinationem originem sumpserunt'.[2] This was a common Urbanist criticism, but is a rather curious observation on Nicolas' part, in view of the fact that it was largely due to Charles' encouragement and support that the Clementine Papacy owed its being. More understandable, but a rather sad comment on his own early efforts in the cause of union, is his criticism of the mischievous intervention of the University in the affairs of the Church, 'in rebus ecclesie agitandis, ut non dicam sagittandis et in belli rebus lingue gladio acuendis.'[3]

Nicolas never displayed very much enthusiasm for Clement VII, who was too much the friend of princes to please him, but his praises of Benedict XIII know no bounds. The Pope's sanctity and constancy made him a shining example

---

1. Ibid. loc.cit.
2. Ibid. fol.65v°, col.2.
3. Ibid. fol.66v°.

to his contemporaries,[1] 'immo certe nomine, vita, sanctitate, constancie, fortitudine Petrus alter erat';[2] he was Christ's vicar and the most acceptable to God of all mankind, 'vicarium eius certissimum, hominumque quo terra ferabat dignissimum deoque gratissimum'.[3] He treats with scorn the suggestion that there could be any doubt about his legitimacy, but if anyone should raise the question, the answer lay in the evidence of the Cardinals, and in the obvious justice of his cause, which had been sufficient to convince all France for a long period of years,[4] 'inconcussa certitudine verum ius habebat, verusque Petri successor erat'.[5] How then, had he lost the power granted by God, since it was impossible for 'nostra inobedientia' to remove it'?[6]

---

1. Ibid. fol.29v°, 'cuius virtutes atque merita velut celestis cuiusdam luciferi in ecclesia radiabat'; fol.95v°, 'sanctum virum, lumenque orbis universi'; fol.121, 'nostri nubilosi temporis lumen, egregius Benedictus XIII'; fol.157, 'sidus evi nostri, immo certe orbis universi lucidissimum.'

2. Ibid. fol.102v°.

3. Ibid. fol.36v°; also fols.29v°, 32v°, 36, 129v°, 161.

4. Ibid. fol.4v°, 'Sed forte dicis ambiguum esse quisnam pontifex esset. Tanto Cardinalium universorum testimonio, tanta luce et evidentia rationum, tantis annorum decursibus illum certum et verum pontificem et sensimus et credidimus'.

5. Ibid. fol.102v°.

6. Ibid. fol.4v°, 'Unde itaque ius perdidit a deo sibi ... attributum. Numquid rebellio interius sibi abstulit, numquid nostra inobedientia potestatem a deo datam adimere potuit'.

That the French royal house, with its long tradition of defending the papacy had, after years of support, turned against Benedict, could be no other than the work of the Devil.[1] Through the influence of liars and intriguers,[2] Benedict had been persecuted and beseiged 'castris, armis, machinis, igne, gladio, exercitu',[3] after which, as if this had not been enough, he was twice ejected from the Papacy[4] 'per fallacissimas suggestiones, calupniosa mendacia, subdolaque machinamenta'.[5]

For this lamentable event, with its incalculable results, Nicolas attached the chief blame to Simon Cramaud, 'sceleratissimo illo patriarcha Alexandrino',[6] and, in a lesser degree, to the other members of the great embassy of Spring 1407, who, although he concedes that many of them were sincere and honest, all feared the opprobious epithet of 'Lunatici'.[7] In making this qualification, he was

---

1. Ibid. fol.4v° 'Unde mutacio ista, unde dubitacio, nisi a maligno'.

2. Ibid. fol.91v°, 'per fallaces mendaciorum machinas, subdolasque excogitatas versutias'.

3. Ibid. fol.4v°.

4. Ibid. fol.36, 'tandem bis e pontificatu eiecimus'.

5. Ibid. fol.32v°.

6. Ibid. fol.95v°.

7. Ibid. fol.95v°; Valois, op.cit. III. p.499, gives a list of the legates.

perhaps thinking of his own friends, d'Ailly and Gerson and of Pierre Plaoul, particularly recommended to his consideration by Jean de Montreuil,[1] all three of whom had been members of the legation, to which, moreover, his beloved Jacques de Nouvion had been attached as Secretary. Many of the members of this legation had reported 'multa nephanda de sancti illius pastoris vita, moribus et operibus ... que nulla veritatis scintilla fulcirentur', and by so doing they had revived and strengthened the schism, which was then on the verge of extinction 'fere extinctum'.[2] The legates, however, had arrived determined, 'omnino decreverant', to evict Benedict whose supremacy they hated, 'cui inviti subiacebant', from the Papacy whatever his attitude should be; for this reason alone, they pursued with great ardour the policy of double cession, knowing that contumacy on the part of the Roman pope would give them an excuse to depose Benedict also.[3] Cramaud had thus, as far as in him lay destroyed all virtue in the Church and State

---

1. Letters of Jean de Montreuil. Ampl.Coll. II. Ep.XXVI. (Bibl.Nat.Latin, 13062. fol.68v^{o}.)

2. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.95v^{o}.

3. Ibid. fol.96. 'quibus legatis et patriarche satis fuit ut sub umbra contumacie Romani intrusi ..... obedientiam possent Benedicto pontifici ... extorquere ..... non obaliam causam amborum cessionem tanto animorum ardore flagitantes .... '

and so had shown himself beyond doubt, to be the precursor of Antichrist.[1]

At the Council of Pisa, Cramaud, 'omnium mortalium perfidissimum' and his associates, were constituted as Benedict's judges, in which capacity, ignoring their obligation under the 'ius gentium', they sent away his envoys unheard 'nec legatos eius audire voluerunt, sed ... minis atque iniuriis gravissimis affectos inaudita legatione exire coegerunt',[2] so that at length, Benedict was 'ignominiose' ejected from the papacy.[3] Thus, casting the rightful heir out of the vineyard, the Patriarch and his associates gave his place over to usurpers,[4] firstly to Pierre de Candia, elected 'in Pisanu cetu', whom they called Alexander, and secondly to Balthasar, John XXIII, who, having poisoned his predecessor, was elected in his stead.[5] This latter was the

---

1. Ibid. fol.95v° 'O infelix et infaustaque legatio que monstri illius et fautorum suorum ministerio ecclesiam destruxit, lumen orbis extinxit .... omnem denique virtutem a regno et ab ecclesia, quantum quidem in illo fuit homine perdito et antichristi proculdubio precursore, prorsus exterminavit'.

2. Ibid. fol.161v°.

3. Ibid. fol.157.

4. Ibid. fol.29v°, 'Veroque herede e vinea pro violentia eiecto, vineam ipsam per alienos plerosque variis intrusionibus usurpari fecerunt'.

5. Valois, op.cit. IV. p.129, says that Balthasar was suspected of having some part in Alexander's death; J.B. Peterson in the Catholic Encyclopedia, vol.I. p.289, says that the charges of having poisoned his predecessor which were brought against John at the Council of Constance are now discredited. It seems possible that Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep. LXI, relates to the death of Alexander. Symptoms not unlike poisoning are described. (Vide Appendix II. p. 286).

most criminal man on the face of the earth, and a worthy Pope indeed, for his own supporters; he was indeed 'the abomination of the desolation standing in the Holy Place.'[1] And so was Christ crucified a second time in the person of his vicar, whose throne was usurped by the monster 'monstrum illud execrabile'. This was, he said, the most wicked work ever seen throughout the ages 'que nichil viderunt secula funestius', but nevertheless, not incongruous in the age of the Antichrist, Christ himself having clearly taught that the appearance of 'the abomination of the desolation standing in the Holy Place' would be a sure sign of his second advent, to do judgment on earth.[2]

Nicolas' hatred of the Councils was bitter and contemptuous, for, he said, they had done nothing to the purpose, but by violent and ill-conceived action, dictated by ungodly men, had continuously aggravated the schism.[3]

---

1. Ibid. fol.65v° 'quo tandem se ac suis moribus dignum invenierent pontificem, Balthasarem, omnium quos terra sustinebat sceleratissimum..'

2. Ibid. fol.117v° 'sed antichristianis non imerito congruebat temporibus, ut Christo rursus in Petro suo crucifixo, principatum sacerdotii monstrum illud execrabile usurparet ..... secundi adventus Christi et novissime adesse ad iudicii signum indubium'. Matthew XXIV. 15-28 is the source of this belief.

3. Ibid. fol.29v° 'Multa quippe super huius execrabilis plaga consolidatione fuerunt vocata concilia atque congregata sed nichil est in omnibus utile gestum, immo morbus ipse ex remediis ineptiis prorsus ac violentis quorumque improborum importunitate in deterius semper aggravatus.'

All that they had finally achieved was the persecution and expulsion of the true Pope, an unheard-of proceeding. Nicolas expressed himself dramatically by means of his favourite simile of the body 'Quis morbum audivit tocius corporis per capitis abscissionem debere curari, unde exempla colligemus quod unquam verus sit pontifex eiectus?'[1] And so they added sin upon sin, 'errorem super errorem, vicium super vicium, maliciam super maliciam incessanter accumulantes.'[2]

This result was indeed, only to be expected, taking their personnel into consideration, for they were 'nefanda sceleratorum conciliabula'.[3] He strongly disapproved of the new practice which had been introduced in the face of ancient custom, of giving votes at the Council, not only to the Bishops, but to the Masters of Arts, Laws and Theology, who had previously attended only to give counsel.[4] Again, as in the 'Disputatio', he criticizes the fool-hardy self-confidence of these people who thought that they had ended the schism, 'plerique in nonnullis conciliis convenienter alligatam immo perfecte sanatam existiment', a confidence which was not universally shared, for 'non desunt tamen permulti qui de ea re nunc plurimum dubitent'.[5]

1. Ibid. fol.4v°.
2. Ibid. fol.156v°.
3. Ibid. fol.177.
4. Ibid. fol.156v°.
5. Ibid. fol.161v°.

Martin V, he mentions only very casually, sparing him the violent diatribes which John XXIII called forth, and giving only a brief account of his election .. 'novissime quoque monstro illo, deo et celo et mundo universo intollerabili eiecto, in Guido de Columpna Constantie tandem subrogatur, que Martinus etiam nunc dicitur.' The following sentence begins 'Ista est absque dubitacione abhominacio desolaciones stans in loco sancto...',[1] which Coville seems to understand as dependent on Martin.[2] It is, however, more likely to apply to the three conciliar Popes, whom he has just listed as usurpers, in general, or perhaps even to refer back to John XXIII, who was the chief object of his fury. His only other reference to Martin, certainly not a very friendly one, is to spread a report to the effect that the Pope had decided to allow a crusading army to be sent to support the King of Sicily against his enemies.[3]

---

1. Ibid. fol.29v°.

2. Coville, Traité p.98.

3. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal no.137, fol.109v° 'Disseminatum est Martinum pontificem agmina cruce signatorum in favorem regis Siculi adversus occupatores terrarum suarum nisi ab illarum desisterent occupatione maturius sese missurum statuisse.'

He obviously does not regard him as the legitimate Pope, and, presumably believing in the right of Benedict's Cardinals to make a new election, he shows no disposition to accept him, even after the death of Benedict.

One of the most unusual features of Nicolas' attitude is that, not only does he continue to the last to proclaim the inalienable right of Benedict, but up to the time of the death of the Pope, which did not become known to him until some time after he had begun the 'Expositio', he appears to have entertained hopes that he would ultimately meet with recognition, and be restored to his rightful position. There is only one statement to this effect, but it seems to leave no room for doubt. 'Ratione ducenti, iam sunt anni exacti ex quo sancto cuidam heremite manifesta super hoc scismate ab angelo allata est revelatio, in qua pontifex ille noster Benedictus quem tantis persecuti sumus angustiis, orthopontifex appellatur.'[1]

For the death of Benedict, Nicolas appears to hold the kings of France responsible. They, he says, expelled him from the papacy, and murdered him in Peniscola, where he had taken refuge from their violence 'in quodam promunctorio ad quod profugus accesserat, post oppressiones alias, venenatosque potiones per quosdam sibi ministratos, ad mortem tandem compulerunt.'[2]

---

1. Ibid. fol.5.
2. Ibid. fol.95v^{o}.

Only less strange than this is his apparent wish to recognize Benedict's impossible Spanish successors. Here again, although there is only one piece of evidence, it seems to be a conclusive one. He says that there are not lacking many who 'plurimum dubitent' touching the work of the Councils, both on account of the oppression of Benedict 'tum propter obedientiam quam in Hispaniis successor eius habere perhibetur, tum propter processum adversum illum, multorum existimatione minus congruenter actum.'[1]

The extreme peculiarity of these views is indicated by the fact that it is impossible to trace more than a handful of people who shared them. Closest in affinity to Nicolas is Benedict's ardent supporter the Spanish Chronicler, Martin d'Alpartil, who was still writing in these years. His '<u>Chronica Actitatorum temporibus Benedicti XIII</u>'[2] although compared with the violence of the 'Expositio', it is almost impartial, gives a similar, if less highly-coloured account of various of the events of the schism, obviously common features of Benedict's defence. They both condemn the part played by the University,[3] and complain bitterly

1. <u>Ibid</u>. fol.161v°
2. Edited by F. Ehrle. Paderborn, 1906. [Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte. Bd.12].
3. Alpartil's <u>Chronica</u>, p.207. Records the damages suffered by the University in the Burgundian assault of 1418, and continues 'nec inmerito, quia ipsis de Universitate Parysiensi .... in Pisana et Costanciensi congregationibus quantum in eis fuit, sophismatibus calupniata in tantum, quod quia voluntarie noluit renunciare papatui, ipsum dominum Benedictum abiecerunt ...' For Nicolas' opinion, Vide supra p. 192.

of the treatment of Benedict's ambassadors at the Council of Pisa,[1] and both contain the allegation that Benedict was poisoned.[2] There is little in d'Alpartil's Chronicle, however, to reflect Nicolas' detestation of Cramaud and John XXII, and his bitter contempt for the Councils.

In France, the only person of any note who is known to have shared Nicolas' protracted obedience was Comte Jean IV d'Armagnac, who refused to recognize Martin till 1430. A few scattered peasants appear to have cherished similar sympathies, but their numbers were always exceedingly small, and constantly diminishing.[3] Whatever the numbers of Benedict's supporters, it is clear that their position was a highly irregular one, and that 'ipso facto', they all incurred severe penalties under the Statutes of the Councils.

The thirty-seventh session of the Council of Constance, which had condemned Benedict had forbidden the faithful to recognize him under pain of losing, as heretics and schismatics, all their ecclesiastical and secular

---

1. Ibid. p.192. 'audencia fuit eis denegata et multa inproperia de papa audiverunt, et propter serviciam Pisis congregatorum predicti ambaxatores incongeriati revenerunt'. For Nicolas' opinion, vide supra p.202

2. Ibid. p.210. 'in morte propter pociones'. For Nicolas' opinion, vide supra p.206.

3. Valois, op.cit. IV. pp.437-478 records what is known of these people.

benefices, dignities and honours, they were further prohibited from obeying Pierre de Luna, from receiving, helping or sustaining him in any way and from giving him either material aid, or counsel and advice.[1] This edict was confirmed by the Council of Sienna in 1423, and thereto was added a prohibition against the support of his successors 'omnes et singulos post obitum dicti Petri de Luna continuantes seu perseverantes in credulitate ... vel observantia erroris et schismatis eiusdem Petri ... damnati ... fore obnoxios atque ligatos poenis et censuris in dicta sententia contentis'.[2] In view of these restrictions, it is clear that Nicolas' freedom of expression must have been due to the fact that the 'Expositio' was not intended for a wide public, perhaps indeed, for his more or less private satisfaction.[3]

The measure of Nicolas' confidence in Benedict, is his theory of the divine judgment which was to overtake Christendom in retribution for his expulsion. France was already suffering in full measure for her share in this evil,

---

1. Mansi, G.D. Conciliorum Sacrorum Collectio Nova, 2nd edition. 53 vols. Venice, 1759 etc. vol.27 (1778) cols. 1141-2. Dated 26 July 1417.

2. Mansi, vol.28, col.1060.

3. Vide infra. p. 228.

and he laid the ultimate share very largely on the shoulders of the French royal house, for its part in the persecution of Benedict, and in particular, for the fact that it had been responsible for Simon Cramaud's fateful legation.[1] The French, he said, and especially the magnates, were reckless in protecting with the very highest recommendations, worthless men, who abused their confidence. 'Hanc ego causam esse puto, quare in istam patriam non solum sit comminatio, sed odiosa execratio propter legationem'.[2]

All the disorders which had since afflicted France, were to be attributed to the expulsion of Benedict, by the Princes, 'unde fomes et radix omnium malorum que post illa tempora regnum Francie per hostilia, civiliaque certamina sustinuit absque omni ambiguitate processerunt'.[3] It is one of his many attractive qualities that, although he had had no part in the persecution of Benedict XIII, he never dissociates himself, in an attitude of self-righteousness from either the sin, or the punishment. He very often uses the first person plural, as 'nostra inobedientia',[4]

---

1. Of which he wrote emphatically 'Hic fons et certa origo est Gallicane desolacionis, hic cardo volvitur totius nostre maledictionis'. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.161v°.

2. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.95v°. 'Mos est Gallorum, et presertim principum regnique magnatum, facile in litteris commendaticiis inserere, ut verbis geruli fides habeatur ...'

3. Ibid. fol.161v°.

4. Ibid. fol.4v°.

'Benedicto .... depulsu, Balthasarem ne dicam Barrabam in sede locavimus',[1] and 'in nostrorum haud dubie gravissimorum peccatorum condignam retributionem'.[2]

The penalty had indeed, already been heavy, - the whole country was dilapidated and ruined by foreign and civil war.[3] Here we find his real attitude to the English stated with great clarity; they were France's oldest enemies, pestilential and cruel.[4] Nevertheless, he has words of praise for Henry V 'qui fortis et prudens et strenuus erat, et mira valde celeritate propter intestina dissidia regni Francorum partem ingentissimam occupaverat, ad spem que corone sua estimatione quasi certam venerat'.[5] Moreover he evidently felt that even the depredations of the English

---

1. Ibid. fol.57v°.

2. Ibid. fol.65v°.

3. Ibid. fol.40v°, 'Deserta est usquequaque furoreque belli civilis ad summum profligata Gallia nostra, regionem nostram coram nobis .... alieni devorant et devorabitur ... Depopulata est ad summum patria universa ...'; fol.65v° 'in ... omnifere tractu regni Francie horribile est diras clades ex bellis civilibus ortas intueri ...' also fol.75, 121v°, 142, 161v° etc.

4. Ibid. fol.109v°, 'Ecce .... in manu Anglorum, vetustissimorum hostium atque crudelissimorum Franciam nostram traditam cernimus, qui hostili animo, veterique odio, cuncta dissipare, confundere, exterminare ac profligare gloriantur ... '.

5. Ibid. fol.101.

were preferable to the extortions of the princes with their private armies.

They who should have protected the people, were in fact, the country's most cruel scourge,[1] being more savagely rapacious even than the Bishops.[2] At the same time, they were luxurious and pleasure-loving, revelling through half the night and then not getting up till nine or ten o'clock in the morning.[3] They were thoroughly effeminate, which vice, unlike the faults of mere youth, there was no prospect of age correcting.[4]

The countryside was so unsafe that the peasants and their flocks sought shelter in the towns, whither the wolves

---

1. Ibid. fol.40v°. 'Illi qui esse solebant propugnatores, nescio quo venenato poculo facti sunt illius exterminatores ... illi qui ab alienis vastatoribus illam defendere debeant, militares nostri acerbius oppugnaturi ... '

2. Ibid. fol.17. 'Principes sunt leones qui vi rapiunt, sed prelati tanquam catuli leonum, qui reliquias eorum devorant.'

3. Ibid. fol.10v°. 'Totis noctibus luditur, cantatur, saltatur, editur, bibitur, luxurie atque voluptati indulgetur, diebus autem usque ad nonam vel decimam horam quiescitur.' fol.103v°, their revelries were the cause of their undoing in battle.

4. Ibid. fol.15. 'In pueris signaliter spes est ad maturam pervenient aetatem ad sapientiamque et prudenciam atque curarum rei publice, in effeminatis autem nec res, nec spes est emmendationis...'

pursued them, in search of their accustomed prey.[1] There was no law, no order, no virtue, 'nulla lege vivitur, nullo iure, nullo ordine',[2] 'nulla virtutis scintilla ... spes iacet, fides exulat ... veritas abiit, pietas obiit'.[3] It was still the sufferings of the peasantry that moved Nicolas most, and he is tireless in painting the misery of their lives, and the desolation of the countryside, when the farmers could no longer plough their lands or tend their cattle, but lost everything they possessed to their oppressors.[4]

There was no King and two 'reguli' fought for possession of the country,[5] while the princes were turning

---

1. Ibid. fol.91. 'Requiescent greges pacifice in urbibus, non timentes scilicet luporum insidias vel predatorum rapinas, latius ubique per agros vagantium, quanquam certe prout fideli plurimorum relatu didici, postquam in agris greges ovium propter villarum solitudinem patereque desolationem pasci desierunt, lupi et urbes irrumpere fluviosque natatu transire, suo iure ceperunt, sequentes videlicet, predam qua vivere consueverant.'

2. Ibid. fol.127.

3. Ibid. fol.40v°.

4. Ibid. fol.5. 'nullus est pastor, nullus arator, nulli boves, nulla iumenta, cultores aut trucidati sunt, aut inedia consumpti aut certe in alienas perfugi regiones ... ' also fols. 6, 16v°, 40v°, 65v°, 90, 91, 127v°, 128v°, 141v°, 222, 222v°.

5. Ibid. fol.57. ... 'Gallia nostra per duos regulos de regni iure decertantes prope iam ad exterminium consumpta est.'

the royal power into a public robbery, 'de regali dominio publicum latrocinium ad malorum summam fecisse'.[1] The individual punishment of the princes for their crimes, had already been heavy. Nicolas attributed to the power of retribution, the staggering losses which their ranks had sustained in the course of the civil and foreign wars. 'Quis enim nostrorum principum qui in oppressione pii pastoris operam aut consensum prebuit, non vel de vita sublatus est, vel captivitate abductus.'[2]

However, it was not only France, but the whole of Latin Christianity that was suffering 'quante nos clades oppresserunt, nec solum nos, sed totam fere latinam ecclesiam, quis satis aut verbis effari, aut stilo comprehendere sufficeret'.[3] His eager interest in all contemporary events provided him with plenty of material in support of the view that society was indeed disintegrating. The kings and princes of Europe, and even the Pope, were being driven forth from their thrones; there was no Emperor to keep the peace, as was, he said, their custom; almost all the proud cities of Europe had fallen before violent attacks. Added to all this was the unbelievable corruption of manners

---

1. Ibid. fol.36.
2. Ibid. fol.36v°.
3. Ibid. fol.121.

and behaviour.[1]

All these disorders were, however, only a beginning, the mere preliminary to a complete catastrophe - the advent of Antichrist, to be followed by the second coming of Christ to judge the earth. The clearest account of his idea of this event is actually not in the 'Expositio', but in the short 'De Antichristo et Ortu eius, vita moribus et operibus',[2] a second open letter addressed primarily to the Princes. Its opening phrases, 'Cogor Principes orthodoxi, Catholicique

---

1. Ibid. fol.57. 'Quantos enim principes in utraque policia in annis istis infelicissimis a suis sedibus eiectos vidimus. Pontificem Benedictum tercium decimum, ... e pontificatu deiectum... Anglie rex sub ubere est. Rex Scocie captivus est. Sicilia pro iure regni solito more debachatur. Reges Hispaniarum contra se bella gerunt ... Ytalos ciuilia bella iugitur afflictant et multo atrocius, Galliam nostram inestimabilibus angustiis hodierna tempestate concussam cernimus ... Nobis autem imperator nullus est, qui tantis mederi valeat incommodis, tamque feralia placare certamina, exitiale postremo ac vetustissimum ecclesie scisma necdum consopitum cernimus. Adde luxum, adde rapinas, adde mores effeminatos, adde pompas et tyrraniden, adde predandi libertatem, rapiendique universali licentiam, adde patrie exterminium agriculture vacationem, mercandique et commeandi libertatem prorsus ereptam .....
Examples of his descriptions of corruption and destruction in both Church and State could be multiplied almost indefinitely.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.357-9. All the elements of this account occur in scattered form in the 'Expositio'.

Pontifices vosque Christiane religionis ceteri cultores ... ' are very reminiscent of the 'Exhortatio ad resistendum contra Mahometicos';[1] its contents are, however, very different, for it was written in 1424-5, and re-echoes the despairing tones of the 'Expositio'.

This day of judgment, 'magnum iudicium', was not, however, to be confused with the Last Judgment 'extremum iudicium', for between the two, there would be a lapse of time whose duration could not be calculated by men or angels, but was known only to the Father. The instrument of the 'magnum iudicium' of the Lord was to be the 'Mahometici', the beast 'de mare' of the Apocalypse, since, he conjectured, they would arrive in ships. The part of the beast 'de terra' which would make the image of the first to be worshipped, was to be taken by the heretics, 'patareni', who would rise in the support of the Infidel[2]. This subject seems to obsess Nicolas increasingly, in the course of the 'Expositio', and towards the end, he is looking back less frequently to Benedict, but is turning his attentions, almost continually, to the future, not altogether unnaturally, since he believed that the hour of the 'magnum iudicium' was fast approaching.

---

1. Vide supra. p. 186-7

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.357-9.

Nicolas expected a quite unprecedented and indescribable calamity, princedoms and kingdoms would fall, and enormous slaughter would fill the earth; indeed he had reason for so thinking, for if Christ, through the mouth of the prophet said 'Qui tangit vos, tangit pupillam oculi mei', his vengeance for the persecution of his faithful vicar would not be light.[1]

The date of the 'magnum iudicium' was not, like that of the last judgment, incalculable. Nicolas knew just how long Christendom was to survive, and it was heavy knowledge to him. The critical year was to be 1427-8, the fiftieth year after the schism, when the moderate form of judgment in progress since 1378 would be superseded by the ferocious severity of the Moslem visitation.[2] Antichrist, who was to lead the irresistible forces of destruction, was already grown to manhood, and eager to perform his awful mission[3]

---

1. Ibid. fol.161v°. 'ideo acerbatus per nos in sui fidelissimi vicarii tam scelerata inauditaque persecutione supramodum dominus tanquam insoliti furoris contra se debachationem, non equo ulterius animo tolerandam existimans, exinde sui novissimi ad iudicium adventus occasionem merito sortitus est.'

2. Ibid. fol.126. 'Id interim mihi ac multis etate provectis solatii perfugium est quod usque ad annum quinquagesimum leve tractabitur ab ecclesia exinde illa mala facturus que incredibilia prorsus erunt.'

3. Ibid. fol.218v°. 'qui non modo quidem iam pridem natus est, sed annosus et provectus et undique sevire paratus'; fol.209v°, 'ipse Antichristus potens utique et validus et ad annos iam perductus in quibus sevire debet, universaque dissipare'; fol.29v° '... Antichristo qui iam grandevus dicitur'.

whenever the conquest of the Greek Church had been completed.[1] Even the name of Antichrist was, he remarks cryptically, to be found by a careful study of the New Testament.[2] He does not commit himself so far as to give it, so perhaps he had not, as yet, made a successful search. However, he gives various other pieces of information; Antichrist was to be both King of Sicily and Emperor,[3] a successor of Henry VI 'licet multis in medio interiectis',[4] some people indeed thinking he would be a future Frederick III.[5] Calling the Moslems and the 'patareni' to his aid, for the destruction of the Christian religion, he would exercise intolerable oppression towards the Church, the Empire and his many Kingdoms.[6] Nicolas, who had for many years been prepared for an early death, was able to comfort himself

---

1. Ibid. fol.36 ... 'post oppressionem Grece ecclesie .... latine ecclesie per mahometicos etiam principes et populos, execranda desolatio ... '

2. Opera, ed. Lydius, p.359.

3. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.76. '.... et tyrannus ille, ... de regno Siculorum ad imperiale convolebit fastigium'.

4. Ibid. fol.126. '... memorati Henrici ... posterus ac successor erit.

5. Ibid. fol.70. 'antichristum quem Fredericum tercium nonulli futurum estimant.'

6. Ibid. fol.76. '... ac imperium immo regna plurima, totamque ecclesiam tyrannide intolerabili opprimet.' Other references to Antichrist are on fols. 13, 16, 74, 90, 118, 129, 134v°, 146v°, 196, 209v°.

only with the hope that he would not survive even the three intervening years which led up to the fulfilment of the prophecies.[1]

This disaster of the dreaded year was not, however, to bring about the end of the world. Out of the desolation, in which the unrighteous were to be the chief, though not the only sufferers, it was appointed that some few saintly men would be spared, by whose agency peace would be brought to the world, and the conversion of the Mahometici, and the even more hateful Patareni, effected. Thereafter, the world would wait in quiet watchfulness for the unpredictable day of the Last Judgment.[2]

Very little of this system was original. Nicolas' apocalyptical theories were all ultimately derived from the Joachite tradition.[3] The conception of a new era in the Christian world had been introduced by Joachim of Flora at the end of the twelfth century. His ideas did not, however,

---

1. Ibid. fol.103v°. 'Sane ego qui hec scribo provecte admodum etatis sum, et diu in vita manere non valeo, et tamen nichil est quod tantum verear, quam ne dies illos turbidos intueri compellor.'

2. 'De Antichristo'. Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.357-9.

3. Accounts of the doctrines of Joachim are given by P. Fournier, Etudes sur Joachim de Flore et ses doctrines. Paris, 1909; E.G. Gardner "Joachim of Flora and the Everlasting Gospel" in Franciscan Essays by P.Sabatier etc. Aberdeen, 1912. pp.50-70; H.Bett, Joachim of Flora. London 1931, gives a brief survey of Joachim's life, writings and followers. J.J.I. von Döllinger in 'Prophecies and the Prophetic Spirit in the Christian Era', trans. A. Plummer, London, 1873, gives a wider survey of the Apocalyptic prophecies. E. Gebhart, "Recherches Nouvelles sur l'Histoire du Joachimisme" in Revue Historique, vol.XXXI (1886) pp.56-73, deals with the reactions of the Church and University of Paris to the development of the Joachite doctrines.

become at all widespread till the middle of the Thirteenth Century, by which time they had been considerably elaborated, and indeed, in some essential points, changed, by the circulation of spurious writings attributed to Joachim which were, in fact, more widely read than his own works. Nicolas was well read in, and valued, all these works, of which he wrote 'his annis, opuscula et visu saluberrima sunt et lectu pernecessaria.'[1] He did not, of course, distinguish between the spurious and the genuine. He quotes most frequently from the spurious, and enigmatical 'Expositio super Isaiam', particularly from the first section, 'De Oneribus',[2] from which on at least one occasion, he quotes extensively. Of the actual works of Joachim, the one with which he seems most familiar is the 'De Concordia'.[3]

---

1. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.81v°.

2. Eximii profundissimique sacrorum eloquiorum perscrutatoris Abbatis Joachim Florensis scripturi super Esaiam. Venice, 1517. 'De Oneribus' is quoted by Nicolas in the 'Expositio', Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fols. 70, 74, 81v°.

3. Divini vatis Abbatis Joachim liber concordie novi ac veteris Testamenti. Venice, 1519.
Quoted by Nicolas in the 'Expositio', fol.126. Other references to Joachim are on fols. 101, 104v°, 118v°, 143.
Several of the spurious Joachite writings are listed in the Bibliography.

One rather curious example of the extent of his indebtedness to the Joachites, is that he several times refers to 'Patareni' in Lombardy and Liguria, and quotes from the 'De Oneribus' to support his remarks.[1] In the first half of the thirteenth century, Lombardy had been the disseminating centre of the 'Patareni', that is, the Cathari.[2] By the early fifteenth century, however, the Cathari had almost entirely died out in Western Europe,[3] and although the word 'patareni' had come to be applicable to heretics in general, and is actually translated by Du Cange as Waldensians,[4] Lombardy had ceased to be one of the danger spots in Christendom. Another example of the influence of the Joachite writings is in the substance of a discourse which Nicolas reported that he had heard delivered as a sermon,[5] which seems, in fact, to be an elaboration of a comment in the Joachite Expositio super Isaiam.[6]

---

1. Ibid. 81v°.

2. Lea, H.C. A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages. 3 vols. New York, 1906. Vol.II. p.193.

3. Ibid. II. pp.258-9.

4. Ibid. II. p.53. The Waldesians were strong in Provence, Dauphiné and the Lyonnais.

5. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.66v°. 'Audi quid de loco isto quiddam vir sanctus in spiritus predixit ... '

6. Without pagination.

Nicolas was also well acquainted with the late fourteenth century prophecies of Telesphorus of Cosenza, a hermit who claimed to have received a divine revelation from an angel in the year 1386. The central idea he has to convey is that God's judgment for the wickedness of the Church would take the form of the victorious onslaught of the Moslems,[1] a theory which does not appear at all in the actual works of Joachim and is by no means so clearly expressed in the spurious works. It is possible, therefore, that it was from Telesphorus that Nicolas absorbed this notion.

One occasion on which Nicolas cites 'sancto cuidam heremite manifesta super hoc scismate ab angelo allate est revelatio',[2] presumably Telesphorus, gives a curious insight into the 'rational' method of interpreting apocalyptic prophecies. It is on the occasion on which Nicolas claims that, according to Telesphorus, the time was now coming for the recognition of Benedict as 'Orthopontifex'. In point of fact, Telesphorus had foretold that the end of the schism and the enthronement of the true Pope, would take place in 1393,[3] and so Nicolas, employing the prophecy

---

1. Bett, op.cit. p.174; Döllinger, op.cit. p.153. Abbatis Joachim Magnus Propheta .... cum compilatione ex diversis prophetis novis ac veteris testamentis Theolosphori de Cusentia. Venice. 1520? p.x. col.3.

2. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.4v°.

3. Bett, op.cit. p.174; Döllinger, op.cit. p.154.

some thirty years later qualifies his remarks with the words 'ratione ducenti'.

Another contemporary by whom it would appear that Nicolas was probably influenced, although he does not quote him explicitly, is the great St. Vincent Ferrier, who also believed in the imminent advent of Antichrist. He wrote to Benedict XIII in 1412, that 'tempus Antichristi et finis mundi, erunt cito, et bene cito et valde breviter', and although he did not presume to name any specific date for this calamity, he thought that there was reason to believe that Antichrist had been born in 1403, and was already nine years old.[1] Nicolas probably did not accept this date, since his statement that Antichrist was already 'grandevus',[2] 'annosus et provectus'[3] in 1423-6, seems scarcely consistent with his being just over twenty years old. Nevertheless, the vehemence of Vincent's treatise 'De fine mundi',[4] is closer in feeling to the despair of the Commentary than are the often obscure apocryphal writings of the Joachites, with their endless and pointless parallels and allegories, and their painfully ingenious calculations of years and

---

1. T. Malvenda. De Antichristo libri undecim. 2 vols. Lyons, 1647. Vol.I. pp.119-20. Dated 27 July 1412.

2. 'Expositio', Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.29v°.

3. Ibid. fol.218v°.

4. Mirabile opusculum sancti Vincentii de fine mundi, Augsburg, 1505?

events. There is, for instance, a great similarity between the use made by St. Vincent and Nicolas of the figure of the statue in Daniel.[1] Again, St. Vincent was prepared for two Antichrists, 'Antichristus mixtus' who would slay the true Pope and usurp his place, and 'Antichristus purus' who would be the arm of avenging justice.[2] There is no mention in Nicolas' commentary of an 'Antichristus mixtus', but his attitude to John XXIII suggests that he may have been influenced by this conception.

D'Ailly himself after a study of the Joachite writings in the library of the College of Navarre, had foretold, in 1385, that the reign of Antichrist would begin in 1400.[3] In this case, however, his prophecy was less fortunate than were some of his other predictions.[4]

Other apocryphal writers to whom Nicolas refers in the Commentary seem to share something of the hazy nature of their subject-matter - the German Rabanus Maurus,[5] and the great English visionary, Merlin, upon whose prophecies there was a Joachite Commentary.[6]

---

1. St. Vincent, Ibid. pp.10-11; 'Expositio', fols.3v°, 57.
2. St. Vincent, op.cit. p.13.
3. Salembier, op.cit. p.313.
4. Ibid. p.357-9. Prophecies of both the Reformation and the French Revolution have been discovered in his writings.
5. 'Expositio', Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol. ?
6. Ibid. fols.81v°, 118. Döllinger, op.cit. pp.25-34, discusses what is known of his prophecy.

It is difficult to tell how far such ideas were unusual. Prophecies, almost all of them ultimately inspired by the works, particularly the spurious works of Joachim of Flora had been common since the middle of the thirteenth century, and Henri de Hesse spoke of their enormous increase during the years of the schism.[1] A certain Thomas of Apulia had drawn large crowds in Paris in 1388 by proclaiming that the reign of the Holy Spirit had begun, and that he was the envoy of the age; but his books were burned and himself imprisoned for life as a madman.[2] Again, about 1411, William of Heldernissen proclaimed a similar doctrine in the Cambrai district of Flanders,[3] and in 1440, a heretic was so bold as to announce the early advent of the Holy Spirit to the Council of Basle.[4] Although Joachim had been entirely favoured by the Papacy during his lifetime, the Joachite writings fell under ecclesiastical censure in the middle of the thirteenth century, their unorthodoxy being accentuated

---

1. "Liber adversus Telesphori Eremitae" in B.Pez, Thesaurus, Anecdotorum novissimus, 6 vols. Augustae Vindelicorum et Graecii 1721-3. Vol.I, pt.2. vol.516. 'Videamus ergo in particulari magis de quibusdam qui diebus istis schismate grandi turbatis, se quasi prophetae ausi sunt effere .... quae omnia contrarius eventus iam dudum falsa probavit, ac per hoc a spiritu humano superstitionibus decepto, praenuntiata declaravit.'

2. Bett, op.cit. p.175.

3. Ibid. loc.cit.

4. Fournier, op.cit. p.42. note 1.

by the fact that they were particularly cherished by the Spiritual Franciscans. However, the University of Paris was always more violent in their condemnation than was the Papacy, and in fact, there does not appear to have been any very strong feeling against such theories in the Church in general.[1] Nicolas himself creates the impression that, while he was not alone in his beliefs, and that, for instance, many of the aged shared his hope of escape from the 'magnum iudicium' through death,[2] the vast majority were unaware of the imminence of the awful fate which overhung them.[3]

It is not easy to say when Nicolas first became interested in the apocalyptical prophecies, but there is an indication that he already had some knowledge of them as early as 1401, in the 'De Ruina', where he refers to a

---

1. Gebhart, op.cit. Revue Historique, XXXI. pp.56-73.

2. Vide supra. p.217 note 2.

3. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.209v°. .... 'dominus tendit arcum conversationis futuri iudicii, vel potius dicam presentis, quamquam rari sunt, qui advertant aut credere valeant. Sed tamen mature videbunt et fatere cogentur ... '

certain Cyril, probably Cyril of Constantinople,[1] and where he also makes a first slight reference to the Mahommedan menace.[2] On the other hand, there are no similar references in any of his other works,[3] although at least some of the works of Joachim are known to have been in the library of the College of Navarre in Nicolas' youth.[4] It seems probable,

---

1. Coville, Traité, p.125, of the officials at the Papal Curia he says '.... qua ex causa numularios supreme tabule eos non incongruenter Cirillus appellat'; Ibid. p.141, of pseudo-prophets, 'De qua siquidem iuvat ampliora agnoscere, Cirillum videat, et illic mira de hiis inveniat ad fidelium instructionem longe antequam orientur, Spiritu Sancto revelante predicta.' Coville, (Ibid. p.125, note 6) says that it is not possible to identify this Cyril, but it seems that it is Cyril of Constantinople, whose prophecies were said to have foretold the ruin of the Papacy. Also known as Cyril the Carmelite, the works with which he was accredited appear to have emanated from Franciscan Spirituals of the thirteenth century. The first mention of his supposed works is in 1295, and they were highly regarded both by Telesphorus and by Cola da Rienzi. In the fifteenth century it was discovered that he was not in fact the author of the works attributed to him, and that, consequently, none of his work was known to have survived. (Bett, op.cit. pp.32-3; Döllinger, op.cit. pp.133-4).

2. Ibid. p.154.

3. In the 'Disputatio Supra Materia Concilii Generalis' however, he mentions his pleasure in the interpretation of the scriptures 'mystice ac salutaliter'. Opera, ed. Lydius. p.79.

4. Vide supra. p. 223.

therefore, that he did not make any very close study of this subject till the time of his second residence in Paris. It is a curious fact that Provins, where Nicolas spent some time in 1423-4,[1] was, in the thirteenth century, the centre of Joachitism. It was at the house of the Franciscans here that Frater Ghérardo in 1253-4 prepared the edition of Joachim's work, prefaced by an inflammatory 'Introductorius' of his own, which first popularised Joachim's prophecies.[2] Although Nicolas entertained a great antipathy for the Mendicants,[3] it seems possible that he may have used their library of apocalyptic writings, and the fact that the references to Joachim in the 'Expositio' seem to occur almost exclusively between fols. 70 and 143, might conceivably mean that this section was actually written at Provins, when he was in close contact with the sources.

In view of the fact that the early fifteenth century was a time of staggering disorder and misery in France, it is not altogether surprising that it should have appeared to many contemplative minds as if the disintegration of their standards and society, was the prelude to the dissolution of Christendom. For most of Nicolas' beliefs there is, in

---

1. Vide supra. p. 180.
2. Gebhart, op.cit. Revue Historique, XXXI. p.65.
3. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fols.143, 217v°.

fact, basis in the Scriptures, - in the book of Isaiah, and in the Apocalyptic portions of the New Testament, the book of Revelations, Matthew XXIV, 15-28, Mark XIII, 14, and the 'little apocalypse' in Thessalonians II, to which he several times refers.[1]

Nicolas does not seem to have continued his work on the Commentary after 1426; the Arsenal MS. stops suddenly, and without explanation. This may have been the result of an illness, or he may have felt that as the year of doom approached, it was not worth his while to proceed. At all events, it is obvious that he had already disburdened himself of the whole of the subject that was on his mind, and that if he had continued with the 'Expositio', he could only have multiplied the already considerable number of his repetitions. Since the work was apparently not for the immediate edification of others, it is possible that he wrote it in order to have a concrete example of his righteous faith on the day of the 'magnum iudicium'.

With whatever nervous emotions the year 1427-8 was fraught, Nicolas, contrary to all his expectations, managed to survive it, and to survive it by ten years. It seems very doubtful, however, whether the failure of his fears to materialize could have shaken his faith in calamity 'ratione ducenti'.

---

1. Ibid. fol.4v°, etc.

Almost nothing is known of this last period of his life, since there are no surviving works. One incident has, however, come to light. Soon after 1430, Nicolas appealed to Pope Eugenius IV for permission to apportion half of the revenues from his prebend at Bayeux, the 'prébende de Bernais', for the support of the six choir boys of the Cathedral, and the Master appointed to instruct them in Singing and Grammar. In November 1432, Eugenius accordingly appointed a commissioner, Jean Louis, Abbot of Mondeye, to look into the matter; after an enquiry, he gave his consent, which was followed by that of the Chapter on the 8th May 1433. Strangely enough, although according to the historian of Bayeux the proceedings had been due to Nicolas' initiative, the sentence drawn up, decreed that the prebend should be halved only after his death, leaving him, apparently, the continued enjoyment of the full revenue during his lifetime. Further papal confirmations were accorded in 1435 and 1436.[1] This,

1. An account of this episode is given in J. Hermant, Histoire du Diocese de Bayeux, Caen, 1705, not in his biography of Nicolas (pp.369-75) but under the chronological account of the episcopacy of Bishop Zeno Castiglione (pp.326-338) p.329, referring to the Cartulary of the Chapter.
A. Thomas 'La date de la mort de Nicolas de Clamanges" in Romania XXV (1896) pp.131-3, publishes a royal confirmation of 1469 which gives the various stages in the making of the arrangement, without any mention of Nicolas' initiative in the matter.
It was Bishop Zeno of Bayeux who first introduced Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, the first English humanist, to the study of the classics. (K. Vickers, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, London, 1907).

and a complaint against modern singing in the 'Expositio',[1] may indicate that he took his duties as precentor at Bayeux a little more seriously than one might suppose.

It would be interesting to know what were Nicolas' reactions to the great events which were taking place in Church and State in the 1430's, the Council of Basle, and the revival of French nationalism under Jeanne d'Arc. It seems impossible, in view of his advanced age, that his views on conciliar government in the Church could have changed, or that he could have realised that a new spirit was alive in the country. His apparently bitter anti-feminism[2] suggests that he would have supported the stern view taken by his friend Pierre Cauchon,[3] Bishop of Beauvais, in whose court the trial of 'La Pucelle' took place,[4] rather than the enthusiastic views of Christine de Pisan, who was prompt to celebrate Jeanne as the Saviour

---

1. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.157. 'Et profecto ritum istum discantandi id est cantum in ecclesiam dissolvendi atque amaturis moribus ad leves et lubricos et vehementer incompositas attrahendi, non a sancto sed a levi et vago et incomposito .... '

   sc. impetuosis a motuis

2. Effeminacy represented to him the most hateful of all the vices. Ibid. passim. fol.50v° 'Vidue absque caput sunt, quia vir caput est mulieris, teste apostolo'.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.CXX, is addressed to him.

4. J. Quicherat, Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc. 5 vols. Paris, 1841-9.

of France, and the glory of her sex.[1] It is somewhat ironic that, after all his prognostications, Nicolas should have lived to see the recovery of Paris by Charles VII,[2] but whatever feelings this may have aroused in him, he did not suffer them for long. He died in the following year, 1437,[3] honoured and lamented, and was buried in a distinguished position in the Chapel of the College of Navarre.[4] It seems likely that during these last years, Nicolas' life was increasingly retired. He had never been robust, and for at least a decade, had been looking forward to death as a release.

---

1. "Un Beau Ditié Fait l'an MCCCCXXIX" in Paris et ses Historiens, pp.420-6.

2. Histoire de France, ed. Lavisse. IV. 2. p.83.

3. Hermant, op.cit. in his biographical account of Nicolas, op.cit. pp.369-75, gives this date, with exact documentary reference. This evidence was, however, totally overlooked, and the date of Nicolas' death was regarded as uncertain till 1896, when A. Thomas independently rediscovered the document, part of which he publishes in Romania, XXV, pp.132-3. The document (Arch.Nat.JJ.205, no.1111c, XLIX. Vide supra. p.229 note 1) states 'après le trepas dudit de Clamenges, qui deceda en l'an mil CCCCXXXVII, ... '

4. Launoy, op.cit. II. p.572. His epitaph was 'Qui lampas fuit Ecclesiae, sub lampade iacet'.

CHAPTER V.

POLITICAL THOUGHT.

Nowhere in Nicolas' writings is his fundamental conception of society expounded in a systematic form. His discussions of principle are incidental and scattered, since for the most part, his views on the structure of society are assumed, or given without explanation. The expression of his thought suffers, in consequence, from a lack of close definition, but although his theories are somewhat vague and unspecific in content, their general trend is very clear, and they are forcibly, indeed dogmatically, held.

Living in an age of anarchy, Nicolas' chief preoccupation is with the establishment and maintenance of good order. This was a problem which had not faced the less chaotic thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to anything like the same degree, and to them, the Thomist version of Aristotle's theory of the State as an institution for the good life[1] had, consequently, sufficed. From this Aristotelian tradition, Nicolas represents an almost complete

---

1. A.J. & R.W. Carlyle, Medieval Political Theory in the West. 6 vols. London, 1903-36. Vol.V.

break, foreshadowing, to a remarkable degree, the reactionary conceptions of the early Reformers,[1] who were similarly faced with the problem of order. A century before their time, Nicolas stressed and enhanced the power and prerogatives of the monarchy, and turned from Aristotle to St. Augustine, with his idea of the repressive State, designed to impose order, 'tranquillitas' on the undisciplined and unlicensed activities of mankind.[2] Also in common with the Reformers, he magnifies the virtues of the primitive Church and early christian society, in which the life of man had been pleasing to God, contrasting this with the degeneracy, lawlessness and godlessness of contemporary times.[3]

Like all political, as opposed to economic conceptions of society, Nicolas' system is based on his view of the nature of man. This he conceived of as being superior to that of the animals, in that man was rational[4] and endowed

---

1. Carlyle, op.cit. vol.VI; J.W. Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century, London, 1928.

2. H.X. Arquillière, L'Augustinisme Politique [L'Eglise et l'Etat au Moyen Age. no.2]. Paris, 1934. Allen, op.cit. p.16. Luther valued the works of St. Augustine next to the Bible; ibid. p.49. St. Augustine was one of the first Christian authors to whom Calvin turned after his early study of law and the classics.

3. 'De Ruina' in Coville's Traité, pp.112-4; Opera ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXI, CII; 'Expositio super Ysyam', Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.5v°.

4. 'Expositio super Ysayam'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.72v°. 'per hominem, qui animal rationale est, consilium accipitur'.

with a certain nobility of character, but inferior by reason of the violence of his sensual appetites and by his lack of moderation, which, unfortunately, greatly outweighed the rational sense.[1] Disregarding these disabilities, he considered that men were gifted with free-will, and thus responsible for their own choice between good and evil,[2] although, since the reward of their merits or demerits came from God alone, it was quite beyond their power to direct[3] or even to understand the course of events.[4]

Men were social in the sense that they were bound to live in communities, and the extreme solitary, who not only cut himself off from the companionship of men, but made no contribution of any kind to their well-being was, Nicolas thought, less than human.[5] Nevertheless, and here was his break with the Thomists, formal society was not essentially natural, but restrictive. It had been imposed by the Divine will for the maintenance of peace and the restraint of unruly and undisciplined human nature, and its

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXVII.

2. Ibid. Ep.XXIX.

3. Ibid. Ep.I.

4. Ibid. Ep.LXVIII. 'Mira nimium et inscrutabilia sunt iudicia Dei, quae saepe, imo pene semper, contraria ex contrariis eliciunt.'

5. Vide supra. p. 43 and note 4.

very foundation was in obedience to the constituted authorities, which had, like the form of society itself, been ordained and established of God. This obedience was essential, not only to the well-being of society, but even to its existence. Without the obligation to obey, he says, there is no fear and no possibility of coercion, and, consequently, free license is given to all evil-doing, 'Ubi enim non est obedientia, nec metus esse potest, nec ulla cohercio: ubi autem ista desunt quis non videat licentiam esse omnium vitiorum ac maleficiorum.'[1] This is a clear statement of his conception of the coercive function of authority, - as something which was imposed on the community from above, in which it had no part, and from which there was no redress.[2] It was by the ceremony of anointing that these powers were conferred on priests and Kings, and, as Melchisedek had been 'Rex simul et Sacerdos', so each power shared something of the nature of the other, the priests exercising dominion over souls and the Kings being, equally with the priests,

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XIII.

2. Arquillière, op.cit. stresses that in St. Augustine's system, obedience to the secular state was to be, not through fear, but through love. It was a coercive authority nevertheless.

sanctified and consecrated to Christ.[1] In every case, obedience was due to authority, not only to Kings and Popes, but also to their subordinate ministers, and although rulers were under the moral obligation to order their government in accordance with the principles of justice, that is, in conformity with the laws, the obedience of the people was in no way limited by the virtue of the ruler. Every superior, secular or ecclesiastic was to be obeyed, since through good and bad alike, God implemented his mysterious judgments.[2]

It was not, however, only by the establishment of the divine right of the rulers in each sphere that Nicolas sought to establish peace, but by a delimitation of the respective spheres of the spiritual and the temporal

---

1. Ibid. Ep.CXXXVII, which gives his fullest discussion of the relationship existing between the two authorities, and the respective functions of each. P.E. Schramm, 'Geschichte des englischen Königtums im Lichte der Krönung'. Trans. by L.G. Wickham Legg. Oxford, 1937. Discusses the important significance of the anointing in establishing a sort of equality between priests and Kings.

2. 'Expositio super Ysayam'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.50. 'Superiorum siquidem est per equitatem iusticie regere subditos unicuique secundum sui gradus exigentiam, iusticiam equabiliter ministrando. Subditorum autem est suo principi sive ecclesiastico sive seculari fideliter obtemperare, illumque arbitrari a deo pro suo salutari regimine sibi prepositum nec tantum bonis ac modestis superioribus precipit nos beatus Petrus fideliter subditi, sed etiam discolis, quorum per nos non vult facta dominus iudicari, sed suo servat iudicanda examini.

authorities, which at the same time obviated all possibility of friction between them, and made the most advantageous use of the more practically effective of the two powers. Thus his treatment of the two authorities, is at the same time, parallel and complementary.

Although pre-eminent,[1] and prior in the sense that temporal peace was the corollary of peace in the Church,[2] the priestly authority was strictly limited. Its sphere was exclusively spiritual, its office being to minister to the religious needs of the people, to pray for the peace of the country, to advise the prince of his spiritual duties, to point out his failings, should he err, 'cum debita reverentia', and to encourage his zeal for the State, 'ad zelum Reipublicae hortari'.[3] Thus even the relations of the Church with the State should be purely spiritual, and so, dissimilar in kind from the relations between two temporal powers.

Not only had the Church no power to exercise temporal influence, but it should have no such interests. He attributed the spiritual poverty and consequent dislocation of the Church to the inordinate extension of its temporalities.[4]

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXII.
2. Ibid. Ep.XVII, LXXVII, CII, CIII.
3. Ibid. Ep.CXXXVII.
4. 'De Ruina' in Coville's Traité. pp.112-5, 147-50.

In fact, although he was bitterly hostile to the Waldensian dogma of the Apostolic Poverty,[1] Nicolas implies that the Church should employ for its own use, only what was necessary for sustenance and clothing, and that the rest of its resources should go to the poor. This, he says, was the custom in the days of the primitive Church, when ecclesiastics were saintly and self-sacrificing, and yet withall, the Church flourished and grew rich in those days, whereas now its provender was utterly wasted.[2]

At the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy was the Pope, who, appointed by the agency of the Holy Ghost in the Papal election,[3] was the Vicar of Christ on earth.[4] His right was absolute and inalienable, since the power that had been attributed by God, could not, under any circumstances, be removed by man.[5] Although all priests were alike anointed and consecrated to Christ,[6] the

---

1. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137, passim. He refers repeatedly to 'patareni' and other heretics in terms of detestation. Vide supra. p.218 etc. The Waldensians were the most important heretical sect in Western Europe at this time.

2. 'De Ruina' in Coville's Traité. pp.112-4.

3. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXII.

4. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fols. 29v°, 36, 36v°, 102v°, 117v°, 121, 139v°, 161v°.

5. Ibid. fol.4v°, 32v°; Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XVII.

6. Ibid. Ep.CXXXVII.

authority whereby the Church was ruled came from above. It was obedience to the Pope and reverence for him that constituted the unifying principle in the Church. He was the fountain-head of discipline and good order,[1] and since his right was inalienable and without redress, even in the ecclesiastical sphere, every source of disorder within the Church was removed.

If the Pope were to fall into misdemeanour of any kind (excepting an error of faith), his failings could be gently and humbly pointed out to him, but there was no possibility of taking any action against him.[2] Nicolas' references to the treatment of an heretical Pope are slight, but he seems to have followed the orthodox Catholic tradition in believing that if the occupant of the Papacy should become tainted with heresy, he 'ipso facto' ceased to be the Vicar of Christ. He excepts such a case from the occasions on which it was permissible to remonstrate with the Pope[3] and explicitly states that it would be beyond praise to oppose him if he were indeed 'schismaticus atque hereticus'.[4] He does not define these terms, and, whereas it could be argued that the detection of heresy presented no difficulties,

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XVII.
2. Ibid. Ep.XXXVII.
3. Ibid. loc.cit.
4. Ibid. Ep.LV.

the term 'schismaticus' might, under the circumstances, have been profitably elaborated, in view of the fact that the great problem of the time actually was, how to detect when the Pope was 'schismaticus'.

On the other hand, the authority which the Pope held by such certain tenure was by no means unlimited. He had sacrificed his personal identity, and had become 'homo communis', without private interests of any kind. As 'servus servorum Dei', he was subjected, as were all slaves, to the law of his masters, that is, to the faithful of Christ, according to which he was to rule and minister to the Church, and administer its goods.[1]

In this last connection, he held that the Papacy had unlawfully extended its duties beyond those divinely attributed to it, apparently objecting to all papal taxation of clergy or laity, and protesting in particular against the abrogation of episcopal and other elections by papal collations and dispensations. This system he regarded as designed by a purely temporal interest in swelling the revenues of the Holy See. Thus, although he was in many respects, an extreme papalist, Nicolas was in complete accord with the Gallican reformers in his reaction to the financial

---

1. Ibid. Ep.II. 'Universi pene mundi servus esse coepisti, servus enim non sui iuris est, sed alieni iuris et arbitrii ..... omnium Christi fidelium servus effectus es.'

system of the papacy, - a comment on the burden imposed on the French Church by the presence of the Popes at Avignon. Any sort of temporal negotiations with the secular princes, such as frequently took place over the filling of benefices, inspired in him the greatest possible abhorrence. Again, he deplored the ambition of the Popes to support temporal authority, as if they were Kings, and even more their pretensions to universal sovereignty.[1]

Although Nicolas' insistence on the rights of Bishops seems to indicate that, like Gobelin Person,[2] he adhered to the old hierarchic conception of the Church and disliked the ever increasing tendency to centralization, his theory of the divine source of papal power meant that there was no place for regular General Councils, since in the normal course of events the Church would be ruled by the Pope, as Vicar of Christ. Nicolas recognized, however, that a part of great importance could be played by General Councils as an emergency measure in times of crisis; he recognized the Oecumenical Councils[3] of the past, though not as all of

---

1. He critizes the temporal interests of the Papacy in the following places: 'Expositio', Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fols.103, 118v°, 163; 'De Ruina' in Coville's Traité, pp.125-6; Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.II. CXII.

2. Cosmidromius Gobelini Person. Historische-Kommission der Provinz Westfalen. Münster, 1900.

3. "Disputatio supra Materia Concilii Generalis", in Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.

equal authority, and he hoped that a Council might restore unity to the Church by bringing about the recognition of the true Pope.[1] That the legitimate Pope could be, in the slightest degree, subject to a Council, he does not for one moment, consider, much less that he could be deposed, or a new election made by conciliar authority.[2] He was, to a certain extent, interested in the reforming activity of the Council, although he saw no reason why its decrees should have any particular authority in themselves, and requested the Scriptural or canonical evidence might be adduced in their support.[3]

He believed, as a nominalist, that the efficacy of the Council depended entirely on its composition.[4] He does not discuss the membership in any detail, but it is obvious that he was opposed to any kind of change in the traditional form, whereby only Bishops and others of episcopal rank had the right to vote. He objected most strongly to the innovation introduced at the Council of Constance, of allowing to vote persons other than these, that is, Masters and Doctors of Arts, Laws and Theology,

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.CXII.

2. He does in fact discuss prospects of a conciliar election in Ep.CXII, but he would only have regarded the result with favour if it had brought recognition to Benedict. It could not, of course, affect his actual legitimacy.

3. "Disputatio" in Opera, ed. Lydius.

4. Opera, ed Lydius, Ep.CII, CXII.

whose proper function, from time immemorial, had been purely advisory.[1]

The priestly authority thus constituted was effective only in the spiritual sphere. It was dependent for its maintenance, defence, and for the implementation of its advices on the secular authority, which might in this sense be said to be prior to it. It was the office of the secular power to create the condition under which the spiritual virtues could thrive, 'tranquillitas', peace.[2] Nicolas however conceived of the relationship of the royal to the priestly power as being a much more active one than St. Augustine had envisaged. It was not merely the province of the secular power to maintain peace, that the Church might, thereupon, exercise its independent functions, but its own purpose was essentially spiritual, that is, actively to foster and promote the spiritual virtues. It is obvious that to Nicolas, this authority was much more real, and, in the prevailing anarchy of the times, offered greater hopes of spiritual benefits than did the ecclesiastical. In the case of the Papacy, Nicolas' chief preoccupation is to establish the inalienable right of the legitimate Pope within a somewhat restricted sphere. In the case of the monarchy,

---

1. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.156.
2. 'De Lapsu Iustitiae'. Opera, ed. Lydius. p.55.

his attentions are directed not only towards claiming for the King the same inalienable right, conferred by the ceremonies of the anointing and consecration, but also to the extension of his sphere of influence, or rather his obligations, over a remarkably wide field. This solution to the problem of order was suggested by the traditions of the French monarchy, which, since the time of St. Louis had been invested with a quasi-spiritual office. The claims of the French monarchy to spiritual jurisdiction had moreover, more recently been extended during the conflict of Philippe IV with the Papacy as the result of a purposeful and cynical policy of aggression.

Thus to Nicolas, the Kings of France, as the traditional protectors of the Church were entitled to a peculiarly intimate relationship with the Papacy, and to a pre-eminent position in the spiritual sphere. 'Tu in primis Rex Clementissime, tuum enim prae caeteris est hoc agere his omnibus Ecclesiasticae unitatis sceleratissimis obicibus.'[1]

Every King, since he was the minister of God, 'Dei minister', to his people, ceased, like the Pope, to be a private individual. In the likeness of God himself, he

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XVII, also the 'Oratio ad Principes Galliarum.' Ibid. p.169.

should consider not his own good, but that of his people.[1] Thus he should not, simply because there was no redress against him, violate the laws which it was his duty to administer. 'Quid enim tam pernitiosum rebus humanis, tam funestum et exitiale, quam ut in maximo constitutus imperio, omnia sibi credat licere, quae libuerit.'[2] Although in respect of obedience, Nicolas had arrived at a position very similar to that of the sixteenth century Reformers, his conception of the monarchy is, in the temporal sphere at least, a less active one. He in no sense conceived of the King as a legislator; his duty was to maintain the established laws of antiquity,[3] whose observance represented to him the manners of a more godly, primitive age.

---

1. 'De Lapsu Iustitiae' in Opera, ed. Lydius. p.39. 'Qui vero Dei minister est, communis debet esse persona, non privata, nec tam sibi quam aliis vivere: et ad Dei similitudinem, cui cura est de omnibus cunctis qui suo sunt commissi regimini .... prospicere.' Each King was, presumably supreme within his own realm, but on one occasion, Nicolas implies that it was the office of the Emperor to keep the peace between them, in case of need. 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fol.157. Vide supra. p. 214, 215 note 1.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXI.

3. 'Expositio super Ysayam'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal. no.137. fol.49v°. 'Nemo est qui dubitare possit in omni secta ac religione leges esse pernecessarios sine quibus .... nec pax atque tranquillitas inter cives inviolata conservari ..... Cum itaque in administratione rei publicae leges sint tam necessarie, magna cura est, ut per homines eruditissimos, probes, fideles et iustos, publiceque utilitatis magis quam privati commodi zelatores, leges ipse ferantur atque instituantur.'

The essence of the Kingly office was the preservation of 'iustitia'. He reiterates this on several occasions but his definitions and usage of the word at different times vary very considerably. However, although he repeatedly refers to the 'Philosophi' and 'Stoici', the most constant of his interpretations seems to be the Augustinian concept of right relationship to God.[1] 'Justitia', he said, included all the virtues, adding with an air of perspicacity, that consequently, if it were lacking, 'ceteras necesse est, de esse virtutes.'[2] More specifically, in the case of the King, it consisted in the maintenance of right relations with, and between other men, the 'ius cuique tribuendi', that is, the observance of the ancient laws and customs which alone were able to combine into one harmonious whole, the different elements of the realm, the three orders 'sacerdotalis', 'militaris' and 'plebcius'.[3] Thus it was 'justitia' alone which was the source of peace in the realm; it was the 'medullam ... huius regni', 'velut vinculum vel glutinam quoddam Politias ... continens atque correctens.[4]

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XCIII. The 'radix et origo omnis iusticiae' is 'Deo subdi, Deum timere, illius mandata servare, illum ex toto corde et proximum tamquam se ipsum diligere'.

2. Ibid. Ep.XCVIII.

3. 'De Lapsu Iustitiae' in Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.

4. Ibid. Ep.CVII.

Chief among the royal duties in this sphere was the protection of the ecclesiastical order. All Catholic Kings and Princes were 'pugiles et defensores a Deo ordinati', bound to preserve the liberties of the Church, defend its rights from aggression.[1] In particular, they ought to prevent encroachments by their own secular judges on ecclesiastical justice. This, and violence against Church property, the King should punish with terrible severity 'exquisitissimis suppliciis' as Nicolas uncharitably says.[2]

Again the King should regulate the conditions of military service so that the activities of the knightly order were indeed directed towards the protection, and not the destruction of the other two;[3] he should further, establish a just system of coinage, favourable to agriculture and trade.[4] At the same time the King should maintain the liberties and immunities of the community as a whole, by which he seems to have meant freedom from arbitrary taxation,[5] against which he voices perennial complaints.

---

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep.XXXI.
2. Ibid. Ep.CXXXVII.
3. Ibid. Ep.LVIII.
4. Ibid. 'De Lapsu Iustitiae'. p. 58-9
5. Ibid. 'De Lapsu' p.55.

It is with specific reference to the impropriety of irregular princely extortions from the people, of the sale of prefectures and public offices that he quotes St. Augustine's famous question, 'Remota iustitia, quid sunt regna nisi magna latrocinia?'.[1] No new taxes, should he said, be levied, except in cases of extreme necessity, when, on the advice and with the consent of the three orders, a purely temporary arrangement could be made, which should lapse whenever the emergency which it was designed to meet, came to an end. In order that such impositions might be rendered unnecessary, he held that the royal household should be strictly regulated 'debet regularem ac moderatum in sumptu et familia habere statum.'[2]

For the King who was to enjoy the exercise of these powers, no ordinary qualities were needed. It was necessary for the prince to be ornamented with every virtue, since in his hands lay the punishment of every kind of crime,[3] but Nicolas goes on to claim for him two virtues in particular, Justice[4] and Clemency,[5] each of which, he says, on different

---

1. Ibid. 'De Lapsu.' p.44.
2. Ibid. 'De Lapsu'. p.55.
3. Ibid. Ep.LVI.
4. Ibid. 'De Lapsu Iustitiae.' pp. 41 & passim.
5. Ibid. Ep.LVI.

occasions, distinguishes the King from the tyrant. This is a further example of his indebtedness to the patristic tradition. It was St. Isidore of Seville who had first defined the difference between the King and the tyrant in terms of 'Justitia' and 'Pietas'.[1] These virtues are, of course, of the utmost importance where there is no redress against the royal power. Later, when writing to Henry V, and perhaps as a tribute to that energetic King, he added a third essential quality 'strenuitas'. Learning and latinity he regarded as very important, for without wisdom, there was no justice, and the unlearned King was a mere 'asinus coronatus.'[2]

With the unhappy example of Charles VI before him, however, Nicolas devised certain means for securing a small measure of protection for the country. The most interesting of these is, perhaps, the attention that he gives to the education of the heir apparent, obviously with the object of ensuring that the actual King should be as near to the ideal as possible, a matter of some difficulty, since the young heir to whom all things were allowed, and whom there was no authority to check, was brought up in the corrupt and licentious court, where he was naturally drawn into the

---

1. Carlyle, op.cit. Vol.I. p.172.

2. Ibid. Ep.CXXXVII. This last remark sounds like a rather unkind reference to Charles VI.

most unsuitable society. These reflections were apparently occasioned by the complaints of his friend, Jean d'Arconval the prince's tutor, who was highly disturbed by the influences to which the young man was being exposed, but powerless to restrain the princely will, - an interesting light on the extraordinary difficulties of giving the medieval heir to the throne any adequate form of training. The detail in which Nicolas describes how the aim of the education of the prince should be to form salutary habits, to teach by example rather than by discipline,[1] suggests the influence of the excellent teaching methods of the early Italian renaissance.[2]

He is also concerned with the problem of how to secure a rational and disinterested exercise of the royal authority when the King himself was not in control. Thus he repeatedly exhorts the princes to consider their responsibilities to the country, which demanded that, the King being unable to minister to the country's needs, they should put the common interests before their own.[3] He stresses the importance of grave and experienced ministers,[4] and suggests that,

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XCIII.

2. Woodward, op.cit. passim.

3. 'Oratio and Principes Galliarum'. Opera, ed. Lydius.p.170.

4. 'De Lapsu'. Ibid. p.40; 'Expositio'. Bibl. de l'Arsenal, no.137. fos.13vo, 15, 102.

during the incapacity of the King, the Parlement de Paris should take upon itself the maintenance of justice in the general, as well as the legal sense.[1] This is obviously an attempt to avoid the disorders resultant on the selfish attempts of the princes to secure individual control of the government. The King's Council he does not mention specifically, presumably because its proper functioning depended on co-operation and good-faith between the princes, which at this time was an unreasonable demand.

For an immediate reform of the country, he proposed, in conformity with the traditions of French political life, the summoning of a States-General of the three orders, to discuss the problems of each, and to take expert advice as to the means of remedying them.[2] These are the only suggestions that he makes for the protection of the people, who are, nevertheless, under no circumstances exempted from the obligation to give full obedience to their immediate superiors.[3]

However, it is in Nicolas' discussion of the relationship of the King of France to the Church, that the enormous appeal of the powerful monarchy is most apparent; this alone

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XCVIII. Vide supra. p. 153

2. 'De Lapsu'. Opera, ed. Lydius. p.59.

3. Vide supra. p. 236 note 2.

seemed to offer any hope of stability, not only in the State, but in the Church, which was no longer capable of providing the motivating force to secure even its own reform. Thus Nicolas, an ecclesiastic and a papalist, is led in all sincerity, to advance claims on behalf of the King of France, to initiative in the ecclesiastical sphere which had been made for Philippe IV with the most cynical dishonesty by de Nogaret - a remarkable example of the repercussions of the Babylonish Captivity and of the schism on a fundamental conception of society.

This power to act in the ecclesiastical sphere was, of course, conditional upon the inactivity of the clergy themselves; there was no question of his entering into competition with them. It was, in any case, peculiar to the crowned and anointed King of France 'tuum enim prae ceteris est, hoc agere',[1] so nothing could be done before Charles VI came to manhood. Then Nicolas called on him to perform his duty to Christendom, to succour the Church in its disaster, and to heal the schism 'Tuum his mundi mederi languoribus, Ecclesiae cladibus subvenire, fidem tueri, pacem quaerere, malum furialis schismatis abolere' .... 'Tunicem Christi inconsutilem ... per impios et carnales Christianos nefaria ambitione laceratam, resarcire stude.'

---

1. Ibid. Ep.I.

He exhorts the King not to fear the difficulty of the task, promising him human and divine aid. The figures of speech which he uses are significant of his conception of the relationship between King and Church 'succurre parenti filius, rex reginam adiuva, liber captivam libera, sospes aegram sana, miles invicta fortitudine militanti auxiliare.'[1] Perhaps, however, the most extraordinary example of his attitude is in the prosopopeia of the Church to Charles VI in Epistola XVII, written in 1402, where the Church addresses the King thus, 'Tu mihi unica spes eras, singulare solamen, tutumque praesidium ... aspice solito pietatis pauperculam ante pedes tuos iacentem, pro suoque Charissimo sponso (i.e. Benedict XIII) tot indigmissionis iniuriis afflicto supplicantem.'[2] Such had been the fate of the Church during the century following the death of Boniface VIII, that de Nogaret's conceptions had prevailed.

This short examination of Nicolas' conception of the structure of society throws some light on the apparent inconsistencies of his career. It is obvious that he was not concerned with the principle of conflict between the ecclesiastical and secular spheres. The question of the supremacy of power simply did not arise between them. In spite of the fact that as an ecclesiastic and a papalist,

---

1. Ibid. Ep.I.

2. Ibid. Ep.XVII.

he was both serious and honest, he was fundamentally attached, on principle and by preference, to the national community, for which, he said, a man should be prepared to lay down his life. Like the sixteenth century Reformers, he accepted the absolute necessity of obedience to the edicts of the prince 'Avertat Deus a me tantam dementiam, ut aliquid in regem vel regnum sceleris admiserim, nec usque ad illum temporis articulum me vivere permittat. Utinam tanta zeli sinceritate cuncti ad illam egregian domum afficeretur quantum ego.'[1] At the same time, by his purely formal obedience to certain of the royal decrees, he might almost be said to prefigure the doctrine of non-resistance. Nicolas, expecting a speedy judgment on Christendom for its wickedness, had no conception of how far-reaching the repercussions of the schism and the conciliar movement were to be.

---

1. Ibid. Ep.XLIII.

APPENDIX I.

The Writings of Nicolas de Clamanges: Manuscripts and Publications.

Only one important work of Nicolas remains unpublished, the 'Expositio super Ysayam' in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. The most comprehensive edition of his works is that of J.M. Lydius, Leyden, 1613, which, despite its title 'Nicolai de Clemangiis .... opera omnia', does not, in fact, contain all his writings, although it includes several items for which he was not responsible. This edition is open to a good deal of criticism, and has been severely condemned by scholars from Von der Hardt[1] to Denifle.[2] Where Lydius used manuscripts, he unfortunately used corrupt ones, and he made indiscriminate use of earlier publications.

Nicolas' writings enjoyed some fame and notoriety in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. His criticisms of abuses in the church in the 'De Ruina et Reparatione Ecclesiae', then usually known as 'De Corrupto Statu Ecclesiae' and in the 'De Presulibus Simonaicis,' which had been orthodox enough in the early fifteenth century, were recognized by the Catholic Church to contain dangerous material. The 'De Ruina'

---

1. Von der Hardt, op.cit.I. pt.II. p.82.

2. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. Introductio, p.xii, note 5. Denifle calls it 'editio pessima.'

was consequently included in a catalogue of prohibited books drawn up for Venice by the Archbishop of Benevento in 1549, and in 1554 Nicolas appears on the list of prohibited authors in the Index of Milan. The prohibition thus extended to all his works was repeated in the first Papal Index, published by Paul IV in 1559, where his 'opera omnia' were condemned without reservation, and although the Index prepared by the Council of Trent and approved by Pius IV in 1564 indicated that Nicolas' works, with those of Boccaccio, Savanarola and Erasmus should be submitted to correction, this was, in fact, never done, and the 'opera omnia' remained on the Index till 1897 when a new ruling by Leo XIII released Nicolas from censure.[1]

---

1. "Nicolas de Clamanges à l'Index au XVIe siècle," article by A. Coville in Mélanges offerts à M. Abel Lefranc, Paris, 1936. pp.1-16.
   D. Clément. Bibliothèque Curieuse Historique et Critique. 9 vols. Leipzig, 1766. vol.VII. pp.172-3. note.
   H. Reusch. Der Index der Verbotenen Bücher. 2 vols. Bonn. 1883, 5. vol.I. pp.367-8, 482.
   Die Indices Librorum Prohibitorum des Sechszehnten Jahrhunderts. Tübingen, 1886. [Bibliothek des Litterarischen Vereins in Stuttgart. CLXXVI]. pp.139, 166, 198, 274, 507.

On the other hand, Nicolas' work was seized upon with delight by the Protestant reformers, the 'De Corrupto Statu Ecclesiae,' and the 'Disputatio super Materia Concilii Generalis,' with its emphasis on the fallibility of the Church militant, enjoying particular favour, and being published many times. Among the more eminent of the reformers who were interested in Nicolas' writings were Duplessis-Mornay, who was the first to publish one of his letters and the Pithou, (later converted to Catholicism) who possessed the 'collectio princeps' of his letters and verse. Lydius himself was a Protestant minister, and he appealed for transcriptions of the Oxford manuscript to Isaac Casaubon, the French Protestant scholar who settled in England in 1610.

When the interest of the reformers in Catholic discipline waned, Nicolas' works, since they were prohibited to Catholics, fell into an almost total neglect, and there were no further editions till Coville published the '<u>Traité</u>' in 1936.

The most important of the sixteenth and seventeenth century editions were two very early ones, Eubulus Cordatus' edition of 'De Corrupto Statu Ecclesiae' in 1519 and another edition belonging to 1519, containing the 'De Lapsu et Reparatione Justitiae' and the 'Disputatio,' in one small volume issued at Basle. The contents of these two editions were repeatedly reproduced, and always without explicit

recognition; it was very rare for recourse to be had to any of the manuscripts.

The earliest list of Nicolas' works approaching completion is that of Hieronymus Drouart in 1609, which was reproduced by Lydius. Launoy[1] gives a catalogue of Nicolas' works from which only one of his writings, the treatise 'Laudatio Franciae' appears to be missing. On the other hand, he reproduces without comment a list of the works published by Lydius, including those which were certainly not written by Nicolas. Several of the works listed by Launoy as unpublished have since been edited.

This Appendix provides a complete list of all Nicolas' known works, with an indication of where each is to be found, a description of the manuscripts containing his unpublished writings, and some account of the most important editions in the British Museum and their provenance. It is not a comprehensive survey of manuscripts and publications. Coville's editions, and in the case of the University letters, Denifle's, are placed first, as being authoritative, other editions are listed chronologically.

---

1. Launoy, op.cit. II. pp.572-80.

UNPUBLISHED

I. Sermon. Vide p. 131.

Sermo Nicolai de Clamengiis de Sanctis Innocentibus
'Nota est tiranni Herodis..'

Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, Manuscrit no.633.
fol.149-154.

No.633 is a small composite manuscript containing in addition to Nicolas' sermon and prayers, the 'De consolatione' of Boethius (fols.1-92) and several of Nicolas' published works; the University letters (fols.93-112), De filio prodigo (fol.112), De fructu eremi (fol.117v°), De prosperitate adversitatis (fol.112v°), De novis festiuitatibus (fol.127v°), De studio theologico (fol.136), Descriptio rei cuiusdam mirabilis (fol.143v°), Contra prelatos simonaicos (fol.146), Tractatus de ruina et reparatione ecclesiae, up to Chapter 39 (fol.154v°). The manuscript seems to be in a good tradition, since there is some reason to believe that the University letters may represent the text of Nicolas' own draft (vide. p.66-7), the 'De ruina' is given its correct title, instead of the more usual, but corrupt 'De Corrupto Statu Ecclesiae', and the text of the treatise, although incomplete, contains the beginning of one of the passages suppressed in the editions, and absent from many of the manuscripts. The script is small but fairly legible. The manuscript is dated in several places.

fol.143v° (at the end of De Studio Theologico)
'Actum 3a Novembras 1453
fol.146 (at the end of Descriptio rei cuiusdam)
Hoc de dicta narratione 1453 4a novembre
fol.149 (at the end of Contra prelatos simonaicos)
Hoc de dicto tractatu 6te Novembris
anno quo supra.

II. Prayers Vide p. 130

1. Oratio quedam ad Deum
'Deus, deus meus, respice in me .. '
Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne Manuscrit no.633.
fol.151.

2. Alia Oratio
'Erravit Domine ovis misera ... '
Ibid. fol.151v° col.1.

3. Oratio preambula ad canonicum servitium septem horarum dicenda a viro ecclesiastico priusquam horas ipsa incipiat.
'Septies in die laudem dicam .. '
Ibid. fol.152.

4. Oratio excitatoria ad surgendum hora matutinali pro matutino officio in ecclesia vel alibi persolvendo.
'Expergisce o anima mea .. '
Ibid. fol.152v°.

5. Oratio dicenda ante horam primam
'Da michi Domine hora prima .. '
Ibid. fol.153. col.1.

6. Oratio dicenda ante horam terciam
'Domine qui hora diei tercia .. '
Ibid. fol.153. col.2.

7. Oratio dicenda ante horam sextam
'Deus virtutum fortis et potens ... '
Ibid. fol.153v°. col.1.

8. Oratio dicenda ante horam novam
'Deus scientiarum, Domine in quo sunt ... '
Ibid. fol.153v°. col.2.

9. Oratio dicenda ante vespertinum servitium
'Deus fons et origo totius pietatis .... '
Ibid. fol.153v°. col.2.

10. Oratio ante completorium dicenda circa solis occasum.
'Ecce iam solis occubitus ... '
Ibid. fol.154. col.2.

III. Commentary

Expositio super Ysayam. Vide pp. 187–219.

Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal Manuscrit no.137.
Incipit 'Quoniam inter omnes scripturas ... '

The manuscript covers 247 large folios, written on both sides and in double columns. The margins are frequently decorated with amusing little sketches of animals, birds, flowers or grotesque human faces and there are corrections in a thin spiky hand which may possible be that of Nicolas. The manuscript was, according to Coville (Traité, p.92-3), almost certainly executed under his directions.

In the first quarter of the manuscript, the capitals are picked out, and the texts from Isaiah underlined in red, which gives the pages a much more attractive appearance as well as making them easier to read. The script is dark and heavy, but large and fairly clear; the use of contractions is not excessive. At the beginning of each text is a space for an ornamental initial, which has never been filled in.

The manuscript is incomplete in that it covers only forty-seven chapters of the Book of Isaiah, concluding with the text of the first verse of Chapter 48. It is, however, probable that this is as much as Nicolas wrote, since it seems likely that the Arsenal manuscript is, in fact, the only one that was ever made.

It is recorded at the end of the manuscript (fol.247) that it was presented to the library of the Theologians of the College of Navarre by Guillaume de Châteaufort, an important figure in the University in the second half of the fifteenth century.[1] He was born about 1415, and almost certainly knew Nicolas during the last years of his life; he may perhaps have inherited the manuscript from him. Coville examined this manuscript which he describes in the Traité, pp.91-96.

---

1. Chart. Univ. Paris. IV. passim.

PUBLISHED

I. Treatises.

1. 1387 Unfinished treatise to which Denifle has given the title of "Laudatio Franciae et Universitatis Parisiensis." Vide pp.44-9.

The publication of this treatise has been somewhat fragmentary. The manuscript, which appears to be the author's own draft, occupies fol.194-204 of Bibl. Nat. Latin 15107 (Chart. Univ. Paris, III, Appendicula. p.XXVIII).

fols. 194-197 are given in Ibid. pp.xxxi-xxxvii.

fols. 196-201 are summarised in the introduction to Ibid. III. no.1557.

fol. 201 is given in Ibid. III. no.1557.

This appears, in fact, to be the end of the treatise, since in referring to no.1557, Denifle says (p.xxxvii note 5) 'et finem tractatus necdum finiti ibidem invenies.'

Short quotations are also given by Denifle in:-

Auctarium I. p.607. note 4. (fol.196).

Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1522 (fol.195b.)

Ibid. III. p.XXXVII. note 5. (fols.199 and 199b).

2. 1400-1 De Ruina et Reparacione Ecclesiae. Vide p.100-1. (Also, less correctly, known as De Corrupto Ecclesiae Statu Liber).

1. Published by A. Coville in Le Traité de la Ruine de l'Eglise de Nicolas de Clamanges et la traduction française de 1564, Paris, 1936. pp.111-156.

Coville gives the full Latin text from the earliest and best manuscript, Bibl. Nat. Latin 3128, which includes some passages omitted from the earlier editions.

Coville, Traité, pp.51-59, and Clément, Bibliothèque Curieuse, VII, pp.172-3 and note 2, pp.173-6 give some account of the earlier editions. Those available in the British Museum are:-

2. Nicolai Clemangiis Archidiaconi Baiocensis et doctoris Theologiae Parisiensis, de Corrupto ecclesiae Statu liber. ed. Eubulus Cordatus. Schlettstadt, 1519? without pagination. From Ms. in Vatican Library.

3. De Corrupto Ecclesiae Statu Liber in Speculum Ecclesiae Pontificae Nicolaus Clemangis Archidiaconus Baiocensis. ed. E. Bulkley. London, 1606. pp.1-76.

From 'librum' sent to him by Doctor Bullenus, who had been Dean of Lichfield, probably Eubulus Cordatus' edition, since Bulkley gives the extract from Trithemius with which the Cordatus edition begins.

4. Strena αποφρητος pro Jacobo et Cunrado Andreae. Hoc est Tractatus .... Nicolai de Clamengiis .... de Corrupto Ecclesiae Romanae Statu. ed. L. Hutter. Wittenberg, 1608.

From Eubulus Cordatus' edition. 1519. (no.2). Hutter reproduces Cordatus' address to Montesius.

The British Museum copy has only the title page, address etc. The text of the treatise is missing.

5. De Corrupto Ecclesiae Statu in Nicolai de Clemangiis Opera omnia. ed. J.M. Lydius. Leyden, 1613. pp.4-28.

From edition of Eubulus Cordatus, 1519. (no.2). Lydius reproduces Cordatus' address to Montesius. (p.3.)

6. Libellus N. Clemangis De Corrupto Ecclesiae Statu in Tractatus de modo Generalis Concilii Celebrandi. ed. G. Durand. Paris, 1671. pp.7-60.

From Eubulus Cordatus' edition. 1519. (no.2). Reproduces Cordatus' address to Montesius (p.5.).

7. De Corrupto Ecclesiae Statu in Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum et Fugiendarum, ed. E. Brown. London, 1690. vol.II.

Appendix ad Fasciculum. pp.555-70.
No mention of manuscript, and no obvious indications of provenance.

8. Nicolai Clemangii Opusculum De Ruina Ecclesiae in Magnum Oecumenicum Constantiense Concilium de Universali ecclesie reformatione unione et fide. 7 vols. Frankfurt, 1696-1742. Vol.I. (1700) pt.III. cols.1-51.

From a Helmstadt Ms.

3. 1398-1403. De Praesulibus Simonaicis. Vide p. 101-2
Opera, ed. Lydius, 1613. pp.160-166.

From a manuscript in the Bibliothèque de St. Victor.

4. 1408-17? . De Filio Prodigo. Vide p. 131, 163.
Opera, ed. Lydius. 1613. pp.109-121.

From a manuscript in the Bibliothèque de St. Victor.

5. 1408-11?. De Fructo Eremi. Vide p. 163.

1. Published in a small book on the solitary life 'In hoc volumine continentur que sequuntur. Primo libellus pulcherrimus sancti basilii .....

Tractatus epistolaris prestantissimi viri magistri Nicolai de Clemengii de fructu heremi et laude, solitarie vite ....

No place of publication given. 1510.
Without pagination. No mention of Ms.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. 1613. pp.121-132.

From a manuscript in the Bibliothèque de St. Victor.

6. 1408-17. De Fructu Rerum Adversarium. Vide p. 131, 163.

Opera, ed. Lydius. 1613. pp.132-143.

From a manuscript in the Bibliothèque de St. Victor.

7. 1409-10. Oratio ad Galliarum Principes qua eos a bello civili dehortatur. Vide p. 147.

Opera, ed. Lydius. 1613. pp.169-174.

From a manuscript, but Lydius does not say where he found it. (p.168).

8. After Dec. 1411. Letter to Gérard Machet 'Non mentis tam affectu a Babylone discendendum,' or 'De Egressu Babylone.' Vide p. 163.

1. Philippe de Mornay 'Mysterium Iniquitatis seu Historia Papatus ... ' (addressed to James I. of England). Saumur, 1611. pp.525-9. No reference to Ms. but he quotes from the 'De Corrupto Statu Ecclesiae,' (which he once refers to by its correct title - 'De ruina et reparatione ecclesiae), 'De Studio Theologico,' 'Contra Prelatos Simonaicos,' 'Contra Nova Sanctorum Festa,' and the 'Disputatio.' pp.522-5.

2nd edition Saumur 1612.
3rd edition Coricheni 1662.

French Translation. Saumur 1611.
2nd edition Geneva 1612.
3rd edition - 1612.

English Translation. London 1612.

As this letter had been published by de Mornay, Lydius separated it from the 'Epistolae' to which it properly belongs and published it with the treatises.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. 1613. pp.174-8.

Lydius refers to de Mornay's edition, but this version is from a manuscript, though he does not indicate its whereabouts.

9. 1412-3. De Novis Celebratibus non Instituendis. Vide p. 154.

1. Opera, ed. Lydius. 1613. pp.143-160.

From a manuscript in the Bibliothèque de St. Victor.

2. 'De Diebus Festis et Sabbato'. Helmstadt, 1703. pp.1-54.

From Lydius. (Prefatio).

10. 1413-4. Liber de Studio Theologico. Vide p. 164.

1. Spicilegium: Sive collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae bibliothecis delituerant. ed. L. d'Achery. 3 vols. Paris, 1723.

Vol.I. pp.473-480.

From manuscript communicated to d'Achery by Raimundus Fromentinus, Canon of Orleans, which also contained the nine University letters.

Aurora sive bibliotheca selecta ex scriptis eorum, qui ante Lutherum ecclesiae studuerunt restituendae.

Ed. F.G.P. Schöpff. Dresden, 1857-. Vol.II (1857) pp.1-29.

Reprinted from d'Achery. 'Ex Dacherii recensione.'

11. Early 1415. Disputatio habita per scriptum super materia Concilii Generalis cum quodam Scholastico Parisiensis. 3 pts. Vide p. 161

1. Nicolai de Clemengiis de Lapsu et Reparatione justiciae libellus. Eiusdem disputatio super materia Concilii Generalis etc. Basle, 1519.

3 pts. pp.38-74.

No mention of manuscript.

2. Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum ac Fugiendarum. In quo primum continetur Concilium Basiliense. ed. O. Gratius. (Cologne) 1535.

3 pts. pp.CXCVII-CCII(v°).

No mention of manuscript, presumably from Basle 1519 (no.1) since the Disputatio is preceded by the works that follow it in the Basle edition.

3. Volumen II tractatuum ex Variis iuris civilis interpretibus collectorum. Lyons, 1549.

3 pts. pp.120-122v°.

No mention of Ms., presumably from Basle 1519 (no.1) since the De reparatione is included in vol.I.

4. Speculum Ecclesiae Pontificae Nicolaus Clemangis Archidiaconus Baiocensis. ed. E. Bulkley. London, 1606.

2 pts. pp.87-144.

5. Opera, ed. J.M. Lydius. 1613.

3 pts. pp.61-79.

From Basle, 1519 (no.1) Lydius gives the rest of the contents of this volume.

6. Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum et Fugiendarum. ed. E. Brown, 2 vols. London, 1690. vol.I.

3 pts. pp.393, 396, 404.

No mention of Ms., Either from Basle 1519 (no.1) or from Lydius (no.5) since it includes the Apostoli Responsio, Arrestum Curiae Parlamenti etc.

7. Von der Hardt, op.cit. Vol.I. (1700) pt.II.

3 pts. col.45-70.

12. Sept. 1419 - May 1420. De Lapsu et reparatione Justitiae. Vide p. 184-6.

Clément, Bibliothèque Curieuse. VII. pp.174-6 and note 3, pp.176-9 gives some account of the editions.

1. Nicolai de Clemengiis de Lapsu et Reparatione Justiciae libellus. Eiusdem disputatio etc. Basle, 1519. Erasmus?

pp.1-38 (preceded by extract from Trithemius and Nicolas' Dedicatory letter, without pagination).

No mention of manuscript.

2. Primum Volumen Tractatuum ex variis iuris interpretibus collectorum. Lyons, 1549.

fo.43-46.

No mention of manuscript, probably from Basle 1519 (no.1) since the extract from Trithemius is reproduced.

3. Magistri Nicolai de Clemangiis ... De lapsu et reparations justiciae, liber unus. ed. H. Drouart. Paris, 1609.

pp.1-19 (preceded by Nicolas' Dedicatory letter without pagination and followed by Vita, and list of works).

No mention of manuscript, but presumably he used one, since he gives an almost complete list of works.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. 1613.

pp.41-59. (Dedicatory Letter, pp.37-40).

From Basle, 1519 (no.1) Lydius gives the rest of the contents of this volume, and Drouart, 1609. Lydius, pp.190-1 reproduces Drouart's 'Vita' and list of works.

13. 1418-20 Exhortatio ad resistendum contra Mahometicos. Vide p. 186-7

Stephanii Baluzii ... Miscellanea novo ordine digesta ed. Mansi. 4 vols. Lucca, 1761-4. Vol.III. p.111. col.2.

From a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Colbert.

14. 1423-6 De Antichristo et ortu eius, vita, moribus et operibus. Vide p. 215-6.

Opera, ed. Lydius. 1613.

pp.357-359.

From manuscript belonging to Cantier of Utrecht collated with a Manuscript in the Bibliothèque de St. Victor.

II. Moral Tale.

c.1403-8? Historia De Raptoris, Raptaeque Virginis lamentabili exitu. Vide p. 118.

J. Hommey. Supplementum Patrum: complectitur multa S.S. Patrum ... scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum opera quae primum e MS codicibus eruit ... J.H. Paris, 1634.

pp.508-518.

No reference to manuscript.

2nd edition - Paris, 1696.

This work is listed by Launoy, op.cit. II. p.578 as 'Descriptio rei cuiusdam mirabilis, quae in

Galliis accidisse ferebatur,' which title it is also given in the Sorbonne Manuscript. no.633, fol.143r°.

Coville summarises the story and discusses the many translations and adaptations to which it gave rise in Recherches, Chap.V. pp.208-44.

III. Verse. Vide p. 118.

Coville has edited all Nicolas' surviving verse from the 'collectio princeps', Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine, Montpellier. no.87, in Recherches sur quelques écrivains du XIVe et du XVe siècle. Paris, 1935. Coville describes this manuscript in Recherches, pp.245-52.

1. 1407-8 Deploratio Calamitatis Ecclesiasticae per schisma nefandissimum, cum exhortatione P.P. et Pontificum ad eius extirpandum.

1. Coville, Recherches, pp.261-4.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. pp.32-6.

(A corrupt and incomplete version from a manuscript communicated to Lydius by Antoine Thys (p.32) and collated with the Bibliothèque de St. Victor manuscript and the Oxford manuscript, copied by Ludovicus Capellus.

2. 1407-8 Fragmentum discriptionis vitae tyrannicae cum detestatione ac reprehensione.

1. Coville, Recherches. pp.277-81.

2. Un chateau scay sur roche espoventable (without pagination), a poem by Pierre d'Ailly with Latin translation by Nicolas. ed. P. de Vitry. 1490. Paris ?

3. Libro Ilamado Menos precio de Corte y Alabança de Aldea ... mis en Français. Y ont esté adioustés les vers François des Eveques de Meaux et de Cambray et les latins de Nicolas de Clemenges. ed. A. de Guevara. 1591.

4. Opera, ed. Lydius. 1613. pp.355-6.

From manuscript of Cantier of Utrecht, supplemented by the Oxford manuscript.

5. Combien est miserable la vie du Tyran. Idem latine per N. de Clamengiis. 1614.

This poem has been published repeatedly. Coville gives a list of the editions in Recherches, pp.273-4.

3. 1407-8 Discriptio vitae rusticae cum laude et commendatione.

Coville, Recherches, pp.274-277.

This poem has been published in the same editions as no.2 above.

4. 1407-8 Descriptio et laus urbis lanuae.

Coville, Recherches, pp.256-259.

5. 1408-11 Ad Gérardum Machet ad sui visitationem incitatio.

1. Coville, Recherches, pp.272-3.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Second half of Ep.CXVI to Gérard Machet.

From manuscript belonging to Cantier of Utrecht.

6. 1411 Super morte eiusdem Jacobis deploratio elegiaca.

1. Coville, Recherches, pp.265-269.

2. Opera, ed. Lydius. Ep. LXX to Jean de Boury.

From manuscript belonging to Cantier of Utrecht.

3. Abbé J. Boulanger "La Renaissance au XVe siècle. Une correspondance entre Nicolas de Clemangis et Jacques de Nouvion" in Revue Historique Ardennaise. VII. 1900. pp.311-4.

From Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine, Montpellier. no.87.

IV. Letters.

1. 1394-5. Nine letters written in the name of the University of Paris. [Among the letters of Nicolas in five manuscripts listed by Denifle in Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.624. note].

Du Boulay's text came from Bibliothèque de St. Victor Manuscrit B 31, now Bibliothèque Nationale, Latin no.14643. [Du Boulay, IV, p.687, Chart. Univ. Paris, III. no.1690 note].

D'Achery's text came from a manuscript sent to him by Raimundus Fromentinus.

i. To Charles VI. 8 June 1394.
'Christianissimo ac religionis...'
Vide p. 54-5

1. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1683, from Arch. Nat. Paris. 67[b], no.59.
2. C. Egasse du Boulay, Historia Universitatis Parisiensis, 6 vols. Paris, 1665-73. vol.IV. pp.637-696.
3. L. d'Achery, Spicilegium: sive collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae bibliothecis delituerant. 3 vols. 1723. Paris. vol.I. p.784.

ii. To Clement VII. 17 July 1394.
'Coegit nos tandem ...'
Vide p. 59-60.

1. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1690, from Arch. Vat. arm.54, no.21. fol.40 etc...
2. Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.699-700.
3. Spicilegium, I. p.784.
4. Abbé Combes, op.cit. p.630-3. From Bibl.Nat. Latin, no.3132[A], collated with other manuscripts.

iii.	To Clement VII. 22 Sept. 1394. "Paucis abhinc ...' Not sent. Vide p. 61.	1. Chart. Univ. Paris. III. no.1693, from Arch. Nat. Paris. J.518. fol.15. 2. Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.701-3.
iv.	To the University of Cologne. After 5 July 1394. 'Litteras parte vestra ...' Vide p. 55 note 3.	Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.704-5.
v.	To the Cardinals of Avignon. 22 Sept. 1394. 'Etsi firmam ...' Vide p. 62.	1. Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.711-2. 2. Spicilegium, I. pp.786-7.
vi.	To the Bishops of France. 'Iustum erat venerabilis ...' Vide p. 55 note 3.	Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.712-3.
vii.	To Benedict XIII. 23 Oct. 1394. 'Quamquam Pater...' Vide p. 64.	1. Du Boulay, op.cit. IV. pp.713-5. 2. Spicilegium, pp.772-3.
viii.	To the King of Aragon. 'Gratissimum regalis vestre...' Vide p. 55 note 3.	Du Boulay, op cit. IV. pp.719-20.
ix.	To Benedict XIII. 14 April 1395. 'Quoniam Pater ...' Vide p. 65-6.	Du Boulay, op.cit. IV, pp.740-7.

2. Personal Letters.

150 (including De Egressu Babylone, excluding the version of Lydius Ep.XI published by Coville in Recherches, p.313).

The only form in which the letters are generally available is in the Lydius edition of the Opera Omnia. It is, unfortunately an inaccurate version of a corrupt text, that of Thomas Cantier of Utrecht. (Title page to letters).

Lydius gives 137 letters (not including the 'De Egressu Babylone' which had already been separately published by Duplessis-Mornay in the Mysterium Iniquitatis).

It is most convenient to refer to the letters by their numbers in the Lydius edition.

The New College manuscript is in the same tradition as the Cantier manuscript used by Lydius, the origin of which appears to be Bibl. Nat. Latin no.3128, dated 1448.[1]

The 'Collectio Princeps' of the letters and poetry of Nicolas is in the library of the Faculty of Medicine at Montpellier, No.87. It contains 134 letters (including the 'De Egressu Babylone' addressed to Gérard Machet). All of these except the two to Simon de Bergères are represented in the Lydius edition. Thus the manuscript lacks six letters given by Lydius (XXXVI, XLVII, XLIX, L, LI, LV).[2] It is perhaps significant that the last five of these relate to the cricis of 1408. (Vide p.124).

This manuscript was made during Nicolas' lifetime and is corrected in his own hand, 'sua manu correcte'. Coville concluded that it was completed between Autumn 1417 and Summer 1418,[3] but it must,

---

1. Coville, Recherches, p.285.

2. Ibid. pp.245-52.

3. Ibid. p.251-2.

in fact, have been some years later than this, since the collection includes letters which could not have been written earlier than 1423. (CXXXII-CXXXV. Vide Appendix II. p.293-4). The manuscript once belonged to the Pithou and was taken to Montpellier during the nationalization of the libraries in 1804.[1]

Only 6 letters have ever been published from this 'Collectio Princeps' (Vide infra. iv, v).

i. 137 letters in Opera omnia, ed. Lydius.

From manuscript belonging to Thomas Cantier of Utrecht, collated (5 Eps.XXVIII, XXXI, CII, CIII, CXXXII) with Bibliothèque de St. Victor DD.9 and supplemented (Ep.CXXXVII) from a transcription of Library of New College, Oxford no.CXXVIII, made by Ludovicus Capellus after Lydius had appealed to Isaac Casaubon.

ii. 2 letters in Stephani Baluzii Miscellanea, vol.III. p.112. col.2 - 113 col.1.

From manuscript in the Bibliothèque Colbert. These letters are the two to Simon de Bergères which distinguish collections in the Montpellier no.87 tradition.

iii. 4 letters in Magnum Oecumenicum Constantiense Concilium, vol.I.

p.4	Ep.I
p.21	" II
p.32	" CII
p.39	" CXII

Extracts from the following letters are published in footnotes.

p.73	note	k	from	Ep.	IV
p.75	"	m	"	"	XII
p.74	"	l	"	"	XIV
p.76	"	o	"	"	"
p.77	"	r	"	"	"
p.71	"	f	"	"	XLII
p.76	"	p	"	"	"
p.77	"	q	"	"	"

1. Ibid. p.246.

From a Wolfenbüttel manuscript which Von der Hardt greatly prided himself upon discovering, believing it to be 'genuinum Clemangium,' and delivering himself of very harsh opinions on the subject of the Cantier manuscript. Actually the Wolfenbüttel manuscript is also in the inferior tradition.

iv. 4 letters in "La Renaissance au XVe siècle. Une correspondance entre Nicolas de Clemangis et Jacques de Nouvion," in Revue Historique Ardennaise. VII. 1900. Article by Abbé J. Boulanger. pp.277-315.

pp.305-6	Ep.	XXXIX	
pp.307-9	"	LVII	
pp.309-11	"	LXIX	
pp.311-14	"	LXX	(Elegy on Jacques de Nouvion. Vide p. 270.)

From Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine, Montpellier, no.87.

v. 13 letters in Coville, Recherches, pp.289-317.

10 from Bibl. Nat. Latin 3128, 13061, 3127.
1 " " " " 14909.

Coville seems not to have noticed that this letter is another version of Lydius' Ep.XI.

2 from Bibl. de la Faculté de Médecine, Montpellier, no.87.

Works Improperly Ascribed to Nicolas by Lydius.

		Provenance
I.	Rhythmie Vetusto Quodam Codice Descripti, Romanum Quendam Advocatum, cognomento le Franco taxantes, ut appareat etiam veteres in Romanam curiam scripsisse. pp.29-31. 2 small items headed "Fridericus Primus Adriano Quarto interalia" and "Otto Frising." pp.31-2. These works are not explicitly ascribed to Nicolas, but they follow immediately after the 'De Corrupto'. They are obviously not his work.	These writings follow the 'De Corrupto' in the Schlettstadt 1519 edition, without any ascription to Nicolas.
II.	Apostoli et Responsio Dati per Nationem Gallicanam, Dominis Cardinalibus. pp.82-98. Lydius discusses the probable attribution of this work to Nicolas (p.80-81) and concludes 'Accipe igitur hilari Lector fronte, hoc, sive Clamingii sit, sive alterius scriptum, nec propter hoc calumniis me obrue, nec tibi acclamem.' The style is not Nicolas'.	Follows the 'Disputatio super Materia Concilii Generalis' in the Basle 1519 edition. pp.75-110, where it is not ascribed to Nicolas, or connected in any way with his work.

The following writings are not explicitly ascribed to Nicolas, but are all included in the 'Opera omnia'.

Similes Formae pro eisdem Quando fit per Procuratores et ibidem pro Abbatibus. pp.99-100.	Basle 1519. pp.110-113.
Constitutio Sacri Basiliensis Concilii super Annates. In sessione vigesima-prima. pp.100-1.	pp.114-5.

Arrestum Curiae Parlamenti Parisiensis super Annatis non solvendis. pp.101-6. pp.115-127.

Sequuntur nonnulla in quibus patet approbatio Sacri Concilii Basilien et pragmaticae sanctionis a rege Francorum. p.106. pp.128-9.

Serenissimo Principi Carolo Francorum Regi, Fratri et consanguine nostro Charissimo etc - Letter from Frederick III. p.107. pp.129-31.

These works have no possible connection with Nicolas. Apart from the differences in style, which are great, he was already over seventy when the Council of Basle opened, and had been failing for some time.

III. It is not obvious where Lydius found the following works:-

1. Epistolae Scriptae Nomine Benedicti Papae.

I.	pp.179-80	To Gregory XII		17 January 1407 from Marseilles.
II.	pp.181-4	"	"	" from Porto Venere.
III.	pp.185-6	"	"	" 13 June 1403, from Porto Venere.

Lydius says 'Etsi a Nicolao de Clemangis certo esse conscriptos asserere non ausim, vix tamen mihi dubium' p.178.

Nicolas had already left the Curia before III was written, (vide p. 117.) and in the case of I and II, which in time it is possible that he could have written, the style is not characteristically his, and there is no positive reason to think that he was responsible.

IV. p.186. To Paul, Lord of Lucca.

Interrogationes Benedicti, date XVIII mensis Aprilis per suos nuncios Gregorio Papae XII in Luca Sequuatur. p.186.

Lydius gives no explanation for including these items.

2. Littera scripta Nomine Universitatis ...
Dominis Cardinalibus Romanis.
p.187-9.
1408

Lydius attributed this letter to Nicolas because Drouart's list of his works had included a letter to the Avignonese Cardinals, who, Lydius says, were transferred from Rome. p.187.

Apart from every other consideration, the date makes this suggestion impossible, this was the year of Nicolas' persectuion. (Vide p. 120-6).

Conclusiones Universitatis Studii Parisiensis, contra Benedictum, cum quibusdam requestio annexis.
pp.189-90.

There is nothing to suggest that Nicolas was the author of any of these works, but in most cases a considerable amount of evidence to the contrary.

APPENDIX II.

Indications of the Dates of the Letters Published by Lydius.[1]

I.	Charles VI.	Paris.	Autumn 1393. 'Ecce iam ternis exactis lustris Petri navicula horribili disiecta tempestate dissipatur.' (p.3. col.1) that is, 15 years after the outbreak of the Schism in 1378.
II.	Benedict XIII.	Paris.	Autumn 1394. Soon after the election of Benedict on 28 Sept. 1394. 'Schismate horribilissimo ... anno iam decimo sexto.' (p.9. col.1).
III.	Unnamed Friend.	Paris.	Autumn 1394. Soon after Ep.II. Nicolas protests against corrections made to this letter by a friend.
IV.	Galeotto di Pietramala.	Paris.	Late 1394 - early 1395. Reply to Galeotto's letter in Ampl.Coll.I. col.1544, written after the letters to Benedict and the Cardinals in the name of the University had been received in the Curia. (Vide Appendix I p. 272)
V.	" "	Paris.	Late 1394 - early 1395. Further discussion of Galeotto's letter.
VI.	Jean de Montreuil.	Paris.	Summer - Autumn 1397. Deals with the beginning of the quarrel with Ambrogio de' Migli, which started in 1397. (Coville, Recherches, pp.120-1) Nicolas left Paris before the end of 1397 (vide p. 75).

1. None of the letters are explicitly dated in the text.

VII.	Ambrogio de' Migli. (Written in the name of Gontier).	Paris.	Summer - Autumn 1397. Soon after Ep.VI.
VIII.	Jean Muret.	Paris.	1395-7. After the opening of correspondence with Galeotto (vide Ep.IV) to whom he sends a message.
IX.	Gerson	Avignon.	Nov.1397 - Summer 1398. Nicolas went to Avignon at the end of 1397. (Vide p. 75) This letter was presumably written before his illness in the summer. (Vide p. 90).
X.	Jean de Montreuil.	Avignon.	Nov.1397 - Summer 1398. (Vide Ep.IX).
XI.	Gontier.	Avignon.	27 Jan. 1398. Another version of the letter published by Coville in Recherches, pp.311-3, which is dated 27 Jan. (Vide p. 275).
XII.	"	Avignon.	Spring or early Summer 1398. Records the death of Galeotto, which occurred before Nicolas fell ill (vide p. 88). Before letter to Gontier published by Coville in Recherches, pp.303-4.
XIII.	Benedict XIII.	-	Sept. or Oct. 1398. After Nicolas had left Avignon, but soon after his return to France. (Vide p. 93).
XIV.	Jean de Montreuil.	Châlons.	Autumn 1398 - 1399. After Ep.XVI. (Vide p. 98 note 1).
XV.	Gerson.	Langres.	Autumn 1398. Nicolas had just left Avignon. (Vide p. 91).

XVI.	Jean de Montreuil.	Langres.	Autumn 1398. 3 weeks after his arrival in Langres. 'tres iam dierum lapsae sunt hebdomades'. p.60. c.1. This is his first letter to Jean de Montreuil after his illness and escape from Avignon. (Vide p. 96.).
XVII.	Charles VI.	-	1402. 'Ecce iam quadrennio per obedientie ereptionem sublati sunt obices illi' (p.61. c.2), that is, 4 years after the subtraction of obedience (28 July 1398).
XVIII.	Jean de Montreuil.	Langres.	Autumn 1398-9. Soon after Nicolas had settled at Langres, he explains his circumstances. (Vide p. 96).
XIX.	" "	Langres.	Winter 1398-9. Nicolas was waiting to see if he could endure the winter at Langres. (p.83.c.1.).
XX.	" "	Langres.	Winter 1398 - end of Sept. 1400. Before Jean's embassy to Germany. (Vide Ep.XXIV).
XXI.	" "	Langres.	1400, before October. Mentions lawsuit which took place 1400-1. (vide p. 103-4). Before Jean's embassy to Germany. (Vide Ep.XXIV).
XXII.	" "	Langres.	Winter 1398-end of Sept. 1400. (Vide Ep.XXIV).
XXIII.	" "	Langres.	Winter 1398 - end of Sept. 1400. (Vide Ep.XXIV).
XXIV.	" "	Faverolles.	End of Oct. - Nov. 1400. 'Abisse te gratia legationis Germaniam iam pridem audieram'. p.90. c.1. A. Thomas, op.cit. p.9. says that Jean left on 20 Oct.

XXV.	Jean de Montreuil.	Langres.	March - April 1401. Nicolas had just heard of Jean's return from Germany, 2 months before. This embassy (vide Ep.XXIV) lasted 3 months (Religieux de St. Denis. II. pp.764-9), that is, Jean must have returned about the end of January.
XXVI.	Gontier.	Langres.	Probably 1399 Before letter published by Coville in Recherches, p.305.
XXVII.	"	Langres.	Summer 1399. 'Annus ecce praeterire incipit in quo urbs Avinio me tenebat' (p.100. col.1), that is, it was a year since he had left. It was not yet autumn. 'Si ante autumni morbiferi periculos aestus ita incandavit...'(p.95. col.1).
XXVIII.	Gontier & Jean de Montreuil.	Langres.	1398-9. Before the letter published by Coville in Recherches, p.296. Both deal with help to Nicolas' brother.
XXIX.	d'Ailly.	Langres.	1399-1400. 'De Ruina', 1400-1, was the outcome of this letter.
XXX.	Johannes de Morsonno.	Langres.	Autumn 1398 - Summer 1403. (i.e. during residence at Langres).
XXXI.	Gerson.	Langres.	Autumn 1398 - Summer 1403. (i.e. during residence at Langres). 'De Praesulibus Simonaicis' was the outcome of this letter.
XXXII.	Stephanus de Gumblacio.	Paris.	Autumn 1398 - Summer 1403, (Absence from Curia) but not April - Autumn 1401, when Gerson was in Brûges. (Connolly, op.cit. p.79, 81), since Nicolas had just met him.

XXXIII.	Jacques de Nouvion.	Avignon.	1-14 June 1403. The restitution of obedience was made on 28 and 30 May. (Valois, III. p.343). This letter was written the day after Nicolas' arrival at Avignon, on his way to join the Pope at Marseilles, where he arrived before 17 June. (Vide p.106 note 2).
XXXIV.	"	Marseilles.	Summer 1403. Reply to Jacques' thanks for Ep.XXXIII. The Curia did not leave Marseilles till the end of Nov. or early Dec. 1403. (Valois, III. p.349, 354).
XXXV.	"	"	Summer - Winter 1403. (Vide Ep.XXXIV).
XXXVI.	Jean de Montreuil.	Avignon.	Summer 1403 - Spring 1408. (Second period at Curia).
XXXVII.	" "	Tarascon.	Dec. 1403. Benedict was at Tarascon by 8 Dec. (Valois, III. p.354). Jean de Montreuil's reply, Bibl. Nat. Latin. 13062. fol.38v° is dated 25 Jan.
XXXVIII.	Gontier.	Marseilles.	Summer-Winter 1404. Curia was at Marseilles from May - 2 Dec. 1404. (Valois, III. p.371, 401. note 1). Could equally be on the occasion of the earlier visit (vide Ep.XXXIV).
XXXIX.	Jacques de Nouvion.	Nice.	Jan. 1405. Curia was at Nice from 21 Dec.1404 till the middle of Feb. 1405. (Valois, III. p.447, note 2, 404). This letter was written after Christmas.
XL.	Regnauld des Fontaines.	Savona. (Scion in Lydius).	Autumn 1405 - Summer 1406. Curia was at Savona during these months (Valois, III. p.415, 442, note 3, 452) and also from 24 Sept. -23 Dec.1407 (Valois, III, p.554, 563) but the letter is less likely to belong to this second period, as the letters seem here to be in chronological sequence.

XLI.	Gerson.	Nice.	2/9 Sept. - 18 Sept. 1406. 'Ex Italia in hanc urbem revoluti sumus'. The only occasion on which the Curia approached Nice from Italy was in Sept. 1406 (Valois, III, 547/9, 553).
XLII.	University of Paris.	Avignon.	June 1408. Nicolas had just heard of Papal letters excommunicating Charles, and the declaration of neutrality, from the University. (Vide p. 121-2).
XLIII.	Regnauld des Fontaines	Langres.	June - July 1408. Defence against accusations. He was not able to remain long at Langres. (Vide p. 122-4).
XLIV.	d'Ailly.	Fontaine.	Nov. 1408. Nicolas had just missed seeing d'Ailly on a visit to Paris. d'Ailly had left by 26 October (Salembier, p.239).
XLV.	Jacques de Nouvion.	in loco sine nomine.	June - Nov. 1408. Defence against attacks. (Vide p. 124).
XLVI.	Gontier.	-	June - Nov. 1408. Crisis (Vide p. 124).
XLVII.	Regnauld des Fontaines.	-	June - Nov. 1408. Crisis. Regnauld taking his Master's degree 'iam tempus adest quo ab illa sarcina magna saltem ex parte liberatus est.' Launoy, II. 925, says that he became a master in 1408.
XLVIII.	Johannes Cognomento Juventus.	-	June - Nov. 1408. Crisis.
XLIX.	Evrard Moriset.	-	" " " "
L.	Jacques de Boury.	-	" " " "

LI.	Johannes Heraudus.	-	June - Nov. 1408. Crisis.
LII.	Jean d'Arconval.	-	" " " "
LIII.	Johannes de Morsonno.	-	" " " "
LIV.	Regnauld des Fontaines.	Valpro-fond.	Autumn 1408. 'Ex longa iactatione me cum sanetis fratribus Carthusianis pauxillum recreans portum tutissimum subii.' Persecution over, since he has been invited to return to Paris. (Vide p.125).
LV.	" "	Valpro-fond.	Autumn 1408. (Residence at Valprofond).
LVI.	Louis, Duc d'Aquitaine.	Valpro-fond.	Autumn 1408. Written nearly 12 years before the 'De Lapsu et Reparatione Iustitiae'. (19 Sept.1419 - May 1420 - Vide p. 184) 'Iamdudum ante annos ferme bissenos ad Ludovicum ... ' 'De Lapsu'. Lydius. p.41.
LVII.	Jacques de Nouvion.	Valpro-fond.	Autumn 1408. Residence at Valprofond. Jacques de Nouvion on embassy in Germany? This letter is definitely not before the death of the Duc d'Orléans (24 Nov. 1407) as Coville has suggested in Recherches, p.201.
LVIII.	Gerson.	Fontaine.	Probably 1409-10. Disorders before the outbreak of Civil War.
LIX.	Jacques de Boury.	Fontaine.	Lent. Probably 1409-10. 'rarum et solubile corpusculum quod his longioribus ieiuniis vehementior atteritur'.

LX.	Jacques de Boury.	Fontaine.	Spring. Probably 1409-10. 'horam prorsus oportunam meae ad tua scripta responsionis verna temperies adduxit' ... 'aliquot dies' ... after Ep.LIX.
LXI.	Gerson.	Fontaine.	1410. Jacques de Nouvion, who left Blois in Dec. 1409 had just sent a letter from Bologna. It is possible that LXI refers to the death of Alexander V, (3 May 1410) although his name is not mentioned. Nicolas alleges that Alexander was poisoned by the future John XXIII in the 'Expositio super Ysayam'. fol.29v°.
LXII.	"	Fontaine.	1408-17. (Residence at Fontaine). Gerson had been ill. No mention of this in Connolly or Masson.
LXIII.	"	Fontaine.	Probably 1410-11. Soon before outbreak of Civil War.
LXIV.	Martin de Talayero.	Fontaine.	Before August 1410 when Martin became a Master. (Chart.Univ. Paris. IV. no.1908). He is addressed as 'Baccalarius' in the superscription.
LXV.	" "	Fontaine.	" "
LXVI.	Jean de Piedmont.	Fontaine.	1412-3. Reply to Jean's criticisms of 'De Novis Celebratibus'. (Vide p. 154).
LXVII.	Gerard Machet.	Fontaine.	After Dec.1411 when Machet became a Master (Launoy, II. 533).
LXVIII.	Gerson.	Fontaine.	1411. After the outbreak of Civil War.
LXIX.	Jacques de Boury.	Fontaine.	Early in 1411. On the death of Jacques de Nouvion, early in 1411 (Coville, Recherches, p.202).

LXX.	Jacques de Boury.	Fontaine.	Early in 1411. On the death of Jacques de Nouvion, early in 1411 (Coville, Recherches, p.202).
LXXI.	Raoul de la Porte.	Fontaine.	Probably 1410-11. Before the end of 1411. Raoul not yet a Master. (Launoy, II. p.922).
LXXII.	" "	Fontaine.	1411. Before the end of 1411 (Vide Ep.LXXI). After death of Jacques de Nouvion.
LXXIII.	" "	Fontaine.	Probably 1410-11. Before the end of 1411. (Vide Ep.LXXI).
LXXIV.	" "	Fontaine.	1411. 'Ecce ad licentiam dicendi praedicandique Domino te vocante properas.' (Vide Ep.LXXI).
LXXV.	" "	Fontaine.	1410-11. Before the end of 1411. (Vide Ep.LXXI).
LXXVI.	Jean Muret.	Langres.	Probably 1408-9. After the end of Nicolas' persecution 'iam dudum finem esse positum insinuaverim'.
LXXVII.	College of Navarre.	Langres.	Autumn 1410. Discusses chances of peace. Juvenal des Ursins pp.452-4, 2 Sept. Armagnacs appealed to Charles VI for peace.
LXXVIII.	Nicolas de Baye.	-	Nov. Probably 1410. Reply to apology of Nicolas de Baye, for not visiting him in October. Nicolas (de Clamanges) was just returning to Fontaine after an absence, presumably at Langres. (Vide Ep.LXXVII) 'non mihi placuisset nec aequum erat ut ad me tanto locorum intervallo disiunctam contendisses.'

LXXIX.	Nicolas de Baye.	-	Before June 1414, when Nicolas de Baye took Holy Orders. (Tuetey, Journal, Notice Biographique, p.XXX). Probably 1411-2.
LXXX.	"	-	" " "
LXXXI.	"	-	" " "
LXXXII.		-	" " " 'te mature confido vos utile futurum in domo domini.' (p.243, c.1.).
LXXXIII.	"	-	After Easter, probably 1412. 'Parce si in praeterita Quadragesima parcius scripsi.' fol.243. c.2.
LXXXIV.	"	-	Autumn 1412. On his way back from Langres.
LXXXV.	"	-	Spring 1414, after Lent. Nicolas de Baye had been busy with preparations for the celebration of his first mass etc. (Ordained on 2 June 1414, Tuetey, p.XXX).
LXXXVI.	"	-	Probably 1412-3.
LXXXVII.	"	-	Probably during Fontaine period, 1403-17.
LXXXVIII.	"	-	Spring 1413. Escape of Nicolas de Baye from Cabochian Riots.
LXXXIX.	"	-	Sept. - Aug. 1412. Discussion of Paix d'Auxerre, 2nd half of August, 1412.
XC.	"	-	Probably late 1412. Before the meeting of the States-General of Jan. 1413? (Lavisse, IV. 1. p.340). 'Hinc Britanni insurgunt'. (p.257, c.1.)

XCI.	Gontier.	Langres.	June 1413. Gontier's house had been sacked by Cabochians. (Gontier et Pierre Col, p.22). (Vide p. 152-3).
XCII.	Jean de Montreuil.	Langres.	Probably 1412-3. (Vide p. 137).
XCIII.	Jean d'Arconval.	Fontaine.	Not after 1410. Probably 1409. Refers to Duc de Guienne (born 6 Feb.1392) as 'Regium Adolescentem'. Perhaps soon after the crisis of 1408. 'sorte meae vocationis contentus esse institui.' (p.289, c.2).
XCIV.	Regnauld des Fontaines.	Fontaine.	Early 1412. Remonstrates against Regnauld's quarrel with Raoul de la Porte over Mastership of College of Navarre, which lasted early 1412-Summer 1413. ('ineunte anno MCCCCXII', Launoy, II. p.923; 'Raoul victor evasit an 1413. July 16', Chart. Univ. Paris. III. p.223. note 1). But, Summer 1412 - Summer 1413, Nicolas was in Langres (vide p. 151).
XCV.	Raoul de la Porte.	Fontaine.	Advent, 1412. 'Quoniam hoc sacrato tempore Domini Adventus ... ' Raoul had recently become a Master (p.273. c.1). Launoy, II. p.922, says that he became Master at the end of 1411.
XCVI.	Nicolas de Baye.	Fontaine.	1403-17. (Residence at Fontaine).
XCVII.	" "	Fontaine.	July - August 1413. Discussion of Peace between Princes, apparently the Paix de Pontoise, 28 July 1413. (Lavisse, IV. 1. p.349).

XCVIII.	Nicolas de Baye.	Fontaine.	Autumn 1413. After XCVII, description of disorders following the peace.
IC.	Jean d'Arconval.	Fontaine.	May 1413. Escape of Jean during Cabochian riots. He was one of 20 suspects arrested on 11 May. (Coville, Les Cabochiens, p.196).
C.	Jean Lelièvre.	Fontaine.	1408-17. (Residence at Fontaine).
CI.	Nicolas de Baye.	Fontaine.	1414. After fall of Soissons to the Armagnacs. (Juvenal des Ursins, p.497-9; Religieux V. p.311-31).
CII.	" "	Fontaine.	Early 1414. Before opening of Council of Constance; 9th Dec. 1413, the Council was formally convoked (Valois, IV. p.255, note 4); the first session was opened by Cramaud on 5th August 1414. (Valois, IV. p.262).
CIII.	" "	Fontaine.	Late 1414. Refers to negotiations at St. Denis. According to the Religieux, p.446. Charles VI arrived on 1 Oct. 1414. This was part of the preliminaries to the Peace of Arras, Feb. 1415.
CIV.	" "	Fontaine.	Late 1414 - Jan.1415. Refers to conversation of Nicolas de Baye with Legate, who had been in Paris from Feb. 1414 till Jan. 1415. (Vide p. 156-7). Nearly 7 years after Nicolas had left Curia, 'cum ante annos ferme septem curia ipsa excessi ...' (Vide p. 156-7) that is, late 1414 or early 1415.

CV.	Nicolas de Baye.	Fontaine.	1415-16. 'mea coepi scripta ab annis ferme XX edita recensere' (p.298, c.2). Mentions this also in 'Disputatio', Lydius, p.79. (1415-16).
CVI.	Jacobus Branlardus.	Fontaine.	1411-7. Commends Jacobus' efforts for peace.
CVII	Jean Lelièvre.	Fontaine.	Late 1415. Refers to 'recenti proelio', obviously Agincourt, 25 Oct. 1415.
CVIII.	Gérard Machet.	Fontaine.	1408 - End of 1411. Gérard not yet a Master. (Vide Ep.LXVII).
CIX.	Gontier.	Fontaine.	1415-17. Refers to continued editing of 'Opuscula'. (Vide Ep.CV).
CX.	"	Fontaine.	Late 1415 - early 1416. Nicolas had just heard that Pierre Col had reached Constance safely. Pierre had been on a journey in the Middle East and arrived in Naples on 9/10 Sept. 1415. He left Constance in Feb. 1416. (Coville, Gontier et Pierre Col, p.189).
CXI.	Jean Lelièvre.	Fontaine.	Spring 1414. Refers to extraordinary weather. In spring 1414, the seasons were disordered. (Juvenal des Ursins, p.496. c.1. Religieux, V. p.478).
CXII.	Council of Constance.	Fontaine.	Summer 1416. 'biennio iam prope expleto huius rei gratia in Sancta Synodo sedatis'. (p.310. c.2). First cession of the Council was on 5 Aug. 1414. (Valois, IV. p.262).

CXIII.	Regnauld des Fontaines.	-	Before the end of 1408. Regnauld not yet a Master. (Vide Ep.XLVII). Probably written before the crisis of 1408, perhaps from Genoa.
CXIV.	Unnamed Friend.	-	Probably during Fontaine period. 1403-17.
CXV.	"	-	Reply to answer to CXIV.
CXVI.	Gérard Machet.	-	Before Dec. 1411. Spring. Gérard Machet not yet a Master (Vide Ep.LXVII). 'cuncta ecce novum ver floribus ornat'. (p.319. c.2).
CXVII.	Gontier.	-	1416-17. After editing works. (Vide Ep.CV).
CXVIII.	Johannis Heraudus.	Fontaine.	Spring. 1408-17. Just after Lent 'post instantis quadragesimae salsos cibos'. p.322. c.2).
CXIX.	Gérard Machet.	Fontaine.	1411. Just before Gérard became a Master. (Vide Ep.LXVII). 'Si itaque post finem tuae examinationis, cuius nunc onus tuas urges cervices, illic te retiret.'
CXX	Pierre Cauchon.	Fontaine.	1408-17. (Residence at Fontaine).
CXXI.	Jacques de Boury.	Fontaine.	1408-17. (Residence at Fontaine).
CXXII.	Jean des Temples.	-	1406-18. Period in which Jean was a Bachelor of Theology. (Chart. Univ. Paris. IV. p.90. n.18).
CXXIII.	Petrus de Cantella.	-	After 1412 when Petrus became Confessor to the King. (Chart. Univ, Paris. IV. no.1803).

CXXIV.	Johannes Juventus.	Fontaine.	1408-17. (Residence at Fontaine).
CXXV.	Louis, Cardinal of Bar.	-	Probably during Fontaine period, 1408-17.
CXXVI.	Nicolas de Baye.	-	Autumn 1416. Nicolas de Baye had decided to give up his work at the Curia. He applied for his release in Nov. 1416. (Tuetey, p.XXIV).
CXXVII.	" "	-	Probably 1412-3. He seems to refer to Ep.LXXXIX. 'Satis ex quibusdam meis scriptis perspicere potuisti quanti concordiam fecerim inter nostros nuper Principes foedere ac iureiurando constitutam. Ecce iam susurrari audio bellum recrudescere.' (p.330. c.1.)
CXXVIII.	" "	-	Probably 1410-16. Refers to suit over benefice for his brother, who was a Bachelor of Theology in 1416. (Vide p. 4 note 3).
CXXIX.	" "	-	After Easter. Probably 1417. Nicolas had had to leave Fontaine because of dangerous disorder.
CXXX.	" "	-	After CXXIX.
CXXXI.	N.	-	Perhaps follows CXXX. Vide p.
CXXXII.	Regnauld des Fontaines.	Paris.	Autumn 1423. After the election of Regnauld to be Bishop of Soissons, on 8 Jan. 1423. (Chart. Univ. Paris, IV. p.421). 'biennio vix peracto in patria Hollandiae suis littoribus egressum' (i.e. the sea). This is a reference to the dam bursting at Dordrecht, on 19 Nov. 1421.

CXXXIII.	Regnauld des Fontaines.	-	Autumn 1423. Answer to reply to Ep.CXXXII .
CXXXIV.	"	-	Probably 1424. There is a change in his relations with Regnauld. (Vide p. 162)
CXXXV.	"	-	" " "
CXXXVI.	Guillaume Evrard.	Provins.	1420 - 1427. Before Evrard became Master in 1427. In same period as the 2 letters published by Coville in Recherches, p.315-7.
CXXXVII.	Henry V.	-	Autumn 1417. After the fall of Bayeux to the English (19 Sept. Coville, Recherches, p.251).

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

PRIMARY SOURCES

MANUSCRIPTS.

1. Works of Nicolas

Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal Manuscrit no.137.
Expositio super quadraginta septem Capitula Ysaye.
fols. 1-247.
Incipit. 'Quoniam inter omnes scripturas ..... '
Date: First half of the fifteenth century.

Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne Manuscrit no.633.
[This manuscript is listed by Coville (Traité p.22) as Bibliothèque de l'Université de Paris no.633, but the University library was divided between the Sorbonne and the Bibliothèque de St. Geneviève in 1937].
Sermon and prayers. fols. 149-154.

Nine letters written in the name of the University.
fols. 93-112.
This manuscript provides a text which differs from that of the published versions (vide Appendix I. p.271-2); there is some reason to suppose that the Sorbonne version may be a copy of Nicolas' original draft. (vide p.55-6;65).

This manuscript also includes a number of Nicolas' writings (vide Appendix I. p.259) which have been published from other sources. I have not examined these works in any detail in the Sorbonne version.

Date: 1453.

Library of New College, Oxford. Manuscript no.CXXVIII.
Letters and poems, which have been published from other manuscripts.
This manuscript is not in the best tradition (that of Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine, Montpellier, Manuscrit no.87), but in the inferior one to which the manuscript from which the Lydius edition was made, also belongs.

Date: Fifteenth century.

2. Letters of Jean de Montreuil.

Bibliothèque Nationale Manuscrit Latin no.13062.

Unedited letters of Jean de Montreuil which A. Thomas[1] suggests were addressed to Nicolas, with the addition of three letters suggested by Abbé Combes.* [2]

Bibliothèque Nationale, Latin, no.13062.

15v°	Ut animo vobiscum...
16r°	Sinere hinc abire...
16v°	Ne frustra sim rogatus...
32r°	Versanti michi frater...
* 34v°	Audiveram et fama fuit...
50r°	A pridem me nosci...
* 50v°	Eruptionem tuam e Babilonia...
55r°	Gonthero ut audieram...
92r°	Nunc tandem agnosco...
93r°	Multis graviter...
101v°	Impulit me...
* 102r°	Verum tota ferat...
103r°	Pluris sunt et pretii dignioris...
152v°	Tuli nunc usque patienter...

---

1. A. Thomas. op.cit. p.38-9.

2. A. Combes. op.cit. Appendix I. pp.617-622.

PUBLISHED.

Ailly, Pd'. "Principium in Cursum Bibliae" in Gersonii ... Opera Omnia. vol.I. Appendix. col.610-617. Writings in the de Montson case, Ibid. vol.I. Appendix. col.693-709.

"De difficultate Reformationis Ecclesiae in Concilio Generali", Ibid. vol.II. Appendix. col.867-875, and Von der Hardt, op.cit. vol.I. pt.VI. fol.249-268.

"De Ecclesiae, Concilii Generalis, Romani Pontificis et Cardinalium Auctoritate" in Gersonii .... Opera Omnia, vol.II, Appendix. col.925-960.

"Canones Reformationis Ecclesiae in Constantiensis Concilio Suscipiendae" in Von der Hardt, op.cit. vol.I. pt.VIII. fol.403-487.

"Tractatus de Ecclesiastica potestate" in Ibid. vol.IV. 2. pt.II. fol.11-78.

De Reformatione Ecclesiae, ed. W. Weissenburger. Basle, 1551, and Speculum Ecclesiae Pontificiae, ed. E. Bulkley. London, 1606.

"De emendatione ecclesiae" in Tractatus de Modo Generalis Concilii Celebrandi. ed. G. Durand. Paris, 1671. pp.67-101, and Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum ac Fugiendarum, ed. Brown, E. London, 1690.

"Combien est miserable la vie du Tyran" in Libro Ilamado Menos precio de Corte y Alabança de Aldea ... Mis en François. Y ont este adioustés les vers François des Evesques de Meaux et de Cambray .... ed. A. de Guevara. 1614.

d'Ailly's poem was translated by Nicolas into Latin.

Ambrogio da Migli. 2 Letters to Gontier Col in Ampl. Coll. II. col. 1456-1465.

Almain, J. "De Auctoritate Ecclesiae et Conciliorum Generalium" in Gersonii ... Opera Omnia, vol.II. Appendix. col. 976-1012.

Alpartil, M. de. Martin de Alpartils Chronica Actitatorum temporibus domini Benedicti XIII. ed. F. Ehrle. Paderborn, 1906. [Quellen und Forschungenetc. Bd.12].

Barzizza, G. Incipit 'Gasparini Pergamensis Clarissimi Oratoris epistolarum liber'. Reutlingen, 1482.

Basin, T. Histoire de Charles VII. ed. Samaran, 2 vols. [Les Classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Age. vol.15, 21]. Paris, 1933, 44. vol.I.

Baye, M. de. Inventaire de Nicolas de Baye, 1419. Précédé d'une notice biographique par Alexandre Tuetey. Paris, 1888.

Journal de Nicolas de Baye, Greffier du Parlement de Paris. ed. A. Tuetey. 2 vols. Paris, Nogent-le-Rotrou, 1885, 8.

These documents, with Tuetey's introductions give a very complete idea of the life, library and household properties of one of Nicolas de Clamanges' greatest friends.

Bersuire, P. Petri Berchorii, opera omnia. Editio novissima, 6 vols. Coloniae Agrippinae. 1730-1.

Bracciolini, P. Poggii Florentini Epistolae Selectae. Rome, 1844. [Spicilegium Romanum, 10 vols., Rome, 1839-44. vol.X].

Brunet, J.L. "Preuves des libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane", in Traités des droits et libertez de l'Eglise Gallicane, vol.II, 1731. Paris.

Bruni, L. Leonardus Aretinus de Studiis et Literis. Paris, 1642.

Chartier, J. Chronique de Charles VII, roi de France. ed. Vallet de Viriville. 3 vols. Paris, 1858. vol.I.

Clamanges, N. de. Nicolai de Clemangiis Catalaunensis, Archidiaconi Baiocensis, Opera Omnia, ed. J.M. Lydius, Leyden, 1613. Includes most of Nicolas' works, but is a very corrupt edition.

La Traité de la Ruine de l'Eglise de Nicolas de Clamanges et la traduction Française de 1564. Paris, 1936. Latin text pp.111-156.

"De Raptoris, Raptaque Virginis lamentabili exitu" in Supplementum Patrum, ed. J. Hommey Paris, 1684. pp.508-518.

Official letters in Chart. Univ. Paris, III. and Du Boulay, op.cit. IV.

For a full list of works and publications vide Appendix I.

Cochon, P. Chronique Normande de Pierre Cochon, notaire apostolique à Rouen. Publiée pour la première fois en entier par C. de Robillard de Beaurepaire. [Soc. de l'Histoire de Normandie]. Rouen, 1870.

Col, G. Journal (incomplete) of embassy to Avignon in Spring 1395 in Ampl. Coll. VII. col.479-530. (Latin).

Account of embassy to England in 1415 in G. Besse, Recueil de diverses pièces servant à l'histoire du roy Charles VI. Paris, 1660. p.94. (French).

Corpus Iuris Canonici. Editio Lipsiensis Secunda. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1879-81. vol.II.

Canon Law on the subject of Holy Orders.

Cortesius, T.A. Latin poems in Delitiae C.C.Italorum poetarum, ed. R.G. Gherus, 2 vols. Frankfort, 1608. vol.I.

Cosneau, E. Les Grands Traités de la Guerre de Cent Ans. 1889. Paris. ed. Cosneau.

Courtecuisse, J. "De Fide et Ecclesia, Romano Pontifice et Concilio Generali" in Gersonii.... opera omnia. vol.I. Appendix. col.805.

'Danse Macabre'. Reproduced from the single known copy of the 'editio Princeps' of Guyot Marchart, Paris, 1485, and completed from the edition of 1486, in Paris et ses historiens au XIVe et XVe siècles, documents et écrits originaux recueillis et commentés. [Histoire Générale de Paris. vol.XXIII]. Paris, 1866. ed. Leroux de Lincy, A.J.V. et Tisserand, L.M. pp.276-281.

Denifle, H.S. et Chatelain, A. Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis. 4 vols. Paris, 1889 etc. ed. H.S. Denifle, A. Chatelain auxiliante.

Vol.III (1894). Covers the years 1350-1394 (including the schism up to the accession of Benedict XIII).

Vol.IV (1897). Covers the years 1394-1452 (excluding the history of the schism, which was to have appeared in vol.V).

Auctarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis. 4 vols. Paris, 1894-1938. vols.I (1894) and II (1897).

Dietrich of Niem. "Avisamenta edita in Concilio Constanciensi" in Finke, op.cit. vol.IV. pp.591-636.

"De Vita ac fatis Constantiensibus Johannis Papae" in von der Hardt, op.cit. vol.II. pt.XV. fol.336-459.

Theodorici de Nyem De Schismate, libri tres. ed. G. Erler. Leipzig, 1890.

'Dit Des Trois Morts et des trois vifs', reproduced from the 'editio princeps' of Guyot Marchart, Paris, 1486, in Paris et ses historiens. pp.276-281.

Douet d'Arq, L. Choix de pièces inédites relatives au règne de Charles VI. 2 vols, Paris, 1863-4. [Société de l'histoire de France].

Durand, G. Tractatus de modo Generalis Concilii Celebrandi. ed. G. Durand, Paris, 1671.

Ferrer, Vincent, Saint. Oeuvres de Saint Vincent Ferrier. ed. Fages, H. 2 vols. Paris, 1909.

Mirabile opusculum Sancti Vincentii de Fine mundi. Augsburg, 1505?

Tractates vitae spiritualis. 1564.

Letter to Benedict XIII containing prophecy about the advent of Antichrist in letter to Benedict XIII in Malvenda, T.

De Antichristo, libri undecim. 2 vols. Leyden, 1647. vol.I.

Finke, H. Acta Concilii Constantiencis, 4 vols. Münster, 1896-1928.

Gerson, J.C. de. Johannes Gersonii .... opera omnia. ed. Ellies du Pin. 5 vols. Antwerp, 1706.

Treatises on the schism up to the time of the Council of Constance. vol.II. pt.I. col.2-156.

Treatises about the Council of Constance. Ibid. II. col.161-392.

Treatises on Clergy and Church. Ibid. II. pt.IV. col.529-664.

"De Simonia abolenda Constantiensis Concilii ope" in Von der Hardt, op.cit. vol.I. pt.II. fol.1-57.

"De Modis Uniendi ac Reformandi Ecclesian in Concilio Universali". Ibid. I. pt.V. fol.68-141.

"De Potestate Ecclesiastica in Concilio Constantiensi". Ibid. IV.2. pt.III. fol.78-136.

Guarino, Veronensis. Epistolae in Ampl.Coll. III. col.855-73.

Haller, J. Concilium Basiliense Studien und Quellen. 8 vols. 1896-1936. Basle. vols.I-IV. Council up till end 1436.

Hardt, von der, H. Magnum Oecumeniam Constantiense Concilium de Universali ecclesiae reformatione, unione et fide. 7 vols. Frankfurt, 1696-1742.

Events of Council. vol.IV. 2 pts.

Hesse, H. de. "Consilium pacis de Unione ac Reformatione Ecclesiae" in Gersonii .... Opera. vol.II, Appendix. col.809-40, also in Von der Hardt, op.cit. vol.II. pt.I. fol.3-60.

Refutation of Telesphorus of Cosenza in Thesaurus Anecdotorum Novissimus. 6 vols. ed. B. Pez. Augsburg, 1721-3, vol.I. pt.2.

Jandun, J. de. "Tractatus de Laudibus Parisius" in Paris et ses historiens. pp.32-79.

Joachim of Flora. Divini Vatis Abbatis Joachimi Liber Concordiae Novi ac Veteri Testamenti. Venice, 1519.

Joachite Writings improperly ascribed to Joachim.

Eximii profundissimique sacrorum eloquiorum perscrutatoris ... Abbatis Joachimi Florensis scripturi super Esaiam prophetam. Venice, 1517.

Abbas Joachim, magnus Propheta - Hec subiecta in hoc continentur libello. Expositio .... Joachimi in librum beati Cirilli de magnis tribulationibus et statu Sancte Matris Ecclesie ... Una cum compilatione ex diversis Prophetis Novi ac Veteris Testamenti Theolosphori de Cusentia ..... Venice, 1520.

Interpretatio praeclara Abbatis Joachim in Hieremiam Prophetam. Venice, 1525.

Vaticinia, sive prophetiae Abbatis Joachimi ... Venice, 1600.

Vaticinia Joachimi Abbatis Calabriae" in Prophetica Anglicana et Romana. ed. Galfridus Monumentensis. Frankfurt, 1608.

Jourdain, C.M.G.B. Index Chronologicus Chartarum pertinentium ad historian Universitatis Parisiensi. Paris,1862.

Juvenal des Ursins, J. Histoire de Charles VI. [Nouvelle collection de mémoires 1ère série. tom 2. ed. Michaud et Poujoulat]. Paris, 1836.

Legrand, J. "De Statu et Potestate Ecclesiae" in Gersonii ... Opera omnia. vol.II. Appendix. col.1122-1130.

"De Auctoritate Concilii supra Summum Pontificem" Ibid. II. Appendix. col.1131-1145.

"De Potestate Papae in temporalibus". Ibid.II. Appendix. col.1145-1164.

Mansi, G.D. Conciliorum Sacrorum Collectio Nova. 2nd edition. Venice, 1759 etc. 53 vols.

Vol.22. Rulings of 3rd and 4th Lateran Councils on Holy Orders.
Vols.27-8. Councils of Pisa and Constance etc.
Vols.29-30. Councils of Basle and Florence etc.

Martène, E. et Durand, U. Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium, amplissima collectio. 9 vols. 1724-33. vols. I, II, III, VII, VIII.

Events of schism 1398-1410. vol.VII. col.598-1219.
Council of Basle. vol.VIII.

Metz, G. de. "La Description de la ville de Paris et de l'excellence du royaume de France, transcript et extraict de pluseurs aucteurs" par Guillebert de Metz, in Paris et ses historiens. pp.131-236.

Molinier, A. Obituaires de la province de Sens. [Recueil des historiens de la France. Obituaires. tom.I]. Paris, 1902. 2 vols. ed. A. Molinier. vol.I.

Monstrelet, E. de. La Chronique d'Enguerrand de Monstrelet avec pièces justificatives 1400-1444. ed. L. Douët d'Arcq. 6 vols. Paris, 1857-62.

Montreuil, J. de. 74 Letters in Ampl.Coll.II. cols. 1314-1454 (ex Schedis Mabillonii), of which at least 18 appear to be addressed to Nicolas.
[7 headed 'Ad Nicolaum de Clemangiis'.
XIII, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, LIX, LXII.
1 headed 'Ad Nicolaum Praeceptorem.
XXXIV.
8 believed by A. Thomas[1] to have been addressed to Nicolas.
XI, XII, XXXV, XXXVI, L, LVII, LXI, LXX.
1 which Abbé Combes[2] suggests was addressed to him.
XXVI.

In addition LXVIII is almost certainly a reply to a letter of Nicolas', Opera, ed. Lydius, Ep.X].

9 previously unpublished letters in A. Thomas, op.cit. p.30, pp.100-9.

[2 of which appear to be addressed to Nicolas, i.e. p.30, p.102].

Abbé Combes gives several previously unpublished

---

1. A. Thomas, op.cit. pp.38-9.

2. A. Combes, op.cit. Appendix I. p.619.

letters of which 2 appear to be addressed to Nicolas. op.cit. pp.540, 541.

There are references to Nicolas in the following letters, Ampl.Col. XLIII, XLIV, LX.

and probably in Abbé Combes, Ibid. p.336. (Qui obsequio fol.51r°).

Moranvillé, H. "Remonstrances de l'Université et de la ville de Paris à Charles VI sur le gouvernement du royaume" in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes. LI. (1890) pp.420-422.

Ockham, William of. The "De Imperatorum et Pontificum Potestate. ed. C.K. Brampton. Oxford, 1927.

Ordonnances des Rois de France de la troisième race. 23 vols. Paris, 1741 etc. ed. Laurière, Secousse, etc. vols. VII-XIII.

Person, G. Cosmidromius Gobelini Person . [Historische - Kommission der Provinz Westfalen]. Münster, 1900. ed. M. Jansen.

Petrarca, F. Francisci Petrarchae epistolae de rebus familiaribus et variae. ed.l. Fracassetti. 3 vols. Florence, 1859-63.

Francisci Petrarchae ... Opera quae extant omnia. Basle, 1554. 4 vols. ed. J. Herold.

Vol.I. Contains De Rebus Senilibus IX. Ep.1, subject of correspondence between Nicolas and Galeotto di Petra Mala.

Pichon, J. Le Ménagier de Paris, traité composé vers 1393. ed. J. Pichon, Paris, 1846.

Premierfait, L. de. Les Offices de M.T. Cicero. Le livre de Vieillesse, translaté du Latin ... 1562.

Le livre de Jehan Bocasse 'De la Louenge et vertu des nobles et cleres dames", translaté ... Paris, 1493.

Incipit. Cy commence Jehan bocace de Certald son livre intitulé de la Ruyne des nobles hommes et femmes, translaté ... Bruges, 1476.

Presles, R. de. "Description de la ville de Paris sous Charles V," (occurring in 'Traduction de la Cité de Dieu', Bk.V, chap.XXV) in Paris et ses historiens, pp.99-115.

Quicherat, J. Procés de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc. [Société de l'histoire de la France]. 1841-9. Paris. 5 vols.

Religieux de St. Denis. Chronique du Religieux de St. Denys, contenant le régne de Charles VI, de 1380 à 1422. Ed. with translation by M.L. Bellaguet. 6 vols. Paris, 1839-52. [Collection de documents inédits].

Rymer, T. Foedera, conventiones, literae et cuiuscunque generis Acta publica inter Reges Angliae et alios ... 2nd edition. 20 vols. London, 1704-32. Vol.IX.

Letters from Martin V and his chancellor to Henry V on Nicolas' behalf.

Salutati, L.C.P. L.C.P. Salutati Epistolae, nunc primum in lucem editae. Florence, Vienne, 1741.

Tarlati, Cardinal de Pietra Mala, G. Letter to Nicolas in Ampl. Coll. I. col.1545-6.

Telesphorus of Cosenza. Livre Merveilleux contenant en bref la fleur et substance de plusieurs traittez. Paris, 1565.

Tuetey, A. Testaments enregistrées au Parlement de Paris sous le règne de Charles VI. [Mélanges historiques vol.3. (1880)]. Paris. ed. A. Tuetey.

Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris. 1405-1449. Paris, 1881. ed. A. Tuetey.

Vergerio, P.P. Primus tomus operum Vergerii adversus Papatum. Tübingen, 1563.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Allen, J.W. A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century. London, 1928.

Arquillière, H.X. L'Augustinisme Politique. [L'Eglise et l'Etat au Moyen Age. no.2.] Paris, 1934.

Saint Grégoire VII. Essai sur sa conception du pouvoir Pontifical. [L'Eglise et L'Etat au Moyen Age. no.4.] Paris, 1934.

Aubert, F. Le Parlement de Paris de Philippe le Bel à Charles VII. 1314-1422. Sa compétence, ses attributions. Paris, 1890.

Baluze, E. Vitae Paparum Avenionensium. Hoc est historia Pontificum Romanorum qui in Gallia sederunt ab anno Christi 1305 usque ad annum 1394. Nouvelle édition par G. Mollat. 4 vols. Paris, 1914-22.

Clement VII - vol.I pp.469-535. Election of Benedict XIII - vol.I pp.537-542. There is no 'Vita' of Benedict, but various references to him, as Pierre de Luna occur in vol.I, and after his election, in the documents in vol.IV. He is also mentioned in the 'Notae ad Vitas', vol.II.

Barante, A.G.B.P. Histoire des Ducs de Bourgogne de la maison de Valois 1364-1477. 13 vols. 3rd edition. Paris, 1825-6. vol.IV.

Baron, H. Cicero and the Roman Civic Spirit in the Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance. [Reprinted from the "Bulletin of the John Rylands Library" vol.22. No.1. April 1938.] Manchester, 1938.

"Franciscan Poverty and Civic Wealth as factors in the rise of humanist thought" in Speculum, a Journal of Medieval Studies published by the Medieval Academy of America, Cambridge, Massachusetts, XIII (1938). pp.1-37.

"The Historical Background of the Florentine Renaissance" in History, new series. (1937-8) pp.315-327.

Three very interesting articles on the recovery of the classical conception of the community.

Barraclough, G. (i) Papal Provisions. Aspects of Church History, Constitutional, Legal and Administrative in the Later Middle Ages. Oxford, 1935.
(ii) "Un document inédit sur la soustraction d'obédience de 1398" in Revue d'histoire ecclesiastique XXX pt.1. (1934) pp.101-115.

Discussion of the light thrown on the policy of the subtraction of obedience by the 'Avisamenta necessaria pro Ecclesiasticis.'

Bayle, M.A. Vie de S. Vincent Ferrier de l'Ordre de Frères-Prêcheurs, 1350-1419. (Traité de la Vie Spirituelle par Saint Vincent Ferrier) Paris, 1855.

Beaucourt, G.D.F. de. Histoire de Charles VII. 6 vols. Paris, 1881-90. Vols. I, II.

Benoist, C. La Politique du Roi Charles V. La Nation et la Royauté. [Etudes historiques sur le XIVe siècle.] Paris, 1886.

Bess, B. Revision of article by G. Schmidt. "Clémanges, Nikolaus von" in J.J. Herzog, Realencyclopedie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Leipzig, 1896-1913. vol.4. pp.138-142.

Bett, H. Joachim of Flora. [Great Medieval Churchman.] London, 1931.

Blanchard, G. Compilation Chronologique Contenant un Recueil en Abregé des Ordonnances édits, déclarations et lettres patentes des Rois de France .... depuis l'année 987, jusqu'à présent. 2 vols. Paris, 1715. vol.I.

Bornecque, H. La Prose Métrique dans la Correspondance de Cicéron. Paris, 1898.

Les Clausulae Métriques Latines. [Travaux et Mémoires de l'Université de Lille, Nouvelle sér.1. Droit, lettres, fasc. 6.] Lille, 1907.

Boulanger, Abbé.J. "La Renaissance au XVe Siècle. Jacques de Nouvion," in Revue Historique Ardennaise. (1894-1914) Paris, 1900. p.277.

Bourquelot, L.F. Histoire de Provins. 2 vols. Provins, Paris, 1839,40. vol.I.

"Les Vaudois du XVe siècle" in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes, VIII (1846) pp.81-109.

An examination of the extraordinary fear of the Vaudois in the middle and second half of the fifteenth century.

Burns, C.D. "Realism and Nominalism" in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. ed. Hastings, J. Edinburgh. vol.10. (1918) pp.583-4.

Catalogue des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques. Paris, 1849. vol.I.
Collectio Princeps of Nicolas' Letters and Poetry listed among manuscripts belonging to the Faculty of Medicine at Montpellier. (p.318).

Calmet, A. Histoire Ecclesiastique et Civile de Lorraine. 2 vols. Nancy, 1728. vol.II.

Carlyle, R.W., & A.I. A History of Medieval Political Theory in the West. 6 vols. Edinburgh and London, 1903-36. vols. I, IV, V, VI.

Causeret, C. Etude sur la Langue de la Rhétorique et de la Critique Littéraire dans Cicéron. Paris, 1886.

Cave, W. Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria. Editio Novissima. 2 vols. 2nd edition. Oxford, 1740.

Nicolas is mentioned in vol.II.

Champion, P. Vie de Charles d'Orléans. 1394-1465. [Bibliothèque du XVe siècle. tom.13.] Paris, 1911.

Histoire Poétique du Quinzième Siècle. 2 vols. [Bibliothèque du XVe siècle. tom. 27, 28.] Paris, 1923.

Nicolas is mentioned in vol.I.

Christophe, J.B. Histoire de la Papauté pendant le XIVe siècle, avec des notes et des pièces justificatives. 3 vols. Paris, 1853.

Christophe, J.B. Histoire de la Papauté pendant le XVe siècle, avec des pièces justificatives. 2 vols. Lyons, 1863.

Clark, A.C. "Ciceronianism" in English Literature and the Classics. (Nine lectures delivered in Oxford) Collected by G.S. Gordon. Oxford, 1912.

Clement, D. Bibliothèque Curieuse Historique et Critique .... de livres difficiles à trouver. 9 vols. Göttingen, Hanover, Leipzig. 1750-1760.

Vol.VI. Leipzig, 1756.

Lists early editions of Nicolas' works.

Clerval, J.A. Les Ecoles de Chartres au Moyen Age du Ve au XVIe siècle. [Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de l'Eure et Loir. tom.11]. Chartres, 1895.

Comba, E. Histoire des Vaudois d'Italie depuis leurs origines jusqu'a nos jours. 2nd edition. Paris, Florence, 1901.

Combes, A. "Sur les Lettres de Consolation de Nicholas de Clamanges à Pierre d'Ailly," in Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age. tom.XIII (1940-1). Paris. pp.359-389.

Not available in the British Museum, but in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

Jean de Montreuil et le Chancelier Gerson. [Etudes de Philosophie Médievale. No.XXXII]. Paris, 1942.

Not available in the British Museum, but in the Warburg Institute, and the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

Combes corrects Coville on a few points of chronology.

Appendix I. pp.617-22 is a very valuable 'Table de concordance entre le MS. B.N.lat. 13062, et l'Amplissima Collectio. Indications des destinataires d'après les éditeurs ou A. Thomas.'

Connolly, J.L. John Gerson, Reformer and Mystic. [Université de Louvain, Recueil de travaux publiés par les Membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie. 2me série, 12me fasc.] Louvain,1928.

Coville, A. Les Cabochiens et l'Ordonnance de 1413. Paris. 1888.

"Les Premiers Valois et la Guerre de Cent Ans." Histoire de France. ed. E. Lavisse. vol.IV.1. Paris, 1902.

Coville, A. Jean Petit. La Question du Tyrannicide au commencement du XVe siècle. Paris, 1932.

Gontier et Pierre Col et l'Humanisme en France au temps de Charles VI. Paris, 1934.

Recherches sur Quelques Ecrivains du XIVe et du XVe siècle. Paris, 1935.

Le Traité de la Ruine de l'Eglise de Nicolas de Clamanges et la Traduction Française de 1564. Paris, 1936.

Includes research on the Traité and a chapter on the Commentary on Isaiah.

"Recherches sur Jean Courtecuisse et ses Oeuvres Oratoires" in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes. LXV. Paris, 1904. pp.469-529.

"Nicolas de Clamanges mis à l'Index au XVIe siècle" in Mélanges offerts à M. Abel Lefranc. Paris, 1936. p.7.

Delaruelle, L. "Une Vie d'Humaniste au Quinzième Siècle. Gregorio Tifernas" in Mélanges d'Archéologie de d'Histoire, vol.XIX. Paris and Rome, 1899. pp.9-33.

Article on the first Greek scholar of the Renaissance.

Delisle, L.V. Etudes sur la Condition de la Classe Agricole et l'Etat de l'Agriculture en Normandie au Moyen Age. Evreux, 1851.

Le Cabinet des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale (Nationale). 3 vols. Paris, 1866. Vols. I, II.

Vol. I. The Development of the Princely and Royal Libraries under Charles V, Charles VI and Charles VII.

Vol.II. Includes mentions of the manuscripts of the College of Navarre, the Pithou Collections, and some of the manuscripts of Nicolas' works.

Recherches sur la Librairie de Charles V. 2 vols. Paris, 1907.

Enlarges on the account of the royal library given in 'Le Cabinet', vol.I.

Denifle, H.S. La Désolation des Eglises, Monastères et Hôpitaux en France, pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans. 2 vols. Paris, 1897-9.

Dewey, J. "Nominalism" and "Realism" in Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, ed. J.M. Baldwin. London and New York. vol.II (1902), pp.421-424.

Digonnet, F. Le Palais des Papes d'Avignon. Avignon, 1907.

Döllinger, J.J.I. von, Prophecies and the Prophetic Spirit in the Christian Era. An historical essay, translated from "Der Weissagungsglaube und das Prophetenthum in der Christliche Zeit" with an introduction, notes and appendices by A. Plummer. London, 1873.

Dorez, L. Review of F. von Ehrle's "Historia Bibliothecae Romanorum Pontificum" in Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire, XI. Paris, 1891. pp.191-5.

Du Breul, J. Le Théatre des Antiquitez de Paris, Paris, 1612.

College de Mignon, pp.702-4.

Du Chesne, F. Histoire de tous les Cardinaux Français de Naissance ou qui ont esté promeus au Cardinalat par l'expresse recommandation de nos Roys. 2 vols. Paris, 1660, 66. vol.I.

Egasse Du Boulay, C. Historia Universitatis Parisiensis; ipsius fundationem, nationes, facultates, magistratus, decreta, censuras et judicia in negotiis fidei, privilegia etc. 6 vols. Paris, 1665-73. Vols. IV, V.

Vol.V contains a short account of Nicolas' life.

Ehrle, F. von. De Historia Palatii Romanorum Pontificum Avenionensis Commentatio. Rome, 1890.

Historia Bibliothecae Romanorum Pontificum tum Avenionensis. tom I. [Bibliotheca dell' Accademia Storico-Guiridica. vol.7.] Rome, 1890.

Vol.II did not appear.

"Aus den Acten des After Concils von Perpignan 1408" in Archiv für Litteratur - und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters. Herausgeben von P.H. Denifle und F. Ehrle, 7 vols, Berlin, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1885-1900. Vol.IV, pp.387-492; vol.VII, pp.576-696.

"Neue Materialen zur Geschichte Peters von Luna (Benedicts XIII)" in Archiv für Litteratur-und Kirchengeschichte, vol.VI. pp.139-308; Vol.VII. pp.1-310.

"Die Kirchenrechtlichen Schriften Peters von Luna" in Archiv für Litteratur - und Kirchengeschichte. Vol.VII. pp.515-575.

These articles contain important material about Benedict XIII.

Fabricius, J.A. Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica ... in qua continentur de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis .... Jo. Trithemii ... Liber de Scriptoribus. Hamburg, 1718.

Trithème gives the earliest list of Nicolas' works.

Fages, H. Histoire de Saint Vincent Ferrier. 3 vols. Nouvelle édition. Louvain, Paris, 1901-4.

Faucom, M. La Librairie des Papes d'Avignon d'après les Registres de Comptes et d'Inventaires des Archives Vaticanes. 2 vols. [Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. fasc. 43, 50]. Paris, 1886.

Largely superseded by von Ehrle's work.

Felibien, M. Histoire de la Ville de Paris. Reveue, Augmentée et mise au jour par G.A. Lobineau. 5 vols. Paris, 1725. vols. I, IV, V.

Several references to the Collège de Mignon.

Figgis, J.N. "The Conciliar Movement and the Papalist Reaction." Chapter II of Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius. 2nd edition. Cambridge, 1916. pp.41-70.

"Politics at the Council of Constance" in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, vol.XIII (1899) pp.103-115.

Fliedner, H. The Martyrdom of a People. A short history of the Waldensians. [Translated from the German by C.C. Brady]. Stirling, 1914.

Fornery, J. Histoire du Comté Venaissin et de la Ville d'Avignon. 3 vols. Avignon, 1909. vol.I.

Fournier, P. Etudes sur Joachim de Flore et ses Doctrines. Paris, Grenoble, 1909.

Gardner, E.G. "Joachim of Flora and The Everlasting Gospel" in Franciscan Studies, ed. P. Sabatier. [British Society of Franciscan Studies. Extra Series, vol.I]. Aberdeen, 1912. pp.50-87.

Gayet, L. Le Grand Schisme d'Occident, Les Origines. Florence and Berlin, 1889.

Gebhart, E. Les Origines de la Renaissance en Italie. Paris, Nancy, 1879.

L'Italie Mystique, Histoire de la Renaissance Religieuse au Moyen Age. Paris, 1890.

"Recherches Nouvelles sur l'Histoire du Joachimisme" in Revue Historique, vol.XXXI. 1886.

Gilson, E. L'Esprit de la Philosophie Médiévale. [Etudes de Philosophie Médievale, no.33]. 2nd edition. Paris, 1944.

Gorce, M.M. St. Vincent Ferrier. 1350-1419. Paris, 1935.

Gröber, G. Geschichte der Mittelfranzösischen Litteratur. 2 vols. Vol.II. Vers und Prosadichtung des 15. Johrhunderts ..... bearbeitet von Stefan Hofer. [Grundriss de Romanischen Philologie]. Neue Folge. Berlin und Leipzig, 1937.

Grosley, J.P. Vie de P. Pithou, avec quelques mémoires sur son père et ses frères. 2 vols. Paris, 1756.

The Pithou at one time possessed the "Collectio Princeps' of Nicolas' letters.

Guibal, G. Histoire du Sentiment National en France pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans. Paris and Toulouse, 1875.

Guilhermoz, P. Enquêtes et Procès. Etude sur le Procédure et le Fonctionnement du Parlement au XIVe siècle. Paris, 1892.

Hauréau, J.B. Histoire de la Philosophie Scolastique. 2 vols. Paris, au Mars, 1872-80.

Hauvette, H. De Laurentio de Primofato (Laurent de Premier fait) qui primus Joannis Boccaccii Opera quaedam Gallice transtulit, ineunte seculo XV. Paris, 1903.

Havet, L. "Prose" in Grande Encyclopèdie. Paris, 1887-1902. Vol.XXVII. p.804.

Includes a short account of metrical prose.

Heinemann, O. von. Die Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel. Wolfenbüttel, 1884.

Includes manuscripts of Nicolas' works.

Hermant, J. Histoire du Diocèse de Bayeux. Caen, 1705.

Life of Nicolas. pp.369-375.

Jacob, E.F. "Nicolas of Cusa", Chapter II of Social and Political Ideas of some great Thinkers of the Renaissance and the Reformation. ed. Hearnshaw, F.J.C., London, 1925. pp.32-60.

"Dietrich of Niem: his place in the Conciliar Movement" in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XIX (1935), pp.380-410.

Some notes on Occam as a Political Thinker. [Reprinted from the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library etc.]. Manchester, 1936.

The Collapse of France in 1419-20. [Reprinted from the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library etc.] Manchester, 1942.

Essays in the Conciliar Epoch. Manchester, 1943.

Hefele, C.J. von. Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux ... Nouvelle traduction française faite sur la deuxième edition allemande ... par H. Le Clerq. 10 vols. Paris, 1907-38.

Vol.VII. 1. Councils of Pisa and Constance etc.

Vol.VII. 2. Councils of Basle, Florence etc. (Both vols. 1916).

Jarry, E. La Vie Politique de Louis de France, Duc d'Orléans, 1372-1407. Paris, Orleans, 1889.

Lafontaine, A.P. Jehan Gerson. (1363-1429). Paris, 1906.

Gives a quite erroneous impression of Nicolas.

Lanson, G. Histoire Illustrée de la Littérature Francaise. 2 vols. Paris, 1923. vol.I.

Launoy, J. de. Regii Navarrae Gymnasii Parisiensis Historia. 2 vols. Paris, 1677.

Vol.I. History of the College from 1304-1640, including many documents.

Vol.II. Biographies of famous students, with lists of works.

Laurand, L. Etude sur le Style des Discours de Cicéron. 3 vols. Paris, 1927-30.

Vol.III. contains a complete list of Cicero's vocabulary.

Lavisse, E. "Etude sur le pouvoir royal au temps de Charles V" in Revue historique XXVI, (1864) pp.233-280.

Examination of the effects of the disintegration of the feudal structure on royal power.

Lea, H.C. A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages. 2 vols. New York, 1906.

Lebreton, J. Etudes sur la Langue et la Grammaire de Cicéron. Paris, 1901.

Le Clerc, V. "Discours sur l'Etat des Lettres en France au Quatorzième Siècle" in Histoire Littéraire de la France. tom. XXIV. Paris, 1862. pp.1-602; and in tom.I of the 2nd edition, 2 vols, Paris, 1865.

Le Duc, A. Gontier Col and the French Pre-Renaissance. New York, 1918. [Reprinted from the Romanic Review, vol.VII, 1916, No.4. 414-457; vol.VIII, 1917, No.2. 145-165, No.3, 290-306].

Lenfant, J. Histoire du Concile de Constance, tirée principalement d'auteurs qui ont assisté au Concile. Amsterdam, 1727.

Histoire du Concile de Pise. 2 vols. Utrecht, 1731.

Leroux de Lincy, A.J.V., et Tisserand, L.M. Paris et ses Historiens aux XIVe et XVe Siècles, documents et écrits originaux recueillis et commentés. [Histoire Générale de Paris. vol.XXIII]. Paris, 1866.

Account of contemporary life and culture in "Appendices aux deux Descriptions Précédentes," pp.239-511, and "Paris selon les miniaturistes du XVe siècle. Notes explicatives", pp.581-7.

Little, A.G. Studies in Franciscan History: being the Ford Lectures, 1916. [Victoria University Publications. Historical series, no.29. (1904 etc)]. Manchester, 1917.

Longnon, A. Paris pendant la Domination Anglaise. Documents extraits des Registres de la Chancellerie de France. [Société de l'Histoire de Paris]. Paris, 1878.

Lorraine, Province. (Anonymous Works) L'Origine de la très illustre maison de Lorraine, avec une abrégé de l'Histoire de ses Princes. Toul, 1704.

The History of the House of Lorraine, with an exact genealogy of that Family. London, 1731.

Luce, S. La France pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans. 2 vols. Paris, 1890-3.

Lunt, W.E. Papal Revenues in the Middle Ages. 2 vols. [Columbia University Press: Records of Civilization. no.19]. New York, 1934.

Marion, J. "Rapport adressé au roi sur les doléances du Clergé aux Etats Généraux de 1413," in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes, VI (1844) pp.277-288. Publication of document pp.281-8.

Masson, A.l. Jean Gerson, Sa Vie, son Temps, ses Oeuvres. Lyons, 1894.

Mellone, S.H. "Scholasticism" in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. ed. Hastings, J. Edinburgh, vol.XI (1900) pp.239-249.

Mesnard, P. L'Essor de la Philosophie Politique au XVIe siècle. Paris, 1936.

Meunier, F. Etude sur la vie et les ouvrages de N. Oresme. 1857.

Michel, A. "Ordre" in Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique, ed. A. Vacant, Paris, vol.XI. (1920). col. 1400-5.

Account of Canons on ordination.

Mirot, L. La Politique Pontificale et le Retour du Saint-Siège à Rome en 1376. Paris, 1899.

Mollat, G. Etude Critique sur les "Vitae Paparum Avenionensium" d'Etienne Baluze. Paris, 1917.

La Fiscalité Pontificale en France au XIVe siècle, périod d'Avignon et du Grand Schisme d'Occident. Paris, 1905.

Les Collations des Bénéfices Ecclesiastiques sous les Papes d'Avignon. 1305-1378.

[Bibliothèque de l'Institut de Droit Canonique, Kaiser-Wilhelm-Universitat. Strasburg. No.1]. Paris, 1921.

Les Papes d'Avignon. 6th edn. Paris, 1932.

Müntz, A. Nicolas de Clémanges, sa vie et ses écrits. Strasburg, 1846.

Thesis. Not available in the British Museum but in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Very slight and ill-informed.

Müntz, E. "Quelques Artistes Avignonnais du Pontificat de Benoit XIII" in Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France. Paris, 1866. p.111.

"L'Antipape Clément VII. Essai sur l'histoire des arts à Avignon vers la fin du XIVe siècle" in Revue Archéologique. Paris, 1888.

"L'Argent et le Luxe à la Cour Pontifical d'Avignon" in Revue des Questions Historiques Nouvelle Série. vol.22 (1899) pp.5-44; 378-406.

Noisy, C.B. Les Ducs de Lorraine. 2nd edition, Rouen, 1864.

Nolhac, P. de. Pétrarque et l'Humanisme, d'après un essai de restitution de sa Bibliothèque. [Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes. Bibliothèque, Sciences Philologiques et Historiques, 1896 etc. Fasc.91]. Paris, 1892.

Paetow, L.J. The Arts Course at the Medieval Universities, with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric. [University of Illinois. The University Studies. vol.3. no.7. 1909 edn]. Urbana, 1910.

Pannier, L. "Notice Biographique sur le Bénédiction Pierre Bersuire, Premier Traducteur Français de Tite-Live," in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes. XXXIII (1872), Paris. pp.325-364.

Petit-Dutaillis, C. "Charles VII, Louis XI, et les premières années de Charles VIII (1422-92). Histoire de France, ed. Lavisse, vol.IV. 2. Paris, 1902. pp.1-317.

Piaget, A. "La Cour Amoureuse, dite de Charles VI", in Romania XX (1891) Paris. pp.417-454.

"Un Manuscrit de la Cour Amoureuse de Charles VI" in Romania XXXI (1902). Paris. pp.597-603.

Picot, G.M.R. Histoire des Etats-Généraux. 2nd edition. 1888. vol.I.

Pinet, M.J. Christine de Pisan. 1364-1430. Etude Biographique et Littéraire. [Bibliothèque du XVe siècle. vol.35]. Paris, 1927.

Pontvianne, R. Un Evêque Français au XIVe Siècle, Pierre d'Ailly etc. [A Biographical Sketch]. Le Puy, 1896.

Poole, S.L. The Moors in Spain. [The Story of the Nations. 1886 etc.]. London, 1887.

A History of Egypt in the Middle Ages. [History of Egypt. ed. W.M.F. Petrie. vol.6]. London, 1901.

Postel, R. Siège et Capitulation de Bayeux en 1417. Caen, 1873.

Power, E. "The Ménagier's wife, a Paris household in the fourteenth century", Chap.IV. of Medieval People, London, 7th edition, 1937. pp.92 — 115.

Prou, M. "Gontier Col d'après un Ouvrage Récent" in Bulletin de la Société Archéologique de Sens. XXXIV (1925) 1.

Precis of Alma Le Duc's work.

Putnam, R. Charles the Bold, last Duke of Burgundy. 1433-1477. [Heroes of the Nations series.]. London, 1908.

Rand, E.K. "The Classics in the Thirteenth Century" in Speculum IV. 1929. pp.249-269.

Shows that the study of the classics was not entirely forgotten.

Rashdall, H. The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. (1895). Ed. Powicke & Emden. 3 vols. Oxford, 1936. Vol.I.

Renan, E. "Joachim de Flore et l'Evangile Eternal" in Nouvelles Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse. Paris, 1884.

Reusch, F.H. Der Index der Verbotenen Bücher. Bonn, 1883-5.

Die Indices Librorum Prohibitorum des Sechszehnten Jahrhunderts. [Litterarischen Vereins Bibliothek, Stuttgart, 1843 etc. - No.176]. Stuttgart, 1887.

Rocquain, F. La Cour de Rome et l'esprit de Réforme avant Luther. 3 vols. Paris, 1893. vol.III.

Rolfe, J.C. Cicero and his Influence. [Our Debt to Greece and Rome. vol.10a]. London, 1923.

Salembier, L. Le Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly, Chancelier de l'Université de Paris, Evêque du Puy et de Cambrai. 1350-1420. Tourcoing, 1932.

Le Grand Schisme d'Occident. 3rd edn. 1902.

Samaran, et Mollat, G. La Fiscalité Pontificale en France au XIVe Siècle. (Période d'Avignon et du Grand Schisme d'Occident). [Ecole Française d'Athènes et de Rome. Bibliothèque. 1897 etc. fasc. 96]. Paris, 1905.

Sanderus, A. Bibliothecae Belgicae Manuscriptae. 2 vols, Lille, 1641, 4.

Manuscripts of Nicolas' works in Belgium.

Sandys, J.E. Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning. Cambridge, 1905

A History of Classical Scholarship. 3 vols. Cambridge, 1908.

Vol.II. From the Revival of Learning to the end of the Eighteenth Century.

Sauval, H. Histoire et Recherches des Antiquités de la Ville de Paris. Preuves des Antiquités de la Ville ... depuis 1399 jusqu'à 1573. 3 vols. Paris, 1724. vols. II, III.

Schlicher, J.J. The Origin of Rythmical Verse in Late Latin. Berlin, 1902.

Schramm, P.E. Geschichte des Englischen Königtums im Lichte der Krönung. Translated by L.G. Wickham Legg. Oxford, 1937. [German edition. Weimar, 1937].

Der König von Frankreich. Das Wesen der Monarchie vom 9 zum 16 Jahrhunderts. Ein Kapital aus der Geschichte des Abendländischen Staates. 2 vols. Weimar, 1939.

Schubert, G. 1st Nicolaus von Clemanges Verfasser des Buches. "De Corrupto ecclesiae statu". Grossenhaim, 1882. Programm der Realschule.

Nicolaus von Clemanges, der Verfasser der Schrift "De Corrupto ecclesiae statu. Grossenhaim, 1883. Inaugural-Dissertation an der Univ. von Leipzig.

Neither of these works is in the British Museum, but in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

Schuberth established Nicolas as author of De Corrupto.

Schwab, J. Johannes Gerson. Eine Monographie. Würzburg, 1858.

Simon, A. Studien zu Nikolaus von Clemanges. 1926.

Thesis. Not available in the British Museum, but in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. More informative than A. Müntz.

Souchet, J.B. Histoire du Diocese et de la Ville de Chartres. 4 vols. Chartres, 1867-76.

Thomas, A.A. De Joannis de Monsterolio, Vita et Operibus, sive de Romanarum Litterarum Studio apud Gallos instaurato Carolo VI regnante. Paris, 1883.

Jean Gerson et l'Education des Dauphins. Paris, 1930.

"Extraits des Archives du Vatican pour servir à l'histoire littéraire. VI. Pierre Bersuire" in Romania XI (1882) pp.181-7.

"La Date de la Mort de Nicolas de Clamanges" in Romania XXV (1896) pp.131-3.

"Le Nom et Famille de Jehan de Monstereul" in Romania XXXVII (1908) pp.594-602.

"Les Etats Généraux sous Charles VII" in Le Cabinet historique, 1878.

"Les Etats Généraux sous Charles VII, notes et documents nouveaux" in Revue historique, XL (1889) pp.55-88.

Supplementary to the previous article.

Thomassy, Jean Gerson et le Grand Schisme d'Occident. 2nd edn. Paris, 1852.

Thurot, C. Notices et Extraits de Divers Manuscrits Latins pour servir à l'histoire des Doctrines Grammaticales au Moyen Age. [Notices et Extraits de Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale XXII. pt.2. (1874)]. Paris.

Tolra de Bordas, J. "L'Antipape Benat XIII en Roussillon. Episode de l'Histoire du Schisme d'Occident" in Revue du Monde Catholique, No.121. 10 April 1866. 6th year. vol.15. pp.20-31.

Tout, T.F. Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England. 6 vols. [Publications of the University of Manchester. Historical Series. no. 34, 35, 48, 49, 57, 64]. Manchester, 1920-33.

Vol.V contains an account of the Use of Secret Seals in France.

"Literature and Learning in the Fourteenth Century English Civil Service" in Speculum. IV. (1929) pp.365-389.

Tschackert, P. Peter von Ailli (Petrus de Alliaco). Zur Geschichte des Grossen Abendländischen Schisma und der Reform Consilien von Pisa und Constanz. Anhang: Petri de Alliaco anecdotorum partes selectae. Gotha, 1877.

Turberville, A.S. Medieval Heresy and the Inquisition. London, 1920.

Tuetey, A. Les Ecorcheurs sous Charles VII. 2 vols. Montbéliard, 1874. [Extraite des Mémoires de la Société d'Emulation de Montbéliard].

Vol.I deals with their origins and early campaigns, 1435-44.

Tyrrell, R.Y. "Metrical Prose in the Correspondence of Cicero" in Hermathena 31. (1906) Dublin.

Vallet de Viriville, A. "Note sur l'état civil des princes et princesses de Charles VI et d'Isabeau de Bavière" in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes. XIX. 1858.

Histoire de Charles VII, roi de France et de son époque. 1403-1461. 3 vols. Paris, 1862-5.

Valois, N. Le Conseil du Roi au XIVe, XVe et XVIe siècles. Nouvelles Recherches Suivies d'arrets et de procés-vesbaux du Conseil. Paris, 1888.

La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident. 4 vols. Paris, 1896-1902.

La Crise Religieuse du XVe siècle. Le Pape et le Concile. 2 vols. Paris, 1909.

"La prolongation du Grand Schisme" in Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France. vol.XXXVI. (1899). Paris. pp.161-178.

Valois supersedes earlier authors on the diplomatic aspect.

"Jacques de Nouvion et le Religieux de Saint-Denis" in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes. LXIII (1902). Paris. pp.233-262. Relation de Jacques de Nouvion, and Collation with the text of the Religieux. pp.240-262.

"Un Ouvrage Inédit de Pierre d'Ailly, le 'De Persecutionibus Ecclesiae'" in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes. LXV (1904) Paris. pp.537-568. Publication of this short treatise, pp.568-574.

Vickers, K.H. Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. London, 1907.

The first English Humanist.

Vignier, J. Décade Historique du Diocèse de Langres. ed. A. Louis. Langres, 1891-4.

Voigt, G. Die Wiederbelebung des Classischen Alterthums oder das erste Jahrhunderts des Humanismus. 2 vols. Berlin, 1880.

Vol.II includes a comprehensive but not entirely unbiassed account of French Classical Studies.

Wallon, H.A. Richard II. Episode de la Rivalité de la France et de l'Angleterre. 2 vols. Paris, 1864.

Jeanne d'Arc. 2 vols. Paris, 1867.

Wendell, B. Traditions of European Literature. From Homer to Dante. London and New York, 1921.

Woodward, W.H. Vittorino da Feltre and other Humanist Educators. Cambridge, 1897.

Wylie, J.H. History of England under Henry the Fourth. 4 vols. London, 1884-98.

The Reign of Henry the Fifth. 3 vols. Cambridge, 1914-29.

The Council of Constance to the death of John Hus. [With an account of the trial and death of Hus]. Being the Ford lectures, 1900. London, 1900.

Zielinski, I. De Constructive Rhythmus in Cicero's Reden. Stolberg, 1914.