

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Holland, Alexander (2018) John Bromyard's Summa Praedicatorum: An Exploration of Late-Medieval Falsity through a Fourteenth-Century Preaching Handbook. Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) thesis, University of Kent,.

DOI

Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/68440/>

Document Version

UNSPECIFIED

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

**JOHN BROMYARD'S SUMMA PRAEDICANTIUM:
AN EXPLORATION OF LATE-MEDIEVAL FALSITY THROUGH A
FOURTEENTH-CENTURY PREACHING HANDBOOK**

Alexander William Holland

Doctor of Philosophy in Medieval and Early Modern Studies

University of Kent

91,417 words

May 2018

CONTENTS

Abbreviations – p. 2

Introduction – p. 3

PART 1 – p. 19

Chapter 1 – The life and works of John Bromyard, p. 19

Chapter 2 – The manuscripts and printed editions, p. 59

Chapter 3 – The function and composition of the Summa Praedicantium, p. 81

Chapter 4 – The circulation and use of the Summa Praedicantium, p. 128

PART 2 – p. 162

Chapter 5 – The sources and construction of the chapter Falsitas, p. 172

Chapter 6 – Truth and falsity, p. 185

Chapter 7 – Justice, power and authority, p. 215

Chapter 8 – Knowledge and identity, p. 237

Conclusion – p. 267

APPENDICES

Appendix A – A list of identifications, p. 277

Appendix B – Citations in the Summa Praedicantium, p. 280

Appendix C – Prologus: transcription and translation, p. 298

Appendix D – Falsitas: transcription and translation, p. 306

Bibliography – p. 357

ABBREVIATIONS

BRUO – A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford

CBMLC – Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues

CSEL Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum

DMLBS – Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources

DNB – Dictionary of National Biography

MF – Manipulus Florum

ODNB – Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

SP – Summa Praedicatorum

ST – Summa Theologica

INTRODUCTION

The Summa Praedicatorum

In this thesis I examine how the idea of falsity was employed by an orthodox preacher during the late Middle Ages as a means of constructing and preserving ‘truth’. In order to do so, I focus on the *Summa Praedicatorum*, an encyclopaedic preaching handbook compiled in the first half of the fourteenth century by the Dominican friar John Bromyard. In addition to a prologue, the *Summa* contains 189 chapters organised alphabetically, from *Abiectio* to *Xps* (Christus). Many of these deal with purely religious themes, whilst others are concerned with more secular issues such as political theory, commerce and social relations. Some, such as *Falsitas*, contain significant elements of both. In principle, a preacher could extract arguments, exempla and authorities from the *Summa* in order to create his own sermons, or to incorporate them within other homiletic and didactic texts. The work is large, containing over 14,000 citations and 1200 exempla. In the earliest surviving manuscript (a substantial codex that can be dated to the middle of the fourteenth century), the text covers 629 folios. There are two complete extant manuscript copies of the *Summa*, and a third which contains two parts of a three volume set. Additionally, there are two distinct abbreviated versions of the text. The most comprehensive of these (with regards to the number of chapters abridged) may be found in two fifteenth-century manuscripts, one of which only possesses the chapters from A to L. An alternative abbreviated version has been included in a fifteenth-century miscellany; this manuscript also contains – amongst a variety of other religious texts – two further extracts from the *Summa*. Between 1484 and 1627 the full version of the text was printed seven times on the continent, but no modern edition has ever been published.¹ Peter Binkley had hoped remedy this state of affairs by publishing a scholarly edition in the late 1990s, but the project failed to materialise.

In addition to the *Summa*, a number of other texts have been attributed to John Bromyard, three of which are extant. The most important of these is the *Tractatus Iuris Ciuilis et Canonici*, a preaching handbook whose argumentation derives from canon and civil law sources. Two sets of sermons also survive: the *Exhortationes* and the *Distinctiones*.

¹ Details of the manuscripts and early printed editions are included in Chapter 2, pp. 59-80.

Most scholars have become acquainted with John Bromyard through the work of G.R. Owst, whose two volumes on preaching extensively mined the *Summa* for witty, informative and curious anecdotes.² Following in the footsteps of a number of early modern bio-bibliographers, Owst mistook the author of the *Summa* for a younger namesake who was active in the latter half of the fourteenth century. Since Owst, a number of unpublished PhD theses have considered specific aspects of the text, whilst a scattering of scholarly articles have also directed attention to the *Summa*, focussing on topics such as sorcery, sex and misogyny. More frequently, however, Bromyard must settle for a much briefer appearance in academic works. The majority of these publications cherry-pick excerpts from the *Summa* as a means of propping up an argument, and although there are many valid reasons for adopting this strategy, it comes replete with the obvious drawbacks of a cut-and-paste approach, taking the material out of its original context. In so doing, there is an evident tendency to see the *Summa* as a mirror of medieval society, rather than as a text which was actively participating in contemporary conversations.

The bio-bibliographical record from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century

Present scholarship is still indebted to the medieval and early-modern bio-bibliographical tradition which furnished important details concerning Bromyard's life and works. However, that tradition has also embedded several confusing and misleading traps into the narrative. Thus, at various times Bromyard has been portrayed as three distinct individuals: John, William, and Philip. He was apparently active in the late thirteenth century when the Dominican Order was in the throes of youthful vigour, but was nevertheless still fighting Wycliffites into the early fifteenth century. In more modern times, he has been variously described as 'doctor', 'abbot' and 'bishop', none of which are consistent with the known facts.³ Delving into this web of rumour feels akin to unravelling a Gordian knot; it is, however, a worthwhile endeavour. Indeed, although the following summary of bio-bibliographical accounts may appear somewhat

2 G.R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926), and *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961).

3 Owst, in particular, was adamant that the author of the *Summa Praedicatorum* was 'Doctor Bromyard': see n. 2. Brian Stone calls Bromyard an abbot: Brian Stone (ed.), *Medieval English Verse* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964), p. 15. John Cox calls Bromyard a bishop: John Cox, *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), p. 37.

repetitive, it should also prove useful to modern scholars. Digitalisation has made many of these texts more accessible, but they are still difficult to navigate, not least because of the obscure Latin abbreviations they tend to employ for individuals and sources.

John Bromyard first enters the bio-bibliographical record in the *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesie*, a bibliography of ecclesiastical writers and their works composed by Henry Kirkestede, prior of Bury St Edmunds.⁴ Henry compiled the *Catalogus* in about 1360 whilst serving as novice master and librarian of the abbey. Two records pertain to Bromyard: the first refers to a ‘Johannes de Bromyerd’ who had written a ‘*Tabulam de iure canonico et ciuili moraliter*’; the second refers to a ‘*Wilhelmus Brumyard Anglicus frater praedicator [qui] floruit A. Ch. 1349*’, who was the author of a ‘*Distincciones*’ and a ‘*Summa bona quae vocatur Brumyard*.’⁵ The modern editors of the *Catalogus*, Richard and Mary Rouse, identify Johannes and Wilhemus as the same individual.

John Bromyard next appears in the *Tabula Quorundam Doctorum Ordinis Praedicatorum*, a list of Dominican writers composed in 1414 by the Spanish friar Louis of Valladolid, O.P. (c. 1380-1426).⁶ Louis names ‘Johannes Bromiardi’ as the author of a tract ‘*secundum ordinem alfabeti moralizando iura canonica et civilia*’.⁷

A generation later, Albert of Castile (c.1460-1522) composed a brief chronicle of the Order of Preachers, a text which also contains bio-bibliographical records of important Dominican authors including Bromyard.⁸ Two entries are relevant, one of which refers to a ‘*Ioannes Bromiord, anglicus*’ and the other to a ‘*Ioannes Broviardi*’. Albert attributes eight works to Bromiord (*Summa Praedicatorum*, two sets of *Sermones de tempore et sancti*,

4 Henry of Kirkestede, *Catalogus de Libris Autenticis et Apocrafis*, ed. by Rouse and Rouse, CBMLC, 11 (London: British Library, 2004). For a brief biography, see R. H. Rouse, ‘Kirkestede, Henry (b. c.1314, d. in or after 1378)’, ODNB (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2942>> [accessed 18 Aug 2017].

5 Henry of Kirkestede, *Catalogus*, pp. 341-42, 511.

6 Heribert Christian Scheeben (ed.), ‘Die Tabulae Ludwigs von Valladolid im Chor der Predigerbrüder vom St. Jakob in Paris’, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 1 (1931), 223-63 (pp. 228, 262).

7 Ibid. See also ‘Fray Luis de Valladolid’ <<https://www.dominicos.org/quienes-somos/grandes-figuras/personajes/luis-de-valladolid/>> [accessed 18 August 2017]; G. Guzman, ‘The Testimony of Medieval Dominicans concerning Vincent of Beauvais’, in S. Lusignan and M. Paulmier-Foucart (eds.), *Lector et Compiler. Vincent de Beauvais, Frère Prêcheur. Un intellectuel et son milieu au XIIIe siècle* (Grâne: Créaphis, 1997), pp. 303-26.

8 The work was published as *Brevis et Compendiosa Cronica de Magistris Generalibus et Viris Illustribus Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Venice: Lazarus de Soardis, 1504), and can be found in R. Creytens, ‘Les écrivains dominicains dans la chronique d’Albert de Castello’, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 30 (1960), 227-313.

Collationes, Additiones, Registrum, Persuasiones, and Tractatus iuris), and a single work to Broviardi (a book ‘moralizando iura canonica et civilia per alphabetum’).⁹

A further reference to ‘Ioannes de Bromiard’ is included in the *Bibliotheca Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*, compiled by the Dominican theologian Anthony of Siena (known as Lusitanus, d. 1585).¹⁰ Anthony ascribes a similar list of works to Bromyard as that which Albert had attributed to ‘Bromiord’: he varies only by omitting one of the sets of sermons, and by including a text entitled the *Summa Iuris Naturalis*. Anthony also notes that the author of a *Supplementum Chronicarum* claims Bromyard was active in 1406. However, Anthony is doubtful about this information, since the Dominican chronicles place Bromyard in the first age. Indeed, in a separate text (entitled the *Chronicon*, and published in the same year as the *Bibliotheca*, 1585), Anthony places Bromyard in the year 1260.¹¹

Further entries on John Bromyard occur in the works of the German Benedictine abbot and occultist Johannes Trithemius (1462-1516), and the German Catholic jurist and theologian Wilhelm Eisengrein (1543/4-1584).¹² The former records that Bromyard was the author of at least four works (*Summa Praedicatorum*, *Summa Iuris Moralis*, *Sermones de Tempore*, *Sermones de Sanctis*), whilst the latter places John under the year 1419.

In English sources, John Bromyard next appears in the dictionary of British writers, compiled by John Leland (c.1503–1552) in the sixteenth century, and published by Anthony Hall as the *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis* in 1709.¹³ Leland records that ‘Joannes Bromearcus’ wrote a ‘*Distinctionum*’ and ‘*Summae Praedicatorum*’, and notes that Conrad Gesner added a ‘*Summam Iuris Moralis*’.¹⁴ He also claims that Bromyard studied at *Isidis Vadum* (Oxford), and should not be confused with the Augustinian John Bromio. As an aside,

9 Ibid., p. 276.

10 Anthony of Siena, *Bibliotheca Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum* (Paris: Nicolas Nivelle, 1585), pp. 132-33.

11 The *Supplementum Chronicarum* to which Anthony refers is a lost continuation of a Dominican chronicle rather than Jacopo Filippo Foresti’s more famous work: Jacopo Filippo Foresti, *Supplementum Chronicarum* (Venice: Bernardinus Benalius, 1483).

12 Johannes Trithemius, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* (Basel: Johann Amerbach, 1494), f. 97r, and Wilhelm Eisengrein, *Catalogus Testium Veritatis Locupletissimus, Omnium Orthodoxae Matris Ecclesiae Doctorum* (Dillingen: Sebald Mayer, 1565), f. 160r.

13 John Leland, *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis*, ed. by Anthony Hall, 2 vols (Oxford: Sheldon, 1709), II, p. 356.

14 See Conrad Gesner, *Bibliotheca Universalis sive Catalogus Omnium Scriptorum Locupletissimus* (Zürich: Christoph Froschauer, 1545), p. 393.

Leland is puzzled that Leandro Alberti failed to include Bromyard in his treatise on the famous men of the Dominican order.¹⁵

A little later, John Bale (1495–1563), bishop of Ossory, evangelical polemicist, and historian, refers to John Bromyard in two bibliographical texts, the *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, and the *Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brytannie... Catalogus*. In the Index, Bale records information taken from ‘*Bostoni Buriensis catalogo*’ (that is, Henry Kirkestede).¹⁶ Thus, ‘*Guilhelmus Brunyarde*’, active c. 1349, is noted as the author of a ‘*Summam theologiae, Distinctiones varias, and Atque alia plura.*’ In addition, ‘*Joannes Bromyerde*’ is mentioned as the author of three separate works, all of which (judging by the incipits Bale provides) appear to be variant titles of the *Tractatus*.¹⁷ Bale notes that John Bromyard was ‘*cantabrigiensis distinctionis*’. He also records a ‘*Philippus Brommerde*’, active in 1490, as the editor of a book of distinctions. However, the incipit included by Bale, and the fact that the earliest printed edition of the *Tractatus* (Cologne: Ulrich Zel, 1473) attributes authorship to ‘*Philippus Bronnerde*’, confirms that Philipp and John Bromyard are identical, and that the book of distinctions to which Bale refers is also the *Tractatus*.¹⁸

In Bale’s *Catalogus* the same information about ‘*Guilhelmus*’ Bromyard is repeated.¹⁹ However, more detailed biographical information is given about John Bromyard, who is said to have attended the 1382 council which condemned Wycliffite doctrines; implicitly, therefore, Bale identifies the author of the *Summa* as the younger Bromyard. Correspondingly, he says that Bromyard was active c. 1390, and attributes nine works to him; the majority of these are identifiable with the works already cited by previous bio-bibliographers, although Bale also includes a ‘*Contra Vuicleuistas*’.²⁰ According to Bale, those who wish to know more about Bromyard should consult the *Fasciculus Zizaniorum Vuicleui*. An additional entry on Philipp Bromyard notes that Bale’s information about this individual has been derived from a text written by the Dominican friar Philip Wolf of Seligenstadt; although this work no longer

15 Leland, *Commentarii*, p. 375.

16 John Bale, *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, ed. by R. Lane Poole (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902), pp. 118, 185.

17 See p. 52.

18 Bale, *Index*, p. 503.

19 John Bale, *Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brytanniae Catalogus*, 2 vols (Basel: Johann Oporinus, 1557-59), I (1557), pp. 429-30.

20 *Ibid.*, pp. 511-12.

survives, the extracts recorded by Bale show that Philip Wolf had included entries on both ‘Ioannes Brommart’ and ‘Philippus Brommerd’.²¹ Bale attributes two works to Philip Bromyard: a ‘divisionum praedicabilium’, which may be identified as the *Tractatus*, and a set of sermons, *per annum*.

In the *Relationum Historiarum de Rebus Anglicis*, the English Roman Catholic scholar John Pits (1560-1616) – making considerable use of the earlier bio-bibliographical accounts, and citing Leland, Anthony of Siena, Trithemius, and Thomas Netter – places further emphasis on Bromyard’s anti-Wycliffite leanings, and records that Bromyard was a doctor of both Laws, and then of Theology, at Oxford, before becoming Chancellor of the faculty of Theology at Cambridge.²² Pits attributes eighteen works to Bromyard, at least six of which appear to be variant names for the *Tractatus*. In addition to these, and other titles already attributed to Bromyard by previous bio-bibliographers, Pits includes: *Lecturae Scripturarum*; *De Missarum Celebratione*; and a *Summa de B. Maria Virgine*.²³

At around the same time that Pits was writing, the Jesuit and papal diplomat Antonio Possevino (1533-1611) – citing Eisengrein – records that John Bromyard is said to have lived around 1419. However, Possevino also notes that this date is inconsistent with that given by Anthony of Siena, who (according to Possevino) recorded that there was a Bromyard active in 1290; however, I have not been able to locate this reference in Anthony’s works.²⁴

The confusion regarding when John was alive was also noted by the Dominican friar Ambrosius Altamura (1608-1677) who assembled the various dates which previous bio-bibliographers had assigned to Bromyard:²⁵ thus, Vincent Baron, Giovanni Michele Piò and others suggest Bromyard was active in 1290;²⁶ Albert of Castile places Bromyard in 1315; others claim 1390; John Pits suggests the fourteenth century; the author of the *Supplementum Chronicarum* records a date of 1406; and Eisengrein believes Bromyard to have been alive in

21 Bale, *Catalogus*, II (1559), p. 70. See Reginald L. Poole, ‘Philip Wolf of Seligenstadt’, *English Historical Review*, 33, no. 132 (Oct., 1918), 500-17.

22 John Pits, *Relationum Historiarum de Rebus Anglicis* (Paris: Thierry and Cramoisy, 1619), pp. 551-52.

23 *Ibid.*

24 Antonio Possevino, *Apparatus Sacer ad Scriptores Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (Cologne: Joannes Gymnicum, 1608), p. 828.

25 Ambrosius Altamura, *Bibliothecae Dominicanae* (Rome: Nicolas Angelus Tinassius, 1677), pp. 63-64, 459.

26 Giovanni Michele Piò, *Della Vite degli Huomini Illustri di S. Domenico* (Bologna: Bonomi, 1620), column 94. Vincent Baron, *Libri V Apologetici pro Religione, utraque Theologia, Moribus, ac Iuribus Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Paris: Piget, 1666), p. 213.

1419. In order to reconcile these dates, Ambrosius says that some scholars have suggested that there were two Bromyards (Ex his aliqui deduxerunt Bromiardos binos fuisse); Ambrosius, however, thought this unlikely.

With greater conviction, Henry Wharton, whilst contributing to William Cave's *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria*, identifies the author of the *Summa* as the John Bromyard, active 1390.²⁷ He claims that the year 1290 is an error, whilst John's death is said to have been after 1419.²⁸ Wharton is notable for providing catalogue references for a number of manuscripts containing works by Bromyard: the *Dicta de missarum celebratione* (Merton, Oxford MS 210); *Exhortationes* (Cambridge Public MS 208); *Tractatus* (Pembroke, Cambridge MS 122, New College, Oxford MS 140, and – although the exact manuscript catalogue number is omitted – in Lambeth Palace Library).²⁹

However, the most comprehensive account of John Bromyard given in the early modern bio-bibliographies is that provided by Jacques Échard in the *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Recensiti Notis Historicis et Criticis Illustrati Auctoribus*.³⁰ Échard draws together the information given in earlier accounts, and provides a thorough lists of texts attributed to Bromyard, most notably giving references to the relevant manuscripts recorded in Edward Bernard's, *Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae in Unum Collecti* (published in 1697).³¹

Other standard bio-bibliographical works of this era – including those composed by Thomas Tanner, Johann Albert Fabricius, and Remi-Casimir Oudin – repeat the same information that has already been discussed.³²

Modern Scholarship

27 Henry Wharton and William Cave, *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria*, 2 vols (Basel: Johann Rudolph Im Hof, 1745), II, p. 83.

28 *Ibid.*

29 *Ibid.*

30 Jacques Quétif and Jacques Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Recensiti Notis Historicis et Criticis Illustrati Auctoribus*, 2 vols (Paris: Ballard and Simart, 1719-21), I (1719), pp. 634, 700-02.

31 See pp. 56-57.

32 Thomas Tanner, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica* (London: Bowyer, 1748), pp. 129-30, 132; Johann Albert Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina*, 6 vols (Florence: Baracchi, 1858), I, p. 263; Remi-Casimir Oudin, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiae Antiquis*, 3 vols (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1722), III, column 1220. The most recent entry on John Bromyard can be found in Thomas Kaeppli, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, 4 vols (Rome: S. Sabinae, 1970-93), II (1970), pp. 392-94.

Following in the footsteps of Bale and the early modern bio-bibliographers, nineteenth-century scholarship on the *Summa Praedicanitum* attributed the text to the younger John Bromyard.

Arthur Miller was responsible for the article on John de Bromyarde that appeared in the *Dictionary of National Biography* in 1886.³³ Miller remarked that Bromyard may have been present at the fourth council of London (wrongly giving the date as 1352 rather than 1382), which assembled under William de Courtenay, Archbishop of Canterbury ‘for the purpose of condemning Wycliffe’.³⁴

Other notable pieces of nineteenth-century scholarship concerning the *Summa* were published by Thomas Wright and Thomas Crane.³⁵ Wright included a selection of exempla taken from the *Summa* in a collection of Latin stories from fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts, whilst Crane’s edition of exempla found in Jacques de Vitry’s *Sermones vulgares* cross references those also found in the *Summa*.

Aside from the work of G.R. Owst, much of the scholarship in the first two thirds of the twentieth century focussed on accurately dating the *Summa*. J.A. Herbert demonstrated that part of the text must have been composed sometime after 1323, since Bromyard uses the phrase ‘*Episcopus sanctissimus magister Johannes de Monemuta quondam Landavensis*’ (that is, formerly bishop of Llandaff), and John of Monmouth is known to have died in 1323.³⁶ Warner and Gilson subsequently noted that the text must have been composed later than 1326, given that Bromyard cites Johannes Andreae’s *Ordinary Gloss to the Clementines*, although it is now known that the *Gloss* was written earlier, probably in 1322.³⁷ G. Coulton accepted a date of c.1390, describing Bromyard as a contemporary of Chaucer. Coulton is also notable for citing and translating several passages from the *Summa*, including one which indicates Bromyard’s presence in Brindisi and Puglia.³⁸ J.-T. Welter, however, believed that the *Summa* was

33 A. Miller, ‘John de Bromyarde’, *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 vols (London: Smith, Elder and Company, 1885-1900), VI (1886), pp. 405-06. See also Herbert Brook Workman, *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926), II, pp. 218, 279.

34 *Ibid.*

35 Thomas Wright, (ed.), *A Selection of Latin Stories* (London: Percy Society, 1842); Thomas Crane (ed.), *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry* (London: D. Nutt, 1890).

36 J.A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts of the British Museum*, 3 vols (London: Longmans, 1883-1910), III (1910), pp. 450-52.

37 George F. Warner and Julius P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King’s Collections*, 4 vols (London: Longmans, 1921), I, pp. 195-96.

38 G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion: Getting and spending*, 4 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927-1950), III (1950), pp. 487-88.

composed c. 1360-1368 on the basis of an exemplum, included under the chapter *Mors*, which mentions the death of a Sicilian king. Welter argued that the king is Louis the Aragonese, who ruled in Sicily from 1342 to 1355, although he provided no evidence to support this claim.³⁹ On even vaguer ground, Joseph Mosher – studying the exempla collections found in English medieval literature – remarked: ‘with [the *Summa*’s] completion at the opening of the fifteenth century the Latin example-book reached its highest development not only for England but for the world.’⁴⁰

The first major step forward occurred in an article published in 1939 by Sister Mary Devlin, who noted that a copy of the *Summa Praedicatorum* was amongst the books of Simon Bozoun, prior of Norwich.⁴¹ Since Simon was dead by 1352, Devlin concluded that, ‘if this is the *Summa Praedicatorum* of the Dominican John Bromyard, a work from which Thomas Brunton [also known as Thomas Brinton] derived exempla and ideas which he used in his sermons, the date for the composition of the *Summa Praedicatorum* may be placed early in the fourteenth century.’⁴²

A parallel development occurred in 1953, when Fr. George Mifsud demonstrated that John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, who died in 1360, knew and cited the *Summa Praedicatorum*.⁴³ In 1957, Emden publicised the date set out by Mifsud in an article for the BRUO. This contains a useful survey of the known facts of Bromyard’s life and surviving manuscripts, although there are a number of errors.⁴⁴ Emden wrongly states that Bromyard ‘was granted licence to hear confessions in Hereford diocese 1 Feb 1326’, and then mistakenly claims that the *Summa* was a ‘revised and augmented’ version of the *Tractatus*.

39 J.-T. Welter, *L'Exemplum dans la Littérature Religieuse et Didactique du Moyen Âge* (Paris: Occitania, 1927), p. 334.

40 Joseph Mosher, *The Exemplum in the Early Religious and Didactic Literature of England*, (New York: AMS Press, 1966), p. 65.

41 Mary Devlin, ‘Bishop Thomas Brunton and His Sermons’, *Speculum*, 14 (1939), 322-44 (p. 326); Mary Devlin (ed.), *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester, 1373-89*, 2 vols (London: Royal Historical Society, 1954), II, p. 326. Indeed, the list of books bequeathed by Simon Bozoun had in fact been published by H. Beeching, ‘The Library of the Cathedral Church of Norwich with Appendix of Priory Manuscripts now in English Libraries, by M.R. James’, *Norfolk Archaeology*, 19 (1917), 67-116.

42 Devlin, *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton*, I, p. x.

43 George Mifsud, ‘John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons’ (unpublished bachelor of letters thesis, Oxford, 1953), p. 215.

44 A. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957-59), I, (1957), p. 278.

In an article published in 1962, Leonard Boyle dated part of the *Summa Praedicatorum* to the onset of the Black Death.⁴⁵ A more detailed and influential study on the date of the *Summa Praedicatorum* was published by Boyle in 1973, which suggests that the text was written between c. 1327/8 and c. 1348; despite being challenged by the recent work of Keith Walls, this remains the orthodox, albeit demonstrably incorrect, position.⁴⁶

Aside from the issue of when the *Summa* was composed (which will be comprehensively dealt with in Chapter 3 of this thesis), a number of scholarly articles have been published on specific aspects of the text. In 1934, H.G. Pfander produced a short piece describing fifteen alphabetical reference books compiled by friars, including a brief description of the *Summa*.⁴⁷ The value of this article lies in the way in which Pfander places Bromyard's work within the context of comparable preaching aids, thereby providing useful clues regarding the utility of the *Summa*, the templates accessible to Bromyard, and possible motivations for writing the text. In a similar vein Christina von Nolcken has investigated the development of alphabetically arranged preaching handbooks in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.⁴⁸ In particular, she has mapped out the way in which the *Summa* has been used by preachers, including Sheppey, Brinton and the author of a sermon found in the fifteenth-century British Library MS Royal 18 B. xxiii. Von Nolcken claims that the *Tractatus* was written by c. 1328, but provides no evidence for this; it is possible that she has dated the work on the dubious assumption that the *Tractatus* preceded the *Summa*, which Bromyard was still writing in 1330.

In the 1960s Paul Olson wrote two brief articles involving the *Summa*.⁴⁹ In the first, Olson mines the text for Bromyard's thoughts on Gothic architecture, and how Bromyard used the beauty of buildings to make moral points. In the second article, he examines the use of

45 Leonard Boyle, 'The Constitution Cum ex eo of Boniface VIII: Education of Parochial Clergy', *Mediaeval Studies*, 24 (1), (1962), 263-302.

46 Leonard Boyle, 'The Date of the *Summa Praedicatorum* of John Bromyard', *Speculum*, 48 (1973), 553-57. See also Leonard Boyle 'The *Summa Confessorum* of John of Freiburg and the popularization of the moral teaching of St. Thomas and some of his contemporaries' in *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274-1974. Commemorative Studies*, 2 vols (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1974), I, pp. 245-68. See also below, p. 15, n. 67.

47 H. Pfander, 'The Medieval Friars and Some Alphabetical Reference Books for Sermons', *Medium Aevum*, 3 (1934), 19-29.

48 Christina Von Nolcken, 'Some Alphabetical Compendia and how Preachers used them in Fourteenth-Century England', *Viator*, 12 (1981), 271-88.

49 Paul Olson, 'A Note on John Bromyard and Augustine's "Christian doctrine"', *English Language Notes*, 3, no. 3 (1966), 165-68.

‘spiritual interpretations’ in the Summa, and whether this might shed light on the way in which language and symbols were used in medieval poetic and visual art.⁵⁰

Elsewhere, Alan Fletcher has briefly analysed a vernacular death lyric which was incorporated into the abridged version of the Summa found in Oriel MS 10, whilst Gillian Rudd has investigated the way the various recensions of Piers Plowman use Noah’s Ark as a metaphor, finding an analogue for Langland’s distinctive interpretation in the chapter Verbum Dei in the Summa.⁵¹

Other scholars have written recent articles which utilise the Summa as a source of evidence for medieval social beliefs and practices. Ruth Mazo Karras has investigated how far Bromyard’s work contained elements of misogyny.⁵² Focussing on the narrative exempla found within the Summa, Karras concludes that although men and women sin equally, women do so by virtue (or rather the vice) of their gender. Catherine Rider, meanwhile, has analysed Bromyard’s chapter on Sortilegium as a means of investigating clerical attitudes towards sorcery. Finally, Richard Firth Green sees similarities in Bromyard’s depiction of contemporary sexual attitudes with those displayed by Chaucer’s Wife of Bath.⁵³

In addition, a number of theses have been written that focus on various elements of the Summa. All of these remain unpublished, and some are particularly inconspicuous. In the 1950s, Catherine Houlihan (also known as Sister Winefride) transcribed and translated three chapters from the Summa – Audire, Praedicatio, and Verbum Dei – and examined the significance of these with regards to medieval preaching. At the very end of her thesis, Houlihan also edited a sermon outline from the Distinctiones.⁵⁴ According to Leonard Boyle, Francis P. Donnelly was preparing to submit a dissertation on John Bromyard in the early 1970s; indeed it was Donnelly

50 Paul Olson, ‘John Bromyard’s Response to the Gothic’, *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 15 (1963), 91-94.

51 Alan Fletcher, ‘A Death Lyric from the Summa Predicantium, MS. Oriel College 10’, *Notes and Queries*, n.s. 24 (January, 1977), 11-12; Gillian Rudd, ‘The State of the Ark: A metaphor in Bromyard and Piers Plowman B.X.396-401’, *Notes and Queries*, n.s. 37, (March, 1990), 6-10.

52 Ruth Mazo Karras, ‘Gendered Sin and Misogyny in John of Bromyard’s “Summa Predicantium”’, *Traditio*, 47 (1992), 233–57.

53 Richard Firth Green, ‘“Allas, Allas! That Evere Love Was Synne!”: John Bromyard V. Alice of Bath’, *The Chaucer Review*, 42, no. 3 (2008), 298-311; Catherine Rider, ‘“Danger, Stupidity and Infidelity”: Magic and Discipline in John Bromyard’s “Summa for Preachers”’ in K. Cooper and J. Gregory (eds), *Discipline and Diversity* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2007), pp. 191-201.

54 Catherine Houlihan, ‘The Medieval Preacher: Chapters from the Summa Predicantium of John Bromyard, O.P.’ (unpublished master’s thesis, University of Birmingham, 1959).

who discovered a key passage that anchors part of the text to the year 1330.⁵⁵ No record of Donnelly or his thesis can now be found. In 1971, Denis Oross completed a doctoral thesis on the *Summa* in which he chose to focus on the same three key chapters and corresponding concerns as Houlihan: sermon, preacher and audience.⁵⁶ Elsewhere, Maureen Gunn completed a dissertation on Bromyard in 1977, although this also remains inaccessible.⁵⁷ Angelika Lozar has completed the most recent doctoral thesis on the text.⁵⁸ Lozar's stated intention was to bring together the current state of knowledge on John Bromyard, and create a catalogue of the narrative exempla found within the *Summa*. It should also be noted that a definitive list of exempla from the *Summa*, promised by Karras back in 1992, remains unpublished.⁵⁹

Due to the paucity of full-length studies, the standard account of the *Summa Praedicatorum* remains a short article written by Peter Binkley, who, in the late 1990s, argued that Bromyard's 'work as a compiler was prompted by the needs of the Hereford Dominicans...in the absence of a well-developed priory library.'⁶⁰ Binkley further suggested that that '[the acquisition of] a collection of originalia would [have been] a long and expensive process; compilations like Bromyard's were the shortest route to a working library capable of supplying the preaching needs of the friars.'⁶¹ In a second, and particularly persuasive, article, Binkley has analysed 'preacher's responses to thirteenth-century encyclopaedism'.⁶² Binkley argues that 'these works, which were ostensibly intended to serve clerics in preaching and the exposition of scripture, failed to satisfy some of their intended audience because they fell into the characteristic frame of mind of the encyclopaedist by describing the natural world as one of peace and order, whereas the preacher was faced with the human world of sin and conflict.'⁶³

The *Summa* served as an antidote to these encyclopaedias; by focussing on sin and human

55 Boyle, 'The Date of the *Summa Praedicatorum* of John Bromyard', p. 535, n. 15.

56 Denis Oross, 'John Bromyard: Medieval Sermon Encyclopedist' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1971).

57 Maureen Gunn, 'The *Summa Praedicatorum* of John Bromyard and its relationship to fourteenth-century Christianity' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Montreal, 1977).

58 Angelika Lozar, 'Studien zur *Summa Praedicatorum* des John Bromyard' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Freie Universität, Berlin, 1998).

59 Karras, 'Gendered Sin and Misogyny in John of Bromyard's "*Summa Praedicatorum*"', p. 235, n. 9.

60 Peter Binkley, 'John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans' in *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. by J. W. Drijvers and A. A. MacDonald (Leiden: Brill, 1995), pp. 255-64.

61 *Ibid.*, p. 263.

62 Peter Binkley, 'Preachers' Responses to Thirteenth-century Encyclopaedism' in *Pre-Modern Encyclopaedic Texts: Proceedings of the Second COMERS Congress, Groningen, 1-4 July 1996*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 79, ed. by Peter Binkley (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 75-88.

63 *Ibid.*, p. 76.

weakness, Bromyard emphasises the disunity and lack of harmony in the world. Binkley is also responsible for the article on Bromyard which appears in the new version of the ODNB.⁶⁴

Unfortunately, there are a number of errors in this: firstly, following Emden, Binkley wrongly says that John was given a licence to hear confessions in 1326; secondly, the first printed edition of the *Summa* is incorrectly said to be that of Nuremberg, 1485; and thirdly, the *Tractatus* is said to have been the template for the *Summa* even though this is demonstrably not the case.

Bromyard has received further attention from Siegfried Wenzel, who has written heavily on Latin sermon material.⁶⁵ In broad terms, Wenzel has placed Bromyard's surviving texts within the wider context of Latin sermon collections. More specifically, he has also written the only scholarly article on Bromyard's *Tractatus*, a work which seems to have circulated more widely in the Middle Ages than the *Summa Praedicatorum*. Significantly, Wenzel has conclusively demonstrated that the *Summa* was not an expanded version of the *Tractatus*, and has also produced evidence which complicates the relationship of both texts.⁶⁶

Keith Walls, an independent scholar, has published the only full-length study of the *Summa Praedicatorum*. His interest predominantly lies in documenting the sources used in the composition of the *Summa*.⁶⁷ Walls also provides the most recent discussion concerning the date of the text, in which he convincingly challenges the orthodox view put forward by Boyle. In doing so, he refutes the notion that the text must have been written from A to Z, and provides significant (albeit circumstantial) evidence that the majority of it was written in the 1320s. However, Walls does not appear to use the manuscript evidence, relying instead on a first edition printed copy of the text. His method primarily involves collating the citations provided by Bromyard. Usefully, Walls includes many excerpts from the *Summa*, both in the original Latin, and in English translation.

64 Peter Binkley, 'John Bromyard', ODNB (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3521>> [accessed 21 January 2013].

65 Siegfried Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 128, 136-38, 322-24; Siegfried Wenzel, *Macaronic Sermons: Bilingualism and Preaching in Late-Medieval England* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), pp. 35-36; Siegfried Wenzel, *Verses in Sermons: Fasciculus Morum and its Middle English Poems* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1978); Siegfried Wenzel, 'Mum and the Sothsegger, lines 421-422', *English Language Notes*, 14, 2 (1976), 87-90.

66 Siegfried Wenzel, 'Bromyard's other Handbook: Canon and Civil Law for Preachers', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 3rd ser., 6 (2009), 93-123.

67 Keith Walls, *John Bromyard on Church and State: The Summa Praedicatorum and Early Fourteenth-Century England* (Market Weighton: Clayton-Thorpe, 2007).

The current thesis, Part 1: new contexts for the *Summa Praedicatorum*

Given the current state of research on the *Summa*, in the first part of this thesis I seek to place the text within its appropriate historical context by thoroughly examining the conditions which influenced its composition, and then investigating how it was used, transmitted, and - in some cases – appropriated.

Chapter 1 explores the life and works of John Bromyard. Despite the paucity of documentary evidence available, it is possible to reconstruct aspects of the compiler's upbringing and role within the Dominican Order. This provides useful background material which shall be utilised in later chapters. Notably it serves to illuminate the contexts surrounding the production of the *Summa*, the motivation for composing it, and the values and attitudes that shaped it. In addition, I investigate the relationship between the surviving works attributed to Bromyard, and explore the possibility that the *Summa* and the *Tractatus* were in fact compiled by different individuals.

Chapter 2 provides detailed descriptions of the surviving manuscripts of the *Summa*, an endeavour which provides valuable information with regards to the acquisition, use and transmission of the text.

In Chapter 3 I consider the utility of the *Summa*, and explore how John Bromyard wrote and compiled the text, the sources he used, and the date of its composition. I engage both with recent work published by Keith Walls, and also the seminal research of Boyle. I also seek to identify why Bromyard compiled the *Summa*. Specifically, I contest Peter Binkley's view that Bromyard wrote the text as a means of compensating for an impoverished priory library.

Chapter 4 considers the use and transmission of the *Summa*. I examine how the text flourished via episcopal, monastic and fraternal networks, and how chapters and sections of the *Summa* were copied and incorporated into other texts. In a separate line of enquiry, I consider why comparatively few copies of the *Summa* survive in comparison to texts such as the *Manipulus Florum*, a florilegium which appears in similar numbers in medieval library catalogues. Finally, I investigate how the ideas within the *Summa* formed part of a wider discourse circulating in society.

The current thesis, Part 2: Falsitas

In the second part of the thesis, I focus on the chapter Falsitas. In doing so, I engage in greater depth with many of the themes already dealt with in the first part of the thesis. More specifically, I investigate the use and utility of the concept of falsity in late-medieval England, its relationship with truth, and the contradictions which undermine the efficacy of the discourse. In particular, I explore a number of issues with which the discourse is entwined: the various concepts of truth; authority and power; and knowledge and identity.

In Chapter 5, I describe in detail how the chapter Falsitas was compiled, and the sources which Bromyard used. Notably, I demonstrate that he was lifting material from the *Manipulus Florum*. I also provide a summary of Falsitas (the entire text and translation may be found in Appendix D), and a summary of Veritas.

Chapter 6 explores how Bromyard negotiates the various meanings of a true life, and how this proves to be problematic for the coherence of the discourse. In a broad sense, Bromyard defines falsity as infidelity to God, which provides the fundamental rationale for condemning every sinner as false. More specifically, he emphasises the obligation to tell the truth. However, this is complicated by the utility of deceiving evil people, and the fidelity owed to others. In addition, although fidelity is a characteristic of truth, Bromyard's condemnation of the unity of the false partially undermines his argument. Finally, I consider how Bromyard deals with the idea of truth as integrity, and the significance of this concept with regards to the social and economic upheavals of the fourteenth century.

In Chapter 7, I explore the implications of Bromyard's contradictory attitude towards those in positions of power: he critiques temporal authority, and yet seeks to uphold social order; he attempts to speak truth to power, but also courts the support of the secular authorities; he shows an awareness that secular institutions were responsible for many social issues, and yet tends to blame individual sinfulness for evil and falsity; he depicts the true as victims, whilst simultaneously recognising that the false are persecuted.

Chapter 8 exposes the way in which Bromyard attempts to defend the veracity of his discourse by stripping away the legitimacy of competing claims to truth. I consider the

implications of Bromyard's association of truth with underlying reality, and falsity with form, particularly with regards to the manipulative power of language. I also examine the issue of secrecy, and the effects of associating the mask of public performance with falsity. Finally, I discuss how Bromyard deals with the difficulty of distinguishing the true from the false.

Ultimately, by investigating how the idea of falsity was employed to shape truth, I seek to illuminate many other subjects dealt with in the *Summa*, and uncover crucial evidence for the nature of the conversations in which Bromyard was participating. In this regard, I suggest that the discourse of falsity disseminated via popular preaching (in conjunction with the development of confessional practices and inquisition, which were relatively much rarer events) served to provide a conceptual framework to explain the world as it was (or as preachers such as Bromyard believed it to be), and correspondingly, to promote the moral behaviour consistent with that world-view.

PART 1

CHAPTER 1: THE LIFE AND WORKS OF JOHN BROMYARD, O.P.

John Bromyard

The extant manuscripts attribute the *Summa Praedicatorum* to a Dominican friar called Johannes de Bromyard.¹ Coupled with oblique anecdotes taken from within the text, this name provides the firmest piece of information with which one can piece together aspects of the compiler's life. Consequently, it is possible to draw certain details about Bromyard from the shadows, albeit with the caveat that the more one speculates, the greater the possibility of deviating from the truth.

The vast majority of Dominican records pertaining to the English province (including priory records and the *acta* from the provincial chapters) were destroyed following the suppression of the Order in England in 1538-39.² However, surviving documentary evidence, primarily from the episcopal records, indicates that there were at least two Dominican friars named John Bromyard who were active in the fourteenth century.³ Both of these friars were attached to the Hereford priory, which was located fourteen miles away from the manor and town of Bromyard.

The elder John Bromyard first appears in the historical record via the episcopal register of Adam Orleton (bishop of Hereford, 1317-27) in an entry datable to 1 February 1326.⁴ Bromyard was due to receive a licence to hear confessions in the diocese of Hereford, but this was deferred on account of his personal absence ('*admissione dicti fratris Johannis de Bromyerd propter ejus absenciam personalem dilata*').⁵ Gunn suggested that Bromyard may have been abroad in this year; there is, after all, ample evidence within the *Summa* to suggest Bromyard was acquainted with France and Italy.⁶ However, there is nothing that would place these foreign

1 For the variant spellings of the name of the author, see Chapter 2.

2 Alfred Emden, *A Survey of the Dominicans in England: based on the ordination lists in episcopal registers, 1268 to 1538* (Rome: Istituto Storico Domenicano, 1967), p. 15.

3 Emden, *Survey*, pp. 103-21.

4 A.T. Bannister (ed.), *Registrum Ade de Orleton, episcopi Herefordensis, 1317-27* (London: Canterbury and York Society, 1908), pp. 350-51. For Adam Orleton, see Roy Haines, *The Church and Politics in Fourteenth-century England: The career of Adam Orleton, c. 1275-1345* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).

5 Emden is incorrect in claiming that Bromyard received the licence on this date. See Emden, *BRUO*, I p. 278. The error is repeated in Binkley, 'Bromyard', ODNB.

6 Gunn is cited by Lozar, 'Studien zur *Summa Praedicatorum* des John Bromyard', p. 7.

visits in the year 1326, and given that Bromyard was evidently expected to receive a licence, it seems more likely that his absence was due to unforeseen circumstances. On the day in question, two other friars—Hugh of Ledbury and John of Leominster – each received a comparable licence to hear confessions.⁷ The episcopal register records that Hugh had been due to receive his licence alongside John Bromyard. Implicitly therefore, it seems that John of Leominster was drafted in as a late replacement for Bromyard. These friars received their licence at Lechlade – a town located about sixty miles from Hereford – and Bromyard’s inability to undertake the relatively long journey may have been due to a more spontaneous reason such as illness, or indeed as the result of pressing business that needed to be conducted on behalf of the Order.

A younger friar with the same name also appears in the episcopal records. In the register of John Trillek (bishop of Hereford, 1344-1360), a Dominican of Hereford Convent called John Bromyard was ordained subdeacon (20 February 1350), deacon (15 March 1350) and priest (22 May 1350).⁸ John is one of a number of friars who in c.1350 passed through several ordinations from subdeacon to deacon in a single year. His rapid progression through the major orders was probably in response to the Black Death which struck Hereford in the Autumn of 1348, and hit more forcefully in the following summer.⁹ In general, the ordination records indicate that it took three or four years for a friar to progress from acolyte to priest.¹⁰ Well-educated older men might receive major orders within twelve months, whilst younger friars would normally receive their orders over a longer period of time, especially if they were below the canonical age for admission into the priesthood (a candidate’s twenty-fifth year).¹¹

It is likely that the younger John Bromyard, who was ordained priest in 1350, is the same individual wrongly identified by John Bale as the author of the *Summa*.¹² Since it is now known that the *Summa* was in circulation before 1352, it cannot have been compiled by this

7 *Registrum Ade de Orleton*, p. 351.

8 Emden, *Survey*, p. 106.

9 *Ibid.*, pp. 106-07. For an account of the impact of the Black Death in the diocese of Hereford, see William J. Dohar, *The Black Death and Pastoral Leadership: The diocese of Hereford in the fourteenth century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995).

10 Emden, *Survey*, p. 21. An acolyte was the most senior of the four minor orders; the major orders consisted of subdeacon, deacon and priest.

11 M. O’Carroll, ‘The Educational Organisation of the Dominicans in England and Wales 1221-1348: A multidisciplinary approach’, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 50 (1980), 24-62 (pp. 55-56). O’Carroll also suggests that it took between two and three years on average for a Dominican to receive major orders.

12 Bale, *Catalogus*, p. 511.

friar, although he may have been responsible for other texts associated with the name.¹³

Contemporary records indicate that the younger John Bromyard incepted as Master of Theology at Cambridge University, and would later serve as Chancellor. He attended the second session of the council convened by Archbishop Courtenay in 1382 at Blackfriars, London, which was responsible for condemning a number of Wycliffite propositions. Some years later, in 1393, he was named as one of the bishop of Hereford's assessors at the heresy trial of Walter Brut. Additionally, he served as the prior of the Dominican convent at Hereford on two occasions (1391, 1398), and was appointed as visitor of the Oxford visitation of the English Dominican province in 1397.¹⁴ No records exist which demonstrate that this John Bromyard was active in the fifteenth century.¹⁵

Trillek's register also reveals that 'Willelmus le Wyte' received an episcopal licence on 27 November 1352 to hear confessions in place of John Bromyard.¹⁶ Emden, Boyle and Binkley have all accepted that this refers to the elder Bromyard, and suggest that it indicates the date of his death.¹⁷ However – assuming this record does refer to the elder man – it is also possible that he had moved to a different convent, was too infirm to carry out his responsibilities, or that new duties prevented him from fulfilling his old ones.¹⁸ More speculatively, it is plausible that the register is referring to the younger Bromyard, ordained priest in May 1350, although if he did receive such a licence between 1350 and 1352 it was not recorded. Ordinarily, a Dominican put forward to receive such a licence was expected to have significant experience as a preacher, since only a limited number were granted to friars.¹⁹ However, given the severe impact of the Black Death on the Hereford priory – as demonstrated by the sharp increase in ordinations

13 See pp. 51-55.

14 Emden, BRUO, I, p. 278, provides the sources for this information. However, he wrongly suggests that the younger John Bromyard was given a licence to hear confessions of 27 October 1352; this was in fact when William le Whyte received a licence to hear confessions in place of John Bromyard. See J.H., Parry, (ed.), *Registrum Johannis de Trillek: episcopi Herefordensis, 1344-1361* (London: Canterbury and York Society, 1912), p. 20. For an explanation of how the Dominicans monitored discipline via the visitation, see pp. 34-35.

15 As mentioned in the introduction, the author of the *Supplementum Chronicarum* is supposed to have recorded that Bromyard was active in 1406, whilst Eisengrein believed Bromyard to have been alive in 1419. See p. 6. G.R. Owst suggested that Bromyard was still alive in 1409: *Owst, Preaching*, p. 69. However, this was based on a date in Bodley MS 859, which contains the *Exhortationes*. This text is now known to have been written by the older Bromyard, and the date 1409 refers to the year in which the text was copied. See Emden, BRUO, I, p. 278.

16 *Registrum Johannis de Trillek*, p. 20.

17 Emden, BRUO, I, p. 278; Binkley, 'John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans', ODNB; Boyle, 'The Date of the *Summa Praedicatorum* of John Bromyard', p. 534.

18 Dominican friars frequently moved between convents, albeit they largely remained within the same visitation. See Emden, *Survey*, pp. 20-25.

19 See p. 39.

around these years – it is possible that the younger Bromyard was presented to receive a licence whilst still an inexperienced friar, and that the disruption of the Black Death prevented it from being recorded. It should be borne in mind that the younger Bromyard may have studied at university prior to joining the Dominican Order, and it is thus plausible that he had already received some theological training. He may subsequently have interrupted his role as confessor in order to continue his studies at a different convent.

Although there are few definitive details known about the life of the elder John Bromyard, it seems likely that he was born in the 1280s or 1290s. He must already have been a priest in 1326 when he was due to be given a licence to hear confession, and thus at the very least in his twenty-fifth year. There is further evidence – which will be set out comprehensively in Chapter 3 – that he was writing the *Summa* throughout the 1320s and 1330s. Based on his evident learning and his role as a confessor, it is probable that he passed through the full Dominican educational programme (or an equivalent period of study at university before he joined the Order), and that this had been completed before 1326 when he was in Hereford; the role of confessor was not ordinarily one given to student friars, and it was common for friars to return to their ‘home priory’ after completing their studies (and for John Bromyard this was almost certainly Hereford).²⁰ Using information gathered from the episcopal registers, Emden has calculated that ‘the usual age for admission to the degree of Bachelor of Theology at Oxford or Cambridge appears to have ranged between 33 and 37.’²¹ Assuming that Bromyard pursued his studies to this level, it seems likely that he was at least in his mid-thirties by 1326, placing his year of birth before c.1290. Additionally, H.O. Lancaster has calculated– albeit for the thirteenth century – that if a high-status man was still living at the age of 21, excluding death by accident, violence, poison or battle, he could expect to live for 43 more years until he was about 64 (data for the fourteenth century has been skewed by the Black Death).²² If Bromyard died in 1352 – which is suggested by the transfer of his episcopal licence to hear confession – this would place his birth in the year 1288.

20 O’Carroll, ‘The Educational Organisation’, p. 7.

21 Emden, *Survey*, p. 22.

22 H.O. Lancaster, *Expectations of Life: A Study in the Demography, Statistics, and History of World Mortality* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1990), p. 8.

Herefordshire

It is highly likely that John was born in the town of Bromyard, which is located fourteen miles north-east of Hereford, twelve miles east of Leominster, and fifteen miles west of Worcester.

Whilst a toponymic surname did not always indicate an individual's place of origin during this period, those who entered a religious Order generally took the name of their birthplace.²³

Bromyard was formed of two parts: a large agricultural manorial estate, known as the 'manor foreign'; and a densely-populated borough that had been established in the early twelfth century.²⁴ The agricultural hinterland was predominantly held by the bishop of Hereford and three 'portioners' (that is, clerics who had been granted a portion of the church lands and tithes). A manorial survey from 1285 indicates that the population of the town lay somewhere between 1200 and 1500.²⁵ The extant episcopal records also show that the town was an important centre for ordinations, and it is known that the bishop of Hereford maintained a residence there up until 1356.²⁶

According to Reverend C.P.R. Palmer (writing in the 1880s), 'within the city of Hereford dwelt a family, which took its surname from the town of Bromyard, and from this family two Dominican religious probably sprang.'²⁷ However, Palmer does not provide any evidence for this, and such an assertion has proven impossible to verify. Nevertheless, in addition to the two friars named John which have already been discussed, a number of Dominican friars with the surname Bromyard appear in the records, the majority of whom are associated with the Hereford convent: Robert de Bromyard was elected prior provincial in 1304; Richard Bromyard was ordained acolyte at Hereford in 1354; another John Bromyard was ordained deacon in Coventry and Lichfield in 1411 (whilst residing at Shrewsbury convent), and priest in 1415 (whilst residing at Hereford convent); and William Bromyerde was ordained acolyte at Hereford in 1415, subdeacon in 1416, and deacon in 1418.

Regardless of whether John emerged from a family of Bromyards already residing in Hereford, there is certainly evidence from within the texts attributed to him that he grew up in

23 O'Carroll, 'The Educational Organisation', p. 26.

24 Phyllis Williams, *Bromyard: Minster, Manor and Town* (Leominster: Orphans Press, 1987), pp. 13-63.

25 *Ibid.*, pp. 43-45, 55.

26 *Ibid.*, p. 14.

27 C.F.R. Palmer, 'The Friar-Preachers or Blackfriars of Hereford', *The Reliquary*, 23 (1882-83), 17-28 (pp. 20-1).

the vicinity. The *Distinctiones*, for example, includes a skeleton-sermon for the feast of Thomas Cantilupe (the former bishop of Hereford – appointed 1274, died 1282 – who was canonised in 1320), which was rarely observed outside the diocese.²⁸ Additionally, there are multiple anecdotes in the *Summa* which appear to reflect John’s origins in a rural place straddling town and country. A considerable number of these have been collected together by Keith Walls, who implicitly suggests that they derive from Bromyard’s personal experiences rather than collections of exempla.²⁹ In one chapter, for example, Bromyard discusses the difficulty in pulling a ewe back from a burning shed, whilst in another he remarks that nobody expects to water animals until the end of Lent.³⁰ Elsewhere, he describes how a cow overturns a pail whilst being milked in a byre, and notes the way in which buckets are manoeuvred on a pulley at a building site.³¹ He tells the story of a man who cannot control three geese, and recounts the burning of stubble after harvest.³² He describes the fear people experience when confronted with lepers, and talks of the babies abandoned at the church door.³³ Given the period in which he was writing, Bromyard also includes details that appear to be firmly anchored to the early fourteenth century, describing the declining fertility of the soil and orchard yields, and how the rising population was straining the resources of the country.³⁴

Additionally, it is possible to trace, or reconstruct, elements of Bromyard’s early life. On entering the Dominican Order, a novice was already supposed to possess a basic grasp of Latin.³⁵ It is evident that not all did so, however. Writing in the 1270s – albeit with a polemical swagger that suggests he was far from an impartial witness – the Franciscan Roger Bacon remarked: ‘Many thousands enter the two students orders [the Dominican and Franciscan Orders] who cannot read the Psalter or [the standard Latin grammar book] Donatus, and

28 Binkley, *John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans*, p. 262.

29 Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 13. In contrast, G.R. Owst remarks that many of the stories may be found in French sermon manuscripts from a century earlier. However, Owst provides no evidence for this, and indeed, incorrectly believed Bromyard to be active in the latter part of the fourteenth century: Owst, *Literature and Pulpit*, p. 303.

30 SP, *Recidivm* 4; *Vocatio* 2.

31 SP, *Patientia* 5; *Obedientia* 21.

32 SP, *Prelatio* 12; *Ordo clericalis* 54.

33 SP, *Recidivm* 14; *Ordo clericalis* 48.

34 SP, *Mors* 90.

35 M.M. Mulchahey, *‘First the Bow is Bent in Study’*: *Dominican Education before 1350*, *Studies and Texts*, 132 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1998), p. 75.

immediately after making their profession, they are set to study theology.³⁶ Considering his subsequent learning, however, it is likely that Bromyard had learnt his ABC and at least a smattering of Latin grammar before he became a friar. There is evidence from continental sources that Dominican priories occasionally sponsored grammar schools, although given the precarious position of Hereford convent in the period of Bromyard's youth, it seems doubtful that this was the case here.³⁷

Phyllis Williams has suggested that there was a grammar or chantry school based next to St. Peter's Church in Bromyard. In support of this idea, Williams cites the work of A.F. Leach, and also notes that the names of five chaplains were recorded in the 1285 manorial survey, one of whom may have acted as schoolmaster.³⁸ According to Leach, a chantry to the chapel to the Blessed Virgin Mary was established in 1394 with a commitment to provide grammar teaching to boys from the town.³⁹ However, Leach does not provide any evidence for this. It is possible that Leach was basing this account on the chantry certificate that was issued in 1548, when commissioners were obliged to make a descriptive list of the chantries in each county. The certificate records that 'a grammer Schole hath bene contynually kept in Bromeyarde', and the residents thus beseech the king to 'Graunte the saide landes to the mayntenaunce of the bringing vp of the yough according to the Foundacion thereof.'⁴⁰ However, the chantry of the Blessed Virgin Mary is known to have existed since the twelfth century, and no date of 1394 appears in any record.⁴¹

If John did not attend school in Bromyard as a child, he may have been helped unofficially or privately by one of the chaplains, or else travelled to a different town to receive his early education. Indeed, by the thirteenth century it is likely there was grammar school in

36 William Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers* (Rome: Istituto Storico Domenicano, 1951), pp. 265-66.

37 Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', pp. 86-87. For the precarious position of Hereford Priory, see pp. 26-32.

38 Williams, Bromyard, p. 61.

39 Arthur Leach, *The Schools of Medieval England* (New York: Macmillan, 1915), p. 211.

40 Arthur Leach, *English Schools at the Reformation, 1546-8* (Westminster: Archibald Constable, 1896), pp. 104-06.

41 Williams, Bromyard, p. 61.

Hereford sponsored by the cathedral.⁴² There is also evidence of grammar schools in Leominster and Worcester in the early fourteenth century.⁴³

Furthermore, there are a number of anecdotes about schooling within the Summa which may have been derived from Bromyard's own experiences. On one occasion he remarks that a schoolboy will take pride in his reading in order to avoid a beating.⁴⁴ On another, he laments the cost of education, indicating that it cost three or four pence per week to send a son to school.⁴⁵ Keith Walls suggests that this seems surprisingly high; in comparison, Merton College paid 4 pence per term for each boy in college to attend an Oxford grammar school in 1277.⁴⁶ Assuming that John was not exaggerating, then either the cost of schooling had increased dramatically over time (or distance), or else he chose to include board, lodging and the acquisition of textbooks and material in the cost. By the sixteenth century, Ledbury is known to have benefited from grammar school boys lodging in the town, and buying victuals from townsmen.⁴⁷ Walls also suggests that John's parents must have been comparatively wealthy.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, this is by no means certain. It is now known that basic schooling in the early-fourteenth century was being made increasingly accessible to boys from relatively modest backgrounds.⁴⁹

The Dominican Order in Hereford

Bromyard may have been recruited and educated by the Order of Preachers as a young man, or he may have studied initially as a secular cleric and then joined the Order as a more mature individual. The issue is complicated by the origins of the Hereford Priory.

The Dominicans first came to Hereford in (or just before) 1246, but a dispute between the friars and the cathedral chapter over offerings from the laity prevented a priory from being fully established until an accord was reached in 1322. During this period, it is difficult to say for certain whether the Hereford Dominicans were in a position to support a schola suitable for

42 Nicholas Orme, 'The Medieval Schools of Herefordshire', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 40 (1996), 47-62 (p. 50).

43 Nicholas Orme, *Medieval Schools: From Roman Britain to Renaissance England* (London: Yale University Press, 2006), p. 370.

44 SP, Gloria 2.

45 SP, Restitutio 2.

46 Walls, John Bromyard, pp. 17-18.

47 Orme, 'The Medieval Schools of Herefordshire', p. 60.

48 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 4.

49 Orme, *Medieval Schools: From Roman Britain to Renaissance England*, pp. 132-33.

training novices and young friars. The continuous legal battle – which frequently ended up in Rome – swung like a pendulum, first favouring one side and then the other.⁵⁰ Although a number of judgements were made which forbade the Dominicans from erecting a priory, other judgements ordered the cathedral chapter to cease molesting the friars.⁵¹ Regardless of these decisions (which appear to have been routinely ignored by both sides), and the various extra-legal measures which were employed to stifle the friars, it seems quite clear that the Dominicans maintained some kind of presence in the city. On at least two occasions (one in the early 1250s and the other in 1264), the cathedral canons were accused of destroying the friars' residence, violent acts which could hardly have occurred had the friars been absent.⁵² Moreover, two interrogatories from c. 1275-80 furnish further information which suggests the friars were present in Hereford (interrogatories record the questions that Dominican proctors were prepared to ask in an upcoming legal case): one asks whether the Dominicans had fully established a priory in the city, whilst another asks whether they had celebrated divine service there and rung the bell to announce the fact.⁵³ Both of these implicitly assume that the friars were active in the city in some capacity; their defence was not based on being absent, but on the nature of their activities.

However, from 1280 to 1317, there is a complete gap in the records. This is, of course, precisely the period in which John is likely to have entered the Order if he had been recruited as a boy or young man (c.1295-1315).⁵⁴ The dispute evidently continued to fester during these years, since in 1317 Pope John XXII wrote to the archbishop of Canterbury asking him to consider the case and make judgement, and it was only in 1322 that an agreement was made between the chapter and John of Bristol, the Dominican prior provincial.⁵⁵

50 A comprehensive study of the available evidence has been published by W.N. Yates, 'The attempts to establish a Dominican Priory at Hereford, 1246-1342', *Downside Review*, 87 (1969), 254-67. See also W.N. Yates, 'The Hereford Dominicans: An Unknown Document', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 41 (1971), 157-73.

51 W.W. Capes, *Charters and Records of Hereford Cathedral* (Hereford: Wilson and Phillips, 1908), pp. 104, 112-13.

52 Yates, 'The attempts to establish a Dominican Priory at Hereford', pp. 257-59.

53 *Ibid.*, pp. 264-66.

54 See, p. 22.

55 *Calendar of Papal Registers Relating To Great Britain and Ireland: Volume 2, 1305-1342*, ed. by W.H. Bliss (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1895), British History Online <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-papal-registers/brit-ic/vol2>> [accessed 5 October 2016], p. 136; Yates, 'The attempts to establish a Dominican Priory at Hereford', p. 262.

During this period of turbulence it is conceivable that friars working in the Hereford region were based nearby. Quétif and Échard have published a transcript from a 1303 manuscript attributed to Bernard Gui which contains a list of the English Dominican priories.⁵⁶ Hereford is not included, although it does appear amongst a second group of priories appended at the bottom of the list; this group had apparently been recorded in a different manuscript, the precise details of which are not provided.⁵⁷ However, the priory at Worcester is included in Gui's original list, even though English records suggest it was not founded until 1347.⁵⁸ Even assuming that a priory had not yet officially been erected, Worcester may still have provided a safe-haven for the friars. Walter Cantilupe, bishop of Worcester (elected 1236-died 1266), was known to be on friendly terms with the Dominicans, whilst in 1276, another bishop of Worcester, Godfrey Giffard, acted as conservator of Dominican privileges in England.⁵⁹

It is also possible that some Dominicans, whose Order enjoyed a favourable relationship with a number of bishops in Hereford such as Thomas Cantilupe and Richard Swinfield (elected 1282-died 1317), may have resided on a nearby episcopal estate, one of which was Bromyard; this would have given the friars easy access to Hereford, and may have strengthened episcopal control over a wider geographical area. In this regard, Swinfield was known to have had many altercations with the dean of the cathedral, John of Aigueblanche, and he may thus have been inclined to support the opponents of the dean, notably the friars.⁶⁰

Additionally, there is some circumstantial evidence that the Dominicans were engaged in educational activities at Hereford from the outset. On 16 April 1250, Pope Innocent IV issued a bull which prohibited the Dominicans from establishing a house in or near Hereford without the consent of the bishop, chapter and parish clergy. This decision was made on the grounds that Hereford was already struggling to support the city's existing institutions which relied on offerings from the laity, including a Franciscan priory, a resident Master of Theology, various hospitals for the poor, and the cathedral and parish churches.⁶¹ The presence of a Master of

56 Quétif and Echard, I, pp. x-xi.

57 Ibid.

58 William Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 495.

59 Ibid., pp. 78, 98.

60 W.W. Capes, *Registrum Ricardi de Swinfield, Episcopi Herefordensis, 1283-1317* (London: Canterbury and York Society, 1909), p. 327.

61 Capes, *Charters and Records*, pp. 85-86.

Theology may have been one of the reasons which initially attracted the Dominicans to Hereford, and they may have hoped to take advantage of the tuition on offer. Bannister assumes that this master was based at the Greyfriars convent, which shared with Oxford, Cambridge and Bristol the ‘distinction of having a Franciscan reader in Theology.’⁶² Specifically, Thomas of Eccleston, a thirteenth-century Franciscan chronicler, noted that William of Leicester served as lector at Hereford in the 1230s, and that lectors who had studied at Oxford subsequently taught at other friaries including Hereford.⁶³ However, Hereford was not mentioned as one of the six major centres of Franciscan theology study in 1337, and according to Nicholas Orme ‘neither friary in the city seems to have become a great centre of education.’⁶⁴ Orme does suggest, though, that there was a cathedral school at Hereford in the thirteenth century, noting that ‘all nine of the English secular cathedrals came to accept the duty of providing teaching in theology or canon law for the local clergy, the responsibility being usually assigned to the cathedral chancellor who had to lecture personally or provide a deputy to do so.’⁶⁵ Even so, evidence from other cathedrals suggests that this teaching was intermittent, and depended on demand from the clergy. In this context, it is possible that the Dominicans were perceived as competition; students who might otherwise be persuaded to listen to (and presumably pay for) the lectures of the existing Master of Theology, were now being tempted by the lectures and disputations offered by the Dominicans, many of which were open to the public.⁶⁶

Nevertheless, whilst there is circumstantial evidence that John Bromyard could have been educated at some stage in Hereford, it seems likelier, based on the convent’s precarious situation, that the vast majority of his education occurred elsewhere. Indeed, one can readily envisage the Hereford friars acting as recruiting agents, snaffling youngsters and sending them off to a neighbouring convent for more rigorous training.⁶⁷ Either way, it seems clear that a number of individuals from the Hereford catchment area became Dominican friars during the period before the convent was fully established. William of Hereford, for example, was prior

62 Arthur Bannister, *The Cathedral Church of Hereford: Its History and Constitution* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1924), pp. 146-48.

63 Thomas of Eccleston, *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Anglium*, ed. by Father Cuthbert (London: Sands and Co., 1909), p. 67.

64 Orme, ‘The Medieval Schools of Herefordshire’, p. 58.

65 *Ibid.*, p. 52.

66 See p. 34.

67 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 265.

provincial of the Dominicans, 1287-1290, whilst Richard Swinfield, bishop of Hereford, patronised the Dominican Robert Bromyard, supporting him in his studies at university.⁶⁸

Further evidence concerning the state of the Hereford Dominican community – and thus its potential ability to nurture young friars – can be found in the records detailing the agreement reached in 1322 between the Dominican friars and the cathedral chapter. Peter Binkley has noted that ‘in the settlement document, [the friars] are led by the prior provincial, John of Bristol; none of the three Hereford friars named is assigned an office. They are simply *tunc Herefordie existentes*.’⁶⁹ Thus, he argues that the Hereford friars ‘were a small group, with meagre resources but great determination. They seem to have been an informal community without a prior.’ However, the document in question actually records the friars in these terms: ‘*fratres Johannes de Norcote, Willelmus de Lantonia, et Willelmus de Wassebourne, necnon et alii fratres eiusdem ordinis tunc Herefordie existentes*.’⁷⁰ The reference to *alii fratres eiusdem ordinis* demonstrates that there were more friars present than those named. Indeed, a corresponding entry can be found in Adam Orleton’s episcopal register which lists a different set of friars. It omits Willelmus de Lantonia and Johannes de Norcote, but includes Hugo de Laiccone, Johannes de Glamorgan and Symon de Borastone.⁷¹ The discrepancy in the witness lists is presumably because only a certain number of individuals were required to be signatories for the purposes of record keeping.

It is difficult to sustain the argument that the Hereford Dominicans possessed meagre resources. Not only were the friars able to fight a seventy-year legal dispute, they were able to win it. This would have been impossible without significant support, primarily from the wider Dominican Order. To illustrate the point with a modern comparison, the friars were not an independent corner shop fighting the council bullies for planning permission; they were a local branch of a major multi-national chain. Indeed, it is inconceivable that the Hereford friars could have afforded to fight the lengthy legal battle without the backing of their provincial and international brethren. Moreover, there are specific instances which prove that individual prior-

68 Bede Jarrett, *The English Dominicans*, rev. by Walter Gumbley (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1937), p. 176; Emden, *BRUO*, I, p. 278.

69 Binkley, ‘John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans’, p. 260.

70 Capes, *Charters and Records*, pp. 197-8.

71 *Registrum Ade de Orleton*, p. 220.

provincials of England became involved with the dispute, corresponding with the pope, and in the case of Hugh of Manchester, appearing before Bishop Cantilupe. A further case of provincial involvement can be identified in 1325. Eight Dominican friars were sent to Hereford where they received a licence to hear confession. The same eight names were licensed by the bishop of Salisbury in c. 1321, and six of the eight reappear in the Salisbury episcopal register following a renewal of licences in 1328.⁷² Peter Binkley suggests that this was a team sent to help the Hereford friars, and sees it as a sign that ‘the Hereford Dominicans were not yet strong enough to serve the diocese.’⁷³ I would argue, however, that the transfer of eight experienced friars to Hereford actually demonstrates the extent to which the Dominican province was willing and able to invest precious (human) resources in the convent.

There is also ample evidence that the convent received royal support during its early struggles. Henry III initially granted the convent ten oaks in 1246, and the friars then received a royal letter of protection in 1270. Indeed, royal intervention may have been instrumental in the friars’ eventual victory; Edward II gave them a new plot of land in 1319, and within three years a permanent agreement was reached with the dean and chapter. If John Leland is to be believed, Edward III was later present at the consecration of the friars’ church. Either way, Edward was certainly complicit in the Dominican convent’s property shenanigans. After the Dominican friars had become firmly established in Hereford, they attempted to expand their property by enclosing Frog Lane, thereby blocking a thoroughfare leading out of the city, and making it much more difficult for Cathedral officials to enforce their jurisdictional rights over citizens who lived beyond this terminus. The dispute was resolved in 1351 only after the friars had dreamt up a legal contrivance in which they agreed to rent their property from the king. Soon afterwards, the rent was acquitted.⁷⁴

Additionally, a suggestive passage within the *Summa Praedicatorum* may shed a little light on the convent’s early numbers. In what appears to be a thinly veiled attack on the episcopal authorities’ treatment of the Hereford friars, Bromyard laments: ‘It is a marvellous

72 Alfred Emden, ‘Dominican Confessors and Preachers Licensed by Medieval English Bishops’, *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 32 (1962), 180-210 (p. 191).

73 Binkley, ‘John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans’, p. 260.

74 Palmer, ‘The Friar-Preachers’, p. 19.

thing, that a great guardian of the city and flock will more willingly tolerate in the city a thousand usurers and as many prostitutes than twenty friars.⁷⁵

More generally, Hinnebusch has attempted to calculate the number of friars in the early English Dominican province, estimating that there were on average thirty-seven friars in each priory.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, this figure must be treated with caution. For example, Hinnebusch (citing a figure provided by Reverend Palmer) records that there were twelve friars at Hereford Priory. This number ultimately comes from a 1352 legal document connected to the enclosure of Frog Lane. The names of those listed are as follows: Thomas Russhok (prior); Richard Baret; John Russhok; Thomas de Ledbury; Hugh de Maddeley; John Brakkeley; William Oweyn; Robert de Ewyas; John Atte More; Philip le Smyth (lay Brother); Simon le Carpenter (lay Brother); Richard le Carpenter (lay Brother). It is doubtful, however, that this list provides an accurate reflection of the state of the convent. If one examines the Hereford episcopal registers for names of Dominican friars ordained and licensed in the years immediately before 1352, a great many are absent from this list. Where, for example, was John Bromyard, or his replacement William le Wyte, who was licensed on 27 Oct 1352? It is possible that a number of friars attached to the convent were not actually present when the case was being heard. Indeed, since the proceedings took place just before Easter, it is likely that a number of friars would have been involved in pastoral work further afield. Moreover, it must be remembered that this took place in the immediate aftermath of the Black Death, which hit Hereford most strongly in 1349.⁷⁷ Thus, it provides limited evidence regarding the state of Hereford Convent in the years when Bromyard would have been residing there.

A Dominican education

If Bromyard joined the Dominican Order as a young man, his journey through the Order's educational system can be clearly mapped out. The Dominican Constitutions stated that a novice had to be at least eighteen years of age upon admission, although dispensation could be

75 'Quod tamen mirabile est dictu, quod unus magnus civitatis et gregis custos tollerabilius sustinet in civitate mille usurarios et totidem meretrices quam xx fratres': SP, Cor 17. Translation by Binkley, 'John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans', p. 260.

76 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 274.

77 Palmer, 'The Friar-Preachers', p. 19.

sought from the provincial prior for candidates who were at least fifteen years of age.⁷⁸ Novices were examined before admission and rejected if deficient in habits and knowledge (*in moribus et scientia*), although there is evidence that some convents did not strictly adhere to this rule.⁷⁹ If accepted, the novice began his novitiate, a probationary period of one year, in which he was expected to learn the rule of the Order and the daily prayer. Only after this could he make his profession.

Education was an essential element of the Dominican ethos. Since the Order was initially established to combat the Albigensian heresy, Dominic realised from a very early stage that education was a vitally important tool for arming preachers. According to Humbert of Romans, the Order's fifth Master General: 'Study is not the end of the Order, but it is exceedingly necessary to secure its ends, namely preaching and the salvation of souls, for without study we can do neither.'⁸⁰ University cities became major centres of the Order, and the Dominicans established their first convent in England at Oxford because of its academic reputation.⁸¹

In contrast to traditional monastic practice, therefore, study replaced manual labour as a daily endeavour.⁸² Student-friars received a special status in the Order, and were given certain privileges. Thus, the prologue to the Constitutions stated:

The prelate has the power of dispensing the brethren in his priory, when it seems expedient, especially in whatever may hinder study, preaching, or the good of souls, since it is known that our Order was especially instituted from the beginning for

78 The canonical age for entrance into a religious order was 14 years. The Dominicans Constitutions of 1228 and 1250 state 18 years. In 1240, the General Chapter ruled that especially young or uneducated youths should not be accepted in great numbers. In 1273 and 1283, the General Chapter drafted penalties for those accepting underage friars. See Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, pp. 266-68.

79 A.G., Little, 'Organisation of the Mendicant Friars in England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, New Series, Vol. 8 (1894), 49-70 (p. 51).

80 'Notandum est autem quod studium non est finis Ordinis, sed summe necessarium est ad fines praedictos, scilicet ad praedicationes, et animarum salutem operandam, quia sine studio neutrum possemus': Humbert of Romans, *Opera de Vita Regulari*, ed. by J.J. Berthier, 2 vols (Torino: Marietti, 1956), II, p. 41. The English translation has been taken from Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 336.

81 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 336.

82 *Ibid.*, p. 218.

preaching and the salvation of souls, and our study must tend principally and ardently and with the greatest diligence to make us useful to the souls of our fellow men.⁸³

Although students were obliged to attend compline daily – in the Dominican office this occurred around dusk – they were frequently excused from attending the other conventual hours in order to focus on their studies.⁸⁴ Student-friars were also given an individual cell for study, whilst a library was usually located at the end of the dormitory. Each convent was required to have a lector who would read daily on the Bible and the Sentences (a textbook of theology compiled by Peter Lombard in the twelfth century), and every friar was expected to attend.⁸⁵ These lectures were generally open to outsiders, although the 1228 Dominican constitutions distinguished between those which were to be held in private, and those which were to be accessible to the public.⁸⁶

The programme of studies was clearly set out by the General Chapter.⁸⁷ Recruits were required to spend two years learning song and divine office before they were permitted to progress with their studies. A friar might then be sent to learn logic (attending lectures, disputations and repetitions) at a *studium artium* for three years (the various studia were convents which specialised in providing intermediate and higher level teaching). After this, he would be eligible to study natural philosophy (and probably ethics and metaphysics) for two years at a *studium naturalium*. If he successfully completed these studies, he might be sent to a *studium particulare theologiae* where he would spend two years attending advanced theological lectures on the Sentences and the Bible. Only student friars destined to become priory lectors were then given the opportunity of studying at a *studium generale*, which were the elite centres

83 'Ad hec tamen in conventu suo prelati dispensandi cum fratribus habeat potestatem, cum sibi aliquando videbitur expedire, in hiis precipue, que studium, vel predicationem, vel animarum fructum videbuntur inpedire, cum ordo noster specialiter ob predicationem et animarum salutem ab initio noscatur institutus fuisse, et studium nostrum ad hoc principaliter ardentique summo opere debeat intendere, ut proximorum animabus possimus utiles esse': Heinrich Denifle (ed.), 'Die Constitutionen des Predigerordens vom Jahre 1228', in *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchen-Geschichte des Mittelalters*, ed. by Heinrich Denifle and Franz Ehrle, 7 vols (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1885-1900), I (1885), pp. 165-227 (p. 194). Translation in Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 335.

84 Little, 'Organisation of the Mendicant Friars in England', p. 60.

85 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 339.

86 *Ibid.*, p. 337.

87 In 1259, a body of statutes regulating Dominican studies was accepted by the General Chapter. Further rules were implemented by the 1274 chapter, and in 1297. In 1305/6 the programme of studies was definitively set out at Genoa. See Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, pp. 337-8, n. 28. For a comprehensive overview see Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study'.

of Dominican learning. A friar was frequently expected to interrupt each stage of study by serving as cursor or lector on the particular subject that he had just mastered.⁸⁸

It is likely that the educational structure in England was based around the geographical area of the visitation.⁸⁹ The English province was divided into three vicariates – England, Scotland, Ireland – and the English vicariate was divided into four visitations. The provincial chapter would annually appoint four visitors who would inspect a number of convents to ensure that preaching, study, and religious observance were being carried out appropriately.⁹⁰ These visitation groups of friaries appear to have solidified in the last quarter of the thirteenth century.⁹¹ It seems likely that there were one or two arts and philosophy schools, and a single school of theology, for each visitation.⁹² Groups of priories within the visitation rotated the teaching of intermediate and higher education; however, it is possible that a group that shared a *studium artium* might not be the same that shared a *studium naturalium*. Theological schools probably rotated less than the other provincial schools. Additionally, each visitation could send one student to Oxford, and one to Cambridge each year. Moreover, after 1326 each province had the right to annually send two friars to a *studium generale* located outside the province. Student-friars were selected to study at Oxford and Cambridge by the provincial prior and provincial chapter.⁹³ The majority of students were expected to study for a year or two and then return to teach at a *Studium naturalium* or *Studium particulare theologiae*, and thus very few would incept as master.

There is significant evidence that Bromyard attended university. For example, his use of canon and civil law in the *Summa* and (assuming it was compiled by the same individual) the *Tractatus* suggests that he was thoroughly acquainted with the subject. Whilst every Dominican priory was supposed to hold copies of the major canon law texts (Gratian's *Decretum* and the *Decretals of Gregory IX*), civil law was only studied at Oxford or Cambridge. A law-student at

88 Little, 'Organisation of the Mendicant Friars in England', pp. 56-57.

89 O'Carroll, 'The Educational Organisation of the Dominicans', p. 36.

90 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 211.

91 *Ibid.*, p. 215. See also O'Carroll, 'The Educational Organisation of the Dominicans', p. 34. The subdelegation of jurisdiction – the vicariate – was introduced into the Order by the chapters of 1273/4/5. Provincial chapters were composed of priors and two elected representatives from each priory (diffinitors).

92 O'Carroll, 'The Educational Organisation of the Dominicans', p. 49.

93 After 1320, students were selected by the General Chapter to read the sentences or incept as master at Paris, Oxford, Cambridge via recommendations from the masters and bachelors at those universities. See Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, pp. 332-42.

university in England was required to study civil law before he could progress to study canon law. Bromyard's relationship with the laws, however, is ambivalent. Although employing legal sources copiously, he complains in *Advocati* that the school of lawyers has one or two hundred students whereas the school of theology barely has five.⁹⁴ In a different chapter, *Sapientia*, he writes that where other masters have a hundred listening, a master in theology will not have twenty.⁹⁵ Bromyard was probably exaggerating, but these anecdotes may also furnish clues about his time spent at university. Although the friars' university lectures were primarily provided for the benefit of their own members, outsiders were permitted to attend these lectures and disputations in order to fulfil their own degree requirements.⁹⁶ Indeed, the Dominicans complained in 1311 that the university authorities at Oxford were preventing secular students from attending.⁹⁷ It is plausible, therefore, that these circumstances explain John's insistence that so few students were studying theology. After all, the faculty of theology was the largest in the university.⁹⁸

Additional anecdotes from the *Summa* suggest Bromyard was well-acquainted with university workings. He describes how the names of students were inscribed on the rolls of masters, and that these students were therefore able to enjoy the safeguards and privileges of the university which were denied to others. Implicitly, therefore, Bromyard suggests that there were a number of unofficial scholars who populated the universities.⁹⁹ He also complains that students attending lectures did not pay attention, and mentions the university brawls which occasionally erupted.¹⁰⁰

In the chapter *Vocatio*, Bromyard refers to 'many thousands of university students'.¹⁰¹ According to Keith Walls, this figure is 'grossly inflated for contemporary Oxford: he may have

94 SP, *Advocati* 30. See Walls, John Bromyard, p. 4.

95 SP, *Scientia* 4.

96 W.J. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 56-57.

97 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 337, n. 26.

98 Using the statistics made available by Emden's BRUO (and notwithstanding the caveat that only a fraction of the total alumni are likely to have been recorded amongst the 14,922 contained in the BRUO), Aston has noted that: 'Theologians total 2,104, as against 2,359 Lawyers of all kinds [i.e. combining the individual faculties of civil law and canon law].' Indeed, theology was the largest individual faculty for seculars as well as religious. T.H. Aston, 'Oxford's Medieval Alumni', *Past and Present*, No. 74 (Feb., 1977), 3-40 (p. 5).

99 SP, *Liber* 15 and 16. See Walls, John Bromyard, p. 4.

100 SP, *Ferie* 6; *Vocatio* 14.

101 'Multis milibus scolarium in una universitate existentibus...': SP, *Vocatio* 14.

in mind Paris or Bologna.¹⁰² However, the most recent surveys suggest there were around two-thousand scholars in Oxford by the early fourteenth century, and the numbers Bromyard provides are thus not overly excessive. Moreover, in addition to students, there were many servants, hangers-on and various other people connected to the university. Such was the pressure of increasing numbers, that an acute shortage of accommodation was apparent by c.1300, which prompted the authorities to claim in a petition of 1303, that ‘the multitude of masters and scholars grows from day to day.’¹⁰³ Cambridge, however, was far smaller; according to Aston: ‘In 1377 the indications are that its total size was in very round terms at least 400, made up of about 200 friars and 200 or more others – a position firmly indicative of the dominant place of the friars.’¹⁰⁴

Amongst the bio-bibliographers, John Leland was the first to claim that Bromyard attended the University of Oxford. Emden suggests in the BRUO that he has probably confused the older with the younger Bromyard. This, however, is not evident, for there is nothing in Leland’s account that indicates he was referring to the younger friar. Indeed, if this were the case, he would surely have placed Bromyard in Cambridge; after all, the extant records firmly associate the younger man with that university. Moreover, it was very rare for a student to study at both Cambridge and Oxford.¹⁰⁵

If the elder Bromyard attended university after entering the Order, it is also more likely that he studied at Oxford, since this was part of the same visitation as Hereford, and it was more usual for student-friars to remain within this group of priories (despite the regulations allowing each priory to send a student to Cambridge too).¹⁰⁶ Indeed, until the second decade of fourteenth century, Oxford was the only studium generale for Dominicans in England.¹⁰⁷

102 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 4.

103 ‘Et si crest la multitude des mestres et des escolers de jour en jour’: L. Toulmin Smith (ed.), ‘Parliamentary petitions relating to Oxford’, in *Collectanea*, ed. by Montagu Burrows, 3rd ser., 32 (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, Clarendon Press, 1896), pp. 77-161 (p. 110). Translation in Jeremy Catto, ‘Citizens, scholars and masters’ in *The History of the University of Oxford: The early Oxford schools*, volume 1, ed. by T.H. Aston (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), pp. 151-92 (p. 156). Catto also notes: ‘At its highest the number of scholars may have risen well above 2,000 about 1310 and it is unlikely to have fallen much below that at any time.’

104 T.H. Aston, G. D. Duncan and T. A. R. Evans, ‘The Medieval Alumni of the University of Cambridge’, *Past and Present*, No. 86 (Feb., 1980), 9-86 (p. 12).

105 Aston, ‘Oxford’s Medieval Alumni’, p. 25.

106 Emden, *Survey*, p. 21.

107 Cambridge legally became a *Studium generale* in 1320, but there is evidence it was already considered one by 1315. There were about ninety friars at the Oxford convent in 1317. According to Courtenay, Oxford was the more prestigious university, but mendicants were more important in Cambridge than Oxford ‘proportionally and constitutionally’: Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars*, p. 23.

It is also possible that Bromyard was recruited into the Order whilst already studying at university. The Dominicans (and their Franciscan brethren) acquired a predatory reputation for grooming young scholars, and tempting them into their ranks.¹⁰⁸ In 1357, Richard FitzRalph, Archbishop of Armagh (a prelate notorious for his antifraternel attacks) accused the friars of abducting youngsters who would never have agreed to join the Order as adults.¹⁰⁹ This critique was echoed in other sources. The University of Oxford passed a statute in 1358 which forbade the friars from receiving any student under eighteen years age into their Orders. The proclamation notes: 'For by apples and drink, as the people fables, they draw boys to their religion, and do not instruct them after their profession, as their age demands, but let them wander about begging, and waste the time when they could learn, in currying favour with lords and ladies.'¹¹⁰ Of course, the Dominicans attracted older individuals as well as the young. According to the thirteenth-century Benedictine chronicler Matthew Paris, a number of fickle religious had chosen to join the friars after following in the footsteps of the bishop of Hereford, Ralph de Maidstone. Ralph had joined the Franciscans at Oxford, and had previously served as chancellor of Oxford University.¹¹¹

University study was split between the Arts faculty, in which students studied the trivium (grammar, logic, rhetoric), the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy) and the philosophies, and the higher faculties (law, medicine and theology). If Bromyard entered university before becoming a friar, the minimum age he could have begun to study the Arts was 14 or 15.¹¹² After seven years of university study, a student might be given a licence to

108 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 265.

109 Orme, *Medieval Schools: From Roman Britain to Renaissance England*, p. 260.

110 'Nam pomis et potu, ut populus fabulatur, puerulos ad religionem attrahunt et instigant, quos professo non instruunt, sicut exigit aetas illa, sed mendicationis discursibus permittunt intendere, atque tempus, quo possint addiscere, captandis favoribus amicorum, dominarum et in dominorum, sinunt consumere, in offensam parentum, puerorum periculum, et ordinis detrimentum': Henry Anstey (ed.), *Munimenta academica, or, Documents illustrative of academical life and studies at Oxford*, 2 vols (London: Longmans, 1868), I, p. 207. Translation by A.G. Little, *The Grey Friars in Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, Clarendon Press, 1892), p. 43.

111 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 263.

112 The Arts course lasted for seven to nine years; a student would initially study the seven liberal arts (especially logic), and then the three philosophies. For the first 4/5 years, he would be required to listen to a master lecture and debate, and also attend review sessions. In the third and fourth year, he would participate in public disputations, first as the opponent and then in the principal role. During the fifth year, he was presented for examination and 'determination', after which he was allowed to lecture on a set text and hold disputations; he thus became a bachelor (*baccalaureus artium*). The period of *baccalaureate* normally lasted three years: Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars*, pp. 30-36.

teach, and within a year he would incept as a Master of Arts. He was then required to lecture as a Regent Master for two years.¹¹³

Mendicants and monks primarily took university degrees in theology or canon law, and did not study the Arts at university. As a result of this, the faculty of Theology required candidates who were not Masters of Arts to have already studied the Arts elsewhere for at least eight years. Four years of the theology course were spent attending lectures on the Bible and Sentences; three additional years were spent participating in disputations, two of which were spent opposing, and one responding. Providing a theology student was studying under a Master of Theology, only one year of Oxford residency was actually required before opponency (acting as the opponent in disputations). After completing the period spent in disputations, the student became a Bachelor of Theology and was allowed to read on the Sentences (before being allowed to do so, however, a friar needed to petition congregation of Regent Masters for grace, to free him from the 1253 statute which would ordinarily require him to have an Arts degree). After a further year or two, the student could lecture on the bible (as a baccalaureus biblicus) which normally took place over the summer term; following this, the student became a Formed Bachelor (baccalaureus formatus). He was required to spend a year or two holding disputations before he could incept as Master (also known as Doctor) of Theology. As a Regent Master, he was obliged to lecture on the bible for two years and sit in congregation.¹¹⁴

Bromyard's role at Hereford Convent

The primary aim of a Dominican friar, however, was not to languish at university, but to employ his learning more fruitfully in pastoral work through preaching and hearing confession. This was clearly important for Bromyard who remarks that the active life of a friar comes with the burdens and temptations which occurs when other's take one into their confidence, but that nonetheless, it is a burden which must be endured.¹¹⁵

According to Emden, friars selected to receive a licence to hear confessions were those 'whose pastoral qualities were deemed by their superiors to be sufficiently commendable to

¹¹³ The minimum age to become a master of arts was 21, and the average age for a master in a higher faculty was about 40: Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars*, p. 24.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 56-66.

¹¹⁵ SP, Vita 2.

warrant selection for the limited number of licences that diocesan bishops were dispensed to grant.¹¹⁶ Not all of Bromyard's contemporaries agreed, however. William Langland, author of the late fourteenth-century apocalyptic visionary text, *Piers Plowman*, characterised the archetypal friar as Sire Pentrans-domos, illicitly insinuating himself into another's confidence for his own nefarious purpose.¹¹⁷

This ambivalence is reflected in the historical record. Throughout the thirteenth century there were frequent arguments between the secular clergy and the friars over the latter's right to preach, hear confession and bury the laity. The conflict was resolved by the bull *Super Cathedram*, which Boniface VIII issued in 1300 (the bull was later re-issued after it was briefly revoked). This allowed the friars to preach to the clergy and laity in their own churches and in public, but they could only preach in a parish church if they had been invited to do so by the bishop or parish priest. Friars who wished to hear confession would be given a licence by the bishop, and numbers were to be regulated in regards to the needs of the faithful. The friars were permitted to bury the laity, but were required to hand over a fourth of all legacies and offerings to the parish priest.¹¹⁸

Not all Dominican friars were permitted or able to preach; for example, laybrothers, student friars, and those who held office were either forbidden from performing this task, or unable to do so.¹¹⁹ Hinnebusch estimates that on average about sixteen friars in each English priory were in a position to preach, eight of whom were likely to have been authorised to do so by the bishop.¹²⁰ From 1318, bishops frequently combined a licence to hear confessions with a licence to preach.¹²¹

Preachers were also licensed internally by the Dominican Order as a way of ensuring that only the most competent were let loose on the populace. According to the 1239/40 General Chapters, a prior should only commission 'mature and prudent' preachers. The Dominicans

116 Emden, 'Dominican Confessors', p. 180.

117 William Langland, *The Vision of Piers Plowman: A Critical Edition of the B-Text based on Trinity College Cambridge MS B. 15. 17*, ed. by A.V.C. Schmidt (London: Everyman, 1995), Passus XX, l. 341, p. 359.

118 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 328.

119 *Ibid.*, pp. 328, 331. However, see Emden, 'Survey', p. 26: 'Lectors of Bristol, Lincoln, and Winchester Convents figure among the friars to whom episcopal licence was granted to hear confessions.'

120 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 331.

121 Little, 'Organisation of the Mendicant Friars in England', p. 241.

habitually preached and confessed throughout the parishes during Lent.¹²² Whilst on a preaching tour, they tended to work in pairs, since this enabled a more experienced preacher to mentor a younger colleague.¹²³ According to Hinnebusch ‘The tutelage of experienced friars would gradually initiate him into the methods and practices of the preaching art.’¹²⁴ There were two types of preacher who were given licences by the Order: a preacher-in-Ordinary and a preacher-general. A preacher-in-Ordinary was required to be 25 years of age. He could be given a restricted or a permanent licence. However, he was limited to preaching within the territory of his own priory, and needed the prior’s permission to preach.¹²⁵

A preacher-general (*predicator generalis*) was given a licence to preach anywhere in his province, and did not need the permission of his prior to preach or hear confessions. It was a title bestowed on a proficient and exemplary preacher who had studied theology for at least three years. The office was probably held for life, and could be issued by the general chapter, or (more commonly) by the prior provincial in conjunction with the provincial *diffinitores* (representatives from each priory). In 1255, the general chapter forbade provinces from appointing more preacher-generals if the province already had a number in excess of one and a half times the number of priories. A preacher-general immediately became a member of the provincial chapter, and thus a legislator of the Order.¹²⁶

Interestingly, Simon Boraston – whilst appearing as a witness at the agreement of 1322 – was described in Adam Orleton’s episcopal register as *predicator generalis*.¹²⁷ The village of Boraston lies thirteen miles north of Bromyard, and given these associations, it is possible that Simon may have taught John at some stage, and that John in turn may have assumed a mentoring role formerly occupied by Simon. In the years immediately after the settlement of 1322, the convent would have needed experienced friars to oversee its development and growth.

Indeed, since Dominican preaching was primarily taught and developed through imitation and mentoring, it seems likely that Bromyard was responsible for overseeing the more

122 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 316.

123 *Ibid.*, p. 285.

124 *Ibid.*, p. 297.

125 *Ibid.*, pp. 286-87.

126 *Ibid.*, pp. 287-89.

127 See p. 30.

inexperienced preachers. On the continent, there are references in this period to *praedicatores in conventu*, who appear to have performed a comparable role. According to Michele Mulchahey:

These ‘conventual preachers’ were in residence usually for a year, during which they became the public voice of the local pulpit, responsible for all the preaching presented to the people. Gifted sermon-makers, these friars also played an important role in grooming the beginning preachers in the house. That role was acted out most powerfully through example. But beyond demonstrating the practice of preaching, the conventual preachers of the fourteenth century were also exponents of the theory of preaching. It was part of their job to put their talents and their knowledge at the disposal of the students in their convent, and Dominican *praedicatores in conventu* oftentimes produced textbooks for the beginners: collections of sermons they had preached, together with explanations of their expository technique.¹²⁸

Aside from his duties as a preacher, confessor and mentor, Bromyard would have been expected to follow the liturgical hours. For the Dominicans, the most important of these was *compline*, which was celebrated in the early evening at the end of the working day.¹²⁹ This provided an opportunity for the laity to attend; indeed, the procession accompanying the chanting of the *Salve Regina* – an antiphon honouring Mary which was introduced by Jordan of Saxony into the Order’s liturgy – was particularly popular. According to the *Vitae Fratrum*: ‘How pleasing their procession was to God and his Holy Mother was shown by the piety of the people, the way they thronged to our churches, the devotion of the clergy who came to assist at it, the tears and sighs of devotion, and the visions accorded.’¹³⁰ Thus, although the life of a Dominican friar involved participation in the secular world, it was still rooted in the ways of a religious order. In practical terms, it also limited the time Bromyard was able to spend on

128 Mulchahey, ‘First the Bow is Bent in Study’, p. 185.

129 Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 219.

130 ‘Bene placitam autem esse Deo et matri sue huiusmodi processionem, concursus populorum, cleri devocio, dulces lacrimae, pia suspiria et admirande visiones declarant’: Gerard de Frachet, *Vitae Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum*, ed. by B.M. Reichert (Leuven: Charpentier and Schoonjans, 1896), p. 59. Translation in Gerard de Frachet, *Lives of the Brethren of the Order of Preachers, 1206-1259*, trans. by Placid Conway and ed. by Bede Jarrett (London: Blackfriars Publications, 1955), p. 134.

compiling the *Summa* and other works (in spite of the possible exemptions from attending some services).

Bromyard's attitudes are also likely to have been shaped by his experiences abroad.¹³¹ There is a great deal of evidence within the *Summa* to suggest that Bromyard travelled around France and Italy. He talks in detail about the nature of sea travel: the operation of the rudder; sailors following the orders of the captain; the sensation that people on land are moving when a ship enters or leaves the port; the rafts used for river transport; and the ships' biscuit eaten when travelling to the Holy Land.¹³² Tellingly, he also remarks that many seamen are more willing to carry robbers across the sea than good men of religion.¹³³

In particular, Bromyard appears familiar with Avignon, which suggests he visited the papal residence there on behalf of his Order.¹³⁴ On one occasion he mentions the obligation for silent reverence in the presence of the pope, and on others he describes the badges for official paupers, and the queues of supplicants for prebends.¹³⁵ He appears to be aware of examinations given for reading, writing, and chanting, whilst he also describes the lavish life of dignitaries, criticising the excessive multitudes of horses and household attendants.¹³⁶ In this regard, Adam Orleton, who acted as royal envoy to the papal curia on several occasions, visited Avignon in 1327 with 70 men and 46 horses.¹³⁷ There is no indication in the *Summa* that Bromyard visited Paris, but he does refer to Reims, Troyes, Metz, Mâcon, thus indicating that he may have followed an eastern route to Avignon.¹³⁸

Keith Walls has identified thirty passages in the *Summa* where John mentions Italy or Italians, and concludes that 'the weight and scope of Bromyard's observations on Italy make

131 For the possibility that he may have delivered some of the material in the *Summa* to a foreign audience, see the case study on *Falsitas*, p. 182.

132 SP, *Mors* 149; *Obedientia* 11; *Exemplum* 13; *Penitentia* 40; *Eucharistia* 17.

133 SP, *Iudicium humanum* 5.

134 The Dominican convent at Avignon was established by 1231, and was located inside the western perimeter wall, near La Porte des Dominicains, 500m from the Palace of the Popes. See Bernard Guillemain, *La Cour Pontificale d'Avignon 1309-1376* (Paris: de Boccard, 1966), Carte 2 'Avignon Pontificale', p. 810. John XXII stayed there whilst the Palace was not yet ready: John Kelly, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 214. For a detailed list of references to Avignon in the *Summa*, see Walls, John Bromyard, p. 5.

135 SP, *Dedicatio* 11; *Iudicium Divinum* 21; *Perseverantia* 11.

136 SP, *Ferie* 5; *Xps* 8; *Honor* 16.

137 Guillemain, *La Cour Pontificale*, p. 443, who notes that the papal support staff at the Palace of the Popes under John XXII numbered between 460 and 538.

138 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 279.

[the contention that he visited the country] quite undeniable.¹³⁹ Bromyard repeatedly refers to the warfare that characterised northern Italy at the beginning of the fourteenth century, describing the conflict in Lombardy between the Ghibellines and Guelphs, and that in Genoa between the Spinola and Doria clans. He also refers to the crusade against the Estensi marquises of Ferrara which had been declared by Pope John XXII in late 1321.

Additionally, Bromyard refers to the clash between the Orsini and the Colonna families in Rome. Significantly, a passage in *Penitentia* suggests Bromyard may have been in Rome in Easter 1318. Bromyard argues in the chapter that there is often fine weather during Lent because the laity are full of repentance, but bad weather and misfortune inevitably follow since people soon revert to sinful behaviour. He then describes a procession – held to appease God – which took place at Rome on the feast of St. Mark, soon after the celebration of Easter.¹⁴⁰ Between 1280-1337 (the period within which Bromyard must have been writing the vast majority of the *Summa*), Easter fell within five days of the feast of St Mark (25 April) in 1302, 1318, and 1329. Since the years 1317-20 were marked by devastating weather in summer, Walls suggests that Bromyard was referring to the year 1318.¹⁴¹

On three occasions, Bromyard mentions Rome when ordinarily one would expect him to say Avignon, the papal seat continuously from 1309 to 1367 (and thereafter intermittently until the antipope Benedict XIII was expelled from Avignon in 1403).¹⁴² Firstly, he criticises clerics who take out loans and cannot pay the money back, whereupon the affected parties head to Rome in order to seek redress. Secondly, he rebukes those who prefer to go to Rome for worldly rewards than to fish for souls. And thirdly, he describes clerics who travel to Rome in order to petition for bishoprics and prebends. There are, of course, multiple possible explanations for these slips, and it was an error also made by many of Bromyard's contemporaries. However, it is also possible that Bromyard initially wrote these passages in the period before the papacy was firmly established in Avignon, or that he was borrowing material from sources that originated from this earlier period.

139 Ibid., pp. 225-30.

140 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 228. Bromyard adds that a similar procession was held at Vienne.

141 Ibid.

142 Ibid, p. 279.

Elsewhere, Bromyard knows of prison conditions in Naples, and remarks that wine is better for growing on higher and stony ground. He also describes how the populace would change sides during the dispute between the Colonna and Orsini, shouting ‘Vive qui venke!’, Long live the winner!¹⁴³

Lozar suggests that much of Bromyard’s information about France and Italy could have been received second-hand via friars who had travelled to England from the continent.¹⁴⁴ There were certainly a significant number of foreign friars in England, many of whom were probably students (conversely, the English province sometimes sent friars to Paris, Cologne or Bologna, but few completed their studies there).¹⁴⁵ Emden has identified the names of 280 continental Dominican friars (primarily by their surnames) who were ordained in England.¹⁴⁶ Most were already deacons, and attended only one ordination, implying they spent a limited amount of time in England. Four ordinations are recorded for foreign friars before 1350, one of which was for a ‘Fr. Amandus de Dacia [Denmark]’, who was ordained as a priest in Hereford in 1287. In total, there are records for 11 foreigners ordained whilst at Hereford. However, it is likely that there were many more foreign friars in England who were already priests. Thus, Emden says: ‘It is perhaps significant in this connexion that there is only one of the seventeen friars from abroad named in the letterbook of the master general, Fr. Raymond de Vineis of Capua, as assigned to English convents, who is known to have been ordained while he was in this country.’¹⁴⁷

Bromyard implicitly confirms that he associated with foreign friars in England, remarking that those brought up in Italy did not enjoy English drink, no matter how good it actually was; thus, he clearly knew Italians who were living, or had lived, in England.¹⁴⁸ However, it seems unlikely that this was his only source of information for France and Italy. Indeed, when he recounts anecdotes given to him from other people, he frequently make this known, saying, for example, ‘as I learned from a holy man telling me’ (*sicut sancto viro mihi*

143 SP, Arma 9.

144 Lozar, ‘Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard’, p. 7.

145 Courtenay, pp. 63-64.

146 Emden, Survey, p. 24.

147 Ibid.

148 SP, Eucharistia 20; Absconsio 6.

narrante didici).¹⁴⁹ Indeed, the most crucial reference to Italy in the *Summa* demonstrates that Bromyard spent time in Brindisi:

By reason of the contributions for those who ride on horseback to the Chapter General and Provincial, the exactions and taxes are so heavy, and the convents are so burdened; and by reason of feasts for inceptors books are pawned or sold, because the communities can neither keep their buildings nor their roofs in repair nor well maintain the wonted number of inmates; whence there impends ruin to the buildings and pawning or sale for the books, or depletion of the libraries, and slender fare, and setting the buildings to pawn. We may see this by experience in the Two Sicilies, where the brethren are wont to ride, wherein, within a short while, the inmates have become very few, as may be seen at Brindisi and other parts of Apulia, where the buildings are falling and the number of inmates so decreases that, as I learned from the prior of Brindisi (and his words were confirmed by my eyes and ears [cuius relationem evidentialia visus et auditus confirmavit]), he had now only five brethren in his convent, whereas there were wont to be forty; for the land is full of horses... It is certain that both communities and subjects are impoverished by the exactions of their rulers and superiors, explicit or implicit, which cause this poverty.¹⁵⁰

The line *cuius relationem evidentialia visus et auditus confirmavit* clearly implies that Bromyard was present himself. Brindisi is 900 miles away from Avignon, although John could have shortened the overland journey by sailing from Genoa to Naples.¹⁵¹ Walls speculates that

149 Welter, *L'Exemplum*, p. 331.

150 'Nam propter contributionem equitantium ad capitula generalia et provincialia exactiones et taxationes tot fiunt et communitates in tantum talliantur: et propter festa incipientium perforarum libri impignorantur, vel venduntur: quod communitates aedificia, nec in statu custodire, nec cooperire, nec personarum numerum solito bene poterunt exhibere: vnde domorum imminet ruina et librorum impignoratio, vel alienatio, vel librariarum depauperatio et fructuum exilis refectio et domorum obligatio [...] Experimento idem satis ostenditur in partibus prouinciae regni Caeciliae, vbi communiter equitates solent: in qua facti sunt numero breui paucissimi, et incolae eius, sicut patet in Brandusio, et alijs Apuliae partibus, in quibus domus cadunt, et numerus inhaitantium in tantum diminuitur, quod sicut priore Brandusino referente, didici, cuius relationem evidentialia visus et auditus confirmavit, quod de conuentu suo tantum quinque habuit socios, vbi solent esse quadraginta, quia terra repleta equis [...] Certum nanque est: quod tam communitates, quam perforae subditae depauperantur: per rectorum et maiorum exactiones, explicitas, vel implicitas, hanc depauperationem concausantes': SP, *Paupertas* 26-28. Translation by Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion*, III, pp. 487-88.

151 Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 285.

Bromyard may have travelled to Brindisi as part of a diplomatic mission.¹⁵² In support of this view, he details a tenuous connection between Bromyard and Adam Murimuth, who, amongst other occupations, served as proctor of Oxford University. Murimuth would have been at Avignon in 1312 in his capacity as a university official, since this was when the dispute between Oxford and the friars' qualifications for graduation was being dealt with by the papal curia. Murimuth also held a Prebendary of Bullinghope, in Hereford, and was therefore active in the same region as Bromyard. In August 1323, Murimuth was commissioned by Edward II to undertake a diplomatic mission to visit Robert of Anjou, king of Sicily. Since Robert remained in his Provençal domains from April 1319 until April 1324, Walls suggests that Bromyard may have accompanied Murimuth on this mission, and then been entrusted with a letter for Robert's chancery in Naples. Walls further speculates that Bromyard was subsequently sent to Brindisi for another, unexplained task. Overall, this seems unconvincing, and Bromyard does not mention any incident which would corroborate such a version of events.

More plausibly, John may have acted as a diffinitor, one of the officials sent on behalf of the English province to attend the annual Dominican General Chapter. It is known that the English province followed regulations and actually did send officials to these gatherings during the early fourteenth century. There are references to English diffinitores being harassed by their French counterparts when travelling to a General Chapter, presumably because of the political conflict between the two nations; indeed, in 1309 a French friar was punished for this offence.¹⁵³ Not all of the locations of General Chapters for the period are known, and it is unclear whether Brindisi would have been in the vicinity of such a place.

Alternatively, since Brindisi was a major port of embarkation for journeys to the East, Bromyard may have been en route to the Holy Land.¹⁵⁴ There is some circumstantial evidence in the *Summa* that supports this possibility. For example, in *Eucharistia*, Bromyard remarks that

¹⁵² Ibid.

¹⁵³ Emden, 'Survey', p. 16.

¹⁵⁴ See, for example, the reference to people travelling to the Holy Land from Brindisi in the Ramsey Abbey Map, c. 1350, created to accompany Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*: Peter Barber et al, *Mapping Our World: Terra Incognita To Australia* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2013), p. 32.

twice-baked bread is taken on journeys to the Holy Land since it does not spoil rapidly.¹⁵⁵ At the time Bromyard was writing, however, travel was complicated by the political situation in these territories. The Crusader states had crumbled in the latter part of the thirteenth century, and in the early fourteenth century there were moves afoot to recapture the lands which had been lost. Bromyard deals with these themes comprehensively in the chapter *Crux*: in the first article, he justifies attempts to recover the Holy Land, provides sermon texts appropriate for preaching the cross, and explains how God helps those going to the Holy Land; in the second article, he explores the power of the cross's defence; in the third and final article, he discusses the virtues required to receive the protection of the cross. Clearly, Bromyard composed this material with a practical purpose in mind, namely to persuade those in the audience to take the cross. Even so, there is little that suggests Bromyard had first-hand experience of the Holy Land.¹⁵⁶

The works of John Bromyard

There are four extant works that are currently attributed to John Bromyard on the basis of manuscript evidence and references found within medieval and early-modern catalogues and bio-bibliographies: the *Summa Praedicatorum*; *Tractatus iuris canonici et civilis*; *Distinctiones*; and *Exhortationes*.

Richard Sharpe has hesitantly suggested that Arras Bibliotheque municipale, MS 184 is a copy of Bromyard's *Sermones*, perhaps identical with the *Exhortationes*.¹⁵⁷ This possibility can be ruled out. Arras Bibliotheque municipale, MS 184 is a collection of sermons and preaching material written in a single English secretary hand of the early fifteenth century. There are fifty-seven sermons within the manuscript, interspersed with various notes, stories, excerpts, and treatises. A sixteenth or seventeenth century hand has written 'Sermones Johannis Broniard fratris dominicani' at the top of the first folio, and Bromyard's name also appears on

155 'Sicut ergo volentes per mare ad terram sanctam vel ad patriam propriam transire secum panem bis coctum pro viatico accipiunt quia illius auxilio melius in mari sustentantur et ad portum perducuntur quia non cito putrescit': SP, *Eucharistia* 17.

156 Bromyard certainly took an interest in Islam and indeed cites the Quran on a number of occasions. See Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 122.

157 Richard Sharpe, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), p. 221.

the spine of the binding. However, in addition to the inclusion of a number of sermons attributed to individuals such as Robert Lychlade and Henry Chambron, the material within the manuscript shows distinct Franciscan associations, borrowing heavily, for example, from the *Fasciculus Morum*, a fourteenth-century preaching manual of Franciscan origins. Thus, the later title attributing the compilation to Bromyard is false.¹⁵⁸

Aside from Bromyard's extant works, a number of lost texts are known to have existed. Evidence of these is partly derived from references made within the extant works, and partly from the bio-bibliographies. Most significantly, Albert of Castile attributes eight texts to Bromyard, listing at least two of the extant works (the *Summa Praedicatorum* and the *Tractatus*) and up to six lost works (the *Collationes*, *Additiones*, *Registrum*, *Persuasiones*, and two sets of *Sermones*, one of which – given they are both *de tempore et sanctis* – might be the *Distinctiones*). There are two pertinent passages, both of which probably refer to John Bromyard:

[1271 A.C.] Fr. Ioannes Bromiord, anglicus, scripsit summam predicantium maximi precii. Item sermones optimos de tempore et de sanctis per totum annum. Item librum qui dicitur collationes eiusdem. Item alium qui dicitur additiones eiusdem. Item alium qui dicitur registrum eiusdem. Item alium qui dicitur persuasiones eiusdem. Item tractatum per alphabetum qui dicitur tractatus iuris eiusdem. Item sermones de tempore et sanctis.

[1292 A.C.] Fr. Ioannes Broviadi scripsit librum moralizando iura canonica et civilia per alphabetum.¹⁵⁹

This comprehensive list formed the basis for subsequent bio-bibliographical accounts, and further titles added to Bromyard's oeuvre are likely to be excerpts from these works, or erroneous.

¹⁵⁸ Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, pp. 182-88; and Wenzel, *Macaronic Sermons*, pp. 203-11.

¹⁵⁹ Creytens, 'Les écrivains dominicains dans la chronique d'Albert de Castello', pp. 270, 276.

The manuscripts and transmission of the *Summa Praedicatorum* will be discussed in more detail in subsequent chapters. A few brief points are worth noting here, however. Firstly, Henry Kirkestede attributed to Wilhelmus Bromyard a ‘*Summa bona quae vocatur Bromyard*’.¹⁶⁰ Anglikar Lozar has suggested a connection between this text and ‘*Bromzerd Bonum*’ bequeathed by Richard of Exeter (d. 1396/7) to Westminster Benedictine monastery. However, the association of the ‘*Summa Bona*’ and the ‘*Bromzerd Bonum*’ (whether they are distinct texts, or an identical work) with the *Summa Praedicatorum* is not certain, since the *Tractatus* was also occasionally listed as a *Summa*.

Secondly, in the prologue to the *Summa Praedicatorum* Bromyard refers to the *Sermones*, explaining that he will frequently notify the reader of similar material that may be found there (‘*frequenter sit missio ad sermones tanquam ad materiam similem vel brevius ordinatam*’).¹⁶¹ Correspondingly, there are further references to the *Sermones* within the text of the *Summa*. They have been abbreviated in the form ‘*Ser.*’ and appear more frequently at the beginning of the text, particularly in the chapters beginning with the letter ‘*A*’.¹⁶² The references do not match sermons in the *Distinctiones* or *Exhortationes* and it is thus clear that Bromyard is not referring to either of these works. A number of references to the *Collationes* and *Additiones* have also been added by an early corrector to the earliest manuscript of the *Summa*, British Library MS Royal 7 E iv. They are frequently abbreviated in the form ‘*Col.*’ or ‘*Ad.*’ alongside two numbers, one indicating the chapter, and the other indicating the specific passage within the chapter (for example, ‘*Col. 45. 15.*’). These references have been incorporated within the main text of Peterhouse MSS 24 and 25; however, they are not included in Avignon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MSS 305, 306.¹⁶³

The *Distinctiones* is a *temporale* (containing sermons for the Sundays of the year) and *sanctorale* (containing sermons for the feast days) cycle, consisting of 155 sermon outlines. For every individual sermon, the *thema* from the day’s lection is divided into four parts, each of which is cursorily developed. The material primarily consists of Bromyard’s own argumentation alongside scriptural quotations, and there are far fewer patristic and other authorities than in the

¹⁶⁰ Pits gives the variant title *Vitam et Summam Praedicatorum*: Pits, *Relationum Historicarum*, p. 551.

¹⁶¹ SP, Prologus, ll. 268-70.

¹⁶² For the following discussion, see Binkley, ‘John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans’, p. 264, n. 26.

¹⁶³ Noted by Lozar, ‘*Studien zur Summa Praedicatorum des John Bromyard*’, p. 30.

Summa.¹⁶⁴ The text survives in a unique manuscript: Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 859. The manuscript is formed of six distinct booklets: the first is formed of a collection of episcopal letters; the second contains Bromyard's *Distinctiones*; the third includes a tract by Paschasius Radbertus on the body and blood of the lord, as well a number of other texts; the fourth contains seven Latin sermons on the purification of the Virgin Mary; the fifth is comprised of Latin sermons and notes; and the sixth is Pecham's commentary on the Sentences. In the second booklet (covering folios 44r-225v), an index (fol. 44r-59v) precedes the main text of the *Distinctiones* (fol. 60r-225v). According to Wenzel, the manuscript dates to 1409/10.¹⁶⁵ The Medieval Libraries of Great Britain project has noted fifteen attested copies in medieval catalogues, although judging by the titles, some of these may be alternative works, such as the missing *Sermones*. Binkley notes that on one occasion Bromyard cites another text using the abbreviation 'Re', which may be a reference to the missing *Registrum*.¹⁶⁶

The *Exhortationes* is a *temporale* cycle containing 76 sermon outlines. It survives in a single manuscript, Cambridge, University Library, MS Kk.4.24, which has been written in a single hand.¹⁶⁷ Bromyard's text covers the folios 1r-114v, whilst the second part of the manuscript contains a random collection (that is, sermons gathered haphazardly for a variety of occasions) of 93 sermons, possibly of Franciscan origin; a number of indices have been included at the end of the manuscript. The text contains a number of references to Bromyard's other works: two to the *Summa Praedicatorum*, four to the *Distinctiones*; two to the *Sermones*; and four to the *Persuasiones*.¹⁶⁸ Thus, notwithstanding the possibility that the references are later interpolations, the *Exhortationes* are likely to have been written after the *Summa* and the *Distinctiones*. A copy of the *Exhortationes* was recorded in the 1382 catalogue of the library of

164 *Ibid.*, p. 258.

165 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 128.

166 Binkley, 'John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans', p. 264, note 26: *Distinction* 22 f [folio 80r].

167 Wenzel, *Macaronic Sermons*, pp 35-37, 140-48.

168 According to Binkley, it contains two references to the *Summa* (Ex 66d [folio 67ra] and Ex 66h [folio 67ra]), four references to the *Distinctiones* (Ex 21g [folio 28ra], Ex 31f [folio 42vb], 32b [folio 43 vb], 75c [folio 111vb]), two references to the *Sermones* ('Ser' Ex 38h [folio 53vb], 43f [folio 60ra]), and four references to the *Persuasiones* ('Per' Ex 13m [folio 18rb], 23e [folio 30rb], 23g [folio 30 vb], 23h [ibid.]): Binkley, 'John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans', p. 264, n. 26.

the Austin Friars in York, and another copy was recorded in the Registrum of the library of the Brethren of Syon, c. 1500-c. 1524.¹⁶⁹

The *Tractatus Iuris Ciuilis et Canonici ad moralem materiam applicati* is a preaching handbook, organised alphabetically, based on sacred, civil and canon law. In addition to a prologue, the *Tractatus* contains chapters on 262 topics. Ninety of these chapter headings do not appear in the *Summa*, although the *Summa* contains twenty-two chapter headings that do not appear in the *Tractatus*. Moreover, the chapters in the *Tractatus* are far shorter than those in the *Summa*. For example, in Hereford, Cathedral Library, MS O. 7. vi., a fifteenth-century manuscript, the *Tractatus* covers 131 folios; in comparison, the *Summa* covers 638 folios in R. According to Thomas Kaeppli, who has compiled the most recent bio-bibliographical list of Dominican authors, there are twenty five extant manuscripts which contain the entire, or a portion of, the *Tractatus*. There are at least two printed editions: Cologne, c. 1473; and Lyon, 1500. Kaeppli also includes Paris, 1500, but I can find no other record of this.¹⁷⁰

The title of the text is recorded in the medieval and early-modern catalogues under various names, alternately called a *Tabula*, a *Tractatus*, or a *Summa*, but usually coupled with a reference to the law/s.¹⁷¹ However, the printed editions employ the title *Opus Trivium*. A number of German manuscripts and the edition of 1473 also wrongly refer to the compiler as Philipp de Bronnerde.¹⁷² According to Bale, the incipit for the *Tabula utriusque iuris* is ‘Ab infancia et teneris annis’. This reference appears to refer to an index which preceded the main text.¹⁷³ Tanner notes a *Tabula* at end of New College MS 223 which reads ‘Ab infantia sunt parvi bene’.¹⁷⁴

There are two main variants of the prologue of the *Tractatus*, which are reflected by different incipits. The manuscripts commonly record the incipit as ‘Quod in sequenti tractatu iura canonica’ (or a variant thereof).¹⁷⁵ The version of the prologue included in the printed editions is slightly different, and begins ‘vt sacre veritatis splendor evidentius cunctis illucescat’. As a

169 MLGB, Catalogue entries: FA8.587 Friars: York Austin Friars: Catalogue, 1382, with additions; SS1.1305 Brigittines: Syon: Registrum of the library of the Brethren, c. 1500-c. 1524
<http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/browse/IJ/#entry1607_anchor> [4 February 2018].

170 Kaeppli, p. 393.

171 For the appearance of the text in the bio-bibliographical record, see pp. 4-9.

172 See, for example, Bamberg Bibl. Roy. MS. Msc. Theol. 148.

173 Bale, Catalogus, p. 512.

174 Tanner, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, p. 129, note ‘e’.

175 Bale, Index, p. 185.

result of this, bio-bibliographical catalogues have included the *Tractatus* as multiple texts based on the assumption that the different incipits refer to distinct texts. The incipit to the main text reads ‘*Abbas non potest in duobus monasteriis presidere*’.

The *Tractatus* is first recorded in Henry of Kirkestede’s *Catalogus*, compiled c. 1360, in which it is recorded as a *Tabula de iure canonico et civili moraliter* and attributed to a John Bromyard. A little later, Albert of Castile distinguished between an individual who wrote a ‘*librum moralizando iura canonica et civilia per alphabetum*’, and another friar who was responsible for the corpus of works attributed to John Bromyard, and which included a ‘*tractatus iuris*’.¹⁷⁶

Interestingly, the *Tractatus* is not referred to in any other work by John Bromyard, nor does it refer to another. Indeed, the relationship between the *Summa* and the *Tractatus* is particularly problematic, and has engendered a significant amount of speculation amongst scholars. G.R. Owst believed the *Tractatus* was based on the *Summa*, whereas Leonard Boyle thought it more likely that the *Tractatus* provided the template for the *Summa*.¹⁷⁷ Binkley is equivocal, but tends to believe that the *Tractatus* was Bromyard’s first work. Boyle’s interpretation is primarily based on the following passage which occurs in the *Summa*’s prologue:

I have emended and augmented in this little book the compilation collected by me earlier, for the use of myself and others, placing certain materials, alphabetically arranged, in their own separate chapters.¹⁷⁸

The most recent and comprehensive discussion on the subject has been provided Siegfried Wenzel, who offers a close reading of the chapter *Sequi*, found in both the *Tractatus* and *Summa*, in order to illustrate the similarities and differences in the two texts.¹⁷⁹ In the *Tractatus*, Bromyard ‘consistently uses a threefold division for the concept under consideration, and by

¹⁷⁶ See p. 5.

¹⁷⁷ Owst, *Preachers in Medieval England*, p. 68; Boyle, ‘The Date of the *Summa Praedicatorum*’, p. 533.

¹⁷⁸ SP, Prologus, ll. 89-95.

¹⁷⁹ Wenzel ‘Bromyard’s other Handbook’.

doing so makes a prior selection for what he will treat of the given topic.¹⁸⁰ In the *Summa*, however, Bromyard includes between two and fifteen articuli in each chapter, including whatever material is deemed relevant. Therefore, says Wenzel, ‘rather than an expansion, the *Summa* is a completely different work.’¹⁸¹ A comparison of the chapter *Falsitas* in both works corroborates this; although a small amount of material is similar, the overall difference in content and layout is vast.¹⁸² Significantly, Wenzel has also discovered that the *Tractatus* refers to a sentence of excommunication issued in the Constitutions of John Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury, which can be dated to the provincial council of 1341-43. Moreover, based on the handling of material in the *Tractatus*, Wenzel comes to the (albeit impressionistic) conclusion that the author of the text was in his ‘younger years’. If this is the case, the relationship with the *Summa* becomes even more complicated, since the one definitive date in the *Summa* refers to the year 1330.

Wenzel further suggests that given the differences in the two texts, ‘one may wonder if the two works are indeed by the same author.’¹⁸³ He concludes, however, that the same author was responsible for both texts: the internal referencing method is similar in the *Summa* and *Tractatus*; there is some duplication of material – such as the treatment of *naufragium*, shipwrecked goods; and finally, ‘[the *Tractatus*] also contains references to Welsh customs, a hallmark of Bromyard’s writings. It would seem that, together with the ascriptions in the manuscripts, the combination of these shared features argues convincingly that [the *Tractatus*] and [the *Summa Praedicatorum*] are by the same author.’¹⁸⁴

There are a number of ways in which Wenzel’s dating of the *Tractatus* may be reconciled with that of the *Summa Praedicatorum*. It is possible that it was actually a mature Bromyard who wrote the *Tractatus*, thus explaining why it was not referenced in previous works; in this situation it may perhaps have been conceived as a concise stand-alone text for those not likely to have a copy of his other works nearby (and thus no need for the inclusion of cross-references). Equally, the passages which date the *Tractatus* and the *Summa* may be later

180 *Ibid.*, p. 116.

181 *Ibid.*

182 See pp. 174-75.

183 Wenzel ‘Bromyard’s other Handbook’, p. 117.

184 *Ibid.*, p. 119.

interpolations, or else written much earlier than the rest of the text; since each work (but particularly the *Summa*) is likely to have been compiled over a number of years, and crammed with material sourced from elsewhere, a single passage provides limited information regarding the date of composition. Even so, it is clear that the *Summa* was compiled before 1352, and there is little evidence (based on the authorities Bromyard employs, and the contemporary references he makes) that he continued to work on the *Summa* into the 1340s. There is also a strong possibility – in spite of Wenzel’s misgivings – that the two works were compiled by different individuals. It is plausible that the *Tractatus* was written by the younger John Bromyard, also a Dominican at Hereford. This would explain why the text appears to have been written by a less mature individual. As a friar at Hereford, the younger John Bromyard will almost certainly have been acquainted with the *Summa Praedicatorum*, and mined it for preaching material (regardless of whether he actually compiled the *Tractatus*). Thus, any duplication of material, or similarity in cross-referencing styles, is easily explicable. His dependence on canon and civil law sources – far more evident in the *Tractatus* than in the *Summa* – reflect prolonged study at university. The younger John was highly learned; in the course of his studies he is likely to have composed various commentaries and other texts. Moreover, the explicit of a fourteenth-century manuscript of the *Tractatus*, New College, Oxford MS 223, affirms that the compiler was at Cambridge (‘Explicit tractatus Johannis Bromyard, ord. fratrum praed Cantabrig’).¹⁸⁵ The elder John Bromyard is not associated with Cambridge, and if he attended university was much more likely to have been at Oxford. As noted earlier, bio-bibliographers such as Henry Kirkestede and Albert of Castile distinguished between two different authors, one of whom wrote a text identifiable as the *Tractatus*, and another who wrote a *Summa* (in addition to other texts). Of course, there is the caveat that one of the texts which Kirkestede attributed to Wilhelmus may have been the *Tractatus*, and also that Albert attributed a *Summa Iuris* (that is, the *Tractatus*) to the same man who wrote the *Summa Praedicatorum*. Indeed, the *Tractatus* must have been finished by 1360 when it was included in Kirkestede’s *Catalogus*, and assuming that John was a youngster when he was

¹⁸⁵ Henry O. Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum MSS. qui in Collegiis Aulisque Oxoniensibus Hodie Adservantur*, 2 vols (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1852), I, p. 83.

ordained as priest in 1350, this gives him little time to have gained the knowledge, experience and credentials necessary to write such a text. However, the dates also allow for the possibility that the younger Bromyard studied at university prior to joining the Order; he last appears in the records in 1393, which mean he could have been born in the 1320s. Thus, a strong (but not demonstrable) case can be put forward that the elder Bromyard compiled the *Summa*, and the younger Bromyard the *Tractatus*.

The lost works attributed to Bromyard are likely to have contained similar material to those which are extant. The *Collationes* is referred to in both Albert of Castile's list and the manuscript copies of the *Summa*. In general, the word *collatio* might refer to either the brief assemblies held in monasteries before the evening meal, or the short readings and sermons preached on these occasions. For a Dominican, the term primarily referred to the brief sermons preached in the evening at compline.¹⁸⁶ More specifically, Siegfried Wenzel notes that the term was often applied to a visitation sermon, which may thus provide evidence for John's role within the Order.¹⁸⁷ Additionally, the term was also used to refer to the weekly informal study group organised by the master of students to discuss moral theology, a meaning which would begin to infiltrate university circles. According to Jeremy Catto, 'The *collatio*...was a kind of practice disputation which may have originated in the highly organised communities of student-friars, among whom it had become an established institution.'¹⁸⁸

Bromyard may have referred to the *Registrum* in the *Distinctiones*.¹⁸⁹ The word 'registrum' generally possessed a comparable meaning to the modern 'register', referring to a list or catalogue. In addition, the term was frequently used to refer to the collected letters of Gregory the Great, and could also be used to denote the collected works of other authors. It is possible, therefore, that this title actually refers to a collection of Bromyard's previous material rather than a separate work.

The *Persuasiones* are cited by the *Exhortationes* in the form 'Per'. The meaning of the term was roughly analogous to the modern English 'persuasion', and it is thus likely that the *Persuasiones* was another sermon cycle.

186 Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', pp. 194-95.

187 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 262.

188 Catto, 'Citizens, scholars and masters', p. 188; Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', pp. 196-98.

189 See p. 51.

Additional works attributed to Bromyard may be identified as excerpts from the texts already discussed. A work entitled *Dicta de missarum celebratione* is attributed to John Bromyard in the fifteenth-century manuscript Oxford, Worcester College, MS 233. The manuscript was given to Gloucester College (along with a sister volume, BL Royal MS 8 G X) by John Whethamstede, abbot of St Albans, and later donated to Merton by Robert Sherles, former fellow (it was previously Merton College, MS 210, and then Merton College, MS 318, before passing to Worcester College in the twentieth century).¹⁹⁰ In 1600, Thomas James recorded the list of texts in the manuscript as follows:¹⁹¹

- Tho Walden contra Wickleuistas.
- Gu Woodeford super causis condemnationis articulorum Io. Wiclefe
- Determinatio M. Io. Deuerose super adoratione imaginum.
- Determinatio eiusdem de peregrinatione.
- Varias responsiones eiusdem ad mendacia sibi imposita ab adversarijs.
- Determinatio eiusdem super praedicatione verbi Dei.
- Determinatio eiusdem super stipendijs annalium Sacerdotum.
- Dicta Io. Bromyard, de missarum celebratione.

However, a little later, Bernard records two additional texts which appear after Bromyard: *Quaestio brevis de virtute Harmonia ad expellendos Daemones ab obsessis Corporibus*; *Anonymus de B. Mariae Conceptione*. The manuscript contains 157 folios, and Bromyard's text covers a single folio, 156r.¹⁹² Quetif suggests that it is an excerpt taken from the *Summa Praedicatorum*. Thomas Tanner, and more recently Coxe, however, claim that it is from Bromyard's *Distinctiones*.¹⁹³ The incipit reads: 'Magna utilitas quam bonus.' Bromyard discusses the utility of the mass in the relevant chapters in both the *Summa* and the *Tractatus*, although the wording is identical in neither, and I have not been able to locate the relevant

¹⁹⁰ Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum*, p. 126.

¹⁹¹ Thomas James, *Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis, Tributa in Libros Duos*, 2 vols (London: Bishop and Norton, 1600), II, p. 16.

¹⁹² Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum*, p. 126.

¹⁹³ Tanner, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, p. 129.

passage in the *Distinctiones*. Pits adds a *Summa de B. Maria Virgine* to Bromyard's corpus of works which Quetif suggest is probably an excerpt from the *Summa*. It is probable that this has been attributed to Bromyard on account of the text which appears directly after the *Dicta de missarum celebratione* in Worcester College, MS 233: the 'Anonymus de B. Mariae Conceptione'. Similarly, the text entitled *Contra Vuicleuistas*, attributed to Bromyard by Bale (through whom it has entered the bio-bibliographical trail), is likely to refer to the initial text recorded in Worcester College, MS 233, that composed by Thomas Netter (also known as Thomas Walden).¹⁹⁴

Pits also attributes a *Lecturas scripturarum* to Bromyard. There is no other reference to this. Bale records that a text with the same title was written by John Waldeby, and attributes a *Scripturarum Lectiones* to John Lathbury.¹⁹⁵ Given the lack of details available, however, and its late appearance in the bib-bibliographical record, it seems clear that Bromyard did not compose such a text.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to illuminate the life of John Bromyard, the friar who compiled the *Summa*. He was evidently well-educated, and is likely to have attended university. His vocation, however, lay within the newly established Dominican community at Hereford, where he probably acted as a mentor to the younger friars. In addition to the significant local ties influencing Bromyard, his sight was also set further afield, reflected by his foreign journeys and his participation within an international preaching order. Thus, the material discussed in this chapter provides important evidence regarding Bromyard's motivations for composing the *Summa*, his access to source material, and the essential utility of the text.

¹⁹⁴ Bale, *Catalogus*, p. 512.

¹⁹⁵ Bale, *Index*, pp. 262, 225.

CHAPTER 2: THE MANUSCRIPTS AND PRINTED EDITIONS

In this chapter I describe and examine the extant manuscripts of the *Summa Praedicatorum*. In doing so I provide codicological and palaeographical analysis which serves – in Chapters 3 and 4 – to further develop my arguments about Bromyard's authorship of the text, the date of composition, and its early use and circulation (I provide cross-references in brackets to indicate the pages in those chapters where my analysis is further developed).

There are two extant manuscript copies of the complete text of the *Summa Praedicatorum*: British Library, Royal MS 7 E iv (hereafter R); and Cambridge, Peterhouse College MSS 24 and 25 (hereafter P). Additionally, two-volumes of a three volume set survive in Avignon Bibliothèque Municipale MSS 305, 306 (hereafter A). There are a further two manuscripts which contain an (identical) abridged version of the text: Oxford, Oriel MS 10 (hereafter O); and Cardiff Public Library MS 3. 174 (hereafter C). However, the latter manuscript only contains chapters from A to L. Finally, British Library, MS Harley 106 (hereafter H) contains three distinct borrowings from the *Summa* (and an additional extract from the *Tractatus*).¹

British Library, Royal Manuscript 7 E iv

R is particularly valuable for the following reasons: it contains the entire, non-abridged version of *Summa Praedicatorum* text in a single, clearly written hand; it can be dated to the middle of the fourteenth century, which establishes it as an extremely early copy; it attributes authorship of the compilation to John Bromyard, O.P.; and finally, since its provenance can be traced to the Benedictine cathedral priory at Rochester, it provides evidence of the early use and transmission of the text.

1 Denis Oross previously referred to the existence of a further manuscript copy of the *Summa Praedicatorum*, Bamberg Bibl. Roy. MS. 148 Q. iv. 10: Oross, 'John Bromyard: Medieval Sermon Encyclopedist', p. 95. This, however, is incorrect, and it appears Oross has confused the *Summa* with the *Tractatus*. Bamberg holds two manuscripts of the latter text, one of which – Msc.Theol.148 – formerly possessed the shelfmark Q. vi. 10; the resemblance of this shelfmark to that provided by Oross is unlikely to be coincidental. See *Katalog der Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Bamberg. 1 Band. 1. Abtheilung. 4. Lieferung. (Theologische Schriftsteller vom XIV. Jahrhundert an)*, ed. by Friedrich Leitschuh and Hans Fischer (Bamberg: Rudolf Koch, 1887-1912), I, I, IV (1904), p. 732.

The manuscript is described by Warner and Gilson in the *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections*, and also by Herbert in the third volume of the *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*. More recently Angelika Lozar has examined the manuscript, and provides a brief description in her doctoral thesis.²

R is a parchment manuscript that has subsequently been divided into two volumes. This must have occurred after its initial compilation, since the end of the first volume and the beginning of the second volume possess folios that originate from the same quire. The first volume contains 305 folios, whilst the second volume contains 334 folios. Both volumes have been rebound in red covers, and there is an inscription of the royal coat of arms of George II on the front of each; this is accompanied by the date 1757, the year in which the Royal Collection of manuscripts was handed over to the British Museum.

In spite of the decision to divide the manuscript, both volumes are cumbersome. The dimensions of each folio are 333 mm x 229 mm. The first volume contains twenty-six quires, the vast majority of which consist of six sheets folded into twelve folios. However, the first quire consists of nine folios made from low-quality parchment, and it appears to have been prefixed at a later date. The final quire of the first volume has been severed – presumably when the manuscript was divided – leaving the initial eight folios in the first volume; the remaining four folios form the first quire of the second volume. Thereafter, each quire in the second volume consists of six sheets folded into twelve folios; the final quire contains six folios.

Throughout the manuscript, the leaves are irregularly shaped, and many contain holes, which – judging by the location of the surrounding text – were part of the folios before writing commenced. There are also occasional but significant splashes of ink, such as that on folio 150v. There is evidence of consistent pricking and ruled lines in all but the first quire, in which only the folios 3r and 3v are lined. The text has been written in double columns: the prologue consists of 42 lines, and the main body of text contains between 48 and 54 lines. There is thus

2 *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts*, I, pp. 195-96; *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, III, pp. 450-52; Lozar, 'Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard', pp. 27-29. Lozar wrongly claims that extracts from the Summa may be found in BL Royal MS 8 E xvii: Lozar, 'Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard', p. 30. This error has arisen because Bromyard includes a verse (in both English and Latin) which is also found in BL Royal MS 8 E xvii (in both English and French). However, Bromyard was not the source for this phrase. See Wright, *Latin Stories*, pp. 29, 221.

marginal space for annotations and corrections; the length of each column is 251 mm, and the width 62 mm, whilst the width of the writing area is 140 mm. Overall, it appears to be neither a cheap quality manuscript, nor a prestige production; in other words, it is a characteristic reference book suitable for a religious institution.

The *Summa Praedicatorum* is the only text contained within the manuscript. A title has been written on the verso side of the first folio. It is partially obscured by damage to the manuscript, but the text which remains – written in a *Cursiva Anglicana* hand – can be read as follows:

[1] *Summa Predicatorum \Roffensis/ ordinem alphabeti propter* [2] *Johannis de Bromyard de ordine fratrum* [3] *Secundo fo. bere. Idem super ezechielem omnia. 12\w/. nullum omnipo\t/ [damaged patch of parchment]*

There is a table of contents on the verso side of the second folio. This is followed by a list of 189 chapter headwords arranged alphabetically in five columns. There are thirty-nine entries in the first three columns, forty items in the fourth column, and thirty-two items in the fifth column. The entries are written in the same *Cursiva Anglicana* hand as that which wrote the title on folio 1v, and the table has not been marked out or lined. The letters A, B, C and D have been written in a different script on the left-hand side of the initial entries that begin with those letters, suggesting the beginning of a task that was not completed. The letters b and c are also written in a small hand above *Beatitudo* and *Caritas* respectively, but this is not continued for other letters. A gap of one or two lines separates entries that begin with different letters. There are also single and double ticks to the side of some entries. Three illegible interpolations have been made in faint red ink, all ending with ‘A3’. These marks and ticks might relate to stages of production of the manuscript, but I have been unable to piece together any precise relationship. The following table shows the list of headwords as they appear on folio 2v:

Abiectio A1	Concordia 9	Gaudio G1 ✓	Misericordia 9	Sacerdotiam S1
Abiecere 2	Cogitatio 10	Gloria 2	Missa 10	Sanctitas 2

Ab infantia 3	Consilium 11	Gratia 3 ✓	Mors 11 ✓	Sapientia 3
Abstinentia 4	Compassio 12	Gratitudo 4	Mundicia 12	Scientia 4
Absconsio 5	Conversatio 13	Gula 5	Mundus 13 ✓	Senectus 5
Abusio 6	Cor 14 ✓		Munus 14	Sensus 6
Absolutio 7	Chorea 15	Homo H1		Sequi 7 ✓✓
Accidia 8	Correctio 16	Homicidium 2	Nativitas N1	Servire 8
Accedere 9	Crux 17	Honestas 3	Negligentia 2	Symonia 9
Accipere 10	Custodia 18	Honor 4 ✓	Nobilitas 3	Societas 10
Accusatio 11		Hospitalitas 5	Nocumentum 4	Sortilegium 11
Acquisitio 12	Damnatio D1	Humilitas 6		Spes 12 ✓
Adventus 13	Desperatio 2		Obedientia O1 ✓	Spiritussanctus 13
Advocati 14	Decime 3	Ieiunium I1	Ocium 2 ✓	✓✓
Adulatio 15	Dedicatio 4	Inconstantia 2	Odium 3	Superbia 14
Adoratio 16	Delectatio 5	Infirmetas 3	Operatio 4 ✓	
Adulterium 17	Detractio 6	Inobedencia 4	Oratio 5 ✓	Temptatio T1
Adversitas 18	Discretio 7	Intentio 5	Ordo clericalis 6	Testimonium 2
Ambulatio 19 ✓	Discordia 8	Invidia 6	Ornatus 7	Timor 3 ✓✓
Amor 20	Dilectio 9	Ypocrisis 7	Ostensio 8	Trinitas 4
Amicitia 21	Dimittere 10	Ira 8		Tribulatio 5
Angelus 22	Divicie 11	Iudices 9	Patientia P1	
Anima 23	Dominatio 12	Iudicium humanum	Passio christi 2	Veritas V1 ✓✓
Arma 24 ✓		10	Paupertas 3	Verbum 2 ✓✓
Ascendere 25	Ebrietas E1 ✓	Iudicium divinum	Pax 4 ✓✓	Via 3 ✓✓
Audire 26	Electio 2	11	Peccatum 5 ✓	Visus 4
Avaricia 27	Elemosina 3	Iuramentum 12	Peccator 6	Vindicta 5
	Equitas 4	Iusticia 13 ✓	Penitentia 7	Virtus 6
Beatitudo B 1	Erubescencia 5		Pena 8	Vita 7 ✓
Bellum 2	Eucharistia 6	Labor L1	Perserverantia 9	Visitatio 8
Benefacere 3	Exemplum 7	Laus 2	Pietas 10	Vocatio 9 ✓✓
Bonitas 4	Executor 8	Lex 3	Predestinatio 11	Voluntas 10
	Excommunicatio 9	Liber 4	Predicatio 12	Votum 11
Caritas C 1		Locutio 5	Prelatio 13	Usura 12
Caro 2	Falsitas F1 ✓	Ludus 6	Pulchritudo 14	
Castitas 3	Fama 2	Luxuria 7		Xps X1
Civitas 4	Ferie 3		Querere Q1	
Contritio 5	Fides 4	Maledictio M1		
Confessio 6 ✓	Filiatio 5	Mandata 2	Rapina R1	
Conscientia 7	Fortitudo 6	Maria 3	Recidivm 2	
Consuetudo 8	Fraternitas 7 ✓	Matrimonium 4	Redditio 3 ✓✓	
	Furtum 8 ✓	Mendacium 5	Regimen 4	
		Mercatio 6		

		Militia 7 Ministratio 8	Religio 5 Restitutio 6 Resurrectio 7	
--	--	----------------------------	--	--

An incomplete index of themes – arranged in three columns, and possibly written in the same hand as that which wrote the table of contents – covers folios 3r-9v. There are significant spaces beneath entries, and only a very refer to the main text; it therefore seems likely that this was an unfinished endeavour. This index is not the same as either the *Tabula vocalis* or *Tabula realis* which appears in the other manuscripts and printed editions.

At the top of folio 10r, an incipit has been written in red ink: ‘Incipit summa predicancium fratris Iohannis de Bromyard de ordine fratrum predicatorium’. In addition, a Westminster Inventory Number, ‘no. 807’, is written in the top right hand corner of the folio. These numbers were given to manuscripts that formed part of the Old Royal Library, and were recorded in the 1542 inventory of books held in the Upper Library at Westminster. At the foot of the folio, there is an ex libris note and anathema –written in the same ink but a different script from that of the main text – which reveals that the book belonged to Rochester Priory: ‘Liber de claustro Roffensi, per fratrem Thomam Horstede precentorem; quem qui alienaverit, alienatum celauerit, uel hunc titulum in fraudem deleuerit, anaethma sit. Amen.’ Given that Thomas Horstede can be identified in extant records, this note has significant implications – which will be dealt with more fully in the following chapters – concerning both the date of the *Summa*’s composition (in addition to the date of this specific codex), as well as its early circulation (see pp. 122-23, 130-37).

The prologue of the *Summa* runs from folio 10v to 11v, and the main body of text follows immediately, covering folios 11v to 305v. There are tables of chapter-headings placed after the chapters *Furtum* [200v], the final F entry, and *Ostensio* [409v and 410r], the final O entry. The table after *Furtum* contains the chapter headings from G to O; the table after *Ostensio* contains the chapter headings from P to X. Since the tables have not been placed at the beginning or ends of quires, and since the text before and after the tables has been written in the same hand, it is clear that the tripartite division does not indicate that the text was being copied from three volumes simultaneously. Finally, a colophon has been written – in a contemporary

hand – on an erasure at the end of the text on folio 638: ‘et in quo finitur summa predicantium Fratris Iohannis de Bromyard de ordine fratrum predicatorum. Lectores, orate pro collectore. Gratia domini nostri Ihesu cum omnibus vobis apo’ vlt’ Amen.’ Underneath this, a smaller hand, has written a note referring to the chapter P 12, 38 [Predicatio 38].

There are a number of hands visible in the manuscript, and it is likely that several more contributed annotations. A single hand writing in a clear, legible Anglicana Formata script is primarily responsible for the main text, the headings, and a small number of corrections and annotations. Lozar has argued that multiple scribes must have been responsible for the main text on the basis that there are variant spellings of the same words; if this is so, however, it is not evident where the various scribal stints begin and end.³ A second hand writing in a Cursiva Anglicana script is responsible for the table of contents, and may also have been responsible for the index. A further hand, also in Cursiva Anglicana, contributes the majority of corrections and annotations. All of the hands are consistent with a mid-fourteenth century date based on palaeographical grounds.

Initials are written in blue ink, and decorated with a red floral pattern. Headings are written in red, whilst paragraphs are denoted by alternating red and blue marks. Catchwords are included on the bottom right of the verso side of the last folio of a quire. The chapter heading and reference number – for example, ‘Falsitas, F1’ is written at the head of each column in the hand of the main scribe. Some – but not all – of the authorities noted in the text are written in the margin; this is particularly so for legal authorities. Subsections of each articulus are also numbered in the margin, although the numbers are occasionally corrected by a later hand. The main body of text contains many crossings-out, underlinings and interpolations. The Catalogue of Western Manuscripts notes that the printed editions include many short passages which appear as marginal additions in the manuscript.⁴ However, it is clear that these marginal additions are corrections, rather than authorial annotations or glosses.

³ Lozar, ‘Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard’, p. 29.

⁴ Catalogue of Western Manuscripts, p. 195.

Cambridge, Peterhouse College Manuscripts 24 and 25

P 24 and 25 contain the other complete text of the *Summa Praedicatorum*. In addition to a brief description found in Lozar's thesis, the manuscripts are described by M.R. James in two catalogues.⁵ Unlike R, these two volumes were originally compiled separately rather than as a single volume that has subsequently been divided. They have been rebound at a later date, and the labels written on the spine of each manuscript have been confused: that on the spine of MS 24 reads 'Bromyard 0-2-4 Pars 2da', whilst that on the spine of MS 25 reads 'Bromyard Summa Predi 0-2-4* Pars 1'.

The manuscript is made of parchment; the condition of the quires varies, but in general the material is of quite poor quality. There are holes and ink spills (although some of the latter post date the original production phase) which appear routinely throughout the manuscripts.

Each volume contains 239 folios, although James mistakenly records that there are 240 folios in P 25.⁶ Quires in both manuscripts mainly consist of either eight or ten folios. The length of the leaf size of P 24 is 368 mm and the width 241 mm, whilst that of P 25 is 400 mm and 241 mm. The size of written space varies depends on the quire and folio. Some folios have very narrow marginal space at the top, bottom and sides. In P 24, for example, the size of the written space for folio 19r, column 2, is 300 mm x 70 mm; the text is situated 30 mm from top of the folio, 38 mm from the bottom, and 30 mm from the outer edge. In contrast, the size of the written space on folio 173r, column 2, is 330 mm x 70 mm; the text is situated 22 mm from the top of the folio, 16 mm from bottom, and 30mm from the outer edge. A similarly cramped example may be found on folio 211v, where the size of the written space for column 1 is 320 mm x 75 mm; the text is situated 42 mm from the top of the folio, 6 mm from the bottom, and 20 mm from the outer edge.

The text is written throughout in double columns. The frames of these columns are faintly ruled in plummet, but the pricking in P 24 has been lost through trimming, and is only occasionally visible amongst the quires of P 25. Only some quires and folios in both manuscripts contain ruled lines for writing. The number of lines in each column differs

5 M.R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899). See also *The University and College Libraries of Cambridge*, ed. by P. D. Clarke, with an Introduction by R. Lovatt, CBMLC (London: British Library, 2002).

6 *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse*, p. 45.

depending on quire, folio and column. For example, in P 24 there are 65 lines on folio 1r, column 2, whereas there are 92 lines on folio 174r, column 2. This lack of uniformity is reflected by the multiple hands which have contributed to the main text of both volumes: a detailed description of each and every hand cannot be given here, but there are examples of Bastard Anglicana, Anglicana Cursiva, Secretary, and what Parkes calls a University script.⁷ When analysed in conjunction with the collation of the manuscript, some interesting conclusions emerge (the following remarks include examples taken from P 24, but the findings apply equally to P 25). A new hand often begins each new quire, although there are exceptions. Sometimes the same hand writes consecutive quires (on quires 3 and 4, for example), and on a number of occasions, different hands have contributed to the same quire (for example, on folio 66r of quire 8, a new hand takes over half-way down column 1, whilst a number of folios in quire 24, such as 217r, contain the hands of at least two scribes alternately taking turns). At the end of some quires, the text becomes smaller, and the margins tighter, as if the scribe is attempting to cram as much text in as possible (on folio 132v at the end of quire 15, on folios 152r and 152v at the end of quire 17, and folios 81r and 81v at the end of quire 10). Quires containing fewer leaves show particular evidence of of cramming (for example, in quire 20, which consists of only eight leaves, the margins are very tight, and two smaller contemporary inserts have been included with additional text). Equally, there is sometimes a gap at the end of the final folio of a quire (folios 92v, 190v, 200v), and on occasion the text is more spaced out at the bottom of the final folio (folios 142v, and 152v). By implication, it seems that multiple scribes were working on discrete quires simultaneously. Given that there is a lack of uniformity with regards to the script employed (and its legibility), the care taken when writing, and the size of the written space, it seems plausible that the scribes were commissioned individually (or at least were working with significant autonomy), rather than within a single workshop.

The *Summa Praedicatorum* is the only text contained within the manuscripts. Inside the front cover of MS 24, a title has been written: ‘*Summa Praedicatorum per Jo Bromyard. Pars 1a.*’ The first three lines of folio 1r read: ‘*Incipit prologus Summe Predican fratris Johannis de*

⁷ For examples of these hands, see M.B. Parkes, *English Cursive Book Hands, 1250-1500* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), plates 1 (ii), 7 (i), 11 (ii), 16 (ii).

Bromyarde ordinis Fratrum Predicatorum'. This is followed by the prologue to the Summa, which is written – in the same hand as that of the incipit – on folios 1r and 1v. A table of chapter headings has been written on folios 1v and 2r. Various marks – [•] [/] [x] – have been made against some but not all of the headings. None of these marks seems to bear any relation to the number or type of corrections and annotations made to each chapter. The table of headings has been reproduced below (but note that the number and layout of the columns does not reflect that in the manuscript):

Abiectio	Consilium	Gaudio •	Misericordia /	Restitutio •
Abiicere	Compassio	Gloria	Missa	Resurrectio •
Ab infantia /	Conversatio	Gratia •	Mors x	
Abstinentia /	Cor	Gratitudo •	Mundicia	Sacerdotiam
Absconsio	Chorea x	Gula x	Mundus	Sanctitas
Abusio •	Correctio		Munus	Sapientia •
Absolutio •	Crux /	Homo		Scientia •
Accidia /	Custodia •	Homicidium x	Nativitas	Senectus
Accedere		Honestas	Negligentia	Sensus
Accipere	Damnatio •	Honor	Nobilitas /	Sequi •
Accusatio x	Desperatio /	Hospitalitas x	Nocumentum	Servire •
Acquisitio	Decime •	Humilitas		Symonia
Adventus	Dedicatio		Obedientia	Societas •
Advocati	Delectatio /	Ieiunium /	Ocium	Sortilegium •
Adulatio /	Detractio /	Inconstantia	Odium	Spes
Adoratio •	Discretio •	Infirmitas •	Operatio	Spiritussanctus •
Adulterium /	Discordia	Inobedencia	Oratio /	Superbia •
Adversitas •	Dilectio	Intentio	Ordo clericalis	
Ambulatio	Dimittere	Invidia •	Ornatus	Temptatio •
Amor	Divicie /	Ypocrisis	Ostensio	Testimonium
Amicitia	Dominatio /	Ira /		Timor
Angelus		Iudices /	Patientia	Trinitas •
Anima •	Ebrietas /	Iudicium humanum	Passio christi •	Tribulatio x
Arma /	Electio	Iudicium divinum	Paupertas	
Ascendere	Elemosina x	Iuramentum /	Pax x	Veritas •
Audire •	Equitas	Iusticia /	Peccatum •	Verbum /
Avaricia /	Erubescencia		Peccator •	Via •
	Eucharistia •	Labor	Penitentia	Visus •
Beatitudo •	Exemplum •	Laus	Pena	Vindicta
Bellum	Executor x	Lex	Perserverantia	Virtus
Benefacere	Excommunicatio	Liber	Pietas	Vita •

Bonitas		Locutio	Predestinatio	Visitatio •
	Falsitas •	Ludus •	Predicatio	Vocatio
Caritas x	Fama	Luxuria x	Prelatio •	Voluntas •
Caro x	Ferie x		Pulchritudo	Votum
Castitas /	Fides •	Maledictio		Usura •
Civitas	Filiatio •	Mandata	Querere	
Contritio x	Fortitudo	Maria		Xps
Confessio /	Fraternitas •	Matrimonium x	Rapina •	
Conscientia	Furtum x	Mendacium	Recidivm	
Consuetudo		Mercatio x	Redditio	
Concordia		Militia	Regimen	
Cogitatio		Ministratio /	Religio x	

This is followed by an index of themes covering folios 2r to 18r which begins: ‘Incipit tabula realis Summe predican’. A further index listing keywords covers folios 18r to 18v, underneath which is written: ‘Explicit tabula uocalis Summe Predicancium’. These two indices are not found in R, but are included in A 305, 306, and in the printed editions. The main text of P 24 covers folios 19r to 239v, and contains the chapters from A to L. On the top right of folio 239v, a note has been written in red ink: ‘Vacat usque in finem huius folii u’ post incipit [erasure] uocabulum / [written in a different hand] manda’.

In P 25, folios 1r to 16v contain the same indices found in P 24, the Tabula realis (1r-16r) and Tabula vocalis (16r-16v). On folio 16v an ex libris note has been added in a later, possibly sixteenth-century, hand: ‘liber collegii sancti Petri’ Cantebrigge’. A list of chapter headings is given on folio 17r. It is followed by an explicit and incipit: ‘Explicit tabula uocalis Summe Pred. Tabula realis et plenaria in quaternis precedentibus satis clare reperietur. Incipit secunda pars Summe Pred. uidel. a littera M et deinceps usque in finem alphabeti. Sequitur uocabulum Malediccio...’ The remaining chapters of the main text covers folios 17v to 239v, beginning with the article Malediccio. At the top of folio 20r, a note written in red ink reads: ‘Vacat totum usque ad uocabulum maria’. A later hand adds: ‘Mentiris sed bene et consequenter est post finem alterius voluminis’.

The initial letter of the first word of a chapter is written over three lines, and capitals are in red and blue. Chapter headings, and abbreviated headings – for example, ‘Abiectio A1’ –

appear at the head of each folio, recto and verso. There are frequent crossings-out and underlinings. Catchwords are included on the bottom right of the verso side of the last folio of a quire. On the bottom of the folio 239v, a colophon has been written: ‘Et quo finitur summa pred. fratris Ioh. de hormyard de ord. fr. predic. Lectores orate pro collectore. Gratia d. n. J. C. cum omnibus uobis. apoc. ult. Amen’.

The palaeographical evidence – although difficult to evaluate – is consistent with a date from the late-fourteenth or early-fifteenth century. It thereby seems safe to conclude that the manuscript is the same as the *Summa Praedicatorum* which is recorded in a catalogue of the library of Peterhouse College, Cambridge, 1418. Significantly, the manuscript provides evidence of the text circulating within a university setting. Correspondingly, this may have helped to disseminate the text further afield, as scholars came and went (see also p. 139).⁸

Avignon Bibliothèque Municipale Manuscripts 305 and 306

The manuscripts housed at Avignon consist of the second and third volumes of a three volume set; it lacks the entries from A to G. The two surviving manuscripts are made of parchment, and can be dated to the fourteenth century on palaeographical grounds. They were rebound in sheepskin in the sixteenth- or seventeenth-century, and a single paper flyleaf has been inserted at the beginning of each manuscript; the spine of Manuscript 306 is particularly fragile. Additionally, the page edges have been flecked in red.

A 305 contains 192 folios, on which the chapters *Homo* to *Oratio* have been written. The length of a folio is 270 mm, and width 190 mm; the length of the written space is 188 mm and the width 127 mm. There are large spaces at the bottom of each folio. The main text has been written in double columns, and the width of each is 56 mm. There is evidence of pricking and ruled lines; there are between 44 (folio 1r column 1) and 48 lines (folio 190v column 1) on each folio. Quires mostly consist of eight folios.

There are three notes on folio 1r written in different hands, all of which appear to date from the fifteenth century. The first reads ‘*summa praedicatorum bromiardi*’; the second reads ‘*prima pars summa predicantium*’; and the third reads ‘*pro com. Bibliotheca fratrum*’

⁸ For a detailed exploration of this, see Chapter 4.

praedicatorum Aveninensis'. There is little reason to doubt the authenticity of the last of these notes. This is significant since it places the text at the centre of the papal curia; interestingly, Clement V (1305-1314), the first pope to reside in southern France (1309+), is known to have stayed at the Dominican convent in Avignon, whilst Clement VI (1342-1352) was crowned there.⁹

Three hands are predominantly responsible for the main text, all of which seem to be written in a fourteenth-century French Gothic bookhand (with characteristics similar to the university hand described by Parkes).¹⁰ The first hand is very clear; the second is a thinner, more angular script; whilst the third is a much smaller script. For the majority of the manuscript, particularly towards the beginning, there are no annotations or underlinings other than marginal references to the articuli and subsections. Vertical lines in the margins of *Iudicium Divinum* (folio 51v) appear to indicate somebody marking out sections of text for later perusal. Some corrections have been made in the hand of the main text on folio 104r. There is underlining and interlinear notes written in red within the chapter on *Misericordia* (folios 112r-120r). Red underlining of authorities begins on folio 166r and continues through to the end of the text. On folio 183v (on which part of the chapter *Operatio* is written) marginal notes are underlined in red. In addition, headings, paragraph marks, and the capital letter of the first word in a chapter are also in red. Capital letters have little decoration. Chapter titles are written at the top of each folio, and shortened forms are also written at the sides. A more recent hand has marked folio numbers in Arabic numerals in red ink at the top of each folio. There is occasional evidence of catchwords, and quire signatures, but most appear to have been cut off.

A 306 contains 238 folios, on which the chapters from *Ordo Clericalis* to *Usura* have been written. Eight chapters have been omitted, however: *Vindicta*; *Virtus*; *Vita*; *Visitatio*; *Vocatio*; *Voluntas*; *Votum*; and *XPS*. Since *Usura* follows directly beneath *Visus* on folio 201v it is clear that the missing chapters were not written on a separate quire or a group of folios which has subsequently been taken out of the manuscript. There is no indication of why these chapters have not been included.

9 Joëlle Rollo-Koster, *Avignon and Its Papacy, 1309–1417: Popes, Institutions, and Society* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2015), p. 219.

10 S. Harrison Thomson, *Latin Bookhands of the Later Middle Ages, 1100-1500* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2008), plate 16, AD1329.

The manuscript is 264 mm in length and 133 mm in width; the length of the written space is 176 mm and the width 131 mm. The main text has been written in double columns, and the width of each is 55 mm. There is evidence of pricking and ruled lines, and there are 48 lines on each folio. Quires mostly consist of eight folios.

The same three notes feature on folio 1r as those which appear in A 305, with the exception that the second reads '2da pars...' The text is written in a single hand, the same as that which was the third main hand in A 305. The decoration and headings are also similar to that found in A 305, with the exception that paragraph marks and decoration of capital letters are sometimes in blue. The text ends on folio 205v, which includes the following explicit: 'Sequitur capitulum de Christo tantum. Et sic et finis.' Folios 206r and v have been left blank. On folios 207r-207v, there is a list of chapter headings; all of the missing chapters aside from *Vocatio* are included in the table. Folios 208r to 237r contain a *Tabula realis*, identical to that found in P. Finally, folios 237r to 238r contain the *Tabula uocalis*, which can also be found in P.

In general, the condition of the manuscripts suggest they were heavily used. Similar to R, they appear to be typical reference books suitable for an institution. The tripartite division has made the manuscripts more portable than R with the drawback that it was evidently more difficult to keep all of the volumes together; thus the first volume is missing. The location of the manuscripts in Avignon (from at least the fifteenth century based on the *ex-libris* note mentioned above) has significant implications regarding the channels of dissemination of the text, and its overall reach (see also pp. 141-42).

Oxford, Oriel College Manuscript 10

O, written in a single fifteenth-century university hand (comparable to a debased *Textura*, according to Parkes), is one of two manuscripts that contain an abridged version of the *Summa Praedicatorum*.¹¹ The version is the same as that found in Cardiff, Public Library, MS 3.174. Descriptions of the manuscript can be found in in Henry Coxe's *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Oxford Colleges*, and in Lozar's thesis.¹² Alan Fletcher has commented on the manuscript

¹¹ Parkes, *English Cursive Book Hands*, plate 16 (ii).

¹² Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum*, I, pp. 3-4; Lozar, 'Studien zur *Summa Praedicatorum* des John Bromyard', p. 31.

with regards to an extract of Thomas of Ireland's *Manipulus Florum*, which is one of two further texts included.¹³ A modern library note found within O also reveals that Patrick J. Horner has at some point in time had access to the text, although as far as I am aware, he is yet to publish anything on it.

The manuscript is made of parchment and contains 446 folios; Coxe erroneously counted 440.¹⁴ It has been rebound in modern, brown leather over wooden boards. The original covers have been kept inside the rebound manuscript and now form the outer fly/endleaves. Book-clasp marks are visible on the first flyleaf and the last two endleaves. There are signs of use throughout the manuscript but it remains in a relatively good condition. The vast majority of quires consist of 12 folios, the length of the leaves measuring 350 mm, and the width 235 mm. Sufficient space has been left for annotations; the length of each column is 260 mm, the width 80 mm, and the width of the written space 175 mm. The text is written in two columns throughout, and there are 62-63 lines on each page. There is some evidence of pricking and ruling, and the text is written in neat, horizontal lines.

Folios 1r to 272v contain an abridged and abbreviated version of John Bromyard's *Summa Praedicatorum*. Twenty-three chapters have been culled from the original complete text, and those that do remain have been abridged; some articuli have been shortened, and some removed; the way in which this occurred may be seen in the case-study on *Falsitas* (pp. 183-84). The following is a list of the 166 chapters present (note that the chapter headwords are not listed in a table in the manuscript):

Abstinencia	Consiliarius	Homo	Mors	Religio
Abusiones	Compassio	Homicidium	Mundicia	Restitucio
Absolucio	Cor	Honor	Mundus	Resurrectio
Accidia	Correctio	Hospitalitas	Munus	Sacerdotas
Accusacio	Crux	Humilitas	Natiuitas	Sanctitas
Aquisicio	Dampnacio	Iemum	Nobilitas	Sapiencia
Aduentus	Desperacio	Inconstancia	Nocumentum	Sciencia
Aduocati	Decima	Infirmetas	Obediencia	Sensus
Adulacio	Dedicacio	Inobediencia	Ociositas	Sequere

¹³ Fletcher, 'A Death Lyric', pp. 11-12.

¹⁴ Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum*, p. 4.

Adorare	Detractorum	Inuidia	Odium	Seruire
Adulterium	Discordia	Ypocrite	Operacio	Symonia
Ambulare	Discomno	Ira	Oracio	Societas
Amor	Diuisio	Iudicium	Ordo clericalis	Sortilegium
Amicicia	Divicie	Iudices hominum	Ornatus	Spes
Angeli	Dominacio	Iudices diuinum	Ostensio	Spiritus Sanctus
Anima	Ebrietas	Iuramentum	Paciam	Superbia
Arma	Electio	Iusticia	Passio	Temptacio
Ascendere	Elemosinas	Laborare	Paupitas	Testimonium
Auditus	Eukaristia	Laus	Pax	Timor
Auaricia	Exempla	Lex	Peccatum	Trinitas
Bellum	Executor	Liber	Peciatoris	Tribulacio
Benefacere	Exogicacio	Locucio	Penitencia	Veritas
Bonitas	Falsitas	Ludus	Pena	Verba dei
Caritas	Fama	Luxuria	Perseuerario	Via
Carnis	Ferie	Mandatum	Pietas	Visus corporalis
Castitas	Fides	Marie	Predestinacio	Vindicta
Civitas	Filacio	Matrimonium	Prelacio	Virtus
Contricio	Fures	Mendaciorum	Pulcritudo	Vita
Confessio	Gaudium	Mercacionis	Querere	Visitas
Consciencia	Gloria	Ministerium	Rapina	Vocacio
Consuetudo	Gracia	Milicia	Recidini	Voluntas
Concordia	Gratitudo	Misericordia	Reddet	Votum
Cogitatio	Gula	Missa	Regimen	Usura
				Xristus

Additionally, Bromyard's prologue is omitted, and the internal system of referencing is only partly in place. The marginal system of cross-referencing also differs from R; capital letters rather than numbers are used to denote parts of chapters up to and including *Exemplum*. Thereafter, some chapters have marginal numbers, whilst others do not.

Folios 273r to 337r contain John Felton's *Sermones Dominicales*, and folios 337r to 446v contain part of Thomas of Ireland's *Manipulus Florum*, an early fourteenth-century florilegium of authorities (Bromyard, in fact borrowed significant material from the *Manipulus Florum*, and the complementary relationship between the two texts will be examined in greater detail in Chapter 3, pp. 85-89, 95, 105-06). Since Felton finished his sermon cycle in 1431, and since all three texts in the manuscript have been written in the same hand, the manuscript was almost certainly written after this date. However, there is also evidence that the *Summa*

Praedicanium initially formed a separate booklet distinct from the other two texts: catchwords are generally included on the bottom right of the verso side of the last folio of a quire, but this pattern has been disturbed between the Summa Praedicanium and the Sermones Dominicales, and there are no catchwords between folio 264 and folio 284; since the Sermones are written on a new folio of a new quire, the absence of a catchword indicates that the texts were written separately, and then added together.

A comparison of the chapter Falsitas in R and P with that in O and C demonstrates that the shorter version is an abridgement of the longer version, rather than the longer version being an expansion of the shorter text. There are passages included in the abridged version which refer to text that has been omitted. For example, in the second article of Falsitas, Bromyard discusses the tricks used by the false. The first cautela (trick) is not included in O and C, but O and C still introduce the second trick as follows: ‘Secunda cautela vtuntur iude proditoris et dalide sampsonis.’ Additionally, at the beginning of the third article, the phrase ‘ex qua auctoritate’ is employed even though the preceding authority has been omitted.¹⁵

Angelika Lozar has also suggested that a textual alteration in the chapter Iudices Diuinum demonstrates that the abridgement must have been composed after 1376 which was when Pope Gregory XI left Avignon for Rome (in the full version of the Summa, the passage places the pope in Avignon, whereas in the abridged version, he is in Rome); this will be discussed further under the dating of the Summa.¹⁶

Throughout the Summa and the Sermones, corrections and annotations have been written in both the hand of the main scribe, and at least two other hands. Further hands appear to have made a small number of additional corrections and annotations. There are also underlinings, and occasional manucula. In addition, there are six flaps where the manuscript has been cut around annotations; the last of these is on folio 22. These are not finger tabs, but appear to have been made when the manuscript was trimmed.

According to Alan Fletcher, the manuscript is a distinctive ‘Oxford production’ based on the colour of the ink, and an ‘orange tinge on the hair sides of the parchment’.¹⁷ Initials and

¹⁵ See pp. 183-84. SP, Falsitas, ll. 643-45, 874.

¹⁶ Lozar, ‘Studien zur Summa Predicanium des John Bromyard’, p. 34. See pp. 118-23.

¹⁷ Alan Fletcher, ‘A Death Lyric’, p. 11.

paragraph marks are in blue and red, whilst chapter headings for the Summa are written in small script at the head of each folio, recto and verso. Two sets of quire signatures have been written on the first six rectos of quires; this is not consistent throughout the manuscript, but in general, the first set comprises of letters and Roman numerals written in lead, whilst the second comprises of letters and Arabic numerals written in ink.

This manuscript is particularly significant as a witness to the redacted version of the Summa. It provides evidence of critical engagement with the text, and the utility of a smaller, more portable text. Its provenance again suggests that the Summa was flourishing in a university setting, and was thus being exposed to individuals from a relatively wide geographical area (see also p. 140).

Cardiff Public Library Manuscript 3. 174

C is an early-fifteenth manuscript containing the abridged version of the Summa Praedicatorum that is also found in O. However, C only contains the chapters from A to L. A description can be found in the Summary Catalogue of the Manuscripts of South Glamorgan Libraries, Cardiff Central Library, and also in Neil Ker's MMBL.¹⁸

The manuscript is made of parchment and has been rebound in modern red/brown leather on wooden boards.¹⁹ In general, it is in good condition. In total, it contains 258 folios, and folio numbers have been pencilled in Arabic numerals at the top right hand corner of the recto side. Folios 2 to 4 and 255 to 257 are medieval fly- and end-leaves, whilst folios 1 and 258 are fly- and end-leaves made of paper/card. The majority of quires consist of twelve folios; the length of a folio measures 230 mm, and the width 160 mm. The text is written in single columns, and there is a great deal of unmarked marginal space; the length of a column is 151 mm, and the width 96 mm. Folios contains thirty-four and thirty-seven lines of text, and there is evidence of consistent pricking, ruled lines, and borders.

The initial flyleaves are covered by scribbles, manuscript numbers and stamps, all of which contribute information on its more recent ownership. A table of chapter headings – from

18 N. Ker, MMBL, ii, pp. 362-63, and Summary Catalogue of the Manuscripts of South Glamorgan Libraries, Cardiff Central Library, compiled by Graham C. G. Thomas and Daniel Huws (Aberystwyth: National Library of Wales, 1994).

19 According to Ker, the boards are 'perhaps medieval, recovered in s. xix'; MMBL, ii, p. 363.

Abstinencia to Luxuria – has been included for the abbreviated Summa on folios 3v to 4r. There are three texts contained within the manuscript, all of which have been written in the same fifteenth-century secretary hand: the Summa Praedicatorum which covers folios 5r to 236v; a sermon cycle on folios 237r to 252v, which is also found in at least thirteen manuscripts of the Fasciculus Morum; and a tract ‘On the celebration of the mass and the dignity of the priesthood’ on folios 252v to 254v. The remaining folios contain pen-trials, scribbling and notes in a number of hands. Throughout the manuscript, the majority of annotations are in a different hand to that of the main text; this annotator’s hand is also responsible for some of the catchwords and quire signatures.

Two phrases in English are included within the text of the Summa: ‘wt þys betyl be he smyte þt al þys wyde world hyt wyte þt to þe vkynde gyues al hs þyng goth hym self a beggyng’ on folio 28v, and ‘horry beware by allerchurch þt þu be nouȝt yfounde al suche’ on folio 118r. These phrases have been repeated with variations in spelling on folio 256v in a sixteenth-century hand: ‘wyth this malle be he smytt that al the world hyt wytt that gyveth away all his thinge and goeth hym selfe a beggyng’ and ‘hurry beware by alruth that thow be not yfound one such.’ There are many vernacular phrases within the Summa (both the full and abbreviated versions), the majority of which tend to be proverbial in nature. The copying of these phrases suggest that they retained a particular pull on the imagination in the sixteenth century; they also provide evidence that the text was still being actively used in later centuries.

The initial on folio 5r is decorated in red, blue and green. Thereafter, the initial letter of each chapter heading of the Summa is decorated in red and blue. Catchwords are included on the bottom right of the verso side of the last folio of a quire, and the first six folios of each quire are marked on the recto side by quire signatures. Headings are written at the top right of folios on the recto side in the hand of the main scribe. There are annotations and underlinings in the majority of chapters of the Summa; not all of these are in the same hand.

On folio 257 a partially erased inscription appears to read: ‘Liber Iohannis [...] Liber venerabilis in cristo patris et domini thome bekynton Well’ et baton episcopi’. Thomas Beckington was administrator and bishop of Bath and Wells, c. 1390-1465. He is thus one of a number of high-ranking ecclesiastical figures and royal official known to have been in

possession of, or used, the Summa. Additionally, there are a number of different manuscript reference numbers recorded in the manuscript: MS 3.174; Phillips MSS 9419; MSS. 63. 25.; 133. In conjunction with other records, the later transmission and ownership of the manuscript can be traced. It is recorded as number 133 in Thorpe's catalogue of 1836.²⁰ In Sotherby's sale of the Phillips manuscripts, 21 March 1896, it featured as lot 102, and was sold to James Tregaskis.²¹ It was subsequently bought from William C. Elly in 1926.²²

C provides further evidence of the utility of an abbreviated version of the Summa. It also suggests that this particular version gained popularity and circulated relatively widely (see also pp. 139-40).

British Library, Harley Manuscript 106

British Library Harley MS 106 is a fifteenth century miscellany containing 157 distinct, theological and religious texts. Descriptions can be found in *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, and also in a PhD thesis completed by Simon Forde on *Repyngdon's Sermones super Evangelia Dominicalia*.²³

The manuscript is made of parchment and has been rebound within modern, black covers. There are five initial folios (marked with a number and star on the top right of the recto folios) followed by a further 369 folios. Additionally, there are three modern paper flyleaves at the beginning of the manuscript, and two at the end. Each folio measures 265 mm x 188 mm. The manuscript is mostly unruled, and the texts appear to have been written at different times and compiled later as a kind of scrap book. Simon Forde has identified six distinct compositional parts written in different hands: (1) folios 1*r-5*v (the starred folios represent folios not included in the subsequent foliation of the codex), containing lists of contents; (2) folios 1r-24v containing texts 1-11, and written on the first two quires; (3) folios 25r-344v containing texts 12-123, and written on quires 2-24; (4) folios 345r-364r containing texts 124-

20 Ibid.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid.

23 *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 4 vols (London: The British Museum, 1808-12), I (1808), pp. 31-33. Simon Forde, 'Writings of a Reformer: A look at Sermon Studies and Bible Studies through Repyngdon's *Sermones super Evangelia Dominicalia*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 1985), pp. 162-71.

140, and written in quires 25-6; (5) folios 364v-365r containing texts 141-156, and written on quires 26-7; (6) folios 366r-369v containing text 157, and written on quire 27. The main hand is written in a legible Anglicana bookhand, and the majority of the text (specifically, the third and fourth parts) is written in two columns. Modern Arabic numerals appear on the top right of recto folios. Contemporary Arabic numerals also appear on top right of recto (and very occasionally verso) folios indicating the text number. On folio 3r, a mark has been written in the top right corner: '35.A.7.', underneath which is the Harley classmark '106'.

In the second and fourth parts (of the six identified by Forde), initial letters and paragraph markings are written in red. In the third part, initials are in blue, whilst paragraph markings, headings and some underlinings are in red. A later hand has highlighted headings and paragraphs marks and underlined incipits.

The text which covers folios 1r*-1v* is a fragment of the works of Richard Rolle.²⁴ Folios 2r*-3v* contain a contents list of twenty-six entries, many of which include multiple texts; for example, the twenty-sixth entry lists texts 133-137. There is no obvious correlation between the groups of texts organised in each entry. Four texts pertaining to John Bromyard are included in this contents list; they may be found in the sixth, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-second entries.

Folios 4v-5v contain four further contents lists, each of which refers to the chapters or headings of an individual text included in the manuscript. On folio 4v the following entry is recorded: 'In Summa praedicancium vide infra fol. 263 usque ad fol 305 inclusos.' The table lists sixty-one headings, referring to the following chapters (the headings are in a single column in the manuscript):

1. Prologus	12. Caro	25. Dilectio	36. Luxuria	49. Mendacium
abiectio	13. Confessio	26. Dimittere	37. Ministratio	50. Mercatio
abiicere	14. Conscientia	27. Iudicium	38. Misericordia	51. Militia
2. Ab infantia	15. Consuetudo	humanum	39. Missa	52. Negligentia
3. Absolutio	16. Custodia	28. Iudicium	40. Mors	53. Odium
4. Abstinencia	17. Damnatio	divinum	41. Ferie	54. Peccatum

²⁴ A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts, p. 31.

5. Accidia	18. Desperatio	29. Iuramentum	42. Fides	55. Predicatio
6. Acquisitio	19. Decime	30. Maledictio	43. Ieunium	56. Prelatio
7. Advocati	20. Compassio	31. Mandata	44. Ebrietas	57. Rapina
8. Audire	21. Custodia	32. Lex	45. Elemosina	58. Excommunica
9. Avaritia	22. Correctio	33. Locutio	46. Infirmetas	-tio
10. Bonitas	23. Dilectio	34. Ludus	47. Iusticia	59. Sacerdotium
11. Caritas	24. Detractio	35. Liber	48. Matrimonium	60. Symonia
				61. Sortilegia

The chapter *Homo* – copied in its entirety from the *Summa Praedicatorum* – covers folios 33v to 36r; the title reads: ‘Capitulum ex. Summa Praedicatorum De conditione et proprietate hominis’. In addition, a further text pertaining to the *Summa* is included on folio 135r; this appears to be a summarised extract of the first article of the chapter *Operatio*. An abridged version of the prologue to the *Summa Praedicatorum*, and a further sixty-two abridged chapters from the *Summa* cover folios 263r-305v. The abridgement is distinct from that which occurs in O and C. The final text associated with Bromyard is an excerpt from *Tractatus* on ‘de Intencione’; this covers folios 313v-314r (see also p. 149).

The Printed Editions

The *Summa Praedicatorum* was printed on at least seven occasions between 1484 and 1627: Basel (Johann Amerbach, 1484); Nuremberg (Anton II Koberger, 1485, 1518); Lyons (Romain Morin, 1522); Venice (Domenico Nicolini da Sabbio, 1586); Antwerp (1614, 1627).²⁵

A comparison of the chapter *Falsitas* in R and the earliest printed edition (Basel 1484, hereafter B) offers a few glimpses of how the text was transmitted and received further afield. In addition to spelling variations, and minor changes, B includes Psalm numbers (which are omitted in R and P), and also a number of additional phrases, cross-references, and corrected citations.²⁶ Thus, it seems clear that B was working from an exemplar not directly descended

²⁵ Kaeppli adds and eight edition, Nuremberg 1575: Kaeppli, *Scriptores*, p. 394. However, I have been unable to verify the existence of this.

²⁶ For example, B includes the phrase ‘De quo etiam intelligitur illud Osee iiiii. Non est veritas in terra’ in the passage just before Bromyard cites Augustine’s *City of God*; B adds ‘ad quem habent semper aures apertas’ when discussing venal judges. B also adds the phrase ‘Et si non habuerint, nisi vnam vaccam, vel gallinam, quando per patriam transeunt, illam capiunt, et talliam soluunt; B adds ‘ad Rom vi’ to a citation for ‘John 8’; B expands the citation ‘bene a zenone’ to ‘li.7.l.’; B adds the cross-reference ‘Et A, xxi, xxvi.’ A number of incorrect Biblical citations in the manuscript copy are correctly recorded in B: the citation ‘Ecc 39’ is replaced

from R. B also omits or changes into Latin the vernacular phrases included in R.²⁷ In addition, B also introduces a number of errors which are not evident in R.²⁸

Conclusion

Having examined the palaeographical and codicological features of the surviving manuscripts of the Summa, I will now investigate how, why and when the text was compiled. As the previous discussion suggests, the manuscripts provide a significant amount of material that sheds light on these issues; the printed editions alone do not suffice.

with 'Proverbio xxix'; B alters a citation to Judges, chapter '16' from Judges '18'; B alters the citation to Job 21 from Job 20. In one cross-reference to another chapter, B replaces A 14, 24 and 25 with A 14, 34 and 35. The citations mentioned above may be found in Appendix D.

- 27 B uses the word 'anglicanam' to describe 'marcam'; B also omits 'que uulgari nomine vocantur weupe' probably because the redactor did not know the meaning of 'weupe' (waif), and the phrase therefore lacked clarity. B omits 'Vecy ly coserz au diable' and 'e cozes entre le partiez'. B replaces the other French phrases with Latin equivalents: 'yl est mieuz venuz' is replaced with 'bene tractatur', and 'yl ad en doz de tiel grant seignur non dicere habere endoz de dieu mez de tiel seignur mez cel le doser au diable, quia ille qui hic est doser falsi' with 'quod fuit alligatus falso, et qui hic est minister falsi'.
- 28 B replaces 'bulgarus', in which Bromyard was referring to the Bolognese lawyer, with 'vulgarus', and 'bulgari' with 'ulgurari'; 'numis' is replaced with 'minis'; 'pro robis' is replaced with 'a robis'.

CHAPTER 3: THE FUNCTION AND COMPOSITION OF THE SUMMA PRAEDICANTIUM

Modern scholarship on Bromyard and the *Summa Praedicatorum* has primarily focussed on the composition of the text. In this chapter, I challenge some of the current orthodoxies, notably those regarding the date of composition and Bromyard's motivations for compiling it. I firstly consider the position of the *Summa* as a preaching aid, and explore its distinct utility within this genre of text. I then discuss how the *Summa* was compiled, and examine the citations made and sources used. This in turn leads to an exploration of the resources available to Bromyard. Finally, I consider the date Bromyard compiled the text, and the motivations which drove him to do so, both of which are crucial for contextualising the work.

Sermon-making and preaching aids

At the beginning of the thirteenth century, growing concern for the pastoral care of the laity triggered a rapid rise in popular preaching.¹ Although a number of *artes praedicatorum* were written as guides to help preachers compose sermons, the most common form of training – for friars, monks, and seculars – involved observing and imitating experienced preachers, reading model sermon collections, and composing one's own sermons.² Texts which provided material that could be placed within these sermons were particularly useful. All-encompassing preaching compendia such as the *Summa Praedicatorum* emerged from a number of distinct genres which developed in the thirteenth century: model sermon cycles; collections of *exempla*; and sets of *distinctiones*.³ Whereas in the twelfth century, the composition of foundational texts such as the *Sentences* (for Theology) and the *Decretum* (for Canon Law) reflected the need to synthesise

-
- 1 Brenda Bolton, *The Medieval Reformation* (London: Edward Arnold, 1983), esp. Chapter 4; *Medieval Popular Religion, 1000-1500*, ed. by John Shinnars, 2nd ed. (Plymouth: Broadview Press, 2007); Ronald Stansbury, 'Preaching and Pastoral Care in the Thirteenth Century' in *A Companion to Pastoral Care in the Late Middle Ages (1200-1500)*, ed. by R. Stansbury (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 21-40. For the pastoral literature that accompanied this movement, see L. Boyle, 'The Fourth Lateran Council and Manuals of Popular Theology', in *The Popular Literature of Medieval England*, ed. by T.J. Heffernan, *Tennessee Studies in Literature*, 28 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), pp. 30-43; Richard Newhauser, 'Religious writing: hagiography, pastoralia, devotional and contemplative works' in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature, 1150-1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 37-56.
 - 2 The standard work on *Artes Praedicatorum* is now Siegfried Wenzel, *Medieval 'Artes Praedicatorum': A Synthesis of Scholastic Sermon Structure* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015). See also Marianne Briscoe, *Artes Praedicatorum, Typologie des Sources du Moyen Age* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992).
 - 3 R. Rouse and M. Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979), p. 4.

written authority systematically, the thirteenth-century preaching aids reflected a need to search this material in order to use it, primarily for the purpose of preaching.⁴ In order to understand the specific utility of these various texts, it is first necessary to consider how a sermon was constructed.

A medieval preacher might compose a sermon in one of two distinct ways, either according to the ancient manner (a homily), or that of the *sermo modernus* (a scholastic or university sermon).⁵ The ancient manner of preaching involved a verse by verse commentary, or moral exegesis, of the day's biblical lection.⁶ In the second half of the twelfth century, a novel form of preaching began to develop which involved the explication of a single *thema* (theme) selected from Scripture; the theme was divided into separate parts, called *membra* or *principalia*, which were then developed in turn.⁷ By the early fourteenth century, the majority of sermons followed the modern form, although there are examples, particularly in Italy, of preachers who continued to compose homilies.⁸

The theme of a *sermo modernus* was usually, though not necessarily, taken from the day's liturgical reading.⁹ Having chosen the theme, a preacher could make a division either *ab intus* or *ab extra*. A *divisio ab intus* divided the words of the theme into constituent parts or phrases, which were then dealt with separately. In contrast, a *divisio ab extra* took a single concept from the theme, and then developed it in distinct ways. Both forms of division could occur in the same sermon, with the latter type following the former.¹⁰ The process of expanding a member of a sermon was known as *dilatatio*.¹¹ This could be achieved in a number of ways: by a further subdivision of a member; through the 'chaining' of authorities; by the typical

4 Ibid., pp. 35-36.

5 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 11.

6 Ibid.

7 Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons*, p. 66.

8 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 14; Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', p. 401.

9 The Dominicans were particularly studious in taking a *thema* from the appropriate liturgical reading. The Dominican liturgy had been established by Humbert of Romans in 1256, and was distinct from that which the majority of the clergy in England followed. See Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', p. 404; Maura O'Carroll, 'The Lectionary for the Proper of the year in the Dominican and Franciscan rites of the thirteenth century', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 49 (1979), 79-103.

10 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, pp. 12-13.

11 Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', p. 407.

fourfold exposition of biblical exegesis (literal, allegorical, tropological, anagogical); by the interpretation of a Hebrew name; and by the use of narrative exempla.¹²

In order to find suitable material for use within sermons, a wide variety of textual aids were composed and disseminated. These included the verbal concordance to the bible, sermonaries containing model sermons, subject indices to biblical and patristic texts, sets of distinctiones, encyclopaedias, florilegia, and collections of exempla.¹³

One of the most important sources of material for a preacher came from sermons that had already been composed. Every sermon that had been written or recorded, whether in skeleton or note form, or with the principal parts fully developed, could function as a ‘model sermon’ in the sense that it provided material and a template for others to use.¹⁴ A preacher might record or recollect a sermon that he had personally heard, or he might come across a written sermon, many of which were included within a sermon cycle or collection. Some of these collections were arranged systematically, whilst others were compiled in a random order. Systematic sermon collections follow the liturgical calendar: *de tempore* cycles include sermons for each Sunday of the church year, from the first Sunday of Advent to the last Sunday after Trinity; *de Sanctis* cycles include sermons for the feast days of the saints. These systematic cycles were generally the products of a scholarly endeavour, intended for circulation, whereas random collections were more likely to be personal collections, often formed of sermons that were actually preached.¹⁵

Monastic, fraternal and university libraries typically contained sermonaries as reference texts; individual sermons and other preaching material might be extracted by a preacher from these texts, and then recorded for personal use in a compact vademecum book, the kind a friar would carry with him on a preaching mission.¹⁶

12 Ibid., p. 409.

13 Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons*, pp. 35-36. According to Richard and Mary Rouse, these tools represented ‘a thirteenth century invention’, the first of which began to appear around 1190; after 1220 ‘a veritable flood of such books appeared.’: *ibid.*, p. 4.

14 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, pp. 3, 12.

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

16 Mulchahey, ‘First the Bow is Bent in Study’, p. 425.

Intriguingly, within Dominican circles, local sermonaries appear to have been particularly valued; they were held in high repute and were often easier to obtain than sermonaries produced in university centres such as Paris.¹⁷

Collections of *distinctiones*, which first emerged in the late twelfth century, provided an additional tool for the preacher. According to Siegfried Wenzel, a *distinctio* involved ‘unfolding a word or concept into several parts or aspects.’¹⁸ Thus, each *distinctio* contained a number of figurative meanings for a particular noun found in the bible. Some collections were composed for personal use, whilst others were intended for copying and transmission. In the early thirteenth century, three or more meanings were frequently taken from a *distinctio* and used to form a single principal part of a sermon. However, by the middle of the century, these distinct meanings began to be used to divide the sermon and thus structure it; each meaning would provide the springboard for further discussion as a separate member, or principal part. In the latter part of the century, *distinctiones* became more elaborate, and the various meanings of a particular word were explored in much greater detail; additionally, the words chosen for inclusion within a collection began to focus more heavily upon moral topics ideally suited for use in sermons. By the fourteenth century, collections of *distinctiones* were incorporating *exempla* and *patristic auctoritates*; in effect, they were functioning as comprehensive preaching compendia.¹⁹ As well as providing the material and structure for the principal parts of a sermon, a *distinctio* could more generally be mined for scriptural quotations.²⁰

From the outset, collections of *distinctiones* were frequently organised alphabetically, an approach which was relatively novel. With the exception of dictionaries, alphabetisation had not hitherto been used to organise material within texts, primarily because it did not reflect a rational, divinely-ordained relationship, such as the order of creation. However, since alphabetisation was useful for searching within texts, it soon became a popular thirteenth-century tool, being employed in the verbal concordance and various subject indices, before later

17 *Ibid.*, p. 425. Parisian exegetical and theological works, for example, were far more popular outside of Paris than Parisian sermonaries.

18 Wenzel, ‘Bromyard’s Other Handbook’, p. 94, n. 6.

19 Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons*, pp. 8-9.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 75. Interestingly, both Simon Boraston and John Bromyard composed a set of *Distinctiones*, both of which may have been accessible to the friars at Hereford convent. Simon Boraston was present at the agreement between the Hereford Dominicans and cathedral clergy, although his *Distinctiones* was written at a later date.

being used to organise material in encyclopaedias, exempla collections, florilegia and other preaching compendia. Two early examples were the *Alphabetum Narrationum*, composed by the Dominican Arnold of Liege between 1297 and 1308, and the *Manipulus Florum*, compiled by Thomas of Ireland in Paris in 1306.²¹

The *Alphabetum Narrationum* is a collection of exempla. As a short moral narrative, the origins of the exemplum can be traced back to classical times. The Dominicans began to produce their own collections from the middle of the thirteenth century, following in the footsteps of (and borrowing material from) the Cistercians. At around the same time, indices to exempla found within popular sermon cycles also began to be produced. It became commonplace to critique preachers (particularly those who belonged to the mendicant orders) for their over-reliance on exempla, especially when it was perceived they were being used for the purposes of entertainment rather than moral edification.²² However, their use and efficacy, when employed appropriately, was repeatedly justified by figures such as Humbert of Romans, master general of the Order of Preachers (1254-1263), who was himself the author of an influential collection, *De dono timoris*.²³

In contrast to exempla, the inclusion of patristic authorities within sermons was less controversial; these were frequently culled from the originalia and placed within florilegia. The *Manipulus Florum* was the first alphabetically organised florilegium; it thus differed from earlier collections of authorities since it was designed to be searched, and used, rather than read in a contemplative frame of mind for one's own moral edification.²⁴ The text was disseminated widely via the Paris stationers, and there are over 180 extant manuscripts.²⁵ Indeed, such was the popularity of the *Manipulus Florum*, that Bromyard's contemporary and fellow Dominican, Thomas Waleys, remarked in the 1340s, that:

It is easy to get hold of authorities since alphabetical concordances of the Bible and of the originalia of the saints have been made so that the authorities may be easily found.

21 *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

22 See p. 243.

23 Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', p. 418.

24 Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons*, p. ix.

25 *Ibid.*, p. 226.

And similarly, several works have been compiled, such as that called *Manipulus Florum* and other large ones, in which authorities extracted from the originalia of the saints are compiled in alphabetical order, so that there is no great difficulty for anyone to have authorities ready at hand.²⁶

Interestingly, Thomas of Ireland included a bibliographical list of authors and works at the end of the *Manipulus Florum*. It is clear that he intended the florilegium to serve as an introduction to the originalia rather than as their replacement. Even though this clearly did not always happen in practice, it demonstrates that a florilegium was not merely useful for those who lacked original sources; it enabled those with a significant library to use the material more effectively. Indeed, Thomas makes precisely this point in his prologue:

Not without some effort, I collected the ears of grain of original sources, namely, various authoritative quotations by holy men, from various books. But realizing that they were not organized and so would not be of much use to anyone else after me, I have concisely gathered them here, as into a sheaf comprised of various ears, in alphabetical order in the manner of concordances so that they can thus be more easily found by myself and by other simple people... For since the sea of original books is like a great and wide ocean that cannot be explored by just anyone, it seemed to me more useful to have a few sayings of the doctors at hand rather than too many.²⁷

26 'Quia facile est auctoritates habere, ex eo quod factae sunt Concordantiae super Bibliam et super originalia sanctorum, secundum ordinem alphabeti, ut auctoritates possint faciliter inveniri. Et similiter, compilata sunt quaedam opuscula, sicut opusculum quod vocatur *Manipulus florum*, et quaedam alia majora, in quibus secundum ordinem alphabeti compilantur auctoritates extractae de originalibus sanctorum, ita quod cuidam, ad habendum auctoritates ad libitum, non est magna difficultas.' Latin and translation in Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', p. 452

27 'Ibidem originalium spicas id est diuersas sanctorum auctoritates de diuersis libris non sine labore collegi. Sed considerans quod sine modo erant et ordine nec post me alicui alii possent prodesse, hic breuiter quasi in unum manipulum ex diuersis spicis collectum secundum ordinem alphabeti more concordanciarum collegi, ut sic a me et aliis simplicibus facilius possint reperiri... Cum enim librorum originalium pelagus sit quasi mare magnum et spaciosum quod a quolibet inuestigari non possit, michi utilius uidebatur pauca doctorum dicta in promptu habere quam si multa': Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons*, pp. 236-38. The translation is by Chris L. Nighman, 'The Electronic *Manipulus Florum* Project' <<http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/Preface.pdf>> [accessed 15 August 2017].

There are few examples of florilegia composed by Dominicans, primarily because the *Manipulus Florum* already fulfilled that function.²⁸ Indeed – as I demonstrate – it is clear that Bromyard also used this text.²⁹

The composition of the Summa

Although crammed with authorities, the *Summa Praedicatorum* is a very different text from a florilegium, containing a much wider variety of material. In the prologue Bromyard reveals that:

I have in this little book, for the use of myself and others, emended and augmented the compilation assembled by me earlier, placing certain materials, alphabetically arranged, in their own separate chapters.³⁰

The chapters of the *Summa* are, in fact, arranged alphabetically only up to the first two letters of each word; for example, *Amicitia* follows *Amor*. Bromyard's choice of chapter-headings is similar to those found in comparable texts. Indeed, such works may have provided Bromyard with a template; thus, 142 of the 189 chapter-headings contained in the *Summa Praedicatorum* also appear in the *Manipulus Florum* (which contains 266 alphabetically ordered topics).³¹

In addition, Keith Walls has perceived distinct groupings of certain religious themes which appear as chapter-headings in the *Summa*.³² These include:

- The seven cardinal sins: *Superbia* (pride); *Avaricia* (greed); *Luxuria* (lust); *Invidia* (envy); *Gula* (gluttony); *Ira* (wrath); and *Accidia* (sloth)
- Six of the seven gifts of the holy spirit (derived from Isaiah 11. 2-3): *Sapientia* (wisdom); *Consilium* (counsel); *Fortitudo* (fortitude); *Scientia* (knowledge); *Pietas* (piety); and *Timor* (wonder/fear of the Lord)³³

28 Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', p. 448. According to Mulchahey, the *Manipulus Florum* 'proved to be perhaps the best friend of the Dominican friar': *ibid.* p. 451.

29 See pp. 105-06.

30 SP, Prologus, ll. 89-96.

31 Since some terms differ and overlap, this number is approximate. For example, the *Manipulus Florum* has *Sapientia* and *Scientia* as a single chapter whereas in the *Summa* they consist of two chapters. Additionally, although Nighman states that there are 266 thematic headings, only 265 appear on the 'Manipulus florum Index' of The Electronic Manipulus florum Project <<http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/MFedition/index.html>> [accessed 15 August 2017].

32 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 237.

- Four of the seven sacraments: Eucharistia (eucharist); Matrimonium (matrimony); Ordo clericalis (Holy Orders); and Contritio/Penitentia (penance)³⁴
- Two of the four cardinal virtues: Fortitudo (fortitude); and Iusticia (justice)³⁵
- The three theological virtues: Caritas (charity); Fides (faith); and Spes (hope)
- Seven of the spiritual works of mercy: Compassio (comfort the afflicted); Consilium (counsel the doubtful); Correctio (admonish the sinners); Dimittere (forgive offences); Oratio/Pietas (pray for the living and the dead); Patientia (bear patiently those who wrong us); and Predicatio (instruct the ignorant)
- Five of the seven corporal works of mercy: Elemosina, Misericordia, Servire (which cover: feed the hungry, give water to the thirsty, clothe the naked); Hospitalitas (shelter the homeless); Infirmis (visit the sick)³⁶
- The two great commandments of Christ: Amore, Dilectio ('Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind' and 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself')
- The ten commandments (a number of chapters cover this material): mandate (commandment); prohibitions against Furtum (theft), Homicidium (murder), Mendacium (lying)
- Issues concerning the reform of the clergy: Ordo clericalis (the clerical order), Prelatio (the office of prelate), Sacerdotium (the office of priesthood), Symonia (simony)

Approaching the issue from a different angle, Peter Binkley has convincingly argued that the Summa is part of a tradition of alphabetical preaching manuals whose organisation and outlook is diametrically opposed to that of the more comprehensive encyclopaedias, also composed by mendicants, which were circulating in the same period. According to Binkley:

33 Intellectus is missing.

34 The sacraments are considered the means by which the faithful partake in the mysteries of Christ. The seven sacraments were first enumerated by Peter Lombard in the twelfth century. See E.A. Livingstone, *A Concise Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 508-09. Bromyard does not include Baptism, Confirmation and Extreme Unction.

35 Prudentia and Temperantia are missing.

36 Bromyard does not include chapters specifically dealing with visits to the imprisoned, ransoming captives and burying the dead.

In their treatment of the natural world, the encyclopaedias follow a scientific arrangement, replicating the order of the natural world: either the Aristotelian structure of substances and elements, or the hexaemeral sequence [pertaining to the six days of creation]. The preaching manuals follow a variety of schemes, in which moral theology (e.g. vices and virtues) and ease of consultation (e.g. alphabetical order) predominate over natural science.³⁷

Preaching manuals and encyclopaedias were genres which tended to conceive of the world in very different ways; the former typically emphasised a sinful world beset by conflict, in contrast to the latter which portrayed the world as peaceful and orderly.³⁸ Thus, Binkley characterises Bromyard's work as an 'Anti-encyclopaedia', one of a number of which comprehensively cover sin and human failing. 'In this sense', says Binkley, 'they are encyclopaedias not of the macrocosm but of the microcosm, specifically of man's moral world'.³⁹

The relative length of each chapter provides further evidence of John's particular concerns. In the following table, the ten longest chapters in the *Summa* are shown next to the number of columns that each covers in the first printed edition of the text. The table has been adapted from one compiled by Walls, but I have added the ten longest chapters from the *Manipulus Florum* to provide a comparison (which helps to indicate the extent to which the interest and focus of each text overlapped). Based on the mean average, each chapter in the *Summa* contains around 5,250 words, covering almost fourteen columns in the earliest printed edition (the number of columns is not important in itself, since this will vary depending on the manuscript and printed edition being used; however, it does provide an indication of the extent to which some chapters deviate from the mean).

	Chapter in SP	Columns	Chapter in MF	Entries
1	Mors	98	Mors	97

³⁷ Binkley, 'Preachers' responses to thirteenth-century encyclopaedism', p. 82.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

2	Ordo clericalis	61	Amicicia	95
3	Religio	59	Correctio	89
4	Penitentia	54	Prelacio	79
5	Prelatio	49	Oratio	77
6	Tribulatio	47	Diucie	63
7	Visitatio	37	Doctrina siue doctor	62
8	Avaricia	34	Auaricia	61
9	Falsitas	33	Amor	58
10	Eucharistia	32	Scriptura sacra	58

Individual chapters are divided into a number of articuli (articles), each of which develops a distinct theme or idea. Altogether there are 1200 articuli in the Summa; the longest chapter, Mors, contains twenty-four, whilst a number of shorter chapters contain just two.⁴⁰ Interestingly, this lack of uniformity amongst chapters is not shared with another text attributed to Bromyard, the Tractatus. In the latter text, each chapter is formed of three articuli, regardless of whether the material fits appropriately into a tripartite division.⁴¹ As an example of the potential awkwardness of this approach, Wenzel cites the chapter Timor (fear), which Bromyard divides into copiosus, viciosus, graciosus. There are two opposite moral values pertaining to fear, but Bromyard requires three categories. Thus, he writes: ‘fear is manifold because of its division into kinds; vicious because of its causing guilt; and favourable because of its glorifying our souls.’⁴²

Throughout the Summa, Bromyard’s own argumentation is supported and illustrated with various authorities, narrative exempla, similitudes and proverbs.⁴³ In the words of Wenzel,

40 Walls, John Bromyard, pp. 42, 182-86.

41 Wenzel, ‘Bromyard’s Other Handbook’, p. 110.

42 ‘Timor copiosus est specierum diuisius; viciosus est culparum causatiuus; graciosus est animarum glorificatiuus’: Ibid.

43 Binkley suggests half of the text is Bromyard’s own argumentation: Binkley, ‘John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans’, p. 257. See Appendix D, Falsitas, for a more detailed example.

Bromyard employed the ‘entire arsenal that was at a later-medieval preacher’s disposal.’⁴⁴ In total, the text contains over fourteen thousand citations, and 1217 exempla.⁴⁵ Chapters have not been developed in an identical fashion, however. *Visitatio*, for example, is unique for its inclusion of fifteen complete model sermons.⁴⁶

The prologue to the *Summa* reveals significant information about Bromyard’s approach to composing the text. At the beginning of the prologue, he emphasises that those living in the present have a duty to pass down knowledge to future generations. This, he claims, is primarily achieved by re-arranging and augmenting the authoritative knowledge which has already been passed down to him.⁴⁷ He justifies this duty by reference to guidance, example and authority (‘*Ad hoc habemus ducem, exemplum, et auctoritatem*’), and compares his work with that of the bee, which collects the pollen of flowers and distributes the fruits of its labour within the honeycomb.⁴⁸ Bromyard then explains that the *Summa* will use examples from the customs of men rather than animals, since this is more efficacious for teaching moral lessons.⁴⁹ In this regard, Binkley notes that ‘Bromyard’s use of animals generally avoids encyclopaedic lore: they appear in fables, in which the animal characters are essentially human actors in animal masks, or in familiar similitudes that appeal to observation more than to the encyclopaedic tradition.’⁵⁰

In the prologue, Bromyard also justifies the use of non-Christian, classical sources, notably by citing a letter from the French Theologian Peter of Blois (c. 1130-c. 1211) which compares the use of such material with that of healing herbs.⁵¹ Bromyard’s discussion of non-Christian classical works reflected conventional wisdom. Although pagan philosophical works were treated with suspicion in the early years of the Dominican Order, by the fourteenth century, it was generally accepted (both within the Order and without) that the study of philosophy was useful for the study of theology.⁵² Nevertheless, in subsequent chapters of the *Summa*,

44 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 116.

45 Binkley, ‘John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans’, p. 259; Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 36.

46 According to Wenzel: ‘The great *Summa Praedicatorum* by Bromyard...contains not only lists of *themata* for special occasions but here and there fairly complete sermons [...] For example, the article on *Visitatio* includes some fifteen collations that are complete model sermons’: Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 221, note 48.

47 SP, Prologus, ll. 17-37.

48 *Ibid.*, ll. 38-39, 174-95.

49 *Ibid.*, ll. 114-20.

50 Binkley, ‘Preachers’ Responses to Thirteenth-Century Encyclopaedism’, p. 86.

51 SP, Prologus, ll. 100-13.

52 Mulchahey, ‘First the Bow is Bent in Study’, pp. 55-59. The 1220 constitutions mandated only theological books were to be studied; books of pagans, philosophy, secular sciences, and the arts were forbidden. The 1228

Bromyard suggests that the beneficial relationship between the two subjects was susceptible to being perverted. Thus, in *Scientia*, he notes:

In the same way philosophy has now consumed the whole of theology: since what are the quaestiones or disputations or determinations of theologians but the empty opinions and unprofitable subtleties of the philosophers and commentators? It is not the case now of the Egyptians being robbed and the Hebrews being thereby enriched, since philosophy is not being drawn to theology, but instead, on the contrary, it is theology which is being drawn into philosophy.⁵³

Authorities in the *Summa* are complemented with exempla. According to Humbert of Romans, erstwhile Master-General of the Dominicans: ‘There are others who for the purpose of persuading people of the validity of their message make use of, at times, exempla only, at other times of authorities only: but it is better to make use of any one of these in the task of persuading the audience to your point of view, so that those not moved by one may be moved by another.’⁵⁴ An exemplum is primarily defined in modern medieval studies as ‘a brief narrative, claiming to be true, and intended for insertion into a discourse for the purpose of convincing an audience through a salutary lesson.’⁵⁵ However, in the prologue, Bromyard employs the word exemplum in a variety of ways: to refer to the lives of illustrious men; the example of Job; the authority of both scripture and non-biblical authorities such as Cassiodorus; the labour of others; and the customs of men and animals. Clearly, the concept possessed a wider function than that of the narrative exemplum or fabula. In addition, Welter has noted how Bromyard employs certain formulae to introduce types of exempla. For sources from natural

revisions added the caveat that this was so unless the Master of the Order or General chapter dispensed otherwise. According to Lozar, Seneca was often used for ethics, and Cicero for classical history: Lozar, ‘Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard’ Lozar, ‘Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard’, pp 43-44. Poets were cited far less. See also Beryl Smalley, *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1960).

53 ‘Ita iam philosophia quasi totam theologiam consumpsit: quia que sunt questiones vel disputationes vel determinationes theologorum: nisi vane opiniones et inutiles philosophorum et commentatorum subtilitates; ita quod non iam spoliantur egyptii, ut ditentur hebrei, quia non philosophia ad theologiam trahitur sed potius econverso theologia ad philosophiam trahitur’: SP, *Scientia* 15. Translation by Walls, John Bromyard, p. 109.

54 Humbert of Romans, *Opera de Vita Regulari*, II, p. 349. Translation in Walls, John Bromyard, p. 176.

55 Nigel Palmer, ‘Exempla’ in *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, ed. by Frank Mantello and A. Rigg (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), pp. 582-85 (p. 583). Narrative exempla are annotated as ‘narr’ in R.

history, he often writes: ‘In exemplo naturali...’ or ‘Exempla in natura insensibili...’ When relating an event, anecdote or exemplum that has been told to him (or so he says), he tends to inform his audience of this.⁵⁶ Moreover, in the chapter *Falsitas* it is evident that Bromyard uses examples from the recent past to illustrate bad behaviour – often employing the word *nuper* – whilst examples of good behaviour are said to have occurred long ago.⁵⁷

According to Bale – relaying information provided by the Dominican friar Philip Wolf – Bromyard had not succumbed to the use of Ciceronian eloquence which characterised the work of his (supposed) contemporaries, but instead continued to write in the scholastic style.⁵⁸ Generally, the Latin used by Bromyard throughout the text is typical of a medieval theologian educated in the schools.⁵⁹ In this regard, Walls suggests that John ‘employs a supple, fluid Latinity, easy to follow yet never stunted: bearing the influence of vernacular prose in word order and syntax, yet still within the tradition of graceful and mature continental prose, markedly different from that of Aquinas or Duns Scotus.’⁶⁰ Those who wish to make their own judgement may do so by reading the chapter *Falsitas*, which can be found in Appendix D.

In amongst the Latin, a number of English and Anglo-Norman words and phrases have been included.⁶¹ This was relatively common in comparable preaching texts (compendia of material and model sermons), and is indicative of England’s tri-lingual society.⁶² However, Bromyard sometimes paraphrases in Latin what he has said in English or French, perhaps indicating that the intended audience extended to those not conversant with the vernacular languages of England.⁶³ It is also probable that Bromyard possessed no knowledge of Greek or Hebrew, since on one occasion he compares those languages to ‘deformed’ script.⁶⁴

Within the text, Bromyard includes a number of internal references indicating other places in the *Summa* that contained relevant material. As a means of helping readers identify

56 Welter, *L’Exemplum*, p. 331.

57 See pp. 178-79.

58 ‘Non est tamen, ut in eo Tullianam eloquentiam desideret quisquam, quum ea aetas doctiores quam facundiores tulerit. Congessit nihilominus, sed stylo scholastico’; Bale *Catalogus*, p. 70.

59 For Bromyard’s education see pp. 25-27, 32-39.

60 Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 273.

61 See p. 181 for examples of these in *Falsitas*. Wenzel estimates that Bromyard includes ‘about forty French proverbs that are explicitly introduced as such’: Siegfried Wenzel, ‘French proverbs from the mouths of English preachers?’ in ‘*Contez me tout*’: *Mélanges de Langue et Littérature Médiévales offerts à Herman Braet*, ed. by Catherine Bel, Pascale Dumont and Frank Willaert (Louvain: Peeters, 2006), pp. 543-58 (p. 544).

62 Wenzel, *Macaronic Sermons*, pp. 1-129.

63 Noted by Lozar, ‘*Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard*’, p. 58.

64 ‘...litteris scriptus iudeorum vel grecorum vel quibuscunque aliis deformatis’: SP, *Intentio* 8. See Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 88.

these passages, he adds Arabic numerals in the margins of a chapter.⁶⁵ These did not correspond to the *articuli*, but merely facilitated the system of internal reference. Thus, John might send a reader to A 7 16. He explains this system in the prologue in the following way:

And because it frequently happens to send [the reader], from one letter and chapter to another on account of the similarity of material, the letter and chapter is referenced to where one is sent, and the Arabic numeral in the margin is marked under which the passage sought may be easily found.⁶⁶

Further finding aids include the two indices entitled the *Tabula realis* and *Tabula vocalis* which are found in P 24 and P 25, A 305 and A 306, and the printed editions. However, since they do not appear in the earliest extant manuscript, R, there is a strong possibility they were added by somebody other than Bromyard after the text had been compiled and disseminated (and thus they will be considered in the next chapter). Indices were generally compiled after a text had proven useful; John of Freiburg (d. 1314) is the first individual known to have composed an index to accompany his work at the outset (the *Summa Confessorum*, completed before 1298).⁶⁷

A final consideration concerns the various stages of composition. The prologue reveals that Bromyard had circulated at least two distinct versions of the *Summa*, and correspondingly, that the composition of the text must have occurred in multiple steps: ‘Another [point to note], that a copy of this having been received before it was finished or corrected in many places, and especially in the first letter A, differs in the division of the following chapters, and in the marginal notation of articles.’⁶⁸ Given Bromyard already revealed that the *Summa* was an augmentation of an earlier compilation, it seems clear that there were at least three main stages of composition: the earlier compilation; the augmentation of that compilation; and the final revision.

Evidence concerning the various stages of composition can be seen in the varying ways Bromyard treats authorities, exempla, and references within different parts of the text. Modern

⁶⁵ Wenzel, ‘Bromyard’s Other Handbook’, p. 116.

⁶⁶ SP, Prologus, ll. 93-99.

⁶⁷ Mulchahey, ‘First the Bow is Bent in Study’, p. 525.

⁶⁸ SP, Prologus, ll. 263-68.

scholars have suggested that greater effort has been made with the earlier chapters than those which occur later in the *Summa*. Houlihan initially noted that the majority of references to the *Sermones* occur at the beginning of the *Summa*, in chapters beginning with A.⁶⁹ According to Walls, there are sixty-nine references to forty-six of Bromyard's own sermons; sixty-three of these occur in the twenty-seven chapters of A.⁷⁰ In addition, Oross has noted that Bromyard tends to classify exempla by source in the early chapters. For example, in the chapter *Abiicere*, exempla appear in this particular order: [1] sensible nature; [2] irrational nature; [3] art; [4] customs of men; [5] laws of God. He also points out that cross-references to other chapters of the *Summa* are more common in the earlier chapters and suggests that they were inserted when the *Tabula realis* was compiled.⁷¹ More recently, Angelika Lozar has provided the caveat that there are a number of references to the *sermones*, as well as those to the *addiciones* and *collaciones*, in chapters P-X.⁷² It should be noted that chapters beginning with A are far more numerous in the *Summa* than those beginning with any other letter. To illustrate this disparity, there are twenty-seven chapters beginning with A in the *Summa* compared to nineteen chapters beginning with A in the *Manipulus Florum* (a text which contains far more chapters overall). The initial set of chapters beginning with A in the *Summa* are also significantly shorter than those elsewhere; the first eleven A chapters are on average (based on the mean) four columns in length.⁷³ When these findings are taken together, however, it is not easy to discern whether Bromyard's attention to chapters beginning with A reflects the initial composition (in which there was a burst of energy that later petered out) or a later reworking.

Walls has further suggested that Bromyard systematically numbers the psalms up until T 5 43 at which point his practice becomes far more uneven; thus 'the inference may be drawn that the copy he worked from had to be ceded to a colleague or to other demands.'⁷⁴ However, this is not evident in the manuscripts (for example, Bromyard does not cite the Psalms at all in

69 Houlihan, 'The Medieval Preacher', p. 125.

70 Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 101.

71 Oross, 'John Bromyard: Medieval Sermon Encyclopedist', p. 91.

72 Interestingly, Walls lists only one reference for P chapters: Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 103, n. 12.

73 *Ibid.*, p. 178.

74 *Ibid.*, p. 50. Walls claims that Bromyard numbers psalms consistently until T.5.43 when he cites 48 psalms by number and 61 without: 'For the twelve chapters of V and one chapter of X the disparity is greater: 38 numbered, 59 unnumbered.'

the chapter *Falsitas*), and it appears Walls has incorrectly made this assumption based on an analysis of the printed editions.

Given the time necessary to write such a text, it is unsurprising that the form of composition was not uniform. Even if Bromyard was largely dependent on key sources and florilegia, it must have taken him many years to write and compile such a lengthy text. Although the constitutions of the Dominican Order allowed friars dispensation from certain liturgical observances, they were obliged to observe *compline*, and attend the daily schola lectures. In addition, if John was licensed to preach and hear confession in the diocese of Hereford, he would have had pastoral duties requiring significant attention.

Siegfried Wenzel has questioned why Bromyard chose to describe the *Summa* as a *libellus*, a ‘little book’. Initially he suggests that it may be a form of modest understatement (an interpretation which I believe to be the most likely), before then speculating, ‘it could of course be that Bromyard wrote the prologue when he began work on [the *Summa Praedicatorum*] – perhaps while he was still working on [the *Tractatus*] – and envisioned a relatively short work to come.’⁷⁵ There are imprecise parallels for this; John of Freiburg for example, incorporated passages from the preface of his *Libellus quaestionum casualium* into the prologue of the *Summa Confessorum*.⁷⁶ Oross similarly suggests that ‘although the collection and classifying of material must represent a life’s work, the actual writing in its final form was done systematically, beginning with the prologue.’⁷⁷ However, this can be discounted; the fact that Bromyard explicitly states that he has reworked the *Summa* demonstrates that he did not begin with the prologue (at least in its final form), but ended with it. On the other hand, Bromyard’s admission that he had reworked chapters beginning with the letter ‘A’, supports the theory that he initially composed the text from A to Z. After all, it is surely chapters written long ago that required the most amount of remedial work. Even so, it is worth remaining cautious about this theory; it is equally plausible that Bromyard wrote the initial draft haphazardly, but intended to revise the entire text from A to Z; the lack of work on later chapters can be ascribed to a realisation that the task was simply too great.

⁷⁵ Wenzel, ‘Bromyard’s Other Handbook’, p. 115, note 59. Wenzel also remarks on the same page: ‘To call *SP*, *libellus*, a small book, is absurd.’

⁷⁶ Mulchahey, ‘First the Bow is Bent in Study’, p. 547.

⁷⁷ Oross, ‘John Bromyard: Medieval Sermon Encyclopedist’, p. 94.

Authorities and sources

The sources and authorities employed by Bromyard whilst composing the *Summa* are significant for two reasons: firstly, they indicate the kinds of texts which shaped Bromyard's moral outlook; and secondly, they reveal the specific texts which he was able to access. Throughout the *Summa*, Bromyard cites the works (and to a varying extent, the specific passages within those works) from which he gathers his authorities, similitudes and exempla.⁷⁸ However, since Bromyard sometimes cites the ultimate authority, rather than the text through which the authority was mediated (and vice versa), reconstructing his library and the sources available to him remains problematic. A further question revolves around the manner in which Bromyard used these texts: whether he enjoyed unbroken access to certain works, utilised a notebook with excerpts of texts that had originally been accessed elsewhere, or relied upon his own memory and power of recollection.

Firstly, it is quite clear that Bromyard relied on a few highly important works for the majority of his sources (in the following discussion, I am much indebted to the work of Keith Walls who has provided the majority of material with which I base my findings on).⁷⁹ Although Bromyard cites the works of 151 non-biblical authors, he seems to have relied primarily on a small corpus of key texts. Thus:

- biblical books comprise approximately 75% of the citations
- biblical books, and canon and civil law texts comprise approximately 85% of the citations
- biblical books, canon and civil law texts, and seventeen further key works (those with twenty or more citations) comprise approximately 90% of the citations

The following table reveals Bromyard's reliance on biblical, patristic and legal texts.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ See Appendix D.

⁷⁹ Walls, John Bromyard, pp. 45-139. The number of citations I include in this discussion have been culled from the work of Walls and Lozar, although I have amended numbers based on my own research. Full details of citations may be found in Appendix B.

⁸⁰ The categories are those employed by Walls, albeit they generally correspond to the various types of text Dominican convents were expected to possess (see pp. 111-12).

Category	Citations
Biblical books	10,566
Patristic authors	1,231
Canon law	909
Classical authors	445
Civil law	384
Christian writers 1100-c.1330 (excluding scholastic theologians, canonists and civil lawyers)	374
Scholastic theologians	140
Saints' lives	66
Christian writers 700-c.1080	42
Histories	39
Muslim writers	13
Other lives	9
Feudal law	9
English law	3
Jewish writers	5
Liturgical tracts	1

Bromyard was heavily dependent on the Bible; he cites books referring to the Old Testament on 6,881 occasions, and books referring to the New Testament on 3,624 occasions. Moreover, there are a further thirty citations referring to the *Glossa ordinaria*, and four to the *Glossa interlinearis*, of the Old Testament, and twenty-seven referring to the *Glossa ordinaria* of the New Testament. Bromyard would have acquired knowledge of biblical texts via the liturgy, daily readings in the refectory and chapterhouse, and private and communal study.⁸¹ He may have possessed a portable one-volume Bible, similar to those that became popular in thirteenth-century Paris.⁸² In addition to this, he almost certain had access to a number of single,

⁸¹ See Hinnebusch, *Early English Friars Preachers*, p. 219-26.

⁸² Frans van Liere, *An introduction to the Medieval Bible* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 39.

glossed biblical books (or sets of related books, such as the Pentateuch, or the Wisdom books).⁸³ Bromyard cites glosses to six of the twelve minor prophets, and his heavy reliance on particular biblical books, such as that of Isaias, may have been prompted by the availability of texts. It is interesting to note that a glossed copy of Isaias was held by the Franciscans at Hereford, and thus may also have been accessible to the local Dominicans.⁸⁴ Alternatively, Bromyard's reliance on certain books may indicate that he had intensively studied or taught a particular text. In a Dominican schola, a single biblical book was studied over the course of each academic year.

Bromyard was particularly reliant on the psalms which form about 13% of his biblical citations. Based on the quotations within the Summa, it appears that he was using the Gallican psalter, the most common version used in the later Middle Ages, and one which was based on the second revision of the Septuagint rather than Jerome's translation of the Hebrew.⁸⁵

In his quest for edifying material from the scriptures, it is also possible that Bromyard used a finding aid such as a concordance. The first verbal concordance of the Bible had been completed by Dominican scholars at Paris in 1230, and consisted of an index of key words alongside a reference to where they might be found within a biblical book; each of the biblical books was divided into seven parts, and marked by a letter, from A to G. In the 1250s a second concordance was completed in which the quotations from the biblical passage were added to the index. Finally, a more concise version, indicating only the more most important contextual words of a quotation, was completed in 1310. However, a comparison of quotations for the word *Falsus* (included in the third concordance) with those that are found in the chapter *Falsitas* in the Summa, do not suggest that Bromyard was using this finding tool as a source of Biblical quotations.⁸⁶ Even so, each Dominican convent was required to be equipped with a concordance, and Hereford Cathedral possessed a copy of the earliest version of the work, indicating that the finding aid was clearly within Bromyard's grasp.

There is also no evidence that Bromyard used Jerome's *Interpretationes Nominum Hebraicorum* – a text which gives the etymology for the names of Jewish figures within the

83 Van Liere, *Medieval Bible*, pp. 37-41.

84 See p. 117 regarding permission to use libraries of other religious institutions.

85 Lozar, 'Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard', p. 41. According to Siegfried Wenzel, 'Preachers of his time usually quote from the Psalms without indicating their number.' As noted above, Bromyard does not cite psalms in the Summa: Wenzel, 'Bromyard's Other Handbook', p. 98.

86 See Chapter 5.

Bible, and is often included at the end of the Vulgate. Nevertheless, Bromyard does include a number of other etymologies of varying accuracy, which he must have obtained from a comparable text.⁸⁷

Intriguingly, a number of scholars have alleged that Bromyard intentionally perverts the meaning of biblical words and passages, such as that which occurs in 1 Thessalonians 1. 8. In this example, Bromyard gives the term *diffamatores* a negative connotation of ‘those who defame’ rather than the neutral meaning of ‘those who disseminate news’.⁸⁸ However, although medieval theologians such as Thomas Aquinas glossed this passage with a neutral meaning, the common definition of *diffamator* nevertheless had the negative connotation of ‘to slander’, and it is unclear whether Bromyard was intentionally distorting the text, or simply explicating it by reference to its literal meaning.⁸⁹

Aside from the Bible, Bromyard relied disproportionately on a small number of key texts. The following list (again, based on the work of Walls) illustrates which non-biblical authorities, and particular works, were cited more than twenty times; the number of citations are shown in square brackets:

Gratian [558] - (d. by c.1160. Canon lawyer. The *Decretum* was compiled c. 1140.)

Decretum [558]

Gregory I [388] - (c. 540-604. Pope 590-604.)

De cura pastoralis [33]

Dialogi [84]

Homiliae [68]

Moralia in Iob [97]

Justinian [353] - (c. 482-565. Byzantine Emperor 527-565.)

Codex [130]

87 Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 50. However, Walls does not provide a citation to any of these etymologies included in the *Summa*.

88 Houlihan, ‘The Medieval Preacher’, pp. xvi-xvii; Oross, ‘John Bromyard: Medieval Sermon Encyclopedist’, p. 98; Lozar, ‘Studien zur *Summa Predicantium* des John Bromyard’, p. 41.

89 Anthony Thiselton, *1 and 2 Thessalonians Through the Centuries* (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2011), pp. 27-29; ‘Diffamator’, DMLBS, <<http://logeion.uchicago.edu/index.html#diffamator>> [accessed 14 September 2017].

Digesta [194]

Novellae Constitutiones [22]

Augustine [304] - (354-430. Bishop of Hippo Regius, and one of the four doctores of the church.)

De civitate dei [93]

Seneca [154] - (c. 4 BC-AD 65. Roman Stoic philosopher, statesman and writer.)

Epistolae morales [73]

Gregory IX [153] - (c. 1170-1241. Pope 1227-1241.)

Decretales [153]

Bernard of Clairvaux [150] - (1090-1153. Cistercian.)

De consideratione [22]

John Chrysostomus [133] - (c. 347-407. Patriarch of Constantinople.)

Super Iohannem [33]

Super Matthaeum [53]

Vitae Patrum [112] - (Collection of hagiographical writings on the Desert Fathers.)

Jerome [101] - (c. 345-420. Jerome was responsible for the biblical translations made from the original Hebrew which were to form the received, vulgate version of the Bible.)

Epistolae [22]

Aristotle [85] - (384-322 BC. Philosopher.)

Ethica [40]

Thomas Aquinas [73] - (1225-1274.. Dominican friar and scholastic theologian.)

Summa theologica [58]

John Bromyard [73] - (c. 1290-c. 1352. Dominican friar.)

Sermones [69]

Vitae sanctorum [66]

Valerius Maximus [46] - (fl. 14-37. Roman collector of historical anecdotes.)

Facta ac dicta memorabilia [46]

Bartholomew of Brescia [44] - (d. 1258. Canon lawyer.)

Glossa ordinaria in Decretum [44]

Peter Comestor [42] - (d. c. 1178. Theologian.)

Historia scholastica [42]

Boniface VIII [41] - (c. 1230-1303. Pope 1294-1303.)

Liber sextus [39]

Ambrose [36] - (c. 339-397. Bishop of Milan, and one of the four doctores of the church.)

Cicero [30] - (106-43 BC. Roman politician, lawyer and orator.)

Cassiodorus [29] - (c.485-580. Roman statesman and writer who established a monastic community.)

Accursius [29] - (c. 1182-1263. Roman jurist.)

Bernard of Parma [25] - (d. 1263. Canon lawyer.)

Glossa ordinaria in Decretales [25]

John of Freiburg [22] - (d. 1314. Dominican friar.)

Summa confessorum [22]

Clement V [21] - (c. 1264-1314. Pope 1305-1314.)

Constitutiones Clementinae [21]

In addition to biblical sources, Bromyard also includes a significant proportion of legal authorities. Roman (civil) law and canon law together formed the *ius commune*, the common law of medieval Europe. They were interdependent, and those who studied law (in continental Europe) were generally expected to be knowledgeable of both.⁹⁰ The position of civil law was a little different in England, since the secular courts operated according to either customary law or the common law.⁹¹

The most important source of canon law was Gratian's *Decretum* (*Concordia discordantium canonum*), which was probably compiled in Bologna, c. 1140. Gratian gathered together existing ecclesiastical canons with the aim of reconciling various traditions and prescriptions into a unified system. Subsequent collections of papal decrees were compiled, eventually being brought together to form the *Decretales* (*Liber Extra*), a collection of five

⁹⁰ Kenneth Pennington, 'Roman and Secular Law' in *Medieval Latin*, ed. by Mantello and Rigg, p. 255.

⁹¹ See p. 217.

books published by Gregory IX in 1234. Later collections included the *Liber Sextus* of Boniface VIII (compiled in 1298), the *Clementinae/constitutiones* of Clement V (published during the pontificate of John XXII in 1317), and the *Extravagantes* (completed in 1325-27). Bromyard does not cite the last of these.⁹² Intriguingly, his use of canon law appears to have been unevenly spread out over chapters, for he only includes a single canon law citation in the chapter *Falsitas*.⁹³

Bromyard's inclusion of significant civil law authorities provides one of the most intriguing mysteries of the *Summa*, since there is no obvious reason for his mastery over (and reliance on) this material. The revival of the study of Roman law began at the end of eleventh century, and was focussed on the body of late imperial law compiled by Justinian at the end of the sixth century. The *Corpus iuris civilis* consisted of four parts: the *Institutiones* (*Institutes*), an introduction to Roman law; the *Codex*, containing imperial legislation from the second to sixth century; the *Digesta* or *Pandectae*, a compilation of excerpts from Roman jurists; and the *Novellae* (known as the *Authenticum*), a compilation of Justinian's legislation which was divided into nine *collationes*.⁹⁴ Clearly some degree of familiarity with this material was required for civil law citations to make sense. Thus, in the prologue to the *Summa*, Bromyard informs the reader:

Laws are not strictly written in this little work, in so far as the manner of a reference, as they are accustomed to be written in books of the laws, which write the old and new Digest and *Infortiatum* in a two-fold way: ff, and they cite of all of the Digests. In this work, the names are frequently expressed of a chapter in general, and a book in particular, lest those who have an abundance of the said books, but do not have great use or experience in working with them, in seeking what is chosen, stray further.⁹⁵

92 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 83.

93 See p. 174.

94 Pennington, 'Roman and Secular Law', p. 266.

95 SP, Prologus, ll. 250-62.

In Chapter 5, the case-study on Falsitas illustrates how Bromyard cited and employed civil law sources in practice.⁹⁶

Scholarship on the Summa has long suspected that John Bromyard relied on florilegia of authorities. Peter Binkley has noted how ‘Bromyard used Gratian’s Decretum as a florilegium of the Fathers; many of his patristic quotations can be traced to the Decretum, even when he does not explicitly name it as his source.’⁹⁷ Binkley does not provide examples for this, but he appears to be correct. In the chapter *Prelatio*, Bromyard explicitly states that he is citing Gregory via the Decretum, whilst in the chapter *Inconstantia*, he cites Sallust through the *Decretum’s* gloss.⁹⁸

Interestingly, Siegfried Wenzel has noticed how Bromyard’s biblical quotations in the *Tractatus* were heavily dependent on canon law: ‘A peculiarity here is that Bromyard also cites canon law when he uses a biblical quotation, as if he knew the Bible through the Decretum and the Decretals. This seemingly strange way of adducing scriptural proof is not uncommon in actual sermons.’⁹⁹ This observation, however, is not borne out with regards to the Summa, suggesting once again that the two texts have distinct characters.

Aside from Bromyard’s use of the Decretum, there is further evidence in the Summa that he utilised florilegia. Indeed, in the chapter *Peccatum*, Bromyard explicitly reveals that the noteworthy parts of the book *De conflictu vitiorum*, ascribed to St Gregory, can be found in the *Flores beati Gregorii*.¹⁰⁰ Ordinarily, however, Bromyard does not identify the specific compilations and florilegia through which authorities were accessed; they were after all, less important than the ultimate source of a particular quotation. One must therefore use more subtle methods to reveal evidence of this. The use of florilegia may account for why Bromyard frequently cites patristic authorities (Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory I, Jerome and John Chrysostomus) with a good deal less precision than he does for other authorities. Walls further argues that the extensive number of references to classical, non-Christian authors indicates the

96 See also appendix D.

97 Binkley, ‘John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans’, p. 257.

98 SP, *Prelatio* 6. See Lozar, ‘Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard’, p. 42; Walls, John Bromyard, p. 91.

99 Wenzel, ‘Bromyard’s Other Handook’, p. 106.

100 SP, *Peccatum* 12. See Walls, John Bromyard, p. 91.

use of a florilegium, or that they were mediated through a key text.¹⁰¹ Additionally, Leonard Boyle has established how Bromyard mined John of Freiburg's *Summa Confessorum* for authorities, frequently without citing his source.¹⁰² A reliance on florilegia may also explain why Bromyard confused Cassian with Cassiodorus and Chysostomus with Chrysologus.¹⁰³ Lozar has suggested that Bromyard may have used the *Auctoritates Aristotelis* and the *Florilegium morale oxoniense* as possible sources, although she provides no evidence for this.¹⁰⁴

It is, however, demonstrable that Bromyard relied heavily on Thomas of Ireland's *Manipulus Florum*.¹⁰⁵ Although I have been unable to analyse the sources for each and every chapter of the *Summa*, it is clear that John used this florilegium both in the prologue and in the chapter *Falsitas*. In the prologue, John includes seventeen quotations derived from either the Bible or the laws, thirteen of which also occur in the *Manipulus Florum*. All of these excerpts end at precisely the same point in both texts. Moreover, a number of those Bromyard cites have been culled from the same chapters within the *Manipulus Florum*, indicating that John was turning to a particular topic and lifting multiple quotes: two quotations have been taken from the chapter *Profectus*, and four from *Studium*. In the case of the latter, three of the citations occur in the same order in both the *Manipulus Florum* and the *Summa's* prologue; in other words, Bromyard was chaining authorities together in the order he found them.¹⁰⁶

There are two examples, however, which demonstrate conclusively that John was borrowing material from the *Manipulus Florum*. One of these is discussed in the chapter on *Falsitas*.¹⁰⁷ The other is a letter from Seneca, referenced as 'epistula 87', which is significantly redacted in the same way in both the prologue to the *Summa* and the *Manipulus Florum*. A comparison of the original with that found in the *Summa* and the *Manipulus Florum* illustrates the point:

101 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 92.

102 According to Boyle, 'Holcot's fellow Dominican and exact contemporary, John Bromyard, probably makes the greatest use of the *Summa Confessorum* of all the writers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.': Boyle, 'John of Freiburg', p. 265.

103 Lozar, 'Studien zur *Summa Predicantium* des John Bromyard', p. 42.

104 *Ibid.*, pp. 43-44.

105 For an introduction to the *Manipulus Florum*, see Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons*.

106 The chaining of the authorities was a method of amplifying members within sermons. See p. 82.

107 See p.175.

Seneca	Manipulus Florum	Summa Praedicatorum
<p>Apes,¹⁰⁸ ut aiunt, debemus imitari, quae vagantur et flores ad mel faciendum idoneos carpunt, deinde quicquid attulere disponunt ac per favos digerunt et, ut Vergilius noster ait, ‘liquentia mella / stipant et dulci distendunt nectare cellas’. De illis non satis constat utrum succum ex floribus ducant qui protinus mel sit, an quae collegerunt in hunc saporem mixtura quadam et proprietate spiritus sui mutant.</p> <p>Quibusdam enim placet non faciendi mellis scientiam esse illis sed colligendi. Aiunt inveniri apud Indos mel in arundinum foliis, quod aut ros illius caeli aut ipsius arundinis umor dulcis et pinguior gignat; in nostris quoque herbis vim eandem sed minus manifestam et notabilem poni, quam persequatur et contrahat animal huic rei genitum.</p> <p>Quidam existimant conditura et dispositione in hanc qualitatem verti quae ex tenerrimis virentium florentiumque decerpserint, non sine quodam, ut ita dicam, fermento, quo in unum diversa coalescunt. Sed ne ad aliud</p>	<p>Apes debemus imitari quae ut vagantur et flores ad mel faciendum idoneos carpunt; deinde quicquid attulere disponunt ac per favos digerunt. Ita debemus, quaecumque ex diuersa lectione congessimus separare. Melius enim distincta seruantur. Deinde ad debitam facultatem ingenii in unum saporem uaria illa libamenta confundere ut etiam si apparuerit, unde sumptum est, aliud tamen esse quam unde sumptum est, appareat.</p> <p>Seneca ibidem (LXXXVII epistola)</p>	<p>Unde Seneca epistula 87: Apes, inquit, imitari debemus, quae ita vagantur et flores ad mel faciendum carpunt, deinde quicquid attulerint, disponunt ac per favos digerunt. Ita debemus, quaecumque ex diuersa lectione congessimus separare. Melius enim distincta seruantur. Deinde ad debitam facultatem ingenii in unum saporem uaria illa libamenta redigere, ut, etiam si apparuerit, unde sumptum est, aliud tamen esse, quam unde sumptum est, appareat.</p>

108 Italics indicate text included in the Manipulus Florum.

<p>quam de quo agitur abducar, nos quoquehas apes debemus imitari et quaecumque ex diversa lectione conguessimus separare (melius enim distincta servantur), deinde adhibita ingenii nostri cura et facultate in unum saporem varia illa libamenta confundere, ut etiam si apparuerit unde sumptum sit, aliud tamen esse quam unde sumptum est appareat. Seneca LXXXIV</p>		
---	--	--

One of the sources included in the prologue that was not mined from Thomas of Ireland is a long passage concerning the grace of God that Bromyard wrongly attributes to Gregory the Great. Angelika Lozar is quite correct in identifying the original authority as Richard of St Victor.¹⁰⁹ However, it is doubtful that Bromyard directly accessed the material via Richard's text; it seems far more likely that he found it in the *Quaestiones super Evangelium Missus Est*, a text attributed (probably erroneously) to the Dominican Albert Magnus.¹¹⁰ This is so for a number of reasons: firstly, the lack of an accurate attribution suggests Bromyard was not reading the text in its original setting; secondly, Bromyard includes no citation for Richard of St Victor in the *Summa*, and networks of transmission suggest that he is more likely to have come into contact with a text composed by a fellow Dominican; and thirdly, Bromyard's use of the quotation comes at a point in the prologue when he was offering thanks to the Virgin Mary; in this regard, Richard of St Victor's quote appears in the *Quaestiones* at a point in which Marian themes are being explored.

Indeed, the question of how John found this particular quote illustrates the difficulty in identifying the actual texts through which he accessed source material. Contemporaries were

¹⁰⁹ Lozar, 'Studien zur *Summa Predicantium* des John Bromyard', p. 42, n. 227.

¹¹⁰ Albertus Magnus, *Opera Omnia*, 38 vols, ed. by E. Borgnet (Paris: Ludovicus Vives, 1890-99), XXXVII (1898), *Quaestio* 141, p. 257.

well aware of this problem, as may be seen from a passage in the prologue to the *Manipulus Florum*.

However, I was not able to ascribe the quotations with certainty to the chapters of books because in different books they are arranged in different ways, and often the same quotation is ascribed to various authors; indeed, frequently one and the same quotation by the same person is found in different places.¹¹¹

Curiously, Bromyard does not cite a number of highly influential texts which one would ordinarily expect a Dominican to use. Aside from three citations referring to the *Liber de dono timoris*, he omits any reference to works composed by Humbert of Romans, a number of which were considered essential reading matter for Dominican friars, notably those concerning the regular life.¹¹²

Neither does Bromyard cite Peter Lombard, author of the *Sentences*, although he does cite two commentaries on it.¹¹³ This was the official theological textbook used by the Dominicans (as well as universities such as Paris and Oxford) in the fourteenth century, and remained so in spite of the growing acceptance and popularity of Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologica*. Since each convent was also a *schola*, one would expect Hereford to possess copies of the *Sentences*. Indeed, it seems likely that John used this textbook as a florilegium, and cited the ultimate authorities instead. It is also possible that Hereford, and indeed English convents generally, possessed sufficient leeway with which to ignore official prescriptions and practice regarding the textbooks they were expected to use; theology may have been taught predominantly through Aquinas.

A further noticeable omission are works written by contemporaries such as the Dominican Robert Holcot (c. 1290-1349), and the Franciscan, William Ockham (c. 1287-1347),

111 'Auctoritates autem quantum ad librorum capitula non potui determinate signare cum in diuersis libris diuersimode signentur, et sepe eadem auctoritas a diuersis doctoribus scribitur, quin immo una et eadem ab eodem in diuersis locis frequenter inuenitur': Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons*, p. 237. The translation is by Chris L. Nighman, 'The Electronic Manipulus Florum Project' <<http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/Preface.pdf>> [accessed 15 August 2017].

112 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 108.

113 See Appendix B.

both of whom produced theological texts which circulated widely in this period.¹¹⁴ Since Ockham was suspected of heresy by the late 1320s, it is possible Bromyard intentionally chose to disassociate himself from such a controversial individual.¹¹⁵ However, no such explanation is available to explain Holcot's absence. In this regard, Keith Walls suggests that Bromyard's personal antipathy towards scholastic theologians may have influenced his choice of texts. Bromyard was certainly critical of how theology was being taught in the higher schools, suggesting that scholars spent far too long concerned with the minutiae of irrelevant questions rather than dealing with the practical issues of sin and salvation.¹¹⁶

More generally, the availability of sources (or lack thereof) may have affected how Bromyard records a particular source, and explain imprecise citations. On occasions where he misquotes a particular text – as happens when he quotes lines from Horace, or includes extracts from the satires of Juvenal – it seems highly likely that he did not have access to a complete text, and was instead relying on an abridged or corrupted copy, perhaps via a florilegium.¹¹⁷

In contrast, texts which Bromyard cites frequently and fully were likely to have been near at hand, and by extension, were almost certainly kept at the convent, or at another place nearby, possibly Hereford Cathedral library. It is also possible key passages had been recorded in a notebook. Correspondingly, these texts are likely to have been available to his most immediate audience, the friars at Hereford. Indeed, where he refers to a specific passage within a work, it seems likely that he expected his reader would be able to access that particular text; in other words, a specific reference may have provided a certain utility, beyond merely demonstrating its authority.

It is further noticeable that Bromyard frequently uses the same source in close proximity. For example, there are multiple citations to the *Vitas Patrum in Temptatio* and Gregory's *Dialogues in Dedicatio*.¹¹⁸ This strongly suggests that he was accessing and using certain books at different times, perhaps because the availability of certain texts was liable to change; he may

114 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 274.

115 See p. 230.

116 SP, Arma 14; Scientia 15. See Walls, John Bromyard, pp. 107, 109.

117 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 91.

118 Lozar, 'Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard', p. 40.

have been borrowing a book which he would have to return, or else he may temporarily have been using a library at another institution.

Indeed, Bromyard occasionally suggests that he was relying on his own powers of memory. When citing Aristotle, he notes: ‘...according to Aristotle in Politics, if memory serves me well.’¹¹⁹ Thus, it seems likely that although key texts were available for frequent use at Hereford, a smaller selection of other texts were accessed elsewhere. Nevertheless, the work of Mary Carruthers on memory in the Middle Ages serves as a final caveat. Carruthers has explored how memory was important for the formation of character; a good memory involved the ability to employ information appropriately in new contexts rather than simply recalling it word-for-word. Correspondingly, when a medieval writer paraphrases an authority, or diverges from the accepted text, this may be part of an attempt to adapt the authority to a new context rather than as evidence that the original text was not at hand.¹²⁰ In other words, although Bromyard’s treatment of the material within the *Summa* provides important clues regarding the material he had to hand, and by implication, the resources of Hereford convent, without considering other evidence, a great deal remains in the shadows.

The Herefordshire Dominicans and the provision of books

The sources used by Bromyard in the *Summa Praedicatorum* throw some light on the state of Hereford Convent’s library in the 1330s, although it is possible that a number of these texts were accessed elsewhere. Additional evidence regarding the resources available to the Hereford Dominicans may be found by investigating the extant manuscripts associated with their priory, and more importantly, Dominican book regulations. Since the state of the convent library provides crucial evidence for Bromyard’s motivations in composing the text, I include a relatively lengthy discussion of the available evidence, and demonstrate that the library was (in all likelihood) sufficiently-stocked.

Neil Ker has identified just two extant manuscripts likely to have belonged to Hereford convent: the first is a fourteenth-century text by Jeronimus which bears the mark of the library;

¹¹⁹ ‘...secundum philosophum in politicis si bene recorder’: SP, Bellum 10.

¹²⁰ Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

the second is a twelfth-century pontificale likely to have been housed in the chapel.¹²¹ The paucity of surviving material reflects the widespread dispersal of Dominican books which accompanied the dissolution of the monasteries in the sixteenth century, and does not (in itself) indicate that Hereford possessed an inadequate or inferior library. For comparative purposes, there are only thirteen extant texts which can be traced to the London Dominicans, and three to those in Oxford. In any case, the particular circumstances of Hereford convent suggest that the survival odds of a fourteenth-century book were slim; by 1424, the convent buildings, including the library and books, had already burnt down on three separate occasions.¹²²

In the absence of a significant corpus of surviving manuscripts, it is necessary to explore other sources of evidence, such as the mechanisms employed by the Dominicans for the provision of books. Evidence for this survives in the Dominican constitutions, the Acta of general and provincial chapters, papal bulls, and various correspondence between friars.

Each convent was expected to possess service books (missals and breviaries), Bibles and accompanying glosses, textbooks for the use of student-friars still learning the preachers' craft, and various preaching aids, sermon schemata, theological works, and confessional handbooks for the use of more experienced preachers. Individual friars were assigned, and allowed to possess, books for their own personal use, and also had access to the books kept in their conventual library, some of which could be borrowed, with the rest forming a reference collection.¹²³ The Bible, the Sentences, and the *Historia Scholastica* of Peter Comestor were the main student textbooks used by the Dominicans in the early fourteenth century.¹²⁴ It was the responsibility of both the convent and the province to provide adequate resources for students.¹²⁵ If a convent lacked suitable material, the Master of Students was supposed to procure the necessary texts.¹²⁶ Humbert of Romans gives the clearest indication of the kinds of material each friar could expect to access. In the *Liber de Instructione Officialium Ordinis*

121 N.R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1964), p. 100

122 Palmer, 'The Friar-Preachers of Hereford', p. 24.

123 K.W. Humphreys, *The Book Provisions of the Mediaeval Friars, 1215-1400* (Amsterdam: Erasmus Booksellers, 1964), p. 32, n. 96.

124 *Ibid.*, p. 23, n. 34.

125 *Ibid.*, p. 20.

126 Humbert of Romans, *Opera*, II, p. 258 n. 2. According to Mulchahey, 'It was part of the master of students' job to ensure that his house had books of this sort or to procure them if it did not; he was to bring his ideas for possible acquisitions to the prior's attention as often as he could.' Mulchahey, p. 191.

Fratrum Praedicatorum, Humbert describes a librarian's duties, and gives a list of appropriate reference works which each convent library ought to possess:¹²⁷

1. a Bible with partial or total gloss
2. a Bible without glosses
3. Summa de casibus
 - a guide for those taking the confessions of others
4. Summa of Geoffrey of Trani
 - a treatise on the Liber extra
5. Summa de vitiis et virtutibus
 - a tract on the vices and virtues
6. Summa de quaestionibus
 - concerning disputations
7. Concordances and interpretations
8. Gratian's Decreta
9. Decretals of Gregory IX
10. Distinctiones morales
11. Sermons for feast days and Sundays
12. Histories
13. Sentences
14. Chronicles
15. Passions and legends of the saints
16. Ecclesiastical history and similar works

A friar might acquire a book in one of three ways: a donation from a member of the laity; a loan from either the province or the convent; or a copy made by the friar himself.¹²⁸ However, a new recruit was technically forbidden from retaining his own books when entering the order,

¹²⁷ Humphreys, *Book Provisions*, p. 33.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

although it is unclear whether these volumes might be returned to the novice once his probationary period was over.¹²⁹ Friends and relatives could donate books to individual friars, but these gifts had to be absolute, and the books were not allowed to be returned to the donor when the recipient died.¹³⁰ Transgressors – those who received books on the understanding that they would revert to the possession of the donor – were to be deprived of these books which were then to be placed in the communal library. Relatives could also give money to family members provided it was spent solely on books.¹³¹ For example, in 1306, a French Dominican, Walter li Sous, received enough money to have eight manuscripts produced, including works written by St Augustine, St Isidore and Albert Magus, and a number of canon law texts.¹³² In addition, friars might receive books in the form of a loan from either the convent or province. Students were normally given a pecunia, a small allowance, with which they could buy both clothes and books.¹³³ A student was only permitted to buy books of ‘known value and necessary for the convent’.¹³⁴ Book loans could be either for a specific period of time, *simpliciter*, or for a friar’s life, *ad vitam*.¹³⁵ According to Keith Humphreys, *ex libris* notes found in English Dominican manuscripts suggest that loans given *ad vitam* were more common. However, judging by the evidence Humphreys cites via an appendix – two manuscripts, only one of which records that is reserved for a particular friar for life – this interpretation does not appear definitive. Either way, there were different borrowing privileges depending on the status of each friar.¹³⁶ According to Humbert of Romans, a list of these loans was to be kept by the librarian.¹³⁷ If a friar had been given money to acquire a book, a lay scribe would often be employed to copy a particular text. Although students were encouraged to make collations and sermons, a friar’s primary vocation was to save souls rather than handle a quill. Consequently, friars were often discouraged from spending too much time personally copying texts.¹³⁸ Particular disapproval

129 *Ibid.*, p. 36.

130 *Ibid.*, p. 20.

131 *Ibid.*, p. 21.

132 *Ibid.*

133 *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

134 *Ibid.*, p. 21.

135 *Ibid.*, p. 34.

136 *Ibid.*

137 *Ibid.*, p. 32.

138 Mulchahey, ‘First the Bow is Bent in Study’, pp. 114-26.

was reserved for friars who copied or composed texts in order to sell them. In 1267 the Roman province strictly forbade this practice unless approval had been given by the provincial prior.¹³⁹

A convent could acquire books in comparable ways to individual friars. Whereas friars relied predominantly on loans from their convent, a convent (re-)acquired the majority of their books from the possessions of deceased friars. Considering friars often moved between convents, mechanisms were put in place to ensure that books were returned to the right convent. Any books or money given to a friar by a particular convent was returned to that convent.¹⁴⁰ Books acquired from elsewhere became the property of the convent within which the friar died. In order to determine whether a book belonged to a particular convent, and also to distinguish whether a book belonged to a convent or the province, each volume had to be inscribed with the name of the issuing convent or province; this facilitated the return of the books when the friar died.¹⁴¹ Of course, this concern implicitly demonstrates the scale of movement involving friars and books between convents. Students were expected to bring their text books with them, and a lector who moved from one convent to another was permitted to take with him at least some of the books which were in his possession, including all his glossed books and postillae, his bible and his notebooks.¹⁴² However, within a lector's period of service at a particular convent, there must have been an opportunity to copy a rare or required text which he possessed, even if the original would subsequently follow the lector to a new convent, or be returned to his original convent. The third way in which a convent might obtain a text was through a donation. Normally, these were made within a donor's lifetime, and the donor, whilst still alive, was permitted to continue using the text.¹⁴³ Finally, a convent was expected to purchase books which it still might lack. Conventual service books, for example, were procured using money from the offerings of the laity. Other volumes might be acquired by selling less useful books.

In 1302, the Roman provincial chapter agreed that each conventual prior was required to acquire a concordance for his convent before the next chapter meeting; if necessary, conventual books could be sold for the purpose. This example demonstrates that the state of convent

139 Humphreys, *Book Provisions*, p. 26.

140 *Ibid.*, pp. 24-5

141 *Ibid.*, p. 41. This suggestion was first made by Humbert of Romans. Further to this, in 1257, the Constitutions of the Order were changed to ensure that provincial and conventual books were clearly distinguished.

142 *Ibid.*, p. 39

143 *Ibid.*, p. 20

libraries was debated at a provincial level, and that steps were taken to ensure that necessary texts were acquired. Elsewhere, the provincial chapter held at Limoges in 1253 asked the priors of Toulouse, Bordeaux Limoges, Montpellier, Narbonne, Cahors, Puy, Marseilles to inform other nearby convents about the contents of their libraries.¹⁴⁴ Again, this reveals that provincial-level decisions were made to ensure each local convent had access to books. Humphreys gives a further example of this concern: ‘If a convent did not provide a student with the necessary books or pecunia the matter could be considered at the provincial chapter; thus a certain English friar M., writing to the prior of the convent at Perth asks that Fr. Thomas of Carrick should be provided with books and pecunia.’¹⁴⁵

Rules were also put in place to prevent convents from dispersing their library collections. Thus, at the general chapter held at Bologna in 1315, convents were forbidden from selling Thomas Aquinas’ *Quaestiones* and biblical commentaries, and other *libri utiles*, unless the convent possessed duplicate copies.¹⁴⁶ In general, if books were sold, the money received had to be spent on other books. For example, in 1272 the prior of Viterbo was obliged to spend money received from the sale of a volume by Avicenna on additional useful books.¹⁴⁷

These rules also applied to members of a convent who sought to sell their books. Individual friars were forbidden from selling books to anybody outside of the Order, unless they were able to gain a special licence to do so. If they did receive such a licence, any money received was to be returned to the convent. Similarly, if a friar sold a book to a fellow friar (which was permitted by the rules, providing he sold it for the same amount that he acquired it), any money received had to be used for the purchase of a more useful book, which in turn would be given to his convent when he died.¹⁴⁸

A final word of caution is perhaps necessary. Since there are very few extant records from the English province, it is difficult to determine whether English practice deviated from that on the continent, and the rules laid down at each general chapter. However, there is nothing to suggest that the English provincial authorities showed any greater disregard for the condition

144 *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34

145 *Ibid.*, p. 21.

146 *Ibid.*, p. 30

147 *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21

148 *Ibid.*, p. 35

of local convents than their continental brethren. Hereford convent was part of the Oxford visitation, one of the four English Dominican regions within which discipline was enforced, and standards maintained. Considering the evidence amassed above, one can confidently conclude that during each inspection, and possibly at each provincial chapter, the state of the convent's library would have been discussed if there were any problems.

Although the regulations are useful in revealing how a Dominican library ought to have functioned, and the type of books a convent ought – in theory – to possess, they are less useful in demonstrating whether this happened in practice. Fortunately, further evidence is available which sheds a little more light on the state of conventual book collections. Keith Humphreys has identified a number of early Dominican catalogues and book-lists which reveal the texts which were actually housed in convent libraries. These include lists cataloguing the collections at St Catherine, Barcelona (1255-1277), Lucca (c. 100 volumes, 1278), Dijon (131 volumes, 1307), Ratisbon (224 volumes, 1347), and Bologna (472 volumes, 1386). In general, the books which formed the mainstay of these collections are consistent with those used by Bromyard in the *Summa Praedicatorum*. Humphreys summarizes his findings thus:

The main features of the libraries of the preachers are, therefore, formed on a common pattern with local divergencies. The emphasis is on Biblical commentaries and exegesis, preaching aids and moral theology. The authors used are mainly contemporary, with the addition of Augustine, Hugh of S. Victor, Saint Bernard and a few others. Thomas Aquinas is the most popular of contemporary writers while Aristotelian philosophy is usually well-represented. Some convents have books on canon law, occasionally one or two civil law books are also found. Works on 'arts' subjects are very rare.¹⁴⁹

However, there is no comparable catalogue for an English convent. The limited evidence which does exist is mostly derived from Leland's sixteenth-century rummaging through the monastic libraries, an endeavour which was concerned primarily with recording works written by English

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 98

authors. It is thus an extremely lopsided record with regards to the state of convent libraries.¹⁵⁰ In consequence, only thirty-one volumes can be identified as belonging to the London convent (eighteen via Leland, and thirteen via Bale who recorded a 1339 inventory), and only ten for Oxford, the second highest number of volumes identified for a Dominican convent.

Additionally, Dominican friars were permitted to borrow books from neighbouring convents, and Bromyard is also likely to have been able to use the libraries of non-Dominican institutions. Throughout the medieval period, books could generally be borrowed from monastic and other libraries on receipt of a monetary pledge.¹⁵¹

Hereford Cathedral possessed the greatest collection of books in the vicinity of the convent. The Cathedral library developed primarily in the twelfth century, and according to R.M. Thomson, who catalogued the manuscripts, ‘the overwhelming impression is of a practical reference library for the canons: patristics and some more recent theology, biblical studies and canon law.’¹⁵² The vast majority of the medieval collection remains intact (a total of 138 volumes), and appears to have been relatively typical for an English secular cathedral. Although there was a great deal of animosity between the cathedral authorities and the friars it is quite possible that a Dominican would have been able to borrow, or at least access, some of the books. Indeed, the cathedral had a chain library for readers.¹⁵³

A second major depository of books existed at the Greyfriars convent. Judging by the press-marks, M.R. James believed the library must have contained around 300 volumes.¹⁵⁴ There is no evidence regarding the nature of the relationship between the Greyfriars and Blackfriars in Hereford, but again it seems plausible that rules of hospitality would have facilitated access and use of each library.

In addition, a number of nearby monasteries possessed significant numbers of books. Whilst providing information for the *Registrum Anglie* – a fourteenth-century national survey of monastic libraries, organised by the Oxford branch of the Friars Minor – the Hereford

150 *Ibid.*, p. 97

151 *Ibid.*, p. 16.

152 R.M. Thomson, ‘Introduction’ in *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library*, ed. by R.B. Mynors and R.M. Thomson (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1993), pp. xvii-xviii.

153 Joan Williams, ‘The Library’ in *Hereford Cathedral: A History*, ed. by G. Aylmer and J.E. Tiller, (London: Hambledon Press, 2000), pp. 511-35.

154 M. R. James, ‘The Library of the Grey Friars of Hereford’, *Collectanea Franciscana*, 1 (1914), 114-23.

Franciscans visited the libraries at Hereford Cathedral, St Guthlac's priory, four other priories in Herefordshire (Wigmore, Leominster, Wormsley, Clifford), Brecon in Wales, and Llanthony in Gloucestershire; all of these houses possessed material which would have been useful for a preacher.¹⁵⁵

The date of the *Summa Praedicatorum*

Attempts to date the *Summa Praedicatorum* through internal evidence (the contents of the text) are complicated by a number of issues. The *Summa* is both a compilation of material already written by others, and also an authorial composition in which Bromyard weaves his own thoughts with material borrowed from elsewhere.¹⁵⁶ Secondly, the sheer size of the text means that it must have been compiled and written over a considerable period of time. It is possible that Bromyard originally wrote parts of it for a different purpose – his own sermons, for example – and one must therefore be aware that passages appearing to date from an earlier period may have been repurposed and subsequently included within the *Summa* much later. In addition, there is no definitive evidence that Bromyard wrote the chapters from A to Z; thus, even if there is strong evidence to date a particular chapter to a specific period of time, this does not necessarily mean that chapters preceding it were written earlier, or those that follow were written later. Thirdly, Bromyard reveals in the prologue to the *Summa* that the text was based on an earlier compilation. And fourthly, there is the possibility of subsequent interpolations.¹⁵⁷ However, evidence provided by the extant manuscripts, in conjunction with the dating of sources cited, and events alluded to, in the *Summa*, does help to shed significant light on when Bromyard composed the text.

155 R.H. Rouse and M.A. Rouse, *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum* (London: British Academy, 1991), pp. 246-322. The number of books recorded at each institution are as follows: Hereford Cathedral (21 titles), St Guthlac's priory (4 titles); Wigmore (10 titles); Leominster (16 titles); Wormsley (1 title); Clifford (16 titles), Brecon in Wales (4 titles) and Llanthony in Gloucestershire (12 titles). The *Registrum* did not survey the libraries of Franciscan houses, and also fails to record the contents of libraries at some larger institutions such as York Minster. The books recorded in the *Registrum* also represent a selection of material that was present; it was not a comprehensive survey: *ibid.*, p. lxxiii.

156 I am not suggesting that Bromyard would have considered himself an author in the modern sense. For an overview of how medieval authors conceived of their role, see Alastair Minnis, *Medieval Theories of Authorship* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012).

157 Since it can be demonstrated that the abbreviated versions of the *Summa* were made after the full version, they will be dealt with in the following chapter.

Early twentieth-century scholarship on the date of the *Summa Praedicanitum* has been discussed in the introduction; scholars attributed the text to the younger John Bromyard, and thus placed its composition in the latter part of the fourteenth century. Subsequent work by Devlin and Mifsud, however, established that the *Summa* was circulating by the early 1350s.¹⁵⁸ This was followed by the seminal work of Leonard Boyle who initially dated the chapter *Operatio* to the onset of the Black Death, and then in 1973 argued that the entire *Summa* was composed between c. 1327/8 and c. 1348.¹⁵⁹ Boyle identified the date of composition based on passages from four chapters: *Iudicium divinum* (dated to 1330); *Ordo clericalis* (dated to 1330-1337+); *Paupertas* (dated to 1346+); and *Tribulatio* (summer 1348).

Firstly, citing a discovery made by the doctoral student Francis P. Donnelly, Boyle noted how a passage in the chapter on *Iudicium divinum* refers to the current year as 1330:

...Daniel 12:12 ‘Happy the man who waits and lives to see the completion of one thousand three hundred and thirty-five days’... Whether this is true, and that period is reckoned from Christ’s incarnation, the waiting time of five years will reveal, since now we are in the year 1330.¹⁶⁰

Since this is the one firm date given in the text, Boyle logically uses it as the basis for the rest of his argument. However, before I discuss Boyle’s three subsequent arguments in detail, his general approach can be challenged on three grounds. Firstly, the passage referring to 1330 may be a later interpolation by a scribe copying the text, and thus the date cannot be definitively anchored by this reference. Secondly, Boyle assumes that Bromyard was absent from his convent in 1326 when he was due to be given a licence to hear confession, and only began to write the *Summa* ‘a year or two after his return to Hereford’; no reason is given in the episcopal records regarding why Bromyard was absent, and there is nothing to suggest that he first began

158 See p. 11.

159 Boyle, ‘The Date of the *Summa Praedicanitum*’.

160 ‘...Danielis (12.12) qui dicit: Beatus qui expectat et pervenit ad dies milletrecentos triginta quinque, [...] Quod utrum verum sit et tempus illud ab incarnatione Christ computetur, quinquennii temporis expectatio ostendet, cum nunc annus currat millesimus trecentismus tricesimus’: SP, *Iudicium divinum* 3.

to write the text after he returned. Thirdly, Boyle also assumes that Bromyard wrote the *Summa* in alphabetical order, from A to Z; whilst this is plausible, it is not certain.¹⁶¹

Returning to Boyle's specific arguments, he secondly cites a passage from *Ordo clericalis* in which Bromyard writes that John of Monmouth, bishop of Llandaff, had sent his archdeacon – 'who still lives' (*adhuc vivit*) – to seek clarification regarding a point of canon law following the promulgation of the Clementine (1317).¹⁶² Boyle claims that the archdeacon is M. Alexander of Monmouth, who is recorded as archdeacon of Llandaff in 1323, and also in 1337. Assuming this is correct, it actually tells us little; it is only Alexander's death that can provide a significant date. It is therefore notable that by 1338 Richard de Halton is recorded as the archdeacon, and it would therefore seem likely that Alexander had now died.¹⁶³ Since a later passage in the same chapter refers to John of Monmouth (who died in 1323) as former (*quondam*) bishop of Llandaff, it is only possible to note that part of the chapter was written after 1323, and part before 1338.

Thirdly, Boyle cites the following passage from *Paupertas*:

Furthermore the canons regular recently decreed in the acts and ordinances of their chapter that the canons should not wear such pleated capes of burnet [brown cloth] as some preachers wear.¹⁶⁴

Boyle pinpoints the ordinance to a constitution that was issued at the general chapter of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine of the province of Canterbury and York at Leicester in 1346. Although it does not correspond exactly, 'it is near enough to suggest that it was precisely this constitution that Bromyard had in mind.' The ordinance in question is this:

Also that the canons regular of the said order – no matter who – in future should on no account use tunics which are too tight or buttoned capes, cloaks or riding-capes or any

¹⁶¹ Boyle's approach has been heavily criticised by Keith Walls. See below, pp. 121-22.

¹⁶² 'Magister Joannes de Monumuta episcopus Landavensis habuit responsum de curia romana per suum archidiaconum qui adhuc vivit et haec mihi retulit': SP, *Ordo clericalis* 39.

¹⁶³ W. Birch, *Memorials of the See and Cathedral of Llandaff* (Neath: John Richards, 1912), p. 331.

¹⁶⁴ 'Canonici etiam regulares nuper in actis et ordinationibus capituli sui statuerunt quod canonici tales cappas non portarent de burneto rugosas quales portant aliqui praedicatores': SP, *Paupertas* 26.

other vestments or hoods furnished with silk or muslin of a colour other than is [that of] the garment itself or the hood: [nor should they use boots with pointed toes]¹⁶⁵

However, Keith Walls has pointed out that only a small number of the Acta of the triennial chapters of the Augustinian Canons in the period survive; those which took place from 1279 to 1322 do not. Additionally, Walls notes that surviving Acta from other orders frequently refer to concerns about clerical dress; in other words, it would be unsurprising if the missing Acta had included a comparable ordinance.¹⁶⁶

Finally, Boyle dates the chapter on Tribulatio to late 1348. Whilst he admits that Bromyard ‘speaks only of heavy rains and of animal mortality and not of the great loss of human life which began in the autumn of 1348 and hit Hereford badly in early 1349’, he subsequently makes the implausible suggestion that ‘it seems likely [Bromyard] was composing the article Tribulatio during those summer months.’¹⁶⁷ However, the timing is too tight for this suggestion to be credible. If Bromyard had spent such a long period of time working on the text, it is hard to believe that he would avoid adding a reference to the mortality of 1348/9. It is far more likely, as Walls suggests, that Bromyard was referring to the devastating weather and famine which occurred between 1315 and 1317. Moreover, Walls also notes that the retention of the reference to the year 1330 (regarding Daniel’s prophecy for the year 1335), implies that Bromyard had probably stopped writing much earlier than the late 1340s. ‘If Bromyard had been engaged on the Summa till 1348’, says Walls, ‘he would have had all of thirteen years after the end of 1335 to return to I.11.3 [Iudicium divinum] and observe that Daniel’s prophecy could not be interpreted as he alleges Jewish rabbis wished – one may imagine that he would not have been averse from pointing out their error – but he did not.’¹⁶⁸

Indeed, Walls has provided the most recent and comprehensive discussion of the dating of the Summa. He refutes the notion that the text must have been written from A to Z, and

165 ‘Item quod canonici regulares dicti ordinis quicumque de cetero tunicis nimis strictis vel botonatis, capis, clocheis seu rotundellis, et aliis quibuscumque vestibus aut capellis, serico aut sindone alterius coloris quam sit ipsum indumentum sive capella apparatus seu botis rostratis, de cetero penitus non utantur’: Chapters of the Augustinian Canons, ed. H. E. Salter (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), p. 55.

166 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 192.

167 Boyle, ‘The Date of the Summa Praedicatorum of John of Bromyard’, p. 537.

168 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 189.

demonstrates the implausibility of this method if the text was written – as Boyle claims – between 1328 and 1348. Boyle’s dating implies that Bromyard wrote a great deal more in the period 1328-1330 than in that of 1330-1348. Approximately 218,000 words/year must have been written between 1328 and 1330, which is ‘a rate of composition more than seven-times faster than the annual 30,000 words [for the remaining chapters]’.¹⁶⁹

Walls also notes that although Bromyard alludes to events in the 1320s, he makes no mention of those from the 1330s and 1340s, such as the conflict between Edward III and Mortimer (1330), and hostilities with France (which broke out in 1337).¹⁷⁰ Bromyard also portrays the army as a ‘poorly led, badly disciplined and unsuccessful army’, which is inconsistent with events such as Crecy (1346). Walls does not explicitly put forward a time-frame regarding when Bromyard composed the text, but implicitly he appears to be arguing for a date primarily in the late 1320s.

Throughout this debate, the manuscript evidence has frequently been overlooked. In this regard, R is particularly useful. An ex libris note and anathema at the foot of folio 10r reveals that the book belonged to Rochester Priory: ‘Liber de claustro Roffensi, per fratrem Thomam Horstede precentorem; quem qui alienaverit, alienatum celauerit, uel hunc titulum in fraudem deleuerit, anaethma sit. Amen.’¹⁷¹ The inclusion of the name Thomas Horstede provides a valuable clue with regards to both dating the manuscript, and also hypothesising about its acquisition, use and transmission. Although Thomas Horstede’s role in acquiring manuscripts for Rochester is set out in the next chapter, a few facts about his life will be set out here, given that his identification is crucial to dating the Summa. A monk named ‘Thomas Horsted’ was ordained subdeacon on 21 September 1331, deacon on 4 April 1332, and priest on 18 December 1333. He is recorded in twenty-fourth position (and implicitly seniority) at the elevation of a prior on 19 August 1333, voting for the successful candidate, John Sheppey.¹⁷² Assuming that the ex libris note in R is accurate (and there is no reason to doubt it), the dates in which Thomas

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ ‘Exemplo etiam nobilis regis Edwardi: cuius consuetudo erat ante bellum peregrinationes facere peronaliter: et personas in utroque iure dei et mundi sapientissimos consulere’: SP, Bellum 23. For example, Bromyard cites the crusade of John XXII against the Estensi marquises of Ferrara in late 1321, which was preached at Parma in February 1322. See Walls, John Bromyard, pp. 226-27.

¹⁷¹ See p. 63.

¹⁷² See Joan Greatrex, *Biographical Register of the English Cathedral Priors of the Province of Canterbury, c. 1066 to 1540* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 613. The majority of monks came from the local area, and the name ‘Horstede’ is almost certainly toponymic, referring to an area on the Medway.

was active suggest that the manuscript was produced or acquired in the middle of the fourteenth century. Given the canonical requirement that a candidate for the priesthood be in his twenty-fifth year, Thomas could only have been born in the first decade of the fourteenth century or earlier. Since the role of precentor was normally given to an experienced monk of middling age, it is thus likely that he acquired his copy of the *Summa Praedicatorum* in the 1340s (or perhaps 1350s), making R an extremely early copy of the text. Crucially, (and in conjunction with the evidence provided by the will of Simon Bozoun, and Sheppey's use of the text), it strengthens the case that Bromyard was writing in the 1320s and 1330s; it must have taken a period of time for the text to circulate (although quite how long is difficult to determine), which would favour an earlier rather than later date of composition.

The purpose and utility of the *Summa*

Given the likelihood that Bromyard was writing the majority of the *Summa* in the 1320s and 1330s, it is possible to speculate with greater certainty regarding his motivations for composing the text. Within the prologue to the *Summa*, Bromyard emphasises the extent to which his work was composed for the benefit of others:

Indeed, the wise men of antiquity did not consider anyone was living, unless they were living for the benefit of others. Whence, Seneca to Lucilius, letter fifty-eight: he who lives for nobody, lives not for himself [...] And the wise man in Ecclesiasticus, thirty-three: Look, says he, how much I laboured not just for myself, but for all who seek instruction.¹⁷³

Correspondingly, it is clear that two distinct influences shaped the composition of the *Summa*: the first is inward-looking, and revolves around John Bromyard's role at Hereford convent; the second is outward-looking and concerns Bromyard's desire to disseminate his efforts further afield, to leave something significant for posterity. Additionally, since the *Summa Praedicatorum* was compiled over a significant period of time, and in multiple stages, it is

¹⁷³ SP, Prologus, ll. 54-86.

possible that the reasons which initially prompted Bromyard to compose the Summa were different from those that inspired him to later expand it.¹⁷⁴

Hitherto, the most forceful explanation of Bromyard's motivations – and the current orthodoxy – has been put forward by Peter Binkley, who argues that the compilation of the Summa 'was prompted by the needs of the Hereford Dominicans for help in composing sermons, in the absence of a well-developed priory library.' According to Binkley, the acquisition of 'a collection of originalia would [have been] a long and expensive process; compilations like Bromyard's were the shortest route to a working library capable of supplying the preaching needs of the friars.'¹⁷⁵

Binkley's thesis is unconvincing for a number of reasons: complex mechanisms had been put in place by the Dominican Order to provide each convent with books; Bromyard's use of sources demonstrates key texts were at hand, and thus likely to be available to other friars; there were two large and accessible libraries in the vicinity of the convent; for an impoverished library, it would have been far more useful, and equally feasible, to acquire or compose a florilegium of authorities (indeed Bromyard's own use of the *Manipulus Florum* illustrates that such a text was already available); the length of the Summa and the time needed to compile it suggest it was a long-term project, rather than one carried out for the immediate needs of the Hereford friars; and finally, the prologue clearly states that Bromyard intended the work to be disseminated far and wide. Within the prologue, it is also instructive that Bromyard does not suggest a lack of resources was responsible for the composition of the Summa. This omission is particularly noteworthy when compared with the prologue of the *Manipulus Florum*. Whereas Thomas of Ireland refers to himself as 'a pauper without any books', Bromyard makes no such pretensions, presumably because his fellow friars are in possession of sufficient material for their sermons. Instead – and in contrast – it seems far more likely that the Summa was compiled as a typical Dominican attempt to organise and have mastery over a mass of material that was already at hand; thus, it was not a case of too little, but of too much.

174 At the very least, the Hereford friars would have been able to access Bromyard's other writings; for example, in the prologue to the Summa, prospective readers are informed that they will frequently be sent to Bromyard's *Sermones*, a text which contains similar material, more briefly arranged.

175 Binkley, 'John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans', p. 263.

Even though Bromyard places much emphasis on his future audience, he was almost certainly inspired and influenced by his position at Hereford. It is possible that John Bromyard was a *predicator generalis*, a permanently sanctioned preacher. Since Dominican preaching was primarily taught and developed through imitation and mentoring, Bromyard may also have been responsible for overseeing the more inexperienced preachers.¹⁷⁶

Furthermore, although much of Bromyard's material is derivative and borrows heavily from well-worn authorities, there are a number of exempla and moral teachings which carry a distinctively local flavour.¹⁷⁷ Mulchahey has studied the dissemination of Dominican texts on the continent, noting that unlike theological works, local sermonaries were valued more than those compiled elsewhere:

When the number of exegetical tools and theological texts are likewise emanating from Paris found on conventual library shelves is compared with the number of Parisian sermon collections amongst Dominican holdings, the conclusion that the former were much more avidly collected as the uniquely Parisian legacy is not far behind. Part of the reason for this preference stems from the fact that local regions themselves in some instances produced indigenous Dominican sermonaries of great repute, sermonaries which were as prized by local convents as were university productions, and which were often much easier to get hold of.¹⁷⁸

In such a comprehensive work as the *Summa*, it is unsurprising that specifically local material is a relatively small part of the whole. Nevertheless, that which is included demonstrates how preaching material could be adapted to local circumstances. The following example illustrates this (although Bromyard does not explicitly state that the nobleman in the anecdote is local, the story has many parallels with the fate suffered by Hugh Despenser the younger, who was executed at Hereford in 1326):

¹⁷⁶ Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', pp. 173, 185.

¹⁷⁷ See pp. 23-24.

¹⁷⁸ Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', p. 425.

People are therefore deceived if they scorn the curses which they deserve. This became clear in the case of a certain nobleman who just lately was sufficiently powerful. He wanted to impark a common pasture: it was put to him that a great number of poor people had animals grazing there who would all curse him. This he admitted: he had often brushed off curses like these, and scorned them. Afterwards this same nobleman was drawn and hanged.¹⁷⁹

It is interesting to note that Sir John Daniel, the individual who donated the site on which the friars built their convent, was also executed in Hereford in 1326, as an alleged accomplice of Despenser. Considering the local nature of this anecdote, one must wonder how the audience would have reacted to a story condemning a nobleman for enclosing common land. The Frog lane dispute – in which the friars of Hereford sought and eventually succeeded in blocking public access to a pathway – must surely have opened them up to a charge of hypocrisy.¹⁸⁰

More speculatively, a further local influence concerns the litigious nature of the convent's origins. Disputes with the cathedral emphasised the importance of litigation to the Hereford friars, and may partly explain Bromyard's knowledge of (and interest in) civil and canon law texts, an unusual characteristic which distinguishes the *Summa* and the *Tractatus* from comparable texts. Of course, it is plausible that Bromyard studied the laws at university before becoming a friar. Even so, the circumstances at Hereford suggest that the friars recognised the importance of legal authority, and were well-versed in such arguments.

In contrast to these inward-looking motivations, the *Summa* was also inspired by a number of outward-looking motivations, both in time and space. The prologue clearly demonstrates Bromyard's commitment to future souls, and he is keen to emphasise that he had compiled his material for the benefit of future generations, not merely for those living in the present. The *Summa Praedicatorum* was his gift to posterity:

179 'Decipiuntur ergo qui maledictiones quas merentur contemnunt: sicut patuit de quodam nobili nuper satis potenti: cui cum communem pasturam imparcare vellet dictum fuit quod multorum pauperum animalia ibi pascerentur: qui omnes ei maledicerent: quod cum ipse contemneret quia frequenter tales evasisset maledictiones fatebatur. Postea idem nobilis tractus et suspensus fuit': SP, Maledictio 1. Translation by Walls, John Bromyard, p. 238.
180 See pp. 31-32.

And just as sparks fly towards those in the distance, so preachers ought not merely enflame those present with the sparks of their words, but, as far as it is possible, they must also accomplish this for future generations and those far away.¹⁸¹

Moreover, Bromyard's implication that those reading the Summa might have access to books of civil law, albeit with little experience in using them, suggests that he did not have a purely Dominican audience in mind; after all, these texts were not ordinarily part of the Dominican armoury.¹⁸²

Conclusion

As a comprehensive compendium of material for preachers, the Summa was a natural descendent of the sets of distinctiones which had begun to be compiled in the previous century. In compiling the text, Bromyard utilised all the weapons available to a preacher. In addition to his own argumentation, he employed Biblical and patristic authorities, exempla, similitudes and proverbs. Crucially, he relied heavily on a small selection of important texts, notably the Bible and florilegia such as the Manipulus Florum. In contrast to Boyle's dating of the Summa, it appears to have been primarily compiled in the 1320s and 1330s, and was definitely in circulation by the middle of the century. Moreover, it seems quite clear that the text was not written as a result of the inadequacies of Hereford convent's library: Bromyard's use of sources demonstrate key texts were available to the friars, and mechanisms were in place to provide the convent with books. Indeed, within the prologue to the Summa, Bromyard focusses on other motivations, his sights set outwards as much as inwards. Correspondingly, it is now necessary to consider the subsequent circulation and use of the text.

181 SP, Prologus, ll. 9-14.

182 Ibid., ll. 251-62.

CHAPTER 4: THE CIRCULATION AND USE OF THE SUMMA PRAEDICANTIUM

In this chapter, I consider the initial dissemination of the text, and its subsequent circulation. I then examine how early users engaged with the text, based on both the manuscript evidence of the *Summa*, and also how Bromyard was cited and employed within extant sermons. There is inevitably some duplication of material with Chapter 2 (repetition is preferable to the hazards and inconvenience of relying solely on cross-references). Finally, I consider the ultimate audience of the *Summa*, and the extent to which Bromyard was influencing and participating within wider conversations, notably with regards to Langland's *Piers Plowman*.

Disseminating the Summa

The prologue to the *Summa* clearly indicates that Bromyard wished to disseminate the text beyond the confines of Hereford convent. As the subsequent transmission of the *Summa* demonstrates, Bromyard's intention was evidently achieved. How this occurred, and to what extent it was facilitated, or hindered, by the Dominican Order, are fundamental questions that need to be tackled, albeit the evidence only permits speculative answers. The first clue appears in the following passage within the *Summa's* prologue:

Another, that a copy of this having been received before it was finished or corrected in many places, and especially in the first letter A, differs in the division of the following chapters, and in the marginal notation of articles. Third, that one may frequently be sent to the sermons, in order to see similar or more briefly arranged material.¹

Bromyard evidently expected that the initial readers of the prologue would have had access to the earlier version of the *Summa*. The warning that the division of chapters and marginal notations differ in each version must have been provided to avoid possible confusion over cross-references within the text. If a reader noted down a particular passage from the *Summa* that had

¹ SP, Prologus, ll. 263-70.

been taken from the earlier version – for example, F 1 16 (Falsitas, section 16) – it would not match the same passage in the later version. Peter Binkley has suggested that this warning was essentially provided for the friars at Hereford. There is some evidence to support this view. Both the earlier version of the Summa, and Bromyard's Sermones, which is also mentioned in the passage, have not survived, indicating that they were not disseminated to a wide audience. Correspondingly, since Bromyard expects the reader to be aware of these texts, it seems likely that this passage in the prologue was specifically directed at those nearby. However, if Bromyard really were writing for the Hereford friars, it seems strange that he would need to share this information in a prologue; in the confines of a small convent, the resident friars would surely discover such things via word of mouth. Indeed, it is highly improbable that a Hereford friar could have remained ignorant of Bromyard's expanded Summa. Moreover, assuming a certain friar, unaware that there were two versions, came across a reference to the text in a set of sermons, and wanted to visit the Summa to seek similar material, he would surely head straight for the particular page, rather than browsing through the prologue beforehand. Thus, Bromyard's warning would have proven useless. In other words, the passage in the Summa must have been directed towards those likely to have had access to the earlier version of the Summa, those currently ignorant of the changes made to the new version, and those who were expected to read the prologue before using it as a reference book.

The key to the puzzle might lie with the word *acceptum*, and the implication that the text had already been received. It seems incongruous to use the word *acceptum* if the text were lying in the convent library. It would, however, be consistent with sending the text to the provincial prior or provincial chapter for approval. These are precisely the kind of people who would have received a copy of the earlier version of the Summa and who would have been aware of Bromyard's Sermones. Additionally, the information concerning changes to the initial version would have been especially useful to those responsible for vetting the text in preparation for wider dissemination. Dominicans were only allowed to disseminate their own compositions if these texts had been examined and corrected by a provincial board of friars.² Thus, it is

2 Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', p. 156. Regulations from 1256 required Dominican authors to submit their work to the master general or provincial prior for examination and correction before circulation. This examination was usually undertaken by a board of *fratres periti*. In 1313 the General Chapter revived this

possible to envisage a scenario in which Bromyard sent the initial, or draft, version to the provincial authorities for comments and suggestions, and the extended version was then sent to the provincial chapter to be officially ratified.

In the absence of definitive evidence concerning the early dissemination of the *Summa*, a comparison with the transmission of another text is instructive. An example of how a Dominican text circulated within a province is provided by the *Libellus de doctrina fratrum*, a text composed by Elias de Ferreriis, prior provincial of Toulouse (1324-37). The *Libellus* was a summary of material a friar ought to know before he was licensed to preach or hear confessions. Elias began to circulate the text in 1333/4. Unusually, a covering letter survives, which details the mechanisms for copying and disseminating the text (the letter was formerly appended to a manuscript of the *Libellus*). On receipt of the manuscript, a convent was required to make a copy within fifteen days, before handing the exemplar to another convent. Each friar was required to learn the contents within four months. In 1335 Elias gave the book to his provincial chapter for inspection, and the circulation of the text was officially ratified.³

The example of the *Libellus* shows how a Dominican text circulated within a province of the order. However, it does not demonstrate how such texts were made available to non-Dominicans. Officially, Dominicans were forbidden from sharing sermon material with those outside the Order, other than the Franciscans.⁴ However, given that extant sermon collections composed by Dominicans were demonstrably circulating amongst non-Dominicans, it is clear that these regulations were not strictly observed.⁵

The circulation of the *Summa*

The provenance of the earliest extant manuscript, R, can be ascertained by an ex-libris note at the foot of folio 10r, which firmly establishes that the codex was acquired for the Benedictine cathedral priory of Rochester by Thomas Horstede, precentor.⁶ As explained in the Chapter 3, it

mechanism, stipulating that such texts had to be sent to the master general. Whether this occurred in practice is unclear, but the practicalities of such a task suggest that it was not always the case.

3 Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', pp. 208-13.

4 The only firm evidence concerns legislation from the Roman province. See Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', p. 422.

5 Two sets of sermons attributed to Bromyard, for example, circulated outside the order. See pp. 51-52.

6 See p. 63.

is highly likely Thomas acquired R in the 1340s (or perhaps 1350s).⁷ Contemporary records place Thomas firmly in the first half of the fourteenth century – a date which is consistent with the palaeographical evidence of the manuscript – and there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the ex-libris note. Around 100 manuscripts formerly belonging to Rochester are extant, having been subsequently added to Henry VIII's Royal Library at Westminster following the dissolution of the priory in 1540. Many of these contain ex-libris notes, the majority of which are written in the same handwriting, thus indicating that they were the work of the same librarian; according to A.G. Watson, who has edited the Rochester library catalogues for the CBMLC series and examined the extant manuscripts, this 'administrative burst' can be dated to the fourteenth century.⁸ Watson, however, suggests one ought to be cautious when using the ex-libris notes as evidence for the origins of the surviving manuscripts: 'Since they quite often have a personal name incorporated in or added to them, they seem at first glance likely to provide a good deal of information about the sources of the books. Unfortunately these names have to be regarded with great suspicion. Many of the persons named, never precisely as donors but frequently with their names in the genitive case in a phrase such as "Liber de claustro Roffensi siluestri prioris" which may imply ownership, donation or acquisition, cannot have a connection with the book in question because they lived too early: the 13th or 14th century inscriptions that record their names can be regarded as no more than tradition or hearsay.'⁹ Although the number of unacceptable names are fewer than those possible, the veracity of the latter is compromised. However, given the date in which Thomas was active, it seems implausible that the ex-libris note is inaccurate in this instance.

Thomas is named in the ex-libris notes of three other manuscripts, all of which appear to date – on palaeographical grounds – to the fourteenth century: the first, BL Royal MS 4 E v, is a biblical concordance; the second, BL Royal MS 6 D vii, contains Gregory's *Moralia in librum Iob*; whilst the third, BL Royal MS 7 F iv, contains the third and second part of Peter of Cornwall's *Pantheologus*.¹⁰ Thomas is also associated with two manuscripts recorded in an

7 See pp. 122-23.

8 *English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues*, ed. by R. Sharpe et al (London: British Library, 1996), p. 465

9 *Ibid.*

10 *Ibid.*, pp. 535-36.

indenture – dated 1 June 1390 (to clarify, this does not indicate when Thomas was alive) – concerning the loan of books and vestments from the prior and convent of Rochester to John Mory [or Amory], rector of Southfleet. One manuscript is described as ‘concordancias pulchras in magno volumini Fratris Thome de Horstede cuius quartum folium incipit abscondit se Adam’ and has been identified as the biblical concordance named above, British Library MS Royal 4 E v. Another manuscript is described as ‘librum Augustini de ciuitate dei Fratris Thome de Horstede cuius 5 folium incipit mentiri.’¹¹

It seems likely that Thomas’ acquisition of manuscripts was connected with his position as precentor, a role which usually involved care of the monastic library.¹² However, aside from R, the extant manuscripts that name Thomas simply employ the phrase ‘per Thomam Horstede’, without specifying his position within the monastery; thus, it is also possible that he was responsible for providing books to the monastic library before becoming precentor. The precise role Thomas played in the composition and acquisition of the manuscripts with which he is associated remains unclear. According to Neil Ker, ‘per’ in this context might mean wrote, procured, or donated. Taking this into account, there are a number of ways through which Thomas could have acquired the text for Rochester: as a gift or bequest; through the purchase of a manuscript that had already been written; or by copying, or commissioning a copy, based on an exemplar text.¹³

If the priory acquired an exemplar of the *Summa*, it may either have been copied by a monk or a commercial scribe. Rochester possessed a vibrant scriptorium in the twelfth century, and produced many of its own manuscripts ‘in house’, but thereafter, production declined and books tended to be acquired from elsewhere.¹⁴ However, this generalisation provides circumstantial and equivocal evidence, and it certainly does not exclude the possibility that the manuscript was copied by a Rochester monk.

As such, there is little evidence regarding the identity of the scribe or annotators, although it remains possible that Thomas had a role in composing the index or correcting the

11 Ibid.

12 Mary Richards, ‘Texts and their traditions in the medieval library of Rochester Cathedral Priory’, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 78, 3 (1988), 1-129 (p. 16).

13 Neil Ker, *Medieval Libraries*, p. 330.

14 Richards, *Texts and their Traditions*, pp. 1-21.

text. In order to explore this possibility, one would need to have evidence of Thomas' own hand. Joan Greatrex has noted that Thomas 'wrote the tabula to the *Moralia*' in British Library MS Royal 6 D vii.¹⁵ Indeed, a heading on folio 268r reads 'Tabula super *Moralia* Thome Horstede'. However, the index table that follows is clearly a neat copy rather than an original; it contrasts greatly, for example, with the scribbled table of contents and index that appears in R [2v, 3r-9v]. It thus seems probable that Thomas was the compiler/creator of this table, rather than the scribe. Since there is little other evidence of Thomas' hand, his role in the composition of R must remain speculative.

Even so, the condition and contents of R provide evidence of how it was copied, and for what purpose it was acquired. Although the manuscript has been rebound into two parts, it was originally a single volume.¹⁶ There are tables of chapter-headings placed after the chapters *Furtum* [200v], the final F entry, and *Ostensio* [409v and 410r], the final O entry, which is likely to indicate that an earlier exemplar copy of the text had been divided into three parts or volumes. Since the same hand is responsible for the main text which occurs immediately before and after each table, and since the tables (and following text) do not mark the beginning of a new quire, it was clearly not being copied from these three distinct volumes simultaneously. It is likely that the divisions were initially made to make the *Summa* more portable, rather than as a means to enable multiple scribes to copy an exemplar more quickly; the inclusion of three separate tables suggests that each volume was to be used separately. Nevertheless, the existence of such divisions must have affected the circulation of the text and encouraged fragmentation; this is illustrated by the way in which the copy of the *Summa Praedicatorum* at Avignon has also been divided into three separate volumes (albeit at different points in the text compared to R), of which two survive.¹⁷

In R, annotations and a few corrections have been made in the hand of the main scribe. A second hand – which is much less legible, and is probably the same as that which wrote the index in the first quire – has subsequently, and thoroughly, corrected the main text. This corrector (who was evidently working on the text after the initial corrections had been made)

¹⁵ Greatrex, *Biographical Register of the English Cathedral Priors of the Province of Canterbury*, p. 613.

¹⁶ See pp. 59-64.

¹⁷ See pp. 69-71.

must have had access to an exemplar copy, suggesting one of three possibilities: that the exemplar was retained for a period of time after the new copy had been written; that the corrector was making additions at a much later date, when Rochester had acquired (or the corrector had access to) a further copy of the *Summa*; or that the corrections occurred before Thomas Horstede acquired the text. It must be noted that Rochester was a small priory with a modest library, and it seems unlikely that it would have spent precious resources on multiple copies of the same work.¹⁸ Finally, a title on the verso side of the first folio of R, in which the word ‘Roffensis’ has subsequently been inserted, suggests that either the manuscript was acquired by the priory some time after it had already been written, or that somebody wished to record ownership when the manuscript was in the process of being lent out.

There are three main possibilities regarding how Thomas may have acquired an exemplar text: firstly, he may have obtained it through episcopal channels; secondly, he may have borrowed the text from a neighbouring institution, probably St Augustine’s, Canterbury; and thirdly, he may have gained access to it via the Dominicans. With regards to the first possibility, there is evidence of fourteenth-century episcopal interference and concern in the state of the Rochester Cathedral Priory’s library. In 1346, the episcopal register of Hamo Hythe, bishop of Rochester, records that Hamo presented the Chapter of Rochester with a number of books in order to remedy a severe shortage of suitable material; the register notes that although the diocesan clergy led good lives and were not ignorant, they had hitherto lacked suitable books to perform their duties properly.¹⁹ Ten volumes are named, including the Gospels of St Matthew and St Mark with a commentary, theological treatises, and books on canon law. It ought to be noted that Hamo did not ordinarily have a good relationship with the monks at Rochester, and was himself accused of failing to perform his preaching duties, an allegation made at Archbishop of Canterbury Simon Mepham’s 1329 visitation.²⁰

18 This proposition is supported by the extant catalogues from the priory dating to 1122/23 and 1202: Richards, *Texts and their Traditions*, p. ix.

19 ‘Nouerit vniuersitas vestra nos ex frequenti rerum experientia quod mesto corde recolimus didicisse nonnullos viros ecclesiasticos nostre diocesis nedum curam animarum verum eciam penitenciare officium gerentes quamuis vita pariter et sciencia commendatos ob defectum tamen librorum ad curam et officium huiusmodi vitium presertim circa informaciones et consilia salutaria subditorum neconon penitencias iniungendas et absoluciones confitentibus impendendas non modicum delirasse’: *English Benedictine Libraries*, B82, p. 532.

20 M.C. Buck, ‘Hythe, Hamo (b. c. 1270, d. in or after 1357)’, *ODNB* (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37508>> [accessed 7 Sept 2017].

Hythe's successor, John Sheppey (d. 1360), cited the *Summa Praedicatorum* on several occasions in his own collection of sermons.²¹ He may have been using R, or he may even have provided the priory with his own personal manuscript for the purposes of copying the text (or indeed vice versa). During his episcopal and political career, Sheppey would become friends with William Edington, bishop of Winchester. Before entering royal service, Edington was patronised by Adam Orleton, bishop of Hereford, who may have acted as intermediary with regards to the dissemination of texts originating in his diocese (in this regard, it should be noted that within the *Summa*, Bromyard appears to aim an unsubtle dig at Orleton, suggesting that they were not on amicable terms).²² Sheppey is also known to have studied at Oxford, where he incepted in theology in 1332. Since Oxford was a major centre of Dominican learning, a *Studium generale*, it may have provided Sheppey with access to texts such as the *Summa*. Indeed, it is known that Sheppey acquired a number of sermons whilst at Oxford from the Dominican friar William Hotoft.²³

The final possible episcopal association lies with Thomas Trillek, bishop of Rochester (1364-1372).²⁴ Trillek was the younger brother of John Trillek, bishop of Hereford, and nephew of Adam Orleton, under whose patronage he prospered. From the 1320s he began to acquire a number of valuable benefices, including a portion in the collegiate church of Bromyard. Even so, from the 1320s to the 1350s he appears to have spent most of his time at Oxford: he gained the degree of MA by 1331; from 1334 onwards he was granted licences which allowed him to be absent from his benefices for the purposes of study; by 1344 he was a bachelor of civil law, and by 1346 he was a licentiate in civil and canon law. However, given both Sheppey's awareness of the *Summa*, and the likelihood that Thomas Horstede acquired the text at an earlier date, it seems unlikely that Trillek had a role in the acquisition of the text, despite his Hereford origins.

If Thomas Horstede acquired an exemplar copy from a neighbouring institution, it is highly likely that this came from St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury. Rochester is known to

21 See pp. 150-54.

22 For an overview of Adam Orleton's career, see Roy Martin Haines, *The Church and Politics in Fourteenth-century England*. See p. 31 for the barbed words Bromyard reserves for the guardian of a city who prefers prostitutes to friars.

23 See p. 150.

24 D.N. Lepine, 'Trillek, Thomas (b. in or before 1312, d. 1372)', ODNB (Oxford University Press, 2007), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/95196>> [accessed 7 Sept 2017]

have borrowed exemplars from St Augustine's whilst building up its nascent library collection in the twelfth century.²⁵ According to Mary Richards, 'the post-Conquest Rochester Priory participated in what we today would call a network of textual traditions, some pre-Conquest in origin, available in south-eastern England... Clear links to centres in London to the north, and Canterbury to the southeast, define a geographical area roughly equivalent to Kent, from which Rochester seems to have drawn the bulk of materials from English libraries.'²⁶ St Augustine's is also known to have possessed two volumes of the *Summa Praedicatorum* by the fifteenth century; it is possible that these are two volumes of a single copy of the *Summa*, but this is not evident in the catalogue. Either way, St Augustine's may have been willing to lend one copy out, whilst retaining a copy for themselves, or they may have allowed a scribe access to the manuscripts within the confines of the abbey.

Finally, it is possible that the *Summa* was carried via Dominican channels of transmission to the friars' convent in nearby Canterbury. Indeed, Rochester was also en route to Dover, and the priory may thus have provided hospitality to the friars (including Bromyard) who were journeying towards the continent.

It is additionally worth considering why Thomas chose to acquire the *Summa* for Rochester. In many instances, an institution had little choice in this regard, since many books were received as a bequest or gift, and therefore reflected the tastes of the donor. However, there is little evidence of that in this instance. Peter Binkley has suggested that Bromyard originally compiled the *Summa Praedicatorum* in order to compensate for a poorly equipped fraternal library at Hereford. Whilst this suggestion is inadequate to explain the initial composition of the *Summa*, it may explain why a priory such as Rochester wished to acquire a copy. Bishop Hamo Hythe's gift of ten volumes to the cathedral library noted the paucity of books that were currently held there.²⁷ Indeed, despite the large number of Rochester manuscripts that are extant, it appears that the library was always relatively small. Based on a comparison of library catalogues, Richards has convincingly argued that the priory's collection 'was modest both in the scope of works represented and in the availability of multiple copies of

²⁵ Richards, *Texts and the Traditions*, p. 4.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²⁷ See p. 13.

key works' especially when compared to the early-fourteenth (1831 volumes) and fifteenth century (1837 volumes) catalogues of Christ Church, Canterbury.²⁸ The size of Rochester's library probably increased in the fourteenth century but its collection is unlikely to have exceeded that of Dover priory which had c. 450 books in 1389. Thus, Rochester's library was 'undistinguished in its time, but invaluable because of its preservation.'²⁹ A second reason may lie with the episcopal appointments. According to Henry Summerson, biographer of Thomas Brinton for the ODNB, 'the see was one often bestowed on favoured preachers: its small size reduced the administrative burden on its occupant, while its position gave easy access to London and the court.'³⁰ Summerson does not provide evidence for this assertion, and given the criticism levelled at Hamo Hythe for failing to preach, one must treat it with caution. Nevertheless, Sheppey and Brinton were both notable preachers, so the suggestion is certainly plausible.

One of the earliest references to the *Summa Praedicatorum* is recorded in a booklist of manuscripts belonging to Simon Bozoun (d. by 1352), prior of the Benedictine cathedral priory of Norwich.³¹ Given the date Bozoun died, the possibility that he acquired the book at a much earlier date, and the fact that the text is likely to have gone through several phases of dissemination before it reached him, this reference provides further strong evidence that the *Summa* was circulating before the middle of the century. The booklist was composed at some point between 1327 and 1352, and is recorded at the end of a copy of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, British Library MS Royal 14 C xiii. There are thirty-one books listed, most of which are theological and legal texts. Four are extant. In addition to the book titles, the values of each text are also recorded. The *Summa Praedicatorum* was valued at 100 shillings, and was clearly a prestigious text. By contrast, the *Decretum* was valued at 60 shillings, and both Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* and Cassiodorus' *Historia tripartita* were each valued at 20 shillings. Keith Walls suggests that Thomas Brinton, who was a Benedictine monk at Norwich cathedral priory in the early 1350s, utilised this copy of the *Summa*, although given Brinton's

28 Richards, *Texts and their Traditions*, p. 21.

29 *Ibid.*

30 Henry Summerson, 'Brinton, Thomas (d. 1389)', ODNB (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3442>> [accessed 7 Sept 2017].

31 See Appendix A, n. 1.

studies at Cambridge and Oxford, and his later position as bishop of Rochester, this is by no means certain.³² Bozoun's career can be traced from records in the priory records. In 1327 and 1334 he is listed as hostiller. He was appointed abbot in 1344, before retiring due to ill health in 1352. For the final few months of his life, he served as abbot of a cathedral cell, St Leonard's, also in Norwich. He appears to have been of local origin, since the name Bozoun was recorded for a number of families living in the vicinity of Norwich at that time. There is no evidence that Bozoun ever attended Oxford or Cambridge, and judging by the priory records, this would have been extremely unusual.³³ It is thus unclear how and for what purpose he acquired the text. However, since the Dominican priory at Norwich was ranked as one of the most important in England, it is possible that the text was disseminated initially through the Dominican network, before being made available to other individuals and institutions. It also seems likely that it was Bozoun's manuscript (or a derivative) that John Wakering, bishop of Norwich (d. 1425), left to the cathedral church of Wells in his will.³⁴ Interestingly, Thomas Beckington (c. 1390-1465), bishop of Bath and Wells, is associated with the abbreviated version of the Summa found in C. However, given that the earliest copy of this version appears to be O, it seems that there is no connection between Beckington's copy and the Norwich manuscript.³⁵ Finally, since Kirkstede visited a number of libraries in East Anglia whilst compiling the *Catalogus* (c. 1360), the reference to a 'Summa bona quae vocatur Brumyard' provides further evidence that the Summa was circulating in this region (albeit the identification of that text with the *Summa Praedicatorum* is uncertain).³⁶

There are two sources of evidence that shed light on the transmission of the Summa in the vicinity of Hereford and the west. Firstly, the Summa is recorded in a list of nearly one hundred books bequeathed by Nicholas Hereford, prior of Evesham (d. 1392).³⁷ The Summa was valued at nine marks (120 shillings). In contrast, a commentary on the Sentences, attributed to the early fourteenth-century Franciscan, Robert Cowton, was valued at seven marks, whilst a missal (presumably ornate) was valued at twenty marks. The list records that the Summa was

32 Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 273; see also Devlin, *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton*, I, p. x.

33 See Appendix A, n. 1.

34 *Ibid.*, n. 6.

35 See pp. 71-75.

36 See pp. 5, 49.

37 See Appendix A, n. 3.

one of five books that had been bought, and provides direct evidence that there was an early commercial trade in the text. Secondly, ‘Bromiardus in Summa’ is referenced in a fifteenth-century collection of sermons acquired by Hereford Cathedral Library.³⁸ The manuscript contains 41 sermons, each of which is written in a different hand, and a version of the *Gesta Romanorum*. According to Siegfried Wenzel, the compiler is anonymous, although he shows sympathy with the friars, and was probably an Augustinian canon.³⁹

In Peterhouse College, Cambridge, the other complete, extant manuscript copy of the *Summa*, P 24 and 25, was recorded in a catalogue of the college library, dated to 24 Dec. 1418; there is also a contemporary inscription, ‘liber collegii sancti Petri’ Cantebriggæ’, on folio 16v of P 25.⁴⁰ It is an intriguing manuscript, divided into two volumes, and written in multiple hands with varying degrees of legibility. The marginal space varies widely: sometimes writing continues to the very bottom of the folio; occasionally text from the end of a section has been added underneath earlier columns; and sometimes there is space without text at the end of a quire. Different hands tend to begin scribal stints on new quires, although this correspondence is not absolute – occasionally a different hand will take over in the middle of a quire. Overall, the evidence suggests that the text was being copied from several discrete booklets simultaneously, almost certainly as a way of completing a commission as rapidly as possible.⁴¹ In addition to P there is further evidence of the text circulating in Cambridge. A bequest of John Thorpe (alive in 1430) left a copy of the *Summa* to Cambridge University Library, whilst John Tittleshall left an abbreviated copy (valued at twenty shillings) to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge in 1458 (it is not possible to identify whether the latter manuscript reflected the abridged version of O and C, or that of H, or indeed a completely different version). Furthermore, the compiler of a collection of sermons preached in the academic years 1417 and 1424-1425 at Cambridge refers

38 Ibid., n. 29.

39 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, pp. 164-65.

40 See p. 68.

41 This is consistent with the evidence presented by A. Doyle and M. Parkes, ‘The Production of Copies of the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Confessio Amantis* in the Early Fifteenth Century’ in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts, and Libraries: Essays Presented to N. R. Ker*, ed. by V. Scattergood and A. Watson (London: Scolar, 1978), pp. 163-210. Trinity College, Cambridge MS R.3.2 contains the second recension of Gower’s *Confessio Amantis* in addition to some of his minor works. The manuscript can be dated to c. 1408-1426. The scribal stints correspond with the beginnings and ends of quires, and it seems likely that the exemplar was distributed in parts for simultaneous copying. Doyle and Parks argue that the compiler, or stationer would typically hire independent craftsmen to complete a commission rather than working in a scriptorium setting.

to a ‘Bromzerd’; Wenzel describes the sermons as a ‘copy of what a note-taker had heard from the pulpit.’⁴²

In Oxford, O is an important witness to a redacted and abridged version of the Summa. The provenance is fairly certain, since it is a distinctive ‘Oxford production’.⁴³ O shortened the Summa by reducing the number of chapters, and contracting or omitting articles within chapters. Additionally, there is no prologue at the beginning of the text, and the internal system of referencing is only partly in place. Unlike other extant manuscripts of the text, the marginal system of cross-referencing is partly marked by letters rather than numerals. A comparison of this version with the full text clearly demonstrates that it is an abridgement rather than the original compilation which has subsequently been expanded; in other words, it is not synonymous with the ‘*compilationem a me prius collectam*’ which Bromyard references in the prologue to the Summa. It is not possible to know whether O is the first ‘fair’ copy of the abbreviated version; the same abbreviated text can also be found in the fifteenth-century C, although a comparison of the chapter *Falsitas* in both manuscripts demonstrates that O is more likely to reflect the original composition. In addition to containing the Summa, O also includes John Felton’s *Sermones Dominicales*, and Thomas of Ireland’s *Manipulus Florum*. The manuscript must therefore have been produced after 1431, since this was when Felton finished his sermon cycle, and the main text of the manuscript has been written in a single hand. It is worth noting that although O contains an abbreviated copy of the Summa, it is still a large, unwieldy text; it is a work of reference suitable for a library rather than a portable volume for personal use. This contrasts with the much more compact C. Other than O, a number of preachers who reference Bromyard in their sermons have connections with Oxford. This includes Sheppey and Robert Rypon (both of whom shall be discussed in the following section) and also the anonymous fifteenth-century Benedictine monk who refers to an ‘*auctor in Summa predicancium*’.⁴⁴

42 See Appendix A, n. 27; ; Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 81.

43 See p. 74.

44 See Appendix D, n. 28.

Elsewhere, Richard Sharpe (while investigating the authorship of the *Sermones super Evangelia Dominicali*, a sermon cycle attributed to Philip Repyngdon) has suggested that H may have belonged to the Augustinian priory of St Bartholomew's in London. Thus:

It is the case, however, that in BL, Harley MS 106 we find a copy of John Eyton's *Tractatus de usura* and what are referred to as *notabilia* from the sermons of Repyngdon which do not, in fact, match the sermons as we know them. This may be more than coincidence. Considering also the presence in the same volume of excerpts from *Florarium Bartholomei*, the work of John Mirfield (d. 1407), clerk and tenant of St Bartholomew's Priory and chaplain to the hospital, one may wonder whether this book, a large miscellany, may even have belonged to a library at the priory, but it contains no direct evidence of its provenance.⁴⁵

In this regard, it may be significant that the Augustinian Canons at Leicester (where Repyngdon was elected abbot in 1394) possessed a copy of the *Summa* in the fifteenth century. Leicester was one of the wealthiest and most prominent Augustinian houses, and kept a considerable library; by the late fifteenth century, an extant catalogue suggest that the abbey possessed over 940 volumes (excluding liturgical books and administrative records). Further north, a prebendary of York Cathedral and royal diplomat, William Cawood, left in 1420 a copy of 'Repyngton super Euangelia' and a copy of 'Brumardum' (in addition to a number of other manuscripts) to be sold to fund the reredos (the ornate screens placed behind the altars) at York minster.⁴⁶ Clearly, these texts were circulating in the same milieu.

The fourteenth century A 305 and A 306, are the sole surviving manuscripts of the *Summa* that exist on the continent. According to Lozar, the manuscripts originally belonged to the Dominican convent at Polignac, although she provides no evidence or reference, and there is nothing in either the manuscripts or the catalogues which suggests this.⁴⁷ It is possible that the text may have been transmitted by Sheppey or Brinton, both of whom visited Avignon on royal

⁴⁵ R. Sharpe, 'John Eyton alias Repyngdon and the *Sermones super euangelia dominicalia* attributed to Philip Repyngdon', *Medium Aevum*, 83 (2014), 254-65 (p. 262).

⁴⁶ See Appendix A, n. 5.

⁴⁷ Lozar, 'Studien zur *Summa Predicantium* des John Bromyard', p. 30.

and ecclesiastical business. The manuscripts contain the Tabulae included in P 24 and P 25, and these were subsequently included in the early printed editions. Middle English and Anglo-Norman words and phrases have been omitted (or translated into Latin) in both A 305 and A 306 and the early printed editions.⁴⁸ Additionally, it is informative that a number of attestations to the *Summa Praedicatorum* in English catalogues refer to the printed editions which were published on the continent.⁴⁹ This is both evidence of the continuing use and popularity of the *Summa* into the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and also that England (in addition to the continent) provided a market for these early printed books. In total, 126 institutions (across the world) currently possess a copy of the 1484 edition, and 116 institutions possess a copy of the 1485 edition.⁵⁰ The availability of printed copies appears to have significantly affected the price of the *Summa*. A manuscript copy is valued at 120 shillings in the late fourteenth century, but just eight shillings in 1520.⁵¹ Of course, given the paucity of evidence (the only other price placed on the *Summa* refers to an abbreviated copy that was valued at twenty shillings in 1458), any conclusion must be tenuous, and there were of course multiple factors that influenced the value of a book.⁵²

It is also worth examining some of the individuals known to have owned or used the *Summa*. The early possession of the text in the hands of four bishops, all of whom became government officials and held offices of state, suggests not only that it was initially transmitted through episcopal networks, but also that it was predominantly mined for material used to promote and uphold orthodox religious views. Whilst the owner of a manuscript did not necessarily reflect the orthodoxy of the text – and in some instances actually affected its orthodoxy (the Wycliffite Bible being the most notorious example of the problematic relationship between reader/owner and text) – the theologically orthodox content of the *Summa* is consistent with those who used it.

48 Lozar noted that Anglo-Norman and English phrases are translated into Latin in A; since the volume containing chapters from A to G is missing, I have been unable to determine whether the vernacular phrases in *Falsitas* are translated in the same way in A and also the printed editions; this would provide useful information regarding the transmission of the text. See Lozar, 'Studien zur *Summa Praedicatorum* des John Bromyard', p. 30.

49 See Appendix A.

50 Incunabula Short Title Catalogue <<http://data.cerl.org/istc/ij00260000>> and <<http://data.cerl.org/istc/ij00261000>> [accessed 7 September 2017]

51 See Appendix A, n. 21.

52 For the impact of the printing press on the price of books, see Simon Horobin, 'Mapping the Words' in *The Production of Books in England, 1350-1500*, ed. by Alexandra Gillespie and Daniel Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 59-78 (p. 75).

A brief description of the orthodox credentials and royal service of Brinton, Wakering and Beckington serves to emphasise this point (the royal service of John Sheppey is discussed in greater detail below, p. 151).

After taking his vows as a Benedictine monk at Norwich, and studying at Cambridge and Oxford, Thomas Brinton had become a member of the papal household by 1362, and was made bishop of Rochester by papal provision in 1373. He became involved with government business, and was responsible for trying petitions seven times in parliament between 1376 and 1380. In the Good Parliament of 1376 he was one of four bishops chosen by the Commons to advise them, and in 1377 was one of the lords and prelates selected to consult with the Commons in regards to the good of the realm. He attended the ‘earthquake council’ at London Blackfriars in 1382, in which a number of propositions of Wyclif were condemned.⁵³

John Wakering was part of John of Gaunt’s administration by 1392, before entering the king’s service in 1394. He was appointed as keeper of the privy seal in 1415, but resigned a year later after being consecrated bishop of Norwich. He was then appointed as a royal delegate to the Council of Constance where Henry V intended to strengthen the English presence. After returning in 1418, he continued to act as a royal councillor, and was appointed to the regency council for the infant Henry VI on 9 December 1422. Interestingly, although the valleys south-east of Norwich were associated with Lollard activity, it was left to Wakering’s successor, William Alnwick, to uproot these dissidents in 1428-31. In contrast, Wakering accepted the compurgation in July 1424 of the chaplain, Hugh Pye of Loddon, who would later emerge as a leading figure amongst the heretics.⁵⁴

Finally, Thomas Beckington (c. 1390–1465), administrator and bishop of Bath and Wells, was in the service of Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, by 1423. He may have been part of the provincial legal staff of Henry Chichele, archbishop of Canterbury, by as early as 1419; by 1423 he was dean of the court of arches, and between 1431 and 1438 he acted as official of the court of Canterbury. He was a member of an embassy appointed in 1432 to negotiate a peace or truce with France, and by 1437/8 he was secretary to Henry VI. In 1439 he joined negotiations

⁵³ Henry Summerson, ‘Brinton, Thomas (d. 1389)’.

⁵⁴ R. G. Davies, ‘Wakering, John (d. 1425)’, ODNB (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28424>> [accessed 7 Sept 2017].

with the French at Calais, and three years later he was appointed to an embassy hoping to arrange a marriage between the king and a daughter of Jean (IV), count of Armagnac. In 1443 he became keeper of the privy seal, and was consecrated bishop of Bath and Wells in the same year. He resigned the privy seal in 1444, and thereafter took little part in government, on the pretext of age and infirmity, but possibly due to perceived political failures. He dealt decisively with Lollards, and promoted higher levels of education amongst his clergy.⁵⁵

The itinerant lifestyle of bishops, who moved around frequently on government and episcopal business, suggests that the *Summa* would have been an ideal travelling companion, a book of lore to dip into if necessary, when access to a larger library was problematic. On the face of it, the *Summa* was not a portable text, but an itinerant bishop was not the same as an itinerant friar, and ‘administration by wagon train’ probably afforded the bishop with means to carry around such a manuscript.

In addition to the early episcopal users of the text, the *Summa* also appeared with relative frequency in the libraries of Benedictine cathedral priories. This provides evidence that by the mid-fourteenth century the Benedictine monks in these foundations – which, unlike traditional monasteries, were located in urban areas – took their pastoral responsibilities seriously. Joan Greatrex has discussed the role of preaching in such priories, noting that there is evidence sermons were preached daily in chapter, on feast days, in a visitational role to dependant priories, and also in parish churches when given an episcopal licence to do so. She concludes, however, that ‘it is not possible to evaluate the degree of importance assigned by the cathedral monks to the pastoral ministry of preaching to the public.’⁵⁶ Siegfried Wenzel is less equivocal:

Sheppey’s work demonstrates another more general feature of preaching in late-medieval England: the field is no longer dominated by the mendicant orders: instead, learned monks move very much into the foreground. This is shown, first of all, by the proportionately large number of Benedictine collections from the 1370s to 1450. It can,

55 Robert W. Dunning, ‘Beckington, Thomas (1390?–1465)’, ODNB (Oxford University Press, 2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1908>> [accessed 7 Sept 2017].

56 Joan Greatrex, *The English Benedictine Cathedral Priories: Rule and Practice, c. 1270-1420* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), p. 279.

I think also be shown by examining a sermon feature which the studies of Beryl Smalley linked closely to the friars, the use of classical and pseudo-classical material in their sermons. While the few friars whose work we know in this period continued to use some of this traditional material, it is Benedictine preachers who came to excel in exploring ‘the classics’ for their sermons. Judging by those texts that have been preserved, it is Benedictine sermons that in our period are rhetorically crafted and innovative.⁵⁷

Even so, this conclusion appears to be overstated. Benedictine monks were still heavily influenced by texts composed by Dominicans such as Bromyard and Robert Holcot. As the section on sermons shall demonstrate (see below), Benedictine monks such as Sheppey were not merely using these texts, but extracting whole sections with little alteration. In other words, they were not appropriating or distorting the fraternal voice, they were simply amplifying it. Secondly, there is the question of evidence. The friars were renowned for having substantial libraries, as indicated by Richard of Bury, the fourteenth-century bishop and bibliophile who wrote:

Whenever it happened that we turned aside to the cities and places where the mendicants we have mentioned had their convents, we did not disdain to visit their libraries and any other repositories of books; nay, there we found heaped up amid the utmost poverty the utmost riches of wisdom.⁵⁸

However, in the aftermath of the reformation, these library collections were dispersed and destroyed, and as such, there is less textual evidence of later-medieval sermons written by friars, than those which had circulated at an earlier date. Although the destruction of libraries belonging to the religious orders affected Benedictine houses too, a relatively large corpora of

⁵⁷ Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, pp. 29-30.

⁵⁸ ‘Cum vero nos ad civitates et loca contingeret declinare, ubi praefati pauperes conventus habebant, eorum armaria ac quaecunque librorum repositoria visitare non piguit; immo ibi in altissima paupertate altissimas divitias sapientiae thesaurizatas invenimus’: *The Philobiblon of Richard de Bury: Bishop of Durham, Treasurer and Chancellor of Edward III*, ed. and trans. by Ernest Thomas (London: K. Paul, Trench and Company, 1888), pp. 75-76, 203.

manuscripts survive from certain institutions such as Rochester, whose significance as a centre of learning is thus artificially enlarged.

A further point that can be made is that the *Summa* is found in libraries of institutions that were poorly stocked, such as at Rochester, and also those of institutions which possessed a wide range of texts, many of which were in multiple copies, such as St Augustine's. In spite of the considerable expense it would take to copy or purchase the *Summa*, it must therefore, have been seen as an economical means of acquiring a wide range of preaching material, whilst also being a useful and/or prestigious addition for more wealthy libraries. The existence of abridged and abbreviated versions of the *Summa* further suggests that the text was accessible to institutions and individuals of more limited means, and those who wished to have a more portable text.

In addition, it is worth considering the question of 'reach': the extent to which the extant manuscripts and catalogue references are indicative of the total number of copies ever made; and the ways in which the popularity of the *Summa* can be measured. The simplest way to approach the issue is to adopt a comparative approach, and measure the *Summa's* popularity against other texts. A particularly informative comparison can be made between the *Summa* and the *Manipulus Florum*, which was, according to Chris Nighman, 'by far the most widely-disseminated and, presumably, the most influential anthology of Latin quotations produced during the Middle Ages.'⁵⁹ There are twenty-five identifications of the *Summa Praedicatorum* from medieval records in England, and a further four extant manuscripts that do not appear in any of these records. In comparison, there are twenty-seven identifications of the *Manipulus Florum*.⁶⁰ Put simply, based on catalogue records, there is very little difference between the popularity of the two texts in England. Of course, whereas there are two complete extant manuscripts of the *Summa*, the *Manipulus Florum* survives in over 180 manuscripts, nineteen of which appear to be of English provenance.⁶¹ There are many possible reasons for the

59 'The Electronic Manipulus florum Project' <<http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/page2.html>> [accessed on 7 September 2017]. The *Manipulus Florum* was published in at least fifty editions between 1483 and 1887. The first edition, c. 1494, is found in seventy-six institutions; the second edition, 1483, is found in sixty-five institutions.

60 'Thomas Hibernicus', MLGB <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/browse/T/#entry3368_anchor> [accessed 7 September 2017].

61 Rouse and Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons*, pp. 226-27.

discrepancy: firstly, the *Manipulus Florum* was distributed via the stationers in Paris, which thus explains the many continental manuscripts; secondly, the *Summa* may have predominantly been owned by individuals and institutions which took great care to catalogue their collections, and were thus much more likely to be recorded relative to the numbers in existence (whilst this may also have been true for the *Manipulus Florum*, there may have been more manuscripts that were unrecorded); thirdly, a significantly larger number of manuscript copies containing the *Summa* may subsequently have been destroyed. In this regard, there is no evidence that the text fell afoul of the authorities in the midst of the reformation; R did, after all, end up at Westminster, as part of the Royal Collection.

Using the *Summa*

The extant manuscripts show clear evidence of use: in each, the text has been corrected in multiple hands; authorities and key passages have been underlined; and there are annotations in the margins.⁶² Occasionally, the integrity of the text has been altered. For example, in P 24 and 25, references to the *Collationes* and *Additiones* – two works attributed to Bromyard – appear in the body of the text, whereas in the earliest extant manuscript, R, they appear in the margins.⁶³

Engagement with the text is further exemplified by the composition of indices. The index found in R remains incomplete and was evidently initiated after Bromyard circulated the text; it forms part of a quire attached to the front of the manuscript after the main body of text had already been written, and it does not appear in any other manuscript. The *Tabula realis* and *Tabula vocalis* (found in P 24 and 25, A 305 and 306 and the printed editions) also appear to have been made by early users rather than Bromyard himself; in this regard, Bromyard did not mention the presence of indices in the prologue – which he clearly wrote or amended immediately prior to distributing the text – whereas he did mention other finding-aids such as the system of cross-referencing.⁶⁴ Although these indices do not appear in R, they must have been composed at an early date given their presence in multiple manuscripts and in print. It is

62 A more detailed investigation of how users engaged with the manuscripts can be found in the *Falsitas* case-study, Chapter 5.

63 See p. 50.

64 John of Freiburg was the first person to compose an index to accompany his work (*Summa Confessorum*) rather than the index being compiled after text had ‘proved useful’. See Mulchahey, ‘First the Bow is Bent in Study’, p. 525.

possible that the headings provide a clue regarding the date of composition (time-constraints have prevented me from studying this in any great depth). Interestingly, there is no mention of pestilentia (that is, the Black Death, 1348-49) in the index; no doubt appropriate content could have been found in Tribulatio for such an entry. However, there is a disproportionately large amount of entries concerning flagellare (referring to the scourge of God rather than flagellantism, the predominantly fourteenth-century movement in which individuals mortified their flesh by scourging themselves). Regardless of when the indices were composed, it must have taken considerable time and effort to do so – the Tabula realis covers folios 2r-18r in P 24. Their presence further suggests that the structure of the Summa did not negate the need for a more incisive finding tool.

Valuable evidence regarding use of the Summa can also be found in the abridged versions, which demonstrate how the text was adapted and appropriated.⁶⁵ It was relatively common for seminal works to be abridged; this occurred for a variety of reasons. John of Freiburg, for example, made an abridgement of the Summa de casibus for less educated clergy⁶⁶ Moreover, concise texts were particularly valued. Thus, Paul of Hungary's Summa de penitentia became a confessional vademecum for Dominicans.⁶⁷ In this context, an abridgement of the Summa made the text more portable, cheaper and quicker to copy or acquire, and allowed additional texts to be copied alongside it. For example, the Manipulus Florum and a sermon cycle followed the Summa in O.

Angelika Lozar has argued that this abridged version of the Summa was composed after 1376, since a passage within the chapter Iudices has been altered to suggest that the pope had already returned to Rome.⁶⁸ Thus, the original passage in R is as follows:

If I swear that the pope is in Avignon when I do not know this, it is permissible some may say that I expose myself to the danger of perjury.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ For how the text was abbreviated see the Falsitas case-study, pp. 183-84.

⁶⁶ Mulchahey, 'First the Bow is Bent in Study', pp. 542, 548.

⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 532.

⁶⁸ 'Ein Textzitat in der Rubrik Iudices (cap. 25) bestätigt, daß der Papst seinen Sitz wieder in Rom hatte, während in der Londoner Handschrift in demselben Zusammenhang vorausgesetzt wird, daß die päpliche Kurie noch in Avignon weilt': Lozar, 'Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard', p. 31.

In O and C, however, ‘Avignon’ has been changed to ‘Rome’. The likeliest explanation for this is that the manuscript exemplar from which the extant copies of this abridged version are based was itself copied during the Western schism of 1378-1417. Since England favoured the Roman claimant, there was therefore a political reason for emending the text.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, this does not necessarily mean that the entire abridgement was made at this point; it is possible that the emendation to Rome was a later scribal interpolation.⁷¹

In H, extracts have been taken from the Summa in three different ways. Firstly, a single, complete chapter, Homo, has been included. Copying an extract in this way (word for word) would have been the simplest way to take material from the Summa, and I suspect that other chapters circulated in a comparative manner; their probable inclusion within miscellanies mean they were less likely to be recorded in medieval catalogues (since not all texts within a miscellany could be recorded), and it may be that the ‘wear and tear’ of frequent use explains why H is the sole survivor of such a tradition. Secondly, an article from the chapter Operatio has been summarised; this demonstrates greater engagement within the text in comparison to a ‘copy and paste’ approach. Finally, there is an abridged version of the Summa containing the prologue and sixty-two further chapters. The way the text has been contracted (regarding phrasing and content of material) again indicates that it has been abridged from the larger text (rather than representing the original text which the larger version expanded), although there is no indication of when this occurred. It is intriguing that an abridged version of the prologue has been included, since the prologue does not specifically contain the sermon-material which was presumably of greatest value for a preacher (indeed, it has been omitted in O and C). This cannot be explained by exemplar-poverty (that is, including a text because it was the only one available), since somebody at some stage must have decided to retain the prologue and exclude other chapters. Clearly, the prologue was seen as an integral part of the cohesiveness of this

69 ‘Si enim iuro papam esse in Avione cum hoc ignorem, licet nonnulli hoc dicant, periurii periculo me expono’: SP, Iudices, 25.

70 The return of the Papal curia to Rome, under Pope Gregory XI, began in 1376. See Stefan Weiß, ‘Luxury and Extravagance at the Papal Court in Avignon and the Outbreak of the Great Western Schism’ in *A Companion to the Great Western Schism (1378-1417)*, ed. by Joëlle Rollo-Koster and Thomas M. Izbicki, (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 67-87, (p. 73).

71 Interestingly, the reference to the prophecy of 1330 in *Iudicium Divinum* was left untouched. See p. 121.

abridgement. It is also significant that the chapters do not follow in strict alphabetical order. This suggests either that the chapters were circulating in distinct groupings or booklets, or that the choice of chapters to be abridged was not definitively planned from the very beginning.

The Summa in sermons

According to Siegfried Wenzel, ‘Three English authors deserve some special attention here for the frequency with which they appear in later sermons: Robert Grosseteste, John Bromyard, and Robert Holcot.’⁷² In particular, the extant sermons of John Sheppey, Thomas Brinton, Robert Rypon and an anonymous sermoniser of British Library MS Royal 18 B.xxiii throw considerable light on the use and utility of the *Summa Praedicatorum*.

John Sheppey was brought up as a Benedictine monk at the cathedral priory of Rochester. He was sent to study at Oxford, and in 1332 was given permission by the bishop of Rochester, Hamo Hythe, to incept in Theology.⁷³ After returning to Rochester, Sheppey was elected prior in 1333. He soon became immersed in government business, collecting taxes, taking part in a number of overseas diplomatic missions, and from 1345 serving as a member of the king’s council. In 1350, he resigned as prior in mysterious circumstances, but he was subsequently provided to the see of Rochester in 1352, and consecrated in the following year. In 1354 he became auditor and trier of petitions in parliament, whilst from 1356 until his death in 1360 he served as treasurer of England.

An autograph collection of sermons composed by Sheppey survives in New College Manuscript 92.⁷⁴ They appear to have been preached between 1336 and 1354, predominantly at Rochester.⁷⁵ Although the sermons are recorded in Latin, the inclusion of vernacular phrases,

⁷² Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, pp. 322-23.

⁷³ According to Mifsud, Sheppey was building a personal library of preaching material whilst a student at Oxford. Interestingly, he attended university before Benedict XII issued constitutions which mandated that young monks should be sent to universities in order to learn how to preach. See Mifsud, ‘John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons’, p. 19.

⁷⁴ At Sheppey’s death, the archdeacon of the diocese, William Reed (who later became bishop of Chichester) bought three volumes of sermons, some of which Sheppey had gathered whilst at Oxford, and some of which he had composed himself. He bound two volumes together (consisting of Sheppey’s own sermons, sermons collected by Sheppey and two further sets of homiletic texts unconnected to Sheppey) which he gave to New College (MS New College 92). He gave the other manuscript (containing a further set of sermons collected by Sheppey, but written in several fourteenth-century hands) to Merton (Merton College MS 248). See Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, pp. 27-28.

⁷⁵ Mifsud, ‘John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons’, p. 36. There are nineteen pieces which are described on the front pastedown as ‘sermones editi, scripti, et predicati per venerabilem patrem dominum Joh’ de Schepeya episcopum’. They are written in Sheppey’s own hand – ‘a swift, personal

and certain remarks made by Sheppey, indicate that the majority were due to be delivered in English.⁷⁶ Significantly, Sheppey refers to Bromyard's works in two of the extant sermons, one of which was probably preached for the feast of Corpus Christi, and another which was delivered on Ash Wednesday 1354.⁷⁷

The first of these was preached on the theme 'Qui manducat hunc panem vivet in aeternum', and although it is not possible to firmly date the sermon, the subject matter provides strong evidence associating it with Corpus Christi. Within the text, Sheppey refers on several occasions to the chapter Eucharistia in the Summa.⁷⁸

More significantly, Sheppey delivered a sermon on Ash Wednesday 1353 (i.e. February 1354), on the theme Flebitis vos ('You shall weep', John 16. 20).⁷⁹ It is a particularly fitting topic for exposition, since Lent was a time for a penitent sinner to examine his or her conscience, in preparation for Easter. The sermon is extremely important for both dating the Summa (and the Distinctiones), and also revealing how Bromyard's texts were used by a preacher. Additionally, it is the only sermon to date from Sheppey's episcopate, and is one of the few fourteenth-century episcopal sermons which survive. Since clerics who heard Sheppey preach were expected to listen and employ comparable material in their own sermons, it can thus also be seen as a conduit for disseminating Bromyard's material to a much wider audience.⁸⁰

Interestingly, it is highly likely that the sermon was delivered in the vernacular to a mixed

cursive' according to Mifsud. The rubrics suggest they were preached on the following occasions: two for Ash Wednesday; four for funeral sermons; two at St Pauls London (1336 and 1337); one at the election of abbess, probably to nuns of Malling; one at Holy Thursday 1343; one at Corpus Christi; and one perhaps at Pentecost.

- 76 A funeral sermon preached in 1344 on the theme 'Ecce, ancilla Domini' was delivered in the vernacular - 'Huius sermonis materia in vulgari': Mifsud, 'John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons', p. 40. Although there is thus an implication that some other sermons would be preached in Latin, Mifsud believes the sermons were predominantly written in Latin and then spoken in English: academic training meant Latin was easier to write than unacademic English; English syntax and idioms were used in Sheppey's Latin, thus the sermons were easy to deliver in English; and there is no evidence that he wrote in English, nor any reason for him to translate an English sermon into Latin. Given the state of the sermons, they were not destined for posterity. Thus 'one can only conclude that the macaronic quality of Sheppey's sermons is due entirely to the fact that they represent preliminary drafts of sermons intended to be delivered in the vernacular, written informally after the manner of of anyone brought up in a bilingual culture': Mifsud, 'John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons', p. 41. A 1363 injunction of the General Chapter of the Benedictines mandated that student monks were to be trained to preach in the vernacular, not just in Latin: H. Leith Spencer, *English Preaching in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), p. 61.
- 77 See Mifsud, 'John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons', p. 215, who remarks that this provides 'eloquent proof of the immediate popularity which [the Summa Praedicatorum] attained.'
- 78 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 29. Sheppey cites SP, Eucharistia 13, 17, 21.
- 79 A contemporary heading in Sheppey's hand reveals that this sermon was delivered on Ash Wednesday 1353 [February 1354] (Oxford New College MS 92). The marginalia are written in the same hand as the main text, which was probably Sheppey's own hand: Mifsud, p. 214.
- 80 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, pp. 257-60. Visitations allowed bishops to implement the Lateran IV reforms. Preaching by bishops on these occasions was intended to be imitated by clerics in the audience who would then preach to the laity. The laity were typically admitted to a visitation sermon.

audience of clerics and laymen: firstly, much of the content of the sermon is directed towards the laity as well as the clergy; secondly, the division is written in English as well as Latin; and thirdly, it was preached on Ash Wednesday, an occasion on which a sermon was typically given *ad populum*, that is, to the people. The sermon is thus an important witness for how certain themes explored by Bromyard – such as the correction of sin, and criticism of the clergy – were articulated and circulated in the period immediately prior to the emergence of Lollardy.

Since Sheppey had been in office for about a year (he was consecrated on 10 March 1353), Mifsud suggests that:

The sermon may also be considered something in the nature of a statement of policy, though not strictly intended to be so. It reveals to us some of the problems which the Church was faced with in England in the crucial years following the Black Death – problems which Sheppey dealt with not only by his public condemnation but also by positive disciplinary measures, as seen in his register.⁸¹

The introduction to the theme is based a passage from Luke; Sheppey explains how men are compared to merchants, some of whom work for God, and some for the devil.⁸² The former exchange the transitory hardships of the present for eternal joy in heaven, whilst the latter indulge in dainty, worldly delights only to spend the rest of their days in the depths of hell. Sheppey then quotes an image found in Holcot's *Lectiones super librum Sapientiae* to portray the second type of man as insane.

The theme is divided twice, initially around the words, *fletus*, weeping – which is necessary and useful for a sinner – and *vos*, you – the rational part of man. However, instead of developing this intrinsic division, Sheppey chooses to develop an extrinsic division, based on four similes that illustrate how a man should weep for his sins. This division is repeated in English in the sermon:

⁸¹ Mifsud, 'John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons', p. 225.

⁸² Sheppey cites Luke 15, '*Negotium Domini venio*', presumably referring to Luke 19. 13: '*Negotiamini dum venio*.'

Anglice:- As a ffader for his sone þat is led for to by aie honged;

As a ffriend for his ffriend þat is in point for to be acombred;

As a maister for his disciple þat schal be degraded;

As a werkman for his werk þat schal be defouled.⁸³

A marginal note in Sheppey's hand directs the reader to sermon fifty-five of John Bromyard's *Distinctiones* (presumably this was a written reminder to himself): 'De istis nota in D[octore] Bromzard d[istinccione] lv'. Sheppey has used this distinction to both structure the division, and also provide significant material for the second and third members of the sermon.⁸⁴ Although Sheppey subsequently discusses the first three of these members in detail, supported with multiple authorities, he does not do so for the fourth.

The first member that Sheppey develops includes large sections of text that have been lifted, almost verbatim from the chapters *Contritio* and *Amor* in the *Summa Praedicantium* (although Sheppey does not cite Bromyard or the *Summa* on this occasion).⁸⁵ Thus, Sheppey compares a father's loss of his beloved son to a man's loss of his own soul, and explains that there there are many who weep more often for the loss of material goods than they do for their sins. In consequence, sinners lose God who is above them, and their soul which is within them; however, they gain a place in hell which is below them.

In the second member, Sheppey explains how a man should weep over his sins like a man weeps for a friend who is 'in point for to be acombred', that is, who is about to be overwhelmed. He initially notes that the higher up somebody is on the ladder, the greater the drop when they fall off the rung, 'anglice ronge'. It is foolish, says Sheppey, if one has compassion for others who fall and not for oneself. He then argues that the reason some people do not consider their own condition is because they believe they will escape punishment. These people may be compared to the thieves and murderers of Wales who expect that their friends and relatives will be able to engineer their escape from custody; as a result, they are executed

83 Von Nolcken, 'Some Alphabetical Compendia', p. 278.

84 According to Wenzel, 'Sheppey not only took the fourfold division but in addition borrowed heavily from Bromyard's second and third parts, writing in fact a redacted, expanded version of his source': Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 26.

85 Sheppey takes material from articles two to seven of *Contritio*, and article two of *Amor*.

before they have time to be properly shriven, or to consider their own death. Sheppey places the blame for these beliefs on flatterers and false prophets who claim that the redemption and mercy of God will not allow any man to be damned. He further explains that a person is culpable if he or she helps to conceal another person's sin. Alongside this he adds a reference to Bromyard: 'Quere de hoc in D[octore] Bromard d[istinccione] 97, membro 2, ad hoc signum o-o'.⁸⁶ In particular, Sheppey condemns incontinent priests and dishonest tradesmen, and those who harbour them.⁸⁷

Sheppey then refers to the chapter *Compassio* in the *Summa Praedicatorum*: 'Si velis plus de compassione vide in Bromyard C12.' Sheppey's attempt to encourage the laity to inform on the clergy was potentially very dangerous, and the implications of this are discussed more fully in Chapters 6 and 7.⁸⁸

In the third member, Sheppey compares a sinner to a degraded cleric. There are three cases, says Sheppey, where the penalty is degradation and consignment to the secular courts: heresy; the forgery of papal letters; and incorrigible disobedience to the ordinary. Thus: a defect in faith is compared to a defect in morals; forgery of papal letters is compared to falsifying God's letters which are the virtues inscribed on the soul; and disobedience to the ordinary is compared to disobedience to God.

Unlike Sheppey, Thomas Brinton did not explicitly reference Bromyard or the *Summa*, but his sermons include many derivative passages. The editor of Brinton's sermons, Mary Devlin, claims that he used material derived from the *Summa* on numerous occasions.⁸⁹ It must be noted that Wenzel casts doubt on the accuracy of this number: 'Of the seventy references to Bromyard the editor gives in her index, some thirty passages occur in Bromyard with varying degrees of closeness, of which – as is usual with Brinton – a number are in more than one sermon.'⁹⁰ Brinton did not structure his sermons around Bromyard's chapters, articles or distinctions, but instead marshalled a number of different authorities from multiple source books.

86 There was a duty of disclosing sin at a canonical inquisition. According to Wenzel, 'the context indeed agrees with a point made in Bromyard's sermon collection as indicated: anyone who helps a sinner to commit a sin or to conceal it shares himself in that sin. This is hardly a homiletic commonplace, and Sheppey must have read Bromyard's work very carefully.' See Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 323.

87 See p. 231.

88 See, for example, pp. 195, 230-32.

89 Mary Devlin (ed.), *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton*, II, pp. 514-15.

90 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 323.

According to Summerson, Brinton's own sermons proclaimed 'a fundamentally conservative social message. Accepting the traditional divisions of society, he repeatedly stresses the interdependence of rich and poor, and outspokenly denounces the wealthy and powerful, and he expresses horror at the peasants' revolt.'⁹¹

A third sermoniser to cite Bromyard was Robert Rypon, a Benedictine monk from Durham Cathedral Priory. Rypon studied at Oxford; he became a bachelor in theology by 1392–1393, and incepted as doctor of theology by 1406. At Durham, he served as subprior, and eventually became prior of Finchley, a dependency of the priory. There are fifty-nine sermons ascribed to him in British Library MS Harley 4894. Rypon references Bromyard on at least thirteen occasions, often referring to him as 'doctor Brumyard'.⁹² He quotes stories, similes, distinctions and exempla.⁹³

A final example illustrating how the Summa was utilised can be found in a vernacular sermon on the text Matthew 20. 13, 'Frende, I do þe no wronge – amice, non facio tibi iniuriam', recorded in British Library MS Royal 18.⁹⁴ The majority of the sermon has been culled from the chapter on Amicitia in the Summa, in which Bromyard identifies three kinds of friendship: utilis, where a man is liked for the material benefits he can confer; delectabilis, where a man is liked for his character; and honesta, where God or the 'good' is liked. The sermon writer adapts this division, explaining that there are two types of friendship, although he only defines the first, utilis. Following Bromyard, he recounts an exemplum regarding fickle inn-keepers, before incorrectly rendering the proverb 'pauper et mortuus non habent amicos' as 'Dethe and povertte hath new frendes'.⁹⁵ After this, he borrows an additional exemplum from Bromyard: A man has three friends he loves – the world, the flesh, and the devil – and a fourth he does not – Christ – who helps him regardless. Interestingly, the sermon-writer omits Bromyard's discussion of Christ as a friend, and instead employs a further exemplum about an avaricious son-in-law. On account of this alteration, von Nolcken describes the sermon-writer as 'lazy and inept';

91 Summerson, 'Brinton, Thomas (d. 1389)'.
 92 Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 66.
 93 *Ibid.*, p. 324.
 94 Von Nolcken, 'Some Alphabetical Compendia', p. 278.
 95 *Ibid.*

regardless of such judgements, the sermon provides evidence of the difficulty in controlling how texts were subsequently used or appropriated.⁹⁶

The ultimate audience

Whilst at Oxford, John Sheppey had acquired an abbreviated copy of John of Wales' *Communiloquium*, a useful aid for preachers. According to the *Communiloquium*, there was a significant difference between preaching and instruction:⁹⁷

Preaching occurs where there is a meeting, or pre-arranged assembly of the people on holidays in churches or in other appointed places, and at times assigned to this purpose. It is the prerogative of those who have received holy orders, and who have legal power and authority, and of no-one else. However, every man can instruct and teach his brother in every place and at every suitable opportunity, if it seems to him useful, because this is a work of charity, which everyone is obliged to perform.⁹⁸

Correspondingly, the reach of the *Summa Praedicatorum* extended beyond the delivery of sermons. Tantalising glimpses of the *Summa*'s influence are visible in other texts which circulated during this period, most notably the dream-vision poem *Piers Plowman*. The suggestion that Langland may have borrowed from the *Summa* or a comparable text has long been mooted. In the 1930s, Owst commented on Bromyard's treatment of the corrupt legal system:

Likewise is it with those other 'twelve Apostles of falsity and Anti-Christ', the compurgators, who 'should go to London, or some other place, to witness for the truth concerning some matter which has hitherto been pleaded in the local court'. Have we not actually here, in Bromyard's vivid narrative, the fundamental idea which inspired

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 29.

⁹⁸ Spencer, *English Preaching*, p. 39.

Langland's incident in *Piers Plowman's Vision*, when the supporters of Lady Mede 'wenden...to Westmynster', to witness to her disputed deed of marriage?⁹⁹

In 1977, John Alford provided further evidence that Langland was indebted to Bromyard's *Summa*. Investigating the role of the Latin quotations in *Piers Plowman*, Alford found that:

Almost all of Langland's biblical associations (such as Lk. 14. 15 and Matt. 6. 25; John 14. 13 and Matt. 6. 10; Ps. 75. 6 and Ps. 72. 12; etc.) can be found in commentaries on the texts; all but two of the quotations in Passus XIV concurring on 'rich' and 'poor' (including the non-scriptural ones) appear in Bromyard's *Summa Praedicatorum* under the obvious headings of 'paupertas' and 'divitiae' – and of the two exceptions one, previously unidentified, shows up under the title 'abstinentia.' Quite likely, the poet drew upon the commentaries and upon some such work as Bromyard's (if not the *Summa Praedicatorum* itself) for the majority of his quotations. Moreover, it is fitting that if he was to borrow the method of the preachers of his day, he should have borrowed their tools as well.¹⁰⁰

More recently, Lawrence Warner has noticed how the term 'patientes vincunt' (the patient conquer) occurs six times in the B version of *Piers Plowman*. Whilst 'patientia vincit omnia' (patience conquers) is proverbial, the use of the plural is almost unique, only finding a parallel in Bromyard's chapter on humilitas in the *Summa Praedicatorum*. Warner has thus followed Alford in suggesting that 'Bromyard [served] as primary conduit.'¹⁰¹

Elsewhere, Gillian Rudd has picked out a distinctive metaphor that appears in both the *Summa* and *Piers Plowman*.¹⁰² The story of Noah's Ark had traditionally been used to show God's patience with mankind. The ark was seen as a place of safety, floating on the waters of

99 Owst, *Literature and Pulpit*, p. 347.

100 John Alford, 'The Role of the Quotations in *Piers Plowman*', *Speculum*, 52, 1 (Jan., 1977), 80-99 (p. 99).

101 Lawrence Warner, *The Myth of Piers Plowman: Constructing a Medieval Literary Archive*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 66.

102 Rudd, 'The State of the Ark', pp. 6-10.

baptism, an interpretation which ultimately derived from I Peter 3. 20. Bromyard, however, changes the moral of this story, comparing the shipwrights who built Noah's ark (and yet perished in the flood) to clerics whose words save souls, whilst their own actions damn them into hell. Intriguingly, this metaphor is also employed by Langland, who similarly compares deviant clerics to damned shipwrights.¹⁰³

Speculation regarding how Langland may have accessed the *Summa* is complicated by how little is known about his life.¹⁰⁴ An early fifteenth-century ascription in a manuscript copy of the C-text notes provides firm evidence of the poet's name:

It is worth recording that Stacy de Rokayle was the father of William de Langland; this Stacy was of gentle birth and lived in Shipton-under-Wychwood, a tenant of the Lord Spenser in the country of Oxfordshire. The aforesaid William made the book which is called *Piers Plowman*.¹⁰⁵

This appears to be confirmed by the narrator in *Passus XV* of the B-text: 'I have lyved in londe,' quod I, 'my name is Longe Wille.'¹⁰⁶ Additional information is provided by the 'autobiographical introduction' which occurs at the beginning of *Passus V* of the C-text (a revision and rearrangement of the B text which was completed by c. 1386).¹⁰⁷ In the following passage, the narrator defends himself against Reason's objections to the manner of life by arguing that – as an educated man – he is not obliged to perform manual labour:

When Y yong, yong was, many yer hennes,
My fader and my frendes foende me to scole
Tyl Y wyste witterly what holy writ menede,
And what is best for the body, as the boek telleth,

¹⁰³ In particular, *Piers Plowman*, B-Text, *Passus X*, ll. 406-10.

¹⁰⁴ The earliest version of *Piers Plowman* must have been written after 1362. See *Piers Plowman*, B-Text, p. xxiv.

¹⁰⁵ 'Memorandum quod Stacy de Rokayle pater willelmi de Langlond qui stacius fuit generosus et morabatur in Schptoun vnder whicwode tenens domini le Spenser in comitatu Oxoniensi qui predictus willelmus fecit librum qui vocatur Perys ploughman': *Ibid.*, p. xx. The ascription is found on folio 89b of Trinity College, Dublin MS 212 (D.4.I)

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, *Passus XV*, l. 152.

¹⁰⁷ *Piers Plowman: A New Annotated Edition of the C-Text*, ed. by Derek Pearsall (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2008), p. 112, *Passus V*, ll. 35-41.

And sykerost for the soule, by so Y wol contene.

And foend Y nere, in fayt, seth my frendes deyede.

Lyf that me lykede but in this longe clothes.

Since any autobiographical details are unable to be corroborated, and bearing in mind that they provide a certain rhetorical function within the poem, one must be wary of interpreting such reflections in a realist manner.¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, given that Langland was evidently well-versed in medieval theology, there is no need to doubt its essential veracity regarding his education. It is unclear, however, whether Langland is referring to a cathedral school or a university; a ‘scole’ might signify either. Interestingly, the poem begins in the Malvern Hills, about ten miles from the town of Bromyard, and less than twenty from Hereford:

Ac on a May morwenyng on Malverne Hilles

Me bifel a ferly, of Fairye me thoghte.¹⁰⁹

Thus, it is quite possible that Langland accessed the Summa at the Cathedral school of Hereford (or Worcester). Equally, Langland may have accessed the Summa at university. Emden does not record Langland in his biographical registers for Oxford and Cambridge. However, the records show that one of his relatives, a Benedictine monk from Norfolk called John de la Rokele, received a doctorate in Theology at Oxford in 1332-33.¹¹⁰

One final possibility remains. In spite of the antifraternality themes which pervade the poem, it is clear – as Lawrence Clopper has persuasively argued – that Langland was sympathetic to the reform of the friars. In this sense, Clopper remarks: ‘The poet’s purpose throughout the poem is to hold a mirror up to the friars couched in terms that they would

108 For a summary of the arguments over the reliability of the autobiographical section, see David Benson, *Public Piers Plowman: Modern Scholarship and Late Medieval English Culture* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), p. 86.

109 *Piers Plowman*, B-Text, Prologue, ll. 5-6.

110 Joan Greatrex, ‘Monk Students from Norwich Cathedral Priory at Oxford and Cambridge, c. 1300–1530’, *English Historical Review*, 106 (1991), 555-83 (p. 581). See also Robert Adams, ‘The Rokeles: an index for a “Langland” family history’, *The Cambridge Companion to Piers Plowman*, ed. by Andrew Cole and Andrew Galloway (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 92.

recognise as a reassertion of the ideal of Francis.¹¹¹ Clopper's further suggestion that Langland may once have been a Franciscan friar rests on much weaker foundations. Nevertheless, if Clopper is correct, Langland's life as a Franciscan may have provided him with the means of accessing the *Summa*, and would surely have informed his use of the text.

Importantly, the popularity of *Piers Plowman* – which survives in over sixty manuscripts – suggests that wider sections of the populace were implicitly exposed to Bromyard's work and ideas. Most notably, it seems clear from a letter attributed to John Ball, that the leaders of the 1381 insurgency had read the B-text, and were rallying around the figure of *Piers Plowman*:

Johon Schep som tyme seynte marie prest of 3ork. and now of colchestre. Greteth wel johan nameles and johan þe mullere and johon carter and biddeþ hem þat þei bee war of gyle in borugh and stondeþ [togidre] in godes name. and biddeþ Peres Plou3man. go to his werk. and chastise wel hobbe þe robbere. and takeþ wiþ 3ow johan trewman and alle hijs felawes, and no mo, and loke schappe 3ou to on heued, and no mo. johan þe mullere hap ygrounde smal smal smal þe kynges sone of heuene schal paye for al. be war or [3]e be wo knoweth 3our frend fro 3our foo. haueþ ynow, & seith hoo. and do wel and better, and fleth synne. and sekeþ pees and hold 3ou þer inne. and so biddeþ johan trewaman and alle his felawes.¹¹²

In addition to the references to 'Peres Plou3man' and 'do wel and better' – the latter phrases thereby demonstrating that those involved were specifically drawing on Langland's work and not merely an archetypal figure of the honest ploughman – the letter implicitly parallels Langland's concern with truth and the 'trewman'. Indeed, when the narrator in *Piers Plowman* encounters Holy Church at the beginning of the poem, he asks how he may save his soul:

'Teche me to no tresor, but tel me this ilke / How I may save my soule, that seint art yholden.' /

111 Lawrence Clopper, *Songes of Rechelesnesse: Langland and the Franciscans* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), p. 298.

112 The letter was recorded by Thomas Walsingham and may be found in an edited form in *Chronicon Angliae*, ed. Edward Maunde Thompson (London: Longman, 1874), p. 322. However, I include the version published by Steven Justice, since this is a transcription of the original manuscript source: Steven Justice, *Writing and rebellion: England in 1381* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), p. 15.

‘When alle tresors arn tried,’ quod she, ‘treuthe is the beste.’¹¹³ Piers the Plowman later appears in Passus V of the Second Vision and agrees to guide the pilgrims to St. Truth. With this in mind, and given Langland’s probable use of the Summa, the second part of this thesis seeks to shed light on Bromyard’s treatment of truth and falsity, and the implications of this. Indeed, even if it is not possible to demonstrate beyond doubt that Langland borrowed from the Summa Praedicatorum, it does provide evidence that Bromyard’s work was – at the very least – part of a widely-disseminated discourse.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored how the Summa Praedicatorum was initially disseminated, and has provided evidence of its early circulation over a wide geographical area. The prevalence of the Summa in episcopal and Benedictine hands illustrates how the text was rapidly appropriated and employed by non-Dominicans. Evidence from attestations and contemporary sermons suggests that the Summa was a popular and influential text despite the relative paucity of extant manuscripts. It was used and adapted for different purposes, and circulated in conjunction with complementary homiletic texts. Moreover, the ideas contained within the text were clearly not confined to the pulpit. The influence of the Summa on Langland’s Piers Plowman suggests that Bromyard’s voice was echoed in a wide range of social conversations. In order to explore Bromyard’s contribution to social, theological and literary discourses, part two of this thesis focusses on the chapter Falsitas, and seeks to investigate the relationship between the idea of falsity, and that of truth.

113 Piers Plowman, B-Text, Passus I, ll. 83-85.

PART 2: FALSITAS

The first part of this thesis explored the contexts behind the composition, circulation and use of the *Summa Praedicatorum*. Bromyard was evidently well-versed in the scholastic theology of his era, but he chose to reject the temptations of the ivory tower in order to follow the pastoral vocation of saving souls. Local factors clearly influenced the composition of the text, but the visibility of Bromyard's foreign travels in the *Summa* demonstrates that he was also drawing upon the traditions, concerns and ethos of the wider Dominican Order, whose roots could be found throughout Christendom. Correspondingly, the authorities employed by Bromyard reflected conventional Christian wisdom that had developed over the preceding centuries. However, Bromyard, was also a friar of his time: the type of text he composed was characteristic of the alphabetically-organised preaching compendia of the early-fourteenth century; and the selection of subject matter, anecdotes and own argumentation were indicative of somebody who was concerned with the ills of the present. Bromyard's text was subsequently circulating and being used in a period when English society was in the midst of significant disruption, most notably that caused by pestilence and demographic catastrophe, social unrest and rebellion, and Lollardy and religious dissent. Furthermore, a number of examples have demonstrated how the audience, text and authorial voice could alter and appropriate Bromyard's discourse: John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, used Bromyard to criticise the clergy in front of a lay audience; the sermoniser of British Library Royal MS 18 B. xxii miscopied one passage, and assiduously chose to ignore another in favour of a more entertaining exemplum; finally, Langland almost certainly used Bromyard as a source-book for *Piers Plowman*, but in so doing inevitably changed the authorial voice.

In the second part of this thesis, I investigate the ways in which Bromyard employed the idea of falsity: firstly, to negotiate the various meanings of truth; secondly, to explain and promote a Dominican conception of the world, and the moral behaviour consistent with that view; and thirdly, to control the legitimate dissemination of knowledge by exposing and undermining competing claims to truth. I consider the efficacy of this discourse, and engage with its implications. The relative length of the chapters *Falsitas* and *Veritas* in the *Summa* serve to

emphasise that it was the former which concerned friars such as Bromyard the most; whereas *Falsitas* covers seventeen folios in R (170r-178r), *Veritas* covers a mere six (596r-598v). The negative space of falsity was used to frame the positive object of truth.

Truth and Falsity

An early life of St Dominic, composed by Jean de Mailly in c. 1243, recounts the seminal moment which inspired Dominic to form a religious order dedicated to uprooting heresy and defending the Catholic faith by means of apostolic preaching. Diego, bishop of Osma, was travelling through the lands of the Albigensian heretics with a small retinue of clerics – including Dominic, a canon regular of the Cathedral church – when he encountered the papal legate and a council of other notable ecclesiastical figures. According to Jean de Mailly:

They [the papal legate et al] received him with honour and asked his advice on what ought to be done for the defence of the faith. On his advice, they abandoned all their splendid horses and clothes and accoutrements, and adopted evangelical poverty, so that their deeds would demonstrate the faith of Christ as well as their words; in this way they hoped to bring back to the true faith the souls which had been deluded by the heretics with their false appearance of virtue. Bishop Diego himself gave the lead in doing this, keeping only brother Dominic and a few other clerics with him; they began energetically to travel round the whole district on foot, preaching in word and deed.¹

In explaining how the world should be conceived and interpreted, designating the behaviour consistent with this conception, and persuading others of the validity of it, Dominican preachers employed the concept of falsity as an unpalatable Other which could be contrasted with truth. Those who adhered to the Dominican conception of the world were themselves identified as true, whilst those who challenged it were identified as false, labels which assigned validity and authenticity (or a lack thereof) to an individual's existence and experiences.

¹ Simon Tugwell (ed.), *Early Dominicans: Selected Writings* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1982), p. 54.

In essence, falsity was contrary to truth. Aristotle famously defined the two concepts in the following way: ‘To say of what is, that it is not, or of what is not, that it is, is false, while to say of what is, that it is, and of what is not, that it is not, is true.’² The Ancient Greek philosophers were additionally aware that propositional truth (in which the meaning of a sentence is either true or false depending on whether or not it conforms to fact and reality), could be distinguished from metaphysical truth (in which truth pertains to the authenticity or integrity of something or somebody— for example, a true friend).³ Of course, although these meanings are distinct, they are also connected, since both are concerned with the accurate conveyance of knowledge.

The relationship between truth and falsity is further complicated by the idea that fundamental truths may be found in fiction. Apollonius of Tyana, a first-century philosopher, commended the tales told by Aesop for precisely this reason:

He made use of humble incidents to teach great truths, and after serving up a story he adds to it the advice to do a thing or not to do it. Then, too, he was really more attached to truth than the poets are; for the latter do violence to their own stories in order to make them probable; but he by announcing a story which everyone knows not to be true, told the truth by the very fact that he did not claim to be relating real events. And the poet, after telling his story, leaves a healthy-minded reader cudgelling his brains to know whether it really happened; whereas one who, like Aesop, tells a story which is false and does not pretend to be anything else, merely investing it with a good moral, shows that he has made use of the falsehood merely for its utility to his audience.⁴

It is also possible to distinguish between statements which are merely false and those which are mendacious. This is reflected in the two major definitions of *falsitas* that are found in the

2 Marian David, ‘The Correspondence Theory of Truth’, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2015) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/truth-correspondence>> [accessed 14 September 2017].

3 David Wolfsdorf, ‘Plato on the Varieties of Truth and Falsity’ <<https://astro.temple.edu/~dwolfsdo/Varieties%20of%20Truth%20and%20Falsity.pdf>> [accessed 14 September 2017]. See also Wolfgang Künne, *Conceptions of Truth* (New York: Clarendon Press, 2003), p. 104.

4 Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, trans. by F.C. Conybeare, 2 vols. (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1912), I, Book V, 14 <<http://www.livius.org/sources/content/philostratus-life-of-apollonius/philostratus-life-of-apollonius-5.11-15>> [accessed 14 September 2017].

Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources (DMLBS). The first refers to an '(instance of) falsehood, untruth', or 'a (logical) fallacy'; the second refers to a person characterised by 'falseness, deceitfulness, treachery', or an act associated with a 'false deed, fraud, crime'.⁵ Thus, there was both a factual element to *falsitas* (that which is contrary to propositional truth, or the facts) and a moral element (that which is characteristic of mendacious behaviour and actions).⁶

The Latin word for truth was *veritas*, which was derived from the Indo-European *ueh1ro*. Isidore suggested that the etymology of *veratrum*, a 'poisonous or medicinal plant, hellebore' could be traced to *verare*, 'to tell the truth', on account of the use of the plant as a way to restore mental health in patients.⁷ Whilst the accuracy of this suggestion is uncertain, the qualities of *veratrum* as both poisonous and medicinal are reflected in the concept of truth. Telling the truth, and having trust in others to do so, is necessary for society to function; however, there are many occasions when the truth can be harmful, both individually and to the wider community. Societies have dealt with this dilemma in various ways, providing social mechanisms for establishing the 'truth', for specifying the circumstances and degree to which members are obliged to tell it, and correspondingly for identifying the circumstances in which members are legitimately permitted to dissemble, or actively lie; correspondingly, the extent to which individuals and groups are themselves considered 'true' members of that society often depends on how they are perceived to participate in these activities. Propositional and metaphysical truth are firmly entwined. The German sociologist and philosopher Georg Simmel suggested that very simple societies are generally more tolerant towards lying than modern societies, since the latter are more complex and are more heavily damaged by deceit; thus, social existence 'rests on a thousand premises which the single individual cannot trace and verify to their roots at all, but must take on faith.'⁸

5 'Falsitas' <<http://logeion.uchicago.edu/index.html#falsitas>> [accessed 14 September 2017].

6 Additional definitions in the DMLBS refer to specific situations involving falsity: the falsification or counterfeiting of coins, seals, documents, weights and measures; and the falsity of judgement in legal cases. The noun *falsitas* was derived from *falsus*, the perfect passive participle of the verb *fallere*, to deceive, or be mistaken; thus, the subject of the verb could either be the agent or recipient of the experience. The etymological origins of *fallere* can be traced to an Indo-European verb meaning to stumble. See Michiel de Vaan, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*, ed. by Alexander Lubotsky, Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, 7 (Boston: Brill, 2008), p. 199.

7 *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, Book XVII, ix, 24, trans. by Stephen Barney and others (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 351.

8 Quoted in Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 15.

Given this context, the concept of falsity was clearly integral to the construction of truth in Dominican texts; it thus provides a key for understanding the complexity within Bromyard's *Summa*. Since the preaching of the mendicant orders became an influential conduit for the transmission of ideas during the late Middle Ages, Bromyard's discussion also provides important evidence of how the concepts of truth and falsity functioned more widely within society. Bromyard draws on themes from biblical exegesis and the battle against heresy, but he also shows concern for more contemporary issues affecting early-fourteenth century England.

A Summary of the chapter *Falsitas*

Falsitas is the ninth longest chapter in the *Summa Praedicatorum*, covering folios 170r to 178r in the manuscript R.⁹ The chapter contains eight *articuli*, each of which develops a distinct argument. In addition, the chapter has been divided into forty-three subsections to facilitate cross-referencing; these are marked by Arabic numerals in the margins of the text.

The first article is brief, and shows how falsity commonly prevails against truth in this world. Bromyard initially describes the conflict in terms of a terrestrial battle in which the wolf is victorious over the lamb. This battle is then applied to those who attend court: judges and false assizers do not listen to the clamour of the *verax et fidelis* who is poor, but instead respond swiftly to the false man who comes with money. In this scenario, money represents the false God. Bromyard then describes the way in which a jury might be corrupted, notably by greasing the palms of the senior juror who would then corrupt others through fear, love, and false information. This section thus introduces many of the themes which feature heavily throughout the chapter: the division of society into those who are good and those who are evil; the corrosive power of avarice; and the corruption of the legal system.

The second article is the longest in the chapter and details the reasons why *falsitas* defeats *veritas*. Firstly, the battle takes place on earth, which is where falsity flourishes. Secondly, many men tend to follow leaders who can trace their lineage back to a great family – primarily because such leaders are wealthy. In this respect, falsity is descended from great stock, since its father is the devil, and its mother, cupidity. Thirdly, falsity can therefore count upon

9 See pp. 59-64.

many soldiers and retainers when battling against truth. Bromyard details a variety of mendacious and sinful behaviour which affects every segment of society, most notably criticising the commercial malpractice associated with false weights and measures. He adds that instead of truth in prayer, mercy in works and knowledge of God on earth, there are evil words, theft, adultery and lies. Correspondingly, there are far fewer true men nowadays than when the Christian religion was in its infancy. False men and liars are then compared to barren thorns for six reasons. Firstly, the false and liars are entwined and united by falsity and lying. Secondly, just as venomous creatures hide under thorns, the false are protected by the powerful. Thirdly, the good seed is unable to grow amongst the thorns; the false do not allow good men to exist amongst them, and instead attempt to pervert others to their falsity. Fourth, thorns and briars prick and wound the sheep and lambs which graze nearby, and – having bagged their prize – they lay waste and despoil. Fifth, they do not bring forth good fruit, and this is reflected in their deeds. Sixth, they are cast into the eternal flames. Bromyard then describes the cunning means through which the false deceive others. Firstly, they give their neighbours gifts and make merry with them. Secondly, they speak agreeably in the presence of others, but deceive them when their backs are turned; this is especially true of those who seek to serve two masters. Thirdly, the false are faithful to those whose help they need, but betray them whenever they no longer need them. Fourth, the false pretend to be on the same side as an enemy in order to gain their help, but as soon as they have accomplished this, they betray them. Fifth, the false attempt to divide and sow discord amongst others for their own benefit.

The third article shows how the service, friendship and society of the false is dangerous. Since they are prone to deceive others, one cannot depend on the false. It is also difficult to identify them since they dissemble and conceal their true nature. Secondly, the false corrupt and pervert others, and their falsity is contagious. In this article, there is some overlap of subject matter with articles two and seven (with regards to the importance of trust and fidelity) and article six (with regards to the identification of the false).

The fourth article illustrates the foolishness of the false. It is unsurprising the false are unfaithful to men, says Bromyard, because they are also unfaithful to God and to themselves. In the latter case, they chase worthless things and ignore valuable things; they care about goods

more than their own souls. Since they are punished severely for chasing these things, they are foolish. This article illustrates two opposing principles at play: firstly, that the false are victorious on earth, which therefore explains the presence of sin; and secondly, that the false are punished both on earth and in hell; thus despite the apparent success of falsity, one should shun it. There are, says Bromyard, more martyrs to falsity than to truth. Consequently, in spite of appearances, it is in nobody's self-interest to join the ranks of the false, and those who do so are fools.

The fifth article reveals the incorrigibility of the false. Bromyard begins on an optimistic note: 'if this falsity of evil men is able to be corrected, there is hope in their salvation.' However, he immediately cautions that 'it is hard to correct time-honoured falsity and the customary false, and they are rarely corrected. Therefore, they are saved rarely or never.'¹⁰ In essence, Bromyard portrays the false as incorrigible, dehumanises them, and advocates their punishment. Occasionally, the false appear to have been reformed, but this is an illusion. Bromyard then claims that it is far better to be ignorant, than to be wise and also false. Indeed, a false man is neither a man in a spiritual sense, nor can he rationally be called a man.

The sixth article examines the causes of falsity. According to Bromyard, there are two major reasons why people are drawn to falsity and struggle to be corrected: the first is cupidity, and the second, negligence. Cupidity is concerned with the malice of the false, and negligence with their lack of spiritual concern for others. The discussion on cupidity is short, presumably since Bromyard persistently condemns avarice and cupidity throughout the entire chapter. Much greater space, however, is devoted to the second issue, which deals with the failure to correct evil committed by others. In particular, Bromyard writes about those who – in modern parlance – might be termed medieval spin-doctors. Thus, whoever is skilled at concealing truth and is adept at colouring a situation is commended by the wicked, and is valued wise and prudent. By these means, a councillor advises his lord, informing and educating him wickedly. In the end, many false men attempt to paint vice as virtue, and virtue as a vice. Bromyard tells the story of a castellan who recently freed a criminal under the cloak of an innocent man, whilst condemning the innocent man under the cloak of the criminal. Four examples are then given concerning how

¹⁰ SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1098-1112.

powerful men in the past have punished various false individuals. Bromyard advocates that lords in his own era should inflict similar punishments, and not reward the false.

The seventh article shows the evil which comes to pass from falsity. Carrying on from the previous article, Bromyard claims that the false not only escape punishment, but are now exalted by princes and potentates with riches and honour. By exalting the false a great deal of evil occurs, both to people and property, and also to the reputation of the country. Much of this section is supported by references to Civil Law. Urged on by false councillors, lords commit many evil deeds, and wrongly appropriate the property of others. This is exemplified by the customs surrounding shipwrecked goods.

Finally, the eighth article briefly sketches out the end of the false, comparing their demise to that of Judas. An exemplum reveals how the devil always collects his debt, and Bromyard concludes by reminding his audience that God is particularly angry with false Christians, those who strive to appear good so as to more easily deceive true Christians.

A Summary of the chapter Veritas

Although this study focusses on Falsitas, I provide here a summary of the chapter Veritas (for reasons of space, however, I do not include a full transcription and translation as an appendix). Veritas is considerably shorter than Falsitas, but it contains many of the same themes, and on two occasions provides cross-references to its corresponding sister-chapter.¹¹

In total Veritas contains six articles. In the first of these, Bromyard provides a distinction of truth attributed to Jerome (although I can find no demonstrable evidence that this attribution is accurate). Truth may be of life, justice or scripture: truth of life involves subjecting the passions of the body to reason; truth of justice involves those in positions of authority making the correct judgement for others; and truth of scripture pertains to doctrinal truth. Bromyard argues that truth is useful since it liberates one from pain, and grants one eternal life. It is necessary in everything said and done, and in every friendship. Nobody trusts the person who is not true in word or deed. Bromyard then turns to the authority of Cicero, noting that there is no hope for the health of anyone who refuses to listen to truth given by a friend. It is much

11 John Bromyard, *Summa Praedicatorum*, 2 vols (Basel: Johann Amerbach, 1484), I, ff. 282r-284r.

better to earn harsh enemies than those who appear sweet, since harsh enemies often say the truth, whereas others never do so.

The second article argues that everyone is obliged to pronounce truth openly (with the exception of those acting as a confessor). This must be done without any desire for revenge. A man's intention is revealed if he has the opportunity to disclose the sin of a friend (justly, and for his friend's correction), in the same way as for one who is not his friend. If he conceals the sin of his friend, he loves carnal and not spiritual friendship. Citing canon law (derived from John Chrysostomus), Bromyard then affirms that everyone must defend truth, since he who does not defend or pronounce truth is a traitor to truth. It is impious to pass over truth in silence on account of an empty stomach or the hope of glory. It is better to obtain wounds for the sake of truth, than goods from flattery.

In the third article, Bromyard explains how truth frequently begets hate and persecution. The deceitful do not love truth: they are like the Jews, and owls who hate sunlight. They are imitators of the devil who shun truth and the true-speaking, whom they persecute and chase away. This is the case even if they were formerly friends. Bromyard recalls the example of a man who gave the following advice to somebody who was bound to a great lord and was unable to leave him: tell him the truth and you will gain your liberty quickly. Bromyard says that there are many who commend truth and the true-speaking, and yet if such truth is spoken or done to them, they murmur and complain. Correspondingly, those who seek truth pay a high price on Earth, but in death God will chase away those who have ruled over and punished them. Thus, truth will eventually conquer all, even though it is frequently destroyed in this life.

In the fourth article, Bromyard reveals how truth is frequently destroyed. There are those who forsake truth by arguing it is consistent with injustice. A harsh lord and his ministers say that excesses and injuries are just. And false merchants and usurers say the same about evil profits, and gaol custodians about those whom they afflict. These people are offended when truth is said to them either in a session or outside it, especially if somebody mentions restitution. Lords claim that they have custom, merchants argue that nobody was deceived by their dealings, and usurers say that others benefit from their activities. Since such people do not welcome truth, and because those economic with the truth are loved, flatterers turn away from truth. There are

thus fewer true-speaking men now than there used to be. Additionally, some either refuse to tell the truth, or act so that others cannot disclose it. For example, ministers of lords do not tell the truth lest they incur punishment, whilst great prelates muzzle preachers who speak against the power of pride and vanity. Many people claiming to be wise refuse to receive a single blow for truth, and yet when they lie at visitations, inquisitions, and assizes, they endanger their souls by not daring to tell the truth – even when obliged to do so by oath – lest they are beaten, slain or their houses burned down. However, they are foolish because they court the vengeance of God. Bromyard then criticises those who seek to serve two masters. He turns this into a moral about those who speak with truth, but act with falsity; their words do not match their actions. They side with one person until the power of that man's enemy is greater, and then they swap sides. Finally, Bromyard says that it is ugly when a Christian is mastered in matters of truth by a Saracen (and more generally, a non-Christian), but this is nevertheless the case. He gives the example of Aristotle who felt obliged to refute the arguments of his friend Plato, since truth was more important than friendship.

In the fifth article, Bromyard discusses those who appear to be true, but do not prove to be so. There are those who conceal many malicious deeds in their work behind words of truth. When a man's words are inconsistent with his works he is not believed. Aristotle provides the example of a man who says some delight is bad but then enjoys that delight for himself. By doing so, he provokes his listeners to follow his example rather than his words. Additionally, there are those who say they enjoy truth but are then offended when they receive it. As a caveat, Bromyard notes that one ought to tell the truth in a suitable way so as not to unduly antagonise others. He then argues that although laws may be true, they are frequently abused by those who claim to uphold them; thus, there is the appearance of truth, but not the reality.

Finally, in the sixth article Bromyard reveals the rarity of those who prove to be true. Bromyard tells a fable in which four associates reside together: fire, wind, water and truth. They wish to go their separate ways, but before they do so, each reveals where it may be found by the others if they require it: fire in stone, wind in the foliage of a quaking aspen, water next to the roots of rushes. Truth, however, confessed that it did not know where it might be found.

CHAPTER 5: THE SOURCES AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHAPTER FALSITAS

By analysing in detail how Bromyard compiled a single chapter such as Falsitas, it is possible to gain a far greater understanding of the overall composition of the Summa. The sources from which Bromyard furnished material for Falsitas reveal important clues about the resources available to him, whilst also providing a point of comparison with which to investigate how Bromyard used and manipulated authorities and exempla for his own rhetorical needs. Many (but not all) of the findings are consistent with the overall picture described in Chapter 3. Significantly, it is demonstrable that Bromyard lifted a quotation from the Manipulus Florum, a discovery which complements evidence found elsewhere in the Summa that he mined florilegia for authorities. However, certain anomalies are also apparent in Falsitas, notably Bromyard's limited use of canon law sources, and his heavy reliance on civil law for attacking specific abuses such as the customs of shipwreck. Additionally, Bromyard makes a number of allusions to contemporary events, the dates of which support the argument – put forward in Chapter 3 – that the Summa was primarily compiled in the 1320s and 1330s.¹ These incidents – alongside other clues which appear in the text – shed considerable light on Bromyard's immediate audience, and strongly suggest that he was reusing material he had composed at an earlier date.

Biblical sources

Unsurprisingly, Bromyard relied heavily on the Bible. He includes ninety-seven citations to twenty-eight distinct Biblical books. Citations sometimes precede and sometimes follow the quotations. The majority of the Biblical passages have been quoted verbatim, but there are also a number of occasions on which he inserts additional text within a quotation, or paraphrases the passage.² Bromyard cites four Biblical passages incorrectly (referring either to the wrong book or chapter).³ This may have occurred due to a subsequent scribal error, or Bromyard may have been utilising Biblical books with a slightly different layout from that which is now standard.

¹ See pp. 118-23.

² SP, Falsitas, ll. 150-52; ll. 264-67; ll. 553-55; ll. 646-49.

³ Ibid., ll. 462-65; ll. 644-45; ll. 1464-65; ll. 1878-79.

Alternatively, he may simply have misremembered, or else misread a citation taken from elsewhere.⁴ Bromyard also includes three further Biblical passages that are unattributed.⁵ Since very few of the citations given by Bromyard match those included in the Biblical concordance under key terms such as *Falsus*, it seems unlikely that he utilised such a tool.⁶ As the following table of Biblical citations shows, he depended most heavily on the Gospel of Matthew, the book of the prophet Isaias, the Psalms, the book of the prophet Jeremias, and the book of Proverbs. His choice of material is consistent with that found throughout the *Summa*, and may reflect the particular books he could access, or those he had studied in depth.

Biblical book	Number of citations
Genesis	1
Leviticus	1
Judges	2
2 Kings	4
3 Kings	5
4 Kings	1
2 Esdras	2
Esther	1
Job	1
Psalms	10
Proverbs	7
Ecclesiastes	4
Wisdom	1
Ecclesiasticus	4
Isaias	12
Jeremias	9
Osee	2

4 For the significance of memory in deployig authorities, see p. 110.

5 *SP*, *Falsitas*, ll. 913-14; ll. 1375-77; ll. 1813-15.

6 *Concordantiae Bibliorum* (Reutlingen: Michel Greyff, not after 1481) <<http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0004/bsb00041531/images/>> [accessed 16 September 2017] (folio 119).

Micheas	3
Nahum	1
Habacuc	1
1 Machabees	1
2 Machabees	2
Matthew	12
Mark	2
Luke	2
John	4
2 Timothy	1
1 John	1

In keeping with late medieval practice, the Psalms are unnumbered in both R and P.⁷ Twenty-two Biblical citations have been underlined in R, but the majority have not; a small number of Civil Law citations have also been underlined.⁸ In contrast, far fewer authorities have been underlined in P.⁹ The practice of underlining authorities would have been useful for a preacher to pick out key passages, thus allowing the chapter to function in a comparable way to a concordance. However, since R and P underline different authorities and passages it seems likely that early users of each manuscript engaged with the text in a more personal way.

Whereas Bromyard frequently cites canon law authorities in other chapters of the Summa, he only cites one canon law source in Falsitas – a reference to the Liber Sextus (formally promulgated in 1298).¹⁰ Intriguingly, this also contrasts sharply with the chapter Falsitas in the Tractatus, which contains multiple references to the Liber Extra (compiled in the 1230s).¹¹ There are a number of possibilities that may explain this: whilst composing Falsitas in the Summa, Bromyard may not have had access to canon law texts, including, by implication,

7 This contradicts Walls who claims that Bromyard numbered his Psalms in the Summa: Walls, John Bromyard, p. 50. However, the Psalms are only numbered in the printed editions of the Summa. Curiously, Wenzel says that the Psalms are numbered in the manuscript copies of the Tractatus: Wenzel, 'Bromyard's Other Handbook', p. 98, note 12.

8 For example, certain Civil law citations such as SP, Falsitas, ll. 1632-43.

9 For one of the few examples, see P, folio 156r, in which the citation to Jeremias 9 is underlined (= ll. 879-84).

10 SP, Falsitas, ll. 1489-90.

11 John Bromyard, Opus Trivium (Cologne: Ulrich Zell, 1473), folios 77v-89r.

the corresponding chapter in the Tractatus; he may not have studied the canon law texts in sufficient detail to know any appropriate canons to cite; or he may initially have composed most of *Falsitas* for a specific audience in which the use of canon law was deemed inappropriate, perhaps reusing sermon material delivered to the laity. Matters are complicated by Bromyard's use of Roman civil law, which he cites on eight occasions in *Falsitas* in the *Summa*: six of these refer to the *Codex*; one refers to a Constitution of the Emperor Frederick II (1194-1250) taken from the *Authenticum*; and one refers to the *Digestum novum*. However, in both the *Summa* and the *Tractatus*, Bromyard discusses divergent interpretations regarding the nature of property by referring to the contrasting opinions of the twelfth-century Bolognese lawyers, Azo and Bulgarus.¹² The duplication of material suggests that one text was borrowing from the other. As I have already suggested in Chapter 1, it seems likelier that the *Tractatus* was incorporating material found in the *Summa*, rather than vice versa.¹³

Leaving aside the relationship between these two texts, and focussing once again on the chapter in the *Summa*, Bromyard includes eight non-Biblical, non-legal citations. In one of these Bromyard attributes a quotation to Augustine concerning the *Civitas Dei*. However, the quotation does not come directly from any of Augustine's works; instead, Bromyard appears to have lifted it from the *Manipulus Florum* in which it may be found, attributed to Augustine, under the chapter *Gloria Eterna*. A comparison of the passage in the two texts illustrates this:

Manipulus Florum	Summa Praedicatorum
In ciuitate dei rex veritas, lex caritas, dignitas equitas, pax felicitas, vita eternitas. Sed in ciuitate dyaboli econtra rex falsitas, lex cupiditas, dignitas iniquitas, lis felicitas, vita temporalitas. ¹⁴	In ciuitate inquit dei rex est veritas scilicet in celo, et eciam in congregacione fidelium, lex caritas dignitas equitas, pax felicitas, vita eternitas. Sed in ciuitate diaboli, id est, in congregacione falsorum rex est falsitas, lex cupiditas, dignitas iniquitas, lis felicitas, vita temporalitas. ¹⁵

¹² SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1573-85. See also *Opus Trivium*, folio 78v.

¹³ See pp. 51-55.

¹⁴ 'Gloria Eterna', *Manipulus Florum* <<http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/MFfontes/GloriaEternaP.pdf>> [accessed 30 August 2017].

¹⁵ SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 121-28.

Ultimately, the passage may be derived from a letter Augustine had composed in c. 413, prior to writing *De Civitate Dei*. The excerpt in question runs thus (and I leave it in the Latin original so that a comparison may be made with the passages above):

...deus enim sic ostendit in opulentissimo et praeclaro imperio Romanorum, quantum ualerent ciuiles etiam sine uera religione uirtutes, ut intellexeretur hac addita fieri homines ciues alterius ciuitatis, cuius modus aeternitas.¹⁶

Bromyard does not cite all his sources. When he describes how briars and thorns prick and strip the wool from the sheep and lamb grazing amongst them, he is borrowing material – uncited – from his fellow Dominican, William Peraldus (c. 1190-1271). Identical language associated with this imagery occurs in three distinct texts composed by Peraldus: a Palm Sunday sermon, the *Summae Virtutum ac Vitiorum* and also in *De Eruditione Principum*.¹⁷

Additionally, Bromyard includes a number of narrative exempla in the chapter. Four of these are marked in the margins of R with ‘narr’, an abbreviation of *narratio*: a tale about a duplicitous horse-dealer; the dogs at war; the marriage of an ugly daughter; and a dishonest gaoler.¹⁸ Bromyard appears to have collected his exempla and fabulae from a variety of sources. For example, whilst describing the tricks employed by the false, he recounts the story of the wolves who manage to persuade hounds of the same colour to join forces with them. This story derives from the *Aesopica*, the corpus of fables attributed to Aesop (d. 564 BC), although it probably originated with the second-century Hellenized Roman, Babrius.¹⁹ It also appears in a sermon composed by Jacques de Vitry (d. 1240). Bromyard does not mention the source of this

16 Augustine, *Epistulae*, 138.3, ed. by A. Goldbacher, CSEL, 44 (Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1904), pp. 144-45. The letter from which the excerpt originates had been sent by Augustine to Marcellinus, a Roman official who had been sent to North Africa to investigate the Donatist controversy. It was one of a number of letters exchanged between Augustine, Marcellinus, and another Roman official, Volusianus, which circulated as a set during the Middle Ages. See James O'Donnell, ‘Augustine’s epistula 151’ <<http://faculty.georgetown.edu/jod/augustine/151intro.html>> [accessed 30 August 2017].

17 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 567-70. William Peraldus (wrongly ascribed to Thomas Aquinas) ‘*De eruditione principum*’ in Thomas Aquinas, *Opuscula Omnia* (Venice: Girolamo Scotto, 1587), Book II, Ch. 9, p. 420; Peraldus, ‘*Dominica in Ramis Palmarum. Sermo tertius*’, *Homelieae sive Sermones* (Lyon: Charles Pesnot, 1576), p. 104; Peraldus, ‘*De superbia*’, *Summae Virtutum ac Vitiorum*, 2 vols (Paris: Peter Billaine, 1629) II, Ch. 6, p. 247.

18 These are: the duplicitous horse-dealers (ll. 656-83); dogs at war (ll. 772-98); the marriage of an ugly daughter (ll. 1281-88); the gaoler changes tunics (ll. 1388-1400).

19 *Aesop’s Fables*, trans. by Laura Gibbs, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 32.

tale, but he does cite both Aesop and Jacques de Vitry on other occasions in the *Summa*.²⁰

Additionally, Bromyard's tale of the duplicitous horse-dealer is also found in one of Jacques de Vitry's sermons. In this exemplum, the cosour (horse-dealer) winks ambiguously at both the buyer and seller. Thus, he may tell whoever received the bad deal that he tried to warn him, and whoever received the good deal that he tipped him off in advance.²¹

Bromyard includes further exempla which pose interesting questions regarding how he acquired his material, and the extent to which he altered it. In the second article, he compares the divide-and-conquer tactics of the false with a conflict that happened in Genoa between the family of the Spinola and those of the Aurea (also known as Doria). This is problematic since the Spinola and Doria were generally allies who sided with the Ghibellines (a faction which supported the Holy Roman Emperor) in opposition to the Guelphs (a faction which supported the Pope).²² Bromyard may have misremembered or misunderstood his source, but it is possible that he is recalling a detail – gained perhaps on his travels to Italy – now unknown to us. Given that the two families were nominally allies, it would have been in the interests of the opposing political faction to divide this alliance apart, although it is unclear in the *Summa*, whether Bromyard considers the two families to be natural allies or enemies.

Elsewhere, Bromyard includes a story of Alexander the Great executing the murderers of Darius, the Persian Emperor. According to Bromyard, the tale may be read in the *Gesta Alexandri*, by which he probably means the *Alexandreis*, a version of the Alexander romance which was composed by the twelfth-century French theologian Walter of Châtillon.²³ Interestingly, Bromyard's use of the tale diverges from the *Alexandreis*, and indeed, other historical sources. According to Bromyard, Alexander encouraged the murderers of Darius to reveal themselves by promising them the leadership of their ancestral lands; he then executed them because the murder of their lord, Darius, proved that they could not be trusted. In contrast, Walter tells the following story: when Alexander invaded the Persian Empire, Darius fled, and

20 See p. 10, n. 35.

21 Crane (ed.), *Exempla*, pp. 129, 268, no. cccix.

22 G.B. Malleon, *Studies from Genoese History* (London: Longmans, 1875), pp. 168-256, 194-313.

23 This was the most widely circulated Alexander romance in the Middle Ages and was alternatively titled the *Gesta Alexandri*. It is based on Quintus Curtius Rufus' *Historia Alexandri Magni*. For the relevant episodes, see Walter Chatillon, *The Alexandreis: A Twelfth-Century Epic*, trans. by David Townsend (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996), pp. 115-30, 141-42.

in the panic was murdered by his relative, Bessus, and a fellow conspirator called Narbazanes. Bessus subsequently assumed the title of king, and his army continued to threaten Alexander's ambitions in the East. Indeed, Alexander used the threat as a pretext to prevent his army from returning home, a possibility which would have hindered Alexander's desire to extend his Empire. Bessus was soon captured by the Macedonian forces, and executed. Narbazanes, however, had surrendered to Alexander and was pardoned; unlike Bessus, he did not wish to succeed to the Persian throne. Thus, although Alexander condemned Bessus as a parricide, he was primarily concerned with the threat Bessus posed, rather than his earlier treachery. Therefore, Bromyard – or his intermediary source – has altered the original material to illustrate a very different moral.

Bromyard also recounts a version of the famous story involving Fabricius and Pyrrhus which he attributes to the *Gesta Romanorum*, a collection of tales compiled about the end of the thirteenth century; the story does not appear in the early printed editions of the *Gesta* although the manuscripts are known to have included a wide variation of material.²⁴ However, the tale can be found in the standard Roman histories by authors such as Livy, Gellius and Plutarch. In the early third century BC, a Roman army, led by Fabricius, was in conflict with a Greek force, led by Pyrrhus. The personal physician of Pyrrhus came to the Romans and said he was willing to poison his lord. Instead of accepting the offer, Fabricius returned the physician to Pyrrhus with a warning about what had transpired.²⁵

In several other narrative exempla, Bromyard employs the word *nuper* (recently) to introduce the tales, rather than by reference to a written authority.²⁶ There does not appear to be a correlation between these tales and factual veracity. In one of them, Bromyard tells a tale of the devil – in the guise of a red-haired boy – taking a man whom he had lent money back to hell.²⁷ In another, he recounts an incident in which a man petitions for a friend held in gaol; the gaoler then responds that he would act to free him even if held two stolen oxen in front of the

24 There were great variations in the tales included in the manuscript copies of the *Gesta Romanorum*. However, this tale does not appear in the Paris printed edition of 1503. See Walls, p. 137.

25 For the history behind this see P.R. Franke, 'Pyrrhus' in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Volume 7, Part 2: *The Rise of Rome to 220 BC*, ed. by F.W. Walbank, et al (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 456-85.

26 *SP*, *Falsitas*, ll. 140; 1390; 1441; 1798; 1897.

27 *Ibid.*, ll. 1902-34.

judge.²⁸ He also uses *nuper* on three further occasions to introduce examples: firstly, he tells the tale of a gaoler who swaps the clothes and names of a guilty man with an innocent man in order to wrongly free one and hang the other;²⁹ secondly, in order to show that a ruler should not trust a subordinate who has deceived the ruler's enemy, he tells the story of an imperial count who, after having received an enemy town through the treachery of one of the townsman, exiled that man from his lands;³⁰ and thirdly, whilst discussing the injustice of customs surrounding shipwrecks he explains how a widow of a shipwrecked man was recently unable to regain some tallies from the wreck.³¹ In general, Bromyard sets examples of bad behaviour in the recent past, whilst good examples tend to have happened long ago. In doing so, he perpetuates the myth of the Golden Age, whilst also highlighting the ills of the present.³²

On two occasions Bromyard alludes to contemporary events. In the first, he says that there are many who make fickle friendships with lords as it was earlier revealed in England (*sicud dudum patuit in Anglia*). When their lords had been incarcerated, or suffered exile, these men joined themselves to their enemies, promising fidelity. However when their former lords came back, these men turned themselves on those with whom they had associated in the interim. On the second occasion, Bromyard remarks that it would be better if modern lords treated false traitors in the same way as previous leaders such as Alexander, rather than relying on false councillors. Given that Bromyard was writing in the first half of the fourteenth century, he appears to be alluding to events in the reign of Edward II. On separate occasions Edward II was forced to exile his favourites, first of all Gaveston (exiled in 1301 and 1311), and then Despenser (exiled in 1321). It seems likely that Bromyard is referring to the latter incident. The Despenser family held lands in the vicinity of Hereford, and Bromyard makes a number of allusions to Hugh Despenser the Younger throughout the *Summa*, most notably to Despenser's

28 *Ibid.*, ll. 140-45.

29 *Ibid.*, ll. 1390-1400

30 *Ibid.*, ll. 1440-49.

31 *Ibid.*, ll. 1798-1805.

32 The origins of this idea may be traced to the late sixth century BC works of Hesiod which described the Golden Age as a time of peace and happiness. These ideas and imagery flourished in classical thought and literature. Lactantius (rhetorician and teacher of Emperor Constantine's son) Christianised the myth, implicitly suggesting that the Golden Age could be identified with the garden of Eden. Lactantius emphasised the importance of avarice in bringing this age to an end, and that the worship of a pantheon of Gods led to unjust laws and injustice. Nevertheless, the emergence of Christianity was responsible for a slight return to 'illius auri temporis'. See Richard Newhauser, *The Early History of Greed: The Sin of Avarice in Early Medieval Thought and Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 19.

execution which took place in Hereford in 1326.³³ After Despenser had been exiled in 1321, he was allowed to return in 1322. During the intervening time, there were no doubt many incidents characterised by the dubious loyalty condemned by Bromyard. In some situations, those swearing oaths to new lords must have been under considerable duress. When, for example, Edmund FitzAlan, ninth earl of Arundel, failed to support the Marcher coalition against the Despensers in 1321, Roger Mortimer seized FitzAlan's lordship of Clun (located in south Shropshire, just over 30 miles from Hereford) and immediately took fealty and homage of its men.³⁴ Bromyard's gaze may actually have been fixed on FitzAlan himself. In February 1321, FitzAlan's son, Richard, was married to Isabella, daughter of Hugh Despenser the Younger. Even so, after considerable pressure, FitzAlan supported the exile of the Despensers in August 1321. However, he then played an important part in their return, and was later one of the judges who sentenced Thomas of Lancaster to death in 1322.³⁵ In this murky political world, Bromyard suggests that such men are compared to the most dangerous dogs, those who advance quickly as if they plan no harm – without barking and with their tail dropped – before they kill.

Bromyard also includes three proverbs in the text: [1] 'Prouerbium est quod in propria patria vacca fugat bouem, sicud et cetera',³⁶ [2] 'Iuxta prouerbium mala herba cito crescit',³⁷ [3] 'Dicitur in proverbio gallicano quod vnus denarius male lucratus omnes alios deuorat'.³⁸ I have not been able to trace the origins of the first and third proverb. However, according to the Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs, an 'Ill weeds grow apace' can be traced to a fourteenth century French proverb, 'male herbe croist'.³⁹ The earliest reference in the English vernacular is to c. 1470: 'in Wyl[d] weed ys sone y-growe'.⁴⁰ Interestingly, the Latin form employed by Bromyard actually occurs in two much earlier sources. The first is found in the Ordinary Gloss of the Codex compiled by Accursius (1182-1263), in book two, under the title: 'De his qui veniam

33 Owst, *Literature and Pulpit*, pp. 302-03; Walls, *John Bromyard*, pp. 238-42. For the historical background see Seymour Phillips, *Edward II* (London: Yale University Press, 2010), pp. 516-18.

34 Rees Davies, *Lords and Lordship in the British Isles in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 79.

35 John Maddicott, *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1322: A Study in the Reign of Edward II* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970); C. Given-Wilson, 'Fitzalan, Edmund, second earl of Arundel (1285-1326)', ODNB, (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9529>> [accessed 18 Sept 2017].

36 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 161-62: 'There is a proverb that in its own land the cow chases off the ox, et cetera.'

37 *Ibid.*, ll. 259-62: 'According to the proverb "an ill weed grows apace."'

38 *Ibid.*, ll. 1864-66: 'It is said in a French Proverb, that one penny badly gained, curses all the others.'

39 Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs, ed. by John Simpson and Jennifer Speake (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 162.

40 *Ibid.*

aetatis impetrauerunt.⁴¹ The passage is concerned with the age at which a young person was permitted to administer any family estates which had been bequeathed to him or her. Whilst women were permitted to do so after their eighteenth year, men were only able to do so after their twentieth year. The gloss considers why a woman should gain something more quickly than a man, and employs the phrase ‘mala herba cito crescit’ to characterise a deceitful and avaricious woman who grows-up quickly.⁴² Secondly, the phrase occurs in a mirror of princes, *De Regimine Principum*, composed by Giles of Rome between 1277 and 1280. The phrase ‘proverbialiter dicitur quod mala herba cito crescit’ can be found in chapter 23 of the first part of the second book.⁴³

In keeping with the tri-lingual society of fourteenth-century England, Bromyard inserts four French phrases within the chapter.⁴⁴ He also includes two English words: the first, ‘wrek’, refers to *wreccum maris*, the royal prerogative concerning wrecks of the sea; the second, ‘weupe’, seems to be a scribal corruption (or derivative) of ‘weif’, the Middle English word for ‘waif’, since the surrounding text refers to lost animals.⁴⁵ In addition to these vernacular words and phrases, Bromyard uses scholastic vocabulary associated with philosophy, notably when talking about *probacio minoris* (proof of the minor premise), *species* (an Aristotelian subcategory of *genus*) and *differentia* (the quality distinguishing a thing from others in the same *genus*).⁴⁶ Quite clearly, Bromyard was conversant with the language of Aristotle.

Falsitas also contains thirty-nine cross references to other chapters in the *Summa*. Those referring to chapters alphabetically preceding *Falsitas* are most commonly introduced by the phrase ‘sicud patet’; those referring to chapters after *Falsitas* are introduced by ‘nota’. The only exceptions are two references to *Tribulatio* which are introduced by ‘sicud patet’ and ‘sicud ille’. Given the content of *Tribulatio*, it seems likely that much of that chapter had been written in the

41 Codex Iustiniani (Paris: Guillaume Merlin, 1559), Book II, Title 45, p. 385.

42 ‘Quare minori tempore impetrat mulier quam masculus? Resp. mala herba cito crescit, et citius est subdola mulier et auara vt ff. ad velle l. sed si ego in fin et hoc ratione non probat morum instituta quia sagacior praesumitur’: *ibid.*

43 Giles of Rome, *De Regimine Principum* (Venice: Bernardino Viani, 1502), II. I, Chapter 23 (page numbers are not provided). This was very successful and is still conserved in more than 300 manuscripts in the original Latin; there are many translations in European vernaculars.

44 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 41; 249; 378-82; 705-06.

45 *Ibid.*, l. 1761; ‘Weif’, MED, <<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED52024>> [accessed 12 September 2017].

46 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1068; 1166-69.

immediate aftermath of the famine years, 1315-1317.⁴⁷ Bromyard's use of the distinct phrases may be evidence that the majority of the *Summa* was composed in alphabetical order and that the words 'sicud patet' were used to refer to episodes that Bromyard had already written, whilst 'nota' was used after Bromyard had finished the entire work when adding citations to earlier chapters of passages recorded in later chapters.

Intriguingly, there is evidence that Bromyard constructed *Falsitas* from several different texts he had already composed. The second article is by far the longest in the chapter, and it possesses several characteristics which suggest it may have originally been composed as (or contained material in) an actual sermon. Firstly, it includes ideas and material covered in other articles, such as the dangers of proximity to the false, the ways in which the false incline others to falsity, the bad things which occur, and the end of the false; this duplication suggests the article may have been composed separately and then reused. Secondly, the article contains a number of distinct subsections which resemble the amplification of members of a division of a sermon; six of these compare the false to thorns, and a further five deal with the tricks of the false. During this article, Bromyard also notes that the anecdote concerning unfaithful men who profess fidelity to the enemies of their banished lords, but then renege on this when their lords return from exile (as mentioned above), occurred in Anglia. It is plausible that Bromyard mentions these events were happening in England because he was delivering a sermon for a foreign audience.

Bromyard duplicates material in several other articles of *Falsitas*. The fifth article deals with incorrigibility, but in the sixth Bromyard includes a reference to the *Liber Sextus* – 'Semel malus semper presumitur malus' (once bad, always presumed bad) – rather than referring to the previous article. In contrast, articles six and seven appear to be linked; the end of the sixth article encourages rulers not to honour false men, whilst the seventh article deals with the way in which contemporary rulers honour false councillors, notably in their treatment of shipwrecks. However, both of these articles include the Biblical citation, *Isaias 10*, 'Ve qui condunt leges iniquas' (Woe to them that make wicked laws).

47 Seymour Phillips, *Edward II* (London: Yale University Press, 2010), pp. 252-53; John Maddicott, *The English Peasantry and the Demands of the Crown, 1294-1341*, (Oxford: Past and Present Society, 1975), pp. 69-75; Ian Kershaw 'The Great Famine and the Agrarian Crisis in England, 1315-1322', *Past & Present*, 59, 1 (1973), 3-50 (pp. 6-16).

In other articles there is further evidence concerning the delivery of material, and the intended audience. In article eight, Bromyard warns the false that they shall be placed in the same gaol as the man who could not pay back his loan to the devil. For that reason, says Bromyard, ‘I say most deeply’ (*ideo dico profundissimo*) that they shall be placed under the Saracens and infidels.⁴⁸ This is one of the few occasions on which Bromyard writes in the first person, giving an indication of the passage actually being spoken.

A little later Bromyard says that God is more angry at false Christians who strive to appear good, and says that such men are accustomed to speak in a holy manner whilst in a private collacio, claiming that they never commit a single falsity, nor permit anyone of theirs to commit one. They bewail the condition of false men when a sermon on falsity is delivered, but their actions demonstrate their hypocrisy.⁴⁹ Quite clearly, Bromyard had a clerical audience in mind for this particular passage.

The most obvious occasion for preaching a sermon on falsity would have been on the eighth Sunday after Trinity, when the theme was frequently Matthew 7. 15: ‘Beware of false prophets that come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.’ Interestingly, although Bromyard cites Matthew, chapter 7, on three occasions in *Falsitas*, he does not employ this particular passage. Since the verse was traditionally used for the denunciation of heretics, its omission is perhaps indicative that this had yet to become a significant issue in England.

A few final remarks may be made concerning the abridged version of *Falsitas* which appears in O and C.⁵⁰ Articles four, five, and seven have been omitted, whilst the remaining articles have been shortened with significant blocks of text omitted. The introductory paragraph has been amended to state that there are four articles in the chapter, corresponding to the titles of the first, second, third and eighth articles; however, within the chapter a significant amount of the sixth article has been retained. The beginnings and ends of articles are not marked in the text. About half the material of the first article has been abridged, mostly from the middle. The majority of the second article has been omitted; however, the reference to recent events ‘in

48 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1946-48.

49 Ibid., ll. 1954-60.

50 See also pp. 71-77.

Anglia' is included, whilst the passage criticising the activities of unjust lords who employ subordinates to commit falsity has been omitted. In the third article, a section criticising flatterers is not included, but the section attacking false Christians remains. The third article ends with the false striving to pervert others, and is followed by material from the sixth article. Interestingly, Bromyard's extended defence of holy men who are wrongly accused of hypocrisy has been omitted. The four examples which demonstrate that lords should punish rather than honour false subordinates has been retained, but the reference to modern lords has not. In the final article, the exemplum concerning the red-haired boy is included, whilst criticism of the hypocrisy of the clergy is not. Neither manuscript includes marginal annotations for *Falsitas*, although some passages are underlined in C. Caution must be used when interpreting the redaction of this material, but the omission of passages concerning the hypocrisy of the clergy may be indicative of the more volatile climate of the latter part of the fourteenth century, in which there was growing reticence to discuss issues of clerical misbehaviour whilst preaching.

Conclusion

By discussing the sources used by Bromyard, it has been possible to identify the ways in which the chapter *Falsitas* reflected (and was acting as a conduit for) an existing discourse. In order to examine how Bromyard utilised and altered this material for different circumstances, and how the early audience engaged with, adapted and appropriated this discourse, it is now necessary to explore three themes in greater detail.

CHAPTER 6: TRUTH AND FALSITY

In *Veritas*, Bromyard distinguishes truth by life, justice, and scripture. Implicitly, *Falsitas* deals with the three opposite characteristics, namely a sinful life, injustice and false doctrine. In so doing, Bromyard employs the discourse of falsity to promote and defend the validity of the Dominican world view, and encourage those within this world to act accordingly. In this chapter, I explore how Bromyard uses the idea of falsity to negotiate the various characteristics of a true life, and how this proves to be problematic for the coherence of the discourse. The depiction of society as a battle between two mutually hostile sides, the true and the false, is integral to Bromyard's discussion. By sinning, the false demonstrate their infidelity to God, which thus provides the rationale for their identification as false. Conversely, fidelity is a fundamental characteristic of truth; a faithful man is a true man, and a true man is faithful. Nevertheless, although Bromyard praises fidelity, he also criticises the *unitas* of the false, since solidarity hinders their correction. In order to demonstrate the illegitimacy of this unity, Bromyard emphasises the weak foundations on which it is based, the fickle self-interest which ensures that the false can never be trusted. In effect, however, Bromyard engages with the difficulty of competing claims to loyalty. It was not simply the idea of fidelity which was at stake, but to whom it was primarily owed. Bromyard also associates falsity more specifically with deceitful words and deeds. In unequivocally condemning mendacity Bromyard was following theological orthodoxy. Critically, however, the fundamental obligation to tell the truth was complicated by the fidelity owed to others, the harm that might accrue, and the utility of deceiving one's enemies. In this regard, Bromyard is not sympathetic to the casuistical thought which was developing in this period (particularly in the context of confession), which sought to reconcile ethical dilemmas by permitting forms of deceit in specific circumstances. This, I suggest, is primarily because preachers were keen to emphasise the clear distinctions between true and false, good and bad, and avoid focussing on the exceptional cases which might complicate such a position, and which might provide bad examples for others to follow; in contrast, material for confessors dealt with ethical dilemmas that were presently occurring and which could not be avoided. Even so, in spite of Bromyard's antipathy towards those who sought to justify

deceptive behaviour, on one occasion he himself implicitly advocates the use of a deceptive ploy, thus undermining the integrity of his argument. The idea of a true life is further complicated by Bromyard's identification of fidelity and telling the truth with being true. Significantly, at the same time Bromyard was making this association, the vernacular word *treuth* – originally meaning (something akin to) integrity, and thus a form of metaphysical truth – began to additionally denote propositional (or factual) truth. Given the conflicting impulses affecting fidelity and telling the truth, there were many dangers to one's integrity. However, although the association of propositional and metaphysical truth complicated the idea of *treuth*, it did not undermine its fundamental significance within the volatile arena of fourteenth-century society.

Two antithetical communities

The battle between truth and falsity which forms the basis of Bromyard's discourse is explicitly modelled on the two antithetical communities described in Augustine's *City of God*, a text which remained influential throughout the Middle Ages.¹ This conception of human society was given renewed impetus by the revival of popular heretical movements from the eleventh century onwards; by the late twelfth century, those labelled as heretics were increasingly perceived in scholarly and theological works as a single Other, regardless of the various (and sometimes) contradictory views they held, the behaviour which they exhibited, and the way in which they identified themselves.² The tendency to perceive the world in binary terms was also influenced by the rise of the Cathedral schools in the twelfth century, and the universities in the thirteenth. Study primarily revolved around the dialectic method, in which two opposing views were contrasted in order to establish the truth; the universities also placed significant emphasis on the study of logic, in which the aim was to demonstrate whether a proposition was either true or

1 Gerard O'Daly, *Augustine's City of God: A Reader's Guide* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 53-66. Indeed, the origins of this idea were much older, and the imagery of two antithetical cities (notably Jerusalem and Babylon) appears in a number of biblical books. For Augustine's later influence, see Eric L. Saak, 'Augustine in the Western Middle Ages to the Reformation' in *A Companion to Augustine*, ed. by Mark Vessey (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), pp. 465-77.

2 For an overview of these developments see Robert Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950-1250* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), and Robert Moore, *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe* (London: Profile, 2012). See also John H. Arnold, *Belief and Unbelief in Medieval Europe* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), who explores the various beliefs and identities which lay beneath (and within) this artificial, binary division.

false, one or the other.³ The displacement of monasteries as centres of learning by the schools and universities, and the separation of theology and philosophy into distinct disciplines was responsible for another (and to some extent contradictory) shift in the conception of truth.⁴

Writing in the 1080s (and heavily influenced by Neoplatonic thought), the Benedictine monk Anselm claimed that only a single Truth was possible since truth referred to the extent to which something was consistent with God; asking whether there was one or many truths was like asking whether there were many ‘rightnesses’ by which an action might be judged correct.⁵ Scholastic theologians, however, tended to adopt a different approach. Aquinas, for example, argued that all things are true if they conform to the divine truth, but they are also true if they conform to the senses and human intellect.⁶ A distinction may therefore be made between ‘Anselmian’ theologians who viewed truth in terms of the relationship between something and God, and those of a more philosophical bent, who tended to consider a thing in regards to the specific characteristics that belong to its nature. Thus, although the universities encouraged individuals to perceive the world in binary terms, at the same time they provided a more pluralistic way of understanding truth and falsity.

Writing as a preacher rather than a scholar, Bromyard primarily engages with the Anselmian understanding of these terms.⁷ Although he does not explicitly define falsity, Bromyard implies that it covers all forms of sinful behaviour, noting that: ‘Falsity has the greatest multitude of retainers, since there are few who do not commit falsity against God or man on some point, indulging and sinning in many ways against God.’⁸ Those who engage in this behaviour are identified as belonging to the false. Thus, says Bromyard (whom I now paraphrase), there are no longer merciful works, since who now freely lends to one in need, foregoing his own superfluous desires, to supply the wants of the needy? Instead of knowledge

3 The method gained prominence in Abelard’s early-twelfth century text *Sic et non*, and was used in Gratian’s *Decretum*. According to Robert Moore, ‘By the 1140s...the masters of Paris were perfecting the technique of expounding the essentials of the catholic faith by systematically rebutting propositions contrary to them, which were often placed in the mouths of fictitious opponents’: Moore, *The War on Heresy*, p. 169.

4 Dallas Denery, *The Devil Wins: A History of Lying from the Garden of Eden to the Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), p. 132.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 128. See also Katherin Rogers, *The Neoplatonic Metaphysics and Epistemology of Anselm of Canterbury* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen, 1997).

6 Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestiones Disputate de Veritate*, Q. 1, Art. 10. <<http://www.corpusthomicum.org/qdv01.html>> [accessed 12 September 2017].

7 However, on occasion Bromyard refers to *veritates* and *falsitates*. See SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 192; 542; 1520; 1523; 1881.

8 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 197-202.

of God, there is worldly knowledge and profit. Evil speech is everywhere, and is especially prevalent amongst the powerful. Theft is ubiquitous since there is scarcely a single man who lives by his own property. Adultery is also common, since more men love mistresses than their own wives. And finally, lying, which is clearly very lucrative, occurs in every conceivable way.⁹ By equating all sin with falsity, Bromyard is essentially following in the tradition of Augustine who argued that falsehood involved living in a way which did not conform with how we were created.¹⁰ Indeed, says Bromyard, by acting falsely against God, the false reveal the greatest idiocy, since although they might be able to conceal knowledge of their falsity and evade vengeance if they are false against men, by committing falsity against God through sinning, they are unable to conceal their falsity and avoid retribution.¹¹

Two contradictory rhetorical effects are evident in Bromyard's approach. On the one hand, the differences between distinct acts and those who commit them are downplayed. Bromyard therefore associates all forms of sinning with the most entrenched social abuses, resulting in a wide label covering many acts and assigned to many people. Therefore, any false act or person becomes a variant, or species, of the worst kind of falsity, rather than a distinct entity. However, since a variety of bad behaviour is placed under the banner of falsity, there is a possibility that the strength of the criticism is diluted. Indeed, in the prologue, Bromyard is clearly aware of the danger posed by such generalisation, noting that, 'examples are to be applied against particular vices, because words against general vices move and fly to a much lesser extent towards the ears.'¹² This contradiction is not entirely resolved in the chapter, but Bromyard does mitigate some of the effects by delving more deeply into the specific characteristics associated with falsity.

Unitas and Fidelitas

According to Bromyard, when the Samaritans and those abandoned out of the ten tribes begged Alexander the Great for his protection, promising him fidelity, Alexander responded, 'In which

9 Ibid., ll. 264-85.

10 Augustine, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, ed. and trans. by R.W. Dyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), book 14, chapter 4, pp. 584-88.

11 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1005-12.

12 SP, *Prologus*, ll. 121-24.

way...can you be faithful to me, who were always unfaithful to God, who did greater for you than I am able to do?'¹³ The story is illustrative of the way Bromyard associates those who betray God by sinning with those who would betray their fellow man. Thus, he remarks: 'Neither must it be wondered that the false are unfaithful to men, on account of two reasons, in which their greatest idiocy is revealed. First, because they are unfaithful to God. Second, because they are unfaithful to themselves.'¹⁴ Correspondingly, throughout the chapter, *veritas* is identifiable with *fidelitas*, and *falsitas* with *infidelitas*. However, in order to explain why the false are so successful, and how they resist correction, Bromyard also condemns the strength of their unity. This is problematic, since there are clear parallels between the idea of *fidelitas* which Bromyard commends, and that of *unitas*, which he criticises. This issue is never explicitly confronted, but there is a suggestion that since the false are motivated by cupidinous self-interest and the desire to avoid harm, such unity is essentially fickle and cannot be relied upon. Even so, this explanation is only partially effective; it essentially relies upon the contradiction that the false refuse to betray each other (regardless of motive, and whether it might save the eternal soul of such a person), and yet are inherently untrustworthy.

In the second article Bromyard notes that the multitude of false men accomplish little against truth, unless they are united amongst each other and in agreement for harming true men. In this way, Herod and Pilate bound themselves together by agreement and friendship for the persecution of Christ. After all, it is only advantageous to have a great force if all are in agreement and united. As a result of their unity, says Bromyard, false men are aptly compared to thorns and thistles, firstly because thorns are entwined with each other in such a way that if you wish to divide or extract one from the others, you are lacerated by the others and prevented from doing so.¹⁵ 'The society of the false is allied thus, and in conspiracies and with mutual support they are entwined, so that scarcely a faithful man or even the greatest and true justiciars themselves, who are sent to enquire about such conspirators and other unjust men, are able to shatter their blade, or lead them back to truth, or correct some of them.'¹⁶ The conspiracy to

13 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1000-03.

14 *Ibid.*, ll. 983-87.

15 *Ibid.*, ll. 347-53.

16 *Ibid.*, ll. 353-60.

which Bromyard refers had a specific legal meaning. A 1305 ordinance defined it in the following terms:

Conspirators be they that do confeder or bind themselves by oath, covenant, or other alliance, that every of them shall aid and [bear] the other falsely and maliciously to indite, [or cause to indite] or falsely to move or maintain pleas; and also such as cause children within age to appeal men of felony, whereby they are imprisoned and sore grieved; and such as retain men in the country with liveries or fees for to maintain their malicious enterprises and this extendeth as well to the takers, as to the givers; and stewards and bailiffs of great lords, which by their seignory, office, or power, undertake [to bear or maintain quarrels, pleas, or debates, that concern other parties] than such as touch the estate of their lords or themselves.¹⁷

This picture of endemic corruption is explicable in terms of the ties of lordship which formed part of the fabric of late-medieval society. A magnate's power derived from his household, estates and affinity.¹⁸ At the centre of the affinity was a group of indentured men retained for service by means of a written contract, who, in return, received monetary fees and annuities. Additionally, these retainers could also expect to receive support from their patrons in the form of livery (acting as a visual representation of power and prestige) and more direct forms of protection.¹⁹ The 1305 ordinance noted that those involved retain men in the country with liveries or fees (receivent gentz de pais a leur robes ou a leur feez). Bromyard uses exactly the same language, remarking that since the powerful are unable to commit various evil acts

17 'Conspiratours sont ceux qui sentre alient p' s'ment covaunt ou p' autre alliaunce, qe chescun eidra & sustendra aut emp'se de fausement & malicieusement enditer ou faire enditer, ou fausement acq'ter les gentz, ou fausement mover plees, ou meintenir; et auxi ceux q' fount enfauntz deintz age appeler la gent de felonies p' quei il sont emp'sonez & moult g'vez; Et ceux q' receivent gentz de pais a leur robes ou a leur feez, pur meintenir lour mauveis emp'ses & pur verite esteindre, auxibien les p'nours come les donours; et Seneschaux et Baillifs de g'untz Seign's, qui p' seigneurie officie ou poeir, enp'nont a meintenir ou sustenir pleez ou baretz pur p'ties autres q' celes que touchent lestat lour seign's ou eux mesmes': Statutes of the Realm, ed. and trans. by C. Stephenson and F. G Marcham, 11 vols (London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1810-1828), I, (1810), p. 145. See also Percy Henry Winfield, *The History of Conspiracy and Abuse of Legal Procedure* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921), p. 1.

18 Peter Coss, 'An Age of Deference' in *A Social History of England, 1200-1500*, ed. by Rosemary Horrox and W. Mark Ormrod (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 52-53. Rees Davies, *Lords and Lordship*, pp. 204-06, 210.

19 Davies, *Lords and Lordship*, pp. 65, 211-12. For this reason, there was considerable debate about the appropriate use and abuse of livery. Legislation was enacted in 1390 and 1399-1401 to define who was able to grant it.

(acquiring property through evil means, wrongly disinheriting others and so forth) without the help of false jurors and false ministers, they give robes (robas) and a fief (feodum) to them.²⁰ Correspondingly, says Bromyard, the twelve apostles of the devil, either because they have harmed many, or intend to do so, strive to be bound to powerful men who they believe can help them. Thus, they try to please those men by helping them to unjustly acquire property, since they believe that by doing so, nobody shall harm them.²¹ According to Rees Davies, the image of maintenance which Bromyard vividly describes is supported by the historical record:

The evidence of how such ‘maintenance’ was deployed to support a client is amply documented both from private correspondence (especially in the fifteenth century) and from seigniorial account rolls. No attempt is made to conceal it. Bribes, threats, and cajolery were regular parts of the armoury; so was an occasional display of physical force as a lord or his officers or even his council led a troop of his tenants to ‘attend’ a local court. More common were rather less intimidating ploys: ‘labouring’ juries, and officials such as sheriff, distributing gifts including robes, wine, and food, identifying would-be supporters and possible opponents. These games were played by all and sundry: cities, such as Norwich and King’s Lynn, were as willing to pay handsomely in gifts and entertainment to win the ‘friendship’ of a great lord as he was anxious to have their support.²²

Davies points out that lords were supposed to help clients only in just causes, and suggests that such influence could be more effective and appropriate than the legal system.²³ The practice of maintenance was therefore an integral part of good lordship. In other words, there is an inherent contradiction at play: in order to act faithfully to each other, lords and their retainers were bound to participate in acts characteristic of falsity. In *Veritas*, Bromyard deals with this by emphasising that fidelity to truth is more important than that which is owed to a friend.²⁴ In

20 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 388-90.

21 *Ibid.*, ll. 369-73.

22 Davies, *Lords and Lordship*, p. 214.

23 *Ibid.*, p. 214.

24 SP, *Veritas*, 10.

Falsitas, he is content to note that the false are more concerned with pleasing their terrestrial lords than acting faithfully to God.

Bromyard's description of the maintenance involved in contemporary lordship was characteristic of (what modern historians tend to call) 'Bastard Feudalism'. According to K.B. McFarlane, whose work did much to popularise the term, Bastard Feudalism 'described the society which was emerging from feudalism in the early part of the fourteenth century...when the tenurial bond between lord and vassal had been superseded as the primary social tie by the personal contract between master and man... Its quintessence was payment service.'²⁵ There were two elements of this which drew particular criticism from contemporaries such as Bromyard: the corruptive influence of money, and the existence of multiple lordship. One of the key characteristics of bastard feudalism was the use of indentures (contracts) detailing the service between a lord and retainer. Bromyard does not use the word indentura (which was used to describe these arrangements), but he does say that the collusion occurs by contract (*de contracta sua*).²⁶ In this period, the word contract had a specific legal meaning, generally referring to transactions which involved the transfer of property or which generated a debt.²⁷ The precise nature of the relationship Bromyard describes is unclear, but the language he uses suggests a bond mediated by money; thus, those involved are motivated by cupidity and pernicious self-interest rather than fidelity. Additionally, Bromyard notes that by acting together the false aim to illuminate and avoid potential dangers; if one man is convicted of conspiracy, the others fear that he might turn 'approver', and betray them to the authorities (according to the common law, a convicted felon might escape execution if he gave evidence which led to the conviction of his accomplices).²⁸ It is for this reason that the false resist correction. Bromyard then cites Gregory's *Morals on the Book of Job*: 'one is joined to another, and not so much as any air can come between them.'²⁹ The greater the unity of reprobates, the greater they oppress the life of the good; if the false can be divided, they might be corrected, but whenever they are

25 K.B. McFarlane, 'Bastard Feudalism' in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1981), pp. 23-44 (pp. 24-25).

26 SP, Falsitas, ll. 414, 417.

27 John Baker, *An Introduction to English Legal History*, (London: Butterworths, 2000), p. 317.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 503.

29 SP, Falsitas, ll. 436-38.

united together, they endure in their obstinacy.³⁰ However, it must be borne in mind that Bromyard is conscious to emphasise (throughout the chapter) that such self-interest is illusory; the false frequently come to a bad end, either in this world or the next. There are thus times when Bromyard appeals to genuine self-interest in order to encourage true behaviour, noting that: ‘in this world he is called a fool who completely strains with the business and concerns for others, and neglects entirely his own concerns. The neighbours say about such a man, he is foolish, since he is soon expelled from that position, and compelled to return to his own life, where he finds no good.’³¹

The second issue concerns multiple lordship, and the challenge of reconciling competing claims to loyalty. This presents a contradiction which cuts through Bromyard’s argument. The unity of the false is sufficient to carry out evil deeds and prevent their correction, but as a result of the illusory self-interest which motivates them, their unity is fickle, and they are thus willing to simulate friendship to multiple lords. Thus, in describing the nefarious tricks employed by the false, Bromyard singles out those who wish to serve two opposing masters, comparing these people to the market-day horse brokers called *cosours*, who speak just as beautifully to the man selling as to the man buying. The broker intends treachery against at least one of the men involved in the sale, and sometimes both, despite always claiming to be each man’s friend with the greatest oaths.³² The moral of the story extends beyond petty deception, and hints at wider conflicts of allegiance within society. Frequently, indentured retainers were able to serve more than one lord, and were as a result subject to conflicting loyalties.³³ In this regard, Bromyard condemns the way in which the false secretly insinuate themselves in the middle of two enemies. With the greatest oaths, the false man affirms to each enemy that he is that man’s friend, and that he may confide in him completely. And he deceives each man, since when he is with one of them, he either slanders or seeks to harm the other, in order to please the man he is with, and to avoid the suspicion that he is the other man’s friend. He then warns the other of any treachery planned, and passes on secrets made under the seal of confession.³⁴

30 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 438-41.

31 SP, *Falsitas*, l. 1051-57.

32 See p. 177.

33 Michael Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism* (London: Longman, 1995), p. 88; Davies, *Lords and Lordship*, p. 210.

34 For the importance of confession in this regard, see pp. 255-58.

Finally, when one of the enemies injures the other, he laments with the injured man, saying that he warned him, and rejoices with the victor.³⁵ Thus, the unity associated with maintenance was also characterised by multiple lordship which illustrates the fickleness of that unity. According to Bromyard: ‘In the following work they demonstrate that in the entire midst of that time, no fidelity was in them, but only expectation to see who wins.’³⁶

In addition to cupidinous self-interest, Bromyard argues that falsity was primarily caused by the refusal to correct sins; instead of doing so, the false defend sinners, and flatter the powerful. In the second section of the sixth article, he affirms that it is insufficient to avoid participating directly in evil deeds; apologists of sinners are criticised because they enable falsity to flourish. Indeed, from the thirteenth century, the late-medieval Church taught that it was a Christian’s fraternal obligation to correct any sinner, whatever his social status, provided such correction was guided by charity or justice. According to Thomas Aquinas, ‘to reveal an unknown sin, which pertains to backbiting...is an act of the virtue of charity, whereby a man denounces his brother’s sin in order that he may amend: or else it is an act of justice, whereby a man accuses his brother.’³⁷ The distinction between correction guided by charity and detractio served to place limits on this criticism.³⁸ In pastoral literature, detractio (backbiting in the vernacular) was primarily associated with the cardinal sin of envy, and associated with murder (of the soul).³⁹ The circumstances in which one could legitimately criticise another person was therefore a contentious issue, and it is evident – particularly in the latter part of the fourteenth-century when the ecclesiastical establishment in England began to face increasing hostility – that the distinction between correction and detraction was clearer in theory than in practice.⁴⁰

35 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 684-709.

36 *Ibid.*, l. 745-48.

37 ‘Sed revelare peccatum occultum, quod, sicut dictum est, ad detractioem pertinet, est actus virtutis, vel caritatis, dum aliquis fratris peccatum denuntiat eius emendationem intendens; vel etiam est actus iustitiae, dum aliquis fratrem accusat’: Thomas Aquinas, ST, II, II, Q. 73, Art. 2
<<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/SS/SS073.html#SSQ73OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

38 In addition, Edwin Craun has explored the conflicting Christian duties regarding correction fraternal correction and the imperative not to judge others: Edwin Craun, *Ethics and Power in Medieval English Reformist Writing*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010) p. 40.

39 See, for example, *The Lay Folks’ Catechism, or, The English and Latin versions of Archbishop Thoresby’s Instruction for the People*, ed. by T. Simmons (London: Early English Text Society, 1987), p. 47; *Dives and Pauper*, ed by Priscilla Barnum, 2 vols (London: Early English Text Society, 1976-80), I (1976), part one, p. 132.

40 See for example, F.D. Matthew (ed.), *The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted* (London: Early English Text Society, 1880), p. 101. The associated conflict between correction and obedience is dealt with in the following chapter, pp. 228-235.

This tension is also evident in *Falsitas*. Although Bromyard emphasises the obligation to correct others (and in doing so, inform upon them), he also condemns the way in which the false tell tales on their enemies. Accordingly, the fifth and final trick employed by the false involves creating discord between an opponent and his lord or master. Bromyard gives an example of a man who sees that his enemy is in favour with a particular lord, and strives to ruin that friendship by making unfounded and malicious accusations. Such men swiftly display bills and allegations in which they hope to please the lords, who would thus have a pretext for reclaiming property: ‘And thus they confound themselves in mutual quarrels, and enrich their lords.’⁴¹ Such behaviour, says Bromyard, is self-destructive. Just as one man accuses a rival in order to gain wealth and position, so another at some stage will accuse him. He will thus lose his soul, and the only person to benefit will be the lord. These ‘telldales’ (*revolutores*) are then compared to owls, handmaids of the devil, and the serpent. In *Falsitas*, Bromyard does not attempt to reconcile the illegitimacy of telling tales with the fraternal obligation to correct sins, but in *Veritas* he emphasises that correction must be done without any desire for revenge. The sign of this, he suggests, is whether a man is willing to correct the sins of a friend in the same way he would for another person.

False deeds and false words

In addition to their infidelity, the false are also characterised by their deceit, their broken oaths, and the lies which they tell. Thus, Bromyard proclaims: ‘He whose word cannot be believed is called false.’⁴² The association between fidelity and telling the truth had biblical roots; the *verax et fidelis* whom Bromyard contrasts with the false man has, in fact, been taken from the book of Revelation:

41 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 847-49.

42 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1066-67.

And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called *verax et fidelis* (true-speaking and faithful), and with justice doth he judge and fight.⁴³

Bromyard remarks that lying, which is clearly very lucrative, occurs in every conceivable way, and has in fact, flooded the entire land. In *Contra Mendacium*, Augustine had influentially defined a lie as ‘a false signification made with a will to deceive.’⁴⁴ Bromyard does not provide this (or indeed any other) definition of lying, either in *Falsitas*, or in *Mendacium*. In the latter chapter, he does, however, distinguish the various types of lie, primarily drawing on the Augustinian tripartite division of malicious lies (those which cause harm to somebody), jocose lies (those which are told to amuse), and benign lies (those which benefit somebody and harm nobody). However, Bromyard also adds a fourth category: indifferent lies (those in which the true or false answer is of no practical interest to the recipient).⁴⁵ Lies which cause harm or scandal (an action that causes danger to the faith) are classified by Bromyard as mortal sins, whereas those that do not, are classified as venial sins. For Bromyard, it was not simply the literal truth of a statement or story which was at stake, but its deeper significance. Thus, when employing a fable of dubious provenance, he notes, ‘I do not bring it forth for its historical truth, as I do not believe it true, but insofar as it is beneficial for the proposition.’⁴⁶ Conversely, Bromyard is unequivocally critical of deception, whether it is committed by word or by deed; this includes examples of simulation (in which somebody actively deceives another person through word or deed) and dissimulation (in which somebody conceals the truth by failing to say or do something).⁴⁷

According to Bromyard, it is wrong to tell lies or deceive others, even if one does so for the sake of friendship, to avoid harm, or to defeat one’s enemies. The necessity to reveal truth is

43 ‘Et vidi caelum apertum, et ecce equus albus, et qui sedebat super eum, vocabatur Fidelis, et Verax, et cum iustitia iudicat et pugnat’: Revelation 19. 11.

44 ‘Falsa significatio cum voluntate fallendi’: Augustine, *Contra Mendacium*, ed. by Joseph Zycha, *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 41 (Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1866), Chapter 12, p. 507. Translation in Augustine, *Against Lying*, Chapter 12, trans. by H. Jaffee in Augustine, *Treatises on Various Subjects*, ed. by R. Deferrari (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1952), pp. 112-75 (p. 160).

45 SP, *Mendacium* 1.

46 ‘Istud non adduco pro veritate hystoricali, quam non credo veram, sed pro tanto valet ad propositum’: SP, *Avaritia*. See Owst, *Literature and Pulpit*, p. 155.

47 Multiple examples can be found in Appendix D.

most forcefully set out in the chapter *Veritas*, in which Bromyard emphasises that a ‘friendship is nothing when the other does not wish to listen to truth and is prepared to lie to the other.’⁴⁸ For Bromyard, telling the truth is consistent with the fidelity owed to others, albeit the very fact that he emphasises this suggests that there were many who disagreed.⁴⁹ Bromyard is equally insistent that truth must be told even if one suffers harm, noting that is ‘better to have suffered punishment for truth, than to receive goods for flattery.’⁵⁰ This is not an isolated remark, but reflects a point which is laboured in both in *Falsitas* and *Veritas*.⁵¹ Thirdly, Bromyard suggests that it is unacceptable to trick or deceive evil people in order to catch them. When a thief is captured, he explains, the man is often promised a great deal so that he reveals the identity of his accomplices, and how they might be captured. However, as soon as the other thieves are caught, all are hanged, including the informer. The devil proceeds in the same way against sinners, showing every sign of friendship until he drags them towards the furnace.⁵² Bromyard is clearly critical of this ploy, even though it is being employed against criminals.

Bromyard’s stance was consistent with theological orthodoxy. There were two distinct attitudes towards lying in the ancient Church: one which permitted a measure of latitude in certain circumstances, and one which did not. The former view was advocated by Jerome, who was aware that there were occasions in the Bible which appeared to condone simulation and deceit.⁵³ This view was rejected by Augustine and later theologians who adopted a far stricter attitude. According to Augustine, lying was wrong in every instance; the damage done to one’s souls always outweighed that done to one’s body.⁵⁴ Augustine further argued that examples of lying in the Bible are either condemned, or should be understood figuratively.⁵⁵ The fundamental rationale for Augustine’s position was based on the belief that human beings are obliged to imitate the truth of God (which had been embodied in Christ), and make manifest the

48 SP, *Veritas* 3.

49 Ibid.

50 Ibid.

51 Ibid. 4-5.

52 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 807-10.

53 Denery, *The Devil Wins*, p. 107. The crucifixion of Christ, for example, was part of a divine trap to ensnare the devil. And later, Paul wrote to the Corinthians: ‘To the Jews I became a Jew to so as to win the Jews’: I Corinthians 9. 20.

54 Denery, *The Devil Wins*, p. 106. Augustine’s views on lying were primarily articulated in two works, *De Mendacio*, composed in 395, and *Contra Mendacium*, composed in 420, although the rationale for his views can be traced to a work entitled *De Doctrina Christiana* composed in 397.

55 Augustine, *Against Lying*, chapter 12, p. 160.

truth that resides within each person, both in words and deeds: ‘The beginning of every work is the word.’ God made all things through ‘His only-begotten word, so there are no works of man which are not first spoken in the heart.’ Truth corresponds to the inner word or concept that is then articulated in language; the extent to which we embody this truth shows our relation to Christ. ‘The Son alone, who is the word of God, was made flesh...in order that by our word following and imitating His example, we might live rightly, that is, that we might have no lie either in the contemplation or in the work of our word.’⁵⁶

Augustine’s prohibition against lying was adopted by subsequent theologians, and accepted as orthodoxy. In the twelfth century, Peter Lombard included it within the third book of the *Sentences*.⁵⁷ However, medieval theologians also began to suggest that in certain circumstances it was licit to employ a variety of non-mendacious forms of deception. These ideas began to take root partly as means of explaining and justifying deception which occurred in the Bible, particularly that for which God was responsible, and also with regards to resolving intractable ethical dilemmas. God’s complicity in an act of deception was most clearly evident in the ransom theory of atonement which predominated in the first millennium of Christianity. It was commonly held that Adam and Eve had sold themselves and their descendants into bondage, handing over their freedom and willingly becoming Satan’s slaves in exchange for false promises. God pitied man’s fallen state and devised a plan to free humanity from the devil’s grasp.⁵⁸ Of course, if he had wished, God could simply have liberated mankind; this, however, would have been tyrannical. According to notions of justice, the devil was owed a ransom. The incarnation, birth, and life of Christ were thus a charade designed to persuade the Devil to exchange his rights over sinful men for one without sin. Christ’s life was the bait, and Christ’s divinity the hook. If the Devil had realised that Christ was God as well as man, he would have been too afraid to make the exchange. However, in the late eleventh century, Anselm of Canterbury refuted this theory. Anselm suggested instead that human sin had defrauded God of

56 ‘Solutus filius quod est verbum dei caro factum est... ut sequente atque imitante verbo nostro eius exemplum recte viveremus, hoc est nullum habentes in verbi nostri vel contemplatione vel operatione mendacium’: Augustine, *De Trinitate*, book 15, ed. by Christof Krambrich, Burkhard Mojsisch, Paolo Rubini, Thomas Zimmer (2005) <http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lspost05/Augustinus/aug_tr15.html> [accessed 1 September 2017]. Translation in Augustine, *On the Trinity*, ed. by G. Matthews and trans. by S. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), book 15, p. 189. See also Denery, *The Devil Wins*, p. 112.

57 Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, trans. by Giulio Silano, 4 vols (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2008), III, 38, 1-5.

58 Denery, *The Devil Wins*, p. 69.

the honour he was owed. Christ's death provided satisfaction for this, since it demonstrated obedience beyond that which was owed, thereby releasing humanity from the chains of original sin. The satisfaction theory of atonement was soon accepted amongst theologians, although the idea of a ransom continued to circulate in the popular imagination throughout the medieval period, appearing in sermons, learned religious works, and plays.⁵⁹ Moreover, medieval theologians still identified instances in which Christ deceived the devil and his daemonic accomplices.⁶⁰ Problematically, the deceptive behaviour of Christ in these accounts exhibited certain parallels with that of the devil. In order to reconcile divine deception with the belief that God was incapable of lying, theologians contrasted prudence with cunning. According to the thirteenth-century Franciscan theologian Bonaventure: 'It is fitting that Christ conquered the devil with his prudence (*prudencia*), for the devil deceived the first man with his cunning (*astutia*).' Bonaventure then quotes Peter Lombard, who was himself referring to Augustine: 'The Redeemer arrives and the deceiver is destroyed, he stretches himself across the mousetrap of the cross, and sets out for the deceiver the food of his blood.'⁶¹ Accordingly, Thomas Aquinas argued that the essence of *astutia* lay in the use of inappropriate means to achieve one's desires. A person commits the sin of *astutia*, 'when, in order to obtain a certain end, whether good or evil, one uses means that are not true but fictitious and counterfeit.'⁶² Aquinas nevertheless emphasised that cunning is a sin even when directed towards a good end. In the 1230s the Franciscan Alexander of Hales had already suggested that communication involved a hierarchy of intentions, and that the literal truth of a statement might be overlooked if a figurative truth was signified.⁶³ Thus, although Jacob deceived his father when he claimed to be Esau, his statement was true in the sense that he was legitimately attempting to claim what was due to the eldest born son. According to Alexander, three types of simulation were praiseworthy: prudent; instructive; and figurative. In the same vein, Duns Scotus noted that since God

59 Ibid., p. 71.

60 Ibid.

61 'Decebat enim, ut Christus sua prudentia superaret diabolum, sicut diabolus sua astutia decepit hominem primum [...] Venit Redemptor, et victus est deceptor, tetendit illi muscipulam crucem suam, posuit ei quasi escam sanguinem suum': Bonaventure, *Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum Magistri Peter Lombardi*, 4 vols in *Opera Omnia* (Quaracchi: College of St Bonaventure, 1882), III, Dist. 20, Art. 1 Q. 5, Conclusio, p. 428. Translation in Denery, *The Devil Wins*, p. 73.

62 'Alio modo, in quantum aliquis ad finem aliquem consequendum, vel bonum vel malum, utitur non veris viis, sed simulatis et apparentibus': Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, II, II, Q. 55, Art. 3. <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/SS/SS055.html#SSQ55A3THEP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

63 Denery, *The Devil Wins*, pp. 122-24.

possessed the power to make lying licit, the prohibition against lying did not rest on the misuse of language, but on the liar's intention to deceive. Accordingly, all lies are sin, but sometimes it is necessary to commit a small sin in order to avoid greater harm.⁶⁴

Within this context, Emily Corran has studied how 'a distinctive way of thinking about the ethics of lying and perjury, which reasoned through cases of conscience and practical situations, first appeared in an academic context in late twelfth century scholasticism.'⁶⁵ Such casuistry was concerned with hypothetical situations and moral dilemmas in which 'a protagonist must choose whether or not to lie or whether to break an oath in order to avoid a greater evil.'⁶⁶ Corran has identified how thirteenth-century handbooks for confessors provided a conduit for the dissemination of these ideas to those involved in the pastoral care of the laity. In addition to assigning penance, and granting absolution, a confessor had an obligation to provide moral guidance; the ideas of equivocation and mental reservation thus emerged as a way to deal with particular ethical quandaries faced by parishioners. Equivocation is when one employs ambiguous language to deceive somebody, or to conceal the truth, whilst mental reservation is when one mentally adds a qualification in order to make an otherwise false statement true. Corran is keen to emphasise that this medieval casuistry sought to resolve moral dilemmas in exceptional circumstances, rather than simply evade the rules on lying. In this sense, it differed from the more brazen casuistry which developed, and was satirised, in the early-modern period. Moreover, Corran also notes that ideas concerning the legitimate use of dissimulation and equivocation were present in a wider social context, many examples of which may be found in the non-academic literature of the period. In general, lying might be permitted if exercised with prudence, whilst perjury and broken vows were far more serious offences; however an equivocating oath was more tolerated more than a false one.⁶⁷ In this context, Corran refers to a passage from the chapter *Iuramentum* in the *Summa Praedicatorum*, noting:

64 *Ibid.*, pp. 124-26.

65 Emily Corran, 'Lying and Perjury in Medieval Practical Thought' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University College London, 2015), p. 3.

66 *Ibid.*, p. 8.

67 *Ibid.*, p. 64.

Bromyard condemns those who use equivocating oaths to fraudulently swear that their master owns a piece of land. Twelve paid witnesses, he says, swore that the land they were standing on belonged to their master, whereas they actually meant the soil they had put in their shoes belonged to him. Why focus on these fraudulent witnesses guilty of equivocating instead of simple perjurers, if there did not remain a feeling among some that equivocations of this kind were more acceptable than an outright false oath?⁶⁸

Whilst this example may show that Bromyard believed there to be a measure of sympathy to equivocation amongst his potential audience, one must be cautious of accepting it as a transparent reflection of contemporary attitudes. If examples of bad behaviour in the *Summa Praedicatorum* reflect a genuine strain of sympathy amongst the laity, then they were also prone to a wide variety of despicable thoughts and actions – indeed, it is hard to imagine a form of depravity that was not enjoyed to varying degrees; it was less like medieval Hereford, and more like Sodom and Gomorrah. Indeed, it should be recognised that Bromyard depicts a world in which the moral rules he advocates actually function as legitimate and true. Thus, he employs examples in the manner of a choreographed fight with imaginary opponents he knows he can defeat. In other words, he knows that those listening would not sympathise with the sinful protagonists. The figures function as straw men and caricatures; the examples are surrogates for more contentious behaviour. Specifically, Bromyard uses exaggerated examples of those who seek to bend the rules, in order to emphasise the legitimacy of those very same rules (in this respect, he also provides examples of those who simply disregard the rules, and brazenly lie or commit perjury). Ultimately, the moral of the story is that it is wrong to deceive others. This is a point which Bromyard reiterates throughout *Falsitas*, and also in the other chapters of the *Summa*. Indeed, it is instructive that Bromyard does not adopt a clear, consistent distinction between cunning and prudence; he condemns both the *prudentia* and *astutia* of the false.⁶⁹ For Bromyard, ethical dilemmas are primarily reduced to the willingness to suffer for the sake of truth. Nevertheless, some caveats are necessary. Firstly, when Bromyard condemns dissemblers,

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

⁶⁹ *SP*, *Falsitas*, ll. 325, 329.

he specifically condemns the fact they dissimulate their falsity; in other words, he does not explicitly deal with the legitimacy of concealing other information. Secondly, he does not deal with cases of moral perplexity, in which the failure to lie or deceive another would lead to one committing a further sin. Thus, two essential characteristics of Bromyard's discourse are evident: on the one hand, he strongly and unequivocally condemns lying and deception; and on the other, he avoids dealing with situations that complicate this clear position, and might provide a justification for disregarding the rules. This, I would suggest, reflects the utility of the *Summa* as a handbook for preaching rather than for confession; the preacher hammers home the rule (based on a clear binary division between right and wrong, true and false), whereas the confessor may be obliged to deal with the exception, if and when it proves necessary (and thus, by focussing on handbooks for confession, there is a danger that the exception is privileged at the expense of the rule). Of course, Bromyard was a confessor as well as a preacher, and it is possible he was more sympathetic when dealing with such cases.

However, one final incident deserves attention. Despite Bromyard's strict denunciation of mendacious tricks, there is an occasion in which he commends a ruler who employs deception in order to catch and punish two false men. According to Bromyard, Alexander the Great was in the midst of pursuing Darius, king of the Persians, when two of the latter's servants, wishing to please Alexander and receive a reward, murdered their lord.⁷⁰ In the aftermath of the murder, the servants initially concealed their role, since they wanted to discover whether Alexander would be satisfied with the deed, and more specifically, those who had perpetrated it. Wily Alexander, recognising their trick, declared that if the men who had killed his enemy wished to come to him, he would reward them richly. However, when they made themselves known, Alexander hanged them from the highest gibbets as an example to his own servants and subordinates, lest any man dared to betray his lord. The key to understanding how this example fits in with the rest of the discourse lies in its function. The trick employed by Alexander is comparable to the one which Bromyard had earlier explicitly denounced, in which a thief was promised his life if he helped to capture his accomplices, but was then hanged. Whereas Bromyard used that example to condemn the use of deception, and characterise the

70 *Ibid.*, ll. 1422-39.

false as untrustworthy, he uses the example of Alexander to emphasise that a ruler should punish rather than honour those who commit falsity in their service; in other words, he is not commenting on Alexander's use of deception, but on his punishment of the false. Even so, Bromyard's apparent approval of this deception serves to undermine the strength of his case, and clearly opens him up to a charge of hypocrisy.⁷¹

Integrity and a crisis of truth?

By showing fidelity to God through keeping his commandments, and by speaking the truth, a person demonstrated that he or she was true. In essence, Bromyard defines the true and false in metaphysical terms. The false man, says Bromyard, is not human in a spiritual sense unless equivocally, in the way of a depiction; he is similar to a man, and yet internally is a devil. This is comparable to lead shaped in the form of coin, which remain lead and is not considered money. In the same way, the false man is not considered a man in either a spiritual or rational sense. After all, it is the possession of reason that is the distinguishing essence (differentia) which separates human beings from others, and it is reason that the false man lacks.⁷² This both justifies punishment, and serves to explain why those listening should not follow the path of falsity – in other words, it makes no rational sense to do so (the implications of which are dealt with in Chapter 7).

Significantly, at the same time Bromyard was associating metaphysical with propositional truth, the concepts truth, integrity, and fidelity began to be signified by a single term in the vernacular. The Old English cognate of *veritas* was *wær*, which signified a covenant, or pledge.⁷³ However, this meaning was more commonly expressed by *triewþ*, from which the modern English word 'truth' derives. The earliest attested meaning of *triewþ* – referring to a firm promise or covenant – occurred in a legal context. The word subsequently came to signify, more generally, the idea of fidelity, and correspondingly, integrity (in other words, the capacity

71 As noted in the previous chapter, Bromyard's use of this tale, deviates from the original source. This alteration serves to emphasise that it is right for a ruler to punish those who are unfaithful to his enemies; originally Alexander is said to have punished pursued the traitors on account of the military threat they continued to pose: see pp. 177-78. Even so, it is clear that the use of deception in the amended version draws on the poetic justice of the deceiver being deceived: see p. 199.

72 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1165-70.

73 'Truth', OED (Oxford University Press, 2015) <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/207026>> [accessed September 14, 2017].

to inspire trust). Later, it was also used to signify faith in the trustworthiness of others.⁷⁴ There is no evidence that the Old English *triewþ* ever referred to the idea of factual accuracy, although such a meaning is attested for the adjective *triew*, which, like the noun, was predominantly associated with fidelity.⁷⁵ In Old English, *sóþ* was the word used to signify conformity to fact or reality, although it could additionally mean conformity with righteousness, and justice.⁷⁶ The word was derived from the present participle of the Indo-European root verb meaning ‘to be’. However, in the early fourteenth century, the Middle English word *treuth* became the primary term signifying both the senses related to integrity and something that conforms with fact or reality; the Middle English *soth* was used far less frequently. As a caveat, it must be noted that *treuth* was an incredibly rich, multivalent term, and although it subsumed aspects of *soth*, it remained a distinct concept. According to the Middle English Dictionary, ‘the word “treuth” and the concepts it expresses defy rigid categorization.’⁷⁷ The main definitions listed are as follows: (1) Fidelity; (2) A promise; an undertaking; a commitment; a pledge of loyalty; (3) Honour, integrity; adherence to one’s plighted word; (4) Honesty in the conduct of one’s business; (5) Goodness or rectitude of character; (6) Divine righteousness; (7) Confidence, trust; faith, belief; (8) A set of beliefs or doctrines; a faith, religion, creed; (9) Ultimate or fundamental reality; (10) Correspondence to reality, accuracy, exactitude; (11) Factual information; (12) The practice of speaking truly and without deceit; (13) Rightness, justness, innocence.⁷⁸

Bearing this caveat in mind, it seems plausible that the rise of popular preaching served as a conduit for a shift in the meaning of *treuth*. The ideas which were contained within the pastoral discourse on truth and falsity were transmitted to the local populace by preachers, many of whom belonged to the mendicant orders. This discourse emphasised the relationship between integrity, fidelity and telling the truth, concepts unified in the figure of God. In Latin texts,

74 The etymology of *Triewþ* can be traced to an Indo-European word from which *tree* is also descended; it is possible that the idea of a firm pledge developed metaphorically from the strength of a tree, or perhaps vice versa. See Richard Firth Green, *A Crisis of Truth* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), pp. 8-31.

75 ‘True’, OED (Oxford University Press, 2015) <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/206884>> [accessed September 14, 2017].

76 ‘Sooth’, OED (Oxford University Press, 1913) <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/184702>> [accessed September 14, 2017].

77 ‘Treuth’, MED <<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED47016>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

78 *Ibid.*

veritas, which originally, and predominantly, meant factual truth, was used to signify this unified idea, whilst falsitas signified the opposite; thus veritas and falsitas functioned as a pair of antonyms. Fals had already been incorporated into Old English vocabulary with connotations of deceit, and with a meaning contrary to *treu*. Thus, the most appropriate English vernacular equivalents for *verus* and *falsus* were *treu* and *fals*. Since the moral discourse was in the process of establishing *treu* and *fals* as the vernacular equivalents of *verus* and *falsus*, the factual meaning of the Latin terms will have become associated with the Middle English terms. Thus, when *falsitas* and *veritas* were translated from Latin to English in a factual sense (either formally, or even unconsciously within one's mind), they were more likely to be rendered as *treu* and *fals*, because that translation already existed. Indeed, these linguistic changes were already foreshadowed in Old English; as mentioned above, *treu*, the adjective form of *treuth* was occasionally used to refer to factual truth in the late Anglo-Saxon era.

In a significant and provocative study, Richard Firth Green has provided an alternative thesis to explain why *treuth* began to mean 'conformity to fact' in the fourteenth century. Green argues that 'the rapid spread of vernacular literacy in the Ricardian period (1376-1399), driven in large part by the bureaucratic and legal demands of an increasingly authoritarian central government, brought about a fundamental shift in popular attitudes to the nature of evidence and truth. The paradigmatic situation here...is the shift...from the communally authenticated trothplight to the judicially enforced written contract, from a truth that resides in people to one located in documents.'⁷⁹ This shift was accompanied by a 'crisis' in which contemporaries lamented the absence of *treuth* (or 'ethical truth' as Green calls it); in essence, the importance of integrity had been supplanted by that of conformity to fact. Green characterises the shift as oppressive (indeed, if *treuth* was 'ethical', Green implicitly suggests that factual truth was not), arguing that although it began to occur from the beginning of the fourteenth century, it became much more visible in the Ricardian era. In spite of the favourable reception of the work, Green's

79 Green, *A Crisis of Truth*, p. xiv.

thesis is undermined by the methodology employed, unconvincing lines of argument, and a lack of conceptual clarity.⁸⁰

Most seriously, Green fails to consider the theological and academic discourses on truth and falsity which were circulating in England during the period; there is very little discussion of how Augustine or Aquinas (or indeed other influential scholars) treated the issues of truth and mendacity. In consequence, little consideration is given to the role of preaching as a mechanism of change. This is significant since it is clear from texts such as the *Summa Praedicatorum* that the idea of being true remained a highly powerful concept; more stringent attitudes towards veracity and telling the truth did not undermine metaphysical truth, but did serve to complicate it. Indeed, the dissemination of texts such as the *Summa* was occurring at precisely the same time that Green identifies a lexical and conceptual shift – that is, a generation earlier than the spread of vernacular literacy in the Ricardian period. In order to evaluate the effect of changing attitudes to factual truth, telling the truth, fidelity and integrity – and the extent to which this was responsible for a ‘crisis of truth’ – it is necessary to examine the relationship between ‘factual truth’ and ‘ethical truth’, and the extent to which the relationship between the two concepts in the fourteenth century deviated from that which existed in the period immediately prior.

I shall first briefly sketch out Green’s ideas on the subject. In discussing the concept of truth, Green predominantly employs a comparative approach, characterising fourteenth-century England as oral and pre-modern, and on this basis drawing similarities to societies described in twentieth-century Nigerian novels. He then projects various concepts of truth and fidelity found in these texts onto medieval English society. Even so, he never specifies which of these (very different) concepts, he believes to be applicable to fourteenth-century England. As far as it is possible to discern, however, he implies that prior to the fourteenth century there were a number of strikingly different ways in which individuals would ‘speak truth’. Initially, he suggests that this covered situations in which a legitimate pretence was being employed – for example, in situations where it was known something did not conform to the facts, but nonetheless delivered

80 Nevertheless, reviewing the work in 2004, the literary scholar Derek Pearsall remarks that Green’s study is ‘the best book that has been written on medieval English literature’ in the previous decade: Derek Pearsall, ‘Medieval Literature and Historical Enquiry’, *Modern Language Review*, 99, 4 (2004), xxxi-xlii (p. xli).

a just outcome.⁸¹ He then later implies that it was comparable to speaking with the honest belief that something was factually true.⁸² Finally, he further blurs the distinction between ‘ethical’ and ‘intellectual’ truth, describing a kind of propositional truth which corresponds not to the facts, but to ‘normative conceptual expectations’.⁸³ It is unclear whether this means filtering the external world through a particular conceptual model (as occurred, for example, when Cardinal Bellarmine condemned the Copernican heliocentrism of Galileo as false because it contradicted scripture), or if it involves a communal pretence in which factual truth is sometimes laid aside if it contravenes other values. Nevertheless, in support of this idea, Green quotes the philosopher and social anthropologist Ernest Gellner, who remarked that the notion of truth for small agrarian communities ‘is that of compliance with a norm, rather than that of echoing an extraneous fact. Truth is for it the fulfilment of an ideal, which in turn is moulded by complex and plural concerns.’ Gellner further suggested that members of these societies internalise concepts and social expectations in such a way that they are unable to distinguish between literal truth and the obligation to adhere to a fictive account of the world, ‘reference to nature and loyalty to social order’.⁸⁴

Even so, it is important to clarify that factual truth, per se, was not subordinate in early-medieval English society to ethical truth; nor logically could it have been. Indeed, I would suggest that by privileging the position of ‘ethical truth’ in Anglo-Saxon legal culture, Green implicitly creates a false and misleading dichotomy. The late Anglo-Saxon concepts *triewþ* and *sóþ* were distinct but inseparable; they were mutually dependent. A person’s integrity or trustworthiness (*triewþ*) was determined by perceived factual knowledge (*sóþ*) about him or her; for example, if somebody in fact possessed the reputation of a liar, he or she was unlikely to be considered trustworthy. What you factually knew (or believed you knew) about somebody affected whether you could trust that person. Indeed, even in situations where telling the truth

81 Green, *A Crisis of Truth*, p. 8.

82 *Ibid.*, p.25.

83 *Ibid.*, pp. 31-40.

84 Green uses Gellner’s analysis to promote the idea that there are two equally valid ways of telling the truth, one which refers to the external world, and the other to social loyalty. However, this misrepresents Gellner’s position. For Gellner, the idea that there were multiple forms of truth was repugnant; truth which did not correspond to the facts was no truth at all. Thus, he famously quipped (not quoted by Green): ‘If truth has many faces, then not one of them deserves trust and respect.’: Ernest Gellner, *Relativism and the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 83. See also Ernest Gellner, *The Uniqueness of Truth: A Sermon Before the University* (London: King’s College, 1992).

conflicted with one's obligation to act with integrity, it was necessary to have a factual understanding of the situation in order to know what acting with integrity entailed. For example, in legal situations where the facts of a case were set aside for the sake of justice (in later tradition, these might be termed 'legal fictions'), any evaluation of what was considered just rested on what was factually known about a case.

Moreover, telling the (factual) truth was important both in Anglo-Saxon society and legal practice. Fundamentally, there were important social reasons for this. As Aquinas noted, 'since man is a social animal, one man naturally owes another whatever is necessary for the preservation of human society. Now it would be impossible for men to live together, unless they believed one another, as declaring the truth one to another.' Accordingly, the acquisition of factual knowledge (*sóþ*) involved accepting information from those considered trustworthy (who possessed *triewþ*). This relationship has been comprehensively studied by Steven Shapin (primarily with regards to the social construction of truth in seventeenth-century England) who argues that 'no practice has accomplished the rejection of testimony and authority and that no cultural practice recognizable as such could do so [...] Knowledge is a collective good. In securing our knowledge we rely upon others, and we cannot dispense with that reliance. That means that the relations in which we have and hold our knowledge have a moral character, and the word I use to indicate that moral relation is trust.'⁸⁵ Correspondingly, since a great deal of factual information is acquired via the testimony of others, it is necessary to evaluate both the trustworthiness of that person, and the validity of the information they are providing. In this regard, psychologists have demonstrated that cognitive filters and biases, based on pre-conceived ideas about the world, significantly affect how individuals acquire, interpret, retain and use 'factual' information. However, these preconceptions are themselves influenced by the information already acquired from others. Thus, a circle is formed: one's existing stock of factual knowledge is employed to judge the validity of another's testimony, and the testimony of others is used to create one's stock of knowledge.

In addition to the *prima facie* argument that the facts in any dispute mattered (disputes occurred and were resolved based on what individuals believed had actually happened), there is

85 Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth*, p. xxv.

demonstrable evidence that telling the truth was important in Anglo-Saxon legal practice. Firstly, the linguistic history of *sóþ* suggests that it was important in legal contexts; the cognates of *sóþ* in Latin (*sons*) and Old Norse (*sannr at sok*), for example, signified legal culpability.⁸⁶ Secondly, the Anglo-Saxon law codes and extant copies of oaths provide specific evidence that *sóþ* functioned as an important concept in legal situations. The following oath, for example, was to be sworn by a person who accused another of theft:

By the Lord, I accuse not N. neither for hatred nor for envy, nor for unlawful lust of gain; nor know I anything soother (*sóþre*); but as my informant to me said, and I myself in sooth (*sóþe*) think, that he was the thief of my property.⁸⁷

Perjury – which, in examples such as that cited above, must clearly have referred to a misrepresentation of the factual truth when under oath – was strongly condemned in Anglo-Saxon penitentials, other ecclesiastical sources and secular laws.⁸⁸ Moreover, given that there was significant clerical participation in ceremonies of oath-swearing, it seems inevitable that secular members of society would be influenced by ecclesiastical, notably Augustinian, notions of lying.

Nevertheless, Green does highlight some important changes which were occurring during this period with regards to legal procedure and the nature of evidence. Whereas Anglo-Saxon legal culture frequently relied upon witnesses attesting to the *triewþ* or integrity of one of the legal parties, by the fourteenth century legal procedure was more concerned with ascertaining the facts of the matter. Additionally, the increasing importance and complexity of written culture affected how these facts were determined. Michael Clanchy has studied how record-keeping and literate culture developed in the period from 1100 to 1300, and notes the following:

⁸⁶ ‘*Sanþa*’, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, ed. by Goos Kroonen (Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 427.

⁸⁷ ‘*On ðone Drihten, ne teó ic N. ne for hete ne for hóle ne for unrihtre feohgynesse; ne ic nán sóþre nát; búte swá mín secga me sáde, and ic sylf to sóþe talige, ðæt he mines orfes þeóf wære*’: Joseph Bosworth, ‘*ÁÐ*’, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth*, ed. by Thomas Northcote Toller (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), p. 57.

⁸⁸ Gregory L. Laing, ‘*Bound by Words: Oath-taking and Oath-breaking in Medieval Iceland and Anglo-Saxon England*’ (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 2004).

Before documents were used, the truth of an event or transaction had been established by personal statements, often made on oath, by the principals or witnesses. If the event were too far in the past for that, the oldest and wisest men were asked what they could remember about it. Numerous examples could be cited of collective oral testimony being given from memory, particularly in cases involving the proof of age of feudal heirs. [...] without documents, the establishment of what passed for truth was simple and personal, since it depended on the good word of one's fellows. Remembered truth was also flexible and up to date, because no ancient custom could be proved to be older than the memory of the oldest living wise man. There was no conflict between past and present, between ancient precedents and present practice. Customary law 'quietly passes over obsolete laws, which sink into oblivion, and die peacefully, but the law itself remains young, always in the belief that it is old.' Written records, on the other hand, do not die peacefully, as they retain a half-life in archives and can be resurrected to inform, impress, or mystify future generations.⁸⁹

In other words, oral culture provided greater latitude for those involved to set aside factual truth for the sake of justice or fidelity to one of the parties involved. Even so, documentary evidence was not synonymous with factual truth; documents, after all, could be manipulated and forged (something which was particularly prevalent in the twelfth century).⁹⁰

More importantly, the development of documentary culture did not suppress the importance of oral culture in legal contexts. Legal procedure throughout the fourteenth century was heavily (and increasingly) dependent on juries (a body of twelve, or occasionally more, sworn men), whose oral testimony was malleable and subject to a variety of influences affecting its factual accuracy.⁹¹ In this regard, Bromyard's *Summa* is instructive. On the one hand,

89 Michael Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066–1307* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), pp. 296-7.

90 *Ibid.*, pp. 318-28.

91 James Masschaele, *Jury, State, and Society in Medieval England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2008), pp. i-xii. There were different types of juries with distinct functions: an inquest was used to discover a matter of fact in a particular inquiry; an assize jury was employed to ascertain the facts about certain property disputes; the presentment (or grand) jury was responsible for presenting crimes and indicting suspects based on the personal

Bromyard implicitly admits that the testimony of the jury provided a vital function in ascertaining matters of fact in the case of the ownership of property (*per homines vicinos iuratos ostendere bona esse sua*).⁹² However, he also describes the way in which a false man might corrupt a jury: ‘if he is not able to copiously touch the hands of all twelve false men, he shall at least touch the hands of the oldest, or most powerful leader of that jury... [and] he shall lead others after him.’⁹³ Bromyard notes how the senior juror, having been corrupted, narrates in the colour of truth a story about the ‘old times of old kings, and...feoffments which were never in the nature of things.’⁹⁴ In other words, individual jury members were able to manipulate communal, social memory in order to put forward a plausible but false account of the facts. Bromyard’s example not only illustrates the conventions employed in producing truth, but demonstrates that these were contested; stories such as this serve to emphasise that social memory was both subject to critique by contemporaries, and was also the result of power relations. Communal memory (or ‘ethical truth’) was created by those who had the power to manipulate it for their own benefit. It is doubtful whether this felt particularly just, ethical or legitimate to those who ended up on the losing side in any dispute.

In addition to emphasising the harm that false testimony does to others, Bromyard notes that by committing perjury, a juror was demonstrating a lack of fidelity to God: ‘There are many who curse the deed of the Jew and do the same that he himself did, for he himself sold Christ, and those who for a bribe say false testimony sell God who is truth.’⁹⁵ However, jurors also owed fidelity to their secular lords. Improvidently, says Bromyard, they consider not how they are ruled by God, but how they are ruled by man. In this regard, there are demonstrable cases of the powerful packing juries full of supporters in order to convict the innocent and take their land; the thirteenth century legal handbook Britton notes the case of the sheriff of Northampton who organised a ‘company of the pouch’ to sit on juries and falsely indict people.⁹⁶

knowledge of jury members; and the trial jury was used both in civil and criminal cases to decide on a verdict.

Jury members were chosen from an increasingly wide section of society in the fourteenth-century, although only free men could serve on a jury in common law courts.

92 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1767-72.

93 *Ibid.*, ll. 70-81.

94 *Ibid.*, ll. 77-79.

95 *Ibid.*, ll. 1886-90.

96 Britton, trans. by F. Nicholas (Washington DC: John Byrne, 1902), p. 79, note 1.

Correspondingly, there were procedures put in place to limit the perceived manipulation of juries. These measures, however, had inconsistent effects, primarily because it was difficult to discover whether a juror had provided dishonest or inaccurate information. Nonetheless, jurors were fined both for making false presentments, and for concealing crimes they knew had been committed; an action named ‘attaint’ could also be brought against jurors accused of giving a false verdict (the verdict was quashed if successful); jury misconduct might also be raised by motion, and a new trial ordered;⁹⁷ sometimes jurors were questioned individually by a judge rather than collectively in order to identify discrepancies and tease out the truth;⁹⁸ in property disputes, mixed juries which contained supporters of both parties were often required; and finally, a jury member could also be challenged and replaced based on his perceived relationship with one of the parties.⁹⁹

Even so, collective memory was not always employed to hinder justice or distort the fundamental facts of a case, even in situations where the testimony seems dubious. Joel Rosenthal has studied fourteenth- and fifteenth-century proof of age proceedings, in which ‘the heir or heiress, or an agent acting on his or her behalf, petitioned for a writ de aetate probando to instruct the escheator to hold a judicial (and oral) proceeding to determine if there was indeed, in literal terms, a proof of the heir’s age.’¹⁰⁰ Rosenthal notes that: ‘The turnover of real property was a serious matter—and for it to hinge on the public performance of a Proof proceeding, with its possible reliance on memories that might incorporate inconsistencies, argues that the “real” question about age was probably beyond dispute. Common and collective memory came fairly close to the heir’s probable age; assertions about his or her majority that were out of line were not likely to be offered, let alone accepted. The voice of the people may have been routinized, but it was articulating the collective consciousness of the marketplace and, as such, was taken seriously, at least as a social convention.’¹⁰¹ In other words, although a witness might claim to know somebody’s age on account of a reason that may or not have been true (for example, that the birth took place at the same time as another significant event), the actual truth of the heir’s

97 Baker, pp. 84, 136.

98 Ibid., p. 75.

99 Noel Denholm-Young, *Seignorial Administration* (London: Routledge, 1963), pp. 117-18.

100 Joel Rosenthal, *Telling Tales: Sources and Narration in Late Medieval England* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press), p. 2.

101 Ibid., p. xvii.

age is likely to have been (more or less) correct. In this sense, such testimony was comparable to the historically inaccurate fable Bromyard provided, which nevertheless pointed to a more fundamental truth.¹⁰²

Conclusion

Bromyard's approach to the idea of falsity is heavily influenced by the rich theological tradition from which he drew, and is characteristic of his role as a preacher. Fundamentally, he depicts the world in terms of two antithetical communities in which the division between right and wrong, true and false, is clear and uncomplicated. However, the complexity involved in leading a moral life creates distinct and antagonistic forces which serve to undermine some of the key arguments. In essence, falsity occurs when one is unfaithful to God by sinning. Correspondingly, the idea of fidelity is integral to truth, but this is complicated by competing claims to loyalty, and the way in which misplaced fidelity (or unity) could hinder legitimate efforts at correction. Despite the fact that the false are united, they are also fickle and untrustworthy. Equally, the line between correction and telling-tales was inevitably ambiguous in practice, if not in theory. In addition to questions of fidelity, Bromyard condemns mendacious behaviour. Unlike the casuistry associated with confession, Bromyard presents this as a clear and unequivocal position; one must tell the truth and act truthfully, and suffer the consequences if necessary. Nevertheless, Bromyard's own approval of Alexander the Great employing deception to punish the false reveals the difficulty in adhering to this position. The various characteristics of truth and falsity are ultimately associated with being true. Retaining personal truth (or integrity) within the contested arena of fourteenth-century society was a difficult balancing act. Contrary to the argument put forward by Green, Bromyard's discourse demonstrates that the idea of truth as integrity was not marginalised. Nor was oral testimony, the validity of which was judged by the perceived integrity of the speaker, supplanted by documentary evidence; they were complementary instruments of producing truth working within the same nexus of power relations. In this regard, those who were powerful enough to use documentary evidence to support their claims were comparable to those who were powerful enough to shape a narrative of

¹⁰² See p. 196.

truth by gathering witnesses as testament to one's truth, or to the veracity of a particular incident. Within this cauldron of change, 'truth as integrity' remained a massively important concept, providing the glue to hold society together (in a particular way), as well as reaffirming and challenging identities. It is beyond the scope of this study to analyse the variety of social changes which may have contributed to a 'crisis of truth', but in general terms, it is explicable by the socio-economic disruption which characterised the fourteenth century, notably dynastic troubles, demographic collapse and the corresponding instability between lords and peasants, and the rise of 'Lollardy'. In each case, at issue were notions of legitimate authority, the validity of particular world-views, and how the truth and falsity of ideas and individuals might be accurately identified. It is these issues which are dealt with in the following two chapters.

CHAPTER 7: JUSTICE, POWER AND AUTHORITY

As part of his coronation oath, Edward II was asked: ‘Sire, will you, so far as in you lies, cause justice to be rendered rightly, impartially, and wisely, in compassion and in truth?’¹ The rendering of justice was an intrinsic responsibility of those in positions of power and authority. It was also the second component of Bromyard’s distinction of truth. This chapter, therefore, examines how Bromyard deals with issues of justice, power and authority. Firstly, I explore the identification of falsity with temporal authority; secondly, I consider the identification of the powerless poor with the victims of falsity; and thirdly, I examine the way in which those in positions of authority were courted by Bromyard, and were integral to the victory of truth. In so doing, a number of contradictory elements become apparent in the discourse: it provides a radical critique of contemporary ills, whilst also seeking to preserve the social order; it attempts to speak truth to power, and yet requires the support of the powerful to make its voice heard; and it critiques institutions and yet holds sinful individuals as personally culpable for the prevalence of falsity.

Temporal authority and the perpetrators of falsity

Fundamentally, Bromyard associates falsity with temporal authority. In doing so, he adheres to the template of the two cities set out by Augustine, who argued that after the Fall mankind had become a slave to sin, pursuing temporal desires rather than living according to the will of God. According to Augustine, only a few men and women will (through the grace of God) be saved, and these form the *Civitas dei*; in contrast, everyone else forms the *Civitas terrena* (which Augustine also calls the *Civitas diaboli*). Both communities are intermingled whilst on earth; they derive their identities from the object of their love. In this context, Cain had founded the first city, and thus the political life of the state had emerged; even so, just government might provide a transient form of peace on earth. Augustine had formulated these ideas following the sack of Rome in 410, and the text *Civitas dei* was designed both to console Christians who had

¹ ‘Facies fieri, in omnibus judiciis tuis, equam et rectam justitiam, et discretionem in misericordia et veritate, secundum vires tuas?’; and in French ‘Sire, frez vous faire en touz vos jugementz owele & dreyt justice, & descrecioun, en misericorde & verite?’: Statutes of the Realm, I, pp. 168, 192.

suffered greatly, and also to absolve Christianity of blame for the harm which ensued. In other words, he sought to argue that temporal suffering occurs on earth because of man's fallen state, and is not influenced by the power (or impotence) of the Christian God; moreover, despite such suffering, the righteous will eventually be saved.²

In keeping with Augustine's approach, Bromyard emphasises that falsity commonly prevails against truth in this world, thereby recognising the presence of suffering and injustice, but also attempting to control how responsibility is assigned for it. Since truth resides in heaven, the role of God in permitting falsity to flourish on earth is obscured, and divine authority absolved. In contrast, culpability lies with personal human failings driven by cupidity, and also with temporal authority, which thrives on and engenders such behaviour. By associating temporal authority with falsity, Bromyard critiques a number of important social institutions, notably lordship and lineage, the legal system, and the idea of familia. Falsity, says Bromyard, resides in its own lordship and kingdom amongst those who love it greatly and hate truth, namely this world. In the congregation of the false, the devil has complete justice, and rules powerfully, giving land, life and limb to those who ought to lack them, whilst depriving others (who ought to have them) of those very same things.³ Bromyard thus implicitly attacks contemporary lordship in which rendering justice was a fundamental responsibility of those who ruled.

In *Falsitas*, those in positions of authority who render justice are frequently compared to the figure of Pilate. Thus, Bromyard notes that 'falsity now holds so much power in the city of the Devil, as much as Pilate formerly held in the city of Jerusalem, since it is just the same as when he liberated the thief Barrabas, and killed Christ.'⁴ Indeed, Bromyard specifically associates falsity with those of high status. A man of superior descent, he says, is able to obtain victory, both because he can call upon many followers – most of whom are attracted by his wealth – and also because his enemies fear him. Falsity comes from great stock (*magno genere*), since its father is the devil, and its mother, cupidity. Such men are thus frequently able to

2 For an introduction to the *Civitas dei*, see Augustine, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, ed. and trans. by R.W. Dyson, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. x-xxix.

3 *SP*, *Falsitas*, ll. 129-34.

4 'Patet ergo quod tantam potestatem habet nunc falsitas in ciuitate diaboli quantum habuit olim pilatus in ciuitate Ierusalem, quia sicut ille Barraban latronem liberauit, et Christum occidit': *Ibid.*, ll. 153-58.

escape justice. Bromyard remarks that whoever is apprehended for theft or murder is more easily liberated if he is from great stock or bound to some great lord, or has friends through whom he is able to control judges, assizers and jurors.⁵

Such criticisms were, in part, hackneyed convention. Legal corruption had long been an object of scorn for satirists (a tradition which can be traced back to the literature of Ancient Rome). Complaints about the corruption of lawyers and judges had become more common in the thirteenth century when a professional judiciary and body of lawyers began to develop.⁶ In particular, theologians were adamant that justice was not a commodity to be bought or sold, and were thus suspicious of anybody who financially benefited from the legal process.⁷

However, Bromyard's criticisms of judges, jurors and litigants also engaged with more specific, contemporary concerns, and are likely to have resonated with his immediate (and later) audience in distinct ways. When Bromyard was writing in the early 1300s, the populace was subject to three distinct forms of law and jurisdiction. Moral matters were dealt with by the ecclesiastical courts, which operated according to Romano-canonical procedure. The communal (county and hundred) and seigneurial (franchisal and manorial) courts operated according to customary law, and dealt with minor disputes, keeping the peace, various administrative matters, and (in the case of manorial courts) the customary arrangements of tenants. Pleas of the crown (felonies and certain types of trespass) and serious civil disputes were dealt with by the royal courts which operated according to the common law; itinerant royal justices were given commissions to oversee some types of case in the localities, most notably the petty assizes (which dealt with certain types of property disputes), and gaol delivery (which emptied the gaols and tried felonies); other cases, however, were heard by the courts at Westminster, notably the Common Bench (which dealt with matters in which the king was not a legally interested party), and the King's Bench (in which he was).⁸

5 Ibid., ll. 135-40.

6 John Yunck, *The Lineage of Lady Meed: The Development of Mediaeval Venality Satire* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963), p. 133; J. Brundage, *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), pp. 477-87.

7 For the origins of this, see Brundage, *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession*, pp. 13-14.

8 For an introduction to the subject, see Baker, *An Introduction to English Legal History*; for the development of the common law, see the collection of essays by Paul Brand, *The Making of the Common Law* (London: Hambledon, 1992).

Significantly, royal justice had begun to become more pervasive from the late twelfth century onwards, affecting greater numbers to a greater degree. There were certainly beneficiaries of this process, although the expansion of royal justice created an expectation that the common law would provide remedies for a variety of perceived injustices, and the failure to comprehensively fulfil this expectation fuelled criticism. The common law was not comprehensive, and the type of actions for which there was a royal remedy were limited. Nor was royal justice accessible to all; the unfree peasantry, for example, were forbidden from pursuing an action in the royal courts. The system was also slow and expensive, and the itinerant justice of the General Eyres (in which the presiding judges possessed a commission to try ‘all pleas whatsoever’) was infrequent and intermittent. Indeed, these all-encompassing itinerant courts were suspended in 1294 and became obsolete after an aborted revival in the late 1320s; this reflected a diminishing royal interest in legal matters during the first half of the fourteenth century, partly as a result of the war with Scotland which diverted royal attention from the courts.⁹

Even so, legal process continued to be used as a source of royal revenue, and exchequer rolls demonstrate royal justice was profitable; Edward I raised funds for his Scottish campaigns by ‘causing justice to be done on malefactors’.¹⁰ Given the financial interests at play, it is unsurprising that there were frequent allegations of corruption. When Bromyard mentions the greatest and true justiciars, he is probably referring to the judges who had been given trailbaston commissions in 1305. These were special commissions which had been set up to deal with abuses of justice, and were mandated to try cases of organized violence, protection rackets, and conspiracy. However, these commissions were also accused of injustice. According to the chronicler Adam Murimuth, writing in the early-fourteenth century:

9 A. Musson and W.M. Ormrod, *The Evolution of English Justice: Law, Politics and Society in the Fourteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999), p. 3.

10 *Croniques de London*, ed. by G. Aungier (London: Camden Society, 1844), pp. 28-29. See also Baker, p. 14.

....so severely and wilfully did they proceed that none could escape punishment, whether they carried out the king's business well or evilly, so that all, even those not indicted or appealed, had to pay large bribes, if they wished to avoid imprisonment.¹¹

It is clear from contemporary accounts of this kind that royal justice encroached upon the jurisdiction of local elites, and posed a threat to existing ways of dealing with disputes. The dynamic between Westminster and the localities was further altered by mid fourteenth-century legal reforms, in which the scope of the common law increased, and the court structure was reformed, notably by the establishment of Commissions of the Peace.¹² There is considerable debate amongst legal historians over the extent to which these changes were evolutionary or – sparked by the social and economic catastrophe of the Black Death – revolutionary, whether the use of the gentry as Justices of the Peace represented devolution, or was in fact characteristic of an increased royal presence in the regions, and whether the subsequent relationship between the interests of the court in London and litigants in the localities was antagonistic or complementary.¹³ Either way, throughout the fourteenth century, political rhetoric emphasised a decline in public order, and that the royal authorities were unable or unwilling to deliver justice.¹⁴ However, such criticism did not merely reflect contemporary attitudes towards royal justice, but often formed part of rhetorical strategies designed to further an individual's particular interests.¹⁵

For Bromyard, this involved making a fundamental distinction between law (which was necessary for justice), and statutes and customs (which expressed the personal whim of false rulers).¹⁶ Within the latter category, Bromyard does not distinguish between statutes (*statuti*), ordinances (*ordinaciones*), and customs (*consuetudines*), all of which were wielded by false men in positions of power. Thus, whilst discussing the injustice of laws and customs pertaining to shipwrecked goods, he employs pairs of terms such as '*statuti vel consuetudinis*' and

11 '*...tam rigide et voluntarie processerunt quod nullus impunitus evasit, sive bene gesserit regis negotia sive male, ita quod sine delectu omnes, etiam non indictati nec accusati, eccessive se redemerunt, qui voluerunt carcerem evitare*': Adam Murimuth, *Adæ Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum*, ed. by E. Thompson (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1889), p. 118.

12 Wendy Scase, *Literature and Complaint in England, 1272-1553* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 46

13 See Musson and Ormrod, pp. 1-11.

14 *Ibid.*

15 Wendy Scase, *Literature and complaint in England*, pp. 5-41.

16 SP, Xps 9

‘statutis et ordinacionibus’.¹⁷ However, in contrast to his vehement criticism of statutes and customs, Bromyard supports his own argument by reference to divine and canon law (*leges diuinas et canonicas*), and Roman civil law (*leges imperiales*).¹⁸ In so doing, he implicitly characterises royal justice as an instrument of falsity, intrinsically at odds with the truth of law. This distinction is more subtle than that which late fourteenth-century sermons (often with heterodox leanings) frequently draw between God’s law and Man’s law. Bromyard’s support of Roman law and canon law (both of which were employed in temporal courts) may be indicative of (and associated in the minds of the early audience with) the Dominican Order’s competence and ability to utilise law in certain jurisdictions, and their litigious character, an association with which the order was routinely criticised.¹⁹

Interestingly, Bromyard does not consistently contrast Roman civil law with royal statutes in other chapters of the *Summa*; in *Civitas*, for example, he argues that laws, statutes and sound doctrine are all necessary.²⁰ His position in *Falsitas* appears to reflect the relationship between royal authority and a specific issue under discussion, shipwrecks. In article seven, Bromyard notes that when a slave of sin and falsity reigns or when he leads those who rule or are sovereign, he causes many evil things; those led by such counsel commit many deceitful thefts and other evil deeds in perdition of their souls. He then begins his lengthy critique of the statutes and customs concerning the franchise of *wreccum maris*, wreck of the sea, which had largely been distributed to all coastal manors in the kingdom.²¹ The first Statute of Westminster (1275), codifying much existing law, mandated that where a man, dog, or cat escaped from a ship, the ship or any property within it should not be judged wreck, and that if

17 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1781, 1790, 1818-19.

18 *Ibid.*, ll. 1606-07, 1609.

19 For an overview of the complaints levelled against the friars, and the various contexts within which they were made, see Guy Geltner, *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism: Polemic, Violence, Deviance, and Remembrance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). For a late fourteenth-century example of such antifraternal criticism, and of the association between the Order of Preachers and the process of law, see ‘Pierce the Ploughman’s Creed’, *Six Ecclesiastical Satires*, ed. by James McMurrin Dean (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1991), pp. 8-49. The poem has been heavily mined by Helen Barr, *Signes and Sothe: Language in the Piers Plowman Tradition* (Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1994), who additionally analyses a number of other antifraternal poems.

20 SP, *Civitas* 11.

21 Rose Melikan, ‘Shippers, salvors, and sovereigns: Competing interests in the medieval law of Shipwreck’, *The Journal of Legal History*, 11, 2 (1990), 163-82, (p. 172).

anybody claimed the goods within a year and a day they should be immediately returned.²² If nobody survived, however, then the goods were considered wreck and confiscated. Bromyard questions the validity of this, and calls it an abuse of every kind of law. He recounts and then rejects the spurious arguments which false men use to justify the appropriation and retention of shipwrecked goods: that they are ignorant of the identity of the owner; that the goods have been abandoned; and that they have protected the goods from the spoliation of others. In the chapter *Consuetudo*, Bromyard remarks that the issue of shipwrecked goods is very close to his heart (*Contra primum abusum, videlicet de naufragis, cuius improbacio michi magis est cordi*).²³ In particular, he associates this abuse with the lords of the diocese of Llandaff.²⁴ At the time Bromyard was writing, this territory was in the lordship of the Despensers, a family to whom Bromyard makes a number of allusions throughout the *Summa*.²⁵ In this context, Bromyard was probably aware that the English custom of wreck treated the goods of shippers and shipowners far more harshly than those of other European coastal nations, who were influenced more heavily by Roman civil law.²⁶ Whereas commercial interests were more important to continental maritime states, feudal rights were paramount in England.²⁷ If shippers were protected, commerce was encouraged. However, since liberty of wreck was widely granted out across England, landowners were favoured at the expense of shippers and carriers.²⁸ Thus, Bromyard emphasises that those who retain such goods are enriched through the misery of those who have suffered most from a shipwreck. It follows, he says, that they harm the most vulnerable in society. He gives an example of a woman whose husband had recently drowned in a shipwreck. In her husband's chest were certain tallies through which she could have regained money that had been owed to her husband. Although these tallies were worth nothing to the salvor, she was still unable to reclaim them.²⁹

22 'Statute of Westminster the First', *The Statutes at Large: From the Magna Charta, to the End of the Eleventh Parliament of Great Britain, Anno 1761 [continued to 1806]*, ed. by Danby Pickering, 46 vols (Cambridge: Joseph Bentham, 1762-1806), I (1762), pp. 74-107 (pp. 79-80).

23 SP, *Consuetudo* 20.

24 *Ibid.*

25 See pp. 179-80.

26 Melikan, pp. 163-64.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 163.

28 *Ibid.*, p. 172.

29 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1798-1805.

However, in spite of Bromyard's criticism of temporal institutions in *Falsitas*, this position is not consistent throughout the chapter. In *Veritas*, for example, Bromyard emphasises that the courts may be just, and it is the individuals within them who are at fault. Thus, he tells the story of a man who complains about the judges and assisors and advocates of the Christian court, saying that he is unable to receive justice. His friend rebukes him and tells him to be quiet since it is the court of Christianity, that is, the court of Christ and the Holy Church. However, the man responds that the court may well be Christian, but those of the court are demons. The same can be said, says Bromyard, for lawyers who abuse others with their laws whilst saying that they hold the laws true and faithful. In this instance, Bromyard feels obliged to recognise the fundamental legitimacy of the courts, but still seeks a way to challenge the evil effects which nevertheless occur. More widely, it also provides a strategic template for those who wish to challenge authority without appearing to sabotage its foundations.

The persecuted poor and the victims of falsity

Throughout the chapter – and again following the tradition of satirical complaint – Bromyard emphasises that the poor are frequently the victims of falsity.³⁰ In the first article, he thus laments that however much a pauper clamours for justice to judges, lords and others, he is still not heard.³¹ Bromyard's discussion of poverty and avarice, and the subsequent reception of his particular stance, would have been informed by his position as a friar. The fraternal orders had emerged in response to the popular religious movements (some heretical) which began to flourish from the second decade of the twelfth century onwards. These were inspired both by Gregorian reform (a concerted effort in the latter part of the eleventh century, associated with Pope Gregory VII, to improve the moral standing and independence of the clergy), and charismatic individuals who preached the *vita apostolica*: a return to the ways of the primitive church, and a life characterised by evangelical poverty. The fraternal orders were therefore active and engaged participants in the debates about poverty which followed in the thirteenth

30 For example, Wendy Scase has argued that the thirteenth-century judicial reforms associated with Edward I influenced the way in which complaint ('the expression of a grievance as a means of obtaining a judicial remedy') could be utilised by peasants, and how the discourse of peasant grievance was subsequently appropriated by other groups as a rhetorical device to strengthen their own positions: Scase, *Literature and complaint*, pp. 42-82.

31 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 28-34.

and fourteenth centuries. Rather than assuming the traditional monastic vow of poverty – the renunciation of personal wealth and commitment to live a simple life with property held in common – the friars pursued a stricter life of mendicant poverty. In 1220, for example, the constitutions of the Dominican Order forbade friars and friaries from accepting or possessing personal property or rents; instead they were obliged to survive on alms sufficient for daily sustenance. The only property permitted was the friary buildings, the land on which it stood, and any money sufficient for daily necessities. However, the most controversial debates surrounded the Franciscan Order; from 1279 until 1322 property given to (and enjoyed by) the Franciscans had technically been vested in the Holy See (in theory this was already the case in 1230 with Gregory IX's decree, *Quo elongati*, in which property was given to agents on behalf of the friars). In response to this fiction, a division emerged between a group of Franciscans who wished to follow a life of absolute poverty in practice, and those of a more lax disposition. In 1322, the Franciscan Order was obliged to accept the responsibility of owning property, and in 1323 the doctrine of absolute apostolic poverty – in which it was claimed that Christ and the apostles held no property – was condemned as heresy.³² Whilst Bromyard was composing the *Summa* in the late 1320s, the master general of the Franciscan Order, Michael, was imprisoned, and (after an anti-pope briefly replaced John XXII and Michael escaped from custody) the majority of the Franciscans submitted to the authority of the pope and the commitment to accept property.³³ Even so, the dispute had a significant impact, not least because it drew attention to the conflicting obligations of obedience and the fraternal correction of a superior (an issue which will be discussed a little later in this chapter). The debate about poverty was also contentious in England in the immediate period after Bromyard, driven predominantly by Richard FitzRalph, bishop of Armagh. Writing (in particular, a text entitled *De pauperie salvatoris*) and preaching in the 1350s, FitzRalph accused the friars of hypocrisy for failing to adhere to their commitment to poverty; however, he also (and somewhat contradictorily) also criticised them for a flawed understanding of Christ's poverty, and for drawing money away

32 M. Lambert, *Franciscan Poverty: The Doctrine of Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order, 1210-1323* (St. Bonaventure, New York: Franciscan Institute Publications, 1998), pp. 221-70.

33 *Ibid.*

from the parish clergy and the poorest in society.³⁴ Moreover, he alleged that the friars' poverty hindered their ability to perform pastoral duties effectively, since they were preoccupied with receiving alms. These criticisms – partly a recapitulation of those circulating since the formation of the fraternal orders – gained significant popularity in the latter part of the fourteenth century.³⁵

Bromyard does not engage with the more contentious aspects of this debate. Instead of focussing on the virtue of poverty, he draws attention to the position of the poor as victims. However, Bromyard is also keen to emphasise that all sections of society are complicit in falsity. Correspondingly, he compares the bond between false men and powerful lords to the association between the Jews and Pilate in relation to the crucifixion of Christ: those wishing to crucify Christ were not able to fulfil their plan without the adjudication and power of Pilate, and he was not able to do so without the false testimony of others.³⁶ Pilate acted with power, whilst the Jews employed falsity; knowledge and power were intertwined. In doing so, Bromyard exploits the way in which a large cross-section of society were involved with the courts, notably as jurors.³⁷ Thus, although Bromyard criticises the powerful and wealthy, he also manages to dampen social antagonism by emphasising the collusion and mutual guilt of all kinds of people.

The pervasiveness of falsity throughout society is further reflected by Bromyard's assertion that false behaviour is primarily driven by cupidity, since it is from this sin that a person wishes to have more than he or she does (or ought) to have; this was applicable to all false individuals, regardless of their position on the social ladder. Indeed, the examples of such behaviour which Bromyard provides throughout the chapter emphasise that the false are specifically motivated by the desire for material wealth. Thus, 'they prefer to place twelve pence in the money-bag, or to have twelve acres in the fields with falsity, and with a curse of God and of his mother and of all the saints, and all good men... than to have half, well-earned with fidelity.'³⁸ In identifying cupidity as the cause of falsity, Bromyard was ultimately harking back to the Pauline dictum that cupidity is the root of all evils ('*radix enim omnium malorum*

34 Wendy Scase, *Piers Plowman and the New Anticlericalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 8-10.

35 *Ibid.*, pp. 1-15.

36 *SP*, *Falsitas*, ll. 391-98.

37 See pp. 210-11.

38 *SP*, *Falsitas*, ll. 1196-1201.

est cupiditas')³⁹, and indeed avarice was considered the major sin in the early Christian church.⁴⁰ The terms *avaritia* and *cupiditas* were generally interchangeable, although following Jerome's translation of the Vulgate, avarice tended to be used in the more generic sense of wanting more, whilst cupidity had connotations of desiring wealth.⁴¹ By the fifth and sixth centuries the position of avarice as the gravest sin was being increasingly challenged by pride, whose pre-eminence was also supported by scripture: 'pride is the beginning of all sin' ('initium omnis peccati est superbia').⁴² Augustine reconciled the two sins by conceiving avarice as *avaritia generalis* – a desire for what is more than is fitting. In this sense, avarice and pride described similar sentiments. In the sixth century, Gregory the Great reorganised the cardinal sins, identifying pride as the most important vice, and it was only with the onset of the developing commercial economy in the eleventh century that avarice regained its position as the major sin in society.⁴³

Driven by avarice, falsity both threatens society, but also helps to constitute it by providing an evil mirror image. Society was conceptualised in various ways during the period Bromyard was writing, most frequently by reference to the three estates or orders: those who pray, *oratores*; those who fight, *bellatores*; and those who work, *laboratores*.⁴⁴ Correspondingly, this tended to be idealised as a harmonious rather than antagonistic relationship. Indeed, in the chapter *Societas*, Bromyard notes that, 'the order of these various ranks in the community ought to be like the position of strings upon the harp... if the strings are disarranged the melody jars.'⁴⁵ Equally, however, he also remarks:

All are descended from the same first parents, and all come of the same mud. For, if God had fashioned nobles from gold, and the ignoble from mud, then the former would have cause for pride. But whereas all are of one material, in that fact 'thy boasting is

39 1 Timothy 6. 10.

40 Richard Newhauser, *The Early History of Greed*, p. xiv.

41 *Ibid.*, p. 92.

42 *Ecclesiasticus* 10. 15.

43 Newhauser, *The Early History of Greed*, p. 95.

44 Georges Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined* (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1980); also Alan Fletcher, "'The unity of the state exists in the unity of its minds": A fifteenth century sermon on the three estates', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 22 (1991), 103-37.

45 *SP, Civitas* 2.

excluded? ... True glory does not depend upon the origin or beginning from which anything proceeds, but upon its own condition.⁴⁶

In *Falsitas*, Bromyard does not dwell on social disharmony between those of different status, other than noting that the false are motivated by wealth, and that the poor are the victims of falsity. Instead, Bromyard legitimises the essential structure by portraying the false as a perversion of a harmonious society; they mimic a social structure which is essentially valid. In particular, Bromyard conceives the false in terms of *familia*, the body of individuals which comprised a household. Accordingly, what renders a man victorious is the number of familial supporters he can call upon, and falsity has the biggest *familia* since there are few who do not commit falsity against God or man on some point.⁴⁷ Thus, Bromyard assigns complicity to individuals from every rank of society, regardless of the power dynamics at play. There are venal judges; crooked jurors who give false testimony at court; hypocritical clerics who flatter the powerful; avaricious counsellors who refuse to correct those they serve; rapacious lords who despoil the poor; dishonest artisans and workmen; and mendacious merchants, manipulating the scales, using false weights and measures, and selling corrupt bread, noxious drink, and putrid spices.⁴⁸ There is, says Bromyard, scarcely a simple or faithful man of the country who does not encounter some form of falsity when he visits a town to buy something.⁴⁹ Given Bromyard's attitude, the contexts which serve to explain the occurrence and prevalence of certain behaviours are obscured. Occasionally, however, there are glimpses which slip out. Thus, although Bromyard insists that lords and jurors were partners in falsity, motivated by avaricious self-interest, he also alludes to the complex pressures placed on jurors, who were swayed by bribes, love or fear.⁵⁰ This partly echoes convention: cupidity, love, hate and fear were the four perverters of human judgement listed by Isidore which (with variations) were common in later

46 *Ibid.*, *Gloria* 2.

47 *SP*, *Falsitas*, ll. 195-99.

48 Bromyard may have been referring to the *auancel*, a special kind of weighing device which could be easily manipulated. He refers to similar devices and tricks in the chapter *Mercatio*. See James Davis *Medieval Market Morality: Life, Law and Ethics in the English Marketplace, 1200-1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 79, 195.

49 *SP*, *Falsitas*, ll. 250-53.

50 *Ibid.*, l. 5221.

sermons and commentaries.⁵¹ However, it is also an admission that there were distinct pressures on jury members, whose decisions were inevitably motivated by a variety of factors. In addition to the pull of fidelity, and the desire to avoid harm (which have been discussed in Chapter 6), recent studies suggest that jury nullification was common; thus, jurors in criminal trials often based their verdicts on whether they believed the punishment was appropriate for the crime.⁵² Indeed, the process of taking a suspect to trial – with the attendant publicity, the possible financial and physical costs of being held in custody for a lengthy period of time, and the fear of being found guilty – may itself have been considered a form of punishment more appropriate than that specifically arising from a conviction. Jurors were extremely sensitive to the possible consequences of their verdicts; to convict an individual might lead to a vendetta with a neighbouring family, whilst to acquit an individual might be used as leverage to ensure future good behaviour.⁵³

In addition to portraying all members of society as complicit in falsity, Bromyard's attitude towards deception, fidelity and obedience also places limits on legitimate responses to the bad behaviour of the powerful. There are two occasions on which Bromyard considers the implications of subordinates who use trickery whilst acting in concert against a superior. In the first, the hound of a nobleman is left in the hands of an acquaintance who mistreats the beast. The starving hound lopes off into the woods where he meets a friendly wolf; the two animals make a pact in which they agree to hunt together. One day, the hound spots his lord wandering in the forest. Since the hound realises that he will be punished if he is spotted in the company of the wolf, he turns on the wolf, and slays his accomplice.⁵⁴ The other trick is a variant of the divide and conquer strategy, in which the false strive to sow discord amongst their opponents. Bromyard does not name the source of the exemplum, although originally it is from Aesop. A band of wolves are keen to destroy the alliance between the hounds and their human masters, so they convince a group of similarly coloured hounds to join their ranks. However, as soon as the

51 Yunck, pp. 33-34, 247-50. Bromyard uses these four figures in the chapter *Equitas*.

52 Thomas Green, *Verdict According to Conscience: Perspectives on the English Criminal Trial Jury, 1200-1800* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

53 Barbara Hanawalt, *Of Good and Ill Repute* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 1-14.

54 *SP, Falsitas*, ll. 710-29.

wolves defeat the other hounds, they turn and kill their canine allies.⁵⁵ Given the period in which Bromyard was writing, and the explicit allusions he makes to the reign of Edward II, these examples would have possessed a specific contemporary resonance. Indeed, the name Taxu, which Bromyard gives to the hound in the first exemplum cited, appears to signify ‘lard/bacon’, and was thus a particularly apt (and hard-hitting) moniker in periods of famine.⁵⁶ More fundamentally, however, both of these tricks contain an implicit message that subordinates acting in concert against a master will inevitably betray each other, either because one of them is inherently faithless (as in the first exemplum cited), or because the other is fundamentally different (as in the second exemplum cited, in which the shared identity between master and subordinate is stronger than that between those who seek to challenge others in positions of authority). The possibility that it might be in the interests of subordinates to keep faith with each other, and that each of them might be capable of doing so, is not considered. Obedience, therefore, is a virtue.

Truth and power

The discourse of falsity articulated in the *Summa Praedicatorum* owed a great deal to the way in which the Dominicans had constructed heresy during the thirteenth century, a period in which they became the driving force behind the Inquisition.⁵⁷ Although those portrayed as false were not identical with heretics, both shared many characteristics, most notably by demonstrating a lack of obedience to ecclesiastical authority, and also a predilection for twisting the truth. The etymological origins of heresy could be traced to *αἵρεσις*, the Greek word for choice; Jerome had famously explained that this signified ‘when each person chooses for himself a doctrine that

55 Ibid., ll. 770-98.

56 Tony Hunt, *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1991), II, pp. 41, 54, 56, 83, 147.

57 A great deal has been written on the development, nature and significance of the Inquisition (and indeed, the role played by the Dominican Order in its workings). See Edward Peters, *Inquisition* (New York: Free Press, 1988); James Given, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline and Resistance in Languedoc* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1997); Bernard Hamilton, *The Medieval Inquisition* (London: Edward Arnold, 1981); Mark Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels: The Inquisition of 1245-46* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2001); John Arnold, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001). For the detection of heresy in England, see Ian Forrest, *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

he considers to be a better one.⁵⁸ Moreover, since Jesus had made known that ‘there shall be one flock and one shepherd’, the authority to proclaim the apostolic faith had been handed down to chosen successors.⁵⁹ Thus, a proto-orthodoxy was evident in the New Testament from the very beginning.⁶⁰ In the first five centuries of Christianity, heresy had accompanied the elaboration of Christian doctrine, but from the mid sixth century to the beginning of the eleventh century, there were no major popular heretical movements; the fight against apostasy and paganism took precedence. There was a sudden resurgence of heresy in the second quarter of the eleventh century, which was then followed by a lull until the second decade of the twelfth century, when popular heretical movements began to flourish.⁶¹ In this context, obedience assumed great significance. Gregory VII (pope, 1073-85) had claimed that a person who does not agree with the Roman Church should not be held to be Catholic, whilst according to the thirteenth-century canon lawyer, Hostiensis, a heretic was ‘he who holds a contrary opinion to the Roman church concerning the articles of faith.’⁶² In other words, the main heresy was disobedience rather than disbelief.⁶³ In addition, heresy was associated with civil disobedience. Justinian I had explicitly equated heresy with treason whilst codifying Roman Law (534), and the proposition was resurrected by Pope Innocent III in 1199.⁶⁴ There are certainly parallels in *Faslitus*. Thus, Bromyard notes: ‘The false are traitors of the laws (as it has been said) in time of peace, and of the land in time of war.’⁶⁵

A further important part of the definition of heresy was that those who held heterodox views refused to be corrected. According to Robert Grosseteste: ‘Heresy... is a choice made for human ends contrary to Holy Scripture, openly declared, and stubbornly maintained.’⁶⁶ The idea

58 ‘Haeresis graece ab electione dicitur, quod scilicet eam sibi unusquisque eligat disciplinam quam putat esse meliorem’: Jerome, *Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas* Lib. III, Cap. V in *Patrologia Latina*, 217 vols, ed. by J.-P. Migne (Paris: Migne, 1841-1855), XXVI (1845), column 417. See also Anders Winroth, *The Making of Gratian’s Decretum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 73; *Etymologies*, Book VIII, iii, 2-3, p. 174.

59 John 10. 16.

60 Mark 3. 14-15; Matthew 10. 20; John 14. 26; 17. 28; Acts 10. 41-2; I Corinthians 15. 3; Galatians 1. 12.

61 See Brenda Bolton, *The Medieval Reformation* (London: Edward Arnold, 1983); Lester, Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (London: Paul Elek, 1978).

62 ‘Qui aliter sentit de articulis fidei quam Romana ecclesia’: cited by R.W. Southern, Robert Grosseteste, the Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), pp. 292-93.

63 Alexander Patschovsky, ‘Heresy and Society’ in *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy*, ed. by Peter Biller and Caterina Bruschi (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2003), pp. 23-44.

64 Moore, *The War on Heresy*, p. 8.

65 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1529-30.

66 Anne Hudson, ‘Preface’, *Lollards and their Influence in Late Medieval England*, ed. by Fiona Somerset, Jill Havens, and Derrick Pitard (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), p. 1.

that the false are incorrigible is evident in *Falsitas*. The false man, says Bromyard, is comparable to a badly written book which is crammed with errors; unless all the letters are erased and written again, the book is corrected with difficulty. Bromyard also compares the false man to an old harpist who has been badly taught and struggles to learn new tunes; he would learn more quickly, if he did not already know a note. It follows, says Bromyard, that those who seek profit through swearing oaths or committing other false acts have played the harp falsely, and the book representing their souls is false.⁶⁷

The association of falsity with disobedience and incorrigibility was, however, problematic. Firstly, obedience provided a convenient excuse for those engaging in disreputable behaviour. Thus, Bromyard condemns how, ‘they conceal work on feast days under the colour of obedience or through necessity of food, saying either that it is fitting to obey their masters, whom they serve.’⁶⁸ Secondly, the obligation to correct a sinner could potentially conflict with the obligation to obey the ecclesiastical authorities. Although Bromyard does not cite any canon law sources for his arguments concerning the correction of sinners, he is in fact drawing on some important – and given the period in which he was writing – controversial authorities. Gratian’s *Decretum* cites Ambrose, ‘he who does not repel an injury committed against an associate is comparable to he who inflicts it’, and also attributes the following to Innocentius, ‘he who does not resist errors, consents to them.’⁶⁹ In the later 1320s and 1330s these authorities were used, principally by the Franciscan William Ockham, to suggest that it was the duty of every Christian to repel injustice inflicted on a fellow believer, even when that injustice was committed by the pope.⁷⁰ Ockham and a number of fellow Franciscans had begun to believe that the stance taken by Pope John XXII on the poverty of Christ and the apostles (as mentioned above) was heretical. Ockham fled Avignon in 1328, and was subsequently excommunicated. In response, he wrote a number of tracts in opposition to the pope. Ockham’s position on consenting to sin contrasted with canon lawyers who had hitherto glossed the authorities by

67 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1117-21.

68 Ibid. ll. 1322-25.

69 ‘Qui socii non repellit iniuriam, similis est ei, qui facit’: *Decretum Gratiani*, C. 23 q. 3 c. ‘Non inferenda’; ‘Qui non resistit erroribus, consentit’: *Distinctio* 83. Canon law citations have been taken from *Corpus Iuris Canonici* (Rome, 1582). I have been unable to find out the veracity of the canon relating to ‘Innocentius’.

70 Takashi Shogimen, *Ockham and Political Discourse in the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 139-40.

emphasising that one was negligent only when one should object. Thus, Rufinus, the twelfth century Italian canon lawyer, wrote: ‘It must be known that one is said to consent in two ways: when one is negligent in objecting to sin when one should object or when one co-operates [with the sinner] by defending the sin or helping him in any way.’⁷¹

The issues at stake are illustrated by John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, and one of the earliest users of the *Summa Praedicatorum*. In a sermon delivered on Ash Wednesday, 1354, much of the material for which was derived Bromyard, Sheppey encourages fraternal correction in a way which undermines clerical authority.⁷² Although recorded in Latin, the sermon was almost certainly delivered in the vernacular to a mixed audience of clergy and laity. Within the sermon, Sheppey encourages members of the audience to reveal the sins of their neighbours, whether cleric or layman, as an act of charity. In keeping with Bromyard, Sheppey condemns ‘flatterers and false prophets’ who – by arguing that God does not allow any soul to be damned – had opened the way to moral laxity. Indeed, Sheppey not only chastises the clergy, but appears to encourage the laity to openly criticise and inform upon them:

What, therefore, say you of those who knowingly admit into their inn concubines and adulterous priests, knowing and permitting them to sin under their own roof? What say you of those who have knowledge of false measures and false weights, knowing that those who passed them are excommunicate by the Great Charter and are able to correct them through a charitable denunciation? I am certain that there are in this diocese more adulterers, fornicators and incontinent priests than in so much space in any other diocese of England. And had I not made investigations, both personally and through my officials, I might scarcely have discovered six guilty couples from the time of my appointment; and yet I found over twenty such, and those that I found were all notorious cases. Look to it, therefore, when you wish to be excused in the presence of God, who have known such things and did nothing for their correction.⁷³

71 *Ibid.*, p. 140.

72 See pp. 151-53.

73 ‘Quid, igitur, dicis de illis qui scienter admittunt ad hospicium concubenarios, adulteros presbyteros, scientes et permittentes eos in domibus illorum peccare? Quid, dicis de illis qui sciunt falsas mensuras, falsa pondera, et sunt excommunicati per cartam magnam et ideo possunt eos per denunciacionem caritativam corrigere? Sum

Sheppey suggests that anyone who helps a sinner commit a sin or to conceal it, thereby shares responsibility for it. This though creates the paradoxical problem, that in order to maintain high standards amongst the clergy, which would encourage respect for clerical authority, one had to seek the help of the laity in exposing the bad behaviour of priests and monks, which would in turn, undermine clerical authority. As such, since the sentiments of fraternal correction were vulnerable to being subverted and appropriated, Sheppey was careful to emphasise the importance of obedience within his Ash Wednesday sermon. As noted in Chapter 4, he compares sinners to degraded clerics, and notes that there are three cases where the penalty is degradation and consignment to the secular courts: heresy, the forgery of papal letters, and incorrigible disobedience to the ordinary.⁷⁴ Moreover, it must be borne in mind that in the generation after Sheppey, the ecclesiastical authorities became much more sensitive towards exposing clerical sins in front of the laity, particularly in response to the rise of Lollardy.⁷⁵

In addition, Sheppey's personal conduct illustrates the difficulty of reconciling obedience, correction and – drawing on a theme which was explored in the previous chapter – fidelity. When Hamo Hythe, bishop of Rochester, was on a visitation of the monastic chapter in 1336, one of the monks, John Hwytelfelde – after downing a gallon of wine – preached a rude sermon in front of a crowd of clerics and laymen, emphasising that Hethe's position as bishop was solely down to the monks who had elected him, a fact that the bishop should do well to

certus quod in isto episcopatu sunt plures adulteri, fornicatores et presbyteri concubinarij quam in tanto spacio in aliquo episcopatu Anglie. Et nisi ego explorassevi per me et ministros meos, non invenissem sex copulas a tempore quo intravi, et tamen inveni reos plures quam viginti copulas tales, et de illis quos inveni laborabat pupplica vox et fama. Videte, igitur, quando vos vultis excusari coram Deo, qui talia scivistis et non egistis ad correccionem': 'Flebitis Vos', ll. 226-39 in Mifsud, 'John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons', p. 222.

- 74 Mifsud points out that this passage suggests that Sheppey had just completed a visitation of the diocese, and that the sermon was therefore a recapitulation of sentiments that he had already, and recently, expressed. In this respect, Sheppey's approach is consistent with how a visitation was expected to work, as illustrated in William Paull's *Speculum praelatorum*, which notes: '...in his visitation the bishop must observe this order: first he must preach the word of God, then inquire of trustworthy men of that parish, without coercion or requirement of an oath, about the life and behaviour of the prelate and the clerics who minister there and of others ordained for the divine worship.' See Mifsud, 'John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons', pp. 27, 257-58.
- 75 For example, Thomas Arundel's Constitutions (1407-09) note: 'Moreover, as the good husbandman sows his seed on such ground as is most fit to produce corn, we will and command that the preacher of God's word coming in form aforesaid, do observe a decorum as to the subject matter in his preaching to the clergy or people, so that the seed be fitted to the auditory under him, by preaching to the clergy chiefly of those vices that are growing up among them; and to the laymen of the sins most rife among them, and not otherwise. Else let him that so preacheth be canonically and sharply punished by the ordinary of the place, according to the quality of the offence': 'Archbishop Thomas Arundel's Constitutions against the Lollards's Constitutions', in *A Collection of the Laws and Canons of the Church of England*, trans. by John Johnson, 2 vols (Oxford: Parker, 1851), II, pp. 457-75 (p. 462).

remember. An angry argument subsequently erupted between Hethe and Sheppey, who, as abbot, defended his monk.⁷⁶ This incident is significant since it demonstrates that not only did Sheppey attempt to justify – rather than chastise – the bad behaviour of the monk, but it also shows he had a history of airing clerical disputes when laymen were present.

More fundamentally, the association between authority and truth creates an ambiguous position regarding falsity, and undermines the rhetorical consistency of Bromyard's argument that the false may be identified with the rich and powerful. Thus, in spite of this explicit association, Bromyard variously positions the false as both (unjust) persecutors and (the justifiably) persecuted. Falsity is both characterised as immensely strong, thus explaining its prevalence and the severity of its threat, and yet also weak and vulnerable, reflecting its need to escape observation and punishment. In addition to the frequent assertion that the false are dissemblers who conceal their falsity, Bromyard includes an extended passage in the second article comparing the thieves and killers who take refuge under the wings and protection of false men to the venomous animals who hide in thorns and hedges.⁷⁷ Bromyard partly reconciles this contradiction by emphasising that the false are not merely hiding for their own protection, but also as predators lying in wait for their prey: he compares them to dogs ready to do the bidding of the hunter, or famished falcons who have spotted a bird; if their great protector wishes that they harm somebody, and they cannot do so immediately, they lie in ambush like bird-catchers.⁷⁸ Even so, the recognition that the false required protection, demonstrates that they were threatened by, and not simply working in concert with, those in positions of power and authority.

Indeed, the position of the false as those subject to the power of others is illustrated by the way Bromyard encourages temporal lords to punish them. There is, however, a significant contradiction in the rhetorical justification Bromyard employs for such punishment. On the one hand, the false are essentially inhuman, and therefore they deserve to be punished. False men, says Bromyard, are valued worse than beasts and inanimate objects, since an ox or another animal is worth many coins, either alive or as a slaughtered carcass, but the false man, alive or

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

⁷⁷ *SP*, *Falsitas*, ll. 450-58.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, ll. 498-505.

dead is worth but a little Greek coin, because the body is worth nothing except to the worms, and the soul is worth nothing except to daemons. Bromyard then quotes from the Gospel of Matthew: ‘It is worth nothing any more, except to be cast out, and to be trodden on by men, and traded for the worms and ashes.’⁷⁹ Nevertheless, although the false are portrayed as inhuman in order to explain and delegitimise their actions, and justify their punishment, by necessity they are (to some extent) rational in order to justify their guilt. This capacity for reason is clearly evident in the way the false act according to perceived self-interest, and in their ability to deceive others. The close relationship between reason and guilt is also evident in contemporary penitential and legal practice. In canon law, for example, intention played an important role in determining the severity of a particular sin, and the responsibility of the sinner.⁸⁰ It follows that if somebody lacked the faculty of reason, he or she was unable to foresee the consequences of an action, and thus lacked the necessary *mens rea*. Indeed, even in the common law – where the effect of an action was more important than the intent of the culprit – an insane person convicted of a felony often escaped execution.⁸¹ According to the *Mirror of Justices*, a fourteenth-century legal textbook, ‘there can be no crime or sin without a corrupt will, and there can be no corruption of will where there is no discretion and an innocent conscience.’⁸²

Regardless of such ambiguity, Bromyard is required to court those in positions of power so that the false are punished. Indeed, these explicit appeals for the powerful to oppose and punish falsity are a tacit admission that it was necessary to utilise the power of the secular authorities in order to counter falsity; clearly, not every secular leader was considered a servant of the devil. In this respect, Bromyard recognises that there were good lords. In spite of his incessant critique of contemporary legal practice, he implicitly admits that there were judges unsullied by corruption, firstly by referring to the greatest and true justiciars, and secondly by noting that anybody who commits theft in the presence of a just, earthly judge may freely be

79 *Ibid.*, ll. 1173-84.

80 James Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law* (London: Longman, 1996), pp. 171-72.

81 H. Crotty, ‘The History of Insanity in Criminal Law’, *California Law Review*, 12, 2 (January, 1924), 105-23, (p. 110).

82 ‘...car crim ne se poet fere ne pecche si noun parmi voluntie corrupue, e corrupcion de volunte ne poet issi si de discrecion noun e innocente de conscins’: Andrew Horn, *The Mirror of Justices*, ed. by William Joseph Whittaker (London: Selden Society, 1895), p. 138.

called a fool.⁸³ Thus, Bromyard places secular authority and the legal system in an ambiguous position as the ever-present companion of falsity, and yet a necessary tool with which to punish the false.

Nevertheless, he is clear that those in positions of power are constrained by the same rules regarding true and false behaviour as anybody else. In particular, lords must not employ the falsity of others to enrich themselves. Moreover, he remarks that nobody should honour or reward the false man or traitor, even if such a man has harmed one's enemies through his falsity; it is impossible to trust somebody who was unfaithful to his first lord, and by rewarding him, other underlings might be motivated to commit treachery. Although Bromyard is clear that the false should never be rewarded, he is far more ambiguous regarding the extent to which the powerful may legitimately take advantage of the falsity committed by others. He includes the well-known tale of Fabricius and Pyrrhus as an example of a virtuous leader who chooses not to exploit the falsity of others for his own benefit.⁸⁴ However, in another exemplum, Bromyard describes how an imperial count captured an enemy town through the treachery of a townsman. The count subsequently exiled the traitor, asserting that a man who was false to his friends and neighbours would never be faithful to him. Although the count punishes the false behaviour of the townsman, he only does so after he has taken advantage of it for his own benefit. Indeed, this ambiguous attitude is also reflected by Bromyard's apparent approval of the deception employed by Alexander the Great (recounted in the previous chapter) to snare the two false men.⁸⁵ In this respect, it is evident that the 'false' ploys and devices used to subvert social order, which Bromyard condemns, are also those used to preserve it, and which, in some cases, he implicitly advocates.

Conclusion

Ultimately, Bromyard's attitude towards authority and society is consistent with the 'conservative radicalism' identified by Jussi Hanka as characterising the social ethos of the

83 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 356-57, 1014-15.

84 See p. 178.

85 See pp. 202-03.

friars.⁸⁶ Although Bromyard critiques temporal institutions, contrasting divine with secular authority, he also seeks the support of the temporal authorities in order to combat falsity. This ambivalence is further reflected by the way in which the false are depicted as persecutors too powerful to be condemned, and yet are also characterised by their desperate attempts to escape punishment, by the fact that they themselves are persecuted. In this context, Bromyard critiques contemporary legal practice, which is riddled with falsity, and which exhibits the very worst elements of contemporary lordship. Bromyard both follows convention, but also engages with specific contemporary issues, including the expansion of royal justice, the professionalisation of lawyers and the judiciary, and the increasingly important role of jurors. The poor are frequently depicted as victims, but the possibility that the discourse might function as a radical critique of society is undermined by the way Bromyard claims all members of society are complicit in committing falsity, driven primarily by cupidity and self-interest. By sinning, human-beings are committing falsity against God, demonstrating their infidelity, and their essential, metaphysical falsity; they are human devils masquerading as men. Only irrational beings would behave in such a way, and since reason is the defining characteristic of mankind, the false are inhuman. By dehumanising the false, Bromyard justifies their punishment; however, in order to justify their guilt, Bromyard is implicitly obliged to recognise that the false have the capacity to understand their actions, to demonstrate their capacity to reason. Given the contradictions evident in the relationship between between falsity and authority, one must question how this material was presented to an audience. Potentially a preacher might pick and choose which parts seemed appropriate in the circumstances, whether prompted by the obligation to speak truth to power, or guided by a prudent desire to avoid conflict (or indeed any other reason). However, the example of Sheppey's Ash Wednesday sermon suggests that the contradictions actually allowed a preacher to both provide a radical and persuasive critique of contemporary ills whilst placing limits on its subversive potential by emphasising the importance of obedience.

86 J. Hanska, *'And the rich man also died: and he was buried in hell': The Social Ethos in Mendicant Sermons*, Bibliotheca Historica, 28 (Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, 1997).

CHAPTER 8: KNOWLEDGE AND IDENTITY

In *Civitas*, Bromyard argues that members of society cannot be adequately protected without laws, statutes and sound doctrine to coerce the reticent and to instruct the willing.¹ Bromyard's attitude towards laws and statutes, coercion and punishment, have been dealt with in Chapter 7. In this chapter I examine the relationship between falsity and knowledge, and in particular, the way in which the idea of falsity was employed to promote and defend the veracity of orthodox teaching and doctrine; the material I discuss thus covers the final component of Bromyard's distinction of truth. Firstly, I consider Bromyard's belief that the false distort truth through the colour of appearance, and the manipulative power of language. Significantly, Bromyard's attempt to invalidate how others construct truth is undermined by the fact that preaching utilised comparable rhetorical techniques. Consequently, Bromyard strives to control competing and critical voices, principally through the use of ventriloquism and refutatio. Whilst acting as a puppet-master, therefore, he places truth and falsity on two clear opposing sides. In order to privilege this binary division he condemns jocularitas, since humour and a lack of seriousness serves to complicate these clear boundaries. Secondly, I explore how the perceived danger of falsity influences Bromyard's attitude to secrecy and the dissemination of knowledge. On the one hand, Bromyard believes that knowledge must be restricted in certain circumstances; on the other, he condemns how knowledge is concealed by the false. With regards to the latter, Bromyard depicts a situation in which the pretence of public performance is contrasted with the authenticity of secret or private discourse. However, this serves to place the position of the preacher, whose very role involved public performance, under increasing scrutiny. It also delegitimises the space in which contentious ideas might be controlled, and makes it difficult for distinct but potentially complementary discourses to legitimately coexist. As a result, Bromyard's attitude to these issues leaves the orthodox preacher vulnerable to the charge of hypocrisy. Moreover, the position of secrecy is also complicated by the role of the priest in the sacrament of penance, and the obligation to maintain the seal of confession.

¹ 'Sed quia iste conditiones predictae congruent haberi non possunt sine legibus et statutis et sana doctrina: que volentes informant nolentes coerceant': SP, *Civitas* 11.

Thirdly, I examine how Bromyard distinguishes the true from the false. Although he has already recognised that appearances can be deceptive, and reputation fickle, it is nevertheless necessary to employ these same mechanisms in order to know who or what to trust. Ultimately, Bromyard suggests that the false eventually reveal themselves, but this response does not satisfactorily reconcile the contradictions at play.

Manipulative power of language.

Fundamentally, Bromyard associates falsity with the colour of appearance, which he contrasts with the immediacy of truth. In particular, he focusses on how the false manipulate language in order to defend sinners. Thus, he explains how the false distort reality in the way a false moneyer makes a base metal appear as silver using a false colour. Using the same kind of disguise, the false make vices appear as virtues, and through this many people become wedded to the daughters of the devil, that is, sins. As a result, the false man is able to pervert truth, and to colour falsity so that it appears true and is commended and reputed prudent.² Indeed, much of the sixth article is devoted to showing how vices and virtues are frequently confused, an idea which was explored thoroughly by Gregory the Great whom Bromyard cites. The depiction of the world in binary terms allows Bromyard to control the terms of the debate, since only two mutually exclusive categories are allowed to exist. Bromyard rails against those who seek to subvert the meaning of these terms, but he does so by confirming the distinct categories. Thus: the perverter of truth is called prudent; the counsellor who encourages rapaciousness is considered wise; he who knows how to deceive somebody is called astute; a vengeful man quick to anger is seen as somebody with power who suffers no injustice; pride in appearance and possessions is called elegance and honour; lustful gluttons who love evil society and taverns are called good associates; he who profits from usury is called fortunate; lax remission of sin is considered gentleness and piety; the persistence of evil is called constancy; unbecoming fear is called humility; outspokenness is valued liberty; sloth is considered continence; interference is named care; avarice is called providence; and the sorceress is called a wise woman.³ The

² SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1217-25.

³ *Ibid.*, ll. 1222-74.

confusion of vice with virtue occurs, says Bromyard, because the devil uses falsity to conceal the true nature of sins. In this way, the devil decorates his daughters with vestments so that many wish to marry them. Bromyard compares the situation to that of a man whose daughter is ugly and whom nobody wishes to marry; clothed in a certain way, however, she appears beautiful, and many men wish to have her. Correspondingly, when the daughters of the devil appear under their own names, such as gluttony, murder, theft and so on, they are considered repulsive. However, by changing names, and clothed in falsity, they become desirable; men defend their beauty and react angrily if a criticism is made. For example, however much a knight is an evil tyrant, and a lord injurious, or a rector simoniacal and slippery, if he keeps a good table, and has a great household, and clothes many squires, and gives gifts liberally, all ugliness of the daughters of the devil is driven away under the cloak of courtesy. The false conceal the ugliness of usury under the cloak of utility, saying that it is useful for the other party; lust is defended under the habit of natural inclination; fraud is justified as commerce; the vanity of fashion is simply following the custom of the land; work on feast days is defended as obedience to one's master or through necessity of hunger; hypocrisy is concealed under a picture of holiness, speech and laughter and derision under the name of jocularly and society.⁴ After criticising those who defend sins, Bromyard attacks those who paint virtuous behaviour in a vicious light. 'Just as the devil and his ministers strive to glorify the vices', says Bromyard, 'so they also strive to falsely blame and, with their lies, criticise the daughters of God and his ministers, that is, the virtues.'⁵ Thus: the truthful councillor is not considered good and faithful; lords who wish to live within their means are reputed wretched; the forgiving man is considered less than a man; the humble man who does not meddle in the business of others is called foolish; and he who does not wish to follow the willing band of evil men in all their illicit associations is put to flight by all as if he were a wondrous wild beast.⁶

Bromyard's discussion of the manipulative power of language engages with, and has been influenced by, a number of factors, including the biblical narrative of the fall, ideas about

4 Ibid., ll. 1281-1329.

5 Ibid., ll. 1330-35.

6 Ibid., ll. 1336-53.

heresy, and also the use of rhetoric.⁷ In essence, the tensions in this discourse surround the relationship between form and content.⁸ Within the chapter, Bromyard frequently associates a pleasing appearance with falsity: that is, falsity gains traction because of its form, because it appears true, or at least beautiful, in contrast to truth, which gains traction because of its content, because it is true. Thus, Bromyard says in article two that the demon knows he is odious in his own form, and if men saw him they would flee him.⁹ The demon therefore sends his disciples in his stead through whom he speaks. In article six, Bromyard frequently refers to the false doing nefarious deeds under the disguise or cloak of a false colour. Implicitly, there is an assumption that truth is transparent.

Although Bromyard's discussion of colour and content clearly has a theological twist, he also draws on classical debates about sophistry and rhetoric – how language could be used effectively to persuade and influence other people.¹⁰ Rhetoric had a chequered history. In the fourth century BC, Plato criticised sophists who used rhetoric to produce 'conviction without knowing.'¹¹ Aristotle, however, believed that rhetoric was a useful tool, primarily because its principal function was to communicate one's point of view.¹² Based on the three parts of speech (the speaker, word, and listener), Aristotle identified three specific means of persuasion: *ethos* (the character of the speaker was worthy of trust); *logos* (the logic of the argument was clear); and *pathos* (the emotional state of the listener was moved).¹³ Nevertheless, ancient Greek works of rhetoric had little bearing on the medieval west. Instead, two Roman works of rhetoric exerted considerable influence: Cicero's *De inventione* (c. 87 BC), and the anonymous (although erroneously ascribed to Cicero during the Middle Ages) *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (c.

7 See Denery, *The Devils Wins*, pp. 21-35.

8 It should be noted that Bromyard was educated in the medieval schools, and was thus working within a philosophical framework of Aristotelian metaphysics. Indeed, although Bromyard considers 'form' dubious, he would nevertheless have understood it as an intrinsic property of an object. Aristotle had argued that all physical objects were composed of matter and form. See Thomas Ainsworth, 'Form vs. Matter', in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2016) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/form-matter/>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

9 SP, *Falsitas*, l. 636.

10 According to the OED, rhetoric may be defined as: 'The art of using language effectively so as to persuade or influence others, especially the exploitation of figures of speech and other compositional techniques to this end; the study of principles and rules to be followed by a speaker or writer striving for eloquence, especially as formulated by ancient Greek and Roman writers.' See 'Rhetoric', OED (Oxford University Press, 2015) <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/165178>> [accessed 10 September 2017].

11 Charles Griswold, 'Plato on Rhetoric and Poetry', in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2016) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato-rhetoric/>> [accessed 10 September 2017].

12 Christof Rapp, 'Aristotle's Rhetoric' in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2010) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-rhetoric/>> [accessed 10 September 2017].

13 Daniel J. O'Keefe, 'Persuasion' in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, ed. by T.O. Sloane (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 595-603.

80 BC).¹⁴ Roman rhetorical theory was based on five elements: *inventio* (the discovery of valid arguments); *dispositio* (the distribution of arguments); *elocutio* (the appropriate style and language); *memoria* (the mental grasp of the matter and words); *pronuntiatio* (a suitable delivery).¹⁵ Cicero defined rhetoric as ‘eloquence [expressing thoughts with fluency, force, and appropriateness] based on rules of art’ and ‘the aim of eloquence was to persuade an audience by speech’.¹⁶ According to Cicero, eloquence was necessary, but it was only useful when combined with wisdom; indeed, eloquence without wisdom was often mischievous.

These views were utilised by Augustine in *De Doctrina Cristiana*, who argued that although rhetoric was based on classical models, it was a necessary tool for the Christian teacher. Thus, since the art of rhetoric was available for enforcing either truth or falsehood, who would dare to claim that the defenders of truth should stand unarmed against falsehood?¹⁷ According to Augustine, content without form was just as bad as the pagan mistake of relying purely on form. Instead, the Christian teacher was required to do three things: firstly, to explain the content of the matter clearly and appropriately so that the audience would understand it; secondly, to express it in a pleasing manner so that the audience would wish to hear it; and thirdly, to expound it in a persuasive fashion so that the audience would act upon it.¹⁸ Rhetoric was thus accepted as a legitimate tool in the Christian armoury, spawning several specific medieval forms, including the *ars praedicandi*. The Dominican Order approved of this position, and friars were expected to exploit rhetorical techniques whilst preaching. Echoing Augustine, Humbert of Romans argued that a preacher needed to cultivate a public persona; the rhetoric and appearance of the preacher ought to be modified to suit the particular audience.¹⁹

14 James Murphy, ‘Rhetoric’ in *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, pp. 629-38 (p. 629). The *De Inventione* is typically called Cicero’s *Rhetorica Vetus*, while the *Ad Herennium* is called his *Rhetorica Nova*.

15 *Ibid.*

16 Elaine Fantham, ‘Eloquence’, in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, pp. 250-60.

17 Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. and trans. by R.P.H. Green (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), Book IV, Chapter 2, pp. 203, 205, 209, 215, 251.

18 *Ibid.* See also Richard Leo Enos and Roger Thompson (eds), *The Rhetoric of St Augustine of Hippo: De Doctrina Christiana and the Search for a Distinctly Christian Rhetoric* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008).

19 Humbert of Romans, *De Eruditione Praedicatorum in De Vita Regulari*, II, pp. 373-484. See also Dallas Denery, *Seeing and Being Seen in the Late-Medieval World: Optics, Theology and Religious Life* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 19-38; Claire Waters, *Angels and Earthly Creatures: Preaching, Performance and Gender in the Later Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), pp. 31-56.

Since integral aspects of rhetoric were associated with falsity, however, this approach was problematic. Indeed, it is clear that Bromyard continued to doubt the authenticity of eloquence. In the prologue to the *Summa*, for example, he remarks:

Many speak, but not to the heart, because not with devotion; but with the composition and ostentation of the words of a philosopher, they soothe the ears of the audience against doctrine. In the book of Augustine *On the Catechising of the Uninstructed*: especially, says he, it is useful to know, therefore, that feeling must be placed within the words, as the spirit is placed in the body. And thus they should prefer to construct better sermons rather than eloquent ones.²⁰

Significantly, Bromyard's attitude towards rhetoric – including all three Aristotelian categories of *ethos*, *logos* and *pathos* – serves to undermine the integrity of his own argument.

Firstly, Bromyard attacks the *ethos* of those who attempt to persuade others. In order to illustrate the danger of being in close proximity to the false, Bromyard tells a story concerning two false friends. One of these men dies, and is succeeded by his son, who is obliged to attend a session at the county court in which the other false man is present. In the course of the day, the false man leads his former friend's son aside, and tells him that he might earn half a mark if he agrees to swear a false oath. The youth says that he would not dare do so on account of the danger to his soul, and because he does not want to offend God. In response, the false man, experienced in the ways of the world, says that the boy's father profited greatly by doing this, as did all the others, and so it was fitting that the boy should profit too. In this way, says Bromyard, the false man often strives to pervert others. Thus, the very act of persuasion (in the guise of perverting others) becomes associated with falsity. Of course, Bromyard is not suggesting that the true do not (or should not) attempt to incline others towards truth. After all, in the prologue to the *Summa*, he positively describes how sparks fly from the exhortation of a preacher, and flaming words reach the ears of those listening, setting ablaze those who are touched within

²⁰ SP, Prologus, ll. 130-39.

their hearts.²¹ Nevertheless, since he criticises the false on the very grounds that they are persuading others (and not merely the nature of that persuasion), any distinction with the persuasive tactics employed by the true lies on weak foundations.

Secondly, Bromyard's critique of the way the false conceal truth behind a veil is complicated by his own use of colores and rhetorical devices. Correspondingly, this undermines the logos, the logic (and integrity), behind the argument. Whilst Bromyard includes many quotations derived from scripture, he adorns the material with his own argumentation and interpretation, with stories and fables. Indeed, although Bromyard remarks that kings should listen to the laws of God, and not romances, fables and lies, he himself employs comparable tales and narrative exempla within the *Summa*.²²

Finally, Bromyard's implicit treatment of pathos is also problematic. One of the reasons that the false are victorious, he argues, is because they use deception in a way comparable to the Antichrist, who will deceive the people in three ways: through wonders, gifts, and terrors. Just as the devil tempts persuasively and bestows delectable things in order to deceive the wretched people, so they give agreeable little gifts to their simple neighbours, and make merry with them, and speak with beauty. They do this until they have what they desire. Nevertheless, says Bromyard, they are different from the devil in two ways. Firstly, they seem to proceed more covertly, since they employ both their own character, and also that of the devil. If they came solely in the form of a demon, they would not prevail. Secondly, whereas the devil seeks to deprive men of a celestial inheritance, they try to deprive wretched people of an earthly inheritance.²³ Bromyard's account clearly harks back to the biblical narrative of the devil deceiving Adam and Eve. In addition, his contemporaries would, no doubt, have been sympathetic to the tale of a trickster exploiting a gullible victim by feigning friendship. However, Bromyard profoundly attacks the very notion of creating rapport, with the implication that if this 'trick' is necessary, then any subsequent deal or relationship is compromised. Philosophers, theologians and psychologists have long noted that rapport is an integral aspect of the art of persuasion – regardless of whether one is trying to communicate the truth, or to

21 Ibid., ll. 5-9.

22 SP, Regimen 7. This reference is noted by Walls, John Bromyard, p. 137.

23 SP, Falsitas, ll. 640-42.

manipulate, control and deceive other people (or indeed, a combination of both) - and Bromyard implicitly criticises a means of creating this: gifts; merry-making; and agreeable company.²⁴ Thus, by exposing how the rapport of the false is created, Bromyard attempts to invalidate it. Nevertheless, he is clearly aware of the usefulness of rapport and its importance for preachers and those who speak truth. In *Veritas*, for example, he emphasises that it is necessary to moderate what one says depending on the circumstances, and he criticises those who alienate others by telling the truth in an inappropriate way.²⁵

Given the parallels between the rhetorical ploys of the false, and those employed by preachers such as Bromyard, a potential charge of hypocrisy was never far away. Bromyard therefore attempts to control the narrative by creating a clearer distinction between the actions of the true and the false. Notably, he employs ventriloquism to define and limit competing arguments, setting up the proverbial straw man. In rhetorical theory, the aspect of a speech in which an opponent's argument was recited and countered was called *refutatio*, and formed part of the *dispositio*. Even here, however, it is possible to perceive how Bromyard might lose control over the argument. By reciting the arguments of others, he brings into being and disseminates contrasting and critical ideas that might otherwise have remained hidden. An example of this strategy occurs in the seventh article, in which Bromyard refutes potential arguments put forward by those who justify retaining property acquired from shipwrecks. Firstly, he says, they claim that since they do not know who owns the property, they have licitly acquired it: that is, *finders keepers*. Bromyard counters this by saying that although they might be ignorant of the owner, they do know that the property does not belong to them. Secondly, they argue that jettisoned goods have been conceded to the occupier of the land; when somebody gives up possession of property, ownership is transferred to the person on whose land it is left. However, says Bromyard, the owner, either alive or dead, desired to have use from those things jettisoned out of a shipwreck, and he did not intend to relinquish them. Thirdly, they claim that since they have defended that property from other marauders, they have earned the right to it. Citing the Roman jurist Pomponius, Bromyard refutes this argument and notes

24 *Ibid.*, ll. 625-32.

25 *SP*, *Veritas* 12.

that such a person is liable to an action of theft. The recitation and refutation of the arguments employed by salvors of shipwrecked goods covers a considerable amount of space in the chapter, and in this instance it is clear that Bromyard wishes to comprehensively deal with each and every argument that might be used (and no doubt was); in so doing, he also disseminates them (although in this instance, it is probable that those who retained shipwrecked goods needed little assistance in creating arguments to justify their actions).

Additionally, Bromyard's denunciation of evil speech, laughter and derision (which, he argues, are frequently excused under the name of jocularitas and camaraderie) suggests ways in which humour provides a cover for contesting ideas and beliefs, and the difficulty in controlling this discourse. As Chaucer was to remark in the *Monk's Prologue*, 'Ful ofte in game a sooth I have herd seye.'²⁶ Given the ambiguity of humour, it is unsurprising that the role of jocularitas has been contested throughout history. Plato was a vocal critic of laughter believing that it overrode rational self-control, and was intimately associated with malice and scorn. Aristotle was slightly more sympathetic; wit was conceived as a valuable part of conversation, although the mockery of jesting was less laudable. Early Christian thinkers were influenced by these criticisms and also the hostile representations of laughter which appeared in the Bible. As a result, laughter was frequently associated with a loss of self-control, and also idleness, irresponsibility, lust, and anger.²⁷ However, Thomas Aquinas put forward a far more positive view of jocularitas, noting 'words or deeds wherein nothing further is sought than the soul's delight, are called playful or humorous. Hence it is necessary at times to make use of them, in order to give rest, as it were, to the soul.'²⁸ Aquinas conceded that 'the pleasure in question should not be sought in indecent or injurious deeds or words' (one must not lose the balance of his or her mind completely), and that we must 'conform ourselves to persons, time, and place, and take due account of other circumstances, so that our fun "befit the hour and the

26 'The Monk's Prologue and Tale', *The Canterbury Tales in The Riverside Chaucer*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), l. 1964, p. 241.

27 John Morreall, 'Philosophy of Humor', in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2016) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/humor/>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

28 'Dicta vel facta, in quibus non quaeritur nisi delectatio animalis, vocantur ludicra vel iocosa. Et ideo necesse est talibus interdum uti, quasi ad quandam animae quietem': Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, II, II, Q. 168, Art. 2. <<http://dhsprory.org/thomas/summa/SS/SS168.html#SSQ168OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

man.””²⁹ Indeed, even though a ‘lack of mirth is less sinful than excess’, Aquinas emphasised that ‘a man who is without mirth, not only is lacking in playful speech, but is also burdensome to others, since he is deaf to the moderate mirth of others. Consequently they are vicious, and are said to be boorish or rude.’³⁰

In recent years, a great deal of scholarship has been devoted to the sociology of humour, and the various functions of jocularity; it is worth exploring these in order to analyse the significance of Bromyard’s attitude. The three classical theories revolve around the way humour can articulate feelings of superiority, provide a psychological relief valve, and deal with incongruous situations. Since then, a number of different approaches have adapted these ideas. The functionalist approach emphasises the way humour encourages social cohesion and diffuses tension in potentially antagonistic relationships. A contrasting approach considers the way in which humour is produced in situations of conflict, and can exacerbate social inequalities, emphasising its exclusivity and the butt of the joke. However, the most relevant work (for the present purpose) involves that which comes under the banner of the symbolic-interactionist or phenomenological approach. According to Giseline Kuipers, ‘in this approach, whether something is defined as humorous or serious is not a given, but something constructed in the course of interactions. The shift from serious to joking conversation becomes an act of conversational cooperation, which can succeed, be withheld, or fail, and this shift creates opportunities for specific types of communication. For instance, people who say something in jest usually have more freedom to transgress norms and bring up taboo topics.’³¹ Humour is thus a forum for negotiating meaning, since its essential non-seriousness provides a ‘way-out’. Correspondingly, the phenomenological approach interprets humour as a world-view, a mode of perceiving and constructing the world. Zijderfeld has described humour as ‘playing with meanings’ which facilitate social experimentation and negotiation, denaturalising the world, and

29 ‘Praedicta delectatio non quaeratur in aliquibus operationibus vel verbis turpibus vel nocivis.[...] est attendendum, sicut et in omnibus aliis humanis actibus, ut congruat personae et tempori et loco, et secundum alias circumstantias debite ordinetur, ut scilicet sit et tempore et homine dignus, ut Tullius dicit, ibidem’: Ibid. <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/SS/SS168.html#SSQ168OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

30 ‘Illi autem qui in ludo deficiunt, neque ipsi dicunt aliquod ridiculum; et dicentibus molesti sunt, quia scilicet moderatos aliorum ludos non recipiunt. Et ideo tales vitiosi sunt, et dicuntur duri et agrestes [...] defectus ludi minus est vitiosus quam ludi superexcessus’: Ibid., Art. 4. <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/SS/SS168.html#SSQ168OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

31 Giseline Kuipers, ‘The Sociology of Humor’, *The Primer of Humor Research*, ed. by V. Raskin (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), pp. 361-98 (p. 381).

revealing its constructedness.³² Correspondingly, Mulkey argues that when people engage with humour they apply different information-processing procedures which allows them to discuss incongruous experiences and negotiate the ambiguous meanings that constitute social life.³³ The idea that humour negotiates and contests meaning provides the context for understanding Bromyard's criticisms, and also illuminates how aspects of jocularitry functioned more widely in medieval society. For example, it serves to explain how theological inconsistencies, doubts and tensions are played out in the humorous texts on the 'Life of St. Nemo', in which Nemo, the Latin word for nobody, is interpreted as an actual person. Thus, Nobody can serve two masters, and Nobody is greater than God; indeed, according to the Bible, Nobody is permitted to do quite a few things that are forbidden to mere mortals.³⁴ Jocularitry thus challenges one of the central characteristics of Bromyard's discourse: the necessity of perceiving the world in terms of two, fixed, binary positions. The dismissal of jocularitry is part of an attempt or ploy to assign fixed meaning to an inherently unstable form.

Nevertheless, Bromyard was clearly correct in detecting the subversive potential of jocularitry. Although there is a biting satirical character to much of his own argumentation in the *Summa*, there are few instances in which Bromyard overtly employs humour.³⁵ On one occasion in which he does do so, however, the dangers are clearly illustrated. In the chapter *Prelatio*, Bromyard recounts how the courtliness of ecclesiastical dignitaries was mocked by an old woman. According to Bromyard, the woman begged a certain bishop for a penny, but was given nothing. She then begged him for a blessing, which he gave without delay. In response, she replied: if it had been worth a half-penny, I would not have received it.³⁶ On the one hand, this anecdote simply serves to criticise the higher echelons of the clergy who were moved by material rather than spiritual values. More problematically, it potentially provides, under the

32 Ibid., p. 376.

33 Ibid., p. 381.

34 Martha Bayless, *Parody in the Middle Ages* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), pp. 1-75.

35 Even so, there are clear examples when Bromyard does employ *trufae*, or idle and humorous stories. For example, he recounts a tale about three Welshmen travelling in England. Unable to speak the language properly, they unintentionally incriminate themselves for a murder committed by somebody else: SP, *Scientia* 18. See Siegfried Wenzel, 'The Joyous Art of Preaching; or the Preacher and the *Fabliaux*', in Siegfried Wenzel, *Elucidations: Medieval Poetry and its Religious Backgrounds* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), pp. 81-98 (p. 86).

36 'Quam curialitatem quedam vetula iocunde derisit; de qua fertur quod cum importune denarium a quodam episcopo peteret, nec obtinere potuit petivit benedictionem, quam cum statim daret respondit mulier, si benedictio tua obolum valuisset illam non obtinuisset': SP, *Prelatio* 20. This example has been included by Walls, p. 164.

cover of humour, a sympathetic voice for those who adhered to the Donatist heresy, in which it was believed that the validity of the sacraments depended on the moral worth of the celebrant (medieval canon law accepted the Augustinian position that the power of God was operating through the celebrant when a sacrament was administered; therefore, the merit of the celebrant was irrelevant). Of course, a benediction is not comparable to a sacrament, and there is no suggestion that Bromyard intended this anecdote to be used in such a way – indeed, he is painstakingly orthodox throughout the *Summa*. However, the tale clearly expresses an attitude which is consistent with Donatism, and which might encourage the formation of such views. In the latter part of the fourteenth century (that is the generation after Bromyard composed the *Summa*), such views were clearly circulating in some form in England. One of the propositions condemned as heretical at the 1382 Blackfriars Council was the following: ‘That if a bishop or priest exists in a state of mortal sin, he does not ordain, nor does he consecrate, nor baptize.’³⁷ Whilst it is impossible to claim that Bromyard’s anecdote directly influenced such views, it illustrates at the very least the potential of humour for propagating them.

The dissemination of knowledge, secrecy and performance

The first section of this chapter has examined the difficulty in distinguishing true from false knowledge, and the way in which Bromyard attempts to control the meaning and limit the power of alternative and contradictory views. In particular, Bromyard’s condemnation of jocularity reveals his desire to restrict the spaces where such views might exist and flourish. Within this context, Bromyard implicitly associates the dissemination of falsity more broadly with the idea of contagion, which he employs to demonstrate the dangers facing individuals and the wider community when coming into contact with the false. Thus, says Bromyard, the false corrupt like a leper, or a diseased sheep, imagery strengthened by references throughout the chapter to ‘malos extraneos’, evil outsiders; falsity creeps into houses like a noxious weed.³⁸

37 It should be noted that this proposition was not specifically attributed to John Wyclif, whose views on the matter were ambiguous. According to Levy: ‘Wyclif may never have arrived at a definitive position regarding the ability of priests in a state of mortal sin to consecrate the host. But his thinking did evolve in this matter... Perhaps scholars will have to be content to say that there were times when Wyclif had been orthodox, times when a Donatist, and other times still when he had walked a perilous path between’: Ian Levy, ‘Was John Wyclif’s Theology of the Eucharist Donatistic?’, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 53, 2 (2000), 137-53 (p. 152).

38 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 222-24, 459, 959.

The fear of contagion became particularly acute whenever the issue of heresy arose. Heresy had often been described in terms of pestilence and plague, and analogies of contagion and infection commonly accompanied the revival of heresy from the eleventh century onwards. Robert Moore has suggested that the metaphor of disease and the use of contagion imagery initially provided commentators with a comprehensive model to explain how the phenomenon of heresy, threatening and novel in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, worked.³⁹ More specifically, a crucial function of contagion imagery was to ostracise and isolate those who were alleged to carry the disease.⁴⁰ In the seventh article, for example, Bromyard recalls a French Proverb, that one penny badly gained, curses all the others.⁴¹ Indeed (as mentioned above), Bromyard emphasises that proximity to the false is particularly dangerous since they are intent on converting others to their falsity.⁴²

Significantly, these dangers complicate Bromyard's attitude towards ignorance and knowledge. To instruct the ignorant was one of the seven spiritual works of mercy. This was clearly a central preoccupation for Bromyard, whose *Summa* was designed to aid those preaching to the laity. However, the obligation to provide knowledge and reveal the truth had to be balanced by the need to restrict the dissemination of false and dangerous knowledge. In *Falsitas*, Bromyard notes that instead of knowledge of God, there is now worldly knowledge and profit.⁴³ He also remarks that just as it is better to have naked parchment than a completely false book, it is also better to lack wisdom and keep God's commandments than to be wise and sin.⁴⁴ Bromyard's discussion of ignorance and knowledge reflects how the ecclesiastical authorities dealt with the issue of heresy before he was writing, but it is also indicative of how it would be dealt with after his text began to circulate. Notably, controls were imposed over who was permitted to convey and mediate knowledge of God to the laity. In an English context, tighter regulations began to be imposed on the teaching and transmission of doctrine in response

39 Robert Moore, 'Heresy as Disease' in *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages*, ed. by W. Lourdaux, D. Verhelst (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1976), 1-11 (pp. 1-2, 9-11). Moore suggests that by the thirteenth century less emphasis was being placed on the analogy of disease; previously it had seemed threatening and in need of explanation; now, commentators relied on first hand experience.

40 Ian Forrest, *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England*, p. 156. See also V. Nutton, 'The Seeds of Disease: An Explanation of Contagion and Infection from the Greeks to the Renaissance', *Medical History*, 27 (1983), 1-34.

41 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1864-66.

42 See p. 242.

43 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 271-72.

44 *Ibid.*, ll. 1143-45.

to the threat of ‘Lollardy’ in the early fifteenth century; in particular, Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Arundel’s Constitutions (drafted in 1407, and published in 1409) prohibited the making, reading and transmitting of unapproved vernacular translations of biblical texts.⁴⁵

If the first step in combating false knowledge involved preventing its dissemination, the second involved dealing with those who already possessed it. According to Bromyard, it is almost impossible to correct a man or woman who has acquired false knowledge; instead, such a person must be punished. As a result of this persecution, the false were prone to hide their true nature. ‘Lest they show their falsity in work’, says Bromyard, ‘they choose to dissemble through fear, or love, or lack of opportunity.’⁴⁶ Indeed, it is clear that persecution forced deviant beliefs and attitudes into the shadows, thereby encouraging the false to pursue their activities clandestinely. This was reflected in the locations where heterodox beliefs flourished and were perceived to flourish. For example, Bromyard describes the way in which venomous animals gain protection and resist correction in hedges. Furthermore, it could be dangerous if the false strove to hide what they were truly thinking. Bromyard thus heavily condemns such secrecy and dissimulation.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, any identification of falsity with dissimulation was complicated. Firstly, it revealed a contradiction with regards to heresy. On the one hand, heresy required the open dismissal of doctrine; on the other, those persecuted as heretics were unlikely to advertise their beliefs in full view.⁴⁸ Secondly, persecution served to create a self-fulfilling prophecy, causing behaviour which in turn justified such persecution: those who held deviant beliefs hid them; hiding beliefs was a characteristic of falsity; such beliefs were therefore false because they were hidden. Moreover, given the ambivalent relationship between persecution and falsity – as discussed in Chapter 7 – any outright condemnation of dissimulation lay on shaky grounds; the true were frequently persecuted, and it was therefore often prudent to hide the truth from their persecutors. In this regard, Augustine had distinguished concealing the truth from lying, noting the occasion when Abraham concealed the fact that Sarah was his wife by affirming that she was his sister: ‘It is not a lie’, says Augustine, ‘when truth is passed over in silence, but

45 ‘Archbishop Thomas Arundel’s Constitutions against the Lollards’s Constitutions’, in *A Collection of the Laws and Canons*, II, pp. 457-75.

46 SP, *Falsitas*, II. 1128-33.

47 *Ibid.*, II. 900-05.

48 Anne Hudson, ‘Preface’ in *Lollards and their Influence in Late Medieval England*, ed. by Fiona Somerset, Jill C. Havens and Derrick G. Pitard (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), p. 1.

when falsehood is brought forth in speech.⁴⁹ Correspondingly, Aquinas argued that it is ‘lawful to hide the truth prudently, by keeping it back’: in some circumstances less than the truth can be virtuous ‘as when a man does not show the whole good that is in him, for instance science, holiness and so forth. This is done without prejudice to truth, since the lesser is contained in the greater.’⁵⁰

Indeed, there is clearly a socio-political angle to the dissimulation Bromyard describes, corresponding to what James C Scott has defined as a public transcript and a hidden transcript. Scott suggests that relations between dominant and subordinate groups are enacted in a public performance, or transcript, in which members of the less powerful group strategically defer to the more powerful group, concealing their authentic feelings and beliefs behind a public mask; it is in the interest of the weak to pretend that they believe what the powerful want them to believe, whilst it is in the interests of the powerful to live up to the ideological claims that give legitimacy to their dominance.⁵¹ However, the authentic feelings and beliefs of each group are either articulated in private settings, forming part of a hidden transcript, or are disguised within the public transcript. Both Bromyard and Scott suggest that social interactions can be placed into two distinct categories, one of which is characterised by acting, and the other by authenticity; for Bromyard, the expression of authentic thoughts in a secret setting (when these thoughts differ from those presented in a more public setting) reflects falsity, whilst for Scott it is a site of resistance that prepares the ground for revolutionary activity. Thus, Bromyard remarks: ‘when false men strain to discuss some falsity or conspiracy, by compact and foresight they arrange their force that they admit no faithful man freely amongst them.’ However, in this regard, Erving Goffman’s suggestion that every social act is a presentation of self, a form of acting, is significant.⁵² Since each and every communicative interaction may be considered a type of performance, it follows that all ‘transcripts’ are posed to varying degrees.⁵³ This does

49 Augustine, *Against Lying*, Chapter 10, pp. 151-52.

50 Concealing the truth with actions was just as permissible as doing so with words: Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, II, II, Q. 111, Art. 1. <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/SS/SS111.html#SSQ111OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017]

51 James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

52 Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990).

53 A significant amount of literature has been written on the idea of privacy (and the extent to which it existed) in the Middle Ages. See Georges Duby (ed.), *A History of Private Life. Volume 2: Revelations of the Medieval World*, trans. by Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1993). In this

not necessarily negate some of the theoretical work already mentioned; a ‘transcript’ may be sufficiently authentic for it to function in the way set out by Scott. Nevertheless, there are significant implications for Bromyard’s discourse. First, preaching was fundamentally a type of performance. In the chapter *Praedicatio*, for example, Bromyard provides a list of the characteristics which give testimony to (or witness) the life of a preacher. These clearly emphasise the importance of how a preacher appeared to others:

Therefore, the first witness named here is religious decorum and suitability of dress and those preaching this and inveighing against ostentation in dress should not follow that fault. The second witness is gentleness of bearing and seemliness of manners in going through towns and villages, so that he does not show levity of mind by going with head uncovered, or by running and hurrying too much or looking about foolishly. Industry indeed is useful to the preacher; it is a necessary witness, because just as the physician does not cure nor the advocate defend a case well, who spend the time of their study in gossiping about their own cares, so etc. Even the private conversation, also of the preacher is examined as a witness, because when they see him in secret conversation to be discreet, devout and using words of edification, they believe more easily in his preaching. Lastly, restraint in food is a necessary witness, because according to the decree taken from the words of Jerome on the prophet Michael (Dist. 35 Ecclesie) ‘He very unbecomingly preaches to the Church who proclaims a poor Christ with a full stomach and rosy cheeks’⁵⁴

respect, it is useful to note that the language of ‘secrecy’ was engrained in Old English. See, for example, ‘ærn’, ‘be-digling’, ‘be-hýdedness’, ‘dæglan’, ‘dierne’, ‘hyge-rún’ in Bosworth-Toller.

54 ‘Primus ergo testis hic nominatus est vestium religiositas et decencia, quem predicante contra vestium superbiam, illam non ostendunt, sed pocius talia eos ornamenta. Secundus est gestus maturitas, et morum in eundo per villas et vices composcio ut non discooperto capite vel currendo vel nimis festinando vel fatue respiciendo animi indicet levitatem. Occupacio vero utilis est predicatori, testis valde necessarius, quia sicut medicus non sanat nec advocatus bene causam defendit, qui tempus studii circa curas suas expendunt in garrulacionibus, ita etc. Privata eciam locucio tanquam testis predicatoris examinatur, quia ubi vident predicatorem in secreta lucucione discretum devotum et habentem verba edificatoria, plus credunt predicacionibus suis. Est postremo victus parcitas testis necessarius, quia secundum decretum sumptum ex verbis Ieronimi super Micheam prophetam, Dis. 35. Ecclesie...: Inconvenienter predicat qui pauperem Christum Pingui ventre et rudentibus buccis annunciat’: SP, *Praedicatio* 18; translated by Oross, John Bromyard, p. 123.

Thus, as Dallas Denery has observed more generally, ‘since the preacher must always consider himself in terms of how he presents himself (even when he is alone), he is, almost imperceptibly, transformed into a thoroughly public being. The preacher is always confronted by and must always adapt himself to some audience. He is always the object of somebody’s gaze, and his conduct, his conscience, his intentions, must always be regulated by the demands to preach to that gaze, by the demand never to be idle.’⁵⁵ Of course, a performance which was true to the character of the performer could hardly be termed false. Nevertheless, it seems inevitable that a preacher, whilst focussing on how he might be perceived by the audience, would become aware of the incongruity between his inner thoughts and desires, and the need to perform and behave in a certain way. Equally, on the occasions when personal standards did not match public performance, it is inevitable that the audience became aware of this too. This may partly explain Bromyard’s assertion that almost everyone was false; how could they not be? At the very least, it provides a distinct context for Bromyard’s citation of Psalm 116: ‘Every man is a liar.’⁵⁶

Secondly, as already discussed, by associating secrecy with falsity, Bromyard is able to delegitimise the space where secret discourse exists. By doing so, however, he is potentially taking away an important safety valve where conflicting and anti-social opinions might play out. For example, although jocularly could be dangerous by providing fertile grounds for illegitimate ideas to flourish, the condemnation of jocularly may have pushed potential criticism into the more dangerous territory of heresy: if it were impermissible to joke about theological inconsistencies, and the conduct of the clergy, then the alternative option was to treat these issues seriously. As Bromyard himself remarks: ‘just as a flowing stream, and flowing river is able to be dammed for a time, nevertheless, it is not long before it comes upon its usual or an alternative way.’⁵⁷

Thirdly, even though a good case can be made that every ‘transcript’ is performed by actors behind a social mask, it is possible that two alternative ‘transcripts’ may both be – to a certain extent – authentic. This is consistent with the recent work of socio-linguists and social anthropologists such as Susan Gal, who notes: ‘The expression of contradictory opinions by a

⁵⁵ Denery, *Seeing and Being Seen in the Late-Medieval World*, p. 28.

⁵⁶ *SP*, *Falsitas*, ll. 266-68.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, ll. 1125-29.

single speaker, in different contexts, is not necessarily evidence of dissembling or inauthenticity. In a bilingual community in Hungary, any single villager expresses many and often conflicting opinions about the value of the two languages he or she speaks, including opinions that show evidence of a resistance to official languages and ideologies. But these contrasting stances cannot be classified as posed versus genuine; they are evidence of the coexistence of deeply felt yet contested discourses.⁵⁸ An example of this pertinent to the present study might be the distinct ways in which the issue of deception was dealt with in the context of preaching and that of confession (for an explanation of this, see Chapter 6). However, since Bromyard positions alternative transcripts as either authentic or posed, anybody who participates in both ‘transcripts’ becomes associated with falsity, and potentially open to a charge of hypocrisy.

Indeed, since hypocrisy was a particularly serious form of (dis)simulation, it is worth dealing with the concept in a little more detail. The word was derived from the Greek *ὑπόκρισις* (hypocrisis), which in turn was borrowed from *υποκρίνομαι* (hypokrinomai) meaning to interpret or to respond. In particular, the term was applied to actors *ὑποκριτής* (hypokrites) who would interpret a play with both gestures and their delivery; thus, the association between hypocrisy and mediated performance was there from the very beginning. Even so, the meaning of the term began to change. In the Septuagint, it was used to signify those who deviated from the faith, and was also the Greek translation of the Hebrew word *חָנֵף* (hanef), which had connotations of seduction and sycophancy. By the early Middle Ages the term meant the simulation of a religious virtue, or the dissimulation of a vice. Bromyard was clearly aware of the deleterious effects of hypocrisy. In the eighth article of *Falsitas*, he considers how God will treat hypocrites who conceal their falsity under the guise of holiness: ‘Just as a man is more angry at a false coin which appears genuine, and thus might deceive him, than one which is clearly counterfeit, so God is angrier at false Christians who strive to appear good in order to deceive others. Such men are accustomed to speak in a holy manner in a private collation, and claim that they never commit falsity, nor permit anyone in their charge to commit it. If a sermon is preached concerning false men, they bewail the condition of the false men with deep sighs. But just as they claim to be good and true in words, so they prove themselves false

58 Susan Gal, ‘Language and the Arts of Resistance’, *Cultural Anthropology*, 10, 3 (1995), 407-24 (pp. 412-13).

in their work.⁵⁹ Although Bromyard's warning is not explicitly directed towards his fellow friars, the passage recalls antifraternal (and, more generally, anticlerical) criticisms that were already circulating.⁶⁰

The friars' participation in the sacrament of penance, and in particular, auricular confession, provided an additional impetus for antifraternalism; indeed, contrasting attitudes towards the necessity and role of the priest in hearing confession and granting absolution also prompted a more general challenge to clerical authority. These criticisms were similarly informed by the tensions involved in the revelation of particular knowledge. The sacrament in question was held to consist of three parts: *contritio*; *confessio*; and *satisfactio* or *penitentia* (all three of which, in addition to *absolutio* – when the priest forgives a penitent's sins on behalf of Christ – are chapters in the *Summa Praedicantium*). According to Aquinas, 'the perfection of Penance requires contrition of the heart, together with confession in word and satisfaction in deed.' In particular, 'the first requisite on the part of the penitent is the will to atone, and this is done by contrition; the second is that he submit to the judgement of the priest standing in God's place, and this is done in confession; and the third is that he atone according to the decision of God's minister, and this is done in satisfaction.'⁶¹

In *Falsitas*, Bromyard does not directly mention the sacrament of penance. However, whilst discussing the false man who seeks to serve two masters, he remarks: 'When he is with the other, he passes time with him in this manner, and so that he please him more he tells him of the secrets made under the seal of confession which he heard from the other man.'⁶² It is not clear whether Bromyard is referring to the betrayal of a secret in a general sense, or more specifically to a priest revealing a sin which was told to him in confession. Technically, the seal of confession signified the latter. In Gratian's *Decretum* it was held: 'Let the priest who dares to make known the sins of his penitent be deposed.'⁶³ Canon 21 of the Fourth Lateran Council similarly stated: 'Let him [the priest] exercise the greatest precaution that he does not in any

59 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1948-64.

60 See below, pp. 259-60.

61 'Requiritur ex parte poenitentis, primo quidem, voluntas recompensandi, quod fit per contritionem; secundo, quod se subiiciat arbitrio sacerdotis loco Dei, quod fit in confessione; tertio, quod recompenset secundum arbitrium ministri Dei, quod fit in satisfactione [...] Ad perfectionem tamen poenitentiae requiritur et contritio cordis, et confessio oris, et satisfactio operis': Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, III, Q90, Art. 2. <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/TP/TP090.html#TPQ90OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

62 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 698-702.

63 'Deponatur sacerdos qui peccata penitentis publicare presumit': *Decretum Gratiani*, c. 2., de Pœn., d. VI.

degree by word, sign, or any other manner make known the sinner, but should he need more prudent counsel, let him seek it cautiously without any mention of the person. He who dares to reveal a sin confided to him in the tribunal of penance, we decree that he be not only deposed from the sacerdotal office but also relegated to a monastery of strict observance to do penance for the remainder of his life.⁶⁴ Although the seal primarily affected the priest, in certain situations the laity were similarly bound. Thus, in the supplement to the *Summa Theologica*, it is noted: ‘The seal of confession affects the priest as minister of this sacrament: which seal is nothing else than the obligation of keeping the confession secret, even as the key is the power of absolving. Yet, as one who is not a priest, in a particular case has a kind of share in the act of the keys, when he hears a confession in a case of urgency, so also does he have a certain share in the act of the seal of confession, and is bound to secrecy, though, properly speaking, he is not bound by the seal of confession.’⁶⁵ In addition, it was permissible to confess daily faults (rather than mortal sins) to somebody who was not a priest; the authority for this was derived from a passage in the epistle of St. James 5. 16: ‘Confess your sins one to another’.⁶⁶

It is clear that the act of confession, and the rules regarding secrecy, reflected two opposing impulses: the first required the revelation of sin, and the manifestation of the sinner; whilst the second required secrecy and the concealment of sin from others.⁶⁷ The balance between (and nature of) these obligations altered over the course of the Church’s history, as the theological understanding of penance developed. In the early Church, greater emphasis had been placed on public penance, in which a penitent would publicly acknowledge his or her sins in order to be reconciled with the Church (that is, the community of believers). However, penance

64 ‘Caveat autem omnino ne verbo vel signo vel alio quovis modo prodat aliquatenus peccatorem sed si prudentiori consilio indigerit illud absque ulla expressione personæ caute requirat quoniam qui peccatum in pœnitentiâ iudicio sibi detectum præsumpserit revelare non solum a sacerdotali officio deponendum decernimus verum etiam ad agendam perpetuam pœnitentiâ in arctum monasterium detrudendum’: *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta*; ed. by J. Alberigo and others, 3rd edn (Bologna: Istituto per le Scienze Religiose, 1973), pp. 230-71 <<http://www.internetsv.info/Archive/CLateranense4.pdf>> [accessed 11 April 2018]; trans. by H. J. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary* (St. Louis: Herder, 1937), p. 260.

65 ‘Sigillum confessionis competit sacerdoti in quantum est minister huius sacramenti: quod nihil est aliud quam debitum confessionem celandi, sicut clavis est potestas absolvendi. Tamen, sicut aliquis qui non est sacerdos, in aliquo casu participat aliquid de actu clavis, dum confessionem audit propter necessitatem; ita etiam participat aliquid de actu sigilli confessionis, et tenetur celare; quamvis, proprie loquendo, sigillum confessionis non habeat’: Rainaldus Romanus, *ST, Supplement, Q. 11, Art. 3*. <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/XP/XP011.html#XPQ11OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

66 ‘Confitemini ergo alterutrum peccata vestra’: James 5. 16.

67 Rainaldus Romanus, *ST, Supplement, Q. 7, Art. 1*. <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/XP/XP007.html#XPQ7OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

subsequently became a more private affair with the widespread adoption (beginning in the late sixth century) of a monastic penitential model associated with Celtic Christianity, which primarily involved penitent and priest, and which was thus to a greater extent outside of the public gaze.⁶⁸

There were two reasons for legitimately hiding one's sins: the first was for the sake of the penitent, and the desire to avoid creating situations which might discourage somebody from confessing his or her sins; the second, was for the sake of the wider public, and the desire to avoid scandal and anything which might encourage sin.⁶⁹ However, although the prevalence of private penance reflected a greater desire for secrecy, it was also accompanied by an increasing focus on the revelation of specific, individual confessions. Whereas, for example, all-encompassing confessions (in which general sins were recounted) were common in the twelfth century, from the thirteenth century confessors began to draw out the specific circumstances of a sin.⁷⁰ In this regard, Bromyard includes in *Confessio* the following aid to memory (which is also found in other contemporary texts): *Quis? Quid? Ubi? Quociens? Per quos? Cur? Quomodo? Quando?* (Who? What? Where? How often? Through whom? Why? How? When?)⁷¹

Given the impulse towards secrecy, and that the power to forgive sin lay ultimately with God, theologians debated the necessity and role of the priest in the sacrament of penance.⁷² Aquinas identified penance as a sacrament, which therefore required a priest as an instrument to convey the grace of God. Thus:

It is evident that in Penance something is done so that something holy is signified both on the part of the penitent sinner, and on the part of the priest absolving, because the penitent sinner, by deed and word, shows his heart to have renounced sin, and in like

68 Thomas Tentler, *Sin and Confession on the Eve of the Reformation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), pp. 3-27.

69 Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, III, Q. 84, Art. 6. <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

70 Arnold, *Belief and Unbelief*, p. 174.

71 *SP*, *Confessio* 11.

72 Tentler, *Sin and Confession*, p. 23.

manner the priest, by his deed and word with regard to the penitent, signifies the work of God Who forgives his sins.⁷³

In *Confessio*, Bromyard adds another reason:

But to set against the shame which could arise from the confessor's hearing [our] sins, God has provided several remedies, one of which is that He has not ordained that we should confess to angels – that would make us afraid, and blush to reveal our impurities to such pure creatures – but to a human being: someone beset with weakness just like others: who also experiences the wars of temptations within himself: who from his own feebleness and frailty has the material for bestowing sympathy on the frail, not for despising or loathing them.⁷⁴

Unlike God, the priest was not omniscient; in order to apply a fitting remedy, he needed to be told the exact nature of a sin.⁷⁵ However, the ignorance of a priest also served to undermine his role, which came under increasing scrutiny and opposition in the latter part of the fourteenth century. According to Wyclif, only God was in a position to know whether a penitent sinner was truly contrite, and therefore properly pronounce absolution. Indeed, he further suggested that private, oral confession lacked biblical authority, and therefore ought to be rejected as a regular practice.⁷⁶ It followed that there was little need for confession to be mediated by a priest rather than directly spoken to God. Thus, an early fifteenth-century sermon for advent Sunday (which was Lollard in sympathy) notes:

73 'Manifestum est autem quod in poenitentia ita res gesta fit quod aliquid sanctum significatur, tam ex parte peccatoris poenitentis, quam ex parte sacerdotis absolventis, nam peccator poenitens per ea quae agit et dicit, significat cor suum a peccato recessisse; similiter etiam sacerdos per ea quae agit et dicit circa poenitentem, significat opus Dei remittentis peccatum': Thomas Aquinas, *ST*, III, Q. 84, Art. 1 <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/TP/TP084.html#TPQ84OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

74 'Contra verecundiam uero quae posset euenire ex hoc, quod confessor audit peccata, Deus plura remedia prouidit, quarum unum est, quod non ordinauit, quod confiteremur angelis, ne timeremus, uel erubesceremus, tam mundis creaturis immunditias nostras ostendere. Sed homini, qui circumdatus infirmitate, sicut alij, qui etiam tentationum bella in seipso experitur, qui ex propria debilitate, et fragilitate, potius habet materiam fragilibus compati, quam contemnere, uel abominare': *SP*, *Confessio* 59. Noted and translated by Walls, John Bromyard, p. 15.

75 See Rainaldus Romanus, *ST*, Supplement, Q. 6, Art. 1 <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/XP/XP006.html#XPQ6OUTP1>> [accessed 1 September 2017].

76 Anne Hudson and Anthony Kenny, 'Wyclif, John', *ODNB* (Oxford University Press, 2010) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/30122>> [accessed 1 January 2018].

And ȝif it be soo þat ani tyme ani of hem, þorou frelte, necligence, oþur ignoraunce,
 falle into ani synne, as tyme as þey repente hem and axen of God wiþ deuoute preiere of
 merci and of grace, anon God neyheþ to suche a soul and forȝeueþ him his synnes.⁷⁷

The fundamental issues at stake in this debate were, nevertheless, those identifiable in Bromyard's discussion of *Falsitas*: who has the right to obtain particular knowledge about someone or something, and who has obligation to reveal that knowledge (to whom), or indeed the right to conceal it (from whom). Bromyard approaches the debate from a strictly orthodox position (one must reveal sin for the correction of the sinner, and conceal it within the bounds of confession), although in *Falsitas* he does not draw attention to the role of the priest in this regard. This may reflect the more general nature of the chapter, or that such criticisms were not sufficiently prevalent at this time to require attention. It may also be an intentional strategy to dampen the criticism which did exist, particularly that which was connected to the Dominican Order.

Indeed, the intimate relationship between the friars and confession was one of the issues which drove antifraternal sentiment within a generation of their inception.⁷⁸ At a practical level, the decision to allow lay members to confess to priests in the fraternal orders had the effect of removing a valuable stream of income away from the parish priest. Given the financial incentives in hearing confession, allegations were soon made that those in the fraternal orders were willing to prescribe lenient penances in order to attract fee-paying penitents. These criticisms were accompanied by wider concerns about the role of the fraternal orders in the Church, and whether they possessed a legitimate function within the Church hierarchy. In this regard, an initial surge of antifraternalism arose at the University of Paris in the middle of the thirteenth century following a dispute between the secular masters and the friars; as a result, William of St Amour was inspired to compose *De Periculis Novissimorum Temporum*, a work that implicitly identified the friars as false prophets foreshadowing the apocalypse. This became

77 Gloria Cigman (ed.), *Lollard Sermons* (Oxford: Early English Text Society, 1989), p. 3, ll. 96-101.

78 A considerable amount of material has been written on the origins and development of antifraternalism. See G. Geltner, *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism*; Penn Szittyá, *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature* (Princeton, Princeton University Press 1986); Wendy Scase, *Piers Plowman and the New Anticlericalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Arnold Williams, 'Chaucer and the Friars', *Speculum*, 28, 3 (1953), pp. 499-513.

the foundational text from which subsequent antifraternalism drew inspiration, and whose ideas were thus perpetuated. William implied that the friars were false imposters, and by the illusion of holiness were able to penetrate the homes of the faithful: ‘Thus it appears from the above who are penetrators of homes and who are the false; it even appears that through such men the dangers of the last times will threaten or already are threatening the entire church.’⁷⁹ In this instance, there was a spiritual dimension to domos; the friars were accused of penetrating and perverting the interior conscience of penitents. As a corollary of this and their role in mediating the Word of God, the friars also acquired an infamous reputation for glossing (and according to their critics, perverting) biblical texts; in other words – and harking back to the first section of this chapter – they became associated with the form of falsity rather than the immediacy of truth.⁸⁰

Additionally, the allegation that the friars were engaged in the illegitimate penetration of conscience was intimately bound to the integral part they played in the papal inquisition (an institution that formally emerged in the second quarter of the thirteenth century). Inquisition involved the discovery and questioning under oath of those reputed to have fallen into heresy, with the ultimate aim of obtaining a confession of error, and then repentance and penance. Although Inquisition had a significant impact on curbing heretical movements, contemporaries recognised that it was a process subject to abuse.⁸¹ Bromyard does not directly address such concerns in *Falsitas* but he nonetheless recognises both the difficulty and also the necessity of distinguishing true from false; it is to the latter issue that the final section of this chapter is devoted.

Identification

79 ‘Sic ergo patet ex predictis qui sunt penetrantes domos et qui sunt pseudo; patet etiam quod per tales instabunt vel instant pericula novissimorum temporum universe ecclesie’: *William of Saint Amour's De Periculis Novissimorum Temporum: A Critical Edition, Translation, and Introduction*, ed. by Guy Geltner (Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 58-59.

80 See, for example, *Pierce the Plowman's Crede*, an anonymous verse satire concerning a poor man's quest for spiritual truth, composed between 1393 and 1401. The author was probably from the south-west Midlands, although he seems to have had connections to London, and was clearly influenced by both Langland, and also Wycliffite writings: ‘Pierce the Ploughman's Creed’, *Six Ecclesiastical Satires*, ed. by James McMurrin Dean (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1991), pp. 8-49. The poem has been heavily mined by Helen Barr, Signes and Sothe, who additionally analyses a number of other antifraternal poems. See also Spencer, *English Preaching in the Late Middle Ages*, p. 246; Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation. Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), pp. 274-75.

81 On the Inquisition, see p. 230, n. 57.

Bromyard is clearly aware that how something is labelled and identified affects how it is perceived. Thus, he remarks: ‘by changing names (as it has been said) and clothed in falsity, they do not abhor them, because they believe or acknowledge them not to be ugly, but they defend them to be beautiful.’⁸² Identification matters. Nevertheless, it is difficult to identify falsity because such people hide their true nature behind a cloak of deception: appearance and reputation do not always correspond to interior reality. Thus, Bromyard notes how such people deceive others in the way a false book deceives the good cleric, and in the way it is difficult to identify a false coin at night time.⁸³

However, despite the difficulty in identifying the false, an issue exacerbated by their tendency to dissemble, Bromyard argues that they eventually reveal their true nature in a similar manner to the lion which appears docile before lashing out against its master after many years in captivity. Indeed, the false are comparable to an infected wound which does not seem bad at the beginning, but rapidly worsens. Falsity is sometimes dissimulated for a while through fear, or love, or lack of opportunity, says Bromyard, but it does not remain hidden for long: in modern parlance, a leopard does not change his spots.⁸⁴ The false eventually identify themselves.

Moreover, although Bromyard compares false behaviour to the weed zizania, he chooses not to make use of the Parable of the Tares, recounted in the Gospel of Matthew, which was traditionally used to illustrate the difficulty in distinguishing the true from the false. Zizania is the Greek name for darnel, a poisonous grass which produces psychotoxic symptoms when ingested.⁸⁵ It resembles and mimics wheat, and it is almost impossible to distinguish the two until they are harvested.⁸⁶ In the parable recounted by Matthew, zizania had been sown in a

82 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1292-97.

83 *Ibid.*, ll. 918-23.

84 *Ibid.*, ll. 1128-33.

85 Howard Thomas, Jayne Elisabeth Archer, and Richard Marggraf Turley, ‘Remembering Darnel: A Forgotten Plant of Literary, Religious, and Evolutionary Significance’, *Journal of Ethnobiology*, 36(1) (2016), 29-44 (p. 29). If it is ingested it produces psychotoxic symptoms; indeed the Latin name is *Lolium temulentum* (*temulentus* is Latin for intoxicated). Although zizania is frequently translated in English as tares, this is a different plant entirely. Unlike darnel - which appears very similar to wheat - tares may be easily distinguished. Thomas and others (p. 36) suggest that this translation was ‘an attempt by Church and State in the Middle Ages to disentangle religious from political dissent, and thus weaken a newly-radicalized Commons. For those who lived in close proximity to the worked land, “tares” was unlikely to be comprehensible as a translation of zizania. Farmers and millers had little to fear from tares—it was inconvenient, certainly, if tares invaded cereal fields, but because its physical appearance is distinct from wheat, it is easy to weed out.’ This seems to me a confused and convoluted argument; the translation was surely made to emphasise a different moral: that the true could be distinguished from the false, and that it was necessary to do so.

86 There is evidence that darnel originated at least 10,000 years ago, evolving alongside wheat in the fertile crescent. ‘Darnel poisoning belongs to a family of chronic diseases called Raphania (originally defined by Linnaeus),

farmer's field by an unnamed enemy; since the farmer could not distinguish the weed from the wheat, he ordered his men to wait until harvest before gathering up the zizania and then burning it. Unsurprisingly, the parable was frequently used as a metaphor for orthodoxy and heterodoxy. Augustine, for example, noted that: 'The harvest will soon be here. The angels will come who can make the separation, and who cannot make mistakes... I tell you of a truth, my Beloved, even in these high seats there is both wheat, and tares, and among the laity there is wheat, and tares. Let the good tolerate the bad; let the bad change themselves, and imitate the good.'⁸⁷ Instead of utilising the imagery associated with this, however, Bromyard employs the proverb 'an ill weed grows apace' (*mala herba cito crescit*), thereby emphasising the destructive capability of the weeds rather than the necessity of waiting before being able to identify them.⁸⁸

Indeed, the idea that the false are difficult to identify is undermined by Bromyard's insistence that the disease of falsity is so prevalent nowadays that it is scarcely possible to avoid a false man. At any great gathering, he says, one does not have enough fingers to identify the false, whilst a single finger is sufficient to identify the true man. In contrast, at the beginning of the Christian religion, there was such a paucity of false men that when a man noted for falsity passed through a village people would stop and stare in wonder, crossing themselves, and saying: behold the false man!⁸⁹ In this example, Bromyard implicitly suggests that it is easy to identify the true and the false.

Correspondingly, although Bromyard recognises the fickleness of reputation, he exploits the power it possesses to influence behaviour, emphasising that it is more honourable if people point and say 'behold the faithful, poor man!' than if they say 'behold the false and rich man!'⁹⁰ Reputation was important in a variety of social and legal contexts: a man or woman of good reputation was less likely to be accused of wrongdoing, and more likely to be cleared if

caused by ingestion of the toxic seeds of wild plants. When darnel enters the food chain, most often in bread or ale, symptoms of its consumption include visual impairment, disorientation, headaches, and even (at high concentrations) hallucinations and loss of consciousness': Thomas and others, 'Remembering Darnel', pp. 31-32.

87 Augustine, 'Sermon 23 on the New Testament', in *Sermon on the Mount; Harmony of the Gospels; Homilies on the Gospels*, ed. by Philip Schaff, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 14 vols, Series I (Buffalo: Christian Literature Publishing, 1888), VI, p. 709; Thomas and others, 'Remembering Darnel', p. 32.

88 See pp. 180-81.

89 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 286-301.

90 Interestingly, in addition to personal reputation, Bromyard also appeals to patriotism, noting that the behaviour of false councillors leads to defamation of the country (ll. 1567-68, 1853-54). He might be suggesting that the shipwrecked customs of England – which differed from those of other coastal European nations – caused tensions, particularly amongst foreign merchants; he might also be suggesting that the political situation more generally was considered alarming by those abroad.

any dispute came to trial; if one possessed a good reputation it was also easier to find somebody willing to stand surety – whether for a loan, bail, or any other matter.⁹¹ In this context, a reputation for falsity could be extremely harmful. Words damaging a man's reputation were not actionable under common law; they were considered mere 'wind'.⁹² However, studies on defamation cases brought to the ecclesiastical courts demonstrate that the insult 'false' was frequently used as a slur to damage a man's reputation – indicating untrustworthiness – and thus exclude him from the local community.⁹³ Moreover, in the early fifteenth century, fama would accrue a significant role in the detection of heresy; (as a crude generalisation) those of good fama were employed to identify theological deviants, and those of bad fama were often the ones identified.⁹⁴ Even so, the utility of reputation as a way of deterring undesirable or 'false' behaviour must not be overstated. It was one thing to know who was responsible for an evil deed, but it was quite another for that knowledge to be acted upon by those in a position of authority and power. Thus, Bromyard describes how false men 'boldly perpetrate evil deeds, despoiling, mutilating, slaughtering, breaking bones and beating their victims, but because they are defended by the powerful, none dares to identify or incarcerate them. If somebody tries to do so, their supporters immediately threaten them, saying, if you point out men of such a lord, it would be better for you to sleep.' Even more maliciously, they threaten the victims who are thus too scared to make any complaint, but instead beg to make amends so that they have peace.⁹⁵ Accordingly, the identification of falsity was dependent on those who had both the power to either make such an identification, or the power to conceal it (in this regard, the relationship between falsity and power has been discussed in detail in the previous chapter).

This issue is illustrated by a statute which was passed in 1361 concerning labourers who 'absent them out of their Services in another Town, or another county.' If the fugitive labourer was apprehended, 'for the Falsity he shall be burnt in the Forehead, with an Iron made and

91 Barbara Hanawalt, *Of Good and Ill Repute* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. ix.

92 Baker, *Introduction to English Legal History*, p. 436.

93 *Ibid.*, pp. 436-46. Defamation involved imputing a crime to a person causing harm to his or her reputation. There was no compensation for the victim in defamation cases, but they benefited via the publicisation of the fact that the claim was false. However, the statute 'scandalum magnatum' (passed under Richard II), the slander of lords, held that great men could be materially harmed by words. Women tended to be labelled with immoral sexual behaviour, rather than falsity.

94 Ian Forrest, *The Detection of Heresy*, pp. 71-74, 150-53.

95 SP, *Falsitas*, ll. 1840-57.

formed to this Letter F.⁹⁶ The efficacy and impact of the statute is unknown, and there are no records of any individual receiving this punishment. However, there are three characteristics of the branding which seem consistent with Bromyard's discourse. Firstly, it treats the false individuals as animals, those who lack humanity; secondly, it visibly identifies these individuals, and this in turn helps to isolate them from the rest of the community (much like a more permanent version of the yellow cross of infamy which heretics who had recanted were forced to wear in thirteenth-century Europe);⁹⁷ and thirdly, those targeted were to be punished with the red-hot fire from the forge, a scorching reminder of where the false will inevitably end up. In this period branding was an unusual punishment; although it had been used to punish heretics in the early Church, the practice ceased by the central Middle Ages.⁹⁸ Additionally, the body-maiming punishments characteristic of Norman justice had mostly petered out in the thirteenth century.⁹⁹ Kellie Robertson has interpreted the punishment as a way of textualising the body, a means of permanently inscribing a record of guilt and subjugation that could be read primarily by the landholding classes.¹⁰⁰ It thus became a visible reminder that badly performed work constituted the labourer's body and identity, and that the authorities had the power to control this. In Robertson's view, it was particularly significant that it was the forehead being branded, since the face was traditionally seen as reflecting the personhood of an individual. In other words, the branding functioned as a means of stripping the veil of falsity from the face. More dubiously, Robertson argues that the labourers potentially subjected to this punishment would not have been able to recognise the significance of the letter 'F', since it was the letter of a word that the labourer could not read or speak. However, this interpretation seems at odds with the available evidence. 'False' was a common insult within communities, and the nature of Bromyard's discourse suggests that the concept of falsity was a firmly established part of the prevailing ideology, an ideology which affected each and every member of society. Moreover,

96 'Pour sa fauxine soit ars en le frount dune fer fait et forme au manere de la lettre F, en signe de Fauxine': Statutes of the Realm, I (1810), pp. 367.

97 John Arnold, *Belief and Unbelief*, p. 73.

98 According to Malcolm Lambert: 'Both in the eastern and in the western portions of the Empire it became the law that pertinacious heretics were subject to the punishments of exile, branding, confiscation of goods, or death. These regulations survived the fall of the Empire, and so did the assumption that it was the right of the Church to call on the State to put down heresy': Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, p. 3.

99 Kellie Robertson, *The Laborer's Two Bodies: Literary and Legal Productions in Britain, 1350-1500* (New York: Springer, 2016), p. 16.

100 *Ibid.*, pp. 15-19.

the suggestion that peasants would have been unable to recognise the form of the letter and its signification is implausible; indeed, recent scholarship has demonstrated that peasants in rural communities were increasingly able to participate, at least to some degree, in written culture.¹⁰¹ Indeed, the battle between truth and falsity involved public and visible signs of identification, in which individuals donned generic social masks identifying themselves as true, whilst branding (metaphorically and in this case, literally) others as false. Thus, the very point of the punishment was to proclaim loudly, and to communicate clearly, on which side the transgressor was fighting.

Conclusion

The teaching and acceptance of sound doctrine was integral to the role of the Order of Preachers. In this chapter, I have considered how Bromyard employs the idea of falsity to privilege a particular conception of the world, and how he suggests truth might be distinguished from falsity. I have also examined some of the implications of this, most notably with regards to the tension between the obligation to reveal knowledge, and the necessity of concealing it.

Fundamentally, although Bromyard criticises how the false create an illusion of truth, he himself employs comparable rhetorical ploys which thus serve to undermine his argument. In order to gain control over the terms of the debate, therefore, Bromyard limits and refutes the arguments of others, taking away the space where deviant beliefs under the cover of jocularity might flourish. The persecution of deviant beliefs creates the conditions for these to be aired in secrecy, which in turn shapes Bromyard's attitudes to the concealment of knowledge: it is necessary to expose deviant views and character which might prove dangerous.

Correspondingly, the false are characterised by a disjuncture between posed public performance and authentic private discourse. Since this distinction is unstable, however, it provides the foundations for those who wished to level a charge of hypocrisy against preachers, and in particular, friars. Moreover, although Bromyard condemns secrecy, he implicitly admits the necessity of hiding certain knowledge from others, notably because it might lead to error, and was thus injurious to the wider population. In the case of confession, secrecy was also necessary for the well-being of the penitent. Nevertheless, since Bromyard characterises truth as

¹⁰¹ See Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*.

unmediated, the role of the priest as mediator in this sacrament is once again problematic.

Additionally, Bromyard's concerns with dissimulation are indicative of a more fundamental issue: if the false conceal their true beliefs and feelings, how can they be identified? Ultimately, Bromyard suggests that the false reveal themselves. Moreover, in spite of his misgiving about the veracity of reputation, he still emphasises the importance of public fama. As a consequence, the contradictions within the discourse are never fully resolved. Thus, in order to refute and challenge the false knowledge, beliefs and identity of others, he inevitably undermines his own.

CONCLUSION

Part 1: Truth and John Bromyard

In Passus I of *Piers Plowman*, Holy Church remarks that Treuthe is the most valuable treasure of all, but adds a note of caution: ‘For Cristen and uncristen cleymeth it echone.’¹ Truth is an elusive ideal which many seek and many claim. It provides a light for those in darkness to follow, and a salve for those who suffer. No doubt, it was for this reason that Thomas Brinton, the fourteenth-century bishop of Rochester (and avid cribber of material from Bromyard’s *Summa*), adopted ‘Veritas liberabit’ as his personal motto.² Nevertheless, truth (or, at least, what is accepted as the truth) also possesses the power to constrain, to suffocate and shackle. It is not simply discovered; it is made, contested, and enforced. Given the significance and power of truth, it is unsurprising that the various beliefs and creeds held by groups and individuals are frequently condemned by opponents as an imitation, perversion and masquerade of something more pure. Within this context, I have explored how a fourteenth-century Dominican friar dealt with truth, and its evil twin, falsity. In doing so I have attempted to demonstrate some of the complexities at play. Richard Firth Green suggests (with a strangely oxymoronic turn of phrase) that Thomas Brinton inhabited ‘the obscure world of the popular preacher.’³ Thus, by examining the ideas of truth and falsity found in the *Summa*, I have also sought to take Bromyard, and by extension popular preaching, out of obscurity and into the light. A crucial question for Bromyard (and indeed any preacher) was how to persuade those listening to accept his version of the truth. The first part of this thesis provides one possible answer: supported by the authority of an officially sanctioned religious order that was prominent in towns and cities throughout Christendom, Bromyard was able to assemble a significant corpus of relevant material, and then disseminate his message widely through the preaching and instruction of those who used the *Summa*. In this regard, it is now axiomatic that the more familiar an idea, the

1 *Piers Plowman*, B-Text, Passus I, l. 93.

2 *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton*, I, p. 9. The verse (‘The truth shall make you free’) is derived from John 8. 32.

3 Green, *A Crisis of Truth*, p. 5.

likelier it is that people believe it to be true: ‘repeat a lie often enough and it becomes the truth.’⁴ Thus, familiarity and trust beget truth.

Accordingly, the first part of this thesis traced Bromyard’s development as a Dominican, his authority as a preacher and the way in which the circulation of the text disseminated Bromyard’s voice far and wide. In so doing, I have attempted to place the *Summa* in its proper historical context. Initially, I explored Bromyard’s upbringing and education, and his role as a friar at Hereford, establishing the extent to which he was influenced both by local factors and also the wider Dominican Order. I then examined the extant manuscripts for evidence relating to the date of composition, use and transmission of the text. In the third chapter, I considered how and for what purpose the text was completed, arguing that it had been composed at an earlier date than hitherto accepted, and that Bromyard had compiled it in response to his role as a mentor at Hereford, rather than to remedy a poorly-stocked conventual library. Finally, I investigated the circulation of the *Summa*, demonstrating its considerable reach: the number of copies found in episcopal hands suggest widespread (and second-hand) dissemination; two significant abbreviated versions provide evidence of considerable engagement with the text; and last but not least, there is a significant possibility that Langland utilised the *Summa*, thereby disseminating Bromyard’s voice even further.

Part 2: Falsity

In the second part of this thesis, I considered how Bromyard utilises the negative space of falsity in order to construct truth. The issues uncovered are those which have appeared throughout history, albeit in distinct guises. In this regard, Freud remarked in the 1930s: ‘What progress we are making. In the Middle Ages they would have burned me. Now they are content with burning my books.’⁵ I will now rescue one of Freud’s most quotable passages from the fire (and one which is strikingly similar to Bromyard’s depiction of the false): ‘He that has eyes to see and ears to hear may convince himself that no mortal can keep a secret. If his lips are silent, he

4 Psychologists call this the illusion of truth: Gerd Gigerenzer, ‘External Validity of Laboratory Experiments: The Frequency-Validity Relationship’, *The American Journal of Psychology*, 97 (2) (1984), 185-95. The quote is often (but without verification) attributed to Joseph Goebbels, the Nazi propaganda Minister.

5 ‘Letter to Ernest Jones (1933)’, *The Columbia Dictionary of Quotations*, ed. by Robert Andrews (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 779

chatters with his fingertips; betrayal oozes out of him at every pore.’⁶ In the case of an academic, these unpalatable beliefs and opinions are sometimes revealed in the footnotes. Thus, whilst discussing Bromyard’s emphatic views on burning evil people and heretics, Keith Walls (to whom I owe a significant debt of gratitude as the only individual to have written a full-length book on John Bromyard) makes the following comment, which he hides away (but also chooses to reveal) in footnote 9 of page 276: ‘Our own times are extremely familiar with the suppression of heretical views... In this century even in liberal Britain candidacy for one political party resulted in a teacher’s suspension: and the Association of Chief Police Officers has decided that even membership of the same party is a cause for dismissal from the Police Force. In Austria a historian was imprisoned on the grounds that he questioned the extent of the Shoah.’⁷ This, for those not familiar with British politics, is a reference to the far-right British National Party, and the holocaust denier David Irving. Regardless of the dubious political sympathies on display, the issues raised by the footnote also reflect the three themes which form the second part of this thesis: that is, how the idea of falsity frames the truth of life, the truth of justice, and the truth of doctrine. The first of these concerns the integrity of self derived from how we conform to the world, and how we participate in truth-telling activities; the second concerns those who have the power and authority to render justice, enforce truth, and punish the false; and the third concerns what we accept as the fundamental truths about the physical, metaphysical, and moral world. In Chapter 6, therefore, I examined how Bromyard deals with the problem of competing claims to loyalty, and in particular, the tension between fidelity and correction. I considered the implications of Bromyard’s strict attitude towards mendacity, noting that the intransigence of the preacher contrasted with the more tolerant attitude of the confessor. I also dealt with the relationship between true behaviour and an individual’s fundamental integrity (their essential metaphysical truth), emphasising that this remained a crucial but contested concept throughout the period in which the *Summa* was circulating. In Chapter 7, I explored how Bromyard’s criticism of the rich and powerful is affected by his reliance on those in positions of authority to disseminate his message, and to punish those guilty of various offences. Correspondingly,

6 Sigmund Freud, *Collected Papers*, trans. by Alix and James Strachey, 5 vols (New York: Basic Books, 1959), III, p. 94.

7 Walls, John Bromyard, p. 276.

Bromyard's insistence on the complicity of all social ranks in falsity tempered the radical potential of the discourse. Finally, in Chapter 8, I investigated how Bromyard promotes the veracity of his own conception of the world, and seeks to invalidate incompatible ideas put forward by others. Most importantly, I exposed the inconsistencies in the discourse which undermine the integrity of Bromyard's argument: these include the association between the rhetorical use of language and falsity; the consequences of limiting the arguments of others, and denying them space in which to propagate; the artificial distinction between performance and authenticity; the fundamental tension between the obligation to reveal knowledge (and in particular the necessity of exposing deviant individuals and beliefs), and the utility of concealing it; and finally, the fickleness of reputation, and its necessity as a means of distinguishing the true from the false.

Afterlife

The contradictions and inconsistencies which riddle the discourse of falsity (and given the circulation of the *Summa*, Bromyard's treatment of the subject surely represents a fair reflection of orthodox teaching), had significant implications for his near-contemporaries in late fourteenth-century England, most notably in regards to the development of heresy and the corresponding prevalence of antifraternalism. It is clear that the discourse was employed (and appropriated) by those who threatened rather than upheld the authority of orthodox truth, whilst the friars also became the target of their own words.⁸

In addition to its potential for appropriation, the discourse has proven to be remarkably durable. Indeed, at this juncture, it is worth providing a potted history of the way in which ideas about truth and falsity have been employed in more modern times. According to the sixteenth-century French essayist and philosopher Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592): 'as for this new-fangled virtue of feigning and dissimulation, which is so greatly in vogue at the moment, I

8 This is neatly illustrated by the way the narrator of the fifteenth-century poem *Mum and the Sothsegger* criticises the friars with a piece of proverbial wisdom: that those who harm others are liable to suffer the same harm themselves. Appropriately, the saying is also found in Bromyard's *Summa Praedicatorum*: Siegfried Wenzel, 'Mum and the Sothsegger: lines 421-422'.

mortally hate it.’⁹ In current historiography, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have gained a reputation as the age of dissimulation. The religious turmoil that accompanied the Reformation, and the courtly intrigue which was intrinsic to the emergence of the early-modern state, both contributed to the development of a culture of secrecy and deceit, which came to be seen as a necessity and an art.¹⁰ Contemporaries responded to the prevalence of dissimulation in various ways, and according to Jon Snyder, it became ‘one of the most controversial and contested of all the early modern virtues.’¹¹

Alongside its reputation as an age of dissimulation, the early-modern period was characterised by a sense of scepticism in which the knowledge of previous generations was increasingly challenged on account of religious pluralism and the foundations of modern science. In this context, prudence remained the archetypal virtue for dealing with issues of trust, balancing scepticism and credulity. By the latter half of the seventeenth century, the reliance on authority which had characterised scholastic epistemology was increasingly rejected in favour of knowledge derived from direct experience and experimentation. Thus, the Royal society, founded in 1660, adopted the motto ‘nullius in verba’ (on the word of nobody), to characterise their endeavour. The logical methods of the schools were rejected on the basis that their pedantry and use of esoteric language originated in a desire for fame and private advantage rather than civic good; scholastic jargon was inaccessible, and prevented the wide dissemination of knowledge.¹²

In the eighteenth century, the French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau adapted and secularised the Christian myth of the Fall; according to Rousseau, humans were born in a natural state of innocence which was corrupted not by a duplicitous serpent, but by the artifice of human society. As a personal motto, Rousseau adapted a line attributed to Juvenal, ‘to consecrate one’s life to truth’. However, although he conceived of truth in an abstract sense as

9 ‘Car, quant à cette nouvelle vertu de faintise et de dissimulation qui est à cet heure si fort en credit, je la hay capitallement’: Michel de Montaigne, ‘De la Praesumption’, *Les Essais*, ed. by P. Villey and V.-L. Saulnier (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965), Book 2, Chapter 17, p. 647. Translated by Jon Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy in Early Modern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), p. 54.

10 A great deal of literature has been written on this. See especially Denery, *The Devils Wins*, p. 9; Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*; Perez Zagorin, *Ways of Lying: Dissimulation, Persecution, and Conformity in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990).

11 Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy*, p. xiv.

12 Shapin pp. 124, 236-7, 338, 349.

inherently good, he criticised the moralists' strict prohibition against lying as 'idle chatter impossible to put into practice'; particular truths could be beneficial, harmful, or irrelevant. For Rousseau, personal integrity was worth more than socially sanctioned hypocrisy.¹³

In contrast to Rousseau's adaptation of Christian ideas, the German philosopher Immanuel Kant reaffirmed Augustine's absolute prohibition on lying. According to Kant, falsehood contradicted and debased the essence of humans as rational beings.¹⁴

Indeed, many of the current philosophical conceptions of truth and falsity demonstrate parallels to those held in previous historical eras. One of the most widely-held views is the correspondence theory of truth, a form of which was popularised by the Cambridge philosophers Moore and Russell in the early twentieth century. In simplified terms, the theory states that 'a belief is true if and only if it corresponds to a fact', a conception of truth which is strikingly similar to that held both by Aristotle and Aquinas.¹⁵ A very different approach guides the coherence theory of truth, which suggests that 'a belief is true if and only if it is part of a coherent system of beliefs'; in this way, truth is treated in the singular rather than the plural, demonstrating parallels with the view held by Anselm in the eleventh century.¹⁶ Even primitivists, who claim that the concept of truth is resistant to explanation, are following in the footsteps of the medieval theologians who equated truth with God, and therefore beyond human comprehension. The most novel ideas about truth may be found within pragmatism, which holds that a belief is true if it will always prove consistent with subsequent experience. Correspondingly 'Truth consists of the actions taken by practical communities to make an idea true, to make it agree with reality.'¹⁷

Such an approach blurs the boundary between the way in which philosophers and social scientists treat the idea of truth. Whereas philosophers try to identify the nature of truth, and the necessary and sufficient conditions for something to be true in a metaphysical sense, social scientists tend to be more interested in how beliefs come to be accepted as true. Since

13 Denery, *The Devil Wins*, pp. 248-52.

14 Immanuel Kant, *Practical Philosophy*, ed. and trans. by Mary Gregor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 613.

15 Michael Glanzberg, 'Truth', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2013) <<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/truth/>> [accessed 10 September 2017].

16 *Ibid.*

17 *Ibid.*

knowledge is shared amongst a community, the ability to acquire socially approved knowledge, and to participate in that community, is dependent on an individual's willingness to allow others to influence his or her conception of the world. In the words of Mary Douglas, 'our colonisation of each other's minds is the price we pay for thought.'¹⁸

However, in order to negate the danger of being colonised with harmful thoughts, individuals learn to sort, evaluate and verify information before accepting it. When the bank of knowledge which makes these evaluations is undermined, individuals are vulnerable to more pernicious threats. Straddling the bounds of critical theory and popular culture, one of the most pervasive concepts employed to describe this danger is 'gaslighting'. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, it may be defined as: 'To manipulate (a person) by psychological means into questioning his or her own sanity'.¹⁹ The utility of 'gaslighting' as a concept shares a number of characteristics with the medieval discourse of falsity, notably in the way it is used to preserve the validity of some beliefs whilst condemning others. Thus, the very act of critiquing somebody's personal set of beliefs may be seen as gaslighting, a characterisation which therefore serves to delegitimise that critique; contrary ideas and beliefs thus become invalid, precisely because they are contrary. In essence, truth becomes relative to personal belief, and as a result, the discourse is easy to appropriate and impossible to control. Consequently, since various individuals and groups are able to access the same discourse as a means of validating their beliefs, the question of whose beliefs are actually true remains contentious and unanswered. The semiotic warfare continues.

Indeed, this battle has been played out on a much grander scale in the twentieth-century political arena, framed by ideological battles which accompanied the fall of Empire, the rise of totalitarian regimes, and the emergence of the major economic and political fault-line between communism and capitalism. Alongside these conflicts, vocabulary was developed to justify the dominant ideology and explain why such a large number of people believed the opposite. Thus, commentators began to speak of indoctrination and brain-washing, propaganda and false

¹⁸ Mary Douglas, *Implicit Meanings: Selected Essays in Anthropology* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. xix.

¹⁹ 'Gaslight', OED (2004) <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/255554>> [accessed 10 September 2010].

consciousness. In this context, the importance of promoting fundamental ideological truth occasionally overrode concerns about the use of deception and deceit.

The dystopian potential of this was famously critiqued by George Orwell in the novel 1984: ‘If you want a picture of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face forever’; The protagonist of the novel works at the Ministry of Truth, the propaganda ministry which deals with the falsification of historical events, and systematically destroys documents through the use of ‘memory holes’.²⁰ ‘The party told you to reject the evidence of your eyes and ears. It was their final, most essential command.’ Instead, one was required to master the double-speak necessary to resolve the cognitive dissonance of contrary ‘truths’. In this scenario, Orwell emphasised that the idea of truth is inherently political: ‘In our age there is no such thing as “keeping out of politics”’. All issues are political issues, and politics itself is a mass of lies, evasions, folly, hatred, and schizophrenia.’²¹ Most famously, Orwell is supposed to have remarked, ‘In a time of universal deceit, telling the truth becomes a revolutionary act.’²²

The idea that truth is inherently political was also integral to the work of Michel Foucault. However, Foucault did not believe the issue involved a contrast between ‘truth’ as reality, and ‘truth’ as an imposter imposed by the authorities. Instead, Foucault suggested that all truth is essentially produced and maintained in ‘regimes’ characterised by ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation, and operation of statements.²³ Every established piece of knowledge permits and assures the exercise of power, which in turn produces the knowledge that sustains it.

A problematic aspect of this analysis is the recognition that truth is socially constructed, (that what is made to function as true might otherwise be so), without accepting that this necessarily invalidates the truth it produces, or that it permits any opposing truth claim to be considered equally valid. The potential for this has been exploited by those on the opposite side of the political spectrum to Foucault. For example, whilst Foucault famously critiqued the idea of expertise in producing and validating ideologically-slanted ‘truth’, the conclusion that expert

20 George Orwell, 1984 (New York: Signet Classics, 1961), p. 220.

21 George Orwell, Shooting an Elephant and Other Essays (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1950), p. 89.

22 This is quite possibly apocryphal, and I have not been able to track down the original source.

23 Michel Foucault, Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977 (New York: Pantheon, 1980), p. 133.

opinion is therefore flawed has been notably employed by one recent British politician who declared: ‘people in this country have had enough of experts.’²⁴ Moreover, the critique of ‘objective truth’ has facilitated the rise of ‘alternative facts’, those which do not strictly reflect the actual facts of the matter, but refer to some deeper truth.²⁵

An extension of this phenomenon has been the idea of ‘fake news’, the deliberate dissemination of false stories, or accounts beset by ‘alternative facts’.²⁶ By using the term ‘fake news’ commentators create a binary division between true and false news, which therefore re-establishes the authority of traditional methods of disseminating news. However, a further and inevitable consequence of this sharp binary division is the ease with which the discourse of ‘fake news’ can be applied against any critical viewpoint.

Regardless, the rise of ‘alternative facts’ and ‘fake news’ has come to characterise a new era beset by doubt and deceit. Indeed, Oxford Dictionaries announced that the 2016 international Word of the Year was ‘post-truth’, an adjective defined as ‘relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief.’²⁷ Of course, this term falsely implies that previous generations lived in a world of ‘truth’. In fact, the idea of a ‘post-truth’ world is simply an old discourse dressed up in new clothes, a twenty-first century ‘crisis of truth’. It is in this context that the incoming President of the United States of America was labelled a ‘false prophet’.²⁸ Indeed, the similarity of the medieval and modern discourse may be illustrated by the following passage, taken from Joseph Heller’s *Catch 22*, but bearing a striking resemblance to that found in John Bromyard’s *Summa Praedicatorum*:

It was miraculous. It was almost no trick at all, he saw, to turn vice into virtue and slander into truth, impotence into abstinence, arrogance into humility, plunder into

24 ‘Have we fallen out of love with experts?’ <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-39102840>> [accessed 10 September 2017].

25 ‘Alternative facts and qualified truths’ <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-scotland-politics-38764003>> [accessed 10 September 2017].

26 ‘The rise and rise of fake news’ <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/blogs-trending-37846860>> [accessed 10 September 2017].

27 ‘Word of the Year 2016’ <<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/word-of-the-year/word-of-the-year-2016>> [accessed 10 September 2017].

28 ‘Vicente Fox on Trump: “Please wake up, America”’ <<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/09/vicente-fox-wake-up-america-227624>> [accessed 10 September 2017]

philanthropy, thievery into honour, blasphemy into wisdom, brutality into patriotism, and sadism into justice. Anybody could do it; it required no brains at all. It merely required no character.²⁹

Final thoughts

Two final thoughts stand out. Firstly, it is clear that modern concerns about living in a post-truth world have significant parallels with those articulated in medieval discourse. I do not claim that by demonstrating these similarities we may therefore avoid the same pitfalls which affected Bromyard's era; humanity has a remarkable capacity for remaining oblivious to such things, for repeating the same mistakes over and over again. However, at the very least, it provides some clarity and context for what is happening. Fundamentally, the discourse of falsity outlined in the *Summa* (and imitated in the present day) provides a strategy for stripping away the legitimacy of certain ideas and actions by exposing how that legitimacy has been constructed. By doing so, those who employ such a strategy often undermine their own beliefs and ideas, demonstrating in the process a staggering lack of self-awareness. Victories of legitimacy are therefore illusory; the discourse remains vulnerable to being appropriated by each and every side.

The second thought concerns the academic value of this research. Given the nature of the subject, this thesis has delved into many distinct fields of medieval history: law; literature; economic and social history; religion and theology. Specialists in these fields will no doubt have much to add. Therein, I hope, lies the significance of the work: it provides a framework that can be utilised by scholars working in various disciplines so that they may identify how their object of study – via the discourse of truth and falsity – relates to that in other fields; and correspondingly, it provides a way for scholars to employ their own expertise to alter and clarify the arguments that I have set out.

²⁹ Joseph Heller, *Catch-22: A Novel* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999), p. 336.

APPENDIX A: A LIST OF IDENTIFICATIONS

The following tables list – in roughly chronological order – references to manuscript and early printed copies of the *Summa Praedicatorum* in library catalogues and other medieval records (up to 1600), and references to Bromyard or the *Summa* contained in contemporary sermons collections. It has been compiled primarily, but not exclusively, from Richard Sharpe's list of identifications, which are themselves culled from the Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues (CBMLC).

A chronological list of attestations, 1350-1600

* = surviving book

¶ = printed book

† = uncertain identification

[] = catalogue reference number in the CBMLC.

1. A list of books owned by Simon Bozoun, prior of Norwich, composed sometime between 1327 and 1352 [B58.25]¹
2. An inventory of books in New College library, Oxford, c. 1386 and later [UO70.264]²
3. A list of books bequeathed by Nicholas of Hereford, prior of Evesham abbey, (d. 1392) [B30.1]³
4. A catalogue of the library of Peterhouse College, Cambridge, 24 Dec. 1418 [UC48.*25–6 = Peterhouse MSS 24 and 25]⁴
5. A bequest (made 1420) of William Cawood, prebendary of York who left 'Brumardum' to be sold for the reredos (the ornamental screens covering the walls behind the altars) at York.⁵
6. A bequest of John Wakering, bishop of Norwich (d. 1425); left to the cathedral church of Wells; recorded in the episcopal register of Henry Chichele, archbishop of Canterbury.⁶
7. A bequest of John Thorpe (alive in 1430); left to Cambridge University library; recorded in a register of benefactors, c. 1424-c.1440 (UC2.39)⁷
8. A catalogue of the library of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, compiled in the fifteenth century (BA1.751)⁸

1 The list of Bozoun's books was recorded in BL Royal MS 14 at some point between 1327 and 1352. See J. David Sumithra, 'Looking East and West: The Reception and Dissemination of the *Topographia Hibernica* and the *Itinerarium ad partes Orientales* in England [1185-c.1500]' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2009), p. 272. The *Summa* was valued at 100 shillings, the *Decretum* was valued at sixty shillings, and a two-tract volume containing Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* and Cassiodorus' *Historia Tripartita* were valued at twenty shillings.

2 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/author/title/medieval_catalogues/UO70/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

3 This is not the same individual as the famous Lollard and antimendicant. Nicholas owned over 100 secular and religious volumes at the time of his death, although only ninety-one books are listed in CBMLC catalogue. Nicholas transcribed or caused to be transcribed nearly 100 volumes. The *Summa* was one of five books that had been bought ('De libris emptis primo incipiendum est'), and was valued at nine marks ('*Summa predicantium qui ualet ix marcas*' = 120 shillings). In contrast, a missal was valued at 'xx marcarum', and Cowton was valued at '7 marcarum'.

4 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/author/title/medieval_catalogues/UC48/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

5 Joseph Thomas Fowler (ed.), *Memorials of the Church of SS. Peter and Wilfrid, Ripon*, 4 vols (Durham: Andrews and Co., 1882-1908), IV (1908), p. 189.

6 E.F. Jacob (ed.), with the assistance of H.C. Johnson, *The Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1414-1443*, 4 vols (Oxford: Canterbury and York Society, 1937-47), II (1937), p. 311: '*Item lego ecclesiae Cathedrali Wellensi librum uocatum Summam Predicantium.*'

7 Henry Bradshaw, *Collected papers of Henry Bradshaw* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1889), p. 24. The second folio begins '*nem e' etiam*'. The bequest appears in the fifteenth-century *Registrum Librorum et Scriptorum*; this contains an inventory of the University library made in 1473, in addition to a list of books and donors.

8 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/author/title/medieval_catalogues/BA1/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

9. A catalogue of the library of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, compiled in the fifteenth century (BA1.752)⁹
10. An inventory of the library of All Souls College, Oxford, c.1443.(UO7.†96 'Bromyard')¹⁰
11. A bequest of John Tittleshall; abbreviated copy left to Corpus Christi College, 1458 (UC20.3)¹¹
12. A catalogue of the library of the Augustinian Canons, Leicester, copied between 1477 and 1494, but revised from an earlier catalogue composed before 1463 (A20.724 = A20.1543) (MS Laud 623)¹²
13. A bequest of John Rowclyff; left to King's Hall, Cambridge, 1492; will recorded in donor documents (UC155.¶2)¹³
14. A bequest of Robert Hayles; left to Gonville Hall, Cambridge, 31 May 1497 (UC132.¶1)¹⁴
15. 1500 Will of canon William Skelton, Lincoln Cathedral ¹⁵
16. Registrum of the library of the Brethren, Syon, c.1500-c.1524 (SS1.686–7)¹⁶
17. Registrum of the library of the Brethren, Syon, c.1500-c.1524 (SS1.¶721)¹⁷
18. Registrum of the library of the Brethren, Syon, c.1500-c.1524 (SS1.1329)¹⁸
19. A bequest of John Lownde; left to Peterhouse College, Cambridge, 6 October 1505; will recorded in donor documents (UC145.¶2)¹⁹
20. A bequest of John Proctor, 26 August 1510; left to Michaelhouse College, Cambridge; will recorded in donor documents; (UC153.¶1)²⁰
21. A list of books sold by John Dorne, Oxford bookseller, 1520²¹
22. A list of books granted by Peter Nobys to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, after July 1525 (UC22.¶6)²²
23. A list of books of New College, Oxford, recorded by John Leland, c. 1536 (UO77.22)²³

9 Ibid.

10 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/UO7/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

11 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/UC20/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

12 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/A20/> [accessed 1 February 2018]. There are fewer than twenty extant manuscripts from the library, but the catalogue demonstrates that it possessed the largest known library of the Augustinian houses in England. The catalogue is extensive and records the names of donors/former owners in some entries. By the late fifteenth century the abbey possessed over 940 volumes, excluding liturgical books and administrative records. 'Iohannes Bromiard in Summa' is written in a list under the heading 'summe'. Entry 724 reads: 'Summa predicancium secundum ordinem Alphabeti in magno volumine cum rubeo coopertorio 2o fo. Venturus camera' (=James, 395). Entry 1543 appears in a section detailing which books were kept 'in libraria in quarto stallo'; this also included the Manipulus Florum, not listed elsewhere, and Bromyard's 'Distinctiones'.

13 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/UC155/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

14 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/UC132/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

15 Rodney M. Thomson, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library* (Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1989), p. 276: 'ij books de summa predicancium.'

16 Vincent Gillespie (ed.), *Syon Abbey* (London: British Library, 2001), CBMLC, 9, p. 200. In addition to references to the Summa Praedicantium, the Distinctiones, the Exhortationes and the Opus Trivium, two further works are attributed to Bromyard in an index to the Registrum: 'Iohannes Bromzarde doctor de provisionibus ecclesiarum'; '< Bromzarde> super oratione dominica.' These attributions perhaps refer to excerpts of a larger work attributed to Bromyard, such as the Summa Praedicantium: *ibid.*, p. 739

17 *Ibid.*, p. 209. The second folio reads: 'adulacio'. The donor is listed as 'Terynden'. Richard Terenden was a canon of St Paul's before entering Syon in c.1488.

18 *Ibid.*, p. 406. The donor is listed as 'Curson'; David Curson was still a brother in 1537 at the cusp of the abbey's dissolution: *ibid.*, p. lvii. The second folio begins: 'stremo vitam'.

19 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/UC145/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

20 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/UC153/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

21 F. Madan (ed.), 'The Daily Ledger of John Dorne, 1520' in *Collectanea*, ed. by C. Fletcher (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885), pp. 71-177 (pp. 106, 112). The Oxford bookseller John Dorne offered the Summa for eight shillings in 1520; the Decretum was being sold for ten shillings. See also Walls, *John Bromyard*, p. 275, n. 2.

22 Nobys was elected master of Corpus Christi 1516. Catherine Hall, 'Nobys, Peter (b. c. 1480, d. in or after 1525)', *ODNB* (Oxford University Press, 2004). <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20227>> [accessed 6 Sept 2017]

24. An inventory of the Upper Library, Westminster, 1542 (H2.*846 = BL Royal MS 7 E iv)²⁴
 25. An electio list, Lincoln College, Oxford, 1543 (UO43.¶41)²⁵

A chronological list of sermonisers who cited (or demonstrably used) Bromyard or the Summa Praedicatorum

1. John Sheppey (c. 1300–1360), Benedictine monk and bishop of Rochester, Oxford New College MS 92
2. Thomas Brinton (d. 1389), Benedictine monk and bishop of Rochester, Harley MS 3760
3. Robert Rypon (d. c. 1419), Benedictine monk of Durham priory, British Library MS Harley 4894
4. Anonymous (fifteenth century), British Library MS Royal 18 B.xxiii²⁶
5. Anonymous, Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, MS 356/583 (sermons preached in academic years 1417 and 1424-1425)²⁷
6. Anonymous (fifteenth century), Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud misc. 706²⁸
7. Anonymous (fifteenth century), Hereford, Cathedral Library, MS O.iii.5²⁹

23 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/UO77/> [accessed 6 September 2017].

24 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/H2/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

25 <http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/medieval_catalogues/UO43/> [accessed 1 February 2018].

26 W.O. Ross (ed.), *Middle English Sermons from British Museum MS. Royal 18 B. xxiii*, Early English Text Society o.s. 209 (London: Oxford University Press, 1940; repr. 1987), pp. 83-91.

27 This manuscript is a collection of sermons preached in the academic years 1417 and 1424-1425. Wenzel describes them as a 'copy of what a note-taker had heard from pulpit.' A Cambridge academic sermon for the dedication of a church, highly abbreviated, refers to 'Bromzgerd': Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 81.

28 According to Wenzel, this is 'a composite manuscript assembled from sermons made and collected by Benedictine monks at Oxford in the fifteenth century.' Thirty-three random sermons are contained in several booklets written in multiple hands, each from the early fifteenth century. One sermon refers to 'auctor in Summa predicancium': Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, pp. 88, 323.

29 Hereford, Cathedral Library, MS O.iii.5 is a fifteenth-century manuscript. It contains a set of forty-one sermons and a version of the *Gesta Romanorum*. Each are in a different hand. One of the sermons contains a reference to 'Bromiardus in Summa.' The compiler or sermon-writer was probably an Augustinian canon, sympathetic to the friars: Wenzel, *Latin Sermon Collections*, p. 159.

APPENDIX B: CITATIONS IN THE SUMMA PRAEDICANTIUM

The following list of citations has been primarily compiled from material collected by Angelika Lozar and Keith Walls. There are flaws in the methodology and results of each. The list compiled by Lozar is limited in scope (it provides 159 citations from seventy-nine individual authorities) although it includes full references for each citation.¹ In contrast, the work of Walls – whilst more comprehensive – is based on the analysis of a printed edition, Basel 1484, rather than the extant manuscripts, and does not include full references for each citation. Additionally, Walls sometimes includes the original, or inferred source as a citation, whilst at other times he includes a compilation text as the citation rather than the original source; since it has not been possible to distinguish these, I have included all citations Walls provides.² The number of citations is noted in square brackets. The names of authors are in alphabetical order based on the common form found in English scholarship; the names of non-Biblical texts are included in the original language in order to facilitate further research. It should be noted that this is not a comprehensive list of the sources Bromyard used.³

BIBLICAL BOOKS [10,566]

Old Testament [6915]

Genesis [266]

Exodus [168]

Leviticus [82]

Numbers [95] [1 G.O.]

Deuteronomy [183]

Joshua [37]

Judges [91]

Ruth [3]

I Kings [139] (= 1 Samuel)

II Kings [96 + 1 G.O.] (= 2 Samuel)

III Kings [139] (= 1 Kings)

IV Kings [105] (= 2 Kings)

I Paralipomenon [16] (= 1 Chronicles)

II Paralipomenon [61 + 1 G.O.] (= 2 Chronicles)

I Ezra [12]

II Ezra [31]

III Ezra [1]

Tobias [76]

Judith [37]

1 Lozar, 'Studien zur Summa Predicantium des John Bromyard', pp. 46-53.

2 See, for example, Walls, John Bromyard, pp. 55-72, 82, 96 notes 6 and 7.

3 Thus, Mifsud suggests that Bromyard borrowed from, but did not cite, the Ancrene Riwe (Ancrene Wisse), an anonymous thirteenth-century guide for anchoresses: Mifsud, 'John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons', p. 217.

Esther [42]
 Job [309]
 Psalms [1333 + 6 G.O.]
 Proverbs [561]
 Ecclesiastes [159]
 Canticles [69 + 1 G.O.]
 Wisdom [241]
 Ecclesiasticus [629 + 2 G.O.]
 Isaiah [641 + 3 G.O. and 1 G.I.]
 Jeremiah [291 + 1 G.O.]
 Lamentations [64]
 Baruch [34]
 Ezechiel [184]
 Daniel [109 + 2 G.O.]
 Hosea [90 + 1 G.O. and 1 G.I.]
 Joel [24]
 Amos [44 + 2. G.O.]
 Obadiah [6 + 1 G.I.]
 Jonah [14]
 Micha [57 + 2 G.O. and 1 G.I.]
 Nahum [23]
 Habakkuk [33]
 Zephaniah [20]
 Haggai [6]
 Zechariah [53 + 4 G.O.]
 Malachi [39 + 3 G.O.]
 I Maccabees [88]
 II Maccabees [80]

New Testament [3651]

Matthew [605 + 7 G.O.]
 Mark [93 + 1 G.O.]
 Luke [507 + 4 G.O.]
 John [416 + 1 G.O.]
 Acts of Apostles [130 + 1 G.O.]
 Romans [287 + 2 G.O.]
 I Corinthians [245 + 3 G.O.]
 II Corinthians [114]
 Galatians [105 + 1 G.O.]
 Ephesians [105 + 5 G.O.]
 Philippians [73]
 Colossians [36]

I Thessalonians [42]
 II Thessalonians [21]
 I Timothy [73]
 II Timothy [43]
 Titus [16]
 Philemon [1]
 Hebrews [138]
 James [148 + 1 G.O.]
 I Peter [90]
 II Peter [41]
 I John [65]
 II John [7]
 III John [2]
 Jude [9]
 Apocalypse [203 + 1 G.O.]
 Unspecified Apostles (Paul?) [9]

GREEK AND ROMAN WRITERS [445]

Aesop (c. 620-564 BC) [10]
 Fabulae [10]
 Anaxagoras (c. 510-c. 428 BC) [1]
 Unspecified [1]
 Anonymous [2]
 Rhetorica [2]
 Aristotle (384–322 BC) [85]
 Categoriae (Praedicamenta, tr. Boethius) [2]
 De anima [1]
 De caelo et mundo [1]
 Ethica (tr. Robert Grosseteste) [40]
 Libri de animalibus (tr. Michael Scot) [5]
 Metaphysica [4]
 Meteora [1]
 Physica [4]
 Politica [3]
 Regula [1]
 Unspecified [23]
 (Pseudo) Aristotle [4]
 De vegetabilibus (tr. Alfred de Sareshel) [1]
 Secretum secretorum (tr. John of Seville) [3]
 Aulus Gellius (c. 125-180+) [1]
 Noctes atticae [1]
 Boethius (c. 480-524) [12]

- De consolatione philosophiae [10]
- De institutione musica [1]
- Unspecified [1]
- (Pseudo) Boethius [5]
 - De disciplina scholarium [5]
- Commentator on Boethius [1]
 - Commentator super Boethium, de disciplina scholarium [1]
- (Pseudo) Cato [3]
 - Disticha Catonis [3]
- Cicero (106-43 BC) [30]
 - De amicitia [4]
 - De legibus [1]
 - De officiis [9]
 - De senectute [1]
 - Epistulae [1]
 - Paradoxa stoicorum [4]
 - Tusculanae quaestiones [5]
 - Unspecified [5]
- Claudian (c. 370-c. 404) [2]
 - Unspecified [2]
- Quintus Curtius Rufus (?) (fl. 41) [3]
 - Historia Alexandri (Gesta Alexandri magni) [3]
- Diogenes of Sinope (c. 412-323 BC) [1]
- Donatus (fl. 1350) [1]
 - Unspecified [1]
- Frontinus (c. 40-103) [7]
 - Strategemata (De scientia rei militaris) [7]
- Fabius Planciades Fulgentius (fl. 500) [1]
 - Mitologiae [1]
- Horace (65-8 BC) [7]
 - Ars poetica [2]
 - Carmina [1]
 - Epistulae [4]
- Julius Valerius Alexander Polemius (fl. 300) [1]
 - Historia Alexandri magni [1]
- Justin [4]
 - Epitome (of Pompeius Trogus' lost Historiae Philippicae) [4]
- Juvenal (fl. 100) [6]
 - Saturae [6]
- Macrobius (fl. 400) [1]
 - Saturnalia [1]
- Ovid (43 BC-17/18 AD) [3]

- Unspecified [3]
- Petronius (c. 27-c. 66) [1]
 - Satyricon [1]
- Plato (c. 428-c. 348 BC) [1]
 - Unspecified. [1]
- Pliny the Younger (c. 61-c. 63) [1]
 - Epistula ad Ursum [1]
- Pliny the Elder (23/24-79) [4]
 - Historia naturalis [4]
- Ptolemy (c. 100-c. 170) [3]
 - Prologus Almagesti (tr. Gerard of Cremona) [3]
- Publilius Syrus (fl. 50 BC) [4]
 - Sententiae (Proverbia) [4]
- Quintilian (c. 35-c. 100) [1]
 - Institutio oratoria [1]
- Sallust (86-c. 35 BC) [2]
 - Catilina [2]
- Secundus the Silent [2]
 - Unspecified [2]
- Seneca (c. 4 BC-AD 65) [154]
 - De avaritia [1]
 - De beata vita [1]
 - De beneficiis [13]
 - De clementia [5]
 - De constantia sapientis [3]
 - De contemptu mortis [1]
 - De ira [5]
 - De moribus [4]
 - De providentia [2]
 - De senectute [1]
 - De tranquillitate animi [2]
 - Epistulae (unspecified) [5]
 - Epistulae morales [73]
 - Libellus ad Marciam [1]
 - Naturales Quaestiones [4]
 - Otium sine litteris [1]
 - Tragoediae [1]
 - Unspecified [31]
- (Pseudo) Seneca [8]
 - De musica [1]
 - De remediis fortuitorum [3]
 - Epistulae ad Paulum [4]

- Seneca the Elder (54 BC-c. AD 39) [8]
 Declamationes [8]
- Socrates (470/469-399 BC) [2]
 Sententiae [2]
- Solinus (fl. 250) [4]
 Collectanea rerum mirabilium (De mirabilibus mundi) [4]
- Suetonius (c. 69-122+) [2]
 De XII Caesaribus [2]
- Terence (c. 195/185-c. 159 BC) [1]
 Andria [1]
- Valerius Maximus (fl. 14-37) [46]
 Facta et dicta memorabilia [46]
- Vegetius (fl. 400) [7]
 De re militari [7]
- Virgil (70-19 BC) [3]
 Aeneis [3]

CHRISTIAN WRITERS OF THE PATRISTIC AGE (up to 700AD) [1231]

- Ambrosiaster [4]
 Commentarius in Epistulas Pauli [4]
- Ambrose (c.339-397) [36]
 Commentarius in Lucam [2]
 Commentarius in Matthaem [1]
 Commentarius in the Psalmos [1]
 De bono mortis [1]
 De Helia [1]
 De officiis [16]
 De quadregisma [1]
 Hexaameron [3]
 Homilia [2]
 Unspecified [8]
- Athanasius (c. 296-373) [1]
 Symbolum [1]
- Augustine (354-430) [304]
 Ad sacras virgines [2]
 Ad Bonifacium de correctione [1]
 Confessiones [11]
 De Benedictionibus Esau et Iacob [1]
 De cathezizandis rudibus [1]
 De civitate dei [93]
 De communi sermone clericorum [2]
 De doctrina christiana [15]

- De Genesi ad litteram [2]
- De Genesi contra Manichaeos [3]
- De gratia et libero arbitrio [4]
- De incarnatione contra Iudaeos [1]
- De quantitate animae [1]
- De regula religiosorum [2]
- De sancta viduitate [1]
- De sancta virginitate [1]
- De sermone Domini in monte [5]
- De trinitate [8]
- De vera religione [1]
- De vita et moribus clericorum suorum [17]
- Enarrationes in Psalmos [14]
- Enchiridion [2]
- Epistula ad Hieronymum [1]
- Epistula ad Macedonium [1]
- Epistula ad Vincentium [2]
- Epistulae unspecified [4]
- Sermo ad religiosos [1]
- Sermo ad decem chordis [2]
- Sermo de decimis [1]
- Sermo de decollatione Iohannis baptistae [1]
- Sermo de pastoribus [1]
- Sermo de puero centurionis [2]
- Sermo de sancto Laurentio [1]
- Sermo de verbis Domini [17]
- Sermones unspecified [15]
- Soliloquia [1]
- Super epistolam ad Galatas [3]
- Super Iohannem [8]
- Super Matthaicum [3]
- Unspecified [51]
- (Pseudo) Augustine [7]
 - De visitatione infirmorum [1]
 - Speculum clericorum [6]
- Basil of Caesarea (c. 330-379) [2]
 - Hexaemeron (tr. Eustathius) [1]
 - Homiliae (tr. Rufinus) [1]
- Benedict of Nursia (c. 480-c. 550) [1]
 - Regula [1]
- Caesarius of Arles (c. 470-542) [8]
 - Sermo de resurrectione [2]

- Unspecified [6]
- Cassiodorus (c. 485-580) [29]
 - Epistulae [2]
 - Expositio Psalmorum [9]
 - Historia ecclesiastica tripartita [15]
 - Unspecified [3]
- Cyprian (d. 258) [6]
 - (Pseudo?) De disciplina et habitu virginum [1]
 - Epistula contra haereticos [1]
 - Sermo de virginitate [1]
 - Unspecified [3]
- (Pseudo) Cyprian [8]
 - De XII abusivis saeculi [6]
 - De singularite clericorum [2]
- (Pseudo-Aeropagite) Dionysius [4]
 - Assignatio [1]
 - De caelesti hierarchia [3]
- Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260-c. 340) [1]
 - Historiae ecclesiasticae [1]
- Eusebius Gallicanus [4]
 - Homiliae X ad monachos [4]
- Eusebius of Vercelli (d. 371) [1]
 - De trinitate [1]
- Fulgentius of Ruspe (d. c. 532) [1]
 - Super Matthaem [1]
- Gennadius of Marseilles (fl. 470) [1]
 - Diffinitio rectae fidei [1]
- Gregory I (c. 540-604) [388]
 - De animarum [1]
 - De cura pastorali [33]
 - Dialogi [84]
 - Homilia de angelis [2]
 - Homilia de discipulis [1]
 - Homilia de Maria [3]
 - Homilia 'Ductus est Iesus in desertum'* [1]
 - Homilia Duo ex discipulis Iesu ibant'* [1]
 - Homilia 'Multi sunt vocati'* [1]
 - Homilia Pentecostes [1]
 - Homiliae unspecified [26]
 - Homiliae de Spiritu Sancto [3]
 - Homiliae in Ezechielem [18]
 - Homiliae in Matthaem [1]

- Homiliae XL in evangelia [10]
- Moralia in Iob [97]
- Registrum [7]
- Super Proverbia [1]
- Unspecified [97]
- (Dubious) Expositiones super Psalterium [1]
- Gregory of Nazianzus (c. 330-c. 390) [3]
 - Apologeticus (tr. Rufinus) [1]
 - Unspecified [2]
- Isidore (c. 560-636) [19]
 - Ethica [1]
 - Etymologiae [3]
 - Epistulae [1]
 - In libros veteris et novi testamenti prooemia [1]
 - Sententiae (De summo bono) [4]
 - Synonyma (Soliloquia) [1]
 - Unspecified [8]
- Jerome (c. 345-420) [101]
 - Contra Pelagianos [1]
 - Contra Vigilantium [1]
 - Epistula ad Aletham [1]
 - Epistula ad Augustinum [1]
 - Epistula ad Damasum papam [1]
 - Epistula ad Furiam [1]
 - Epistula ad Heliodorum [3]
 - Epistula ad Marcellam [1]
 - Epistula ad Monachos [1]
 - Epistula ad Nepotianum [2]
 - Epistula ad Pammachium [1]
 - Epistula ad Paulinum [1]
 - Epistula ad Rusticum de penitencia [3]
 - Epistula ad Theodorum [1]
 - Epistula ad Tirasium [3]
 - Epistula contra Helvidium [1]
 - Epistula contra Iovinianum [4]
 - Epistula de viduitate servanda ad Eustochium [2]
 - Epistulae [21]
 - Prologus totius sacrae scripturae [2]
 - Prologus in Abdiam prophetam [1]
 - Prologus ad Naum [1]
 - Super Epistulam ad Ephesios [1]
 - Super Ezechielem [1]

- Super Isaiaam [2]
- Super librum Actuum [1]
- Super Matthaicum [5]
- Super Osee [4]
- Super Psalmos [2]
- Unspecified [31]
- John Cassian (c. 360-435) [11]
 - Collationes patrum [11]
- John Chrysostomus (c. 347-407) [133]
 - De compunctione cordis (tr. Annianus?) [1]
 - De dignitate sacerdotali [1]
 - De eo quod nullus laeditur nisi a semet ipso [1]
 - De reparartione lapsi [1]
 - De symbolo [3]
 - Epistula (unspecified) [1]
 - Homilia de fatuis virginibus [1]
 - Homiliae [6]
 - In dialogo suo [1]
 - Super Epistulam ad Hebraeos (tr. Mutianus) [3]
 - Super Epistulam ad Timotheum [2]
 - Super Epistulam ad Titum [1]
 - Super Iohannem [33]
 - Super Lucam [1]
 - Super Matthaicum [53]
 - Super Videns arborem fici [2]
 - Unspecified [22]
- (Pseudo) Chrysostomus [4]
 - Opus imperfectum in Matthaicum [4]
- Julianus Pomerius (d. c. 500) [2]
 - De vita contemplativa [2]
- Leo I (d. 461) [3]
 - Apologia [1]
 - Sermo (in Breviarum, first Sunday in Lent) [1]
 - Unspecified [1]
- Leontius (fl. 650) [4]
 - Vita Sancti Iohannis Eleemynarii (tr. Anastasius Bibliothecarius) [4]
- Martin of Braga (c. 520- c. 580) [1]
 - Formula vitae honestae (De quattuor virtutibus cardinalibus) [1]
- Origen (c. 185-c. 254) [8]
 - Homiliae in Exodum (tr. Rufinus) [1]
 - Homiliae in Leviticum (tr. Rufinus) [1]
 - Unspecified [6]

- Orosius (d. after 418) [1]
 Unspecified [1]
- Pelagius (c. 350-423+) [4]
 Epistula ad Demetriadem [2]
 Liber de vita christiana [2]
- Peter Chrysologus (d. 449) [12]
 In quadam epistula [5]
 Sermo super Matthaëum [1]
 Unspecified [6]
- Possidius (fl. 400) [2]
 Vita Sancti Augustini [2]
- Prosper of Aquitaine (c. 390-c. 463) [1]
 De vitiis et virtutibus [1]
- Quodvultdeus (d. 453) [2]
 Sermo adversus quinque haereses [2]
- Sidonius (c. 430-c. 486) [1]
 Epistulae [1]
- Vitas patrum [112]
- Gaius Marius Victorinus (c. 275 –363+) [1]

CANON LAWYERS [909]

- Glossa interlinearis in Decretum [8]
- Bartholomew of Brescia (c. 1200-1258) [44]
 Glossa ordinaria in Decretum Gratiani [44]
- Bernard of Parma (d. c. 1263) [25]
 Glossa ordinaria in Decretales [25]
- Boniface VIII (c. 1230-1303) [41]
 Constitutio [2]
 Liber Sextus [39]
- Clement V (1264-1314) [21]
 Constitutiones Clementinae [21]
- Giovanni d'Andrea (c. 1270-1348) [14]
 As unnamed gloss to Lib. VI and Clementines [3]
 Apparatus ad Clementinas (glossa ordinaria) [7]
 Apparatus ad Sextum (glossa ordinaria) [2]
 Gradus consanguinitatis vel affinitatis [2]
- Gratian (d. by c. 1160) [558]
 Decretum [558]
- Gregory IX (c. 1145-1241) [153]
 Decretales [153]
- Gregory X (c. 1210-1276) [3]
 Statua in Concilio Lugdunensi [3]

- Guido de Baysio (d. 1313) [1]
 Apparatus ad Sextum [1]
- Henry of Segusio (Hostiensis) (c. 1200-1271) [17] (See also Civil Law)
 Summa super titulis Decretalium [7]
 Unspecified [10]
- Hugh of Pisa (d. 1210) [1] Canonist
 Unspecified [1]
- Innocent IV (c. 1195-1254) [12]
 Apparatus in quinque libros Decretalium [7]
 Super Liber Sextum [5]
- Jean Lemoine (1250-1313) [2]
 Glossa super bullam Benedicti [1]
 Super Constitutionem [1]
- Ottobuono (Adrian V) (c. 1216-1276) [1]
 Constitutiones [1]
- Urban II (c. 1042-1099) [1]
 Rescriptum [1]
- William of Montlezun (fl. 1325) [5]
 Glossa in Decretales [1]
 Glossa in Librum Sextum [2]
 Lectura super Clementinas [2]
- William of Rennes (fl. 1235) [1]

CIVIL LAWYERS [384]

- Accursius (c. 1182 – 1263) [1]
 Glossator in Digeum Vetus [1]
- Glossator in Corpus Iuris [28]
- Henry of Segusio (Hostiensis, c. 1200-1271) [2]
 Super Codicem [2]
- Justinian (c. 482-565) [353]
 Codex [130 + 13]
 Digestum Vetus [81 + 7]
 Infortiatum [32]
 Digestum [81 + 7]
 Institutiones [7 + 1]
 Novellae Constitutiones (Authenticum) [22]

FEUDAL LAW [9]

- Libri Feudorum [4]
 Glossa in Libros Feudorum [5]

ENGLISH LAW [3]

Breve Regis [2]

Magna Carta [1]

CHRISTIAN WRITERS (700-1100) [42]

Autpert Ambrose (c. 730-784) [2]

De conflictu vitiorum et virtutum [2]

Bede (c. 673-735) [15]

Commentarius in Epistulas canonicas [2]

Commentarius in Proverbia [1]

De luxuria super Matthaëum [1]

Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum [9]

Unspecified [2]

Haimo of Auxerre (fl. c. 840-870) [2]

Commentarius in Epistulas Pauli [2]

John of Damascus (c. 675-749) [3]

Unspecified [3]

(Pseudo) John of Damascus [9]

Liber Barlaam et Iosaphat [9]

Papias (c. 60-130) [1]

Unspecified [1]

Paulinus II of Aquileia (c. 726-c. 802) [3]

Liber exhortationis [3]

Peter Damian (1007-1072) [3]

Historia Petri Damiani [1]

Unspecified [2]

Rabanus Maurus (c. 780-856) [3]

Commentarius in Matthaëum [3]

Remigius of Auxerre (c. 841-908) [1]

Unspecified [1]

CHRISTIAN WRITERS (excluding Scholastic theologians, canonists and civil lawyers) (1100-c. 1330) [374]

Alexander of Canterbury (fl. 1120) [1]

De similitudinibus [1]

Alexander Neckam (1157-1217) [4]

De naturis rerum [3]

Unspecified [1]

Alfonso X (1221-1284) [5]

Liber [5]

Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) [150]

Ad milites templi [1]

Apologia [7]

- De consideratione [22]
- De hypocritarum pena [1]
- De libero arbitrio [1]
- De praecepto et dispensatione [2]
- Epistula ad Cluniacenses [1]
- Epistula dominum abbatem [1]
- Epistula ad ducem Aquitaniae [2]
- Epistula ad episcopum Senosensem [2]
- Epistulae [3]
- Expositio regula Sancti Benedicti [1]
- In glossa [1]
- Sermo de divinis [1]
- Sermo de labore messis [1]
- Sermo de trinitate [1]
- Sermo de via vitae [2]
- Sermo 35 [1]
- Sermo 38 [1]
- Sermo 89 [1]
- Sermones [14]
- Sermones de angelis [4]
- Sermones quadregesimae [2]
- Super Cantica canticorum [14]
- Super Marcum [1]
- Super Matthaëum [1]
- Super Missus est [1]
- Super Psalmos [1]
- Unspecified [59]
- (Pseudo) Bernard [2]
 - Meditationes [2]
- Caesarius of Heisterbach (c. 1180-c. 1240) [1]
- Eudes de Sully (d. 1208) [2]
 - Sermones [1]
 - Tractatus de quadam muliere [1]
- Gerald of Wales (c. 1146-c. 1223) [6]
 - Itinerarium Kambriae [6]
- Henry of Saltrey (fl. 1150) [1]
 - De purgatorio Sancti Patricii [1]
- Hélinand of Froidmont (c. 1160-1229+) [3]
 - Chronica [2]
 - Unspecified [1]
- Hugh of Fouilloy (c. 1100-c. 1172) [4]
 - De claustrum animae [4]

- Humbert of Romans (c. 1200-1277) [3]
 Liber de dono timoris (Tractatus de abundantia exemplorum) [3]
- Jacques de Vitry (c. 1160-1240) [4]
 Unspecified [4]
- Jacobus de Voragine (c. 1230-1298) [16]
 Legenda Sanctorum [16]
- Innocent III (1160/1-1216) [6]
 De vtilitate conditionis humanae [6]
- John Bromyard (c. 1290-c. 1352) [73]
 Collationes [4]
 Sermones [69]
- John of Salisbury (c. 1120-1180) [11]
 Policraticus [11]
- Peter of Blois (c. 1130-c. 1211) [3]
 Epistulae [3]
- Peter Comestor (d. c. 1178) [42]
 Historia scholastica [42]
- Peter the Venerable (c. 1092-1156) [1]
 Unspecified [1]
- Richard (Unspecified) [1]
 Unspecified [1]
- Thomas of Cantimpré (1201-1272) [18]
 Bonum universale de proprietatibus apum (Liber de apibus) [18]
- Vincent of Beauvais (c. 1190-c. 1264) [16]
 De eruditione regalium filiorum [6]
 Speculum historiale [8]
 Speculum naturale [2]
- Walter Map (1140-c. 1210) [1]
 Epistula Valerii ad Rufinum ne ducat uxorem [1]

SCHOLASTICS [140]

- Alain of Lille (c. 1128-1202) [1]
 De planctu naturae [1]
- Albert Magnus (c. 1200-1280) [5]
 Commentarius in Aristotelis Meteora (Super libros meteororum) [1]
 Super Lucam [2]
 Super quartum sententiarum [1]
 Unspecified [1]
- Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) [13]
 De casu diaboli [2]
 De incarnatione verbi [2]

- In quadam epistula [1]
- Unspecified [8]
- Hugh of St. Victor (c. 1096-1141) [19]
 - De anima [3]
 - De sacramentis [1]
 - De vanitate mundi [2]
 - Didascalicon de studio legendi [2]
 - Epistula ad quendam nobilem nubere volentem [1]
 - Soliloquium de arra animae [2]
 - Super librum Psalmorum [1]
 - Unspecified [7]
- John of Freiburg (d. 1314) [22]
 - Summa confessorum [22]
- Peter of Tarentaise (1102-1174) [4]
 - Commentarius in Petri Lombardi Sententias [4]
- Robert Grosseteste (c. 1175-1253) [5]
 - Epistula ad Innocentium IV [1]
 - Sermo papae et cardinalibus traditus [2]
 - Super Dionysii De caelesti hierarchia [2]
- Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225-1274) [73]
 - Epistula ad ducissam Lotharingiae [2]
 - Quaestiones quodlibetales [2]
 - Scriptum super secundum Sententiarum [2]
 - Scriptum super quartum Sententiarum [5]
 - Summa contra gentiles [1]
 - Summa theologica, prima pars [6]
 - Summa theologica, prima secundae [10]
 - Summa theologica, secunda secundae [36]
 - Summa theologica, tertia pars [6]
 - Unspecified [2]

MUSLIM WRITERS [13]

- Abu Ma'shar al-Balkhi (787-886) [1]
 - Liber de magnis coniunctionibus [1]
- Al-Farabi (c. 782-c. 950) [1]
 - De diffinitione philosophiae [1]
- Averroes (1126-1198) [1]
- Avicenna (980-1037) [5]
 - De venenis (tr. Gerard of Cremona) [1]
 - Philosophia sua [3]
 - Unspecified [1]
- Muhammad (c. 570-632) [5]

Alcoranum (Al-Quran, tr. Robert of Ketton) [5]

JEWISH WRITERS [5]

Josephus (37-c. 100) [1]

Unspecified [1]

Isaac Israeli ben Solomon (c. 832-c. 932) [1]

De diffinitionibus (tr. Gerard of Cremona) [1]

Petrus Alphonsi (fl. c. 1100) [1]

Unknown [1]

Septuagint [1]

Talmud [1]

HAGIOGRAPHY [66]

Ambrose [2]

Bartholomew [2]

Basil [1]

Beatrice [1]

Bernard [3]

Dominic [2]

Edmund, King of England [1]

Edmund, Archbishop [3]

Edward, King of England [1]

Fursey [1]

Gangulphus [1]

Germanus of Auxerre [3]

Gregory [11]

Jerome [2]

John the Almsgiver [4]

John the Evangelist [1]

Leo I [1]

Louis the Pious [5]

Lucy of Syracuse [1]

Lupus of Troyes [1]

Mark the Evangelist [1]

Martha [1]

Mary Magdalene [1]

Martin [4]

Mother of God (Apocryphal story concerning) [3]

Nicholas [1]

Saints (in such deeds of) [1]

Sebastian [1]

Silvester [3]

Stephen [1]

Thomas the Apostle [1]

Thomas of Canterbury [1]

LIVES OF NON-CANONISED [9]

Alexander III [1]

Fratres Mendicantes (Gerard of Fracheto and Humbert of Romans) [2]

Hugh of St. Victor [1]

Charlemagne (Pseudo Turpinus) [4]

HISTORIES [39]

Chronica Pontificum Romanorum [1]

Chronica Quaedam [6]

Chronica Romanorum Imperatorum [3]

Gesta Augustini Cantuariensis [1]

Gesta Iuliani Apostatae [1]

Gesta Romanorum [3]

Gesta Saracenorum [1]

Gesta Traiani Imperatoris [3]

Historia Antiochena (Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum) [4]

Historia Gallicorum [2]

Historia Inventionis Verae Crucis [1]

Historia Quaedam Apocrypha [4]

Historiae [4]

Historiae Romanorum [3]

LITURGY [1]

Liber Passionarius [1]

APPENDIX C: PROLOGUS

The following is a transcription of the Prologus in R, alongside my own translation. Spelling is faithful to R, but I have altered the punctuation to make the text more comprhensible. Paragraph markings are where they occur in R. Quotations found in the Manipulus Florum have been cited in the footnotes; these may be examined at the Electronic Manipulus Florum Project.¹ Line numbers have been added to facilitate searching the text; they do not reflect the manuscript layout.

Line	BL MS Royal 7 E iv	Translation
1	Predicancium vita secundum beatum Gregorium super ezechielem parte prima omelia tercia sonat et ardet. Sonat verbo; ardet desiderio. Es ergo candens est predicacio accensa. Sed de candenti ere scintille prodeunt, quia de eorum exortacione verba flammancia ad aures audiencium procedunt. Recte ergo predicatorum verba appellata sunt	The life of those preaching, according to Saint Gregory (in the third homily, part one, on Ezekiel) resounds and burns. It resounds with the word; it burns with desire. Incandescent bronze, therefore, is preaching ablaze. But sparks come forth from burning bronze, since from their exhortation, flaming words reach the ears of those listening. Thus, the words of preachers are justly called sparks, since they set ablaze those who are touched within their hearts. And
10	scintille, quia eos quos in corde tetigerint incendunt. ² Et sicut scintille ad distantes volant, ita predicatorum non solum inflammare debent presentes scintillis verborum, sed etiam posteris et distantibus quantum possibile est proficere debent exemplis scriptorum. Vnde Cassiodorus libro secundo epistula 22: Sequens, inquit, etas cum aliqua opinabili novitate succedat.	just as sparks fly towards those in the distance, so preachers ought not merely enflame those present with the sparks of their words, but, as far as it is possible, they must also accomplish this for future generations and those far away, through the examples of works written. Whence Cassiodorus, book two, letter twenty-two, who says: Let the coming age arrive with some imaginable innovation. For if it is glorious to hand down our abundant knowledge for future generations, how much greater is it to go beyond the works we have inherited. Just as,
20	Nam si gloriosum est posteris auctas extendere facultates, quanto prestancius est hereditarias augere virtutes. ³ Sicut ergo qui hereditatem augmentat, aliqua invenit ab antecessoribus sibi derelicta, aliqua de sua industria addit, ita in scribendo inventata atque augmentanda sunt. Vnde Seneca ad Lucillum Epistula 65: Fateor a sapiente mihi ista acquisita sunt mihique laborata. Sed agamus modum	therefore, he who augments his inheritance somehow found things left to him by his predecessors – and by his own industry somehow adds to it – in the same way, in recording things found, and said or written by others, these writings are to be otherwise organised and augmented. Whence, Seneca to Lucillius, letter sixty-five: I admit that from a wise man those things have been acquired for me, and laboured for me. But let us follow the way of the householder. We make
30	patrisfamilias. Faciamus ampliora, que	greater those things we have received; let that greater

¹ <<http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/index.html>> [accessed 1 February 2018].

² MF, Predicacio Y.

³ MF, Profectus F.

<p>40</p> <p>50</p> <p>60</p>	<p>accepimus; maior ista hereditas a me ad posteros transeat. Multum adhuc restat operis ultimumque restabit. Nec ulli nato post mille secula precludetur occasio aliquid adhuc adiciendi.⁴ Cuilibet ergo non solum sibi vel suo tempori, sed etiam posteris vivendum est.</p> <p>Ad hoc habemus duces, exemplum, et auctoritatem. Duces habemus naturam. Sol enim et omnia luminaria, quantum possibile est omnibus lucent. Non solum presentibus sed etiam posteris nostris lucebunt. Exemplum illustrium virorum vitam. Dicit Imperator: Voluntarios, inquit, labores appetimus, ut quietem aliis preparemus, ut in Auctentica, Ut divine iussiones in principio, collatione secunda. Item dicit imperator: Omnes, inquit, dies ac noctes nobis contingunt cum cogitatione degerere, ut aliquid placens deo, et amabile nostris collationibus prebeamus in Auctentica, Ut iudices sine quoquo suffragio in principio collationes secunde. Auctoritatem sapientium. Antiqui enim sapientes non estimabant aliquos vivere, nisi viverent ad aliorum utilitatem. Unde Seneca ad Lucilium, epistola 58: Non sibi vivit qui nemini vivit.⁵ Idem in epistula 82: Paucis natus est, qui populum sue etatis tantummodo cogitat. Sic etiam loquitur Tullius libro de amicitia, capitulo sexto. Non, inquit, minoris cure est mihi, qualis post mortem meam res publica fuerit quam qualis hodie.⁶ Idem de officiis libro primo capitulo sexto: Preclare, inquit, scriptum est a Platone, non solum nobis nati sumus; ortusque nostri partem patria vindicat, partem amici; atque ut placet stoicis, que in terris gignuntur ad usum hominum omnia</p>	<p>inheritance be passed on by me to future generations. Much work still remains to be done, and much will remain. Neither will the opportunity be denied to anyone born after a thousand generations of still adding something. Life must be lived, therefore, not only for oneself or one's own times, but also for future generations.</p> <p>For this we have guidance, example and authority. As guidance, we have nature. Indeed, the sun and all the stars light up as far as possible for everyone. They will shine not just for the present generation, but also for our descendants. As example, we have the life of illustrious men. The Emperor says: We willingly seek labour, in order that we may prepare peace for others, as in the Authenticum: 'Ut divine iussiones', at the beginning of the second collatio [collatio eight, titulus ten]. Again the Emperor says: Every day and night it falls upon us to spend in thought, so that we may provide something pleasant, and pleasing to God, through our deliberations, in the Authenticum: 'Ut iudices sine quoquo suffragio', at the beginning of the second collatio [collatio two, titulus two]. We have the authority of the wise. Indeed, the wise men of antiquity did not consider anyone was living, unless they were living for the benefit of others. Whence, Seneca to Lucilius, letter fifty-eight: He who lives for nobody, lives not for himself. Again in letter eighty-two: He who considers so greatly the people of his own era, has been born for the few. Such a sentiment, indeed, is spoken by Cicero, in De Amicitia, chapter six: The state of the republic after my death is no less a concern to me, than its condition today. Again, in book one, De Officiis, chapter six, Cicero says: It was splendidly written by Plato that we are born not just for ourselves; our birth-place and fatherland claims part of us, our friends another; and as it pleases the Stoics, all things which are begotten on earth are created for the use of</p>
-------------------------------	--	--

4 MF, Profectus G.

5 MF, Solitudo et tumultus Q.

6 MF, Vtilitas D.

70	<p>creari. Homines vero hominum causa esse generatos ut ipsi inter se alii aliis prodesse possent.⁷ Sic etiam loquitur lex civilis dicens quod homo nascitur rei publice: ff. de captivis et postliminio reversis, lege postliminium § filius transfuga id est in digesto novo libro XI, in qua lege continetur, quod homo primo nascitur patrie, deinde parentibus. Quibus concordat philosophus primo, ethicorum docens,</p>	<p>men. Men were created, truly, for the sake of men, so they themselves might be able to help each other. Civil Law also speaks of such, saying that man is born for the republic: ff. ‘de captivis et postliminio reversis’, in the law ‘postliminium’, § filius transfuga, that is in Digestum Novum, book XI, in which the law is contained, that man is born first for his country, then for his parents. For which things, the philosopher (Aristotle) agrees, in the first of Ethics, teaching that</p>
80	<p>quod bonum universale divinius est. Vide aliam legem huic concordantem f. 3.16. Sic etiam loquitur Paulus ad Romanos 14: Nemo, inquit, sibi vivit, et cetera. Et sapiens in Ecclesiastico 33: Videte, inquit, quantum non solum mihi laboravi, sed omnibus exquirentibus disciplinam.</p>	<p>universal goodness is more divine. For this, see the other concordant law f. 3.16. And St Paul says the same: Nobody lives for himself etc. And the wise man in Ecclesiasticus, thirty-three: Look, says he, how much I laboured not just for myself, but for all who seek instruction.</p>
90	<p>Istorum ergo informatus exemplo compilationem a me prius collectam in isto libello ad meam et aliorum utilitatem emendavi et augmentavi ponendo certas materias sub determinatis literis secundum ordinem alphabeti, per propria capitula distinguendo. Et quia frequenter contingit mittere de una litera et de uno capitulo ad aliud propter similitudinem materie, de qua agitur, in loco, de quo mittitur, cotatur litera et capitulum, ad quod mittitur, et numerus algorismi extra in margine, sub quo, quod quereitor, faciliter inuenietur.</p>	<p>Therefore, having been influenced by their example, I have in this little book, for the use of myself and others, emended and augmented the compilation collected by me earlier, placing certain materials, alphabetically arranged, in their own separate chapters. And because it frequently happens to send the reader, from one letter and chapter to another on account of the similarity of material, the letter and chapter is referenced to where one is sent, and the Arabic numeral in the margin is marked under which the passage sought may be easily found.</p>
100	<p>In hoc etiam opusculo non videtur vanum dicta et exempla inserere de diversis facultatibus, quia sicut dicit Petrus Blesensis in quadam epistola: Nunquam, inquit, super frater verbis vim faciam, de qua facultate sumantur, dummodo edificent ad salutem. Nam nec de herbis queritur, in qua terra, vel cuius ortolani cura vel cultura adoleverint dummodo vim habeant sanativam. Nam de fabularum</p>	<p>Even in this little work it does not seem worthless to insert sayings and examples from diverse branches of study, since just as Peter of Blois says in a certain letter: Never, brother, says he, shall I take issue with the branch of study from which the words have been taken, provided that they lead to salvation. For concerning herbs, one neither complains about the kind of earth in which they are cultivated, nor of the gardener who has looked after them, provided they possess health-giving properties. For concerning the</p>

7 MF Amicia BO.

<p>110</p> <p>120</p> <p>130</p> <p>140</p>	<p>gentilium moralitate forma quandoque erudicionis elicitur et fas eciam est ab hoste doceri, et ditare ebreos de spoliis egipciorum.⁸</p> <p>Sepius tamen exempla ponuntur accepta de moribus hominum, quam de animalibus vel aliis rebus ignotis utpote hominibus, quibus loquendum et predicandum est, magis nota et credibilioris persuasionis. Per nociora enim debet ignotorum sciencia adquiri. Frequencius eciam exempla sunt applicata contra vicia particulari, quia generalia minus movent et volant tantum ad aures, quemadmodum amici generales, qui tantum recipiuntur ad aulam. Singularia vero volant ad cor, sicut amici speciales, qui recipiuntur ad cameram. De hoc regraciatur Ruth 1: Inueni, inquit, gratiam in oculis tuis et locutus es ad cor ancille tue. Multi loquuntur sed non ad cor, quia non deuocione, sed verborum compositio et philosophie ostentatione aures demulcent auditorum contra doctrinam. Augustini libro de catechizandis rudibus: Maxime, inquit, est utile nosse ita esse proponendas verbis sentencias, ut preponitur animus corpori, et ita malle debent meliores quam diserciores inueniri sermones, sicut malle dicuntur prudenciores quam formociores habere amicos.⁹</p> <p>Est aliud eciam advertendum, quod frequenter in hoc tractatu adducuntur gentiles et eorum opera in testimonium veritatis. Et si queratur in doctrina fidei cristiane quid nobis de hiis que foris sunt, respondet beatus Gregorius in moralibus, libro primo: Ad confutandam, inquit, impudenciam nostram gentilis</p>	<p>morality of the gentiles' fables, the form of wisdom is sometimes drawn forth, and it is even permitted to be taught by the enemy, and to enrich the Hebrews from the spoliation of the Egyptians.</p> <p>More frequently, however, examples are used concerning the customs of men, rather than of animals or other unknown things, since – as one might expect for men, to whom we must speak and preach – they are better known, and of more credible persuasiveness. Indeed, the knowledge of what is not-known must be acquired through known things. More frequently, too, examples are to be applied against particular vices, because words against general vices move and fly to a much lesser extent towards the ears – in such a way they are like acquaintances, who are received only in the guests' waiting hall. Specific words fly to the heart like close friends who are taken back to one's chamber. Concerning this, Ruth I: She says: I found grace in your eyes; you have spoken to the heart of your handmaid. Many speak, but not to the heart, because not with devotion; but with the composition and ostentation of the words of a philosopher, they soothe the ears of the audience against doctrine. In the book of Augustine On the Catechising of the Uninstructed: especially, says he, it is useful to know, therefore, that feeling must be placed within the words, as the spirit is placed in the body, and thus they should prefer to construct better sermons rather than eloquent ones, just as they are said to prefer to have prudent rather than rash friends.</p> <p>Indeed, it is something that must be acknowledged, because frequently in this tract, [readers] are led towards the gentiles and their works, in testimony of truth. And if one complains concerning these things, which for us are outside the teachings of the Christian faith, Saint Gregory responds, in <i>Moralia</i>, book one: To confound our impudence, the gentile man Job is handed down as an</p>
---	---	--

8 MF, *Doctrina siue doctor* AY.

9 MF, *Studium* A.

150	<p>homo Iob ad exemplum deducitur, ut quia obedire homo legi sub lege positus despicit eius saltem comparacione evigilet, qui extra legem legaliter vixit. Erranti igitur homini data est lex. Erranti vero sub lege adducitur testimonium illorum qui extra legem sunt, ut quia conditi condicionis nostre ordinem servare nolumus, preceptis admonemur et quia precepta</p>	<p>example, since as a man placed under the law despises to obey it, he may anyhow be roused by a comparison with a man who lived legally outside the law. The law is therefore given to the man who errs. Truly, the testimony of those who are outside the law is handed down to the erring man, since as we do not want to keep the order of our given condition, we are admonished through precepts, and because we disdained these precepts, we might be brought to compunction through examples. Thus, therefore, the man outside law is handed down as the means, so that</p>
160	<p>contempsimus, exemplis confunderemur. Sic ergo homo sine lege ad medium deducitur, ut eorum qui sub lege sunt pravitas confundatur et ex accione secularium accio confundatur religiosorum, dum illi vivendo custodiunt, quem ipsi promittendo contempnunt.</p>	<p>those who are depraved under the law may be brought to compunction, and from the activity of secular men, the activity of religious men may be brought to compunction, provided that they guard this through their living, rather than demonstrating contempt with promises.</p>
170	<p>Huic eciam proposito accedit, quod dei virtus et sapiencia non solum Ninivitas, verum eciam ciconiam, milvum atque yrundinem contra incredulos tempus suum non agnoscentes, in testimonium criminis invitavit necnon, et Iob iumenta precipit interrogare, ut rationem habentibus et non utentibus sint in exemplum. Ex diuersis ergo multa in unum colligendo non sine magno labore naturam sequor apium, unde Seneca epistula 87: Apes, inquit, imitari debemus, que ita vagantur et flores ad mel faciendum carpunt. Deinde quicquid</p>	<p>For this proposition, it is also added that the virtue and wisdom of God summoned not just the Ninevites, but also the stork, the kite and the swallow in testimony of this charge, against the disbelievers of his time, who did not admit responsibility, and he orders Job to question mules, so that they may serve as an example for those who hold but do not use reason. By gathering many things from diverse sources into one collection, therefore – and not without great labour – I follow the nature of bees, whence Seneca, letter eighty-seven: We should, says he, imitate the bees which roam thus and pluck the flowers for making honey. Then they arrange</p>
180	<p>attulerint, disponunt ac per favos digerunt. Ita debemus, quecumque ex diuersa leccione congessimus separare; melius enim distincta servantur, deinde ad debitam facultatem ingenii in unum saporem varia illa libamenta redigere, ut, eciam si apparuerit, unde sumptum est, aliud tamen esse, quam unde sumptum est, appareat.¹⁰ Quod in copore nostro videmus operari naturam. Alimenta, que accepimus,</p>	<p>whatever they have borne and distribute it throughout the honeycomb. Thus, we must sift through whatever we have amassed from diverse reading material; for having been separated, they are in a better state to render in one flavour those various offerings for the appropriate faculty of one's disposition, so that even if known from where it has been attained, nevertheless it appears to be other than that from where it has been taken. Because in our body we see nature working. Having been nourished, those things</p>

10 MF, Studium AC.

190	<p>quamdiu in sua qualitate perdurant, stomacho onera sunt, ac cum mutata sunt, in vires et sanguinem transeunt. Idem est in illis, quibus aluntur ingenia prestemus, ut quecumque hausimus non paciamur integra esse.¹¹ Idem epistula secunda: Cum multa percurreris, unum excerpe.¹² Idem epistula 87: Nec scribere tantum nec legere debemus. Altera vires consternabit et exhauriet de stilo dico, altera diluet.</p>	<p>which we consumed are burdens for the stomach whilst they remain in their original state, yet when they have been digested, they course through men and through their blood. The same occurs with the things we supply with which the faculties are nourished, so that whatever we draw forth, we do not allow it to be whole. Also, letter two: When you encounter many, select one. Also, letter eighty-seven: We must neither write nor read too much. One of these shall overcome and exhaust men (I talk of the stylus); the other shall</p>
200	<p>Invicem huius alterum altero temperandum est, ut quicquid lectione collectum est, stilus redigat in corpus.¹³</p>	<p>temper this. In turns, one must move from one of these to the other, so that whatever is collected through reading, the stylus may render in form.</p>
210	<p>Ceterum quicquid in hoc opusculo reprehendendum existimant, mee ascribatur insufficiencie. Quicquid vero vutile, salvatoris et perpetue virginis attribuat clemencie et beatissimi doctoris Gregorii auxilio. Lectoresque pro collectore preces porrigant salutare. Quod ideo faciant, quia non minus videtur promereri precum suffragia, qui operatur cibum, qui non perit, pro animabus in eternum victuris, quam qui edificat hospitale pro corporibus iterum morituris. Cum teste beato Gregorio in moralibus vivificacio et conservacio animarum sine comparacione vivificacionem et conservacionem excedat corporum.</p>	<p>Moreover, whatever in this work is deemed reprehensible, it may be ascribed to my deficiency. Whatever truly is useful may be attributed to the clemency of the saviour and perpetual virgin, and to the help of learned Saint Gregory. And readers may stretch out well-wishing prayers for the collector. That they may therefore do so, least since the suffrage of prayers, which seems to merit no less, works imperishable nourishment for souls to live for eternity, rather than that which builds again the bodies about to die in a hospital. With the testimony of blessed Gregory in <i>Moralia</i>: the vivication and preservation of souls exceeds without comparison the vivification and preservation of bodies.</p>
220	<p>Nescio, inquit, si potest homo a deo in hac vita maius accipere. Ignoro, an possit ac gracia interim maiorem aliquam deus homini conferre, quam ut eius ministerio perversi homines in melius mutantur, ut de filiis diaboli filii dei efficiantur. An forte cuiquam maius videbitur esse mortuos suscitare. Ergo ne maius erit suscitare carnem iterum morituram quam anima in eternum victuram. Ergo ne maius erit carnem</p>	<p>I do not know, says he, if man is able to receive anything greater in this life from God. I do not know whether God is able to confer anything greater to man than this grace, than that by his ministry perverse men might be changed into better, and that from sons of the devil, they might be made into sons of God. Or perhaps to some it shall seem greater that the dead be awakened. Therefore, shall it be greater to awaken flesh that will die again, than a soul that shall live to eternity? Therefore, shall it be greater to recall the flesh to the joys of the world than</p>

11 MF, Studium AD.

12 MF, Studium AI.

13 MF, Studium AB.

230	<p>revocare ad gaudia mundi quam anime restituere gaudia celi. Ergo ne maius erit restituere carni bona transeuncia iterum peritura quam anime bona eterna reddere in eternum mansura. O qualis dos, qualis dignitas talem gratiam a deo accipere. Non debuit dei sponsa a sponso suo dotem aliam accipere, non decuit celestem sponsum sponse sue dotem aliam donare, quam ut per adopcionis gratiam possit multos deo filios gignere et de filiis ire</p>	<p>restore the joys of heaven to the soul? Therefore, shall it be greater to restore to the flesh transient goods that are to perish again, than to render eternal goods to the soul in its eternal abode? Oh what a dowry! It is a dignity to receive such grace from God. The bride of God ought not to receive another dowry from her bridegroom. It is not fitting that the celestial groom gives as a gift another dowry to his bride, than that through the grace of adoption she might be able to give birth to many sons for God, and from the sons of anger and the sons of hell to enrol heirs for the kingdom of heaven.</p>
240	<p>filiis iehenne regni celestis heredes ascribere. Idem super ezechielem homelia duodecima: Nullum omnipotenti deo tale est sacrificium, quale est zelus animarum.¹⁴</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Ad idem beatus Gregorius omelia quinta super euangelia: Plus, inquit, est verbi pabulo victuram in eternum mentem reficere, quam ventrem moriture carnis terreno pane saccare.¹⁵</p>	<p>Again, homily twelve, on Ezechiel: Nothing is a sacrifice for such an omnipotent God, as the zeal of souls.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For the same, Saint Gregory, homily five on the Gospels: It is more, says he, to refresh the mind with the fodder of the word in eternal life, rather than to satisfy the dying stomach of flesh with earthly bread.</p>
250	<p>Postremo circa tractatum sequentem tria sunt advertenda. Unum quod leges adducte non ita in hoc opusculo scribuntur quantum ad cotacionis modum, sicut in libris scribi solent legistarum, qui digestum vetus et novum et inforciatum per duplex scribunt, ff. et totum allegant digestorum. In hoc vero opere et voluminis in generali et libri in speciali frequenter nomina exprimuntur, ne illi qui dictorum librorum habent copiam, sed eos vertendi magnum non habent usum vel experienciam, in querendo, quod allegatur, longius euagentur.</p>	<p>Finally, there are three things concerning the following tract that must be brought to one's attention. One, that laws are not strictly written in this little work, in so far as the manner of a quotation, as they are accustomed to be written in books of the laws, which write the old and new Digestum and Infortiatum in a two-fold way: ff, and select from all of the Digests. In this work, the names are frequently expressed of a chapter in general, and a book in particular, lest those who have an abundance of the said books, but do not have great use or experience in working with them, in seeking what is chosen, stray further.</p>
260	<p style="padding-left: 40px;">Aliud, quod exemplatum ab isto acceptum, antequam esset factum vel correctum, in multis et specialiter in prima litera, a, sequencium discrepat capitulorum distincione et exteriori articulorum annotatione. Tertium quod frequenter sit</p>	<p style="padding-left: 40px;">Another, that a copy of this having been received before it was finished or corrected in many places, and especially in the first letter A, differs in the division of the following chapters, and in the marginal notation of articles. Third, that one may frequently be sent to the sermons,</p>

14 MF Salus B.

15 MF, Verbum F (1).

270	missio ad sermones tamquam ad materiam similem vel brevius ordinatam.	in order to see similar or more briefly arranged material.
-----	---	--

APPENDIX D: FALSITAS

The following is a transcription of the chapter Falsitas in R, alongside my own translation. Spelling is faithful to R, but I have altered the punctuation to make the text more comprehensible. Paragraph markings are where they occur in R. I have only amended errors in the case of clear scribal mistakes (for example, when a phrase has been unnecessarily repeated). Biblical translations are derived from the Douay-Rheims Bible. Italics in R indicate a marginal interpolation or correction. Folio numbers have been included in square brackets. SS refers to the manuscript subsection employed by Bromyard for cross-referencing. Line numbers have been added to facilitate searching the text; they do not reflect the manuscript layout.

SS	Line	BL MS Royal 7 E iv	Translation
	1	[170r a] Falsitatis et veritatis. Primo facienda est adinuicem comparacio, quo ad potenciam et victoriam ostendendo quod falsitas in hoc mundo, ut communiter contra veritatem preualet. Secundo ostendetur quod non est mirabile quod preualet contra veritatem propter multas causas que eam vincere faciunt. Tertio ostendetur quam periculosa est falsorum seruitus et societas et amicitia. Quarto falsorum ostendetur stulticia. Quinto incorrigibilitas. Sexto, ostendetur que sit radix et causa tante falsorum innumerabilis multitudinis. Septimo ostendere restat que mala ex falsitate cotidie contingunt. Octauo quis sit falsorum finis.	Of falsity and truth. Firstly, a comparison must be made, side by side, with regards to power and victory, showing that falsity prevails in this world when commonly in opposition to truth. Secondly, it shall be shown that it is not miraculous that it prevails against truth on account of the many reasons which make it conquer. Thirdly, it shall be shown how the service, friendship and society of the false is dangerous. Fourth, the foolishness of the false shall be shown. Fifth, their incorrigibility. Sixth, that which is the root and cause of such an innumerable multitude of the false shall be shown. Seventh, it is left to show which evil things commonly come to pass out of falsity. Eighth, what is the end of the false.
	10		
1	20	Racione primi est sciendum quod talis est comparacio inter falsitatem et veritatem vt frequenter qualis est inter lupum et agnum. De quibus habes, D 11, 12. Quia sicut in omni conflictu et ludo et facto, lupus contra agnum preualet. Sicut eciam pilatus contra Christum in hoc mundo preualuit. Sic in causis et placitis falsus contra veracem, et impius preualet aduersus iustum, Aba. 1. Et specialiter vbi verax et fidelis est pauper et falsus est nummosus. In hoc casu potest pauper clamare iusticiam suam	First, through reason it must be known that such a comparison between falsity and truth is frequently comparable to that between a wolf and a lamb. Concerning which, you have D 11, 12 [Divicie 12]. Since just as in every conflict, play and deed, the wolf prevails against the lamb, just as Pilate prevailed against Christ in this world. Thus in actions and pleas, the false man prevails against the true, and ‘the wicked prevaieth against the just’, Habacuc 1. And this is especially so where the truthful and faithful man is poor, and the false man full of money. In this case the pauper can clamour for his

2	<p>30</p> <p>40</p> <p>50</p> <p>60</p>	<p>ostendendo ad iudices dominos et alios qui ad faciendum iusticiam ordinantur usque ad raucedinem. Potest eciam curias sequi usque ad lassitudinem et vite tedium et non exaudietur, vbi falsus sine omni clamore vel labore, tantummodo manus illorum cum nummis tangendo exauditur et expeditur. Mirabile videtur quod clamans non exauditur et mutus auditur et causa est quia vnus venit in nomine nummi, alius in nomine dei. Apud tales, enim, falsos assisores et huius, yl est mieu3 venu3, et libencius recipitur qui venit in nomine nummi quam dei. Nec mirum, quia quilibet libencius recipit et cum meliori uultu illum qui venit in nomine domini sui quem diligit quam illum qui venit in nomine domini quem non diligit, vel quem non repu [170r b] tat dominum suum. Sed talium dominis maxime dilectus est nummus, quod innuit cristus in euangelio, vbi docet quod nemo potest duobus dominis seruire, innuens mammonam esse cupidorum dominum. Quod ergo mirum si venientem in nomine eius libenter recipiant.</p> <p>Iterum cicius auditur ille qui venit in nomine domini sui, quem diligit et timet quam in nomine illius domini quem non timet et diligit. Ita cicius, isti audiunt, vnum venientem cum nummis cum paucis uerbis, quam vnum qui clamat pro amore veritatis et pro amore dei et omnium sanctorum.</p> <p>Iterum, sicut in omni bello vbi deus iuuat pars aduersa vincitur, sicut patet, B 2, articulo 8. Ita in placitis causis et negociis huius, vbi iste falsus deus denarius iuuat, veritas vincitur, quia ita manus illorum, in quorum manibus iniquitates sunt fortificat in tangendo quod eos fortiter</p>	<p>justice by disclosing to the judges, lords and others who are ordained for the doing of justice, until he is hoarse. He is also able to follow the court until exhaustion and weariness of life, and he shall not be heard clearly, whereas the false man without any clamour or labour is clearly listened to and expedited, merely by touching their hands with money. It seems wondrous that he who clamours is not heard, and the mute man is heard, and the reason is that one comes in the name of money, for whom they always have open ears, the other in the name of God. In the presence of such false assisors, and their kind, he who comes in the name of money rather than God is well treated, and freely received. Nor is it extraordinary, since whoever comes in the name of his lord, whom he loves, is received more freely, and with a better expression, than the man who comes in the name of a lord whom he does not love, or whom he does not reckon his own lord. But such men love money as lords greatly, which Christ implies in the gospels, when he teaches that nobody is able to serve two lords, showing wealth to be the lord of avarice. What is therefore miraculous if they freely receive whoever comes in his name?</p> <p>Again, the man who comes in the name of his lord, whom he loves and fears, is more quickly heard than he who comes in the name of the lord whom he does not fear and love. Thus, they hear more quickly he who comes with money, with few words, than he who clamours for love of truth, and for love of God and all the saints.</p> <p>Again, as in every battle where God helps, the enemy is defeated, as is shown in B 2, article 8 [Bellum 8]. Thus, in pleas, actions and such business when the false God, money, helps, truth is conquered, since in this way it fortifies the hands of those – in whose hands lie iniquities – in greasing the palms, which helps them act strongly</p>
---	---	--	--

3	70 80 90 100	<p>agere et vincere facit. Et si non possit manus omnium, xxii falsorum tangere habundanter, tangat saltem manus antiquioris vel potencioris patrie ductoris, et adhuc contra veritatem prevalebit, quia ille vnus vel timore vel amore vel falsa informacione qua factum falsissimi, antiqua tempora antiquorum regum et feoffaciones que nunquam fuerunt in rerum natura narrando, colore veritatis colorabit, et alico predictorum modorum alios post se ducet. Et sic in mundo isto falsitas preualet, sicut dominus et deus in dominio et regno suo. Et veritas in plano campo seu platea in ista lucta seu hastiludio vel bello vbi falsi cum denariis sunt ex parte contraria et eciam mediatores in negocio, sicut in duodena et huius prosternitur. Et sic verificatur illud, ys, 59: Corruit in platea veritas, sicut patet A 14, 38.</p> <p>Sed cum veritas sit tam fortis quod teste scriptura, 2 Esdre, 3: Super omnia vincit veritas, et eodem, libro, capitulo 4^o, habetur quod dixerunt omnes: Magna est veritas et preualet, mirabiliter videtur dictum quod falsitas veritatem prosternit. Sed hic non debet esse mirabile consideranti locum et modum et omnia auantagia que falsitas habet pro parte in isto bello. Habet enim ex parte sua omnia auantagia que bellantes uictores facere consueuerunt.</p> <p>Quorum primum est ex loco, in quo pugnant, B, namque, 2, 2 et A 25, 6. Dictum est quod locus pro bello bene electus multum pugnantibus iuuat, quod eciam sit in terra et dominio proprio et habeat circa se homines, scilicet, qui eum multum diligunt et aduersarium odio habeant.</p>	<p>and be victorious. And if he is not able to copiously touch the hands of all twelve false men, he shall at least touch the hands of the oldest, or most powerful leader of the jury, and he shall prevail against truth, since that one, either through fear, or love, or false information, in which he shall colour the falsest deed by narrating in the colour of truth both the old times of old kings, and also feoffments which were never in the nature of things, and in some of the aforesaid ways, he shall lead others after him. And thus in this world falsity prevails, as a lord and God, in his lordship and kingdom. And on the battlefield truth is struck down – whether in this contest it is a street, a tournament or a war – when the false men are with coins from the opposing side, and also mediators in the matter, as in the twelve and such kind. And it is thus verified, Isaias 59: ‘Truth hath fallen down in the street’, as is shown, A 14, 38 [Advocati 38].</p> <p>But since truth is so strong that, in the testament of scripture, 2 Esdras 3 [The apocryphal 3 Esdras 3]: ‘Truth conquers all things’, and in the same book, chapter four, it is held that all said: ‘Truth is great and prevails’, the saying that falsity strikes down truth seems miraculous. But this ought not be miraculous to those considering the place and means and all advantages which falsity has for its side in this war. Indeed, it has out of its side all the advantages which are accustomed to make fighters victorious.</p> <p>The first of which is the place in which they fight, B 2, 2 [Bellum 2] and A 25, 6 [Ascendere 6]. It has been said that the well-chosen place for war which helps fighters greatly is that which is also in their own land and lordship, and has men around it who love it greatly and cannot abide the enemy.</p>
---	-----------------------------------	---	--

110	<p>Sed falsitas eligit sibi locum apciorem videlicet hunc mundum inter suos qui multum eam diligunt [170v a] et alteram partem magno odio habent, id est, veritatem in dominio et regno proprio. Siquidem in hoc casu quod veritati negatur falsitati conceditur. Sed hic mundus, id est, congregacio falsorum negatur esse regnum veritatis. Ipsa enim veritas dicit regnum suum non esse de hoc mundo. Ergo regnum</p>	<p>But falsity chooses for itself an appropriate place, namely this world, in its own lordship and kingdom, amongst those who love it greatly, and have much hatred towards the other side, that is truth. It follows in this case that what is conceded to falsity, is not said for truth. But this world, that is the congregation of the false, is said not to be the kingdom of truth. Indeed truth itself says its kingdom is not of this world.</p>
120	<p>falsitatis esse oportet iuxta sententiam Augustini de ciuitate dei. In ciuitate inquit dei, rex est veritas, scilicet in celo, et eciam in congregacione fidelium, lex caritas, dignitas equitas, pax felicitas, vita eternitas. Sed in ciuitate diaboli, id est, in congregacione falsorum, rex est falsitas, lex cupiditas, dignitas iniquitas, lis felicitas, vita temporalitas.</p>	<p>Therefore, the kingdom of falsity is like Augustine describes it in The City of God. In the city of God, says he, truth is king, namely in heaven and also in the congregation of the faithful, law is charity, dignity is equity, peace is happiness, life is eternal. But in the city of the Devil, that is, in the congregation of the false, falsity is king, law is avarice, dignity is inequity, a quarrel is happiness, life is temporal.</p>
130	<p>In hoc enim regno, id est, in congregacione falsorum habet totam altam iusticiam et ita potenter regnat quod aliis dat terram hereditatem vitam et membra qui hiis omnibus carere deberent et alios hiis priuat qui priuari non deberent, quia forcior latro vel homicida qui ducitur ad castrum vel ad alium carcerem, si sit de magno genere vel sit alligatus alicui magno ductori vel ipse vel amici eius habeant, vnde conducere possint iudices assessores</p>	<p>Indeed in this kingdom, that is, in the congregation of the false, the devil has complete justice, and rules powerfully thus, because he gives hereditary land, life and limbs to others who ought to lack all these things, and deprives others of these things, who ought not to be deprived, since he who is led to the castle or another gaol for theft or murder is more forcefully liberated if he is from great stock, or if he is bound to some great lord, or if he himself, or friends of his have property, from which they are able to take into service judges, assizors and the jury. Whence a custodian of prisoners is recently said to have responded to a certain person petitioning for a friend who was being held in gaol: ‘Be silent, if he held in his hand two stolen oxen in the presence of the judge, I would help him escape.’ Behold how he gives life to whom he ought not. On the other side, if the faithful man has powerful enemies,</p>
140	<p>et patriam liberatur. Vnde nuper cuidam roganti pro amico quem in carcere habuit. Respondisse fertur ille ductor tace, si in manu duos coram iudice boues furatos haberet ego facerem eum euadere. Ecce quomodo vitam dat cui non deberet. Ex alia parte si fidelis homo habeat inimicos potentes qui numis vel muneribus patriam ducunt, indictatur incarceratur et occiditur quandoque pro terra vel maneriis suis, que</p>	<p>who rule the land with coins or money, he is at a certain time pointed out, incarcerated and killed</p>

4	<p>150 illi potentes desiderant. Sicut Achab desideravit vineam Naboth, pro qua habenda occisus fuit, sicut patet, 3. Reg. 21. Aliquando pro odio et alijs causis. Patet ergo quod tantam potestatem habet nunc falsitas in ciuitate diaboli quantam habuit olim pilatus in ciuitate Ierusalem. Quia sicut ille Barraban latronem liberauit, et Christum occidit, ita nunc falsitas et falsi homines qui locum tenent pilati quia</p> <p>160 pugnant in propria in qua sunt audaciores. De qua et prouerbium est quod in propria patria vacca fugat bouem, sicut et cetera. Sed secus erit in regno veritatis, id est, in alio seculo. Ibi enim veritas vincet et falsos ponet cum pilato cuius locum in terra tenuerunt.</p> <p>170 Secundum quod iuuat in bello ad victoriam optinendam est generis sublimitas talibus. Enim ut communiter plures fauent et plures secum ducere possunt plusque aduersarii tales timent, taliumque libencius in matrimonium ducuntur filie et specialiter vbi generis sublimitatem concomitantur multe [170v b] diuicie et largitas magna. Sed falsitas de magno genere vtpote diabolum habet patrem. Ipse enim mendax est et pater eius, Io. 8, et cupiditatem matrem. Quia communiter cupiditas parit falsitatem</p> <p>180 quia propter illam sunt falsa periuria mercatorum falsa testimonia iuratorum et huius, hec ergo multos habet filios et filias, quibus dicit veritas, Io. 8, vos ex patre diabolo estis, et multos generos specialiter quia multe falsitatem secuntur diuicie quia tales in hoc mundo cito ditantur. Quod mirum ergo est quod hec cum tot filiis et filiabus et generibus tanta familia et excercitu veritatem vincat que in hoc</p>	<p>for his land or manors, which the powerful men desire. Just as Achas desired the wine of Naboth, who on account of this was then killed, as is shown, 3 Kings 21. At other times it happens for hatred and other reasons. It is shown therefore, falsity now holds so much power in the city of the Devil, as much as Pilate formerly held in the city of Jerusalem. Just as he liberated the thief Barrabas, and killed Christ, so now falsity and false men who hold the position of Pilate, and fight in their own land, in which they are daring. Concerning this there is also the proverb that in its own land the cow chases off the ox, etc. But it shall be otherwise in the kingdom of truth, that is, in another age. Thereupon truth conquers, and puts the false with Pilate, whose place on earth they held.</p> <p>Secondly, what helps to obtain victory in war is superiority of descent. Indeed, as is common, many favour such men, and they are able to lead more with them, and many adversaries fear such men, and the daughters of such men are gladly led into marriage, and especially when many riches and great largesse accompany the superior man of descent. But falsity is from great descent, as one might expect from that which has the devil as a father. Indeed, ‘he is a liar, and the father thereof’, John 8, and cupidity the mother. Since cupidity commonly begets falsity, and since on account of that there are the false perjuries of merchants, the false testimonies of jurors, and such things, it therefore has many sons and daughters – to whom truth speaks, John 8: ‘You are of your father, the devil’ – and, in particular, many kin, because many riches follow falsity, since such people are soon enriched in this world. What is therefore miraculous about the fact that falsity, with so many sons and daughters, and kin, so many dependents and men, defeats truth, which in this</p>
---	---	--

230	vendicio quin cum ea crescat in intencione uel facto ementis vel vendentis vel vtriusque, quia sicut dicitur Ester. 16, callida fraude decipiunt. Vel ad minus se mutuo decipere intendunt, in tantum quod vix venditur mensura bladi vel potius vel panni quin ista [171ra] herba in mensura crescat, quia in panno et blado pulcrum ostendunt exterius et abscondunt peius interius uel quod falsis vtuntur mensuris.	the evil weed of falsity; there is scarcely an acquisition or sale, in which it does not grow within the intent or act of the acquisition or sale, or other transaction, just as it is said in Esther 16: ‘with crafty fraud they deceive.’ Or at least they intend to deceive each other, in so far that scarcely a measure of either wheat, or rather, bread is sold, in which that weed does not grow, since they show the exterior beauty of bread and wheat, and conceal the worse interior, or because they use false measures. When also they mix bad drink or water to wine, do they not commit falsity?
240	Quando eciam potum malum vel aquam vino miscent nonne falsitatem committunt. Vix sine ista ponderantur specimina vel alia que pondere venduntur, quia ibi antiqua et putrida nouis admixta omnia pro bonis venduntur. Ibi ergo hec famulatur vnam partem statere tenendo, vix sine ista soluitur pecunia quia falsos denarios bonis admiscent. Vix emitur equus vel bos quin ista pedem teneat, e cozes entre le partiez.	Spices and other goods which are sold by weight are hardly ever weighed without it, since the old and putrid are added to the new and all are sold as good. Thereupon, he serves these things holding one part of the weight; scarcely without this is wealth loosened, since they mix false pennies with the good. Scarcely a horse or ox is bought, in which falsity does not grasp the foot, and the things between the parts. Scarcely does a simple or faithful man of the country come to buy something in those large villages, who does not meet with those of the weed before he returns. In this way, because the enemy, that is, the devil, has sown zizania in number, that is, in money, which, as has been said, is calculated in weight and measure, it is said that it contravenes the precept of God, Leviticus 19: ‘Thou shalt not do that which is unjust.’ Note M 6, 8 [Mercatio 8].
250	Vix venit aliquis simplex vel fidelis de patria ad emendum aliquid in istis magnis villis quin obuiet isti herbe antequam redeat. Ita quod inimicus, id est, diabolus superseminauit zizannia, in numero, id est, in pecunia que ut predictum est numeratur pondere et mensura vt dictum est contra dei preceptum, Leuiticus 19, non facies iniquum. Nota M 6, 8. Et in tantum habet in crescendo efficaciam, iuxta prouerbium, mala herba cito crescit, quod sicut zizannia; quandoque bonum bladum ad terram trahit et illud quasi adnullat. Ita hec in tantum veritatem adnullauit, quod modo verificatur illud, Osee 4, non est veritas in ore, quia quis nunc veritatem loquitur, cui potest modo credi. Ps, omnis homo mendax. Non est misericordia in opere quia quis nunc gratis mutuatur indigenti uel superfluitatibus suis subtrahit ut indigentis	And to a great extent it grows efficaciously, according to the proverb: ‘An ill weed grows apace’, because it is like zizania; whenever it draws the good wheat to the ground, it is as if it destroys it. In this way, to a great extent it destroyed truth, which is verified in Osee 4: Truth is not in prayer, since who now speaks the truth, who is able now to be believed? The Psalms [115]: ‘Every man is a liar.’ Mercy is not in work, since who now freely lends to one in
260		

7	<p>270 defectus suppleat. Non est sciencia dei in terra, sed sciencia terrena et lucratiua; sed maledictum, quia pauci uidentur euadere et specialiter de potentibus quin cadant in aliquem punctus malediccionis seu excommunicacionis contente in iure, vel in sentenciis prouincialibus et contentis in noua carta, quam non tenent; furtum, quia vix est qui uiuat de proprio; adulterium, quia plus alienas quam proprias diligunt vxores; mendacium, in omni arte tam speculatiua que uidelicet est lucratiua tam; in mecanica vt predictum est inundauerunt super totam terram. Quia omnes declinauerunt a veritate suple ad falsitatem, per quos falsitatis familia in tantum multiplicatur quod pro vno quem habere solebat in cristiane religionis principio, nunc habet x, quia in principio cristianitatis ut dicere tanta erat falsorum paucitas et admiracio quod quando homines videbat vnum de falsitate notatum per vicum transire se cruce signabant, digito eum, quasi admirando ostendentes et dicentes, ecce falsus homo. Sed nunc econuerso tanta est falsorum multitudo et verorum paucitas quod si haberent xx di [171rb] gitos et vix sufficerent ad ostendendum falsos, specialiter quando est comitatus vel patrie congregacio inter quos tamen vnus digitus sufficit ad ostendendum fideles. Et adhuc forte digitus illi officio deputatus esset ociosus pro magna diei parte. Ita quod sicut quandoque solebat falsus esse in admiracionis ostensione, sicut bubo de die ita nunc fidelis, in tantum quod quando loquela est inter aliquos de istis curialibus vel hominibus magni status et de senescallis et aduocatis et huius, si forte a casu ori loquencium aliquis occurrat</p> <p>280</p> <p>290</p> <p>300</p>	<p>need, foregoing his own superfluous desires, to supply the wants of the needy? Knowledge of God is not on Earth, but worldly knowledge, and profit; but evil speech, since few seem to avoid, especially with regards to the powerful, falling into some point of a curse or rather excommunication, having been shown contempt in law or in provincial assemblies, and for things refused in a new charter which they do not have; theft, since there is scarcely one who lives by his own property; adultery, since more love mistresses than their own wives; lying, in every conceivable way, which is clearly so lucrative; in this device, as already said, they have flooded the entire land. Since all men veer from humble truth to falsity, and through these the family of falsity is multiplied, because for the one which the beginning of the Christian religion used to have, now it has ten, since in the beginning of Christianity, there was such a paucity of false men, and there was wonder because when men saw one noted for falsity pass through a village, they crossed themselves with a finger, as if regarding in wonder, and saying, behold the false man! But now, so great is the multitude of false men, and so few of truth, that if they had twenty fingers, they would be scarcely sufficient for pointing out the false, especially when there is a retinue or congregation of the jury, amongst whom one finger is sufficient to point out the faithful men. Hitherto, the finger perchance assigned for that duty was idle for the great part of the day. Thus, whenever a false man used to be a display of wonder, like an owl in daytime, so now is the faithful man, insofar that when there is speech amongst others about those courtiers or men of great status, and about stewards, advocates and such men, if by chance some faithful man opposes the speech of those speaking, they look at</p>
---	--	--

8	<p>310</p> <p>320</p> <p>330</p> <p>340</p>	<p>fidelis, illum cum quodam pondere et capitis agitatione, quasi raritatem talium, et quam carum sic talem inuenire exprimunt admirantes, triticum inter tot zizannia et auem pulcram inter tot bubones et agnum inter lupos.</p> <p>Nec mirum est si admirentur quomodo fidelis tot falsorum euadit insidias, quia facilius posset demonis effugere malicias per crucem suam et aquam benedictam et bonam vitam et huius sicut patet C 17, 38, sed per talia falsorum non fugat versutias, quia bonis plus nocent sicut lupus plus nocet oui quam lupo et in nocendo habet prudentiam propriam et eciam demonis. Et sic patet illud, Yso. 32, fraudulentum vasa pessima sunt. Quod ergo mirum si falsitas et falsi tanta armati multitudine simul et astucia veros vincant et veritatem opprimunt.</p> <p>Et quia parum contra veritatem proficeret falsorum multitudo nisi essent inter se vniti et concordantes ad nocendum veracibus, sicut facti fuerunt concordantes et simul amicitia colligati herodes et pilatus ad persequendum cristum sicut nec prodest magnum habere exercitum nisi sic concors et vnitus.</p> <p>Ideo quartum, quod falsos in bello iuuat contra veritatem est falsorum simul colligatio, quia sicut dicitur, Naum. 1, sicut spine se inuicem complectuntur.</p> <p>Tales enim spinis et tribulis congrue comparantur propter vi condiciones in spinis inuentas communius quam in arboribus fructuosas.</p> <p>Quarum prima est quod spina spinam et ramus ramus sic complectitur, et sic mutuo se tenent quod si velis veprem vel</p>	<p>him in wonder, with a certain heaviness and shake of the head, as if to express the rarity of discovering such men, and thus how dear, the wheat amongst so much zizania, and a beautiful bird amongst so many owls, and a lamb amongst the wolves.</p> <p>Neither is it a marvel if they are viewed with wonder, in the way that a faithful man evades so much treachery of the false, since he is more easily able to flee the malice of a demon through his cross and holy water and a good life and such things, as is shown C 17, 38 [Crux 38], but through such things he is not able to chase away the cunning of the false, since they harm the good more, just as the wolf harms a sheep rather than a wolf, and in harming has its own, and also a daemon's, prudence. And thus it is shown in Isaias 32: 'The vessels of the deceitful are most wicked.' What therefore is miraculous, if falsity and false men, altogether armed with such a multitude and with cunning, defeat the true and oppress truth?</p> <p>And the multitude of false men accomplish little against truth, unless they are united amongst each other and in agreement for harming true men, just as Herod and Pilate became bound together by agreement and friendship for the persecution of Christ, just as it is not advantageous to have a great force, unless in agreement and united.</p> <p>Therefore, fourth, the binding together of the false is what helps the false in the war against truth, since, as is said in Nahum 1: 'as thorns embrace one another.'</p> <p>Indeed, such men are aptly compared to thorns and thistles on account of six conditions found more commonly in thorns than in fruitful trees.</p> <p>The first of which is that a thorn is entwined with a thorn, and a branch with a branch, and thus they hold each other together, because if you wish</p>
---	---	---	--

9	<p>350</p> <p>360</p> <p>370</p> <p>380</p>	<p>spinam ab aliis diuidere ab eisdem retineris et non solum sic spinam retinent, sed extrahentem pungunt et lacerant. Nota P 4, 5. Sic falsorum societas est ita confederata et in conspiracionibus et mutuis supportacionibus sunt ita complexi quod vix aliquis fidelis vel eciam ipsi maximi et veraces iusticiarii qui mittuntur, vt de talibus conspiratoribus et aliis iniuriis inquirant, possunt aciem illorum frangere vel ad veritatem deuenire [171va] vel aliquam illorum corrigere. Et ista alligacio excercitus diaboli non solum est assessorum et falsorum iuratorum inter se, sed eciam inter iniuriosos barones et dominos patrie. Illi enim duodenarii xii videlicet diaboli apostoli cogitantes vel quod nonnullis nocuerunt vel nocere intendant in futurum quod eciam illi potentes in multis casibus eos iuuare possunt, nituntur eis alligari, eisque in omnibus malis adquisicionibus et iniusticiis quas per eos fieri desiderant quantum possunt placere cogitantes si eis placeant quod nullus eis nocebit. Improuide tamen cogitant non quomodo a deo, sed quomodo ab homine proregantur, de quibus quando aperte iniuriantur, et alii inter se altercantur quomodo hoc facere audebat vel incipere satis congrue respondetur, yl ad endoz de tiel grant seignur non dicere habere endoz de dieu mez de tiel seignur mez celle doser au diable, quia ille qui hic est doser falsi in aula inferni erit doser diaboli.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Illi vero mundi potentes videntes quod in malis adquisicionibus et exheredacionibus et aliis iniuriis non poterunt in curiis et comitatibus sine talibus falsis iuratoribus et patrie ductoribus, propositum suum optinere, nec sine falsis ministris multa colligere, eis dant robas et</p>	<p>to divide a thorn or briar from the others, you are held back by them, and thus they preserve not only the thorn, but fight and lacerate whoever tries to extract it. Note, P 4, 5 [Pax 5]. The society of the false is allied thus, and in conspiracies and with mutual support they are entwined, so that scarcely a faithful man or even the greatest and true justiciars themselves, who are sent to enquire about such conspirators and other unjust men, are able to shatter their blade, or lead them back to truth, or correct some of them. And this alliance of the swarm of the devil, of assizers and false jurors, is not just amongst them, but also amongst unjust barons and lords of the jury. Those twelve, the twelve apostles of the devil, either because they have harmed not a few, or intend to harm in the future, considering that powerful men in many cases are able to help them, strive to be bound to them, and as far as they might, please them, in all the evil acquisitions and injustices which they desire to be made through them, thinking if they please them, that nobody shall harm them. Improvidently they consider not how they are ruled by God, but how they are ruled by man, of whom, when they are openly wronged, and others argue amongst themselves, how he dared to do or begin this, it is fittingly and sufficiently answered, he has the support of such a great lord, that is not to say he has the protection of God, but of such a feudal lord. Henceforth, that man, is the pannier of the devil, since he who is the pannier of the false man here, in the hall of hell he shall be the pannier of the devil.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Truly, the powerful of the world seeing that they shall not be able to fulfil their plan, in evil acquisitions, disinheritances, and other injustices, in law courts and county courts without such false jurors and leaders of the jury, nor collect much without false ministers, give robes to them, and a fief and friendship are gathered for them, and they</p>
---	---	---	---

10	<p>390 feodum, et amicitia eis colliguntur, eosque in malis factis suis supportant, et contra deum et rationem defendunt. Et ita patet quod talis est alligacio inter falsos de patria et dominos qualis fuit inter iudeos et pilatum in cristi crucifixione. Ipsi enim volentes ipsum crucifigere propositum optinere non potuerunt sine pilati adiutorio et potestate. Nec ipse id facere potuit sine ipsorum falso testimonio. Ille ergo eos iuuuit potestate et ipsi eum falsitate. Sic in proposito potentes falsos supportant potencia et falsi potencium complent voluntates suis falsitatibus et ista de causa complectuntur et mutuo se tenent spine iste et vepres ut spine significant alciores dominos que communiter alcius ascendunt, vepres vero inferiores falsos ministros et amicos. De quibus, Ys. 32, super humum populi mei spine et vepres ascendent.</p> <p>400</p> <p>410 Ipsi vero falsi inter se in falsitatibus suis confederati sunt primo ut mutuis adiutoriis lucrentur ut in comitatibus vnus alium lucrari faciat in hiis que agenda sunt de hundredo seu contracta sua vel quantum ad innocencium suppressionem, vel quantum ad nocencium liberacionem. Et alius idem ei faciat de contracta sua, sicut patet, A 14, 24; 25, et A 21, 26. Secundo ut periculum enitent. Sciunt enim vel</p> <p>420 vereissimiliter timent quod si vnus illorum coram iustitiarijs [171 vb] et huius esset de conspiracione vel falsitate conuictus ne similia ipsi patientur vel ne ab illo qui secreta illorum scit qui in tali casu gauderet socios habere in pena accusarentur. Et sic idem quod latronibus eis contingit qui timent ne socii capiantur, non quia eos diligant sed uel ut ipsos in latrocinijs iuuent vel ne appellatores</p>	<p>support them in their evil deeds, and defend them against God and reason. And so it is shown that such is the bond between the false from the jury and lords, in the same way it was between the Jews and Pilate in the crucifixion of Christ. The same men wishing to crucify him, were not able to fulfil their plan without the adjudication and power of Pilate. Neither was he able to do so without their false testimony. He therefore helps them through his power, and they help him through falsity. In such a proposition, the powerful support the false through power, and the false supply the desires of the powerful with their falsities, and those, from this cause, are entwined, and hold themselves together, these thorns and briars, so that the thorns signify the higher lords who commonly ascend higher, the briars, the inferior false ministers and friends. Of which, Isaias 32: ‘Upon the land of my people shall thorns and briars come up.’</p> <p>Those false men between each other are confederates in their falsity, firstly, so that they profit by mutual help, so that in collusion, one helps the other profit in these things, which must be done by the hundred or by contract, either for the suppression of the innocent, or for the liberation of harmful men. And the other does the same for him by his contract, as is shown A 14, 24 and 25 [Advocati 24 and 25], and A 21, 26 [Amicitia 26]. Secondly, so that they avoid the danger. They know or similarly fear, if one of the men is convicted of conspiracy or falsity in the presence of justices, that they might suffer in a similar way to him, or might be accused by the man who knows their secrets, who in such a case is glad to have his associates punished. And thus the same happens with them, the thieves, who fear the capture of their associates, not because they love them, but because they either help them with thefts, or might become their approvers. Thus,</p>
----	---	---

11	<p>430</p> <p>440</p> <p>450</p> <p>460</p>	<p>ipsorum fiant. Sic ergo cum magnis et eciam inter se vepres et spine iste. De quibus Ys. 7, vepres et spine erunt in vniuersa terra, fiunt contra veros et veritatem et eciam contra correccionem propriam fortes. Vnde beatus Gregorius in moral' super illud Job. 41, vna vni coniungitur et nec spiraculum quidem incederet per eam. Reproborem inquit vnitas bonorum vitam tanto durius premit, quanto se ei per colleccionem durius opponit. Et ibidem qui diuisi corrigi poterant, in iniquitatum suarum pertinacia vniti perdurant, suntque audaciores ad resistendum, sic quia peruersos vnitas roborat dum eos concordat, et non solum sic seipsos defendunt et mutuo se iuuant, sed eciam uolentem spinam vel veprem extrahere, id est, corrigere pungunt sicut patet C 16, 44. Nota V 8, 42.</p> <p>Secunda condicio in spinis et tribulis inuenitur quod serpentes et animalia venenosa communiter sub eis habitant in sepibus. Enim talia animalia communiter inueniuntur, ita sub alis et proteccione falsorum hominum; latrones homicide pugnatores et falsi ribaldi quando puniri deberent habent refugium. De quo in ps. dicitur refugium herinaciis. Et non solum malos extraneos sic protegunt spine iste, sed eciam communiter pessimam habent familiam quia secundum iudicem populi et ministri eius, Ecc. x. Et princeps qui libenter audit uerba mendacii, id est, dominus falsus, omnes ministros habebit iniquos, Ecc. 39. Quia qualis dominus tales diliget amicos talem uult familiam sicut ergo sepes facta est habitacio serpentum et spelunca animalium rapacium. Sic domus illorum facta est spelunca latronum quibus</p>	<p>therefore, those thorns and briars are with the great, and also amongst them. Of which Isaias 7: 'Briars and thorns shall be in all the land', and be used against true men and truth and also against their own vigorous correction. From which, blessed Gregory, Moralia on the Book of Job 41: 'One is joined to another, and not so much as any air can come between them.' The unity of reprobates more firmly oppresses the life of the good, says he, the more firmly it opposes it by assembling together. And at that very time, those divided were able to be corrected, but united they endure in the obstinacy of their iniquities, and dare to resist, and thus unity reinforces the perverse, whilst harmonising them, and not just because they defend themselves, and give mutual help to each other but also because they fight whoever wishes to extract the thorn or briar, that is to correct them, as is shown C 16, 44 [Correctio 44]. Note V 8, 42 [Visitatio 42].</p> <p>The second condition found in thorns and thistles is that venomous serpents and animals commonly reside under them. Indeed such animals are commonly found in hedges, thus, under the wings and protection of false men; thieves, killers, brawlers, and false rogues have refuge when they ought to be punished. Of which it is said in Psalm 103: 'refuge for the irchins [hedgehogs]'. And those thorns protect not just evil strangers, but also commonly have the worst family, since 'as the judge of the people is himself, so also are his ministers', Ecclesiasticus 10. 'A prince that gladly heareth lying words, hath all his servants wicked', Ecclesiasticus 39 [Proverbs 29]. Since this kind of lord loves such friends, he wishes such a household, just as a hedge has become the habitat of serpents, and a nest of rapacious animals. Thus their house has become a nest of thieves, of which it is said in Mark 11 and Luke 19: 'but</p>
----	---	---	---

470	<p>dicitur Mar. xi et Lu. 19, vos autem fecistis eam speluncam latronum, in qua diucius defenduntur quam in ecclesia et in habitaculum draconum, Jer. X. Ibi vulpes foueas habent, Mat. 8.</p>	<p>you have made it a den of thieves', in which place they are defended for longer than in a church, and in a 'dwelling for dragons', Jeremias 10. There, 'the foxes have holes', Matthew 8.</p>
480	<p>Et sicut sepes talia animalia defendit et illa animalia quantum eciam possunt sepes defendunt, quia qui dissipat sepem mordebit eum coluber, Ecc. x. Et quis auderet sepem inuadere in qua esset draco magnus. Sic predicti magni tales tam extraneos quam proprios venenosos in tantum defendunt quod si quis eos velit indictare vel actachiare vel incarcerare vel de peccatis suis eos corrigere multiplices eis si magni sint qui hoc attempnant fundunt [172ra] et fieri procurant preces et literas. Si vero vicini sint multiplices contra eos excogitant malicias. Idem eciam venenosi sepem suam in tantum defendunt in tantumque eius uoluntati sunt parati,</p>	<p>And just as the hedge defends such animals, those animals, as far as they might, defend the hedge, since 'he that breaketh a hedge, a serpent shall bite him', Ecclesiastes 10. And who dares to invade a hedge, in which there is a great snake? Thus the aforesaid great men defend such outsiders as much as their own venomous creatures, because if one wishes to point them out, or seize, or incarcerate, or correct them of their sins, they expend for them in many ways, if they are great who venture upon this, and arrange entreaties and letters to be made. If neighbours are manifold, they contrive to do malice against them. Again, the venomous also defend their hedge to such a degree, and in such a degree are prepared for his will, because dogs to the voice of the hunter are not more prepared for the prey, or the famished falcon having spotted a bird, than they are for doing whatever that great protector may have told them. If he wishes to lash somebody, or seize the prey, or despoil or murder, he does not cease unless his protector says so, just as it is said for dogs, do this and it does. Or if they are not able to do so immediately, they are like bird-catchers regarding birds; thus they lie in ambush for them until they fulfil what was ordered. Of which Jeremias 5: 'Among my people are found wicked men, that lie in wait as fowlers, setting snares and traps to catch men. As a net is full of birds, so their houses are full of deceit'</p>
490	<p>quod canes ad vocem venatoris non sunt paraciores ad predam, vel falco famelicus visa aue quam ipsi sint ad faciendum quicquid ille magnus defensor eis dixerit. Si voluerit quempiam verberare vel predam capere vel spoliare vel occidere, non restat nisi quod dicat sicut dicitur canibus hoc, fac hoc et facit. Vel si statim facere non poterunt, sicut ancupes auibus; ita illi illis insidiantur, usque illud quod iussum est impleuerunt. De quibus Jere. 5, inuenti sunt in populo meo impii insidiantes quasi aucupes laqueos ponentes, et pedicas ad capiendos viros. Sicut decipula auibus, sic domus eorum plene dolo.</p>	<p>Si voluerit quempiam verberare vel predam capere vel spoliare vel occidere, non restat nisi quod dicat sicut dicitur canibus hoc, fac hoc et facit. Vel si statim facere non poterunt, sicut ancupes auibus; ita illi illis insidiantur, usque illud quod iussum est impleuerunt. De quibus Jere. 5, inuenti sunt in populo meo impii insidiantes quasi aucupes laqueos ponentes, et pedicas ad capiendos viros. Sicut decipula auibus, sic domus eorum plene dolo.</p>
500	<p>Tertia condicio est quod semen bonum inter spinas crescere non potest, ita nec semen uerbi dei inter tales. Teste Cristo qui dicit, Luce. 8, quia exorte spine</p>	<p>The third condition is that the good seed is not able to grow amongst thorns, so neither the seed of the word of God amongst such men. In the testament of Christ, who says in Luke 8: 'and the</p>

12	<p>510 suffocauerunt illud.</p> <p>Sed tamen spine quandoque arborem bonam inter se crescere permittunt, in qua permissione isti spinis peioris esse condicionis dignoscuntur, quia isti quando aliquam tractare intendunt falsitatem vel conspiracionem ita compacte et prouide ordinant exercitum suum quod nullum fidelem inter eos admittunt libenter. Verbi gracia, si quis indiget falsa duodena, nititur</p> <p>520 quantum potest multis prelocucionibus et cogitacionibus ita procedere quod omnes sint falsi qui munere vel amore vel timore velint falsitati condescendere. Ecce quomodo ordinator exercitus diaboli astute ordinat aciem suam. Si vero propter excepciones quas pars facit aduersa illi quos sic ad bellandum contra veritatem repellantur, vel aliquis illorum ab apostolatu illo, in quo omnes sunt iudas et</p> <p>530 nullus Andreas excludatur loco cuius oportebit fidelem et prius in excogitatum habere hominem, alii illum nituntur multis persuasionibus promissis et minis ad suas falsitates inclinare, sicut illi falsi nitebantur micheam prophetam ad falsum inclinare, 3 Reg. 22, dicentes ei quod bona regi diceret sicut alii falsi dixerunt. Ecce spine iste non permittunt arborem bonam inter eas crescere quia si noluerit spinis</p> <p>540 inclinari sicut lepus venabitur, et in omni curia amittet, statimque dicent illud quod leguntur iudei dixisse de Cristo. Sap. 2, circumueniamus iustum quoniam inutilis est nobis et contrarius operibus [172rb] nostris. Et sic talem habebunt persecucionem a falsis vicinis suis qualem habuit quondam populus dei a sarracensis qui sicut dicitur, Mac. 1, apud quemcunque inueniebantur libri testamenti</p>	<p>thorns growing up with it, choked it.’</p> <p>But nevertheless, at some time thorns allow the good tree to grow amongst them, in which permission, false men are discerned to be of a worse condition than the thorns, since when false men strain to discuss some falsity or conspiracy, by compact and foresight they arrange their force that they admit no faithful man freely amongst them. For example, if he lacks the false twelve, he strives as much as he can with many words and thoughts to proceed thus, that all are false, who with a bribe or love or fear wish to stoop to falsity. Behold, in this way the organiser of the force of the devil cunningly arranges his side. If on account of objections which the opposing side makes, those whom they have gathered for fighting against truth, are repelled, or another one of those from that apostolate – in which all are Judas and none Andrew – is excluded, in whose place it shall be proper to have the faithful (and previously not thought of) man – the others strive with many persuasions, promises, and silver to incline him to their falsities, as those false men strove to incline the prophet Micheas to a false deed, 3 Kings 22, saying to him that he should speak good things to the king, as other false men spoke. Behold, those thorns do not permit the good tree to grow amongst them, since if he does not wish to be worsened by thorns, just as a hare, he shall be hunted, and lose the action in every court, and immediately they shall say what the Jews are gathered to have said about Christ. Wisdom 2: ‘Let us therefore lie in wait for the just, because he is not for our turn, and he is contrary to our doings’. And thus such men shall suffer persecution by their false neighbours, of the kind the people of God formerly suffered at the hands of the Saracens, who, as is said, 1 Machabees 1: ‘And every one with whom the</p>
----	--	---

13	<p>550 domini, et quicumque obseruabat legem domini secundum iussum regis trucidabant eum. Sed beati qui persecucionem paci propter iusticiam, Matt. 5, beatus, qui in omnibus talibus persecucionibus pro veritate respondit, sicut respondit predictus Micheas, 3 Reg. 22, viuit inquit dominus, quia quecunque dixerit mihi dominus hoc loquar.</p> <p>560 Quarta condicio veprium et spinarum est quod ouem et agnum inter eas pascentem vel commorantem vel eas tangentem et pungunt et lana spoliant, eciam si sit tota nuda quod non habeat nisi vnum manipulum; eciam illud auferunt si poterunt. Sic predicti falsi fidelibus et simplicibus inter eos habitantibus multipliciter nocent et nocendi querunt occasiones. Et si quam paruam lanam, id est, parua bona forte habuerunt, illis eos spoliant, quia si non habuerint nisi vnam bonam acram terre prope terram illorum illam malo cambio vel alio modo, sicut Achab vineam Naboth, 3 Reg. 21, adquirere nituntur. Si non habuerit nisi vnum equum vel aliud animal vel seruum vel quodcunque quod desiderant illo eos defraudare nituntur. Ecce quomodo iste spine lanam auferunt cum tota maledicti ouium tonsores, de quibus Mich. 3, qui violenter tollitis pellem illorum desuper et carnes, et cetera, et sic ab eo qui non habet supple nisi modicum et quod habet aufertur ab eo, Mar. 4. Nota N 4, 1.</p> <p>570</p> <p>580 Quinta condicio veprium et spinarum est quod fructum multum aptum non portant nisi pro porcis. Ita nec isti quia per fructus in sacra scriptura opera intelliguntur. Iuxta illud Mat. 7, a fructibus, id est, operibus cognoscetis eos. Cum ergo</p>	<p>books of the testament of the Lord were found, and whosoever observed the law of the Lord, they put to death, according to the edict of the king.’ But of the saint who suffered persecution for the sake of justice, Matthew 5: Blessed is he who in all such persecutions answered for truth, as the aforesaid Michaeas responded, 3 Kings 22: ‘As the Lord liveth, whatsoever the Lord shall say to me, that will I speak.’</p> <p>The fourth condition of briars and thorns is that they prick the sheep and lamb grazing amongst them, either lingering near or touching them, and strip the wool, even if it is completely bare but for one bundle; they even carry that away if they can. Thus the false harm in many ways the faithful and the simple living amongst them, and seek occasions for doing harm. And if by chance they had little wool, that is few goods, they despoil them of that, since if he does not have anything except one good acre of land near to their land, they struggle to acquire that through an evil exchange, or in another way, as Ahab with the vineyard of Naboth, 3 Kings 21. If he does not have anything except one horse, or other animal, or a serf, or anything that they desire, they struggle to defraud those things from him. Behold the way in which these thorns carry off wool with all the skin, cursed sheep shearers, of which, Micheas 3: You who ‘violently pluck off their skins from them, and their flesh’, and ‘he that hath not, (except a little), that also which he hath shall be taken away from him’, Mark 4. Note N 4, 1 [Nocumentum 1].</p> <p>The fifth condition of briars and thorns is that they do not bring forth much suitable fruit, except for pigs. In this way, neither do those men, since in sacred scripture works are understood through their fruits. According to Matthew 7: ‘By their fruits (that is, works) you shall know</p>
----	--	---

16	<p>630 loquuntur, quousque quod cupiunt habuerint. Est tamen in eis dissimilitudo in duobus.</p> <p>Primo quia isti videntur caucius procedere quia vtuntur ingenio proprio et eciam diaboli. Scit enim demon quod in forma propria est odiciosus, et ideo in proposito suo non preualeret quia homines eum fugerent. Ideo istos tanquam suos mittit discipulos in quibus loquitur.</p> <p>640 Secundo quia ille hereditate celesti isti miseros priuare nituntur terrena.</p> <p>Secunda cautela vtuntur iude proditoris et dalide sampsonis, Iud. 18 et Ioab 2 Regnum 20, de quibus in Ps, locuntur pacem cum proximo, quia nulli pulcrius locuntur quam latrones et falsi homines, mala autem in cordibus eorum. Jer. 9, in ore suo loquitur pacem cum amico suo, et occulte ponit ei insidias.</p> <p>650 Et iste modus falsitatis specialiter conuenit prophetis baal qui claudicant in duas partes, 3 Regum 18, qui videlicet volunt duobus dominis contrariis seruire et placere. Tales enim mediatoribus assimilatur in nundinis equorum qui cosours vocantur quia ipsi tam vendenti quam ementi pulcre locuntur, et ab vtraque</p> <p>660 parte quandoque munera accipit ille, scilicet, proseneta et tamen vni parti insidias ponit quia vnam decipit et quandoque ambas quia illi quem iuuat in facto vendicionis iterum paratus erit deipere in contractu empconis, et semper tamen amicum se esse asserit maximis iuramentis. Si uero pars senciens se deceptam, illum de decepcione reprehendat, quibus cautis uerbis se excusat</p>	<p>merry with them, and speak with beauty, and till a time they shall have what they desire. There is nevertheless a difference in them in two ways.</p> <p>First, they seem to proceed more covertly, since they employ their own character, and also that of the devil. Indeed the demon knows that in his own form he is odious, and therefore in his own guise he would not prevail, since men would flee him. Therefore he sends those, so to speak, his disciples, in whom he speaks.</p> <p>Second, whereas he deprives men of a celestial inheritance, they strive to deprive wretched people of an earthly inheritance.</p> <p>Secondly, they employ the trick of the Jewish traitor, and of Dalilah of Samson, Judges 18 [Judges 16] and Ioab, 2 Kings 20, of whom, in the Psalms [27]: ‘who speak peace with their neighbour’, since none speak more beautifully than thieves and false men, ‘but evils are in their hearts.’ Jeremiah 9: ‘With his mouth one speaketh peace with his friend, and secretly he lieth in wait for him.’</p> <p>And this mode of falsity is especially appropriate for the prophets of Baal, who are deficient in two ways, 3 Kings 18: Those who wish to serve and please two opposing masters. Indeed such are compared to the market-day horses brokers, who are called cosours, since they speak as beautifully to the man selling as to the man buying, and whenever the agent receives money from either party, he nevertheless plans treachery to one party, since he deceives one and at times, both, since to him whom he helps in the act of selling, he was again prepared to deceive in the contract of buying, and nevertheless he always claims to be a friend with the greatest oaths. If one party knows he has been deceived, he blames that man for the deception; by these crafty words he excuses himself saying that through</p>
----	--	---

670	<p>dicens, quod signis vel nutibus eum de defectu premuniuit. Vnde de quodam tali fertur quod modo vni parti faciem vertendo ei annuere solebat oculo et capud inclinare, quasi diceret, valet pro vobis. Alteri vero so [172vb] lebat idem facere. Quando vero vnus sensit se deceptum, malum suum secum plangere solebat et dicere, nonne feci tibi signum quod non fuit pro vobis. Illud enim signum quod tibi feci fuit quod</p>	<p>signs or nods he warned him of the defect. Whence about such a thing, it is said that in this way by altering the face to one party, he was accustomed to wink at him and to incline his head, as if to say, it is good for you. To the other he was accustomed to do the same. When one realised he had been deceived, he was accustomed to lament with him his misfortune, and to say, did I not make the sign to you, that it was not for you? Indeed, the sign that I made to you was that it was not good for you. If one was rejoicing about his deal, he wished to rejoice with him, asserting to have made the sign to him, as he thus did.</p>
680	<p>non valuit pro vobis. Si vero vnus de mercacione sua gaudebat secum gaudere uolebat asserens sibi fecisse signum ut sic faceret.</p> <p>Omnino per istum procedunt falsi qui inter duos inimicos faciunt se occulte quasi medium, quia maximis iuramentis affirmabit se esse amicum quando ei loquitur et quod tantum faceret pro eo sicut pro patre vel seipso, et tantum</p>	<p>he thus did.</p> <p>Entirely the false proceed like those who insinuate themselves amongst two enemies as if secretly in the middle, since he shall affirm greatly with oaths that he is his friend when he speaks to him, and that he does as much for him as for his own father or himself, and he is able to confide much in him about this. And he says the same to the other party. And he deceives each party, since when he is with one of them, he either slanders the other, or he seeks in some way to be able to harm him in order to please the man he is with, lest that man discover that he is a friend to the other with whom he is hostile. As is shown A, 15, 9</p>
690	<p>potest de se confidere. Et idem dicit alteri parti. Et vtramque partem decipiet quia quando est cum vno illorum qui alteri insidiatur vel obloquitur, vel querit quomodo ei nocere poterit vt isti placeat, ne eciam iste deprehendat quod est alteri amicus cum eo eidem insidiatur. Sicut patet A 15, 9. Et premuniuit eum de altero quod eius caueat insidias. Quando vero est cum altero eodem</p>	<p>[Adulatio 9]. And he warns him of the other, that he might avoid his treachery. When he is with the other, he passes time with him in this manner, and so that he pleases him more he tells him of the secrets made under the seal of confession which he heard from the other man. Finally, when one of the enemies injures the other, with the wounded man he laments, alleging he warned him, and with the joyful man he rejoices. Cunning are the cosours of the devil. Of which, Proverbs 26: ‘As he is guilty that shooteth arrows, and lances unto death, so is the man that hurteth his friend deceitfully.’</p>
700	<p>modo se habet ad illum et ut isti plus placeat in secretis sub sigillo confessionis narrat ei que ab altero audiuit. Finaliter quando vnus inimicorum alteri dampnum intulerit cum leso plangit asserens se eum premunisse et cum gaudente gaudet. Vecy ly coserz au diable. De quo, Prouer. 26, sicut noxius est qui mittit lanceas et sagittas et mortem sic vir qui fraudulenter nocet amico suo.</p>	<p>so that he pleases him more he tells him of the secrets made under the seal of confession which he heard from the other man. Finally, when one of the enemies injures the other, with the wounded man he laments, alleging he warned him, and with the joyful man he rejoices. Cunning are the cosours of the devil. Of which, Proverbs 26: ‘As he is guilty that shooteth arrows, and lances unto death, so is the man that hurteth his friend deceitfully.’</p>

18	<p>750 auantagium et fugere dampnum. De quibus 2 Thim. 3, prophetauit paulus dicens, erunt homines seipsos amantes proditores proterui et cetera. Nota infra eo cap. 35.</p> <p>760 Talis est eciam amicitia falsorum hominum adinuicem inter quos vnus falsus propter predam vel lucrum et aliquod auantagium lupo sociatus. Si postea videt istum lupum potentem habere aduersarium a quo potest maius habere auantagium, si non potest vtrique amicitiam simulare aperte contra lupum illum se vertit. De quibus omnibus dicit dominus, Jerem. 6, quod sunt ambulantes fraudulentem vniuersi corrupti.</p> <p>770 In isto uero facto non quibuscunque canibus sed periculosissimis assimilantur qui mature incedunt cauda deposita quasi nihil male cogitent nec latrant antequam mordeant.</p> <p>780 Quarto tali vtuntur falsi cautela quandoque contra fideles vel eciam contra alios falsos quali secundum fabulas vtiebantur lupi contra canes. Lupi enim secundum fabulam illum uolentes canes expugnare videntes suorum paucitatem respectu multitudinis aduersariorum cogitauerunt quod sine cautela vincere non potuerunt. Consilio ergo diffinitum fuit quod aliquos de canibus ad partem suam allicerent per quorum auxilium reliquos vincerent et finaliter ipsos eciam vencerent adiutores. De communi ergo consilio talem circa hoc excercuerunt cautelam; alloquebantur canes eiusdem cum eis coloris dicentes, vos et nos eiusdem nature sumus. Hoc enim forma corporis et pilorum ostendit color. Ex quo ergo eiusdem sumus nature, licet forte ad tempus inter homines morati sitis. Iuuate nos et sitis de parte</p>	<p>injury. Of which, 2 Timothy 3, Paul has foretold saying: Men shall be lovers of themselves, traitors, stubborn, and so on. Note within the same chapter, 35 [Tribulatio 35].</p> <p>Such is also the friendship of false men, amongst whom one false man on account of a prize, or for profit, or some advantage, associates with the wolf. If later he see that wolf has a powerful adversary, from whom he is able to have greater advantage, and if he is not able to simulate friendship to each side, he turns himself openly against the wolf. Of which the lord says to all such, Jeremias 6: 'They walk deceitfully [...] they are all corrupted.'</p> <p>Truly, in that deed they are compared to not just any dogs but the most dangerous, those who advance quickly, with tail dropped, as if planning no evil, nor barking, before they kill.</p> <p>Fourth, false men employ such a trick, whenever they are against the faithful or even against other false men, in the manner that wolves employ (according to the fables) against dogs. Wolves, indeed (according to that fable) wishing to fight off dogs, seeing there were few of them in respect of the multitude of their adversaries, thought that without a trick they were not able to win. The plan, therefore, was hatched that they would win over some of the dogs to their side, through whose help they would defeat the rest, and finally they would also conquer their helpers. Therefore, by common counsel they executed such a trick around this; they harangued dogs of the same colour as them, saying we are of the same nature. Indeed, the form of the body, and colour of the fur shows this. Out of which, therefore, we are of the same nature, although perhaps you have been civilised for a time amongst men. Help us, and you shall be on our</p>
----	--	--

19	<p>830 Quinto tali vtuntur falsi cautela quali vtuntur qui volunt aduersariorum vincere exercitum. Nituntur enim illi discordias facere inter homines exercitus et principes vel saltem inter inferiores homines exercitus, sicut patet B 2, 3. Ita isti videntes partem aduersam esse fortem nituntur inter eos discordias seminare et vnum ab aliis separare. Verbi gracia, vnus talis videns aliquem ei contrarium esse</p> <p>840 bene cum domino terre vel alio magno cogitat quomodo per accusationes vel quascunque malicias illam diuidere possit amiciciam, ut facilius aduersarium vincat. Et eo cicius tales proponunt bilas et accusationes quo amplius estimant dominis illis placere qui ex talibus accusationibus et brigis temporaliter multum lucrantur. Et sic mutuis brigis seipsos confundunt et dominos ditant. Seipsos dico quia sicut</p> <p>850 vnus nunc alium accusat, quando ipse accusans regnat, ita alius illum accusabit quando tempus mutabitur. Neuter vero aliquid lucrabitur, sed animas suas perdent, et dominus lucrum habebit terrenum, vt de utroque illorum verificetur illud Prouer. 12, fraudulentus non inueniet lucrum.</p> <p>860 Iterum tales falsi reuolutores assimilantur buboni, sicut patet E 2, 4. Iterum assimilantur diaboli focariis sicut patet A 14, 26. Iterum assimilantur colubro sicut patet A 25, 31. Quod ergo mirum si falsitas [173va] cum omnibus his quandoque auantagiis et cum aliis hic cotatis et cum tota familia sua veritatem cum sua parua familia vincat, qui tamen melius se a falsitate cum suis ministris custodient si fecerint quod hortatur deus. Jer. 9, vnusquisque inquit se a proximo suo custodiat et in omni fratre suo non habeat</p>	<p>Fifth, false men employ such a trick in the way of those who wish to conquer the force of their adversaries. They strive to make discord amongst men and leaders of a force or at least amongst the low-ranking men of a force, as is shown B 2, 3 [Bellum]. Thus, seeing their adversaries to be strong, they struggle to sow discord amongst them, and to separate one from the others. For example, such a man seeing an adversary to be well with the lord of the land, or another great man, thinks in what way through accusations or other malicious things he is able to divide that friendship, so as to more easily defeat his adversary. And therefore such men swiftly display such bills and allegations, in which they consider to please those lords greatly, who from such accusations and disputes gain much temporally. And thus they confound themselves in mutual quarrels, and enrich their lords. I say ‘themselves’, since just as one now accuses the other, and when he himself accuses, he rules, when the times change, another shall accuse him in the same way. Neither shall gain anything, but they shall lose their souls, and the lord shall have earthly profit, as may be verified concerning each of them, Proverbs 12: ‘The deceitful man shall not find gain.’</p> <p>Again, such false yarn-spinners are compared to owls, as is shown E 2, 4 [Electio 4]. Again they are compared to handmaids of the devil, as is shown A 14, 26 [Advocati 26]. Again, they are compared to a serpent, as is shown A 25, 31 [Ascendere 31]. What therefore is wondrous, if falsity with all these advantages at any time, and with numerous others here, and with its entire family, defeats truth with its little family? If they do what God exhorts, they shall nevertheless guard themselves better from falsity with its ministers. Jeremiah 9: ‘Let every man take heed of his neighbour, and let him not trust in any</p>
----	--	--

20	<p>870 fiduciam quia omnis supplantans supplantabit. Et omnis amicus fraudulenter incedet et vir fratrem suum deridebit et veritatem non loquetur.</p> <p>Ex qua auctoritate patet eciam ratio et veritas et causa tertii articuli quod videlicet falsorum periculosa sit societas amicitia seruitus et dominium. Primo decipiunt. Pro quo est sciendum quod in istis sicut et in quibuscunque aliis</p> <p>880 contractibus confidens in eis est sicut qui pedem ponit super rotam que ita situatur quod mouetur ad leuem tactum in illa. Enim qui credit stare decipitur et quanto forcius eam pedibus premit, tanto volocius et durius cadit. Sic in proposito qui pedem confidentie in quocunque negocio figit in falsos. De quibus in Psal. pones eos ut rotam. Decipietur, et quanto plus et familiaris in eis confidit tanto turpius</p> <p>890 decipietur, quia non est peior hostis quam domesticus inimicus, quia ipse melius decipere potest. Confidenter ergo se super illos in quacunque pollicia appodians est sicut qui se appodiat super baculum arundineum. Sic ergo confidenti dicitur, 4 Regum 18, speras in baculo arundineo atque confracto egipti super quem si incubuerit homo comminutus ingreditur manum et perforabit eam.</p> <p>900 Et licet ad tempus falsitatem suam dissimulent in fine tamen eam ostendet more ferocium animalium, sicut leonum et huius que aliquociens in fine magistrum suum occidunt, qui eis multis annis seruiuit. Sic isti qui sunt feris peiores quia fere solum seuiendo nocent isti vero tam seuiendo quam blandiendo, excepto quod peius nocet blandiendo et famulando, quia sub isto colore simplices in eis</p>	<p>brother of his: for every brother will utterly supplant, and every friend will walk deceitfully. And a man shall mock his brother, and not speak the truth.'</p> <p>From which authority the reason, truth and cause of the third article is also revealed, that the society, friendship, service and lordship of the false is dangerous. First, they deceive. For which it must be known that when he confides in him regarding various undertakings, it is as if he is putting his foot above a wheel which is situated in such a way that it is moved at the lightest touch. He who thinks to stand on it is deceived, and however much more strongly he presses it with his feet, he falls so much quicker and harder. Thus in the proposition, is he who fastens the foot of trust in whatever business on the false. Of which in the Psalms 82: 'Make them like a wheel.' He shall be deceived, and how much more and familiarly he confides in them, so much uglier he shall be deceived. There is not a worse enemy than a household enemy, since the same man is able to deceive better. Trustingly therefore, he attaches himself to those in his business, just as he who leans himself on a staff of reeds. Thus, therefore, it is said to the trusting man, 4 Kings 18: 'Dost thou trust in Egypt a staff of a broken reed, upon which if a man lean, it will break and go into his hand, and pierce it?'</p> <p>And although at the time they dissimulate their falsity, in the end nevertheless it reveals itself in the manner of ferocious animals, such as the lion and other creatures, who in the end sometimes kill their master, a man who looked after them for many years. Dissemblers are worse than wild beasts, because beasts only harm in a rage. Dissemblers flatter like they are raging, except that flattering and serving harms worse, since under that colour the simple confide in them;</p>
----	--	---

21	<p>910 confidunt, sub qua confidentia tempore viso oportuno exheredant furantur occidunt et produnt, quibus dicere congruit illud iude, quemcunque osculatus fuero ipse est tenete eum. Pro illis ergo verificatur illud Ecc. 7, melior est ira risu.</p> <p>Iterum non solum decipiunt ad modum rote, sed etiam ad modum falsi libri in quo bonus clericus subito legens</p> <p>920 decipi potest, et ad modum false monete de nocte. Sicut enim tempore obscuro non bene discernitur falsa moneta que similitudinem habet exterius a bona que tamen de claro die a bona discernitur, et a fidei viro perforatur, vel in ignem mittitur. Ita falsi in nocte huius vite. De qua infra M 11, [173vb] 52. Quia etiam velamen corporis habent super faciem, quia etiam sub veritatis similitudine in uerbis et</p> <p>930 conuersacione ficta falsitatem suam ostendunt mencientes se ueros esse cristianos. more quorundam qui fingunt se esse magnorum nuncios ut lucrentur et honorentur. Sic isti fingunt se bonos esse. Et ideo sicut falsa moneta similitudinem bone habens non autem valorem vt dictum est ab alia facilliter non discernitur. Ita nec falsi, de quibus Jer. 6, argentum reprobum uocate eos. Ab aliis facilliter discerni non possunt, propter predicta impedimenta et causas. Sed in morte et in die alterius seculi</p> <p>940 omnibus predictis malicie velaminibus sublatis quando manifesta erunt abscondita cordium omnibus hominibus et spiritibus tunc aperte apparebit, qualis quam falsa sit moneta illa. In fine quippe hominis denudacio operum illius, Ecc. XI. Tunc sciet quilibet respondere ad questionem que queritur, Mat. 22, que nunc est satis</p>	<p>through these confidences, when the dissemblers see their opportunity, they disinherit, steal, kill and betray, for whom it is congruous to say the words of Judas: ‘Whomsoever I shall kiss, that is he, hold him fast’, [Matthew 26, Mark 14]. For these therefore it is verified Ecclesiastes 7: ‘Anger is better than laughter.’</p> <p>Again they deceive not just in the way of a wheel, but also in the way of a false book, in which the good cleric reading is suddenly able to be deceived, and in the way of false money at night. In the dark, false money is not well distinguished from the good because it is similar externally, but nevertheless, by a clear day it can be distinguished from the good, and is pierced by the faithful man, or cast into the fire. So are the false in the night of this life. Of which, M, 11, 52 [Mors 52]. Since they also have a veil of the body over their face, since also under the similarity of truth, in words and fictive conversation they reveal their falsity, lying that they are true Christians, with the habit of certain people who contrive to be messengers of the great so as to gain profit and be honoured. Thus, those men pretend to be good. And therefore, just as false money has similarity to good, not however the value (as was said), it is not easily distinguished from the other. Thus, neither are the false, of whom, Jeremias 6: ‘Call them reprobate silver.’ They are not able to be easily distinguished from others on account of the aforesaid impediments and reasons. But in death, and in the day of the other age, with all the aforesaid coverings of malice removed, when the secrets of their hearts shall be manifest to all men and spirits, then it shall clearly appear, how in what way that money is false. Of course, ‘in the end of a man is the disclosing of his works’, Ecclesiasticus 11. Then he shall know how to respond to the certain question which is sought in Matthew 22,</p>
----	--	---

22	<p>950</p> <p>960</p> <p>970</p> <p>980</p>	<p>obscura, cuius videlicet est ymago hec et superscripcio, que videlicet in animabus depingitur falsorum. Sicut eciam falsa moneta in igne conflatur quia fidelis homo in thesauro suo eam non ponit, ita illi tunc in ignem mittentur inextinguibilem, Mat. 25. Tunc apparebit quod falsum est quod conflauit, Jer. X.</p> <p>Secundo quia inficiunt sicut leprosus vel ouis morbida. De quibus E 7, 11. Quod patet per hoc quod fertur de duobus talibus falsis in vna patria, quorum vno mortuo filius ei succedens ad quandam talium iuit congregacionem, sicut ad comitatum vel huius quem alius falsus racione amicitie paterne ad partem ducens ipsum informauit de quodam falso iuramento quod iuraret illo die et lucraretur dimidiam marcam. Iuuenis uero adhuc tenerioris consciencie respondit se hoc facere non audere propter domini dei offensam et anime sue periculum, cui inueteratus dierum malorum tali inquit modo pater tuus lucratus est multa, sic eciam ego, sic nos omnes et sic oportet te lucrari et sic facere si vis in patria ista viuere. Ecce non sufficit falso falsitas sua nisi eciam alios tales faciat. Sic sepius peruersus alios peruertere nititur et sic prophete et predicatores diaboli alios cum eis prophetare faciunt. Et nox nocti indicat scienciam in Ps. De quibus Jere. 14, falsum prophete vaticinantur.</p> <p>Nec est mirandum quod falsi sunt hominibus infideles, propter duo in quibus illorum maxima ostenditur stulticia. Primo quia sunt deo infideles. Secundo quia sunt sibi ipsis infideles. Et qui sibi nequam est cui bonus est, Ecc. 14. Quod enim mirabile est quod sint infideles [174ra] homini qui</p>	<p>that which is quite in darkness, ‘whose image and inscription is this?’ – which, clearly, is depicted in the souls of the false. Just as false money is also refined in the fire, since the faithful man does not place it in his chest, thus, those are then cast into the eternal fire, Matthew 25. Then it shall appear that ‘what he hath cast is false’, Jeremias 10.</p> <p>Second, they are dangerous since they corrupt like a leper, or diseased sheep. Of which E 7, 11 [Exemplum 11]. Because it is shown by what is said about two such false men in a jury. One of these men died and was succeeded by his son who went to a certain congregation of such men, like a session at the county court and such. The other false man, by reason of paternal friendship, leads the boy to one side, and tells him of a certain false oath that he might swear on that day, and gain half a mark. The youth truly thus far of a tender conscience, responded that he would not dare do this on account of an offence of the lord God, and danger to his soul. The veteran of evil days says: ‘in such a way your father profited greatly, so I also, so us all, and so it is fitting that you profit, and do such a thing, if you wish to live in this jury.’ Behold his falsity does not suffice for the false man unless he also makes others false men. Thus, the perverse man often strives to pervert others. And so prophets and preachers of the devil cause others to prophesise with them. ‘And night to night sheweth knowledge’, in the Psalms 18. Of which Jeremias 14: ‘The prophets prophesy falsely [in my name].’</p> <p>Neither must it be wondered that the false are unfaithful to men, on account of two reasons, in which their greatest idiocy is revealed. First, because they are unfaithful to God. Second, because they are unfaithful to themselves. ‘He that is evil to himself, to whom will he be good?’, Ecclesiasticus 14. What indeed is miraculous, that</p>
----	---	--	---

23	<p>990 sunt infideles deo qui tanta fecit pro eis. Sicut patet A 20, 7. Antiqui enim sapientes hoc habuerunt tanquam principium et infallibilem veritatem quod videlicet falsus deo esset falsus homini. Sicut patet de Constantino imperatore D 12, 5. Sicut etiam patet per hoc quod legitur quod Alexander respondit samaritanis et derelictis ex x tribubus cum eius peterent dominium et proteccionem et promitterent ei fidelitatem. Quomodo inquit mihi fideles esse possitis qui deo qui maiora pro uobis fecit quam ego facere possem semper infideles fuistis. Si mandata dei non custodierunt quomodo mandata hominis custodirent. Et tamen in falsitate contra deum maximam ostendunt stulticiam quia faciendo contra hominem illius aliquo modo vindictam et aspectum et noticiam et falsi cognicionem subterfugere poterunt, faciendo. Vero falsitatem contra deum peccando ipsius cognicionem et visum et ultionem nullo modo subterfugere poterunt. Sicut ergo quilibet diceret illum stultum qui furtum committeret in presencia iusti iudicis terreni, ita stultissimum dicere potest qui falsitatem committit in presencia iusti iudicis celestis qui contemplatur bonos et malos, Prouerb. 15.</p> <p>1000</p> <p>1010</p> <p>1020</p> <p>Secundo illorum ostenditur stulticia in hoc quod sunt sibi ipsis falsi seipsos decipientes apud mundum. Enim diceretur stultus mercator qui pro re vili et incerta et parui valoris plus daret et laboraret et sustineret et expenderet quam pro re sibi magis necessaria et vtiori et precisiore. Verbi gracia, qui plus daret pro panno pessimo et qui non duraret per annum, quam pro optimo qui duraret per totam vitam. Iterum qui plus daret pro vno</p>	<p>those who are unfaithful to man, are unfaithful to God, who did so much for them? Just as is shown A 20, 7 [Amor 7]. Indeed, the old wise men held this to be, as it were, the principal and infallible truth, that whoever is false to God, is false to man. Just as it is shown by Emperor Constantine D 12, 5 [Dominatio 5]. Just as it is also shown through how (as it may be read) Alexander responded to the Samaritans and those abandoned out of the ten tribes, when they begged for his lordship and protection and promised him fidelity. In which way (said he) can you be faithful to me, who were always unfaithful to God, who did greater for you than I am able to do? If they did not keep the commandments of God, in what way would they keep the commandments of man? And nevertheless in falsity against God, they reveal the greatest idiocy, since by acting against man in some way they are able to evade vengeance, and sight, knowledge and recognition of their false deed. Truly, by committing falsity against God through sinning, they are in no way able to evade recognition and sight of this, and retribution. Therefore, just as one may freely call him a fool who commits theft in the presence of a just earthly judge, thus, one can call him most foolish who commits falsity in the presence of the just judge of heaven, he who ‘beholds the good and the bad’, Proverbs 15.</p> <p>Second, their idiocy in this is revealed, because they are false to themselves, deceiving themselves in the world. Indeed the merchant is called foolish who gives and works and endures and expends more for a worthless and uncertain thing of little value than for the thing that is of greater necessity and utility and value for him. For example, he who gives more for the worst cloth, which does not last through the year, than for the best, which lasts for his entire life. Again, he is foolish who gives more for one animal, or for one</p>
----	--	--

24	<p>1030 animali vel pro re mobili quam pro regno vel si pro vili ueste vel animali uellet tam preciosam uestem et regnum perdere. Sed falsi sunt huius quia frequenter pro robis quas a dominis accipiunt falsitatem committunt, et uestem glorie quam a deo in eternum accepturi essent amittunt et eciam uestem gracie. Iterum plura sustinent et dant et carius tam expendendo vel sustinendo emunt paruam mundi</p> <p>1040 cupiditatem de qua ad diem non habent certitudinem quam regnum celeste quia frequenter auditum est quod pro falsitate quam fecerunt, et pro cupida sua adquisicione verbera, et eciam mortem sustinuerunt et vitam propriam dederunt vbi nunquam vnum ictum pro veritate sustinuerunt, vel vnum membrum dederunt. Plures ergo martires habet falsitas quam veritas. Sicut patebit L 1, 12. Nota M 11, 106.</p> <p>1050</p> <p>Iterum apud mundum stultus diceretur qui totaliter intenderet alienis negociis et rebus, et res suas omnino [174rb] negligeret. De tali enim vicini dicerent fatuus est quia cito de officio illo expelletur, et ad propria redire cogetur, vbi nihil boni inueniet. Ita potest dici istis qui totaliter cupiditati deseruiunt et fasitati et circa illa</p> <p>1060 sollicitantur, et de rebus propriis, id est, de anima et loquela et huius non curant; quam false et male sint, qui eciam hereditatem suam in alio seculo bonis operibus instaurare nolunt.</p> <p>Quod autem tales sint falsi tali ostenditur racione. Ille dicitur falsus cuius uerbo credi non potest. Sed isti sunt huius ergo et cetera. Probacio minoris, si queratur ab eis an diligant aliquam rem</p>	<p>mobile thing, than for a kingdom; or if he wishes to lose a precious garment and the kingdom for a worthless garment or creature. But the false are of such a kind, since frequently they commit falsity for robes which they receive from their lords, and they send away both the garment of glory and also the garment of grace which they are about to receive in eternity from God. Again, they endure and give many things, and by so dearly expending or enduring they acquire their worthless desires of the world, concerning which they do not have any assurance 'at the end of the day' as they would with the celestial kingdom, since it is frequently heard that for the falsity which they did, and for their avaricious acquisition, they sustained blows and even death, and gave their own life when they never sustained a blow for truth, or gave one limb. Therefore, falsity has more martyrs than truth. Just as shall be revealed L 1, 12 [Labor 12], and M 11, 106 [Mors 106].</p> <p>Again, in this world he is called a fool who completely strains with the business and concerns for others, and neglects entirely his own concerns. The neighbours say about such a man, he is foolish, since he is soon expelled from that position, and compelled to return to his own life, where he finds no good. In this way, it may be said for those who completely devote themselves to cupidity and falsity, and are agitated about that, and do not care about their own concerns, that is, about the soul and speech and such things; how false and evil are those who do not wish to restore their inheritance in another world with good works.</p> <p>However, that such men are false is revealed through this reason. He whose word cannot be believed is called false. As they are of this kind, therefore, et cetera. Proof of the minor: if sought from them, whether they love some</p>
----	--	--

25	<p>1070 terrenam plusquam seipsos, dicent quod non, et tamen isti dicto credi non potest, quia in opere illud ostendunt esse falsum, quia in opere videmus quod omnes denarios volunt habere veros et omnes res exteriores bonas. Et si inuenirent vnum denarium falsum displiceret eis. Seipsos vero volunt habere falsos et malos nec eis hoc displicet sed bene placet. Opus ergo ostendit quod plus</p> <p>1080 diligunt denarios suos et alias res quam seipsos, quia illud cui bona plura volunt plus diligunt. Sed aliis rebus plura bona volunt. Ergo plus eas diligunt. Maiorem mecum concedent. Minor patet, quia pecunie uolunt fidelitatem quod nolunt sibi ipsis. Animalibus vero suis volunt vitam fortitudinem et huius, sibi ipsis vero hic mortem culpe et postea mortem eterne pene. Opera enim illorum hoc</p> <p>1090 uolunt. Ipsi nolunt quod animal illorum in foueam cadat. Et ipsi in foueam cadere uolunt inferni. Nemo ergo eis credat quando dicunt quod plus seipsos rebus suis diligunt quia alia multa appreciantur, seipsos nihil. Et sic verificatur de illis illud prouerb. x, cor impiorum pro nihilo.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Sed si hec malorum falsitas corrigi posset spes esset de eorum salute. Sed antiquam falsitatem et consuetudinarios falsos durum est corrigere et raro corriguntur. Ergo raro vel nunquam saluantur. Quod autem cum difficultate vel nunquam emendantur, patet, tam ex dictis C 8, 11, quam ex dicendis. Liber qui est totus falsus cum difficultate imo nunquam corrigi potest nisi tota littera in eo scripta radatur et noua scribatur et melius esset quod nulla littera in eo scripta esset.</p>	<p>earthly thing more than themselves, they say that is not so, and nevertheless what was said cannot be believed, since in their work they reveal it to be false, since in their work we see that they wish to have all pennies true, and all things visibly good. And if they discover one false coin it displeases them. Truly they wish to have themselves false and evil; neither does this displease them, but pleases them well. Their work therefore shows that they love their pennies and other things more than themselves, since that for which they wish more good things, they love more. But they wish more good things for other things. Therefore they love them more. They shall concede the greater with me. The minor is shown, because they wish fidelity to money what they do not wish for themselves. They wish truly a strong life for their animals and such things, and for themselves, a death of guilt, and later a death of eternal punishment. They wish this by their work. The same men do not wish that their animal falls in a ditch. And the same wish to fall into the pit of Hell. Nobody therefore believes them when they say that they love themselves more than their possessions, since many other things are valued, but not themselves. And thus it is verified concerning those, Proverbs 10: ‘The heart of the wicked is nothing worth.’</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">But if this falsity of evil men is able to be corrected, there is hope in their salvation. But it is hard to correct time-honoured falsity and the customary false, and they are rarely corrected. Therefore, they are saved rarely or never. That they are reformed with difficulty, or never, is shown out of those things said C 8, 11 [Consuetudo 11], as it is out of these sayings. The book which is completely false is with difficulty, or rather never, able to be corrected, unless all the letters written in it are erased and newly written, and it would be better had no letters been written</p>
----	--	--

26	<p>1110 Citharedus eciam senex qui a principio male utputa a malo informatore cithare didicit et diu et quasi per totam vitam notas illas male facere consuevit cum difficultate corrigitur. Melius et cicius in illis bene informaretur si nullam notam sciret. Ita illi qui semper quando lucrari poterunt, vel oportunitatem viderunt in iuramentis et factis in comitatibus et huius falso citharizabant et male, quorum liber [174va]</p> <p>1120 animarum et conscienciarum est totus vel maior pars falsus. De illis enim verificatur illud Ecc. 1, peruersi difficile corrigitur. Quia sicut in plaga male sanata licet ad tempus malum non videatur, tamen cito se ostendet. Et sicut gutta fluens et riuulus fluens ad tempus obturari potest, non tamen diu quin solitam vel aliam inueniet viam. Ita licet eorum falsitas, aliquando timore vel amore, vel oportunitatis defectu, ad tempus dissimuletur, ne in opere illam ostendant diu tamen latere non debet.</p> <p>1130 Vnde Crysosto Super Mat. omilia 37, a omnis malicia confunditur quidem aliquociens ratione veritatis corrigitur autem nunquam maxime eorum qui proposito malo et non ignorancia peccant quem admodum. Si aliquis claudere voluerit aque currentis meatum si hec exclusa fuerit vno in loco per aliquam uiolenciam aliunde sibi semitam rumpit.</p> <p>1140 Sic et eorum malignitas ex vna parte confusa, alium sibi aditum adinuenit. Sicut ergo melius esset nudum habere percamenum, quam librum totaliter falsum, ita melius esset eis quod nullam haberent scienciam vel sapienciam quam quod omnem talem haberent sapienciam. De qua Jere. 4, sapientes sunt ut faciant malum. Iuxta illud ecclesiasti. 19, melior</p>	<p>in it. The old harpist, who from a bad beginning – that is he learned to play the harp from a bad teacher, and continued for a long time, as if for his whole life he was accustomed to play those notes badly – is corrected with difficulty. He might have become well instructed, better and quicker in these things, if he knew no note. In this way are those who when they are able to profit, or see an opportunity in oaths, and deeds in war-bands, and such things, have played the harp falsely and badly; the book of their souls and consciences is all, or the greater part, false. Concerning these things it is verified in Ecclesiastes 1: ‘The perverse are hard to be corrected.’ Since just as in a badly healed wound, although it does not seem bad at the time, it nevertheless shows itself rapidly. And just as a flowing stream, and flowing river is able to be dammed for a time, nevertheless, it is is not long before it comes upon its usual or an alternative way. Thus, although their falsity, lest they show it in work, may be dissimulated for a time, through fear, or love, or lack of opportunity, nevertheless, it must not lie hidden for long. Whence Chrysostom, Homilies On Matthew 37: ‘All malice is certainly confounded many times through the reason of truth; it is never, however, corrected in the greatest of those who sin through an evil way of life, and not from ignorance.’ If someone wished to block the course of the flowing water, and blocks it in one place, through some violence from elsewhere it bursts a path for itself. And thus their malice, confounded from one side, devises another opportunity for itself. Just as therefore it is better to have naked parchment than a completely false book, thus it is better for them that they have no knowledge or wisdom than they have all such wisdom. Of which Jeremias 4: ‘They are wise to do evil.’ According to Ecclesiasticus 19: ‘Better is a man that hath less wisdom, and wanteth</p>
----	---	---

27	<p>1150 est homo qui minuitur sapiencia in timore, quam qui habundat sensu et transgreditur legem altissimi. Et bene dicit melior est et cetera. Sicut melior est denarius verus quam centum falsi. Et quod mirum quod homo fidelis melior est non homine, id est, homine falso qui non est homo spiritualiter loquendo nisi equiuoce, sicut homo pictus quia solum similitudinem habet hominis et tamen intrinsecus diabolus est. Teste</p> <p>1160 Cristo, Io. 6, vbi de talibus loquens ait, vnus ex vobis diabolus est. Quia sicut denarius plumbeus non est denarius sed plumbum. Ita homo diabolicus et falsus diabolus dicitur. Et non solum spiritualiter, sed eciam racionabiliter loquendo, talis dici potest non homo, quia non differencia quantumcunque speciem constituat, quod caret differencia caret specie. Sed differencia hominis est ratio siue</p> <p>1170 racionabilitas qua in viuendo caret. Ergo pro tanto humanitate caret. Sicut ergo bonus homo melior est multis rebus inanimatis, ita in proposito melior est falsis, qui peius valent brutis, et rebus inanimatis, quia bos vel aliud animal tam viuum quam mortuum occisum, multos valet solidos. [174vb] Falsus vero nec mortuus nec viuus valet obolum, quia corpus nihil valet nisi vermibus. Anima</p> <p>1180 nihil valet nisi demonibus. Ergo domini sentenciam, Mat. 5, ad nihilum valet ultra nisi ut mittatur foras et conculsetur ab hominibus et tradatur vermibus et terroribus.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Causa autem tante malorum et falsorum multitudinis et incorrigibilitatis est duplex. Vna habendi cupiditas. Secunda est negligentia. Prima attenditur penes propriam maliciam. Secunda penes aliorum</p>	<p>understanding, with the fear of God, than he that aboundeth in understanding, and transgresseth the law of the most High.’ And he says well, it is better, et cetera. Just as one true penny is better than a hundred false. And what is wondrous that the faithful man is better than he who is not man? – that is a false man, one who is not human (spiritually speaking) unless equivocally, like a depiction of a man, since he only has similarity to man, and nevertheless internally is a devil. In the testament of Christ, John 6, when speaking of such he says: ‘One of you is a devil.’ Because just as a lead penny is not a penny, but is a piece of lead. Thus the diabolical man is called the devil. And not just spiritually, but also rationally speaking a false individual cannot be called a man, because the differentia [distinguishing essence], to whatever extent, establishes the species; what lacks the differentia, lacks the species. But the differentia of man, however, is reason or rationality, which the false man lacks in life. Therefore, he lacks to this extent humanity. Just as therefore the good man is better than many inanimate things, in this proposition he is thus better than false men who are valued worse than beasts and inanimate things, since the ox or another animal is worth many shillings, both when alive and also as a slaughtered carcass. The false man neither dead nor living is worth a halfpenny, because the body is worth nothing, except for the worms. The soul is worth nothing, unless for daemons. Therefore, the opinion of the lord, Matthew 5: ‘It is good for nothing any more but to be cast out, and to be trodden on by men’, and traded for the worms and ashes.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">However, the cause of such a multitude and incorrigibility of evil and false men is two-fold. One the cupidity of having property. The second is negligence. The first is concerned with their own malice, the second with the sloth of others. In</p>
----	---	--

28	<p>1190 pigriciam. Quomodo autem cupiditas mater est omnium falsitatum patet quia ex hoc quod quilibet vellet plus habere quam habeat, et quam iuste habere deberet. Secuntur in mercacionibus tot usure et periuria, in perquisicionibus tot decepciones et est mirabile malunt ponere in bursa xii denarios, vel habere in campis xii acras cum falsitate et malediccione dei et matris eius et omnium sanctorum et bonorum virorum et proprium porchas</p> <p>1200 quam habere medietatem cum fidelitate bene lucratum et in tempore laboratum cum benediccione et cetera. Et tamen honestius esset ei in vita quod esset fidelis et vtilius in morte. Primum patet quia honestius et pulcrius esset quod digito eum ostenderent, ecce fidelis homo et pauper quam quod dicerent, ecce falsus homo et diues. Vtilius esset in morte cum paupertate ad regnum quam cum diuiciis transire ad infernum.</p> <p>1210 Secunda causa attenditur penes alios qui non solum malos et falsos non fugiunt vel corrigunt, sed tanquam diaboli nutrices. Eos in peccatis suis nutriunt et peccatores commendant, et honorant, et sub commendacionis pallio vicia occultant. Et sicut falsus monetarius quod non est argentum vel aurum argentum apparere facit sub quodam falso colore, ita isti vicia virtutes apparere faciunt sub quodam falsi coloris pallio. Sub quo diaboli filias, id est, peccata multis maritant. Verbi gracia, a mundialibus qui scit veritatem peruertere et colorare falsitatem ita quod veritas appareat commendatur et prudens reputatur. Qui vero scit multas inuenire maliciosas cautelas, et consilia mala dare et dominum suum informare quomodo multa male adquiret et nihil reddat quod antecessores</p> <p>1220</p>	<p>what way cupidity is the mother of all falsities is shown by the way he freely prefers to have more than he has, and which he ought to have rightly. There follows in commercial activities so much usury and perjuries, in profits, so many decepciones, it is remarkable that they prefer to place twelve pence in the money-bag, or to have twelve acres in the fields with falsity, and with a curse of God and of his mother and of all the saints, and all good men, and his own pigs, than to have half, well-earned with fidelity, and laboured in time with a benediction etc. And nevertheless it may be more honourable to him that he is faithful in life, and more advantageous in death. First, it is shown that it is more honourable and beautiful that they point to him with the finger, and say behold the faithful and poor man, than that they say, behold the false and rich man. It is more beneficial to be poor in death and go to the kingdom than to have riches and go to the fire.</p> <p> The second cause is directed to others who not only do not shun or correct the evil and false, but are sucklers of the devil so to speak. They nourish them in their sins, and commend and honour sinners and under the disguise of commendations conceal sins. And just as the false moneyer makes that which is not silver or gold appear as silver under a certain false colour, thus those make vices appear as virtues under the certain disguise of a false colour. Under which they marry the daughters of the devil, that is sins, to many. For example, he who knows by worldly means to pervert truth, and to colour falsity so that it appears true, is commended and reputed prudent. He who truly knows to contrive many evil tricks, and give evil counsel, and inform his lord in what way he may acquire many things with evil, and return nothing that his predecessors acquired with evil, because he may also despoil</p>
----	---	--

29	<p>1230 sui male adquisierunt quod eciam spoliēt naufragos, accipiēdo wreġ et omnia talia faciat in quibus videtur aliquem iniquarum legum habere colorem. De quibus Ys. x, ve qui condunt leges [175ra] iniquas vocatur sapiens in consiliis dandis. Et secundum Jero libro i contra Pelagianos, qui scit alium decipere dicitur astutus. Vindicatius homo qui pro vno uerbo displicencie sibi dicto uel pro uerbo quod nunquam fuit uel pro facto quod nunquam fuit, quod tamen ei ab aliquo diaboli membro narratur, facit alium verberari, et incarcerari, et huiusmodi qui eciam pro paruo forefacto altam uult habere emendam reputatur potens et magnanimus. Vnde in eius commendacionem dicunt potens est, et nullam iniuriam uult pati. Et tamen melius esset iniuriam pati quam facere. Sic enim se uindicando docent, qualiter deus de eis se uindicabit.</p> <p>1240</p> <p>1250 Superbia uero circa lectum, et apparatus curiosum circa cameram lectum corporis et equituras et huius uocatur mundicia et honestas. Luxuriosi et gulosi et qui malas diligunt societates et tabernas, quorum pedes de nocte, et die ad malum currunt uel currere parati sunt uocantur boni socii. Qui uero de vsuris et falsitatibus cito ditatur uocatur felix uel fortunatus</p> <p>1260 homo, quia fortunate bona accidunt. Et secundum beatum Gregorium qui, 3 2 moral. tractat quomodo uicia uirtutes se esse simulant. Dissoluta inquit remissio quali mansuetudo et pietas habetur effusio misericordia creditur, et malorum pertinacia constancia dicitur, et timor incompetens humilitas creditur, et uocis superbia ueri libertas estimatur, et pigricia aliquando quasi continencia quietis</p>	<p>shipwrecked vessels, receiving shipwrecked goods, and he may do all such things in which it seems to have some colour of unjust laws. Of which see Isaiah 10: ‘Woe to them that make wicked laws.’ He is called wise in giving this advice. And according to Jerome, Book I Against the Pelagians: He who knows to deceive somebody is called astute. A vengeful man who for one word of displeasure spoken to him, or for a word that never was, or for a deed that never was, that nevertheless is told to him by some member of the devil, makes the other be beaten or incarcerated and such things, who also for a minor misdemeanour wishes to impose a harsh punishment, is reputed powerful and courageous. Whence, in their commendation, they say he is powerful, and he wishes to suffer no injustice. And nevertheless it is better to suffer injustice than to commit it. Thus by claiming vengeance they teach how God shall claim vengeance on them.</p> <p>Pride around the bed, and meticulous preparation around the chamber bed of the body, and riding, and such things, is called elegance and honour. They call the lustful and gluttons, and those who love evil society and taverns, whose feet run, or are prepared to run, towards evil by night and day, good associates. He who gains wealth swiftly from usury and falsity is called a happy or fortunate man, since through fortune good things happen. And blessed Gregory in Moralia on the Book of Job 3, 2 discusses the way they simulate vices to be virtues: Lax remission of sins (says he) is held gentleness and piety, excess is believed mercy, and the persistence of evil is called constancy, and unbecoming fear is believed humility, and the pride of a fair voice is valued liberty, and sloth is considered as if the continence</p>
----	---	---

30	<p>1270 attenditur. Et inquietudo vigilans sollicitudo nominatur. Et sic de aliis ibidem enumeratis.</p> <p>Iterum auaricia prouidencia dicitur et sortilega mulier sapiens uocatur.</p> <p>Isto ergo modo diabolus sub clamide falsitatis, diabolus omnes filias suas nuptui tradidit et in tantum eas talibus uestibus decorat quod multi eas desiderant. Non nulli enim qui nunquam aliter fuissent mali</p> <p>1280 videntes peccatores sic vocari et honorari peccatores fiunt. Tales sub illa clamide diaboli filiam accipiunt. Vnde est de diabolo in isto casu. Sicut de quodam homine de quo habetur quasi sic quod filiam suam nullus accipere noluit in matrimonium quia nomen turpe habuit et male vestita erat quibus mutatis multi eam petebant. Ita in proposito multi filias diaboli quando nominibus turpibus et</p> <p>1290 propriis nominantur, sicut gula, homicidium furtum et huius eas in tantum abhorrent quod se cruce signant. Sed mutatis ut dictum est nominibus et falsitate uestitas eas non abhorrent [175rb] quia nec turpes eas credunt vel fatentur. Sed pulcras eas esse defendunt. Et si quis eas vituperauerit vel deformes dixerit irascuntur tam ipsi qui eas habent tam illorum amici. Verbi gracia,</p> <p>1300 quantumcunque sit malus tyrannus miles et iniuriosus dominus vel simoniacus et lubricus rector si bonam mensam teneat, et magnam familiam habeat et multos armigeros vestiatur et donaria libenter det, tota turpitudine filiarum diaboli sub clamide absconditur curialitatis, quia tales curiales vocantur. Et si quis contra eos loquatur, statim alii clamidem illam extendunt et turpitudinem abscondunt, dicentes curialis</p>	<p>of peace. And interfering is named vigilant concern. And thus of other things enumerated there.</p> <p>Again, avarice is called providence and the sorceress is called a wise woman.</p> <p>In that way, therefore, the devil under the cloak of falsity trades all his daughters for marriage, and in such a way he decorates them with such vestments, that many desire them. Some indeed who were never otherwise evil, seeing sinners thus called and honoured, become sinners. Under that cloak such men receive the daughter of the devil, whence in that case it is from the devil, just as concerning a certain man, of whom it is held that nobody wished to receive his daughter in marriage, since her name was held ugly; she was then clothed with evil, through which changes, many requested her. Thus, in the proposition, many abhor the daughters of the devil greatly when they are named with their own and ugly names, such as gluttony, murder, theft and such things, that they sign themselves with the cross. But by changing names (as it has been said) and clothed in falsity, they do not abhor them, because they believe or acknowledge them not to be ugly, but they defend them to be beautiful. And if somebody criticises the sins or calls them deformed, they become angry, so do those who have them, and so do their friends. For example, however much a knight is an evil tyrant, and a lord injurious, or a rector simoniacal and slippery, if he keeps a good table, and has a great household, and clothes many squires, and gives gifts liberally, all ugliness of the daughters of the devil is driven away under the cloak of courtesy, since such men are called courteous. And if one speaks against them, the others immediately extend that cape, and conceal the ugliness,</p>
----	---	---

31	<p>1310</p> <p>1320</p> <p>1330</p> <p>1340</p>	<p>homo est iustum esset quod haberet plura quam habeat. Sic eciam vsuras et eius turpitudinem abscondunt sub clamide vtilitatis dicentes quod vtile et placens est vtrique parti, luxurie turpitudinem sub habitu naturalis inclinacionis, fraudem sub specie empcionis et vendicionis, dicentes quod possunt vendere, ita care sicut possunt, superbum habitum et apparatus tam in vanis hominibus et mulieribus sub clamide consuetudinis dicentes quod oportet quod conformentur aliis de patria.</p> <p>Operacionem in festis sub colore obediencie vel victus necessitatis dicentes vel quod oportet eos magistris suis obedire quibus seruiunt, vel quod sic oportet facere quia aliter viuere non possunt, yipocrisim sub pictura sanctitatis, loquacitatem et cachinacionem et derisionem sub nomine iocunditatis et societatis. Nota V 8, 41.</p> <p>Et recte sicut diabolus et eius ministri nituntur filias suas, id est, peccata ut dictum est decorare ut a multis amentur. Ita nituntur filias dei, id est, virtutes et eius ministros fallaciter vituperare et mendaciis suis deturpare. Sicut patet per omnes virtutes predictis viciis contrariis. Verax consiliarius reputatur inscius. Vnde quando de tali fit mencio. diaboli ministri cum scapularum motu dicunt bonus fidelis</p> <p>homo volentes annuere quod nihil boni sit. Ita ab eisdem domini qui volunt de suo viuere nec volunt vltra vires expendere in robis et festis et huis quantumcunque sint elemosinarii reputantur miseri. Qui non uult se vindicare sed ex humilitate remittere, dicitur ab eis non homo. Non curiosum vocant insipientem, quia humiliter viuit ideo insipiens vocatur. Ita humilitas insipencia ab eis vocatur. Nolens</p>	<p>saying, the man is courteous, it would be just that he had more than he does. Thus, they even conceal usury, and its ugliness, under the cloak of utility, saying that it is useful and pleasing for the other party, the ugliness of lust, under the habit of natural inclination, fraudulence under the appearance of buying and selling, saying, that they are able to sell thus as dearly as they can, and proud bearing and clothes on vain men and women under the cloak of custom, saying that it is fitting that they conform to others of the land.</p> <p>They conceal work on feast days under the colour of obedience or through necessity of food, saying either that it is fitting to obey their masters, whom they serve, or that it is thus necessary to do so, since otherwise they are not able to live; hypocrisy under a picture of holiness, speech and laughter and derision under the name of jocularity and society. Note V 8, 41 [Visitatio 41].</p> <p>And accordingly, just as the devil and his ministers strive to glorify his daughters, that is, (as it is said) sins, so as to be loved by many, thus they strive to fallaciously blame and, with their lies, criticise the daughters of God and his ministers, that is, the virtues, just as it is shown through all virtues contrary to the aforesaid vices. A truthful counsellor is considered unknown. Whence, whenever mention is made of such, the ministers of the devil, with a shrug of the shoulders, say he is a good faithful man, wishing to imply that he is not good. Thus, lords who wish to live within their means, and neither wish to pay men in robes and feasts and such like beyond however much there are alms, are reputed wretched by the same men. He who does not wish to avenge himself, but out of humility to forgive, is said by them not to be a man. They call whoever is not meddling a fool, since he lives humbly. Therefore, humility is called foolishness</p>
----	---	---	---

	1350	<p>malorum sequi uoluntates in omnibus societatibus [175va] illicitis tanquam singularis ferus ab omnibus fugatur. Qui contra dei iniurias et peccatores irascitur contempnitur ab eis et melancholicus vocatur et multis cachinnis deridetur. Sanctus ab eis ypocrita et ypocrita ab eis sanctus vocatur. Sunt enim in talibus iudiciis ita laici sicut qui nunquam viderunt aurum, vel auricalcum, vel sicut</p>	<p>by them. He who does not wish to follow the willing band of evil men in all their illicit associations is put to flight by all as if a unique wild beast. He who is angry against sinners and the injuries of God is condemned by them and called melancholy, and derided with many jeers. The holy man is called a hypocrite by them, and a hypocrite is called holy. Thus, the laity are in such judgements as those who have never seen</p>
	1360	<p>fatui qui inter aurum et cuprum discernere nesciunt; vnum aliud credentes et econuerso. Ita isti eis placentes sanctos et displicentes ypocritas vocant. Volentes circa ea que ad dei honorem et animarum salutem pertinent feruenter agere presumptuosos vocant. Illi videlicet qui presumptuosos vocant omnes qui feruencius agere uolunt quam ipsi agere consueuerunt qui nunquam feruenter</p>	<p>gold or brass, or as the foolish, who do not know how to discern gold from copper; they believe one the other and vice versa. Thus they call those pleasing to them holy, and those displeasing them, hypocrites. Those who wish to fervently urge about things which pertain to the honour of God and the salvation of souls, they call presumptuous. Evidently, those who have never acted fervently call presumptuous all who wish to act more fervently than they were accustomed to act, not because the work they urge regarding them is evil, but since that</p>
	1370	<p>egerunt, non quia opus quod agunt de se malum sit, sed quia eis insolitum est ab eis que consultum non est. Qui in preiudicium illorum totum fieri reputant, quantumcunque bene fiat, omne quod circa eos sine eorum consilio fit et assensu. Qui videlicet beatum dixerunt populum cui hec sunt, id est, larga dona, illosque usque ad magnum exaltant statum quorum dextera repleta est muneribus. Non dantibus vero</p>	<p>which has not been advised upon by them is unfamiliar to them. They consider everything that happens around them without their advice to happen to their complete prejudice, however much it happens well. Clearly ‘They have called the people happy, that hath these things’ [Psalm 143.15], that is, the generous gifts, and always exalt those to a great position, of whom the right hand is filled with bribes. Truly they show a heavy expression to those not giving. And what is worse, in the testament of God, Micheas 3: ‘They prepare war against him’, either of bad remarks, or another persecution. Indeed at any time experience teaches this.</p>
	1380	<p>ponderosum ostendunt uultum. Et quod peius est, teste deo, Michee. 3, sanctificant super eum prelium, vel oblocucionis vel alterius persecucionis. Hoc enim quandoque experientia docet.</p> <p>Patet ex predictis quomodo diabolus cum ministris suis nititur filias proprias decorare et ornare et dei filias deturpare. Et sic assimilantur in hoc facto cuidam ciuitatis preposito, et castri custodi qui in</p>	<p>by them. He who does not wish to follow the willing band of evil men in all their illicit associations is put to flight by all as if a unique wild beast. He who is angry against sinners and the injuries of God is condemned by them and called melancholy, and derided with many jeers. The holy man is called a hypocrite by them, and a hypocrite is called holy. Thus, the laity are in such judgements as those who have never seen gold or brass, or as the foolish, who do not know how to discern gold from copper; they believe one the other and vice versa. Thus they call those pleasing to them holy, and those displeasing them, hypocrites. Those who wish to fervently urge about things which pertain to the honour of God and the salvation of souls, they call presumptuous. Evidently, those who have never acted fervently call presumptuous all who wish to act more fervently than they were accustomed to act, not because the work they urge regarding them is evil, but since that which has not been advised upon by them is unfamiliar to them. They consider everything that happens around them without their advice to happen to their complete prejudice, however much it happens well. Clearly ‘They have called the people happy, that hath these things’ [Psalm 143.15], that is, the generous gifts, and always exalt those to a great position, of whom the right hand is filled with bribes. Truly they show a heavy expression to those not giving. And what is worse, in the testament of God, Micheas 3: ‘They prepare war against him’, either of bad remarks, or another persecution. Indeed at any time experience teaches this.</p> <p>It is shown out of the aforesaid in what way the devil with his ministers strive to glorify and embellish his own daughters, and criticise the daughters of God. And thus they are compared in this deed to a certain provost of a city and</p>

32	<p>1390 quadam ciuitate satis noua nuper multos habens in carcere, conuictus fuit quod uestem seu tunicam cuiusdam fidelis hominis quem in carcere habuit posuit super latronem, qui in eodem detinebatur carcere, nomenque fidelis hominis ei imponens pro muneribus sibi datis, vestem vero et nomen latronis posuit super fidelem hominem. Et sic latronem in habitu fidelis iustificauit et liberauit et fidelem in habitu latronis condemnauit. Sic omnino in toto</p> <p>1400 predicto processu faciunt illi quibus dicitur Ys. 5, ve qui dicitis bonum malum, et malum bonum ponentes tenebras lucem et lucem tenebras, ponentes amarum in dulce et dulce in amarum.</p> <p>Ve inquit eis quia organa spiritus maligni sunt per quorum [175vb] linguas ad multorum locuntur deceptionem. Ille enim sciens se in forma propria odiosum per discipulos loquitur et multos seducit, dum laudatur peccator in desideriis anime sue et iniquus benedicatur, multi decipiuntur per illos, de quibus Ys. 3, popule meus qui beatum te dicunt, ipsi te decipiunt et viam gressuum tuorum dissipant. Quia si omnes tales fugarent sicut aues fugant bubonem de die non essent tot mali et falsi. Exemplum vero tales fugandi et non solum fugandi sed</p> <p>1410 eciam illi in potestate constituti sunt, exemplum habent tales puniendi, primo in Alexandro magno ex cuius gestis habetur quod ipso persequente Darium Regem Persarum fugientem, duo de seruis suis volentes Alexandro placere promocionem magnam ab eo sperantes ipsum dominum suum occiderunt, sed tamen ad tempus occultauerunt, expectantes quid Alexander de hoc diceret, vtrum uidelicet de facto illo</p> <p>1420</p>	<p>custodian of a castle who in a certain new city, recently holding many in prison, was proved to have placed the robe or tunic of a faithful man, whom he held in prison, on a thief, who was being detained in that prison, and the name of the faithful man was given to the thief in exchange for bribes given to the castellan, and the cloak and the name of the thief was placed on the faithful man. And thus he pardoned and freed the thief in the habit of the faithful man, and condemned the faithful man in the habit of a thief. Thus, so many act entirely in the aforesaid way as him, for whom it is said, Isaias 5: ‘Woe to you that call evil good, and good evil: that put darkness for light, and light for darkness: that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter.’</p> <p>Woe, says he, to those, since they have spited the mouth pieces of the spirit, through whose tongues they speak for the deception of many. That man indeed knowing he is odious in his own form, speaks through his disciples, and seduces many, whilst the sinner is praised in the desires of his soul, and the unjust blessed; many are deceived through these, of which Isaias 3: ‘Oh my people, they call thee blessed, the same deceive thee, and destroy the way of thy steps.’ Since if all put to flight such men, as the birds put to flight the owl of day, there would not be so many evil and false men. An example of putting to flight such men, especially so those who have been placed in power have an example of punishing such men, is first taken from the Deeds of Alexander the Great. It is held that when Alexander was pursuing Darius, king of the Persians, who was fleeing, two of Darius’ servants wishing to please Alexander, and hoping for a great promotion from him, killed their own lord. Nevertheless they concealed their role at the time, waiting to discover what Alexander says of this, and whether he is vexed</p>
----	--	--

33	1430	<p>et factoribus grauaretur vel contentaretur, qui illorum excogitans cautelam fecit clamari quod si tales qui inimicum suum occiderant ad eum venire vellent faceret eos alciores homines de tota patria vel parentela sua quo audito, ad eum venientes in altissimis patibulis suspendit tam seruis et subditis propriis quam alienis dans exemplum ne quis audeat dominum suum perdere.</p>	<p>or satisfied concerning the deed, and the perpetrators. Alexander, recognising their trick, proclaims that if the men who had killed his enemy wished to come to him, he would make them high men of the entire land or over their kinsmen. Having heard this, they came to him, and Alexander hanged them from the highest gibbets, providing an example to his own servants and subordinates, and for others, of what happens when one dares to ruin his lord.</p>
	1440	<p>Secundum exemplum ad idem patuit nuper in facto cuiusdam comitis imperii qui bellum habuit contra quamdam villam quam per prodicionem vnus ciuis eiusdem ville accepit. Ipsum vero ciuem non solum de villa illa, sed etiam de toto dominio suo fugauit asserens ipsum nunquam ei fidelem fore posse, quin etiam ipsum proderet quando tempus videret, qui tam falsus extitit contra vicinos et amicos suos.</p>	<p>The second example was revealed recently in the deed of a certain count of the Empire, who made war against a certain village, which he received through the treachery of a citizen of the village. He exiled the same citizen not just from that village but from his entire domain, asserting that he who proved so false to his neighbours and friends would never be able to be faithful to him, but that he would also betray him when he saw the time.</p>
	1450	<p>Tertium exemplum habetur ad hoc ex gestis romanorum in quibus continetur quod inter fabricium et pirrum erat bellum. Medicus vero pirri venit ad fabricium promittens se velle pro muneribus dominum suum intoxicare quem fabricius pirro vinctum remisit significans quid ei optulisset.</p>	<p>The third example for this is taken from the Deeds of the Romans, in which one may read of the war between Fabricius and Pyrrhus. The doctor of Pyrrhus came to Fabricius, promising he would poison his lord for bribes. Fabricius sent him back to Pyrrhus fettered, signifying what had been offered to him.</p>
	1460	<p>Quartum exemplum ad idem in sacra scriptura de Dauid, 2 Regum 1, qui occidit illum qui occidit dominum suum saul, qui tamen estimauit se in hoc multum dauid placuisse. Idem fecit de illis qui occiderunt dominum suum Ysbosech in hoc credentes eidem placere. 2 Regum 4. Sic ergo hos proditores interfecit, 2 Mac. 4. Quod uerbum licet sic ad [176ra] dauid applicetur tamen ad litteram de iuda dicitur macabeo qui illos occidit, qui fratres suos pro muneribus aduersariis tradiderunt et</p>	<p>The fourth example is in holy scripture concerning David, 2 Kings 1, who killed the man who had killed his lord Saul, even though that man considered he had pleased David much in this. He did the same concerning those who killed their lord Isboseth, believing they would please him with the deed, 2 Kings 4. ‘So he put these traitors to death’, 2 Machabees 4 [10]. What may be applied to David is applicable to the letter, concerning Judas, called Machabeus, who killed those who traded their brothers to their adversaries for bribes, and</p>

34	<p>1470 aduersarios in quadam turri obsessos fugere permiserunt.</p> <p>Horum ergo exemplo nullus deberet falsum vel proditorem honrare sed fugare, et si hoc ei incumbit punire vel agere ad hoc quod puniatur quia si sit falsus sibi vel amicis suis natura rei docet quod eum non honoret. Si uero sit falsus inimicis suis omnia predicta exempla docent quod non honoretur que quidam extra magnam</p> <p>1480 includunt rationem. Viderunt enim illi antiqui sapientes et dei propheta Dauid quod si ipsi honorarent promouerent proditores inimicorum suorum duo sequerentur pericula; vnum videlicet quod videbatur eis quod verissimiliter cogitare potuerunt quod nunquam essent eis fideles nec possent in eis confidere qui tam falsi primis dominis suis extiterunt, quia dicit regula iuris in 6, semel malus semper presumitur malus.</p> <p>1490 Aliud cogitare et timere potuerunt ne serui illorum videntes dominos suos falsos et proditores aduersariorum suorum honorare, magnaue eis dare, irent ad aduersarios illos, vt ab eis magna dona reciperent pro prodicione illorum. Hoc enim verissimiliter timere potuerunt, quod cupidi hoc facerent, videntes se posse plus habere dominos suos prodendo quam</p> <p>1500 eisdem seruiendo.</p> <p>Si domini moderni easdem causas cogitarent, et eadem iudicia de falsis proditoribus facerent pauciores essent tam tempore pacis quam belli qui huius facerent falsitates.</p> <p>Et reuera materiam habent et causam easdem excercendi vindictas quia eadem facta et falsitates modernis fiunt temporibus. Satis enim tempore pacis</p>	<p>permitted besieged adversaries in a certain tower to flee.</p> <p>Therefore, by the example of these men, nobody should honour the false man or traitor, but drive him away, and if it is within his authority, punish him, since if he is false to him, or his friends, the nature of the thing teaches that he does not honour him. If truly he is false to his enemies, all the aforesaid examples, which enclose a certain, additional great reason, teach that he should not be honoured. The wise men of antiquity, and prophet of God, David, saw that if they honour and promote traitors of their enemies, two dangers follow: one, it seemed that those who only have the appearance of truth would never be faithful to them, nor would they be able to confide in those who proved so false to their first lords, since the rule of law says in the sixth [Liber Sextus]: once bad, always presumably bad.</p> <p>The other, they were able to consider and fear that their servants would see their lords honour and give greatly to the false and traitors of their adversaries, and thus go to those adversaries so as to receive great gifts from them for their treachery. Indeed they could plausibly fear that the avaricious might do this, seeing they could have more by betraying their lords, than serving them.</p> <p>If modern lords considered the same reasons, and made the same judgements of false traitors, there would be as few in the time of peace, as of war, who make falsities of this kind.</p> <p>And in fact they have the same grounds and reason for exercising vengeance, since the same deeds and falsities happen in modern times. It is sufficiently shown in</p>
----	---	---

35	<p>1510 ostenditur quod multi sunt qui faciunt quod egerunt illi quos iudas ut predictum est occidit qui videlicet fideles persecuntur et indictant et multis modis dampnificant et fures et homicidas pro muneribus abire permittunt.</p> <p>Tempore eciam belli imminente inter magnos de terra nonnulli inter partes claudicant neutri parti fideles qui Saule et Ysbosech regnantibus cum ipsis</p> <p>1520 conregnare volunt. Ipsi uero deficientibus cum Dauid contra eos insurgunt. Et cum Abimelech contra Gaal, sicut ille falsus Zebul. Iud 9. Et de talibus forsitan modernis temporibus [176rb] auditum est. De quibus nota supra eod. c. 17. tales habere merentur quod habuit menelaus, 2. Mac. 5. De quo dicitur ibidem quod eum occiderunt quia legum et patrie proditor fuit. Legum suum ut predictum est tempore</p> <p>1530 pacis falsi proditores sunt patrie vero tempore belli, quam penam in hoc seculo non semper euadunt in alio vero nunquam.</p> <p>Ex dictis ergo patet quod falsos sibi vel amicis nullus honorare debet sed potius punire quia inimici sunt nec falsos aduersario suo quia ei imposterum falsi et inimici erunt et sui eciam illorum exemplo.</p> <p>1540 Sed heu nunc falsi et inimici tam animarum quam corporum et bonorum et subditorum et aduersariorum non solum non puniuntur, sed a principibus et potencibus diuiciis et honoribus exaltantur de quibus in Ps. vidi impios superexaltatos et electos sicut cedrus et cetera.</p> <p>Ex quorum exaltacione multa secuntur mala et pericula tam animarum que perduntur quam corporum que</p>	<p>a time of peace that there are many who do what those did (whom Judas Maccabeus killed), who persecuted, indicted and injured the faithful in many ways, and permitted the release of thieves and murderers for bribes.</p> <p>Also at a time of threatening war between the great of the land, not a few hover between sides, faithful to neither side, those who in the reigns of Saul and Isboeth wished to reign with them. The same men faltering, they rise up with David against them. And with Abimelech against Gaal, just as that false man Zebul (Judges 9). And concerning such deeds, perhaps it has been heard in modern times. Concerning which, note chapter 17 of the same book. Such men deserve to have what Menelaus had, 2 Machabees 5. Of whom it is said they killed him at that time since he was a ‘traitor to the laws, and to his country.’ The false are traitors of the laws (as it has been said) in time of peace, and of the land in time of war. They do not always evade the penalty in this age, and will truly never do so in another age.</p> <p>It is shown out of these sayings that nobody ought to honour those false to himself or to friends, but rather punish them, since they are enemies; nor should he honour those false to his adversary, since they shall be false to him thereafter, and are also his enemies by their example.</p> <p>But alas, now the false – enemies of souls as they are of bodies, goods, subordinates and adversaries – are not only not punished, but exalted by princes and potentates with riches and honour, concerning which in the Psalms [36]: ‘I have seen the wicked highly exalted, and lifted up like the cedars [of Libanus].’</p> <p>Out of their exaltation, many evil deeds and dangers follow, of souls which are lost, and likewise of bodies which are killed, and of</p>
----	---	---

36	<p>1550 occiduntur quam possessionum que auferuntur et amittuntur, terre eciam que diffamatur et turbatur, vt de eis uerificetur illud Prouer. 30, per tria mouetur terra, et quartum non potest sustinere per seruuum cum regnauerit et cetera, ut per seruuum istum intelligitur seruus peccati. Iuxta illud. Io. 8. qui facit peccatum seruus est peccati. Talis enim seruus peccati et falsitatis quando regnat vel quando eos qui regnant vel dominantur ducit omnia predicta mala causat. Quorum primum est quod eorum ducti consilio multa agunt furta colorata, et alia mala facta in animarum suarum perdicionem. Et ut huius dicti veritas clarius videatur ponatur exemplum primo in hiis rebus in quibus domini habent proteccionem et dominium, sed non proprietatem sicut in bonis subditorum, secundo in hiis in quibus nec habent dominium nec proprietatem. Racione primi est sciendum quod lex ciuilis codice de quadrienni prescripcione. L. bene a Zenone dicit quod omnia principis esse intelliguntur, super dicit glosa quo ad proprietatem vt dixit Azo, sed Bulgarus contra nisi quo ad proteccionem. Moderni vero falsi consiliarii videntes quod sequaces azonis honorantur et ditantur, et sequaces Bulgari vilipenduntur et nihil luçantur sicut patet A 15, 3. Azonem secuntur facientes dominos vti rebus subditorum ut propriis, sicut patet D 12, 24. De talium enim consilio non solum sunt fures mobilium, sed quod peius est raptores immobilium sicut ibidem patet. [176va]</p> <p>Secundo in his rebus in quibus non habent dominium sunt fures falsi principes et terrarum domini cum consiliariis suis sicut patet de occupantibus bona</p>	<p>possessions which are carried away and lost, also of the land, which is defamed and disturbed, as is verified concerning them, Proverbs 30: ‘By three things the earth is disturbed, and the fourth it cannot bear, by a slave when he reigneth’ - ‘by that slave’, the servant of sin may be understood. According to John 8: ‘Whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin.’ When such a slave of sin and falsity reigns or when he leads those who rule or are sovereign, he causes all the aforesaid evil things. The first of which, that those led by their counsel commit many deceitful thefts and other evil deeds in perdition of their souls. And, so that the truth of this appears more clearly, an example is given first in these things, in which lords have protection and lordship, but not ownership, just as in the goods of subordinates, second in these things, in which they have neither lordship nor ownership. Of the first, by reason it must be known that Civil Law, the Codex, ‘de quadrienni prescripcione’, lex, ‘bene a Zenone’, says that all things are understood to be for princes, on which it says in the gloss, with regards to ownership (As Azo [of Bologna] said), but Bulgarus is to the contrary, unless with regards to protection. False counsellors today see that those following Azo are honoured, and enriched, and those that follow Bulgarus are despised, and profit nothing, just as it is shown A 15, 3 [Adulatio 3]. They follow Azo allowing lords to enjoy the things of their subordinates as their own, just as it is shown D 12, 24 [Dominatio 24]. By the advice of such men they are not just thieves of chattels, but (what is worse) plunderers of real property, just as it is thereupon shown.</p> <p>Second in these things in which they do not have lordship, the thieves are false princes and lords of the lands, with their councillors, just as it is shown concerning seizing the goods of</p>
----	---	---

37	<p>1590 naufragorum tales enim bona naufragorum iniuste occupando furtum committunt, et furti pena indicantur. Codice de furtis in auctentica nauigia, libro 6, titulo 2, vbi habetur de verbo ad uerbum quod sequitur. Nauigia si quocunque loco peruenerint a quo casu contingente rupta fuerint vel aliter ad terram peruenerint tam nauigia quam bona nauigancium ipsis integre seruentur ad quos spectant antequam nauigii periculum incurrissent sublata. Penitus</p> <p>1600 locorum consuetudine que huic aduersa est sanctioni, transgressores huius nostre constitutionis bonorum publicacione multentur. Et si res exegerit iuxta mandatum nostrum omnibus bonis compescantur, qui nec propter leges diuinas et canonicas que huius dominorum dampnant abusum, sicut patet C 8, 28, nec propter leges imperiales, vel istam</p> <p>1610 iustinianam illam pessimam dimittunt consuetudinem. Sub nulla viuere volunt lege, et ideo sine lege peribunt.</p> <p>Ibidem eciam. co. de furtis. le. in eum, tales infra annum tenentur restituere in quadruplum; post annum vero in simplum propter actoris negligenciam qui tantum de repetendo distulit et negligens fuit. Codice eciam, libro xi, titulo de naufragiis; libro i, dicitur sic, si quando naufragio nauis expulsa fuerit ad litus et infra fiscus se non interponat. Quod enim habet ius fiscus in aliena calamitate, vt de re tam luctuosa compendium secretur. Hec ibi.</p> <p>1620 Sed dicunt falsi quando nescitur cuius sunt bona illa iuste domino terre confiscantur; ergo per solam ignoranciam rerum dominium acquirunt. Quod est falsum quia sic res inuenta esset inuentoris</p>	<p>shipwrecks; unjustly seizing the goods of shipwrecks, they commit theft, and thefts are proclaimed with punishment. Codex, ‘de furtis’, in Authenticum, ‘nauigia’, librum 6, titulus 2, where it is had word for word which follows. If ships approach any place having been wrecked by accidental circumstance, or otherwise come to land, the ships themselves and the goods of the ships, should be preserved wholly for those who were waiting for them before the ships encountered danger. Having suffered deeply by the custom of places, which is opposed to this ordinance, transgressors of this, our constitution, are fined by confiscation of goods. And if according to our mandate the matter demands, those who neither dismiss that worst custom according to divine and canonical laws, which punish the abuse of these lords (as is shown C 8, 28 [Consuetudo 28]), nor do so according to imperial laws, or that of Justinian, shall be held for all goods. Under no law they wish to live, and therefore they shall perish without the law.</p> <p>Also in the Codex ‘de furtis’, lex ‘in eum’ such men are held to account within a year to compensate the value fourfold; after the year, the simple value, according to the negligence of the plaintiff, who insofar as he delayed to recover it, was negligent. Codex, librum 11, titulus ‘de naufragiis’; in librum 1, it is said thus: if a ship is ever driven to shore and along it by shipwreck, the fisc does not interfere. Indeed what right has the fisc to interfere in another’s calamity, in order to pursue a profit from so grievous a matter? Thereupon, this.</p> <p>But the false say when it is not known whose goods those are, they are justly confiscated by the lord of the land; therefore they acquire the lordship of things only through ignorance. What is false, since this thing found is of the finder, and it</p>
----	---	--

38	<p>1630 et licitum mihi esset occupare omnem rem cuius dominum ignorarem. Et contra legem et rationem codice vnde vi. l. cum querebatur, libro 8, titulo 4, vbi expresse lex reprobatur talem bonorum occupationem. Sanctimus inquit talem possessorem predonem intelligi ridiculum, et enim est dicere vel audire quod per ignoranciam alienam rem aliquis, quasi propriam occupavit. Omnis autem scire deberet quod non suum est hoc ad alios modis omnibus pertinere. Sequitur cito post. Si quis alienam rem aduersus domini voluntatem attigerit, [176vb] furti actione tenetur. Glosa dicit ignorancia non excusat; quia ignorabat cuius esset, quia hoc non tenebatur scire, sed sciebat non esse suam.</p> <p>Iterum dicunt res derelicta occupanti conceditur iuxta regulam iuris que dicit quod nullius in bonis est occupanti conceditur. Istud est verum quando est certum quod est derelicta et quod dominus nullam inde vtilitatem querat. Sed in proposito fuit dominus sic viuus fuit mortuus de rebus illis ex naufragio proiectis vtilitatem habere desiderat, nec vnquam eas derelinquere intendebat.</p> <p>Ex hiis patet quod talis acquisicio per ignoranciam cuius sunt per leges reprobatur. Sed forte dicent ignorancia sola non acquiritur dominium quia alie cause concurrunt; vna quod super terram talis domini proiciuntur, et ipse eas ab aliis defendit raptoribus. Sic dicentes, sunt de opinione illorum quorum sententiam recitat in simili Pomponius et cetera. Pomponius, ff. de rerum dominio acquirendo le. tractat in digesto nouo, libro 3, titulo 1, casus legis, porcellus meus a lupo raptus a vicino de ore lupi eripitur, qui</p>	<p>is licit for me to seize every thing of whose lord I do not know? And contrary to the law and reason: Codex ‘vi’, lex ‘cum querebantur’, librum 8, titulum 4: where the law expressly rejects such a seizure of goods. We have confirmed (it says) - such a possessor is to be considered a robber. And indeed it is ridiculous to say or hear that somebody has occupied another’s property as his own through ignorance. Every man must know what is not his belongs to others in all ways. It follows immediately after. If one takes another’s property against the will of the owner, an action is held for the theft. The gloss says ignorance is no excuse; he was ignorant whose it was, since he was held not to know this, but he knew it was not his.</p> <p>Again they say a thing left is conceded to the occupier according to the rule of law which says, what is in no man’s possession is conceded to the occupier. That is true when it is certain that it has been left, and that the owner seeks no use. But in the proposition, the owner, either alive or dead, desired to have use from those things jettisoned out of a shipwreck, nor did he ever intend to relinquish them.</p> <p>Out of these it is shown that such an acquisition through ignorance is condemned through the laws. But perhaps they shall say ownership is acquired not only in ignorance, since they make claim to another reason; one, that they are cast onto the land of such a lord, and they themselves defend them from other marauders. Thus saying they are of the opinion of those whose arguments Pomponius similarly recites. Pomponius, ‘de rerum dominio acquirendo’, lex, ‘tractat’, in Digestum Novum, librum 3, titulus 1. A case of law, my piglet taken by a wolf, snatched from the mouth of a wolf by a neighbour, who</p>
----	---	---

1670	porcum dicit esse suum consilarii sui cum eo concordant dicentes, quod in ore lupi desinit esse meum sicut auis quando de manu mea volat et piscis quando de nassa mea ad aquam fugit et alia bestia quando ad siluam euadit, sicut eciam desinit esse meum quod auis de area, vel miluus de alio loco quod meum prius fuerat portat. Volunt ergo isti dicere quod sicut piscis vel auis auolans non mea sed capientis sunt ita	says the pig is his. His counsellors agree with him, saying what is in the mouth of the wolf ceases to be mine, just as when a bird flies from my hand, and whenever the fish flees from my net into the water, and when another beast escapes into the forest, just like when the bird moves from the yard, or the pike from another place, what was earlier mine also ceases to be mine. They wish therefore to say that just as the fish or fleeing bird are not mine, but are of whoever catches them,
1680	porcus in casu posito. Sic consimiliter dicunt isti de bonis que ante naufragium meum erant in naufragio auolauerunt, et mea esse desiuerunt. Pomponius vero legislator illis dupliciter obuiare videtur. Primo quia licet hoc verum sit in illis que sunt fere nature sicut in auibus, et huius non tamen in porcis, qui sunt nature domestice. Secundo quia auis auolans mea fit, si a me capi postquam auolauit possit, ita de porco,	thus, the pig in the case posited. Thus, they say it is similar concerning goods which were mine before the shipwreck; they flew away in the shipwreck, and ceased to be mine. Pomponius, proposer of the law, seems to oppose them in two ways. First, although it is true for those which are of a feral nature, just as in birds and such kind, it is not for pigs which are of a domesticated nature. Second, since the bird flying away becomes mine if captured by me after it flew away, you say it
1690	ita eciam dic de bonis naufragorum in quibus dominium in naufragio non amittebatur. Per naufragium enim vel quemcunque talem casum fortuitum, res mea non desinit esse mea, et hoc est ibidem sequitur diffinitive in textu: si inquit naufragium, quod amissum sit non statim nostrum esse desinit. Assumit enim hoc tanquam per se verum ad probandum intentum [177ra] de bestia in ore lupi et est	may be thus concerning a pig, and also concerning the goods of a shipwreck, in which ownership was not lost in a shipwreck. Indeed, through a shipwreck or any such accidental case, my thing does not cease to be mine. Thereupon, this follows definitively in the text: if (he says) there is a shipwreck, what has been lost does not immediately cease to be ours. He takes this as true in itself for approving the proposition concerning
1700	iste exempli intellectus. Sicut rerum dominium per naufragium non amittitur, quin verus dominus iuste eas mortuus vel viuus habere debeat, si tamen de ore luporum eripi possunt de facto, quia de iure eripi deberent, ita dominus porci eius dominium iuste vendicat si de ore lupi eripi possit. Et quia aliqui forte exemplum suum negarent, ideo probat illud dicens, denique quadruplo eum teneri qui rapuerit bona	a beast in the mouth of a wolf, and that is the understanding of the example. Just as ownership of things is not lost through a shipwreck, but that the true lord justly ought to have them, dead or alive, if nevertheless they can be snatched from the mouth of wolves by deed, since by right they should be snatched, in this way the lord of the pig justly claims his ownership, if it can be snatched from the mouth of the wolf. And since others perhaps deny his example, therefore, he proves it, saying, finally, whoever seizes the goods of

39	<p>1710 scilicet naufragorum. Sequitur conclusio ibidem. Si igitur manet nostrum ego arbitror et furti competere actionem, suple contra illum qui porcum sic liberatum vel bona sic proiecta detinet, sicut patet supra eodem capitulo. 37.</p>	<p>shipwrecks is to be liable for fourfold the value. The conclusion follows. If, therefore, it continues, I think he may pursue an action of theft, suppliant against the one who keeps the liberated pig, or the abandoned goods, as is shown in the chapter of the same text, cited above, 37.</p>
	<p>1720 Nec valet quod instant dicentes talia bona mortuis restitui non debere, sicut dictum est, C 8, 30, quia nec exempla illorum sunt ad propositum de dampnatis et intestatis et bastardis quorum bonis secundum iura civilia domini succedunt, nec tamen aliquid de his pro mortuis facere tenentur. Quia sicut primi ratione criminis vita, ita aliis bonis exterioribus iuste priuari possunt. Alii vero in detestacionem paterni criminis his priuantur racionaliter quidem vt alii talibus territi exemplis consimilia fugiant crimina. Patet ergo ex predictis quod iste falsorum abusus est contra iura</p>	<p>Nor is what they maintain valid, saying such goods must not be restored to the dead, as has been said C 8, 30 [Consuetudo 30], since neither are their examples for a proposition concerning the condemned, intestates and illegitimates, whose goods according to civil law go to the lords, nor are they held to do anything for the dead concerning these things. First, by reason of a life crime, they are thus able to be justly deprived of other worldly goods. Others are deprived of these in execration of a paternal crime, rationally indeed, so that others flee from similar crimes terrified by such examples. Therefore, it is shown out of the aforesaid that this abuse of the</p>
	<p>1730 divina naturalia canonica et civilia antiqua scilicet Digestorum et noua scilicet codicis et nouissima scilicet authenticarum. Patet eciam quod concausa quam assumunt cum ignorancia nulla est quod totum occupare debeant. Illi tamen quorum bona sic conseruantur conseruatoribus tenentur ad antitodum.</p>	<p>false is contrary to divine law, natural, canon, and civil, the old (of the Digestum) and new (of the Codex) and the newest, (of the Authenticum). It is also shown, that a concomitant reason, which they accept with no ignorance, is that they must seize everything. Nevertheless, those whose goods are saved are bound to the salvors for recompense.</p>
	<p>1740 Iterum videtur quod declinare non poterunt quin sola ignorancia illorum causa sit quare bona occupant naufragorum quia ipsi concedent quod si scirent verum dominum ea, ei restituerent. Ergo si sciencia domini esset causa restitutionis ignorancia est causa non restitutionis. Si hec sit causa talis effectus per se, scilicet, calorum contraria causa est, causa contrarii effectus, scilicet, frigoris. Sic in proposito, si oppositum de opposito, et propositum de proposito.</p>	<p>Again it seems that they are not able to reject this, but that the cause is only through their ignorance, on account of which they seize the goods of the shipwreck, since the same concede that if they knew the true lord, they would restore it to him. Therefore, if knowledge of the lord is the cause of restitution, ignorance is the cause of no restitution. If this is the cause of such an effect in itself, the contrary of the cause of heat is the cause of the contrary effect, cold. Thus in the proposition, if the opposite is inferred from the opposite, the proposition is inferred from the</p>

40	<p>1750</p> <p>1760</p> <p>1770</p> <p>1780</p>	<p>Si vero hoc concedunt incidunt in legem que habetur supra eod. capitulo. 37. co. vnde vi.</p> <p>Huic dicunt quod non sola ignorancia, sed defectus probacionis causa est quare talia dominis confiscantur. Sed sicut in re inuenta sufficit quod dominus eam suam esse probet, dicendo certa signa que in libro vel alia re continentur, sicut eciam in animalibus amissis et ad dominium [177rb] alicuius venientibus que vulgari nomine vocantur weupe. Si infra annum et diem probet esse suum, quia amisit illa recuperat. Ita sufficere deberet quod per certa signa que dicit esse in arca sua que ad terram proicitur de dicis seu talliis seu aliis rebus, per certa eciam signa que in doliis sculpsit et per homines vicinos iuratos ostendere bona esse sua. In casu enim posset nauis in exitu de portu domino nauis cum omnibus vicinis aspicientibus cum omnibus viuis in ea contentis periclitari. Item casu contingere posset quod nauis in omnibus vicinis nota ad terram veniret, omnibus, qui in ea fuerunt submersis, quia tempestate imminente se in barca ponentes ut ad terram fugerent submergebantur, ex quo in omnibus talibus casibus certissime probare posset certius quam de animali quod suum ut dictum est infra annum et diem probare. Non videtur statuti vel consuetudinis ratio que continet quod vbi nullum animal viuum euadit, bona domino terre confiscantur. Est ergo pocius abusus et contra omnem legem vt ostensum est et racionem. Et totum istud malum accidit per falsos sapientes, per quos talia fiunt statuta, de quibus Ys. x, ve qui condunt leges iniquas, et scribentes iniusticiam</p>	<p>proposition. If truly they concede this, they fall in with the law, which is held, as above in the same texts, chapter 37, Codex, ‘vnde vi’.</p> <p>They say that it is not just ignorance, but a defect of attempting to establish the facts that is the cause by which such goods are confiscated from the owners. But just as it suffices in a thing found that the owner proves it to be his, by revealing certain signs which are contained in a book or in another thing. It is the same for animals which are lost and come to the lordship of someone, which in the common language are called waifs. If within a year and a day he proves it to be his, that which he lost, is restored. Thus it must suffice, that through certain signs, which he says are in his chest, which is thrown up on land, concerning lawsuits or tallies or other things, through certain signs which he carved in vessels, and through neighbouring men and jurors, to show the goods to be his. In a case, a ship, with all living things contained in it, may suffer shipwreck in exit from a port, with the owner of the ship and all neighbours watching. Again, in a case it is able to happen that the ship noted by all neighbours comes to land with everyone who was in it, drowned – because of a threatening storm they placed themselves in small boats in order to flee to land and were drowned – out of which, in all such cases, he is most certainly able to prove, certainly more than an animal, what is his, and to prove it (as was said) within a year and a day. The reason of the statute or custom which specifies that where no animal escapes alive, goods are confiscated to the lord of the land does not appear. It is therefore rather an abuse, and against every law (as was shown) and reason. And all that evil happens through false wise men, through whom such statutes are made, of which Isaias 10: ‘Woe to them that make wicked laws’, and those writing have written injustice in their statutes and</p>
----	---	---	---

1790	<p>scripserunt in statutis et ordinacionibus suis, vt ipsi ex illorum qui in maxima sunt miseria sicut in naufragio bonis ditentur, et illi miseri omnia sua amittent vel medietatem dent ut aliquid recuperent. Sequitur, vt opprimerent in iudicio pauperes et vim facerent cause humilium populi mei vt essent vidue quarum mariti submersi sunt, preda eorum. Nuper enim talis vidua dicas que in cista mariti sui</p>	<p>ordinations, so that they are enriched with goods from those who are in the greatest misery, as in a shipwreck, and those wretched people lose everything, or give half, so that they regain something. It follows that they ‘oppress the poor in judgement, and do violence to the cause of the humble of my people: that widows’ (whose husbands have drowned) ‘might be their prey’, [Isaias 10. 2]. Recently such a widow could have regained tallies which were in the chest of her</p>
1800	<p>submersi erant per quas multas marcas marito suo debitas recuperasset a confiscatore cui nunquam dice valuerunt petiuit nec optinere potuit. Sequitur et pupillos suos, filios submersorum diriperent, bonis paternis eos priuando. Ecce qualis ex tam iniquo statuto sequitur effectus.</p>	<p>drowned husband, with which many marks were owed to her husband, from a confiscator for whom the tallies were worthless. She begged, but was unable to obtain anything. It follows, they would plunder orphans, the children of the drowned, depriving them of paternal goods. Behold in what way, out of such an iniquitous statute, the effect follows.</p>
1810	<p>Sed quid facient illi quia talia statuta condunt vel tenent contra naufragos quando ipsi in morte naufragium patientur corporis. Istam enim questionem querit ab eis propheta in uerbis immediate in autoritate sequentibus, quid inquit facietis in die visitacionis et calamitatis, quando illa putrida nauis corporis vestri ad mortis scopulum confringetur, ad cuius tunc confugietis auxilium. Nunquid tunc [177va] valebit vobis inanis statuti vel consuetudinis allegacio. Vbi derelinquetis gloriam uestram vel quibus certe aliis confiscationibus. Ut sicut vos bona confiscatis naufragorum ita vobis mortis patientibus naufragium bona uestra</p>	<p>But what shall they do, since they compose or hold such statutes against the shipwrecked, when they themselves suffer a shipwreck in the death of the body? The prophet seeks that question from them in the following words unmediated in authority: (says he) ‘what will you do in the day of visitation, and of the calamity’ [Isaiahs 10] when that putrid ship of your body is shattered towards the rock of death? ‘To whom will ye flee for help?’ Is it possible the plea of an empty statute or custom shall then be strong for you? ‘And where will ye leave your glory’, or with whom the other confiscations? Just as you confiscate the goods of a shipwreck, so for you suffering the shipwreck of death, your goods are confiscated, the body with worms, the soul with daemons, goods to your enemies, as the promise of Christ is verified in these, saying, Matthew 7: ‘For with what judgement you judge, you shall be judged.’</p>
1820	<p>confiscentur, corpus, scilicet, vermibus anima demonibus bona inimicis, ut sic cristi promissum in eis verificetur, dicentis, Mat. 7, in quo enim iudicio iudicaueritis iudicabimini.</p> <p>Et non solum de falsorum ducatu</p>	<p>And danger to souls follows not just from</p>

41	<p>1830 sequitur periculum animarum tam ipsorum quam dominorum qui eorum vtuntur consilio et statutis vt dictum est, sed etiam corporum occisio quia tam domini qui talia cupidorum sequuntur consilia quam ipsi consiliarii aliquando occiduntur, et terre diffamatio. Terra enim propter falsos etiam apud exterarum diffamatur nationes et maleficiorum multiplicatio, propter enim tales falsos et periuros malorum supportatorum. Mali multiplicantur. Mala audacter perpetrant, spoliando mutilando occidendo tibias et brachia frangendo et crudeliter verberando et totum in audacia falsorum hominum vel qui eos in malis suis ita potenter defendunt quod nullus eos indictare audeat vel incarcerare. Illi enim supportatores statim eis minantur, dicentes si indictaueritis homines talis domini, vel aliquem rigorem exercueritis melius esset vobis dormire. Et quod crudelius est ipsos etiam per illos malefactores lesos, ita minis terrent totam culpam eis imponentes quod non audent de eis querulare vel iusticiam petere, sed leti sunt cum toto dampno quod habent pacem et concordiam petere et emendam facere.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Vel quia sperant quod si deprehendantur ratione munerum vel parentele et huius falsi eos suo periurio liberabunt, propter hoc enim absque timore mala perpetrant. Sequitur etiam bonorum exteriorum amissio quia sicut tam ipsis quam dominis per falsitates veniunt ita recedunt, quia dicitur in proverbio gallicano quod vnus denarius male lucratus omnes alios deuorat. Ex quo tot mala falsorum sequuntur ducatum. Patet quod falsi dominos ducentes vel regentes vel etiam veraces decipientes, sunt sicut</p>	<p>the leadership of the false, both to their [souls], and the souls of their lords who use their council and statutes (as has been said), but also the death of the body, since, both the lords who follow such greedy counsel, and the counsellors themselves, are slain at a point in time, and there is defamation of the land. On account of the false, the land is defamed in other nations, and there is a multiplication of crimes on account of such false and perjured men of evil supporters. Evil men are multiplied. Boldly they perpetrate evil deeds, despoiling, mutilating, slaughtering, breaking bones, and cruelly beating, and all in the audacity of false men, or those who powerfully defend them in their evil, because none dares to identify or incarcerate them. Those supporters immediately threaten them, saying, if you point out men of such a lord, or you exercise another obduracy, it would be better for you to sleep. And what is more cruel, they terrify with threats the same people struck by those evildoers, imposing the entire blame on them, so that they dare not complain about them or beg for justice, but are glad with the entire loss, and beg to make amends so that they have peace.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Since they expect that if they are caught, by reason of bribes or kin and such things, the false shall liberate them through their perjury, they perpetrate evil without fear. The loss of exterior goods follows since just as they come to them and their lords, through falsity, so do they slip away, since it is said in the French Proverb, that one penny badly gained, curses all the others. Out of which, so many evil deeds follow the counsel of false men. It is shown that false men leading or ruling lords or even deceiving the true, are just as the plank</p>
----	---	---

42	<p>1870 planca que lupum in puteum cadere facit. Volentes enim lupum capere aliquando plancam deceptorie super puteum ponunt et abscondunt ponentes predam aliquam ante, tali modo, quod eam attingere non possit nisi super plancam illam pedem ponat. Sic domini qui mediante planca [177vb] falsorum predam acquirunt super eorum consilium se fundantes. In puncto ad inferna descendunt, Iob 20, quia pedem affectionis et confidentie super falsam plancam et putridam posuerunt.</p> <p>1880 Finis autem falsorum similis erit fini iude proditoris sicut et similes sunt ei in vita, vnde glosa super illud, Mat. 26, exinde querebat oportunitatem ut eum traderet. Multi inquit sunt, qui factum iude execrantur, et idem faciunt quod ipse fecit nam ipse cristum vendidit, et qui pro munere falsum testimonium dicunt, deum</p> <p>1890 qui veritas est vendunt. Et non solum idem faciunt quod iudas, sed grauius delinquant sicut multis rationibus ostensum est, E 6, 37. Et ideo iuste turpiorem finem habebunt. Illius enim diabolus animam rapuit. Istorum vero quandoque et corpus simul et animam rapuit, ita neutrum in terra dimittit. Sicut nuper patuit de quodam tali de quo quidam fide dignus cuius dictis fidem adhibent qui eius vitam nouerunt narrare consuevit quod cum falsitate multa</p> <p>1900 acquirens de mammona iniquitatis, diues effectus fuit, finis vero diuiciarum et vite sue talis fuit. Vno die ipso in campo existente puer rufus ignotus ad vxorem venit in domo querens vbi maritus esset. Ipsa vero respondente quod in campis. Adiecit ille diabolus in forma pueri, dicas ei in reditu suo quod reddat mihi debitum meum nocte ista. Cui illa, nescio quod</p>	<p>which makes the wolf fall in the well. Those wishing at a time to seize the wolf put a plank of deception above the well, which they leave, placing the bait there, in such a way that he is not able to touch it, unless he places his foot above the plank. In this way are lords who acquire plunder by means of the false plank, establishing themselves on such counsel. ‘And in a moment they go down to hell’, Job 20 [Job 21], since they placed the foot of affection and trust on a false and putrid plank.</p> <p>The end of the false shall be similar to the end of the Jewish traitor, just as they are similar to him in life, whence the gloss on him, Matthew 26: ‘from thenceforth he sought opportunity to betray him.’ There are many who curse the deed of the Jew and do the same that he himself did, for he himself sold Christ, and those who for a bribe say false testimony sell God who is truth. And they do not just do what Judas did, but fail more seriously, as has been shown by many reasons E 6, 37 [Eucharistia 37]. And therefore they shall justly have an ugly end. The devil seized his soul. Truly whenever he has seized both their body and soul together, he leaves neither on earth. Just as it was recently revealed concerning such a certain man, about whom a certain trustworthy man, whose faith those who knew his life employ in sayings, was accustomed to tell, that acquiring much with falsity from a mountain of iniquity, the effect was riches, the end was of riches and his life. One day, a boy in the field, red and unknown, comes to the wife in her house seeking the whereabouts of her husband. She responds that he is in the fields. That devil – in the form of a boy – continued, ‘tell him on his return that he renders to me my debt this night.’ To whom, she says, ‘I do not know that he is obliged to anybody in any matter.’</p>
----	--	--

	1910	<p>alicui obligetur in quocunque. Ille uero asperius et amarius uerbis recitans ait, omnino nocte ista debitum meum ab eo habere uolo. Cum uero vxor omnia ista marito narrasset, ipse dixit iuste petit. Nocte uero illa lectum suum parari precepit in quadam domo forinseca, in qua nunquam ante dormire consueuerat, nec aliquem ibi secum habere uoluit. Ipso ergo domum illam intrante, et cum lumine remanente omnibus eiectis. Illi de domo curiosius per rimas introsipientes quid faceret, uiderunt illum in forma pueri cum homine illo fortissime computantem, pluresque pecunie sacculos ut eis uidebatur inter se habuerunt. Mirabantur quia non intrauit per ostium sed ascendit aliunde. Dum uero illi exterius expectarent ut uiderent finem circa compositum discordare ceperunt, et grossa uerba inter se habere.</p>	<p>He, with words rough and bitter, says, 'tonight I wish to have my debt in entirety from him.' When the wife told all to her husband, he said, 'he asks justly.' That night he ordered his bed to be prepared in a certain outhouse in which he was earlier never accustomed to sleep, nor did he wish to have another there with him. He entered that house, and with the remaining light ejected everyone. Those from the house, very curious, looking through cracks to see what would happen, saw that creature, in the form of a boy, with that man, vigorously reckoning, and many purses of money, as it seemed to them, they had amongst them. They looked in wonder, since he came not through the front door, but ascended from elsewhere. Whilst they watched from the outside, so as to see the end, those inside began to quarrel about the reckoning, and to have coarse words amongst themselves. The household seeing that, shattered the door so they might enter and help their master; the door shattered; the light was extinguished. But when they carried the other light in, they found neither their master, nor that ruddy boy. In which thing, what else can be thought, except that the devil had lent him much.</p>
	1920	<p>Famuli uero hoc uidentes ostium fregerunt, ut intrantes magistrum suum iuuarent; ostio uero fracto; lumen extinctum fuit. Sed cum aliud lumen portarent, nec magistrum suum nec rufum illum inuenerunt, qua in re quid aliud [178ra] pensari potest nisi quod diabolus multa mutuauerat. In malis enim lucris diabolus tales iuuat, talibusque vel mutuatur vel aliquo modo tradit ad mercandum vel dat ad expendendum. Iuxta illud Mat. 4, omnia inquit hec tibi dabo de quibus quia nesciuit compositum reddere, accepit eum secum ad ponendum in carcere inferni usque reddat vltimum quadrantem quod nunquam erit. Falsi ergo lucratores de ipso speculum suum faciant, ne et ipsi similia paciantur, et in eodem carcere profundissimo ponantur, ideo dico profundissimo sub sarracenis et infidelibus erunt, sicut patet D 1, 18. Quia sicut homo</p>	<p>In evil profits, the devil helps such men, and either lends to them, or hands over in another way for commerce, or lends for their spending. According to Matthew 4: 'All these will I give thee', he says, about which since he did not know how to render the account, he took him with him for placing into the infernal gaol, until he might return the final coin, which shall never happen. Therefore, false profiteers act in his image, and lest they suffer similar to him, and are placed most deeply in the same gaol, for that reason, I say most deeply, they shall be under the Saracens and infidels as is shown D 1, 18 [Damnatio 18]. Since just as the man is more angry against a false coin which appears good, since it readily deceives</p>
	1930	<p>illud Mat. 4, omnia inquit hec tibi dabo de quibus quia nesciuit compositum reddere, accepit eum secum ad ponendum in carcere inferni usque reddat vltimum quadrantem quod nunquam erit. Falsi ergo lucratores de ipso speculum suum faciant, ne et ipsi similia paciantur, et in eodem carcere profundissimo ponantur, ideo dico profundissimo sub sarracenis et infidelibus erunt, sicut patet D 1, 18. Quia sicut homo</p>	<p>Since just as the man is more angry against a false coin which appears good, since it readily deceives</p>
	1940	<p>illud Mat. 4, omnia inquit hec tibi dabo de quibus quia nesciuit compositum reddere, accepit eum secum ad ponendum in carcere inferni usque reddat vltimum quadrantem quod nunquam erit. Falsi ergo lucratores de ipso speculum suum faciant, ne et ipsi similia paciantur, et in eodem carcere profundissimo ponantur, ideo dico profundissimo sub sarracenis et infidelibus erunt, sicut patet D 1, 18. Quia sicut homo</p>	<p>Since just as the man is more angry against a false coin which appears good, since it readily deceives</p>

43	<p>1950 plus irascitur contra denarium falsum qui apparet bonus quia cicius per eum dicitur, quam contra manifeste plumbeum per quem non faciliter decipitur, ita deus contra falsos cristianos qui ut bonos decipiant nituntur boni apparere. Tales in collatione priuata solent sanctissime loqui et seipsos in tantum iustificat quod pro toto mundo ut dicunt vnam non facerent falsitatem nec aliquem de suis facere permetterent. Et si</p> <p>1960 sermo fiat de falsis hominibus, ipsos detestantur, et statum illorum cum suspiriis plangunt. Sed ita bonam et veram faciunt partem suam in uerbis ita falsam eam faciunt in opere, de quibus Gen. 27, vox quidem vox iacob, sed manus manus sunt esau. Et in Ps. corde et corde locuti sunt.</p> <p>Quia fidei corde et ore loqui videntur, quando non habent occasionem falsum committendi, sed alio corde, et ore quando predam vident et oportunitas occurrit falsitatem faciendi. Pro talibus tota orat ecclesia dicens, disperdat dominus vniuersa labia dolosa, in Ps. Non solum illorum qui faciunt, sed per quos hec faciunt qui sunt quasi manus illius capitis. Sed caueant quia sicut homine delictum committente pro quo manum amittere debet, si vnam manum habeat aridam illa amputari debet. Ita in proposito oculus nequam erui debet, sicut patet C 11, 4, et manus arida amputari et in ignem mitti. Quando enim dominus quisquam de aliquo confidit quod in agendis suis siue que animam tangunt siue corpus fideliter aget quasi pro manu illum habet. Si autem illum decipiat et quod ei commissum est fideliter non faciat manus arida est, et abscidetur, et in ignem mittetur, quia contra dominum est manus</p>	<p>him, than against an obvious lead coin which does not deceive him easily, so God against false Christians who strive to appear good so as to deceive the good. Such are accustomed to speak in a private collatio in a holy manner, and justify themselves so much, that for the whole world, as they say, they do not make a single falsity, nor permit anyone of theirs to make one. And if a sermon is made concerning false men, they draw a curse on themselves, and bewail the condition of the false men with deep sighs. But just as they make their part good and true in words, so they make it false in their work, of which Genesis 27: ‘The voice indeed is the voice of Jacob; but the hands are the hands of Esau.’ And in the Psalms [11]: ‘with a double heart they have spoken.’</p> <p>Since they appear to speak with a faithful heart and mouth when they do not have the opportunity of committing a false deed, but in another heart and mouth when they see the prize and an opportunity of committing falsity occurs. For such men the whole church prays, saying, ‘may the lord destroy all deceitful lips’, in the Psalms [11]. Not just of those who do these things, but through whom they do them, who are as if the hand of that head. But beware, since just as with a man committing an offence for which he must lose a hand, if he has one withered hand, it must be amputated. Thus, in the proposition, the evil eye ought to be destroyed, as is shown C 11, 4 [Consilium 4], and the withered hand amputated, and cast into the fire. When the lord confides something about a matter, because he acts in good faith in his dealings, which either touch the soul or the body, it is as if he has him for a hand. If however the man deceives him, and does not do faithfully what has been commissioned for him, the hand is withered, cut off and cast into the fire, ‘because their hand is against God [the lord]’,</p>
----	--	---

		eorum, Mich. 2.	Micheas 2.
--	--	-----------------	------------

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

- Avignon, Bibliothèque Municipale, Manuscripts 305 and 306
 British Library Manuscript, Royal 7 E. iv
 British Library Manuscript, Harley 106
 Cambridge, Peterhouse, Manuscripts 24 and 25
 Cardiff, Public Library, Manuscript 3. 174
 Oxford, Oriel College, Manuscript 10

PRINTED SOURCES

- Aesop's Fables*, trans. by Laura Gibbs, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
 Albert of Castile, *Brevis et Compendiosa Cronica de Magistris Generalibus et Viris Illustribus Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Venice: Lazarus de Soardis, 1504)
 Albertus Magnus, *Opera Omnia*, 38 vols, ed. by E. Borgnet (Paris: Ludovicus Vives, 1890-99), xxxvii (1898)
 Altamura, Ambrosius, *Bibliothecae Dominicanae* (Rome: Nicolas Angelus Tinassius, 1677)
 An Alphabet of Tales: An English 15th century translation of the *Alphabetum narrationum*, ed. by Mary Banks (London: Early English Text Society, 1904)
 An Old English Miscellany, ed. by R. Morris (London: Early English Text Society, 1872)
 Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo?* in *A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham*, ed. and trans. by Eugene Rathbone Fairweather (Westminster: John Knox Press, 1956)
 Anstey, Henry, (ed.), *Munimenta academica, or, Documents illustrative of academical life and studies at Oxford*, 2 vols (London: Longmans, 1868), 1
 Anthony of Siena, *Bibliotheca Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum* (Paris: Nicolas Nivelles, 1585)
 Aquinas, Thomas, *Opuscula Omnia* (Venice: Girolamo Scotto, 1587)
 -----*Corpus Thomisticum*
 ----- *Summa Theologica*, ed. and trans. by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benziger Bros., 1947-48)
 Augustine, *Contra Mendacium*, ed. by Joseph Zycha, *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 41 (Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1866)
 ----- *Sermon on the Mount; Harmony of the Gospels; Homilies on the Gospels*, ed. by Philip Schaff, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 14 vols, Series I (Buffalo, New York: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1888), vi
 ----- *Epistulae*, ed. by A. Goldbacher, CSEL, 44 (Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1904)
 ----- *Against Lying*, trans. by H.B. Jaffee in *Augustine, Treatises on Various Subjects*, ed. by Roy Deferrari (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1952)
 ----- *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. and trans. by R.P.H. Green (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995)
 ----- *Augustine, The City of God Against the Pagans*, ed. and trans. by R.W. Dyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
 ----- *On the Trinity*, ed. by G. Matthews and trans. by S. McKenna (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

- Bale, John, *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, ed. by R. Lane Poole (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902)
 ----- *Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brytanniae Catalogus*, 2 vols (Basel: Johann Oporinus, 1557-59)
- Bannister, A.T. (ed.), *Registrum Ade de Orleton, episcopi Herefordensis, 1317-27* (London: Canterbury and York Society, 1908)
- Baron, Vincent, *Libri V apologetici pro religione, utraque theologia, moribus ac juribus Ord. Praed.* (Paris: Piget, 1666)
- Bonaventure, *Commentaria in quatuor libros sententiarum Magistri Peter Lombardi*, 4 vols in *Opera Omnia* (Quaracchi: College of St Bonaventure, 1882)
- The Book of Vices and Virtues: A Fourteenth Century English Translation of the Somme le Roi of Lorens d'Orléans*, ed. by W.N., Francis (London: Early English Text Society, 1942)
- Britton, trans. by F. Nicholas (Washington DC: John Byrne, 1902)
- Bromyard, John, *Summa Praedicatorum*, 2 vols (Basel: Johann Amerbach, 1484)
 ----- *Opus Trivium* (Cologne: Ulrich Zell, 1473)
- Calendar of Papal Registers Relating To Great Britain and Ireland: Volume 2, 1305-1342*, ed. by W.H. Bliss (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1895), British History Online <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-papal-registers/brit-ie/vol2>>
- Chapters of the Augustinian Canons*, ed. H. E. Salter (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922)
- Chatillon, Walter, *The Alexandreis: A Twelfth-Century Epic*, trans by. David Townsend (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996)
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, *The Riverside Chaucer*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Codex Iustiniani* (Paris: Guillaume Merlin, 1559)
- A Collection of the Laws and Canons of the Church of England*, trans. by John Johnson, 2 vols (Oxford: Parker, 1851)
- Concordantiae bibliorum* (Reutlingen: Michel Greyff, not after 1481) <<http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0004/bsb00041531/images/>>
- Corpus Iuris Canonici* (Rome, 1582)
- Crane, Thomas (ed.), *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the Sermones Vulgares of Jacques de Vitry* (London: D. Nutt, 1890)
- Denifle, Heinrich (ed.), 'Die Constitutionen des Predigerordens vom Jahre 1228', in *Archiv für Literatur-und Kirchen-Geschichte des Mittelalters*, ed. by Heinrich Denifle and Franz Ehrle, 7 vols (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1885-1900), 1 (1885)
- Devlin, Mary (ed.), *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester, 1373-89*, 2 vols, (London: Royal Historical Society, 1954)
- Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils: Text, Translation and Commentary*, trans. by H. J. Schroeder (St. Louis: Herder, 1937)
- Dives and Pauper*, ed by Priscilla Barnum (London: Early English Text Society, 1976)
- Eisengrein, Wilhelm, *Catalogus Testium Veritatis Locupletissimus, Omnium Orthodoxae Matris Ecclesiae Doctorum* (Dillingen: Sebald Mayer, 1565)
- English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues*, ed. by R. Sharpe et al (London: British Library, 1996)
- Fabricius, Johann Albert, *Bibliotheca Latina*, 6 vols (Florence: Baracchi, 1858)

- Fasciculus Morum: A Fourteenth-Century Preacher's Handbook, ed. by Siegfried Wenzel (University Park, London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989)
- Foresti, Jacopo Filippo, Supplementum Chronicarum (Venice: Bernardinus Benalius, 1483)
- The Friars' Libraries*, ed. by K. W. Humphreys, CBMLC, I (London, 1990)
- Gerard de Frachet, Vitae Fratrum Ordinis Praedicatorum, ed. by B.M. Reichert (Leuven: Charpentier and Schoonjans, 1896)
- Lives of the Brethren of the Order of Preachers, 1206-1259, trans. by Placid Conway and ed. by Bede Jarrett (London: Blackfriars Publications, 1955)
- Gesner, Conrad, Bibliotheca Universalis sive Catalogus Omnium Scriptorum Locupletissimus (Zürich: Christoph Froschauer, 1545)
- Giles of Rome, De Regimine Principum (Venice: Bernardino Viani, 1502)
- Horn, Andrew, The Mirror of Justices, ed. by William Joseph Whittaker (London: Selden Society, 1895)
- Humbert of Romans, Opera de Vita Regulari, ed. by J.J. Berthier, 2 vols (Torino: Marietti, 1956)
- Isidore of Seville, The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville, XVII, trans. by Stephen Barney and others (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- Jacob's Well: An English Treatise on the Cleansing of Man's Conscience, Part I*, ed. by A. Brandeis (London: Early English Text Society, 1900)
- James, Thomas, Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis, Tributa in Libros Duos, 2 vols (London: Bishop and Norton, 1600), II
- Jerome, Jerome, Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas Lib. III, Cap. V in Patrologia Latina, 217 vols, ed. by J.-P. Migne (Paris: Migne, 1841-1855), XXVI (1845)
- Kant, Immanuel, Practical Philosophy, ed. and trans. by Mary Gregor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Kirkestede, Henry of, Catalogus de Libris Autenticis et Apocrafis, ed. by Rouse and Rouse, CBMLC, 11 (London: British Library, 2004)
- Langland, William, The Vision of Piers Plowman: A Critical edition of the B-Text based on Trinity College Cambridge MS B.15.17, ed. by A.V.C. Schmidt (London: Everyman, 1995)
- Piers Plowman: A New Annotated Edition of the C-Text, ed. by Derek Pearsall (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2008)
- The Lay Folks' Catechism, or, The English and Latin versions of Archbishop Thoresby's instruction for the people*, ed. by T. Simmons (London: Early English Text Society, 1987)
- Leland, John, Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis, ed. by Anthony Hall, 2 vols (Oxford: Sheldon, 1709)
- The Libraries of King Henry VIII, ed. by James Carley, CBLMC, 7 (London: British Academy, 2000)
- Lollard Sermons, ed. by Gloria Cigman (Oxford: Early English Text Society, 1989)
- Lombard, Peter, Sentences, trans. by Giulio Silano, 4 vols (Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2008)
- Manuel, Don Juan, *The Book of Count Lucanor and Patronio: A Translation of Don Juan Manuel's 'El Conde Lucanor'*, trans. by John Keller and Keating Clark (New York: Peter Lang, 1993)
- Middle English Sermons from British Museum MS. Royal 18 B. xxiii, ed. by W.O. Ross, Early English Text Society o.s. 209 (London: Oxford University Press, 1940; repr. 1987)
- Mirk, John, *John Mirk's Festial*, ed. by Susan Powell (Oxford: Early English Text Society, 2009)

- *Myrc's Instructions for Parish Priests*, ed. by Edward Peacock (London: Early English Text Society, 1868)
- Montaigne, Michele de, 'De la Praesumption', *Les Essais*, ed. by P. Villey and V.-L. Saulnier (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965)
- Murimuth, Adam, *Adæ Murimuth Continuatio Chronicarum*, ed. by E. Thompson (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1889)
- Ockham, William, *De corpore christi in eucharistia in Opera Theologica*, Volume X, ed. by Carolus Grassi (St Bonaventure: Franciscan Institute, 1986)
- Oudin, Remi-Casimir, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiae Antiquis*, 3 vols (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1722)
- Pastors and the care of souls in Medieval England*, ed. by J. Shinnars and W.J. Dohar (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1998)
- Peraldus, William, *Homelieae sive Sermones* (Lyon: Charles Pesnot, 1576)
- *Summae Virtutum ac Vitiorum*, 2 vols (Paris: Peter Billaine, 1629)
- Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, trans. by F.C. Conybeare, 2 vols (London: Loeb Classical Library, 1912)
- Piò, Giovanni Michele, *Della Vite degli Huomini Illustri di S. Domenico* (Bologna: Bonomi, 1620), column 94. Vincent Baron, *Libri V Apologetici pro Religione, utraque Theologia, Moribus, ac Iuribus Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Paris: Piget, 1666)
- Pits, John, *Relationum Historicarum de Rebus Anglicis* (Paris: Thierry and Cramoisy, 1619)
- Possevino, Antonio, *Apparatus Sacer ad Scriptores Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (Cologne: Joannes Gymnicum, 1608)
- Quétif Jacques, and Jacques Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Recensiti Notis Historicis et Criticis Illustrati Auctoribus*, 2 vols (Paris: Ballard and Simart, 1719-21), I (1719)
- Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum ueterum*, the Latin Text established by R. A. B. Mynors, ed. by R. H. Rouse and M. A. Rouse (London: British Academy, 1991)
- The Register of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1414-1443*, ed. by E.F. Jacob with the assistance of H.C. Johnson, 4 vols (Oxford: Canterbury and York Society, 1937-47), II (1937)
- Registrum Johannis de Trillek: episcopi Herefordensis, 1344-1361*, ed. by J.H. Parry (London: Canterbury and York Society, 1912)
- Registrum Ricardi de Swinfield, Episcopi Herefordensis, 1283-1317*, ed. by W.W. Capes (London: Canterbury and York Society, 1909)
- Registrum Thome de Cantilupo: episcopi Herefordensis, 1275-1282*, ed. by R.G. Griffiths and W.W. Capes (London: Canterbury and York Society, 1907)
- Registrum Thome de Charlton, episcopi Herefordensis, 1327-1344*, ed. by W.W. Capes (London: Canterbury and York Society, 1913)
- Richard de Bury, *The Philobiblon of Richard de Bury: Bishop of Durham, Treasurer and Chancellor of Edward III*, ed. and trans. by Ernest Thomas (London: K. Paul, Trench and Company, 1888)
- Six Ecclesiastical Satires*, ed. by James McMurrin Dean (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1991)

- The Statutes at Large: From the Magna Charta, to the End of the Eleventh Parliament of Great Britain, Anno 1761 [continued to 1806], ed. by Danby Pickering, 46 vols (Cambridge: Joseph Bentham, 1762-1806)
- Statutes of the Realm, ed. and trans. by C. Stephenson and F. G Marcham, 11 vols (London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1810-1828)
- Stone, Brian (ed.), *Medieval English Verse* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964)
- Syon Abbey, ed. by Vincent Gillespie (London: British Library, 2001), CBMLC, 9
- Tanner, Thomas, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica* (London: Bowyer, 1748)
- Thomas of Eccleston, *De Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Anglium*, ed. by Father Cuthbert (London: Sands and Co., 1909)
- Toulmin Smith, L., (ed.), 'Parliamentary petitions relating to Oxford', in *Collectanea*, ed. by Montagu Burrows, 3rd ser., 32 (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, Clarendon Press, 1896), pp. 77-161
- Trithemius, Johannes, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* (Basel: Johann Amerbach, 1494)
- The University and College Libraries of Cambridge, ed. by P. D. Clarke, with an Introduction by R. Lovatt, CBMLC (London: British Library, 2002).
- Walsingham, Thomas, *Chronicon Angliae*, ed. Edward Maunde Thompson (London: Longman, 1874)
- Thomae Walsingham, quondam monachi S. Albani, *historia Anglicana*, ed. H.T. Riley, 2 vols., pt 1 of *Chronica monasterii S. Albani*, *Rolls Series*, 28 (London: Longman, 1863-4)
- George F. Warner and Julius P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections*, 4 vols (London: Longman, 1921)
- Wharton, Henry and William Cave, *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria*, 2 vols (Basel: Johann Rudolph Im Hof, 1745)
- William of Saint Amour's De Periculis Novissimorum Temporum: A Critical Edition, Translation, and Introduction*, ed. by G. Geltner (Leuven: Peeters, 2008)
- Wyclif, John, *The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted*, ed. by F.D. Matthew (London: Early English Text Society, 1880)
- *De Eucharistia*, ed. by J. Loserth (London: Wyclif Society, 1892)

SECONDARY WORKS

Theses and dissertations

- Bartle, R.H., 'A study of private book collections in England between c. 1200 and the early years of the sixteenth century, with special reference to books belonging to ecclesiastical dignitaries' (unpublished bachelor of letter's thesis, Oxford, 1958)
- Brim, Constance, 'The development and decline of British antifraternall literature' (unpublished doctoral Thesis, McMaster University, 1990)
- Burakov, Olga, *False speech: Sins of the tongue, selfhood, and Middle English romances* (unpublished doctoral thesis, New York University, 2008)
- Cavanaugh, Susan H., 'A study of books privately owned in England, 1300-1450' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1980)
- Corran, Emily, 'Lying and Perjury in Medieval Practical Thought' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University College London, 2015)

- Forde, Simon, 'Writings of a Reformer: A look at Sermon Studies and Bible Studies through Repyngdon's *Sermones super Evangelia Dominicalia*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham, 1985)
- Gunn, Maureen, 'The *Summa Praedicatorum* of John Bromyard and its relationship to fourteenth-century Christianity' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Montreal, 1977)
- Houlihan, Catherine, 'The Medieval Preacher: Chapters from the *Summa Predicantium* of John Bromyard, O.P.' (unpublished master's thesis, University of Birmingham, 1959)
- Laing, Gregory L., 'Bound by Words: Oath-taking and Oath-breaking in Medieval Iceland and Anglo-Saxon England' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Western Michigan University, 2004)
- Lozar, Angelika, 'Studien zur *Summa Predicantium* des John Bromyard' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Freie Universität, Berlin, 1998)
- Mifsud, G. 'John Sheppey, bishop of Rochester, as preacher and collector of sermons' (unpublished bachelor of letter's thesis, Oxford, 1953)
- Oross, Denis, 'John Bromyard: Medieval Sermon Encyclopedist' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1971)
- Sumithra. J. David, 'Looking East and West: The Reception and Dissemination of the *Topographia Hibernica* and the *Itinerarium ad partes Orientales* in England [1185-c. 1500]' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2009)
- Torrey, Michael David, 'Anxieties of deception in English morality plays and Shakespearean drama' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Virginia, 1996)
- Trivasse, K.M., 'The training and pastoral work of the Dominicans of the English province during the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries' (unpublished master's thesis, Manchester, 1990)

Printed secondary literature

- A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum, 4 vols (London: The British Museum, 1808-12)
- Adams, Robert, 'The Rokeles: an index for a "Langland" family history', *The Cambridge Companion to Piers Plowman*, ed. by Andrew Cole and Andrew Galloway (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014)
- Ainsworth, Thomas, 'Form vs. Matter', in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2016)
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/form-matter/>>
- Alford, John, 'The Role of the Quotations in *Piers Plowman*', *Speculum*, 52 (Jan, 1977), 80-99
- Allen, Elizabeth, *False fables and exemplary truth in later Middle English literature* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005)
- Allen, John, *Bibliotheca Herefordensis; or, A descriptive catalogue of books, pamphlets, maps, prints, etc.* (Hereford: J.Allen, 1821)
- Amory, Frederic, 'Whited Sepulchres: The Semantic History of Hypocrisy to the High Middle Ages', *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 53 (1986), 5-39
- Andrews, Robert (ed.), *The Columbia Dictionary of Quotations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993)
- Anon., *The Topographer* (London, 1789)
- Anon., *Archaeologia Cambrensis* (London, 1850)

- Arnold, John, *Inquisition and Power: Catharism and the Confessing Subject in Medieval Languedoc* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001)
- *Belief and Unbelief in Medieval Europe* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005)
- Aston, T.H., 'Oxford's Medieval Alumni', *Past and Present*, 74 (1977), 3-40
- Aston, T.H., G. D. Duncan and T. A. R. Evans, 'The Medieval Alumni of the University of Cambridge', *Past and Present*, 86 (1980), 9-86
- Aylmer, Gerald and J.E. Tiller, *Hereford Cathedral: a history* (London: Hambledon Press, 2000)
- Baker, John, *An Introduction to English Legal History*, 4th ed. (London: Butterworths, 2000)
- Bannister, Arthur, *The Cathedral Church of Hereford: Its History and Constitution* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1924)
- Barber, Peter, et al, *Mapping Our World: Terra Incognita To Australia* (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2013)
- Barr, Helen, *Signes and Sothe: Language in the Piers Plowman Tradition* (Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1994)
- Bayless, Martha, *Parody in the Middle Ages: The Latin Tradition* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996)
- Beeching, H., 'The Library of the Cathedral Church of Norwich' with M.R. James, 'Priory Manuscripts now in English Libraries', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 19 (1917), 67-116
- Benson, David, *Public Piers Plowman: Modern Scholarship and Late Medieval English Culture* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004)
- Bestul, Thomas H., 'True and False "Cheere" in Chaucer's "Clerk's Tale"', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 82 (1983), 500-514
- Binkley, Peter, 'John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans' in *Centres of learning: learning and location in pre-modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. by J. W. Drijvers and A. A. MacDonald (Leiden: Brill, 1995), pp. 255-64
- 'Preachers' Responses to Thirteenth-century Encyclopaedism' in *Pre-Modern Encyclopaedic Texts: Proceedings of the Second COMERS Congress, Groningen, 1-4 July 1996*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 79, ed. by Peter Binkley (Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 75-88
- 'John Bromyard', ODNB (2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3521>> [accessed 21 January 2013]
- Birch, W., *Memorials of the See and Cathedral of Llandaff* (Neath: John Richards, 1912)
- Bloomfield, M.W., et al., *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues, and Vices, 1100-1500 AD*, *Medieval Academy of America Publications*, 88 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1979)
- Boehner Philotheus, 'Ockham's Theory of Truth', *Franciscan Studies*, n.s. 5, 2 (1945), pp. 138-61
- Bolton, Brenda, *The Medieval Reformation* (London: Edward Arnold, 1983)
- Boroditsky, Lera and Alice Gaby, 'Remembrances of Times East: Absolute Spatial Representations of Time in an Australian Aboriginal Community', *Psychological Science*, 21, 11 (2010), 1635-39
- Bosworth, Joseph, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth*, ed. by Thomas Northcote Toller (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898)
- Boyle, Leonard, 'The Constitution "Cum ex eo" of Boniface VIII: Education of Parochial Clergy', *Mediaeval Studies*, 24 (1) (1962), 263-302

- ‘The Date of the Summa Praedicatorum of John Bromyard’, *Speculum*, 48 (1973), 553-7
- ‘The Summa Confessorum of John of Freiburg and the popularization of the moral teaching of St. Thomas and some of his contemporaries’ in *St. Thomas Aquinas 1274-1974. Commemorative Studies*, 2 vols (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1974), I, pp. 245-68
- ‘Notes on the education of the Fratres Communes in the Dominican Order in the Thirteenth Century’, in *Xenia medii aevi historiam illustrantia oblata Thomae Kaeppeli, O.P.*, ed. by R. Creytens and P. Kuenzle, *Storia e letteratura*, 141 (Rome: Edizioni di Storia E Letteratura, 1978), pp. 149-267
- ‘The Fourth Lateran Council and Manuals of Popular Theology’, in *The Popular Literature of Medieval England*, ed. by T.J. Heffernan, *Tennessee Studies in Literature*, 28 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), pp. 30-43
- Bradshaw, Henry, *Collected papers of Henry Bradshaw* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1889)
- Brand, Paul, *The Making of the Common Law* (London: Hambledon, 1992)
- Brinton, Alan, ‘St. Augustine and the problem of deception in religious persuasion’, *Religious studies*, 19, 4 (1983), 437-50
- Briscoe, Marianne, *Artes Praedicandi, Typologie des Sources du Moyen Age* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992)
- Brown, Michelle, *Guide to western historical scripts: from antiquity to 1600* (London: British Library, 1990)
- Brundage, J., *The Medieval Origins of the Legal Profession* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008)
- *Medieval Canon Law* (London: Longman, 1996)
- Bruschi, Caterina and Peter Biller (eds), *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy* (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2003)
- Buck, M. C., ‘Hythe, Hamo (b. c. 1270, d. in or after 1357)’, ODNB (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37508>>
- Butler, L.A.S., ‘Excavations at Blackfriars, Hereford, 1958’, *Transactions of the Woolhope Naturalists’ Field Club*, 36 (1960), 334-42
- Capes, W.W., *Charters and Records of Hereford Cathedral* (Hereford: Wilson and Phillips, 1908)
- Carson, Thomas, *Lying and Deception: Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)
- Casciani, Santa, ‘Reason, Deception, and Franciscan Spirituality in *Inferno* 26 and 27’, *Quaderni d’italianistica*, 22, 2 (2001), 37-55
- Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements, second series, 53 vols (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1886-1960)
- Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library, ed. by R.B. Mynors and R.M. Thomson (Cambridge: D.S.Brewer, 1993)
- Carruthers, Mary, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Catto, J., ‘Citizens, scholars and masters’ in *The History of the University of Oxford: The Early Oxford Schools*, volume 1, ed. by T.H. Aston (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), pp. 151-92
- Clanchy, Michael, *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066–1307* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013)
- Clancy, Martin, *The Philosophy of Deception* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)

- Clopper, Lawrence, *'Songes of Rechelesnesse': Langland and the Franciscans* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998)
- Cooley, Charles H., *On Self and Social Organization*, ed. by Hans-Joachim Schubert (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998)
- Connolly, Margaret and Linne R. Mooney (eds), *Design and Distribution of Late Medieval Manuscripts in England* (York: University of York, 2008)
- Coss, Peter, 'An Age of Deference' in *A Social History of England, 1200-1500*, ed. by Rosemary Horrox and W. Mark Ormrod (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- Coulton, G. *Five Centuries of Religion: Getting and spending*, 4 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927-50)
- Courtenay, W.J., *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987)
- Cowgill, Bruce Kent, "'By corpus dominus": Harry Bailly as false spiritual guide', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance studies*, 15 (1985), 157-81
- Cox, John, *Shakespeare and the Dramaturgy of Power* (Princeton : Princeton University Press, 2014)
- Coxe, Henry O., *Catalogus Codicum MSS. qui in Collegiis Aulisque Oxoniensibus Hodie Adservantur*, 2 vols (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1852), I
- Craun, Edwin D., *Lies, Slander, and Obscenity in Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- *Ethics and Power in Medieval English Reformist Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)
- Creytens, R., 'Les écrivains dominicains dans la chronique d'Albert de Castello', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 30 (1960), 227-313
- Crocker, Lester Gilbert, 'The Problem of Truth and Falsehood in the Age of the Enlightenment', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 14, 4 (1953), 573-603
- Crotty, H., 'The history of insanity in criminal law', *California Law Review*, 12, 2 (1924)
- Croniques de London*, ed. by G. Aungier (London: Camden Society, 1844)
- Danziger, Shai and Robert Ward, 'Language Changes Implicit Associations between Ethnic Groups and Evaluation in Bilinguals', *Psychological Science*, 21, 6 (2010), 799-800
- David, Marian, 'The Correspondence Theory of Truth', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2015)
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/truth-correspondence>>
- Davies, James, *Handbook to Blackfriars' Monastery* (Hereford, 1855)
- Davies, Rees, *Lords and Lordship in the British Isles in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- 'Wakering, John (d. 1425)', *ODNB* (Oxford University Press, 2004)
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28424>>
- Davis, James, *Medieval Market Morality Life, Law and Ethics in the English Marketplace, 1200-1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- D'Avray, D.L., *The Preaching of the Friars. Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985)

- Denery, Dallas George, 'From Sacred Mystery to Divine Deception: Robert Holkot, John Wyclif and the Transformation of Fourteenth-Century Eucharistic Discourse', *Journal of religious history*, 29 (2005), 129-144
- Seeing and Being Seen in the Late-Medieval World: Optics, Theology and Religious Life (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- 'Biblical Liars and Medieval Theologians' in *The Seven Deadly Sins: From Individuals to Communities*, ed. Richard Newhauser (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 111-28
- *The Devil Wins: A History of Lying from the Garden of Eden to the Enlightenment* ((Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015)
- Denholm-Young, Noel, *Seignorial Administration* (London: Routledge, 1963)
- Devlin, Mary, 'Bishop Thomas Brunton and His Sermons', *Speculum*, 14 (1939), 322-44
- Dohar, William J., *The Black Death and Pastoral Leadership: The diocese of Hereford in the fourteenth century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995)
- Douglas, Mary, *Implicit Meanings: Selected Essays in Anthropology* (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Doyle A. and M.B. Parkes, 'The Production of Copies of the Canterbury Tales and the *Confessio Amantis* in the *Early Fifteenth Century*' in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts, and Libraries: Essays Presented to N. R. Ker*, ed. by V. Scattergood and A. Watson (London: Scolar, 1978), pp. 163-210
- Driver, J.T., 'The Papacy and the diocese of Hereford, 1307-77: some aspects of ecclesiastical administration in the fourteenth century', *Church Quarterly Review*, 145, 289 (1947), 31-47
- Duby, Georges, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined* (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 1980)
- (ed.), *A History of Private Life. Volume 2: Revelations of the Medieval World*, trans. by Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1993)
- Duncumb, J., *Collections towards the history and antiquities of the County of Hereford*, 2 vols (Hereford: Wright, 1804)
- Dunning, Robert W., 'Beckington, Thomas (1390?-1465)', ODNB (Oxford University Press, 2004), <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1908>>
- Elliott, Dyan, 'True Presence/False Christ: The Antinomies of Embodiment in Medieval Spirituality', *Mediaeval Studies*, 64 (2002), 241-66
- Emden, Alfred, *A survey of the Dominicans in England, based on the ordination lists in episcopal registers, 1268 to 1538* (Rome: Istituto Storico Domenicano, 1967)
- 'Dominican Confessors and Preachers Licensed by Medieval English Bishops', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 32 (1962), 180-210
- *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957-59)
- *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge University Press, 1963)
- Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, ed. by T.O. Sloane (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001)
- Enos, Richard Leo, and Roger Thompson (eds), *The Rhetoric of St Augustine of Hippo: De Doctrina Christiana and the Search for a Distinctly Christian Rhetoric* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008)

- Fantham, Elaine, 'Eloquence' in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, ed. by T.O. Sloane (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 250-60
- Feehan, Thomas D., 'Augustine on Lying and Deception', *Augustinian Studies*, 19 (1988), 131-40
 ----- 'The Morality of Lying in St. Augustine', *Augustinian Studies*, 21 (1990), 67-81
- Fichtenau, Heinrich, *Heretics and Scholars in the High Middle Ages* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000)
- Fletcher, Alan, 'A Death Lyric from the Summa Predicantium, MS. Oriel College 10', *Notes and Queries*, n.s. 24 (1977), 11-12
 ----- "'The unity of the state exists in the unity of its minds": A fifteenth century sermon on the three estates', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s., 22 (1991), 103-37
 ----- 'The Topical Hypocrisy of the Pardoner' in A. Fletcher, *Preaching, politics and poetry in late-medieval England* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1998), pp. 266-80
 ----- *Preaching, Politics and Poetry in Late-Medieval England* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1998)
 ----- *Late-Medieval Popular Preaching in Britain and Ireland: Texts, Studies, and Interpretations* (Brepols, 2009)
- Forrest, Ian, *The Detection of Heresy in Late Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)
 ----- 'The Politics of Burial in late-medieval Hereford', *English Historical Review*, 125 (2010), 1110-38
- Foucault, Michel, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (New York: Pantheon, 1980)
 ----- *The Courage of Truth: The Government of Self and Others II*, trans. by G.Burchell (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)
- Fowler, Joseph Thomas (ed.), *Memorials of the Church of SS. Peter and Wilfrid, Ripon*, 4 vols (Durham: Andrews and Co., 1882-1908), IV (1908)
- Franke, P.R., 'Pyrrhus' in *The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 7, Part 2: The Rise of Rome to 220 BC*, ed. by F.W. Walbank, et al (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 456-85
- Freud, Sigmund, *Collected Papers*, trans. by Alix and James Strachey, 5 vols (New York: Basic Books, 1959), III
- Gal, Susan, 'Language and the Arts of Resistance', *Cultural Anthropology*, 10, 3 (1995), 407-24
- Gelber, Hester G., *It Could Have Been Otherwise: Contingency and Necessity in Dominican Theology at Oxford, 1300-1350* (Leiden: Brill, 2004)
- Ernest Gellner, *Relativism and the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)
 ----- *The Uniqueness of Truth: A Sermon Before the University* (London: King's College, 1992)
- Geltner, Guy, 'Faux Semblants': Antifraternalism Reconsidered in Jean de Meun and Chaucer', *Studies in Philology*, 101, 4 (2004), 357-80
 ----- 'Brethren Behaving Badly: A Deviant Approach to Medieval', *Speculum*, 85 (2010), 47-64
 ----- *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism: Polemic, Violence, Deviance, and Remembrance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)
- George, Marie I., 'Imagination as Source of Falsehood in Aquinas', *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association*, 67 (1993), 187-202
- Gigerenzer, Gerd, 'External Validity of Laboratory Experiments: The Frequency-Validity Relationship', *The American Journal of Psychology*, 97 (2) (1984), 185-95

- Gillespie, V., 'Doctrina and Predicacio: The Design and Function of Some Pastoral Manuals', Leeds Studies in English, n.s. 11, 36-50
- Given, James, *Inquisition and Medieval Society: Power, Discipline and Resistance in Languedoc* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1997)
- Glanzberg, Michael, 'Truth', Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2013)
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/truth/>>
- Goffman, Erving, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990)
- Goodich, Michael, 'Microhistory and the inquisitiones into the life and miracles of Philip of Bourges and Thomas of Hereford' in *Medieval Narrative Sources: A Gateway Into the Medieval Mind*, ed. by Werner Verbeke, Ludovicus Milis and Jean Goossens (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), pp. 91-106
- Greatrex, Joan, 'Monk Students from Norwich Cathedral Priory at Oxford and Cambridge, c. 1300–1530', *English Historical Review*, 106 (1991), 555-83
- *Biographical Register of the English Cathedral Priories of the Province of Canterbury, c. 1066 to 1540* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)
- *The English Benedictine Cathedral Priories: Rule and Practice, c.1270-c.1420* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Green, Richard Firth, *A Crisis of Truth: Literature and Law in Ricardian England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002)
- "'Allas, Allas! That Evere Love Was Synne!": John Bromyard V. Alice of Bath', *The Chaucer Review*, 42, 3 (2008), 298-311
- Green, Thomas, *Verdict According to Conscience: Perspectives on the English Criminal Trial Jury, 1200-1800* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988)
- Griffiths, Paul J., *Lying: An Augustinian Theology of Duplicity* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2004)
- Griswold, Charles, 'Plato on Rhetoric and Poetry', in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2016)
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/plato-rhetoric/>>
- Guillemain, Bernard, *La Cour Pontificale d'Avignon 1309-1376* (Paris: de Boccard, 1966)
- Guzman, G., 'The Testimony of Medieval Dominicans concerning Vincent of Beauvais', in S. Lusignan and M. Paulmier-Foucart (eds.), *Lector et Compilator. Vincent de Beauvais, Frère Prêcheur. Un intellectuel et son milieu au XIIIe siècle* (Grâne: Créaphis, 1997), pp. 303-26
- Haines, Roy, *The Church and Politics in Fourteenth-century England: The career of Adam Orleton, c. 1275-1345* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978)
- Hamilton, Bernard, *The Medieval Inquisition* (London: Edward Arnold, 1981)
- Hanawalt, Barbara, *Of Good and Ill Repute* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- Hanna, Ralph, *Pursuing History: Middle English manuscripts and their texts* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996)
- Hanska, J., '*And the rich man also died: and he was buried in hell*': *The Social Ethos in Mendicant Sermons*, *Bibliotheca Historica*, 28 (Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, 1997)
- Haren, Michael, *Sin and Society in Fourteenth-Century England: A Study of the Memoriale Presbiterorum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Havelly, Nicholas R., 'White words, false world: Chaucer's Pandarus and the antifraternal tradition in Troilus, books I-III', *Medium Aevum*, 61 (1992), 250-260

- Havergal, Francis Tebbs, *Fasti Herefordenses* (Edinburgh, 1869)
- Heller, Joseph, *Catch-22: A Novel* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999)
- Hellinge, L., and J.B. Trapp, *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Volume 3, 1400-1557* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)
- Herbert, J.A., *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts of the British Museum*, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1883-1910), III (1910)
- Hicks, Michael, *Bastard Feudalism* (London: Longman, 1995)
- Hinnebusch, William, *The Early English Friars Preachers* (Rome: Istituto Storico Domenicano, 1951)
- Historical Manuscripts Commission, *The Manuscripts of Rye and Hereford Corporations, etc. Thirteenth report, Appendix Part IV* (Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1892)
- Horner, Patrick J., 'Benedictines and preaching the Pastoralia in late medieval England: a preliminary inquiry' in *Medieval monastic preaching*, ed. by Carolyn Muessig (Leiden: Brill 1998), pp. 279-92
- Horobin, Simon, 'Mapping the Words' in *The Production of Books in England, 1350-1500*, ed. by Alexandra Gillespie and Daniel Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 59-78
- Horrox, Rosemary (ed.), *A Social History of England, 1200-1500* (University of Cambridge, 2006)
- Hudson, Anne, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)
- 'Preface', *Lollards and their Influence in Late Medieval England*, ed. by Fiona Somerset, Jill Havens, and Derrick Pitard (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003)
- Hudson, Anne, and Anthony Kenny, 'Wyclif, John (d. 1384)', ODNB, (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30122>>
- Hughes, M. E. J., "'The Feffement That Fals Hath Ymaked": a Study of the Image of the Document in "Piers Plowman" and Some Literary Analogues', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 93 (1992), 125-34
- Humphreys, K.W., *The Book Provisions of the Mediaeval Friars, 1215-1400* (Amsterdam: Erasmus Booksellers, 1964)
- Hunt, Tony, *Teaching and Learning Latin in Thirteenth-Century England*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Boydell and Brewer, 1991)
- Jacobs, Nicolas, 'Gawain's false confession', *English Studies. A journal of English language and literature*, 51 (1970), 433-35
- James, M.R., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899)
- 'The Library of the Grey Friars of Hereford', *Collectanea Franciscana*, 1 (1914), 114-23
- Jansen, K.L., 'Mary Magdalen and the Mendicants: The Preaching of Penance in the Late Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 21 (1995), 1-25
- Jarrett, Bede, *The English Dominicans*, rev. by Walter Gumbley (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1937)
- Johnson, Richard, *The Ancient Customs of Hereford* (Hereford, 1882)
- Jones, Joseph, *Hereford, Cathedral and City* (Hereford, 1858)
- Justice, Steven, *Writing and rebellion: England in 1381* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994)

- Kaeppli, Thomas, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, 4 vols (Rome: S. Sabinae, 1970-93), II (1970)
- Karger, Elizabeth, 'Ockham and Wodeham on Divine Deception as a skeptical hypothesis', *Vivarium*, 42 (2004) 225-36
- Karras, Ruth Mazo, 'Gendered Sin and Misogyny in John of Bromyard's "Summa Predicantium"', *Traditio*, 47 (1992), 233-57
- Katalog der Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Bamberg. 1 Band. 1. Abtheilung. 4. Lieferung. (Theologische Schriftsteller vom XIV. Jahrhundert an), ed. by Friedrich Leitschuh and Hans Fischer (Bamberg: Rudolf Koch, 1887-1912), I, I, IV (1904)
- Kelly, John, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986)
- Kempshall, Matthew S., *Rhetoric and the Writing of History: 400– 1500*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011)
- Ker, N.R., *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1964)
- *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-2002)
- Kershaw, Ian, 'The Great Famine and the Agrarian Crisis in England, 1315-1322', *Past & Present*, 59, 1 (1973), 3-50
- Kienzle, B.M., 'Preaching as Touchstone of Orthodoxy and Dissidence in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 43 (1999), 19-54
- (ed.), *The Sermon, Typologie des Sources des Moyen Age Occidental* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000)
- 'Medieval Sermons and their Performance: Theory and Record' in *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages*, ed. by C. Muessig (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 89-124
- Kijewska, Agnieszka, 'The True and the False 'I' in Boethius' *De consolatione*', *Mediaevalia. Textos e Estudos*, 23 (2004), 217-26
- Knowles, David, *The religious orders in England*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948-1959)
- Kossmann, H., 'Fellowship his fer. A note on Eueryman's false friend', *English Studies. A journal of English language and literature*, 45 (1964), 157-60
- Kroonen, Goos, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-German* (Leiden: Brill, 2003)
- Künne, Wolfgang, *Conceptions of Truth* (New York: Clarendon Press, 2003)
- Kuipers, Giselinde, 'The Sociology of Humor', *The Primer of Humor Research*, ed. by V. Raskin (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), pp. 365-402
- Lambert, M., *Franciscan Poverty: The Doctrine of Absolute Poverty of Christ and the Apostles in the Franciscan Order, 1210-1323* (St. Bonaventure, New York: Franciscan Institute Publications, 1998)
- *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3rd edn. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002)
- Lancaster, H.O., *Expectations of Life: A Study in the Demography, Statistics, and History of World Mortality* (New York: Springer, 1990)
- Larsen, Andrew, 'Are all Lollards Lollards?' in *Lollards and their influence in late medieval England* (Woodbridge, 2003), ed. by Derrick G. Pitard, Fiona Somerset and Jill Havens
- Leach, Arthur, *English Schools at the Reformation, 1546-8* (Westminster: Archibald Constable, 1896)

- The Schools of Medieval England (New York: Macmillan, 1915)
- Lepine, David, “‘A Long Way from University’: Cathedral Canons and Learning at Hereford in the Fifteenth Century in The Church and Learning’ in *Later Medieval Society: Essays in Honour of R.B. Dobson*, ed. by Caroline M. Barron and Jenny Startford (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2002)
- Levy, Ian, ‘Was John Wyclif’s Theology of the Eucharist Donatistic?’, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 53, 2 (2000), 137-53
- Liere, Frans Van, *An introduction to the Medieval Bible* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014)
- Little, A.G., *The Grey Friars in Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford Historical Society, Clarendon Press, 1892)
- ‘Organisation of the Mendicant Friars in England’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, New Series*, 8 (1894), 49-70
- Little, Lester, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe* (London: Paul Elek, 1978)
- Livingstone, E.A., *A Concise Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Lloyd, Simon and Rebecca Reader, ‘Paris, Matthew (c. 1200–1259)’, *ODNB* (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21268>>
- Lobel, M.D., *Historic towns: maps and plans of towns and cities in the British Isles with historical commentaries from earliest times to 1800*, 2 vols (London: Hammond & Kell, 1969)
- MacKean, W.H., *Rochester Cathedral library: its fortunes and adventures through nine centuries* (Rochester: Cathedral Library, 1953)
- Macy, Gary, ‘The Dogma of Transubstantiation in the Middle Ages’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 45, 1 (1994), 11-41
- Madan, F. (ed.), ‘The Daily Ledger of John Dorne, 1520’ in *Collectanea*, ed. by C. Fletcher (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885)
- Maddicott, John, *Thomas of Lancaster, 1307-1322: A study in the reign of Edward II* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970)
- *The English Peasantry and the Demands of the Crown, 1294-1341*, (Oxford: Past and Present Society, 1975)
- Malleson, G.B., *Studies from Genoese History* (London: Longman, 1875)
- Mann, Jill, *Chaucer and Medieval Estates Satire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973)
- Mantello, Frank and A. Rigg (eds) *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996)
- Marshall, George, ‘The Blackfriars Monastery and the Coningsby Hospital, Hereford’, *Transactions of the Woolhope Naturalists’ Field Club*, (1920), 239-47
- Masschaele, James, *Jury, State, and Society in Medieval England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2008)
- McFarlane, K.B., ‘Bastard Feudalism’ in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Collected Essays* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1981), pp. 23-44
- Melikan, Rose, ‘Shippers, salvors, and sovereigns: Competing interests in the medieval law of Shipwreck’, *The Journal of Legal History*, 11, 2 (1990), 163-82
- Miller, A., ‘John de Bromyard’, *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 vols (London: Smith, Elder and Company, 1885-1900), VI (1886), pp. 405-06
- Minnis, Alastair, *Medieval Theories of Authorship* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012)

- Moore, R.I., 'Heresy as Disease' in *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages*, ed. by W. Lourdaux, D. Verhelst (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1976), 1-11
- *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007)
- *The War On Heresy: the Battle for Faith and Power in Medieval Europe* (London: Profile, 2012)
- Morgan, Gerald, 'Langland's conception of Favel, Guile, Liar, and False in the first version of *Piers Plowman*', *Neophilologus*, 71 (1987), 626-33
- Morgan, N. and R. Thomson (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Volume 2, 1100-1400* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Morreall, John, 'Philosophy of Humor', in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2016)
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/humor/>>
- Morse, Ruth, *Truth and Convention: Rhetoric, Representation and Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Mosher, Joseph, *The Exemplum in the Early Religious and Didactic Literature of England*, (New York: AMS Press, 1966)
- Moss, Laurence S., 'Platonic deception as a theme in the history of economic thought: the administration of social order', *History of political economy*, 28 (1996), 533-57
- Mulchahey, M.M., *'First the bow is bent in Study' Dominican Education before 1350*, *Studies and Texts*, 132 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1998)
- Muessig, Carolyn (ed.), *Medieval Monastic Preaching* (Leiden: Brill, 1998)
- (ed.), *Preacher, Sermon and Audience in the Middle Ages* (Leiden: Brill, 2002)
- 'Sermon, Preacher and Society in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 28 (2002) 73–91
- Murphy, James, 'Rhetoric' in *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, ed. by Frank Mantello and A. Rigg (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), pp. 629-38
- Musson, A. and W.M. Ormrod, *The Evolution of English Justice: Law, Politics and Society in the Fourteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999)
- Newhauser, Richard, *The Treatises of Vices and Virtues in Latin and the Vernacular*, *Typologie des Sources du Moyen Age Occidental* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1993)
- *The Early History of Greed: The Sin of Avarice in Early Medieval Thought and Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- 'Religious writing: hagiography, pastoralia, devotional and contemplative works' in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Literature, 1150-1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 37-56
- Newhauser, Richard, and J. Alford (eds.), *Literature and Religion in the Later Middle Ages: Philological Studies in Honor of Siegfried Wenzel*, *Medieval and Renaissance texts and studies*, 118 (Binghamton, New York, 1995)
- Nutton, V., 'The Seeds of Disease: An Explanation of Contagion and Infection from the Greeks to the Renaissance', *Medical History*, 27 (1983), 1-34
- O'Carroll, M., 'The Lectionary for the Proper of the year in the Dominican and Franciscan rites of the thirteenth century', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 49 (1979), 79-103

- ‘The educational Organisation of the Dominicans in England and Wales 1221-1348: A Multidisciplinary approach’ *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 50 (1980), 24-62
- *A Thirteenth-Century Preacher’s Handbook: Studies in MS Laud Misc. 511*, Studies and Texts, 128 (Toronto: Brepols, 1997)
- O’Connell, Brendan, ‘The Poetics of Fraud: Jean de Meun, Dante and Chaucer’ in *Chaucer in Context: A Golden Age of English Poetry*, ed. by Gerald Morgan (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2012), pp. 261-78
- O’Daly, Gerard, *Augustine’s City of God: A Reader’s Guide* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)
- O’Keefe, Daniel J., ‘Persuasion’ in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, ed. by T.O. Sloane (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 595-603
- Olson, Paul, ‘John Bromyard’s Response to the Gothic’, *Medievalia et humanistica*, 15 (1963), 91-94
- ‘A note on John Bromyard and Augustine’s “Christian doctrine”’, *English Language Notes*, 3, (1966), 165-68
- O’Malley, J.W., ‘Introduction: Medieval Preaching’, in *De ore domini. Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*, ed. by T.L. Amos, A. Green and B.M. Kienzle, *Studies in Medieval Culture*, 27 (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1989), pp. 1-11
- O’Mara, V. and S. Paul (eds), *A Repertorium of Middle English Prose Sermons, SERMO*, 4 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008)
- Orme, Nicholas, *English Schools in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen, 1973)
- ‘The Medieval Schools of Herefordshire’, *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 40 (1996), 47-62
- *Medieval Schools: From Roman Britain to Renaissance England* (London: Yale University Press, 2006)
- Orwell, George, *Shooting an Elephant and Other Essays* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1950)
- 1984 (New York: Signet Classics, 1961)
- Owst, G.R., *Preaching in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926)
- *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961)
- Palmer, C.F.R., ‘The Friar-Preachers or Blackfriars of Hereford’, *The Reliquary*, 23 (1882-83), 17-28
- ‘Fasti ordinis fratrum praedicatorum: the provincials of the friar-preachers, or Black friars, of England’, *Archaeological Journal*, 35 (1878), 134-65
- Palmer, Nigel, ‘Exempla’ in *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, ed. by Frank Mantello and A. Rigg (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), pp. 582-85
- Pantin, W.A., *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963)
- Parkes, M.B., *English Cursive Book Hands, 1250-1500* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969)
- Patschovsky, Alexander, ‘Heresy and Society’ in *Texts and the Repression of Medieval Heresy*, ed. by Peter Biller and Caterina Bruschi (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2003)
- Pearsall, Derek, ‘Medieval Literature and Historical Enquiry’, *Modern Language Review*, 99, 4 (2004), xxxi-xlii
- Patton, Celeste A., ‘False “rekenynges”: sharp practice and the politics of language in Chaucer’s Manciple’s Tale’, *Philological Quarterly*, 71 (1992), 399-417
- Pegg, Mark, *The Corruption of Angels: The Inquisition of 1245-46* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2001)

- Pennington, Kenneth, 'Roman and Secular Law' in *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, ed. by Frank Mantello and A. Rigg (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), pp. 254-66
- Perryman, Judith C., 'The "false Arcite" of Chaucer's Knight's Tale', *Neophilologus*, 68 (1984), 121-33
- Peters, Edward, *Inquisition* (New York: Free Press, 1988)
- Peters, Hans, 'Middle English "fals"', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 223 (1986). pp. 120-24
- Pevsner, Nikolaus, *Herefordshire* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963)
- Pfander, H., 'The Medieval Friars and Some Alphabetical Source Books for Sermons', *Medium Aevum*, 3 (1934), 19-29
- Phillips, Seymour, *Edward II* (London: Yale University Press, 2010)
- Poole, Reginald L., 'Philip Wolf of Seligenstadt', *English Historical Review*, 33, no. 132 (1918), 500-17
- Pugh, Tison, "'Falseness Reigns in Every Flock": Literacy and Eschatological Discourse in the Peasants' Revolt of 1381', *Quidditas*, 21 (2000), 79-104
- Ramsey, Boniface, 'Two traditions on lying and deception in the ancient church', *The Thomist*, 49 (1985), 504-33
- Rapp, Christof, 'Aristotle's Rhetoric' in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2010)
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-rhetoric/>>
- Richards, Mary, 'Texts and their traditions in the medieval library of Rochester Cathedral Priory', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 78, 3 (1988), 1-129
- 'The Rochester Cathedral Library: A Review of Scholarship 1987-2005', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 37 (2006), 283-320
- Rider, Catherine, "'Danger, Stupidity and Infidelity": Magic and Discipline in John Bromyard's "Summa for Preachers"' in Cooper K, Gregory J (eds), *Discipline and Diversity* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2007), pp. 191-201
- Roberts, P., 'Sermon studies scholarship: the last thirty-five years', *Medieval Sermon Studies*, 43 (1999), 9-18
- Robertson, Kellie, *The Laborer's Two Bodies: Literary and Legal Productions in Britain, 1350-1500* (New York: Springer, 2016)
- Rogers, Katherin, *The Neoplatonic Metaphysics and Epistemology of Anselm of Canterbury* (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen, 1997)
- Rollo-Koster, Joëlle, *Avignon and Its Papacy, 1309-1417: Popes, Institutions, and Society* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2015)
- Rosenthal, Joel, *Telling Tales: Sources and Narration in Late Medieval England* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press)
- Rouse R. and M. Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979)
- Rouse, R. H., 'Kirkestede, Henry (b. c.1314, d. in or after 1378)', *ODNB* (Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2942>>
- Rudd, Gillian, 'The State of the Ark: A metaphor in Bromyard and Piers Plowman B.X.396-401', n.s. *Notes and Queries*, 37 (March 1990), 6-10

- Saak, Eric L., 'Augustine in the Western Middle Ages to the Reformation' in *A Companion to Augustine*, ed. by Mark Vessey (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), pp. 465-77
- Scase, W., *Piers Plowman and the New Anticlericalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
- *Literature and Complaint in England, 1272-1553* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Schäfer, Ursula, 'Deception: An essay on the lexicalization of a multi-faceted concept in medieval English' in *Ex Praeteritis Praesentia*, ed. by Matthias Eitelmann and Nadyne Stritzke (Heidelberg, 2006), pp. 21-42
- Scheeben, Heribert Christian (ed.), 'Die Tabulae Ludwigs von Valladolid im Chor der Predigerbrüder vom St. Jakob in Paris', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 1 (1931), 223-63
- Schneyer, J.-B. (ed.), *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150–1350*, 11 vols, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters*, (Münster/Westphalia: Aschendorff, 1969–1990)
- Scott, James, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992)
- Shapin, Steven, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994)
- Sharpe, Richard, *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997)
- 'John Eyton alias Repyngdon and the Sermones super euangelia dominicalia attributed to Philip Repyngdon', *Medium Aevum*, 83 (2014), 254-65
- Shaw, Judith, 'The Influence of Canonical and Episcopal Reform on Popular Books of Instruction' in *The Popular Literature of Medieval England*, ed. by T.J. Heffernan, *Tennessee Studies in Literature*, 28 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), pp. 44-60
- Shaw, Teresa, 'Wolves in Sheep's Clothing: The Appearance of True and False Piety', *Studia Patristica*, vol. 29 (1997), 127-32
- Sheehan, M.W., 'The Religious Orders: 1220-1370' in *The History of the University of Oxford. Volume I: The Early Oxford Schools*, ed. by J.I. Catto (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984) pp. 193-224
- Shinners, John (ed.), *Medieval Popular Religion, 1000-1500*, 2nd ed. (Plymouth: Broadview Press, 2007)
- Shogimen, Takashi, *Ockham and Political Discourse in the Late Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- Simpson, James, 'Religious Forms and Institutions in Piers Plowman' in *The Cambridge Companion to Piers Plowman*, ed. by Andrew Cole and Andy Galloway (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 97-116
- Simpson, John and Jennifer Speake (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Slater, T.R. and Gervase Rosser (eds.), *The Church in the Medieval Town* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998)
- Smalley, Beryl, *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1960)
- Snyder, Jon R., *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy in Early Modern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012)
- Somerset, F., *Clerical Discourse and Lay Audience in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- Somerset, Fiona, Jill C. Havens and Derrick G. Pitard (eds), *Lollards and their Influence in Late*

- Medieval England (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003)
- Southern, R.W., Robert Grosseteste, the Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986)
- Spencer, H. Leith, English Preaching in the Late Middle Ages (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993)
- Stansbury, Ronald, 'Preaching and Pastoral Care in the Thirteenth Century' in *A Companion to Pastoral Care in the Late Middle Ages (1200-1500)*, ed. by R. Stansbury (Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 21-40
- Strohm, Paul, 'False Fables and Historical Truth' in *Hochon's Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), pp. 3-10
- Summary catalogue of the manuscripts of South Glamorgan Libraries compiled by Graham C.G. Thomas and Daniel Huws (Aberystwyth: National Library of Wales, 1994)
- Summerson, Henry Summerson, 'Brinton, Thomas (d. 1389)', ODNB (Oxford University Press, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3442>>
- Szittyá, Penn, 'The friar as false apostle: antifraternal exegesis and the "Summoner's tale"', *Studies in Philology*, vol. 71 (1974), 19-46
- *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986)
- Tachau, Katherine H., 'Robert Holcot on contingency and divine deception' in *Filosofia e teologia nel Trecento: studi in ricordo di Eugenio Randi*, (Louvain-la-Neuve: Fédération internationale des instituts d'études médiévales, 1994), pp. 157-96
- Tentler, Thomas, *Sin and Confession on the Eve of the Reformation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977)
- Thiselton, Anthony, *1 and 2 Thessalonians Through the Centuries* (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, 2011)
- Thomas, Howard, Jayne Elisabeth Archer, and Richard Marggraf Turley, 'Remembering Darnel, a Forgotten Plant of Literary, Religious, and Evolutionary Significance', *Journal of Ethnobiology*, 36(1) (2016), 29-44
- Thomson, R.M., 'Introduction' in *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Hereford Cathedral Library*, ed. by R.B. Mynors and R.M. Thomson (Cambridge: D.S.Brewer, 1993)
- Thomson, S. Harrison, *Latin Bookhands of the Later Middle Ages, 1100-1500* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Tugwell, Simon, *Early Dominicans: Selected Writings* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1982)
- Tutino, Stefania, 'Nothing but the Truth? Hermeneutics and Morality in the Doctrines of Equivocation and Mental Reservation in Early Modern Europe', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 64:1 (Spring, 2011), 115-55
- Vaan, Michiel de, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*, ed. by Alexander Lubotsky, *Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series*, 7 (Boston: Brill, 2008)
- Volk-Birke, Sabine, *Chaucer and Medieval Preaching Rhetoric for Listeners in Sermons and Poetry* (Tubingen: Gunter Narr, 1991)
- Von Nolcken, C., 'Some Alphabetical Compendia and How Preachers Used Them in Fourteenth-Century England', *Viator*, 12 (1981), 271-88
- Wagner, Fritz, 'John Bromyard' in *Mente caelum inhabitans*, ed. by Thomas Klein (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 2009), pp. 81-84

- Walls, Keith, *John Bromyard on Church and State: The Summa Predicantium and Early Fourteenth-Century England; a Dominican's Books and Guide for Preachers* (Market Weighton: Clayton-Thorpe, 2007)
- Walsh, Katherine, 'Archbishop Fitzralph and the Friars at the Papal Court in Avignon, 1357 – 60', *Traditio*, Vol. 31 (1975), 223-45
- 'Fitzralph, Richard (b. before 1300, d. 1360)', ODNB (Oxford University Press, 2004)
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9627>>
- Ward, H.L.D., and J.A. Herbert, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3 vols (London: British Museum, 1883)
- Warner, Lawrence, *The Myth of Piers Plowman: Constructing a Medieval Literary Archive*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014)
- Waters, Claire, *Angels and Earthly Creatures: Preaching, Performance and Gender in the Later Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004)
- Watson, N., 'Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel's Constitutions of 1409', *Speculum*, 70 (1995), 822-64
- Weiß, Stefan, 'Luxury and Extravagance at the Papal Court in Avignon and the Outbreak of the Great Western Schism' in *A Companion to the Great Western Schism (1378-1417)*, ed. by Joëlle Rollo-Koster and Thomas M. Izbicki, (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 67-87
- Welter, J.-T., *L'Exemplum dans la Littérature Religieuse et Didactique du Moyen Age* (Paris: Occitania, 1927)
- Wenzel, Siegfried, 'Chaucer and the Language of Contemporary Preaching', *Studies in Philology*, 73 (1976), 138-61
- 'Mum and the Sothsegger, lines 421-422', *English Language Notes*, 14, 2 (1976), 87-90
- *Verses in sermons: Fasciculus Morum and its Middle English Poems* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1978)
- *Macaronic Sermons: Bilingualism and Preaching in Late-Medieval England* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994)
- 'A Dominican preacher's book from Oxford', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 68 (1998), 177-203
- 'French proverbs from the mouths of English preachers?' in *'Contez me tout': Mélanges de Langue et Littérature Médiévales offerts à Herman Braet*, ed. by Catherine Bel, Pascale Dumont and Frank Willaert (Louvain: Peeters, 2006), pp. 543-58
- *Latin Sermon Collections from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009)
- 'Bromyard's other Handbook: Canon and Civil Law for Preachers', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History, Third Series*, 6 (2009), 93-123
- 'The Joyous Art of Preaching; or the Preacher and the Fabliaux', in Siegfried Wenzel, *Elucidations: Medieval Poetry and its Religious Backgrounds* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), pp. 81-98
- *Medieval 'Artes Praedicandi': A Synthesis of Scholastic Sermon Structure* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015)
- Williams, Arnold, 'Chaucer and the Friars', *Speculum*, 28, 3 (Jul., 1953), 499-513

- Williams, Joan, 'The Library' in *Hereford Cathedral: A History*, ed. by G. Aylmer and J.E. Tiller, (London: Hambledon Press, 2000), pp. 511-35
- Williams, Phyllis, *Bromyard: Minster, Manor and Town* (Leominster: Orphans Press, 1987)
- Winfield, Percy Henry, *The History of Conspiracy and Abuse of Legal Procedure* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921)
- Winroth, Anders, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Wolfsdorf, David, 'Plato on the Varieties of Truth and Falsity'
<<https://astro.temple.edu/~dwolfsdo/Varieties%20of%20Truth%20and%20Falsity.pdf>>
- Workman, Herbert Brook, *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926)
- Wright, Cyril Ernest, *Fontes Harleiani: A study of the sources of the Harleian collection of manuscripts preserved in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: The British Museum, 1972)
- Wright, T. (ed.), *A Selection of Latin Stories* (London: Percy Society, 1842)
- Wurtele, Douglas, 'The Bane of Flattery in the World of Langland', *Florigelium*, 19 (2002), 1-25
- Yates, Nigel (ed.), *Faith and fabric: A history of Rochester Cathedral, 604-1994* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press and Friends of Rochester Cathedral, 1996)
- Yates, W.N., 'The attempts to establish a Dominican Priory at Hereford, 1246-1342', *Downside Review*, 87 (1969), 254-67
- 'The Hereford Dominicans: An Unknown Document', *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 41 (1971), 157-73
- Yunck, John, *The Lineage of Lady Meed: The Development of Mediaeval Venality Satire* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963)
- Zagorin, Perez, *Ways of Lying: Dissimulation, Persecution, and Conformity in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1990).

URLs

- Aquinas, Thomas, *Collected works* <<http://www.corpusthomicum.org/>>
- Aquinas, Thomas, *Summa Theologica* <<http://dhspriority.org/thomas/summa/index.html>>
- Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources <<http://logeion.uchicago.edu/>>
- Electronic Manipulus Florum Project, ed. by C. Nighman
<<http://web.wlu.ca/history/cnighman/index.html/>>
- Medieval Libraries of Great Britain <<http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/authortitle/>>
- Middle English Dictionary <<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>>
- Oxford English Dictionary <<http://www.oed.com/>>
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy <<https://plato.stanford.edu/>>