

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

History Faculty Publications

History

2008

Citations of 'noster' John Pecham in Richard Fleming's Trinity Sunday sermon: evidence for the political use of liturgical music at the Council of Constance

Chris L. Nighman

Wilfrid Laurier University, cnighman@wlu.ca

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.wlu.ca/hist_faculty



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nighman, Chris L., "Citations of 'noster' John Pecham in Richard Fleming's Trinity Sunday sermon: evidence for the political use of liturgical music at the Council of Constance" (2008). *History Faculty Publications*. 17.

https://scholars.wlu.ca/hist_faculty/17

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History at Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

“Citations of ‘*noster*’ John Pecham in Richard Fleming’s Trinity Sunday sermon: evidence for the political use of liturgical music at the Council of Constance”[1]

Published in *Medieval Sermon Studies* 52 (2008), 31-41.

Chris L. Nighman
Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Abstract:

This article examines a sermon for Trinity Sunday that was delivered by Richard Fleming at the Council of Constance in 1417. The author argues that Fleming’s citation of liturgical chant and a homily composed by John Pecham, together with certain external evidence, suggests that he was trying to bolster the reputation of the English Church in order to counter attempts to deprive the English delegation of its status as a ‘nation’ within the council. As such, it constitutes an interesting confluence of pulpit oratory, liturgical music, and ecclesiastical politics at this council.

Richard Fleming (c.1385-1432) was the most prolific and, arguably, the most important English preacher at the Council of Constance (1414-18). In Heinrich Finke’s *Predigtenregister*, which until recently has served as the essential bibliographical resource for speeches delivered at this council, Fleming is cited as the author of four surviving sermons, more than any other English preacher at Constance.[2] Since the publication of Finke’s sermon register, two additional sermons from this council have been determined to be Fleming’s. One of these is ‘*Ecce sedes posita in celo*’ (Apc. 4:2),[3] which was discovered by Johannes B. Schneyer in *Stift Sankt Paul im Lavantthal MS 30/4*. [4] This sermon, which Fleming delivered at Constance on Trinity Sunday in 1417 (6 June),[5] seems on the surface to be quite different from his other conciliar sermons in that it does not apparently relate to current conciliar politics. However, a closer examination of this text reveals that it is not so apolitical after all and that Fleming seems to have intended this sermon as part of an effort to promote the English ‘nation’ during a particular episode of political conflict at this council.

The record of Fleming's preaching activities at Constance suggests that he served as the English delegation's spokesman during the most crucial phase of this council. During the late Spring and Summer of 1417 the council was divided between two factions in what has come to be known as the 'priority conflict'; this dispute pitted the Emperor-elect Sigismund and the German and English delegations, who called for the council to enact significant reform legislation before proceeding to a papal election, against most of the cardinals and the French, Italian and Spanish *nationes*, who advocated holding a conclave as soon as possible in order to finally heal the papal schism, leaving the question of reform to the new pope. This was the context in which Fleming delivered several sermons that are highly politicized speeches employing powerful rhetorical strategies in driving home his points in support of the *causa reformationis*. Fleming's sermons for Epiphany (6 January 1417) and for Passion Sunday (28 March 1417), which anticipated the coming 'priority conflict', are especially notable in this regard, for they stand as remarkable examples of polemical oratory in exhorting the council to enact sweeping ecclesiastical reforms *in capite et in membris*. These concerns are also seen in several eulogies that are attributed to Fleming which were delivered after his sermon for Trinity Sunday.

In contrast, Fleming does not engage in the political issues of reform and union in his Trinity Sunday sermon and instead focuses upon a point of theology. Indeed, Schneyer characterized 'Ecce' as a 'Schulpredigt' that demonstrates the preacher's scholastic erudition and speculative abilities, as well as his knowledge and cleverness, 'in ein helles Licht'.^[6] This departure from Fleming's other appearances in the conciliar pulpit might be explained by the reception of his two previous sermons, especially the one he delivered for Passion Sunday, 'Accipiant qui uocati sunt', which Hermann von der Hardt considered to be 'by far the most

severe' sermon of its kind, leading him to wonder whether 'the council heard it patiently'.[7] It would thus be tempting to assume that Fleming's approach in his sermon for Trinity Sunday was the result of criticism he may have incurred for too harshly condemning members of his audience for committing simony and nepotism, and for blocking the council's reform efforts, in his previous sermon. However, Fleming makes no statement in 'Ecce' that alludes to such a situation; the sermon does contain the standard humility trope, a *captatio beniuolentiae*, but it is not so suggestive as the passage in Schneyer's edition would indicate.[8]

A more likely explanation is suggested by Schneyer's appraisal of this sermon. Despite Fleming's prominence as a preacher at Constance, he was only a junior member of the Oxford theology faculty at the time, holding canonries in both York Minster and Lincoln Cathedral, as well as being the rector of Fishtoft in Lincoln diocese. At the age of about 31, he was no doubt interested in preferment; and, indeed, his ambition was soon fulfilled when he was consecrated as Bishop of Lincoln in 1420.[9] Therefore, it may be no coincidence that in 'Accipiant', which he delivered just ten weeks before 'Ecce', Fleming had complained that there were too few theologians who were also secular clerics among the higher ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy:

Et, amantissimi domini, licet theologie precommendem scienciam, honorabiles alias facultates non reprobato, sed non possum conuiuenti oculo pertransire, quin merendo admirer et meream admirando, quod in hoc sacro generali per anthonomasiam concilio, preter uenerabiles religiosos, qui in illa sciencia omnino nutriti sunt, ultra duos prelatos in sacra theologia doctores non uideo.[10]

Thus, it would be reasonable to conclude that 'Ecce' was designed as a vehicle for self-promotion by which Fleming could advertise his own qualifications as a theologian 'in a bright light' to any members of his audience who were, or who later would be, in a position to advance his career.

However, a consideration of the sources cited by Fleming in this sermon suggests yet another motive. As one would expect, among the *auctores* cited in ‘Ecce’ we find such major writers as Anselm, Aristotle, Augustine, Avicenna, Bartholomeus Anglicus, Basel, Bernard, Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, John of Damascus and Thomas Aquinas. But in addition to these famous philosophers and theologians, Fleming also makes a point of prominently citing an author who is rarely mentioned in conciliar sermons: Archbishop of Canterbury John Pecham, O.F.M. (d.1292). In compiling his edition of ‘Ecce’ Schneyer was unable to identify any of the sources for these citations attributed to Pecham, but with the aid of electronic resources that were not yet available when Schneyer was working on this text, I have been able to determine that this sermon contains five of Pecham’s antiphons for Trinity Sunday and one of his responsories for the same office. Moreover, I have also identified two quotations from an unedited homily by Pecham known as *De trinitate*.

In his first citation of Pecham, Fleming proclaims

quod mellitissimo scemate cecinit uenerabilis noster Pecham, tocius Anglie primas, sic exordinens anthiphonas percelebris huius festi: ‘Sedenti super solium, congratulans trisagium seraphici clamoris, cum Patre laudat Filium, indifferens principium reciproci amoris. Sequatur per suspirium, quod geritur per gaudium, in sanctis celi choris; leuemus cordis studium, in trinum lucis radium, splendoris et feruoris.’[11]

This quotation from Pecham’s first and second antiphons for first Vespers in his office for Trinity Sunday is immediately followed by the following relevant passage from his homily *De trinitate*:

‘Nec enim,’ inquit ille, Cantuariensium candis et flos theologorum, in legenda diei presentis, ‘frustra iuxta Ysayam duo seraphin trisagium continencia ter ayos incessanter clamancia summe Domini trinitatem trina sanctitatis congratulacione protestancia sedentis super solium caput et pedes obumbrare feruntur, ut uidelicet manifeste insinuent excessiuum trinitatis archanum comprehensionis sue transcendere facultatem utpote nec satis ad maiestatis immensitatem, nec satis acutam ad summe simplicis misterii profunditatem. Quamquam enim limpide

contuencia lumen in lumine Pater, Filius et Spiritus Sanctus uere personaliter differentes in unius uideant existere simplicitate essencie, uigor tamen circumscripti luminis omnino perlustrare nequit abbyssum intermine maiestatis.’[12]

Taken together, these two antiphons and the excerpt from Pecham’s homily comprise some fourteen lines in Schneyer’s edition, one of the longest quotations in this sermon. Fleming prefaces the second quotation from Pecham thus, ‘Sic predicti nostri Pecham anthiphonauit facundia’, in introducing his third and fourth antiphons *in primis Vesperis*:

Si nosce uis hec germina, non semina sed lumine consideret indago, lux Deus est intermina, de qua res manat gemina, tam amor quam ymago. Lux non decisa, radium diffundens, per hoc medium multiplicat ardorem. Si Pater gignit Filium, cum ipso spirans terciū concorditer amorem.[13]

Fleming’s next quotation from Pecham cites one of the archbishop’s responsories for the third Nocturn of Trinity Sunday as follows:

Quod uenerabilis ille noster Cantuariensis in quodam responsorio egregie rethorizat: ‘A ueterani facie manauerit ardens fluuius antiquus est ignitus et facies est Filius, ardoris fluxus Spiritus duorum amoris medius. Sic olim multipharie prophetis luxit trinitas, quam post pandit ecclesie in carne fulgens ueritas.’[14]

The final citation of Pecham in Fleming’s sermon ascribes the following excerpt from *De trinitate* to ‘uenerabilis noster Pecham in legenda’:

Includit enim hoc et trinum celum, solium uidelicet trinitatis, non solum immensitatis diuicias, uerum eciam ne quid desit, delicias mutue caritatis Patris gignentis, Filii nascentis et Spiritus Sanctus ab utroque procedentis.[15]

Finally, for the first part of the concluding doxology to this sermon Fleming employed, though in this case without attribution, another antiphon from Pecham’s Trinity Sunday office: ‘O lux beata trinitas, tres unum, trinum unio, imperialis unitas in trium contubernio.’[16]

Fleming’s citations of Pecham are of particular interest in terms of how he often refers to him as ‘noster/nostri’ and employs various terms of respect, praise and admiration for ‘ille Cantuariensis’ (‘uenerabilis’, ‘quod mellitissimo scemate cecinit’, ‘antiphonauit facundia’,

‘candis et flos theologorum’, ‘egregie rhetorizat’) because he did not do so for any of the other authors whose works are cited in this sermon, including St. Augustine who is the only authority that is quoted more often than Pecham is. Clearly, Fleming intended not only to promote himself in a subtle way through preaching this sermon, but also to promote Pecham overtly as a composer of beautiful liturgical chant and as a notable theologian.

Pecham was not the only English writer who was shown favour by an English preacher at Constance. In the preface to his register of the Constance sermons Heinrich Finke referred to Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (d.1253), as the national *Lieblingschriftsteller* of English preachers at Constance.[17] Finke’s protégé, Paul Arendt, echoed this sentiment in his monograph on the Constance sermons, referring to Grosseteste as the *Lieblingsautor* of English reform preachers, especially when they dealt with the issue of simony.[18] Neither Finke nor Arendt explain which particular sermons exemplify this preference for Grosseteste by the English, but at the time they were writing there were only two printed Constance sermons by English preachers that cite Grosseteste: Henry Abingdon’s sermon ‘Sitis repleti fructu iusticie’ (Phil. 1:11), which was printed in full by Christian Walsh in the eighteenth century, and Fleming’s Epiphany sermon, ‘Surge illuminare Iherusalem’ (Is. 60:1), excerpts of which were edited by Finke in his sermon register. Abingdon cites Grosseteste twice, but in neither case does he offer any particular terms of admiration for ‘Lincolniensis’.[19] But in the single reference to Grosseteste in ‘Surge’, Fleming does call him ‘iste doctor memorie uenerabilis’ and praises him for being ‘intrepidus’ in delivering his famous address to the papal curia at Lyon in 1250.[20]

While Arendt seems to have relied exclusively on printed sources, Finke had access to numerous manuscripts containing unprinted Constance sermon texts; thus, he may have also had

in mind two citations of Grosseteste in Robert Gilbert's sermon 'Ascendimus Iherusalem' (Lc. 18:31) which were not included in the excerpts from this sermon that he published in his register.[21] In one of these passages Gilbert cites Grosseteste as 'doctor egregius Lincolniensis' and in the other he refers to him as 'doctissimus Lincolniensis'.[22] Finke and Arendt were unaware of yet another English sermon that heavily cites Grosseteste; 'Tristicia uestra uertetur in gaudium' (Jo. 16:20) was actually known to Finke, who printed excerpts from this sermon in his register, but he cites it as anonymous and apparently was not aware of its English authorship.[23] While Grosseteste is not mentioned in the excerpts that Finke printed, 'Lincolniensis' is cited several times elsewhere in 'Tristicia', but in only one of these cases does the preacher offer any particular praise for Grosseteste, and it is done by including him in a list of 'zelantissimi doctores' which also includes Dyonisius, Bernard of Clairvaux, 'Armachanus' (Richard FitzRalph) and 'Parisiensis' (Giles of Rome), all of whom had criticized the abuse of exemptions.[24] Finally, there is one other Constance sermon of probable English authorship, this one entirely unknown to Finke and Arendt, which cites Grosseteste: 'Tu es qui uenturus es' (Mt. 11:3), a remarkably long sermon which cites 'Lincolniensis' no less than twelve times.[25] However, while Grosseteste was clearly a favourite authority for this preacher, he never offers any terms of respect or praise for him; nor does he, or any of the other English preachers discussed above, use the possessive adjective 'noster' in emphasizing Grosseteste's nationality.[26] The other surviving sermons by English preachers at Constance do not mention 'Lincolniensis' at all.[27] Thus, while a major figure such as Robert Grosseteste is cited, occasionally with terms of admiration, by some English preachers at Constance, these comments pale in comparison to Fleming's repeated and effusive praise for 'Cantuariensis' and his insistent claim of Pecham as 'noster' in this Trinity Sunday sermon.

Because the liturgical setting for 'Ecce' is of great importance in trying to discover its significance, it is worthwhile to attempt a reconstruction of the manner of its delivery. While it is possible that Fleming preached it at one of the smaller churches in Constance, there is no record of another sermon being preached on Trinity Sunday in 1417; in fact, this is the only known Trinity Sunday sermon delivered at this council. It is therefore reasonable to assume that Fleming preached this *sermo festiualis* in the cathedral before an audience composed of dozens of prelates and secular lords, as well as hundreds of others of lesser rank, both laymen and ecclesiasts, from all over Europe. It also seems probable that Fleming, who had been a canon of York Minster for over a decade, would have sung the antiphons and the responsory by Pecham that were included in this sermon, rather than simply speaking the words. This would explain why Fleming did not bother to cite Pecham as the author of the antiphon that was incorporated into his concluding doxology; his audience would have known this if he sang it. Moreover, it also seems likely that Pecham's entire office was employed for the celebration of Trinity Sunday that year and that it was performed by liturgical singers brought from England. The presence of English musicians and singers at Constance has long been known because their impressive performances in 1415 and 1416 for the feast of St. Thomas Becket (29 December) are described in Ulrich Richental's chronicle.[28] But Manfred Schuler has shown that there were actually two groups of English singers that traveled to Constance, the first of which presumably arrived with the main contingent of English delegates in January 1415 shortly after the council began, and the second in September 1416. The existence of this second group is attested by a chronicle which recounts a performance by English singers at the cathedral in Köln on 8 September 1416 for the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary while on their way to Constance in a party led by Bishop John Catterick of Coventry-Lichfield and Bishop John Wakering of Norwich.[29] This

group had departed from England in early August and arrived at the council on 24 September 1416, about two weeks after the performance at Köln. It is worth noting that Richard Fleming was very likely a member of this entourage.[30]

Another interesting point regarding this sermon is suggested by the evidence indicating that Fleming originally composed 'Ecce' not while he was at Constance, but previously when he was at Oxford. First of all, Pecham's homily *De trinitate*, which is twice cited in this sermon, is a very rare text; because it survives in only two known manuscripts that are both of English provenance,[31] it is reasonable to suppose that Fleming wrote this sermon and originally delivered it at his alma mater. Moreover, Fleming does not make any internal references to the council in this sermon, unlike all of his other speeches at Constance; for example, in his Epiphany sermon Fleming refers to the city or the council by name no less than six times; and in his other sermons he either mentions Constance explicitly or refers to 'this council' or 'this synod'. Thus, Schneyer's comment that this sermon reads like a 'Schulpredigt' is probably closer to the truth than he realized. But if 'Ecce' was indeed first composed and delivered at Oxford, there would have been no reason in that putative original version for Fleming to refer to Pecham repeatedly as 'noster' in emphasizing his nationality. Fleming presumably adapted his academic sermon for delivery at Constance by adding the term 'noster' to several of his references to Pecham, though the various terms of admiration and praise for Pecham might have either been included in the original version or added later.

Why, then, did Fleming promote Pecham to this conciliar audience? There is no evidence indicating that there was a canonization process underway for this Franciscan archbishop at that time. Nor does it seem likely that Fleming and the English liturgical singers who probably performed at Constance for the feast of Trinity Sunday in 1417 were promoting

Pecham's office for Trinity Sunday for wider use on the continent; although his homily *De trinitate* was probably unknown outside of England, the survival of a number of fourteenth-century Franciscan breviaries from all over Europe which contain Pecham's Trinity Sunday office attests to the fact that it was already widely-known and used by members of that order on the continent.[32]

Given the nature of Fleming's other conciliar sermons, it seems that the most likely explanation is to be found by considering the political situation at Constance. In October 1416 Cardinal Pierre d'Ailly began to agitate against the current system by which the relatively small English delegation sat as a separate *natio* unto itself, separate from the German 'nation', thus having equal status with the German, French, Italian and Spanish *nationes* when important conciliar business was put to a vote. This complaint culminated in a formal protest on 3 March 1417 by Jean Campagne (or Campan), proctor of the King of France, who presented an extended treatise arguing that the English church was simply too small and thus not important enough to warrant a separate political identity at the council. In response, the English protonotary, Thomas Polton, drafted a lengthy defense of the status of the *natio Anglicana* which was entered into the official conciliar Acta on 31 March.[33] Although it appears that the issue was dropped at this point, the English delegation seems to have continued to regard its status as threatened. When Archbishop of Canterbury Henry Chichele wrote to Bishop Robert Hallum of Salisbury, the acknowledged leader of the English 'nation' at Constance, on 23 April 1417 to congratulate him and his colleagues on their recent 'victorious defense of the rights and honor of the realm', he also urged unremitting vigilance against any future machinations by the French.[34]

Considering these circumstances, it seems that Fleming's Trinity Sunday sermon is not so apolitical as it appears to be on the surface, and therefore not so anomalous in comparison to his

other conciliar sermons. What Fleming seems to have been doing here is attempting to augment the prestige of the English ‘nation’ at this council and thus bolster the arguments that had been recently advanced by Polton in response to the French protest. Trinity Sunday would have been an ideal occasion for this because during this period it was regarded as a more important feast in the English church than in most other parts of Europe; in the Sarum Missal, the most widely-employed use in England, Sundays in the summer and autumn are numbered from Trinity Sunday, not from Pentecost, as in the Roman Missal.[35] Moreover, Fleming’s choice of the pericope ‘Ecce sedes posita in celo’ (Apoc. 4:2) as his theme is also significant as this line is found among the *lectiones* for Trinity Sunday in the Sarum Missal, but not in the Roman Missal.[36] This is a detail that would not have gone unnoticed by many of the clerical members of his audience.

Although Cardinal d’Ailly apparently did not begin his public attack on the English right to sit as a separate ‘nation’ until October of 1416, Henry V and his advisors must have anticipated such a challenge in response to the close relationship that had developed between Sigismund and the English king. This would explain why the English conciliar delegation was reinforced by the arrival of three bishops and various other individuals, including Fleming and a group of liturgical singers, during the Fall of 1417. Thus, the liturgy for the feast of St. Thomas Becket at Constance in December 1416, which would have had a larger choir performing than had been the case a year prior, probably also served the same political function of bolstering the prestige of the English delegation. But Becket’s feastday and Trinity Sunday are not the only instances in which sacred performances seem to have been employed by the English for political purposes at Constance. In late January of 1417 the English delegation twice staged an Epiphany play, first for the burghers of Constance and then for Sigismund and members of the German

‘nation’. In a previous article I have argued that these productions probably served as political propaganda in combination with Fleming’s Epiphany sermon, in which the English position in the coming ‘priority conflict’ had been announced. Three weeks after Fleming preached ‘Surge’ Sigismund returned to Constance after an absence of some eighteen months. A few days later he was entertained by the English bishops who hosted a lavish banquet at which this Epiphany play was performed. Then, in a letter written at Constance a few days after that banquet, John Forrester reported to Henry V that Sigismund had assured the leaders of the English delegation that he would support their policy of promoting ecclesiastical reforms at the council.[37]

It therefore appears that it was not really John Pecham himself that Fleming was promoting in this sermon; rather it was the *ecclesia Anglicana* as a whole that he was promoting through Pecham. Thus, the key adjective in Fleming’s citations of Pecham would be the ‘noster’ rather than the ‘uenerabilis’ and the other terms of praise he used. But we may also be witnessing a nascent nationalist sentiment that involves the promotion of England itself, rather than the English church per se, as expressed in Chichele’s letter which praised Polton’s successful defense of the reputation and rights of *the realm*. This would explain why Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury, an Italian by birth, is not also identified by Fleming as ‘noster’ in this sermon. However, if this were the case, then Fleming missed the opportunity of citing Bartholomeus Anglicus as ‘noster’; indeed, he is merely cited as ‘Bartholomeus’ without the ‘Anglicus’ that is often attached to his given name.[38] Because it is highly unlikely that Fleming was unaware of this national appellation, it is reasonable to suppose that he decided against referring to Bartholomeus, who is cited only for a single short quotation at the beginning of this sermon, as ‘Anglicus’ or ‘noster’ because this would have diluted his emphasis upon Pecham as the author of liturgical chants and a theological homily directly related to the occasion

of his sermon. That Fleming was using Pecham to glorify the English church as a whole is also supported by the theory that he was also promoting himself in this sermon. By this time Fleming had become established as a prominent spokesman for the English 'nation' at Constance; thus, his self-promotion and his promotion of the church of his homeland would have naturally overlapped and reinforced one another in this overtly theological and covertly political sermon for Trinity Sunday. The purpose of 'Ecce', then, seems to have been to make the English presence at this council much more impressive than it otherwise would have been in order to counter any further attempts to merge the English and German delegations; for if d'Ailly and Campagne had been successful in their attempt to repeal the right of the English representatives to vote as a separate 'nation' at Constance, not only would the prestige of the English have suffered a major blow, but the 'reform party' would have been isolated under a single *natio* in the 'priority conflict'.

Endnotes

1. Portions of this article were included in a paper I presented in July 2002 at the International Congress for Medieval Studies, University of Leeds. I would like to thank Dr. Alma Santosuosso and Dr. Debra Lacoste of the Faculty of Music at Wilfrid Laurier University for their assistance as I conducted further research in converting that conference paper into the present article.
2. H. Finke, *Acta concilii Constanciensis* 2, (Münster, 1923), pp. 367-545. While the excerpts from sermons that are printed in this register continue to be important sources for scholars, the bibliographical information in Finke's register has been supplanted by a resource created by Phillip Stump and myself which is provided online by the Bibliographical Society of America: www.bibsocamer.org/BibSite/nighman-stump/. See C.L. Nighman & P. Stump, 'A New Bibliographical Register of the Sermons and Other Speeches Delivered at the Council of Constance (1414-18)', *Medieval Sermon Studies* 50 (2006), 71-84.
3. The other sermon has been edited and discussed in two previous articles of mine: "'Accipiant qui vocati sunt': Richard Fleming's Reform Sermon at the Council of Constance", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 51.1 (Jan. 2000), 1-36; and 'Rhetorical Self-Construction and its Political Context in Richard Fleming's Reform Sermon for Passion Sunday at the Council of Constance', *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 33.2 (2001), 405-25.
4. J.-B. Schneyer, 'Konstanzer Konzilspredigten: Eine Ergänzung zu H. Finke's Sermones- und Handschriftenlisten', *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 113 (1965), 361-88 at p. 377. Schneyer subsequently edited this sermon in 'Konstanzer Konzilspredigten: Texte', *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 119 (1971), 222-31.
5. Schneyer incorrectly identified 'Ecce' as an Epiphany sermon and misdated it to 6 January 1417; see C.L. Nighman, "New Dating for 'Ecce sedes posita in caelo': a Sermon by Richard Fleming at the Council of Constance", *Notes and Queries* n.s. 42.4 (Dec. 1995), 433-4.
6. Schneyer, 'Texte', p. 222.
7. Hermann von der Hardt, *Historia litteraria reformationis* (Leipzig, 1717), vol. 3, p. 17: 'Sermo est longe gravissimus, quo immania praelatorum scelera, imprimis amor pecuniae, ambitio, luxus, ignorantia summa libertate deteguntur, et vehementer taxantur; ut mirum sit eum patienter audivisse concilium'. This appraisal would be echoed by Heinrich Finke and Paul Arendt; see Nighman, 'Self-Construction', pp. 405 (note 2), 406.
8. As I have pointed out previously ('Self-Construction', pp. 406-7, note 7), Schneyer mistranscribed a line in the exordium of 'Ecce' where Fleming supposedly states that he is delivering this sermon 'non obstante crimine meo' (p. 222). However, in both of the known manuscript copies of 'Ecce' (Klosterneuberg, Stiftsbibliothek CCl 640, f. 81vb; Stift Sankt Paul im Lavantthal, MS 30/4, f. 146v) the clause actually reads 'non abs causa deterians me'.

9. For an overview of Fleming's career, see C.L. Nighman, 'Reform and Humanism in the Sermons of Richard Fleming at the Council of Constance (1417)', University of Toronto Ph.D. thesis, 1996, pp. 19-46 (available online from the National Library of Canada: <http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/obj/s4/f2/dsk3/ftp04/NQ41569.pdf>).
10. 'Although I recommend the science of theology, I do not reprove the other honorable faculties, yet I cannot overlook with a congenial eye (indeed I am amazed with wonder and I wonder with amazement) that in this holy general council, except for the venerable religious, who are thoroughly nourished in that science, I do not see more than two prelates who are doctors of sacred theology' (Nighman, 'Accipiant', p. 29, ll. 742-49).
11. Klosterneuberg CCl 640, f. 82ra; cf. Schneyer, 'Texte', p. 223; and St. Paul MS 30/4, f. 147r. All of the excerpts from 'Ecce' in this article are derived from the Klosterneuberg manuscript, which was unknown to Schneyer, because it is generally superior to the copy in the St. Paul manuscript and, hence, Schneyer's edition. For example, the Klosterneuberg manuscript contains several lengthy passages that are omitted in the St. Paul manuscript, and in each of the three references to 'noster uenerabilis Pecham' the St. Paul manuscript and Schneyer's edition have 'uere' instead of 'uenerabilis', as found in the Klosterneuberg manuscript. I am currently preparing a critical edition of 'Ecce' that will be included in a collection of all eighteen sermons delivered by English preachers at Constance. The entire text of Pecham's office for Trinity Sunday has been edited by W. Lampen in 'Jean Pecham, O.F.M. et son Office de la Trinité', *La France Franciscaine* 11 (1928), 223-9; these two antiphons are found on p. 223. They are also printed in G.M. Dreves, *Historiae Rhythmicae. Liturgische Reimofficien 1, Analecta hymnica medii aeui* 5 (Leipzig, 1889), 19; and idem, *Lateinische Hymnendichter des Mittelalters 2, Analecta hymnica medii aeui* 50 (Leipzig, 1907), 593.
12. Klosterneuberg CCl 640, f. 82ra-b; cf. Schneyer, 'Texte', p. 223; and St. Paul MS 30/4, f. 147r. Pecham's homily *De trinitate* is known to survive in only two manuscripts: London, British Library MS Royal 10 B.IX, ff. 61v-63v; and Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek C636, ff. 78r-84r. For this passage, see London, Royal 10 B.IX, f. 61v (ll. 28-35); and Uppsala C636, f. 78v-79r (ll. 15-23, 1-3).
13. Klosterneuberg CCl 640, f. 82rb-82va; cf. Schneyer, 'Texte', p. 224; and St. Paul 30/4, f. 147r-v. For these antiphons, see Lampen, 'Pecham', 223, and Dreves, *Historiae*, 19.
14. Klosterneuberg CCl 640, f. 83ra; cf. Schneyer, 'Texte', p. 226; and St. Paul 30/4, f. 148v. Schneyer assumed that this was a reference to Anselm of Canterbury, citing one of that author's *orationes* in the *Opera omnia* published in Venice, 1744, tome 1, p. 359. But this text is not found in that source and it is worth noting that elsewhere in this sermon Fleming refers only to Pecham, not Anselm, as *Cantuariensis*. For this responsory, see Lampen, 'Pecham', 227, and Dreves, *Historiae*, 21.
15. Klosterneuberg CCl 640, f. 83va; cf. Schneyer, "Konzilspredigten" (1971), p. 227; and St. Paul 30/4, f. 149r. For this passage from Pecham's homily, see London, Royal 10 B.IX, f. 61v (ll. 45-8); and Uppsala C636, f. 79r (ll. 15-19).

16. Klosterneuberg CCl 640, f. 84va; cf. Schneyer, 'Texte', 231; and St. Paul 30/4, f. 151r. For this quotation, see Lampen, 'Pecham', 224, and Dreves, *Hymnendichter*, p. 595. Lampen designates it as *Hymnus 1. ad Matutinum*, while Dreves cites it as the first antiphon for first Nocturn.
17. Finke, *Acta 2*, p. 377. Finke also notes the importance of John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* in this regard.
18. Paul Arendt, *Die Predigten des Konstanzer Konzils. Ein Beitrag zur Predigt- und Kirchengeschichte des ausgehenden Mittelalters* (Freiburg im Briesgau: Herder & Co., 1933), p. 79.
19. Nighman, 'Reform', pp. 68–69, 135 (n. 80).
20. C.W.F. Walch, *Monimenta medii aevi* fasc. 2 (Gottingen, 1758), 183–205 at pp. 190, 192. See the online transcription of this text on the Electronic Resources for the Council of Constance website: <http://www.councilofconstance.com>.
21. Finke, *Acta 2*, 486-8. Finke cites the preacher as "Gylbertus doctor Anglicus" following the rubric in the sole manuscript copy he knew (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS theol. fol. 413 (632), ff. 5r-15v). He inferred the date as 21 February 1417 on the basis of the liturgical feast (Dominica in quinquagesima) and some unknown internal evidence that suggested that particular year. However, I have found a second copy of this sermon in Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellonska, MS 1596, ff. 194vb-200vb; the rubric for this copy ascribes it to Robertus Gilbertus, doctor Oxoniensis and dates the sermon to Dominica in quinquagesima 1415 (10 February).
22. Krakow, B.J. MS 1596, ff. 7v, 10v.
23. Margaret Harvey has determined from internal evidence that 'Tristicia' was almost certainly preached by an Englishman; see her unpublished doctoral thesis: 'English Views on the Reforms to be Undertaken in the General Councils (1400-1418), with Special Reference to the Proposals Made by Richard Ullerston', Oxford University, 1964, p. 180. This theory has been confirmed by my discovery of the rubric to this sermon in the sole manuscript copy, apparently overlooked by Finke, which attributes it to an English theologian named John Luke. Phillip Stump and I are currently collaborating on an article that examines the reform proposals in this sermon in the context of the reform committee deliberations and the eventual settlement of the English concordat with Martin V.
24. Koblenz, Landeshauptarchiv, Best. 701, Nr. 192, ff. 111r-118v, at f. 116v.
25. Schneyer, 'Texte', 175-221. This anonymous Advent sermon was tentatively attributed to Fleming by Schneyer, who discovered 'Tu es' in the same St. Paul manuscript that contains one of the two known copies of 'Ecce'. Schneyer had little doubt that it is of English authorship; this is indicated not only by the many quotations from Grosseteste, but also by the preacher's report that he found a book by Athanasius 'in armario copiosissimo conuentus Oxoniae' (p. 181). 'Tu es'

contains the only other reference to John Pecham (p. 215) that I have found in English sermons from this council, and he is cited without any terms of praise or the possessive ‘noster’.

26. In his recent survey of Grosseteste’s reputation among English writers, James McEvoy notes that the English preachers at Constance referred to him as ‘Lincolniensis noster’. Dr. McEvoy communicated with me in preparing that essay, as is duly acknowledged therein. I suspect that in our correspondence I may have carelessly used this phrase, giving McEvoy the mistaken impression that Grosseteste was actually cited as ‘noster’ by the English preachers at this council. See J. McEvoy, ‘*Robertus Grossatesta Lincolniensis, an Essay in Historiography, Medieval and Modern*,’ in *Robert Grosseteste and the Beginnings of a British Theological Tradition*, M. O’Carroll ed., Bibliotheca Serphico-Capuccina 69 (Rome, 2003), 21-99, at pp. 58-66 at p. 66.

27. I have found no mention of Grosseteste or Pecham in the following Constance sermons that are attributed to known English preachers at this council (‘Videns civitatem flevit super illam’ by John Wells; ‘Unum corpus sumus in Christo’ by Geoffrey Schall; ‘Erunt signa in sole et in luna’, ‘Almificencie tue in summo’, and ‘Tempus est ut iudicium’ by Robert Hallum; and ‘Accipiant qui uocati sunt’, ‘Quod mortuus est’, ‘Spiritus erit in gloria’, and ‘Absorpta est mors in uictoria’ by Richard Fleming), as well as several anonymous ones that were very likely preached by Englishmen at Constance (‘Nunc abscondita sunt oculis tuis’, ‘Confortamini in Domino’, and ‘Pax uobis’). For the manuscripts, see the entries for these sermons in Nighman and Stump, ‘Register’.

28. L.R. Loomis (trans.), *The Council of Constance: the Unification of the Church* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1961). In describing the feast of St. Thomas in 1415 Richental notes that the English celebrated it ‘splendidly...with great humns of honor, great pomp, all the relics in Constance, and tall burning candles. And all day long, at Matins, Primes, Tierce, Sext, Nones, Vespers and Compline, trumpeters rode about the city, with their King’s arms on their trumpets and blew on them continually’ (p. 138). In recounted the celebrations held one year later, Richental again notes the English trumpeters with their royal insignia and comments on the beautiful singing of Vespers and also ‘sweet English hymns on the organ’, the Mass conducted by the Bishop of Salisbury assisted by two other bishops, at which ‘all the clergy were present’. The day concluded with a banquet to which the English invited the ‘patriarchs,... bishops and scholars’ (pp. 146-7).

29. M. Schuler, ‘Die Musik in Konstanz während des Konzils 1414-1418’, *Acta Musicologica* 38, fasc. 2/4 (1966), 150–68, at pp. 157-8.

30. C.L. Nighman, “Another Look at the English Staging of an Epiphany Play at the Council of Constance,” *Records of Early English Drama* 22.2 (1997), 11-18, at pp. 12, 16-17 (note 10).

31. See Richard Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Brepols, 1997), p. 294.

32. Lampen, ‘Pecham’, 222; Dreves, *Historiae*, pp. 21-2; idem, *Hymnendichter*, pp. 594-7.

33. L.R. Loomis, 'Nationality at the Council of Constance', *American Historical Review*, 44 (1939), 508-27; C.M.D. Crowder, *Unity, Heresy and Reform (1378-1460): The Conciliar Response to the Great Schism* (New York, 1977), 110-26; J.-P. Genet, 'English Nationalism: Thomas Polton at the Council of Constance', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 28 (1984), 60-78.

34. Loomis, 'Nationality', p. 523.

35. In the prothema of 'Quod mortuus est', his eulogy for William Corff, Fleming makes explicit reference to the English practice of numbering Sundays following Trinity Sunday, rather than Pentecost, where he notes that his theme for the present sermon is 'contained in the Sunday epistle of the present week, at least according to us [English] who refer to the Sunday on the octave of the Trinity as the first.' ('...contenta in epistola dominicali presentis ebdomade, saltem secundum nos qui primam dominicam facimus in octava Trinitatis'); see Nighman, 'Reform', p. 381, ll. 6-8.

36. F.H. Dickinson (ed.), *Missale ad usum insignis et praeclarae ecclesiae Sarum* (London 1861-83), p. 451.

37. See Nighman, 'Another Look', p. 12, where I argue that the luxurious gold and silver plate used for the banquet, as well as the properties and perhaps also the players for this Epiphany play, were brought to Constance by Bishop Richard Clifford of London, who arrived on 7 October 1417, rather than the group led by Wakering and Catterick.

38. Schneyer, 'Texte', 222.