

The recipient(s) of Geert Grote's *Letters* 15, 27 and 85

In correspondence with my much regretted colleague Rudolf van Dijk O.Carm., dating back to 2008, Frans Hendrickx showed special interest in three letters written by Geert Grote (1340-1384), founder of the religious reform movement known as the *Devotio moderna*. He was planning, at some time in the future, to analyse these letters in greater detail in connection with his interest in the history of the Carthusian Order. Hendrickx referred to Van Dijk's *Prolegomena*, where the letters in question are accorded the designations 'Epp. 15; 27; 85'.¹ Since he never pursued his proposed investigation, it seems an apt tribute to him to review what has been said about these three letters. All three are pastoral in content, and they have all allegedly been written to a single recipient. In the rubric preceding the first of them, *Ep.* 15, the recipient is called Matthew of Tiel.² Since this identification occurs in different branches of the stemma, it should, at least for this letter, be considered trustworthy. The purpose of this contribution is twofold, first, to try and find out whether there are arguments to support the often encountered claim that this Matthew intended to enter the Carthusian Order, and secondly, in connection with this, to consider whether the two other letters are indeed addressed to the same recipient.

The letters that aroused the interest of Frans Hendrickx have come down to us through different channels. One of these is a group of manuscripts, all from Carthusian monasteries in the 'Prouincia Rheni',³ that transmit a short, but fairly consistent series of letters. It is a further purpose of this contribution to investigate the history and interrelationship of the manuscripts that contain some or all of the letters in the series.

¶ I am immensely grateful to Nigel Palmer, Emeritus Professor of Medieval German, St Edmund Hall, Oxford, who scrupulously corrected an earlier version of this essay, and whose acute observations contributed greatly to its consistency and intelligibility, and likewise most grateful to Kees Schepers for his careful reading of my text, and for his numerous comments and observations.

¹ The three letters are described and analysed briefly in Van Dijk 2003, pp. 491-492 (*Ep.* 15); pp. 507-508 (*Ep.* 27); p. 553 (*Ep.* 85). For Grote's literary output, see Van Dijk 2003, pp. 434-585, description and analysis of each of the letters *ibid.*, pp. 478-563; Grote's life and achievements are described in detail in Épiney-Burgard 1970, as well as in Van Zijl 1963, all with extensive bibliographical references.

² Mulder 1933, the standard edition of most of the surviving letters written by Geert Grote; for *Ep.* 15 see *ibid.*, pp. 50-51, for some elucidation and comment on the text, pp. XXXI-XXXII.

³ Short outlines of the history of these houses can be found in Schlegel - Hogg 2004.

GEERT GROTE

It would seem appropriate to begin by listing the main events in Grote's life very briefly. Geert Grote was born in Deventer as the son of a wealthy and influential cloth merchant. At the age of fifteen, he was sent for further study to the University of Paris, where he was accorded the degree of *magister artium* in 1358. He then spent several years in Paris, before returning, in or around 1366, to his home town. His attempts to secure a career in the Church resulted in his being given a position as a prebend in Aachen (1368) and Utrecht (1371). Traditionally it has been maintained on the authority of his biographers⁴ that he gave up his active life in the world after a grave illness, which led to his conversion to an ascetic and spiritually oriented life, in imitation of Christ and his first followers. Neither the illness nor the conversion can be dated precisely, but it seems most likely that these events occurred in 1374.⁵ In order to interiorize the resolution that underlay his new vocation, Grote spent an unspecified period of time (probably three years) between 1374 and 1379 in Monnikhuizen, the Carthusian monastery near Arnhem, as a paying guest, without taking vows. On the advice of the Carthusians, however, he decided to exchange the secluded life in the charterhouse for a life of preaching in the world, attested from c. 1379 until his death as a victim of the plague on 20 August 1384. In his sermons, as also in his treatises and *consilia*, he called on his contemporaries, apparently with much success, to give up their secular lifestyle and to embark on a more devout life in imitation of Christ and his first followers. In addition, he attempted to improve the moral standards of contemporary clergymen. His efforts in this field basically came down to his opposition to two forms of clerical abuse, 'incontinence' (failure to observe the vow of chastity) and corruption with regard to ecclesiastical property and the fulfilment of positions, an abuse designated as 'simony' in both medieval and modern texts dealing with the subject and which included the widespread custom of requiring payment of an admission fee from prospective residents in religious institutions.⁶ Among the perpetrators of such abuses we can rank superiors in monasteries who turn a blind eye to subordinates who refused to abandon personal property after they had entered a convent. Such residents were referred to as 'proprietary' in medieval sources, and I shall use the term 'proprietaryism' for this offence.⁷

⁴ The main biographies of Grote are R. Dier van Muiden, *Scriptum de magistro Gerardo, domino Florencio, et multis aliis deuotis fratribus*, ed. Dumber 1719, pp. 1-113; Thomas a Kempis, *Vita Gerardi Magni*, ed. Pohl 1922, pp. 31-115; and Petrus Horn, *Vita magistri Gerardi Magni*, ed. Kuehler 1909, pp. 325-370. For an evaluation of the reliability and achievements of these biographers, see Van Dijk 2003, pp. 41-48, Van Zijl 1963, pp. 1-30, and Épiney-Burgard 1970, pp. 3-7.

⁵ Cf. Van Zijl 1963, pp. 81-87, Épiney-Burgard 1970, pp. 37-39 (where 1374 is suggested as the most probable date on p. 38), and Épiney-Burgard 1998, p. 16.

⁶ For Grote's struggle regarding transgressions against the vow of chastity, see now Hofman 2011, pp. 90-150; for his struggle against corrupt practices Hofman 2016, ch. I, pp. 23-49.

⁷ For the question of personal property in relation to the Carthusians, see Gaens 2013, pp. 52-53; 68-77, on the subject more generally Mixson 2009.

It seems very likely that it was Grote's condemnation of incontinence that ultimately led to his downfall, which came about when Floris van Wevelinckhoven (1379-1393), the Bishop of the diocese of Utrecht, issued a decree restricting permission to preach to ordained priests, and taking it away from deacons.⁸ Effectively, Grote, who was a deacon, was forbidden to preach as a result. Hereafter, Grote alternated his preaching activities with periods of study and seclusion. During this period he resided in two rooms in his own house, which was otherwise occupied by single or widowed women.

THE CONTENTS OF *LETTERS* 15, 27 AND 85

To return now to Matthew of Tiel, and the three letters allegedly written to him. Their content is as follows.

In the short letter edited by Mulder as *Ep.* 15, which will comprise some forty lines in the forthcoming edition, Grote exhorts his correspondent to persevere in the new state of monastic life, on which he had just embarked as a novice, for such a life pleases God most of all.⁹ Even if it might appear to him later on that some other vocation could in fact offer the same, or perhaps even greater satisfaction (ll. 1/8), he should nevertheless recognize that the monastic life is superior, and distance himself from all experiences and persons associated with his former way of life in the world (ll. 9/17). He also warns his correspondent that temptations are not over now that he has entered religious life, and that God will undoubtedly put him to the test through periods of boredom during which divine consolation is withdrawn (ll. 18/27). But such suggestions are inspired by the devil, and not only Grote's correspondent, but in fact all novices are tempted by similar hesitations and impulses to return to the world (ll. 27/43).

Ep. 27, critically edited recently,¹⁰ was written as an answer to a correspondent who had shortly before informed Grote that he had taken his monastic vows (ll. 1/3). Grote warns him that this decision does not automatically imply that he has now left behind all impediments and temptations (ll. 3/10). Coming to the point immediately, Grote advises him that he should not be disturbed if he discovers that fellow monks have not renounced personal property. Rather than blaming them for it, he should only concern himself with their misconduct if he is sure that he can induce them to change their ways (ll. 11/27). If, however, he decides to call someone to account, he must first pray for God's assistance, and then carefully prepare his admonition, in order to

⁸ In this connection, see Hofman 2011, pp. 103-116, esp. 109-110.

⁹ This short summary follows the more elaborate account by Van Zijl 1963, pp. 211-213. Reference is made to the added line numbering in the edition by Mulder 1933, pp. 50-51 (*Ep.* 15), in the edition by Rüthing 1966, p. 406 (*Ep.* 85), and for *Ep.* 27 to the line numbering in Hofman 2016.

¹⁰ Hofman 2016, Text 8 (pp. 379-381) and Ch. IX (pp. 165-181).

avoid the culprit feeling insulted (ll. 28/41). Also, he must himself be careful to set aside any concern for personal property at once (ll. 42/47). In a short final section, Grote admonishes his correspondent to stay away from worldly preoccupations and smalltalk, and to be aware that he can only do his best, that life in accordance with a monastic rule is only an attempt at perfection, and that in most circumstances small failures do not really matter (ll. 48/60).

The content of *Ep.* 85 resembles that of *Ep.* 15 rather more closely than *Ep.* 27, though the two letters are not as similar to one another as Rütthing suggested.¹¹ This short letter, comprising merely some twenty lines in the forthcoming edition, was written to a correspondent who had apparently complained about suffering from temptation. Grote advises him to persevere in his trust in God (ll. 1/11), and to be reassured that he will only become truly confirmed in his intentions when he has eventually overcome temptation (ll. 11/19). Although it seems plausible that this correspondent lived in a religious community, nothing in the letter explicitly confirms this supposition beyond doubt.

THE RECIPIENT(S) OF *LETTERS* 15, 27 AND 85

There can be little doubt that Grote addressed *Ep.* 15 to Matthew. The letter survives in eleven manuscripts,¹² and is also known from two others lost in 1870, from which De Ram had published the text some years earlier.¹³ Three manuscripts mention the recipient in the *incipit*; the fact that these manuscripts belong to three different branches in the stemma gives greater weight to the authenticity of the attribution.¹⁴

Ever since Mulder first hesitantly proposed that the recipient of *Ep.* 15 might be identical with the addressee of *Ep.* 16,¹⁵ a letter demonstrably meant for

¹¹ Rütthing 1966, p. 402, with reference to a similar observation, attributed to the Strasbourg librarian Jung, in Acquoy 1857, p. 17.

¹² Listed in Van Dijk 2003, pp. 491-492. See below.

¹³ De Ram 1861, *Ep.* 15 at pp. 91-93.

¹⁴ The following manuscripts mention the name of Grote's correspondent in the *incipits*. *H2* (The Hague, KB, 78 J 55, one of three manuscripts that transmit the 'collected letters'): "ad suum nouicium Mathiam de Tyla"; cf. Van Dijk 2011; Van Dijk 2003, pp. 190-203, with mention of *Ep.* 15 at p. 201 no. 61; for its provenance from the Benedictine abbey of Saint-Jacques in Liège, see Hofman 2016, ch. III.3, pp. 83-89. *E* (Emmerich, Stadtarchiv, 13, or., prov.: Emmerich, Brethren of the Common Life): "magister Gerhardus suo nouicio Mathie de Tyla", cf. Van Dijk 2003, pp. 177-179, with mention of *Ep.* 15 at p. 178 no. 3. A garbled version in *B* (Basel, UB, A X 92, prov.: Basel, Carthusians): "ad nouicium monachum in Tyla"; cf. Van Dijk 2003, pp. 123-125, with mention of *Ep.* 15 at p. 124 no. 5. Regarding these and other manuscripts, see further Table 1 below, with the accompanying comments.

¹⁵ Cf. Mulder 1933, pp. xxxi-xxxii, admittedly with some hesitation: "Epistolae xlii [= *Ep.* 16] alicui tempori adscribendae, nullam aliam rationem inueni, nisi quod missa est "ad nouum monachum" [which is a common *incipit* for *Ep.* 16, cf. *ibid.*, p. 52, and Van Dijk 2003, p. 493]. Quodsi liceret conicere, monachum nouum esse eundem Matthiam de quo in epistolis lxi [= *Ep.* 14] et lvi [= *Ep.* 15]", taken over with much less hesitation by Tiecke 1941, p. 113.

a novice proposing to enter the Carthusian Order,¹⁶ various scholars have maintained with little substantiation that Matthew was hoping to become a Carthusian.¹⁷ Others have given Mulder's suggestion much more credit than he did himself, and simply maintained that Matthew was the recipient of *Ep.* 15 as well as of *Ep.* 16, thereby implicitly endorsing the view that Matthew had a leaning towards the Carthusians.¹⁸ When he published four previously unknown letters by Grote from a manuscript that had as its origin the charterhouse of St Barbara in Cologne, H. Rütting for the first time seriously questioned this *communis opinio*.¹⁹ In this sceptical view he was then followed by Post, Épiney-Burgard and Van Engen, who also take up a cautious position and remain silent regarding the order which Matthew wished to join.²⁰

There is in fact no corroborating evidence at all from Carthusian sources which might confirm the claim that Matthew spent his novitiate in a Carthusian monastery, or ever lived in one, and in particular there is not a scrap of evidence that he ever resided in the charterhouse of Monnikhuizen just to the north of Arnhem, founded in 1336 and formally active from 1342 onwards, where Grote himself had stayed.²¹ If Matthew ever joined the Order, he certainly did not achieve any prominence, for he is nowhere mentioned in the *Annals* of the Order compiled in the seventeenth century by Charles Le Couteulx, even though this annalist pays some attention to Grote.²²

Neither is there any documentary evidence that he entered and later lived in either of the two other charterhouses that had already been founded before 1380 in the modern Netherlands, namely Geertruidenberg (1336) – in Grote's day

¹⁶ For this ascription see, most notably, Van Dijk 2012.

¹⁷ Especially confident about this is Van Dijk, most notably in 'Raadgevingen', 2012, pp. 20-23; 40, but also in his *Prolegomena*, 2003, in his summaries of *Epp.* 15 (pp. 491-492); 27 (pp. 507-508). For the same view, see Tiecke 1941, p. 113.

¹⁸ Tiecke 1941, pp. 113-114; Van Zijl 1963, p. 209 and (esp.) fn. 9, although he writes somewhat further on (p. 211): "When Mathias [sc. de Tyla] entered the novitiate – of what order and which monastery is not known – Groote exhorted him to persevere in his new state of life ... [etc]."

¹⁹ Rütting 1966, p. 402, fn. 46: "Mathias war aber vermutlich nicht Kartäuser", the sole argument being that Grote discusses the question of proprietorism in *Ep.* 27, whereas "[d]as Problem des Eigenbesitzes der Mönche ist jedoch in den niederländischen und deutschen Kartausen des 15. Jahrhunderts nie aktuell gewesen" (*ibid.*).

²⁰ Post 1968, pp. 60-61; Épiney 1970, pp. 209-210; Van Engen 2008, p. 46, who writes: "Matthew of Tiel, then a novice somewhere".

²¹ For Monnikhuizen, see Goder 2004, with further references. The two Matthews mentioned in the prosopography of this house, as compiled by De Backer 2012 [revised version of De Backer 1983], *ibid.*, p. 162 [p. 105], cannot be identical with Grote's correspondent; no. 199 [no. 196 in 1983], "Matthias van Amsterdam", died in 1479, and no. 200 [no. 197 in 1983], "Matthias de Pirmont", even later, in 1532. Nor can the Matthew mentioned in the necrology of the house, as published by Scholtens 1953. I am most grateful to Harald Goder and Krijn Pansters for their kind support and assistance, procured in connection with my quest for the identity of Matthew.

²² He is not mentioned in the indices (prepared by Dom P. Chalaud, cf. Hogg 2004, p. 157), Le Couteulx 1891, vol. 8. Le Couteulx culls his short biography of Grote, whom he calls a "magnus Ordinis benefactor et amicus", inserted in the annal for 1384 (vol. 6, pp. 339-343), almost entirely from Thomas a Kempis' *Dialogus*. For Le Couteulx (1639-1715), see Hogg 2004, pp. 153-159.

belonging to the 'Provincia Picardiae' – and Roermond (1376) – in Grote's day belonging to the 'Provincia Alemaniae Inferioris'.²³ Nor can it be established that he ever entered any of the houses of the Order located in present-day Belgium.²⁴

If we may thus rule out the possibility that Matthew entered any of the Dutch or Belgian houses, only one further option needs still to be investigated, namely charterhouses outside the Low Countries for which the acceptance of a Dutch novice might at least seem feasible, and not too far-fetched or unlikely. Essentially, this limits our quest to at most six houses in the (later) Provincia Rheni²⁵ situated in modern Germany which had been established before 1380: Mainz (established 1320/1323), Koblenz (1331), Trier (1331), Cologne (1334/1338), Strasbourg (1335) and Freiburg/Br. (1346). Connections between speakers of Eastern Middle Dutch (or closely related Western Middle Low German)²⁶

²³ The Dutch and Belgian houses are listed and summarily described in Schlegel - Hogg 2005 (*Monasticum Cartusiense*, Bd. 3), with recent bibliographical references; a list conveniently arranged according to the foundation dates can be found *ibid.*, pp. 96-97. Two Matthews only, both living in the 16th century, are listed in the prosopography for Geertruidenberg as compiled by Sanders 1990, pp. 189-209, at p. 203; not a single Matthew is documented for Roermond in the relevant period in Palémon Bastin's *Reliquiæ Chartarum Capituli Generalis* (MS. Grande Chartreuse 1 Cart. 16); I am most grateful to Harald Goder, who kindly checked this for me.

²⁴ I have checked all Matthews in De Grauwe - Timmermans 1999. On the basis of dates mentioned in the entries, only one single Matthew could possibly, but implausibly, be identified with ours, a certain "Mathias Coninck", in 1415 procurator in the charterhouse in Ghent, who died there on 14 July 1433 (*ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 22, cf. De Grauwe 1976, p. 247, no. 2112). If this Matthew were to be identical with Grote's correspondent, then he must have died at the advanced age of 74. This might seem unlikely, but his identification with the recipient of the letter cannot be ruled out completely, for Grote mentions no surname for his Matthew, just that he came from the town of Tiel – that "de Tyla" should be taken as a surname seems improbable. The *Consuetudines* of Guigo (*CG*) as well as the *Statutes* of the Order, both *antiqua* (*SA*) and *noua* (*SN*), require an age of 20 for entering the novitiate (cf. *CG* ed. [Laporte] 1984, c. 27, § 1 (p. 220, 1-6); Hogg 1989, *SA*, 2, c. 23, § 1 (p. 205)), which lasts one or two years (cf. *CG* ed. [Laporte] 1984, c. 22, § 2 (p. 212, 15-18); Hogg 1989, *SA*, 2, c. 23, § 9-10 (pp. 206-207); cf. also *SN*, 2, c. 6, § 1-2, (Hogg 1989, p. 303), where strict observance of the regulations set out in *SA* is prescribed). If the date '1380' is correct for *Ep.* 15, in which Grote welcomes Matthew's novitiate, then he must have been born in or before 1359, and in the year of his death, 1433, he would have reached at least the age of 74 years. (I have not been able to trace in any of the statutes dating from the Middle Ages the requirement that full profession is only possible 4-5 years after the age of 21, as set out for the later period by Jaricot 2014, T. 4, p. 4, commenting on the novitiate; p. 13, commenting on the solemn profession four years after the temporary vows.) Two other Matthews really seem to belong to the next generation, unless they had reached a remarkably old age, a certain "Mathias de Keyrspe" who took his first profession in Lugny, and a second one resident in Antwerp and who died (there?) in 1454 (*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 263, Cf. De Grauwe 1976, p. 248, no. 2123). For yet another Matthew, see "Mathias Hey(ne)man", attested as prior in Zelem between 1440 and 1442, otherwise unknown (De Grauwe - Timmermans 1999, vol. 1, p. 355, cf. De Grauwe 1976, p. 248, no. 2122).

²⁵ Formally, houses in this province belonged to the 'Provincia Alemaniae Inferioris' in Grote's days, as the separate province was not constituted until 1400.

²⁶ The most recent contribution on the close proximity of the vernacular language spoken in the later Middle Ages in the Eastern Low Countries and the adjoining regions in Western Germany is Schlusemann 2013, with further references.

and the northerly houses are well documented. The most obvious example that comes to mind is of course the nobleman Heinrich Egger from the Lower Rhenish town of Kalkar, a fellow student of Grote in Paris, who later entered the Order, in which he made a splendid career, serving as prior in Monnikhuizen, Roermond, Cologne and Strasbourg, and for decades as visitator of the ‘Provincia Alemaniae Inferioris’.²⁷ Among many other examples I limit myself to five monks who all came from the Low Countries and successively fulfilled the function of prior in the charterhouse of Beatusberg near Koblenz between 1366 and 1387.²⁸ The last two, Gerlacus (prior 1382-1383) and Hermannus de Dauentria (prior 1383-1387), are mentioned in Grote’s *Ep.* 6, convincingly redated by Scholtens to 1383.²⁹ Furthermore, the lists of members who have lived or died in the houses in Mainz, Koblenz, Trier, Cologne and Rettel, which survive in two codices from the Trier community,³⁰ contain numerous Dutch names. However, Matthew from Tiel is not found among them.³¹ This leaves us the houses in Freiburg and Strasbourg. Despite Egger’s priorate in the latter house at the end of his career, it really seems unlikely that a prospective young candidate from the Netherlands would consider joining the Order as a novice in a house so far south. In sum, the conclusion seems inevitable that there are no grounds to support the suggestion that Matthew had opted for a novitiate with the Carthusians.

Next, we must give consideration to the two other letters allegedly written to Matthew, *Epp.* 27 and 85. In what follows I refer to the relevant witnesses by the *sigla* used in my recent (2016) edition of *Epp.* 27 and 41. For the readers’

²⁷ For Heinrich Egger, in addition to Scholtens 1964, see in particular Rütting 1967, and most recently the online biography by I. Kwiatkowski, <http://www.rheinische-geschichte.lvr.de/persoenslichkeiten/E/Seiten/HeinrichEghervonKalkar.aspx>, accessed on 08-01-16.

²⁸ They are enumerated and briefly discussed by Scholtens 1964, p. 388.

²⁹ Scholtens 1964, pp. 391-393; regarding the letter Van Dijk 2003, pp. 482-483, with further references. Further arguments in favour of this identification and a new dating have been proposed by Klausmann 2003, pp. 145-147.

³⁰ Manuscript Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 1669/350, contains lists of monks who lived in these monasteries between 1337/1347 and 1682/1668, written in a 17th-cent. hand; Manuscript Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 1668/351, f. 27r-33v, contains lists of monks who died in Koblenz, Trier, Cologne and Monnikhuizen (called ‘Gelria’ in the manuscript) between 1350 and 1521, in a 16th-century hand. For a very brief description of these manuscripts, see Keuffer – Kentenich 1914, p. 158. I am most grateful to Mrs Anja Runkel, photographer of the Stadtbibliothek/Stadtarchiv Trier, who provided excellent digital images of these two documents, and to Prof. Michael Embach, director of the same institution, who was instrumental in making them available to me.

³¹ In the 16th-century necrology, I found only a single Matthew who could possibly, but unlikely, be identified with Matthew of Tiel: “dominus mathias nobe monachus, sacrista treuerensis” listed on f. 29v, for 1446, which means that he died in 1445; the entry in the 17th-century inventory, however, rules out his candidature, as an entirely different place of birth is mentioned there (on f. 166ra): “1446: Mathias Nobe de Washeim sacrista 1 Ianuarii”; and if this should not be convincing, the date of his death surely makes his candidature very improbable: as in the case of the Matthew from Gent, he seems to belong to a later generation than Matthew of Tiel, unless he reached an age of at least 86 years (for the method of calculation, see fn. 24 above).

convenience, all manuscripts discussed here are listed together with their sigla in Table 1, together with details of their current location and information about other texts written by Grote transmitted in these manuscripts (all letters).

In the introduction to the *editio princeps* of *Ep.* 85, Rüthing hesitantly suggested that this letter might also have been addressed to Matthew. And ever since Mulder suggested in 1933, without further argument, that Grote addressed *Ep.* 27 to Matthew,³² this assumption has been taken as established fact.³³ Nothing in the letters themselves, however, points to Matthew as recipient, nor is there much external evidence: the extant manuscripts transmitting *Ep.* 85 have neither rubric nor colophons,³⁴ and in most manuscripts *Ep.* 27 is similarly transmitted without either. Those manuscripts that offer some elucidation just state that *Ep.* 27 is a 'letter by Master Geert Grote (or: Magnus)',³⁵ or a 'letter to a professed monk' (manuscript *W*). Only in one manuscript do we read: 'Epistola magistri Gerardi Groet ad fratrem Mathiam de Tyla' – and this is the rather late (c. 1470) witness *R*, probably written in the Roermond charterhouse, which contains an unreliable version of the text.

Three arguments have been presented to identify Grote's correspondent as Matthew: firstly, the two letters are similar in content to *Ep.* 15, an argument adduced by Rüthing,³⁶ secondly, *Ep.* 27 follows immediately after *Ep.* 15 in the 'letter collections' as well as in most other manuscripts transmitting both letters, and thirdly, *Ep.* 27 (or both *Ep.* 27 and *Ep.* 85) follow *Ep.* 15 and are transmitted in manuscripts whose origin or provenance is to be sought in Carthusian monasteries. All three arguments can easily be refuted.

As regards the similarity in content, Grote often recycles the same arguments in different treatises. This is most obvious in his vernacular *consilium* against charging an entrance fee from prospective candidates for a place in a house of tertiaries,³⁷ which overlaps for entire stretches with his similar vernacular

³² Mulder 1933, p. xxxvi, just writes: "... si, ut opinor, epistola LVII (= *Ep.* 27) ad eundem Matthiam missa est, ..."; 'LVII' refers here to the (adapted) numbering according to the sequence in the The Hague 'corpus epistolarum' *H2*, as is explained *ibid.*, p. xxiv. The letters, incidentally, are copied in the same sequence in the Liège 'corpus' *L*.

³³ Mulder, *Epp.*, p. xxxi; 119-121; Tiecke, *Werken*, pp. 113-114; Van Zijl, *Gerard Groote*, pp. 220-222; Rüthing, 'Briefe', pp. 400-402; Épiney-Burgard, *Gérard Grote*, pp. 209-210; Van Dijk, *Prolegomena*, pp. 507-508; Van Dijk, 'Raadgevingen', pp. 20-23; 40. Post, *Modern Devotion*, pp. 73-74, also seems to take it for granted that Grote wrote *Ep.* 27 to Matthew.

³⁴ *Ep.* 85 is preserved not only in the codex currently kept in Darmstadt, which Rüthing used for his edition, but also in the Magdeburg letter collection. See Van Dijk 2003, p. 293, where this witness is listed as 'Werk 36'; see also p. 553. Rüthing was unaware of the fact that a photograph of the text in this manuscript is preserved in the Titus Brandsma Instituut, Nijmegen. See below, last section, on the comparative quality of these two witnesses.

³⁵ Thus preceding the full text in *D* *A, and the tiny excerpt in *B2*; see also section IX.3.1-2 (pp. 168-179) and the *app. crit.* preceding l. 1 on p. 379 in ed. Hofman 2016.

³⁶ Rüthing 1966, pp. 400-402, adducing as support for his interpretation that the Strasbourg librarian Jung, quoted by Acquoy 1857, p. 17, held the same view.

³⁷ *Leeringhe ende onderscheit vander sonden der symonien*, edited as Text 7 (ch. VIII) by Marinus van den Berg in Hofman-van den Berg 2016; earlier edition: Van Engen 2005, pp. 137-144. The correspondences between the two texts are evident from the *apparatus fontium* in the

consilium on the same topic written for an unidentified community of beguines.³⁸ One further example, which stands alongside many others, is his assertion that human law derives from divine law, based on St Thomas's *Summa*, which is already presented in the single treatise that predates his conversion, against the building of the Dom tower in Utrecht, and which is repeated in similar words in both his diatribe against focarists and his *consilium* for beguines.³⁹ Moreover, Rütting invalidates his own argument, when he says that thematic correspondences between *Epp.* 15 and 16 cannot be adduced as proof that Matthew was the recipient of this latter letter.⁴⁰

On closer inspection the correspondences between the three letters hardly deserve the weight that was accorded to them by Rütting. In both *Ep.* 15 and *Ep.* 85 Grote mentions temptations, but in a different manner. In *Ep.* 85 he reassures a correspondent who had apparently been overtaken by temptations and urges him to put his trust in God, whereas in *Ep.* 15 the initiative to mention this matter is taken by Grote himself. Here he warns his correspondent not to give in to temptations, as these are unavoidable: firmness helps to overcome them. In *Ep.* 27, on the other hand, Grote primarily discusses, except for the first ten lines, the all too human inclination among conventuals to retain personal property for themselves – a vice which significantly is nowhere mentioned in *Epp.* 15 and 85. In this context it must further be noted that the Carthusians are the only order for which there is no evidence of proprietarism in the 14th century,⁴¹ and this is precisely the order that Grote held in such high esteem. Conversely, when we approach this topic from the opposite angle, and investigate the other letters by Grote that deal with this question, we find that these are all addressed not to Matthew, but to Cistercians, the religious order where proprietarism was most widespread during the later Middle Ages:⁴² Grote's five letters in which ownership is the central theme are addressed to the abbot of the Cistercian monastery in Kamp-Lintfort (*Ep.* 41; 44), to the community under his guidance (*Ep.* 42), to the abbess of the Cistercian nunnery Ter Hunnepe near Deventer, which was subject to the paternity of Kamp (*Ep.* 45); the theme is also mentioned in a garbled collection of notes addressed

2016 edition, but they stand out even more clearly in Van Engen's *editio princeps*, where they are juxtaposed.

³⁸ *De simonia ad beguttas*, edited as Text 6 (ch. VII) by Marinus van den Berg in Hofman-van den Berg 2016; earlier edition: De Vreese 1940.

³⁹ Compare Grote's *Turrim*, l. 57-62 (cf. ll. 388-391) ed. Hofman 2003, with *Focar.*, ll. 88-90 ed. Hofman 2011, and with *Simonia beg.*, ll. 604-612 (cf. 761-770) ed. Van den Berg-Hofman 2016. In another example Grote admits himself that he had already used the argument elsewhere; and indeed the passage in his *Cura past.*, l. 123-130 (ed. Hofman 2016, p. 287), is remarkably similar to that in his *Locat.*, ll. 383-388 (ed. Hofman 2016, p. 258). More examples can easily be traced through the *index fontium* in Hofman-van den Berg 2016 by comparing parallel passages listed s.v. 'Gerardus Magnus'.

⁴⁰ Rütting 1966, p. 402 fn. 46.

⁴¹ On the strict observance of the monastic vows by the Carthusians, see Rütting 1989.

⁴² For the reluctant attitude towards attempts at reform on the part of the Cistercians, see Elm and Feige 1980; Elm 1989; Elm 1992.

to a male monastic community that housed at least some individuals accused of proprietarism, probably Cistercians (*Ep.* 46).⁴³ Secondly, Grote advises his correspondent towards the end of this letter (ll. 48-51 ed. Hofman 2016) not to get involved in futile conversations with fellow monks, for instance during Mass or meals. It is hardly conceivable that he would give such advice to a recently professed Carthusian, as this order was (and still is) renowned for its strict observance of obligatory silence.⁴⁴ All of this suggests that *Ep.* 27 was not meant for a Carthusian at all,⁴⁵ and that a Cistercian is a much more likely candidate to be the recipient of the letter. In this context, however, it must be conceded that no Matthew of Tiel is attested or mentioned in the surviving *Statuta* of the general chapters of the Cistercian Order for the relevant period either.⁴⁶

The second argument adduced is that *Ep.* 27 follows *Ep.* 15 in most of the extant witnesses, and that it is likely therefore that this letter was written to the same correspondent.⁴⁷ A first objection that immediately comes to mind is that in most manuscripts *Ep.* 27 is followed immediately by *Ep.* 41 – a letter addressed to William II of Cologne, the recently elected abbot of the Cistercian abbey near Kamp-Lintfort on the Lower Rhine.⁴⁸ If we follow this line of reasoning, then it would be equally appropriate to conjecture that either this abbot or another Cistercian was the recipient of *Ep.* 27, especially as the question of personal property is the central topic discussed in both letters.⁴⁹

It cannot be denied that the three surviving *corpora epistolarum*, most evidently in the lost Magdeburg collection, are at least partly arranged according to the principle that letters to the same recipient are grouped together, and that their compilers paid no attention to the date of sending, as Rüthing already noted in 1966. Now that we have the full descriptions of all three witnesses published by van Dijk in 2003, however, it has become evident that this observation must not be overrated. Eight letters to Grote's old friend Johannes Cele do indeed follow each other in both letter collections.⁵⁰ The same is true for the closely related collections in *L* and *H2* with regard to four letters addressed

⁴³ For an analysis of these letters, see also Hofman 2016, ch. X-XIII; and for the argument that *Ep.* 46 was also meant for a community of Cistercians, *ibid.*, ch. XIII.

⁴⁴ On this topic, among many other publications, see in particular Peeters 2007.

⁴⁵ A suggestion already made by Rüthing 1966, p. 402 fn. 46.

⁴⁶ In the edition of the *Statutes* by Canivez 1935 for the period up to 1450, not a single Matthew is attested. It seems hardly relevant to consider entries for "Mat(t)heus" in the general index, Canivez 1941, p. 327, as all manuscripts containing *Ep.* 15 refer consistently to "Mat(t)hias".

⁴⁷ This was first proposed by Rüthing 1966, pp. 400-402.

⁴⁸ For this letter see now Hofman 2016, ch. X, pp. 183-189; *Ep.* 41 is attested in eight witnesses, of which six survive; in six copies (*L H2 M*, the letter collections, and *M4 M5 *A*, the related Carthusian witnesses, for which see below) *Ep.* 41 follows *Ep.* 27.

⁴⁹ A more plausible explanation for the sequence *Epp.* 27 – 41 is perhaps that the same theme, private property in a monastic context, is touched upon briefly in *Ep.* 27, 11-36 (line numbering according to ed. Hofman 2016), and that it is the main topic of *Ep.* 41; on the thematic ordering of the letters, see below.

⁵⁰ For Cele and Grote see Hofman 2009.

to the Deventer schoolmaster Willem Vroede, but precisely these letters are scattered in the Magdeburg collection *M*. Conversely, a series of letters to his intimate university friend Guillaume de Salvarvilla, as well as a series of letters addressed to William II, the Cistercian abbot of Kamp or to the monks supervised by him, are grouped together in *M*, but these stand far apart from one another in *L* and *H2*.⁵¹ And it must be admitted that letters to different correspondents are more frequently placed together than (short) strings of letters to the same correspondent. Van Dijk later drew attention to the fact that many letters in the two surviving letter collections *L* and *H2* are arranged thematically rather than according to recipient.⁵² When thematic ordering, in addition to arrangement according to recipient, comes to be seen as an underlying principle for the compiler(s) of the letter collection(s), then it at once becomes apparent that the hypothesis that Matthew was the recipient of *Ep. 27* is thereby undermined.

And finally, the style in the three letters differs. *Ep. 15* is formulated in the second person singular, and seems pervaded with intimacy and familiarity, as if written to a close friend, whereas the two other letters are much more formal in style, and written in the second person plural.⁵³

THE TRANSMISSION OF *LETTERS 15, 27 AND 85*

We must now turn to the channels through which the letters have come down to us. Again, clarification about references to the manuscripts discussed can be culled from Table 1. *Ep. 15* is attested in twelve (almost) complete copies, of which nine still survive, and in one fragmentary copy (*M6*). For *Ep. 27* the figures are twelve (almost) complete copies and three (sometimes tiny) fragments, of which eleven witnesses still survive.⁵⁴ Apart from the fragmentary copy *M6*, all witnesses (extant or lost) that transmit *Ep. 15* also transmit (at least part of) *Ep. 27*. In eight cases *Ep. 27* directly follows *Ep. 15*,⁵⁵ whereas in three others a single, but different letter also written by Grote interrupts the sequence: *Epp. 15 – 85 – 27* (*D *C*) and *Epp. 15 – 62 – 27 – 16* (**B*). In addition, *Ep. 27* survives in two further witnesses that lack *Ep. 15* (*R W*).

⁵¹ See Rütthing 1966, pp. 401-402; the manuscripts are described in Van Dijk 2003, pp. 190-203 (*H2*); 270-283 (*L*); 287-300 (**M*).

⁵² Van Dijk 2011, pp. 181-182.

⁵³ This was already noted by Tiecke 1941, pp. 114-115. However, we must be careful not to overestimate this difference in style, as Grote switches between singular and plural forms in the letters to his old and close friend Johannes Cele (Cf. *Epp.* 10-11 – 13-14 – 32-34 – 64 ed. Mulder).

⁵⁴ The manuscripts are conveniently listed in Van Dijk 2003, pp. 507-508 (*Ep. 15*); p. 553 (*Ep. 27*). For further details regarding these witnesses, see Hofman 2016, ch. IX.3-4, p. 168-181.

⁵⁵ In two, probably three, copies, *Ep. 27* is acephalous: there is no visible transition from *Ep. 15* to *Ep. 27* in *L H2 *A* (according to De Ram).

With the exception of three copies (*E K W*),⁵⁶ the manuscripts can be classified in two clearly distinguishable groups. The two letters follow each other in the three *corpora epistolarum* *L H2 M*, but they have come down to us independently through a second main channel of transmission as well, a group of ten closely related witnesses to the text of which seven are still extant. Most of these have Carthusian monasteries in or near the Rhine valley as their provenances. In these manuscripts, *Epp.* 15 and 27 are combined with (a selection of) other letters, most of them pastoral in character (*Epp.* 10; 16; 29; 41; 62; 70). On the basis of a full collation of the text of *Ep.* 27⁵⁷ it can be established that the copies preserved from Mainz (*M4*)⁵⁸ and Basel (*B*) derive from a single intermediate exemplar, while three further copies from Mainz (*M5*) and Strasbourg (**A* **B*) are apographs of the oldest (s. XIV^{ex.}) manuscript *M4* (Mainz).⁵⁹ On the basis of shared variants, it can further be shown that the two remaining Carthusian copies from the houses in Roermond (*R*) and Cologne (*D*) are somewhat further removed from the common exemplar of *B M4*, but still close to these witnesses. All of this together leads to the conclusion that the 'Carthusian' copies derive from a single common exemplar. This finding at the same time invalidates the last of the arguments for locating the recipient of *Ep.* 15 (and 27) in a Carthusian milieu.

Some further considerations are in place here. The close relationship of these Carthusian witnesses to the text suggests an important role for the house of the Order in Mainz. This house had been founded in 1320 in Eltville, was relocated to the Michaelsberg just to the south of Mainz in 1323, and officially incorporated into the Order in 1326. By the end of the eighteenth century, the charterhouse was judged 'monastically scarcely viable' by the ecclesiastical authorities, and was therefore closed down in 1781.⁶⁰ Much of its library has survived, especially in the Mainz Stadtbibliothek.⁶¹ Among its holdings are

⁵⁶ What stands out immediately is that *Epp.* 15 and 27 are transmitted in an entirely different context in these witnesses, most notably so in the two manuscripts that have a more traditional Modern Devout provenance (*E W*).

⁵⁷ See Hofman 2016, ch. IX.4, pp. 179-180, for full details.

⁵⁸ Quite inadvertently, I had originally devised the *sigla* *Mal M5 Ma3* for the witnesses from the Mainz charterhouse preserved in the Stadtbibliothek Mainz with the signatures I 349, I 149 and I 137 respectively. However, after Dr Annelen Ottermann (Stellvertretende Amtsleiterin, Wissenschaftliche Stadtbibliothek, Mainz, to whom I am most grateful) had observed that I used two different *sigla* in my description of manuscript Mainz, SB, I 454 in Hofman. *Focar.*, pp. 186-187; 240-241 (Cf. pp. 247-248), very kindly pointing out the inconsistency of using different *sigla* for the same witness, I have decided to distinguish more clearly and consistently between these manuscripts, and now refer to them as follows: Mainz, SB, I 349 = *M4*, I 149 = *M5* and I 137 = *M6*.

⁵⁹ Not counted so far are the fragment *B2*, also originating from Basel (transcribed from *B*), and the lost third Strasbourg codex **C*, mentioned by Acquoy 1857, which cannot be placed in the stemma as no evidence for its text has been preserved, but which may be linked to *D* on the basis of their shared sequence of letters *Epp.* 15 – 85 – 27; for *M6* see below.

⁶⁰ Cf. summarily Roth 2004, pp. 556-558, with further references.

⁶¹ All surviving manuscripts, with details of their present location, are listed in Krämer 1989, vol. 2, pp. 532-549.

fourteen codices transmitting works written by Grote.⁶² Relevant for us here is in the first place the late fourteenth-century manuscript *M4*, which has copies of Grote's *Epp.* 15 – 27 – 41.⁶³ The short sequence of letters was copied from this exemplar into the early fifteenth-century (post-1408) codex *M5*,⁶⁴ in which it was combined with five other letters (*Epp.* 70 – 10 – 16 – 62 – 29) transcribed from an exemplar which has not survived, and which may therefore possibly have been borrowed temporarily by the scribe from another library.⁶⁵ This hypothesis that a borrowed exemplar might have been used becomes more likely when we turn our attention to the third related codex from Mainz, *M6*.

This third witness, also dating to the first quarter of the fifteenth century, transmits precisely those letters that were copied into *M5* from a source other than *M4*, but in a different order: *Epp.* 29 – 70 – 10 – 16 – 62, supplemented by about half of the text of *Ep.* 15. As I wanted to determine whether these letters were copied from *M6* into *M5*, I decided to collate the text of Grote's short *Ep.* 10, written to his close friend John Cele.⁶⁶ This letter is known from seven manuscripts, of which five still survive: the letter collections *L H2* (**M*), and otherwise *only* in the Carthusian witnesses *B M5 M6* (**A*).⁶⁷ Several deviations from the text as transmitted in *L H2* which are shared by *M5* and *M6* (which originate from the same charterhouse) prove that these two witnesses stand close together;⁶⁸ just one further deviation from *L H2* is shared by *B M5 M6*, perhaps demonstrating that these witnesses ultimately derive from a common exemplar.⁶⁹ Other deviations from the text in *L H2*, however, occur only in *M6*, whereas *M5* (and *B*) have a somewhat more correct and more plausible text that is in line with *L H2*.⁷⁰ This proves that *M6* cannot have served as exemplar for *M5*.

⁶² Listed and described in Van Dijk 2003, pp. 300-315.

⁶³ For further observations on *M4*, as well as on *M5 M6*, see Hofman 2016, Ch. IX.3-4, pp. 171-172; 174-176; 179-180; X.4, pp. 186-189.

⁶⁴ Variant readings proving this beyond doubt are discussed in Hofman 2016, ch. IX.4 and X.4.

⁶⁵ Testimony in extant manuscripts from the Mainz charterhouse about the borrowing and lending of books is recorded in Schreiber 1927, pp. 53-55.

⁶⁶ Edited by Mulder 1933, pp. 37-38; on the letter, see Van Dijk 2003, pp. 487-488 (Van Dijk is wrong when he lists the second Strasbourg manuscript **B* (= *2) among the witnesses!); on the relationship between Cele and Grote, see now Hofman 2009.

⁶⁷ For the readers' convenience, the lost witnesses **M* and **A* are here given in brackets, preceded by an asterisk (*); the reference to the second lost witness from Strasbourg in Van Dijk 2003, pp. 487-488, is unfortunately erroneous.

⁶⁸ Reference is to added line numbers in ed. Mulder 1933, pp. 37-38: **9** *incutere] mouere M5 M6; possum] possit M5 M6; 19/20* *Cedula – scribendos] om. M5 M6; 26* *sigillau] L H2 B, sigillo M5 M6*. Variants from **A* are disregarded, as this witness was copied from *M5*, see below.

⁶⁹ **23** *cupio] L H2, capio B M5 M6*.

⁷⁰ Most conspicuous is the final sentence, present in *B L H2*, partly missing in *M5*, but preserved in full in *M6*: **26** *Ora (thus L H2 B, against Mulder) pro me, frater, et recommenda me recommendandis] hab. L H2 B, om. M6, et recommenda me recommendandis] om. M5, et cetera hic scr. M5; Cf. also: 3* *reuoluite] M5 cett., reuolue M6; 15* *faciat] M5 cett., faciat M6; 17/18* *Superbus est, despectum pati non potest] M5 cett., quia pati non potest. Superbus est enim ualde M6; 22* *pure] L H2, om. spatio uacuo relicto B¹, pura suppl. B², pura priuacio M5, praua priuacio M6*.

The most obvious conclusion from these findings, of course, would be that it is the other way round: that *M5* served as exemplar for *M6*. However, another conclusion is also possible, and that is that both witnesses were transcribed independently of one another from the 'borrowed', and now lost exemplar. This alternative conclusion becomes less unlikely when we turn to the text of *Ep.* 15 in *M6*. The first part of this letter, as far as p. 51, l. 2 "tuus" in Mulder's 1933 edition,⁷¹ is found in *M6*, but then the text suddenly breaks off mid-sentence for no apparent reason: the scribe simply ceased his copying activity in the middle of a verso, which thereafter remained blank. Secondly, on the basis of a collation of *Ep.* 15, it can be established that for this letter *M6* displays all variants present in *M4*,⁷² as well as several additional ones,⁷³ but lacks some variants present in *M5* (and apographs).⁷⁴ Moreover, the hand that was responsible for the main text in *M6* also supplied the *incipit* "magister Gerardus suo nouicio" in the upper margin in *M4*, which was probably derived from the *explicit* of *Ep.* 27 in that manuscript ("prescripta hec quidam magister Gerardus Magnus scripsit" two leaves further on), and as for "suo nouicio" most likely derived this from the contents of the letter itself. These facts establish beyond doubt that in the Mainz charterhouse the text of *Ep.* 15 was copied independently in both early fifteenth-century witnesses *M5* (1408) and *M6* (s. xv^a) from the older manuscript (s. xiv^d) *M4*,⁷⁵ but they also provide the one sensible explanation for the sudden interruption of the text of *Ep.* 15 in *M6*: the scribe realized that the text of *Epp.* 15, 27 and 41 was already available in the charterhouse. He decided that there was no need to copy these letters once again, but that it would still be worthwhile transcribing letters which they did not yet possess from the 'borrowed' codex, which may well have had to go back to its original owner.

M5 in turn served as exemplar for other apographs, namely two now lost witnesses which were kept in the municipal library in Strasbourg until their destruction in 1870 during the Franco-Prussian war. I limit myself to a single example to demonstrate the dependence of **A* and **B* on *M5*: for the phrase (l. 22) "quanta peiora tibi preuisa fuissent" in *Ep.* 15 we find "quanto tibi peiora tibi preuisa fuissent" in *M4 M5¹ M6*; the second occurrence of "tibi" was – rightly – erased in *M5*, obviously by a later reader *M5²*, as the phrase reads "quanto peiora tibi preuisa fuissent" in **A* **B*: in these two witnesses the first occurrence of "tibi" was disregarded.⁷⁶

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, fn. b.

⁷² 2 tue uite tr. B *M4 M5 M6* **A* **B*; 7 pre] quem *M4 M5 M6*, questionibus **A* **B*.

⁷³ E.g. 7 est] hab. *M4 cett.*, om. *M6*; 25 tardus] *M4 cett.*, cordis *M6*; 26 inimicus emend. *M6*, in mitis *M4*.

⁷⁴ 5 tibi] hab. *M6 cett.*, om. *M5* **A* **B*; 25 est] hab. *M6 cett.*, om. *M5* **A* **B*.

⁷⁵ In my datings, I follow the conventions set out in Gumbert 2009, p. 12-13, which means that superscript letters ^{a-d} designate first to fourth quarters of centuries.

⁷⁶ Reference is again to added line numbers in ed. Mulder 1933, pp. 50-51. The following variants are of special interest, as they prove this dependence beyond doubt: 5 tibi] hab. *M4 M6*, om. *M5* **A* **B*; 14 sperge] *K E B M4 M5 M6*, sperne corr. *M5²*, sic **A* **B*; 26 tardus est] tardus *M4¹*, est

The contents of both lost codices were fortunately described very accurately by De Ram in the introduction to his 1861 *editio princeps* of Grote's *Letters* 70 – 10 – 16 – 62 – 15 – 27 – 41 – 29, which he based on these manuscripts. Their contents coincide exactly with the description of two codices in the extremely detailed catalogue of the immense town library in Strasbourg that was put together in 1746 by J.J. Witter,⁷⁷ and in addition to many printed books lists no fewer than 892 manuscripts. The holdings of this library were collected by the religious (or mystic) community on the island known as the Grüner Wörth just outside the city walls of medieval Strasbourg, founded in 1371, which was established as a commandery of the Knights Hospitaller after negotiations between its founding father, the unthinkable rich banker and 'lay mystic' Rulman Merswin, with Fr. Konrad von Braunsberg, at that time Großprior of the German branch of the Hospitaliers.⁷⁸ This community managed to survive as a Roman Catholic enclave in the predominantly Lutheran city of Strasbourg until the French Revolution, when the library of the house was transferred to what eventually would become the Bibliothèque Municipale.

*suppl. M4², om. *A *B, cordis est M6, tardus M5; 37 ab] sic M5¹, a corr. in ras. M5², sic *A *B = Mulder's fn. g; this dependence is further confirmed by the incipits and explicits of each of the six letters, which coincide exactly for M5 *A and, where applicable, *B; it should be noted that the words '(Schluß)' and '(Anfang)' in Van Dijk's description of Epp. 70 – 16 – 62 in M5 (2003, p. 304) are deceptive: part of the texts is no longer extant through the loss of several leaves in the manuscript (probably three before and three after f. 152). Unfortunately, the original make-up of the quires can no longer be reconstructed since its restoration in 1968. Dr. Annelen Ottermann, Stellvertretende Amtsleiterin, Wissenschaftliche Stadtbibliothek, Mainz, to whom I am most grateful, very kindly, but in the end to no avail, checked the construction of the manuscript for me. For further details, see the description in Hofman 2016, Ch. IX.3, pp. 174-176 – these folia were apparently present when *A *B were copied from M5 (or from an intermediate exemplar).*

⁷⁷ Compare De Ram 1861, pp. 67-69, with Witter 1746, pp. 49-50, where *A = D 108, and *B = D. 107. In his introduction, pp. [III-IV], the Strasbourg professor Witter writes that he reorganized the library of the Hospitaller commandery in Strasbourg at the request of J.B. Kentzinger, then Master of the commanderies in Strasbourg and Sélestat (Schlettstadt), as well as of the German branch of the Hospitaliers in general, and assigned new shelfmarks to the holdings of the rearranged library. We may suppose that by this date the presumably rather small holdings of the impoverished commandery in Sélestat, which had at least since the early 16th century been dependent on the wealthy house in Strasbourg (cf. Rödel 1972, pp. 193-199), were included in the library.

⁷⁸ On the house 'Zum Grünen Wörth' of the Knights Hospitaller (Ordo Hospitalis sancti Iohannis Ierosolimitani) on the 'Green Island', its idiosyncratic place and status in the Order, and its connections to the religious community in the city of Strasbourg, see most recently, and very briefly, Borchardt 2008, Mossman - Borchardt 2009, with further references; also Rödel 1972, pp. 181-193. For the library, in addition to Witter 1746, see also Rathgeber 1876, pp. 41-43. The Grüner Wörth was situated beneath what is now the École Nationale d'Administration, to the south-west of the medieval city walls on the western bank of the river Ill. Stephen Mossman is currently preparing a monograph on the Grüner Wörth with as provisional title: *Rulman Merswin and His Age: The Literary Spirituality of the Strasbourg Hospitaliers and the Late Medieval Rhineland*; I am most grateful to Stephen Mossman for communicating this to me and for pointing out the exact location of the former commandery, of which nothing survives today.

Manuscript D 107 in Witter's catalogue transmitted among various other texts Grote's *Epp.* 15 – 62 – 27 – 16 – 70,⁷⁹ and his manuscript D 108, in addition to a significant collection of works compiled by Grote's friend and mentor Heinrich Eggher von Kalkar, contained Grote's *Epp.* 70 – 10 – 16 – 62 – 15 – 27 – 41 – 29 in exactly the same order as in the Mainz witness *M5*. These letters were edited in 1861, as noted above, by De Ram on the basis of manuscript D 108, to which he accorded the *siglum* *A*, with variants, where applicable, from manuscript D 107, which he called *B*.

In his introductory section,⁸⁰ De Ram regrets the fact that he had not been aware of the existence of yet another manuscript witness containing letters written by Grote, in his day still extant among the holdings of the Strasbourg Bibliothèque municipale, when he visited that library in 1829 – this third witness, for which I propose the *siglum* **C*,⁸¹ only surfaced in 1857, when Acquoy wrote in the introduction to his edition of fourteen letters by Grote that G.H.M. Delprat, in the mid-nineteenth century a leading expert on the Modern Devotion, had drawn his attention to a codex containing Grote's *Epp.* 70 – 15 – 85 – 27.⁸² Delprat knew about its existence from a letter sent to him by the Strasbourg librarian A. Jung. Evidently, Jung had searched the holdings in his care more intensively as the years had passed, for the two earlier witnesses **A* **B* are properly listed in the index of Witter's 1746 catalogue,⁸³ whereas there is no reference to the third codex.

The absence of this manuscript from the catalogue of the former holdings of the Hospitallers' library indicates that this copy must have come from a different collection, most probably the library of the Strasbourg charterhouse.⁸⁴ The medieval Carthusian manuscripts that were preserved in the Strasbourg municipal library until 1870⁸⁵ had their provenance in the Strasbourg Carthusian monastery Marienbühl (Mons Ste Marie), situated at some distance outside the

⁷⁹ In his introductory section, De Ram states that his manuscript **B* (D 107) transmits only *Epp.* 15 – 62 – 27 – 16, but in his footnotes he gives variants from **B* for *Ep.* 70 as well; since he repeatedly reiterates the same sequence of letters, both in his introduction and in his first footnote accompanying each letter, we must conclude that *Ep.* 70 was the last of the group of Grote texts transmitted through **B*.

⁸⁰ De Ram 1861, p. 69.

⁸¹ Van Dijk 2003, pp. 401-402, uses the *sigla* **1*; **2*; **3*, but it seems more appropriate to follow De Ram's *sigla*.

⁸² Acquoy 1857, pp. 12; 17.

⁸³ Witter 1746, p. [60], s.v. "Gerhardus Gros".

⁸⁴ On the interaction between religious communities in Strasbourg in the later Middle Ages, see now Mossman, Palmer, Heinzer 2012, and on the role of the charterhouse in the religious life of the city most recently N.F. Palmer, 'The Strasbourg Carthusians and the literary context in late-medieval Carthusian literature', in: Hamburger - Palmer 2015, pp. 479-487, A. Passmann, 'Die Kartause zu Straßburg', in: *Archives de l'Église d'Alsace*, n.s., 9 (1958), pp. 81-97. I am most grateful to Nigel Palmer for drawing my attention to these studies, and to Johan Oosterman, Nijmegen, for making them available to me.

⁸⁵ Only twelve manuscripts from the collection have survived, four of which were already given by the Strasbourg Carthusians during the Middle Ages to the charterhouse in Basel and one to the charterhouse in Mainz. For these manuscripts, see Krämer 1989, 2, pp. 748-749.

city walls of the medieval city in the district Koenigshoffen.⁸⁶ This charterhouse, which had been confirmed in 1339 shortly after its foundation by the local bishop Berthold de Bucheck, survived until 1591, when the municipal authorities and inhabitants of Strasbourg closed down the house of the community, imprisoned the four remaining monks, and confiscated their property.⁸⁷ Their substantial library was transferred to the collection of the Chapter of St Thomas, originally a Roman-Catholic collegiate church which had joined the protestant (Lutheran) movement very early on, in 1524. One year later, the monks were released from prison, and their books were apparently given back to them.⁸⁸ Their prior, Jean Schustein, refounded the Alsatian priory of the order in the nearby township of Molsheim in 1598.⁸⁹ After the dissolution of French religious houses in 1790 in the wake of the Revolution, J.J. Oberlin, a former university professor in Strasbourg, succeeded in safeguarding the libraries of most religious institutions in the Alsace region, among them that of the charterhouse in Molsheim; ultimately, by the end of the eighteenth century, their collections were brought together in the Bibliothèque Municipale.⁹⁰

On the occasion of the transfer of the library of the charterhouse to the Chapter of St Thomas in 1591, an inventory of the collection was compiled, which lists no less than 365 volumes, most of them manuscripts, but excluding the most valuable ones and those used in the liturgy.⁹¹ Unfortunately, Acquoy in 1857 listed just the four letters written by Grote, but omitted any further description of the codex containing them. This inventory is far less detailed than the catalogue of the Hospitallers' library, and it is therefore impossible to identify 'codex *C' here with any certainty.⁹² On the basis of the presence of the extremely rare *Ep.* 85 in this codex, extant only in a single witness (*D*),⁹³ it seems not unreasonable to suggest that the manuscript came from the Strasbourg charterhouse.

I shall conclude this contribution with a few more speculative observations, although I am keenly aware that I may hardly be the proper person for speculation after the reproaches with which I showered others in the first part of this paper. Notwithstanding this, I noted above that the third witness from the

⁸⁶ For a summary account, see Schlaefli 2004, with further references.

⁸⁷ Ingold 1894, pp. 5-10.

⁸⁸ Cf. Schmidt 1877, pp. 59-62.

⁸⁹ Cf. Ingold 1894, pp. 10-13.

⁹⁰ All of this is set out in detail in Rathgeber 1876, pp. 10-12; 25-28; 130-133, see also p. 173. Unfortunately, I have not been able to consult Rott 1971.

⁹¹ This inventory is presently kept in the Archives de la ville et de l'Eurométropole de Strasbourg, where it forms part of a collection filed under the siglum IAST 100 f°70. The collection as a whole is described in *Inventaire* 1937, c. 144-146, where the catalogue is listed under the year 1591 in c. 145. I am most grateful to Mmes A. Lamy and M. Chevresson of the Archives in Strasbourg, who provided this information.

⁹² I ordered digital images of this inventory, but unfortunately I could not identify 'codex *C' in it.

⁹³ Edited by Rùthing 1966, p. 406, as 'Brief D5'.

Mainz charterhouse *M6* was originally in the private possession of Ortwinus Hoppener, as is clear from an ownership notice on f. 1r: "Iste liber pertinet M. Ortwinio Hoppener de Francfordia".⁹⁴ Ortwinus was born in Frankfurt around 1375, was ordained priest in a secular context, and was already in touch with the Mainz charterhouse by 1411, when he honoured this house with a generous donation, large enough for the establishment of two new cells.⁹⁵ In that year or shortly thereafter, he entered the charterhouse, where he rose to the priorate (in 1418-1422, and from 1426 until his death in 1428). His period of office in Mainz was interrupted by the same function in three other charterhouses, in Strasbourg (1422-1424), Basel (1424-1425) and Freiburg (1425-1426). These successive priorates in both Mainz and Strasbourg might endorse the suggestion that Ortwinus may perhaps have been in some way involved in the transfer of a body of texts from the Mainz charterhouse to the house in Strasbourg, which included the six letters written by Grote as transmitted in *M6*. The texts as transmitted in witnesses *A *B from the house of the Knights Hospitaller in that same city might have been transcribed from an intermediate copy kept in the charterhouse.

Finally, a few words may be in order regarding a witness originating from the charterhouse of St. Barbara in Cologne, to which I have assigned the siglum *D*. This witness, now kept in Darmstadt,⁹⁶ is the *codex unicus* preserving Grote's *Epp.* 82, 83, 84 (and 85),⁹⁷ but the same manuscript also transmits the text of *Ep.* 15 and 27 in a version somewhat further removed from that in

⁹⁴ The manuscript is described in List - Powitz 1990, pp. 246-247, but unfortunately with rather little information on the codicological details. There are clear caesurae at several places in the manuscript, as indicated by changes of hand and blank leaves at the end of texts (f. 63-64; 92-94; 125v-130; 141-142; 149-152 after the Grote texts on f. 143-148; 155-156; 158v-163 have apparently remained blank), and there are good grounds for assuming that in its present state the manuscript is a convolute, consisting of different codicological units, and on the authority of the ownership mark most probably bound together at the request of Ortwinus Hoppener. I am most grateful to Dr Annelen Ottermann, Mainz (as in fn.76), for reassuring me that this is most likely the case. Whether Ortwinus acquired the constituent parts of the manuscript inside or outside the charterhouse, cannot be established anymore.

⁹⁵ For Ortwinus, see especially Simmert 1958, pp. 6; 32 (no. 28; 30, priorate in 1418-1422; 1426-1428), deed of the 1411 donation edited *ibid.*, pp. 149-150; on the books he donated to the Mainz charterhouse (which are preserved in the Mainz Wissenschaftliche Stadtbibliothek under the *sigla* 14; 16; 46.2; 63; 107; 137; 142; 224; 369; 453; 585; and in Oxford, MS. Laud Misc. 173), see Schreiber 1927, p. 74 and very briefly List - Powitz 1990, pp. 42-43.

⁹⁶ Manuscript Darmstadt, ULB, 2276, described by Rütting 1966, pp. 394-395, Marks 1974, pp. 356-357, and Van Dijk 2003, pp. 168-170; both Marks 1974, p. 418, and Van Dijk 2003, p. 417, list this manuscript among those from the Cologne charterhouse that are now lost, neither of them realizing that their 'lost' witness is in fact identical with the Darmstadt manuscript.

⁹⁷ As observed earlier, a photograph of the text of *Ep.* 85, contained on f. 46v of the lost Magdeburg letter collection, is preserved in the 'Brandsma Collection' in the Titus Brandsma Instituut, Nijmegen (NL). A comparison between the two witnesses reveals that the quality of the text in the Magdeburg copy (here: *M) is better than that in *D*. In anticipation of a critical edition of *Ep.* 85, I note the following superior readings (reference is to ed. Rütting 1966, p. 406, with added line numbering): **1** scitis] *M, etiam *C, sciatis *D*; **4** quod] *sec. Bibl.* *M, quam *D*; **6** meo] in *praem.* *M, false; **9/10** emptans] Rütting, est potestas sic *D* *M; **10** aliqua nobis *tr.* *M (clearly

the group of witnesses which can be linked to the Mainz charterhouse.⁹⁸ As is evident from Rütthing's description,⁹⁹ this manuscript contains the six letters by Grote together with a copy of Heinrich Eghers's *Libellus de continentiis et distinctione scientiarum*¹⁰⁰ and further material datable to the third quarter of the 15th century.¹⁰¹ The Grote letters were inserted, on originally blank leaves, some time shortly after 1496 by the procurator of the Cologne charterhouse Gobelinus Laridius († 1556). Gobelinus was born at Fischenich near Cologne around 1476, joined the Order at St Barbara's in 1496, and later served as prior in Mainz and Freiburg, but he is especially renowned for his critical edition of the Vulgate from 1530.¹⁰² The manuscript is one among many witnesses testifying to the eagerness of the Carthusians to provide manuscripts for a new library after the terrible fire that destroyed the entire library of the Cologne charterhouse on 6 November 1451.¹⁰³

It may be possible, very tentatively, to propose an identification for the institution from where this idiosyncratic collection originally came. When Rütthing published the new letters from the *codex unicus*, he also gave in passing a clue regarding its origin or exemplar, but without jumping to any conclusions. In the *explicit* of Heinrich's *Libellus*, directly preceding the first letter by Grote, Gobelinus had noted that he found this text in an autograph copy in Heinrich's own hand, which in his day was preserved in the charterhouse of Beatusberg at Koblenz.¹⁰⁴ In the light of what we know of Grote's relations with the inhabitants of this house,¹⁰⁵ it may therefore be possible to link these letters to the charterhouse in Koblenz as well.

better, cf. **11** fuerimus); **12** uiriliter] *D*, uniuersaliter **M*, false; **15** desperauerat] *D*, desperauerit **M* (clearly better, cf. **13** estimauerit); **16** loquor] loquar **M*; **16** tamen] *om.* **M*. Cf. next note.

⁹⁸ This is the appropriate place to observe that it has turned out, on the basis of the full collation of *Ep.* 27 presented in the *app. crit.* of my edition of *Ep.* 27 in Hofman 2016, that Rütthing's *codex unicus* transmits a particularly untrustworthy version of *Ep.* 27, and that the same is true for the text of *Ep.* 15 as transmitted in *D*. This sloppiness in the copying of texts, evident from comparison with other witnesses, can alert us to the fact that the exemplar used by the scribe Gobelinus may itself have been an inferior copy, or that in this case Gobelinus himself was sloppy in his copying; see the description of *D* in Hofman 2016, Ch. IX.3.1, pp. 168-170.

⁹⁹ Rütthing 1966, pp. 393-395.

¹⁰⁰ Regarding this work, see Rütthing 1967, pp. 76-82.

¹⁰¹ For further information about the contents, see the description by Marks 1974, pp. 356-357; also Hofman 2016, Ch. IX.3.1 pp. 168-170.

¹⁰² For Gobelinus, and an evaluation of his critical genius, see also Marks 1974, pp. 134-137.

¹⁰³ On this disaster and the efforts made to assemble an entirely new library collection as quickly as possible, see Marks 1974, pp. 8-12.

¹⁰⁴ "Iste libellus transcriptus [*sic MS.*] est ex primo originali et diligenter collacionatus ad idem originale quod scriptum erat manu propria huius ter quaterque beati et deuotissimi uiri Henrici Kalkar, et ipsum originale habetur in domo Confluencie", quoted in part by Rütthing 1966, p. 396, and in full in Rütthing 1967, p. 76 fn. 2. When we realize that the *incipit* of the first letter written by Grote occurs in the next line in the manuscript, we might perhaps interpret the words "in tali loco" in this *incipit* ("Epistola magistri Gerardi groett dauentriensis pro duobus iuuenibus ad fratres Carthusienses in tali loco") as referring back to the words "in domo Confluencie" in the directly preceding *explicit*.

¹⁰⁵ See above, in the discussion of the recipient of *Ep.* 15, and with more detail Scholtens 1964, pp. 391-393.

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

On closer inspection, various assumptions about Grote's *Letters* 15, 27 and 85 cannot survive a critical re-examination. It has been rightly assumed that Grote addressed his *Ep.* 15 to a certain Matthew of Tiel, but there is no proof that this correspondent intended to enter the Carthusian Order. Matthew has been proposed as the recipient of *Ep.* 27 as well, with the inference that there is a Carthusian connection for that letter, but there is no proof for this either. Since much of the contents of this letter deals with proprietarism, a newly professed Cistercian seems a much more likely recipient, as the vice of proprietarism was widespread among the Cistercians in Grote's day, whereas it was virulently opposed and counteracted in the Order of the Silent Monks. It has also been suggested, though hesitantly, that *Ep.* 85 was addressed to the same person, but again there is no evidence to substantiate this proposal. It is most likely the case that this letter was intended for a monk, but even this conjecture cannot be established with certainty. What all of this teaches us is that much caution is warranted when confronted with at least some of the presuppositions that underlie the work of our great scholarly predecessors.

TABLE 1
MANUSCRIPTS TRANSMITTING GROTE'S *EPP.* 15 AND 27

Signum	Signature	Date	v. Dijk, <i>Prol. p.</i>	Or./prov.	<i>Epp.</i>
Letter collections					
<i>L</i>	Liège, BU, 229 (c)	a. 1451	270-283	Or.: Namur, Crutched Friars	15 (= 57 [59vD]); 27 (= 58 [60vD]), with 65 other letters
<i>H2</i>	Den Haag, KB, 78 J 55	s. xv ^a	190-203	Prov.: Liège, St. Jacques (Benedictines)	15 (=57 [61vD]); 27 (= 58 [62vD]), with 65 other letters
* <i>M</i>	[Magdeburg, SB, XII 8° 12]	s. xv ^{ab}	287-300	?	15 (= 28 [29vD]); 27 (= 29 [30vD]); 85 (= 35 [36vD]), with 71 other letters
Carthusian and related manuscripts					
<i>M4</i>	Mainz, SB, I 349	s. XIV ^d	312-313	Prov.: Mainz, St. Michael (Carthusians)	15 27 41
<i>M5</i>	Mainz, SB, I 149	a. 1408	303-305	Or.: Mainz, St. Michael (Carthusians)	70 10 16 62 15 27 41 29
<i>M6</i>	Mainz, SB, I 137	s. xv ^a	301-303	Or.: Mainz, St. Michael (Carthusians)	29 70 10 16 62 15

*A	[Strasbourg, BM, olim 660 D 108]	?	401-402	Prov.: Strasbourg, Hospitallers	70 10 16 62 15 27 41 29
*B	[Strasbourg, BM, olim D 107]	?	402	Prov.: Strasbourg, Hospitallers	15 62 27 16 70
*C	[Strasbourg, BM]	?	402	Prov.: Strasbourg, Carthusians (?)	70 15 85 27
B	Basel UB A X 92	s. xv ^a	123-125	Prov.: Basel, Margarethental (Carthusians)	16 8 70 62 15 27 10
B2	Basel UB A X 47	a. 1496	122-123	Or.: Basel, Margarethental (Carthusians)	27
R	Wien ÖNB 15228	s. xv ^d	376-378	Prov.: Roermond, Bethlehem (Carthusians)	<i>16 27</i> 62
D	Darmstadt, LHB, 2276	s. xv ^c	168-170	Or.: Köln, St. Barbara (Carthusians)	82 83 84 15 85 27
Different origin or provenance					
E	Emmerich SA 13	> 1470	177-179	Or.: Emmerich, Brethren	29 56 15 27 16 62
W	Hannover LB XIII 859	c. 1440	211-213	Or.: Wittenburg, Windesheim Regular Canons	66 22 70 65 62 27 56 24 57
K	Köln HA GB 8° 60	s. xv ^b	232-233	Or.: Köln, Crutched Friars	15 16 27

Remarks:

- In my datings, I follow the conventions set out in Gumbert 2009, p. 12-13, which means that superscript letters ^{a-d} designate first to fourth quarters of centuries.
- col. 2 (Signature): square brackets [] indicate that this witness is lost.
- col. 6 (*Epp.*): a number in *italics* indicates that this letter is transmitted fragmentarily in this witness.
- *L*: the 57th letter in this *corpus epistolarum* is counted as no. 59 by Van Dijk, p. 281, as the first text in this witness is not a letter, but *Focar.*, and as Van Dijk, p. 273, forgets to count no. 14.
- *H2*: the 57th letter in this *corpus epistolarum* is counted as no. 61 by Van Dijk as the *corpus* is preceded by a different codicological unit containing 4 letters in this witness
- *M*: three letters are counted twice by Van Dijk, p. 291-295: *Ep.* 24 (nos 19-20); *Ep.* 13 (nos 43-44); *Ep.* 14 (nos 49-50).

REFERENCES

Manuscripts

- Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, MS A X 47
 –, MS A X 92
 Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, MS 2276
 Den Haag, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 78 J 55
 Emmerich, Stadtarchiv, MS 13
 Hannover, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek Hannover, MS XIII 859
 Köln, Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln, MS HA GB 8° 60
 Liège, Bibliothèque de l'Université, MS 229 (c)
 [Magdeburg, Stadtbibliothek, MS XII 8° 12]
 Mainz, Wissenschaftliche Stadtbibliothek, MS I 137
 –, MS I 149
 –, MS I 349
 [Strasbourg, Bibliothèque municipale, MS olim 660 D 108]
 [–, MS olim D 107]
 [–, MS olim?]
 Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 15228

Printed sources

- J.G.R. Acquoy, *Gerardi Magni Epistolae XIV*, Amsterdam, 1857.
 Chr. de Backer, 'De kartuize Monichusen bij Arnhem. Prosopografie samen met de regesten van de zopas ontdekte oorkondenschat', in: F. Hendrickx, Tom Gaens (eds), *Amo te, sacer ordo Carthusiensis. Jan De Grauwe, passionné de l'Ordre des Chartreux*, Leuven, 2012, pp. 133-204, version revised by the editors of id., id., in: J. De Grauwe (ed.), *Historia et spiritualitas Cartusiensis. Colloquii quarti internationalis Acta, Gandavi - Antverpiae - Brugis, 16-19 Sept. 1982*, Destelbergen, 1983, pp. 69-155.
 K. Borchardt, 'Hospitaliers, mysticism and reform in late-medieval Strasbourg', in: Victor Mallia-Milanes (ed.), *The Military Orders*, vol. 3. *History and Heritage*, Aldershot, 2008, pp. 73-79.
 J.M. Canivez (ed.), *Statuta capitulorum generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis ab anno 1116 ad annum 1786*, T. 3: *Ab anno 1262 ad annum 1400*; T. 4: *Ab anno 1401 ad annum 1456*; T. 8. *Indices*, Louvain, 1935; 1936; 1941.
 G. Dumber, *Analecta seu uetera aliquot scripta inedita*, vol. I, Deventer, 1719.
 R.Th.M. van Dijk, *Prolegomena ad Gerardi Magni Opera Omnia*. Pars I,1. *Die Forschungslage des gesamten Schrifttums (mit Ausnahme des Stundenbuches) = Gerardi Magni Opera Omnia*, vol. I [*Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 192], Turnhout, 2003.
 R.Th.M. van Dijk, 'Raadgevingen voor een kartuizernovice. Geert Grote en zijn *Brief over een nieuwe monnik*', in: Ch. Caspers, R. Hofman (eds), R. van Dijk, *Twaalf kapitels over ontstaan, bloei en doorwerking van de Moderne Devotie*, Hilversum 2012, pp. 19-43.
 R. van Dijk, 'Die Überlieferung der Briefschaften von Geert Grote', in: *Quaerendo*, 41 (2011), pp. 172-182.
 K. Elm, 'Spätmittelalterliche Reformbemühungen unter den Zisterziensern im Rheinland und in den Niederlanden', in: R. Kottje (ed.), *Die niederrheinischen Zisterzienser im späten Mittelalter*, Cologne, 1992, pp. 3-20.

- K. Elm, P. Feige, 'Der Verfall des zisterziensischen Ordenslebens im späten Mittelalter'; 'Reformen und Kongregazionsbildungen der Zisterzienser im Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit', in: [K. Elm, P. Joerißen, H.J. Roth (eds)], *Die Zisterzienser. Ordensleben zwischen Ideal und Wirklichkeit. Eine Ausstellung des Landschaftsverbandes Rheinland, Rheinisches Museumsamt, Brauweiler; Aachen, Krönungssaal des Rathauses, 3. Juli-28. September 1980*, Cologne, Bonn, 1980, pp. 237-254.
- K. Elm, 'Westfälisches Zisterziensertum und spätmittelalterliche Reformbewegung', in: K. Elm, *Mittelalterliches Ordensleben in Westfalen und am Niederrhein*, Paderborn, 1989.
- H. van Engen, 'Twee onuitgegeven brieven van Geert Grote over de derde orde van Sint-Franciscus', *Ons Geestelijk Erf*, 79 (2005), pp. 105-145.
- J. Van Engen, *Sisters and Brothers of the Common Life*, Philadelphia, 2008.
- G. Épiney-Burgard, *Gérard Grote (1340-1384) et les débuts de la Dévotion Moderne*, Wiesbaden, 1970.
- T. Gaens, 'Fons hortorum irriguus, ceteras irrigans religiones. Carthusian influences on monastic reform in Germany and the Low Countries in the 15th century', in: S.J. Molvarec, T. Gaens (eds), *A Fish Out of Water? From Contemplative Solitude to Carthusian Involvement in Pastoral Care and Reform Activity. Proceedings of the Symposium Ordo pre ceteris commendatus. Held in Zelem, Belgium, September 2008*, Leuven, 2013, pp. 51-103.
- H. Goder, 'Monnikhuizen / Monichusen', in: G. Schlegel - J.L. Hogg, *Monasticon Cartusiense*, Bd. 2; 3 [*Analecta cartusiana*, 185:2; 3], Salzburg 2004-2005, pp. 161-171.
- J. De Grauwe, *Prosopographia cartusiana Belgica (1314-1796)*, Gent – Salzburg, 1976.
- J. De Grauwe, F. Timmermans, *Prosopographia cartusiana Belgica renovata (1314-1796)*, Salzburg, 1999.
- J.P. Gumbert, *Illustrated Inventory of Medieval Manuscripts in Latin Script in the Netherlands*, vol. 2, Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL, Hilversum, 2009.
- J.F. Hamburger, N.F. Palmer, *The Prayer Book of Ursula Begerin*, vol. 1. *Art-Historical and Literary Introduction*, Zurich-Dietikon, 2015.
- R. Hofman, 'Geert Grote's treatise *Contra turrim Traiectensem* and his conversion to a spiritually oriented life', in: Ch. Caspers, R. Hofman, H. Blommestijn (eds), *Spirituality renewed (Studies in Spirituality Supplements, 10)*, Leuven, 2003, pp. 41-55.
- R. Hofman (ed.), *Gerardi Magni Opera Omnia*, Pars II.1. *Sermo ad clerum Traiectensem de focaristis – Opera minora contra focaristas* [*Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 235], Turnhout, 2011.
- R. Hofman (ed.), *Gerardi Magni Opera Omnia*, Pars II.2. *Scripta contra simoniam et proprietarios*, cura et studio Rijcklof Hofman adiuuante Marinus van den Berg [*Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 235A], Turnhout, 2016.
- R. Hofman, 'Johan Cele (1343-1417) en de bloei van de Latijnse school te Zwolle', in: M. Teeuwen, E. Rose (eds), *Middeleeuwse magister. Feestbundel aangeboden aan Árpád P. Orbán bij zijn emeritaat*, Hilversum, 2009 [2008], pp. 187-200.
- J. Hogg, 'Dom Charles Le Couteulx, annalist of the Carthusian Order', in: *Analecta Cartusiana*, 223, Salzburg, 2004, pp. 153-159.
- J. Hogg, *The Evolution of the Carthusian Statutes from the "Consuetudines Guignonis" to the "Tertia compilatio"*. Documents, vol. 1. *Consuetudines Guignonis; Prima pars statutorum antiquorum*; vol. 2. *Secunda pars statutorum antiquorum*;

- Tertia pars statutorum antiquorum; Statuta nova* (anastatic repr. of ed. Basel: Amorbach, 1510) (*Analecta cartusiana*, 99, 1-2), Salzburg, 1989.
- A.M.P. Ingold, *Les chartreux en Alsace. Prieurs de Strasbourg et de Molsheim*, Colmar & Paris, 1894.
- Inventaire des archives du Chapitre de St-Thomas de Strasbourg*, avec un préface par J. Adam, Strasbourg, 1937.
- I. Jaricot, *Essai sur l'histoire de nos coutumes chartreuses*, vol. 4. *Statuts de l'Ordre des Chartreux, première partie (Ancienne 2ème partie des Statuta Antiqua et Nova Collectio)*, etc. (*Analecta Cartusiana*, 308.4), Salzburg, 2014.
- M. Keuffer and G. Kentenich, *Verzeichnis der Handschriften des historischen Archivs der Stadt Trier*, 8. Heft. *Handschriften des historischen Archivs*, Trier, 1914.
- Th. Klausmann, *Consuetudo consuetudine vincitur. Die Hausordnungen der Brüder vom gemeinsamen Leben im Bildungs- und Sozialisationsprogramm der Devotio moderna*, Fränkfurt a.M. etc., 2003.
- S. Krämer, *Handschriftenerbe des deutschen Mittelalters [Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz, Ergänzungsbände 1-2]*, München, 1989.
- W.J. Kuehler (ed.), 'Petrus Horn, *Vita Magistri Gerardi Magni*', in: *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, N.S.*, 6 (1909), pp. 325-370.
- Dom C. Le Couteulx, *Annales ordinis Cartusienensis ab anno 1084 ad annum 1429*, vol. 1-8, [edited by monks of the same Order], Monstrolii [Neuville-sous-Montreuil], 1887-1891.
- G. List, G. Powitz, *Die Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek Mainz*. Bd 1. *Hs. I 1 - I 150*, Wiesbaden, 1990.
- R.B. Marks, *The Medieval Manuscript Library of the Charterhouse of St. Barbara in Cologne* (*Analecta cartusiana*, 21-22), Salzburg, 1974.
- J.D. Mixson, *Poverty's Proprietors. Ownership and Mortal Sin at the Origins of the Observant Movement*, Leiden, etc., 2009.
- S. Mossman, N.F. Palmer, F. Heinzer (eds), *Schreiben und Lesen in der Stadt. Literaturbetrieb im spätmittelalterlichen Strassburg*, Berlin and Boston, 2012.
- S. Mossman, K. Borchardt, 'Strasbourg (Bas-Rhin) et l'Île verte', in: *Prier et combattre. Dictionnaire européen des ordres militaires au Moyen Age*, Paris, 2009, pp. 887-888.
- W. Mulder (ed.), *Gerardi Magni Epistolae (Tekstuitgaven van Ons Geestelijk Erf, 3)*, Antwerpen, 1933.
- A. Passmann, 'Die Kartause zu Straßburg', in: *Archives de l'Église d'Alsace*, n.s., 9 (1958), pp. 81-97.
- T. Peeters, *Gods eenzame zwijgers. De spirituele weg van de kartuizers*, Gent, 2007.
- M.I. Pohl, *Thomae Hemerken a Kempis Opera Omnia*, vol. 7, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1922.
- R.R. Post, *Modern Devotion. Confrontation with Reformation and Humanism*, Leiden, 1968.
- F.-X. De Ram, 'Venerabilis Gerardi Magni de Daventria epistolae VIII, ex duobus codicibus MSS. bibliothecae publicae Argentoracensis', in: *Compte Rendu des séances de la Commission Royale d'Histoire ou Recueil de ses Bulletins*, 3rd ser., T. 2, 1st Bull., Bruxelles, 1861, pp. 66-110.
- J. Rathgeber, *Die handschriftlichen Schätze der früheren Straßburger Stadtbibliothek. Ein Beitrag zur elsässischen Bibliographie*, Gütersloh, 1876 (pdf download of this book available from the Universitätsbibliothek, Münster, through the link <http://sammlungen.ulb.uni-muenster.de/hd/content/titleinfo/1651610>).

- W.G. Rödel, *Das Großpriorat Deutschland des Johanniter-Ordens im Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Reformation (an Hand der Generalvisitationsberichte von 1494/95 und 1540/1541)*, Köln, 2¹⁹⁷².
- H.J. Roth O.Cist., 'Mainz', in: G. Schlegel - J.L. Hogg, *Monasticon Cartusiense*, Bd. 2 [*Analecta cartusiana*, 185, 2], Salzburg, 2004, pp. 556-562.
- J. Rott, 'Sources et grandes lignes de l'histoire des bibliothèques publiques de Strasbourg détruites en 1870', in: *Cahiers alsaciens d'archéologie d'art et d'histoire*, 15 (1971), pp. 145-180.
- H. Rüthing, *Der Kartäuser Heinrich Egger von Kalkar 1328-1408*, Göttingen, 1967.
- H. Rüthing, 'Die Kartäuser und die spätmittelalterlichen Ordensreformen', in: K. Elm (ed.), *Reformbemühungen und Observanzbestrebungen im spätmittelalterlichen Ordenswesen*, Berlin, 1989, pp. 35-58.
- H. Rüthing, 'Vier neue Briefe Geert Grootes', *Ons Geestelijk Erf*, 40 (1966), pp. 392-406.
- J.G.M. Sanders, *Waterland als woestijn. Geschiedenis van het Kartuizerklooster 'Het Hollandse Huis' bij Geertruidenberg 1336-1595*, Hilversum, 1990.
- L. Schlaefli, 'Strasbourg-Koenigshoffen', in: G. Schlegel, J.L. Hogg, *Monasticon Cartusiense*, Bd. 2 [*Analecta cartusiana*, 185, 2], Salzburg, 2004, pp. 589-596.
- G. Schlegel - J.L. Hogg, *Monasticon Cartusiense*, Bd. 2; 3 [*Analecta cartusiana*, 185, 2; 3], Salzburg, 2004-2005.
- R. Schlusemann, 'Von der IJssel bis Ostwestfalen: ein Kulturgebiet?', in: D.E.H. de Boer, I. Kwiatkowski (eds), *Die Devotio Moderna. Sozialer und kultureller Transfer (1350-1580)*, Bd. 1. *Frömmigkeit, Unterricht und Moral. Einheit und Vielfalt der Devotio Moderna an den Schnittstellen von Kirche und Gesellschaft, vor allem in der deutsch-niederländischen Grenzregio*, Münster, 2013, pp. 57-83.
- C. Schmidt, 'Livres et bibliothèques à Strasbourg au Moyen-Âge', in: *Revue d'Alsace*, n.s., 6 (1876), pp. 433-454; n.s., 7 (1877), pp. 59-85.
- H.J.J. Scholtens, 'Hendrik van Eger uit Kalkar en zijn kring', in: A. Ampe (ed.), *Dr. L. Reypens-album. Opstellen aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. L. Reypens s.j. ter gelegenheid van zijn tachtigste verjaardag op 26 februari 1964*, Antwerpen, 1964, pp. 383-408.
- H.J.J. Scholtens, 'Necrologie van het Kartuizerconvent van Monnikhuizen', in: *Archief voor de geschiedenis van het Aartsbisdom Utrecht*, 72, 1-2 (1953), pp. 90-124.
- H. Schreiber, *Die Bibliothek der ehemaligen Mainzer Kartause. Die Handschriften und ihre Geschichte*, Leipzig, 1927.
- J. Simmert, *Die Geschichte der Kartause zu Mainz*, Mainz, 1958.
- J.G.J. Tiecke, *De werken van Geert Groote*, Nijmegen, 1941.
- W. De Vreese (ed.), *Geert Groote, De simonia ad beguttas. De Middelnederlandsche tekst opnieuw uitgegeven met inleiding en aantekeningen*, 's-Gravenhage, 1940.
- M.-R. Wagner, *Inventaire analytique du dépôt de la fondation Saint-Thomas*, Strasbourg, 1995.
- J.J. Witter, *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum, In Bibliotheca Sacri Ordinis Hierosolymitani Argentorati Asservatorum*, Strasbourg, 1746, POD reprint 2012 available through Amazon, pdf download available from the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München, through the link http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/fs1/object/display/bsb11054632_00005.html (accessed 26-01-16).
- Th. P. van Zijl, *Gerard Groote, ascetic and reformer (1340-1384)*, Washington, D.C., 1963.

ABSTRACT

The focus of attention in this article is on three letters written by Geert Grote (1340-1384), founder of the religious reform movement *Devotio moderna* (his *Epp.* 15; 27; 85). It was until now generally assumed that Grote sent all three letters to a certain Matthew of Tiel. The purpose of this article is twofold, first, to try and find out whether there are arguments to support the often encountered claim that this Matthew intended to enter the Carthusian Order, and secondly, to consider whether the letters are indeed all three addressed to this recipient. On closer inspection, it can be established that Grote indeed addressed his *Ep.* 15 to Matthew, but there is no proof that he entered the Carthusian Order. Matthew has been proposed as the recipient of *Ep.* 27 as well, with the inference that there is a Carthusian connection for that letter, but there is no proof for this either. Since much of the contents of this letter deals with unallowed personal property in a monastic setting, a newly professed Cistercian seems a much more likely recipient. Likewise, there is no evidence that *Ep.* 85 was meant for Matthew. A further purpose of this contribution is to investigate the history and interrelationship of a group of manuscripts, all from Carthusian monasteries in the 'Prouincia Rheni', that transmit a short, but fairly consistent series of Grote's letters, among them his *Epp.* 15 and 27. This second topic turns out to be quite a major contribution to our understanding of how the Carthusians fit in with the *Devotio moderna*.

Address of the author: Titus Brandsma Instituut, Erasmusplein 1, NL-6525 HT Nijmegen (rijcklof.hofman@TitusBrandsmaInstituut.nl)