

TEXTKRITISCHE UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZU MORE'S "GESCHICHTE RICHARD'S III."

Literatur-Verzeichnis.

- Historia Richardi Regis Angliae ejus Nominis Tertii, per Thomam Morum, Londinensis Civitatis jam tum Vice-Comitem Conscripta, circiter Annum 1513. Francofurti ad Moenum, Ex Officina Genschiana Anno 1689.
- More's History of King Richard III. ed. with Notes, Glossary and Index of Names by J. Rawson Lumby. Cambridge at the University Press. 1883.
- Hardyng's Chronicle, Neudruck von Ellis, Lond. 1809.
- Hall's Chronicle, Neudruck von Ellis, Lond. 1809.
- Grafton's Chronicle, Neudruck von Sir Henry Ellis, Lond. 1809.
- Sir John Harington, Metamorphosis of Ajax, Lond. 1596.
- Sir George Buck, History of the life and reigne of Richard the Third, bd. III.
- Pauli, Geschichte Englands, Gotha 1858, bd. V.
- Bridgett, Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More, Lond. 1891.
- Roger Ascham, Works ed. Giles, bd. III.
- Wülker, Engl. Lit.-Gesch., II. Aufl. Leipz. 1906, bd. II.
- Ten Brink, Engl. Lit.-Gesch., 1893, bd. II.
- Garnett, English Literature, Lond. 1903, bd. I.
- Dictionary of National Biography, bd. 38 u. 39.
- James Gairdner, Richard III. in Notes & Queries, 2nd ser. I. Lond. 1856.
- J. Gairdner, Letters & Papers Illustrative the Reigns of Richard III. and Henry VII. Bd. I Lond. 1861, bd. II Lond. 1863.
- J. Gairdner, Did Henry VII. murder the princes? in 'The English Historical Review', bd. 8. Lond. 1891.
- J. Gairdner, Life and Reign of Rich. III. Lond. 1878.
- Clements R. Markham, Richard III. in 'The English Historical Review' bd. 8. Lond. 1891.
- C. R. Markham, Richard III.: His Life and Character Reviewed in the light of recent research. Lond. 1906.

Mit Thomas More's "Geschichte Richard's III" setzt eine neue richtung in der englischen geschichtsschreibung ein. Gewöhnlich mit dem weltanfang beginnend und meist bei der beschreibung der älteren, für sie weiter zurückliegenden zeit Beda folgend, vielfach auch aus ihrer eigenen phantasie noch manches hinzufügend, werden die verfasser der älteren vers- und reimchroniken erst bei der schilderung der ungefähr zeitgenössischen zeit einigermaßen zuverlässig: aber auch da, wo ihre angaben den tatsachen entsprechen, ist ihre geschichtsschreibung nichts anderes als ein bloßes aneinanderreihen der beschreibung einzelner ereignisse. Auch als der aufschwung der englischen prosa in der zweiten hälfte des 15. jahrhunderts der englischen geschichtsschreibung zugute kam und man sich dabei fast ausschlieflich der prosa bediente, blieb der charakter der chroniken derselbe: ein aufzählen geschichtlicher ereignisse.

In Thomas More tritt uns nun ein mann entgegen, der vollständig mit dieser bisher üblichen art der geschichtsschreibung bricht, der, wenn auch noch nicht ganz frei von dem zuge der zeit, als erster versucht, in modernem sinn geschichte zu schreiben: "wir haben es hier zum ersten mal mit wirklich pragmatischer geschichtsschreibung zu tun, die die folgen mit den ursachen verknüpft, die die ereignisse sich aus den zeitverhältnissen und dem charakter der hauptpersonen einer periode entwickeln läßt".

(Wülker, Engl. Lit.-Gesch. 1906, II, 234.)

Ten Brink urteilt in seiner Engl. Lit.-Gesch. (1893, II, 506), nachdem er vorher von der lateinischen rezension gesprochen hat, folgendermaßen:

„Die englische bearbeitung verdient das lob, welches der bedeutendste prosaiker der nächsten generation ihr gespendet hat:

"Sir Thomas More, in that pamphlet of Richard the Third, doth in most part, I believe, of all these points so content all men, as, if the rest of our story of England were so done, we might well compare with France, or Italy, or Germany, in that behalf."

(Roger Ascham, Works, ed. Giles, III, 6.)

„Die englische prosa“, fährt Ten Brink fort, „macht hier einen energischen anlauf zu künstlerischer gestaltung. Zeigt sie auch in manchen stücken noch etwas altfränkischen charakter, so erhebt sie sich durch gewählten, prägnanten ausdruck, durch sorgfältigeren satzbau, durch wirksame und nicht zu häufige anwendung der antithese und anderer stil-mittel weit über das niveau der alltäglichen rede, ohne gleichwohl irgendwie in künstelei zu verfallen. Sie erscheint das geeignete werkzeug einer geschichtsschreibung, welche der zusammenhang der begebenheiten energischer zu fassen und insbesondere die inneren triebfedern der handelnden personen zu lebendiger anschauung zu bringen bemüht ist. Das charakterbild des dämonischen usurpators ist in scharfen linien, die sich dem gedächtnis einprägen gezeichnet; aber auch das reiche detail der erzählung und die nach einfachen gesichtspunkten, jedoch glücklich getroffene gliederung des stoffes verdient anerkennung. Die vielfach ventilierte und in verschiedenstem sinne beantwortete frage nach der glaubwürdigkeit der darstellung soll uns hier nicht näher beschäftigen. Wie es scheint, hat eine Richard III. sehr feindselige tradition, die wohl auf den kardinal Morton zurückgehen könnte, dem historischen kern manche romantische ausschmückung umgehängt, und andererseits aber auch manche glaubwürdige und sonst nicht überlieferte nachricht aufbewahrt.“

More's unvollendet gebliebene „Geschichte Richard's III.“ erschien zuerst in Grafton'schen Compilationen in Grafton's fortsetzung von Hardyng's Chronik 1543 und von Hall's Chronik 1548. Im jahre 1557 druckte More's neffe Rastell das bruchstück von neuem unter folgendem titel:

“The history of King Richard the thirde (unfinished) writen by Master Thomas More than one of the undersheriffis of London: about the yeare of our Lorde. 1513. Which worke hath bene before this tyme printed, in hardynges Cronicle, and in Hallys Cronicle: but very mucche corrupte in many places, sometyme hauyng lesse, and sometime hauing more, and altered in wordes and whole sentences: mucche varying fro the copie of his own hand, by which thys is printed.”

Eine lateinische version erschien in der zweiten ausgabe von More's lat. werken, Löwen 1566.

Ein von More selbst stammendes zeugnis, in dem er sich selbst als den verfasser einer der beiden rezensionen, entweder der lateinischen oder der englischen, bezeichnet, besitzen wir nicht. Infolgedessen gehen die ansichten über die urheberschaft des bruchstückes weit auseinander.

Bei Sir John Harington (1561—1612) findet sich in seinen "Metamorphosis of Aiax" (1596) folgende angabe:

"Lastly the best, and best written part of al our Chronicles, in al men's opinions, is that of Richard the Thirde, written as I have heard by Morton, but as I most suppose, by that worthy and incorrupt magistrate, sir Thomas More, sometimes lorde chancelor of Englande."

In seiner "History of the life and reigne of Richard the Third" (III, 75) schreibt Sir George Buck (gest. 1633), dafs "doctor Morton (who succeeded Bouchier in the see of Canterbury) wrote a booke in Latine against king Richard, which came afterward to the hands of Mr. More, sometime his servant."

und fügt hinzu:

"This booke was lately in the hands of Mr. Roper of Eltham, as sir Thomes Holy, who saw it, told me."

John Ellis (1777—1809) kommt in der vorrede zum neudruck von Hardyng's Chronik (1809, p. 19) zu folgender ansicht:

"For myself, I am inclined to think that the English copy was the work of Morton, for, as Grafton has printed it, one sentence bears internal evidence of an earlier pen than that of sir Thomas More. The writer in detailing the circumstances of king Edward the Fourth's last sickness, says, it "continued longer then false and fantastickall tales untruly and falsely surmised, as I myself that wrote this pamphlet truly knew". Now, at the time of king Edward the Fourth's death, sir Thomas More could have been scarcely three years old. The colours of eloquence also are so richly spread over the whole tract, that it has no appearance of having been translated from another language. Morton, who was the first patron and friend of More, might possibly have put the Manuscripts into his hands, and the transcript being found by Rastell, among his uncle's papers, we cannot wonder that it should appear among the posthumous works of More. It is singular that the passage quoted should be omitted in

the editions of the reign printed in Hall, Holinshed, Stow and Speed. The notice of Jane Shore's death in the eighteenth year of Henry the Eighth, which occurs in another page [499], and which might be supposed to militate with the idea of Morton being the author, was evidently foisted in by Grafton."

Im Dictionary of National Biography urteilt Sidney Lee bd. 38, 445:

"Between the English and Latin renderings are important differences, and the Latin seems to be the original, of which the English is a paraphrase. The tone is strongly Lancastrian and often implies that the writer was a contemporary witness of some of the events described. This More could not have been, and the theory that Cardinal Morton wrote the work in Latin, which is inferior to More's authentic Latin prose, and that More supplied the English version deserves careful consideration."

In demselben werk schreibt W. A. J. Archbold im 39. bd. pag. 153:

"The 'History of Richard III.' usually ascribed to Sir Thomas More and printed in the collected editions of More's English and Latin works, was probably originally written in Latin by Morton. It is clearly the work of a Lancastrian contemporary of Edward IV. which More was not, and it is assigned to Morton by Sir John Harington and by Sir George Buc. More's connection with the work seems to have been confined to translating it into English and amplifying in the English version."

Bridgett sagt in 'Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More', Lond. 1891, p. 79 folgendes:

"In the year 1513, while More was undersheriff, he managed to find time to compose his 'History of Richard III.', both in English and Latin. It was, however, never completed, nor was it published during More's life . . . Some have doubted whether this work is by More or merely translated by him. The intrinsic evidence is in favour of its being his composition. The English is beautiful, and More paid no less attention to his English prose than to his Latin style. The book is full of pithy sayings. The speeches introduced (though not to be taken as really spoken)

are the work of an orator like More, who had carefully trained himself on ancient models."

Richard Garnett vertritt in seinem werke 'English Literature', Lond. 1903, I, 321 folgende ansicht:

"After the Utopia, the most important work by More, or ascribed to him, is the unfinished 'Life of King Richard the Third'. A Latin version of this work exists, and it has been questioned which is the original. It is also the question, whether, on the strength of an old tradition or some appearance of the book's proceeding from an eye-witness, it should not be attributed to Cardinal Morton, in which case More could only be the translator. This view appears to us highly probable, for the following reasons: It is unlikely that More should have left so brief a work unfinished, which Morton, a busy statesman stricken in years, might well have done. The neatness of the style, which led Hallam to term it the first English classic, is a phenomenon not uncommon in translations from the Latin, when native English exuberance was tamed by imitation of the tersest of tongues. Camden's Elizabeth is a conspicuous instance. If so, it is more probable that More would render another man's work than his own. The extremely favorable view of Edward the Fourth's character would scarcely have been taken by More, but would be inevitable to Morton, who must have written when Edward's daughter was Queen of England."

Ten Brink nimmt in seiner Engl. Lit.-Gesch. (1893) II, 506 folgenden standpunkt ein:

„Leider schwebt über den umständen, unter denen diese schrift entstanden ist, ein dichtes dunkel, dessen aufhellung vielleicht niemals gelingen wird. Die in der zweiten auf-lage von More's lat. werken (Löwen 1566, p. 44 ff.) zuerst abgedruckte lateinische rezension kann wegen ihrer mangelhaften form nicht wohl aus der feder jenes feingebildeten humanisten geflossen sein. Sie liegt aber nachweislich der englischen darstellung zu grunde, sodaß More nur das verdienst zu gebühren scheint, die arbeit eines unbekannten, aber ungefähr gleichaltrigen zeitgenossen in die muttersprache übertragen und an einzelnen stellen ergänzt zu haben, eine annahme, die wiederum ihre inneren schwierigkeiten hat.“

Einer ähnlichen meinung ist Pauli. Er schreibt in seiner 'Geschichte Englands', Gotha 1858, V, 697:

„Sir Thomas More, der unter Heinrich VIII. so berühmte kanzler und märtyrer für den alten glauben, hat eine geschichte Edward's V. und Richard's III. geschrieben, über deren ursprung und glaubwürdigkeit man niemals völlig ins reine kommen wird. Die unter More's werken in der regel abgedruckte lateinische rezension ist in so holpriger sprache geschrieben und so voll lücken, daß schon im jahre 1596 die vermutung ausgesprochen wurde, sie könne unmöglich das werk des klassisch feingebildeten freundes des Erasmus sein. Wahrscheinlich gehört sie noch dem kardinal Morton an, bei dem More in jungen jahren viel verkehrte, und dem er seine stark lancastrische vorliebe verdankte.“

Es würde zu weit führen, alle urteile der für oder gegen die verfasserschaft More's eintretenden geschichtsforscher hier einzeln anführen zu wollen. Es sei nur noch gestattet, etwas ausführlicher die ansichten von James Gairdner und Clements R. Markham wiederzugeben, die sich beide in neuerer zeit mit der erforschung der zeit Richard's III. eingehend beschäftigt haben.

James Gairdner schreibt in Notes & Queries, 2nd ser. I (Lond. 1856) p. 105 ff.:

“But if the original work was not More's there can be no doubt whose it really was. The old opinion that it was Morton's, as Sir John Harington had heard, and Buck confidently believed, bears every mark of probability. Cardinal Morton might very well have written the Latin History. His politics and his prejudices fit the word exactly. The historian is an evident Lancastrian, but a friend to Edward IV.; he is also bitterly opposed to Richard III., and an evident adherent to the Woodville party. All this was Cardinal Morton; and the reason why his Ms. should have got into More's custody is not far to seek; for More, it is well known, was, when a young man, a member of the cardinal's household.”

Noch im I. bd. (Preface XVIII, anm.) von 'Letters & Papers Illustrative the Reigns of Richard III. and Henry VII.' (Lond. 1861) ist Gairdner derselben meinung:

“Sir Thomas More’s History of Richard III. (which there is no reason to believe, is a translation of a work of Morton) . . .”

Doch schon im II. bd. desselben werkes (1863, Preface XVII ff.) kommt er zu anderer ansicht:

“It is true that much curious argument and research have been employed by able writers to bespeak a more charitable judgment of Richard III., but it is easier to cast doubts on a number of separate facts, than to weave anew the web of history. The testimony to Richard’s crimes is scanty; but so is the testimony to every occurrence of the period. His reign, however, is, as a whole, considerably less obscure than that of his successor; for we have not only the contemporary annals of Fabyan and Rous, and the valuable contemporary chonicle of Croyland, but also the more important history of Richard III., by Sir Thomas More. Even this latter, too, is in some respects entitled to rank as a contemporary work; for though, according to the received date of More’s birth, he was only three years old ¹⁾ at the time of Richard’s usurpation, his information was unquestionably derived from very competent witnesses. That his narrative is prejudiced, is true; but it is a fact, which, rightly estimated, by no means diminishes its value. Indeed, the partizanship it displays almost suggests a suspicion that it was not written by More, but by one of an older generation; and Sir John Harington, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, mentions a tradition that it was written by Cardinal Morton. I myself was much inclined to this opinion till very lately, and having given expression to it in the first volume of this book, I think it right to state the reasons which have now led me to think otherwise. The first publication of this history was in the continuation of Hardyng’s Chronicle printed by Grafton in 1543. It was also embodied in Hall’s Chronicle which appeared soon after. But in both of these works great liberties had been taken with the text. Not only had verbal alterations been

¹⁾ Diese angabe verbessert er später in ‘Life and Reign of Richard III.’ (1878) und in seinem artikel in ‘The English Historical Review’ 1891, p. 445 (s. u.).

arbitrarily introduced in both, but in Grafton some of the most interesting passages were mutilated, and in Hall, matter had been freely interpolated from other authors. These corruptions of the text were pointed out by Rastell, who printed the work in 1557 from a copy in More's own handwriting, and added that it was written about the year 1513, when More was undersheriff of London. Now, as Rastell was More's nephew, his testimony on such matter is of the utmost value, and there can be no reasonable doubt that the work, as printed by him, was the composition of More himself. But was this the original of the history of Richard III., or only a translation of a Latin work also attributed to Sir Thomas, which was printed among his Latin writings, at Louvain 1566? Internal evidence hardly enables us to say with confidence in which language the work may have been first written, but the great inferiority in style of the Latin history, when compared with More's ordinary writings in that language, afford a considerable presumption in favour of another authorship. Then the hypothesis that the work was Morton's if we only suppose the preamble to have been written by another hand, has a high degree of internal evidence to support it. The peculiar learnings of Morton are everywhere apparent. The writer is a good hater and a thorough Lancastrian, but he has a high regard for Edward IV., whose worst deeds he seems anxious to palliate by hinting that Richard was at the bottom of them. He almost seems to have been present among the company that gathered round Edward's death-bed: for he reports his dying words, and how he "laid him down on his right side, his face towards them". But the first paragraph of the history was certainly not written by Morton; for it not only mentions King Henry VIII., who succeeded to the throne nine years after Morton's death, but also speaks of "Thomas, Lord Howard", who married one of Edward IV.'s daughters, as "after Earl of Surrey", which title was not given him till the first of February 1514. The question then arises, if the preliminary paragraph was not written by Morton, is it likely that the work itself was? Considering that editors in those days were by no means scrupulously accurate, I should have been inclined to

think that the editor of More's Latin works had himself translated the preamble, as he evidently did the title¹⁾ from the English edition by Rastell; just as Rastell himself (who, however, indicates the fact by marginal notes) has supplied some passages in the English version from the Latin. But a Ms. of this Latin history exists in the Heralds College, which an examination proved to me that this hypothesis was untenable. It is not in More's hand, but is evidently an original draft of the work before the final corrections had been made; and this Ms. contains the preamble.

Thus we are clearly led to two conclusions: first, that the English history was written by More, having been printed by Rastell from a copy in More's own handwriting; and second, that the Latin history, if not also More's work, was certainly not that of Cardinal Morton. But, as it has never been attributed to any one but More or Morton, there appears to be no very sufficient ground for rejecting the voice of tradition which ascribes it to the former. It certainly has not been translated from the English, for occasionally it leaves blank for facts that the English version supplies.

There is, however, still one point bearing on the question of authorship, which I must not omit to notice. In proof that Glo'sters ambition aimed at the crown even during his brother Edward's life, the following anecdote is given in both versions, and vouched for in the Latin by the author's personal recollection: "Howbeit this haue I by credible informacion learned that the selfe nighte in whiche kynge Edward died, one Mystlebrooke longe ere mornynge came in greate haste to the house of one Pottyer, dwellyng in Reddecrosse strete without Crepulgate; and when he was with hastye rappyng quickly letten in, hee shewed vnto Pottyer that kynge Edward was departed.

¹⁾ The Latin title prefixed is "Historia Ricardi Regis Angliae ejus nominis Tertii, per Thomam Morum, Londinensis civitatis jam tum vicecomitem conscripta, annum circiter MDXIII." Vicecomes is generally understood to mean sheriff, but this was not the office More held. In Rastell's title it is "then one of the undersheriffs". I find, however, More himself, in his "Utopia", calls himself vicecomes.

By my trouthe, manne, quod Pottier, then wyll my mayster the Duke of Gloucester bee kynge. What cause hee hadde soo to thynke harde it is to saye, whyther hee, being toward him, anye thyng knewe that hee suche thyng purposed, or otherwyse had anye inkelynge therof: for he was not likelye to speake it of noughte."

To this the Latin history makes the very remarkable addition: "Quem ego sermonem ab eo memini, qui colloquentes audiverat, jam tum patri meo renuntiatum, cum adhuc nulla proditiōis ejus suspicio haberetur."

The author had heard this anecdote reported to his father before any one suspected what Glo'ster was aiming at, that is to say, within a few days or weeks of the death of Edward IV., or at all events before Richard became King. This More could not possibly have remembered, or even understood, if he was born, as is commonly supposed, in 1480; for in that case he was only three years old at Richard's accession. But the date of his birth rests on very uncertain testimony, the earliest authority for it being More's great grandson, who, as Mr. Hunter thinks, 'followed the inscription on the painting of the More family at Burford'. 'We may observe', adds Mr. Hunter, 'that if Lewis has given the inscriptions correctly from the Well Hall picture, or if those inscriptions were themselves correct, Sir Thomas More's birth should be carried back to 1476, for he was 'aged 50' when Ann Cresacre was 'aged 15', and her birth is 'fixed by very decisive evidence to 1511'. If Sir Thomas More was born in 1476, all difficulty in supposing him the author of the Latin history, so far as this anecdote goes, is at an end."

In erwiderng auf Markham's artikel "Richard III" in 'The English Historical Review' 1891, p. 250 ff. schreibt Gairdner *ibid.* p. 445:

"But why is this treatise to be attributed so decidedly to Morton and not to More? The information, no doubt, came from Morton in the main, and More must have had it from the Cardinal himself when he was a young lad in his household. But the reasons against More's authorship are not at all satisfactory. That the author was present

beside the deathbed of Edward IV. is a very questionable statement founded on a passage which seems to be an interpolation in the narrative when it was first published in the continuation of Hardyng's Chronicle. In fact, the passage is almost proved to be by another hand, seeing that it does not appear in the genuine text printed by Rastell from a Ms. in More's own handwriting. Mr. Markham, however, says that 'More was then a baby in arms, if indeed he was born'. It is indeed true, according to the date at one time universally assigned to his birth, that More was three years old at the death of Edward IV.; but it is now distinctly ascertained that he was born in Feb. 1478 and that he was therefore over five years old at the date in question. Of course I do not mean to insinuate that a child of five years old, having no connexion with the Court, was at all likely to have been present at the deathbed of Edward IV.; for the passage, as I have said, is not a genuine part of the original treatise. But More's true age at the time does happen to be important with reference to another point in the narrative. For the history in question was written both in Latin and English, and if the one version was a translation of the other, it is hard to say which is the original, for they have very much the appearance of proceeding from the same pen. Yet perhaps something might be said in favour of the theory that the Latin was by Morton and that More translated it into English, but that the Latin, as we have it at all events, bears quite as distinct evidence as the other of having been written in Henry VIII.'s time, long after Morton's death. Yet among the very few points contained in the Latin history which are not in the English is a remarkable statement that the author remembered a conversation in which a servant of the duke of Gloucester, just after king Edward's death, told his father that the duke would assuredly be king. That a child only three years of age could have remembered such a conversation is of course incredible; but a boy of five who observed the deep impression it made upon his father might have remembered it quite well."

Sir Clements R. Markham ist sowohl in dem oben erwähnten artikel als auch in seinem 1906 in London erschie-

nenen werke 'Richard III: His Life and Character Reviewed in the light of recent research' p. 168 folgender ansicht:

"By far the most important of the original authorities, and the one on which all subsequent history has been based is Archbishop Morton. His narrative is contained in the 'History of Rich. III.' erroneously attributed to Sir Thomas More, who was in Morton's household when a boy. This work first appeared . . . Fourteen years after its publication another and somewhat different version was brought out by Rastell in 1557. Rastell was related to Sir Thomas More, and he alleged that this version was taken from a manuscript written in More's handwriting about 1513. A Latin version written long before its publication, was printed at Louvain in 1566 with various additions to the imaginary speeches, and an address to Henry VIII. and the Earl of Surrey. Sir George Buck and Sir John Harington¹⁾ had heard that the work was written by Morton. The Latin version could not have been, for it is addressed to Henry VIII., and Morton died in 1500. The history, as we have it, contains long speeches and dialogues which must have been fabricated by the writer. The narrative from the death of Edward IV. to the accession of Richard was certainly written or dictated by Morton, for no one else could have been cognizant of some of the facts. The title given by the publisher is misleading. It is not a 'history of Richard III.', but a very detailed narrative of the events from his brothers death to his own accession, covering a period of less than three months. It ends abruptly at a point just before the date of Morton's flight from England. His personal knowledge ceased with his departure, and here the story suddenly comes to an end. He was evidently acquainted personally with every detail and he possessed an exceptionally accurate

¹⁾ Mr. Gairdner has suggested that the book attributed to More is a translation of one written in Latin by Morton.*) (See Letters & Papers etc.) It is really the English version that was dictated or inspired by Morton.

*) Markham scheinen die ausführungen Gairdners im zweiten bd. von Letters & Papers und in dem artikel in 'The English Historical Review', in denen er seine im ersten bd. von Letters & Papers geäußerte ansicht widerruft, völlig entgangen zu sein.

memory. The errors and alterations of dates in the narrative must consequently have been made intentionally and with an object. The story of the murder of the young princes at the end of the book cannot have been written by Morton, for it alludes to events which happened after Oct. 12, 1500, the date of the prelate's death. The outline of the story of the murder was no doubt inspired, as Lord Bacon shrewdly suspected, by Henry VIII. himself. Rastell assumed that the English version of this 'History of Richard III.' was composed by Sir Thomas More, because a copy in his handwriting was found among his papers. The previous publication by Grafton proves that there were other copies abroad, differing slightly from each other, and there is no reason for assuming that the copy in More's handwriting was the original. Indeed there is evidence that it was not. Grafton's version contains a good deal at the end, which is not in the narrative attributed to More by Rastell. The latter ends abruptly as if the whole had not been copied. More merely made an unfinished copy. The respect with which this production had been treated is due to Sir Thomas More's reputed authorship, and to this is to be attributed its comparative freedom from criticism. It is in reality an unscrupulous party pamphlet, and its authorship ought not to affect its character. Yet the reply to any objection to statements contained in it has hitherto been that it was written by the good and virtuous Sir Thomas More, and therefore must be true.¹⁾

Internal evidence makes it certain that More did not write it. The author speaks of the deathbed of Edward IV. as an eyewitness. More was then only five years of age. He was born in Feb. 1478. This seems conclusive. Sir Thomas made an incomplete copy, when a young man, of a work which was attracting a good deal of attention, and of which there were other copies in circulation. The date of the copy is said by Rastell to be 1513, when More's age was about thirty-five. The actual compiler of the book as

¹⁾ See for instance Sharon Turner (III, 462), who claims unquestioning belief in this scurrilous production, because 'all confess More's ability and integrity'. See also Jesse (p. 156 n and p. 500).

we have it, is unknown. But the information and the inspiration of the whole work with the exception of the story of the murder of the young princes at the end, is undoubtedly from Archbishop Morton. I have, therefore, referred to the work as by Morton, and to the story of the murders, which is clearly not by Morton, as by Rastell's anonymous historian."

Ein kurzer rückblick über die einzelnen ansichten gibt also folgendes bild:

1. Thomas More ist der verfasser der lat. und engl. rezen- sion behaupten Gairdner und Bridgett.

2. Der lat. text ist von Morton nach Buck und Garnett. (Buck: "doctor Morton wrote a booke in Latine against king Richard, which came afterwards to the hands of Mr. More."

Garnett: "More could only be the translator [of a work of Morton]. It is unlikely that More should have left so brief a work unfinished."

Pauli vermutet, dafs die lat. rezen- sion noch dem Cardinal Morton angehört, ebenso

Archbold (im D. of N. B.): "the work was probably originally written in Latin by Morton More's connection with the work seems to have been confined to translating it into English and amplifying in the English version."

Zweifel finden sich bei Harington und Sidney Lee.

Harington: "... Richard the Thirde, written as I have heard by Morton, but as I most suppose by ... Sir Thomas More."

Lee: "the theory that Morton wrote the work in Latin and that More supplied the English version deserves careful consideration."

3. Der lateinische text ist nicht von Morton behauptet Markham:

"The Latin version could not have been written by Morton, for it is addressed to Henry VIII."

(Anm.: Dafs sich bei Rastell der hinweis auf Heinrich VIII. fast wörtlich so findet wie im lateinischen text, übergeht Markham vollständig.)

4. Ten Brink hält die lateinische rezension für das werk eines unbekannten zeitgenossen More's, gibt aber für seine annahme innere schwierigkeiten zu:

„Die lateinische rezension kann wegen ihrer mangelhaften form nicht aus der feder jenes feingebildeten humanisten geflossen sein. More scheint nur das verdienst zu gebühren, die arbeit eines unbekannten, aber ungefähr gleichaltrigen zeitgenossen ins Englische übertragen und an einzelnen stellen ergänzt zu haben, eine annahme, die wiederum ihre inneren schwierigkeiten hat.“

5. Ellis erblickt in Morton den verfasser des englischen textes:

“I am inclined to think that the English copy was the work of Morton.”

6. Markham sieht in dem überlieferten englischen text die überarbeitung eines von Morton stammenden werkes durch einen unbekannten kompilator. Er stellt folgende sätze auf:

“It is really the English version that was dictated or inspired by Morton.”

“The narrative from the death of Edward IV. to the accession of Richard was certainly written by Morton.”

“The story of the murder of the young princes at the end of the book cannot have been written by Morton.”

“The history as we have it contains long speeches and dialogues which must have been fabricated by the writer.”

“The actual compiler of the book, as we have it, is unknown.”

“Sir Thomas More merely made an incomplete copy, when a young man, of a work, which was attracting a good deal of attention, and of which there were other copies in circulation.”

“But the information and the inspiration of the whole work with the exception of the story of the murder of the young princes at the end is undoubtedly from Archbishop Morton.”

Mit ausnahme des in Notes & Queries 2nd ser. I, Lond. 1856, p. 105 ff. erschienenen artikels von James Gairdner, in dem er nur wenige stellen des lateinischen und englischen textes mit-

einander vergleicht, um beispiele für eine bisweilen fast wörtliche übereinstimmung dieser sätze im Lateinischen und Englischen zu geben, geht keine der oben erwähnten arbeiten näher auf das beiderseitige verhältnis der lateinischen und englischen rezension ein.

Was ergibt nun ein genauer vergleich zwischen der lateinischen rezension und den überlieferten englischen texten?

Vorliegender untersuchung ist einerseits der text der besten ausgabe von More's lat. werken zu grunde gelegt, die bei Gensch in Frankfurt a/M. im jahre 1689 erschien, und andererseits der Rastell'sche text von 1557 in dem von dr. Lumby für die Pitt Press Series (Cambridge, 1883) besorgten neudruck. Soweit es angebracht erschien, auch die chroniken von Hardyng und Hall zum vergleich heranzuziehen, sind die betreffenden stellen nach den von John Ellis im jahre 1809 veröffentlichten neudrucken dieser chroniken angeführt worden.

Es würde zu weit über den rahmen der vorliegenden arbeit hinausgehen, in ihr alle einzelheiten und geringeren abweichungen der texte von einander feststellen zu wollen: dies sei vielmehr der späteren veröffentlichung eines paralleldruckes der texte vorbehalten. Es soll hier lediglich der versuch gemacht werden, durch einen vergleich der hauptsächlichsten und interessantesten verschiedenheiten oder auch durch wiedergabe von in beiden rezensionen übereinstimmenden stellen neue gründe und beweismittel zu finden, die für oder gegen die verfasserschaft More's oder eines anderen mannes sprechen.

Zur orientierung: Der lat. text wurde nach spalten gezählt, von denen im druck je zwei zu einer seite vereinigt sind. Die vorangestellten zahlen bezeichnen spalte und zeile der spalte. Die stelle, wo der engl. text entnommen ist, ist nach seiten- und zeilenzahl angegeben.

Beide texte beginnen folgendermaßen:

1, 1: Edvardus Rex, ejus nominis Quartus, actis vitae annis quinquaginta tribus, mensibus septem, diebus sex, qui annum ab regno coepto secundum &

Anglia. N. F. XXI.

1, 1: Kyng Edwarde of that name the fowrth, after that hee hadde lyued fiftie and three yeares, seuen monethes, and sixe dayes, and thereof reygned

vigesimum numeraret, concessit fatis, anno post Christum natum quadringentesimo & octuagesimo tertio supra millesimum, superstitibus masculi sexus liberis duobus, foeminei quatuor: Edvardo videlicet Rege designato, annorum circiter tredecim: Richardo Eboraci Duce, qui biennio minor erat: Elisabetha, quae postea ducentibus fatis Henrici septimi conjux fuit, & Octavi mater, regina forma atque indole egregia: Caecilia, non perinde fortunata ac formosa: & Brigitta, virtutem ejus cujus nominis erat repraesentante, professa & vitam religiosam ducente in monasterio monialium inclusarum apud Bertfordiam: Anna, postea honorifice nupta Thomae, tunc temporis Domino Hawardo, & postea Comiti de Surre: & Catharina, quae sortem subinde variam experta, interdum secundam, saepius adversam, postremo, si haec postrema est, (nam adhuc vivit) pietate, beneficentiaque nepotis Henrici Octavi prosperrimam, ac se plane digniam consecuta est.

(1, 28)

two and twentye yeres, one moneth, and eighte dayes, dyed at Westmynster the nyynth daye of Aprill, the yere of oure redempcion a thowsande foure houndred foure score and three, leauinge muche fayre yssue, that is to witte, Edwarde the Prynce, a thirtene yeare of age: Richarde duke of Yorke, two yeare younger: Elizabeth, whose fortune and grace was after to bee Quene, wife unto kinge Henrie the seuenth, and mother unto the eighth: Cecily not so fortunate as fayre: Brigitte, whiche representynge the vertue of her whose name she bare, professed and obserued a religious life in Dertforde, an house of close Nunnes: Anne, that was after honourablye maryed unto Thomas, than Lorde Hawarde, and after Earle of Surrey. And Kathe-ryne whiche longe tyme tossed in either fortune, sommetime in wealth, ofte in aduersitye, at the laste, if this bee the laste, for yet she lyueth, is by the benignitye of her Nephewe, Kinge Henrye the eighte, in verye prosperous estate, and woorthye her birth and vertue.

(1, 21)

Gleich der anfang gibt also ein beispiel, wie eng sich der englische text hier wie auch an vielen anderen stellen an den lateinischen anschliesst und teilweise dieselbe konstruktion und dieselben wörter herübernimmt; es sei nur kurz hingewiesen

auf *actis vitae*, das mit *after that hee hadde lyued, fortunata*, das mit *fortunate, virtutem ejus cujus nominis erat repraesentante professa & vitam religiosam ducente*, das mit *whiche representynge the vertue of her whose name she bare, professed and obserued a religious life* übertragen wird. In ähnlicher weise, bisweilen den lateinischen text erweiternd, bisweilen kürzer fassend, ist der englische text fast bis zu ende übertragen, und an vielen stellen läßt sich leicht die lateinische vorlage im Englischen an dem satzbau, an den vielfach vorhandenen relativischen anknüpfungen an vorausgehende sätze, an partizipialkonstruktionen, die vielfach wörtlich herübergenommen sind, nachweisen. Und doch kann nicht von einer „übersetzung“ dieses lateinischen vorbilds ins Englische gesprochen werden, denn an anderen stellen zeigen sich auslassungen von sätzen im englischen texte, die für das verständnis der folgenden ereignisse von wichtigkeit sind, und die, obwohl sie im lat. texte vorhanden sind, sich nicht im englischen finden.

Doch zurück zu dem oben gegenübergestellten texte. Die englische rezension gibt die regierungszeit mit 22 jahren, 1 Monat und 8 tagen genauer an und fügt noch hinzu, dafs Edward IV. in Westminster am 9. April 1483 starb. Auffällig ist die bemerkung des lat. textes *superstitibus masculi sexus liberis duobus, foeminei quatuor*, obwohl gleich darauf fünf töchter dem namen nach aufgezählt werden. Es scheint hier im lat. text ein versehen vorzuliegen, ebenso wie an einer späteren stelle (12, 9), wo ebenfalls von nur vier töchtern gesprochen wird. Das Englische verbessert beide male die fehler, im ersten falle, indem es allgemein von *leauinge muche fayre yssue* spricht, im anderen falle, indem es *her doughters* wiedergibt.

Hardyng's und Hall's Chronik weisen hier folgenden text auf (Hard. 472, 15):

“And so with in a fewe dayes thys noble prynce dysceased at Westmynster the .ix. daye of Apryll, in the yere of oure Lorde .M.CCCC.lxxxiii. after that he had reigned .xxii. yeres one moneth and .viii. dayes, & was w̄ great funeral pompe conueyed to Wyndsore, leuyng behynd hym, .ii. sonnes, Edward the prynce, (of whom this story entreateth), a chylde of thirtene yeare of age: Richarde duke

of Yorke, two yeares yonger, then the prince, & fiue doughters", etc. (Es folgt die aufzählung der namen.)

Quae postea ducentibus fatis und regina forma atque indole egregia ist im Englischen zu whose fortune and grace was after to bee Quene verwoben (die chroniken sagen nur (Hard. 472, 21): Elizabeth which, by Goddes grace, was maryed to kyng Henry the .vii. and mother to kyng Hery y̅ eyght.); pietate beneficentiaque ist zu benignitye gekürzt und se plane dignam zu woorthye her birth and vertue erweitert. Beide texte weisen ferner die für die datierung derselben überaus wichtige angabe auf: "Anna, postea honorifice nupta Thomae, tunc temporis Domino Hawardo, & postea Comiti de Surre", und: "Anne, that was after honourablye maryed unto Thomas, than Lord Hawarde, and after Earle of Surrey".

Die Chroniken geben folgenden text Hard. 472, 23: (Cecily not so fortunate as fayre) "fyrst wedded to y̅ vycoūt Welles, after to one Kyne and lyued not in great wealth, Brydget professed her selfe a close nonne of Syon, Anne maryed to lorde Thomas Hauwarde, after Earle of Surrey, and duke of Northfolke, Katheryne etc."

Gairdner bemerkt dazu in *Early Chroniclers of Europe, England*, p. 294: "It [sc. Th. More's History of Rich. III.] is said to have been written in the year 1513, when More was under-sheriff of London. If the statement means that it was completed in that year, we must understand it according to the old computation by which the year 1513 ended on the 24th March of what we should call the year 1514. For in the beginning of the work More speaks of Thomas, Lord Howard, as "afterwards earl of Surrey", who was so created on the 1st February 1514, for his services at Flodden Field."

Beide texte stimmen weiter in folgendem überein: "& Catharina, quae sortem subinde variam experta, interdum secundam, saepius adversam, postremo, si haec postrema est, (nam adhuc vivit) pietate, beneficentiaque nepotis Henrici Octavi prosperimam, ac se plane digniam consecuta est."

Der englische text nimmt auch diese stelle fast wörtlich herüber, bis auf die schon oben angeführten geringen abweichungen.

Es wird also nur von Catharina bemerkt (und zwar von beiden texten): nam adhuc vivit, for yet she lyueth. In dem text der Chroniken findet sich diese angabe nicht (Hard. 472, 26): “Katherine y̅ yōgest doughter was maryed to lorde Willyā Courtney, sonne to y̅ earle of Deuōshire, which lōgtyme tossed (in either fortune, sommetime in wealth) after in aduersite, tyl y̅ benignitee of her nephewe kyng Hērye y̅ .viii. brought her into a sure estate, accordyng to her degre & progeny.”

[Da nach Markham's angabe (Rich. III. 1906, p. 86) Cecily ungefähr 1503, Anna vor 1515, Bridget 1517 und Katherine 1527 starb, so könnte, wenn von der möglichkeit einer späteren interpolation dieser stelle abgesehen wird, die entstehung der texte leicht in ein noch späteres jahr als 1514 (etwa 1517) verlegt werden.]

Grafton, der ja als der kompilator des textes der Chroniken anzusehen ist, scheint also diese bemerkung gestrichen zu haben.

Es bestehen demnach folgende möglichkeiten:

1. Ist der englische text an dieser stelle lediglich aus dem Lateinischen übersetzt, so wären beide texte nicht vor Febr. 1514 unter der regierung Heinrich's VIII. entstanden, oder
2. wäre diese stelle in beide texte später interpoliert worden, oder
3. gingen beide texte auf ein und denselben verfasser, der nach Febr. 1514 geschrieben haben müfste, zurück.

Die erste möglichkeit würde gegen die verfasserschaft Mortons, die zweite für die eines unbekannten kompilators, und die dritte für die eines unbekannten, aber gleichzeitigen autors, bez. für die More's selbst sprechen.

Beide texte fahren folgendermafsen fort:

<p>1, 29: Is, quem dico, Rex quum in palatio obiisset, quod est apud Benedictinorum coenobium, ad Occidentem Solem circiter mille passus Londino distans, magnifico inde funere</p>	<p>1, 22: This noble Prince deceased at his palice of Westminster, and with greate funerall honoure and heaunesse of his people from thence conueyde, was entered at</p>
---	--

delatus est Vindesoram: ibique non sine summo totius populi dolore lachrymisque sepultus est. Quippe qui tam benignus ac facilis fuit, dum pax erat, (nam bello necesse erat partes mutuo esse infestas) ut neque alius quisquam in Anglia regnarit unquam patribus populoque charior: neque is ipse alia vitae parte aequè charius, atque ea quae illi postrema fuit. At eam ipsam tamen charitatem desideriumque ejus invisus parricidae sequentis principatus auctiorem fecit. (etc.).

(1, 42)

Windesor. A Kinge of suche gouernaunce and behaioure in time of peace (for in war eche parte muste needes bee others enemye) that there was neuer anye Prince of this lande, attaynyng the Crowne by battayle, so heartely beloued with the substaunce of the people; nor he hymselfe so specialye in anye parte of his life, as at the time of his death. Whiche fauour and affection yet after his decease, by the crueltie, mischief, and trouble of the tempestious worlde that folowed, highelye towarde hym more increased.

(2. 10)

Die lage von Westminster ist im Lat. genauer angegeben, attaynyng the Crowne by battayle ist eingeschoben und der letzte satz des Lat. ist im Engl. erweitert. In den chroniken fehlt der erste satz This noble Prince etc. bis Windsor an dieser stelle ganz, er wurde schon weiter oben im text verwertet.

Es folgt die beschreibung Eduard's IV:

1, 50: Erat corpore procero, specie vere regia, multum illi animi, nec minus consilii inerat. Adversis rebus imperterritus, prosperis laetus magis quam elatus. Aequus in pace clemensque, in bello acer & ferox. In aggrediendis periculis promptus, nec ultra tamen quam posceret ratio, praeceps. Cujus res bellicas quisquis recte aestimet, is profecto non minus prudentiam ejus admi-

2, 17: He was a goodly parsonage, and very Princely to behold, of hearte couragious, politique in counsaile, in aduersitie nothyng abashed, in prosperitie rather joyfull then prowde, in peace juste and mercifull, in warre sharpe and fyerce, in the fiede bolde and hardye, and nathelesse no farther then wysedome woulde aduenturouse. Whose warres who so well consyder, hee shall

rabitur, sicubi cessit, quam laudabit audaciam, ubi vicit. Os & vultus erat, quem videre velles: corpus amplum, ac magno robore strictis artubus: quanquam liberiore victu corporisque indulgentia paulo tandem habitior est factus; nec tamen aspectu indecorus. Caeterum genio ac libidini ab ineunte statim aetate per omnem vitam (quatenus eum rerum gerendarum ratio non avocabat) admodum debebatur more hominum fere omnium: nam valentibus aegre persueris modum in magna fortunae licentia. (2, 10)

no lesse commende hys wyse-dome where hee voyded, than hys mannehooode where he vainquissed. He was of visage louelye, of bodye myghtie, stronge, and cleane made: howe bee it in his latter dayes, wyth ouer liberall dyet, sommewhat corpulente and boorelye, and nathelesse not vncomelye; hee was of youthe greatlye geuen to fleshlye wantonnesse, from whiche healthe of bodye, in greate prosperitie and fortune, wythoute a specyall grace hardelye refrayneth. (2, 31)

Also auch hier zeigt sich ein enges anlehnen des englischen textes an den lateinischen: Cujus res bellicas quisquis recte aestimet etc. wird mit whose warres whoso well consyder etc. übertragen; os & vultus erat, quem videre velles ist zu he was of visage louelye, und liberiore victu corporisque indulgentia zu wyth ouer liberall dyet gekürzt, habitior ist zu corpulente and boorelye erweitert, ebenso ist der letzte teil von nam valentibus an in rhetorisch erweiterter form wiedergegeben; per omnem vitam, ferner quatenus eum rerum gerendarum ratio non avocabat und more hominum fere omnium fehlen ganz.

In dieser weise setzen beide texte ihre schilderung fort:

2, 10: Id vitium ejus non admodum fuit molestum populo, quod neque unius voluptas viri diffundere se tam late posset, ut omnibus fieret gravis: & ille vel precio quod libuit, emercari solebat, vel precibus eblandiri: nusquam grassatus violentia: flexu praeterea aeta-

2, 31: This faute not greatlye gryeued the people: for neyther could any one mans pleasure stretch and extend to the dyspleasure of verye manye, and was withoute violence, and ouer that in hys latter dayes [b]lessyd and wel lefte. In whych tyme of hys

tis evasit (ut fit) postremis diebus moderatior, in quibus regnum ejus quietissimum, & rerum status florentissimus fuit. Bellum neque aderat ullum, neque ullum imminabat, nisi quod nemo expectabat: quippe externus metus omnis aberat. Domi vulgo quies, & inter purpuratos ab rege conciliata concordia. Regi ipsi omnes non vi, sed sua sponte obediebant, veriusque reverebantur eum quam metuebant. A pecuniis exigendis (quae res una fere mentes Anglorum alienat a principe) jam pridem prorsus destiterat, neque moliebatur quicquam unde nasceretur occasio tributorum, vectigal e Gallia jam olim obtinuerat. Barauco annum ante mortem unum armis potitus fuerat. Hic Rex quanquam per omne tempus imperii tanta comitate fuit in quoslibet, ut nihil illum magis commendaret multitudini, eam tamen progressu temporis (quum plerisque principes diu confirmata potentia vertat in superbiam) multis partibus auctiorem fecit: nempe ea aestate, quae illi postrema fuit, Vindesorae versatus, Praefectum Londini, atque aliquot e Senatoribus accessit ad se; haud alia de causa, quam ut se apud eum venatione oblectarentur. Ibi eos non tam magnifico ac sump-

latter daies thys Realm was in quyet and prosperous estate: no feare of outewarde enemyes, no warre in hande, nor none towarde, but such as no manne looked for; the people towarde the Prince, not in a constrained feare, but in a wyllynge and lounge obedyence: amonge them selfe, the commons in good peace. The Lordes whome he knewe at varyaunce, hymselfe in hys deathe bedde appeased. He hadde lefte all gatherynge of money (which is the onelye thyng that withdraweth the heartes of Englyshmenne fro the Prynce) nor anye thyng intended hee to take in hande, by which hee shoulde bee dryeuen theretoo, for hys tribute oute of Fraunce hee hadde before obtayned. And the yere foregoynge hys deathe hee hadde obtayned Barwycke. And al bee it that all the tyme of hys raygne hee was wyth hys people soo benygne, courtesye, and so familyer, that no parte of hys vertues was more estemed; yet that condicyon in the ende of hys dayes (in which many princes, by a long continued souerainty, decline in to a prowde porte from debonayre behaioure of theyr beginning) meruaylously in him grewe and increased; so farrefoorthe that

tuoso, quam amico & populari apparatu excepit, ferinamque carnem tam affluenter illinc transmisit in urbem, ut haud temere invenias aliud, quod ei aut plurim[a]m¹⁾ aut maiorem benevolentiam conciliaverit apud populum: apud quem res exigua facta comiter magnis beneficiis, praeponderat, ac pro majoris in se amoris argumento ducitur. (1, 49)

¹⁾ gedruckt: plurimum.

in the sommer the laste that euer he sawe, hys hyghenesse beeyng at Wyndesore in huntynge, sente for the Mayre and Aldermenne of London to hym. For none other eraunde, but too haue them hunte and bee mery with hym, where hee made them not so statelye, but so frendely and so familiar chere, and sente venson from thence so frelye into the Citye, that no one thing, in many dayes before, gate hym eyther moe heartes or more heartie fauoure amonge the common people, whiche oftentimes more esteme and take for greater kindenesse a lyttle courtesye, then a greate benefyte. (3, 33)

& ille vel precio quod libuit, emercari solebat, vel precibus eblandiri und jam pridem prorsus fehlen ganz.

Die chroniken weisen nach to the dyspleasure of verye manye folgenden text auf: (Hard. 473, 16:) .. "veraye many, nor a multitude bee greued by a priuate mannes fantasie or voluptuousnesse, whe it was doe wout violēce: and in his latter dayes he left al wild daliaūce & fel to grauitee, so þ he brought his realme into a wealthie & prosperous estate, al feare of outwarde enemies were clerely extinguished, & no warre was in hande," etc. Für Wyndesore setzen die chroniken (Hard. 473, 35): he beyng at the "Haueryng at the Bowre" sente ..

Es wird weiter erzählt, dafs die zuneigung der untertanen zum könig auch für dessen söhne "a meruailouse forteresse and a sure amoure (mirum haud dubie firmamentum fuisset ad principatum)" gewesen wäre,

2, 56: si non eos amicorum | 4, 7: if deuision and discencion
inter se divisio exarmasset, | of their frendes hadde not

atque execrabilis imperandi sitis ad eorum perniciem incitasset illum, qui si aut natura valere quicquam aut fides potuisset, suum corpus hostibus pro ipsorum salute objicere debuisset. Quippe Richardus Glocestriae Dux, natura patruus, nomine tutor, beneficiis devinctus, obstrictus sacramento, ruptis omnibus humanae societatis vinculis, contra jus ac fas hoc egit, ut nepotibus suis orphanis ac sibi creditis, auferre vitam regnumque in se transferre posset. Caeterum quoniam hujus viri facta materiam fere praesentis operis implent, haud abs re fuerit mores ejus describere, quo fiat illustrius, cujusmodi vir ille fuerit, qui tantum animo scelus sustinuit concipere.

Richardus ergo Eboraci Dux, nobilis, factiosus, potens cum Rege de regno non annis hostiliter, sed civili more legibus in Senatu disceptavit. Tantum aut causa aut gratia valuit, quum Rex innocentior esset quam sapientior, ut ex Parlamenti Senatus Consulto, cujus apud Anglos summa at-

vnnarmed them, and lefte them destitu[t]e, and the execrable desire of souerayntee prouoked him to theire destruccion, which yf either kinde or kinde-nesse hadde holden place, muste needes haue bene theire chiefe defence. For Richarde the Duke of Gloucester, by nature theyr vncl, by office theire protectoure, to theire father beholden, to them selfe by othe and allegyaunce bownden, al the bandes broken that binden manne and manne together, withoute anye respecte of Godde or the worlde, vnnaturallye contriued to bereue them, not onelye their dignitie, but also their liues. But forasmuche as this Dukes demeanoure ministreth in effecte all the whole matter whereof this booke shall entreate, it is therefore conueniente, sommewhat to shewe you ere we farther goe, what manne this was, that coulde fynde in his hearte so muche mischief to conceiue.

Richarde Duke of Yorke, a noble manne and a mightie, beganne not by warre, but by lawe, to challenge the crown, puttyng his claime into the parlamente. Where hys cause was eyther for right or fauour so farrefoorth aunounced, that kinge Henrye his bloode (all bee it he hadde a goodlye

que absoluta potestas est, successor Henrico Regi, repudiata ipsius sobole (quanquam egregio principe) designaretur, regnum sibi posterisque suis perpetuum protinus ab Henrici morte auspicaturus. Quam ille non moratus, . . (3, 23)

Prince) vtterlye rejected, the crowne was by authoritye of parliament entaylled vnto the Duke of York and his issue male in remainder immediately after the deathe of Kinge Henrye. But the Duke not enduryng so long to tarye, . . (4, 33)

Beide texte weisen schon an dieser stelle auf den prinzenmord hin. Cum Rex innocentior esset quam sapientior und cujus apud Anglos summa atque absoluta potestas est fehlen ganz. Vorliegende parallele gibt wiederum ein deutliches beispiel, wie sehr der englische text von der lateinischen vorlage abhängig ist. Für But forasmuche as this Dukes demeanoure etc. bis so muche mischiefe to conceiue setzen die chroniken folgenden text: (Hard. 474, 17:) "And fyrste to shewe you that by coniecture he pretended this thing in his brothers life, ye shall vnderstonde for a trueth that the same nyght" etc. und schliessen hieran die botschaft Mistlebrooke's an Pottyer an (Rastell, Lumby's ausg. p. 7). Nach puttyng his claime into the parlamente fügen die chroniken ein (Hard. 468, 12): . . parliamēt holden y̅ .xxx. yere of kyng Henry the .vi., where it ether for right or for fauoure his cause was so set forth and auanced, that the bloodde of the sayd kyng Henry, although he had a goodly sonne, was clerely abiected, and y̅ crowne of the realme by (authoritye of parliament entaylled etc.). —

Von Richard, dem dritten sohn des herzogs von York, wird folgendes erzählt:

3, 52: Richardus hic, de quo praesens sermo instituitur, ingenio atque animi robore utriusque fratrum par: forma probitateque utrique fuit inferior: habitu corporis exiguo, inaequalibus atque informibus membris, extanti dorso, alteroque humero erectior, os inamabile,

5, 25: Richarde the third sonne, of whom we nowe entreate, was in witte and courage egall with either of them, in bodye and prowesse farre vnder them bothe, little of stature, ill fetured of limmes, croke backed, his left shoulder much higher then his right,

torvum, ac plane ejusmodi quale bellicosum in purpuratis ac martium appellari, in aliis aliter, solet. Versipellis, iracundus, invidus, semperque, etiam ante partum, pravus. Quippe quem fama est haud aliter alvo materna eximi, quam obstetricante ferro potuisse, quin Agrippam etiam natum eum pedibusque praelatis exiisse ferunt. Praeterea nec indentatum, sive aliquid astruxit vero, odio natus rumor, si[v]e¹⁾ natura futuri praescia praepostere multa in ejus ortu ostendere voluit, qui multa foret in vita contra naturae fas designaturus. Caeterum bello haud instrenuus Dux est habitus, cui, quam ad pacem, natura fuit accommodatior: saepe victor evasit: subinde etiam victus, quam rem ne aemulorum quidem quisquam ipsius aut inscitiae aut ignaviae unquam tribuit: supra facultates profusus, quae ne deficerent, ex aliis exhaurire cogeatur quod in alios effunderet. His artibus factum ut amicitiam instabilem stabile odium pareret. Consilia sua non aliis unquam credere, quam per quos exequi necesse fuit: at ne iis ipsis quidem aut ante aut amplius quam res urgebat. Personam quam-

¹⁾ gedruckt sine.

hard fauoured of visage, and suche as is in states called warlye, in other menne otherwise, he was malicious, wrathfull, enuious and, from afore his birth, euer frowarde. It is for trouthe reported, that the Duches his mother had muche adoe in her trauaile, and that hee came into the worlde with the feete forwarde, as menne bee borne outwarde, and (as the fame runneth) also not vntothed, wither menne of hatred reporte aboue the trouthe, or elles that nature chaunged her course in hys beginninge, whiche in the course of his lyfe many thinges vnnaturallie comitted. None euill captaine was hee in the warre, as to whiche his disposition was more metely then for peace. Sundrye victories hadde hee, and sometime ouerthrowes, but neuer in defaulte, as for his owne parsone, either of hardinesse or polityke order; free was hee called of dyspence, and sommewhat aboue hys power liberall, with large giftes hee get him vnstedfaste frendeshippe, for whiche hee was fain to pil and spoyle in other places, and get him stedfast hatred. He was close and secrete, a deepe dissimuler, lowlye of counteynaunce, arrogant of heart, outwardly coumpinable

libet induere, gerereque, & tueri gnaviter. Hilarem, severam, gravem, remissam, prout sumere aut ponere suasit commodum. In vultu modestia, in animo fastus, impotens, immanis. Verbis adblandiens hiis, quos intus impense oderat: nec eorum abstinens complexibus quos destinabat occidere. Crudelis atque immitis, haud ob iram semper, sed ambitionis ergo saepius, dum vel augendae fortunae suae, vel firmandae studeret. Quippe amici, inimique aequa ratio fuit, comparati cum commodis, neque cujusquam morte abstinuit unquam, cujus vita videretur consiliis suis obstare. Constans fama est Henricum sextum, dum exutus regno in arce Londinensi captivus asservaretur, ab isto crudeliter adacto sub costas pugione, confossum ac trucidatum idque nec jubente nec opinante rege, qui si maxime decrevisset de medio tollere, quem fortassis e commodo magis ducebat suo vivum in sua potestate habere, alium tamen haud dubie tam dirae carnificinae fuerat praefecturus, quam germanum fratrem. Sunt qui suspicentur istius etiam tecta & callide occultata consilia in fratris Clarentiae Ducis perniciem non defuisse, quamquam resisteret, ac reniteretur aperte. (4, 44)

where he inwardely hated, not letting to kisse whome hee thoughte to kyll; dispitious and cruell, not for euill will alway, but offer for ambicion, and either for the suretie or encrease of his estate. Frende and foo was muche what indifferent, where his aduantage grew, he spared no mans deathe, whose life withstoode his purpose.

He slewe with his owne handes king Henry the sixt, being prisoner in the Tower, as menne constantly saye, and that without commaundement or knoweledge of the king, whiche woulde vndoubtedly, yf he had entended that thinge, haue appointed that boocherly office, to some other then his owne borne brother. Somme wise menne also weene, that his drifte couertly conuayde, lacked not in helping furth his brother Clarence to his death: whiche hee resisted openly, . . (6, 31)

Der englische text sagt, daß seine linke schulter höher war als die rechte, während der lateinische text nur altero hat. Es fehlt im Englischen obstetricante ferro, (die chroniken fügen nach trauayle ein (Hard. 469, 2): \dot{y} she could not be delyuered of hym vncutte), es fehlt ferner der hinweis auf Agrippa, die schilderung des charakters Richards ist bisweilen stark gekürzt, ausgelassen ist außerdem crudeliter adacto sub costas pugione confossum und quem fortassis ex commodo magis ducebat suo vivum in sua potestate habere. Die chroniken setzen nach kyng Henry the sixt hinzu (Hard. 469, 20): He slewe in the towre kyng Henry the .vi. sayng, "Nowe is there no heyre male of kyng Edward the thyrde, but we of the house of Yorke"; whiche murder was done without kynge Edwardes assent, whiche would haue appoynted etc.

Beide texte führen noch mehr gegen Richard erhobene beschuldigungen an, fügen aber schließlicly hinzu:

4, 60: Sed hac de re nihil certe asserere possum, suspiciones duntaxat hominum, conjecturasque secutus, quibus vestigiis ut aliquando venitur ad verum, ita frequenter erratur. Quamquam hoc ipse jam olim fideli relatione comperi, Mistelbrocum quendam protinus Edwarde defuncto ad Potieri domum, qui Richardo familiaris erat, curriculo contendisse, pulsatoque violenter ostio, multo ante lucem, quum & violenta & intempestiva pulsatio magni ac subitarii negotii fidem faceret, propere intromissum regem eadem hora extinctum nunciasset. Ad quam vocem Botierus velut exultabundus: Non est ergo dubium (inquit) quin meus Dominus Glocestriae Dux illico sit fu-

7, 9: But of al this pointie, and whoso diuineth vppon conjectures maye as wel shote to farre as to short. Howbeit this haue I by credible informacion learned, that the selfe nighte in whiche kynge Edwarde died, one Mystlebrooke longe ere mornynge came in greate haste to the house of one Pottyer dwellyng in Reddecrosse strete without Crepulgate, and when he was with hastye rappyng quickly letten in, hee shewed vnto Pottyer that kynge Edwarde was departed. By my trouthe, manne, quod Pottier, then wyll my mayster the Duke of Gloucester bee kynge. What cause hee hadde soo to thynke harde it is to saye, whyther hee,

turus Rex, sive consiliorum
ejus conscius fuerit, sive aliquo
signo rei eventum praesenserit,
(nam temere dictum haud exis-
timo) quem ego sermonem ab
eo memini, qui colloquentes
audiverat, jam tum patri meo
renuntiatum, cum adhuc nulla
proditionis ejus suspicio habe-
retur. Caeterum ut revertar
ad historiam, seu Richardus ..
etc. (5, 19)

being toward him, anye thynge
knewe that hee suche thynge
purposed, or otherwyse had
anye inkelynge thereof: for
hee was not likelye to speake
it of noughte. But nowe to
returne to the course of this
hystorye, were it that the
duke of Gloucestre, .. (7, 26)

Qui Richardo familiaris erat, ferner curriculo und quam
& violentia & intempestiva pulsatio magni subitarii negotii
fidem faceret sind weggelassen, eingeschoben ist dwellyng in
Reddecrosse strete without Crepulgate. Was zeigen aber die
viel wichtigeren auslassungen hoc ipse jam olim und quem ego
sermonem ab es memini, qui colloquentes audiverat, jam tum
patri meo renuntiatum, cum adhuc nulla proditionis ejus
suspicio haberetur? Auffällig ist, dafs der englische text
beide übergeht, trotzdem er hier sich doch ziemlich genau an
die lateinische vorlage anschliesst und auch den folgenden satz
Caeterum ut revertar ad historiam etc. fast wörtlich herüber-
nimmt. Von einer versehentlichen auslassung kann deshalb
wohl nicht die rede sein.

“Howbeit this haue I by credible informacion learned”
sagt der verfasser des englischen textes und fügt hinzu “what
cause hee hadde soo tō thynke harde it is to say”. Dafs er
dies “jam olim” aus glaubwürdiger quelle erfahren hat und
sich erinnert, dafs dies gespräch “jam tum” seinem vater von
einem, der die sprechenden gehört hatte, berichtet worden ist,
verschweigt er. Es ist also anzunehmen, dafs entweder

1. diese stelle des lateinischen textes nicht von demselben
verfasser stammt wie die des englischen, oder
2. der verfasser hätte, wenn man die meinung vertritt, dafs
beide texte aus einer feder geflossen sind bei der um-
arbeitung des lateinischen textes ins Englische, diese
stelle als nicht mehr so genau in der erinnerung
haftend gestrichen.

Obwohl nun More zu jener zeit, von der die vorliegende erzählung berichtet, ungefähr fünf jahre alt war, und die ansicht nicht von der hand zu weisen ist, daß sich der verfasser in späterer zeit noch an vorgänge erinnert habe, die sich ihm in so früher jugend eingeprägt haben, so bleibt es doch immerhin unwahrscheinlich, daß More es unterlassen haben sollte, in den englischen text die bemerkung einzuflechten, daß er sich erinnere, daß diese erzählung ab eo, qui colloquentes audiverat, seinem vater berichtet worden sei. Da auch die Grafton'schen kompilationen in Hardyng's und Hall's Chronik keine übertragung dieser stelle aufweisen, so scheinen auch die anderen, vor dem erscheinen von Rastell's text zirkulierenden versionen eine wiedergabe dieser bemerkung quem ego sermonem etc. nicht gekannt zu haben.

Es beständen also folgende möglichkeiten:

1. entweder sind beide texte nicht von demselben verfasser, und der bearbeiter des englischen textes hat die bemerkung weggelassen, weil er sich nicht auf seinen vater berufen konnte, oder
2. wäre diese bemerkung eine spätere interpolation, oder
3. weisen die englischen rezensionen hier eine lücke auf, wie sie auch noch an vielen anderen stellen zu finden sind, daß sätze mitten im zusammenhang fehlen.

In den beiden ersten fällen würde daher die ansicht vertreten werden können, daß der lateinische text die arbeit eines unbekannten kompilers wäre, der ungefähr zu derselben zeit wie More, oder vielmehr kurz vorher sein werk verfaßt haben mußte, im letzten falle könnte die meinung aufrecht erhalten werden, für beide texte denselben verfasser anzunehmen. Doch bieten sich bei weiterem vergleich nicht noch andere fälle, die bestimmtere schlüsse ermöglichen?

Es folgt eine beschreibung der pläne Richards:

5, 19: Caeterum ut revertar ad historiam, seu Richardus olim secum animo regnum invaserat, seu consilium ex nepotum aetatis opportunitate ceperat, quae res plerumque segnes

7, 25: But nowe to returne to the course of this hystorye, were it that the duke of Gloucester hadde of olde foreminded this conclusion, or was nowe at erste thereunto moued,

etiam & quietos impellit ad facinus, certum est decrevisse eum, vita pueris adempta, regno velut sceleris pretio potiri. Gnarus itaque veterum factionum, quibus inter aulicos laborabatur (quas, quoad ejus erat, tedulo etiam aluerat) regis Edvardi cognatis reginae sanguini & familiae tantam auctoritatem & tantas opes invidentibus, contraque non minus iisdem de rebus invis, eam rem suis consiliis magno putavit adjumento fore, si partium praetextu, velut offensas veteres ulturus, suum occulte negotium ageret, itaque & ignoratione factionis alterius ad alterius perniciem abuteretur. Tum ex ea quae superesset paulatim quos posset commodum in suam sententiam perductis, si quos parum opportunos offenderet, eos per insidias incautos, nec mali quicquam suspicantes opprimeret. Nam hoc illi constabat, si qua evasione consilium ejus efferi contingeret, confestim fore, ut inter dissidentes factiones suo ipsius sanguine foedus sanciretur. Hae dissensiones amicorum, quanquam nonnihil erant ipsi Edvardi molestae, tamen dum erat incolumis, eo negligentius eas habuit, quod utramque partem cognovit frenare se, quum vellet, pro suo arbitratu posse. Caeterum ubi

Anglia. N. F. XXI.

and putte in hope by the occasion of the tender age of the younge Princes his Nephues (as opportunitye and lykelyhoode of spede putteth a manne in courage of that hee neuer intended) certayn is it that hee contriued theyr destruction, with the usurpacion of the regal dignitie vppon hymselfe. And for as muche as hee well wiste and holpe to mayntayn a long continued grudge and hearte brennyng betweene the Quenes kinred and the kinges blood, eyther partye enuying others authoritye, he nowe thought that their deuision shoulde bee (as it was in dede) a fortherlye begynnynge to the pursuite of his intende, and a sure ground for the foundation of al his building yf he might firste, vnder the pretext of reuengynge of olde displeasure, abuse the anger and ygnorance of the tone partie, to the destruccion of the other: and then wyne to his purpose as manye as he coulde: and those that coulde not bee wonne, myght be loste ere they looked therefore. For of one thynge was hee certayne, that if his entente were perceiued, he shold soone haue made peace beetwene the bothe parties, with his owne bloude. Kynge Edward in his life,

postrema egritudine decumbens, vires labascere sensit, & deploratam medicis salutem suam, aetatem liberorum animo reputans, quanquam nihil formidabat minus, quam id quod evenit, prospiciens tamen multa illis mala nasci ex amicorum dissensione posse, quando aetas eorum per se imbecilla atque improvida, consiliis amicorum (quibus fulciri solis poterat) nudaretur, qui dum se discessionem ac discordia disjungerent, partibus & studiis intendi, minus verum quod esset, cernerent, aut curarent: saepeque quo suam quisque factionem in principis gratiam promoveat, placitura magis omnes quam profutura consulerent. Haec, atque hujusmodi suum revolvens, multos e purpuratis accersi jubet, nominatim Marchionem Dorsettum, reginae ex priore marito filium, atque Richardum Hastyngum, virum nobilem, cubicularium suum, qui insignes inter se inimicitias exercuerant: Item alios utriusque factionis, qui tum aut in aula fuerunt, atque aliunde conquiri poterant. Hos ubi Rex adesse vidit, levatus paululum, & suffultus pulvinis, sic uti fertur, allocutus est: (6, 7.)

albeit that this discencion beetwene hys frendes somewhat yrked hym, yet in his good health he sommewhat the lesse regarded it, because hee thought whatsoeuer busines shoulde falle betwene them, hymselfe should alwaye bee hable to rule bothe the partyes. But in his last sicknesse, when hee perceiued his naturall strengthe soo sore enfebled, that hee dyspayred all recouerye, then hee consyderynge the youthe of his chyldren, albeit hee nothyng lesse mistrusted then that that happened, yet well foreseyng that manye harmes myghte growe by theyr debate, whyle the youth of hys children shoulde lacke discrecion of themself and good counsayle of their frendes, of whiche either party shold counsayle for their owne commodity and rather by pleasaunte aduyse too wyne themselfe fauour, then by profitable aduertisemente to do the children good, he called some of them before him that were at variaunce, and in especyall the Lorde Marques Dorsette, the Quenes sonne by her fyrste housebande, and Richarde the Lorde Hastynges, a noble man, than lorde chaumberlayne, agayne whome the Quene specially grudged, for the great fauoure,

the kyng bare hym, and also for that shee thoughte hym secretelye familyer with the kyng in wanton coumpanye. Her kynred also bare hym sore, as well for that the kyng hadde made hym captayne of Calyce (whiche office the Lorde Ryuers, brother to the Quene, claimed of the kinges former promyse) as for diuerse other greate giftes whiche hee receyued, that they loked for. When these lordes with diuerse other of bothe the parties were comme in presence, the kyng liftinge vppe himselfe and vnder sette with pillowes, as it is reported on this wyse sayd vnto them. (9, 12.)

velut seleris pretio, quibus inter aulicos laborabatur, quoad ejus erat, contraque non minus iisdem de rebus inuisis, pro suo arbitrato, quibus fulciri solis poterat, qui dum se discessione & discordia etc. bis aut curarent, haec atque huiusmodi secum revolvens und qui tum aut in aula fuerunt, atque aliunde conquiri poterant fehlen ganz im Englischen; seu consilium ex nepotum aetatis opportunitate ceperat; quae res plerumque segnes etiam & quietos impellit ad facinus, saepeque quo suam quisque factionem in principis gratiam promoveat, placitura magnis omnes quam profutura consulerent ist etwas weiter ausgeführt; as it was in dede, and a sure ground of his building und whatsoever busines shoulde falle betwene them ist eingeschoben, ebenso fügt der englische text verschiedene gründe hinzu, weswegen die königin Hastynges übel wollte. Der lateinische text führt dieselben erst später in anderem zusammenhang an (cf. 30, 55). Es macht sich hier also eine freiere behandlung des lateinischen textes geltend. Ferner ist hinzuweisen auf die in beiden texten sich findende bemerkung: uti fertur, and as it is reported, die gegen die

meinung spricht, dafs der verfasser am sterbebette Eduard's IV. geweilt haben müsse.

Es folgt die rede Eduard's IV. auf dem sterbebett, in der er die vornehmen des reiches auf die nachtheiligen folgen ihres ehrgeizes und ihrer uneinigkeit für das reich, für seine kinder und für sie selbst hinweist.

7, 20: Qui tam improbus ardor gloriae hoc in regno proximis his annis quantum suscitaverit incendii, quantum stragis ediderit, utinam tam facile Deus oblivisci velit, quam nos reminiscimur. Cujus mala si privata mihi tam animo praecogitare licuisset, quam re ipsa postea majore meo dolore, quam voluptate sum expertus, dispeream, si flexis poplitibus exhibitum honorem tam multis hominum capitibus redemissem.

(7, 29)

10, 33: Of which immoderate appetite of woorship, and thereby of debate and dissencion what losse, what sorowe, what trouble hathe within these fewe yeares growen in this realme, I praye Godde as well forgeate as wee well remember. Whiche thinges yf I coulde as well haue foresene, as I haue with my more payne then pleasure proued, by Goddes blessed Ladie (that was euer his othe) I woulde neuer haue won the courtesye of mennes knees, with the losse of soo many heades. (11, 8).

Eduard IV. war verschieden, und nun zog der junge könig Eduard V. von Ludlow in Wales, wo er bis dahin geweilt hatte, nach London zur krönung, in begleitung verschiedener vornehmer aus der partei der königin und einer starken bedeckung. Der herzog von Gloucester, der wohl einsah, dafs er nicht eher seine pläne verwirklichen konnte, als bis er den jungen könig in seiner gewalt hatte, suchte nun mit list seinen zweck zu erreichen.

8, 1: Defuncto rege, filius natu major Londinum, utpote regiam urbem, petere maturat, qui vivo patre, Ludloi vixit in Vallia: nam ea deinceps primogenitis regum, vivis adhuc parentibus propria ditio est, quae quum ab rege prout

12, 6: As sone as the king was departed, the noble prince his sonne drew toward London, which at the time of his decease, kept his houshold at Ludlow in Wales. Which countrey being far of from the law and recourse to justice,

sita esset, eo negligentius habita, in morem prope silvestrem, coepta est efferari improbis hominibus, latrocinii, ac caede licenter impuneque grassantibus. Edvardus filius eo cum imperio missus est, ut praesentis auctoritate principis facinorosorum audacia fraenaretur. Moderator pueritiae datus est Antonius Vodevilus, cognomento Riverus, reginae frater, vir haud facile discernas manune an consilio promptior. Tum adhibiti in consilium alii, ut quisque puero proximus materno genere fuit. Eam rem ab regina curatam, quae suae factionis opes ab teneris statim principis annis firmaret, frustratus tantam ejus spem. Richardus praetextum sibi ad eos evertendos, initiumque ad reliquum inceptum suum conficiendum fecit. Nam quorum in illos odium maxime implacatum novit animosque in se benevolos, eos partim coram alios per epistolam ac nuntios exploratae fidei compellans, admonet rem neutiquam ferendam, principem amisso patre, juvenem ipsis cognatum in custodia & manibus esse agnatorum, ablegatis propemodum ipsis, qui neque minus certa in eum fide, & longe honoratior pars regii generis fuerant, quam sanguis ejus maternus, qui nisi libidini

was begon to be farre oute of good wyll and waxen wild, robbers and riuers walking at libertie vncorrected. And for this encheason the prince was in the life of his father sente thither, to the end that the authoritie of his presence should refrayne euil disposed parsons fro the boldnes of their formar outrages. To the gouernaunce and ordering of this yong prince at his sending thyther, was there appointed sir Antony Woduille Lord Riuers and brother vnto the Quene, a right honourable, man, as valiaunte of hande as politike in counsayle. Adjoynd wer there vnto him other of the same partie, and in effect euery one as he was nerest of kin vnto the Quene, so was planted next about the prince. That drifte by the Quene not vnwisely deuised, whereby her bloode mighte of youth be rooted in the princes fauor, the Duke of Gloucester turned vnto their destruccion, and vpon that grounde set the foundation of all his vnhappy building. For whom soeuer he perceiued either at variance with them, or bearing himself their fauor, hee brake vnto them, some by mouth, som by writing and secret messengers, that it neyther was reason nor in

patris visum aliter esset, per quam erat indignus, qui cum ejus atque ipsorum sanguine misceretur: quos nunc non primos apud regem esse, neque illi honorifice, neque sibi tutum, ut quorum permagni referat, haudquaquam pati aemulorum suorum potentiam, gratia & favoribus adolescere apud principem puerum, natura facilem, aetatis vitio credulum, nec satis callentem delatorum calumnias. Meminisse vos, inquit, opinor, patrem ejus quamquam annis & rerum usu maturum tamen ejus factionis suasu impulsuque quovis circumactum, longe profecto magis, quam aut ex ipsius honore, aut ex usu cujusquam fuerit, praeterquam illorum qui sua ne bona an mala nostra avidius appetierunt, in incerto est. Itaque si non quorundam nostrum gratia magis apud regem, quam ulla cognationis ratio valisset, paulum certe abfuerat, quo minus aliquot nostrum circumventos insidiis oppressissent, tam hercle facile, quam oppresserunt eum qui regis sanguine haud minus prope aberat. Verum faventibus Superis eo periculo defuncti sumus, sic tamen ut vel majus impendeat, si principis affectus patimur quocunque nostris inimicis libebit impelli:

any wise to be suffered, that the yong king, their master and kinsmanne, shoold bee in the handes and custodye of his mothers kinred, sequestred in maner from theyr compani and attendance, of which eueri one ought him as faithful seruice as they, and manye of them far more honorable part of kin then his mothers side; whose blood (quod he) sauing the kinges pleasure, was ful vnmetely to be matched with his; whiche nowe to be as who say remoued from the kyng, and the lesse noble to be left aboute him, is (quod he) neither honorable to hys magestie, nor vnto vs, and also to his grace no surety, to haue the mightiest of his frendes from him, and vnto vs no little jeopardy, to suffer our wel proued euil willers to grow in ouer gret authoritie with the prince in youth, namely which is lighte of beliefe and sone perswaded. Ye remember, I trow, king Edward himself, albeit he was manne of age and of discrecion, yet was he in manye thynges ruled by the bende, more then stode either with his honour, or our profite, or with the commoditie of any manne els, except onely the immoderate aduancement of them selfe. Whiche whither they sorer

quibus haud difficile sit vel ignorantis jussum ad perniciem nostram praetexere, nisi Deus & vestra vigilantia malitiam eorum in ipsos avertat, qua in re non est quod quisquam nostrum negligentius se gerat ob male sartam paulo ante concordiam, quam tametsi simulate inierint, regis potius affectibus sunt obsecuti, quam suis. Neque quenquam nostrum tam vecordem arbitror, ut multum sibi putet confidendum, qui ex inimico veteri amicum recentem se profiteatur, nisi quis forte existimet una hora subito coactam pacem, ac ne toto quidem adhuc mense coalitam, altius eorum pectoribus insedissee, quam tot annis alte actam ac radicatam invidiam.

thirsted after their own weale, or our woe, it wer hard I wene to gesse. And if some folkes frendship had not holden better place with the king, then any respect of kinred, they might peradventure easily haue betrapped and brought to confusion somme of vs ere this. Why not as easily as they haue done some other alreadye, as neere of his royal bloode as we? But our Lord hath wrought his wil, and thanke be to his grace that peril is paste. Howe be it as great is growing, yf wee suffer this yonge kyng in oure enemyes hande, whiche without his wytyng, might abuse the name of his commaundement, to ani of our vndoing, which thyng God and good prouision forbyd. Of which good prouision none of vs hath any thing the lesse nede, for the late made attonement, in whyche the kinges pleasure hadde more place then the parties willes. Nor none of vs I beleue is so vnwyse, ouersone to truste a newe frende made of an olde foe, or to think that an houerly kindnes sodainely contract in one houre, continued yet scant a fortnight, shold be deper settled in their stomackes then a long accustomed malice many yeres rooted.

His atque hujusmodi verbis, literisque homines ex se ardentis vehementius incendit, sed praecipue duos, Edvardum Bukyngamiae Ducem, & Richardum Hastyngum, ambos fama atque opibus celebres: sed Dux natalibus illustrior, alteri, ex munere quod gerebat, multum autoritatis adcreverat, siquidem praefecerat eum rex cubiculo suo, quod est apud Anglos perquam honorificum. Hii qui non tam sibi mutuo bene vellent, quam reginae, parentibus pariter cuperent male, hactenus facile cum Richardo conspirarunt, ut suorum inimicorum praetextu maternos amicos principis amolirentur: ita rebus inter ipsos ad hunc modum compositis, quum illos intellexissent tanta manu regem deducturos, ut nihil in eos auderi tute queat ab inermibus, sin ipsi contra parent copias, ad manus rem venturam, cujus & semper dubius eventus est, & quum ab adversa parte princeps esset, suam, proditiōis nomen ac speciem subituram ingenio eos exarmandos statuunt. Itaque curaverunt, uti per viros idoneos reginae persuaderetur, multum esse periculi in eo consilio, quod depellendi periculi causa inibatur. Nam pacatis rebus, Proceribus reductis in concordiam, animisque om-

With these wordes and writynges and suche other, Duke of Gloucester sone set afyre them that were of themself ethe to kindle, and in especiall twayne, Edward Duke of Bukingham, and Richarde Lorde Hastings and chaumberlayn, both men of honour and great power. The tone by longe succession from his ancestrie, the tother by his office and the kinges fauor. These two, not bearing eche to other so muche loue, as hatred bothe vnto the Quenes parte, in this poynte accorded together wyth the Duke of Gloucester, that they wolde vtterlye amoue fro the kynges companye all his mothers frendes, vnder the name of their enemyes. Upon this concluded, the Duke of Gloucester, vnderstanding that the Lordes whiche at that tyme were aboute the kyng entended to bryng him vppe to his Coronacion, accompanied with suche power of theyr frendes, that it shoulde bee harde for him to brynge his purpose to passe, without the gathering and great assemble of people and in maner of open warre, wherof the ende he wiste was doubtuous, and in which the kyng being on their side, his part should haue the face and name of a rebellion; he secretly

nium intentis ad excipien-
dum regem, ac diademate in-
signiendum, si amici reginae
cogant multitudinem, injectu-
ros haud dubie metum hiis
quibus aliquando simultas cum
illis intercesserat, ne non tan-
tummodo regis causa, cui
nemo discrimen intentet, in-
vadendi: sin congregetur, dis-
cordia. Atque hoc pacto fore,
ut hii vicissim suas cogerent,
copias, deinde velut vim re-
pellerent, illaturos quorum
opes quod illa nosceret, plu-
rimum pollerent: qua ex re
totum regnum in armis ac
tumultu futurum. Tunc ejus
damnum omne, quod & im-
mensum expectabatur, & magna
pars in eos fortasse casura, a
quibus illa maxime vellet
averti. Omnes ei uni atque
amicis ejus acceptum relatu-
ros, utpote quos causarentur pri-
vati odii causa conturbasse
rem publicam, violata per in-
juriam concordia, cujus ma-
ritus ipsius moriens author
sanciendae fuisset. (9, 51.)

therefore, by diuers meanes,
caused the Queene to be per-
swaded and brought in the
mynd, that it neither wer
nede, and also shold be jeo-
pardous, the king to come vp
strong. For where as nowe
euery lorde loued other, and
none other thing studyed vp-
pon, but aboute the Coronacion
and honoure of the king; if
the lordes or her kinred shold
assemble in the kinges name
muche people, thei should
geue the lordes, atwixte whome
and them hadde bene somme-
tyme debate, to feare and
suspecte, leste they shoulde
gather thys people, not for
the kynges sauegarde, whome
no manne enpugned, but for
theyr destruccion, hauyng more
regarde to their olde variaunce,
then their newe attonement.
For whiche cause thei shoulde
assemble on the other partie
muche people agayne for their
defence, whose power she
wyste wel farre stretched.
And thus should all the realme
fall on a rore. And of al the
hurte that therof should ensue,
which was likely not to be
litle, and the most harme there
like to fal wher she lest would,
all the worlde woulde put her
and her kinred in the wyght,
and say that thei had vn-
wyselye, and vntrewlye also,
broken the amitie and peace

that the kyng her husband
so prudentelye made betwene
hys kinne and hers in his
deathbed, and whiche the
other party faithfully ob-
serued. (15, 15.)

utpote regiam urbem, nam ea deinceps primogenitis regum, vivis adhuc parentibus propria ditio est, frustratus tantam ejus spem, nec satis callentem delatorum calumnias, tametsi simulate inierint, ingenio eos exarmandos statuunt und pacatis rebus fehlen ganz; eingeschoben ist so prudentelye (made) betwene hys kinne and hers und and whiche the other party faithfully obserued; ab rege wird zu far from the law and recourse to justice erweitert, ebenso ist weiter ausgeführt ut facinorosorum audacia fenaretur, moderator pueritiae, rem neutiquam ferendam, ablegatis propemodum ipsis, quos nunc non primos apud regem esse etc. bis adolescere apud principem, und sin congregetur, discordia, doch gibt der englische text auch manche stellen der vorstehenden parallele in kürzerer form wieder. Mit ihrer angabe ac ne toto quidem adhuc mense coalitam und continued yet scant a fortnight decken sich beide texte nicht vollständig.

Die chroniken geben den anfang der parallele in kürzerer fassung (Hard. 475, 27): "The younge kyng at the deathe of his father kepte housholde at Ludlowe, for his father had sente him thither for iustice to be doone in the marches of Wales, to the ende that, by the autoritee of his presence, the wylde Welshemenne and euell dysposed personnes shoulde refraine frome their accustomed murthers and outerages. (The gouernaunce of this yong prince) was cōmitted to lorde (Antony Woduile) earle Riuers and lorde Scales brother to the quene, a wise hardye and honourable personage, as valyaunte of hande as pollitick of counsell, and with him were assocypate other of the same partye; and in effecte euery one as he was nere of kinne vnto the quene, so was he planted (next about the prince. That drifte by) the quene semed to bee deuysed whereby her bloodde myghte of ryghte in tender youth bee so planted in the prynces fauoure, that afterwarde it shoulde hardely bee eradicated oute of the same. The duke" .. etc.

Für Edwarde Duke of Buckingham haben die chroniken Henry (D. of B.) und für Richarde Lorde Hastings schreiben sie Wylliam (L. H.).

Es ist ferner darauf hinzuweisen, dafs die chroniken den bisher behandelten stoff in anderer anordnung bringen, als er sich im lateinischen text und in Rastell's Version findet, und erst vom anfang der eben angeführten parallelen ab behält auch der text der chroniken dieselbe reihenfolge der gedanken bei wie der lateinische und Rastell's text.

(Fortsetzung folgt.)

LEIPZIG.

OSCAR HÜBSCHMANN.