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ABSTRACT

Edinburgh University Library MS. 93 (Ed), hitherto unedited, is a collection of devotional (didactic, pastoral, meditative) treatises and Wycliffite scriptural fragments dating from the first half of the fifteenth century.

The treatises selected for editing are representative of the content, textual complexity, and biblical and patristic sources of the manuscript as a whole. The treatises edited are 'The Ten Commandments' (two versions); 'The Three Goods'; 'The Four Errors'; 'Of Lords and Husbandmen'; 'Meditation I of St. Anselm'; and 'The Statthal of Sin'. Ed is the base text for these editions, and the critical apparatus accompanying them provides all substantive variants from all known extant copies of the treatises. The edited texts are followed by interpretative notes and biblical and patristic commentaries. The textual variation among the copies of each treatise is fully considered in a separate discussion preceding the treatise. Those treatises which were not selected for editing have been included in this thesis as transcriptions; among the transcriptions are the Emendatio Vitae of Richard Rolle, and Wyclif's Sermon 'The Eight Blessings of Christ', and his tractate 'The Sixteen Conditions of Charity'. Thus this thesis contains, either as edited text with critical apparatus or as transcription, the entire manuscript.
In addition to the editions, transcriptions, and textual discussions, I attempt in the general introduction to place Ed in its literary and historical context. I also consider the various extant manuals of instruction and the arrangement of their texts, and I suggest, in conclusion, that for Ed there is a discernible pattern in the arrangement.

Rounding out the thesis are various appendices, one of which is a textual introduction to and edition of 'The Three Arrows' which although not in Ed is relevant to the understanding of certain aspects of Ed. I have also provided a chart of affiliated manuscripts and shared treatises.
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VOLUME I

Selected Treatises
In this preface I wish to explain, in general terms, what this thesis is about, and to give the reader an overview of it, for there is some danger of over-emphasis, or, worse, distortion, in presenting editions of selected texts from some one manuscript. My reasons for selecting the texts that I do are set out in the section on editorial method; ideally I would have preferred to edit all of the texts, but time has not allowed me this luxury. I have attempted in this thesis to do justice to the manuscript as a whole, but I am also aware of the fact that various parts of this thesis are relentlessly textual, and that the literary and religious aspects have been confined, for the most part, to the notes: I can only hope that the introduction retrospectively restores the balance.

This thesis is both an edition and a survey of late fourteenth and early fifteenth century devotional treatises. I have selected and edited, and provided introductions for the following six devotional treatises found in (Ed) Edinburgh University Library MS. 93: 'The Ten Commandments' (two versions), 'The Three Goods', 'The Four Errors', 'Of Lords and Husbandmen', 'Meditation I of St. Anselm', and 'The Stathel of Sin'. These treatises are representative of the content, textual complexity, and sources of the manuscript as a whole. I have also provided a transcription
of the remainder of the manuscript; among the better known texts transcribed are a version of Hisyn's translation of Richard Rolle's *Emendatio Vitae*, and an abridged version of John Wyclif's sermon 'The Eight Blessings of Christ'. In addition to the edition-transcription of Ed, I have also re-edited the fairly popular treatise 'The Three Arrows', which although not in Ed is relevant to our understanding of Ed's wider textual relationships and the kinds of sources tapped by the writers of devotional treatises.

In the introductory survey of devotional treatises, I look at the various manuscripts related (in differing degrees) to Ed, and I suggest that a useful way of studying these manuscripts is to consider them as codices (or books) which were compiled with manuals of instruction as their core. There is, of course, great variety in, and among, these devotional-instructional compilations, but as I attempt to show with Ed, there is good reason for believing that the arrangement of texts in at least one of these compilations proceeded according to a plan, or design, and that the resultant compilation attempted to offer its reader both in content and through its structure a practical path to a more detailed and self-transcendent knowledge of God.
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A Note on Certain Editorial Conventions

I have broken several typographical-notational rules, or conventions, in the writing of this thesis, and as my conventions may cause some confusion at first, it is best that the reader be forewarned.

(i) For aesthetic reasons and clarity of presentation I have not (save for the 'Abstract', 'Preface' and exceptions noted below) placed the title of a treatise or tract within single quotation marks.

Exceptions: (a) I have used single quotation marks for titles or incipits taken directly from a catalogue entry. (b) I have used single quotation marks for titles of treatises or tracts when these titles differ from those used in this thesis, or when the titles occur in a quotation taken from another thesis, article, book, or letter.

(ii) The British Museum referred to in this thesis is now the British Library. When I began the thesis, and organized my references, the British Library, as such, was not yet existent. Rather than change my reference system (and thus allowing the possibility of confusion to arise) I chose to stay with my British Museum (B.M.) references.
# Table of Contents

## Volume I (Selected Treatises)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Note on Certain Editorial Conventions</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Manuscript</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Note on Editorial Method</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ten Commandments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements of Text and Variants</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text (Rhetorical Version)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts (Prologue and Mixed Version)</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Three Goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Four Errors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Lords and Husbandmen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources</strong></td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation I of St. Anselm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textual</strong></td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialectal</strong></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text</strong></td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources</strong></td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Stathel of Sin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text</strong></td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources</strong></td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume II (Transcriptions, Appendices, and List of Works Consulted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seven Deadly Sins</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Five Bodily Wits</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Five Ghostly Wits</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Works Consulted .......................... 549
Classified List of Catalogues Consulted .............. 568
A Supplementary Note on the Latin Source of Meditation I of St. Anselm ......................... 574
Appendix IV: Chart of Affiliated Manuscripts ......... pocket of inside back cover
Edinburgh University Library MS. 93 (Slain Laing 140)\(^1\) (Ed)

20\(^{f.}\) men \(\)at prayen hym not deuoutely

ff. 1 + 103 + iii. Fly-leaves and pastedowns are blank paper.

Dimensions: 6 1/4" X 4 1/4". Written space c. 4" X 2 5/8".

22 long lines per page.

Collation: a\(^6\), b\(^8\)-d\(^8\), e\(^7\) (wants 8), f\(^8\)-m\(^8\), n\(^7\) (wants 8), o\(^3\).

Pagination: 17th century.

Hand: Secretary book-hand with elements of Textura and Anglicana. Blue initials (3 line) with red ornament.


Date: Dr. A.I. Doyle (letter of 24 November, 1974) suggests a dating after 1430, but perhaps before 1450.

Provenance: English, but contains no evidence of contemporary ownership. The signatures of Thomas Awdeley 1668 (f. 2\(^F\)) and J. Ames (ff. 1\(^F\) and 100\(^F\)) appear, the latter adding a comment on the biblical texts before his name: 'I take to be WICKLIF'S translation. J. Ames'; he has also annotated f. 100\(^F\) as 'II Peter, I. 5-9.' and f. 103\(^V\) '16 Mark 11 V. to end'. As the gospel portion of Mark is now incomplete we can only assume that at the time of Ames's possession the entire gospel was intact.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) See Catherine R. Borland, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library (Edinburgh, 1916), 149-150.

\(^2\) For Joseph Ames the bibliographer and antiquary see D.N.B. i, 353-355. Miss Borland suggests that Thomas Awdeley may have been a descendant of Lord Chancellor Audley (1488-1544), for whom see D.N.B. i, 723-726. However, with equal probability Thomas Awdeley may have been a descendant of John Awdeley (1559-1577) 'a London printer and miscellaneous writer.' D.N.B. i, 748.
Contents:

1. ff. 1v-3v

The Ten Commandments (Rhetorical Version)

[wants beginning and possibly end; leaves misbound: the proper order should be 2v, 2v, 3v, 3v, 1v, 1v, 4v, etc.

See the introduction to The Ten Commandments in this thesis, and the preliminary discussion of the arrangements of text and variants.]

Begins [as bound]: his neste whi lyers, for pei haten

Ends [as bound]: glosers and fals questioners breken

2. f. 1r

Table of Contents

Begins: Here bigynneth a table pat
tellith how many maters ben in
his boke

Ends: [17th century hand] A Treatise
of Sinne [Table of Contents does
not refer to concluding (ff. 100r-
103v) biblical passages.]

3. f. 4r

Prologue to The Ten Commandments [incom-
plete at beginning]

Begins [incomplete]: by eny maner wey
and crist seith

Ends: hestys & þei be not greuous nor
heuye.

[For a printed edition, see Kellogg and
Talbert, p. 371.]

4. ff. 4r-10v

The Ten Commandments (Mixed Version)

Begins: Here bygynneth þe ten
commandmentes of god þat eche
man must kepe. God hym self
spake all þese wordes
Ends: virgynes & all holy men and women have taught vs trewly to heuen.

[See Check-List, p. 61, item A.1 (b); for full reference see item 5, below.]

5. ff. 10v-15r The Seven Deadly Sins

Begins: Here sueth be seuen deadly synnes.

Pride Enuye & wrath bene synnes of be fende

Ends: moste loue and moste worship pat myght doo to Ihesu criste.

[See P.S. Jolliffe, A Check-List of Middle English Prose Writings of Spiritual Guidance (Toronto, 1974), 83-84, item F.21 (a-b), hereafter referred to as Check-List.]

6. ff. 15r-16r The Five Bodily Wits

Begins: Here folowith be 5e bodely wittis. HEryng. seyngs.

Smallyng. Tanstynge & Towchynge.

Ends: is forerwth hym by goddis lave an resone.

[See Check-List, p. 75, item D.9.]
7. ff. 16r-18r  The Five Ghostly Wits
Begins: Here suen þe fyue gostely
wittis. UNdirstondynge, mynde,
2 wil, ymaginacion & resone

Ends: who so sueth reson he goeth not
awys.

8. ff. 18r-22r  The Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost (A
Version)
Begins: Here sueth þe .vii. yeftis of
þe holigoste. WIsdome.
vndirstondynge. Counseil.
Strenkeþ. kannyng

Ends: or vnablip hym to þe yeftis of
þe holy goost.

9. f. 22rv  Six Maners of Consent to Sin
Begins: Here suen. six manner consentis
to syms. HÆ consentith þat
helpith £o doo a wikked deed.

Ends: and he þat stertith abak for
to reprehonde it.

[See Check-List, p. 82, item F.11.]
10. ff. 22v-25v The Eight Blessings of Christ

Begins: Here suath ye eijt blessyngys of crist in ye gospel of matthew .5°. Thys beene ye .viii. blessynges of crist

Ends: to tel goddis law & his will.

[The longer version of this (MS. Bodley 788) is printed in Thomas Arnold, ed., Select English Works of John Wyclif (Oxford, 1869), i, pp. 406-412. For the other extant manuscripts of this sermon see Ann Hudson, 'Contributions to a Bibliography of Wycliffite Writings', N.AQ. ccxviii (1973), 451.]

11. ff. 25v-27r The Three Goods

Begins: Off thre maner goodis. Iff pou haue godis of grace as vertues

Ends: preuely bryngeth in deeth to mannes soule. Amen.

[See Check-List, p. 109, item I.19.]
12. f. 27rv  The Seven Sacraments
   Begins: Here sueth pe seuen sacramentis.
   Baptym is pe first sacrament pat
   raketh man

   Ends: for alegeance of peynes in body
   and soule.

13. ff. 27r-28r  Four Needful Things
   Begins: Here sueth four nedefull thyngys
   to eche man. First is pat he
   must here

   Ends: Ihesu for his holy name, Amen.

   [See Check-List, pp. 105-106, item 1.9.]

14. ff. 28r-36v  The Four Cardinal Virtues
   Begins: Here bigynneth pe iiiij. cardynall
   vertues. Temperance. Prudence.
   Rightwisnes

   Ends: Ihesu hath sufficient strenk.

   [See Check-List, p. 69, item G.22.]
The Sixteen Conditions of Charity

Begins: Here begynneth pe xvj condicions of charite declarid.

Einds: [incomplete] wit who went a mys.


The Twelve Chapters of Perfection of Richard Hampole. [Emendatio Vitae]

Begins: Here sueth xii. chapitours of perfeccion of Richard hampolle drawynge. The first is: how wicked men shuld.


[For a printed edition of a version (Mysyn's translation, Corpus Christi College, Oxford MS. 236) close to that of Ed, see R. Harvey, ed., The Fire of Love and The Mon ding of Life, or The Rule]

17. ff. 79v-80v The Seven Bodily Works of Mercy Begins: Here bigynyth pe seuen bodily werkis of mercy. Crist shal say at pe day of dome

Ends: holden to pray for his frendis.

18. ff. 80v-31v The Twelve Articles of the Faith Begins: Here bigynyth pe .xii articlis of pe feith .... The first article is pat god is one substance

Ends: vertue to fulfill pat thynge for whiche pei bene ordeyned.
19. ff. 81v-82v  The Eight Tokens of Meekness

Begins: Here bigynne the viij. tokens of mekenes whereby euer man and woman may be knowen and seen.
The first tokyn is his, but he hath none

Ends: his bileue amongst all the children of israel.

[See Check-List, pp. 87-88, item G.12.]

20. ff. 82v-83v  The Sixteen Tokens of Love

Begins: Here bigynneth six [sic] tokenes of loue. Iff thou louest thi frende, bisely

Ends: travaile besily til he haue hem.

[See Check-List, p. 88, item G.14.]

21. ff. 83v-85r  The Four Errors

Begins: Here sueth the four arrouris of yuel lyuyngne. Iff any man seyth any parte

Ends: doith the wil of god dwellith withouten ende.

[See Check-List, pp. 82-83, item F.13.]
22. ff. 85r-87r  The Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost
(B Version)
Begins: The vij. yiftis of pe holy goste. The first makith low
hise hertis
Ends:  To pe namely bat ben rauyshyd
in contemplacion.

23. f. 87rv  The Magnificat
Begins: Magnificat anima mea dominum
MI soule magnifieth bo lorde
Ends:  in to worldes of worlodes. Amen.
[For a printed edition close to this
(from B.M. MS. Harley 2343) see W. Maskell,
'Appendix to the Prymer', Monumenta
Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicae (London,
1846), 235. Maskell's folio reference is
incorrect: for fol. 2 read ff. 95v-96v.]

24. ff. 87v-90r  Of Lords and Husbandmen
Begins: Here swen now lordis &
husbondmen shulde teche goddis ....
All mighty god in trinite
Ends:  austyn, be glorious doctor of
holy chirche.
[See Check-List, p. 104, item I.1.]
25. ff. 90r-95v Meditation I of St. Anselm

Begins: Here bigynmeth þe meditaciones of seynt anseelme. My life ierith me sore, for I serche it

Laxis: all þo þat loueth þi name Ihesu, Amen.


26. ff. 95v-100r The Stathel of Sin

Begins: Here bigynmeth a retice þat is þe stabile of synne. Iff þou couetist to be mayde cleane

Ends: whome þou has bought with þi precious blode, Amen.

[For a printed edition of this (from University College, Oxford MS. 97) see]
27. f. 100-102 Biblical Passages from 2 Peter, 2 Corinthians, and James

[2 Pet i, 5-9] Begins: SEynt petir seyth pat we shulden

Ends: shalbe aynistrid to vs. plenteously.

[2 Cor. vi, 1-7] Begins: Here bigynmeth be vi chapitour of poule to be Corinthis. BUT we helpynge monesheth

Ends (incomplete): armurys of rightwisnes of be right.

[Jas. iv, 1-17] Begins: Wherof bene batels and che'estis amonge yow

Ends: it is syn to hym pat can doo good and doith not.

[For the above passages see the Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible, eds. J. Forshall and F. Madder, (Oxford, 1850), iv.; see bibliography for full reference.]
28. ff. 102\textsuperscript{r}-103\textsuperscript{r}  

The Sacrament: biblical passages  
describing the Last Supper [Matt. xxvi,  
26-29; Luke xxii, 14-16; 1 Cor. xi,  
23-24]  

Begins: Here suth of \( \text{he} \) sacrament.  

And while \( \text{he} \) soupiden \( \text{i} \)hesu  

toke  

Ends: dispose oper thynges when I come.  

[For the above passages see the Later  
Version of the Wycliffite Bible.]

29. f. 103\textsuperscript{v}  

The Gospel of Ascension Day [Mark xxvi,  
14-20]  

Begins: The gospell of \( \text{he} \) ascension  
day. Whan \( \text{he} \) eleuen disciplis  
saten at \( \text{he} \) mate  

Ends (incomplete): wrought with hem  
and confermyd \( \text{he} \)  

[For the above passage see the Later  
Version of the Wycliffite Bible.]
INTRODUCTION

This introductory essay contains three interconnected parts. The first part is an attempt to place Edinburgh University Library MS. 93 (Ed) in its literary and historical setting, and involves a brief discussion of the historical background of vernacular manuals of religious instruction and the various doctrinal items which constitute these manuals.

The second part begins with a suggestion that manuals of instruction might be more profitably studied within the context of the codex in which they are found rather than as independent texts. Following from this is a study of various codices containing manuals of religious instruction and the arrangement of their texts. A classification of these codices is provided.

The third part is an elaboration of the second, but with the attention focused on Ed, and the ways in which it is a derivative and yet unique devotional collection. The arrangement of the instructional texts in Ed is also studied; and in this concluding study I suggest that for Ed there is a discernible pattern in their arrangement.

I

To judge from its contents -- Ten Commandments, Seven Deadly Sins, Seven Sacraments, Twelve Articles of the Faith, etc., -- Ed is to be associated with that general class of medieval manuscripts termed manuals of instruction. It is
not, as I will show in a later section, merely another of the 'manye bokes and tretees of vyces and vertues and of dyuersd doctrynes', but an unusually full and unique compendium of didactic, pastoral, and meditative treatises, and one dependent upon heterodox, as well as orthodox, sources for its 'dyuersd doctrynes'.

Ed, like so many manuals of instruction and devotional codices written before it, may be seen as a written response to a series of problems, questions, or events. The Christian manuals of instruction have a fairly long and continuous history, beginning with early second century 'catechisms' and continuing to the present day; they are in the

1 'Orologium Sapientie', Bodl. MS. Douce. 114, f. 92. For a printed edition of this tract, see Karl Horstmann, Anglia x (1887-1888), 323-394.

2 This assertion rests upon several assumptions: in order to establish the historical context I have assumed that Ed and the other codices mentioned here, and elsewhere in this introduction, are products of reflective thought. More specifically, I have assumed that Ed as a manual of instruction and a devotional codex was copied and compiled for a purpose, and that the scribe-compiler was aware of this purpose. For these, and other, general historical presuppositions see R.G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (1946; rpt. Oxford, 1973), 308-315.

3 T.F. Simmons and H.E. Nolloth, eds. The Lay Folks' Catechism E.E.T.S. O.S. cxviii (1901), xxx, hereafter referred to as Lay Folks' Catechism. As Simmons and Nolloth note, the word catechism was not used to describe a book until the early sixteenth century; historically, the word was descriptive of the method (question and answer) used to instruct people in the beliefs of a religion (Christian and Judaic) (xxx-xxxI), and mutatis mutandis the principles and techniques of a philosophy (Socratic), see R.G. Collingwood, An Essay on Philosophical Method (1933; rpt, Oxford, 1970), 10-11.
first instance a response to the absence of knowledge of God and His Church. The Christian Church has, from time to time, and in different places, felt it necessary to restate, reformulate, and propagate the central tenets of the Faith, to prod the indolent into action, and to counter ignorance with knowledge. Gregory the Great’s Liber Regulæ Pastoralis was an early (c. 590) and influential attempt to provide the bishops and clergy with a manual of guidance in the instruction of the laity. It was translated by Alfred the Great (c. 894), and sent out to various English bishops as the Cura Pastoralis. Alfric (c. 998) stipulates that priests before they are ordained are to have 'a psalter, epistle book, gospel book and mass book ..., manual, an Easter table..., a pastoral book, a penitential and a reading book ...'; the 'manual' was presumably to be used by the


7 Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, i, ed. Benjamin Thorpe (London, 1834?), 441-451, quoted by Margaret Deanesly, Sidelights on the Anglo-Saxon Church (London, 1962), 127-128. That a priest should have these various books is obviously the ideal.
priest in catechizing the numerous but ill-educated faithful. By the early thirteenth century it had become increasingly and painfully clear to the hierarchy of the Church that the education of the laity, and the clergy, on a local basis -- by bishops -- had failed. The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 was summoned by Innocent III to remedy specific abuses within the Church and the failure to educate the laity and clergy was among these. Canon 21, Omnis utriusque sexus, was promulgated to deal with this problem; in scholastic terms, its formal object was confession

---

8 The Christian in the eleventh century was to know the Pater Noster and Creed, 'if he learn them not he cannot receive the holy housel or be given Christian burial or lawfully stand sponsor at a baptism or at a confirmation (the laying on of the bishop's hands); not until he learns it and knows it well.' Code of Æthelstan (c. 1027), quoted by Margaret Deanesly, Sidelights on the Anglo-Saxon Church, 125; see also p. 114: 'A priest within his shire must baptise babies, say mass in his church on Sundays and holy days and teach his people in English the meaning of the creed and Our Father; lay people must know these by heart.' If this constituted the total required memorization on the part of the laity, (and they often failed in it, else why the continual reminder to the clergy) then the remarkable memory of medieval man so frequently alluded to must have been confined to the clergy.

and the preparation of the clergy to elicit good confessions from the laity:

Sacerdos autem sit discretus et cautos, ut more periti medici super infundat vinum et oleum vulneribus sauciati; diligenter inquiras et peccatoris circumstantias et peccati .... 10

While the specific influence of Canon 21 on the Liber Poenitentialis can be discerned, 'its principal legislative part' notes C. R. Cheney 'would be more in place among the decisions of a provincial council or diocesan synod than in a manual for priests.' 11

How these canons affected England is best summarized by Father Boyle:

One of the results of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 was a heightening of interest in the cure of


souls, and the years that followed the Council saw a generous effort on the part of prelates to provide, in accordance with the Lateran directives, a better-educated clergy who could bring the laity to a reasonable understanding of the essentials of Christian belief and practice. In England, during the reign of Henry III, nearly every diocese contributed to the movement for reform, chiefly by statutes modelled upon or deriving from decrees of Innocent III's great council. The Council of Oxford in 1222, the Council and Constitutions of the Legate Otto at London in 1237 and of the Legate Ottobono at London in 1268, catered in varying degrees for the Church of England as a whole. 12

However, by 1281 observance of the various canons and decrees had apparently weakened, and the Archbishop of Canterbury (the Southern primate) summoned his clergy to the Council of Lambeth (1281) and issued yet another, and fuller, version of the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council, which incorporated material from other, and more recent, councils. 13

---


13 For the canons see F.M. Powicke and C.R. Cheney, Councils and synods, with other documents relating to the English Church (Oxford, 1964), ii, pt. 2, 886-918, hereafter referred to as Councils and Synods, ii.
The important canon for our purposes is the one with the rubric 'De informatione simplicium sacerdotum' (incipit: 'Ignorantia sacerdotum'). The canon is too long to quote here in toto, but as Pecham's canon is an elaborated 'sketch of Christian doctrine and morals... which followed the same main lines' as Grosseteste's statute,\(^{14}\) it is well to quote from Grosseteste's more succinct statement first:

Ut unusquisque pastor animarum et quilibet sacerdos parochialis sciat decalogum, id est, decem mandata legis mosaicae, eademque populo sibi subjuncto frequenter predicet et exponat. Sciat quoque quae sunt septem criminalia, eademque similariter populo predicet fugienda. Sciat insuper saltem simpliciter septem ecclesiastica sacramenta, et hii qui sunt sacerdotes maxime sciant que exiguntur ad vere confessionis et penitentiae sacramentum, formamque baptizandi doceant frequenter laicos in idioma commun. Habeat quoque quisque eorum saltem simplicem intellectum fidei, sicut continetur in simbolo tam maiori quam minori, et in tractatu qui dicitur 'Quicunque vult', qui cotidie ad Primam in ecclesia psallit.\(^{15}\)


\(^{15}\) Councils and Synods, ii, 246.
Pecham's main points are adumbrated in the opening paragraph of 'De informatione simplicium sacerdotum':

In quorum remedium discriminum statuendo precipimus ut quilibet sacerdos plebi presidens, quater in anno, hoc est, semel in qualibet quarta anni, die una sollemnvi vel pluribus, per se vel per alium exponat populo vulgariter, absque cuiuslibet subtilitatis texture fantastica, quatuordecim fidei articulos, decem mandata decalogi, duo precepta evangelii, scilicet, gemina caritatis, septem etiam opera misericordie, septem peccata capitalia, cum sua progenie, septem virtutes principales, ac septem gratie sacramenta. Et ne quis a predictis per ignorantiam se excuset, que tamen omnes ministri ecclesie scire tonentur, ea perstringimus summaria brevitate. 16

The direct influence of Pecham's canon on the form and content of Latin and vernacular manuals of instruction has been fairly well established elsewhere, 17 as has the influence of Pecham's Constitutions upon the subsequent

16 Councils and Synods, ii, 900-901.

Provincial Constitutions of John Thoresby, archbishop of York (1357), and Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury (1408).

It seems, then, that the history of the contents of the manual of instruction is, to some extent, to be inferred from the canons of Provincial councils, both in England and abroad, and from the codes of Anglo-

17 contd.)


18 Lay Folks' Catechism, xv.

19 The Lollard Lible, 295.

20 Councils and synods, II, 337-383.
Saxon and Danish Kings, their writings, and the writings of their bishops. Using these sources it seems that while the instruction of laity and clergy has always (as far as we can tell) been of great importance, the required knowledge and number of specific items of doctrine has varied, and that, in general, the medieval layman of 1420 was required to know more than the medieval layman of 1027. This, of course, has interesting implications, and it may help to explain, among other things, the seeming necessity of more elaborate and self-contained written manuals of instruction.

II

The manuals of instruction themselves took on a variety of forms in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. W.A. Pantin has attempted to bring order to the religious

21 In order to have manuals of instruction, in different forms and in abundance, other things are, of course, required: plentiful and stable supplies of raw materials, stable conditions for the producers, and an audience willing and able to underwrite the cost of production. These factors have influenced, and continue to influence, all book production. For the importance of these material factors see H.S. Bennett, 'The Production and Dissemination of Vernacular Manuscripts in the Fifteenth Century', The Library, 4th series, i (1946-1947), 167-178.
literature of the fourteenth century, but his attempt, lucid and compelling though it is, is vitiated, in part, by his rigid methodology, for he fits religious literature into three discrete compartments, and devotes chapters to each: 'Manuals of Instruction for Parish Priests' (chapter nine); 'Religious and Moral Treatises in the Vernacular' (chapter ten); and 'English Mystical Literature of the Fourteenth Century' (chapter eleven).

His chapter discussions, focusing as they do upon these separate compartments, do not account for the overlap of these types of classes of religious literature.

---

22 The English Church in the Fourteenth Century, 189-262, esp. pp. 220-235. For the summary table which follows, see pp. 222-233. However, the 'alarming mass of material' still remains. There have, of course, been other attempts at classification. A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400, ed. J. Burke Severs (New Haven, Connecticut, 1970) ii, sections III, IV, and VI which is based upon J.F. Wells's A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400 (New Haven, Connecticut, 1916), and presumably superseded it, is far from complete, not well-organized, and does not consider the mass of manuals, other compendia of devotional and meditative treatises, or even some of the treatises themselves; (in this respect, the Severs edition is not an improvement on the Wells edition).

There have been two other, more recent, partial attempts at making some sense of the tremendous variety of vernacular religious texts; but both have concentrated on individual treatises, not codices, and have classified them. P.S. Jolliffe's, A Check-list of Middle English Prose Writings of Spiritual Guidance (Toronto, 1974), hereafter cited as Check-List, is a useful guide to, for the most part, the manuscript sources of lesser-known treatises. Jolliffe is also critical of Pantin's narrow focus, see Check-List, 12-13. N.F. Dicks's 'Varieties of Middle English Prose', Chaucer and Middle English Studies in honour of Rosell Pope Robbing, ed. Beryl Rowland (London, 1974), 348-356, is merely a skeleton framework of Middle English prose onto which are hung a selection of the usual well-known texts.
His treatment of 'Religious and Moral Treatises in the Vernacular', admittedly involving a consideration of 'a most alarming mass of material', is illustrative of both the success and failure of his method.

He divides these works into five groups, citing texts which he considers the 'starting point' of each group and derivative texts. Since the discussion in a later section of this introduction is an attempt at the classification of various types of vernacular treatises of religious instruction it is best to set out a summary table of his groups, and to comment on those pertinent to our discussion.

Group 1

starting point: *Mirror of Holy Church* (Mirror of St. Edmund).

---

derivatives: various English translations;  
Prick of Love (verse); How a man shall live  
perfectly (English version of first part of the  
Mirror, also in verse).

Group II

starting point: Manuel des péchés.  
derivatives: Handling Sin (verse translation);  
Of Shrift and Penance.

Group III

starting point: Somme le Roi.  
derivatives: Aesbite of Dvirt; Book of Vices  
and Virtues.

---

24 For the manuscripts and extracts see E.J. Arnould,  
Le Manuel des péchés, (Paris, 1940), 359-436. For  
Handling Sin see Robert of Brunne's 'Hondlyng Synne',  
ed. J.F. Furnivall, E.E.T.S. O.S. cxix, cxxiii. (1901, 1909);  
this edition also contains William of Waddington's  
'Manuel des Pechies' as a parallel text.

25 For manuscripts of the Somme le Roi see Vices and  
Virtues, xix-x. Aesbite of Dvirt, ed. R. Morris,  
E.E.T.S. O.S. xxiii (1866); for Book of Vices and  
Virtues see fn. 17, above.
Group IV

'The chief characteristic of this group is an ingenious attempt to equate the various groups of "sevens."'

convenient starting point: St. Anselm's Homily on the Beatitudes (in Latin).

derivatives: Tempulum Domini (Latin);
Speculum Vitae (Middle English, verse).

Group V

Miscellaneous treatises

1. The Poems of William of Shoreham.

2. The Prick of Conscience.

26 For St. Anselm's Homily see 'Homilia II', Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina, clvii, cols. 595-597; also The English Church in the Fourteenth Century, 227-228 for further references to other homilies and the Tempulum Domini. For the Speculum Vitae (The Mirror of Life) see J.E. Wells, A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 388.

4. Livre de Seyntz Medicines.
5. Lay Folks' Catechism.

The above groups do not constitute a systematic attempt to classify all, or even most, vernacular treatises of religious instruction. Although it is not indicated by Pantin, his groups may be seen to be an attempt to organize, for the most part, those treatises and meditations (and implicitly the codices themselves) which are aids to confession, and not necessarily aids to devotion. This distinction is not a rigid one: obviously, a person who takes confession seriously, and prepares himself for it, is also preparing himself for the devotional life. However, Pantin's groups, differing as they do among themselves, still present a distorted picture of the variety of religious, moral and devotional treatises, as well as codices, available to clergy and laymen in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

For example, in Group III Pantin in listing the Book

---

28 Jolliffe's study, Check-List, preserves the variety of vernacular treatises, but his categories are not very useful for classifying codices.
of *Vices and Virtues* (among others) as a derivative of the *Somme le Roi* underestimates the importance of the fact that the *Book of Vices and Virtues*, as a codex, is known to exist in only two manuscripts, while other English translations of the *Somme le Roi*, either complete or in part, exist in eight other manuscripts. He also fails to note that these translations appear as often as not with other devotional texts. One is left with the impression that of this type of literature there are three fairly well-known and influential texts. In fact, of the two translations noted by him, the *Alenbite* is unique, and was not, to judge from the dearth of imitators, well-known at all in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; and the cited *Book of Vices and Virtues* also had a limited appeal, and when it was known it was for some of its parts and not as a whole (or separate codex).

With Group V 'Miscellaneous treatises' the problems are slightly different. The group is indeed miscellaneous: extremely popular poem-treatises like *The Prick of Conscience* are not of the same order as the *Lay Folks' Catechism*; one could argue, pace Pantin, that the aim of *The Prick of Conscience* was not popular instruction, that it, unlike

---

29 Pantin does note that the Book appears in six other translations; however, see *Vices and Virtues*, xxxii, xlvi-lxi. The two codices are B.M. MS. Additional 17013, and Huntington Library MS. HM 147; the other extant text of the Book is found in BM, MS. Additional 22283,'Simeon', but this manuscript also contains numerous other religious pieces, e.g. the *Mirror of St. Edmund, Prick of Conscience, Speculum Vitae*.

the Speculum Christiani and Lay Folks' Catechism, was not in the first instance a text to be taught. The same can be said of The Poems of William of Shoreham, Livre de Seynts Medicines, and the Desert of Religion; these were elaborations and incidental products of religious and moral education, and not the primary vehicles for its inculcation. Pantin also over-estimates the popularity of the vernacular versions of the Speculum Christiani as a totality: from Holmstedt's Introduction and Table to the extant manuscripts of the Speculum Christiani it is clear that with the purely vernacular copies (only one copy of which contains the entire treatise) it was known for one or two excerpts, and not in its entirety. The bulk of the Speculum is written in Latin with English verse and prose only thinly interspersed. One could not infer this from Pantin's account.

I have attempted to show, through this brief critique, that Pantin's 'attempt to analyse and classify' religious and moral treatises in the vernacular is not altogether satisfactory, that its inadequacies are the result not only of applying distinctions too rigidly, but of ignoring the

---

31 Speculum Christiani, xv-cxxxiii, 326-328.
32 Speculum Christiani, xvi.
33 The English Church in the Fourteenth Century, 220.
complexities of manuscript compilation. Pantin's broader objective, however, is not without value; as a general account of religious literature of the fourteenth century it does provide us with a readily available frame-work into which lesser-known tracts and treatises may, perhaps, be fitted. Unfortunately, his framework for the vernacular religious treatises is too selective, and inconsistent to be of much help in the classification of vernacular religious codices.

There is an alternative approach, however: Pantin's grouping of religious and moral treatises in the vernacular may be looked upon as a successful attempt to identify treatises with regard to a narrowly defined subject matter. His groups may not be satisfactory classificatory categories, but he has directed attention to certain kinds of texts, and he has put them into an historical context. The next step is to take the different codices and to group, or categorize, them with regard to the kinds of texts they contain, and the ways in which these texts are arranged within the codices. That is, the classificatory scheme I suggest would consider manuscripts as codices, and not as repositories of interesting, but unconnected, treatises.34 The next step,

or stage of categorization, would be one which considered the different forms, or types, of codices within each major grouping. For example, given the major subject of religious and moral codices in the vernacular it is possible, taking one type of codex only, to classify it thus (a more detailed analysis of this scheme follows the discussion):

I. Codices containing Manuals of Instruction.

A. Prose

1. Manual as predominant text or alone.

B. Verse

The same five categories can be used.

It is apparent in the above classification that no allowance has been made for the distinction between long and short manuals, but this may be more properly dealt with at another level, since within any one sub-group it is likely to involve problems of textual relationships.35

---

35 See the introduction to The Ten Commandments in this thesis.
Further headings, II, III, etc. may be used to classify other types of codex: codices containing meditative treatises as primary texts; codices containing devotional texts as primary texts; codices containing moral texts and codices containing liturgical and homiletic texts as primary texts.

The schema I have suggested is open to the criticism of rigidity, that is, like Pantin's classification, fails to account for the overlap of classes. This may be so, but the schema I propose is 'open-ended'; that is, it is capable of refinement through the addition, deletion and re-ordering of classes. In the end, the overlap of classes may be, to some extent, unavoidable, but, as I suggest in the following discussion, the attempt to account for the overlap, within one codex, of the various classes of vernacular religious treatises raises other questions, and in the answering of these, the original framework may need to be adjusted. The schema, above, is provisional.

The advantage of classification by codex, as opposed to treatise, is that it would seem to allow us to classify a body of literature in a way which reflected the tastes and objectives of its producers and consumers. A further advantage to this kind of classification is that it focuses our attention on each codex, and its contents as a meaningful totality, and not just its more interesting or well-known parts. A classification of this kind has considerable relevance to the study of the popularity of certain books (and their individual contents), book production, and the history and sources of popular piety.
It has been noted that Ed is to be associated with that general class of medieval manuscripts known as manuals of instruction. I have already suggested that it is possible, by way of classification, to say more about manuals of instruction: there are different kinds of manuals, each presumably assembled with different objectives in mind. The following section is both a brief introductory discussion of these different kinds of manuals and a discussion of Ed's relationship to some of them. As a preliminary to this discussion I have provided the following classified list of manuscripts.36

1. Manual as predominant text, or alone.

(H₂) B.M. MS. Harley 2343
(P₁) Columbia University MS. Plimpton 258
(A) B.M. MS. Additional 17013
(H₄₁) Huntington Library MS. HM 147
(B₄) Bodl. MS. Eng.Th. c. 57
(L₄) Lambeth MS. 408.


(A₂) B.M. MS. Additional 28,026.
(Rw₁) Bodl. MS. Rawlinson A 381
(Rw₂) Bodl. MS. Rawlinson C 283

36 The list of manuscripts has been compiled from those manuscripts related either directly or indirectly to Ed. I have not attempted a systematic search of all extant catalogues, but in investigating the manuscripts related to Ed other manuscripts containing manual texts were discovered. The following survey is also preliminary.
(Ar₁) B.M. MS. Arundel 507
(G₁) G.U.L. Hunterian MS. 512
(E) Emmanuel College, Cambridge MS. 246
(A₁) B.M. MS. Additional 27392
(Ty) Trinity College, Oxford MS. 86
(G₁) G.U.L. Hunterian MS. 472 (?)

(Tn) Bodl. MS. Tanner 201
(St) Bibl. Ste Geneviève MS. 3390
(Tx) Trinity College, Dublin MS. 245
(B) Bodl. MS. 938
(T) Trinity College, Cambridge MS. R.3.21 (601)
(C₂) C.U.L. MS. Nn. 4. 12
(Ed) E.U.L. MS. 93
(C₅) C.U.L. MS. II. 6. 43

(L) Bodl. MS. Laud Misc. 23
(Ly) Bodl. MS. Lyell 29
(J) John Rylands Library MS. Eng. 85
(Rw) Bodl. MS. Rawlinson C 209
(T₁) Bodl. MS. Tanner 336
(S) B.M. MS. Additional 22283 (?)
(H) B.M. MS. Harley 1706 (?)

(L₁) Bodl. MS. Laud Misc. 174
(G) C.U.L. Hunterian MS. 520
(U) University College, Oxford MS. 97
(C₆) C.U.L. MS. Wh. 1. 12.
(N) New College, Oxford MS. 95
(T₂) Trinity College, Cambridge MS. B.14.54 (337)
(C) C.U.L. MS. Pp. 6. 31
(V) Westminster School MS. 3

1. Manual as predominant text, or alone. The manuals in this group can be considered as didactic codices; they may have been used by priests in the catechising of the faithful (A, Hn₁, Bt)³⁷, for virtually all of the canons of the Lambeth Constitutions are covered, and there is ample explanatory material (including biblical citations). In one (Lb) there is mention of the obligation prelates, parsons, vicars, and priests owe to the instruction of the laity:

'Pat eueryh pat vndyr hym has kepyng of sowlys opynly on englysch vpon sundays preche and tache haw; pat boy hawe cure of. pe lawe and pe lore to knove god almysty and his werkys.'³⁸ It is possible that a slimmer version of the

---

³⁷ For A and Hn₁, see Vices and Virtues, x, and for Bt, see P. Hodgson, 'Ignorancia Sacerdotum...', fn. 17, above.
³⁸ 'Lay Folks' Catechism, 7.
manual circulated, perhaps in booklet form, and was used by the laity as part of a programme of early religious instruction, (see Pl). 39

The essential doctrines of the faith are presented (either whole or in part) in these codices — Pater Noster, Ave Maria, the Apostle’s Creed, the Five Senses (both inner and outer), the Fourteen Points of the Faith, the Ten Commandments, the Seven Sacraments, the Seven Deeds of Mercy (both bodily and spiritual), the Seven Virtues, and the Seven Deadly Sins. This list may be extended to include the Eight Blessings of Christ, the Sixteen Conditions of Charity, and so on, (see H 2 and section III) but the initial ten items may be looked upon as forming the core of a manual of this type. Items in addition to these are probably accretions, which once joined to the manual become difficult to remove.

2. **Manual, liturgical and homiletic texts.** Several of the manuals in this group have been inserted into Horae or Prymers: in G 3 the manual 40 portion follows the Easter

---


40 The catalogue entry of J. Young and P.H. Aitken, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Hunterian Museum in the University of Glasgow* (Glasgow, 1908), 420, describes the manual section as a Primer, but the items listed by Young and Aitken as belonging to the Primer are not the same as those listed by Maskell, *Monumenta Rituaria ii*, pp. xi-xii, nor by H. Littlehales, ed., *The Prymer or Lay Folks’ Prayer Book*, R.E.T.S. O.S. cv(1895), viii-x. The various items in the Primer section of G 3 are the same as those discussed under Group I above.
Table and precedes the Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary; in $A_1$ and $B$ the manual has been added at the end of the Prymer.\footnote{A and $E$ also appear to be close textually, both having the same calendar with the same entries for 21 May, 'Here was the quake the yeer of our lord M. ccc. lxxvij', and 16 July, 'King Richard was crowned the yeer of our lord M. ccc. lxxvij'. They also share the same version of The Ten Commandments; see the catalogue of manuscripts in the introduction to The Ten Commandments in this thesis. I hope to pursue these, and other, connexions elsewhere.} In $A_2$ the manual has been tacked onto an English commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel; the Gospel portions are also in English and in the earlier version of the Wycliffite Bible. The manual appears in whole in Ty and in part in $Rw_1$ as part of what appears to be a priest's book; in $Rw_1$ the Ten Commandments and Seven Deadly Sins follow 'Hymnies for the Sundays and festivals throughout the year', while in Ty the manual is number five of sixteen items, which include: various sentences of excommunication, forms of confession, and tracts on the visitation of the sick, and the celebration of the sacrament of matrimony. In $Rw_2$ the manual, with longer pieces on the Seven Deadly Sins and the Ten Commandments, is part of a codex containing various Latin reference texts: 'Canones Evangeliorum', 'capitula omnium librorum Sacre Scriptura', and 'Excerpta ex Scintillis Defensoris; omn tabula capitulorum', among others. In all of these codices the manual portion is relatively small when compared to the other liturgical and
homiletic texts, but its inclusion in these codices suggests that the instruction of the laity begins with the instruction of the clergy, and that various liturgical texts might be used to carry other necessary, but more didactic messages.

3. **Manual, devotional and moral texts.** For some of the codices in this section the manual is, for the most part, the dominant portion of the codex, but the addition of devotional, pastoral, and moral treatises, and the expansion of the manual itself, so alter the character of the codex that it can no longer be considered as a straightforward didactic book, as are those in 1, above. The various codices in this section have the manual as their only common core. In Th the manual is prefixed to the 'Memoriale Credentium'. In St the manual portion is a version of The Lay Folks' Catechism (see Lb, above), and it is preceded by tracts on the Ten Commandments; the Apostle's Creed; and Faith, Hope and Charity. The manual and three tracts account for over half of the codex, the rest being devoted to Richard Rolle's 'Form of Perfect Living', and 'Ego Dormio'. In Tx the manual is the opening text, and it is followed by twelve tracts (some, arguably, by Wyclif), all of a stern moral character, and several certainly devotional. C5 also opens with the manual, but the rest of the codex — 143 out of 156 folios — is given over to various prayers, meditations, some in Latin some in English, and several edifying legends.
Another codex which is similar in the variety of its contents, and which also begins with the manual is T. However, as with C₅, the remaining text of T dwarfs the manual; it has well over 300 folios containing numerous Lydgatean religious poems, poem-meditations on the Mass, and various prose pieces -- Benefits of the Communion, Life of Adam. B begins and ends with manual texts, but its remaining tracts have manual material scattered throughout them; for example a tract on the Seven Deadly Sins, among others, has been inserted into the long devotional-meditative treatise Pore Caitif, and the Seven Sacraments has been put between Of Widowhood and Quicunque Vult.

Ed, likewise, begins with the manual, and as with several other manuscripts in this section the devotional and moral treatises slightly outnumber (in folios) the amount of manual text. It is worth noting, however, that Ed, like B, has manual texts after devotional tracts: the Bodily Works of Mercy and the Twelve Articles of the Faith follow Rolle's Twelve Chapters of Perfection.

The codices in this section are to be distinguished, then, by the usual, but not invariable, arrangement of manual text plus devotional or moral texts. Occasionally, portions of the manual, excerpts perhaps, will be slotted

---

42 That these pieces were intruded into the treatise was known, apparently, by at least one contemporary, for in the numbering of the various sections of the treatise the extraneous pieces were not numbered. See Sister Mary Teresa Brady, R.D.C., 'The Pore Caitif: An Introductory Study', Traditio x (1954), 533, fn. 40.
into different positions in the codex, presumably as reminders that the doctrines of the Church are the seed ground of devotion. This suggestion will be explored more fully in part III of this introduction.

4. **Manual and meditative texts.** In this section I have attempted to account for those codices which contain the manual and meditative treatises. However, there are definitional problems inherent in the class called, here, meditative treatises, for meditations may well be, to some readers, devotional texts, and as such texts they (and the manual) could be dealt with in section 3. I have classified a treatise as meditative if it deals with apocalyptic or eschatological themes, or in some way forces the reader to think upon the Last Day. Using other criteria a wider selection of manuscripts could be classified in this section. L, J, and Rw begin with a manual, and this is followed by various meditations: 'A devoute meditation of Richard Hampole', 'A meditation on the name of Jesus' (Rw); The Mirror of Sinners, and The Three Arrows of Doomsday, among other pieces (L, J). Ly's manual follows the Mirror of Sinners, and Poor Caitif. S and H are included in this section for both contain manuals and meditations, but both are long codices containing texts other than meditations, so the classification of them is uncertain. S has the long manual text The Book of Vices and Virtues, and H has two different manuals in various places in the codex. To judge
from the arrangements of the texts of L, J, Rw and Ly it seems that when a manual occurs with meditative texts it does so as an entity; that is, the manual text is not broken up and its pieces inserted among meditative - devotional - pieces. It is possible that the meditations, being as a rule longer than the devotional tracts, were taken and copied so as to form one large unit, thus occupying, before the whole manuscript was finally ordered, a fairly continuous and long stretch of manuscript. This seems to be the case with the Mirror of Sinners and The Three Arrows meditations, for they were often treated as a pair, and, often as not, were copied as a pair.43 It is also possible that meditations were perceived by the scribes to be in a class by themselves and were not treated as devotional texts.

5. Manual extracts, and other texts. There are numerous codices which contain extracts, occasionally fragments, of manuals, but the kinds of extracts vary. N, a codex of Wyclif's (or Wycliffite) sermons and tracts, has the Seven Works of Mercy and the Creed, and these are separated by four tracts. C has only a long treatise on the Seven Deadly Sins by Richard Lavynham,44 the rest of the codex containing...

43 Sec Appendix II of this thesis.
44 Other copies of the Lavynham treatise occur in the following manuscripts: L, Rw, C, above; British Museum MSS. Harley 211, ff. 35r-46; Harley 1197, ff. 5r-29v; Harley 1288, ff. 64r-73v; Harley 2383, ff. 65r-78v; Royal 8.C.I. ff. 144v-156; Dr. Williams's Library MS. Anc. 3, ff. 133-145v; Trinity College, Cambridge MS. B. 14. 19, ff. 243r-258v; Bodleian Library MSS. Ashmole 750, ff. 89v-96v; continued over/...
various tracts: 'Propur Mille', 'The holi prophete david seid', 'A tretys of ili dyuers pouits', 'A tretys of hugh of seynt victor', and the Four Errors. In T₂ the extracts predominate: the Creed, Ten Commandments, and Bodily and Spiritual Wits take up all but ten pages of the codex.

L₁ has a short tract on the Creed and this has been inserted into a codex containing a very long tract on the 'Life of the Virgin Mary and numerous apocalyptic meditations: Mirror of Sinners, Three Arrows, and the Meditation I of St. Anselm. The manual extracts in it include the Ten Commandments, the Pater Noster, and the Twelve Articles of the Faith. The codex is in two parts, the first being in Latin and the second English; the contents of the English part resemble those of U, in that U and L₁ have the same apocalyptic meditations. Both C₆ and W open with commentaries on the Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Ten Commandments, but C₆ adds a treatise on the Twelve Articles of the Faith, and W adds a list of the Bodily and Spiritual Works of Mercy; both codices contain various tracts on devotional and moral topics which are, in general, guides to a more perfect way of life.

There does not seem to be any pattern to the arrangement.

44 continued...

Douce 60, ff. 193r-213r; St. Peter Hungate Museum of Church Art at Norwich in volume 48, 153, 926, ff. 21r-58r; and University of Leeds MS. Brotherton 501, ff. 68v-74r. For the above references I have depended upon J. F. W. van Zutphen's edition of Lavenham's treatise, A Litil Tretys (Rome, 1956), xxxiii. For the most part, I have not attempted to classify the codices containing this treatise.
of these extracts in the various manuscripts, nor does one manual text seem more popular than another. Of the codices noted, the manual texts and their positions in the codex which might deserve closer attention are the Creed, the Seven Deadly Sins, and the Ten Commandments. If more codices were studied the number of manual extracts might well increase, and definite patterns might emerge.

III

In the above survey I have concentrated on the manuals and their occurrence with or without certain other kinds of text. In this concluding section, however, I wish to look more closely at the manuals of Group 3, specifically the relationships of the doctrinal and meditative and devotional topics of these codices, some of the ways in which these topics and their treatment varied, and the various arrangements of these topics within the codex. In this way the unique nature of Ed can be assessed, and an appreciation gained of some of the subtleties and complexities connected with the compilation of a devotional codex.

As has been noted in Section I, the actual contents of the manual were determined, to a great extent, by specific canons of various Church and Provincial Councils; Archbishop Thoresby's Canons were translated into English:

The laws and the lore to knawe god all-mighten,
That principali may be shewed in this six thinges;
In the fourtene poynctes that faile to the trouthe,
In the ten commandements that god has gyven us,
In the seuen Sacrements that er in hali kirke,
In seuen dedys of merci until oure seuen-cristen;
In the seuen vertues that ilk man sal use,
And in the seuen dedely sinnes that man sal refuse."^{45}

These same injunctions appear in Lb and John Gaytryge's
Sermon, and in a slightly different form in the Speculum
Christiani;^{46} they summarize what were thought to be the
essential doctrines of the faith in mid-fourteenth century
England. These six topics were not the only set of doctrines:
the Book of Vices and Virtues offers the following six: the
Ten Commandments, the Articles of the Faith (Creed), the
Seven Deadly Sins, Virtues, the Pater Noster, the Seven
Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the 'related virtues'.^{47} In
the Book of Vices and Virtues the list is not enumerated at
the beginning of the treatise, so the various topics treating
the essentials of the faith were covered without this being
specified. I do not wish to push too far this distinction
between the direct assertion of the required doctrines and

---

^{45} From Thoresby's Register, York, and quoted from Lay Folks' Catechism, 20.

^{46} Religious Pieces in Prose and Verse, 1-15; Speculum Christiani, 8-9.

^{47} Vices and Virtues, xxii.
the seemingly indirect assertion of them, but as a structural, or ordering, device, the enumeration of what is to be covered often affects what follows and in what order. It is clear, however, that there existed in the fourteenth century a list of requisite doctrinal topics.

In terms of the doctrinal points covered, Ed follows the Thoresby canon (and this applies, by and large, to the other codices of Group 3 as well): Ed has the Ten Commandments (two versions), the Seven Deadly Sins, the Bodily and Spiritual Wits, the Seven Sacraments, the Bodily Works of Mercy, and the Four Cardinal Virtues. With regard to the organization of its manual, Ed may be seen, then, as a more catechetical text than that of the Book of Vices and Virtues, but, as is indicated in the following, certain tracts in Ed's manual clearly follow a textual tradition distinct from those of Lb, and one not overtly catechetical.

(i) The Mixed Version of the Ten Commandments of Ed, along with A1 and C3, is textually related to S (of the Book of Vices and Virtues), and B1 (The Ten Commandments of John Wyclif). To complicate matters further, part of the

48 The four cardinal virtues are Temperance, Prudence, Righteousness, and Strength, and is a unique treatise; Faith is also treated at the end of the treatise. Charity has a tract to itself -- The Sixteen Conditions of Charity. Hope is not treated, but it can be argued that Hope is the motivating force of the closing apocalyptic meditations.

49 For a fuller account of the Ten Commandments and its various versions, see the introduction to it in this thesis.

50 Bodleian MS. 789, ff. 108-123.
Mixed Version of Ed is also textually dependent upon Lb, or an Lb-like text. Ed also has a Rhetorical Version of the Ten Commandments, and this is textually related to B and Ty.

(ii) The Seven Deadly Sins of Ed is closer in overall form and content to Lb than to S, but, again, the version in Ed depends upon a different textual tradition; Ed, and the manuscripts to which it is related -- Ly, T, Cj, G1, A1, T£, and J -- draw upon a text, or texts, which have the remedies to the Seven Deadly Sins following each deadly sin. Such an arrangement argues for a source closer to the Miroir du Monde or Chaucer's Parson's Tale than to Lb, or S.51

(iii) The Twelve Articles of the Faith of Ed parallel by article (but not by commentary) the first eight articles of S; Ed and T depend upon the same source for their version of the Creed. However, as Curt Bühler has observed, the

51Vices and Virtues, xxiii. Francis does not note that William of Pagula's Oculus Sacerdotis, Pars Dextera, also has the remedies against sin, see National Library of Scotland, Advocates MS. 18.3.6. ff. 64v-81v. The remedies in this manuscript follow the discussion of each sin. B has the remedies against the sins gathered together at the end of the treatise, but these remedies are not antidotes to the specific sins, see ff. 247v-248v.
articles of the Creed vary greatly both in number and in order: Ed may have depended upon an Lb or S-like text for its Creed.

Although it is tempting to place Ed (and several of the manuscripts to which it is related) with the standard catechetical text of Lb, the texts of the treatise suggest that the scribe of Ed, or more properly the scribe of its immediate source, or perhaps its compiler, drew upon a variety of sources for his texts. That is, various tracts in Ed retain traces of catechetical and more discursive compilations, so Ed as a compilation may be seen as representing a fusion of two distinct manual traditions.

The above accounts, in part, for the antecedents and the diversity of sources of Ed's manual. The following consideration of the arrangement of the treatises is, essentially, an attempt to explain both the relationship of the manual tracts to the other devotional and meditative tracts, and the literary-religious structure of the codex as a whole. The explanation I will offer is based upon the presupposition that a codex is compiled according to a design, that a codex (in this case a type of devotional codex) is not a random assortment of didactic, devotional, and meditative treatises. I have also assumed that the

---

52 'The Apostles and the Creed', Speculum xxviii (1953), 338.
53 See Parkes, pp. 127-131. Parkes mentions but does not discuss the influence of the concept compilatio in the production of vernacular books; however, he cites (p.131, fn. 1) the forthcoming Ph.D. thesis of Mr.A.J. Minnis, 'Medieval Discussions of the Role of the Author', Queen's University of Belfast, and his discussion of the 'applications of the notion of compilatio in vernacular literature'. I have not seen this thesis, nor have I been able to locate it; it is, apparently, still 'forthcoming'.

act of writing or compiling Ed presented the scribe-compiler with a problem (or problems), and that his product, in this case the manuscript Ed, is a record of his attempt to solve what is, essentially, a religious problem: How to reconcile a finite man with an infinite God.54

For ease of discussion, and so that the order of the tracts in Ed is clear, I have set out below the contents of the codex, with manual tracts underscored.

1. Ten Commandments (Rhetorical Version, fragment)
2. Ten Commandments (Mixed Version)
3. Seven Deadly Sins
4. Five Bodily Wits
5. Five Ghostly Wits
6. Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost (A Version)
7. Six Manners of Consent to Sin
8. Eight Blessings of Christ (abridged version of Wyclif's sermon)
9. Three Manners of Good
10. Seven Sacraments
11. Four Needful Things
12. Four Cardinal Virtues
13. Sixteen Conditions of Charity
14. Twelve Chapters of Perfection of Richard Hampole
15. Seven Bodily Works of Mercy
16. Twelve Articles of the Faith
17. Eight Tokens of Meekness
19. Four Errors

54 The influence of Collingwood, The Idea of History, 314-315, is apparent. With regard to my explanation, I have attempted in it, in Popper's words, 'so to reconstruct the problem situation as it appeared to the agent, that the actions of the agent become adequate to the situation.' Karl Popper, Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach (1972; rpt. Oxford, 1975), 189.
20. Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost (3 Version)
21. The Magnificat
22. Of Lords and Husbandmen
23. Meditation I of St. Anselm
24. Statheal of Sin

The manual portion of Ed is best seen within the context of the devotional, or meditative, life. It is an aid in the preliminary stage in the steady movement from ignorance of God, and His laws to knowledge of God, His love, and self-transcendence. The manual is an important stage for it lays the moral groundwork of the higher devotional or meditative life. Items 1-12 are, for the most part, tracts concerned with the conduct of one's life: they are intensely moral tracts which make the reader not only aware of the pervasive and sometimes ineradicable nature of sin, but of man's power to overcome sin.

Both versions of the Ten Commandments focus on the prohibitions and injunctions, as well as on the breakers of the commandments. The Seven Deadly Sins treat not only of the sins, of course, and their branches, but of the remedies against the sins. The Bodily Wits are to be guarded against sin: "No thynge maketh men soner to falle from be commaundements of god than doeth be entrynge of be fende at be v wyndowis of be body". The Ghostly Wits are to help man
fight off sin: 'Vndirstondynge is youen to man of euel thynge to fleeing it, and of good thynge to seche it, gete it, and holde it.' The Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost (A version) are given to man to help him improve the tone of his moral life: 'Wysdome þat commeth from aboue is first chaast, also it is pesible, it is esy to treat to goodnes, it is consentynge to good thynges ...'.

The Eight Blessings of Christ is built around Christ's Sermon on the Mount and the eight beatitudes, but the commentator (presumably Wyclif) has used these beatitudes to lecture on the inroads of sin: 'Blessid be pore men in spirit, for heren is þe kyngdome of heuen. And here crist techyth makes ayens pride of worldely men...'. Sin and its correction in this world through the use of one's 'goods' is the subject of the Three Goods:

Iff þou haue godis of grace as vertues, or godis of kynde as myght & strenkeþ, or goodis of fortune as goodis of þis world, spend hem welte and discreetly whil þou myght and art of power, for ellis þei shal turne to þine accusynge at þi moste nede, when þou shalt yeyle rekenynge of all þe goodis þat god hath lent to þe whil þat þou dwellist here.

With the exception of Confirmation and Holy Orders, the sole concern of the Seven Sacraments is with the prevention or purgation of sin.
The transition into the second part of the codex -- the devotional and meditative part -- begins with a short tract on Four Needful Things:

First is that he must here be words of God & his law. 
Be second he must understand be words of God ....Be thrid he must worche hereafter in deed ....Be fourth is his to contynue in good werkes to be ende of his life, for if he do wele for a tyme and at be last turneth ayen to his synn all his former doynge helpith hym not to heuen ....

The emphasis in this tract is on the 'words of god', and the attentive listening to it.

The Four Cardinal Virtuoso while occasionally touching on sin, and the necessity of penance, is, for the most part, concerned with establishing what temperance, prudence, right-wisness, and strength are, and ought to be, for the Christian, and how these virtues like strength 'makith a man stronge in louse both to god & to man, and also herby a man hath grace to suffre strongly aduersities, and to be myghty in discrete penance'. After reading this tract, one has been armed, as it were, and is now prepared to read on, to listen to the word of God, to meditate, and to strive for perfection: love and knowledge of God.

As a preparation for this next step there is the treatise the Sixteen Conditions of Charity, which begins, formally, the second part of the codex. Part I may be seen, then, as a preparation for the devotional life, or, if one
chooses, the meditative life. But before beginning this life (and it is essentially a mental life) one must conform to the laws of God, rid oneself of sin (and in order to do this one must know what the chief sins are and their remedies), prepare the body and the mind for the assaults of sins, know and receive the Sacraments for they protect one against sin, listen to the word of God for it edifies, and practice the cardinal virtues for they prepare man to know and believe in God.

The second part begins, as noted above, with the Sixteen Conditions of Charity, a treatise which, as noted earlier, may be seen as an extension of the virtues. Like the disquisitions on the virtues, the Sixteen Conditions of Charity emphasizes what the conditions are: for example, 'The first is that caritas is patient of wrongs, for all our caritas not be ensampled of crist...'. It is worth remarking that in the second part the discourse centres around charity, love, caritas rather than around poenitentia, as in Part I.

Next follows the Twelve Chapters of Perfection of Richard Hampole, a long treatise (41 folios) beginning with a chapter entitled 'how wicked men shuld turn hem from synn';

---

55 See fn. 48, above.
with the final two chapters being 'The .xi. of perfite loue of god. The .xii. of contemplacion of goddis ordynance and worchynge.' This is Richard Misyn's translation of Richard Rolle's De Emendatione Vitae, and may be looked upon as a devotional text beginning with a meditation upon sin, and the sinfulness of man (rather than a didactive tract explaining sin) and ending with a long tract on contemplation, beginning 'Contemplacion or contemplatyue life hath thre partyes as in redynge, praynge & thynkyng.' The Rolle treatise is, then, a self-contained programme for the devotional or meditative life; in many ways (and in spite of its opening chapter on sin) it seems to presuppose a fairly thorough knowledge of manual material.

The chapters of this treatise are meditations upon particular aspects of the devotional and contemplative life — poverty, tribulation, patience, prayer, holy thinking, perfect reading, cleanness of heart — they are not discourses which attempt to tell the reader what a thing is by way of composition, progeny, or remedies. 56

Because of the length and the fact that it is a separate extended meditation on the path of perfection,

56 'Pore Caitif' (see fn. 42) has similar topics: 'Vertuous Pacience, Of Temptacioum, The Loue of Ihesu, Of Verri Meeknes, Actiif Liif and Contemplacioum' (p. 532). Although Sister Mary Brady calls 'Pore Caitif' a 'manual of religious instruction' it is not a manual in the sense I have used it; 'Pore Caitif' is not well suited for formal religious instruction, for it lacks the didactic element usually found in the manuals and catechisms. It seems better suited for reading and meditation.
this treatise may have been read as a separate work. However, the compiler may have placed this work, after the central notion of caritas had been introduced, as a recapitulation, in the meditative mode, of the more didactic points made in the first twelve tracts, and as a foreshadowing of the concluding meditations. The treatise itself has in its opening lines an enumeration of the contents of the treatise, so the reader could choose, if so inclined, a tract appropriate to his devotional mood.

The next two tracts -- Bodily Works of Mercy and the Twelve Articles of the Faith -- are from the manual and may be seen to follow, without disjunction, either the Sixteen Conditions of Charity (if the Twelve Chapters is omitted), or any of the Twelve Chapters tracts. The Bodily Works of Mercy and the Twelve Articles of the Faith are universally applicable. The Bodily Works of Mercy are evidence of the working of charity in the soul of the sinner-contemplative; they are also useful reminders to the would-be contemplative that he is part of the world and that his love of Christ entails love of man. The Articles of the Faith, although a short tract, is an important document for any reader, for the articles are the essential propositions of Christian thought: they are also at the same time, and at a different level, encapsulations of the central mysteries of the religion, and at another level they are the recapitulation of the life of Christ. The reader is forced at this stage, if he is alert to the text, to stop and to consider what it is that he believes.
These two tracts, unlike the other manual tracts, are not concerned with sin, and its purgation, and it is interesting to note that they have been put last and after the notion of charity has been discussed. It is of course not a necessary sequence; the Bodily Works of Mercy and the Twelve Articles of the Faith or Creed may well be put at the beginning of the manual (see B, Tn, Tx) and there are good doctrinal arguments for doing so, but they may, depending upon the compiler, be put in other places, and to good effect.

With the Eight Tokens of Meekness, Sixteen Tokens of Love, the Four Errors, and the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost (B version) there is an elaboration of the themes of humility and the right ordering of one's life. Although these topics have been considered previously (meekness and humility were mentioned as remedies to the deadly sin of pride, and balance in one's life was mentioned in the Four Cardinal Virtues), they were not treated at length, and they should receive a more detailed exposition. In the Four Errors one is gently reminded, in subject matter and tone, of parts of the discourse on the Seven Deadly Sins: 'for why all thynge þat is in þe world is couetise of ey, lust of flesh & pryde of life, which is not of þe fader but of þe world'. But the harsh moral tone of the Four Errors has a purpose, and one is warned from the opening sentence: 'If any man semyth any parte of holy writ hard or heuy to vndirstonde, purge hys sylf of þes errouris þat suen...'. This tract may be seen as a necessary warning to those who would travel the path of the contemplative that the soul of man is sin-stained,
and that sin alone obscures the proper understanding of Holy Writ.

The B version of the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost blends fragments of the Pater Noster with the Beatitudes, and the reader is returned once again to a higher plane: 'The seveneth maketh the soules desire euermore vpward with yeft of the spirit of wisdom', and the tract closes with a litany-like roll of those to whom the Holy Ghost will come and dwell in: 'To ye pat hathe cleene soules, To ye pat bene oyned in good loue, To ye pat kepeth not to be seyn to veyn icy, To ye pat be devocut nyght & day in prayers, To ye pat bene make within & without, To ye pat dwellith in pepes, To ye namely pat ben rowshyd in contemplacion.' The Magnificat, which follows, is a small celebration, perfectly within keeping for those who long for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, but do so in a perpetual season of Lent.

Of Lords and Husbandmen begins the apocalyptic or eschatological section of the codex. It is, essentially, a pastoral treatise made up of citations from the fathers and the bible admonishing and instructing 'Lordsis and husbandmen' how they 'shulde teche goddis commaundmentys & pe gospel to her servauntis as pei shall answerse for hem to god in pe dreadfull day off doomes.' The tract ends with a reference to David and the love he had for
his people: 'and he fed hem in be innocence of his hert'.

The concern and responsibility that one feels for the salvation of one's subjects and charges gives way in Meditation I of St. Anselm to a fearful concern for one's own salvation: 'My life ferith me sore for when I serche it bisely it seemyth to me eiper in syn or without fruyte wele nysgh all my life.' Throughout the treatise there are self-abnegatory phrases directed toward the speaker: 'O merciful god you norishyst & fedyst & abydist an vnprofitable worms and stynkynge in synne'; he refers to himself as 'bareyn soule', 'vnfruytful tre', 'wrechid synner', and 'caitife synner'. The speaker's final plea is to be spared the 'euerlastynge corrupcion' of hell, and to be included 'with all þo þat loueth þi name Ihesu' in heaven. The meditation is an effective display of the power of the mind to conjure up that 'day of myst and of darknes', and the imagined response of a wretched sinner faced with eternal damnation.

The Stathele of Sin continues in the same eschato-
logical mood, beginning with a warning to the sinner to 'gadder to gedyr þe myghtes of [his] soule', and to meditate upon his 'wrechid lyuyng'; thereafter various fragments of his wretched living are called to mind, and his unworthiness is dwelt upon: 'I this wrechid erthly worme, þe moste vilest synner of synners of all...
haue in so myche deseruyd be streitnes of bi right wisdoms'. In contrast to the previous meditation, the sinner-speaker of the Stathel of Sin makes the appeal for salvation early in the meditation, and repeats it often throughout: every thought of his worthlessness calls forth a cry of agony, and he begs to be spared damnation. In the end he submits himself to Christ's mercy and trusts in Christ's love for man: 'and aftir þat how swete he is in his louers & last of all how mercyful he is to synners', and calls upon his Name, again and again. The treatise is not as effective as Meditation I of St. Anselm, lacking its power of expression, and rhetorical balance.

The codex ends with extracts from the Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible. Item 25 is composed of extracts from 2 Peter i, 5-9; 2 Corinthians vi, 1-7 (incomplete), and James iv, 1-17; these treat of the shunning of various forms of corruption, and the pursuit of virtue. The Sacrament is a collection of biblical texts, also from the Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible, concerned with the eucharist, and the Last Supper. The Gospel of the Ascension Day, another Later Version extract, is that of Mark xvi, 14-20, and is, apparently, incomplete. The text which remains concerns the influence of the Ascension on the disciples, particularly their preaching mission, and the powers given to
them to spread the word of Christ.  

These may have been reference texts (analogous to modern appendices containing primary texts), to which the devout reader could turn. There are references throughout the different treatises to the word of God, 'holy writ', and 'goddis lawe' and in several treatises the reader is enjoined to read or learn 'holy writ' (Of Lords and Husbandmen, implicitly through an exemplum, and Four Needful Things through an injunction: 'eche man and woman shuld bisely hewe and lerne be worde of god').

The second part of Ed is the longest section in the codex, and in some ways it is, on first appearance,

---

57 The influence of the literal aspect of this text, and of one passage in particular, is still to be felt. A religious sect in East Tennessee (not far from Cosby, Tennessee) interprets (in a modern edition of course) 'siue shal do awey serpentis, & if siue dryknen any venyme, it shal not susien hem' as meaning that for those who believe and are baptized the poison of snakes cannot harm them, so their faith is put to the test. There are two or three deaths, or near deaths, every year, presumably as a result of, ultimately, a lack of faith.

58 There is, of course, a difference between hearing and learning Holy Writ and reading it, but reading is one way of learning Holy Writ, and as biblical extracts are provided with the codex I have assumed that they would be read, perhaps in response to a suggestion in a text, an injunction, or out of curiosity.
the most amorphous. I have attempted to show in the
discussion of this second part how the devotional and medita-
tive tracts are, in the first instance, dependent upon
the manual texts for the essentials of the faith. The
devotional tracts which do touch on manual material do
not go into the same detail: they do not list the
commandments, breakers of them, or discuss the different
branches of a particular sin. I have also suggested that
the second part is primarily a series of discourses, or
meditations on the theme of charity, and some of the
qualities which indicate that charity is at work --
humility, meekness, love for one's subjects, and finally
a species of love that is necessary for one's salvation:
self-love. It is, perhaps, this, the love of the image
of God in man, which finds expression, ultimately, (and
following the fear of one's own damnation) in the
closing sentence of Meditation I of St. Anselm: 'Resseyue
me þerfore to þi mercy, mercyfyl Ihesu resseyue me within
þe nowambre of þi chosen, so þat I be fed in þe with hem
þe prayse þe with hem þat I withouten enfeloy in þe,
with all þo þat loueth þi name Ihesu, Amen.'

The codex, looked upon as a compilation, has as its
design the growth of knowledge, not only of the faith
(the manual, and its pieces), and of God himself (The
Twelve Chapters of Perfection), but of man's unique
relationship to God, and man's utter dependence upon
God, His love, and His mercy (Meditation I of St. Anselm, and The Stathel of Sin). It is this pattern, this progression, as it were, of man's growing awareness of God which perhaps guided the compiler in his choice of texts, and their arrangement.
Editorial Method

Critical Approach

In preparing the following editions of treatises from Ed I have attempted to preserve the texts as they appear in Ed, and to provide syntactical and lexical variants from all known extant copies of these texts. These are not critical editions, for I have not attempted to restore putatively original readings, nor, in fact, do I presume to know (on the available evidence) what the originals contained. There are, of course, good reasons for presenting the scribal texts of Ed without further editorial contamination.

First, the texts of Ed (and this holds true for many of the other manuscripts as well) are the product of one scribe (or perhaps scribe-compiler) who copied his texts, for, presumably, an audience. The texts, therefore, are illustrative of both the scribe-compiler's tastes and those of his audience as well. Looked upon this way, the texts of Ed (and indeed the entire manuscript) constitute a cultural artifact variously composed: it is an historical document which has in turn its own history, and the alteration of the text may well obscure this history.¹

¹ For a succinct account of the various aspects of literary texts, and the critical approaches to them see R.S. Crane 'The Teaching of Literary Texts', The Idea of the Humanities and other Essays Critical and Historical (Chicago, 1967), 11, 181-189.
Second, if we assume for the moment that the objective of textual criticism is the restoration (or in many cases the re-creation) of a text 'as close as possible to the original',\(^2\) then we face a formidable epistemological problem: How, and in what ways, do we know the probable content of a text (or texts) which may or may not have actually existed, but is, in any event, now lost? In many cases editors, and textual critics, proceed on the assumption that an original existed, that it was composed by one person, and that they (the editors) have a particular insight into the œuvre of this writer.

Having worked on what is generally considered to be anonymous medieval English devotional prose I am not in a position to have this special insight into an œuvre, thus I have not felt compelled to alter the text before me so that it conforms to my idea of the original. I have preferred to allow the texts of Ed to stand, as the scribe wrote them.

However, among the various extant copies of the texts there may well be one or more copies which through the accidents of time and place of copying are antecedent to the texts of Ed. I have therefore discussed the textual variation among the extant copies of the texts, and I have established textual groups based upon scribal

variation in addition, omission, substitution, and word order. In the discussions of manuscript relationships I also attempt to establish, through this variation, separate textual identities of groups of copies of a text. I have not sought to identify one copy of a text (or a group of copies) as being close to the original, but rather I have attempted to isolate those copies which depend, in all probability, upon the same immediate source(s).

It is, of course, possible to arrange these immediate sources in some coherent way so that one, or another, immediate source is prior to another, but these hypothetical arrangements depend, ultimately, upon a priori notions of originality, notions which require a separate and full treatment, and notions which are in themselves beyond the scope of this thesis. 4


4 I plan to pursue this topic elsewhere.
The Selection of Devotional Tracts

In preparing an edition of Ed the following factors have made it necessary that the edition be a selective one:

1. Several tracts contained in Ed have been edited and printed from other manuscripts; these are: The Sixteen Conditions of Charity, edited by F.D. Matthew, The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted, E.E.T.S. O.S. ixxiv (1880), 353-355; a version of the Magnificat close to that of Ed printed from B.M. MS. Harley 2343 by W. Maskell, Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae, (London, 1842), iii, 245; and the biblical passages on ff. 100r-103v which are, with a few minor variants, verbatim extracts from the Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible, edited by Forshall and Madden (Oxford, 1850). Two other tracts have been edited and are now being used, I am told, in the preparation of critical texts and will, in due time, be printed; these are: The Eight Blessings of Christ, which is being edited by Pamela Gradon, and The Twelve Chapters of Perfection of Richard Hampole, which is being re-edited by Margaret Amassian (for references to earlier editions of these see the description of Ed). The above tracts account for 50 folios, or almost half of the manuscript. Transcriptions of these tracts are included in the thesis.

5 Personal conversation with A. Hudson.

6 Personal letter of 2 December, 1976.
(2) The remaining 20 tracts are extant in approximately 74 different copies, some of which have also been printed elsewhere (see description of Ed for references). For some of these tracts there is a complex textual history, and the reconstruction of the various histories is a time-consuming and tedious enterprise; for other tracts the textual histories are less complicated, and their reconstructions are relatively easy. The tracts also vary among themselves with regard to content, purpose and length. Because of the number of separate tracts involved and their occurrence in so many different copies, time has not allowed the editing with full critical apparatus (variants, textual notes, and discussions of manuscript relationships) of all the tracts. Some kind of selection from the 20 remaining tracts was necessary, and it was best that that selection was representative of the content, textual complexity, and biblical and patristic sources of the manuscript as a whole.

The following criteria have been used in selecting tracts to be presented with critical apparatus:

(i) The tracts to be edited with apparatus were to be representative of the manuscript as compiled. For ease of selection I divided the tracts into categories according to their content: (i) didactic tracts; (ii) tracts of pastoral concern; (iii) meditative treatises. Selections were made
from each of these categories, and with regard to the following criteria.

(2) Tracts were then selected for (i) the complexity of their textual traditions, and for (ii) their use of vernacular biblical and patristic sources.

(i) In selecting tracts for the complexity of their textual traditions I have been able to sort out the different versions and to establish manuscript groups or 'twigs' within the versions. This concentration on the identification of versions and manuscript groups has involved me in the wider study of devotional tracts closely related to, but not contained in, Ed. In this regard I have edited a recension of The Three Arrows, which is included in the thesis as Appendix II.

(ii) I have also selected tracts for their apparent use of vernacular biblical and patristic sources, for I have been interested in the contemporary influence of the Wycliffite Bible, and the various tracts associated with Wycliffe and the Wycliffites. Since Ed contains several long biblical passages from the Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible (ff. 100r-103v), I have thought it of interest to follow up this source, and to identify similar Wycliffite extracts in the devotional tracts. This approach has been fruitful in the following tracts:
Of Lords and Husbandmen, The Ten Commandments, The Four Errors and The Three Arrows. Other vernacular sources have been noted.

The above criteria have guided me in the selection of the tracts to be presented with critical apparatus. Using the same criteria a different set of tracts might have been selected, but in most instances that selection would have been less textually complex, and the range of vernacular biblical and patristic sources less varied.

The following tracts have been selected for editing with critical apparatus:

The Ten Commandments (Two Versions; didactic)
The Four Errors (pastoral concern)
oc Lords and Husbandmen (pastoral concern)
Meditation I of St. Anselm (meditative)
The Statethel of Sin (meditative),
Presentation of Text, Critical Apparatus, and Notes

Text

The text of Ed, as has been noted, is presented as it appears in the manuscript:

Manuscript lineation has been observed, and folio references are noted.

Abbreviations and contractions have been expanded and underscored.

I have preserved the Ed scribe's word division. Words which have been divided at the end of a line usually appear in the manuscript with a form of hyphen, and this linking marker has been preserved.

Capitals are editorial, but I have attempted to follow the scribe's capitalization where it seemed appropriate.

Punctuation is modern, but I have been influenced by the scribe's punctuation (or marking) system, and I have attempted to follow it.

---

7 I hope to pursue the punctuation of the Ed scribe (and the scribes of manuscripts closely related to Ed) in a separate note elsewhere.
Critical Apparatus

The critical apparatus for each treatise contains all substantive (that is, syntactical and lexical) variants from all extant copies of that treatise.

The apparatus is set out in the usual manner: the lemma from Ed is followed by its variant readings. The variant readings are followed by sigla, the spelling of any one reading being indicated by the sigla immediately following it. When there are various, and differing, readings for one lemma, the different readings are separated by a semicolon (;), with the full-stop (.) closing the variant readings for that lemma.

I have used abbreviated lemmata when the variant readings are for three or more words; for example, in Meditation I of St. Anselm, line 26, the variant appears thus:

for ... men (1. 30) om. CB. In this variant CB omits from, and including, 'for' to, and including, 'men', at line 30.

The abbreviations and contractions of the variant readings have been expanded and underscored. Capitalization and punctuation are editorial.

Occasionally the scribes of the various manuscripts blunder and either they correct or fail to note the blunder. In both cases I have attempted to record, in the variants or in the interpretative notes, these scribal errors, or corrections, for these might provide interesting information concerning textual descent. In the transcriptions, the scribal errors and corrections are noted in the margin.
For clarity and ease of reference I have placed all variant readings opposite the text. There are, however, several exceptions to this: because of the number and length of Ar's variant readings in Meditation I of St. Anselm and The StatheI of Sin, and P's lengthy addition to The StatheI of Sin, these readings have been put in a separate appendix -- Appendix I. Their place in the variants opposite the text has been noted and the reader is referred to Appendix I.

Notes and sources

Notes

I have provided interpretative notes (referred to by line number) to each treatise. In these I consider some (not all) of the textual, palaeographical, lexicographical, literary, and historical problems raised either by the text of Ed or by those related to Ed. They are not intended to be exhaustive; they are merely observations of different kinds, some of which are more fully elaborated than others.

There are no notes to the transcriptions; however, for The Twelve Chapters of Perfection I have provided occasional variants in the margin. These are denoted 'Misyn' and 'Ca': for the Misyn translation see R. Harvey, ed. E.E.T.S. cvi, and for Ca see Gonville and Caius College MS. 669^.
Sources

I have attempted to identify as many biblical and patristic sources and analogues as possible. As many of these are mentioned (sometimes in passing) in the notes, I have collected these sources and analogues together, and put them into a more accessible separate section. Where the source or analogue is of particular interest the reader is referred to the appropriate line in the notes.

The biblical references are to the Douay-Rheims version of the Bible. Exceptions to this are noted both in the notes and in the separate list of sources.
The Versions and Manuscript Relationships of The Ten Commandments

B.U.L. MS. 93 (Ed) contains two distinct and hitherto unedited versions of The Ten Commandments:

(i) Rhetorical Version, ff. 1^r-3^v, defective at the beginning (wanting approximately one folio) and omitting the ninth and tenth commandments. (For further discussion of Ed's imperfections see the note on the arrangement of the Rhetorical Version preceding the text.) The same version is also found in Bodleian MS. Tanner 336 (Th); ff. 141^r-145^v.

(ii) Mixed or Discursive-Rhetorical Version, ff. 4^r-10^v. The same version is also found in Trinity College Cambridge MS. R.J.21 (601), (T), ff. 2^v-6^r.

In this introduction to the versions of The Ten Commandments a separate account of the Rhetorical, Discursive, and Mixed versions of The Ten Commandments will be provided; the placing of the two Ed treatises with respect to one or more of these three versions will be discussed; the textual relationships of each treatise will be briefly considered, and there will be an account of the possible method of composition of the longer and more complex mixed version.

1 The classification of texts as 'Rhetorical' or 'Mixed' is discussed in sections I, II, and III of this introduction. For references to these manuscripts, see 'Manuscripts: Descriptions and Notices.'
of Ed, and T.

In studying the manuscript relationships of the Middle English texts of The Ten Commandments several matters have to be taken into account, not least of which are the attempts of modern scholars to construct a literary or cultural background for individual texts. The attempts have usually been directed toward establishing (or denying) a connexion between the text at hand and that of Wyclif's 'Pe Ten Commandments' in Bodley MS. 789.  

Thus Curt Böhler in 'The Middle English Texts of Morgan MS. 861' suggests that 'the present tract [The Ten Commandments] may possibly be the "pre-existing commentary" which Arnold believed Wyclif may have used. Böhler's suggestion is rejected by A.L. Kollogg and E.W. Talbert who in 'The Wyclifite Pater Noster and Ten Commandments, with special reference to English MSS. 85 and 90 in the John Rylands Library' state that Rylands English MS. 85 'is closer at virtually every point to the Wyclif original than Morgan 861'.

---

2 Thomas Arnold argues for the Wyclifite or Lollard origin of Bodley 789: see his Select English Works of John Wyclif (Oxford, 1869-71), iii, 82, hereafter cited as 'Arnold'. Others more concerned to define the relationship of their manuscript with reference to Bodley 789 are: W. Nelson Francis, ed. The Book of Vices and Virtues, E.E.T.S. O.S. ccxvii, Appendix I, 316, (B.H. Additional 2228), hereafter referred to as Vices and Virtues, Appendix I. See also the following two notes.


4 E.J.R.L. xlii (1960), 370, hereafter referred to as 'Kollogg and Talbert'.
The Kellogg-Talbert argument is, as shown in some detail in the Appendix on their article, a weak one, for both the Rylands and the Morgan texts are, in structure and content, very similar. Also the readings used to connect the Rylands text with that of Bodley 789 are quoted out of context, and without regard to the larger structural dissimilarities separating the texts of the two treatises. Kellogg and Talbert attempt to account for the obvious differences between the various texts by discerning in these extant texts a pattern of progressive compression or expansion of The Ten Commandments treatise; that is, the 'pre-existing commentary' of, for example, B.M. HS. Add. 22283 is over a period of time compressed, perhaps by

---


6 Kellogg and Talbert, 365. They divide the manuscripts into
I. Orthodox or 'Pre-existing' Commentary
II. Wyclifite Commentary
A. Version Attributed to Wyclif
B. Expanded Versions
C. Compressed Versions
For a critique of the 'Compressed Versions' see Appendix III.

7 B.M. Add. 22283 is, with eleven other manuscripts, assigned to 'I. Orthodox or 'Pre-existing' Commentary'.
Wyclif, or by Wycliffites; at another stage it is expanded, and at still another it is compressed yet again. This argument, on the face of it, seems plausible: many of the devotional tracts in the Ed manuscript preserve evidence of compression or expansion, but as the variant readings for the two Ed treatises on The Ten Commandments indicate, the compression and expansion are usually confined to matters of content: words, phrases, perhaps whole sentences, but rarely is any part of the structure of the treatise so compressed or expanded that it no longer resembles its putative common source. The two studies mentioned above -- Dühler's and Kellogg and Talbert's -- have ignored the structure, the organization of the commentary-argument, and have focused on individual readings, presumably those stemming from a Wyclif original; this concentration on the particular readings within certain treatises of The Ten Commandments has not advanced the study of the textual relationships among these treatises.

Before attempting to establish whether a treatise is or is not close, textually, to the Wyclif original, it is best that each text first be classified according to structure.

---

8 The Ed and T scribes often omitted, substituted or added words, phrases, and sentences; see, for example, the mixed version, lines 40, 65-66, 73-74, 82-84, 87-90 for additions and omissions. The text contains Latin headings for each commandment, but the 'omission' of these in Ed does not alter the commentary of the discursive and rhetorical sections, nor does it occasion a structural change.

9 For appreciable variation in structure which does not affect the dependence upon the same common source see 'The Manuscript Relationships of The Four Errors'.
and content thus providing textual groups; after establishing textual groups then it is possible to go on and to comment on the probability or improbability of any one text being a descendant of any other. The following discussion is concerned primarily with establishing different textual groups among the various manuscripts catalogued by Kellogg and Talbert, those noted by Dr. A.I. Doyle and those others hitherto unnoticed. The possible textual relationship of different manuscripts to the Wyclif original of Bodley 789 will be commented on, but only in so far as the occurrence

---

10 Textual groups, possible lines of descent, and contamination seem to be at secondary importance to Kellogg and Talbert in their analysis of Rylands English 85, Morgan 861 and Bodley 789. The pressure of their argument is toward establishing a connexion between Rylands English 85 and Bodley 789.

11 For manuscripts catalogued by Kellogg and Talbert, see their article, noted above, pp. 363-366. Dr. A.I. Doyle, in a personal letter of 22 June, 1975, supplied the following list of manuscripts: 'A number of other texts I have noted however beginning "God hymself..." but not as continuing in the same way, some uncertain, some "Who brake these commanmentes...?" e.g. Hunter v.3.15, Bodley 938, Trin. Oxford 86, New College 67, Dr. Williams Anc. 3, Add. 28026, Cambridge U.L. li. vi.43, Trin. Dublin 70...'. In addition to Kellogg and Talbert's catalogue and Dr. Doyle's list the following manuscripts also contain the relevant versions of The Ten Commandments and were located in the course of research: Bodl. MS. Rawl. C. 209, ff. 2°-7°; E.U.L. MS. 93, ff. 1°-3°, 4°-1°; Bodl. MS. Tanner 336, ff. 141°-145°; Trinity Coll., Cambridge MS. R. 3.21 (601), ff. 2°-6°. A new catalogue incorporating the above manuscripts, list, and catalogue is included in this introduction.
of certain readings is possibly attributable to the existence of a Wyclif original or Wyclif-like original: the central concern of this introduction is with the versions of The Ten Commandments, and not with the dependence of any one text on some original to which access cannot be proven.

In the opening paragraphs of this introduction the terms 'Rhetorical Version', 'Discursive Version' and 'Mixed' or 'Discursive-rhetorical Version' of The Ten Commandments were used as labels for particular types of texts. These terms are, it is suggested, more useful than 'Version attributed to Wyclif', 'Expanded Versions' and 'Compressed Versions' in characterizing, and classifying, the different extant versions of The Ten Commandments, for they allow one to discriminate between them and to classify them with regard to major and obvious structural elements, rather than to the alleged author, and the length of the tract. At a later stage, and with a more restricted purpose, it may be useful to think in terms of Wyclif-influenced texts.

As the following study will involve frequent mention of various manuscripts, it is best that a catalogue, with sigla, be set out. For ease of discussion, manuscripts mentioned hereafter will be referred to by their sigla.
Versions of The Ten Commandments

A Catalogue of Manuscripts Affiliated with Ed T

Rhetorical Versions

Type I


(Tc) Trinity College, Dublin MS. 70, ff. 174 V-181 V.

(C5) Cambridge University Library MS. II.6.43, ff. 2 F-9 V.

(RW) Bodl. MS. Rawl. C. 209, ff. 2 F-7 F.


Type II

(Ed) E.U.L. MS. 93, ff. 1 F-3 V.

(Tn1) Bodl. MS. Tanner 336, ff. 141 F-143 V.

(B) Bodl. MS. 948, ff. 16 F-17 V.

(N1) New College, Oxford MS. 67, ff. 1 V-2 F.

(Ty) Trinity College, Oxford MS. 86, f. 54 V (fragment).

Discursive Versions

Type I


(Hn1) Huntington MS. NH 744, f. 13 V *

(L2) Bodl. MS. Laud Misc. 524, f. 11 F-19.
An Asterisk indicates that the manuscript has not yet been consulted, and is included on the authority of Kellogg and Talbert and their catalogue.

This catalogue has been compiled according to the classification in the 'Introduction to the Versions of The Ten Commandments...'. Acknowledgement is again made to A.L. Kellogg and E.W. Talbert's article 'The Wyclifite Pater Noster and Ten Commandments...', B.J.R.L. xiii (1960), 365-366. Dr. A.I. Doyle has also made numerous suggestions and these, too, are here again acknowledged (see fn. 11, above).
I. Rhetorical Versions

'Rhetorical' is here used to describe a kind of text that is compact (when compared to other and different extant texts), rigidly organized, and, with respect to the internal structure of each commandment, repetitive.\(^{12}\) Texts of the rhetorical version type are organized thus:

(i) Statement or commandment, or brief note of commandment.

(ii) General query about 'Who braketh this heeste', followed by list of breakers.

(iii) Specific query about, for example, 'Whi mycheris?', followed by the answer, which may or may not be supported by a biblical or patristic citation or quotation.

The above structure, or organization, is used throughout the various individual commandments; thus the reader

\(^{12}\) The term 'rhetorical' is adopted with some hesitation, but as the texts under consideration seem to fulfill in part Aristotle's criteria for good rhetorical prose style the term has been used as descriptive of the texts; see The Rhetoric of Aristotle, translated by R.C. Jebb, edited by J.E. Sandys (Cambridge, 1909), 154 [book III, viii–ix] and the discussion of the 'language of prose', and Aristotle's distinction between 'the running style' and 'the compact style'. For the influence of Aristotelian rhetoric on (and its fate in) the medieval sermon see Etienne Gilson, Michel Menot et la Technique du Sermon Medieval, Les Idees et les Lettres, Deuxieme serie (Paris, 1955), 93–154; and the following articles by Harry Caplan, 'Classical Rhetoric and the Medieval Theory of Preaching', Classical Philology, xxvii (1932), 73–96, esp. pp. 77 ff.; "Henry of Hesse" On The Art of Preaching', P.M.L.A. lviii (1933), 340–361, for a useful tract on the art of preaching; and 'Rhetorical Invention in some Medieval Tractates on Preaching', Speculum ii (1927), 284–295.
having read a rhetorical version of The Ten Commandments
ought to know the commandments, the different kinds of people
who break these commandments, and (in some cases) biblical
and patristic judgements on the breakers. A good example
of this type of text is provided by C₅ below; other
samples from different commandments and manuscripts can
be found in Appendix III and in the edited text of Ed's
rhetorical version, ff. 1¹-3¹, with variants from Tn₁.

C₅, ff. 7¹-8¹:

[The seuenthe commandement. [T]he seuenthe
commandement of all mystty god is þys:
þº. shalt do no þefte. What men breken þis

---

¹³The rhetorical version tracts seem especially suitable
for reading aloud, for there is the statement of command-
ment followed by a series of questions, questions which
could be put to an audience. Several of the rhetorical
versions occur in manuscripts which may well have been
catechisms, e.g. K, J, and To.

¹⁴Since no printed edition of this text exists, the follow-
ing edited text is provided, and with the following editor-
ial changes: abbreviations are expanded and marked;
modern punctuation, capitalization, and lineation is
provided; emendations are made where necessary and are
enclosed in square brackets. Other texts, either
accessible in this thesis, or available in print, are
presented without editorial treatment.
& profete Osee in iiiij c°. siet: trubc° is not in erb° but cursednes & þefe. Mercy is a wyé & science of þa lord, for þys þynge shall morne all þat dwellen þer ymne. Why robberys? For þey robben openly. / Ysaie þ° profit seyeþ [xxxiii] c°: Wo to þ° þat robbest, wherþer þy sylf shall not be robbed. Whan þu hast full robbed þan shall þu be robbed.

Why extortioners? For þey spoyleþ men of her godys fauly. þ° wyseman seyeþ sapiens .iij. c° þ° vnpiteous man seyeþ begyle we þ° rystwys man for vnprofitable he is to vs & contrary to oure werkys, by most foule deþ condempne weh him & so proue we þ° paciens of him.

The texts of Ed and Th I are very close to that of G₅, J and M but they are distinct as the following passages from Ed and Th I indicate.

Ed (lines 67 ff.):

But þus mychers, robbers & extortioners broken his neste. Why mychers? For þe stolen preuyly, as seith þe profet Osee: troweth is not in erth, but cursidnes &
The seventh commandment of God is

Pis: Thou shalt do no theft. And pis broken
michers, robbers & extorcioners. Whi michers?
For pis stolen priveli, as he prophete se
seip. {ij. c': Trupe is not in aeu, but
cursidnesse & thefts, & mercio is awei, and
science of pis lord, for pis ping schal mourn
alle pis dethen pere ymne. Whi robbers? ....

[Tn, from this point on, follows, for the most part,
the version of C. J and M.]

Several similarities and dissimilarities, not confined
to the seventh commandment, are worth noting: (i) The Ed
and Tn texts have the same structure as C. J, and M;
this structure is characterized by its dependence upon the
question (and its response) as an organizing element within
the treatise itself. (ii) The Ed and Tn texts also have
the same supporting biblical and patristic material and in
the same order as the version of C. J, and M. However,
while the structure and general content are similar, there
are important distinctions within the texts of Ed and Tn.
that set them apart textually from the other version.

(i) The rhetorical version texts of Rd and part of Th₁ do not have the statement of commandment and supporting biblical text; for example, the Rd text begins the fourth commandment without mention of the commandment, or the question of who breaks it:

And so vnkynde men, froward men & rebel men
broken his beast. Why vnkynde men?

Likewise, the Th₁ text begins the fourth commandment without reference to the content of the commandment itself:

Who broken be fourth commandement? Vnkynde men, frowarde men & rebel men. Whi vnkynde men?

However, Th₁ is not consistent in this, for with the fifth commandment (and those subsequent) the full commandment is mentioned:

be fifpe commandement is bis: Thou schalt sê noman, neibër wíþ pîne hoondis, ne in þi wille.
And þis broken enuiouse men, wrâbful men, & anereous men. Whi enuiouse men?

This abrupt shift in Th₁ may well be the result, ultimately, of the mixture, or conflation, of two different types of rhetorical versions: one type organized around the question 'Who broken þe _ commandment?' and another type built upon the
statement of the commandment, plus the assertion 'And his [pus] broken ___ men, ___ men, & ___ men.' It is fairly clear that Ed depends upon this latter kind of rhetorical version, for each of its commandments begins: 'And so [pus, pies] ___ men, ___ men, & ___ men broken his beasts.' The Ed text, like that of Tn₁, goes on to ask the question 'Whi ___ men?' and supplies the answer; in this respect, as well as in the citation of biblical and patristic texts, Ed and Tn₁ follow the main tradition of the rhetorical version.

(ii) There is one other unique feature that suggests that the text of Tn₁ is a distinct type of text within the rhetorical version tradition: The Tn₁ tract begins, formally, with the *incipit*: 'Here is declarid breueli who broken þe ten commaundementis of god', and ends formally with the *explicit*: 'Here sendiþ þe X commaundementis schortli declarid. Almiþi ihesu graunte us grace to kepe hem.' It seems that by design The Ten Commandments of Tn₁ were to be 'declarid breueli', and the text, at least through the fourth commandment, follows this design: the text is shorn of the commandments and the biblical material cited in support of them. The focus is on the breakers of the commandments, and the reader is not allowed to forget that.

As noted above, Tn₁ is unique among the extant manuscripts in stating at the outset the intention to be 'declarid breueli'. However, Ed, which might have provided corroboration at this point, is defective at the beginning and incomplete at the end; but the structure and content of the remaining Ed text -- the lack of the statement of commandment,
and a similar lack of biblical text prior to the list of breakers -- indicate that the Ed text is related to that of \( Tn_1 \), and is of the same type within the rhetorical version. Given the defective nature of the Ed tract it is not possible to state with any certainty more than that (i) the Ed tract of The Ten Commandments (ff. 1\(^r\)-3\(^v\)) is firmly within the rhetorical version, a version best represented by the text(s) of J, M, and C\(_5\); and that (ii) the Ed tract is more closely related to the text of \( Tn_1 \) than to any other text within or without the rhetorical version tradition. However, Ed and \( Tn_1 \) are not so closely related that either can have copied from the other, and while it is probable that Ed and \( Tn_1 \) descend from the same common source, it is not probable that they descend immediately from the same source.

II. Discursive Versions

'Discursive' is used here to describe texts which have as their general organizing principle the movement from a premise (in this case the statement of a commandment) to a conclusion (that it is in the interest of God and the sinner that the commandment be obeyed). Generally, the internal structure of each commandment (beyond premise and conclusion) is best described as digressive and, with regard to the cited biblical text, exegetical.\(^{15}\) Specifically, the internal

---

\(^{15}\) With respect to matters of form, and the movement from 'premise' to 'conclusion', the discursive versions are best seen as products of the \textit{artes praedicandi}, which as Caplan points out 'owe as much eventually to Aristotle's logical works as to the doctrines of the art of rhetoric proper', "Henry of Hesse" on \textit{The Art of Preaching}, 343.
structure of the commandments of the discursive versions can be formally characterized as dialectical in the sense that the commandment itself is a 'proposition' to be analyzed for its truth; the 'proofs' cited in support of the truth of the proposition are biblical and patristic authorities, and the 'conclusion' is the restatement of the initial proposition, usually with an expanded tropological sense.

However, while this dialectical structure is not adhered to rigidly in all of the commandments, it is, perhaps, the most obvious of the various exegetical methods used in the different commandments and in the several treatises. The function of each commandment may, in the end, be that stated by the writer of B↓: 'And so write ten bestis ben as ten mirouris that men may see himself yynne'; in the making of the 'mirouris' the writer is at liberty, within the allowable conventions of homiletic prose, 16 to use whatever structural or organizing principles were available. It is worth remarking that the actual verbal structure of the discursive versions is not, as in the rhetorical versions, repetitive; there is not the reliance upon the question 'Who broken ye ___ commandment?'; nor upon its sequel 'And

16Henry of Hesse, among others, identifies four methods in preaching: '(1) The oldest, and this Christ used, as well as many holy doctors after him. (2) The modern. (3) The old, which flourished after Christ and the saintly theologians, and before the moderns. (4) The substitute, gathered from all these methods I have mentioned'. "Henry of Hesse" on The Art of Preaching", 347; The methods are discussed on pp. 348-359.
The discursive versions, as stated above, are less rigid in internal structure, less rhetorical (in the sense suggested earlier), and perhaps as a result (not a necessary consequence) of this looser organization there is greater variation among the various extant texts of the discursive versions of The Ten Commandments than among the rhetorical versions texts. It is possible, however, to distinguish two types of discursive versions texts: Type I represented by S17 and Type II, represented by B1, (hereafter referred to as Type I and Type II respectively). The two types of texts differ, usually, in content, and when the content is occasionally the same the arrangement of the content will differ; the two texts also have different conclusions. Kellogg and Talbert have compared the two types of texts,18 and have concluded that B1 (Type II) is indeed indebted to an S-like text (Type I) for much of its content, and perhaps structure. What Kellogg and Talbert have not noted, however, is the major, and distinctive addition of Type II, the conclusion to each commandment.

17 Arnold, III, 82, distinguished between the commentary of B1 and 'the mild and colourless commentary of the Laud [L2] MS.' and U1. Kellogg and Talbert, 367-369, suggest that B1 may be derived from a version close to that of S (to which L2 and U are related).

18 Kellogg and Talbert, 367-369.
The conclusion to the first commandment of Type II reappears, in a much reworked form, in two other treatises on The Ten Commandments -- C₃ and A₁ -- 19 and since these two treatises are (with the exception of the first commandment) closely connected with the second Ed treatise on The Ten Commandments it is best that their relationships to Types I and II be clarified now, and within the context of the discursive versions. Besides the conclusion to the first commandment, there are also other points of contact between these two treatises and Types I and II, notably in the first part of the Prologue, and in the second commandment (see discussion in Appendix III). A brief discussion of the textual relationships, Prologue, second commandment, and conclusion is provided below.

(i) The connexion between Type I, Type II, and C₃ is not a purely textual one; that is, if the scribe of the common source of C₃ and A₁ used a Type I or II text it was not so much as an exemplar to be copied as a text to be responded to, to be inspired by. Given the diversity of the texts it is not possible to establish a definite textual connexion. However, as the following observations indicate, it is possible to note similarities in the subject matter and its treatment, and thus to

19 Dr. A.I. Doyle, in a personal letter of 22 June, 1975, furnished references to these two manuscripts, but with regard to The Seven Deadly Sins, The Five Wits and The Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost. C₃ and A₁ also have the same version of The Seven Deadly Sins.
establish possible lines of influence within specific sections of the treatise. It must be noted though that these lines of influence do not preclude the possibility that C₃ and A₁ represent a third type of text, a Type III as it were. The following points consider various lines of influence which suggest that this possible third type may have its beginnings in Types I and II.

(ii) The first paragraph of the Prologue of C₃ (A₁ does not have the first paragraph) parallels Type I (S); the Prologue of Type II appears to be a reworking of the Type I Prologue, and is unique. The second paragraph of the Prologue of C₃ parallels that of J, as does the text of A₁. As noted in Appendix III the Prologue is occasionally treated as a separate item (with incipit and explicit) and as such it may well have a separate textual history. One textual feature is clear, however, with the exception of J, the Prologue (in its various forms) usually appears in discursive and mixed versions, and not rhetorical versions.

20 A 'line of influence' as used here (and elsewhere in this thesis) is descriptive of certain phrases, sentences, and, in the end, specific ideas, and occasionally matters of style which are common to two or more manuscripts. Such a descriptive term is used when close and consistent textual correspondence between two or more manuscripts is lacking, thus making the establishment of specific lines of descent impossible. A line of influence, as I use it, is an attempt to account for the presence of certain verbal resonances in one manuscript by reference to another, or others. With more evidence or greater textual correspondence, a line of influence may suggest a line of descent.

21 Manuscripts having the Prologue of J, in whole or part, are: T, ff. 2-3; C₃, f. 3r; Ed, f. 4r (part); A₁, f. 42r (part).
(iii) Likewise, the second commandment of C3 (see Appendix III) and A1 also appears to be connected with the discursive versions, but, again, the attempt to assign it to any one type within the discursive versions meets with difficulties. In these two treatises the entire commentary on the second commandment is devoted to 'Jeremy be prophet sayeth: that to a just, and the longi', three things'; assuming ultimate descent from a Type I or Type II text, then either the commentary is a collapsed version of Type I, or it is a slightly condensed version of Type II, itself a condensation of Type I.22 The substance and structure of the commentary seem to argue for dependence upon a Type II text: focus on Jeremias iv, 2; paraphrase of Matthew v,37 (rather than a literal translation of Matthew v,34 - 37); and an argument-commentary constructed around the above biblical texts in English rather than around a more expansive treatment in Latin and English as in Type I (which adds Acts iv, 12, and Philippians ii, 10).

(iv) A comparison of the concluding commentaries to the first commandment (set out below) suggests a slightly more tangible dependence upon the Type II text:

22 See Kellogg and Talbert, 370, and Arnold, iii, 82.
And so be proud man make be feend his god. Pus it is in deede, howevereoure moue blabre. And so preestis bat prechen more moore to have a loos, qbir for wynnyng of worldli goodis, qbir lustis of hire bali, makyn fals leckmesse in hevane and erpe and water. And pus mai men knowe how þese maundementis ben brokyn, hope of preestis and of secularis. And so in trust of yrmagis many ben discyved, in hope of help or help in a maner neede, as þe olde lawe and þe newe witnyssen. De Dedis of Apostlis, in þe seventenþe chapiter, seip þus; Sipen God is Lord of hevene and of erpe, he wonþ not in templis maad wiþ hondis, ne he is worshippid wiþ mannys honde, for þat he hap neede of any þinge þat man doþ, sipen he giveþ unto alle liif, and wynde ensperyng, and al qbir þing .... And sipþe we ben þe kyn of God, us aeste not suppose þat þat perteyneþ unto God is like unto gold or silver or ston, of þe craft of gravynge, or of mannis hond-worcyng. For þat þing þat is hise to men, is abhominacioun bifice God. But, for we knowyn him litil, we loven him þe lese.
And as it is a cursed avoutrie a man to drawe a
weie some of is loue from his true wife and sette
it on is concubynes, so it is gostli a cursed
avoutrie to god a man to drawe any part of his loue,
ciper of 'his' truste and sette it on oper dode
ymages, or on dremes, or on any oper fantasyes.
For god wilnot bus be worshiped in dode ymages,
but in quicke men, bi whiche ben onel goddes
ymages, and lickenesse of be holi trynites; his
is be treuthe, al jif awaryce of wordli prestes and
blynde customes of be loved peple, bi illusions of
be feerd, faste and mistylych defandyng be contrarie
of his mater, more trauaylynge for offrynge of
wordly godes bus for helpe of mannes soule or pore
manmes profite, as her dede schewip. And suche
vicious prestes ben vnable to be cleped hardes of
manmes soules, for holy writte clepe) wicked prestes
blynde lederes in be gospelle of matheu, be fifete)
chapitur [m. xv^o., marginalium] .... And suche
vicious prestes folow bus noust, neiher leue hem
noust listli to bei despice her synne, and go
gertuesliche bei rizt weie to heuene.

The following consideration is not so much a textual
study as it is an appraisal of the possible literary
influence of one type of text upon another. C_3 and A_1,
like B_1 (Type II), mention priests, and the often bad
example they set: 'And no preestis bat prechen moore
to have a loes, oipir for wynynge of worldli goodis,
oipir justis of hire bali, mkyn fals leekmesse in
hevene and erthe and water' (E_2): 'And suche vicious
Preston ben vnable to be cleeed herdes of mannes soules,
for holy writte cleeed wicked prestes blynde ledere in
pe gospele of matheu', (text of C_3, see also A_1). No
other extant texts mention priests.

Another feature, unique to these three texts, is
the linking of falsos gods with images: 'And so in trust
of ynglis many ben disseyved, in hope of help or helpe in
a minor neede, as be olde lawe and be newe witnyssen ....
Sipen God is Lord of heaven and of erthe, he wolde not in
tempis read wiþ handis, ne he be worshipped wiþ mannys
hande ...' (D_1); 'so it is gostli a cursed avoutrie to
god a man to drave any part of his loue, oipir of 'his'
truste and sette it on oþer dede ymagez, or on drames,
or on oþer fantasyes. For god wilnot be
worshiped in dede ymages ...', (text of C_3, see also
A_1). C_3 and A_1 are, admittedly, more virulent in their
denunciations of priests, and the suggestion of an
image (in the notion of the 'straunge goddes' of the
first commandment) receives far more attention in them
than it does in E_2, but the vehement tone, and the
unbalanced discussion, do not materially affect the
possible literary connexion between E_1 and C_3A_1:
these three texts, for this one commandment and its
conclusion, agree in substance and tone. It is not
possible (with the evidence available) to state with any certainty that the C3 and A1 texts were influenced by the text of B1, but the evidence adduced does at least suggest that behind the text of C3 and A1, and at some stage, there lay a B1-like text.

Of equal uncertainty is the extent of their debt to the Type I text. It can be argued that the common source of a much condensed version like that of C3 and A1 may have been influenced by a fuller text at some stage in the composition of the treatise (note reference to 'Jeremy the prophet'). If this did occur then the texts of C3 and A1 may preserve an abridged version (with interpolations) of a once-time longer version. A problem arises, however, when suitable longer versions are being sought out as possible influential sources. The analogous references, and vaguely similar content, are of little value in establishing textual connections. At best one is left with possible lines of influence, and for the texts of C3 and A1 these lines of influence run through both Type I and Type II. It is well to keep in mind that much of what has been said regarding the texts of C3 and A1 will hold true for the discursive section of the second Ed treatise on The Ten Commandments, a text to which a separate section will be devoted.

23 See fn. 31, esp. (i) and (ii) for additional evidence of probable access to a fuller text.
In the above discussion of the discursive and rhetorical versions a classification of the various extant texts of The Ten Commandments has been attempted. This classification has been based upon a study of the structures, and organizing principles of the texts, and it was prompted, in the first instance, by an earlier attempt to account for the obvious differences between the two Edinburgh treatises on The Ten Commandments. One Edinburgh treatise has been discussed and placed among the rhetorical versions; however, the other treatise is not so easily placed, for it combines structural features associated with both discursive and rhetorical versions; thus, this text is called the Mixed or Discursive-Rhetorical Version. It will be referred to in the following section as Mixed.

III. The Mixed (or Discursive-Rhetorical) Versions.

'Mixed' is used to describe a text which in its structure is composed of specific portions of discursive and rhetorical version texts. That is, any given commandment in the mixed version text will have two separate and distinct sections: (i) the commentary, or argument, will be discursive (and perhaps related to one of the established discursive versions), and (ii) the conclusion will be rhetorical (and usually a condensation of one of the rhetorical versions). 24

24 The present structural classification does not rule out the possibility that there might be mixed texts which do not fit the above criteria; when (and if) such texts are found then the criteria, and perhaps the idea mixed, will have to be reinterpreted in light of the new evidence.
The following is a study of the structure and content of the treatise on The Ten Commandments found in both the Ld and T manuscripts; it is an account (in so far as this is possible) of the way this treatise took the shape it has in this version. In this study of the structure and content of Ld and T's treatise, the various ways in which it is similar to or dissimilar from the other extant treatises on The Ten Commandments will be specified. Such a study will allow one to place the texts of Ld and T relative to these and it will also provide the necessary background material for a necessarily more speculative account of the way the text took shape.

It has already been noted that the LdT treatise is a mixed or discursive-rhetorical version, and that such versions have a discursive commentary and a rhetorical conclusion, and that each section is separate; such a structure is apparent in the following extract from the commentary and conclusion of the first commandment:

25 Ed, ff. 4v - 10v, and T, ff. 2v - 6v have the same version of The Ten Commandments treatise. There are minor differences between the two texts of this treatise, but these are dealt with in a later section.

26 A comparison of the various statements of commandments might prove useful in identifying and clarifying textual connexions; but as such a comparison involves the added, and as yet unsettled, textual complexities of the Earlier and Later Versions of the Wycliffite Bible, it is best that such complexities be set aside, and that the lesser textual complexities of the commentary and conclusion be dealt with: see Appendix III, fn. 8 and references there cited.
Thys is þe first heest of god almyghty, 
commaundynge all affeccions, all loue, 
all worshypye, and all þe icy of mannes 
hert be doon to our lord Ihesu crist. 
Here god commaundith þat all mannes 
bileue, trust, and loue be set onely in 
god & in none oþer thyng ayenst his wil. 
And here he forfendith all bileue & trust 
in all maner wichecraftes, sweuenees, 
charmes, coniurisons, for þo þat putten 
her bileue or trust in any suche, withdrawyng 
somwhat of her bileue & trust fro god, & so 
brekyng þis heste. Also proude men, wordely 
men, and fleshly men brekan þis heest. Why 
proude men? For þei maken þe deuel her 
god. Why worldely men? For þei make worldely 
goodys her god. Why fleshly men? For þei 
maken her belies her god.

There is an abrupt shift between 'þo þat brekyng 
þis heste' and 'Also proude men', and it seems that this 
shift may signal a movement from one version to another. 
The reader is not prepared for this list of 'breakers' 
as he is in, for example, the rhetorical version where 
the statement of commandment, and its brief exposition, 
is followed by the general query 'Who brekiþ þe first 
commaundement'. A similar transitional phrase or question
is also found in Lb, a mixed text much resembling the Ed and T version. It is worth setting out an extract from Lb, not only to demonstrate its smooth transition into the list of breakers, but also this similarity in structure and general content to the EdT version.

Lb (Lay Folks' Catechism, E.E.T.S. O.S. cxviii, 35):

Pou most loun hym with al þyn herte.  
and seke his worshipe. and plesse hym be  
fore alle ófer thyngys. If þou do his welf  
þou most stody to kepe his commaundementys  
and his lawe be-fore alle ófer preceptys and  
lawes maad of men for ellys þou louyst not  
hys lawe be-fore ófer. and so not hym-self  
be-fore al ófer thyngys Also þou most forsake  
al manner wycche craftys, and coniurynge of  
fendys. and þat þou seke nat trewthe of  
dede spiritys. but only of god. and his lawe as  
he commaundys hym-self in his lawe.  

Who brekys þe fyreste commaundement? Prowde  
men. wordly men. and fleschly men. Why  
prowde men. For þey make þe deuyl here god.  
Why wordly men. for þey make worldy godys here  
god. and why fleschly Men for þey make here  
bely here god.  

In the Lb version, as in the rhetorical version,  
there is, for the reader, the marker of the question;  
however, the Lb version, like the EdT version, has the
list of breakers stitched on at the end and not woven throughout the treatise, as in the rhetorical versions: this is an important structural difference, and it places the Lb text with the other mixed texts. And it is, as far as is known, the only other text besides Ed and T which has as its structure discursive version plus rhetorical version.

While the Lb version has the same structure as the EdT version, there are minor differences in content in the rhetorical sections, and major differences in the discursive sections. Without going into too great detail it is, perhaps, sufficient to point out the following differences between the Lb and EdT versions:

(i) The rhetorical sections of Lb begin with the question of 'Who brekys be ____ maundement?' The EdT text begins its rhetorical sections with the assertion 'Also ____ men, ____ men, and ____ man broken his heest.' In all other respects the three texts -- Lb, Ed and T -- are virtually alike, and among the various rhetorical versions these three texts are unique for their concision, and catechetical-like form. For the rhetorical sections the three texts probably drew from the same common source, with the text of Lb retaining a feature -- the introductory question -- usually associated with the more expansive and didactic rhetorical versions.

(ii) In the discursive section, however, the Lb text appears to have had access to a source distinct from that of Ed and T, and indeed distinct from the other texts
previously considered. Lb preserves vestiges of another
text, and one not too distant from Type I: these are
most clearly seen in the fourth commandment where Lb
elaborates on the comment 'Holy wryt spekys of pre
fadyrs';27 a similar elaboration is to be found in
Type I (8) and it is introduced (and partially summed
up as well) by a similar comment 'But heere se schullen
vndurstonde þer been þre maners of fader and mooder'.28
Both texts then go on to develop, in their own distinc-
tive ways, the three sources of 'fader and mooder':
'bodili fader and mooder'; 'þe seconde maner of fader
and mooder ... is crisit and his blessede moode[r]. vr
ladi seinte Marie'; 'And also god is oure chief fader.
and al holy chirche þt is þe noumbe of alle gode angels'.29
The texts of Ed and T do not deal explicitly with 'þre
fadyrs' or 'þre maners of fader and mooder', nor do.
the closely related texts of C3 and A1. A comparison
of each commandment of the Lb text with the correspond-
ing commandment in a Type I or II text suggests that the
dependence of the Lb text upon one type or another is
tenuous. This is also true of a similar comparison with
the texts of Ed and T, and the C3 and A1 texts: the
version of Lb, like B1, is unique, both in the sources
it has tapped, and in the comment appended to them.

27 Lay Folks' Catechism, 43.
28 Vices and Virtues, Appendix I, 325.
29 Vices and Virtues, Appendix I, 325.
The possible textual relationship of $C_3$ and $A_1$ to Types I and II has been considered in the section on discursive versions and as stated there any consideration of the texts of $C_3$ and $A_1$ is, implicitly, a consideration of the texts of Ed and T so close are the two types.

In general, it has been suggested that $C_3$ and $A_2$ show signs of having drawn on both Type I and II texts, but that definite textual connexions could not be established. This is true of the Ed and T texts as well. In Appendix III there are set out extracts of the second commandment from the Ed, $C_3$, S (Type I), and $E_1$ (Type II) texts; the comparison there indicates that for the second commandment the EdT, and $C_3A_1$ texts are closer to a Type II than to a Type I version, but, again, the evidence for a definite textual connexion is lacking. Perhaps more revealing in the comparison is the closeness of the $C_3$ text to that of Ed. A closer study of the texts of $C_3A_1$ and their relationship to those of Ed and T might be useful in illuminating a possible method of composition of the EdT version.

With the exception of the first commandment, and setting aside the comparison of the second commandment in Appendix III, the closeness, the textual similarity, of $C_3$ and $A_1$ to EdT has only been asserted. The following points cover the range of similarities and dissimilarities among the four texts:

(i) The second, third, fifth and sixth commandments of $C_3$ and $A_1$ parallel, in whole or part, the EdT version:
of these parallel texts only the fifth follows the EdT version completely. The other parallel texts either are shorter (being compressed by omission), or they parallel the Ed text for a number of lines, and then diverge. The following commandment (with commentary) is set out to illustrate the degree of similarity of the commandment closest to the Ed text:

C3, f. 5v:

Pis is pe fyuep heeste of god. Pe fyuep heeste.
þou schalt slee no man.
And þis heeste forbedeþ al vnskilful sleeynge, þe which is seide in foure maneres, as bodili manslaughtter, and bacbitynge & wiþholdyng of worldli goodes or gostely from hem þat nedep þese goodes, and yuel ensaumple of lyuyng to þe peple. Aile þes braunches ben before god graumouse manslaughtters, þe whiche as seynt poule seþ in þe firste epistel to þe corinthes in þe sext chapitur: haueþ no part in þe kyngdom of heuen.

Ed, (lines 154 ff.):

The fifte commandment of god is þis. Thou shalt not slee no man wilfully, neiþir with euel wil in hert. Ffor þis is one of þe .iiiij. synnes þat euþir cryeth vengeance byfore all myghty god. And now þis syn is seid of .iiiij. maners, as bodely mannes slakter, bakbytyng, with holding of worldely goodis or gostely fro hem þat nedith þes goodis, and euel ensample of lyuyng of þe peple. All þes braunchyes bene before god greuous manslaughtris, þe whiche, as seyth seynt poule, haiþ no parte in þe kyngdom of heuen. And þus enuyous men ... [Rhetorical Version text follows].
For this particular commandment, as well as for those which partially parallel the Ed text, it is clear that both texts depend, ultimately, upon the same common source. However, this dependence is not complete, as the following establishes.

(ii) The first, fourth, seventh, eighth, and the ninth and tenth,\(^{30}\) commandments do not parallel the Ed text. It seems that for these commandments the scribe (or in this context the author) of the common source of A1 chose to interpolate, or rather to adapt the text to his own particular, and caustic, ends. The eighth commandment is an exemplary adaptation:

\[\text{C}_3, \text{ff. 6}\text{v}-7\text{r}:\]

\[\text{Pe eiste} \text{p heest of god almighty}. \text{Pe eistip heeste is} \text{ } \text{bis}. \text{You schalt bere no fals wittenesse. And heere al manere of lesynges be}"\]

\[\text{forbode, for eche lesynge is a synne and fals wittenesse asenes god, } \text{bat is } \text{pe treuth}. \text{And } \text{pe mooste lesynge and falseste wittenesse of alle ben tokens of holynesse wi} \text{cute to blynde } \text{pe worlde, when vices ben wi} \text{inne, as knottes of freres girdles and her cowped schoum, and not honde} \text{lynge monei, ben sygnes of } \text{[f. 7r]} \text{passyngene penaunce, and al affection to god,}\]

\(^{30}\)The ninth and tenth commandments of \(\text{C}_3\) and \(\text{A}_1\) are highly condensed, and thus bear little resemblance to the relatively full text of Ed. The tenth commandment parallels the Ed text for the final six lines.
and hertliche forsakyng, and despisyng worldli monai. And so of alle alle other signes sif pei ben not in deede, as pe figure tokniþ where is a fouleþ ypocrisie and lesynge manere, and fals wittenesse berere þan suche one is. Ffor seynt Ion seip in þe first epistel þe firste chapitre, þat suche one haþ name of life, bot hire god he is deed.

[For the EdT version see lines 227 ff.]

The above interpolation, and the previously noted dissimilarities, point toward a common source for C3 and A1 distinct from that of the Ed and T texts. Yet behind this common source there lies a text which in its discursive sections resembles the probable common source of the texts of Ed and T. This surmise is based upon the following observations:

(i) C3 and A1 form a tight textual group, but one not without internal inconsistencies which point back toward a longer and more fully documented text: A1 has several variant readings which seem to indicate that the scribe of A1 worked from a slightly longer text. C3 has inter-textual and marginal biblical and patristic citations, and these probably were not added while the text was being copied.

(ii) This hypothetical text may or may not have had the interpolations of C3 or A1: the interpolations may have been filtered out by the common source of the Ed and T texts. But one fact is fairly certain: since the second, third, fifth and sixth commandments survive in
more or less the same form in all four texts, there existed, at some stage, a text which provided two different textual groups with that text.

(iii) C₃, A₁, and T have the same Prologue, with Ed having the conclusion to this Prologue. Again, the presence of such a text in two separate versions strongly suggests that all four of these depend upon a common source for their text of the Prologue.

If, as has been suggested, the four texts depend upon a common source for much of the discursive sections, then how is the structural variation among them to be accounted for? That is, why are the four texts which are alike in so many ways (and explicably different in other ways) so very different in structure? The difference can be accounted for if the composition, as opposed to the transmission, of the texts is carefully considered. The scribe of the common source (not necessarily the immediate source) of Ed and T probably used, and perhaps condensed, a rhetorical version text. This explanation is plausible given the fact that the Ed manuscript contains texts of both the mixed and the rhetorical versions; we know from this that it was not unknown for the two versions to co-exist in a single manuscript. It would have been a simple matter for the scribe or redactor of the common source to abstract the appropriate rhetorical phrases from one of the rhetorical versions and to append these to the discursive text. Such a text would then be not only exegetical but catechetical as well. Something like this
may have been done with Lb: the compositional process for this manuscript, as with the four under consideration, was not one of compression, as proposed by Kellogg and Talbert, but rather one of compilation, or assemblage. The Ed and T texts preserve a version of The Ten Commandments that is an attempt to fuse together two separate versions; the point at which the two were fused together is clear and unmistakable.

The Textual Relationships of Ed and T.31

For the above discussion on the mixed versions the textual identity of the Ed and T version was assumed; that identity properly applies of course only to the now lost common source of the Ed and T texts, and not to these in themselves. Ed and T are very close but their texts are not identical and neither is the copy of the other, as the following shows:

(1) T is, in all probability, not a copy of Ed, for T has Latin headings from the Vulgate for each commandment; Ed does not have these headings, nor references to them. It is unlikely that the scribe of T would stop copying to ferret out appropriate Latin passages to introduce each commandment. There are also numerous unique additions or substitutions in the text of T which point to a source distinct from that of Ed: for example, at line 40, and at the end of the rhetorical section, the scribe of T

31 Line references are to the Ed text and variants of The Ten Commandments, (mixed version), ff. 4r-10v.
or its source adds a lengthy conclusion to the first commandment. This is a significant addition, and it is attributable either to the scribe of T or to his immediate source; there is nothing similar to it in the Ed text. At line 33, T substitutes the phrase 'not in god' for 'fro god' thus rendering obscure the otherwise clear 'withdrawyng somewhat of her bileue & trust fro god [nat in god T]'. Likewise the balanced sentence of the Ed text, 'For the luyen vertues and yeuen hem to vices', line 125, appears in T as 'for they lyeue nat vertues but yeue hem to vyces'. This last is explicable as a kind of scribal rewriting, but as the Ed text is not deficient at this point, the reading is probably the result of the scribe of T or of its immediate source. The strongest evidence against the supposition that the Ed text is the immediate source for the T text is the presence of the previously mentioned Latin heading for each commandment.

(ii) Ed is not a copy of T, for T has numerous omissions (when compared to the Ed text) which are unlikely to have been added by conjecture on the part of the Ed scribe; for example, at lines 65-66, Ed reads 'and make no lesyng' where T is silent; at lines 75-74, Ed supplies what T omitted through homoteleuton 'Why ydil swerers? For oopis be not' ('Why' is preceded by 'nedefull' and 'not' is followed by 'medefull'). There are similar long omissions by T at lines 82-84, and at lines 87-90, and Ed is extremely unlikely to have supplied the
text it does through conjecture, (see text and variants).

The omissions in T exclude T from consideration as the immediate source for Ed.

Considering the evidence from (i) and (ii) above and with the specific character of the Ed and T texts already established in the sections on the discursive and mixed versions, it is possible to say with some certainty that Ed and T preserve one and the same version, elsewhere unattested, neither manuscript being the source of the other, but each depending upon the same common source at an unknown number of removes.
Arrangements of text and variants
of The Ten Commandments

The Ed manuscript contains two versions of The Ten Commandments and both versions have been edited, and critical apparatus provided, as part of this thesis. As both Ed versions are defective in varying degrees, it is best that the defects be set right but without destroying the overall integrity of the Edinburgh text. To such an end the following arrangements of texts and variants have been made:

Rhetorical Version

(i) The rhetorical version text in the Edinburgh manuscript has, at some stage, been mis-bound: the proper order of folios should be 2r, 2v, 3r, 3v, 1r; (see Catherine Borland, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Mediaeval Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library, 149).

(ii) The Edinburgh rhetorical version is also defective at the beginning and end, wanting approximately two folios. In the introduction it was stated that this treatise is 'defective at the beginning (wanting approximately one folio)' and that it lacks the ninth and tenth commandments. It is possible that the Ed scribe copied from a manuscript which lacked one folio and was also defective at the end. However, the following facts should be considered:
(1) That the rhetorical version treatise should precede the medieval table of contents is inferred from the ending of this treatise which appears on the same folio as the following incipit: 'Here bigynneth a table pat tellith how many maters ben in pis boke.' The arrangement of the treatise as it is in the codex is: ending of treatise plus table of contents plus beginning of treatise (the bottom of which is trimmed). Thus I have inferred that the rhetorical version treatise was originally copied onto the first two - three leaves, one of which was destroyed at some stage with part of another being trimmed.

(2) The treatise as it is in Ed does not have a formal incipit, and it is the only text in Ed which does not have an introduction, or any indication -- rubricated capital, etc. -- that it is a separate text.

(3) The Ed text does not have the first three commandments, nor the last two, but as the text, as it appears in Ed, may be seen to be a whole without them, this seeming discrepancy is not in itself good evidence either for the use of an abbreviated exemplar or for the putative damaged state of the manuscript. The text of the missing folios is supplied from the closely related text of Tn1, ff. 141r-142r; 145rv, with the text preceding and following the normal order of the commandments as they appear in Ed. Lineation of this separate text is that of the Tn1 manuscript.
Mixed Version

(i) Ed's mixed version (ff. 4r-10v) follows the rhetorical version in the manuscript and does so in this thesis; however, the mixed version is also defective at the beginning, having only a fragment of the Prologue to The Ten Commandments; variants for this fragment are set out below the text.

(ii) For the sake of completeness the entire Prologue from T, ff. 2v-3r is provided as a separate variant. As the T text is in double columns, the lineation of this variant is editorial, a departure from the usual practice in this thesis of observing manuscript lineation.
Here is declarid breuuli who
broken þe ten commaundementis
of god. Proude men worldly men
& fleschli men broken þe first com-
maundement. Whi proude men?
For þei maken þe deuil here god,
as ioob seib xli. c°: 'þe:* deuil is kyng
upon alle þe sonis of pride. Whi
worldli men? For þei maken
worldli godis here god, as poul
seib 'to þe eficies:* v. c°: An auerous man is
servaunt of mawmetis, and
schal not haue heritage in þe kyng-¹
dom of heuene. Whi fleschli men?
For þei maken her wombe here god,
as seint poul seib to þe philipen-
is-sis. iiij. c°: Be þe my folowers &
wayte þe hem þat walken so,
for many walken þat ben ene-
emies to cristis cros, whos ende
is deep, and þe wombe here god
& ioie in here confusioun. Who
broken þe secunde commaunde-
ment? Veyne spekers, grete
swerers, and wickid worchers.
Whi veyn spekers? For here wor-
dis ben not medeful, as crist seip
in pe gospel. Matthew xiiij. c°.: Of every
idil word pat men spoken, pei*  *MS. s
schulen selde rekennyng þer of
at þe day of dome. Whi greet
swerers? For here oþis ben not ne-
deful, as þe wise man seip. ecclesiasticus
xxiiii.: A man mich swerynges
schal be fulfillid with wickiden-
se & vengeaunce schal not go
fro his hous wip worst seldyng.
Whi wickid worchers? For here
werkis ben vnleful, as seint
[f. 142r] poul seip to þe romayns xvij. c°.: Awaite se hem þat letten þe lawe
of god, and dele se not wip hem
for bi softe speche þei disseyuen
þe hertis of ynnocent men. Who
breken þe þridde commaunde-
ment? Men þat þenken not on god
hertili, ne praien him not deou-
teli, ne done not þe werkis of
mercie charitably. Whi men þat
[f. 142r] þenken not on god hertili? For
þei ocupien here poustis in vanite-
es, as michee þe prophete seip
ij. c°.: Woo to you þat þenken vn-
profitable poustis, worchynge
[f. 142r] yuel in soure couchis in þe mo-
rewe list. Whi [begin collation with Edinburgh text]
worshyp] worshipen Tr.
and] but Tr. as ... pe xv c°] as it is written in pe gospel of matthew xv. c° Tr.
worshypeth] worshipen Tr. forsoyth] om. Tr.
hertis] herte Tr. bene] is Tr.
doith] done Tr.
mercy] mercie charitably Tr.
as ... pe v c° (1. 10)] as it is written in iones epistil iii. c°. Tr.
loued] louiden Tr.
wer] weren Tr. And so] Who breken pe fourȝ commandement Tr. Marginalium: 4 Tr.
breken pis beste] om. Tr.
for helpyn] for þei helpen Tr.
shuld doen] schulden Tr. as ... seith (1. 17)] as it is written in þe boke of ecclesiasticus iiij. c° Tr.
sterith] terriþ Tr.
as Isaie. seith] as ysaie þe prophete seip xxx. c° Tr.
seith] seien Tr. ye] om. Tr.
þei] it Tr.
error] errors Tr.
as ... for (1. 29)] as it is written in þe boke of numbers xvi. c° Dathon & abiron for Tr.
men pat prayen hym not devoutely? 
For pei worship hym with her lippes 
and not with her hertys, as crist 
seith by matheu pe xv c°: pis peple 
with lippes worshypeth me, but for 
soyth her hertis bene fer frome me. 
Why men pat doith not pe werkes 
of mercy? For pei leuen verteus & ye- 
uen hem to vices, as Iohun seith pe 
v c°: light cam in to pe world and 
men loued more derknes pan light, 
for her werkes wer euel. And so 
vnkynde men, froward men & rebel 
men breken pis heste. Why vnkynde 
men? For helpyn not her aldres 
as pei shuld doen, as pe wiseman 
seith: he pat worshypeth fadre and 
moder shalbe maide merye in sones, 
and he is cursed of god pat sterith 
hem to wrath. Why froward men? 
For pei wolen not take gostely te- 
chynge, as Isaie seith: sons of 
frowardnes not willyng to here pe 
lawe of god pat seith: speke ye to 
vs plesand thynges,though pei be 
errore. Why rebelle men? For pei 
bene vnbusum to criste & to hys chy- 
roche, as wer Daton & abiron pat
30 synked] soncken tr.
32 And ... heste (l. 33)] p fifpe c maundement is pis: Th i schaite sile noman, neiPær wiþe pinne hoendis, ne in i will: And pis breke enuyouse men, wrathful men & aereous men Tr. \textit{r}minalium: 5 Tr.
34 haiten] pei haten Tr.
35 of ... pistol (l. 36)] as seint Iom seip in his prid epistle iij. c°. Tr. [ iij. c°; perhaps expunged as it has two faint lines drawn through it].
38 he] bat he Tr.
39 broþer] broþir Tr; __. brok.
41 to ... man] as it is written eccl isticus xviiij. c°. Tr. __. xp god be b fr re wns.
42 of] pe Tr.
43 riche se] richessis Tr. norow ... pe (l. 49)] Tr. expunges mo, and write morew tide til to auentide.
46 shall chaunge] schal be chaungid Tr. and ... heste (l. 51)] pe sixte comauement f god is eou schaite do no lecheris. And pis breken fornicatorus anumters, a d holours Tr. \textit{r}minalium: 6 Tr.
51 forn aries] fornicato rs Tr.
52 MS. e pung; i and t p io p o l.
53 as ... seith] as it is written in thobie iij. c° Tr.
54 men] men for co womman Tr.
55 toke] token Tr. [ wife] om. Tr.
58 to ... wiseman (l. 59)] as it is written in sapience iij. c° Tr.
for vnbutumnes to moyses & Aaron

30 synked down to hell all qwyk, wyfe & chylde with all þat longed to hem. And þes enuyous men, wrathfull men & auarous men broken þis heste. Why enuyous men? For haiten or

35 bakbyten her bredren, of whyche speketh Iochum in his pistel: Eche man þat hateth his broþer is a man sleer & he þat seith he loueth god & hateth his [broþer] is a lyer. Why wrathful men?

40 For þei smyten or dispisen her bredren, as seynt austeyn seith: A wrathful man is hateful to god & he is fellow to fendys. Why auerous men? For þei releuem not in nede her even cristem, to þe whiche seith þe wise man:

45 [f. 3r] Haue mynde of pouerte in tyme of plenty & of þe nede of pouerte in þe day of richesse, fro morow to euen þe tyme shall chaunge. And þus fornícaryes, aunoutryers and holours broken his heste. Why fornicaries?

50 For þei defoulen her bodyes in lechrye, as tobye seith: þe deuel as-modeus slowe seuen men, for þei toke not her wife after þe forme of clene wedlok. Why aunoutryers?

55 For þe broken þe holy sacrament of matrimonie, to þe whiche seith þe
children] The children Tr.

shallb.) schulen be Tr. accounted] accounted & in pore last eend &e schulen faile speche Tr.

to ... pug] as seint poul sei) to be espieces v. co. Tr.

none] no Tr.

But ... heste (l. 68)] The seuen p comandement of god is pis, &ou schalt do [left minim of a written and subpuncted] no parte. And pis broken michers, robbers, & extorcioners Tr. Marginalium: 7 Tr.
as ... Osee (l. 70)] as pe prophete osee sei) .iiij. c°. Tr. &e] &e Tr.

pies thynges] pis ping Tr. all ... mourne (l. 74)] pe erpe schal mourne alle pat dwellen perynne Tr.

robben] pei robben Tr. to ... profite] as ysaie sei)p xxxijj. c°. Tr.

wher] whepir Tr. robbeth] robbist Tr. life] self Tr.

fully] om. Tr.

shalt pou] &ou schalt Tr.
as ... seith (l. 82)] as it is written in sapience .iij. c°. Tr.

vnpituous] The vnpiteuous Tr.

he is vnpfrofitable] vnpfrofitable he is Tr.

so proue wej proue we so Tr.

And ... heste (l. 89)] The viij comandement of god is pis, &ou schalt here no fals witnesse aijena &i neisbore. And pis broken liigers, glosers, and fals questmongers Tr. Marginalium: 8 Tr.
wiseman: children of auoutrye

her seede shall be outlawed, and
if þei bene of long life, at noght
þei shalbe acounted. Whi holouris?
For þei waisten her bodyes vnkyndly,
to þe whiche poule seith þus: wit
ye wele þat holouris hathe none
heritage in þe kyngdome of heuen.
But þus mychers, robbers & extor-
sioners breken his heste. Why my-
chers? For þe stelen þreasely, as seith
þe profet Osee: troweth is not in
erth, but cursidnes & thefte, & mercy
is a wy & science of þe lorde, for
þies thynges all þat dwelleth þer-
in shuld mourne. Why robbers? For
robben opynly, to þe whiche seith
god by Isaie þe profite: woo to þe
þat robbeth wher þi life shal not
be robbed, whan þou haste fully rob-
bed þan shalt þou be robbed. Why
extorsioners? For þei spuleyn men
of her godes falsly, as þe wise man
seith: vnpitous man seith: Begyle
we 'þe' right wisman, for he is vnpro-
fitable to vs and contrarie to our
werkes, by moste foule deth conde-
mpne we hym & so proue we þe
pacience of hym. And þus lyers
of ... man (1. 91)] as it is writen ecclesiasticus .xx. c° Tr.

lyers] a li'er Tr. heritage] enherite Tr.

hell] perdictioum Tr. hyden] þei hiden Tr. trewhit] þe truþe Tr.

as ... profite] as ysaie seip .xxxiiij. c° Tr.

high] so hiþ Tr. we] þou Tr.

sleghtnes] sliþnesse Tr.

questioners] qwestmongers Tr. trewh] þe truþe Tr. as ... seith (1. 99)] as it is writen in ysaie .lix. c° Tr.

Dome ... bakward] Turnid is bacward dome Tr.

trewth] Tr expunges t before truþe.

goo] gon Tr.

from] fro Tr.
glosers and fals questioners broken
his neste. Whi lyers? For þei haten

trewth, of whiche speketh þe wise-
man: better is a thefe þan þe bisesnesse
of lyers, for boith shullen heritage
hell. Why glosers? For hyden trewht,
as seith Isaie þe profite: þis peple is
of high sermone, so þat we may not
vndirstonde þe sleghtnes of her tong
in whiche is no wisdome. Why fals
questioners? For þe sellen trewth, as
Isaie seith: Dome is torned bakward,
for trewth is fallen in þe strete and
equate mai not goo in & he þat
seseth from syn is able to be dispi-

The Tanner MS. 336 text of
the Rhetorical Version of 'The Ten Commandments'
[commandments 9 and 10]

A193 [End collation with Ed.] Þe ix & ðe tenþe

A195 Thou schalt not coueste þi neis-
boris hous. And þis brekeþ he
þat wrongfulli coueitiþ in his
herte, þouþ he do it not in dede,
as it is seide in þe boke of ecclesiasticus

A200 v. c°: Wille þou not coueite wic-
kidli possessiouns, ne folowe
pou in pi strenkbe be co-
yetyngis of pin herte; it schal
not profite bee in tyme of ven-
geaunce. Thou schalt not
coueite pi nei5boris wijf & pus
breken poo men pat coueiten
in herte, & to her power done it
in deed, as crist seip in Matthew .v. c°:

Every man pat seeb awomman
furtu coueite hir hap now
done lecherie with hir in his herte.
Ne pou schalt coueite be ser-
usuntis of pi nei5bore, ne ge-
ue alle, ne no ping pat is his.
And pis broken poo men pat
haue lust and likyng in such
wrongful couetyng, as it is
writen in sapience .iiiij. c°.: 'vn-
stableness of couetyng ouir-
turneP witt wipouten malice.
Also seint ion seip in his first
epistle .ij. c°.: Thoo pingis pat
ben of be world ben couetise of
ipe & couetise of flesch & pride
of lijf, and pese be synnes
enwappen alle öbre pat ony
man doip. Weere sendip
be x comaundementis sch-
ortli declarid. Almiʒti Ihesu*

*MS. expunged g.

graunte us grace to kepe hem.
Notes (Rhetorical Version)

The following notes are confined primarily to commenting on specific differences between the Thl text or the EdTn1 version, and the texts of J and M. The editors of these latter two texts, Kellogg and Talbert, and Bühler (see introduction for full references) have pointed out various other connexions between their texts, and the sources upon which they depend, but they were not aware of the existence of the Ed and Tn1 texts (among others). So, much of what is said in the following notes not only presupposes, but adds to, and, where necessary, corrects the work of these earlier commentators.

A1 who broken. See also lines A22-A23, A44-A46, 12-14, 32-33, 49-51, 67-68, 87-89, A194-A215. The Tn1 and Ed texts (unlike the texts of J, M, and Tc) do not have the full statement of commandment from the biblical text of the WBL, Exodus xx, 1-17. Tn1, however, from the fifth commandment onwards, has a statement of commandment which resembles the statements in the WBL: for example, the ninth and tenth commandments in Tn1 'ben ðese: Thou schalt not coueite ði neisboris hous.[commentary]. Thou schalt not coueite ði neisboris wif ... [commentary]. Ne ðou schalt coueite þe seruauntis of ði neisbor, ne geue all, ne no þing þat is his.' [commentary], lines A194-A215. The J text agrees with the WBL, Exodus xx, 17, and its ninth and tenth commandments 'ben ðese / Thou shalt not coueite ðe hous of ði neisbor neþer þou shalt desire his wyf. not seruaunt. not hand maide. not oxe not asse: nester alle þingis þat ben hise.' Kellogg and Talbert, 376. The M text follows, with minor variations, the J biblical text, but, like Tn1, has the full biblical statement of commandment broken up into its separate injunctions and comments on each one in turn, citing a biblical authority in support of the comment. These similarities notwithstanding, the commentary of the Tn1 text is closer to that of the J text than to the M text: both the Tn1 and M texts appear to be slightly condensed recensions of a text which in its biblical text and commentary probably resembled the J text, or one very close to the J text, but one with inter-textual biblical and patristic citations.

A5 Whi ... men. [and passim]. As noted by Bühler, 689, fn. 12, and Kellogg and Talbert, 372, fn. 3, T.F. Simmons and H.E. Nolloth, eds., The Lay Folks' Catechism, E.B.T.S. O.S. cviii, p. 115, draw attention to the repetition of the question 'Who brekys?' (see line A22 below), and point to its survival in Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism of 1552. The Lay
Folks' Catechism, as noted by Bühler, 'merely lists the "breakers" without giving the Biblical texts that support or enlarge upon these selections'. M (Bühler's text) and J (Kellogg and Talbert's text) give the biblical texts, and cite the precise sources, as do the Ed and Tn1 texts. The list of 'breakers' in The Lay Folks' Catechism [Lb] may well be a condensation of the more expansive EdTn1 version, (or the JM version), but Lb is otherwise unrelated to these texts.

A11 An ... haveone (line A14). J reads: 'an avarous man is a servaunt of mawmetis: and shal not enherite be kyngdom of haveone', Kellogg and Talbert, 372. WBE (with variants) reads: 'ech formycatcur [lechour MSS. GMPQT], or vnolene man, or mouseous [servaunt MSS. QT] that is servaunge [seruinge MSS. Qq] of ydols, or mawmetis, hath not her4tage in the kingdom of Crist and [and of MSS. QT] God.' Ephesians v,5.

A17 Be ... confusioun (line A22). The Tn1 text agrees with the J text through line A21, but adds 'A icie in here confusioun', a clause which echoes WBE, Philippians iii, 19: 'whos god is the wombe, and the glorie in confusioun of hem, that sauren erthele thingis.'

A22 (1) See note to line A1.

(2) needful. The J text, as it stands in print, reads 'needful'; the manuscript reads 'meedful'.

A36 vengeaunce ... yeldying (line A37). J reads 'veniaunce with worst yelding: shal not go fro his hous / The texts of Tn1, J, M, (as well as To) preserve an abridged version of the WBE, Ecclesiasticus xxiii, 12: 'A man myche swerende shal be fullfild with wickidnesse [WBE]; and veniaunce schal not go awai fro his hous. And if he disseyueth a brother, his trespass schal be aboute hym; and if he feyneth, he schal trespass doubli. And if he swerith in veyn, he schal not be justified; for whi his hous schal be fillid with worst yelding [WBE].' 

A41 Awaite ... men (line A44). Again, the Tn1 text, as well as J, M, and To, follows an abridged version of the WBE, Romans xvi, 18.

A44 See note to line A1.

A53 Woo ... list (line A56). Text agrees with J.

4 pis ... me (line 6). Text agrees with J.

10 light ... euai (line 12). Text agrees, with minor variation, with J: Ed, Tn1 and M read 'darkermesse' for J's 'darknessis'.
12 See note to line Al.

17 he ... wrath (line 20). Text agrees, with one exception, with J. Ed and C5, f. 6r, read 'sterith' for 'terrih'; the WBL (as well as Th1, J, M and To) uses 'terreth'; and he is cursid of God, that terreth to wrath the moder' (Ecclesiastious iii, 18). In the WBL the clause is rendered thus: 'and he that wraththith the moder is cursid of God.' The use of 'sterith' in Ed and C5 may be an independent scribal attempt at a simplification of 'terreth', or it may represent the usage of an available but no longer extant recension of the Wycliffite Bible (itself an attempt at a simplification of 'terreth' which is tentatively resolved in the WBL usage 'wraiththith').

22 sones ... error (line 26). Th1 agrees with Rylands. Ed's substitution of 'he' for 'it' agrees with N, and 'error' for 'errors' appears to be unique.

28 pat ... hem (line 31). Text agrees with J.

32 See note to line Al.

36 Eche ... lyer (line 39). Text agrees, with minor variation, with J: MS. Ed (line 39) reads 'brok is a lyer'; Th1 reads 'bopir is a lier', and Rylands has 'bopir he is a lier'. The scribe of Ed probably misread j with suspended abbreviation for -er as a k. The text has been emended on this assumption.

41 A ... fendys (line 43). Text agrees with J.

46 Haue ... chaunge (line 49). Text, in general, agrees with J. Ed (lines 48-49) reads 'morrow to even ye tyme shall chaunge'; J has 'fro erli vnto even ye tyme shall chaunge'; and Th1 reads 'fro morewilde til to suentide tyme shal be chaungid'; Th1's reading agrees with the WBL, Ecclesiastious xviii, 26. The J translation, as noted by Kellogg and Talbert, 374, fn. 6, 'is nearer to EV [Earlier Version] than LV [Later Version].'

49 See note to line Al.

53 ye ... wedeloke (line 56). Text agrees with J. Th1, M, and C5, f. 7v, add, at line 54 and after 'men', 'for co wommen'. This is a reference to Sara, daughter of Raguel, who 'was 3000 to seuen hasebondis, and a feend, Asmodeus bi name, killide hem, anoon as thei haden entrid to hir.' WBL, Tobias iii, 8. The text of lines 53-56 does not parallel the WBEI, nor is it a condensation of the WBEI texts. As in most of the biblical texts of the rhetorical versions of The Ten Commandments the immediate source of the biblical
text is difficult to isolate: for some texts the scribe of the common source seems to have had access to and used one of the versions of the Ycolistie Bible, and for other texts, for example lines 53-56, the scribe responded to a version of the Wycliffite Bible. The three related, yet distinct, texts of Tn₁, M, and C₅ preserve a unique response in the clarifying addition (an addition vis-a-vis other texts) of 'for oo woman'. Such an addition suggests that these three manuscripts drew upon, ultimately, the same source for this biblical passage.

59 children ... accounted (line 62). Ed and To agree with Rylands through 'accounted', line 62. J₃, Tn₁, and C₅ read 'accountid and in her last ende. þei shule faille speche', Kellogg and Talbert, 375. In J₃, as noted by Kellogg and Talbert, 375, fn. 1, 'and ... speche' is a marginal insertion. The insertion appears to be in the same textura hand as that of the main text, but there is very little other marginal material, so an extensive palaeographical analysis is not possible. It is to be assumed then that the scribe of J corrected his own mistake, and that his exemplar had 'and ... speche'. Thus, Tc (a possible source for J) is probably not a source for J, though it is still possible that J and To depend upon the same immediate source.

64 wit ... heuen (line 66). With the exception of the beginning, Ed agrees with J, which reads: 'þis þing wite þe wel'.

67 See note to line 61.

70 troweth ... mourn (line 74). Ed agrees, with minor variation, with J: Ed, line 73, reads 'þis þynge' while J₃, Tn₁, M, C₅, and To read 'þis þing'. Tn₁, lines 73-74 substitutes 'þe er þe schal mourne alle þat dwellen þe ryyme' for 'all ... mourne'. Tn₁'s substitution should be compared with WBEI, Hosea iv, 3: 'For this thing the erthe schal mourne, and ech that dwelith in that lond, schal be sijk ...'.

76 Tn₁ here agrees with J through line 79. Ed, line 77, reads 'life' where Tn₁, J₃, C₅, and To read 'self'.

82 vnprofitous ... hym (line 87). Ed agrees, with one exception, with J. Ed, line 82, has 'vnprofitous'; J reads 'þe vnprofitous'. Tn₁ and M agree in variation at line 82, 'vnprofitable he is', and at line 86, 'proue we so'. The reading 'vnprofitable he is' may be attributable to the WBEI, Wisdom ii, 12: 'Higile wee thanne the rištvis man, for vnprofitable he is to vs, and contrarie to oure werkis', but 'proue we so', having no parallel in the WBEI, may well be scribal, and might have been in the common
source of Th1 and M. It is also possible (as it is simple matter of word-order inversion) that the variant in each text was independently introduced.

See note to line A1.

better ... hell (line 93). Ed's text seems to be a simplified version of the WBE, Ecclesiasticus xx, 27: "Betere is a thef than the besyneres of a man liere; forsothe bothe shuln eritagen perdicioun." The texts of Th1 and J are closer than Ed to the above WBE text. N and C5, f. 8\textsuperscript{r}v, substitute the following text for lines 91-97: 'Poul seip in þe Deedes of Apostalis .xxj. c°. I woot þat after me rauischynge wolues schullen come techinge leynge desseyuable to make oþer to folowe hem. Why glosers, for þey hiden þe treuþe. as Poul seith to Tymothe .iiiij. c°. tyme schal come. whanne men schullen not susteyne holsum techyrge. and þei schullen turne awey þe heringe fro treuþe.' Böhler, 691. M and C5 share the same source, and one distinct (at least for the eighth commandment) from Ed, Th1, J, and To.

pis ... wisdome (line 97). Ed agrees with J.

Dome ... dispised (line 103). Ed agrees with J; Th1, at line 99, reads: 'Turnid is bacward dome', a reading also found in N, C5, and the WBE. Isaiah lix, 14.

See note to line A1.

Wille ... vengeaunce (line A205). Th1, with one exception, agrees with J: at line A202, Th1 and C5 read 'couestyngis' where J, To, and the WBE read 'coueting'. The WBE, Ecclesiasticus v, 1-2 has 'Wile thou not taken heed to wickide possessiouns, and ne seye thou, Ther is to me suffisaunt llt; no thing forsothe it shal profiten in the tyme of veniaunce, and of oppressing, or deth. Ne folowe thou in thi strengths the coueiting of thin hertee. The agreement in variation of Th1 and M is probably not indicative of a close textual connexion (see note to line 91 above), but, as with other biblical texts, it may point to the use of the same recension of the Wycliffite Bible; that is, if the commentary of the tract The Ten Commandments is of one tradition, but the biblical texts contained within the tract are liable to comparison with any available English translation of the Vulgate, then the scope for scribal tampering becomes considerable.

Th1, through line A212, agrees with J.
A219 Th₁ (lines A219-A221) with minor variation, agrees with J: at line A221 Th₁ 'omits' (vis-a-vis J) 'pe'. Morgan omits this passage, and the one following.

A223 Th₁ (lines A223-A226) is closer to the WH, I John ii, 16: 'For al thing that is in the world, is causeitise of fleisch, and causeitise of iṣen, and pride of lijf'. J, Tc, and C₅ read 'pe [ṭeṣe C₅] jinges ben of pe world. causeitise of iṣen. and lustis of fleish. and pride of lijf', Kellogg and Talbert, 376.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Biblical Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Job xii, 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Ephesians v, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>Philippians iii, 17-19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A28</td>
<td>Matthew xii, 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus xxiii, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A41</td>
<td>Romans xvi, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A53</td>
<td>Michee ii, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Matthew xv, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>John iii, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus iii, 6, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Isaias xxx, 9-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Numbers xvi, 27-33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1 John iii, 15; iv, 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I have been unable to locate this reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Tobias iii, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Wisdom iii, 16-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Ephesians v, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Case iv, 1-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Isaias xxxiii, 1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Wisdom ii, 12, 20, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus xx, 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Isaias xxxiii, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Isaias lix, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A200</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus v, 1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A210</td>
<td>Matthew v, 28.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A219  Wisdom iv, 12.
A223  1 John ii, 16.
The Prologue to The Ten Commandments from Trinity College, Cambridge MS. R.3.21(T), ff. 2v - 3r.

A Prologue on the .x. commaundmentes

ALL MANER men shuldyn hoide goddyes commaundmentes, for w'out kepyng and rewlyng by hem may noman besiuyd, and

P5 so the gospell telleth howe con askyd cryst what he shuld do forto come to beuyn, and cryst bado hym yef he wold enter in to blysse that he shuld kepe the commaundmentes of god. Almighty god seythe in hys lawe on thys wyse:

P10 whoso seythe that he loueth me, and kepeth nat my commaundmentes, he ys a lyer, and trewthe ys nat in hym. And as god seythe: The fende ys fadyr of all lesynges. Therfore lest we become the fendes children thorough lesynges lat vs know

P15 goddes .x. commaundmentes, and kepe hem besyly w' alloure myght as trew men to Ihesu cryste. And wete thow well that oure lord Ihesu cryst hath nat bodyn vs do but that we may well kepe w' the helpe of goddes grace, yef we

P20 do oure besynesse therto, for elles nit had be ayenst reson to have boundyn men open theyre damnacion to have kept hys commaundmentes, and in oure god may non vunreason be by any maner way.

And so god seyth in hys gospell to all maner men:
P25 My charge ye lyght, and my yok ye swete,
and seynt Iohn the euangelyst seythe:
The charge of god ys to kepe hys commandmentes,
and they be nat greuous ne heuy.

P29 Explicit Prologus.

For a printed edition of the same Prologue of Kylands English MS. 85 (J), see A.L. Kellogg and E.W. Talbert, 'The Wycliffite Pater Noster and Ten Commandments ...', B.J.R.L. xliii (1960), 371; for other manuscripts see C.U.L. MS. Nn. 4.12, f. 3v; B.M. Add. 27592, f. 42 (omits lines Pl-P10 of the Trinity text above). The latter two manuscripts are closer to the J text.
[Fragment of Prologue from Ed]

i by any manner way. And crist seith in his gospell to all manner folke: My charge is light & my yoke is swete. And seynt Iohun be evangelist sevyth: be charge of god is to kepe his hestys & be not gresous nor vij heuye.

Variants from MS. T.
i And cris] And so god T.
ii folke] men T.
vi hestys] commaundmentes T.
Biblical Sources

P7  Matthew xix, 16-17.
P10 1 John ii, 4.
P12 John viii, 44.
P25 Matthew xi, 30.
P27 1 John v, 3.
Here we are keeping (1. 1) Fili mi custodi sermones meos & precepta mea reconde tibi. Ffilli honora dominum & valebis propert eum. ne timeueris alium serua mandata mea a viues a legem meam quasi pupillam oculi tui custodi; liga eam in digitis tuis; scribe eam in tabulis cordis tui. Proverbia.vij0. T.

all] om. T.

lorde god] lord thy god T.

be fore me aliene goddis (1. 8)] straunge goddes before me T.

not] om. T.

a grauen ymage] no grauen thynges T. with mannys hondis (1. 10)] om. T.

heuen] heuen aboue T.

MS. expunged le between shalt and not. loute hem, ne (1. 14)] om. T.

lorde god] lord thy god T.

wikkydnes] wykydnesses T. in] in to T.

hated] hatyn T.

thousandis] a thousand T.

do] louen T. myne hestys] my commaundmentes T.


affeccions] affeccion T.
Here bygynneth be ten commandments of god that eche man must
of hym kepe.

G

self spake all these wordes:

I am thy lord god that
led be out of egipte fro be house of
seruage, thou shalt not have before
me aliene goddis, thou shalt not make
to be a grauen ymage with mannys
hondis, neper any likenes whiche is in
heuen, neper in erth by neipe, neper
of be thynges whiche bene in watres
vndir be erth, thou shalt not liute
hem, ne worship hem. I am thy lorde
god, a stronge gelous lover, visitynng
be wikkynnes of fadres in children
in to be thrid & fourte generation of
hem pat hated me, and I do mercy in
to thousandis of kyndredes of hem

pat louse me & kepyn myne bestys.
Thys is be first heest of god almy-
ghty, commaundyng all affeccions, all
louse, all worshype, and all be joy of
be doon] to be do T.
wichecraftes] wychecraft T.
coniurisons] and coniuracions T.
po] they T. putten] put T. or] eyther T.
withdrawyn] w\^drawen T. somewhat] som T.
MS. expunged for between trust and fro. fro god] nat in god T.
brakyn] brakyn T. heest] commandment T.
MS. expunged wo between men and and.
heest] commandment T.
deu] fende T.
make] makyn T.
maken] make T. god] god. And so hit ys concluyd of thys commandment that no creature in heuen ne in erthe be worshypyd, drad, and louyd in oure soules aboue oure maker, but all creatures beloued benethe hym aftyr worthynes and ordre. But thys mayst thow nat well discuss in thysylfe, but aftyr that thow louest the lawe of thy god; ffor oonly therby and thereaftyr shalt thow haue pref in thysylfe, whether thow settest the creatoure, or the creature before T.

taken] take T.
veyne] ydell T.
mannes hert be doon to our lord Ihesu [f. 4v]
crist. Here god commandith pat all
mannes bileue, trust, and loe be set
only in god & in none oper thyng a-
yenst his wil. And here he forfandith
all bileue & trust in all manner wichecraf-
tes, sweuuenes, charmes, coniurisons,
for he pat putten her bileue or trust
in any suche, withdrawyng somewhat
of her bileue & trust fro god, & so
brekyng his heste. Also proude men,
worldely men, and fleshly men
broken his heste. Why proude men?
For hei maken he deuel her god. Why
worldely men? For hei make worlde-
ly goodys her god. Why fleshly men?
For hei maken her belies her god.

The second commandment.
Hou shalt not taken he
name of bi lord god in veyne,
for god clepeth hym gyly pat taketh
his name in veyn. Ieremie he profet
seyth to a iust sichte longyth.iiij. thy-
seund] secund ys T. Marginalium: .i.; .iij. T.

thrid] thryd ys T. Marginalium: .iij. T.

.iij.] thre T.

fro] from T. pine] thy T.


seyng] om. T. MS. expunged ys between gospel and she. gospel] gospell, and so T.

he lerid] they lernyd T. lewyd] they lewde T.

techyth] telleth T.

shuld] shulden T.

sey] to sey T.

doubil] doubleth T.

If] om. T.

seith] sey T. MS. expunged ys between seith and she. seib she] sey ye, ye T.

and ... lesyng (l. 66)] om. T.

wordis] oath T.

eny] om. T.

or] other T. any of] om. T.
Mgys. The first is trewht, be secund good profite, and be thrid resonable doome, and if eny of þis .iij. thynges fallen fro þine oþe, þan þine oþe is ild and a greit synn displesyng god. And so in nede god & þe holy doom shuld be þine oþe, & by no membre, ne by noon oþer creature of god shalt þou swere on eny wyse, as crist chargith vs seyng in hys gospel: she, she, nay, nay shuld be cristen monys wor-wys, wer he levid, wer he lewyd, as crist techyth vs all in þe same place. And for þe hert & þe mouth shuld accorde in speche and not sey one ðe thy-nke an oþer; þerfore crist doubil þis he & þis nay, as þough he wold sey: If ye seith she in your hert, seib she with your mouth & be ye trew men and make no lesyn. And þus she, she, & nay, nay shulde be cristen monys wordis with out eny veyne sweryng by god, or by eny of his creatures. Also veyn
Haste] commandment T.

bene] be T. nedefull ... not (1. 74) om. T.

bene] be T.

The ... pis] Si autem non audieritis me vt sanctificetis diem sabbati & ne portetis anus & ne inferatis per portas Ierusalem in diem sabbati, succendam ignem in portis eius & deorabit domos Ierusalem & non extinguetur. Ieremiae. xviij. The thryd commandment ye to. Marginalium: Tercium mandatum T.

Hawe ... halow] haue in mynde that thow halew T.

and do] om. T.

pe ... be (1. 81)] In the viij. day ys T.

And ... hem (1. 84) om. T.

pi sone] neyther thow ne thy son T. and] ne T. pi seruaunt] ne thy seruaunt T.


within] in T.

for ... holy (1. 90) om. T.

MS. expunged ma before moste.
speakers, ydel swerers & wykked wor-
chers broken his haste. Why veyn spe-
kers? For her wordes bene not mede-
full. Why ydil swerers? For oopis
be not medefull. Why wiked wor-
chers? For her werkes bene vnleful.
The thrid commandment of god is his:

   Aus mynde to halow hine
   holy da-. In six days hou
   shalt worche and do hine

own werkes; be seueneth day shal
be be rest of his lord god, bat day
shalt hou doo no seryule work. And
fre his werkes shuld his sise kepe
hem: his sone and his doughter, his ser-
aunt & his maide, his werk beste and
his straunger bat dwellith within hine
house, for in sixe days god maide
heuen and erth see & all thynges bat
is with in hem and rested in be seuen-
th day & blessid bat day & maid it holy.
But synn is his cruellest werke &
moste bende of all other werkes;
93 MS. corrected chargid to chargid.
94 for] om. T.
95 ceessith} sasen T. from] fro T. MS. I expunged between folkes and ceessith.
96 occupien] occupy T.
98 cianseth] ciansyn T. swalowen] swolow T.
99 all] om. T. holdynge] ffor many boldyn T.
101 suer eipir] bothe T.
102 left] last T.
104 be lust] lust T.
106 to worship] worshyp T.
108 to besie] besy T.
110 to comfort] comfort T.
112 MS. corrected 'πu kunnyng' to 'πi kunnyng'.
113 halow] haue T.
114 pat] om T.
115 thanken] that thankyn T. of] on T.
117 doon] do T.
119 of] on T.
Before eche man is char'gi'd to kepe hym from synne for euermore. For many folke ceassith on þe holy day from greit bodely trauesile, but þei occu-pien hem in greit gostely synnes, suche folke clenseth þe gnate & swalowen þe camel all hole, holdynge more pe-rill in a litel bodely werke þan in greit gostely synnes, all be it þat euers eipir shulde be left on þe holy day. But on þe holye day folkes shulden principally forsake þe lust of þe fleche, and þe joy of þe world, and veyn dis-portys and goo to þe chyrche à to wor-shyp god in his sacramentis deuoutly, and to bisie hem to know her own wrecchednes and þe greit kyndnes of god. À to viset, and to comoorth þi medye neghbures, bodely and gostely after þi power and þ'i' kunynge. And þus þou shuldest halow þi self on þe holy day. And þus men þat on þe holy day thanken not of god hertely and prayen hym not deuoutly and doon not þe werkes of mercy charitablerly broken þis commaundement. Why men þat thanken not of god hertely?
120 occupyen] occupy T. in] w T.
121 prayen] praye T. hym] om. T.
124 doon] do T.
125 mercy] mercy charytably T. leyuen] loue nat T.
126 and] but T. yeuen] yseu T.
128 & pi moder] and modyr T.
130 hest] commandment T.
134 of] to T.
138 or] syther T.
140 it] be T.

The fourth commaundment of god.

Worshyp þi fadre & þi moder þat þou be of long lyfe vpon erth. Þis hest wolde þa kynde also þat þou worship þi fader & þi moder & þat þou help hem in reasonable mesure of wordely godes, if þei haue nede of hem. And also with stren-

kþis of þi body travaile for hem, coun-

seile & conforte hem after þi kunnyng, a reverence hem with wordis of mouth, for he þat mysusyth his fader or his moder shall die an euel deeth as god-

dis lawe seith if it repent hym not. And counseile & teche hem, if þou be wiser þan þei in all make maner, how
shulden] shuld T. god al myghty] almyghty god T.
houndishe] houndys T.
to] forto T. MS. expunged p between for and yeit.
worshyp] worshyp and to lous T.
his] om. T.
rebel men] rebeles T.
haste] commaundment T.
taken] take T. gostely] no gostly T. rebel men]
Rebelles T.
been] be T.
The ... his (i. 155)] Odit deus manus ess[ua]dentes
sanguinem innoxium. Proverbia viij. The fyfthe
commaundment ys T. Marginalium: Quintum mandatum T.
now] om. T.
of] on T. mannes slakter] manslaughtre T.
with holding] and w'holdyng T.
fro] from T.
nedith] nedyn T.
of pe] to the T.
he shulden lyfe iustely to please god
all myghty, ffor seynt austeyn seith
pat it is an houndishe condition a
chylde to for yett to worship his
fadre and his moder. And so vnkynde
men, froward men & rebel men broken
his heste. Why vnkynde men? For hei
helpen not her eldres as hei shulden.
Why froward mon? For hei wo1 met
taken gostely techyng. Why rebel men?
For hei been vnbusom to crist and
to his chirche. The fifte commaund-
ment of god is his.
Hou shalt not slee no man
wiffully, neibir with euel
wil in hert. Ffor his is one of pe.iiiij.
synnes pat euer cryeth vengeance by
fore all myghty god. And now his syn
is seid of.iiiij. maners, as bodely man-
nes slakter, bakbytyng, with holding
of worldely goodis or gostely fro
hem pat nedith his goodis, and
euel ensample of lyuyng of he pe-
seith seynt poule] seynt poule seynt T. haie]
hauie T.

MS. men. wrathfull wrathful men (1. 171).

heest] commandment T. MS. men for for þei (1. 173).

The ... god (1. 178)] Non erit meretrix de
filiabus Israel neque scortator de filijs Israel.
Deuteronomium .xxiij°. The syxth commandment ys.
T. Marginalium: Sextum mandatum T.

not doo (1. 179)] do no T.

heest] commandment T.

& holotre] om. T.

do] om. T.

lecherye ... hert (1. 189)] in hys hert the lechery T.
ple. All these braunchyes bene be fore god grauous manslaughtris, pe whiche, as seyth seynt poule, haie no parte in pe kyngdom of heuen.

And hue enuyous men,

wrathful men & auarous men bre-
ken pis heest. Why enuyous men? For pei haiten or bakbyten her bredren. Why wrathful men? For pei smyten or dispisen her bredren. Why auarous men? For pei releue not in nede her euencristen. The sixt commaundment

How shalt not of god.
do lechery. Thys heest forbidith pe cursed deede & stynkyng of bodely lecherie & gostely also. Of bodely as symple fornicacion & auoutrye & holoere, she and ful consen-t peerto, for pe leste of pis is dedely

synn before god, and so crist seith in his euangelie: Who so seith a woman and consentyngely couetyth hir to do le-
cherye he baith doon lecherye in his
156 is] hit ys T.
196 life] lyfe tyme T. be fore] om. T.
197 in to] in T.
199 and died] and yef he dyed T.
200 ony] om. T.
201 to fore] before T. bryng] bryng hym T.
202 lawe] prophete T.
204 heste] commaundment T.
209 The ... bis (1. 210)] Nolite dare locum diabolo qui furabatur iam non furetur magis autem laboret operando quod bonum est manibus suis vt habeat vnde tribuat necessitatem pacienti. Ad Ephesios iij. The vij commaundment ys. T. Marginalium: Septimum Mandatum T.
211 not doo] do no T.
hert by fore god. Gombly lecherie is symonye, ydolatrie & ypocrisie, and 
be condicjon of suche folke is to be sorye 
when men vndirnymen hem, and glad 
when men praissen hem. But of bode-
ly lechirie is to wyt, pat bough a man 
had lyued neuer so welie and pleasyngly 
to god all his life be fore, and after 
fei down in to lecherie by a syngle 
woman, be whiche some foolyses hol-
den litle synne, and died perin with-
out ony repentance, all his gode life 
to fore shuld not saue hym, ne brynge 
to blisse as god witnesseith by his lawes. 
And þus fornicaries, aoutriers and ho-
louris broken þis heaste. Why fornicari-
es? For þei deroulon her bodis in lechy-
rice. Why aoutrers? For þei broken 
þe holy sacrament of matrymonie. 
Why holouris? For þei waisten her 
bodies vnkyndely. The seventh 

commandment of god is þis. 
Hou shalte not doe thefte, 
Thefte as a doctour seith is
213 goodys] goodys thiefly T.
214 owen] oweth T.
215 wronge] wrongfull T.
218 sleghlys] sleghlys and deseuytes T.
220 boihe] bothe of T. or T.
221 dede] of dade T. is forfendith] ys forfendyd T.
223 heest] commandment T.
225 robbe] robbhe T.
227 The ... thys (1. 228)] Ne testis sis frustra contra proximum tuum, ne lactes quosquam labijs tuis. ne dicas quomodo facit michi. sic faciam si vt reddam unicuique secundum opus suum. Proverbia .xxiiij. c
The viij. commandment ys. T. Marginalium: Octauum Mandatum T.
230 euencrystyn T.
231 om. T.
232 heir (1. 233)] om. T.
233 lesyn T. his] theyre T. heritage] right herytage T. gyltlesse] men (1. 234)] a gyltlesse man T.
234 doo] do T.
takyng of goodis withouten leue and wil of hem pat owen hem. In his god forfendith all maner wroge takynge and withholding of eny mannes goode, all preuey stelyng, robbynge & bi'g'ylyng, all sleghtys in byynge and selynge, and be dede of eny wrongful takyng of eny mannes goode, boihe qwyeke & dede, is forfendith of god in his com-

Hou shalt not bore fals witnes ayens bi neigh-
bore, for porowgh many fals witnesse beryng, many a right heir lesith his heritage & many gyl-
teles men is doon to deeth; pus crist pat was moste innocent & neuer did synne was dampned to pe deeth by
The ix. commaundmentys.


wrongeful] wrong T.

goodys] good T.

and syluer] syluer T. of corne] and corne T. all] of all T.

mouen] mous T.

from] fro T. MS. expunged h before self.

heest] commaundment T.

maner] om. T.
two false witnesses. Also in his heast [c. 9v]
god forfendith all lesynges, for eche
lesyng is a false witnes ayenst oriste,

240 þe whiche is trewth as he hym self
seith. Also seynt Ambrose seith: Bredren
flee ye lesyne, for all þat louen lesyng
be sone of þe deuel. And þus liers,
glosers and fals questioneris brekyn

245 þis heast. Why liers? For þei halten
trewth. Why glosers? For þei hiden
trewth. Why fals questionaries? For
þe sellen trewth. Th[e] ix. commaundment.

250 Hoo shalt not cawett þi
neighbours house. Here god:
fortewith all wrongeful
desire and courtysye of any mannes go-
odyns, buyt of hous and land, of gold
and silver, of cloth, of come, and all

255 oþer thynges þat may not mouen þem
self from one place to an oþer. And
right as god forfendith in þe seuen-
meth heest þe deede of all wrong
ful takyng of any mannes goodys, so in

263  The ... this (l. 264)] Si nechatus fuerit quis cum
vxeore alterius, & adulterium perpetrauerit cum
vxeore proximi sui morte, moriatur, mechus & adultera.
leuiticus .xx°. The .xth. commandment ys. T.

265  pe wife (l. 266)] om. T.
266  ne] om. T.
269  is his] hys ys T.
270  heest] commandment T.
271  heest] commandment T.
274  so in ... hert deadly synne (l. 275)] so the ... hert ys dedely syn T.
275  by cause (l. 276)] because that T.
276  weneth] wenen T.
279  myghten] myght T.
281  wolden] wolde T.
282  pe straitnes] streytncs T.
his heest he forfendith all maner wrongful desire and coustysse in hert to any mannees goods, for he leste of his is deedly synne. The tenth commandement of god is this.

Hou shalt not desire he wife of he nebor, ne his servant, ne his maide, ne his ox, ne his ass, ne no thyng he is his. And right as god in he

vj heest forfendith he dede of lecherie & spousebreche, so in his heest he forfendith he will and he consent of he hert, for as he dede of lechery is deedly synne, so is he ful consent and he de-syre of he hert deedly synne. And by cause many foolish weneteth he if hei doo not he dede of lechery he it is no peril all be it he pat hei wolen doo it by her wil, if hei myghten com herto. And by cause also he pat many foolish wolen be theues ne war it for he straitnes of he lawe &
wene] wenen T. be] ys T.

284 tu] for to T. of mys] amys T.

285 hor] that T. wrong] wrongfull T.

286 coustise] desyre T.

287 .ij.] two T. forfendith] forbeth T.

289 noghbur] noyghbors T.

293 commaundmentis] holy commaundmentes T.

294 shule] MS. shulde with d subpuncted; shull T.

295 frome ... eual] om. T.

296 is right] ys the ryght T. And] om. T.

297 & dode] and in dode T. criste] God T.

298 & confessours] confessours T.

299 all holy men] all other holy folke, men T.

300 to heuen] to go to heuen T.
for the galowes wene pat it be no synne to coueite of mys in hert oter mennys

goodis, but if þei fulfill her wrong coueite in dede. Perfore god here in þies þat last commandmentis forfendith fals coueite of þi neghburis godys and also vnleful desire of þi neghbur wife, in tokene þat suche vnreasonable coueite with out þe dede doynge is damnable in þe sight of god. Perfore kepe we bisely & wilfully þies commandmentis of god & þei shule kepe vs frome all maner euel; þis is þe wey & none oter is right wey to heuen. And in þis wey, boþ in worde & dede, criste & his apostile, martirs & confessours, virgynes & all holy men and women haue taught vs trevely to heuen.
Notes

1 Fili mi custodi .... T [Proverbia, vii, 1-3]. The Latin biblical text in T does not agree in every respect with potentially available contemporary vulgate texts; compare, for example, T's text with that of the following:


B (otherwise unrelated to T) has the same or similar Latin headings as T, but as marginalia. The B text of The Ten Commandments could be considered a much-shortened rhetorical version, but lacks the repetition of 'Who breki> be ______ commandement', and reads, for example, in the second commandment, 'hou takist >u> name of god in veyn? When I name god or any creature, yerd ydel speche or customable avering', f. 3r. This text is not included in the catalogue of the versions of The Ten Commandments; another B text (ff. 16r-17v) is included under the rhetorical versions.

2 God ... hestys (line 20). The text of Ed agrees, in general, with the WBL.

WBL, Exodus xx, 1-7 (with variants from 'MS. I', Bodley MS. 277; asterisks indicate place at which variation begins):

And the Lord spak alle these wordis. Y am thi Lord God, that ladde thee out of the lond of Egip, fro the hous of servage. Thou schalt not make to thee a graven ymage, nether ony licenesse of thing which is in heuen aboue, and which is in erthe byneth, nether of tho thingis, that ben in watris vndur erthe; thou schalt not *heris tho [loute hem MS. I], nether *thou schalt worchiphe [worchiphe hem MSS. IS]; for Y am thi Lord God, a stronge gelouse louyere; and [om. MSS. UK] Y visite the wickidnesse of fadris [fadris in children MS. I] in to the third and the fourthe generacion of hem that haten [hatiden MS.I] me, and Y do mercy in to 'a thousynde
[thousands MSS. IS], to hem that louen me, and kepen wyn hecatis.

Ed agrees in variation with Bodley MS. 277, but the agreement is not complete, as a close comparison of texts reveals. The variants from Bodl. MS. 277 are noted by way of partial explanation of the variation in Ed: that is, the scribe of Ed, or its source, may have used a version of the Wycliffite Bible as a check against the biblical text of his exemplar, and finding his exemplar wanting substituted 'correct' readings for 'defective' ones.

According to Forshall and Madden, Bodl. 277 is a revised copy of the WBC: the revisor's 'object was to render the version more plain and intelligible'; see WB, i, p. xxxi. C. also seems to have used a biblical text very close to that of Bodl. 277: see the first commandment, f. 3v.

41: Vir multum iurans .... T [Ecclesiasticus, xxiii, 12].
Again, T's Latin text does not agree with a contemporary Vulgate version.

Bible, Lyra: Vir multum iurans implerit iniquitate,
à non discedet a domo illius plaga.

B: Vir multum iurans replebitur iniquitate
à non discedet a domo eius plaga, ecc. 23°.

60 And ... creatures (line 69). This passage should be compared with the following from B1:

Crist techiþ in þe gospel to haveoure wordis þus, she, she, and naþ, mow wþouten ony ooþ. Per he doubliþ his wordis, as if he wolde seie, — 5If se seie she in soure soule, seie she wiþ soure mouþ, and be se trewe men. Select English Works of John Wyclif, ed. T. Arnold, (Oxford,1869-71), iii, 84; cited as 'Arnold'.

72 nedefull .... not (line 74). T's omission of 'nedefull.' Why ydil swerers? For oþ is be not' is probably attributable to homoteleuton, the scribe of T having copied 'not' of line 72 then copied the word following 'not' of line 74 — 'nedefull'. It is also possible that T's exemplar read 'for theyre wordys be not medefull' (as do Tn, and Tc among others) and that the omission in T was occasioned by the repetition of 'nedefull'.

76 T's Latin biblical text agrees with Bible, Lyra, [Ieremia xvii, 27]. B: for Si read Ex.

78 Ed's passage (lines 78-90) should be compared with the following extracts from the V uphe, Exodus xx, 8-11:

Haste synse to halve thin holy day [V uphe];
in sixe daies thou schalt worche and schalt
do alle thi werkis; forsothe in the seuenthe
day is the sabat of thi Lord God; thou schalt
not "do any werk [do in it seruyle werk MS.I],
thou, and thi sone, and thi douistir, and thi
seruaunt, and thin handsmaide, thi werke beeste,
and the comelyng which [that MS. Ed.] is withynme
thi satis; for in sixe dayes God made heusene and
erthe, the see, and alle thingis that ben in the,
and restide in the seuenthe daie; herfor the Lord
blesside the daie of the sabat, and balewise it.
[V uphe]

The reading in Ed of 'And fro pies werkes shuld pies
sixe fepe ben', line 82, does not occur in T; the only
other text which has this reading is C5, f. 5f, but
this text has numerous biblical readings not shared
by Ed, and is also a different version. Another reading
omitted (via-g-via Ed) by T is that of lines 87-90,
'for ... holy'; the closely related text of C5, f. 5f,
also omit this clause, but it is difficult to trace
T's omission back to and through C5 as this latter
text has a much-condensed biblical passage, thus
obliterating its antecedents. Again, the variation in
and among the various biblical texts in the different
texts of The Ten Commandments points towards either
independent, coincident variation or to scribal access
to 'revised' versions of the V uphe.

125 Ieyuen. T's reading 'Iowe nat' is unique, all other
extent manuscripts reading a form of 'Ieyuen'.

127 Honora patres tuo .... T [Ecclesiasticus vii, 29-30]
should be compared with Bible, Lyra: Honora patres tuo,
& gemitus matris tuae obliuiscaris. Memento, quomiam
nisi per illos natus non fuisses: & retribue illis,
quomodo & illi tibi.
B follows T.
Worshyp ... erth (line 130). This passage should be compared with WEF, Exodus xx, 12:

Honour thy father and thy mother, that thou be of long life upon earth, that the Lord thy God shal gyue to thee.

Odit deus manus .... T [Proverbs viii]. I have not been able to locate this reference.

Thou ... hert (line 158). WEF reads: 'Thou shalt not swe.' The EdT addition is unique.

T's Latin biblical text agrees with Bible, Lyra [Deuteronomy xxiii, 17]. B follows T.

Nolite dare locum .... T [Ad Ephesians iv, 27-28]; compare with text of Bible, Lyra: Nolite locum dare diabolo. Qui furabatur, iam non furetur; magis autem laboret operando manibus suis, quod bonum est, ut habeat unde tribuat necessitatem patienti. B: Nolite locum dare diabolo qui furabatur iam non furetur, magis autem laboret operando manibus quod bonum est ut habeat unde tribuat necessitatem patienti. Eph. 4:

Ne testis sis .... T [Proverbs xxiv, 28-29] should be compared with Bible, Lyra: Ne sis testis frustra contra proximum tuum; neo lactes, quanquam labiis tuis. Ne dicas: Quomodo fecit mihi, si faciam ei: & reddam unicuique secundum opus suum.

B agrees with Bible, Lyra.

glosers. O.E.D. s.v. Glozer [f. Gloze v¹ + er¹] 1, gives the meaning 'One who writes glosses; a commentator', and cites 'Sic many false gloseris, maken goddis laws derk', The English Works of Wyclif Hither- to Unprinted, ed. F.D. Matthew, E.E.T.S. O.S. lxxiv, 288. However, there is a more precise definition implicit in Wyclif's condemnation of 'clerks possessioners' who 'suffren, helpen & meyntenen false preechouris, gloseris, to robbe pe peple bi fals beggynge, bi symonye & ypocrisie & blasphemye putt vpon crist', The English Works of Wyclif, 135. Here 'gloseris' are identified (as an appositive)
with 'false prechouris'.
false questioneris. T reads 'false questmongers'.
'Questioneris' and 'questmongers' mean virtually
the same thing: see O.E.D., s.v. Questmonger, 'One
who made a business of conducting inquests.'

248 Alij diuidant propria .... T [Proverbia xi, 24]
ought to be compared with Bible, Lyra: Alij
diuidunt propria & ditiores fiunt: alij rapiunt non
sua, & semper in egestate sunt.
B agrees with Bible, Lyra.

263 Si mechatis fuerit ... T [Leviticus xx, 10] should
be compared with Bible, Lyra: Si meechatus quis
fuerit cum uxore alterius, & adulterium perpetrauerit
cum uxore proximi sui mort: moriantur, & [om. B,
otherwise agrees with Bible, Lyra] meechus &
adultera.

274 so is ... synne (line 275). T's omission of this
clause seems to be the result of the repetition
of 'synne'.

284 of mys. T reads 'amys': both 'of mys' and 'amys'
can be read here as 'wrongly', see O.E.D. s.v. Amiss
adv., pred.a., and sub., A.3., and s.v. Miss sb.
II, 3.
Biblical Sources

5  Exodus xx, 1-6.
21  Luke x, 27.
42  Exodus xx, 7.
47  Jeremias iv, 2.
56  Matthew v, 37.
66  James v, 17.
77  Exodus xx, 11.
98  Matthew xxiii, 24.
132  Ecclesiasticus vii, 29-30.
138  Exodus xxi, 17;  Matthew xv, 4-6.
144  I have been unable to locate this reference.
156  Exodus xx, 13.
168  1 Corinthians vi, 9-10.
178  Exodus xx, 14.
186  Matthew v, 28.
202  Matthew v, 19.
211  Exodus xx, 15.
213  I have been unable to locate this reference.
229  Exodus xx, 16.
240  John xiv, 6.
241  I have been unable to locate this reference.
249  Exodus xx, 17.
265  Exodus xx, 17.
The Manuscript Relationships of The Three Goods

The hitherto unedited tract The Three Goods is extant in three other manuscripts in addition to E.U.L. MS. 93 (Ed) ff. 25v-27r; they are:

(L) Bodleian MS. Laud Misc. 23, f. 43rv.

(T) Trinity College, Cambridge MS. R.3.21 (601), f. 12f, col. a - 12v, col.b.

(Cc) Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS. 385, pp. 220-221.

The existence of the tract has been noted by Dr. P.S. Jolliffe, Check-List, 109, item I.19, but Jolliffe's entry is not complete, for he has the tract surviving in Ed and Cc alone, nor is his comment that Cc is 'imperfect at end' accurate, (see note to line 67).

The results of a detailed collation of the above manuscripts are summarized in the following notation.

[Ed][CcT:L]

In the discussion which follows, the distinct character of Ed will be established; the similarities

1 For references to these manuscripts see 'Manuscripts: Notices and Descriptions'.

2 The above list of surviving manuscripts is not complete in any final sense; other manuscripts containing The Three Goods may survive, but a search of the 50 or so manuscripts containing tracts also found in Ed has brought to light T and L only. Dr. A.J. Doyle, in a personal letter of 22 June, 1975, stated that he did not have anything noted for The Three Goods.
and dissimilarities within the textual group CcTL will be considered, and in a concluding section the wider textual relationships of the group CcTL will be commented on.

I. The distinct character of Ed.

As the following significant variant readings of agreements in additions, omissions, substitutions, and word order\(^3\) indicate, the text of Ed is not as close to the texts of Cc, T, and L as these texts are to each other. To keep the discussion within manageable proportions, less significant or minor variation (for example, addition of 'to', line 25, 'bat', line 32, or substitution of 'be' for 'bis', line 5) is not considered.

Additions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line(s)</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>CcTL</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>rekennynge</td>
<td>a streyt rekenynge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>bought with</td>
<td>bouȝt be with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>art in hele</td>
<td>art of power and in hele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>knowe pou</td>
<td>knowe pou weel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Throughout the discussion of manuscript relationships the terms 'addition', 'omission', 'substitution' are used to describe textual differences as they occur between Ed and the other manuscripts which are compared to it. The text of Ed is taken to be a copy of the tract The Three Goods and not the original: it is used here as a base text. It is possible, of course, that Ed is closer to the original than CcTL, but this cannot be proven.
The scribe of Ed, if presented with a CcTL-like exemplar, may have, in the act of copying, pruned that exemplar; it is also possible that the scribe of Ed made a faithful copy of his exemplar and merely preserved that exemplar's text. These explanations account, in a general way, for Ed or its exemplar's dependence upon a CcTL-like source. It is also possible that the readings in CcTL are additions made by the immediate source of CcTL to its text, and that Ed's readings preserve vestiges of a now lost text to which the immediate source of CcTL had access. This explanation accounts for the agreements in variation in CcTL while allowing for the possibility that Ed drew from a text antecedent to that used by CcTL. As the following readings indicate, Ed, as a text, is distinct from the text (in its shared form) of CcTL.

Omissions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line(s)</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>CcTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>ðe chefe lord of hem to [y]eue hem to whome he wil</td>
<td>ðe cheef lord, hem to ðeue to wom he Wolfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>euerlastynge helth</td>
<td>helþe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>fals world</td>
<td>world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>seith lightly</td>
<td>sei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substitutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line(s)</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>CcTL</th>
<th>CcTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>peynes</td>
<td>payne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,65</td>
<td>synnes</td>
<td>synne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>saith</td>
<td>doth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>trustely</td>
<td>truly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CcTL</td>
<td>triste not so in goddis mercy but</td>
<td>pat [om. TL] drude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>trust so in goddis mercy pat pou ne drede</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word Order:

| line 16 | Ed     | euel or weel | CcTL   | euel or weel |

It is not possible to say with any certainty that Ed's unique readings are attributable to a source distinct from that used by CcTL, for Ed's variation may well be the result of independent variation: the scribe of Ed may have altered his text for various reasons, but none of his alterations say anything substantive about his immediate source. It is clear that whatever the precise character of Ed's immediate source, it is, for the most part, not very far removed from a CcTL-like text.

However, it is possible to exclude L and Cc from consideration as possible immediate sources for Ed:

(i) L omits lines 55-59, lines not likely to be supplied independently by Ed, or CcT.

(ii) Cc substitutes 'meke' for EdTL's 'trew', line 54, and 'here' for EdTL's 'of', line 55; in both cases the agreements in variation by EdTL point toward their dependence upon a text distinct from that of Cc.
Moreover, Cc adds, at line 67, a long extract from 'The Seven Deadly Sins',⁴ and as this extract is an integral part of Cc's tract it is unlikely that EdTL would, independently of each other, end their copying of a text of continuous prose at precisely the same point.

(iii) It has been shown, so far, that L and Cc were probably not the immediate sources for Ed, or T, but the further exclusion of T as a possible source for Ed or LCc presents certain problems.

(1) The only variants in T which might be called 'indicative errors' are the minor omissions of the article 'a' at line 44, and 'be' at line 10; at line 49 the scribe of Cc has added (above and between 'to' and 'man') 'a', and at line 10 L agrees with T in omitting 'be', but these readings lack the conjunctive force of a major omission, or interpolation.

(2) At the very place where T and Cc agree in such a major omission-- at line 56 both T and Cc omit (vis-a-vis Ed) 'aftir be forme of goddis lawe'-- L is silent having omitted 'god ... to', lines 55-59. L's four line omission is explicable through a mechanical error: the passage, part of which is omitted, begins with 'to god' and ends with 'to goddis'. This, of course, does not exclude L from dependence upon T. However, it can be argued that TCc's omission of 'aftir be forme of goddis lawe' is

---

⁴ For a full consideration of this addition see the discussion of the unique character of Cc, below, and for the text see note to line 67.
not a conjunctive 'error', that the phrase, of its nature (for it questions, implicitly, formal confession to a priest at least once a year)\(^5\) is potentially objectionable to scribes of different doctrinal suasion, and that its omission is a result of independent, coincident variation, and not dependence upon the same immediate source. Alternatively the scribe of Ed may have added the phrase in an attempt to make precise the slightly ambiguous 'knowleschynge of synnes to god and man' ('aftir þe forme of goddis lawe' that is).

(3) T has several unique readings which do not appear in any of the surviving texts: for example, at lines 22, 32, 38, and 64, T reads 'commandementes' for EdLCc's 'hestitis'. These readings may originate with the scribe of T, or they may represent the readings of T's exemplar, but if T were the immediate source for Ed, L, or C: one would expect to find, given the number and pattern of T's unique readings, one or two T-like readings in at least one of the surviving texts, but this is not the case. In the end, the case against T as the possible immediate source for Ed, L, or Cc rests on this third point, and it is suggested with some hesitation that T is probably not the immediate source for any of the surviving texts.

---

\(^5\) See, for example, Wyclif's comment in 'Nota de Confessione': 'Also þis lawe of confessioune þat iche man mut nedis shryuen oony in þe þer priuely to his propur prest, it semeth open aþens reasen.' The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted, ed. F.D. Matthew, E.E.T.S. O.S. lxxiv (1880), 329. For a full discussion of this reading, and possible scribal attitudes toward it, see note to line 56.
If this conclusion is accepted, then it is possible to characterize Ed as a text that is close to the texts of Cc, T and L, but is separated from these texts by at least one other text — its immediate source — not Cc, T, or L.

II. The textual group CcTL, and its wider connexions.

In comparing Cc, T, and L with Ed certain agreements in variation occur between Cc and T, and T and L, agreements which are, at first, suggestive of Cc and L's dependence upon T. As discussed above, the possibility exists that T is the immediate source of one or both of the texts, but, as suggested, it is not a possibility leading to a probability. The similarities between Cc and T, and T and L remain, however, and it is well to consider them now, and separately, involving, as this will, the reconsideration of familiar readings.

The shared readings of CcT.

For the most part, the agreement in variation between Cc and T has been covered in (1) and (2) above, but the purpose there was the consideration of T as a possible source for Cc (among others), and not a consideration of CcT's dependence upon the same immediate source. CcT have no additions or substitutions in common; the shared agreements are confined to the omission of line 56, 'aftir þe forme of goddis lawe', and the relatively minor omissions of line 10, 'þe', and line 49, 'a' (the omission of 'a' in Cc has been corrected by the scribe). The
textual evidence of the tract itself is not solid enough to support the assertion that Cc and T depend upon the same immediate source. The only other evidence which might be of use lies outside the text itself: T and Cc share, besides The Three Goods, the tract beginning (in T) "Charyte ys aloue that we shuld haue to god"; this tract follows, in both T and Cc, The Three Goods. The text of the unique addition in Cc is a fragment from the concluding commentary on the seventh deadly sin (see note to line 67 for text) and can also be found in The Seven Deadly Sins of T, f. 7v, col. a. Given the fact that the only other surviving manuscripts which contain either or both of these tracts also contain The Three Goods, it is reasonable to conjecture that Cc and T drew upon the same source for 'Charyte ys aloue', The Three Goods, and The Seven Deadly Sins, whole (T), or in part (Cc).

The shared readings of TL.

T and L agree in variation against Ed and Cc at lines 1, and 41: TL, at line 1, substitute (vis-a-vis Ed) "Howe a [om. L] man shall yelde a streyt reconyng of thre goodys" for Ed's 'Off thre maner goodis'. Cc has no rubric. At line 41 TL substitute 'but' for Ed's 'pat', and Cc reads 'but pat'. Clearly, the shared rubric

6 'Charyte ys aloue' occurs in T, ff. 12v, col. b - 16v, col. b; in Cc it is found on pp. 221-222. The tract is also found in Durham Dean and Chapter MS. A. IV. 22, pp. 105-116, and John Rylands Library MS. English 85, ff. 25v - 36v, Jolliffe, Check-List, 127, item M.4.
of line 1 is indicative of T and L's dependence, at some stage, upon the same source; this rubric echoes the clause 'when thou shalt yeilde a streyte rekenyng of all goodys that god hath lent to the' also found in TLCc. Again, the textual evidence of the tract will not support the assertion that T and L depend upon the same immediate source: the evidence of one rubric, while substantial, is not compelling, and the substitution of 'but' for 'pat', while intriguing in the particular context (see note to line 41), may be the result of independent, coincident variation. As with the shared readings of CcT (above) it is possible to look beyond the tract The Three Goods itself, and to identify one other tract shared by L and T: The Three Goods of T is preceded by the tract The Twelve Lettings of Prayer, and in L The Twelve Lettings follows it. Again, no other manuscript, other than T, contains the two tracts together, so the inference that L and T drew upon the same source for both The Twelve Lettings and The Three Goods is a reasonable one, but one that on purely textual grounds is not certain.

III. The manuscript relations of The Three Goods: A Summary.

(i) The text of Ed, because of various additions, omissions, and substitutions, can be seen as a text

7 The Twelve Lettings is found in T on ff. 10r, col.b - 12r, col.a; in L on ff. 44v - 46v; for other copies see Durham Dean and Chapter MS. A. IV. 22, pp. 98-103; John Rylands Library MS. 85, ff. 19r - 24v, and British Museum MS. Cotton Titus D. xix, ff. 158r - 161v, Jolliffe, Check-List, 85, item G.3.
distinct from those of Cc, T and L, but one that is, nevertheless, close to the immediate source of Cc, T, and L.

(ii) The texts of Cc, T, and L form a fairly tight textual group. It has been tentatively established that as a result of additions, omissions, and patterns of substitution none of the extant texts could have been the immediate source of the other, and that as a result of agreements in variation it is possible that Cc, T, and L used, at some stage, the same immediate source.

(iii) The possibility that Cc, T, and L used the same immediate source is strengthened by the discovery that T contains two other tracts, in addition to The Three Goods, one of which appears in L and the other in Cc. T is the only extant manuscript which contains all three tracts, and as T is textually related to L and Cc, but not sufficiently so to be the source of either, it is suggested that T, along with L and Cc, drew from an immediate source having the same contents, and in perhaps the same order, as T; that is T, L, and Cc did not, it is suggested, draw, for example, The Twelve Lettings from one manuscript, The Three Goods from another, and 'Charyte ys aloue' from yet another. The over-lap of tracts in Cc, T and L can be accounted for by assuming the existence of a T-like immediate source.
1    Off ... goddis] Howe a [om. L] man shall yelde a
    streyte reconyng of thre goodys TL; om. Cc.
5    pis] the TCcL.
9    yelde] siue L. rekennynge] a streyte rekennyng TCcL.
10   pe] om. TCc.
11   to] om. L. pat] om. TCcL.
13   of] om. TCcL.
14   [yeue hem] NS, peue hem; yeue TCcL. to] 'to' Cc.
15   wele or euel] suell or well TCcL.
17   bought with] bought the with TCcL.
19   peynes] payne TCcL.
22   hestis] commandmentes T.
23   art in hele (1. 24)] art of power and in heele TCcL.
24   euerlastynge] om. TCcL.
25   lent pe] lent to the TCcL.
28   &] for to L.
Off thre maner goodis.  

ff þou haue goodis of grace
as vertues, or godis of kynde
as myght & strenkeþ, or

5 goodis of fort’u’ne as goodis of þis world, spend hem wele and discretly whil þou myght and art of power, for ellis þei shal turne to þine accusynge at þi moste nede, when þou shalt yelde reken-nynge of all þe goodis þat god hath
lent to þe whil þat þou dwellist here.
Ffor anone as þou art dede þe goodis
turne ayen to god, þe chefe lord of
hem to [y]eue hem to whome he wil,

10 and peyne or mede to þe, aftir þine
wele or suel dispandynge. Ffor god-
dis loue þat bought with his hard
passion and his precious bloid, eipir
for drede of bitter peynes, eipir for

20 loue of heuenly blis forsake and dis-
pise þi syn, and leyue syn or it leyue þe; & kepe trewly goddis hestis, and
with þi god wil, whil þou maist and art
in hele, purchase þe everlastynge helth

25 with þe goodis þat god hath lent þe,
for whan þou diest, þou myght no lenger
kepe hem. Be not ashamed to be
scorned of folys & begyn to be a good

say it] say that hyt TccL. heestis] commandementes T.

know bou] know how well TccL. more] the more TccL.

short, and] short TccL.

halow'en'] hys halewyn TccL.

lightly] om. TccL. saith] dothe TccL.


me goddis] me in goddys TccL.

trust so] trust nat so TccL. but] but TL; but but Cc. ne] om. TccL.

a] 'a' Cc; om. T.

And] om. Cc.

for] by TccL.

trew] make Cc.

of] here Cc. synnes] synne TccL. god ... to (1. 59)] om. L.

aftir ... laws] om Tcc.
man, but be sore ashamed before 
30 conscience to be praisid and borne vp 
of the fals world and dwell still in sin.
If you say it is hard to kepe goddis hestis know you that this is more in heavens, and this time is but short, and
35 god and all halow'en wil helpe ye, if 
you wilt yif fully this will bearto. If you 
seith lightly as the fals world saith:

goddis hestis may I not kepe, ne leve 
40 all greit synnes, but I put me [in] god-
dis mercy. Here I warne ye that you 
trust so in goddis mercy that you ne drede 
his rightwisnes, for in what synn 
rightwisnes fyndith he deed, herin he wil 
be fast bynde, as seynt gregori saith
45 and saynt bernard also. And also he 
lenger that god abidith, he harder he 
demeth, if we amend vs not. And 
seyn austeyn saith that god yeueth 
not mercy to a man til he dispose hym 
to make an ends of his synn. And as
men bene lost for wanesope, so many 
many men bene begylid for ouerhope to 
goddis mercy without worthy fruyt of 
penance, he which ben love & trew
50 knowlecchynge of synnes to god and 
man aftir he forme of goddis lawe,
59 of foryeuenes] foryeuemes TCcL.
63 fast] faste nght & day L.
64 trustely] trewly TCcL. heestis] commandments T.
65 synnes] syn TCcL.
67 Amen] om. TCcL.
& ful contricion & hole satisfaccion. And
with þis meynes haue stedfast hope
to goddis mercy, and of foryeuences of
synn. Here þou haist be fore þe good &
yuel, sour and swete, life and deeth,
vertuus and vices, icy and peyne, ny-
ght & day: þerfore pray fast to god
þat þou folow trustely his heestis, and
to put away stynkyngs synnes þat
preuely bryngeth in deeth to mannes
soule. Amen.
Notes

13 Ed's reading 'þe chefe lord of hem to [y]eue hem to whome he wil' (line 14) is to be compared with TcCl's 'the chyef lord, hem to yeue to whom he woll'. The manuscript reading in Ed is 'þeue', but the p and y in Ed are not always clearly distinguished, and the scribe may have intended a y; alternatively, the scribe of Ed may have been influenced by the letter shape of an exemplar which confused p and y. The reading 'þeue hem to whom he wil' does not make sense, and for this reason, together with the reading of TcCl, the text of Ed is emended.

23 whil þou maist and art in hele (line 24). TcCl read 'whyle thow mayst and art of power and in heele' which echoes the reading of lines 6-7 'whil þou myght and art of power'; the scribe of Ed may have pruned his text, for the phrase is, within the confines of a short tract, obviously repetitive. It does not seem likely that the scribes of T, Cc, and L, copying independently of each other, would have introduced 'of power and in': the addition, if indeed it is such, is probably not the result of independent, coincident variation.

24 euerlastynge. TcCl omit this modifier, or, possibly, its appearance in Ed is an addition. Although 'helth', here may be taken to imply more than physical well-being, the Ed scribe may not have been satisfied with its implications, and added 'euerlastynge' so as to secure the point. If the immediate source of TcCl had the reading 'euerlastynge', then it is possible that the scribes of T, Cc, and L wished to soften the message and to focus the reader's attention on what was attainable -- well-being in this world through the proper use of 'þe goodis þat god hath lent' him (line 25).

31 In L 'in' has been inserted between 'dueelle' and 'synne'.

38 In Cc 'I' has been inserted above and between 'may' and 'not'.

39 put me [in] goddis mercy. TcCl read 'put me in goddys mercy'. It is clear from the reading in line 46 'trust so in goddis mercy' that the text presupposes the imagined speaker to have put himself in God's mercy. The warning is addressed to that imagined speaker who will not keep 'goddis hestis', nor 'leyue all greit synnes', but delivers himself
to the mercy of God. The text is emended in an attempt to clarify what it is that the sinner actually does.

Here ... rightwisnes (line 42). TCcL read 'Here I warne the that thou trust nat so in goddys mercy, but [but pat Cc] thou drede hys rightwysnes.' The reading of TCcL is a compound sentence which can be broken into two admonitions: 'Sinner, do not place your trust in God's mercy alone' and 'be afraid of his righteousness.' In TCcL, the sinner's trust in God's mercy is treated as a separate matter, and is not connected directly to his dread of God's righteousness, but in Ed the warning is directed toward the sinner whose excessive trust in God's mercy leads him into the error of taking lightly God's judgement of his moral life. In Ed, the sinner's loss of dread of God's righteousness is a result of his 'overhope to goddis mercy' (lines 52-53).

In Cc 'a' has been inserted above and between 'to' and 'man'.

Knowlechyng ... mercy (line 59). The omission in L of 'god ... to' (line 59) is probably the result of the similarity of 'to god' and 'to goddis': the scribe of L, losing his place, resumed copying at a similar place thus omitting the passage. There is also the possibility that the omission is not mechanical, and that the entire passage is objectionable for doctrinal reasons, as seems to be the case with TCc's omission of 'aftir þe forme of goddis lawe'.

The text of L, as a result of the omission of the above passage, leaves the reader with the impression that penance is the acknowledging of one's sins to God's mercy (not to God) and that penance is the forgiveness of sin; the scribe of L (or the scribe of his immediate source) has contrived to distort, perhaps unknowingly, an important sacrament. As the other texts make clear, sins are acknowledged to god and man, and through contrition and the penance, 'hole satisfaccion', the sinner is allowed to hope in God's mercy and to hope for forgiveness of his sins.

The omission of 'aftir þe forme of goddis lawe' in TCc may be attributable to a scribe alert to the controversy surrounding confession in late medieval England. The qualification of confession by the phrase 'aftir þe forme of goddis lawe' can be identified with Wyclif's 'Nota de Confessione', The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted, ed. F.D. Matthew, E.E.T.S. O.S. lxxiv (1880), 325-345. [Matthew (p. 325) follows W.W. Shirley in ascribing the 'Nota de Confessione' to Wyclif].
Wyclif, in this tract on confession, distinguishes between confession according to the old law ('goddis lawes') and the new law, which is the creation of the Pope: 'þus it semeþ presumpcioun of þis pope [Innocent] to make þis lawe; for hooly churche shuld not þus be charged wiþ newe lawes, whenne oolde sufficeden', pp. 328-329. Wyclif then uses his distinction between the old and new law to question the efficacy of contemporary forms of confession:

Sitt it were to wite þe reson of goddis lawe
whi men shulden hoolde hem in here bondes, &
not make lawe frc cristis ordre. It is oft
seid in goddis lawe þat men shulden not adde
þerto ne take þerfor, lest þei failen, siþ
it is made at poyntr deuyse; and þus it
semeþ a feendis presumpcioun, þat hiseþ
himeilf a-bouen god, to make þus a newe
lawe wiþouten leeue of þe furst treuþe.
Also þis lawe of confessioun þat iche man
mut nedis shryuen oonys in þe þer priuely
to his propur prest, it semeþ opun ægens
reson. for a man may be baptized in tyme
þat he haþ discreciou, & anon aftur be ded
wiþ-outen doynghe of dedly synne. lord, whi
shuld þis man be damptned al if he shriue
him not þus in þe þeer? Ion baptist shroof
hym neuer þus, ne any apostle of crist; and
sitt bileue nedþ vs to graunte þat þei ben
seyntes in heuen. and þus it may fallen of
many martyrþes, & of men þat han no propur
prest. who is he þat lettiþ god to saue men
as he haþ ordeyned before þe pope & his lawe
camen inne, & before þe world was made?
Also god gyueþ frely his grace, not-wiþ-
stondynghe mannhes lawe. whi may not god do
grace to his treue seruantes þat seruen
him wele, al if þer were noo siche prest nor
pope? as sumtyme was non. (pp. 329-330)

Wycliff's objections to confession are many and varied, and his criticisms are, in the main, appeals to common sense in the guise of 'reson'. In the tract he is highly critical of confession under the control of the Church, and attempts to undermine the Church's (and the Pope's) power to regulate confession by invoking 'reson': 'þat iche man mut nedis shryuen oonys in þe þeer priuely to his propur prest, it semeþ opun ægens reson.' He then goes on to cite examples from the bible, 'goddis lawes', which support his position. Confession 'aftir þe forme of goddis lawe' is confession prior to the Church's control: 'Confessioun þat man makiþ of synne is made of man in two maners. Summe is mad oonly to god truly by
herte or mouþe. And sum confessioun is made to man, and þat may be on many maneres: ouþer opynly &
generaly, as men confesseden in þe colde lawes; Or
pruieuly & rownygly, as men confessen nowe-a-daies,'
(pp. 327-328). Needless to say Wyclif's sympathies
lay with confession according to the old law and he
is somewhat successful in establishing the paucity
of biblical support for confession according to the
new law. The thrust of his argument, of course, is
directed toward those who would maintain that con-
fession according to the new law (the Church) is the
same as that according to 'goddis lawe'. He is quite
explicit about the nature of confession 'aftir þe
forme of goddis lawe' in his conclusion to the tract:

& pus alle autoritâs þat ben founden in
goddis lawe, þat techen þat men shulden
shriue hem, ben to graunt to þis witt; þat
men shulden shriue hem to god, and in case
to her broþur, whenne it profitip to hem.
but antecrist shulde shame here þat if men
shulden þus shriue hem, þenne þei shulden
telle þe emperour clerkis in her eeris alle
her synnes, & do what þei bidden hem do, for
ellis god wole not assoile hem. (p. 345)

The reading in Ed of 'aftir þe forme of goddis
lawe' is an important qualification within the context
of confession, and, as I have sought to illustrate
above, it is one with Wycliffite connexions. If the
phrase were in the common source of EdTcc then there
were good doctrinal reasons, at the time of copying,
for its deletion by different scribes working
independently of each other. There are also good,
if partisan, doctrinal reasons for its insertion by
a heterodox scribe.

58 meynes. The sense implied here seems to be a
theological one: 'þies meynes' are 'knowlechynyng
of synnes to god and man', 'ful contricVW', and
'hole satisfaccion'; see O.E.D. s.v. Mean ab2. II,
10e. 'Means of grace (Theol.): the sacraments and
other religious agencies viewed as the means by which
divine grace is imparted to the soul, or by which
growth in grace is promoted ...'. The earliest
attestation of this sense is 1642.

67 The text of Cc does not end here: the addition is
from the commentary on 'Lechery' in the tract
The Seven Deadly Sins; for comparison, see the
transcription of the Ed text, ff. 14v - 15r.
The additional text of Cc, p. 221:

also preie god for grace to wiþstande synne 
wt vertu, wich schal haue gret reward in tyme 
komynge, for vices and vertues mown not duallyn 
to gedere in a man, no more þan lyst & derkenes, 
hoot & cold; þerfore seip seynt pouisle þþ þer 
is non a cord be twen god and þe fend, ne bi 
twen paynemys & true cristenemen. Þerfore do 
þþ cristenemenys werke, for ell[es] þþ art as 
fer from a cristeneman as a luscheburue is from 
a good peny, for þe name & þe tokene wt ouþteforþ 
maþþ not þe þyng, but vertu wt inne & true 
worcych. Hopest þþ þþ siche men louen god & 
seryyn hym þþ ben i-clepid cristenemen, & þþ desiren 
hertyl wordligoodis vn mesurably & 
leuen after lust as þe world askþ wete þþ weeþ 
þþþ world is contrary to god, for god louþ 
mekenesse & buxumnesse; þe world louþ pride 
& rebelte. God wole pees & paciens, þe world 
strif and wrath; god wole mercy and charyte, 
þe world enuye & cruelte; god louþ clennesse 
& chastite, þe worlde hooriotrie & fouþle 
lustis; god wole mesure & pourte, þe worlde 
couetyse & auarice; god wole penal:me & 
abstinence, þe worlde glotenye & drunkenesse & 
were is more contrariete & discord þanne is 
scheded. Þerfore loue and worschepe þþ god in 
kepyng besiliche his hestis, for þat is þe 
moþte loue & worschepe þþ þþ myst do to ihesu 
crist.
Sources and Analogues

41 Cf. Osee x, 12-13:

12 Sow for yourselves in justice, and reap in the mouth of mercy, break up your fallow ground: but the time to seek the Lord is, when he shall come that shall teach you justice.

13 You have ploughed wickedness, you have reaped iniquity, you have eaten the fruit of lying: because thou hast trusted in thy ways, in the multitude of thy strong ones.

42 Cf. John viii, 24:

Therefore I said to you, that you shall die in your sins. For if you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sin.

44 I have been unable to locate these references.

48 Cf. Wyclif's 'Augustinus', The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted, ed. F.D. Matthew E.E.T.S. O.S. lxxiv (1880), 281, three lines from the bottom:

Now is þe tymé of mercy to amende vs. ʒiþ is not come þe tymé of iugement. we han space, we han place, we don synne, eke amende we oure gilitis.

54 Cf. Wyclif's 'Nota de Confessione', The English Works of Wyclif ..., p. 329; for text and brief discussion of Wyclif's consideration of penance 'aftir þe forme of goddis lawe' see my note to line 53.
The Manuscript Relationships of The Four Errors

The hitherto unedited tract The Four Errors survives in nine manuscripts; the eight in addition to E.U.L. MS. 93 (Ed), ff. 83\textsuperscript{v}-85\textsuperscript{r}, are:\textsuperscript{1}

\begin{itemize}
  \item [(C\textsubscript{1})] C.U.L. MS. Ff. 6.55, ff. 168\textsuperscript{v}-170\textsuperscript{v}.
  \item [(G)] G.U.L. Hunterian MS. 520 (V.8.23), pp. 295-297.
  \item [(H\textsubscript{1})] B.M. MS. Harley 2388, f. 36\textsuperscript{rv}.
  \item [(T)] Trinity College, Cambridge MS. R.3.21 (601), f. 17\textsuperscript{r}.
  \item [(G\textsubscript{2})] G.U.L. Hunterian MS. 512 (V.8.15), (unfoliated).
  \item [(C)] C.U.L. MS. Ff. 6.31 (§4), ff. 98\textsuperscript{v}-99\textsuperscript{v}.
  \item [(D)] Durham Dean and Chapter MS. A.IV.22, f. 149\textsuperscript{rv}.
  \item [(Sa)] Society of Antiquaries MS. 300, ff. 99\textsuperscript{v}-100\textsuperscript{r}.
\end{itemize}

The Four Errors, while unedited, has received some attention from Dr. A.I. Doyle. In preliminary work on this tract Dr. Doyle noted the existence of different versions and placed Ed's text with those of C\textsubscript{1} and C\textsuperscript{2}.\textsuperscript{2}

This, as the following discussion shows, is not a completely accurate assessment. A detailed collation

\textsuperscript{1} For references to these manuscripts see 'Manuscripts: Descriptions and Notices'.

\textsuperscript{2} Letter of 19 June 1949, and kept in Edinburgh University Library's Rare Books and Manuscripts Department's annotated copy of Catherine R. Borland's A Descriptive Catalogue of the Western Medieval Manuscripts in Edinburgh University Library.
the above manuscripts against the base text Ed reveals the following groups:

I [(Sa)(Ed:C₁:GH₁)(T)] II [G₃:C:D]

These Groups will be discussed separately and with comparison to Ed³, and there will be a short concluding section reviewing the findings of the individual studies.

I [(Sa)(Ed:C₁:GH₁)(T)]

The relationships between manuscripts in Group I are more complex than those of Group II, and as this complexity tends to obscure the relationships of all the manuscripts it is best that this complexity be dealt with first.

The above brackets and parentheses are used in an attempt to classify the manuscripts of Group I according to shared agreements between them and to point out what are, in essence, three different types of texts. The fact that Sa and T are substantially different texts is represented by placing them (in notation form) outside the text of EdC₁ GH₁ (which for the purposes of this discussion I call the 'core text'), but both Sa and T have more in common with this core text than with the kind of text

---

³ Throughout the discussion of the manuscript relationships the terms 'addition', 'omission', and 'substitution' are used purely to describe textual differences as they occur between Ed, and the other manuscripts which are compared to it. The text of Ed as a copy of The Four Errors is used as a base text of that tract, but the selection of the base text, in this edition, does not imply in any sense 'best text', or 'original text'.
represented by Group II. The following discussion is concerned with the textual relationships of Sa, for this text shares readings with manuscripts from both groups, and thus can be seen as a possible bridge between the two groups: moreover, the text of Sa may also be very close to the archetype of the tract. The textual relationships of EdC₁GH₁T will be discussed in a later section.

Sa is related, by shared variants, to (i) the core type text of EdC₁GH₁ as well as to (ii) the Group II text, but (iii) because of unique additions, and its relationships with other texts, it represents, on the whole, an independent text within the Group I version.

(i) The closeness of Sa to the 'core type' of text is clearly illustrated by Sa's agreement with EdC₁GH₁T at lines 8, 11, 15, and 22-23: the Group I text does not begin the tract with a listing of the four errors; the Group II text does (see discussion concerning this list and G₂CD below), nor does the Group I text introduce each error with the phrase 'As for...' as does the Group II text. In both respects Sa follows the Group I text in major readings, and in one other which may result from not listing the four errors: SaEdC₁GH₁T read 'and ðerfore', lines 11 and 23. Sa also agrees with some or all Group I manuscripts in the following variants: Group I manuscripts read 'poule' for 'seynt poul', line 23, and they read 'origene' for 'ðe greet clerk Origene', line 28.
(ii) However, Sa is not in every detail a Group I text, for it shares readings peculiar to the Group II manuscripts as well: for example, at line 5 SaG3C read 'he him' ['he him'] D for 'he himself' C1GH1T. At line 7 SaG3CD read 'esi & list' for 'esy' EdC1GH1, and at line 6 SaG3CD omit 'pies'. However, these agreements between Sa and G3CD are not as significant as those that bind Sa to the Group I manuscript sand are more indicative of the complex and varied character of Sa than of a close textual connexion.

(iii) While the text of Sa is very close to the Group I text, it is also distinct from that text in the following readings: Sa cites all biblical and patristic sources within the text; C cites two within the text and the rest in the margin, and GG3 cite the sources in the margin; the other manuscripts (with one exception) do not cite the biblical and patristic sources at all. At line 23, Sa's full biblical citation appears within the text; GC's equally full citation appears in the margin. Sa, at line 38, omits the phrase 'acordingly herto': all other manuscripts retain the phrase. There are two other minor

---

4 The cited sources of CN1 are: line 28 'Pe grete clerk origens super exodus 6c1012c0 seiyng', C; line 39 'crisostom seyp super lucam 165'.C; and crystendom seyp vp on luke pe xvi.c'. H. See the discussion of H1 for importance of H1's apparent slip, and notes to lines 28, 39.
variants which need noting: at line 16 SaC₁ read 'wherof' while EdGH₁T read 'wherfore', and G₃CD omit the word, but at line 9 SaGH₁T read 'wherof' while EdC₁ read 'wherfore', and G₃CD omit the word again; such variation is not convincing evidence for a close textual connexion. At line 49 SaGH₁ read 'wey is brood' and EdC₁G₃C read 'wey brode'. The variation between 'wey is brood' and 'wey brode' may well be attributable to the immediate source of SaGH₁ and its reliance on a variant text of the Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible (hereafter cited as WBL); see, for example, the variants to WBL, Matt. viii, 13-14. However, with equal probability the variant may have been independently introduced.⁵

From the above discussion it is possible to characterize Sa as an essentially Group I text, both in structure and content, but one with one or two readings also found in the Group II text. Sa also preserves or contains unusually full (for a purely devotional tract) biblical

⁵ Given this particular variant (line 49) this seems a reasonable approach to take; however, the argument concerning Wycliffite biblical sources is more fully developed later in the discussion of EdC₁GH₁, and in Appendix II with regard to C₁GH₁.
and patristic citations within the text; the same citations appear, however, in the margins of G and G3 manuscripts from Groups I and II respectively. As Sa does not share variants indicative of any of the Group II manuscripts (substitutions or additions at lines 8, 11, 15, and 22-23; omissions at lines 11, 16, and 23), Sa does not descend from G3CD. D can be excluded immediately for it omits lines 46-52, lines supplied by Sa.

Descent from GH1T or the immediate source of this group is likewise ruled out, for these three manuscripts omit lines 13-15, 'for ye flesh couetith contrary to ye spirite & ye spirit to ye flesh', lines which are supplied by SaEdC1G3CD. GH1T also add at line 22 'couetise which sum men couettyng erreden fro ye feiþ & bi settiden hem wiþ many sorowis'; this addition is not shared by SaEdC1G3CD. T, like D above, can be excluded for its omission of lines 46-52; T also has numerous unique additions, substitutions and omissions which not only separate it from Sa, but from the other manuscripts as well.

Descent from the remaining two manuscripts EdC1 is possible, though not probable; that the three manuscripts are closely related is well attested by the evidence above: the additions, omissions and substitutions that separate G3CD and GH1T from each other and SaEdC1 also reinforce the close textual connexion of Sa to EdC1. The following
variants are illustrative of the range of agreements and disagreements between Sa, Ed and C1.

Of the above variants those at lines 5, 7, 10 and 38 are indicative of EdC1's probable dependence upon the same immediate source; this dependence upon the same immediate source is not vitiated by C1's apparent agreements with Sa. In every case in which C1 agrees with Sa (and Ed disagrees) Ed's disagreements may be seen to have

---

6 The variants that follow are not peculiar to SaEdC alone; for the purposes of the discussion I have thought it best to restrict the citing of variants and their manuscript to those under discussion. For a full listing of variant readings see the appropriate line in the variants.
been independently introduced. That is, Ed's variation can be explained without reference to Ed's immediate source; for example, in lines 5, 6, 11, and 15 Ed's omissions can be seen as prunings of the text of his immediate source; at line 29 the scribe of Ed has apparently misread 'co' as a two-compartmented 'e', producing 'enformeth hym to be maners of his world' for 'confereme hym to be maners of his world', and the misreading makes sense as well.\(^7\) SaCl's omission (via-a-vis Ed) of lines 52-66 is not, probably, an omission at all, for the scribe of Ed has added an extract from the WBL, I John ii, 15-17; no other texts have this addition. The only variant with any conjunctive and separative force is that at line 38; EdCl's reading 'acordyngly hereto' agrees with the reading in other manuscripts, and it is not likely to be introduced independently. Sa's omission of this phrase therefore disallows it as the possible immediate source for EdCl. This, however, is not presumptive evidence for Sa's independent textual status.

The most conclusive evidence for Sa's independent textual status is that of Sa's addition\(^8\) of biblical and patristic citations within the text; Sa adds: line 9 'to be romayns be xii. chapitre'; line 12 'to be romayns

---

\(^7\) See note to line 29.

\(^8\) Sa's readings are additions when compared to the base text Ed. See fn. 3 above.
Ed and C₁ do not cite the precise sources of their biblical and patristic passages, and it does not seem likely that the scribe of Sa would pause each time he confronted 'saynt poule saith' or 'crisostom saith', put his quill down, locate the source, and then carefully add 'Galata...'. Nor does it seem likely that the scribes of C₁ and Ed would be so flawless in their method as to avoid adding at least one biblical or patristic citation from an immediate source that had these as an integral part of the text.⁹ It seems far more likely that the scribes of EdC₁ used a text more like that of G (with marginal citations) than that of Sa, if indeed the immediate source(s) of EdC₁ had citations at all. If the evidence of Sa's citations is allowed to stand, then it is highly probable that Sa is not a copy of EdC₁, or their immediate source, yet it is also probable that Sa is very close to that source.

As has been shown above, various readings in Sa appear in widely differing manuscripts, but because of additions, omissions, and substitutions unique to these manuscripts, and thus not appearing in Sa, Sa does not depend upon them for its text. Sa, as is shown by the readings it shares with these same manuscripts, is nonetheless related to them, and it is possible that Sa is very close to the immediate sources of the two different groups. The relationship of Sa to the

⁹ H at line 39 is not so flawless; see fn. 4 above, and note to line 39.
immediate sources of the two groups will be noted, but not focused on in the following discussions concerning the remaining manuscripts of Groups I and II.

Group I (Ed:C₁:G₁)(T)

All of the above Group I manuscripts, and their distinctive features, are noted in the above discussions, but with reference to Sa. The following discussion, while being repetitious in some respects, is a systematic account of (i) the distinctive feature of Ed; (ii) the shared character of EdC₁; (iii) the shared character of G₁(T), and (iv) the distinctive features of G, H₁, and T. The distinctive features of C₁ have been discussed above with regard to Ed and Sa, and a separate section will not be devoted to a recapitulation of what are, in effect, minor variants with little separative or conjunctive force. The relationships of C₁ to Ed and G will be covered, however, in the discussions of topics (i), (ii) and (iii). For brevity and clarity topics (ii) (the shared character of EdC₁) and (iii) (the shared character of G₁(T)) will be discussed together: by contrasting the manuscript sub-groups the shared character of each sub-group will become apparent.

(i) The distinctive features of Ed.

For the most part, Ed and C₁ form a close textual group; the variants of EdC₁ and Sa listed above illustrate the kinds of readings shared by EdC₁. However, Ed and C₁ disagree in the following:
Significant omissions.

lines 50-51 Ed
And how streyt is þe yate and narow þe wey þat
C1G And hou strait is þe yate & narow þat.

The omission of 'þe wey' is unique to C1G. Ed and SaGj follow, verbatim, the Earlier and Later Versions of the WB, Matt. vii. 13-14. Forshall and Madden list no variants to support C1G's omission: that is, the omission in C1G is probably not a scribal correction stemming from access to a WB. The omission could have been independently introduced by two separate scribes who found 'þe wey' in this context redundant, for 'þate' to them may have also meant 'A way' (see O.E.D. s.v. Gate sb2.I), and 'narow' was taken by these scribes, to modify 'þe yate'.

lines 52-66 Ed

The brode wey is lustis of þis world, whom men couetith. The streyt þat is, whiche is shewid by traualis and fastynges, into whiche þe apostelis entred, and þerfore þe apostle saith: Nil ye loue þe world, neiþer þo thynges þat bene in þe world, for who euer loueth þe world þe charite of þe fadre is not in hym, for why all thyng þat is in þe world is couetise of ey, lust of flesh & pryde of life, whiche is not of þe fadre but of þe world, and þe world shal passe and þe couetise of it. Forsothe who þat doith þe wil of god dwellith withouten ende.
C\textsubscript{1}GH\textsubscript{1}TSaG\textsubscript{3}CD omitted.

Substitution: line 4 Ed holy writ

C\textsubscript{1}GH\textsubscript{1}TSaG\textsubscript{3}CD goddis lawe.

Because of the Lollard connotations of 'goddis lawe',\textsuperscript{10} the scribe of Ed, perhaps to avoid the obvious taint of heterodoxy, substituted less contentious words for holy scripture. This, however, is conjectural: heterodoxy in this case may not hinge on the substitution of the two words.

The Edinburgh text's 'interesting addition',\textsuperscript{11} (lines 52-66) makes it unique among surviving manuscripts of The Four Errors, with the bulk of the addition from 'Nil', line 57, to 'ends', line 66, being an accurate rendering of I John ii, 15-17 from the Earlier Version of the WB (hereafter cited as WBE).\textsuperscript{12} Clearly, either the scribe of Ed or the scribe of Ed's immediate source had a Wycliffite biblical version to hand. Dependence upon a Wycliffite biblical source is not peculiar to Ed; as the

\textsuperscript{10}See Margaret Deanesly, The Lollard Bible (Cambridge, 1920), 358: 'The "law of Christ", an "Goddis lawe" were still (1428) the ordinary Lollard terms for the New Testament and the Bible'. For a fuller discussion of this term, and its implications, see note to line 4.

\textsuperscript{11}Doyle, letter of 19 June 1979.

\textsuperscript{12}Dr. Doyle did not note the Wycliffite source for the addition; for the Earlier Version passage see note to lines 52-66.
following variants, and WB passages show, GH₁(T) have scrupulously followed the same source.

(ii) The shared character of EdC₁, and (iii) the shared character of GH₁(T).

The only significant addition is that of lines 21-22:

EdC₁ for the rote of all yuelis is coueystys.

GH₁ for the rote of alle yuelis is coueystys which sum men couetyng erreden fro pe sei b & bi settiden hem wi many sorowys

T ffor the roote of euellen ys coueystys whiche sum men couetyng errydyn w many sorowys

UBL For the rote of alle yuelis is coueystys, which sum men coueystinges erreden fro the feith, and bi settiden hem wi many sorowys. (I Tim. vi.10)

The only significant omission occurs in lines 12-15:

EdC₁ poule saith: Do se not pe bisones of your flesh in desires, for pe flesh couotith contrary to pe spirite & pe spirit to pe flesh

GH₁(T) poul sei b Do se not pe bisines of soure fleisch in desires

UBL and do se not the bisynesse of [soure]*fleisch in desiris. (Rom. xiii, 14)

GH₁(T)'s addition and omission are shared by no other manuscripts, and in both instances GH₁(T) have followed a Wycliffite biblical source. EdC₁ (along with SaC₃CD) have, on the other hand, departed from that source: at

* Forshall and Madden cite 'soure flesch' as a variant in one other manuscript.
or have used different recensions of the WB.

(iv) The distinctive features of G, H₁ and T.

The shared variants of GHI (T) have been set out above, and for G those variants must constitute its distinctive features. Save for one minor addition 'but fewe' for 'few', at line 52, G has no unique additions, omissions, or substitutions, so there is little that distinguishes it from the manuscripts to which it is related. However, there are unique additions, omissions, and substitutions in H₁ and T, and these variants exclude these manuscripts from consideration as possible immediate sources for any of the extant manuscripts.

The distinctive features of H₁.

Addition: line 39 H₁ adds (with G₁C, and minor variation) 'crystendom seyþ vp on luke þæ.xvi. č o'.

Omission: line 20 H₁ omits 'men'.

Substitutions: line 39 H₁ substitutes 'crystendom' for 'crisostom'.

line 41 H₁ substitutes 'conforsiþ' for 'enforsith'.

Word Order: line 51 H₁ reads 'þe weye narow' for 'and narow þe wey'.

The manuscript to which H₁ is most closely related, G, omits the phrase 'þe wey', line 51. If G, or a G-like manuscript, were the immediate source for H₁ then the phrase 'þe weye' may have been supplied by conjecture, or by reference to a Wycliffite biblical version. The reverse — that G copied from H₁ — does not seem likely, for the
scribe of G is meticulous in his marginal citations of biblical and patristic sources, and at line 39 writes 'crisostom', and refers in the margin to Luke 16. The ascription in H₁ to 'crystendom sey¡ vp on luke pe. xvi. c°' is the only biblical or patristic citation in H₁, and the scribe of G (like the hypothetical scribe of Sa) is not likely to identify sources while engaged in copying a text. The fact that H₁'s only biblical citation is within the text (rather than in the margin) seems to point toward an immediate source that also contains its citations within the text. The existence of such a source would explain GHI₁'s close textual resemblance as well as the inconsistencies in their respective biblical and patristic citations: the scribe of G would have a fully annotated text to work from; thus he could copy the text while citing the source in the margin; the scribe of H₁ would be able to copy his text and, save for the one instance, avoid copying the biblical and patristic citations.

The distinctive features of T.

T is riddled with unique additions, omissions and substitutions, but is, nonetheless, firmly within the Group I tradition, and in the major addition and omission noted in the discussion of topics (ii) and (iii) above it is also closely related to GHI₁.

Unique additions: line(s) Ed holy writ

T goddys lawe or any tretys
goundyd in goddes lawe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Original Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ed <em>vndirstonde</em></td>
<td>T <em>vndyrstand or to do</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ed <em>esy</em></td>
<td>T <em>esy and gracyous</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ed <em>vndirstonde</em></td>
<td>T <em>vndyrstand and do</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ed <em>fallen</em></td>
<td>T <em>ffall they nat</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ed <em>iniuryes</em></td>
<td>T <em>iniuryes or wronges</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ed <em>life</em></td>
<td>T <em>lyfe in w† standyng the menynges of hys iij enemyes.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unique omissions:** T omits 'all', line 21; 'of trewth', line 38, and, with D (to which it is not otherwise connected), lines 46-52 (66 in Ed): 'And þerfore crist saith...þat fynden it', (line 52), and in Ed to line 66, ending 'withouten ende'. The independent omission of lines 46-52 (66) in T and D is understandable, for the omitted portion is a biblical passage which, while pointing out that the gate is straight and the way narrow, also softens the fairly uncompromising ending of the discursive section: 'And ouer þis who euer lyueth not here a sharp life, it is vnpossible hym to be saued'.

**Unique substitutions:** T substitutes 'wyll ye nat be' for 'nyle ye be', line 10; 'ye' for 'we', line 24, and 'wordys' for 'menys', line 34.
lines 21-22 EdC₁ SaG₂ CD have omitted a significant portion of the biblical text, and at lines 13-15 the same manuscripts have added to the biblical text. The addition and omission in GH₁(T) separate these manuscripts from EdC₁, and point toward an immediate source distinct from that used by EdC₁.

That GH₁ probably shared the same immediate source is evident if the variants from another, and longer tract are studied: C₁ GH₁ are the only surviving manuscripts which have both The Four Errors and The Three Arrows.¹³ The three manuscripts also agree in additions, omissions, and substitutions against all other manuscripts containing The Three Arrows, and in those variants C₁ GH₁ form a separate version. However, as in The Four Errors, there are differences within the same version, and, as in The Four Errors, GH₁ agree in certain kinds of variation against C₁. The conclusions in The Three Arrows appendix are that (i) C₁ GH₁ are probably derived from the same immediate source, a source distinct from the immediate sources of the other versions, and that (ii) because of readings unique to GH₁, C₁ and GH₁ may well have used different exemplars,

¹³ The distinct character of Sa has already been established; the discussion of G₂CD (Group II), which follows in a different section, will cover the variants that make these manuscripts distinct from those of Group I.

¹⁴ See Appendix II.
As the additions and substitutions suggest, T's various alterations are expansions of the senses of the words; the scribe of T wants to make explicit what is implicit: the reader is not only to 'vndirstonde' but to 'vndyrstande and do'. Its abbreviated ending reinforces this: 'And ouer thys whoeuer lyueth nat here a sharpe lyfe in w*standyng the menynges of hys iiij enemies hyt ys impossiblyl hym to be sauyd.'

II [G₃C:D]

The manuscript relationships of Group II are less complex than those of Group I. The distinctive features of G₃CD are, in the main, shared as opposed to individual features, and this, in itself, makes the discussion of variants a simpler task. The following exposition of significant additions, substitutions, and omissions will establish (i) the independent character of G₃C:D, and (ii) G₃C's probable dependence upon the same immediate source. As the discussion will show, much of the evidence for (ii) is contained within (i).

(i) The independent character of G₃C(D).

Significant additions and substitutions.

line(s)

8 Ed The first errour is worldely maner, wherfore saynt poule saith

G₃CD  þe firste errour is worldly maner
The second error is fleshly lust
The pride error is false covetise
And the fourth is veynglorie. As for the
firste seynt poul sei

28 Ed Origene

G3CD be greet 'cl rk' Oriene.

The addition at line 8 is interesting, mainly for the substitutions which seem to follow from it: for example, at line 8 where EdC1GH1TS read 'The first error is' G3CD substitute 'As for the first', and again at line 11 'The second is' becomes in G3CD 'As for the second', and similarly at line 15 for 'The third is' G3CD read 'As for the pride', and finally at lines 22-23 'The fourth error is' becomes in G3C 'And as for the fourthe' (and in D 'And as to the fourthe'). An addition like that at line 8 and the substitutions that follow it are not the result of independent coincident variation, and are probably derived from the same immediate source; this is almost certainly true of the full citation of the auctor, 'be greet clerk Origene', at line 28. The close textual relationship of G3C is also affirmed, for both manuscripts cite not only 'be greet clerk Origene' but add 'super Exodus 6.12'; G3 does so in the margin, while C adds it in the text. Only two other manuscripts (Sa and G) give the scriptural citation, but they represent a different textual tradition. There are three more additions worth noting: at line 7, G3CDSa read 'esy ' list' instead of 'esy'; at line 23 where G3CD read
'seynt poul' for 'poule', and, at line 39, G\textsubscript{3}CD read 'who so euere' where EdC\textsubscript{1}GSaH\textsubscript{1}T read 'who euer'.

Substitutions. There is only one significant substitution shared by G\textsubscript{3}CD: they read 'to stonde' while EdC\textsubscript{1}GSaH\textsubscript{1}T read 'bat he stondyth', line 26. EdC\textsubscript{1}GSaH\textsubscript{1}T's reading is attested to by the majority of manuscripts in the WBL (I Cor. x, 12); G\textsubscript{3}CD's reading is cited as extant in one other manuscript.

Significant omissions.

The omissions also seem to be derived from the same immediate source; for example, G\textsubscript{3}CD omit 'wherfore', lines 9, 16, 'and þerfore', lines 11, 23. These omissions, like the addition at line 8, may be seen as minor adjustments to the text. There are other less significant omissions: G\textsubscript{3}CD omit 'þe', line 20, and 'þus', line 28, while G\textsubscript{3}C omit 'þe', line 18, and G\textsubscript{3}CbSa omit 'þies', line 6. (ii) G\textsubscript{3}C's dependence upon the same immediate source.

It is clear, then, that G\textsubscript{3}CD are very closely related, and it has been suggested that they are derived from the same immediate source. The possibility exists, in theory, that one of the manuscripts G\textsubscript{3}, C, or D is the immediate source; however, D can be excluded from consideration as it omits lines 46-52;\textsuperscript{15} lines supplied

\textsuperscript{15}D shares this abbreviated ending with T, but since this is the only significant variant shared by them, and since both texts represent different versions, the shared omission cannot be the result of one copying from the other. As suggested in the discussion concerning T's similar omission, the abbreviated ending has its uses, for it forces the reader to meditate on the words (in D) 'þa ouer pis who euer lyueþ not here a scharp lyyf it is vnpossible hym to be saued'. For a tract dealing with the four errors of evil living the above is an appropriate ending.
by G₃C, and lines not likely to be added independently by two different scribes. The same can be said for the occurrence of identical biblical and patristic citations: G₃C are not likely to supply these independently. It is not possible to assign priority to G₃ or C, for neither possesses unique additions, omissions, substitutions or any other type of scribal variation that will allow C to descend from G₃, or G₃ to descend from C. In the absence of such conjunctive and separative variants (or errors), I have preferred descent from the same immediate source as the most probable explanation for the consistency of their shared variation.

A review of the manuscript relationships of The Four Errors. Using scribal variation in addition, omission, and substitution the texts of The Four Errors can be divided into two separate groups: Group I is composed of manuscripts SaEdC₁GH₁T, and Group II is composed of manuscripts G₃CD.

These groups can, in turn, be subdivided:

(i) Sa agrees, on the whole, with the other manuscripts of Group I, but it is, because of unique readings, distinct from them. The possibility exists that Sa is very close to the archetype, as well as the immediate source(s), of the Group I texts of The Four Errors, for it, like the putative immediate source, has full intertextual biblical and patristic references. It has been
suggested that such a text would have been needed to account for GH₁'s close textual resemblance (both with regard to the text proper, and the biblical and patristic citations). A text similar to Sa in biblical and patristic citations may also have been the immediate source for G₂C.

(ii) EdC₁ tend to agree against other manuscripts within Group I, and thus are grouped together; however, Ed's text is, in parts, a much-pruned version of C₁; Ed also adds 14 lines, much of it from the WBL. C₁, in some respects, is very close to G; they, in fact, share the same version of another tract The Three Arrows. While the scribal variation in this shared tract confirms their probable dependence upon a shared common source, it does not confirm that C₁G shared the same immediate source.

(iii) GH₁T tend to agree against all other manuscripts. Because of unique additions, omissions and substitutions T can be separated from GH₁. GH₁ are textually very close, so close in fact as to have possibly used the same immediate source. G's readings are, however, more accurate, and the text of G has full marginal citations of biblical and patristic sources. Detailed collations of GH₁ using the shared treatise The Three Arrows show that GH₁, for that treatise, probably used the same immediate source also.

(iv) G₂CD form a tight textual group that is distinct in both the structure of the tract itself and in specific readings. However, D ends imperfectly and
for that reason, and for other minor textual inconsistencies, D's text is distinct from the texts of G3C. It is not possible to assign textual priority to G3 or C, but it is assumed that both manuscripts probably descend from the same immediate source which in its manner of citing biblical and patristic sources resembles Sa.

This study has been concerned with the textual relationships of the extant manuscripts of The Four Errors, and primarily the relationships of those manuscripts in two's and three's, the 'twigs' of the tree. It has not been the object of this study to establish a manuscript tree, a stemma, though much of the material for such a tree is provided. There are certain problems or obstacles inherent in establishing a tree for The Four Errors.

First, the rich vein of separative and conjunctive variation is exhausted once the major groups have been established. This is compounded by the relative shortness of the text -- 46-56 lines (52 in most cases) -- thus there is not enough text rich enough in variation to allow one to discern a pattern of conjunctive and cumulative variation. In longer tracts, The Stathel of Sin for example, this pattern of conjunctive and cumulative variation is important, for it supports and strengthens what would be, in a shorter text, a tenuous link. One way out of this dilemma is to isolate other tracts and treatises that co-occur with a shorter text. For
The Four Errors and specifically for Group I texts, The Three Arrows can be invaluable in providing much needed confirmation of a suspected pattern of variation. More work, however, is needed on The Three Arrows and its different versions before any conclusive evidence can be advanced with regard to the textual relations of its sometime companion tract The Four Errors.

Second, a study of the dialectal relationships of The Four Errors, The Three Arrows and The Mirror of Sinners would be useful in clarifying murky textual relationships, but this would be a large undertaking in itself, one that would involve a detailed study of the dialect of the Central and Central-West Midland counties. The present study has been co fin d to solving the first problem, and has suggested the shape the branch ought to have, given the surviving 'twigs'. The second problem, while beyond the scope of this study, is nevertheless an important one, and one that will have to be solved before a definitive stemma can be established.

16 Professor Angus McIntosh's article 'Two Unnoticed Interpolations in Four Manuscripts of the Prick of Conscience', N.M. lxxvii (1976), 63-78, provides a useful demonstration of the relevance dialectal factors may sometimes have to textual problems.
Here sueth thynges (1. 2) & now syp next a treijs of foure errours Sa; Marke wel þees foure errours whiche letten be verrey knowyng of holy writt C; Here syp a short treijs of iiiij errours þt lettiþ man to haue trew vndirstondyng of holy scripture H1; om. C1GG3DT.

holy writ] goddis lawe C1GH1SaG3CD; goddis lawe or any tretysse groundyd in goddes lawe T. heuy] heuy to him C1GH1G3CD.

to] forto C1G. vndirstonde] vndyrstand or to do T. pourge] bisie D. hym silf] be himsilf C1GH1T; be him SaG3C; þe him D.

þies] om. SaG3CD. errouris] foure errouris C1GH1TSaG3CD.

esy] MS. Æsey; esi & list SaG3CD; esy and gracous T.

vndirstonde] vndyrstand and do T; vndirstonde. þe firste errore is worldly maner. The secunde errore is fleschly lust. The þride errore is fals cousite. And [om. D] þe fourþe is veynglorie G3CD. The ... wherfore (1. 9)] As for þe firste G3CD.


The ... þerfore] As for þe secunde G3CD. secund] second errore C1GH1TSa.

saith] seik to þe romayns þe xiii. c°. Sa. Marginalium: Romanos xiii°, Galatas 5 c° C; Romanos 13 G.

for ... flesh] om. GH1T.

The ... wherfore (1. 16)] As for þe þridde G3CD. thrid] þridde errore C1GH1TSa.


fallen] ffall they mat T.

in to] to D. þe snare] snare G3CSa.

and noyous desirys] desires & noious GH1TD.


and] in to D.
Here sueth þe foure errouris of yuel lyuyng.

ff e y man semyth eny pënte of holy writ hard or huy
to vndirsto e, poir e hym silf of þies errouris þat s n and no doute it shalbe ful esy to c nseyue & vndirstonde. The first errour is worl-
dely maner, wherfore saynt poule saith:

nyle ye be conformed to þis world.

The secund is fleshly lust, and þerfore poule saith: Do þe not þe bisesnes of your flesh in desires, for þe flesh coue-
tith contrary to þe spirite & þe spirit to þe flesh. The thrid is fals couetyse wherfore poule saith: þei þat wole be mayde ryche fallen in to temptacion and, in to þe snare of þe deuel and in to many vnprofitable and noyous de-
sirys þe whiche drenchen men in to dethe and þerdicion, for þe rote of all
The ... parfore (1. 23)] And as for þe fourpe CG3D. couetouse] couetise which sum men couetyng erreden fro þe felþ & bi settiden hem wiþ many sorowis GH1; couetise whyche sum men couetyng errédyn wiþ many sorowys T.


þat he stondyth (1. 26)] to stonde G3CD.


origenes] þe greet clerk origene DG3; þe grete clerk Origene super exodus 6 c°, 12 c°. C. þus] om. G3CD. who so euer (1. 29)] whosoever GH1T.

enformeth] conformeþ C1GH1TSaG3CD. þis] þe C1.

Eythyr] or CD.

his] his his H1.


menys] wordys T. eibir] or C1GH1TSaG3CD. om. D.

euer] 'euer' H1. voidith] a voidiþ D.


Eiper who euer (1. 41)] 'Eiper who euer' G3.


monynges] menyngis G. Eiper] or CD.

not] 'not' C1. all] 'alle' H1. iniuryes] þe iniuries C1GH1TSaG3CD; iniuries or wronges T.
yuelis is couetyse. The fourth error
is veyn glorie, and þerfore poule saith:
Be we not mayde couetouse of veyn

25
glorie, for he þat gessith hym silf þat
he stondyth, be he wayre þat he falle
not. Of þe malice of þis .iii. erroreis
spékith origene seynge bus: who so
þuer enforcing hym to þe maners of þis

30
world; Eythyr whoþuer enforcing hym
not faithefullly to restreyne his fleshly
lustys; Eliþer whoþuer bisieth hym

to geit worldely goodis with vn-
just menys, eþir in vndew tyme; Eli-

35
þir whoþuer voidith not fro hym all veyn
glorie, he is seruaunt to vices & traitour
to god & he shal neuer haue trew vn-
dirstondyngge of treوث. And acoryngly
herto Crisostom saith: whoþuer restrey-

40
neth not þe malice of his hert; Eliþer who
þuer enforcing hym not bisiely to ayensay
his fleshly monynges; Eliþer whoþuer of
all his hert foryeueth not all iniuryes þat
45 life] lyfe in w'tstandyng the menynge of hys iij enemyes T.

46 And ... ende (l. 66)] om. DT.

49 wey brode] weie is brood GH₁Sa.

50 And] om. GH₁.

51 and narow pe wey] & pe weye narow H₁. pe wey] om. C₁G.

52 few] but fewe G. The ... ende (l. 66)] om. C₁GH₁SaG₂C.
bene done to hym; And ouer his, who ouer

lyueth not here a sharp life, it is vn-
possible hym to be saue. And perfore
crist saith: stryue ye to entre by pe strate
yate, for pe yate pat ledith to perdicion.
is large & pe wey brode, and perbene ma-

ny pat entren by it; And how streyt is
pe yate and narow pe wey pat ledith
to life & perbene few pat fynden it. The
brodewey is lustis of his world, whom
men couetith. The streyt pat is, whiche [f. 85r]
is shewid by tresualis and fastynge, in
to whiche pe apostellis entred, and per-
fore pe apostle saith: Nil ye loue pe wor-
ld, neibor pe thynges pat bene in pe world,
for who ouer loueth pe world, pecharite

of pe fadre is not in hym, for why all
thynges pat is in pe world is couetise
of ey, lust of flesh & pryde of life, whiche
is not of pe fadre but of pe world, and
pe world shall passe and pe couetise of it.

Forsote who pat doith pe wil of god
dwellith withouten ende.
Notes

Here sueth pe fourre errouris of yuel lyuynge (line 2). The Four Errors, as it appears in C.U.L. MS. Fr. 6.31 (§ 4) is, according to Deanesly, a Lollard tract: "The MS. contains also another Lollard tract on the "Four errors which letten the very knowing of holy writ", and 'the hand of these tracts [there are four other tracts in this section of Ff. 6.31] is c. 1300-1400", The Lollard Bible, p. 445. This determination is perhaps circumstantial, for The Four Errors is part of a manuscript which includes a tract assigned, provisionally, to Wyclif - 'The holy prophet david saith'. Deanesly's attribution of this latter tract to Wyclif (p. 446) is by no means certain, s The Lollard Bible, pp. 241, fn. 4, and pp. 268-70.

Deanesly's introduction to her edition of 'The holy prophet david saith', The Lollard Bible, pp. 445-46, is not altogether accurate: she observes that the tract 'is followed in the MS. by four other Lollard tracts, which all each other with incipit, explicit or title, and give the appearance at first of forming a single treatise ...'; she then goes on to note four tracts, but includes 'The holy prophet ...' as one of the other tracts which follows itself. There are indeed, four tracts which follow 'The holy prophnet', the fourth being without title and beginning 'Also mathu seip in pe same schapitle', ff. 38r-42v. Two tracts have incipits: "Meekness", ff. 16v-27r begins 'Now here it is to be holde with bisy sowle pe profite pte n schal have ...', and this tract is followed, as Deanesly notes, with 'Here sueth pe seiyngis of dyuers doctoris vpe e xxvi capetil of Matthu ...', f. 27v. The texts of all five tracts begin with two or three-line ornamental initials. It is fairly clear that the rubrics and initials et off the various tract from each other. The other tracts noted by Deanesly above warrant, if only for the variety of their sources - 'dyuers doctoris' — closer attention.

Ed's reading 'holy writ' may be a conscious substitution for 'god is lawe' of the putative immediate source. The term 'goddis lawe', to be sure, is not unusual in Ed's a whole, but in Ed 'goddis lawe' is used, with three exceptions, to refer to the precepts and commandments of God, and not the Bible, or holy scripture as such. The Ed scribe's terms for the Bible are: 'goddis word(es)', ff. 16v, 17v, 63v, 67r; 'word of god', 59v; 'holy writ', 63r, 73v, 83v, 85v, 90v; 'holy scripture' 63r, and 'holy bokis' 73v. The three exceptions
where 'goddis lawe' is used to mean the Bible occur, interestingly enough, in The Eight Blessings of Christ, on f. 25r (this is sermon 123 of the Wycliffite 'Proprium Sanctorum' printed by Arnold, Select English Works of John Wyclif, pp. 406-12). Of this sermon, and the general contents of Ed, Anne Hudson notes: 'The other items of this manuscript are orthodox, but the text of the sermon, even including the final, and typically Lollard, reference to true men standing against Antichrist, is unexpurgated.' Medium Ævum x1 (1971), 153, fn. 8. The Ed text is, however, a much shortened version of the Wycliffite sermon. No attempt was made by the Ed scribe to filter out 'goddis lawe' or other Lollard terms in The Eight Blessings of Christ, but it is clear from the evidence of the other tracts that 'goddis lawe' is not the Ed scribe's preferred term for the Bible, though the term is admissible for particular precepts, commandments and injunctions of God. As Deanesly has noted (p. 227, fn. 1) F. Wiegand in De Foclesiae Notiones quid Wiclif docuerit, Leipzig (1891), 58 draws attention to Wyclif's 'use of lex Dei absolutely as a term for the Bible.' I quote from Wiegand's text: 'Legem Dei quae nihil aliud sit nisi scriptura sacra illo nomine ob id appellari, quod a Deo data eiusque testamentum infringibile sit nec a Deo separari possit.'

12 C's citation of Gal. 5 is unique among the extant manuscripts of The Four Errors, and may well be indicative of the fuller biblical and patristic citations of the putative immediate source of G3C(D). See also notes to lines 28 and 39.

16 C's chapter number ([6]) is not very clear on the microfilm or the photograph.

16 þei þat wole ... couetyse (line 22). This passage in Ed (see edited text) should be compared with the WBL and the same passage in GH1(T); for T's close but divergent readings see variants.

WBL, I Tim. vi, 9-10: For thei that wolen be maad riche, fallen in to temptacioun, and in to snare of the deuel, and in to many vnprofitable desiers and noyous, whiche drenchen men in to deth and perdicioun. For the rote of alle yuelis is coueytise, which summen coueitinge erriden fro the feith, and bisettiden hem with many sorewis.

GH1: þei þat [om. H1] wolen be maad riche fallen in to temptacioun and in to þe snare of þe deuyl, and in to many vnprofitable desiers & noious þe whiche drenchen men [om. H1] in to deeþ &
perdicium, for he rote of alle yuelis is couesite which sum men coueityng erreden fro he fei <& bi settiden hem wip many sorowis.

GH₁ follow the Wycliffite biblical text more closely, and at greater length, than do any of the other manuscripts, but the difference is purely one of degree. It is evident that at some stage in the composition or transmission of The Four Errors a Wycliffite biblical version was used, and that at another stage (prior to or at the copying of GH₁) a Wycliffite biblical text was consulted, and different material added, that is, in comparison with the other manuscripts.

C's citation of the patristic source within the text is indicative, perhaps, of the kind of text used as an exemplar by the scribe of C: in C the biblical passages are noted in the margins, but the two patristic citations (lines 28 and 39) are noted within the text; these aberrations in the method of citing sources may be a result of the scribe of C having followed his exemplar's method. That is, the hypothetical exemplar of C may have, like Sa, cited all biblical and patristic sources within the text. The possibility does exist (and it does not exclude the above scribal explanation) that inclusion of the patristic authorities — Origen and Chrysostom — provides the necessary support at the very point where the specific moral imperatives gleaned from the Bible are converted into specific moral practices: comment on the Bible requires documentation. I have been unable to locate the specific sources mentioned. Origen's 'Commentariis in Exodus', P. G. 12, cols. 263-298 is incomplete, as is Chrysostom's New Testament commentary, a fact recognised in the late 14th and early 15th centuries (see C.U.L. MS. Ff. 6.31, f. 35r) 'crisostem in his werk vcomplete pe xxi omelie'.

enformeth. Ed's 'enformeth' may be a misreading of 'conformeth'; such a misreading might arise if o and e, through ligature or biting, appeared as a two-compartmented o. Ed's reading, however, makes sense: see O.E.D. s.v. Inform v. III. 4b. 'To train or discipline in some particular course of action; to instruct in some particular subject, doctrine, etc.; to teach how to do something. Const. of; to, in, with, or with infin, or subord. clause.' As there is no reflexive use noted before 1611, the Ed scribe may have read 'hym' as a proper noun third sing. dat. — 'who so ever conformeth hym [another] to he maners of this world ...' — rather than as a reflexive 'hym[sel]' as is clear from lines 25-38: 'for he fat gessith hym sifl fat he stondyth, be he wayre fat be falle not'. Lines 27-38
are addressed to one who 'gessith hym sylf þat he stondyth'.
M.E.D. lists another possible meaning for 'enformeth' s.v. enfourmen v. 6f ' infect or affect', cf. (c. 1384) W.Bible (1) Dan. 4. 30: With dewe of heuen his body was enfourmed or defoulid [W.Bible (2); colouryd; L infectum].' There is no reflexive use noted by M.E.D., nor is a use with the prep. 'to' noted.

35 The scribe of H1 has added 'euer' above and between 'who' and 'voidþ', and has marked its place with a caret.

39 H1's reading 'crystendom seyþ vp on luke. þe. xvj. c0.' seems to be a scribal slip, perhaps occasioned by an exemplar that also had an inter-textual patristic citation at this place in the text. This is H1's only citation, and is, it seems, a misreading of 'Crysostom'.

40 'Eiper who euerel added by scribe of G3 in margin.

41 H1's 'conforsiþ' is not cited in the O.E.D. or M.E.D., and is possibly a scribal misreading of a two-compartmented e as co. For 'enforsiþ' see O.E.D. s.v. Enforce v. 5b. refl. 'To exert oneself, strive.'

41 The scribe of Sa has added 'him' in the margin and has marked its place between 'enforsiþ' and 'not' with a caret.

42 For G's 'menyngis' see O.E.D. s.v. Mean sb1. 'A lament, complaint.' 'Menyng(is)' is not cited as one of the variant forms of Moan, but both Mean and Moan are derived from the 'OE meanan Mean v2.' T has both forms of the word, 'monynges', line 42, and 'menynges', line 45.

43 C1, in a different colour ink, has 'not' above and between 'forseueþ' and 'alle', and its place is marked with a caret. The scribe of H1 has added 'alle' above and between 'not' and 'þe', and has marked its place with a caret.

52- These lines of Ed should be compared with the following verses from the WBE, I John, ii, 15-17:

Nyle þæ lousy the world, nether tho thinges that ben in the world. If ony man loueth the world, the charite of the fadir Is not in him. Forwhi al thing that is in the world, is coueytise of flesch and coueytise of ien, and pride of lijf, whiche is not of the fadir, but it is of the world. And the world shal passe, and the coueytise Of it; sotheli he that doith the wille of God, dwellith in to with outen ende.
Biblical and Patristic Sources

10 Romans xii, 2.
12 Galatians v, 16.
24 Galatians v, 26.
25 1 Corinthians x, 12.
28 I have been unable to locate this reference; however, Origen’s commentary on Exodus is incomplete (see note to line 28).
39 I have been unable to locate this reference. There is no extant commentary of Chrysostom on Luke (see note, line 28).
47 Matthew vii, 13-14.
57 1 John ii, 15-17.
The Manuscript Relationships of Of Lords and Husbandmen

Of Lords and Husbandmen of E.U.L. MS. 93 (Ed), ff. 87v-90r, is a short tract dealing with the responsibilities of lords and husbandmen to servants and family, specifically the spiritual responsibilities of the paterfamilias.¹ There are two other copies of this tract extant:

(C2) Cambridge University Library MS. Hh.1.3., ff. 2r.²

(W) Westminster School Library MS. 3, ff. 117v-119v.³

The three above copies are, as far as can be determined,⁴ the only surviving copies of the tract; moreover, they

¹ There are numerous references throughout the tract to the families, or 'meyne'; see the Commentary and various references to St. Augustine and his works. This tract ought to be compared with the Wycliffite tract 'Of Weddid Men and Wifes and of Here Children also', Cap.III, Select English Works of John Wyclif, ed. Thomas Arnold, (Oxford, 1869-71), iii, 193-95. The same tract appears in W, ff. 121r-132v.

² Dr. A.I. Doyle, in a letter of 24 November 1974, noted that in this manuscript the tract was incomplete; Dr. P.S. Jolliffe also noted that it was imperfect at the end, Check-List, p. 104, item 1. If Ed and W preserve the entire text, then C2 is not incomplete, or imperfect. Apparently, by having the missing phrase at line 63 tacked onto the end of the tract, the tract appeared shorter than it in fact was, and as a result confusion arose.

³ For references to the cited manuscripts see 'Manuscripts: Descriptions and Notices'.

are, as the following evidence of scribal variation indicates, so closely related as probably to have shared the same immediate source.

For the sake of brevity the following analysis is a summary of the complete evidence, with particular attention being focused on the more significant conjunctive and separative variants (or errors).\(^5\)

Additions: Of the 14 additions made by both or either of C\(_2\)W to the base text Ed, 10 are shared by C\(_2\)W, two are unique to C\(_2\), and two are unique to W. Of the unique additions all could be considered minor (that is, the additions 'A', 'e', 'a', etc.), and the kind a scribe might make unconsciously to the text, or in a conscious attempt to make his copy more explicit; in any event, the unique additions reveal very little about the textual relations among the manuscripts. The shared additions, however, are, if not conclusive, intriguing evidence, the most revealing being those of line 96, where both C\(_2\) and W read 'the laws of god' against Ed's 'the lawe', and line 80 where C\(_2\)W add 'o\(\)er [or W] household meyne' to Ed's 'meyne'.\(^6\) For whatever reason Ed does not have the above phrase, but it is clear that C\(_2\)W have not arrived at the same reading by chance.

---

\(^5\) Throughout the discussion the terms 'addition', 'omission' and 'substitution' are used to describe the relationship of C\(_2\)W to Ed; the terms do not imply that Ed is the exemplar of C\(_2\)W, nor do they imply that Ed is earlier than or closer\(^6\) to the original than C\(_2\)W. Ed is taken as the base text, and for ease of discussion the various manuscripts are compared to Ed.

Omissions: The omissions in both or either of C2 and W present a more complex textual situation. Of the five unique omissions in C2 three (lines 12, 68, and 98) can be considered minor ("a", "e", etc.), and not very significant variants when considering close textual relationships. Two other variants, however, are useful in clarifying the C2W relationships. At line 28 C2 omits the phrase "in be ends" while Ed and W retain it, though the scribe of W (or its corrector) subpuncts the phrase. C2, had it been copying from W, might have omitted the phrase because of the marking, but it would surely have omitted the preceding phrase "miserere be first", for in W it is subpuncted as well. The reverse - that W copied from C2 - is likewise ruled out, if not by the above, then by the unique omission in C2 of the phrase "or by good wil", line 54, which W renders "or good wille". This is not the kind of phrase that W would supply by conjecture if C2 had been the source.

There are five unique omissions in the text of W, three of which are minor, and two, perhaps, significant. The omission of the phrase "as bei shall", line 4, might have been omitted in C2, but C2's text has been trimmed, thus eliminating whatever evidence there may have been. However, in line 63 W omits the phrase "holde whome he may"

---

7 See note to line 54.
while adding, with $C_2$, the phrase 'chastise whom he may'.

It is worth noting that in this line $C_2$ retains, with minor variations, all of the text of $E_d$ plus that of $W$, and does so by a scribal insertion attached to the end of the tract. It is unlikely that $C_2$ supplied the missing phrases by conjecture, and it is equally unlikely that $W$, with its omission of the phrase supplied by $E_dC_2$, was the source of either.

The preponderance of the evidence of the omissions points to $C_2W$'s dependence upon the same immediate source. There are over 18 instances of shared omissions, including articles and substantives, as well as phrases: both $C_2$ and $W$ read 'an erl' for 'he eerl Iulian' line 65, and, among the phrases, both omit 'Here suen', line 1, and 'of his psalme', line 27. It is clear, I think, from the evidence of the additions and omissions that $C_2W$ are exceptionally close; with the added evidence from the substitutions the case for the shared immediate source is strengthened.

Substitutions: Substitutions are, in themselves, very difficult genetic variants to rely upon, for in them the individual personality, or impersonality, of the scribe is gently asserted, and in subtle and incremental ways. The addition or omission of a half-line, or the interpolation of several, or more, lines, is a bolder assertion, and leaves a definite spoor, and in many cases can be relied upon in forming loose genetic groups. The substitutions of $C_2W$, while telling us very little about the direct connexion of $C_2$ with $W$, tell us (by inference) much about
the immediate source probably shared by them. It has already been noted that \( C_2 \) read 'an erl' for 'he erl Iulian', line 65; the substitution, I suggest, occurred in their immediate source, one that found the reference to Julian of Eclanum either obscure or not essential in a pastoral text.\(^8\)

In line 54, \( C_2 \) read 'beneuolence' while Ed reads 'by violence'. Ed's reading, while in error when compared to the Latin text (see note to line 54), is intelligible, for the passage is concerned with admonition and the various forms it can take: 'yeue he by violence or by good wil, haunte he disciplyne'. In accepting the reading 'beneuolence' the scribe of \( W \) failed to adjust his text, as \( C_2 \) did, and retained the phrase following 'beneuolence'-- 'or good wille'. The scribe of \( C_2 \) apparently noticed the clarifying (for Ed?) but empty expansion and omitted it. The word 'beneuolence' in \( C_2 \) is abbreviated - b\( \text{nu} \)/\( \text{ol} \)/\( \text{ce} \) - and if Ed\( C_2 \)'s immediate source had a similar abbreviation then the scribe of Ed might have misread the abbreviation (or found it difficult), and in an attempt to make sense of the exemplar's word wrote 'by violence'. \( C_2 \) and Ed both, in their own ways, solved the problem; \( W \), however, solved the riddle of the corrupt word, but also succumbed to the definition/expansion following

---

\(^8\) The omission could be a result of a generalized filtering out of exact patristic citations. The same process can be seen at work in the tract The Four Errors; note especially the full citations of (Sa) Society of Antiquaries MS. 300, and the meagre ones, for example of (D) Durham Cathedral MS. A. iv. 22, and (C) Cambridge University Library MS. Ee.6,31. For a possible Wycliffite source see note to lines 65-78.
it, and copied it as well.\(^9\)

The majority of the substitutions (16) point toward a shared immediate source for \(C_2\) and \(W\). Of these 16 substitutions seven are relatively minor:

\(C_2\) read 'on' for 'of', lines 41, 61, 90; 'on' for 'in', line 57; 'a' for 'in', line 48; 'pe' for 'bi', line 15, and 'by' for 'pe', line 39. These shared readings, though minor when considered individually, become significant when considered collectively; that is, considered together these readings form a pattern, and this pattern is explicable in terms of a shared immediate source. The other readings, not minor, also point to a shared source: \(C_2\) read 'yu schalt' for 'to', line 25 (Ed is in error here); 'be' for Ed's 'maybe', line 59, and 'more' for 'moste', line 67.

\(C_2\)'s reading 'more' at line 67 is interesting for it can be compared with a similar reading from the cited source the 'boke to pe eerl Julian' ('a tretijs...to an eerl clepid Julian', hereafter cited as 'a tretijs'):\(^{10}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ed} & \quad \text{fro pe moste to pe leste} \\
\text{W} & \quad \text{fro pe more to pe leste} \\
\text{C}_2 & \quad \text{fro pe more til pe leste} \\
\text{a tretijs} & \quad \text{fro pe grettere til to pe leeste.}
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^9\) However, see note to line 54 and comments regarding the punctuation in \(W\).

\(^{10}\) For a full reference to this tract, and the relevant extract see note to lines 65-78.
C\textsubscript{2}W retain the comparative form which Ed abandons in favour of the superlative, 'moste'. The Latin text, in this line, reads '\textit{a maiore usque ad minimum}'. The agreement of C\textsubscript{2}W points, in this instance, (as in the major ones discussed above) to their dependence upon the same immediate source.

The unique substitutions, when studied carefully, also seem to lend support to the argument for C\textsubscript{2}W's dependence upon the same immediate source. There are a total of 14 unique substitutions made by C\textsubscript{2} and W. In three of these EdC\textsubscript{2}W are at variance at the same place in the text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>C\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>shalbe</td>
<td>schuldy be</td>
<td>schulen be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>here</td>
<td>hiryn</td>
<td>heryng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>\textit{pe story of daniel}</td>
<td>\textit{pe prophecie of daniel}</td>
<td>\textit{pe book of danyel}.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In lines 18 and 43 C\textsubscript{2}W's readings are sufficiently close (allowing for readings stemming from abbreviations) for both manuscripts to have drawn upon the same immediate source. With the readings in line 86 it is not possible to identify conjunctive readings indicative of such a source: one reading may be derived from the immediate source, but nothing more certain can be said.

There is no over-lap in the remaining 11 unique substitutions. Of these, C\textsubscript{2} has eight (superscripts indicate number of substitutions, lines 22, 36, 44, 46\textsuperscript{2},
63\textsuperscript{2}, and 66), all of which may be attempts (not always successful) to make the readings more explicit: for example, at lines 35-6 C\textsubscript{2} reads 'for to slake bridils to sinne', where EdW read 'for to slak bridels to synnes'. The scribe of C\textsubscript{2} may have, in this instance, substituted 'sinne' to draw attention to sin as such, to the entity Sin. In EdW the use of the plural 'synnes' seems to stress the individual, and discrete, acts of sinning, rather than the idea of sin. Another attempt is less successful: at line 66 C\textsubscript{2} reads 'to alle sugetis to \textit{pe}' where EdW read 'to all suget to \textit{pe}'; in this case C\textsubscript{2} has apparently substituted a substantive form of the word for a verbal one. The cited source for this line (and the passage in which it is contained) is 'a tretijs', and its reading '...to alle men suget to \textit{pee}' - tends to support the reading in EdW. The other six unique readings of C\textsubscript{2} are: \textit{\'pe} for \textit{\'pi'}, line 22; 'also' for '\&', line 44; 'in' for 'for', line 46; 'servant' for 'serve', line 46, and two instances of 'whan' for 'whom' in line 63. Again, it is not possible to state with certainty whether these readings are derived from the immediate source or not; the substitution of 'servant' for 'serve' is possibly an attempt to improve the sense of the clause 'but also ye for your maner serve to crist in wele lyuyng'. The two substitutions in line 63 are not as helpful:

lines 61-4 Ed...how eche man enflawmed with charite shal draw from syn whom he may, holde whom he may, & fere whome he may

W...how eche man enflaumed wi\textit{p} charite scal drawe fro synne whom he may, chastise whom he may & fere whom he may
C₂... hou ech man enflaumyd wᵗ charite schal
drawe fro synne whom he may, 'holde when
he may, schastise when he may & bere whom he
may'.

C₂'s reading 'whan' weakens the sense of a passage concerned
with the effect that each man, 'enflaumed with charite', has
on another man, and specifically those who are subject to
the man of charity.

The three unique readings in W are more difficult to
assess, for each, with good reason, may be derived from the
immediate source: W reads 'suggettis' for 'servantis', line
3; 'suggettis' for 'suget', line 33, and 'forsweryng' for
'fro swerynge', line 76. The reading at line 3 - 'suggettis'
for 'servantis' - is part of the rubric, and may be a substitu-
tion by the scribe of W who wished to give the tract a title
appropriate to its audience, presumably one that not only
had servants but subjects as well. The reading at line 33 -
'suggettis' for 'suget' - is, like that of C₂ at line 66,
the substitution of a substantive form for a verbal one, but
one that, in this instance, makes better sense: 'selde good
resoun of hem þat ben suggettis to you'. It is possible
that the above two readings in W are also in its immediate
source, but the evidence from EdC₂ argues against these
readings being derived from that source. The argument
against these readings relies, of course, upon EdC₂'s
dependence, at some stage, on that same immediate source,
or in Ed's case one very close to it. W's other unique
reading - 'forsweryng' for 'fro swerynge', line 76 - finds
support, however, in 'a tretijs', and since this is the source mentioned by the tract Of Lords and Husbandmen the reading 'forsweryng' may well be derived from the immediate source of C₂W. The reading in EdC₂, if corrupt, is not an unreasonable one given the context: 'counsel to hem ṭat ṭei kepe hem from pride, from bakbytynge, fro fornnicacion, fro lechery, fro wrathe, and fro swerynge & couetyse, ṭat is rote of all yuels', lines 74-78. The repetition of 'fro' in this passage may have conditioned the scribe to rewrite 'forsweryng' as 'fro sweryng'.

If all the evidence of additions, omissions, and substitutions is considered, then it is fairly clear that at some point C₂W depended upon the same immediate source for their text of Of Lords and Husbandmen, and that Ed depended upon a text very close to that source of C₂W, but one that was, nonetheless, distinct from it. It is also clear that in the writing of the original Of Lords and Husbandmen the author either had to hand the Latin text of the De Salutaribus Documentis (from which he translated the appropriate parts), or he had its English translation 'a tretijs ṭat seynt austin made to an eerl clepid Julian' (from which he extracted the appropriate parts); given the close resemblance of lines 65-78 in Of Lords and Husbandmen to the opening lines of Chapter 7 of 'a tretijs' it is more likely that the scribe used the English translation.
Here sue[n] om. C_{2W} how] obl. C_{2}.

\& \ldots \text{to (1. 5)}] \text{oblit. through trimming of page C}_{2}.

seruautis] suggetis W.

as \text{sei shall]} \text{om. W. answere] \& answere W.}

in \text{be dredfull day off dome (1. 6)}] on domisday C_{2W}.

his] [hi]s C_{2} shalbe] schulde be C_{2}.

a] om. C_{2}.

and \text{pat]} \text{oblit. C}_{2}.

\text{bi]} \text{be C}_{2W} god] \text{bi god C}_{2W} of] \& \text{of C}_{2W}.

\text{of all \text{bi mynde]} om. C_{2W}.

\text{strenkith]} \text{strengpes W. \text{be whiche]} wych C_{2W}.

\text{to']} \text{om. W. shalbe} schuldy be C_{2}; \text{schulen be W.}

and \ldots \text{some]} \text{om. C}_{2W}.

\text{bi silf]} \text{be self C}_{2}.

\text{be]} \text{om. C}_{2W} \text{beu]} C_{2W} to Ed.

to] \text{om. C}_{2W}.

\text{of \text{bis psalme]} \text{om. C}_{2W}.

\text{miserere \text{be first in \text{be ende]} on miserae \text{be first}

\text{in \text{be ende W. on miserae \text{be fryste C}_{2}}.}
Here sune how lor-
dis & husbandmen shulden teche goddis
commandmentys & pe gospel to her ser-
uantis as pei shall answere for hem

to god in pe dredfull day
off doome.

All myghty god in trinite
commandith generally to his peple pat
eche man tel to his sones how god led
his peple out of egipte: & pat it shalbe
as a token in thynge honde saith god, and
as a thynge of mynde before thynge ysen
and pat pe law of pe lorde be suer in thy
mouth. Also god seyth generally: pou shall
loue bi lorde god of all thynge hert, of
all bi soule, of all bi mynde, and of all
thy strenkith. And pese wordis pe whiche
I commaunde 'to' pe his day shalbe in pine hert
and pou shalt tel hem to bi sones, and
thou shalt thynnk on hem sittynge in pin
house, & goynge in pe wey, and slepynge
and rysynge; kepe bi sylf a bi soule be-
sily, ne foryet pou pe wordis whiche
pine ysen hath seen a fall pei not from pin
hert in all pe days of bi life; [pou] shall
teche hem to bi sones & bi sones sones.

Seynt Austyn seith of biis psalme, mi-
serere pe first in pe ende, generally to cristen
gouverne ... meyne (l. 30) gouverne se your sons,
gouverne se your meyneys C2W.

for] om. C2W.
to speke] forto speke C2.
to do] forto do C2.
god] gode C2W. suget] suggetis W.
weyward] a weiward W. forto] to W.
synnes] sine C2.
be lightnes] lystnesse C2W.
felith] fele C2W. ferdnes] fersnesse C2W. Also]
& also C2.
displeiseth not] displeisip be not C2W. be] by C2W.
but not] not C2W.
1j] oon & fyftype C2W.
here] hiryn C2; heryng W.
&] also C2.
in] & C2W.
by violence] beneuolence W; [hene]uolence C2. or
by good wil] or good wille W. om. C2.
men þus: Gouerne ye your housys; gouerne ye your me[y]ne, for as it pertenyth to vs [f. 88v]
to speke to yow in þe chirche so it pertyneth to yow to do in your housys, þat ye yelde god reson of hem þat ben su-
get to yow. God loueth disciplyne. It is weyward and fals innocence forto slak bridels to synnes; ful perilously þe some fe-
liþ þe lightnes of þe fader, þat afterward he felith þe ferdnes of god. Also þe synn þat displesith not in þe some deli-
teth þe, but age hath forsaken þe, but not couetyse. Also seynt austyn of Ioses gospel, in þe ljemelie, saith þus: Bre-
dren whan ye here þe lorde saynge:
Where I am, þere & my seruaunt shalbe, nyl ye bythynk onely good bishopes &
clerkis, but also ye for your maner serve to crist in wele lyuynge, doynge almes & preachynge his name in doctryne to
whom ye may, þat eche man, also hus-
bondmen, know by this name þat he howith fadris lous to his meyne for
crist & euerlastynge life. Amoneshe he [f. 89r] all his, teche he, stire he, chastysse he,
yse he by violence or by good wil, haun-
nte he disciplyne. So in his house he
hath fulfillid þe office of holy chirche
57 in] on C2W. bishopis] a bishopis C2W.
59 maybe] be C2W.
61 of] on C2W.
63 holde whome he may] 'holde whan he may, schastise when he may' C2; chastise whom he may W. & fere whom he may] 'a fere whom he may' C2.
65 pe eorl Iulian] an eorl C2W.
67 most] more C2W.
68 to be] til to pe C2. pe swetnes] swetnisse C2.
72 god] om. C2W.
73 pou command (1. 74)] command C2W.
75 hem] hem-self C2W.
76 fro swerynge (1. 77)] forsweryng W.
77 a coustysse] & fro coustisse C2W.
79 not] no C2.
80 meyne] oþer [or W] houshold meyne C2W. hathen] hap C2; he hap W.
84 shuld] schuldiþ C2W.
and in some manner bishopis office, he serv-
uyng to cryst pat withouten ende he
maybe with cryst. And Austyn techith

be same sentence in be teneth omelie
of Iohum, how ech man enflawmed with
charite shal draw from syn whom he may,
holde whom he may, & fere whom
he may. Also seynt Austeyn in his boke to

pe eerl Iulian writith bus: My broder
I beseche pat pou tel to all suget to be
and of good wil in pine hous, fro be mo-
ste to be leste, be louse & be sweetnes of
heuenly kyngdom & be bitternes of hel,
& be pou besy and wakynge of here
helth, for pou shal yele reson to our
lord God for all men suget to be whiche
bene in pin house. Shew pou, byd pou,
commaund, counsel to hem pat be kepe [f. 89v]

hem from pride, from bakbytynge, fro forni-
cacion, fro lechery, fro wrath, and fro
swerynge & couetyse, pat is rote of all
yuels. For seynt poule saith: He pat hath
not cure of his & moste of his homely

mayne hatben remyed pe feyth, and is
worse pan an hathen man. Perfore kyng
nabugodonos prechid to his peple be
merueylis of god, and sent pistlis in to all
his empire, pat all men shuld drede god of
story] prophecy C₂; book W.
lyng] king C₂.
of] on C₂W.
witnessith] witnessen W.
witnessitha] wyttessen C₂W.
& duke] & be duke W.
pe law] pe law of God C₂W.
pe] om. C₂W.
pe] C₂t.
is] partially oblit. C₂.
heuen, and no man be hardy to blasphem hym; as pe story of daniel tellith. Also pe noble kynge Iosias prechid pe law of god opynly & clepid pe peple of iewis from ydolatrie & ower synnes and did grete vengeance of trespassouris of pe law as pe boke of kynges & paralipomenon witnessith pleynly; and so did pe noble kynge Iosaphat & pe solempe kynge Ezachie as pe same bokys witnessithe.

Perfore god commaunddid pe kynge & duke of pe peple shuld haue pe law writen to hem & study perin nyght & day as pe fifte & pe sixt boke of holy writ tellen. And pe lord god almyghty chees Dauid pe kynge for to fede his peple, and he fed hem in pe innocence of his hert and in vndirstondynge of his hondys led hem as pe sauter witnessith. All pis is text of holy writ & autorites of sey-nt Austyn, pe glorious doctor of holy chirche.
NOTES

1 Here...to (line 5). The omission of 'Here suen' in C₂W may well be the result of a shared exemplar; however, the damaged state of C₂ makes it difficult to reconstruct the partially obliterated words, and for the remaining text (part of line 3 through 'to' line 5) the only word remaining is the bottom half of what appears to be 'sugetis'. What does seem clear, however, is that C₂ does not have the same reading as Ed, and like W, seems to have omitted several phrases and words, or chosen a more concise way of introducing the tract. C₂W consistently omit or thin out certain words, as is evident from the variants. The Ed text could, however, be seen as an expansion of another more austere text, perhaps much like C₂, W, or their exemplar; compare line 5 where Ed reads 'in pe driedfull day off dome', with C₂W's 'on domisday'.

2 Husbandmen. Husbandmen probably refers to the head of the household, see O.E.D. s.v. Husbandman 2a. 'A man who is the head of a household, the "goodman" of the house; the householder', and as noted in the O.E.D. such a use is attested in the Wycliffite Bible (WB), Matt. xxiv, 43: 'If the housbonteman wiste in what houre the theef were to cumme.'

10 &... mouth (line 14). These lines are fairly close to those of WBB (Earlier Version) Exodus xiii, 9: 'it schall be as a token in pi honde & as mynde befoe pin eyse; pat pe lawe of pe lord euermore be in pi mouþ'. All three manuscripts read 'a thynge of mynde' where the Earlier Version has 'mynde', which in the Later Version is corrected to 'a memorial'. The Vulgate reads monumentum, and presumably: the variation in EdC,W, along with that in the Earlier Version, may be traced to a literal rendering of, perhaps, moni mentum. The variant in EdC₂W can be attributed, I think, to their immediate source, one which seems to have been influenced more by the Earlier Version of the WB rather than by the Later.

16 of all pi mynde. The phrase 'of all pi mynde', not present in C₂W, is probably the result of the repetition of the same phrase: 'of all pi...', and should be compared to similar shared omissions at lines 19, 27, and 63; all of these shared omissions point toward a shared immediate source.

18 'to'. In the Ed text 'to' appears above and between 'commaunde' and 'pe', and its place is marked with a caret. W omits the preposition, so W's immediate source
may have been the source for Ed's momentary lapse; however, such evidence for a shared immediate source is not conclusive.

25 [\textit{\textit{pou}}]. CoW read \textit{\textit{pou}} and this reading seems preferable to the ambiguous 'to' of Ed. 'To' could be a dialectal variant of thou (see O.E.D. s.v. Thou, and forms cited) and it would appear in Ed as a relict form, for Ed's usage for thou, 2nd sing. noun is consistently 'pou'/\textit{Thou}', and occasionally 'pou'. If 'to' is a relict form then it is due, probably, to the exemplar, as it is not part of Ed's repertoire of forms. Alternatively 'to' could be a simple blunder attributable either to a defective manuscript or a careless scribe.

27 \textit{miserere ... ende (line 28).} W marks 'on miserere be first in be ende' for omission, probably because it adds little to the tract, save for an ambiguous precision. The reference to 'his psalm, miserere be first in be ende' is to the Fourth Penitential Psalm (Ps. 50(51)). See \textit{Miserere, Revised Medieval Latin Word - List, s.v. Miser/amen, 'peritential (51st) psalm (eccl.) c.980. c. 1293'}. W may have marked the phrases for omission because they were misleading: the psalm was not 'miserere be first' but miserere the fourth, and a further reference to 'of his psalm' would have been, perhaps, baffling to W, and otiose to Co. The phrase 'in be ende' seems to have been useless to both manuscripts or their exemplar, for it is marked for omission in W, and omitted in C2. The text quoted in the three manuscripts is from the final paragraph of St. Augustine's exposition on Psalm 50, \textit{'Enarrationes in Psalmos', Aurelii Augustini Opera, C.C.S.L. (Turnholti, 1956), xxxviii, 615-16.}

29 \textit{Gouerne...couetyse (line 41).} This passage, a paraphrase of St. Augustine's exposition on Psalm 50, offers good evidence, over a very few lines, for the close textual relationships of CoW and, at some distance, Ed: (a) There is the general similarity of the grammatical distinction between the 2nd pers. sing. 'pou'/\textit{Thou} to 'ye'/\textit{you}, 2nd pers. plu. All three manuscripts observe this distinction throughout the text. (b) CoW add the phrase 'gouerne se youe sonys', line 29, and read 'displees' be not' for 'displeaseth not'. (c) CoW omit 'ye', line 37 and 'but', line 40. (d) C2W substitute 'fersnesse' for 'ferdnes', line 38; 'py' for 'ye', line 39, and 'gode'/\textit{good} for 'god', line 33. These readings are probably attributable to their immediate source. There are, of course, unique
readings in this passage, e.g., W substitutes the substantive 'suggettis' for the predicate adjective 'suget', line 33; C reads 'also' where EdW read 'Also', line 38; and Ed, perhaps unsure of his exemplar, wrote 'meyne' for 'meyneys', line 30, but attempted to erase, then marked for omission, the y, preferring 'mene' to 'meyneys'. Ed's usage 'mene' or 'meyneye' seems rather straightforward - 'A family household', but C, W both have the plural form 'meyneys', and this seems to imply 'Servants', see O.E.D. s.v. Meinie 2b. 'Used as a plural: "Servants". Elsewhere in the tract (lines 51, and 80) C, W read 'meyne', and in those lines the meaning 'family' is intended, see note to lines 78-81.

33 god. C, W's reading of 'gode'/'good' corresponds to the Latin text's bonam. 'Enarrationes in Psalmos', Ps. 50. W's 'suggettis', however, has no support in the Latin text.

43 here. C's 'hiryn' is probably the inflected plural form of the verb 'here', (c.f. 'schuldin', line 84), the present participle ending in C being formed by adding -i/ynge; however, C's 'hiryn' and W's 'heryng' could well be the result of individual scribal interpretations of their immediate source.

54 by violence. Ed's 'by violence' does not occur in the Latin text -- 'In Joannis Evangelium tractatus', Sancti Aurelii Augustini Opera Omnia, P.L. xxxv, cols. 1768-9, benevolentiam does--nor does 'or by good will'. Apparently, the source for this phrase is to be sought in the immediate source(s) of Ed and W, and the confusion surrounding 'by violence'/ 'benejuculence'/'beneuolence' is probably a result of that source's abbreviation of the word; such a mishandling of one word could give rise to two quite different responses. The scribe of Ed justifies the phrase 'or by good will' by rendering the questionable word as 'by violence', the opposite effect of 'good will'. The scribe of C however, justifies his reading 'beneuolence' by omitting the redundant expression 'or by good will'. W's scribe seems aware of the problem too, for he sets off the phrase 'or good willes' with periods, as if to suggest that 'or good willes' might have a meaning slightly different from that of 'beneuolence', or that it is merely an expansion of the word it follows. Paul G. Arakelian in his article 'Punctuation in a Late Middle English Manuscript', N.M. lxxvi (1975), 621 notes that the periods mark off and enclose the phrases (usually dates or numbers), his observation can be extended to other manuscripts, and with much the same result, but it is worth noting that the period may be used to mark off other kinds of phrases,
as well as 'dates or numbers'.

63 holde ... may. The scribe of $C_2$, because of the repetition of 'may', omitted almost an entire line, but corrected his error, copied the line at the end of the tract, and marked the line's place with a caret after 'may', line 63. The scribal correction reads: 'holde whom he may, schastise whom he may, fare whom he may', a reading that combines everything contained in $E_d$ as well as $W$, in addition to yielding several unique readings. Such variation is, perhaps, to be expected, for the passage is a paraphrase of Section 9 or 'be teneth omelle', and, more importantly, a repetitive one; note that 'whom he may' appears at least three times in each manuscript. The scribe of $E_d$, perhaps because of the repetition of 'may', may have omitted the phrase 'chastise whom he may'; the same is probably true of $W$'s omission of 'holde whom he may'.

65 eerl...yuelis (line 73). Both $C_dW$ agree in the substitution 'an eerl' for $E_d$'s more precise 'be eerl Julian'. The reference is probably to Julian, bishop of Lelandum. Lines 65-78 should be compared with a very similar passage from 'a tretijs pat seynt austin made to an eerl clapid Julian', Harley MS. 2330, ff. 22 -25', edited by Sven Fristedt in The Wycliffe Bible, Part II (Stockholm, 1969), p. 20. I have used Fristedt's text:

J Biseche, my broþir, J biseche, telle þou to alle men suget to þee and of good wil in þin hous, frou þe grettere til þe leeste, þe loue and þe sweetnes of heuenli kingdome and þe drede of helle, and be bise and wakynge of her heeleþ. forwhi for alle men sugetis to þee þat ben in þin hous þou schalt yelde resoun to þe lord, telle þou, bidde þou, comande þou, councele hem þat þei be war of pride, of bacbiting, of drunkennesse, of fornycaiciou, of lecherye, of wræpe, of forswering, of couetise þat is roots of alle yuelis.

As Fristedt has noted, this tract (also titled 'De Salutaribus Documentis') is one of several in the manuscript whose subject matter is of Lollard origin, and the 'Libar De Salutaribus Documentis' 'in especial is purely in the spirit of Wycliffe', The Wycliffe Bible, Part I (Stockholm, 1953), p. 44. Fristedt's arguments, based primarily on a study of translational methods, are intricate and their effect is cumulative rather than conclusive; however, I am prepared to accept the general implication of a Lollard origin
for the above treatise 'to an eerl clepid Julian', and to suggest that the common source of $C_2W$Ed probably used, at one stage, a manuscript much like Harley 2330. For other manuscripts of the tract, see Fristedt, *The Wycliffe Bible*, Part II, p. LXXI.

fro swerynge. W's 'forsweryng' is the reading also found in Harley MS. 2330 (noted above), and may well be the reading of the common source. EdC_2's reading 'fro swerynge' agrees with the context - 'from pride, from bakbytynge, fro fornicacon, fro lechery, fro wrath, and fro swerynge' -- and may be a variant reading occasioned by the repetition of 'fro', and the occurrence of a word without 'fro' before it, (assuming that the immediate source had 'forsweryng').

For 'renyd' see O.E.D. s.v. Renay, Reny l.s. 'To renounce, abjure (one's faith, God, lord, etc.).'

He...man (line 81). C$_W$ at line 80, add 'oper [or 'W] household meyne'. The passage is from I Timothy, v,8. and the version as presented by EdC$_W$ (and particularly C$_W$) ought to be compared with the _WBE_: 'Forsoth if any man haue got cure of his owne, and moost of his household men', he hath denied the feith, and is worse than an vnfaithful, or heten, man'. haue hath (one other manuscript); meyne (several other manuscripts). The similarity of C$_W$, and Ed, to the Wycliffite text is more striking if the above translation of the Vulgate is compared to two other contemporary translations of the passage: (1) 'Whoso forsope has no cure of his owne and most of his homly; as ben faders and moderis and brebere and of suyche, maner; he is werre þan þe vpretere and has denied be fei', (MS. Parker 32.f. 197', col. 1. in *The Pauline Epistles*, ed. Margaret J. Powell, E.E.T.S. O.S. cvxii: 216); (2) 'a who þat haþ no charge of þilke þat beþ of his, & most of þilke þat þat þat homlyche wiþ hym, he haþ forsaken his feiþ; & is worse þan a mysbylafed man'. (MS. Selwyn College 108 L.l., f. 78', in *A Fourteenth Century English Biblical Version*, ed. A.C. Paues (Cambridge, 1904), 113). It seems probable then that the archetype of the tract Of Lords and husbandmen had to hand a Wycliffite version of the Pauline Epistles, and that this version was very close to the Earlier Version.
Biblical and Patristic Sources

10 Exodus xiii, 9.
11 Deuteronomy vi, 5-8.
27 Psalm 145, 15.
29 St. Augustine, Psalm 50, 'Enarrationes in Psalmos', Aurelii Augustini Opera, C.C.S.L. (Turnhult, 1956), xxxviii; 615-616.
41 John xiv, 3.
60 St. Augustine, 'In Joannis Evangelium: tractatus X', Sancti Aurelii ... , cols. 1471-1472.
78 1 Timothy v, 8.
82 Daniel iii, 95-100; iv, 1-34.
86 4 Kings xxxiii, 1-37.
87 2 Paralipomenon xxxiv, 1-33.
93 2 Paralipomenon xvii, 1-19; xxix, 1-36; xxx; xxxi.
98 Deuteronomy xi, 1-32; Josue i, 1-8.
99 2 Kings xxii, 1-22.
103 Psalm xvii, 1-51.
The Manuscript Relationships of Meditation I of St. Anselm

Meditation I of St. Anselm of E.U.L. MS. 93 (Ed.), ff. 90r-95v, is a generally accurate translation of St. Anselm's Latin 'Meditatio ad concitandum timorem'.

Other copies of the Middle English translation include:

(U) University College, Oxford MS. 97, ff. 155v-158v.

(S) British Museum MS. Add. 22283, ff. 116v, cols. a-b - 117r, col. a.


(Li) Bodleian MS. Laud Misc. 174, ff. 85r-88v.

(L) Bodleian MS. Laud Misc. 23, ff. 55r-57v.

(Cb) Cambridge Fitzwilliam Museum MS. Bradfer-Lawrence 8, ff. 7r-9v.

(Ar) British Museum MS. Arundel 197, ff. 3v-6v.

(G2) Glasgow University MS. Hunter 496 (V.7.23), ff. 178v-183v.

1 St. Anselm, 'Meditatio 1', S. Anselmi Opera Omnia, ed. F.S. Schmitt (Edinburgh, 1946), iii, 76-79.

2 Printed by Carl Horstman, Yorkshire Writers: Richard Rolle of Hampole and His Followers (London, 1896), ii, 443-445. Horstman supplies readings from S. For references to the cited manuscripts see 'Manuscripts: Descriptions and Notices'.

3 D.J. Lloyd, 'An Edition of the Prose and Verse in the Bodleian Manuscript Laud Miscellaneous 23' (Yale Univ. Ph.D. thesis 1943), 126-132. Lloyd edited this manuscript from photographs on deposit with the Library of Congress, and was not able to consult the manuscript itself. I have consulted his thesis and the manuscript, and noted the errors in transcription. His edition is essentially a transcription, with emendations being made from the Horstman text; Lloyd's thesis is hereafter cited as 'Thesis MS. Laud Misc. 23'.
As far as I or Dr. Doyle can determine, the above nine manuscripts are the only extant copies of the Middle English translation, and they all are textually related.\(^4\) The following discussion provides the first preliminary analysis of the textual relationships of all the manuscripts, and the different genetic groups are established on the basis of scribal variation in omission, addition, substitution and word order.\(^5\) For a more detailed account of the manuscript relationships and textual variation of U,S,T\(_1\), L\(_1\),L,Cb,Ar,Ed and G\(_2\) see the notes following the text of this treatise. The dialects of the various texts are considered in the dialectal section following this introduction.

I have attempted to keep the following introduction succinct, for the various textual relationships affecting other texts which emerge from a study of this tract receive a more elaborate and systematic treatment in the introduction to The Stathel of Sin (which follows this tract). The present introduction may therefore be looked upon as a preliminary study whose conclusions are amplified in the introduction to The Stathel of Sin.

\(^4\) Dr. A.I. Doyle (personal letter of 24 November, 1974) has informed me that there is a different translation in B.M. MS. Harley 535.

\(^5\) Throughout the following discussion, and in the notes, the terms 'addition', 'omission', 'substitution', and 'word order' are used to describe the various textual differences as they occur between Ed and the other manuscripts to which it is compared. The text of Ed, which is the base text in this edition, is treated as a copy of the treatise Meditation I of St. Anselm, and not the original.
In establishing the priority of some manuscript readings, that is, the process whereby certain readings or variants are thought to be closer to the archetype than others, I have had occasional recourse to the Latin critical text of 'Meditatio I', but that text has only been treated as a general guide, for the Middle English text may well have been a translation of a corrupt or modified Latin exemplar; besides, the scribe of the Middle English archetype from which all the extant copies descend may have taken liberties with the Latin text that a more cautious translator-scribe would have avoided.

The Latin text is however a valuable check, and it has been particularly useful in explaining a few readings contained in one group while absent from another.

Horstman, in his printed edition of 'A ful good meditacion...' (in this thesis The Stathel of Sin) and the Meditation I of St. Anselm, stated that for these tracts (as well as for three others) the 'Simeon MS [S]... in these pieces copies the Univ. Coll. Ms.'

This early opinion has been reaffirmed by Doyle who has noted their closeness, and says of S and its contents

---

6 It should be pointed out, however, that most of the variation among the manuscripts is likely to be due to the vagaries of scribal habit. Recourse to the hypothesis of a defective Latin exemplar is therefore probably needless; it is well, however, to keep the possibility in mind when considering a fairly close translation of a Latin text.

7 Horstman, ii, p. 436.
that 'certain peculiar items may be argued to be derived from Univ. [97] directly . . . '.

U and S are so similar in text against the other manuscripts (that is, in agreements in addition, omission, substitution and word order) that it is apparent that S is probably a copy of U or of a U-like text.

U is probably not a copy of S or of an S-like text, for S has several scribal errors that are not in U, nor are they reproduced elsewhere: at line 43, where UT1L1LEdG2 read 'right', S omits the word; at line 154, where UT1LCb read 'falle bow not' (L1Ar read 'falle not', and EdG2 read 'fall') S omits the entire phrase as UT1LCb have it. There are other minor variations in S: 'is it!'/'it is' is reversed in S at lines 7 and 71; and 'of' replaces 'for', line 190, but these are the kinds of variants likely to occur anywhere in a manuscript, and, indeed, at line 71, LG2Ar agree with S, but little can be made of this, or of the other minor variations.

The burden of proof for U and S's dependence upon the same immediate source must rest, finally, on the evidence of conjunctive and separate variants, those readings that join U and S and separate them from the other manuscripts; the variants that follow are only a sample of the more significant. The most significant variant, given the very close similarity of U and S, is

---

8 A.I. Doyle, 'Appended notes and bibliographical index to a survey of later Middle English theological literature' (Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis 1952), 152.
a conjunctive and separative one: U and S omit the phrase 'þe grete day of þe Lorde it is ful nyȝ', lines 47-48; this phrase, however, appears in the other manuscripts, with minor alterations (see variants to lines 47-48). The omission of these phrases probably came about because 'þe grete' etc. follows the first 'nyȝhe', and the phrase 'and swifte in his comyng' follows the second 'nyȝ'.

The scribes of U and S (or their immediate source(s)) omitted the phrases because of the repetition of the same word a line below. The other manuscripts, however, have the phrase (as does the Latin critical text), and since it occurs in a biblical passage the evidence points toward a scribal error, and one that is confined to U and S.

Again there is agreement between U and S against all other manuscripts at lines 1-2, where they share the same rubric; at line 67, they read 'þei shuld' for 'þou woldest'; at line 68, U and S read 'vanyssh he away' as against variations of 'spitte hem away'/'spit hem from þe'; at lines 84-85, they read 'and alle þat' where the other manuscripts read 'also more nyȝhe þan'.

The list could be extended but it would only confirm what is clear from the above error and readings, and that is that S may well be a faithful copy of U. Alternatively, they may both be faithful copies of the same immediate

---

9 The portion omitted is the opening of Zephaniah 1. 14, and U and S are not usually given to tampering with biblical passages.
source; this possibility would at least account for the
closeness (where they are close) of $T_1 L_1 LCBAREdG_2$ to $US$
in that they could have used the same immediate source,
or one(s) very close to the putative immediate source(s)
of $U$ and $S$.

What does emerge from a study of the variants of all
the manuscripts is the existence of the following genetic
groups: \([(US) (T_1 L_1 L)] [EdG_2] [Cb] [Ar]\); none of the
extant manuscripts is the immediate source of any other,
as is proved by the presence of omissions unique to one
and not passed to another. It is also clear from $U$ and
$S$’s omission, at lines 47-48, that $T_1 L_1 L$, $EdG_2$, $Cb$, and
$Ar$ depend upon immediate sources different from that (or
those) used by $U$ and $S$. That this is so is more clearly
shown by the following substitutions occurring in lines
167-168:

\[
\begin{align*}
EdG_2 & \text{ of } [\text{on } G_2] \text{ what party maist } \text{you draw or}
hold be \\
T_1 L_1 Cb & \text{ in what parte schal he holde hym} \\
US & \text{ where schal he holde hym} \\
L & \text{ omitted}
\end{align*}
\]

The scribe of $Ar$ succumbs, it seems, to homoteleuton and
omits the entire two lines following 'ensegid' and begins
with the portion following 'constreyned'. Although the
above substitutions indicate that $EdG_2$, $T_1 L_1 Cb$, and $US$
depend upon different immediate sources, it is worth
noting that over most of the tract $U, S, T_1, L_1, L, Cb, Ed,$ and
$G_2$ have a great many readings in common.

It can safely be said that $T_1 L_1 LCBEdG_2$, though
textually close to US, are several 'generations' away, for many of the variant readings cannot be explained by independent, coincident variation on the part of the various copyists of the surviving texts. This is particularly true in the case of Ar and Cb, for both manuscripts are defective in many ways: Cb has lengthy omissions from lines 26-30, and from lines 64-86; the former is paralleled in part in Ar from lines 19-30. The scribe of Ar, moreover, chooses to expand the given text, so his copy can be regarded as virtually a different version of the meditation. 10 Unfortunately, the expansions in Ar appear nowhere else so there is little immediate general textual interest in them. Ar, however, may be seen as a surviving example of what could befall the original Middle English translation of Meditation I of St. Anselm.

10 See notes and Appendix I for the interpolations in Ar.
The Scribal Dialects of the Extant Copies of Meditation I of St. Anselm

The section is primarily a summary of the views of Professor M.L. Samuels, and Mr. Michael Benskin on the dialects of the texts of Meditation I of St. Anselm. This section falls into three parts. Part I presents a map of all extant copies of the meditation with their tentative locations so indicated. Part II is a general consideration of these placements, and, in more detail, some of the problems surrounding the placements of Ed, G₂, and L. Part III comprises a linguistic profile of the scribal dialect of Ed, based on an analysis in respect of the 270 items used in Professor McIntosh's questionnaire for a survey of the northern and midland dialects of later Middle English. This profile is a characterisation of Ed's written language, and of use chiefly for taxonomic purposes: it is neither a grammar of the dialect, nor an inventory of all its spellings. This is followed by

---

1 Michael Benskin read and commented on an earlier version of this paper and suggested several major revisions, especially in part II; and as I have incorporated his revisions and amplifications, this dialectal section is best seen as a collaborative effort. I also wish to acknowledge the help of Mr. George Leslie who drew the map.


3 Cf. Angus McIntosh, 'Scribal Profiles from Middle English Texts', N.M. lxxvi (1975), 220.
abstracts from the profile of those items for which, taken in combination, the variant forms are of particular importance both as evidence of dialectal origin in the Central Midlands, and as evidence for more narrowly-defined provenances within this region. 4

I. The Map. It must be noted that the provenances suggested for the dialects of the various scribes are not, in the first instance, geographical: they are relative locations established within an overall matrix of scribal dialects, some of which are of known local origin. Such an ordering, of course, has geographical implications and as has been suggested these implications may amount to fairly well-defined placings. 5 We may be fairly confident that the scribal dialect of Ar belongs to the Warwickshire-Leicestershire border, somewhere in the area about Atherstone, Hinckley and Nuneaton; it is at least unlikely to derive from a place much outside this area. The location of S in northern Worcestershire, somewhere in the vicinity of Bordesley and Alcester is firmer still: there is much material from this and the surrounding area, some of it is localised, and the dialectal peculiarities of S link it particularly closely with a small sub-set of that material. Of the nine extant copies of the Meditation, however,

4 For the principles of localization, see A. McIntosh, 'A New Approach ...', pp. 392-403.
only the above two are written in a language that is both
dialectally consistent and strongly local in character.
With the exception of Ch and L₁, the remainder are in
varying degrees 'colourless', and in some cases may be
dialectally mixed. Thus the locations suggested for these
others are accordingly tentative.

II

What is known of the local origins of the scribal
dialects of the various copies of a given text may combine
with the evidence for their textual relations to yield
a coherent account of the origins and dissemination of
that text, and allow the recovery of a part of its
literary history; however, this account must be qualified.

First, we cannot know that the language of a given
copy is that of the scribe who wrote it: an exact, or
'mirror', copyist would replicate the text before him,
thus producing a copy of a text which displays the dialectal
characteristics of the exemplar and not those of the
抄写者.

Second, we cannot be sure, even when the language of
a given copy is indeed that of its scribe, that the scribe
produced the copy in the same place as that in which he
acquired his written language: that is, the scribal
dialect tells us very little about where the copy was made.
Thus, the geographical implications of scribal dialect
are, in theory, independent of the geographical distribu-
tion of a text. However, in practice, as may be expected,
there is quite commonly agreement between the textual critic's groupings and the geographical distribution of the several copies of a text; but even here care must be taken as to the kinds of logical conclusions that may be drawn: the one cannot in any sense be said to confirm the other. Where the textual groupings run counter to the dialectal groupings, we have to accept that there is no coherence between them. Such a finding may lead us to reexamine our textual and dialectal groupings and to refine our observations, but the observation that a copy C belongs textually to a group of copies known to have been made in, for example, London, cannot, as a matter of principle, refute the observation that the dialect of C belongs to, for example, Durham. Scribes and manuscripts travelled, and in one remove a quite different textual tradition could be introduced into an area where many copies had already been made by local scribes from some other version of the same text. These factors must be considered, and they qualify our evidence: thus, if textual relations are inadmissible as falsification of dialectal provenance, then they cannot be used to confirm it when they agree. Their agreement or disagreement merely allows a coherent and fuller story to be told.

From consideration of the textual variants in the extant copies of Meditation I of St. Anselm, the following groups emerge (see the introduction to Meditation I, above):
For the dialects of Ed, G₂, and L, competing locations have emerged, and we are at present unable to choose between them. The following points should be considered:

(1) The Meditation is a very short text, and its yield of dialoctal information, when analyzed using the present questionnaire, is rather small. As a result, it may be that some of the present uncertainties arise from using too small a sample of the scribal dialect in question; the profiles obtained so far may be insufficiently detailed. For G₂ and L, additional information, drawn from other texts written by the same scribes and dialectally consistent with their texts of the Meditation, may resolve the difficulty; however our uncertainty over Ed remains, because additional information, drawn from analyses of all the other texts, has already been exploited for these purposes.

(2) In principle, it is possible that the scribal dialects of Ed, G₂, and L are not internally consistent, and rather than representing some genuinely local usage, they may be hybrids that have arisen in the course of copying by scribes who in part reproduced the dialect of their exemplars, and in part substituted the forms appropriate
to their own. Except in the special case presented by Central Midland Standard (see I, below), this is unlikely to provide the correct explanation. The scribal dialects of these manuscripts do not display the large number of functionally-equivalent variants that characterises a thorough-going Mischsprache; nor (with the possible exception of L) can they be split into the two or three dialectal sub-sets, each assignable to some one area separate from the others, that characterise a 'layered' text (or incipient Mischsprache). Our present analyses of the dialects of G₂ and L are admittedly not very extensive; but that for Ed is comprehensive, and apart from one or two northernly relict forms in Rolle's Twelve Chapters of Perfection (Emendatio Vitae), and one or two forms that are possible western relicts in other texts, the language of Ed is evidently the usage of some one scribe. In G₂, the form bus 'these' is assumed to be relict from a westerly exemplar (which may not be proximate). In L, similar origin for bus is assumed, which allows placing in northern Buckinghamshire; but if _owns_ 'own', adj. and _hors_ 'through' are similarly accounted for, then the placing in Bedfordshire is open. Further analysis is needed to determine the extent of the relict stratum.

---

(7) The dialects of these three copies may be
accommodated, in varying degrees, to Central Midland
Standard, and thus present a problem similar to that
confronting a modern dialectologist who attempts to
localize the speech of someone whose local accent has
been modified by contact with speakers of Received
Pronunciation. Central Midland Standard was probably not
identical with any one local dialect, but it was
sufficiently like the local scribal dialects of a large
part of the Central Midlands for there to be widespread
interference and contamination in the language of texts
copied by Central Midland scribes from Central Midland
exemplars. The dialects of Edward are evidently of
this Central Midland type. Moreover, within the Central
Midlands there are, in any event, quite large areas over which
little dialectal variation has so far been observed, and
the difficulty of placing 'colourless' material is com-
pounded. Evidence is now emerging that attention to the
finer detail of orthography may go some way toward
resolving such difficulties; it is also likely that the
questionnaire used for the present analyses, and the
maps so far available, are inadequate for these purposes.
It is now apparent that it will require much further
work before any firmer placings can be expected for the
dialects of these copies of the Meditation.

7 M.L. Samuels, 'Some Applications of Middle English
Dialectology', English Studies xlv (1963), 81-94, rpt. in Approaches to English Historical Linguistics, see especially pp. 407-415.
Of the other manuscripts, the following should be noted.

(4) The placing of T, in central Warwickshire is Michael Benskin's conclusion. Professor Samuels considers that the forms *swech* 'such', *wordel* 'world', *baw(n)e* 'then' and *put* 'yet', which are not typical in that area, point farther south or south-west; but such a provenance would square less well with some of the other forms that are well-accommodated in central Warwickshire. It is possible that T₁ exemplifies a 'two-layer' text, and if this is the case then further analysis is needed.

(5) U is apparently mixed, but identification of the separate 'layers' is far from clear. The best that can be said in favour of the provenance here suggested is that there is a fairly substantial component that can be placed, as a single assemblage, in this part of western Worcestershire; and that the form *meny(e)* 'many', if it belongs to the same dialectal 'layer' as *luytel* and related spellings, points rather strongly in this direction.

For U we also have some documentary evidence of ownership which connects it with a William Counter who was 'presented to the living of Pirton in Worcestershire', 8 a village lying about 14 miles to the west of the area suggested for S. In addition to this there is a close literary connexion between U and S, for both manuscripts

---

contain many of the same treatises, three of which — 'The Five Wounds', 'Exposition of the Lord's Prayer', and John Clanvowe's treatise 'The Two Ways' — are extant only in U and S. This evidence, of course, can in no way confirm the placing of the scribal dialect of U, but it does allow us to suggest, with somewhat more confidence, that if we assume a local scribe the placing of U in northern Worcestershire may be the most reasonable approach to take. The problem of 'layering', however, remains, and more work on the various dialectal components is required before a firm placing of the scribal dialect is possible.

In this consideration of the scribal dialects of the Meditation I have merely sketched the outlines for a more thorough and much larger study: some of the problem areas have been identified, but a great deal more work on the scribal dialects of the Central Midlands is required before more than tentative solutions can be suggested.  


10 I wish to acknowledge, here, the help and generous assistance of Professor M.L. Samuels and Michael Bonskin for their analyses and placings of the scribal dialects of the Meditation.
The relative frequencies of the variant forms for a given item are here represented by the use of round brackets. Forms not enclosed in round brackets are dominant; forms enclosed in a single set are (secondary variants); and forms enclosed in a double set are ((minor variants)), in some cases occurring once only. For any item, there may be two or more variants having the same frequency: thus, for example, 'both' admits boikh (boith, boithe, bope, boik). Square brackets are used to condense information: thus, for example, deth[e] implies both deth and dethe. The forms implied by any one representation in which square brackets are used have always the same relative frequency: thus ((fra[m])) implies both ((frem)) and ((frah)). Hyphens are editorial, and indicate either a space between elements of a single word-item (for example, by-fore for Ms. by fore), or an element abstracted from some larger word (for example, bisy- from bisynea). Transcription is diplomatic, and standard expansions are used.
A profile of the dialect of Ed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key word</th>
<th>Forms for entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 the</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 these</td>
<td>these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 those</td>
<td>those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 she</td>
<td>she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 her</td>
<td>her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 it</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 they</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 them</td>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 their</td>
<td>their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 such</td>
<td>such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 which</td>
<td>which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 each</td>
<td>each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 many</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 man</td>
<td>man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 any</td>
<td>any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 -and</td>
<td>-and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 'much'</td>
<td>'much'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 are</td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This profile represents an ordered copy of an analysis made by completing a questionnaire designed for use with northern and midland dialects of English; for a discussion of the McIntosh-Samuels profile see Angus McIntosh, 'Scribal Profiles from Middle English Texts', pp. 219-223.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key word</th>
<th>Forms for entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 were</td>
<td>wer (war)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 is</td>
<td>is (his)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 was</td>
<td>was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 shall g.</td>
<td>shal (shall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 shall p.</td>
<td>shullen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 would g.</td>
<td>wold (wolde)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 would p.</td>
<td>wolden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 will g.</td>
<td>wil; 2sg wilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 will p.</td>
<td>wolle[ e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 'gar' etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 'ta' etc.</td>
<td>mak-, tak-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 'til' + sb.</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 'til' + inf.</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 from</td>
<td>fro, from (frome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 after</td>
<td>after (after)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 then</td>
<td>pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 than</td>
<td>pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 though</td>
<td>though (though)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 if</td>
<td>if (Iff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 as</td>
<td>as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 against</td>
<td>ayens (aye, aye, ayenst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 before g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 since</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 yet</td>
<td>yit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 while, conj. rel.</td>
<td>willis (whil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 afterwards</td>
<td>afterward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 'at' rel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key word Forms for entry

46 strength strenk(e) (strenkith, strenk-
47 death deeth (deth[s])
48 earth erth-
49 wh- wh-
50 not not
51 nor ne (nor)
52 a/ο o
53 world world; worlde-
54 think thynk- thenk- (penk)
55 work v. worches
56 pres. part. -ving
57 there þere (þer)
58 where where (wher)
59 sb. pl. -es, -is (-a) (-ys)
60 might v. myght (myghten)
61 through þorough (through, þorous, þorowgh)
62 when when (whan)
63 pres. ñeg. -ith (-eth) (-yth)
64 pres. pl. -en (-yn)
65 weak pt. -ed, -id
66 weak ppl. -id (-ed) (-yd)
67 str. ppl. -en (-yne)
68 give y-
69 about adv.
70 about pr. about[e]
71 above adv. aboue
72 above pr.
Key word Forms for entry

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>-aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>-amb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>among adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>among pr. among</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>-ang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>-ank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>answer sb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>answer v. answer[e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>ask ax-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>away awayy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>been be[ne]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>before adv-t. biforn, before (biforme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>before pr-t. by-fore, byfore, biforme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>before adv-p. be-fore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>before pr-p. before, by[-]fore, biforme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>began (to) began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>behoves bihoueth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>beneath adv. byneth, byneipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>beneath pr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>between pr. betwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>blessed blessid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>both boipe (boith, boithe, boipe, boipe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>brother broper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>busy adj. bisy[-] «byse-»</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key word</td>
<td>Forms for entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 busy v.</td>
<td>bisie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 but</td>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 by</td>
<td>by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 call ('name')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 came sg.</td>
<td>cam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 came pl.</td>
<td>came</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 can</td>
<td>can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 cast</td>
<td>cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 choose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 church</td>
<td>chirche (chyrche)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 could</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 daughter</td>
<td>daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 day</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 die pres.</td>
<td>dye, di-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 die pt.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 did pt.</td>
<td>sg. did-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 did pt.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116 -dom</td>
<td>-dom[e]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 down</td>
<td>down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118 east</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 eight</td>
<td>eist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 eighth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 either (of)</td>
<td>eipir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 either (or)</td>
<td>eipor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 eleven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 eleventh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key word</td>
<td>Forms for entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>-or (gen.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>-est (supl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>eye sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>eye pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>fight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>flesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>fowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>-full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>grow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key word</td>
<td>Forms for entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>heaven  heuen (( heuyn))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>hell  hell (hel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>high  high, high-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>him  hym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>holy  holy (( holi))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>-hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>how  how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>-ing (vbl. sh.) -ynge ((-ynge))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>k (for usual c) ((k))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>know  know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>laugh v. laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>law  lawe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>less  lasse, lesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>-less  -les, -lis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>life  life ((lyfe))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>little  litil ((litel))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>live v. lyue[-] ((lue))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>lord  lorde ((lord))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>love sh.  loue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>love v.  loue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>low  lowe, low-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>-ly  -ly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>may v.  may ((mai)); 2ag maist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key word</td>
<td>Forms for entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>'mon' etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>my + cons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>my + h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>my + vow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>name sb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>neither (of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>neither (nor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>-ness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>nigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>nine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>ninth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>one adj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>one pron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>ought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key word</td>
<td>Forms for entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own</td>
<td>own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>peple (pepl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>poor[es], pore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pray</td>
<td>pray (pray-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td>pres. say, sai- (say[-])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see</td>
<td>pres. se[-]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seek</td>
<td>seke, sek-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self</td>
<td>sif ((self))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven</td>
<td>seuen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seventh</td>
<td>seueneth (seuenyth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ship</td>
<td>-shyp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin sb.</td>
<td>symne (syn, synn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin v.</td>
<td>sym- , syne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>six[es]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sixth</td>
<td>sixt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>some (sum, summe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son</td>
<td>sone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorrow sb.</td>
<td>sorowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorrow v.</td>
<td>sorow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soul</td>
<td>soule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>south</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>star</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key word  Forms for entry

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>stead   sted-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>ten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>tenth   teneth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>thee    ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>third   thrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>thou    pou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>thousand thousand-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>three   thre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>thy + cons. ye (thy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>thy + h  pine (thyne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>thy + vow. pin[e] (thyn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>together to-gedur, to-gedir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>true    trew-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>twelfth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>twelve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>twenty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>two     two, toweyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>upon    vpon ( upon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>'wate'  (know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>way     wey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>well adv. wele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>went    went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>whether wheber ( wheber)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>hither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key word</td>
<td>Forms for entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>thither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>whither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>without adv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>without pr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>worship sb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>worship v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here appended to this profile of Ed is a shorter list of forms indicative of Midland and Central Midland scribal dialects.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{Midland and Central Midland Dialectal Characteristics}

\textbf{Midland indicators}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Key word} & \textbf{Form(s)} \\
they & \textit{bei} ((\textit{thei}, \textit{be})) \\
them & \textit{hem} \\
their & \textit{her} ((\textit{here})) \\
each & \textit{ech}e \\
are & \textit{bene} ((\textit{ben})) \\
pres. 2sg. & \textit{-ith} ((\textit{-ath}), (\textit{-yth})) \\
pres. pl. & \textit{-en} ((\textit{-yn})) \\
\end{tabular}

\textbf{Central Midland discriminators}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
such & \textit{suche}, \textit{siche} \\
each & \textit{ech}e \\
any & \textit{eny} \\
much & \textit{myche} \\
are & \textit{bene} ((\textit{ben})) \\
after & \textit{aftir}, \textit{aftir} ((\textit{after})) \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{12} This list was compiled with the help of Michael Borskin. For maps of some Central Midland forms see M.L. Samuels, 'Some applications... ', pp. 404-418.
if
before a.
strength
nor
think
sb. pl.
might v.
through
ask
both
either (of)
eye pl.
father
mother
neither (nor)
old
or
say pt. etc.
self
stead
thousand
well adv.

if (Iff)
before o.
strenke\) ((strenkith, strenk)\-))
nor (nor)
thynk\-, thenk\- (\yenk)
-es, -is (-s) (-ys)
myght (myghten)
borough (through, borow, borowen)
ax-
boi\(s) (boyth, boithe, bo\(s), boi\)
-eir
y\(en, y\(es, i\(en, i\)en
fadre (fader, fadir)
moder (modre)
nei\(er
olde
or
said, sayd[e], sayd
silf (self)
sted-
thousand-
wel\(e)
Here ... anselmo (1. 2)] heere is a good meditacion, the which seynt anselme maade US; S. Austine is seynge Ar; om. T. 'pe meditacions] a meditacion L L; 'pe meditacion CbG2.

My] 0 my Cb. sore] so sore G2. whan] UST1L1LCbG2Ar; om. Ed.

serche it bisely] bisyli enserche it UST1L1LCbAr.


wele nyghe] durynge Ar.


Ed.

serche it bisely] bisyli enserche it UST1L1LCbAr.


wele nyghe] durynge Ar.


Ed.

serche it bisely] bisyli enserche it UST1L1LCbAr.


wele nyghe] durynge Ar.


Ed.

serche it bisely] bisyli enserche it UST1L1LCbAr.


wele nyghe] durynge Ar.


Ed.
Here bigynneth pe meditacion of seynt anselme. [f. 90r]

My life ferith me sore for [whan] I serche it bisely it semyth to me eiper in syn or without fr'u'yte wele nyghe all my life. And if eny tyme eny fruyt be seen perin, yit it is pan as feyned or vnperfite, or in some maner corrupte, so pat eiper it may not plese 5 god as it shuld, or els it fully displesith hym. Therfore now pou synful wriche bi life not wele nyghe all, but fully all, eiper it is in syn & dampnable, or it is vn- [f. 90v] fruytfu/ and dis isable. But wher to make 10 I [departison] bytwix vnfruytfu/ and dampnable, for it is certeyn & trow pat tre- wth sayde hymself, Every tre pat makith not good fruyt shalbe cut down & cast
UST₁L₁Cb. Verrily... men (1.30)] Ar: see Appendix I.
20 do] do outrely UST₁L₁; ouctirly L; vitirly G₂.
account ... nought] accountid not good fruyt L₁. at]
om. UST₁L₁; as Cb.
21 body] my body Cb.
22 But] ffor whi Cb. who] who is he ḟat Cb.
24 coste] costi G₂. wasteth UST₁L₁L₁; schalle waste
UST₁L₁L₁CbG₂.
25 an] pin UST₁L₁L₁Cb.
26 synne] synne, and wel I may seie stynkyng in synne
UST₁L₁G₂. ffor ... men (1.30)] om. Cb.
27 to] vnto T₁.
28 ḟan a] ḟan is a UST₁L₁L₁G₂. to] vnto T₁.
29 lathesome] wlatsum UST₁L₁L₁G₂.
30 is] om. G₂.
31 clepe] say Ar. ḟe] y Ar. no] om. L₁; an no Ar.
32 vile] fouler Cb.
33 and] om. G₂. ḟan caryen] ḟan a careyne UST₁L₁L₁CbAr.
My] Myn L₁.
35 for to] to Cb. ḟgu] I UST₁L₁L₁CbAr.
36 ḟgu] y Ar. now do] do nowe G₂. 0 ḟou synner] om.
Ar 0] And U; A ST₁L₁; om. L₁CbG₂.
37 certis] sertemiy Ar. not] no Cb. ḟat] 'ḥat' S;
om. L₁L₁. ḟat all] alle ḟat Cb. life] lyf at dyuere
tymys Ar.
38 all ... is (1.39)] Ar: see Appendix I. ḟat it]
at 'ḥit' L₁. all wepe] om. all G₂; al ḟou vnkepe Cb.
39 also] om. G₂. soule] soul is Ar. wondirfully
wrecchid (1.49)] wrecchidly wondirful, and wondirfully
wrecchide UST₁L₁; wrecchidely synfully & wonderfully
wrecchide L₁; wrecchidli wondirfully and wondirfully
wrecchched Cb.
into þe fire. Verrily what profitable
thynge þat I do I acount it at nought
for to answere to þe sustynance of body
þat I mysuse. But who fedith any beste
þe whiche profitithe not as my[c]he as it
coste? O mercyful god pou norishyst & fedist
a abydist an unprofitable worme and
stynkyng in synne, ffor withouten company-
son more suffrable is a roten hound to
men þan a synful soule to god, and myche
more lathesome is siche a soule to god
30 þan is siche a hound to men. Alas alas
now may I clepe þe no man but shame
and repreue of all men more vile þan a
beste and worse þan caryen. My soule
is sore anoied of my life, I am sore
35 ashamed for to lyue and dye dar þou not, [f. 91r]
þerfore what shalt þo now do? O þou synner
certis not but þat all þi life þou wepe
all þi life, so þat it all wepe it all. But
yit in þis also is þi synful soule wondir-
288

41 so] as Ar. or myght know] om. UST₁L₁LcbAr.
42 pat] om. Ar. For ṭi ... right (1. 47)] om. Cb. For ṭi] Dat ṭus UST₁L₁L; and 'it' Ar. siker] om. Ar.
43 right as] om. right S; as thowe Ar. what] what ṭat L.
44 is] were UST₁L₁Lg₂Ar. doist] thynkest Ar. ṭan] ṭou UST₁Ar; now L₁; om. L.
45 Why ... soule (1. 46)] om. L. sloughte] slough UST₁L₁Lg₂Ar.
46 synful] ṭow synful UST₁L₁; to do gode dedus ṭou synfulle Ar. of doʊe] of ṭi doom UST₁L₁LAr. commeth] cometh the fast a.pon ṭe Ar.
47 right ... is (1. 48)] om. Ar. right] om Cb. ṭe ... nyṣ (1. 48)] om. US. ṭe lorde] oure lord T₁L₁Lcb.
48 is] It is T₁L₁LcbG₂Ar. in his] om. L₁.
49 A ... ṭat day] ṭat is ṭe day of wrethe Ar. wrath] waṭe Cb. ṭis ṭat] it is ṭat G₂. a] ṭe Ar.
51 a day of myst ... clarionynge (1. 53)] a daie of trompe and clarionynge, a daie of mist and of derkenes, a daie of cloud and of whirlewynde G₂. a] ṭe Ar.
52 a] ṭe Ar. cloude] cloudis Ar. whirlewynde] whorelle wyndis Ar.
53 a] ṭe Ar. trumpe] trumpetis Ar. clarionynge] clarnoris Ar.
54 bitter] sharpe & kene Ar. ṭat ... ṭe (1. 55)] owre lorde Ar. ṭat] ṭe UST₁L₁Lcb.
55 Whi ... deed (1. 59)] Ar: see Appendix I. slepist ṭou] slepist ṭou ṭow UST₁L₁Lcb.
56 lathyd] wlated UST₁L₁LcbG₂.
57 Who] ffor who UST₁L₁Lcb.
59 slepith] slepis not at so grette a pounder, certis he slepif not Cb. luyynge] om. UST₁L₁Lcb.
60 tree] tree, wheer been ṭi [pey Cb] fraytes. Thow tree UST₁L₁LcbG₂; tre, where bethe ṭe gode frutis ṭat ṭou bringgiste furthe, ṭou tre Ar. art] were L.
40 fully wrechid by cause þat it sorowith not so myche as it knowith, or myght know þat it shulde. For þi it slepith siker in slouthe right as it knew not what it is worthy to suffre. What doist þou, þam bareyn soule? Why art þou so sloughte synful soule? þe day of dome commeth it is right nyghe, þe grete day of þe lorde is ful nyʒ and swifte in his commynge:

A day of wrath is þat day, a day of troublable and of angwysh, a day of care & of wrechidnes, a day of myst and of derknes, a day of cloude and of whirlweyne, a day of trumpe and of clari-nynge. 0 þat bitter vois of þat dredefu day of þe lorde. Whi slepist þou synful soule and worthy to be lathyd, Why slepist þou? Who so wakith not and who [f. 91v]

so quakithe not at so grete a thundre, certis he slepith not but he lyuynge is deed.

60 þou vnfruytful tree, þat art worthy
and ... brent] & to be cast into pe fyre & brente Ar.

Soythly] certis Cb; truly Ar. [you haste] þe by bethe. Ar.

not] no noþer Ar. [þat is] and UST1L1LCbAr.

þe ... god (1. 86)] om. Cb. wolde god þat] þat wolde god Ar.

þorough] by UST1LAr. þorough forthynkynge] byfor þenkyng þe L1. forthynkynge] sore contricion & repentans Ar.

broken] alto brokyn Ar. in þe] om. UST1L1LAr. and wold god þat] And so schulden US.


spit hem from þe] varyssche away US; spitte hem away T1L1; spit hem away L1; spete þem owte fro þe Ar.' gessist] weneþ UST1LAr; woldest L1.

some] eny US; þi Ar. be] alle way 'be' Ar. lítel] but litulle Ar. þat] om. T1L1LAr.


is it] hit is SLG2Ar. soyth] so UST1L1LAr. þat ... lítel (1. 75)] Ar: see Appendix I.

by] MS.: be; be L1. goddis hestys] þe heste of god T1L1LG2. vnworshipith] vnworship G2.

yis what] om. yis S.

þan dar] perfors dar T1; dar þanne L. a] eny US. is] þat is UST1; þat it is L. whan he vnworshipith] whanne it vnworschipe LG2; whan to vnworschipe T1L1; forte vnworschip U; for forte vnworschipe S.

how] whanne UST1L1L. is it] it is LG2; om. it L1.

tree and vnprofitable] and vnprofitable tree US. worthy] and worþi Ar. to] om. Ar.

what ... answer] what ãnswer wilte þou geue Ar. answer] MS. as 'answre.

þat] þilke US. day] dreedefulle day Ar. whan ... at (1. 79)] om. Ar.

at þe] to þe UST1L1L; for with þe Ar. all ... god (1. 86)] Ar: see Appendix I.
an ax and a fire, worthy to be knit & brennt,
where bene bi fruytes? Scothly þou hast
not by prickynge thornes, þat is bitter
synnes, þe whiche wolde god þat þei prickid

be so sore þorough forthynkyng þat þei
wer broken, in þe, and wold god þat þei
wold wex so bitter in þe þat þou woldest
spit hem from þe. Perauenture þou gessist
þat some syn be litel, but wold god þat

þe streyt domesman wold hold any syn
lilit. But alas is it not soyth þat all syn
by brekynge of goddis hestys vnworship-
pith god? Yis sikerly yis what synne
þan dar a synner sey is lilit? Whan he vn-
worshippith god how is it lilit? 0 þou
dry tree and unprofitable worthy to

euerlastynge fire, what shalt þou an-
swere in þat day when it shalbe axid
of þe at þe twynkylynge of an yse all
80 of þi life] of lyuyng þeuen to þe UST1L1L. þou] UST1L1G2; om. Ed. hast] hast spen L.
81 soythly] om. US.
82 foundyn] founded in þee L1T1LG2. of yuel] om. UST1L1LG2.
83 in] of UST1L1LG2. sloouth] s louf' L. speche] woord UST1L1L.
84 also more nyghe þan (1. 85)] and of alle þat US.
85 þan] þat T1L1L. lyuynge] 1-lyuyn US.
87 schal] schullen UST1L1LCbG2. shall brest] seer wilie arixe & breste Ar. out] vp UST1L1LcbG2Ar. vnwarne] without any warnyng UST1L1LCb; without any warnyng Ar.
89 whiche] þe whiche UST1L1LCbAr. knowist] seest UST1L1LCb; seist fulle litul Ar. not] om. Ar.
90 Certis ... suffrid (1. 100)] Ar: see Appendix I. moo] for moo UST1L1LCbG2; fe'il mo L. ferdeful] gryslly US.
91 ben] þene U; þulke ben S. synnes] om. UST1L1LCb. knowist] seest UST1L1L; seest þe CB.
92 synnes] om. UST1L1LCb. gessist] wenest UST1L1LCb. now] om. UST1L1LCb.
93 not in charge] not suele SUT1L1LCb. how] þe how CB. dedis] om. UST1L1LCb.
95 moste derk] aitherderkest US; most derkest L1LCb; derkest T1. for] Theere UST1L1LCb.
96 dowte] om. CB. þerin] om. UST1L1LCb.
98 in body] in þi bodi T1L1LCb; with þi body US. Than as now] for þanne as now is CB. not] not be tym of mercy. Thanne as now schal no UST1L1L; not be tym of mercy neiþer þanne as now is schalle no CB.
101 art ... resseyue] shalte resseeue Ar. what ... do (1. 102)] om. Ar.
102 do] doen L. þou ... þe (1. 103)] þei been UST1L1LCbAr.
80 what so ever may be foundyn of yuel in werk or of slouth, of speche, or of silence to be leste thought, yee also more
nygte pan pou haste lyued if it haue not be dressid to pe wil of god. Alas how many synnes shal brest out hera unwarred as it wer enemyes li gynge in awayte whiche pou knowist not now?
85 Certis moo and h p ily more ferdeful pan bene pies synnes pat pou knowist now. How many synnes pou gessist now bene not in charge? ow many dedis pou gessist now be good openly shal shew hem to be moste derk synnes? For without dowte pou shalt resseyue perin body & soule as pou haste wroght hem in body. Than as nw shal not for-thynkyng be resseyued, ne any amend-ment suffrid. Tynke erfore here what pou art worthy to resseyue par and what pou haste do. If pou through goddis
goodis] gode dedis Ar.

yuels] eville Ar. \(\text{pat ... not (1. 109)}\] make muche tike. \(\text{if dei [per L]}\) ben mony [om. U] euelles [eville Ar] and fewe goodes mak muche serve \(\text{SUT}_1L_1\) CbAr. cunynge & [om. G_2].


0] \(L_1\): space left for capital.

wrechid] vnproufitable \(\text{UST}_1L_1\) Lcb; om. Ar. whe\(\text{per}\] where Ar. thynge] warmynges Ar.

in \(\text{pe}\] om. Ar. hidous] hydonesse Cb.

grete] om. Ar. sorow] gronyng \(\text{gronynges L}\] in sorwe \(\text{UST}_1L_1\); gronyngynge and sorowe \(\text{[sorwys Ar]}\) CbAr. whe\(\text{per}\] where Ar.

to draw] forto drawe \(\text{UST}_1L_1\) LAr. out of] fro Ar. \(\text{pe}\] om. Ar. mer\(\text{pe}\] \(\text{T}_1\) Ar.

\& ... wepynges] \& lern for to dye Ar. wepynges \(\text{UST}_1L_1\) Lcb. cursid] for cursed Ar.

wrechid ... hammers (1. 116)] grosse a hevy symmis \(\text{pat}\) \(\text{pes hammers Ar. whiche]}\] \(\text{pe whiche \(\text{UST}_1L_1\) Lcb. }\) \(\text{bus]}\) \(\text{pat L.}\)

hammers] om. Cb. for to brake] to bete downe Ar. 0] And SAr.

ouer dullyd] dede Ar. whiche] \(\text{pe whiche \(\text{UST}_1\) Lcb; whiche}\) \(\text{pe L}_1; \) \(\text{pat Ar. }\) \(\text{bus]}\) \(\text{pesa G}_2\) Ar;

for to] to Ar. stirre] fer G_2; a wake up Ar. Alas] Alias alias L.

whiche] \(\text{pe whiche \(\text{UST}_1\) Lcb; for }\) \(\text{pe whiche Ar; whiche is }\) G_2. so] \(\text{bus L}_1\) Lcb; \(\text{bis Ar.}\)

ferdeful] grisly US; om. Ar. a] om. LAr. is] G_2; see l. 119. to horse] a hors G_2; ordeyned Ar. for to] for L; to Ar.

caitife synner] vnproufitable synnere \(\text{UST}_1L_1\) LcbAr. \(\text{pres}]\) yous; \(\text{fise \(\text{UST}_1\) Lcb.}\)

be to \(\text{pe}\] be 'y'nowe to be Ar. cause ... But (1. 125)] Ar: see Appendix I. cause] om. \(\text{UST}_1L_1\) Lcb. euer] euer euer U. to] forto \(\text{UST}_1L_1\) LcbG_2.

sorow] waymentynge US. and] om. \(\text{UST}_1L_1\).
grace fyndyst in be many goodis and few
yuels pat pou ne haste after bi cunynge &
power amendid hem pou haste than grete
cause to joy, but loke bi joy be temperid with
drede. And if pou perseyuest in be many yuels
& few goodis pou haste cause of myche [sorow]
but of goddis mercy dispeyre pou not. O

110 pou wrechid synner wheber pese thynges
sufficen not to be to make in be hidous
and grete sorow, wheber these thyngys
sufficen not to be to draw out of be me-
row & blode in wepyng, cursid be pat

115 wrechid hardnes whiche bus heuy
hamers bene to light for to brake. O
pat ouer dullyd alewth whiche bus sharp
prickis bene to blont for to stirre. Alas
for sorow of pat dede slepe whiche so

120 ferdeful a thundir is to horse for to a-
wake. O pou caftife synner pese thyng-
es shuld be to be cause ouer to continew
in sorow and pese thynges oughten

[f. 93r]
for to] to USLCb. to be] see US. euer more] euer

wepynge] wepynes USCh. shal] shulde Ar. I ... stil
(1. 126)] y be saymyngly stille Ar.

be] om. L1, and] om. Ar. styele] to stelle Ar.
from] fro US1LG2Ar.

of be ... silf (1. 136)] Ar: see Appendix I.


whiche] be whiche US1L1Lcb. rise] thanne aryse US
T1L1Lcb. auysement] eny auysement US1L1LcbG2.

hastely] hastif US1L; hasty L1CB. wondfull]
so wonderful US1L1CB.

certys ... silf (1. 136)] om. cb. wrecched] wykkede
US1L1L.

pis] pese G2. spedith] spe\'k\'i\p L. to] om. L.

if] hou; US. it may not] set may it not US.

rekened] lykned US1L1LG2. yuel] hing US1L1L. it]

nymght] 'nist' Ar. and ... maist (1. 138)] to redeme
be false forfetis of bi fraelle yowthe Ar. be] to be
US1L1Lcb. hou without sorow] stille US1L1Lcb.

if ... maist] om. US1L1Lcb.

weght] to weistc US1L1Lcb. sorow] a sorwe US1L1
G2Ar.

ferdnes vpon ferdnes] and fe] om. fere Ar. woo]
and woo US1L1LAr; and, [om. woo] cb.

for] ffor with T1CBAr. fallith] belongethe Ar.

to] for to T1L1LcbAr. what ... wrathid (1. 151)]
Ar: see Appendix I. trespassour] trespass L.


And ... yolden] And to whom I selde US1L1L; and to
whom we selde asen cb.
for to suffice to be evermore to snobbe by-
sely in wepynge. But wherto shal Isey-
nyngly be stil, and steyle any thynge from
be ysen of my soule of be heuynes and
gretnes of my wrechid youthe, in payne
of whiche per shal rise withouten auys-
ment so hastely sorows & wondirfull
woos pat sodeynly of hem per shal grow
an vnsuffrable tempest. Certys pou wrechid
synne all pis spedith not to be & nepeles
if I sey all pat I may thynke, it may not
by rekened to pat, pat be yuel is in it
sift. Perfore let pine ysen wepe by day &
by nyght and neuer be pou without sorow.
If pou bithynke be wele pou maist put
weght vpon weght, sorow vpon sorow,
ferdenee vpon ferdnes, woo vpon woo.
For he shal deme be to whom it fallith
to punyshe what pat any trespassour
or any inobedient to god synneth, be
whiche hathe euere yolden to me good for
yuel. And I to hym haue euere yolden yuel [f. 93v]

125
130
135
140
145
moste] be mooste UST1L1LCb.

moste] be mooste UST1L1LCb.

moste] be mooste UST1L1L; is be mooste Cb. & om. UST1. moste] be mooste UST1L1L; schal be be moost Cb.

Alas] Alias alias UST1L1L; om. good] om. UST1L1LCb.

be] om. UST1L1LG2.

wra] G2. 0] A ST1L1; moste UST1L1LL; is be moost Cb. & om. T1. how] and how CbAr.

doo, To whom haue I doo UST1LCbAr. how ... doon] om. T1. how] and how CbAr.

pow. almyghti] om. UT1L1LCbAr. I ... it (1. 154)] om. UT1L1LCbAr. I ... almyghti (1. 156)] om. S.

fall.] falle pow not UT1LCb; falle not L1Ar. vpon] on Cb. 0 ... me (1. 155)] om. UT1L1LCbAr.

ou] be G2.

om. Ch. allmyghty] moste dreedefulleste domysman Ar. ou] bi ponishment Ar.

Certis] for Ar. me] al me UST1L1LCbG2Ar.

"he" L; om. Ar. 0] A ST1L1LCb; om. Ar. angwishes] angwysshe of he Ar.

and anoies G2; om. Ar. in crist dome] in cristis dome G2; om. UST1L1LCb; in pat day of bi grete dome Ar. shal be] schullen panne bee US; panne schullen T1L1LCb; panne schulde be L. 'Vp' on he] For on pat US; ffor on he Ar; On pat T1L1LCb.

oon] to G2; tone Ar. vpon] on UT1L1LCb; And on S; & in Ar.

pat] be Ar. rightwisnes] ristfulnesse UST1L1LAr. sore] me sore Ar.

open] be opene UST1L1LCbAr.

above] above be Cb. wrathful] most dreedefulle Ar. within] within be Ar.

ferynge] fretynge G2; smertynge UST1L1LCbAr. withoute] And withoute UST1L1L; And wiPoute bee CbAr.
for good, the whiche is now moste suffryng
and the shalbe moste vengynge, now
moste mercyful, & the moste rightful.
Alas to whome haue I synned good god?

150 I haue vnworshippid the. the allmyghty
I haue wrathid. 0, I wrechid synner what
haue I done, how yuel haue I doon? Alas
the wrath of the allmyghty, I haue deser-
uyd the it fall vpon me. 0 good god

155 the mercy let it fall vpon me, thou wrath
of the allmyghty where maist thou beta-
ken in me. Certis the is no thynge in me
the may suffre the. 0 the angwishes
& noies the in crist dome shal be. 'Vp'on the

160 oon side shalbe synnes accusynge, vpon
the othre side streit rightwisnes sore af-
rynge, bynethe open derknes of hell,
aboue the wrathful domes man, within
a ferynge conscience, withoute the bren-
vnphis \ vnnethe \ of hard T_1\ 1\ L; \ and so vnneth \ and of hard Cb; \ pat ful \ vnnethe \ of harde Ar. \ pen\ om. UST_1\ 1\ LCBAr. \ he] \ a Cb. \ rightwiseman] \ ristful man Cb; \ ristwys US.

166 \ A UST_1\ 1\ LCB; \ Alas \ pen \ a Ar. \ you wrechid] om. UST_1\ 1\ LCBAr.

167 \ ensegid \ ... pus (1. 168)] \ om. L. \ ensegid] \ besieged US; \ pat is pus \ by segyd Ar. \ of ... constreyned (1. 168)] \ om. Ar. \ of ... \ pe (1. 168)] \ in what partie schal he holde hym T_1\ 1\ Lc; \ where schal he holde hym US. \ of \ on G_2.

168 \ 0] \ A UST_1\ 1\ LCB; \ Alas \ pen \ a Ar. \ you wrechid] om. UST_1\ 1\ LCBAr.

169 \ 0] \ A UST_1\ 1\ LCB; \ or Ar. \ I] \ he Ar. \ appe] \ MS. appeire appeere.

170 \ impossible] \ vnpossyble LCBAr.

172 \ where] \ placis Ar. \ no place] \ nowhere UST_1\ 1\ LCBAr.

173 \ I shal] \ om. UST_1\ 1\ LAr. \ shal] \ om. L_1. \ fynde] \ fynde it UST_1\ 1\ LCBAr. \ I ... agrise] \ and sore y schaile agrise Cb. \ I] \ me UST_1\ 1\ L. \ shal] \ shalbe Ar. \ sore] \ om. UST_1\ 1\ L. \ agrise] \ ashamyd Ar.

174 \ and ... present] \ om. L_1. \ 0] \ A UST_1\ 1\ LCBAr. \ he] \ om. T_1\ Ar.

175 \ fro] \ for L_1. \ wrathid] \ 'the' dredefulle Iuge Ar.

176 \ where ... help (1. 177)] \ wheres schal I haue helthe, \ Where schal I haue cousemyl US. \ where ... counsel] \ om. L.

177 \ where ... help] \ om. Ar. \ help] \ helpe T_1\ 1\ LCB. \ who ... wounde (1. 178)] \ om. UST_1\ 1\ LCBAr. \ help] \ heele G_2.

178 \ he] \ \ 'he' \ L_1. \ pat is] \ pat 'is' L; \ om. is L_1. \ clepid] \ called Ar. \ sauyour] \ pe anjel (1. 179)] \ om. Cb.

179 \ clepid] \ called Ar. \ sauyour] \ pe sauyour Cb. \ of] \ on UST_1\ 1\ LGBAr. \ counseil] \ conceil \ where schaile y haue helpe Cb. \ which] \ pe whiche UST_1\ 1\ LAr.

180 \ clepid] \ called Ar. \ sauyour] \ pe sauyour Cb. \ of] \ on UST_1\ 1\ LG_2; \ vppoun Cb; \ in Ar.

181 \ Certis] \ truely Ar. \ pis is] \ it is UST_1\ 1\ LCBAr. \ he] \ be Cb; \ for he Ar.
nynge world, vnupis þan þe rightwise-
man shalbe saued. 0 þou wrecyid synner
þus ensegid, of what party maist þou draw [f. 94r]
or hold þe þus constreyned, where shall
þou hide þe? 0 how shal I appere
for to hide me? It shalbe impossible, and
for to appere it shalbe vnsuffrable. I
shall seche where to hide me, but no pla-
ce I shal fynde I shal sore agrise to appe-
re and euer I shalbe present. 0 who is he
þat shal delyuer me fro þe handis of wra-
thid god? Where shal I haue conseil?
Where shal I haue help, who shal help
my wounde? Who is he þat is clepid þe
aungel of þe greit counseil whiche
is clepid sauyour þat I may cry of his
name: Certis þis is Ihesu; he hymself is
Looke vp perfor e'en now pou synner T₁ L₁. Looke up now perfor e'en now pou synner Cb.

soule] synner G₂.

stedfast] good UST₁ L₁ LcbAr. [you] om. UST₁ L₁ Lcb; be Ar. hope] but hope Ar.


from] om. Ar.


moste offendid] score agrued with pryde UST₁ L₁ Lcb; score agrued wî pride T₁ L₁ Lcb; sore greuyd with syn Ar. make ... hestis (1. 194)] om. Cb. make ... sey (1. 195)] om. UST₁ L₁ LcbAr.

sey] þanne seie to him þus Cb. Ihesu] perfor ihesu Ar. name] holy name Ar.


þi comfortable name] þi swete name. þi comfortable name G₂.

moste] om. UST₁ L₁ Lcb.

blessid] swetteste Ar. for] for synneres Ar.

holy name] owene self UST₁ L₁ Lcb. saue] om. UST₁ L₁ LcbAr.

me ... þe] be to me ihesu UST₁ L₁; be to vs ihesus L; be to me sauyour Ar.

of noght] om. UST₁ L₁ LcbAr. let] suffur Ar. Ihesu ... Ihesu (1. 211)] om. UST₁ L₁ LcbAr.
pe iuge whom I drede so sore. O pou
synful soule be pou comfortid. O soule why
art pou so derry and troubllest me? Hope
pou in god for yit I shal knowlege to hym;
bihold pou caitif soule, biholde & be of
stedfast hope, & dispere pou not; hope
in hym meste whome pou dredist moste;
flee to hym from whome pou fleddist; cry [f. 94v]
vpon hym hertly & contynuely for mercy
whome pou haste moste offendid; make
pe to hym ayens whome pou haste bene
proude; cleue to hym fro whome pou haste
depertyd pe; withstondynge his hestis &
seイ Theasu, Theasu, for bi name Theasu do to me
afyr bi name Theasu. Fforyet not me Theasu
out of bi proteccion, pouh I haue be a gnete
trespassour. Thesu biholde me with pe
yses of bi mercy, inwardly clepyng bi
name, bi comfortable name, to synners
pe moste delitable name and of moste
blessid hope, for what is Theasu to sey but
saunour Perfore Thesu for bi holy name saue
me, tristynge in pe pou pat madist me
of noght, let me not perishe. Thesu accepte
my wil, pouh my wordis be lewid, for
I knowleche in trewhat I neiPer can
me may inclepe biin help, neiPer deserwe
to haue it, but of bi speciall grace, but
for I can not as I shulde. I recommande
haue ... and (1. 213)] om. UST1L1LChAr.

let] suffur Ar. it neuer] me not UST1L1LChAr; me L. be dammned] to be dannymyd Ar.

pou] the pou Cb. Inesu] om. UST1L1LChAr.


moste] be mooste UST1L1LChAr.

pat] om. UST1L1LChAr. pine almyghty] Almyghtie sin L. pine ... made] pou haste so dure bough]te Ar.

for] i godeneses] i beseeche thee UST1L1LAr; y beseeche Cb. know pat] and knowe and kepe thou in as al pat Cb; to know pat Ar.

pat] om. UST1L1LChAr. is] is UST1L1LChAr. wipe away] wipe it away UST1L1L. cleme] om. UST1L1LChAr.

pat] om. UST1L1LChAr. is ouris] alle wickednes pat come] of vs Cb. ouris] ootheres UST1L1LChAr. Inesu] O inesu Cb. mercy ... handwerke (1. 222)] haue mercy UST1L1L; haue merci on vs Cb; on me haue mercy Ar.

tyme ... mercy] it is tyme of mercy L1; tyme of mercy is Cb.

me not] not me CbG2Ar. me] om. UST1L1L. tyme] be tyme Cb. dome] dreadful doome Cb.

shalbe] shalle hit be Ar. be] me Cb. in ... shall (1. 225)] to se me Ar.

or lesynge] om. UST1L1LChAr. descende] descende downe Ar.


lorde] om. UST1L1LChAr. shall] may Ar. not] noone USL1L1L; neuer Ar. in hell] ne any of pou pat goon down [om. L1] into helle UST1L1LChAr; nor none of hem pat gothe downe to helle Ar. If ... lorde (1. 228)] Therfor gode lorde y beseeche pi mercy Ar.

lord suffre me] suffre me lord UST1L1LChAr. entre] to entre LChAr. in to] to L1; in G2. brode] large S.

it] merci certis lord it Cb; for gode lorde it Ar. neuer be] be neuer Cb; nothing be Ar. be be streyer (1. 230)] streiter be L1.

to pi mercy (1. 231)] om. UST1L1LChAr.
me to *bi mercy Ihesu; *hou *pat boughtist [*f. 95r*
me, haue mynde of *bi price and departe
it fro pe deuel, and let it neuer be damp-
med. *Dhou Ihesu *pat madist me porough

215 *bi godenes, let me not parishe porough
my wickednes, and as *hou art moste mer-
cyful suffre not my wickednes to lese *pat
*pat *pine almyghty godenes hathe made.
Mercyful Ihesu for *bi godenes know *pat

220 *pat is *pine and wipe awaye cleene *pat
*pat is ouris. Ihesu Ihesu mercy of *pin hand
werke, while tyme is of mercy *pat *hou
dampne me not in tyme of *bi dome,
for what profite shalbe to be in my bolde

225 or lesynge if I shall descende into euern-
lastyng corrupcion? For damned men
lorde shall not prayse be in hell; if *hou
wilt lorde suffre me entre in to be brode
bosome of *bi mercy it shal neuer be be

230 streyter for me. Resseyue me perfore to
mercyful Ihesu] moost desirable Ihesu USLcb; moost desira desirable ihesu L₁; þu mooste desirable Ihesu T₁; þou most benigne lorde Ar. resseyue] receyue me þerfore mooste desirab Cb.

of þi chosen] of one of þi chosyn flocke Ar.

fed] om. Ar. prayse] and þat y may prayse Ar.

þat ... Amen] in euerlastyng Ioye, y besoke þi grete mercy amen Ar. þat] and þat UST₁L₁LCb.

Ihesu] om. UST₁L₁LCb; ihesu so be it G₂.
bi mercy, merciful Ihesu resseyue me within pe nowmbre of bi chosen, so pat I be fed in pe with hem & prayse be with hem [f. 95v] pat I withouten ende ioy in pe, with 235 all po pat loueth bi name Ihesu, Amen.
Notes

1 Here ... anselme (line 2). US agree in their readings as do, generally, L₁LcbG₂Ed. The unique reading (and mistaken one) is that of Ar. T₁ omits the rubric altogether. Such variation among the rubrics is, perhaps, to be expected, for the Latin texts (from one of which this Middle English tract is probably a translation) also vary in their rubrics. However, the variation in these tracts is of such a kind as to point back to the exemplar of each genetic group; the readings are too close to be the result of chance.

dispensable ... and. L₁'s omission of almost an entire line is probably due to the repetition of the words 'vnfruytful and' in the line following, for the scribe begins immediately after the second 'vnfruytful and'. The omission does not appear in any other manuscript.

departison. The balance of the readings points in the direction of US, and their 'departison' (U)'/ 'departison' (S). G₂, very close to Ed in most variants, reads 'departson' (as does L₁) and though this form is not listed in the O.E.D., 'departson' is, and it is easy to see how the variation, through abbreviation, could come about. Ed's 'deparsum' is not listed in the O.E.D. or the M.E.D. For cb's reading 'a departinge' see O.E.D. departing vbl. sb. 1. 'Division (in various senses); distribution, sharing'. (Cf. O.E.D. departison [sb.] 1. 'Division into parts; distribution, portion'). Ed's 'deparsum' is, apparently, a mistake.

hymself, Euerly. The two line omission in EdG₂ may be taken as proof their probable dependence upon the same source; the scribe of this exemplar has not used the Latin text of the Vulgate as corroboration for the English text.

qui] que T₁L₁L. That is to seyn] þat is L₁L.

makith. The reading of 'makith' (EdCb) as opposed to 'bereth' (UST₁L₁LArG₂) presents the interesting question of the possible source for the substitution in EdCb. The English translation that accompanies the Latin (and without the Latin in EdG₂) is also found in a slightly different form in a M cycliffe version: Matt. iii, 10.: '... every tree þat maketh not good fruyt schal be kit down and schal be cast in to þe fier'. I have quoted here from the Later Version, British Museum MS. Royal I.C.VIII., f. 300V, col.1, which forms the base text for the WR of the Forshall and Madden edition. It seems then that the translation of the Bible fresh in the minds of the
scribes of EdCb, or their exemplars, might have been the Wycliffite one, but such an inference is made purely on the survival of 'makith', and the similarity of the passages. Forshall and Madden do not list 'bereth' as a variant of 'makith', but do note the omission of 'pe' in a minority of MSS., and G2 omits 'pe' in its rendering. However, both the omission of 'pe' and the substitution of 'makith' could well be part of a tendency toward simplification, and such a conscious editing by the scribe is not to be ruled out.

20 L's reading 'ouctirly' is not supported in the O.E.D. as a variant of 'outerly', and is probably the result of a confusion between o and t.

26 synne, ffor. The reading in UT1L G2 of 'synne', and wel I may see stynkyng in symne does not occur in EdSL. While the omission in EdSL seems to indicate a common line of descent, it may well be the result of independent, coincident variation occasioned by the repetition of 'synne'. The occurrence of the phrase in G2, however, excludes Ed (which in many respects otherwise resembles G2) from consideration as the immediate source of G2! the phrase is probably not a conjectural emendation made by the scribe of G2 to his copy. For consideration of G2 as source of Ed see note to lines 51-53.

37 pat. The scribe of S has inserted 'pat' above and between the words 'but al'. L1L also omit 'pat', but the omission, while suggestive of a common source for SL1L, may well be the result of homoteleuton. That L1 and L do not descend from S (or U) is clear from the longer omission in US at lines 47-48 not shared by L1L.

38 The scribe of L1 has placed 'it' in the margin, and indicated its position in his copy by a caret between 'pat' and 'al'.

42 siker. See O.E.D. s.v. Sicker, a. and adv. B. adv. 1: 'With security; safely; confidently.'

47 pe ... ny; (line 48). US omit 'pe grete day of pe lorde is ful ny'; given the close overall textual similarity of U and S such an omission may be taken as a conjunctive and separative variant arising from the duplication of 'nyghe'/'ny'; a line below. This is not a necessary conjunctive and separative variant, as the scribes of U and S may have omitted the phrase independently of each other and their exemplar(s).

51 a ... clarionynge (line 53). The scribe of G2 apparently having lost his place and starting with 'say' (line 53), discovered his mistake and resumed copying where he had originally left off (line 51).
Such a rearranged word order as G2's is unique, and it excludes Ed from probable dependence upon G2 as an immediate source; this word variation in G2, however, does not exclude it from dependence upon the same immediate source as that used by Ed.

53 clarionyng. Ar's 'clarnoris' is not cited in the O.E.D. or M.E.D. 'Clarnoris' may be a hybrid form of 'clangor' plus 'clamour', or it may be a variant of 'clamour', but the earliest attested occurrence of 'clamour' is 1592: see O.E.D. s.v. Clamour sb. 4. If 'clarnoris' is a variant of 'clamour' then it may have arisen through a scribal confusion of the letter m improperly formed, e.g. fm. However, such a case involves, among other things, positing the existence of 'clamour(is)' (s.v. Clamour) prior to 1592.

65 korough forthynkynge. L1 reads 'byfor þenkynge', a plausible error, but given the context the sense of such a reading is ambiguous if not awkward. That such an error could arise may have been reason enough for the scribe of the immediate source of EdG2 to substitute 'þorough' for 'by', and to add 'in þe' (line 66). The sense is clearer through such scribal editing, and it makes misinterpretation in reading or copying less likely.

66 and ... litel (line 69); Whan (line 74) ... god (line 75). These lines present several textual problems. It is fairly clear, I think, from the variants that T1L1EdG2 used an immediate source distinct from that used by US; however, the variation between the manuscripts is such that it is difficult to say what the precise nature of that immediate source is. The variation confirms the main outlines of the different genetic groups, yet implicates each group with the other. The only plausible explanation for the similarity amid diversity is to postulate the existence of an itinerant exemplar (perhaps much like T1) which moved throughout the area giving rise, in turn, to copies from which the extant manuscripts (including US) derive.

67 Ar's 'miste' is above and between 'way' and 'spete', and its place is marked with a single insertion mark.

69 be. Ar's 'be' is above and between 'way' and 'but', and its place is marked with a single insertion mark.

89 knowist. EdG2 read 'knowist' for 'seest'. The emphasis here, as in line 65 above, seems to be on a kind of common-sense clarity: 'seest' although appropriate to the imagery of the ambush--'enemies liggyng in awayte'-- is not appropriate to a more devotional and didactic (and less visual) treatise.
EdG do not seem as concerned with vision as with the immediate intellectual apprehension of the message: sins are to be known not seen.

90 L reads 'fe'l' mo' where UST1CbG reads 'fer moo'. The 1 of 'fe'l' is in blue ink. See O.E.D. s.v. Felt adv. A.1 'To a great extent or degree, much.'

93 U reads 'yuele' for its usual 'yule'. This is U's only y/x confusion.

113, T1 writes 'merpe' for 'merow'/'mergh'/'meru' (line 113), and 'youthe'/'youpe' (line 128). As the scribe of T1 otherwise clearly distinguishes his p and y, the variation may be the result of an ill-formed y in T1's immediate source; alternatively, the variation may have arisen through a confusion of p and y, but the scribe of T1 is both clear and consistent in his use of y and p. The only support for the confusion being the result of the immediate source of T1 rests on a similar confusion in Ar which reads 'myrthe' for 'merow', and 'thought' for 'youth'. The latter example, however, is contained in an interpolation (see Appendix I, lines 127-136), and may not be reliable evidence. The interpolation in Ar is unique, so it is impossible to check its analogue(s) and to see similar readings occur; however, it is tempting to speculate on the possibility that Ar and T1 used the same immediate source. T1, though, is not that source, for it omits the phrase 'how yuel hauj I doon', at line 152, and this phrase is not likely to have been conjecturally added by the scribe of Ar.

116 SAR read 'And' where all other manuscripts read 'A': such reading is likely to be the result of a misreading of 'a' or 'A' as an ampersand.

133 L reads 'speki' for 'speedith'. The k in L's 'speki' is faint, so as a corrective the scribe (or a reader) has placed the letter k in the margin.

135 reckoned. See O.E.D. s.v. Reckon v.1.7 'To account, assign, or attribute to (a person or thing).' The earliest recorded use cited in the O.E.D. is 1526.

137 Ar's 'nist' appears above and after 'by'.

142 In the margin of L the scribe (or a corrector-reader) has written 'he'; this is, apparently, a reference to the word 'trespasse' in the L text, for in the other manuscripts it is 'trespassour'. The marginal 'he' in L is an attempt to make sense out of a scribal error. D.J. Lloyd noted the marginal correction but read it as 'ne', and could find no place for it in the sentence (see D.J. Lloyd, 'Thesis MS. Laud Misc. 23', p. 130, n.2).
3.53 I ... allmyghty (line 156). The unique omission here by S is probably to be attributed to the repetition of the word 'allmyghty'. This error along with others (see lines 7, 43, 71) may be taken as proof of the textual independence of U from S. For further discussion of the relationship of U to S, and their probable dependence upon the same immediate source see the introduction to The Stathel of Sin, part III, 'The inter-relationships of the core group texts', and note to line 118 of that treatise.

L's 'pe' has been squeezed in between 'suffre' and 'a', and in a different hand from that of the main text.

ferynge. Ed's use of 'ferynge' is to be compared with U's use of 'smertynge'. The O.E.D. cites 'smertynge' s.v. Smarting ppl. a. as first appearing in 1548. The substantive use is much earlier -- c. 1175, but in this instance--'a smertynge conscience' (U)-- 'smertynge' is a participial adjective, and, by analogy and function, 'ferynge' ought to be one as well. 'Ferynge' is not cited under the ppl. a. forms of feren in the M.E.D. The reasons for the substitutions may well have been a conscious attempt at altering the meaning of the phrase: a conscience (for RdG) fears or frets, but does not smart. It is also possible that the readings (if not original) are an attempt at unravelling another scribe's spelling.

vnuPis. Ed's form is not listed under the variant forms of 'uneaths', see O.E.D. s.v. Uneth adv. lb 'Scarcely, hardly, barely (in respect of extent, amount, degree, etc.)', but possibly with sense 2a. 'Reluctantly, unwillingly.' The sense one adopts will depend upon the attitude one takes toward salvation. Given the nature of the 'synnes accusynge', the 'rightwiseman' either is scarcely or is reluctantly saved.

US share the same word order, and, like their omissions and substitutions, this variant points to a shared immediate source.

help. RdG both substitute 'help' for 'helpe': such a substitution may be attributed to a confusion between h and p. However, it is possible that 'help' is a conscious substitution for 'heele': 'help' with the sense succour may have been thought more appropriate for a 'wounde' which is, after all, a spiritual one, and one not susceptible to being healed.

he. The scribe of L1 has written 'he' in the margin, and marked its place with a caret.
pat is. L has omitted 'is', but above and between 'pat' and 'clepid' a word has been inserted, and it appears to be 'is'. The omission here (if we consider it as such) coincides with the same omission in L₁, and as a type of conjunctive variant it is crucial to the connexion of L₁ to L. Because of omissions unique to one and not shared by the other (for example, L, line 14, and L₁, line 174), there is little to support one being the copy of the other; however, the consistency of their agreements (against other manuscripts) and the conjunctive variant above points to their probable dependence upon the same immediate source.

182 0 ... a (line 186). These four lines, shared by EdG₂, but altered and parts omitted by UST₁L₁LcBAr, are indicative not only of EdG₂'s probable dependence upon the same immediate source, but of the close relationships of the other manuscripts already noted: for further shared omissions (and substitutions) within this group see lines 191-194; 196-201; and 205-211. It is apparent from these variants that (1) UST₁L₁L are very similar in text; (2) CbAr seem to depend, but in a variety of different ways, upon the UST₁L₁L group; (3) EdG₂ are textually very close, and preserve a distinct text.

196 Fforyet. The reading 'fforyesf' in SLAr may have a common source, but it is the kind of error -- final f for final t -- that given the word and the context is understandable. The sense seems to require 'forgive'; compare S's 'ffor gef nou Ihesu pis proude trespassour' with U's 'ffor gef nou ihesu pis proude trespassour'. The Latin text reads obliviscor, 'forget'. The other manuscripts have 'Foryet', so the plea is for the 'trespassour' to be forgotten UT₁L₁Cb not to be forgotten EdG₂, and to be forgiven SLAr.

203 See note to lines 182-186 for other additions by EdG₂.

perishe. The scribe of Ed wrote 'periche' then corrected it; for another example of the same correction see line 215.

218 pine almyghty. The scribe of L has corrected his mistake by lining through 'p' and marking 'pin' to take its place. The double insertion/deletion (?) mark seems to indicate that a change to the text affects two words.

221 ouris. The substitution of 'ouris' for 'oothere' (UST₁L₁LcG₂Ar) may well be a conscious one which makes quite clear the distinction between those things in man of divine origin and those things of human, and personal, creation. The plea to 'Mercyful Ihesu' is, in Ed, a more personal one which acknowledges, and makes clear, the personal (and human) source of evil.
Biblical Sources*

17 Matthew iii, 10.
31 Psalm xxi, 6.
33 Job x, 1.
46 Sophonias i, 14-16.
53 Apocalypse iii, 16.
60 Matthew iii, 10.
121 Jeremias xiv, 17.
165 1 Peter iv, 18.
179 Isais ix, 6.
181 Matthew i, 21.
195 Psalm cviii, 21.
226 Psalm cxiii, 17.
233 Psalm v, 12.

The Manuscript Relationships of The Stathel of Sin

The Stathel of Sin of E.U.L. MS. 93 (Ed), ff. 95v - 100r, is extant in six other manuscripts:¹

(U) University College, Oxford MS. 97, ff. 153r-155v.

(S) British Museum MS. Additional 22283, f. 116r, cols. a-b - 116v, col. a.

(L₁) Bodleian MS. Laud Misc. 174, ff. 82r-85v.


(Ar) British Museum MS. Arundel 197, ff. 1rv; 3rv [with interpolated text on ff. 1v-3r].


Carl Horstman printed an edition of the tract² using U as his base text, and citing variants from S; although he was aware of the existence of the tract in L₁, he did not note variants from it. The edition here presented is the first to cite all substantive variants from the extant manuscripts, and it is also the first to consider and to attempt a clarification of the various textual relationships among the different copies of the tract.

In collating the above manuscripts the following textual groups have been identified:

¹ For descriptions and references to the cited manuscripts see 'Manuscripts: Notices and Descriptions'. I have relied upon information given me by Dr. A.I. Doyle (personal letter dated 24 November, 1977) and Dr. P.S. Jolliffe's Check-List, 109, item I. 18 for the identification of the surviving manuscripts.

² Yorkshire Writers, ii (London, 1896), 441-443.
As is indicated in the above notation, the texts of U, S, L₁ and T₁ (allowing for minor variation within the group) form a group distinct from the texts of Ed, Ar, and P.

In the following discussion the distinct character of the USL₁T₁ group (hereafter called the 'core group') will be sketched out; the relationships of Ed, Ar, and P to this core group will be considered, and the distinct textual characters of Ed, Ar, and P will be established. In the concluding section the inter-relationships of the texts of the core group will be discussed, and the various core group texts will be considered as possible immediate sources for the other texts.

I. The distinct character of the core group texts.

These are best distinguished by their shared major additions, and substitutions; to avoid confusion, the

---

3 The notation is an attempt to represent family (or genetic) likenesses based upon scribal variations, and it is not an attempt to represent lines of descent. The problem of descent is taken up in the concluding section of this introduction.

4 The term 'core group' is used purely for convenience: USL₁T₁ form a very tight textual group, thus providing a consistent core of readings to be used in comparison with other texts. This 'core group' was arrived at by collating USL₁T₁ with Ed (see note to line 118). Throughout the following discussion the terms 'addition', 'omission', 'substitution' and 'word order' are used to describe the various textual differences as they occur between Ed and the other manuscripts to which it is compared. The text of Ed is treated as being a copy of the tract The Statheol of Sin and not the original. It is the base text in this edition.
occasional agreement of Ar or P with the core group is not noted in this section.

Additions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line(s)</th>
<th>USL₁T₁</th>
<th>USL₁T₁</th>
<th>USL₁T₁</th>
<th>USL₁T₁</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>as longe as as. as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>til þe tyme þat til þe thynk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þat þe þinke al þe tyme 'til'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>feue foule Ed few fleshly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stynkynge fleschly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>dedes doon Ed dedis aftir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after here bapteteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157-158</td>
<td>me, and þet i þis stynkynge wrecche, vnnenthes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kan see þise greete kyndenesse doon to me. Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192-194</td>
<td>My goode ihesu Ed My Ihesu, my faire Ihesu,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>haue mercy on me. my lorde Ihesu,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My faire ihesu my swete Ihesu,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>haue mercy on me. My mercyful ihesu haue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mercy on me. my swete ihesu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>haue mercy on me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substitutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line(s)</th>
<th>UST₁</th>
<th>UST₁</th>
<th>UST₁</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>stathel; stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L₁ scalil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>þei so doc, let Ed þei do so,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hem ryse lorde as let hem rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þin owone seruant; lorde as þe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seruauntys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above core group readings are only a selection of the more important variants; if we take into account some of the numerous minor agreements in variation (for example, at line 172, USL₁T₁ read 'pi' for Ed's 'pe', at line 173, USL₁T₁ read 'for to' for 'to', or at line 195, USL₁T₁ read 'in' for 'on') the case for the overall similarity of the texts of U, S, L₁ and T₁ is strengthened.

As the above readings indicate, the core group texts, when compared with Ed, tend to agree among themselves, thus suggesting that USL₁T₁ drew upon the same immediate source. However, as S's addition at line 21 and L₁'s substitution at line 5 also suggest, the core group is not without its internal disagreements, but these will be dealt with at greater length and in more detail in a later section. For the moment it is important to note that, minor differences aside, USL₁T₁ consistently agree in variation against Ed, and in certain major variants against Ar and P.
II. The distinct textual characters of Ed, Ar, and P.

The text of Ed.

Much of the evidence for the distinct textual character of Ed is cited above in part I, and this discussion will refer to that body of readings.

The text of Ed (unlike the texts of Ar and P) is not very dissimilar from the core group texts; that is, if we were to read The Stathel of Sin in Ed, and then to read the same tract in U or T₁, the overall sense of the tract would be much the same, but in particular readings we would note differences in content and meaning between the Ed tract and the core group tracts. The Stathel of Sin in Ed may be seen as a slimmer, or slightly pruned, version of the core group tract: the scribe of Ed, perhaps through error, has omitted (vis-a-vis the core group texts) 'be tyme þat' at line 21, 'foole stynkyinge' at line 74, 'doon' and 'here' at line 131, as well as the repetitious 'haue mercy on me' of lines 192-194. The minor variation in omission adds to this impression: at line 28, Ed omits 'with', at line 50 'oother', at line 63 'with', at line 72 'Highe', at line 113 'by', at line 119 'so', and at lines 186-187 'þat' is omitted twice.

---

5 This is purely an hypothesis, and it presupposes the possibility that Ed may have used a text resembling a core group text as an immediate source. That this immediate source is no longer among the extant copies of the tract is dealt with in the concluding section of this introduction.
A comparison of the Ed tract with that of the core group also reveals subtle differences in sense in several passages: the scribe of Ed who, at line 125, has substituted 'vengeance' for 'dampnacion' may have wished to stress the fact (and the hope) that 'to be a shepe of þi flok pasturynge in þi law' may well lessen the punishment for 'all mysbileuyng', but it will not, necessarily, save one from the sentence of 'dampnacion', which, in the end, is God's prerogative and not man's.

The high claims of the core group that the sheep in the right pasture are saved from 'þat apert dampnacion' are modified by the scribe of Ed. Similarly in lines 179-181 the meaning is appreciably altered by the substitution of 'mynde' for 'myn' and the omission of 'freelte' after 'þe whiche'. The following passage in Ed is to be contrasted with the same passage in USLiT1:

Ed

as mannes frelty wil suffre and specially
mynde þe whiche I beseche þe for to strenk
with þe grace of þi myche mercy

Core group
(cited from U)

as mannes frelte wol suffre & sp.-cially myn
þe whiche freelte i beseche þee to strengthe
with þi grace for þi muchel mercy.

Setting aside the possible origins of the different readings (see note to lines 179-181) it is clear that in Ed 'grace' is to strengthen the 'mynde' and not, as in the core group, 'myn [freelte]'. The plea in Ed is not necessarily a personal one, but one for man in general and
not for a man in particular -- the reader-sinner of the tract. In conclusion, the text of Ed may be seen, then, as a slightly shorter and pruned copy of a text close to the core group The Stathel of Sin, and one that in some of its substitutions alters the meaning of that archetype, sometimes dramatically so.

The text of Ar.

The text of Ar presents several problems: it is, on the one hand, probably a copy of a text (or texts) fairly close to those of the core group, and on the other hand it is, as a result of interpolations and numerous additions, omissions and substitutions, a text far removed from the other versions. Given the scope of this introduction -- the consideration of textual relationships -- it is not germane to the discussion to treat at length the idiosyncratic substitutions and interpolations of Ar. (For the sake of completeness the longer substitutions and interpolations are included in Appendix I of this thesis). However, it is possible to point out and comment on the various ways in which Ar is related to, as well as distinct from, these other versions.

It will become apparent from the following selection of agreements in variation that the scribe of Ar (or its immediate source) used as its exemplar a text very similar to the core group text.
Pin highe maieste 'ewe foule stynkyng fleschly A deere Ihesu me, and yet i pis stynkyng wrecche, vnnethe canne se pis grete kyndenesses done to me. Nowe

Aftir Heere rightwisely suffrid penance Pere
tiAr Heere repentaunce Pere killyd

Aftir Heere killyd & slayne
The above agreements, however, should not obscure the fact that Ar is a much-revised text, and that the scribe of Ar (or its exemplar) frequently added phrases and deleted entire passages: for example, the scribe of Ar has omitted lines 18-28, an error occasioned by the repetition of similar material (see note to line 18); repetition of similar phrases at lines 44 and 46 may explain another omission in Ar's text (see note to line 44). In the first 50 lines alone six seven lines (or 17 counting the 10 line omission of lines 18-28) have a unique omission of one word or more. The variation in substitution is even more

---

6 The pattern of omission and substitution apparent in the first 50 lines remains the same throughout the text.
significant: within the first 50 lines there are 20 lines which have a unique substitution of one word or more. These, however, are substitutions which still bear some resemblance to the readings of Ed and the core group; later substitutions (for example, lines 49-58, and 82-126) are expansions, or interpolations. One in particular (lines 82-126) rambles on for one-and-a-half folios, and is a somewhat lurid meditation in itself on the passion of Christ.

In summary, the text of Ar is, in various readings, fairly close to the texts of the other versions, but its many unique additions, omissions and substitutions suggest that it is, as a whole, a different and independent version of The Stathel of Sin, and not merely a conflation of two or more different texts.

The text of P.

P, like Ar and Ed, seems to be a copy of a text similar to that of the core group. But, like Ar, P is not a faithful copy of some extant text of the core group type, as its plentiful and unique variant readings attest.

P's connexion with the core group is, however, clear, and it is best to consider it now, before going onto the unique characteristics of P.

---

7 See Appendix I for text.
Additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line(s)</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>as, as</th>
<th>USL₁T₁P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>as, as</td>
<td>as longe as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>pe to</td>
<td>USL₁T₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pe, swete lord, for to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P pe goode lord to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>dedis aftir baptyme</td>
<td>USL₁T₁P dedes doon after here bapteem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substitutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line(s)</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>Here bigynneth a tretice pat is pe stabile of synne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US Heere bigynneth a ful good meditacion for 'oon' to seie by him self al cone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L₁T₁ omitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P Meditacio bona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>And USL₁T₁P Aftir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>pe USL₁T₁P Heere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>peere USL₁T₁P Heere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>pe USL₁T₁P pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>foot USL₁P f&quot;et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>pe seruantys USL₁T₁P pin owene seruaunta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td>all apert vengeance USL₁T₁ pat apert dampnacion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P pe apperte dampnacion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td>rightwisely suffrid USL₁T₁ ristfully suffred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P ristfully of pe swete lord suffred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td>pe USL₁T₁P Heere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P Heere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several of P's variants require explanation: among the substitutions, line 1, P reads 'Meditacio bona'; from this it might be inferred that P derived its title, a good meditation, from a text much like U or S, that is from one which had as its incipit (or part of its incipit) the phrase 'a good meditation'. Conversely, it may be argued that P's 'Meditacio bona' is a scribal opinion of the tract he was copying, and that the title has no textual basis whatsoever. I have listed 'Meditacio bona' among the substitutions of US-like texts more as a suggestive variant than as one that points unequivocally toward dependence upon such a text. Similar arguments can be raised against making much of the substitution 'feet' USL₁P for 'foot', line 86: the scribe of P may have found the reading 'be sole of be foot' slightly awkward and changed it.

For the most part, the readings noted above (see also those for Ar) are taken as suggestive of P's dependence upon a core group type of text for its immediate source, but, as with Ar, the scribe of P has altered the text of his exemplar, and in the altering has produced a slightly different version.

The major alterations are these: unique omissions at lines 24-28; 37; 45-46; 50; 62; 105-107; 124; and 151 - end of text (for comment see the notes to the above lines).

Unique substitutions and additions have also changed the character of the tract: in an attempt to make precise
the vague or general the scribe of P has, it seems, substituted or expanded the following readings: the imprecise 'some preuey place by þi sylf' of EdUSL₁T₁Ar, line 14, becomes, in P, 'of þyn hows þat is deuout'; similarly, at line 16, the scribe of P, seemingly not content with a mere 'biholdyng þi wrechd lyuyng'; specifies the number and manner of such a 'biholdyng': 'and reheere ten or twelue of þi grettest synnes in þe sy$t of god rist þere or þou passe fether þeyns & sey þus'. Other substitutions which appear to narrow the reference or modify or completely change the sense of the putative exemplar are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line(s)</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>the whuche hast lessed þi self bynethe angels wyfully forto take</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdUSL₁T₁</td>
<td>so lowly mekyng þe and so wilfully for me takynge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>wrecchednessis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdUSL₁T₁</td>
<td>þe remanent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>shamyfully enhauncyng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdUSL₁T₁</td>
<td>highynge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>y, as in kynde haueþ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdUSL₁T₁</td>
<td>I, haue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>mysbileue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdUSL₁T₁</td>
<td>heþenes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>fals mysbileuyng men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdUSL₁T₁</td>
<td>mysbileuynge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As P does not parallel Ed or the core group texts after line 151 it is difficult to classify P's text from there on; it is probably best seen as an interpolation, or divagation, allowing the scribe to assert, toward the end, that 'I thanke þe hertily my lord ihesu crist, for þou hast nat clepid me to þe rewle of seynt Benet ne of seynt austyn ne of seynt ffrannceys ne to non oþer rewle ordenyd by mannes chesyng but to þat souereyn & to þat holyest rewle'.

To summarize: the scribe of P probably used a text close to the core group as his immediate source, but he was not intent on replicating that exemplar, preferring, instead, to substitute for or expand on general or imprecise words and phrases. His expansions and substitutions are not as long nor as frequent as are those of the scribe of Ar, nor can P's omission be seen as prunings as can those of Ed. The text of P, like that of Ar and Ed, may well be the result of one scribe's individual handling of his exemplar, or it may represent that scribe's handling, and perhaps faithful copying, of a much-revised exemplar.

III. The inter-relationships of the core group texts.

In the following brief discussion the agreement in variation among the texts U, S, L₁ and T₁ will be considered, and each core group text will be discussed as a possible exemplar of one or more of the extant texts.

Within the core group the following sub-groups have some support from the variants: UST₁; USL₁; US.
Evidence for other sub-groups either does not occur or the occurrence (for example, L₁T₁) is based upon a questionable variant: L₁T₁ agree in omitting the incipit (line 1), as does Ar, and P.

UST₁.

UST₁ agree against other texts in the following readings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line(s)</th>
<th>UST₁</th>
<th>stathel</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>stable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UST₁</td>
<td>stathel</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L₁</td>
<td>scapil</td>
<td></td>
<td>wrecchlydnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>UST₁</td>
<td>Ai</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>UST₁P</td>
<td>kyndeneses</td>
<td>EdL₁</td>
<td>kyndeneses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>UST₁</td>
<td>a goode</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good swete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>a swete</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good swete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any of the above conjunctive readings (that is, where UST₁ agree in variation against all other texts) could be the result of independent, coincident variation.

USL₁.

USL₁ agree against other texts in the following readings:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line(s)</th>
<th>USL₁</th>
<th>EdT₁ArP</th>
<th>USL₁P</th>
<th>EdT₁</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>USL₁</th>
<th>EdΤ₁</th>
<th>Ed</th>
<th>T₁</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>for my synnes</td>
<td>for why my synnes</td>
<td>ffor þat</td>
<td>for why þat</td>
<td>for why lyke wyse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>þee, sweete lord, for to</td>
<td>þe to</td>
<td>þe goods lord</td>
<td>þe for to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>am brouȝt</td>
<td>brouȝt</td>
<td>USL₁</td>
<td>EdΤ₁P</td>
<td>brought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any of L₁'s agreements in variation with US, like those of T₁, could be the result of independent, coincident variation. The results of the above comparisons are instructive: as has been shown in part I, USL₁T₁ are, because of shared readings, best seen as forming a separate textual group. However, within this close-knit group there are disagreements; these disagreements have been compared, and it is clear that for purposes of determining the closeness of L₁ or T₁ to US the various departures of L₁ and T₁ offer little convincing evidence for their dependence upon either U or S. It is worth noting, at this stage, that the unique omissions in L₁ (lines 1; 8-9) and T₁ (lines 1; 76-77; 78; 100-101) exclude these texts from consideration as immediate sources for U, S, Ed, Ar and P.
The relationship of U to S has been discussed previously in the introduction to Meditation I of St. Anselm. There it is concluded that S may well be a faithful copy of U, or they may both be faithful copies of the same exemplar. The various unique readings of S and U in The Statute of Sin reinforce this observation, but it is now possible to say with somewhat more force that S and U are probably faithful copies of one and the same exemplar.

U is clearly not a copy of S, for at line 21 S reads *al be tyme *til *pat be þinke* where U (and L_1 T_1) read *til be tyme pat be þenke*. The word *til* in S is added by a different hand in the margin and after *tyme*; at line 33 S reads *suffre* where all other texts read *suffice*; other readings in S not appearing in U — omission of *of*, line 106; addition of *his*, line 190, — are relatively minor, and cannot be used as evidence for or against U's possible dependence upon S, or another source.

The suggestion that U and S used the same immediate source rests on the slender evidence of U's omission of *dethe* at line 118: all other texts read *dethe day*. If U had been the immediate source for the other texts, then each scribe would have had to supply *dethe* by conjecture: given the scribes of L_1 and T_1 and their tendency to vary in their readings, it seems unlikely that *dethe* would have been in all cases the natural,
conjectural choice. To account for 'dethe' in the other
texts and its absence in U, and to account for the high
degree of similarity among the texts of U, S, L₁ and T₁,
it is probably best to postulate the existence of another
text, one textually closer to U than to S, and one that
was the immediate source of U, S, L₁ and T₁.³ The
scribes of Ed, Ar, and P may have used this same text,
but, with equal probability, there may have been one or
more exemplars between the putative immediate source
of USL₁T₁ and that (or those) used by Ed, Ar, and P.

³ I have postulated the existence of one text, but this,
of course, assumes that such variation as there is
between U, S, L₁, and T₁ is the result of the scribes
working on these manuscripts, and not a result of their
exemplars. There are other approaches: the total
variation between these texts may be the result of
variation introduced by the scribes of the now lost
exemplars plus variation introduced by the scribes of
the extant texts.
Here (1. 2) Heere bigymmeth a ful good meditation for 'con' to seie by him self al one US; Meditacion bona P; om. L₁T₁Ar.

couetist] covete A desire Ar.

ciene] clenese P. soule] soule take hede: & serch wel i conscience Ar. soule ... synne (1. 6) soule of he filipes of synne as hit may be here in his lif P. as ... be] om. Ar.

in his life] om. US₁T₁Ar. stable] stathal US₁T₁; scabill L₁; wrecchydnes Ar.


be ... busy] but if you have gode warines per of and Ar.

cleannes ... to (1. 9)] om. L₁.

be speciall] om. P.

encressynges] encres P. tan ... bihoueth] Then furthe more a pon this hit bihoueth Ar.

a ... day (1. 12)] night by nyght or day by day as for a sereteyne tyme Ar.

contynuynges] om. P. contynuynge ... good (1. 13)] to dispose he to be Ar. longe US₁T₁P] om. Ed.

thynkyth] yynke] pat P.

by ... there] of ym hows pat is deuout P.

and specially] and haue special P.

mynde ... biholdynges] om. P. lyuynge ... pus (1. 17)] lyuynng and reherse ten or twelue of bi grettest synnes in be syst of god rist there or you passe farther ymne & sey pus P.

pus] this Ar.

if ... mouth (1. 28)] om. Ar.

and ... so (1. 20)] om. P. thankith it] penketh pat it US₁T₁.

eftsome] eft P.

til ... thynk (1. 22)] til he tyme pat he penke US₁T₁; al he tyme 'til' pat he pinke S.

Here bigynneth a tretice pat is pe stabile of synne.

ff pou coustist to be mayde clene in soule, as it may be here in pis life, of all pe stabile of synne, pe whi he will alwey leue in pe aftir pi confessi , be pou neuer so bi-sy so pat p_u maist by pat ciennes be maide able to resseyue pe speci ll grace of god in encressynge of pi perfeccion. pan biho-ueth pe a certeyn tyme nyght by nyght, or day by day, contynuynge as [longe] as pe thynkyth it doith pe goo in some prau ey place by pi silf, & pere gadder to gedyr pe myghtos of pi soule and specially pi mynde in biholdynge of pi wrecchid ly-uyng, seyng pus with hert, or with mouthe, or with boithe togedir, if pe boipe list, and if pe thenkith it doith pe good to do so: Lorde Ihesu crist, and eftsone [f. 96v] reherse these iii wordis, Lord Ih su crist, til pe thynk & pat pou fele verily in pis hert
not ... mouth (l. 28)] om. P.


& mouth] and with mowth USL1T1. Lorde] and say Lord
P. he] be P; om. USL1T1.

wrecche ... be] wrecche and y wene my self be Ar.
most wickid] wikkedest P. & ... lathesome (l. 30)]
be moste wrecche P; om. Ar.

of all] of alle 'oper' Ar. be whiche] bat P. be
whiche] bat P.

wonderfully haue] wundurfully ofte tymes haue Ar.
highe] om. P.

maieste] godenes Ar. so ... bat] so ofte haue
renuwyd my synnfulle dedus bat Ar.

suffice] suffre S. to] forto P. for ... symmes] for

sonde] sondes Ar; wrek P. be whiche] whiche P.

multitude ... nowmbred] no man may numbur the Ar.
In] Then in Ar; om. P. In ... sighe (l. 36)] And
here in his biholdynge bu schalt sighe T1.

his biholdynge] om. P. thou shalt] shalt thou P. sighe]
sike S.

& as hertly] om. ArP maist] canne Ar; kanst or mayst
P.

why] om. USL1P for ... be] for why lyke wyse as a Ar.
smythies] sporyer P. doith ... biholdynge (l. 41)].
dothe rubbe a way alle rusti yronne & makethe hit shewe
fayre & bright in be same maner of wyse gostly dothe a
sorowfulle & a contrite herte rubbe a way be 'fowle
rusti' synnyes fro a mannyes sowle & makethe hym shyne
fayre & bright in be sight of god. Then after his
'in' by holdynge Ar.

be] bat P.

and ... fet] om. P. sighynge] sikynge S.

a] bi P. And] Aftir USL1T1ArP. biholdynge ...
general] om. P.

in general] om. Ar.
acorde with thy mouthe, & thyn pasee
forthe, and not erst boogh you shuldest

sey it never so oft til þat it so be, & whan
þat it is so sey þan forth þus as I tell
þe, with þat same acordance of hert
& mouth: Lorde þeseu crist I am he þat
wreche, þe moste wickid synner & þe

moste lathesome of all þe whiche so
wonderfully haue wrathid þe highe
maieste, & so oft þat my wit may
not suffice to tel it. For why my synnes
be as þe sonde of þe see þe whiche for

multitude may not be nowmbred. In
þis biholdyng, & here, þou shalt sighe
& sorow as depely & as hertly as þou maist:
for why þat þat þe smythes file doith
to þe rusty yren þe same gostely doith

a sorowful & a depe-fet sighynge to
a synful hert. And þis biholdyng þus
of þi wrecchid lyuynge in general, þou
mynde & biholdynge om. P. biholdynge kyndnes (1. 44]) remembr & thynke on be grete kyndnes Ar.

god ... pus] god what he 'hat'e' done fore be and then say thus Ar.

boiþ ... all myghty (1. 46]) om. P. boiþ ... before (1. 46]) om. Ar.

all myghty] om. Ar.

& was nowght] om. P.

broughtist ... forthe] brought þou nat me forth P. forthe ... þin] & hast made 'me' vn to þi nowme Ar.

ymage ... þi] om. Ar. ymage &] om. P. in to ... it (1. 58]) and to no noþer symlyytude where for y may say & thynke bothe þat y am myche bounde to þi 'grete' mercy. And of þes grete gyfles of þi grace haue y had but litulle perseverans & remembars to loue and thanke þe perfer a y shulde a done wherefor & if þi mercy helpe me not it Ar.

above ... creaturis] om. P. all] alle other USL\text{T}_1. porch] wherborw P.

þe ... synned] om. P.

þe ... blis] þe blisse, face P; þee in blisse face to face T\text{I}.

of synners] om. USL\text{T}_1P. vilest] foul P. haue ... deseruyd (1. 56]) in so mychel haf deseruyd P. in] i SL\text{I}.

þi] þe L\text{I}.

so] om. USL\text{T}_1P. if] om. T\text{I}.

it ... me] me had be better P.

to haue] haue P. þer] Heere USL\text{T}_1ArP. sighe] syke S.

And aftir] Then after Ar.

haue ... kyndnes] þis þou shalt calle to þi mynde þe grete kyndenes Ar,

seyynge] & sey P. pus].þis Ar. boyth ... list (1. 63)] om. P boyth] om. T\text{I}.

and mouthe] & with mouth USL\text{Ar}, if ... list] om. Ar. þe] þu T\text{I}. Thesu crist (1. 64)] om. P.
shalt haue mynde & biholdynge of þe
kyndenes of þi lorde god & say þus,

boiþ with hert and with mouth, as it is
seyd before: Lord god all myghty, some
tyme when I had no beyng & was no-
wght, þou broughtist me forthe to þin
ymage & to þi liknes in to so noble a

beyng above all creaturis þorough
þe whiche had I not synned I myght
haue had þe by grace in þis life, and in þat
opher haue seen þe face to face in blis. And
I this wrechid erthly worme, þe moste

vilest synner of synners of all haue in so
myche deservyd þe streitnes of þi right
wisdom, so þat but if þou help me ye-
uynge me þi mercy it wer better to me
neuer to haue be borne. Þer shalt þou sighþ

and sorow as þou didist before, and aftir
haue mynde of þe kyndnes of his in-
carnacion seyyng þus, both with hert
and mouth if þe boþe list: Lorde þesu
64 highe] hight Ar.

65 pe] pi self Ar., so ... takyne (1. 66)] the whuche 
hast lesed pi self bynethe angels wylfully forto take 
P.


67 pe chargis] charges P Ar. & pe wrecchednessis] and 
pe wrecchednesse L1; & wrecchednesses T1; om. Ar.

69 pe remanent] pe remauntes Ar; wrecchednesses P. 
saue] outake P.

70 pis] a Ar. worme] caytiffe Ar.

71 me] myself Ar. highynge] shamfully enhauncyng P; 
me] om. Ar.

72 haue displesid] haue ofte tymys ful greuusly displesyd 
Ar. pi maieste] in highe maieste USL1T1Ar.

73 be wel] welle P.

74 few fleshly] fewe foule stynkyng fleece USL1T1Ar. 
delices] deyltes UT1ArP.

75 wheidir] om. Ar, substituted in 1. 76. Dere ihesu] 
A deere Ihesu UST1Ar; A ihesu P. wheidir ... hide 
(1. 76)] & y shulde fle fro pe, whever shulde y go 
for hyde Ar.

76 & ... not (1. 77)] om. T1.

77 Dere] Heere USL1TARp. sighe] syke S.

78 as ... before] om. T1. and ... mynde] Then a pon 
is ] pou shalt calle to mynde Ar.

79 of] om. Ar. kyndenes] grete kyndnes Ar. passion] 
passion suffrynge Ar.

80 Was ... crist (1. 81)] Lord ihesu crist, was hit nat 
ynow vnto pe P. was it] It was Ar.

81 crist] om. S. to be comen] to become USL1T1ArP.

82 but ... ouer] but pou of grete mercy over Ar. pat 
... mysbilesyng (1. 126)] interpolation in Ar, see 
Appendix I for text.

83 dedely] om. P.

84 betynges] betyng P.

85 sole] soles L1. pe] pi USL1T1P.
crist art thou not he 

of awngels, so lowly mekyn e þe and 
so wilfully for me takynge upon þe all 
þe chargis & þe wrecchednessis of man-
kynde as hunygr, thrist & colde with all 
þe remanent saue synn & ignorance. And 

I lorde þis wrecchid erthly worme, not 
mekynge me but highynge me in so my-
che þat I haue displiesid þi maieste, cha-
ungynge þe þat art þe wel of euer lasty-
ge godenes for a few fleshly delices 
of þis wrecchid life. Dere Ihesu whedir 
may I fle, hide me may I not & shew 
me dar I not. Dere shal þou sighe & sorow 
as þou didist bfore, and aftir haue mynde 
of þe kyndenes of his passion & sey þus: 

Was it not ynoghe to þe my swete lord 
Ihesu crist þus to be comen man for þe louse 
of man, but if þou ouer þat for þe releuyngne 
of so many dedely wrecchis tokist upon 
þe to suffre so hard betynges, so vnnow-
mbrable woundis þat fro þe sole of þe
foot] feet USL₁P. was] þer was P.

skynn ne lyme] lyme ne skyn USL₁T₁P. blessid] om. P.

I] A i UST₁; om. P.

þi] om. USL₁T₁P. of reson] & by reson P.

betwix] between USP. heuen and hel] helle & heuene P.

trewly lord] lord trewly P. apayed] payed SP.

do so] so doo USL₁T₁P. þe servauntys] þin owene servaunt; USL₁T₁P.

own] om. L₁.

of me] on me P.

þis] þus P. stronge] straunche U; straunche SL₁T₁. fremmed] an exiled P.

Here shalt þou] Here þow schalt US. sighe] syke S. as ... bifore (1. 101)] om. T₁.

passion] blod P. wounds ... hert (1. 103)] om. P.

holow] perlynge T₁.

but ... þat] and for alle P. thre] om. P. kyndenes] kyndenesses UST₁P.

named] seid P. þat ... passion (1. 107)] om. P. of] om. US.

of] om. S.

of] om. US. generally done] do generally USL₁T₁P.

after ... haue] haue after þis P. speciall] a special P.

many] eny P.

Good swete] A goode swete UST₁; a swete P.

as] om. L₁. and a] and by a USL₁T₁P. thousandfold] thousand part P. more worthy] würtier P.

I, haue] y, as in kynde haueþ P. þe to] þee, swete lord, for to USL₁; þe goode lord to P; þe for to T₁.
foot to be crown of thyne hede was no
skynne ne lyme of pe blid body pat it
ne famed ful of pe pr·cious blowes. I wickid
cursid wreche what may I do? I am cause
of pe d thes. Where may I won, for by
pe rig·twisedome of reson all pe crea-
turis pat bene betwix bo·en and hel
shulde fight ayens myne oonly body.
Now trewly lorde I am wele apayed pe
pei do so, let hem r'se lorde as pe servau-
ntyys of pin own houshold, venge with
maistry her lord & h r maker of me,
pis stronge fremed wreche pat so tray-
tourly hathe ben cause of my lordis tur-
ment. Were shalt pou sighe & sorow as
pu diddist before, hauyn e gostely
mynde of his precious passion, wounde
by wounde, to be holow of his hert.
But by cause pat bese thre kyndenes
before named, pat is to sey, of pe ma-
kyinge, of his·ma·kynde takynge, &
of his precious passion han bene generally
done to all ope·r as wele as to pe; perfore [f. 98v]
shalt pou aftir pis haue speciall mynde
of some special kyndenes doon to pin
oonly body byfore many ope·r & sey pus:
Good swete lord Ihesu crist, how many
as worthy, and a thousandfold more wor-
thy pan I, haue be suffrid of pe to dye,
modris wombis] moder wombe P.
aftir] after here burthe USLT1. to] om. S.
hepene] mysbileue P. dethe] om. U.
& to] and so to USLT1P.
ouer] owen P.
brought] am broust USLT1. folde ... chirche] holy-churche P.
a shepe] on P.
pasturynge ... be] om. P.
all] bat USLT1; be P. vengeance] dampnacion USLT1P.
mysbileuynge] fals mysbileuyng men P. Here] Then here Ar.
shalt] pow schalt US. bus] his Ar.
mouth ... grace (i. 130)] a blessyd lorde per hath bene mony a creature bat hath be more acceptabler Ar. more ... am (i. 130)] worthier pan y, je & fer more able to grace P.
am, by cause] am in pi sight, and hathe be cause Ar.
mo] om. P. dedis aftir baptyme] dedes doon after here baptsem USLT1P; dedus after per baptym Ar.
eny] om. USLT1Ar. aftir myne] om. Ar. han] om. USLT1Ar.
bene] the whiche bethe Ar. rightwisely suffrid] ristfully suffred USLT1Ar; ristfully of pe swete lord suffred P. my] om. USLT1ArP.
hedid] be ded L1, stikid] or stikied P.
drenchid ... synn (i. 136)] drenched in dedly synne, or som sodeyn de] P. drenchid] drownyd Ar.
s] summe L1. to] in T1. to ... fire (i. 137)] for ever more Ar.
some in her madris wombis and some
some after before any baptism, and so to be
damned to endless darknes, and some to
lyue in her hevenes to here deth the day
& to be damned to endelis peyne. And

I swete lord Ihesu crist am clepid of thyn
ouer habu/dant godenes & porcus pe grace
of baptism, brought in to bi folde, pe
whiche is holi chirche, to be a shepe of
bi flok pasturynge in bi l w, her to be kep

saued from all apert vengeance of all
mysbileuyngge. Here shalt thou thank
bi lord god as hertly as thou maist and
aftir shalt thou thynk pus & sey with bi
mouth: bow many more worthy and

fer more able to grace pan I am, by cause [f. 98v]
of many mo good dedis aftir baptyme
pan I haue eny doon aftir myne, han
bene rightwisely suffrid of pe my swete
lorde, some to be hangyd or hedid, stikid

or drenchid, or sodeynly dede in some deede-
ly synng, and so to be damned to endelis
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137 sikerly ... be] verely gode mercyfulle lorde, y may thynke & say bothe Ar.

138 thousande more worthy] thousendfold worpier & wyser P. more more L. worthy] worpier Ar. I have] I am haan USLT1Ar.

139 boilynge] wellyng P.

140 perfors] om. P. won] brenne perynne P. pou] god P. be in hauen (1. 141)] be 'ned' in hevyn Ar.

142 myn ... body] om. Ar. hast pou] pou hast Ar.

143 lord] om. USLTAr. cle id] callyd Ar. to be] vn to be Ar; into P.

144 penance] repentaunce USLT1Ar.

145 kept ... dome (1. 149)] 'savyd, y hope to] pi grete mercy Ar. from] fro USLT1.

147 pis] pis lif USLT1P. from] fro USLT1. pat] be P.

149 per] Neere USLT1ArP.

150 maist] canst or maist P; can Ar. afterward] after shalt P. bus] pis Ar.

151 Lorde ... [Text of P no longer follows Ed and related texts; see Appendix I for divergent text of P].

153 may not] cannot Ar. for] of USLT1Ar. vnnowmmbrable] innumerable USAr.

155 will ... be (1. 156)] wille and alle be preysynge & thankynge pat y canne make is as it were no thynge in comparison, in recumpens vn to pi gode 'grace' Ar.

156 for] of US. ouerhaboundant] grete a boundant Ar. kyndenes] goodness & kyndenesse USLT1Ar.

157 doon] shewyd Ar. into] to USLT1. me. Now (1. 158)] me, and yet i pis stynkyng wrecche, vvmethes kan see pis grete kyndenesse doon to me. Now USLT1; me, and yet y so sympulle a wrecch vn nethe canne se & perseue pis grete kyndnes done to me. Nowe Ar.

158 lorde] gode lorde Ar. worthy to be] worthy of my deserte sauynges] pi grete mercy to be Ar.

159 killyd] slayn USLT1; & slayne Ar. or] other US. hangyd] hangyd up Ar. a] & Ar. but for] sauynges Ar.
fire. The sikerly lorde it may be þat a
thousande more worthy þan I haue be
lawfully damnoned to be ilynge pit of

del, þerfor to won as longe as þou shalt be
in heuen for, lewer synnes an I haue
doyn myn oonly body, and yit hast þou
my swete lord Ithesu cle id me ayen to þe
grace of penance in his life þorough þe

which I may be kept and saued from
all apter vengeance in this life, and
after þis from þat horrible dampnation
of all fals cristen en in þe day of dome.
þer shalt þou thanke þi lord as hertly as

þou maist & afterward thynk þus and
sey with þi mouth: Lorde god fadir of
mercy and of comfort what shal I do, for [f. 99r]
I may not make amendis for myn vn-
nowmmbrable synnes þat I haue wrecchid-
ly wrought ayens þi wil. I may not
thank þe for þe ouerhaboundant kyndenes
þat þou haste graciously doon vnto me.
Now trewly lorde I war worthy to be
dede, killyd or hangyd as a hound, but for
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160 sle my self] sle me my self USLT1. silf ... not] self, and pi commandment is also yat y shulde not Ar.

161 lorde god] gode lorde Ar.

162 wrecchidly ... y (l. 166)] wrecchidly ofte tymys have disobeyed pi lawys & commandemete tis and if it please not pi gode grace to sles me with pi nowne handys, y Ar.

163 vnto] to USLT1. And it be so (l. 164)] And yef it so bee USLT1.

169 vengeance] correccion Ar. vpon] on Ar. and ... may (l. 175)] in what wyse geu wilta so yat it may be to pi blessyd plesure & 'my' saluacion, and Ar. pi] 'pi' L1.


175 may] may doo USLT1. Here] And here Ar. to] vnto Ar. be ... as] be mercifulle lorde as Ar.

177 in] and USLT1 Ar. life] lif tyme Ar.

178 from] fro USLT1 Ar. seruice ... wil (i. 179)] servyce as ny as my friaell disposicion wille Ar. All] And USLT1.

179 suffre] suffur me Ar. and specially] om. Ar.

180 mynde] myn USLT1; om. Ar. whiche] whiche freelte USLT1 Ar. be sech pi grete mercy to stedfast Ar. be ... Amen (i. 181)] om. Ar. for to] to USLT1.

181 pe] pi USLT1. of] for USLT1. Pare] Here USLT1; Then here Ar.

182 down] om. USLT1 Ar.

183 hertely and as mekely] meekely and as hertly USLT1; mekely & as lowly Ar.

184 maist] canne Ar. vp] up agene Ar.

186 faire he] fair yat he USLT1 Ar.

187 lorde] lowly Ar. He] yat he USLT1 Ar.

188 all] om. T1.
I may not ale my silt, and also I shuld not; therefore I beseche pe lorde god almyghty 
that you wilt ale me pi silt pat so wrec-hidly hath done vnto pe. And it be 
so pat pi grete pite & pi grete gode-
nes so bynde in pi rightwisenes pat pou 
like not to ale me pi silt, pan I beseche 
pe pat you wilt send pin aungel of right-
wisenes with his brennynge swerde to 
take vengeance vpon me, and if pi myche 
mekenes and pi grete mercy wole not suf-er pe to fulfil pe vengeance pat I haue 
deserved, and me ought not by pe lawe 
lorde to ale me my silt, for 'pan' dampe I 
my soule, pan wil I do pat in me is and 
all pat I may. Here I yelde me to pe as 
pi bondeman & pi prisoner & pi perpetuall ser-
wart in all pe days of my life neuer to de-
part from pi service. All pis lorde wil I do 
as mynnes frealty wil suffre and specially 
mynde pe whiche I beseche pe for to strenkpe 
with pe grace of pi myche mercy, Amen. Pere 
shalt you fall down to pe ground and 
yelde pe to hym as hertely and as sekely 
as you maist, and aftir pat sit vp and 
rest pe thenkyng pe bus: How good pat 
god is in hym silt, and how faire he 
is in his aungels, and how lordely he go-
uerneth all his creaturis, and aftir pat how
his) om. L₁.
he is to) he is in UL₁T₁; he is in his S; a pon Ar.
with mouth] mouth ST₁Ar. without] and without Ar.
failyng] feynynge US₁T₁; faynyng with alle pine
hole substans Ar. My ... swete Ihesu (1. 193)] My
goode ihesu haue mercy on me. My faire ihesu haue
mercy on me. My lord ihesu haue mercy on me. My
swete ihesu haue mercy on me US₁T₁Ar.
vpon] on US₁T₁Ar.
me, bough] me ihesu bough US₁T₁Ar. on] in US₁T₁Ar.
all] alle the creatures US₁; alle oper creaturis Ar; 
alles creatures L₁.
qwike] the quicke Ar. whome] whiche US₁T₁; the 
whiche Ar. bought] dure bowtte Ar.
sweete he is in his louers & last of all how mercyful he is to syn ers. And pan sey bus boi p with hert & with mouth withouten eny failynge: My Ihesu, my faire Ihesu, my lorde Ihesu, my swete Ihesu, my mercyful Ihesu haue mercy vpon me, and not oonly on 195 me, bough I haue moste nede, but on all qwike and dede whome thou hast bought with bi precious blode, ameN.
Notes

1. Here ... synne. P's reading 'Meditacio bona', which appears as the title, may have been suggested by a reading similar to that of US: 'Heere bigynmeth a ful good meditacion ....' Alternatively the scribe of P may have found the meditation to be a good one and thought it deserved such a title. The scribe of Ed does not share US's incipit and has, apparently, derived its incipit from the text itself calling it 'a tretice hat is þe stabile of synne'.

5. stable (see also 'stabile', line 1). Of the seven extant copies of 'The Stathel of Sin', three read 'stathel' (U, S, T), one 'scapil' (L1), one 'stable' (Ed), one 'filpe' (P), and one 'wrecchydnes' (Ar).

The variation in L might be accounted for in palaeographic terms, for 'scapil' could be a scribal attempt to make sense of an ambiguously formed 'stathel', a good example of which survives in U. The 'long-s' is ligatured to the short, and in U's case, near truncated t: the resulting digraph --st could be mistaken for sc. As it happens there is a possible alternative form available to the scribe, see O.E.D. s.v. Scath-a. Also absol. as sb. 'Injurious, harmful, dangerous'. Such a sense is more obvious, at first, than is 'stathel' (see O.E.D. Stathel s.v. Staddle sb. 1): 'A foundation, lit. and fig.' L does have some support, however, for its reading of 'scapil' as the injury or harm of sin, for P reads 'þe filpe of synne', and Ar has 'þe wrecchydnes of þi synnys'. These various readings -- 'scapil', 'filpe', and 'wrecchydnes' -- may also be seen, however, as scribal attempts at clarification of the slightly unusual usage of 'stathel' applied to the ineradicable nature of Sin.

As noted above 'stathel' means a foundation, both literally and figuratively, and it is the figurative sense implied in the 'staths' of synne', for the treatise itself deals with that residual foundation of sin in man 'þe which will alwey leue in þe aftir þi confession' -- Original Sin. Ed's reading 'stable' (or 'stabile', line 2) is more difficult to explain. The only attested substantival use is that of 'A building ... in which horses are kept', and this, while admissible in a metaphorical sense in line 2, does not seem to be the intended sense in line 5: that is, how would one covet 'to be mayde clene in soule ... of all þe stable of synne'? There is a possible but conjectural explanation which will account for Ed's 'stable': 'stable' may, possibly, be a scribal misreading of 'staple': the scribe of Ed seeing an h-like þ was confronted with, perhaps, two unknown words, 'stahle'
and 'stapel', and having to choose between two unknowns, he equivocated and interpreted the h-like shape as a h, thus providing himself with a word he knew, or had seen before.

21 til þe thynk. S reads 'al þe tyme þat þe þinke', but in the margin, and in a different hand, there has been added 'til'. There does not seem to be any mark indicating where 'til' is to go, and as it follows 'tyme' (the last word in the column) I have placed it between 'tyme' and 'þat'. S's reading does not occur elsewhere.

38 The scribe of Ar has written 'fowle rusti' above 'synmys fro' and marked its place for insertion with a caret.

43 haue ... kyndenes. The scribe of P originally wrote: 'haue mynde of þe kyndenesse of þi lord'.

44 The scribe of Ar has written 'hath þe' above and between 'he' and 'done', and marked its place with a caret.

49 The scribe of Ar has written 'grete' above 'mercy' and marked its place with a caret.

59 Per. The text of Ed reads 'Per' at lines 59, 77, 149, 181, and 'Heere' at lines 100, and 126; all other texts consistently read 'Heere'. If we assume, for the moment, that the scribe of Ed used as his immediate source a text much like the core group, then Ed's 'Per' is an interesting substitution which may well refer to the 'preuey place' of lines 13-15 -- 'in some preuey place by þi sylf, & þere gadder to gedyr þe myghtes of þi soule' -- a place where the reader-sinner is to go and 'sighe and sorow' as he has done before (lines 59, 77), thank the lord as heartily as he may (line 149), and 'fallie down to þe ground and yelde ... to hym as hertely and as mekely' as he may (line 181). The readings 'Here shalt þou sighe & sorow as þou diddist before' (lines 100-101), and 'Here shalt þou thanke þi lord god as hertely as þou mayt' (lines 126-127) may be indicative of Ed's immediate source. It is worth remarking that in USL1T4ArP the repetition of 'Here' gives these tracts an immediacy, or urgency, lacking in Ed. Ed's use of 'Per' points to another place, and, possibly, to another time: the reader-sinner is to pray, sigh, sorrow, and submit 'Per', not 'here'.

82 þat ... mysbileuynge (line 126). The scribe of Ar has added a digressive meditation of one and a half folios on the wounds and passion of Christ; for the text of the meditation see Appendix I.
stronge. Ed's reading is to be contrasted with SL₁'s 'strauenge', and U's 'strauench'. The readings of USL₁T₁ are variant forms of 'strange', see O.E.D. s.v. Strange a. 'Strange' is not listed as a variant form of 'strange', and may be considered as a sub-
stitution. Ed's exemplar or its immediate source may have had an ambiguous reading, for example 'strange' (a variant form of 'strong') which variously inter-
preted either would mean 'strange', 'foreign', 'alien', or 'strong', 'gross', 'flagrant', 'flagrantly guilty' (see O.E.D. s.v. Strong a. 11e). If the scribe of Ed interpreted 'fremmed' to mean 'foreign', 'strange', or 'unknown' (see O.E.D. s.v. Fremd a. 1, 2a), then he probably found 'strange' of 'strange fremmed' (i.e., foreign alien) redundant, and, seeking to avoid an apparent redundancy, he substituted 'strong' for 'strange'. The confusion might not have arisen had the Ed scribe, or the scribe of its immediate source, interpreted 'fremmed' as 'not related, of another family or house; opposed to sib or kin' (see O.E.D. s.v. Fremd a. 4). Given this interpretation, the phrase 'piis straunge fremde wrecche' (T₁) would have the unambiguous meaning of a foreign, or alien wretch, unrelated to God's family. In T₁USL₁, the reading 'strauenge fremde wreche' reinforces the paradox that a man is but may not finally be one of God's family: though man is a creation of God and stands in the same relationship to God as the child to its father, man is also capable through sin of severing for eternity that paternal link with his Father. Ed's 'stronge fremmed wrecche', or flagrantly guilty alien wretch, while suggesting that man is somehow outside, or separated from, his creator, does not suggest, as do USL₁T₁, that man is potentially not part of God's family.
354

holow. 'Holow' may mean the 'internal cavity' of Christ's heart, but it might also mean 'the middle or depth' of His heart; this latter sense, however, is not attested before 1863, see O.E.D. s.v. Hollow sb. j. T1 reads 'perlynge' see O.E.D. s.v. Purling vol. sb.2 'The action of Purl v.2: chiefly referring to the sound'; see O.E.D. s.v. Purl v.2 'Of water, a brook, etc. To flow with whirling motion of its particles ...'. The earliest attestation for 'purling' is 1598, and for 'purl' it is 1591.

dethe. U's unique omission of 'dethe' is of textual interest. U, and usually S, agree in variation against most other texts, so when one or more of the other texts omit (vis-a-vis Ed) words or lines, US can be relied upon to support Ed; similarly, when Ed appears to 'omit' (vis-a-vis L1T1) words or phrases US support L1T1. Finally, on the rare occasions when S has a unique omission (vis-a-vis Ed), U1T1 support Ed, thus suggesting that of the available texts U is the most useful in providing corroboration at crucial points.

As U's omission here of 'dethe' is not supported by any other text, and as all other texts read 'dethe', it is not likely that U is the immediate source for these texts: if U is to be the immediate source for S, and perhaps L1T1, then it is necessary to postulate that the scribes of S, L1 and T1 independently of each other added 'dethe'. It is, on the whole, more likely that S,L1,T1, (and U) drew upon the same immediate source, and that the scribe of U was, as far as the evidence suggests, more careful in his copying than the scribes of S,L1,T1, save in this instance.

hedid. The scribe of L1 has apparently misread an h as a b (writing 'be ded' for 'hedid') for in L1's text there is a high degree of similarity between the letter shape of h and that of b; the resultant reading also makes sense, so it would not have been discovered by the scribe if he were rereading for sense.

The scribe of Ar has added 'hed' above and between 'be' and 'in', and has marked its place with a caret.

grace of penance. USL1T1Ar read 'grace of repentaunce', and are, theologically, more precise. Penance (punishment, penalty, or expatiation) is a sacrament: 'The prydde sacrament is clepsyd Penaunce pat is sopfast forthynkyng pat we haue for our synmys wþ-owt wyl or þost to turne agayn þerto.' The Lay Folks' Catechism, ed. T.F. Simmons and H.E. Nolloth, E.E.T.S. O.S.exviii (1901), 65, 67. As a sacrament it prepares one to receive God's grace; but grace is not a necessary consequence of receiving the sacrament, as John Wyclif, a harsh and unrelenting critic of the
Church's control of the Sacrament of Penance, was quick to point out in his 'Nota de Confessione': 'ffor god, þat synue grace & is in þe soule, assouyleth & dop a-way synne, and þis may not þe prest do, siþ it is propur to god', F.D. Matthew, ed., The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted, E.E.T.S. O.S. lxxiv (1880), 333. Wyclif is slightly extreme in his denial of the efficacy of confession, to a priest, but he is, in the main, theologically accurate when he says that God gives grace, absolves, and does away with sin. Grace does not reside in nor flow from penance; however, repentance is prior to penance, and in repentance the sinner can be said to have discovered, or felt, the working of grace in himself: he is, in the act of repentance, turning toward God and His grace, if He chooses to give it.

Lorde ... end of text. P no longer parallels Ed, or any other text; see Appendix I for text of P.

The scribe of Ar has written 'my' above and between 'þe' and 'saluacion', and marked its place with a caret.

The scribe of Li has added 'þi' in the left-hand margin of the manuscript, and placed a caret between 'þe' and 'mychel'.

mynde þe whiche I beseche þe for to strenkeþ. Ed's reading is to be contrasted with that of USL₁T₁: 'myn, þe whiche freelte i. biseche þee to strengthe'. In Ed, the plea is to God to strengthen 'specially mynde' and in USL₁T₁ it is to strengthen 'specially myn [freethe]'; the emphasis in Ed is shifted from the earlier 'mannes frelty' to, presumably, '[mannes] mynde', the centre, or seat, of man's understanding, and the faculty to which 'þe grace of ... myche mercy' is directed.

faire. The scribe of Ar has written 'fayre' above and between 'howe' and 'þat', and marked its place with a caret.

failynge. USL₁T₁Ar read 'feynyng'. If the reading in Ed is a deliberate substitution for 'feynyng' then it is possible that the scribe of Ed (or its immediate source) sought to temper the suggestion of insincerity at the very place (in a devotional treatise) where it ought not to be present: at this stage -- the culmination of the meditation -- 'feynyng' might become a distraction.
Sources and Analogues

3 Cf. The Cloud of Unknowing, ed. P. Hodgson, E.E.T.S. O.S. ccxviii (Rev. rpt. 1973; 1944), 64, lines 10-11:

A perfors, who-so coueti to come to clennes pat he lost for symne, a to wynne to pat welbe per alle wo waunti, him bihoui bidingly to trauayle in pis werke, a suffre pe pyne perof, what-so-suer pat he be, whetor he have ben a customable sinner or none.

6 Cf. The Cloud of Unknowing, p. 68, lines 4-5:

For pat pyne schal always last on þee to þi deep day, be þou neuer so besi.

14 Cf. The Cloud of Unknowing, p. 121, lines 5-7, and Hodgson’s notes:

& on þe same maner, wher anoþer man wolde bid þee gader þi miþtes & þi wittes holiche wip-inne þi-self, & worschip God þere

33 Cf. Apocalypse xx, 7:

And when the thousand years shall be finished, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go forth, and seduce the nations, which are over the four quarters of the earth, Gog, and Magog, and shall gather them together to battle, the number of whom is as the sand of the sea.

49 Cf. Genesis, ix, 6:

Whosoever shall shed man’s blood, his blood shall be shed: for man was made to the image of God.

124 Cf. 1 Peter v, 2:

Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking care of it, not by constraint, but willingly, according to God: not for filthy lucre’s sake, but voluntarily.
151  Cf. Psalm xxxix, 12-13:

12 Withhold not thou, O Lord, thy tender mercies from me: thy mercy and thy truth have always upheld me.

13 For evils without number have surrounded me; my iniquities have overtaken me, and I was not able to see.

They are multiplied above the hairs of my head: and my heart hath forsaken me.

167  Cf. Genesis iii, 24:

And he cast out Adam; and placed before the paradise of pleasure Cherubims, and a flaming sword, turning every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.