

VARIOUS

NOTES AND QUERIES,
NUMBER 08, DECEMBER
22, 1849

Various
Notes and Queries, Number
08, December 22, 1849

*http://www.litres.ru/pages/biblio_book/?art=35493503
Notes and Queries, Number 08, December 22, 1849:*

Содержание

WHAT BOOKS DID OTLOH WRITE?	5
NOTES UPON CUNNINGHAM'S HANDBOOK FOR LONDON	10
WIVES OF ECCLESIASTICS	12
TOWER ROYAL	17
Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.	20

Various
Notes and Queries, Number
08, December 22, 1849

*"When found, make a note of."—CAPTAIN
CUTTLE.*

WHAT BOOKS DID OTLOH WRITE?

Sir,—In Dr. Maitland's able vindication of the *Dark Ages* (p. 419. 1st ed.), he concludes his interesting extract from the scribe Otloh's account of himself by saying:—"One would like to know what books they were which Otlohnus thus multiplied; but this, perhaps, is now impossible." I have it accidentally in my power to identify two at least of the number; and if it was his universal practice to subscribe his name, as he does in these instances, a search into the principal repositories of MSS. would, no doubt, give a large list. A valuable MS. volume in my possession has been thus described by a learned Benedictine: "Codex Membranaceus constans foliis 223 numerando; sæculis ix. desinente, x. et xi. incipiente, variis manibus scriptus, per partes qui in unum collectus, ex scriptis variis natidæ scripturæ carlovingicæ, varia continens: 1° Vita et Passio, seu Martirium S. Dionisii; scripta fuit ab Hilduino Abbate Coenobii S. Dionisii in Francia sub Ludovico Pio." It is said that Hilduinus was the first writer who gave the marvellous story of the saint carrying his own head in his hand for nearly two miles after his decapitation. But he tells us that he abridged his narration *ex Græcam et Latinorum Historiis*.

2° Revelatio facta S. Stephano Papæ de consecratione altaris

SS. Petri et Pauli ante Sepulchrum S. Martirii Dionisii quæ consecratio facta fuit v. kal. Aug. 754. This part of the MS. is remarkable for containing in one place the date written in Roman ciphers, thus—dccLiiii. v. kl. aug.; a circumstance so rare in MSS. of this age, as to have astonished the learned diplomatists Papebroch and Germon.

3° Historia S. Simeonis Trevirensis Solitarii. Of whom it is recorded that he lived *sub Poppone Episcopo Trevirensi, in quædam cellula ad portam nigram sitâ*. At fol. 36. an interesting account of the death of the saint is given by the author, who was present, and with the assistance of two other monks, piously performed his obsequies. It appears that the abbey of S. Maximin was about 120 paces from the cell of the saint at Treves, and it is therefore most probable that the writer was a monk of the Benedictine order then belonging to that foundation; but he puts his name out of doubt by the following couplet, inscribed at the end of the narrative:—

"Presbiter et monachus OTLOH quidam vocitatus
Sancte tibi librum BONIFACII tradidit istum."

This dedication of his labours to S. Boniface may only indicate his veneration for the national saint; but, as he tells us he worked a great deal in the monastery at Fulda (of which S. Boniface was the patron saint and founder), may not this have been one of his labours there? At a subsequent period, it appears, he revised and

amplified Wilibald's *Life of Boniface*.

I must summarily indicate the other contents of this interesting MS., which are: 4. Passio SS Sebastiani et Vincentii. 5. Vita S. Burchardi. 6. Vita et Passio S. Kiliani (genere Scoti). 7. Vita S. Sole. 8. Vita S. Ciri. 9. Depositio S. Satiri. 10. Alphabetum Græcum. 11. Officio pro Choro cum notis musicis, pro festo S. Pancratii; sequitur ipsiis martiriis passio. 12. Vita S. Columbani [this is anonymous, but is attributed to his disciple Jonas, and contains much valuable historical matter]. Lastly, 13. Vita S. Wolfgangi, by the hand of our interesting scribe OTLOH, written at the instance of the Benedictine Coenobites of his monastery of S. Emmeram, at Ratisbon, where the saint was buried. This, as in the case of the *Life of S. Boniface*, is a *rifaccimento*; it was made from two older lives of S. Wolfgang, as Otloh himself tells us, one of them by a certain monk named Arnolfus, the other having been brought out of France. He is here, therefore, more an author than a scribe; but he declares modestly that it was a task he would willingly avoid for the future. The passage of his Preface is worth transcribing: "Fratrum quorundam nostrorum hortatu sedulo infimus ego, O coenobitarum S. Emmerammi compulsus sum S. Wolfgangi vitam in libellulis duobus dissimili interdum, et impolita materie descriptam in unum colligere, et aliquantulum sublimiori modo corrigere.... Multa etiam quæ in libro neutro inveniebantur, fidelium quorundam attestazione compertâ addere studui, sicque quædam addendo, quædam

vero fastidiose vel inepte dicta excerpando, pluraque etiam corrigendo, sed et capitularia præponendo. Vobis O fratres mei exactoresque hujus rei prout ingenioli mei parvitas permisit obedivi. Jam rogo cessate plus tale quid exigere a me." At the end of the Life he has written:—

"Presul Wolfgange cunctis semper vererande
Hæc tua qui scripsi jam memor esto milii
Presbiter et Monachus Otloh quidam vocitatus
Sancte tibi librum Bonifacii tradidit istum."

We have here sufficient evidence that Otloh was a worthy predecessor of the distinguished Benedictines to whom the world of letters has been so deeply indebted in more recent times.

Dr. Maitland's mention of the calligraphic labours of the nun Diemudis, Otloh's contemporary, is not a solitary instance: in all ages, the world has been indebted to the pious zeal of these recluse females for the multiplication of books of devotion and devout instruction. An instance, of so late a date as the eve of the invention of printing, now lies before me, in a thick volume, most beautifully written by fair hands that must have been long practised in the art. As the colophon at the end preserves the names of the ladies, and records that the parchment was charitably furnished by their spiritual father, I think it worth transcribing:—

"Expliciunt, Deo laus omnipotente, quinque libri de
VITA & CONVERSATIONE SANCTORVM PATRV

Scripti per manibus Sororum AUE TRICI et GHEEZE YSENOUDI in festivus diebus suis consororibus dilectis in memoriam earum. Finiti ano dni M° CCCC° XLIX ° in festo decollationis Sci Johannis baptiste ante sumam missam. Et habebant ad hoc pergamenum sibi ex caritate provisum de venerabili presbitero Dno NICOLAO WYT tunc temporis earundem patre spirituali & sibi ipsiis spiritualiter ac in Dno sat reverenter dilectio. Ex caritativo amore sitis propter Deum memores eorum cum uno AVE MARIA."

I omitted to mention that Massmann, in his *Kleinen Sprachdenkmale des VIII. bis XII. Jahrhunderts*, Leipsig, 1830, p. 50, says: "The Benedictine priest Otloh, of Regensburg, left behind him a work, *De Ammonicione Clericorum et Laicorum*, in which is twice given a Latin prayer (Cod. Monacens. Emmeram. f. cxiii. mbr. sæc. xi.), at fol. 51. d., as *Oratio ejus qui et suprascripta et sequentia edidit dicta*, and at fol. 158. as *Oratio cuidam peccatoris*." On fol. 161. b. is an old German version, first printed by Pez (Thes. i. 417.), corrected by Graff. Diutiska, 111. 211., by Massmann, at p. 168. Otloh mentions in this prayer the destruction of his monastery of St. Emmeram, which took place in 1062.

I have advisedly called him Otloh, and not Otlohnus.

S. W. SINGER.

Mickleham, Dec. 10. 1849.

NOTES UPON CUNNINGHAM'S HANDBOOK FOR LONDON

No. 1. "*Gerrard Street, Soho.* * * * At the Turk's Head, in Gerrard Street, Johnson and Sir Joshua Reynolds founded, in the year 1764, 'The Literary Club.'"

It would appear from the following extracts in my Common-place Book, that the *original* Turk's Head, at which the Literary Club first held their meetings, was in *Greek Street, Soho*, not in Gerrard Street:—

"The Literary Club was first held at the Turk's Head in Greek Street, which tavern was almost half a century since removed to Gerrard Street, where it continued nearly as long as the house was kept open."—*European Mag.* Jan. 1803.

"The Turk's Head, in Gerrard Street, Soho, was, more than fifty years since, removed from a tavern of the same sign the corner of Greek and Compton Streets. This place was a kind of head-quarters for the Loyal Association during the rebellion of 1745."—Moser's *Memorandum Book*, MS. dated 1799.

No. 2. *Storey's Gate, Birdcage Walk, St. James's Park.*—I have seen it stated, but do not recollect where, that "Storey's" was a house of public entertainment. "Webb's," mentioned in the following extracts, was also a place of a similar description:—

"April 25. 1682.—About nine, this night, it began to lighten, thunder, and rain. The next morning, there was the greatest flood in St. James's Park ever remembered. It came round about the fences, and up to the gravel walks—people could not walk to *Webb's* and *Storie's*.

"April 3, 1685.—This afternoon nine or ten houses were burned or blown up, that looked into S. James's Park, between *Webb's* and *Storie's*."—*Diary of Phillip Madox*, MS. formerly in the possession of Thorpe the bookseller.

No. 3. *Capel Court*.—So named from Sir William Capell, draper, Lord Mayor in 1503, whose mansion stood on the site of the present Stock Exchange.—Pennant's *Common-place Book*.

No. 4. *Bloomsbury Market*.—This market, built by the Duke of Bedford, was opened in March, 1730. Query, was there a market on the site before?—*Ibid*.

No. 5. *Bartlet's Buildings*.—*Mackeril's Quaker Coffee-house*, frequently mentioned at the beginning of the last century, was in these buildings.—*Ibid*.

No. 6. *St. Olave's, Crutched Friars*.—Names of various persons who have occupied houses in this parish: Lady Sydney, 1586—Lady Walsingham, 1590—Lady Essex, 1594—Lord Lumley, 1594—Viscount Sudbury, 1629—Philip Lord Herbert, 1646—Dr. Gibbon, 1653—Sir R. Ford, 1653—Lord Brounker, 1673—Sir Cloudesley Shovel, 1700—*Extracts from the Registers made by the Rev. H. Goodhall*, 1818.

WIVES OF ECCLESIASTICS

In reply to your correspondent's query as to the "wives of ecclesiastics," I find amongst my notes one to this effect:—

ERROR, to assume in ancient genealogies that a branch is necessarily extinct, simply because the last known representative is described as "Clericus," and *ergo*, must have died S.P.L.

It will be obvious to many of your readers that Clericus is *nomen generale* for all such as were learned in the arts of reading and writing, and whom the old law deemed capable of claiming benefit of clergy,—a benefit not confined to those in orders, if the ordinary's deputy standing by could say "*legit ut clericus*."

The title of Clericus, then, in earlier times as now, belonged not only to those in the holy ministry of the Church, and to whom more strictly applied the term Clergy, either regular or secular, but to those as well who by their function or course of life practised their pens in any court or otherwise, as Clerk of the King's Wardrobe, Clerks of the Exchequer, &c. Though in former times clerks of this description were frequently in holy orders and held benefices, it must be evident that they were not all so of necessity; and the instances are so numerous where persons having the title of "Clericus" appear nevertheless to have been in the married state, and to have discharged functions incompatible

with the service of the Church, that the assertion will not be denied that the restrictions as to contracting matrimonial alliances did not extend to clerks not in holy orders or below the grade of *subdiaconus*. The *Registrum Brevium* furnishes a precedent of a writ, "*De clerico infra sacros ordines constituto non eligendo in officium.*" This distinction alone would prove that other clerks were not ineligible to office. The various decrees of the Church may be cited to show that the prohibition to marry did not include all clerks generally. Pope Gregory VII., in a synod held in 1074, "*interdixit clericis, maxime divino ministerio consecratis uxores habere, vel cum mulicribus habitare, nisi quas Nicena Synodus vel alii canones exceperunt.*"

The statutes made by Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas, Archbishop elect of York, and all the other bishops of England, in 1108, in presence of King Henry I., and with the assent of his barons, confine the interdiction respecting marriages to *Presbyteri, Diaconi et Subdiaconi*, and a provision is made by them for those cases where marriages had been contracted since the interdict at the Council of London (that probably in 1103), viz. that such should be precluded thereafter from celebrating mass, if they persist in retaining their wives. "*Illi vero presbyteri, diaconi, subdiaconi, qui post interdictum Londoniensis Concilii foeminas suas tenuerunt vel alins duxcrunt, si amplius missam celebrare voluerint, eas a se omnino sic facient alienas, ut nec illae in domos eorum, nec ipsi in domos earum intrent.... Illi autem presbyteri qui divini altaris*

et sacrorum ordinum contemptores praelegerint cum mulcibus habitare a divino officio remoti, omnique ecclesiastico beneficio privati, extra chorum ponantur, infames pronunciati. Qui vero rebellis et contemptor foeminam non reliquerit, et missam celebrare presumpserit, vocatus ad satisfactionem si neglexerit, viiiij. die excommunicetur. Eadem sententia archidiaconos et cononicos omnes complectitur, et de mulieribus relinquendis et de vitanda carum conversatione, et de districtione censurae si statuta transgressi fuerint.... Presbyteri vero qui relictis mulieribus, Deo et sacris altaribus servire elegerint, xl. dies ab officio cessantes, pro se interim vicarios habebunt, injuncta eis poenitentia secundum hoc quod episcopis eorum visum fuerit." In 1138 the penalty for priests marrying was deprivation of their benefices, and exclusion from the celebration of divine service:—"Sanctorum patrum vestigiis inhaerentes, presbyteros, diaconos, subdiaconos uxoratos, aut concubinarios, ecclesiasticis officiis et beneficiis privamus, ac ne quis eorum missam audire praesumat Apostolica auctoritate prohibemus."

Many such decrees have been made at various synods and councils holden for reformation of the clergy, but I can find none wherein marriage is interdicted to clerks generally. I will refer to one more only, viz. that made in the Council of London, held at Westminster in 1175. Here it will be seen most distinctly that the prohibition against entering the marriage state was confined expressly to *Clerici in sacris ordinibus constituti*, and that it was not only lawful for clerks below the grade of subdeacon to marry,

but that having subsequently once entered the marriage state and being subsequently desirous *ad religionem transire*, and to continue in the service of the Church, they could not do so and be separated from their wives unless *de communi consensu*; if they continued, however, to live with their wives, they could not hold an ecclesiastical benefice: "Si quis sacerdos vel clericus in sacris ordinibus constitutus, ecclesiam vel ecclesiasticum beneficium habens publice fornicarium habeat," &c.... "Si qui vero infra subdiaconatum constituti matrimonia contraxerint, ab uxoribus nisi de communi consensu ad religionem transire voluerint, et ibi in Dei servitio vigilanter permanere, nullatenus separentur: sed cum uxoribus viventes, ecclesiastica beneficia nullo modo percipiant. Qui autem in subdiaconatu, vel supra, ad matrimonia convolaverint, mulieres etiam invitae et renitentes relinquunt."

This it will be seen that the title "Clericus" under some circumstances, affords no certain indication that a lawful marriage may not have been contracted by the person so described and consequently that he might not have *prolem legitimam*.

W.H.

It does not follow that William de Bolton was an ecclesiastic because he was called Clericus; that designation being, even in that early time, often used in a lay sense.

I have just come across an instance of a prior date. In the Liberate Roll of 26 Henry III. the king directs a payment to be made "to Isabella, the wife of our beloved clerk, Robert

of Canterbury, to purchase a robe for our use." Even in the reign of Richard I. it may be doubtful whether the term was not used with both meanings; for in the charter of Walter Mapes, granting certain lands, among the witnesses are "Rogero, capellano, Willelmo, capellano, Thoma, *clerico meo*, Waltero, clerico, Jacobo, clerico, Bricio, fermario meo."

[Symbol: Phi]

[In addition to the information afforded by the preceding communications "A SUBSCRIBER" will find much curious illustration of this subject in Beveridge's *Discourses on the Thirty-Nine Articles*, where he treats of the Thirty-second article "On the Marriage of Priests."

He must however consult the edition printed at the Oxford University Press in 1840, which contains for the first time Beveridge's *Discourses on the last Nine Articles.*]

TOWER ROYAL

Sir,—In your second number I find a query by Mr. Cunningham, respecting the origin of the name of *Tower Royal*; although I cannot satisfactorily explain it, I enclose a few notes relative to the early history of that place, which may, perhaps, afford a clue to its derivation.

In early records it is invariably called "la Real," "la Reole," "la Riote," or "la Ryal or Ryole;" and it is described simply as a "tenement;" I have never found an instance of its being called a "tower". At the close of the reign of Henry III. it was held by one Thomas Bat, citizen of London, who demised it to Master Simon of Beauvais, surgeon to Edward I.; this grant was confirmed by that sovereign by charter in 1277. (Rot. Cart. 5 Edw. I. m. 17.—Placita de Quo Warranto, p. 461.) This Simon of *Beauvais* figures in Stow and Pennant as Simon de Beawmes. In 1331 Edward III. granted "la Real" to his consort Philippa, for the term of her life, that is might be used as a depository for her wardrobe. (Rot. Pat. 4 Edw. III. 2nd part, m. 15.) By Queen Philippa it was extensively repaired, if not rebuilt, and the particulars of the works executed there by her direction, may be seen in the Wardrobe Account of the sixth year of her reign, preserved in the Cottonian MS. Galba E iii. fo. 177, et seq.; this account is erroneously attributed in the catalogue to Eleanor, consort of Edward I. One Maria de Beauvais, probably a

descendant of Master Simon, received compensation for quitting a tenement which she held at the time Philippa's operations commenced. In 1365 Edward III. granted to Robert de Corby, in fee, "one tenement in the street of la Ryole, London" to hold by the accustomed services. Finally, in 1370 Edward gave the "inn (hospitium) with its appurtenances called le Reole, in the city of London," to the canons of St. Stephen's, Westminster, as of the yearly value of 20*l.* (Rot. Pat. 43 Edw. III. m. 24.)

It is sufficiently clear that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries this place was not called *Tower Royal*; nor does there appear to be any ground for supposing it was so named in earlier times, or, indeed, that it was ever occupied by royalty before it became Philippa's wardrobe. The question, therefore is narrowed to this point:—what is the significance of "la Real, Reole, or Riolo?" I should be glad if any of your correspondents would give their opinions on the subject. I may add, that the building was in the parish of St. Thomas Apostle, not in that of St. Michael Pater Noster Church, as Stow wrote. (Rot. Pat. 4 Edw. III. 2nd part, m. 38.)

T.H.T

Let me refer Mr. P. Cunningham to "Stow's *Survey*, p. 27. 92. Thoms' Edition," for a full answer to his query. The passages are too long to cite, but Mr. C. will find sufficient proof of the part of a royal residence having once stood in this obscure lane, now almost demolished in the sweeping city improvements, which threaten in time to leave us hardly a fragment of the London of

the old chronicler.

The Tower was also called the Queen's Wardrobe, and it was there, Froissart tells us, that Joan of Kent, the mother of Richard II., took refuge during Wat Tyler's rebellion, when forced to fly from the Tower of London. The old historian writes that after the defeat of the rebels "pour le premier chemin que le Roy fit, il vint deuers sa Dame de mère, la Princesse, qui estoit en un chastel *de la Riolle* (que l'on dit la Garderobbe la Reyne) et là s'estoit tenue deux jours et deux nuits, moult ébahie; et avoit bien raison. Quand elle vit le Roy son fils, elle fut toute rejouye, et luy dit, 'Ha ha beau fils, comment j'ay eu aujourd'huy grand peine et angoisse pour vous.' Dont respondit le Roy, et dit, 'Certes, Madame, je le say bien. Or vous rejouissez et louez Dieu, car il est heure de le louer. J'ay aujourd'huy recouvré mon heritage et le royaume d'Angleterre, que j'avoie perdu.' Ainsi se tint le Roy ce jour delez sa mère." (Froissart, ii 123. Par. 1573.)

Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.

Текст предоставлен ООО «ЛитРес».

Прочитайте эту книгу целиком, [купив полную легальную версию](#) на ЛитРес.

Безопасно оплатить книгу можно банковской картой Visa, MasterCard, Maestro, со счета мобильного телефона, с платежного терминала, в салоне МТС или Связной, через PayPal, WebMoney, Яндекс.Деньги, QIWI Кошелек, бонусными картами или другим удобным Вам способом.