

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

English Theses

Department of English

Spring 5-2-2018

Wycliffite Influence in an Age of Political and Religious Turmoil: A Reassessment of Jack Upland, Friar Daw's Reply, and Upland's Rejoinder

Bradley Peppers

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english_theses

Recommended Citation

Peppers, Bradley, "Wycliffite Influence in an Age of Political and Religious Turmoil: A Reassessment of Jack Upland, Friar Daw's Reply, and Upland's Rejoinder." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2018.
https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/english_theses/230

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of English at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

WYCLIFFITE INFLUENCE IN AN AGE OF POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS TURMOIL: A
REASSESSMENT OF *JACK UPLAND*, *FRIAR DAW'S REPLY*, AND *UPLAND'S REJOINDER*

by

BRADLEY PEPPERS

Under the Direction of Scott Lightsey PhD

ABSTRACT

Jack Upland, *Friar Daw's Reply*, and *Upland's Rejoinder* participate in the development and transmission of poetic visions, depicting a world in decline in which friars play a central role. *Jack Upland*, a Wycliffite prose treatise written between 1390 and 1400, attacks friars as vanguards of Antichrist. *Friar Daw's Reply* is a point-by-point fraternal response to *Jack Upland* written in alliterative verse, composed in either 1419 or 1420 and by a member of the London Blackfriars. *Upland's Rejoinder*, a verse rebuttal written in the margins of *Friar Daw's Reply*, dates to approximately 1450 and was composed by a Lollard sympathizer. Known as the "Upland series," these poems respond to nearly two centuries of Latin antifraternal writing including the proto-reformation efforts of William of St. Amour, Richard FitzRalph, John Wyclif, while also following in the secular poetic tradition of Chaucer, Langland, and Gower, who wrote against friars and the decay of human society.

INDEX WORDS: *Jack Upland*, *Friar Daw's Reply*, *Upland's Rejoinder*, Antifraternal, John Wyclif, Lollards

WYCLIFFITE INFLUENCE IN AN AGE OF POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS TURMOIL: A
REASSESSMENT OF *JACK UPLAND*, *FRIAR DAW'S REPLY*, AND *UPLAND'S REJOINDER*

by

BRADLEY PEPPERS

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2018

Copyright by
Bradley James Peppers
2018

WYCLIFFITE INFLUENCE IN AN AGE OF POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS TURMOIL: A
REASSESSMENT OF *JACK UPLAND*, *FRIAR DAW'S REPLY*, AND *UPLAND'S REJOINDER*

by

BRADLEY PEPPERS

Committee Chair: Scott Lightsey

Committee: Edward Christie

Paul Schmidt

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

May 2018

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to my grandfather, Charles J. Casper (1939-2007), who encouraged me to follow my dreams, but passed before he could see them come to fruition.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As a student who returned to Georgia State University to begin a second undergraduate degree, I owe a great debt of gratitude to Dr. Paul Schmidt, who taught the British Literature Anthology course that convinced me to become an English major. Since then, Dr. Schmidt has played a significant role in my work and encouraged me in more ways than I can describe. I also owe a sincere appreciation to Dr. Scott Lightsey, who sparked my interest in medieval literature, encouraged my ideas, directed my M.A. thesis, provided excellent mentorship, and helped me to make my work more coherent. I am also grateful for Dr. Eddie Christie's approach to early medieval texts, his devotion to accurate translation, and demand for clarity and development in my prose. I am also thankful for Dr. Calvin Thomas' mentorship and approach to the critical theory that has become an integral part of my textual analysis. I owe sincere praise to all of the incredible professors I've had the opportunity to work with during my time at Georgia State University, and will always remember the inspiration they provided as I move on to Ph.D. work and new challenges in life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
1 PREFACE	1
2 INTRODUCTION	3
2.1 Historical and Literary Context.....	3
2.2 The Impact of Dates and Authors.....	7
2.3 Chapter Organization.....	10
3 JACK UPLAND.....	12
3.1 <i>Jack Upland</i> and Its Historical Context.....	12
3.2 William of St. Amour and the Birth of Antifraternalism	13
3.3 Archbishop Richard FitzRalph and Fraternal Hostility	16
3.4 John Wyclif: A New Age of Philosophy, Theology, and Conflict with the Church	17
3.5 <i>Jack Upland: The Philosophical and Theological Parallels of Wyclif and Wycliffite Texts</i>.....	21
4 FRIAR DAW’S REPLY.....	33
4.1 <i>Friar Daw’s Reply</i> and Its Historical Context.....	33
4.2 Friar Daw’s Reply: A Friar’s Lewed Response.....	38
5 UPLANDS REJOINDER.....	54
5.1 <i>Upland’s Rejoinder: Apocalyptic Discourse and the Figure of Antichrist in Piers Plowman</i> and the Antifraternal Tradition.....	54

6 CONCLUSION..... 63

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 68

1 PREFACE

This thesis examines the role of three largely forgotten antifraternal texts: *Jack Upland*, *Friar Daw's Reply*, and *Upland's Rejoinder* participate in the development and transmission of poetic visions, which depict a world in decline, where friars play a central role. *Jack Upland*, a Wycliffite prose treatise written between 1390 and 1400, attacks friars as vanguards of Antichrist, who upset the order of the three estates and operate outside the hierarchy of the church as mendicants in hope of financial gains. *Friar Daw's Reply*, a point-by-point fraternal response to *Jack Upland* written in alliterative verse, was composed in either 1419 or 1420 and potentially by a member of the London Blackfriars. *Upland's Rejoinder*, a verse rebuttal written in the margins of *Friar Daw's Reply*, dates to approximately 1450 and was composed by a Lollard sympathizer. Known as the "Upland series," these poems represent nearly two centuries of antifraternal writing that begins with William of St. Amour in 1257 in response to Pope Innocent III's "Franciscan Rule" that established the first Order of Friars Minor. Following William of St. Amour, Archbishop Richard FitzRalph carried on the antifraternal endeavor, engaging in conflicts with the papacy and friars in London during the 1350's. The most prolific antifraternal writer, John Wyclif, took up FitzRalph's ideas concerning property, possessions, and the right of use. Wyclif was later condemned for his attacks on the clerical power of the papacy and priesthood in 1377; these condemnations include his conclusion that God alone new the mind of man and could absolve him of his sins, and placed limitations on the spiritual power and earthly possessions of clergy. The Black Friars' Council of 1382 condemned Wyclif as a heretic for his denial of the Eucharist transubstantiation, which dealt with the material reality of the bread and wine, and means Wyclif denied the theological interpretation that the objects became the literal body and blood of Christ. As Wyclif's polemics spread, his followers became

known as Wycliffites and associated with the Lollard movement, which gave momentum to Sir John Oldcastle's failed uprising against Henry V in 1413 and John Huss' nascent Czech nationalist movement gain their momentum. The Upland series employs the motivation of earlier reform movements, participates in the dissemination of Wycliffite thought, and contributed to the development and expansion of antifraternel sentiment within the larger debate on church reform that leads to the English Reformation initiated by Henry VIII's disagreement with the Pope in 1527, which is associated with the Protestant Reformation led by Martin Luther across western and central Europe in the sixteenth-century.

The Upland series contains similar linguistic and thematic parallels with the exegetical treatises of key writers of proto-reformation texts such as William of St. Amour, Archbishop Richard FitzRalph, and John Wyclif, but the works also follow in the English poetic tradition of Chaucer, Langland, and Gower, who wrote against friars and the decay of human society. As this thesis will show the Upland series not only took part in an antifraternel poetic tradition that shares a theological perspective made significant by its use of Biblical glosses, figures, imagery, and the ecclesiological concern for the apocalypse and Antichrist, but also, through its affiliations with vernacular poetry as it depicts the outlines of a growing reformist impulse only later realized under Henry VIII. That the Upland series supervenes the poetry of Chaucer, Langland's *Piers Plowman*, the many Wycliffite poems that begin to crop up in the 1380's, and places the poems within a tradition concerned with the "numberless and placeless figures who are the sons of Cain and allies of Antichrist, men whose final significance lies not in history, but at its End" (Szitty 230).

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Historical and Literary Context

The relationship between Wycliffite and Lollard sermons and Langland's *Piers Plowman* has amassed substantial scholarship for over forty years, shaping much of the thinking on proto-reformation attitudes on English ecclesiastical satire and theological treatises. Anne Hudson's elaborative synthesis of Proto-Reformation theology in England (1978) precedes a profusion of scholarship on Langland's alliterative masterpiece, but the anonymous works *Jack Upland*, *Friar Daw's Reply*, and *Upland's Rejoinder* remain, for the most part, ignored. In his 1968 edition of the Upland series, P. L. Heyworth labels these texts irrelevant:

It remains to be said that the modest interest of these texts is that of a footnote to an historical controversy. In five hundred years they have received barely a dozen pages of desultory academic discussion scattered over as many books, and it is to their credit that they cannot claim a single learned article to themselves. They have earned their neglect. If I tidy them away to an honest grave it is not with any claim to definitiveness but because there is no good reason why they should ever be disinterred again. (53)

Ever since the critical discussion of Langland's proposed associations with Wyclif and the Lollards began with Anne Hudson's *English Wycliffite Writings* (1978), and the Upland series, despite what it represents, became a footnote in the history of Wycliffite theological reform. Known for their sharp anticlerical inquisition and expositions on Eucharistic theology, the Upland series deserves examination as key examples of the antifraternality tradition, John Wyclif's influence, the Lollard movement, and therefore our effort to gain a deeper understanding of related historical events such as the Oldcastle Revolt of 1414. This thesis brings needed critical attention to the Upland series, finding that the significance of each poem requires a reevaluation of their relationship to the reformist impulse in contemporary religious movements, their

significance to important persons of church and state, and our understanding of the surviving texts written by Wyclif and his contemporaries.

The complex history of antifraternal literature and the Wycliffite movement requires an examination of religious and historical documents and the literary counterparts through which they find more popular expression. The vast majority of the relevant literary texts do not begin to appear until the mid-fourteenth century, long after the initiation of anti-mendicant movements following Pope Innocent III's 1209 "Franciscan Rule" that established the first Order of Friars Minor.

The social and economic landscape of Western Europe had become more secular by the early thirteenth century, which resulted in the decline of the importance of religion, church attendance, and confession. In response, the church sought to reclaim a lost foothold in Christian communities so friars became a "popular instrument for extirpating heresy" (Lawrence 188). There was a new mode in the development of the *ars praedicandi*, as friars competed with their diocesan brethren by approaching their audience in ways that "siphoned congregations away from parish churches, and with them, of course, went the flow of offerings and pious requests, which were diverted into trust funds administered for the friars" (152-153). The individual poems of the Upland series follow the criticisms and long held debates over the role of friars, their competition with the church for funds, and existing outside the hierarchy of the church. Medieval friars resembled monks in dress and lived in orders, but while monks lived a communal life in monasteries outside of cities and labored to provide their sustenance, friars appeared homeless, apostolic, and seemingly inverted the message of the apostle Paul.¹ In their composition of sermons and lessons, friars acted as deceivers described by Christ in an

¹ Paul's message in 2 Cor. 6:10 on the endurance of hardship.

eschatological warning delivered to his disciples on the Mount of Olives in Mark 13: in other words, friars sought to please their listeners in hopes of financial gain. Descriptions of friars also relate to Christ's warning in Matt. 7:15 when he speaks of false prophets who are like ferocious wolves in sheep's clothing. Before the thirteenth century, no other religious group operated outside the hierarchy of the church, but friars roamed and behaved as they pleased.

The individual texts of the Upland series do not begin to crop up until after the promulgation of Wyclif's Eucharistic heresies (1380-1382) and supervened events of social, economic, and political change. The Black Death of 1348, in which a pneumonic and bubonic plague spread and killed an estimated 30-45% of Britain's population by 1350, brought drastic social change to England. After 1348, the repeated outbreak of plague produced tension that precipitated a number of complex social issues in communities, which included an increased fear of crime, a rise in the use of offensive speech and vulgar language, religious anxieties of a God that inflicts punishment for sin, and a drastic decrease in the population of wage laborers. The massive decline in England's population led to the emergence of cities and towns, social systems adapted to a rising middle class, a recession in farming as the number of manorial laborers declined, and the growth of skilled craft guilds led to a more industrialized society. The Statute of Laborers of 1349 and 1351, which sought to control wages and preserve the feudal system, contributed to repeated social uprisings. The largest of these social uprisings occurred in June of 1381 in response to additional financial strains from a rise in levies and poll taxes implemented by the state, rents owed to manorial lords, and exploitation by the church. Known as the Peasants Revolt of 1381, Wat Tyler led a group of peasants who marched from Kent and Essex into London. The peasant army captured the Tower of London, killed the Archbishop of Canterbury and the King's Treasurer, and met King Richard II, a boy of only 14 at Mile End in

an attempt to assuage insurgence of rebels. As tension also increased between church and state, the reform efforts of John Wyclif and his followers sought to challenge papal abuses, insisted on the poverty and virtue of clergy, and criticized the destructive behavior of friars. For the peasantry, or those of the third estate, religion became “the belief in the punishing or rewarding omnipotence of God [and no] ...civilizing of affect-subduing effect. (Elias 169). The Walsingham Chronicler blames friars for their role in the Peasants Revolt of 1381, their envy of landowners, justification of wrongdoings, of nobles, saying good is bad and bad is good, leading nobles astray by flattery and lies, and leading all classes astray (*Chronica Majora* 150). He concludes that

I also think that the evil times should not only be blamed on the classes mentioned, but generally on the sins of all the living people in England, including the mendicant orders, so as to increase the reasons for the troubles. For the mendicants were not mindful of the profession they had made, and also forgot the purpose for which their orders had been instituted. The most holy men who formed their order had wished them to be poor and completely free of all temporal possessions, precisely so that they should not have what they might fear to lose if they spoke the truth. (149-150)

Though the Walsingham chronicler attributes friars to the political and economic turmoil that led to the Peasants Revolt of 1381, “Wyclif’s teachings, as yet known almost exclusively to the learned, were not instrumental in any appreciable way in causing it” (Stacey 11). That Wyclif’s ideas became political and challenged both Church and State, it follows that they did not contribute to the growing communal movements across Britain and Europe

2.2 The Impact of Dates and Authors

Jack Upland, an anonymous prose treatise, attacks friars in a manner similar to Wyclif and his Lollard followers. The speaker of *Jack Upland* denounces friars for their deceptive behavior; they are the “fellist folk that ever Antecrist foond,” (56) “Caymes castel-makers,” (70) and they “summe men of lawe to distroye Goddis lawe” (35). No evidence exists to identify a specific author or apply an exact date for *Jack Upland*, but Heyworth estimates a date of 1390 based on “Uplands’s familiarity with Wyclif’s sacramental heresies [and] his frontal attack on the orthodox theory of the Eucarhist” (17). The author of *Jack Upland* accommodates the propagation of Wycliffite thought and distortions created when his works were translated from Latin to English. Before his death, Wyclif’s followers, who became known as Lollards, began to preach his ideas outside Oxford. In accordance with K.B. McFarlane, Anne Hudson suggests “that the recent view that Lollardy was a spent force in Oxford by the time Wycliff himself died on 31 December 1384 needs substantial reconsideration” (in Kenny 83). An approximate date of 1390 situates *Jack Upland* with Wycliffite texts such as *The Latern of Light* and the *Dialogue Between Jon and Richard*; texts that recycle similar claims against friars, though they appear in different formats and attain value as literary examples of the *Piers Plowman* tradition. *Jack Upland* survives in two manuscripts, British Library MS Harley 6641² and Cambridge University Library MS Ff. vi. 2³, and in two black letter editions of 1536. Modern editions include Thomas Wright (1861), Walter Skeat⁴ (1897), Heyworth⁵ (1968), and James Dean⁶

² By a fifteenth century hand.

³ In a sixteenth century hand.

⁴ Wright and Skeat do not base their editions on the MSS.

⁵ Heyworth bases his edition on the Harley MS.

⁶ Dean bases his edition on Heyworth, checks against the MS. versions, and consults Skeat’s notes.

(1991).

Friar Daw's Reply emerges as a point-by-point fraternal response to *Jack Upland*, and by a poet thought to have associations with the London Black Friars and Thomas Walsingham. Heyworth suggest that the *explicit* to *Friar Daw's Reply* "declares the author was one John Walsingham, and this suggests that his family may have come from Walsingham in Norfolk" (7). Though Heyworth consulted Emden's list, *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500* to qualify the chronicler Thomas Walsingham as the possible author of *Friar Daw's Reply*, he did not produce enough correlated textual evidence in *Friar Daw's Reply* and the known biographical information from Walsingham's life to confirm the claim. Heyworth places a date of 1419-20 based on textual allusions to the hanging of friars in 1402, Wyclif's official condemnation from Oxford in 1410, the condemnation at the Council of Constance in 1415, the failure of the Oldcastle Rebellion in 1414, and contemporary references to taxation and sorcery. Thomas Walsingham lived until 1422, was anti-Lollard, a noted historian of the Peasants' Revolt of 1381, and associated with Oxford, and these factors may provide the impetus for the *Jack Upland* author to address or call upon Walsingham in the *explicit*. Wright and Skeat ascribe a date of 1402, but they ignore textual evidence and therefore devalue the precedence of *Friar Daw's Reply* as a historical and literary document. *Friar Daw's Reply* exists in a single manuscript, Bodleian MS Digby 41, fol. 2. Modern editions include Thomas Wright (1861), Heyworth (1968), and James Dean (1991). In my study of the MS., I viewed corrections and emendations noted by Heyworth through digital imagery and recognized his claim for two correctors, one modest, and a second, who canceled readings with underlines, indicated substitutions by a caret that appears before the cancelation, and placed the new reading in the

margin.⁷ Through digital magnification, the evident corrections and emendations in the MS. reveal a violent hand and substantive changes.

The text of *Upland's Rejoinder* appears as a verse rebuttal in the margins of *Friar Daw's Reply* by a Lollard sympathizer and uses arguments that originate with antifraternals such as William of St. Amour and Richard FitzRalph. "N. P. Kerr dates the hand of the *UR* scribe to shortly after 1450" (Heyworth 18) and Heyworth argues that the "*UR* text is a holograph and that the T hand is an interpolator and not a scribe who had access to a different version of the poem than the *UR* scribe" (Dean 201). Heyworth suggests further that the author sets himself apart from the "ignorant and extravagant Lollardy of the mid fifteenth century; he may well have been a secular who did not like friars" (Heyworth 19). Dean considers the author of *Upland's Rejoinder* a Lollard, who "like Langland and Daw/Walsingham, supports his polemical arguments with Latin scriptural quotations... [who's style] is a brief quotation from the Gospel or from a Pauline epistle" (Dean 202). *Upland's Rejoinder* exists in the margins of the *Friar Daw's Reply* MS, Bodleian MS Digby 41, fol. 2. Modern editions include Thomas Wright (1861), P.L. Heyworth (1968), and James Dean (1991). In my study of the MS., I confirmed Heyworth's claim that *Upland's Rejoinder* contains the work of two hands, 393 lines in the first, 47 lines in the second. While Heyworth uses the orthographic, phonographic, and monographic features of the text to base his arguments for scribal corruption, he suggests that more than one copy of *Friar Daw's Reply* existed, and that *Upland's Rejoinder* exists as a holograph based on the author's selective refutations and the copyist's careful use of the margins. In its current state, portions of the MS. have become difficult to interpret from wear and damage. Though readability varies from page-to-page, each page shows damage and deterioration from wrinkles, uneven

⁷ See PLH's introduction from his edition of the texts, pp. 29-52.

cuts, faded ink caused by oxidation, and mold or humidity. Corners of the MS. pages show the most damage, have become brittle, and require extreme care in their examination. Though the binding of the codex was tight, it obstructed my ability to clearly read text in the inner margins: this could be a result of how the MS. was trimmed and poor attention to how it was bound in the codex. The state of the MS notwithstanding, evidence visible through digital enlargement concurs with Heyworth's 1968 edition, which Dean bases his 1991 edition.

2.3 Chapter Organization

Given *Jack Upland's* consonance with the prevailing Wycliffite view of friars as a menace to the spiritual work of the parish, I will examine the connections between the text of *Jack Upland* with the anticlerical and anti-mendicant movements that range from the early thirteenth through the late fourteenth-century in Chapter I. The attacks on the friars in *Jack Upland* precipitate from William of St. Amour's conflicts with friars and the papal disputes over teaching positions at the University of Paris, Richard FitzRalph's conflicts with the friars, and John Wyclif's continuation of Augustinian theology and philosophy of propositional realism. *Jack Upland* shares exigent themes such as property ownership, lordship, possessions, begging, and the selling of sacraments, with FitzRalph's *Defensio Curatorum*, Wyclif's *Fifty Heresies and Errors of Friars*, and anonymous Wycliffite treatises. Written as a semi-alliterative prose treatise, *Jack Upland* comprises a sequence of sixty-five questions of a pointed antifraternal nature to an unnamed and presumed, corrupt friar – it forms a correlation to the movements of antifraternalism and Wycliffe thought.

The alliterative poem titled *Friar Daw's Reply* rebuts *Jack Upland* point-for-point – thus Chapter II addresses the rhetorical relationship between *Friar Daw's Reply*, *Jack Upland*, and the theological similarities with Richard FitzRalph's *Defensio curatorum*, and conflict with the

friars. As a suitable response to *The Layman's Complaint*, the anonymous poems *Defend Us From All Lollardry* and *The Friar's Answer* provide concerns on mendicants for the Lollards and the translated Bible. Thomas Hoccleve's *Minor Poems* display a forceful attack against Lollardy in verse form. As an equivocal counterattack, the writer of *Friar Daw's Reply* exposes the corrupt nature of the friars in their ironic response to *Jack Upland*. *Friar Daw's Reply* adds to the triadic relationship of the Upland series and highlights the sustained disagreement over transubstantiation of the Eucharist in the theology and writings of Wyclif before his death.

Upland's Rejoinder appears in the margins of the *Friar Daw's Reply* manuscript (MS) as a Lollard repartee and by the hands of two unknown scribes. Chapter III advances the discussion of the Upland series as *Upland's Rejoinder* relates to the dissemination of Wycliffite thought, Lollardy, the development of antifraternal poetry, and its relationship with Langland's *Piers Plowman*. *Piers Plowman* and congruent Wycliffite texts provide an opportunity to explore the degree to which friars choose begging over physical work, fit into a world in moral decline, and serve as a symbol for the apocalyptic and eschatological interpretations of the Antichrist. *Upland's Rejoinder* picks up with the entrance of Antichrist where Langland leaves off in *Piers Plowman* approximately 70 years earlier, and emphasizes the threat friars pose to the stability of the church as false prophets.

I conclude my exposition on this complex theological debate with a brief discussion that addresses the need for an updated study of anti-fraternal texts, which offers a contemporary perspective and continuation of existing work in the field. These texts highlight decades of social, political, and religious change in the late medieval period, and function as a prerequisite for continued reform through the mid-sixteenth century.

3 JACK UPLAND

3.1 *Jack Upland* and Its Historical Context

The semi-alliterative prose treatise known as *Jack Upland* shares numerous thematic elements with antifraternial writings of the later fourteenth and early fifteenth-centuries, and provides a unique witness to the literary tradition that began at the University of Paris in 1253 with William of St. Amour. P.L. Heyworth's edition of the Upland series (1968) claims that the works have earned their neglect, deserve to be tidied away to an honest grave, and have no good reason to be disinterred again (53). To his credit, Heyworth emends the work of Thomas Wright (1861) and Walter Skeat (1897), explores supplementary evidence in his attempt to date the MSS., considers the implications of authorship, and notates textual variations between the MSS, but he denies any inherent literary, historical, or philological value in the texts. However, his edition precedes substantial progress by scholars such as Anne Hudson, Penn Szitty, and Stephen Lahey in the field of medieval religious reform. These largely-ignored texts participate in the development and expansion of antifraternial sentiment within the larger debate on church reform, helping to describe the reformist arc from William of St. Amour, Archbishop Richard FitzRalph, John Wycliffe, and on to Martin Luther in the sixteenth-century.

The initial sections of this chapter provide background and a reevaluation of key elements in ecclesiastical and literary history that gave birth to the antifraternial tradition and influenced the underlying ideas of the heretofore undervalued Jack Upland texts. The early historical elements include implications related to the foundation and spread of fraternal orders throughout Europe and Britain; the ecclesiastical reform efforts of William of St. Amour; the ideas of Archbishop Richard FitzRalph, and John Wyclif; each of these vital threads contributed vital components and texts that generated the theological foundations from which the material

incorporated in *Jack Upland* emerged. The final portion of this chapter examines the literary, historical, and philological value of *Jack Upland*. As a Wycliffite text, *Jack Upland* appends substantive material from texts related to John Wyclif and the dissemination of Wycliffite theology – this includes the *Fifty Heresies and Errors of Friars*,⁸ the *Vae Octuplex*,⁹ and the *Tractatus de Pseudo-Freres*. *Jack Upland* transmits Wyclif’s vehement attitude towards the mendicancy of the friars and their disregard for the function of the parish. Taking up the ideological force of other, earlier anonymous ecclesiastical satires such as *Piers the Plowman’s Crede* and *The Plowman’s Tale*, or Langland’s *Piers Plowman*, *Jack Upland* achieves an objective congruent with Wyclif’s rationale for an English translation of the *Bible* – it appeals to a wide audience in an accessible language and challenges the secular and clerical authority of the church. As an era of social unrest and a “profound shift of attitude” (Newman VIII) emerged, common threads in the texts’ political, religious, social, and literary figures carry forward the reformist debate well into the fifteenth century, making *Jack Upland* – overlooked perhaps because of its singular MS status and lesser quality of writing – a significant marker within the evolving debate. In order to situate the *Jack Upland* text, a brief historical framework must be recalled.

3.2 William of St. Amour and the Birth of Antifraternalism

The birth of antifraternalism as a result of Pope Innocent III’s 1209 decision that granted permission to Francis of Assisi to found a new religious order; after considerable growth, the Franciscan Order¹⁰ became official on April 16, 1210 and spread throughout western Europe,

⁸ It is possible to attribute this text to Wyclif but it could have been written by one of his disciples.

⁹ This text is found accompanying Wyclif’s Sermons but contains no indication of authorship or date.

¹⁰ Also known as the *Order of Friars Minor*.

eventually gaining in status until it began to impinge on the prerogatives of the diocesan system, forming conflicts within the church. The tradition of antifraternal writing began in 1253 when conflicts arose between friars and seculars over teaching positions at the University of Paris. William of St. Amour, a master in the Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris,¹¹ argued against the inclusion of friars in the university and the church. Although the university excommunicated the friars, Pope Innocent IV rescinded the excommunication in July 1253 (*CUP* 1: 247-8) and rebuked the faculty for their refusal to allow the friars reentry, but later instituted limitations on the ecclesiastical privileges of the friars (263-4) that lasted until his death sixteen days later, in July of 1254 (267-70). After the succession, Pope Alexander IV held the Franciscans in high regard, restored their privileges (276-7), expelled William of St. Amour and other faculty from the university (319-23), and later barred William from Paris (326). This early victory within the university sparked ideological gains and by 1244, orders such as the Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, and Carmelites had spread throughout Europe and the Near East.

William of St. Amour's corpus of exegetical writings extend beyond the scope of this research, but his accusations against friars lie behind the apocalyptic sentiments in the Upland series, characterizing the friars as a newly-arrived danger to the church through an apocalyptic warning to the church about the danger of the Antichrist. His *De periculis*,¹² an exegetical treatise "On the Dangers of the Last Times," advanced the theory that mendicant friars posed a

¹¹ The *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* documents the medieval records of the University of Paris and contains vital communications between faculty, students, and authorities of government and religion. Volume 1 details disputes between William of St. Amour, Pope Innocent IV, and Pope Alexander IV.

¹² *Tractatus de periculis novissimorum temporum ex Scripturis sumptus*.

threat to the world. Rooted in Scripture, *De periculis* does not perform a direct attack on friars; it glosses Scripture in order to list behaviors of those associated with the arrival of Antichrist:

... dangerous times will menace because *there will be men in the church who are self-loving, greedy, [elated,] proud, blasphemous, disobedient, ungrateful, wicked, without sympathy, aggressive, accusers, incontinent, savage, miserly, betrayers, bold or wanton, swollen, lovers of pleasures more than of God.* (Geltner 49)¹³

William's *De periculis* transformed the theological and political perspective of friars that later circulated in England by the mid-fourteenth century, and influenced Richard FitzRalph, Wyclif, the Lollards, and the text of *Jack Upland*. William's "reactionary ecclesiology, which, driven to its extreme conclusions and couched in explicit apocalyptic terms, challenged the very orthodoxy of the mendicant orders by underscoring their incongruity with traditional monasticism – the beacon of traditional Christian perfection – and their general threat to ecclesiastical law and order." (Geltner 2). Between 1350 and 1450, and as antifraternality writing continued in France by lesser known authors such as Jean de Pouilly, William of St. Amour's works began to circulate in English libraries, were copied anonymously, and his Biblical language and exegesis influenced English antifraternality writers such as Archbishop Richard FitzRalph. Although Jean de Pouilly takes up the general themes of William of St. Amour's but with less emphasis on the eschatological consequences of friars (the idea that friars mark the End), the dissemination of William of St. Amour's antifraternality writing gives impulse to FitzRalph's similar and rather querulous relationship between the friars in papal court, condemnation, and excommunication.

¹³ Gloss of 2 Tim. 3:2 as it appears in Geltner's translation of *de periculis*. See Geltner pps. 23-27 for notes on his edition and translation of the text from its surviving MSS.

3.3 Archbishop Richard FitzRalph and Fraternal Hostility

Archbishop Richard FitzRalph, like William of St. Amour, held a position among the secular clergy as a master theologian and argued his case against the friars at the papal court. While FitzRalph's relationship with friars remained on good terms for much of his life, he became aware of their oppositional practices to that of the secular clergy, and their status of exemption from episcopal authority.¹⁴ On a visit to Avignon in 1349, FitzRalph received a commission from the English clergy, to lay before Clement the Sixth a number of well-known complaints against the friars, in which he develops themes that reappear in exegetical treatises by John Wyclif after 1379 and in Middle English verse a century later. In *De Pauperie Salvatoris*,¹⁵ an address made on July 5, 1350, "FitzRalph tells us in his dedication, [that] he was deputed by the pope to make enquiry with two other doctors into certain questions which had long been agitated in the mendicant orders concerning property, lordship, possessions, and the right of use" (Poole XXXV), themes which Wyclif includes in the *Summa Theologie* and later faces condemnation for in 1377. By 1356 FitzRalph's work was halted under order from the diocese, after which he took up a position of hostility against the friars in London and preached seven or eight sermons (Trevisa 39) against them at St. Paul's Cross.¹⁶ On November 8, 1357, FitzRalph gave the *Defensio Curatorum*, his best known and most widely circulated sermon, before Pope Innocent VI and had gained a reputation as the fiercest opponent of friars since William of St. Amour. The *Defensio Curatorum* lists nine conclusions from his previous sermons to illustrate the friars' deceitful and fraudulent behavior. He states that Jesus was always poor and never

¹⁴ For a comprehensive review, see Walsh, Katherine. *A Fourteenth-century Scholar and Primate: Richard FitzRalph in Oxford, Avignon and Armagh*, Clarendon, 1981.

¹⁵ See Poole, Reginald Lane. *Iohannis Wycliffe De Dominio Divino Libri Tres*, Oxford, 1890 for a glossed ed. of FitzRalph's *De Pauperie Salvatoris*.

¹⁶ A preaching cross and pulpit on the grounds of Old St. Paul's Cathedral, London.

willfully begged, never taught to willfully beg, that no man who willfully begs be considered holy, and the friars do not follow those rules. FitzRalph goes on to state that Pope Alexander IV does not oppose his conclusions, the Parish Church is the proper place for confession, and that the Parish Priest is the proper person to hear confession (39-40). FitzRalph's *Defensio Curatorum* takes up the fiery condemnation initiated by William of St. Amour, glosses Scripture, condemns the friars, considers them cursed, charges St. Francis of Assisi with their very existence, and argues for the immediate removal of their privileges by Pope Alexander IV. Though the mendicants issued a *Libelli* against FitzRalph's complaints, he died in 1360 before a tribunal of three cardinals could reach a conclusion in their case. While William of St. Amour had engaged in an eschatological framework, FitzRalph assumed an ecclesiastical perspective in claiming that the friars possessed no capacity within the hierarchy of the church. As an influential opponent of the friars during his campaign against them at Oxford, FitzRalph's ideas on dominion and grace emerge as a prominent component of Wyclif's repudiation of ecclesiastical authority and denouncement of the mendicant orders. Given FitzRalph's influence, it comes as no surprise that Wyclif becomes the most prolific antifraternal writer of the later fourteenth century.

3.4 John Wyclif: A New Age of Philosophy, Theology, and Conflict with the Church

Ordained as a priest in 1351, Wyclif spent most of his time in Oxford for ecclesiastical benefices, gained influence as a philosopher before 1371, earned his doctorate in 1372, and engaged in the service of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster and son of Edward III.¹⁷ Though

¹⁷ Herbert B. Workman suggests that the alliance between Gaunt and Wyclif was one in which both parties stood to benefit. Workman notes that in an alliance to the duke, Wyclif likely saw the potential for Gaunt to push his doctrine on disendowment, which return the Church to its original poverty, and Gaunt saw the ability to increase his financial holdings (275-84).

Wyclif's polemical works against the friars did not begin until 1379, but their lexical framework emanates from his philosophical treatises beginning in 1360. As a metaphysical realist, Wyclif argued for propositional realism and the nature of universals, "the existence of which relies on the ideas in God's mind, the divine mental acts by which created beings have their reality...

[which] prepares us for understanding the relation between divine thought and created being..."

(Lahey 9). Wyclif sets himself apart from other medieval logicians in the first chapter of his

Tractatus de Logica where he claims to "write on logic as a kind of religious obligation"

(Kretzmann 42). In chapter one, he proclaims that

[c]ertain people who love God's law have persuaded me to compose a reliable treatise aimed at making plain the logic of Holy Scripture. For in view of the fact that many people go into logic having imagined they would thereby come to know God's law better, and then, because of the tasteless concoction of pagan terms in every analysis or proof of propositions, because of the emptiness of enterprise, abandon it, I propose to sharpen the minds of the faithful by introducing analysis and proofs of propositions that are to be drawn from the Scriptures. (42)¹⁸

Though Wyclif chooses few examples from Scripture in his logic,¹⁹ *de Logica* incorporates topics of ontology and his philosophy of language. Wyclif composed a collection of treatises titled *Summa Theologie* beginning in 1373 "on the foundation of all human law in God's law and its implications for secular politics, ecclesiology, scriptural interpretation, and crimes against God's commands." (Lahey 14). It was the first of the *Summa*, Wyclif's *De Civilio Dominio*, that angered the English bishops and led to his condemnation in 1377, when the ire of the church was rendered in a papal bull by Gregory XI. Wyclif's theological, political, and popular radicalism offended church authorities, who compiled a list of nineteen errors listed in the series of five

¹⁸ *Tractatus de Logica*, I, 1.2-10. Trans. Norman Kretzmann

¹⁹ See Kretzmann's "Continua, Indivisibles, and Change." and Lahey's *John Wyclif*, pps. 1-29.

bulls from Gregory in 1377. The first of his two most offensive lines of thought dealt with dominion, or the idea that authority should come from a man in a state of righteousness. This theory attacked the clerical power of the papacy and priesthood; it meant that God alone knew the mind of man, and could absolve him of his sins. The second offense limited clergy to spiritual power and their earthly possessions to the necessities for survival. The Vicar of Christ should live in a state of poverty and virtue, conform to the life of St. Peter, and set an example of Christian goodness as a humble shepherd. The church should not have temporal power, obtain political power, practice financial extortion, or remain exempt from usual laws and taxes. Of texts that later influence Wycliffite writings such as *Jack Upland*, Langland's *Piers Plowman*, of which the B-text was composed between 1377-9 and the C-text in the 1380's,²⁰ show that "both the papacy and the leaders of the English church in Langland's time were adamant that defending the material foundations of the church as a major landholder and political power was essential to the defense of Christian faith and the church of Christ" (Aers 139). Langland identifies the contemporary papacy with Antichrist over the material and temporal power of the medieval church, from which similar claims are later found in *Jack Upland* and *Upland's Rejoinder* being influenced by Wyclif's accusations and the church's adamant defense.

In a direct response to Gregory XI's papal bull, Wyclif appeared before Archbishop William Courtenay of London and Simon Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury, in February of 1377. Though Wyclif escaped condemnation with the support of John of Gaunt, and an angry mob of Londoners, he went on to charge monks for their possessions of property and the friars for the wealth and property they had amassed in *De Blasphemia*, also claiming the friars divided

²⁰ The C-text revised the content of the B-text except for the later sections.

the Body of Christ, presumed to hear confessions, and absolve people from sin; they committed sins of lechery, adultery, extortion, robbery, and usury. Following Wyclif's conflict with the papacy, it becomes no coincidence that Langland revises the A-text of *Piers Plowman* and uses the character of Conscience in the B-text to object to how friars both teach and contradict the law that God gave to Moses: "*Non consupisces rem proximi tui*" [one should not covet their neighbor's goods] (XX.279). Langland points to issues over the interpretation of common property, in which friars' want the same privileges and income as parish priests communicates when the character of Envy says "alle thynges under hevene oughte to ben in commune" (20.276). Where Fitzralph argued that Jesus and his disciples chose "civil" poverty over "natural" or "original" dominion, to say that Jesus employed self-restraint over his natural lordship (Scase 55), Wyclif supported the concept that all property be held in common but by the just, in the time of grace, and until that time, all power and wealth should be held by God as a corporate symbol of Christian society and lay princes as God's vicars (*De civili* 96-103).

The Black Friars' Council of 1382 condemned Wyclif's *De Eucharistia* as heretical for its denial of the Eucharist transubstantiation. Wyclif returned to Lutterworth where he retaliated with the composition of *Fifty Heresies and Errors of Friars*,²¹ *Controversial Tracts*, and continued to send out tracts against monks and Pope Urban VI. Wyclif's final two works, the *Triologus* and *Opus Evangelicum*, contain significant thoughts on antifraternal and antipapal arguments; he claims that the pope or any individual against the Scriptures of Christ is Antichrist.²² The *Triologus* summarizes topics of ontology and philosophy that began during his

²¹ It is possible to attribute this text to Wyclif but it could have been written by one of his disciples.

²² See Wyclif, Iohannis. *Operis Evangelici*, vols. III and IV, 1896, pps. 106-109.

time at Oxford, and the *Opus Evangelicum* provides both analysis and commentary on chapters from the Gospels of Matthew and John.

A more developed discussion of how Wyclif's ideas influenced the Lollard movement appears in the next chapter, detailing how Lollardy became a treasonous offense, punishable by burning at the stake during the reign of Henry IV. Lollard movements included that of Sir John Oldcastle's failed uprising against Henry V in 1413, leading to his execution in 1417. Wycliffite theology and philosophical realism also motivated a Czech nationalist movement and the reform efforts of John Huss. The Lollards showed their allegiance to Wyclif in their writings and continued challenge papal and priestly power, and it is in alignment with these attitudes that we find the *Upland Series* weighing in on this crucial contemporary debate.

3.5 *Jack Upland*: The Philosophical and Theological Parallels of Wyclif and Wycliffite

Texts

The opening lines of *Jack Upland* launch into a direct attack against friars with corresponding arguments and syntax found in Wyclif and Wycliffite texts. Jack's initial complaint states that the "Anticrist and hise disciplis, bi coloure of holynes, wasten and disceiven Cristis / Chirche bi many fals signes" (2-3). Similar arguments had appeared in the Wycliffite texts *Tractatus de Pseudo-Freris* and *Vae Oculplex* on the friar's destructiveness and deception. The *de Pseudo-Freris* states that "þise habitis crien to þe folc holynesse & stablenesse, þat god & garnementis of ypocritis, as crist clepiþ ofte Pharisees" (302). The *Vae* argues that "þese men seien þat siche holynesse stondiþ in her colours, and bodily abitis, wiþ oper feyned signes" (384). While the language of these texts appear to present direct parallels with clear referents, the word *colour(e/s)* does not refer to the color of the friar's garments. The context of these texts define it as a reason or argument with supporting grounds, a specious reason or argument, or to act with

deceptive means (“cōlour”). The *MED Compendium* confirms that the text of *Jack Upland* refers to deception, which is also the case in texts by Wyclif his followers that deal with identical subject material. Within the antifraternel tradition and analogous Wycliffite tests, *Jack Upland* assumes an indistinguishable stance against the corrupt behavior of friars akin to *Piers Plowman*, but with less complex language. The word *signes*, when used in the context to Wyclif’s *De Blasphemia*, underscores the deceptiveness of friars in their use of false symbols when associated with the passion of Christ; friars make people believe that their mass is better than a priest’s: *Pese freris...maken þo puple to trowe þat one masse of hor is better to God þen oþer of comyne prestis, and herof serven hor sygnes and hor feyned varyaunce to schewe hor ypocrisye to þo lewid folke.* (425). The cunning and deceptive rhetoric of friars undermines the role of the Church and disrupt the balance between the three estates.

As a commonplace theme in the literature of the later Middle Ages, Jack discusses the three estates and how friars attenuate what had already become a fragile system by the later 1370’s.²³ He designates priests “to preche the Gospel truli and to preye in herte devoutli, to / mynistris the sacramentis freli, to studie in Goddis lawe oonli, and to be trewe / ensaumpleris of holi menne lijf continuli, in doynge and in suffringe...” (9-11). Friars roam and travel among parishes and preach false teachings to the public; they intercept alms from the needy, and tithes from the parish church. That friars meddle in parish work, causes ill-will between priests and their parishioners (*Fifty Heresies* 374). Jack characterizes friars as given leave from law; and so the ignorant, unlettered men take their living away from that of the parish priests. They ruin,

²³ Upland’s commentary on the friars’ threat to the estates includes lines 7-59.

disgrace, and show no devotion to matins and mass – with one goal in mind – to sell the sacraments.²⁴

Friars impair the power of the state when they give knights and lords permission to fight for other realms than their own, to kill and burn the homes of others, and destroy charity. The nobility or lords should “...justifie mysdoers in ward and defende Goddis servauntis from letters of her / office...” (12-13). The *Fifty Heresies* emphasizes this issue: “Bot why schulde þo kyng mayntene²⁵ in his lond soche traytours bothe to God and hym, and cruel enemyes of alle Cristen men?” (391). Jack’s emphasis on charity provides a gloss on the text of the apostle Paul’s first letter to Timothy “be thou an example of the believers, in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity... Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.” (1 Tim. 4:12-16). Jack takes up the seriousness of saving souls in a not so ironic plea; he wants the friars to see that God “...is almyghti, alwitti, algoodli, and alwilful, as He hath made man / in soule to His ymage, as in mynde, resoun, and wille, and to His liknesse bi wer- / kis of bileve, tristi hope, and lastinge charite...” (*JU* 4-6). It becomes impossible to deny that Jack intends his treatise to function as an act of charity and save the friars’ souls:

Frere, take hede to my tale and to myn entent also, for charite chasith me therto to chalenge youre defaultis, that ye moun amende to God and to man this mys or ye die, bi open knowlechyng of youre gilt, and go therfro bityme. For hou schulde ye endure undampned to helle to leve Crist and His lawe for youre rotun ritis, and seie that Goddis lawe is fals to fourme or to lerne, til ye hadden founden a glos feyned of youre wittis. (326-331)

²⁴ As related to the word “signes” in line three, selling sacraments refers to religious ceremonies and strengthens the argument of hypocrisy.

²⁵ To help, assist, support and evildoer or an evil cause (“mainten”).

Jack's concern for the community embraces the notion of common profit that appears in the works of Chaucer and Langland. In Chaucer's political dream vision, the *Parliament of Fowles*, he exhibits anxiety for the welfare of the community and the duty of the individual:

Know thyself first immortal,
 And loke ay besyly thow werche and wysse
 To commune profit, and thow shalt not mysse
 To comen swiftly to that place deere
 That ful of blysse is and of soules cleere. (73-77)

The *Prologue* of Langland's *Piers Plowman*, rats convene to discuss the construction of a collar for their common profit, fasten a bell to it, and hang it on the cat's neck so they can avoid him. Much in the same, Wyclif's *De Civili Dominio* remodels FitzRalph's political arguments to define social order and secular authority. The *De Blasphemia* considers man's faith as a tool that moves one to pursue Christ, "and coveyte noght private suffrages, but more treuly aftir comyne profite" (426). As a common theme in the fourteenth century, common profit embraced the well-being of the crown and its subjects.

Jack defines the peasantry or commoners as those who "truli laboure for the sustinaunce of hem-silf, and for prestis and for lordis doynge wel her office" (13-14). Friars magnified the growing tension between commoners and their lords over the payment of rents, and increased a growing strain on their parish priest due to a decline in church attendance and tithes. Friars gave commoners permission to leave their true labor and become idle men full of deceit, and in short, to do anything they please and live in opposition to God's law. Friars epitomize the seven deadly sins, present them as an enticing buffet, and offer large servings at a high price. Upland portrays the three estates as ordained by the divine but opposed and weakened by Antichrist. As an

Estates Satire,²⁶ Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* represents the three orders in the characters of the Knight, Parson, and Plowman. Upland deems the friars the "fellist folk [or cruelest men] that ever Antecrist found ben last brought into the Chirche" (56), which mirrors the *Vae*: "And þes ben speciali men of þes newe ordris, and moost þese freris þat last comen ynne" (379). The friars come from various seeds of Antichrist's sowing, "...of / dyvers cuntreis and kynredis..." (*JU* 57-8). Like the *Vae*, which glosses the text of Matthew 23 and expresses a series of eight woes against friars, Jack fears that they will lead to the detriment of the three estates; friars' not only operate outside the hierarchy of the Church but they contradict God's Law. In addition, friars show no obedience to bishops, no loyalty to nobility, and do not till the earth, sow seed, weed fields, nor reap crops – their primary concern – personal well-being. Friars sell heaven to whomever they like and "yit thes wrecchis witen not where to be hem-silf saved or dampned" (63). They prey on wealthy nobles and pray for those who pay well for their services. Jack considers "...al the fyve ordris..." (68) false and wishes for their destruction. Upland compares friars to "...Caymes castel-makers..." (70), the Pharisees flattering people, false prophets, unsound soldiers, and proud and empty men in Antichrist's vanguard: he pleads that God protect the three estates from this captain and his army. Jack demands to know if the friar's order "...ben groundid in Goddis / lawe... [and if they] ...thenkist / to be on Cristis side..." (79-81). Jack's overview of how friars diminish the already unstable balance between the three estates forms the basis for his substantial criticisms in the remaining lines of the poem.

Following his opening statements on the three estates, Jack asks a series of 65 questions, which accuse friars of a life against biblical scripture and the apostolic life of Christ. "The questions themselves form a kind of satire, since they are often humorous and are intended to

²⁶ See Jill Mann, *Chaucer and Medieval Estates Satire*. Cambridge UP, 1973.

indicate and perhaps to correct abuses; but they are hardly subtle” (Steinberg 44). The remaining portion of this chapter evaluates how selected passages from *JU* continue to exemplify the antifraternal themes in Wycliffite texts. Jack asks: “Frere, sit her ony ordre more perfighte than Crist Hym-silf made? / Frere, if Crisis rule is moost prefight, whi rulist thee not theraftir?” (*JU* 86-7). These questions parallel the opening lines of the *Fifty Heresies*: “First, freris seyn þat hor religioun, founden of sinful men, is more perfite þen þat religion or order þo whiche Crist hymself made, þat is bothe God and mon. (367). *Jack Upland* and the *Fifty Heresies* charge friars for breaking their traditions more than God’s commandments (372), and that friars do not give alms “to pore feble men, to pore croked men, to pore blynde men” (387) The friars follow a rule contrary to Christ, steal from the rich and poor alike, “...and geve hem no thing agen, have thei never so myche nede” (*JU* 96). To further emphasize the friars’ deceptiveness, Jack critiques the friars’ clothes and states that they appear to be beggars; his use of the words *abite* and *habytys* refer to their outward appearance, customary practice, moral disposition, and behavior (“habīt”). Considering Pope Bonafice VIII’s decree in 1065 that “made excommunication the penalty for abandoning the regular habit” (Heyworth 121), the word *habit* carries an ironic undertone since the friars choose to appear as beggars and simultaneously practice acts of mendacity. The word *apostata* appears as both a noun and adjective in *Jack Upland* and the *Fifty Heresies* to denote one who abandons their religion or article of faith, but also as one who violates a code of ethics or morals (“apostate”). Jack asks “...frere, whi art thou prisoned and clepid²⁷ apostata for levyng thin / ordre...” (107-108) and the *Fifty Heresies* states that “if a frere leefe his bodily habite, to þo whiche he is not bounden by Gods lawe, he is holden apostata and scharply pursued, sumtyme to prisoun, and sumtyme to þo deth” (373). Though one can

²⁷ Be called or have a certain designation (“clēpen”).

view voluntary poverty as an arduous ideal to sustain, the “gradual absorption of the friars into the ecclesiastical establishment they had criticized was accomplished by a slow relaxation in their observance of poverty” (Lawrence 222). Friars chose a life of voluntary poverty, which deprived the clergy’s ecclesiastical rights and support for those who were truly poor. In other words, friars performed acts of theft that impaired the finite ecclesiastical economy from which parish churches acted as stewards to those in need.

To continue the theme of the friars’ hypocritical and duplicitous lifestyle, Jack condemns the friars for their luxurious houses since “...Crist dide not so...” (135). In an attempt to learn the Apostles’ Creed, the narrator of *Pierce the Plowman’s Crede* consults a Franciscan, a Dominican, an Augustinian, and a Carmelite to find that they do not know the Creed and yet they still attempt to solicit money from him. The narrator of *Pierce the Plowman’s Crede* beholds the extravagance of the Dominican’s house:

And awaytede a woon, wonderlie well ybeld,
 With arches on everiche half and belliche ycorven,
 With crochetes on corners, with knottes of golde,
 Wyde wyndowes ywrought, ywritten full thikke,
 Schynen with schapen scheldes to schewen aboute,
 With merkes of marchauntes ymedled bytwene,
 Mo than twenty and two twyes ynoubred. (172-8)

The *Fifty Heresies* comments on the “...feyned beggers, [who] have lordly plasis...” (368) and that Christ nor his apostles had no great churches or cloisters, but they went from country to country to preach the Gospel. Jack’s accusation that the friars “...begge in anotheres / lymytacioun unpunyschid” (*JU* 143-4) and their role as a limiter relates to common attitudes towards tax and toll collectors one finds in Luke 18: 9-14, where Christ compares the prayers of Pharisee and tax collector. Like first century tax collectors, friars received the rights to a specific district, profited from fraudulent behavior, traveled into the territories of others, and were

notorious for dishonesty: the Mishnah classifies tax collectors with murderers and robbers.

Jack's attack of the friars' abuse of letters of fraternity contains similar language from the *Fifty*

Heresies and Book 4.30 of Wyclif's *Dialogus* on the *Heresies of the friars: letters of fraternity*:

Again, according to laws admitted and known by everyone, nobody should deceive his brother in physical trade. How much more is this so in the spiritual commerce of perpetual inheritance! Since traders in temporal goods are required to have certainty about what they are selling, how much is this so in the more valuable spiritual commerce? Since friars neither have any certitude of their own promise, nor do those buying have any of the good for which they hope, it appears both that the friars sow silly deception to both parties, and they commit a greater fraud than if they were selling a cat in a sack. (*Wyclif: Dialogus* 279)

Friars sold letters of fraternity, prayers, and the golden trentale, a set of thirty requiem masses said on the same or on different days and sung for money.

Jack Upland and the *Fifty Heresies* speak in opposition to friars that lived outside the laws of man, king, and the church; they glossed the Scriptures as they saw fit and stole children away from their families to increase the numbers of their order (*JU* 151-71, *Fifty Heresies* 384-5). FitzRalph's *Defensio Curatorum* records a story of how friars beguiled children into their order, held them against their will, and did not allow them to speak to their father or mother (347-53). As the Black Death struck England in 1348, extended into Western Europe into the late fourteenth century, and reoccurred until the seventeenth century, mendicant communities suffered a decrease in numbers that they sought to regain. While no accurate study exists to cite the decline and increase of mendicants, as "supernumerary ecclesiastics, the friars violate the ecclesiastical order and indeed the divine order in which God made all things" (Szittyá 224). Jack criticizes friars for their large numbers and that "...with so many freris / is greet cumbraunce to the puple and agens Goddis wille that made al thingis in / meASURE, noumbre,

and weight; and Crist ordeyned twelve apostlis with fewe othere / prestis to do servyce to alle the world, and thanne was it best don” (288-91). Chaucer’s Wife of Bath comments on their abundance in that they

serchen every lond and every strem,
As thikke as motes in the sonne-beem,
Blessynge halles, chambres, kichenes, bourse,
Citees, burghes, castles, hye toures,
Thorpes, bernes, shipnes, dayeryes (867-71)

In Book 4 of his *Vox Clamantis*, John Gower express his concern that the number of friars have increased beyond the acorns on an oak and continue to grow: “Vt neque ramosae numerabis in ilice glandes, / Tu fratrum numerum dinumerare nequis” (II, 951-2); “Sic crescit numerus fratrum, fit et ordo minutus, / Dum miser in miseris gaudet habere pares” (II, 1009-10). Although their numbers diminished by approximately sixty percent after the Black Plague, the complaint that the friars’ numbers grew out of control reappears in *Upland’s Rejoinder*, *Piers Plowman*, in Wycif’s *De apostasia*, and in poems such as John Skelton’s *The Image of Ipocrysy* in the sixteenth century.

Jack continues to underscore the friars’ greed and contrary nature to Christ’s teachings as he questions the friars’ endearment to the rich over the poor. The *Fifty Heresies* reproaches the friars’ draw to “hom confessioun and biring of riche men by mony sotil meenes, and messe pens, and trentals” (374). *Pierce the Plowman;’s Crede* chastises the Augustinian’s for the same:

Thei covetun confessions to kachen some hire,
And sepultures also, some wayten to cacchen.
But other cures of Cristen thei coveten nought to have,
But there as wynnynge lijth -- he loketh none other. (468-71)

Jack speaks at length about friars’ who “...preche ye fals fablis of freris and feined myraclys, and leven the / Gospel that Crist bade preche and is moost holsum lore to bodi and to soule, and /

so also oure bileve bi whiche oonli we moste be saved...” (188-90). Complaints and concerns for the preaching’s of friars appear in William of St. Amour’s *De periculis* where he glosses Matthew 24 to illustrate how the friars embody the sixth, seventh, and eighth eschatological signs associated with the apocalypse: false prophets shall rise, the charity of many shall grow cold, and the gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world (40-1). William relied on the sixth sign and cited Paul’s second letter to Timothy to emphasize the growth in Antichrist’s numbers and his apocryphal eschatology (21). Richard de Bury’s *Philobiblon* carries William’s theological doctrine in his description of the friars’ sermons and teachings:

...they rely upon some treatises of small value, from which they derive strange heresies and apocryphal imbecilities, not for the refreshment of souls, but rather for tickling the ears of the listeners. The holy scripture is not expounded, but is neglected and treated as though as it were commonplace and known to all, though very few have touched its hem... (187)

The *Fifty Heresies* (368, 393), the *Vae* (389), and *Pierce the Plowman’s Crede* (455-6) share a collective sense of the friars’ boundless ignorance and illiterateness (“fōl”) though some had become more literate by the late fourteenth century. *Pierce the Plowman’s Crede*, like *Jack Upland*, warns of the mendicant, scoundrels²⁸ who slander priests for heresy when they sell anything for a penny – even the body of Christ himself (*JU* 212-9). Jack advances the apocryphal theme that charity shall grow cold, focuses on begging, and that friars never give alms to the poor; Wyclif condemns begging in *De Blasphemia* (410-19) and the *Fifty Heresies*, which highlights the friars’ begging without need (383). That *Jack Upland* uses the verb *contrarien* on thirteen occasions articulates the influence of Wycliffite writings of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century, as it appears in the antifraternial writings of Wyclif, Hoccleve, Chaucer,

²⁸ *PPC*, “foles” (455)/*JU*, “foolis” (199).

Lydgate, and anonymous texts such as *Pierce the Plowman's Crede*. The *MED Compendium* indicates the first use in 1390 in a religious lyric titled *Hose wolde him*. Though Francis intended his Order of Friars Minor to devote their lives to poverty, these ideals shifted by the middle of the thirteenth century, from which we see the antifraternel writing of William of St. Amour crop up in 1253.²⁹

Jack's final claim against the friars causes confusion and charges them with the Wycliffite heresy about the Eucharist.³⁰ Wyclif challenged the doctrine of the Eucharist in 1379 in *De apostasia* and *De Eucharistia*, which had no connection with the friars, but turned former friends and the friars against him. "His attacks on the mendicants in his Eucharistic writings were largely peripheral to his main arguments. Nevertheless, the friars reacted strongly, and Wyclif responded to their opposition with even more intemperate attacks of his own..." (Szitty 154). Of the three heresies Wyclif was condemned for in 1382, the Eucharist concerned

the substance of material bread and wine that remains after the consecration in the sacrament of the alter, that accidents do not remain without a subject after the consecration in the same sacrament, that Christ is no in the sacrament of the alter identically, truly and really in his own bodily person (in Hudson *Selections* 142).³¹

Wyclif's opposition to the Eucharistic theology of the church and the miracle of transubstantiation, dealt with the reality of the bread and wine – that the objects became the literal body and blood of Christ. Though Wyclif's theology changed over time, his thoughts

²⁹ See C.H. Lawrence, *The Friars*, Longman, 1994, pps. 43-64.

³⁰ The following chapter on *FDR* will return to this question as it relates to Friar Daw's answer that the friars maintain the orthodox position.

³¹ Hudson translates the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, edited by W.W. Shirley, 1858, pps. 277-8. and Henry Knighton's *Chronicon*, edited by J.R. Lumby, vol. 2, 1895, pp. 158.

developed from evidence in biblical scripture,³² and a combination of his realist philosophy and materialistic skepticism. Wyclif could not accept that the body and blood of Christ's corporeal body replaced the bread and wine, of which no physical changes took place. Possibilities that surround Jack's confusion stem from a sense that the "technical terms of the Eucharistic controversy may have achieved popular currency, with consequent debasement and loss of exactness" (Heyworth 171). While the assumption that the confusion of thought occurs as an accident on the anonymous author of *Jack Upland*, a similar accusation appears in the *Vae*:

But þe fend, siþ he was loosid, haþ meved freris to reverse þis;
and, as þei seien, her newe seintis and newe doctours þat þei han,
techen þat þis sacrament is an accident wiþouten suget, or ellis
nouzt, for it is quantite and qualite. (*Vae* 386)

Jack urges the friars to "...amende to God and to man..." (327) and "Go now forth, frere, and fraiste youre clerkis, and grounde you in Goddes lawe, / and geve Jacke and answere, and whanne ye asoilen that I have seide sadli in truthe, / I schal asoile thee of thin ordre and save thee to hevene" (332-334). Jack receives his answer from the anonymous writer of *Friar Daw's Reply*, which affords the "possibility of a convention of pairing in the poetry of the fraternal controversies" (Szittyá 197).

Though *JU* articulates the character of a ploughman or rustic in the form of a prose treatise, it takes up charges made against friars by William of Saint Amour, Archbishop Richard FitzRalph, and John Wyclif. *Jack Upland* creates a characterization of friars that begins at the University of Paris with Amour's *De periculis*, and later embodies the antifraternality tradition continued by FitzRalph, Wyclif, and the Lollards in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth

³² Matt. 26:26-9; Mark 14:22-5; Luke 22:19-20; I Cor. 2:23-7

centuries. *Jack Upland*'s tone intonates the greedy and hypocritical behaviors of friars as they operate outside the hierarchy of the church, and inflects the theological parallels that associate friars with the Antichrist – the false apostles or pseudo apostles often associated with Matthew 23. That Wyclif's latter doctrine on the Eucharist led to a hostile relationship with friars and an unfavorable reaction from church, his use of the Bible, eschatological thought, and particular application of vocabulary influenced the antifraternial tradition correlated with *Jack Upland*. As a result, *Jack Upland* epitomizes the acerbic disputes between the mendicants and Wyclif, but also typifies the response to Lollards seen in *Friar Daw's Reply* and the following confutation of *Upland's Rejoinder*. As the following chapters attempt to demonstrate, these texts occupy and serve as a substantial witness to the ecclesiological idea that “becomes broadened to a societal and metaphysical one: the friars, wanderers, and supernumeraries, have no place in the created world... [-] men whose final significance lies not in history but at its End.” (Szittyá 230).

4 FRIAR DAW'S REPLY

4.1 *Friar Daw's Reply* and Its Historical Context

The alliterative work *Friar Daw's Reply* answers *Jack Upland* in a “point-for-point rebuttal... [as a] fraternal answer to a Lollard work.” (*Six Ecclesiastical* 145). *Friar Daw's Reply* contains more poetic qualities than *Jack Upland* and attacks Lollards with accusations of “schism and heresy, the worst of all sins” (Oakden 2, 60). Friar Daw presumes an alliance between the Lollards and the Antichrist, and that “due punishment will be meted out to them at the Judgment Day” (60). The rhetorical relationship between *Friar Daw's Reply* and *Jack Upland* illustrates theological and contextual similarities between Richard FitzRalph's *Defensio curatorum*, a sermon given before a church council of cardinals at the Papal Court in Avignon on

November 8, 1357.³³ FitzRalph's *Defensio* initiated a legal battle with all four orders of mendicant friars from 1357-60. The mendicants involved in the curial proceedings responded to FitzRalph in a *Libellus*, a formal decree, and both parties issued *Excepciones*³⁴ in response to the *Libellus* of the other.³⁵ Much like *Jack Upland*, FitzRalph's attacks on the friars concentrated on their abuse of mendicancy, their failure to observe the profession of poverty, and problems with their confessional practice: "including doubts over the distinction between venial sin, and with conflicts of jurisdiction arising from abuses of confessional procedure" ("Richard FitzRalph" 409). The friars' attack on FitzRalph provides an analog to the *Friar Daw's Reply* author's focus on Upland's personal matters. The friars also denied FitzRalph's "authority to prosecute the case, accused him of doctrinal errors and argued that as his actions deserved the sentence of excommunication, he ought to be treated as an excommunicate and excluded from the papal courts" ("Archbishop" 237). The ambiguous nature of the friars' *Libellus* and *Friar Daw's Reply* present a contingent dialogue against their accuser with "no attempt to discuss the canonical merits of their position in the pastoral field" (238). Like Daw, the friars provided no justification for their voluntary begging, which contradicts the teachings and life of Christ.

As the study of *Friar Daw's Reply* illustrates the influence of William of St. Amour and Richard FitzRalph's antifraternal arguments and the dissemination of Wycliffite thought, it presents a historical and cultural witness that demonstrates the transmission of Wyclif's doctrine

³³ See Katherine Walsh's *Richard FitzRalph in Oxford, Avignon, and Armagh*, specifically pps. 406-51.

³⁴ A list of objections, disqualifying remarks, or counter-arguments against one's claims.

³⁵ The related documents to the case are contained in Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College MS 64. Of these documents, FitzRalph's *Defensio* is the only text available for study in print. I rely on Katherine Walsh's commentary and the four anti-mendicant sermons preached by FitzRalph on December 18, 1356, January 22, 1357, February 26, 1357, and March 12, 1357. These sermons are available in *Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum...* vol. 2, London, 1690.

in Lollardy, with individuals such as Sir John Oldcastle, and the reform movement of John Huss in Bohemia. The unique relationship between *Upland's Rejoinder* and *Friar Daw's Reply* requires an examination of the Lollard movement since it appears in records as a faction associated with the lower-class, but also in the regard that one can differentiate between the terms Wycliffite and Lollard. Since the previous chapter outlines the antifraternal tradition from Amour's conflicts at the University of Paris and excommunication, and FitzRalph's attack on the papacy for the friar's privileges and his exclusion from the university, FitzRalph's fearless criticisms account for a mere fraction of the dissension that erupts in response to Wyclif and the Lollards. In 1382, Wyclif experienced considerable censure under Archbishop Courtenay, condemnation from the Blackfriars Council, and the term Latin term *Lollardi* came into use to describe a religious movement known for its use of the vernacular scripture.³⁶ Although Lollardy became associated with heresy during the reign of Richard II (1377-99) and received protection from John of Gaunt until 1386, the anti-Lollard campaign reached a climax in 1395 – the Lollards nailed their Twelve Conclusions to the door of St. Paul's and Westminster and risked being burned at the stake. Roger Dymock's *Liber contra XII errores* offers a rejoinder to the Lollard conclusions, defends the church's orthodox view of the Eucharist, and emphasizes the threat that Lollard theology posed to the church. Andrew Cole argues that "Wyclif's disciples, the Wycliffites, and the so called lollards require separate dilations... [since their] conflation [underestimates] the richness of lollardy" (*William Langland's* 27). This division articulates nonconformities between Wycliffite and Lollard writing though Lollardy emerges out of Wyclif's antifraternalism, but with an ideological focus on Christian discipleship. Lollardy "realizes the productive potential of Wycliffite antifraternalism and, more broadly,

³⁶ See Knighton's *Chronicon*. vol. 2, pp. 178-9.

anticlericalism, since lollards are imagined to live in the ways priests refuse to live. The lollard life grants, in turn, the license to impugn other lay persons for their debauchery, heckle friars for their feigned ascetic piety, and speak [against the covetous and sins of untrue bishops]" (43). As analogs that further demonstrate the relationship between Lollards and mendicant friars, the anonymous poems *Defend Us From All Lollardry* and *The Friar's Answer* present mendicant replies³⁷ that respond to *The Layman's Complaint*, which comments on the virtues of poverty. As a witness to attacks on Lollardy, Thomas Hoccleve's poem, *To Sir John Oldcastle* addresses the Lollard issue after the Lollard Knight Oldcastle, once a comrade of King Henry V, flees into hiding. Similar to *Jack Upland's* regard for the salvation of mankind, the poem opens with a placid tone that pleas for Oldcastle to repent, but then turns to a forceful attack against Lollardy that coincides with inimical tenor of *Friar Daw's Reply*, but in verse form. As *Jack Upland* critiques mendicant errors, Hoccleve's poem presents an ironic turn seen in the criticisms of *Friar Daw's Reply* against Lollards: "Hoccleve's poem is thus meant as a preemptive warning about the fate awaiting any, like Oldcastle, who might stray away from religious orthodoxy and secular obedience" (Knapp 142). Hoccleve considered Lollards servants of the devil; he charged them with deceit and as heretics who beguiled John Oldcastle.³⁸

Of the first Lollards prosecuted for heresy, John Badby, a tailor who refused to recant his Lollard views in Smithfield Market before Prince Henry,³⁹ disappeared in flames. The Lollard Knight, Sir John Oldcastle, a friend of Henry V, offered protection to Lollards until discovered

³⁷ *Defend Us From All Lollardry* and *The Friar's Answer* show the mendicant's concerns for the Lollards and the translated Bible; the availability of the Bible in the vernacular allows for laypersons to question the authority of mendicants.

³⁸ See Knapp's *The Bureaucratic Muse: Thomas Hoccleve and the Literature of Late Medieval England*, 2001, pp. 129-46.

³⁹ Son of Henry IV, second monarch of the House of Lancaster, assumed the throne in 1413 until his death in 1422.

after the death of Henry IV. Like Badby, Oldcastle declined to renounce Lollardy. Oldcastle retreated to Cooling Castle until his arrest; he “made a bold confession of faith, denounced the misuse of images and pilgrimages, and rejected both Transubstantiation and the necessity of auricular confession” (Trevelyan 337). Deemed a heretic, Oldcastle received a forty-day reprieve from Henry, but escaped the Tower of London to conspire with other Lollards and sympathizers to apprehend the Henry at Eltham. The Lollards coup allowed Oldcastle to evade the King’s forces and flee to the Welsh mountains until his discovery three years later, after which he was hanged, and then burned at the stake. Far from London at the University of Prague and in the villages of Bohemia, Wyclif’s theological writings took hold and gave rise to the Hussite movement. John Huss,⁴⁰ a copier of Wyclif’s theological works, began a preaching career in 1403 and became leader of a pietistic religious movement. Huss’s theological work, as influenced by Wyclif, attacked the clergy, bishops, the papacy, and Wyclif’s doctrine of the Eucharist. In exile, Huss’s preaching and his *De ecclesia* (1413) took on a radical tone and applied Wyclif’s doctrines to the Czech reform movement. In an attempt to end controversies within the church and the papal schism, Huss agreed to attend the Council of Constance in November of 1414, but faced imprisonment, trial, condemnation, and execution. Like Badby and Oldcastle, Huss refused to rescind the claims against him and answered

God is my witness... that the things charged against me I never preached... In the same truth of the Gospel which I have written, taught and preached, drawing upon the sayings and positions of the holy doctors, I am ready to die to-day. (Schaff 257)

Huss asked for Christ to have mercy on him but suffered death by fire, after which his ashes

⁴⁰ See Schaff’s *John Huss, His Life, Teachings and Death, After Five Hundred Years*. Charles Scribner’s, 1915. for a comprehensive review of Huss’s life and contributions to religious history in Europe and the West.

were gathered up and thrown into the Rhine river.

As an equivocal counterattack, the writer of *Friar Daw's Reply* exposes the corrupt nature of the friars in his ironic and often ambiguous response to *Jack Upland*. Though the *Friar Daw's Reply* author's verse presents a more complex style than *Jack Upland*, his argument lacks a sufficient response to Jack's charges, and provides the rationale necessary to examine his rhetorical strategy. Given Daw's wordy and pointed 932-line response to *Jack Upland*, this chapter provides a close examination of the opening lines and selected passages thereafter. *Friar Daw's Reply* adds to the triadic relationship of the Upland series, highlights the sustained disagreement over Transubstantiation of the Eucharist, associates with Wyclif's exchange with mendicants during the Blackfriars Council of 1382, and shares relevance with archbishop Arundel's inclination to control Lollard preachers, their books, and their role in universities.

4.2 Friar Daw's Reply: A Friar's Lewed Response

The apocalyptic and prophetic opening of *Friar Daw's Reply* alludes to scriptural references from Jeremiah, Revelation, and Matthew 24, which accuse Lollards of error, heresy, division within the church, and likens them to destructive foxes who teach false fables. Daw's accusation that the Lollards tell "fals fablis" (24) shares the sentiment of *Jack Upland* and the exchange between the Host and Parson in Chaucer's *The Parson's Prologue*. The Host says "Telle us a fable anon, for cokes bones!" (29) of which the Parson replies:

Thou getest fable noon ytoold for me;
For paul, that writeth unto thymothee,
Repreveth hem that weyven soothfastnesse,
And tellen fables and swich wrecchednesse. (31-4)

Daw replies to Jack's accusation that the friars avoid labor⁴¹: "Wede, corn, ne gras wil ye not hewen / Ne lyven wit Jakke in labour, but al to your ese" (34-5). Jack's argument alludes to the parable of the "Wheat and Weeds" found in Matthew 13.24-30 (*Six Ecclesiastical* 179), which is followed by an explanation from Jesus to his Disciples,⁴² this reinforces *Jack Upalnd*'s focus on man's eternal salvation. The Greek word "zizania" (*Latin Vulgate Bible* Matt. 13.25), translated as *tares* or *darnel* in modern editions of the parable, refers to *lolium temulentum*, a weed that looks like wheat before maturity and carries a poisonous fungus that spoils the flour when ground together with the harvested wheat (Thomas et al. 29-44). That Jack calls the friars "divers settis of Antecristis sowing" (57) mirrors the parable's explanation of weeds sown by the enemy at night, while men slept. The similarity of the tares and wheat before they reach maturity represents the circumstance faced by a first-century Palestinian wheat farmer and his ability to distinguish between the two plants. If friars, like the large number of tares in the parable, became entangled with the world as the roots of the wheat and weeds were known to do in the field, then friars present a theological quandary for the church and those in opposition to their destructive behavior and false scriptural glosses. Daw relays no admittance that he prefers to beg over the labor of a plowman, and assumes Jack's "argument ayens so many freres" to be "lewid" (*FDR* 37). Since Daw speaks in third person, he undermines "himself such that he becomes a figure of ridicule" (*Six Ecclesiastical* 180) when he admits that men call him "as lewid as a leke" (45), and confirms that friars do not perform manual labor: "Wede, corn, ne gras have we not to hewen" (55). Though Daw glosses the Apostle Paul's directive that one should preach the gospel day and night from 1 Thessalonians 2:9 and Acts 6, his defense fails to embrace Paul's apostolic life and

⁴¹ *JU* 56-63.

⁴² Matt. 13.36-43

regard for man's eternal salvation. In effect, Daw adopts and appropriates Scripture as needed for his defense; his disregard for exactitude likens his argument to an act of pageantry and a spectacle of falsity. Szittyta notes the friars' famous verbal powers in preaching, of which the Dominicans and Franciscans developed compelling and dynamic abilities to preach using anecdote, story, and fable (52-54). The use and adaption of convictive preaching techniques allowed friars to make meaningful, yet spurious connections to their listeners.

Although the composition of *Friar Daw's Reply* dates to approximately thirty-six years after Wyclif's death in 1384, his influence remained present in Wycliffite and Lollard writings into the middle of the next century. In a direct attack against Wyclif, Daw says "that wickide worme – Wyclif be his name – / Began to sowe the seed of cisme⁴³ in the erthe" (71-2). Though he addresses the selling of sacraments, he assumes that Jack mistakes friars for parish priests, who refuse communion until their parishioners pay their penny (82). As Daw refutes Jack's claims, he resorts to considerable bitterness and impolite name calling in his criticism. Daw likens Jack to Satan or an evildoer ("schrewe") in his defense: Jack "seist that we biden the castels of Caym (105) but Daw refutes that it "is Goddis hous, oold schrewe, that we ben aboute!" (106). Where Jack puts forth a treatise of questions that expose friars for their corrupt nature and opposition to the life of Christ, Daw fires back in a fashion contrary to the teachings of Christ and alludes to scripture from Matthew in lines 114-123⁴⁴:

The spiritis of the devel makyn youre tokenys!
 Thourgh quenching of torches in your taylende ye resseyve your wisdom.⁴⁵
 Youre preching is perilouse; it poiseneth sone;
 As honyed venym it crepith in swot. (125-8)

⁴³ A schism in that Wyclif created a divide within the church.

⁴⁴ 114 (Matt. 7.20); 121 (Matt. 23.23); 122 (Matt. 6.16); 123 (Matt. 23.27)

⁴⁵ Dean glosses this line as "You receive your wisdom through torches quenched in your arse" (*Six Ecclesiastical* 153).

Daw's ninety-line paraphrase⁴⁶ of Revelation 8-11 continues the apocalyptic theme from the opening lines and sustains Daw's rancorous rhetorical strategy of antagonism and the type of personal attack received by FitzRalph. Daw's lengthy paraphrase maintains a negative reference to Wyclif's doctrine, but his discursive style persists in opposition to Jack's regard for man's eternal salvation: "For the which with Farao in helle ye wil be dampned" (189). Though Daw regards the manipulation of scripture as a sin, he acknowledges his ignorance and lack of education: "Jak, thus to dubby with Scripture me thinkith grete folie, / For as lewid am I as thou, God wote the sothe." (211). A similar relationship occurs between a layman and a friar in the texts of *The Layman's Complaint* and *The Friar's Answer*. Where *The Layman's Complaint* draws attention to the unlettered friar's selling of the scripture, *The Friar's Answer* asks the layman what he shall do if mankind can read scripture for themselves and no longer need the assistance of friars. The morose speaker of *The Friar's Answer* attributes the translation of the "gospel in englishe" (10) to the devil, but while his reprobation points to no specific priest,⁴⁷ like Daw, his censure appears as a direct attack against Wyclif. Daw uses his misguided interpretation of sin, which includes pride, wrath, envy, covetousness, lechery, gluttony, sloth, malice, and treachery to liken Jack's religious order to "...Anticristis vanwarde," (217) and that the "devel is your Duke" (219): "Thus semith that ye, more than we, be Anticristis frendis" (224). *Friar Daw's Reply* reveals the vigorous quarrels between friars and those involved in the Lollard and Wycliffite movements whose exegetical commentary remained congruous to Wyclif's antifraternial criticisms long after his death.

⁴⁶ Lines 129-209.

⁴⁷ Robbins notes that the word "poppe" in line 15 refers to any priest (339).

Daw's reply persists at great length to answer each of *Jack Upland's* questions, but his rhetorical strategy recurs as a misunderstanding or an avoidance of Jack's initial query. Though Daw attempts to explain the Holy Trinity, the highest order, he names the orders of angels in heaven, other worldly orders, and exclaims "How many ordis ther ben can I not telle, But if I cowed calkyn al manniskynde" (254-255). While Daw advances his claim with the justification that he cannot calculate all mankind, he evades Jack's question as to what order of friars he belongs to – his clever but illusive response states that he belongs to "Cristis ordre" (260). Friar Daw continues to defend his order's tendency to travel in pairs; he references the Epistle of James where Mary and Martha, Peter and John, and Rachel and Leah represent two perfect lives that live in an active and contemplative manner. As Daw replies to Jack's concerns about the apostolic life, he ignores events in scripture such as Luke 10, where Christ appoints a group of seventy to be laborers of the Lord's harvest: the opening verses of this chapter also lists the principles on which St. Francis founded the order of Friars Minor. That Daw clings to Christ's command to travel in pairs as the seventy in Luke 10 do, confirms his praxis to extract and adopt portions of scripture and ignore critical principles that define discipleship – to maintain a life of poverty.

To contend with the issue of charity, Daw explains the ideals of monastic life and refers again to the Epistle of James in an attempt to contest the argument over faith versus works. Though Daw advocates for the teachings and general behaviors of his fellow friars, that they founded their orders on love, truth and a vow to teach the Christian life, when Daw acknowledges Jack's accusation that friars steal from the poor and rich,

Jak, thou seist we piken from the pore and from the riche,
And not yeven ayenward though that thei ben nedy⁴⁸
That almes is pykyng I fynde it in thi boke,

⁴⁸ "And give them nothing in return although they are indigent." (*Six Ecclesiastical* 159)

And I herde it nevere afor in no manere scripture.
 But if alwey pikers, Jak, thou wolt us maken,
 Ther we piken but seely pans, thi secte pikith poundis.
 What we yeven to the pore, it nedith not thee to telle, (322-9)

he avoids a direct answer, fails to deny the charge, and his ironic remarks instruct Jack that scripture defines one who receives alms as a thief. While Daw appears to regard acts of charity as a private matter in accordance with scripture found in Matthew 6,⁴⁹ he assumes that “almesdede shul be hid and sweten in thin hondis” (329).⁵⁰ Daw defends Jack’s charge that friars take from the rich and poor without giving to those in need (*JU* 95-6) with scriptural glosses that fail to validate the allegations he reverses back onto Jack, Daw’s *modus operandi* illustrates the superfluity of his rhetoric.

That *Friar Daw’s Reply* returns *Jack Upland’s* criticism in regards to expensive clothing worn by mendicants, calls attention to concurrent attitudes conveyed by contemporary sources that circulated among academic and fraternal circles known by the authors of *Jack Upland* and *Friar Daw’s Reply*. Clues that describe Lollard clothing appear in ecclesiastical documents, sermons, anonymous poetic works, and the chronicles of Henry Knighton and Thomas Walsingham (*Premature Reformation* 147). Andrew Cole summarizes the message of a Worcester sermonist in that one cannot go “strictly by the stereotypes... [since lollards] dress like friars, like wolves in sheep’s clothing, going about barefoot without a hood and wearing torn garments as a means to display a feigned fraternal piety” (“Invention” 48). Where Jack asks why a poor beggar wears such precious clothes and to understand the significance of their great hood,

⁴⁹ Matt. 6.1-4 instructs one to keep their alms giving a secret in order to avoid the hypocrisy of other men who shout their deeds in the synagogues and in the streets.

⁵⁰ That his acts of charity will come into misuse in the hands of Jack. See PLH (149) for commentary on “sweten” as taken as the infinitive of “sweat.”

scapular,⁵¹ a knotted girdle, and over-gown (“copis”) made from fine cloth, which shows no sign of poverty; Daw asks if the width and shape of Jack’s gown, robe, and cloak serve to keep him warm. That Daw asks why Lollards wear grey clothes and assumes they signify humility, shows no sign that Lollards wear garments made from fine cloths or of color. Daw’s ironic defense of the friar’s clothing instructs Jack that he should “blame the werer, for myn order hath ordeyned al in good mesure” (355-6). Daw contends that his

...grete coope that is so wijd signefieth charite
That largeli longith to be sprad to sibbe and to frende,
Figurid in the faire cloith of Salomons table,
And bi wedding garnement that Crist hadde at His feeste.
My greet hood behynde, shapun as a sheeld,
Suffraunce in adversitee sothely hit scheweth,
Herbi to reseyye preef for oure Goddis sake. (369-375)

Daw believes that his clothing symbolizes charity, Christ’s wedding garment, sufferance in adversity, and he deflects personal responsibility when he states that the “Frere Menours” (382) will answer Jack’s question as to the “knottide girdil” (381). *Pierce the Plowman’s Crede* acknowledges the possibility that the Franciscans, known as the Greyfriars, “usen russet also, some of this freres, / That bitokneth travaile and trewthe opon erthe.” (719). As for the dress of Lollards, the chroniclers Knighton⁵² and Walsingham⁵³ document that Lollards wore garments of a russet color. Though William Woodford “turns the tables and alleges that the Lollards wore

⁵¹ A sleeveless garment or piece of cloth that hangs from the shoulders, worn over the habit, and reaches to the ground in the front and back. (“scapulārī(e)”), (*Six Ecclesiastical* 137-8).

⁵² “Principales pseudo-Lollardi prima introduction hujus secte nefandre vestibus de russeto utebantur pro majore” (Knighton ii, 184).

⁵³ In reference to the followers of Wyclif, Walsingham states that “indutos longis vestibus de russeto sectae unius” (*Chron Angl* 395). Walsingham’s *Historia Anglicana* warns of Wyclif’s theology and erroneous conclusions as found heretical and contrary to the state and church. He speaks of Wyclif’s companions at Oxford and his comrades, but also of a sect living elsewhere, who wear garments of russet as a sign of perfection, walk with naked feet, and discuss the errors of the church in public and in the sermons they preach (*Historia Anglicana* i. 324).

wide-furred hoods, fine linen, silver buckles, and furred gowns to their feet” (in *Premature Reformation* 146), the Macaronic sermons found in MS Bodley 649 contain theological and political opposition to the Lollards and illustrate additional evidence that they wore simple, unadorned garments. The third sermon of the series affiliates Lollards with the Antichrist and warns of their suspicious dress and behavior:

The first messenger sent by the devil to lead the human race back to slavery is Lollardy wrapped in holiness. They show great external holiness: they fast a great deal, go about in simple clothing, use humble speech, and appear pale. These are signs of holiness, but not everything that glitters is gold.⁵⁴

In a similar tone of the Macaronic sermons, a Worcester sermonist lambastes lollards for their seemingly identical resemblance to friars:

‘Take non hede,’ abyt Crist, ‘of false profites, 3e, valse lollardes, þat cum to 3ow e cloþyng o mekenes & holi leuyng for to teche or to preche 3ow.’ ‘for hardeliche,’ seith Crist, ‘þei be with-in-forth mor cruwel þan any wlues, 3e, & more cursedde þan any hondes...’ (Grisdale 66)

While Daw’s concern with Lollard dress reveals his congruence with the commentary of William Woodford, he exposes an explicit hypocrisy when he attempts to justify the fine vestments worn by his sect. As the colors grey and russet represent the pervasive attire of the lower classes and the limited variations of their dyeing process, one can presume a marked resemblance between a priest, a Lollard, or a Franciscan at first glance.

As Daw continues to answer *Jack Upland*’s questions, he refutes any wrongdoing, deflects claims of heresy, and creates ironic contradictions to in his responses. When asked of the

⁵⁴ Primus nuncius quem demon mittit ad genus huanum ad redigendum ipsum in seruitutem est Lollardria wrappet in holiness. Magnam santitatem ista secta ostendit exterius: abstinent multum in aperto, indedent in simplici apparatu, loquuntur pauperime, et pallide respiciunt. Ista sunt signa sanctitatis, set non est totum aurum quod splendet.” (Horner 85).

friars' "costly housis" (452), Daw turns Jack's inquiry back on him and asks Jack why he "houses thou not pore men as wele as thi beestis?" and then instructs Jack to answer "thine owne" (462) question. Daw claims that the friars' live in cloisters "Foundid afor with charite" (466), with a roof barely hangs on the cross beams; he wishes Jack ill luck and wants to know "where saw thou ever frere houses thourghout the realm, / Lich in ony realte to the toure of Londoun" (470-1). Daw contradicts Matt. 19.21 to justify Jack's allegation that friars steal children away from their homes and draw them into service: "Crist a theef that dide the same, / Sayinge to the riche man, "Go, and selle thi goodis, and gif hem to the pore, yif thou wole be perfit..." (542-543). Daw warrants the theft of children and believes that "Chiste appoved thefte" (554), he insists that (Jack) "in thi frenzy⁵⁵ thou fonnest more and more! / Thou wenyst to make to me a diche, thou fallist thi-silf therinne!" (560-1).⁵⁶ While the selling of sacraments and burial masses became a substantial complaint about friars, Daw's resorts to crude insults – he asserts that Jack lies and contradicts himself: "Thou jawdewyne, thou jangler, how stande this to-gider? / By verre contraiccion thou concludist thi-self" (586-7).⁵⁷ Daw refuses to deny or admit that friars covet the sacrament of confession, but not burial or other charitable acts for the poor; he attempts to use the anger of parish priests as a distraction that friars take tithes that benefit the parish church and blames Jack instead.

While Daw's conclusions parallel the type of anti-Lollard polemic purported by friars and members of state such as Archbishop Thomas Arundel, they draw on similar conclusions that also associated Lollardy with revolt. Though the church strove to connect Wyclif's revolutionary

⁵⁵ Frenzy; act foolishly.

⁵⁶ "You believe you are creating a ditch for me, but you fall into it yourself!" (*Six Ecclesiastical* 166).

⁵⁷ "You half-wit, you chatterbox, how can these statements be reconciled?" (*Six Ecclesiastical* 167).

ideas and attempted theological reform to the revolt of 1381, and declared his twenty-four of his conclusions erroneous, the heresy affiliated with Lollardy became an offense of treason or felony by 1425. Wyclif's final works dealt with exegetical treatises on the Eucharist, Christ's prophecy of the Antichrist, the end of the world, and that Matthew 24 provided a set of events that began to occur verse-by-verse. Though Wyclif condemns the Flanders crusade of 1383, the papal schism, and claims made by both popes, he posits the friars at the center of the prophecies about the Antichrist. The dissemination of Wyclif's exegetical treatises and the implications they held for the power of church and state become clear in the comparison of *Jack Upland* and *Friar Daw's Reply*. Wyclif communicates the prophecy of Christ in Matt. 24.⁵⁸ to explain the entry of friars into the world, and that "many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many" (*KJV*). The argument presented in *Jack Upland* becomes clear when juxtaposed with Wyclif's commentary on Matt. 24, but Daw's reply connects to sources such as *The cruel Constitution of Thomas Arundel*, which shows the extent to which the Church was willing to go to restrain the words, acts, thoughts, and deeds of Wyclif and his followers. Though Jack and Daw argue over what constitutes an apostolic life, the preaching of the gospel, and what defines heresy, they dismiss the importance linked to the translation of the *Bible* into English. As an ardent opponent of the Lollards, Arundel decided who was allowed to preach and required that they carry a letter of permit, he commanded that no book or treatise by John Wyclif be made or read in schools, halls, hospitals, or other places, and proclaims that to translate the text of the holy scripture to English from Latin a dangerous thing. Given Wyclif's death in 1384, Arundel's vehemence

⁵⁸ See Wyclif's *Opera minora*, pp. 354-82 and *Opus evangelicum*, vol. 2, pp. 98-234 for commentary on Matt. 24.

towards the Lollards and followers of Wyclif extended into the fifteenth century and further, which demonstrates the extent of Wyclif's proto-reformation efforts and influence.

Daw's claims of heresy against Jack share consonance with the opposition from officials of Church and state such as Arundel, who declared Lollards and followers of Wyclif as heretics. Although harsh measures were taken to drive Lollards underground by the early fifteenth century, the author of *Friar Daw's Reply* would be aware of John Badby's execution in 1410 and John Oldcastle's failed revolt in 1414. Daw states that the friars "wynnen more therwith than Crist and His apostlis" (604) and that much of their "lyvyng is of the Gospel" (606); he argues that friars live as Paul's apostles did. Though he supports his knowledge and authority of the Gospels in Latin glosses, he contradicts his defense when he asks "how shulden freres pursue heresie, / And many of hem wite not what heresie meneth?" (646-7), and again when he admits that he is "not lettered but I am Frere Dawe, And can telle wel a fyn what heresie amountith" (648-649). Daw reverses Jack's case of heresy and contends that Jack "is called an heretike that heresies sowith, / As Arrians, Wyclyfanes, Sabellyanes..." (661-2), but "thou and thi sect ben heretikes alle" (673). That Daw takes offense to Jack's line of questioning becomes clear in his rhetoric on apostleship and begging, "Daw distinguishes between Christ's divine and human natures. As divine, He had no need to beg; as human, He was poor and needy." (*Six Ecclesiastical* 194). In his *Defensio curatorum*, FitzRalph criticizes the theological conclusion that Christ participated in willful begging:

Also 3if Crist beggide wilfulliche he was a verrey ypocrite, semyng a begger, & was no verrey begger, for Crist was neuer a verrey begger, for no man þat may haue y-now3 at his wille, is a verrey begger, þou3 he begge. But he is a verrey faytour (= deceiver), & he þat beggeþ wilfullich may haue y-nou3 at his wille; for elles he beggeþ nou3t willfulliche, but he is dryue to by nede, and Crist was neuer ypocrite. Panne Crist beggide neuer wilfulliche, noþer as a faytour. (Trevisa 84)

That Daw accepts scripture from Luke 10 and Paul's instructions to the Corinthians⁵⁹ as an endorsement for evangelical begging, he reflects the conflict between *The Layman's Complaint* and *The Friar's Answer*: the layman says "Goddis lawe 3e reuerson, / And mennes howsis 3e persen, / As poul beriþ wittnes." (13-5) to which the friar answers, "Yf y sae hit longoþ not / ffor prestis to worche where þei go, / Þei leggen for hem holi writ / And sein þat seint polle did soo." (17-20). Though Luke 10 contributes to a sustained argument over apostolic poverty in exegetical treatises and antifraternality poetry, Paul stipulates that one should earn food through the means of manual labor as he did,⁶⁰ but Daw prefers lazy begging and to divest the poor of their chattels.

Though the antifraternality tradition highlights the issue that friars operate outside the hierarchy of the church; Amour, FitzRalph, and Wyclif address a dire concern for the church's ecclesiastical order that the church held no official count of friars, and the eschatological prophecy of false prophets and followers of the Antichrist. Jack asks "what charite is it to charge the puple with so many freris," (*JU* 286) "for to encrease with so many freris is greet cumbrance to the puple and agens Goddis wille that made al thingis in mesoure, noumbre, and weight" (288-90). Jack cites a verse from the book of Wisd. 11.20 "You, however, ordered all things by measure, number and weight," a matter taken up by FitzRalph in the *Defensio curatorum*: "But sich multiplicacioun y-founded vpon beggyng & beggerye, as freres telleþ, may nouzt ordeyne a *certeyn* noumbre of persones þat þei schulde fynde, noþer þei mowe of *certein* oon person fynde" (*Trevisa* 58-9). Wycliffite writings such as the "Tractatus de Pseudo-freris" states similarly that "it is good & resonable men to haue chirchis in mesure, & in number, & in

⁵⁹ 1 Cor. 9.14

⁶⁰ See 2 Thes. 3, 1 Thess. 2.9, 1 Cor. 9.14, 2 Cor. 11.7-14, Acts 18.3

weyhte...” (Matthew 321). Langland’s *Piers Plowman* alludes to Wisd. 11.20 in a speech by Conscience on the threat of friars to the parish:

That in measure God made alle manere thynges,
 And sette it at a certain and at a siker nombre...
 Monkes and moniales and alle men of religion—
 Hir ordre and hir reule wole to han a certain noumbre...
 A certein for a certein – save oonliche of freres!
 Forthi, quod Conscience, ‘by Crist kynde wit me telleth
 It is wikked to wage yow – ye wexen out of noumbre! (254-69)

Friar Daw, in his expected and antithetical mode, suggests

Than hath God maad sum thing that He wolde not make,
 And so His sovereyne goodnesse is contrarious to Him-silfe...
 God and Holi Chirche determined noo noumbre
 Of preesties ne of freris to helpen mannis soule,
 For the mo good ther ben the better is Cristis spouse
 And though fewer myghten done that that man nedith,
 Yit many hondis to-gider maken light werk. (821-38)

Daw steps beyond his typical contradictory rhetoric and intimates that if Jack’s acceptance of the Gospel prevails, then Christ contradicts himself. As the theme of apocalypticism and friars as false prophets occurs in *Upland’s Rejoinder*, a discussion on the exegetical interpretations of the Antichrist, Wyclif’s attacks on friars and the papacy, and the Czech reform movement, which includes the writings of John Huss and the Oldcastle Revolt appears in the following chapter.

Debate over the Eucharist and Transubstantiation emerged as a huge consequence for Wyclif and his followers after 1379. Before the dispute Wyclif knew “many friars, especially in the Oxford schools, as his friends and supporters” (Szitty 152).

Throughout the medieval period, the words Jesus used, called the words of institution, were the basis for the central liturgical office of the faith of the Eucharist. Of the sacraments recognized to be outward signs of inward grace, the liturgical celebration of Eucharist in the Mass was regarded as supreme sacrament, in which the entire salvation of the world is embodied. The attempt to understand exactly what occurs in the Eucharist was an important

part of medieval theology from the ninth century onward. Extensive theological dialogue was devoted to understanding exactly what Jesus meant by “this is my body.” After all, anyone could see that is was bread he was holding. (Lahey 104)

Wyclif’s theology on the Eucharist, theories of metaphysics, and propositional realism stem from an ongoing debate, originating in the ninth century, and influenced by William Ockham. In *De eucharista*, Wyclif criticizes Christians who practice a lesser faith than pagans, since a pagan commits a lesser evil if they worship the sun as god than a Christian that worships the accidents seen in the hands of a priest during mass (*De eucharista* 26-7). Wyclif declares God’s gift a deception if one must honor it with an illusion since one’s senses can see the physical nature of bread and wine after the consecration (*De eucharista* 57). Wyclif concludes that a transformation of the elements places the human perception of reality and their senses at risk as a reliable tool of inference (*De eucharista* 73). Friar Daw confuses the argument over the Eucharist and says to Jack that “Thou berist us on honde that we seien there is not Christis bodye”⁶¹ (843). Though Lollards expressed a known concern “about sinful or “unclean” priests having the power to handle Christ’s body and perform the sacrament of Transubstantiation,” (*Six Ecclesiastical* 197) Daw refers to Wyclif by name as he countermands his prior statement and now accedes with the church:

Jak, we seie with Holy Chirche that ther is Cristis bodi,
And not material breed with Wiclyf your maistir,
The whiche put ther but as a signe and not verre Cristis bodi,
Aftir a manere spekyng that Holy Chirche usith (845-8)

Wyclif clarifies his stance on the Eucharist in a distinction between two types of vision, two kinds of meat to eat, and two forms of consumption; he divides the corporal and spiritual life to

⁶¹ You accuse us of saying Christ’s body is not there (*in the bread*) (*Six Ecclesiastical* 174)

affirm that the body of Christ is seen with the mental eye (a spiritual experience), the faith of a mirror (*De eucharista* 13). While Daw believes that the Transubstantiation of the Eucharist “wole not be confect but oonli of a preest” (864)⁶² in his statement made up of the orthodox opinion, Wyclif believed it impossible for one to please God by eating or drinking the sacrament if it represents a sign – he notes a duplicity of falsity in a phrase that translates as *the truth or falsehood double-hater* “veritas odiens duplicitatem falsitatis...” (*De eucharista* 159). As Daw makes no attempt to refute Wyclif’s arguments, Wyclif never denies the presence of Christ in the sacrament but instead, he designates it as a spiritual presence – bread remains bread.

According to Theodore L. Steinberg, *Jack Upland*’s final plea to the friar “seems motivated by an interest in the welfare of his society and of the individuals who compose that society and whose souls may be in jeopardy” (46), Friar Daw suggests that Jack founded his grace “Not in Goddis Gospel but in Sathanas pistle” (900) in his final elaborate attack on Jack’s charges. “*Sathanas pistile: Epistola Luciferi*, an anti-clerical satire in the form of an open letter to popes and bishops sardonically commending their life and pleading only for a little more loyalty to Beelzebub... [and] very popular in the Middle Ages” (Heyworth 161).⁶³ As his reward, Daw insists that Jack “shalt have the Popis curse and al Holi Chrichis... [the curse] yovun to Caym, and Choeis... the curse that Crist yaf to Phariseis,... [and the curse] Figurid in the figge tree” (907-11). Daw wishes the sorrows of Mount Gilboa, Sodom, Moab and Ariel, and the curse of Saint Francis.⁶⁴ Daw informs Jack that if his questions “...not thi sawes sufficientli assoiled, /

⁶² That it can be created by no one except a priest.

⁶³ See *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe: A New and Complete Edition*. vol. 3, pp. 190-193. or Anne Hudson’s *Selections From English Wycliffite Writings*. pp 89-93.

⁶⁴ Saint Francis “wished his brothers only to pray and not to read, cursed a Friar Minor who founded a convent for study in Balogna. The friar fell ill and died when a ball of fire and Sulphur struck him in his bed.” (*Six Ecclesiastical* 199).

Let hem senden ayen, it shal be amendid” (926-7), a provocative remark that prompts *Upland’s Rejoinder*. That Daw labels Jack a “Jawdewyne” [a fool], commends him to God, and that he should no longer advise friars how to preach, provides an ironic and suspicious ending to *Friar Daw’s Reply* since in the fifteenth century the word daw, or jackdaw became synonymous with a fool or lazy person. Though the word daw also means a specific type of crow, there remains a possibility that it refers to the black habits of Dominican friars.

The rhetorical relationship between *Jack Upland* and *Friar Daw’s Reply* embodies the dissemination of Wycliffite thought and Lollard movement that led to the adverse reactions from members of church and state. While Steinberg suggests that *Friar Daw’s Reply*, when regarded as a satirical work against friars, is “made more pointed, more subtle, by having been put into the mouth of a friar” (46), Margaret Aston notes the commonalities between Lollards and their mendicant counterparts in that those “with similar aspirations and temperaments, if they are not the best of friends, always make the worst of rivals” (17). Wyclif’s reform efforts invited a fundamental change to the practices of the church and the preaching of the Bible that altered the known methods and doctrines of the establishment. Though Lollardy emanates from Wyclif’s teachings, it “remained throughout... a theological movement, to which its... considerable literature and the records of ecclesiastical proceedings bear abundant witness (Aston 2). As *Friar Daw’s Reply* responds to the figure of Jack Upland, who became a figure for secular clerics in opposition to mendicant friars, the Lollard author of *Upland’s Rejoinder* takes up the position of an indignant countryman in response to Friar Daw.

5 UPLANDS REJOINDER

5.1 *Upland's Rejoinder: Apocalyptic Discourse and the Figure of Antichrist in Piers Plowman and the Antifraternal Tradition*

As a singular work in the margins of the *Friar Daw's Reply*, *Upland's Rejoinder* leaves no question about the lines to which it replies, and like Daw, the author substantiates his claims with Latin scriptural quotations, bitter name calling, and abusive remarks. The *Rejoinder* embodies the late medieval antifraternal literary tradition and calls for an analysis of the dialogue created between the *Rejoinder* and Langland's *Piers Plowman* because of their common themes – especially the apocalypse and the entrance of Antichrist. Although Langland composed the B-text approximately 70 years earlier⁶⁵, the *Rejoinder* picks up where *Piers Plowman* leaves off, with the entrance of Antichrist, which exposes the dangers of the friars' mendicancy. Subsequent to Langland, the *Rejoinder* illustrates how friars pose a threat to the church: they choose begging over physical work, they engage in materialistic desires in the selling of sacraments, and as followers of Antichrist, they attack the church as false prophets. The consonance between the *Rejoinder* and *Piers Plowman* expands the complex intertextuality in that “friars are not simply set within a social or ecclesiastical or empirical framework, but within a symbolic frame that stretches from the present to the end of time. The friars do not merely exist within the present; they help to reveal it meaning by locating it within Salvation History” (Szittyá 247-8). This chapter examines how the *Rejoinder* and *Piers Plowman* illustrate in common the tropes of antifraternal poetry, in which *Piers Plowman* demonstrates the degree that friars fit into the discussion of a world in moral decline, and serve as a symbol for the apocalyptic and

⁶⁵ Langland composed the A-text from 1367-70, the B-text between 1377-9 where he adds additional material, and the C-text in the 1380's where he makes revisions to all but the final sections. This chapter focuses on Langland's B-text.

eschatological interpretations of Antichrist. Of most importance to this discussion, this chapter aligns selected passages that illustrate how the themes of poverty and begging account for the lack of charity and the fall of morality and virtue, showing that over half a century later, the *Rejoinder* appears to echo closely the ideas in *Piers Plowman*. While the faults of friars reoccur in the Upland series and related antifraternal writings mentioned in previous chapters, they are described with analogous language and function as prominent figures of the apocalypse and Antichrist; Langland's condemnatory descriptions of friars, by contrast, operate in a metaphorical fashion, differing somewhat from the more abusive language found in the *Rejoinder* or FitzRalph's *Defensio*.

Upland launches his rebuttal in response to Daw's apocalyptic opening⁶⁶ and shares similar language with *Piers Plowman*, the *Mum and the Sothsegger*, and Chaucer's *The Parliament of Fowls* that characterizes friars as chattering, deceitful birds. In a direct address to Daw Topias, the *Rejoinder* author claims that Daw "...hast condicions of a tame chowghe / [and he] ...chiterith and he bribith alle that he may gete" (7-8). To suggest Daw chatters like coughs, associates him with a species of crow-like bird call a daw or jackdaw, known for its ability to be tamed and taught to mimic human voices (*Six Ecclesiastical* 216). A reference to "chowghe" appears in the *Mum and the Sothsegger*, where the term sothsegger refers to a soothsayer or one who practices divination by means of physical signs: the term also takes its root from Arabic, and means to make unusual noises, croon, or hum. Where the *Mum and Sothsegger* describes the Soothsegger as "chiding and chatering as choghe was ever" (345), Chaucer's *The Parliament of Fowls* attributes thievery to the crow and associates the magpie

⁶⁶ Since *Upland's Rejoinder* appears in the margins of *Friar Daw's Reply*, the direct correlations between the poems are obvious.

with friars who chatter: “The thef, the chough, and ek the janglynge pye” (345). In Passus XII of *Piers Plowman*, Ymaginatif speaks of Kynde who “...is the pies patron and putteth it hir ere” (XII.226), and then explains how the peacock symbolizes the wealthy:

‘Ac of briddes and of beestes men by olde tyme
 Ensamples token and termes, as telleth thise poetes,
 And that the faireste fowel foulest engendreth,
 And the feblest fowel of flight is that fleeth or swymmeth.
 And that is the pecok, and the pehen — proude riche men thei
 bitokneth.
 For the pecok and men pursue hym may nocht flee heighe:
 For the trailynge of his tail overtaken is he soone.
 And his flessch is foul flessch, and his feet bothe,
 And unlovelich of ledene and looth for to here. (XII.235-43)

Where friars become associated with the chattering of magpies and their habits of black and white, Langland also adopts a negative personification of the peacock in terms of the wealthy, whose many possessions prevent their flight:

So is possession peyne of pens and of nobles
 To alle hem that it holdeth til hir tail be plukked.
 And though the riche repente thanne and birewe the tyme
 That evere he gadered so grete and gaf therof so litel,
 Though he crye to Crist thanne with kene wille,
 I leve his ledene be in Oure Lourdes ere lik a pies. (XII.247-52)

As with the magpie, avian symbolism in ecclesiastical texts plays on the difference between inner qualities and outer appearances, here arguing that the a peacock’s tail “denotes foresight, since the tail being behind is that which is to come; and foresight is the faculty of taking heed to that which is to come” (Evans 312), symbolizing one who practices divination. The peacock, which “is said to have the slinking gait of a thief, the voice of the devil, and an angel’s garb” (312), hides its menacing qualities beneath its showy plumage. In all cases found in ecclesiastical satire, both the magpie and peacock conceal their deceitful nature beneath their distinctive outer garments and persuasive rhetoric.

Upland continues to represent the negative behaviors of animals as they are represented in Christian exegetes, which portray animals such as the fox as heretics and false teachers.⁶⁷ Upland claims that the friar "...blaberest blasphemies..." (10) falser than Satan's in his second temptation of Christ.⁶⁸ He counters Daw, calls him the "...fabelst of foxes..." (14), and says if one took the "...propirte of tweye foxes and werkes of tweye freres, / And than thou fyndest hem in eche acorde, bot freres ben the werse" (18-19). To demonstrate the destructive nature of friars who travel in pairs, Upland employs the story of Sampson,⁶⁹ who caught 300 foxes, bound them in pairs with torches, and released them into the standing grain of the Philistines. In Passus VIII of *Piers Plowman*, in search of Dowel, Will meets a pair of friars who he calls "Maistres of the Menours, men of grete witte" (VIII.9). Will assumes the pair of friars can tell him where to find Dowel since they know the rural areas, courts, and travel all over the lands, however, Langland illustrates the deceitful nature of foxes in the friars' reply: "Amonges us... that man is dwellynge, / And evere hath, as I hope, and evere shal hereafter" (VIII.18-19). Out of frustration, Will disputes the friars' claim:

...Soothly, *Sepcies in die cadit iustus*.⁷⁰
 Sevene sithes, seith the Book, synneth the rightfulle,
 And whoso synneth, I seide, dooth yvele, as me thynketh,
 And Dowel and Do-yvele mowe noght dwelle togideres.
Ergo he nys noght alwey at hoom amonges yow freres:
 He is outhwhile elliswhere to wisse the peple. (VIII.21-6)

The friars assume the role of foxes, when they use a "forbisne" (a parable) to teach Will about a man in a boat, who after being battered by winds, is not thrown into the sea. Will objects to the

⁶⁷ 2 Peter 2.1; Judges 15.4-5; Song of Songs 2.15.

⁶⁸ Matt. 4.6

⁶⁹ Judges 15

⁷⁰ For a just man shall fall seven times [and shall rise again]... (Prov 24.16).

relevance of the parable, claims “no kynde knowyng,... to conceyve alle thi wordes” (VIII.57), and takes leave to “go lerne better” (VIII.58). That the pair of friars attempt to teach Will using a parable as a metaphorical tool, shows their understanding of Christ’s common method of teaching, in which he shared a lesson of morality to all types of people in terms they could understand. Foxes symbolize a duplicitous and dangerous creature that reflects a long held attitude in religious thought from authors such as Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, and Bede, which Chaucer personifies in the relationship between the cock and fox of the Nun’s Priest’s Tale, where he personifies “the controversy which took place in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries between the secular clergy and the friars” (Dahlberg 277). Arnold Williams points out that “Chaucer accepts and reflects the attitude of the secular party,” and that “in fact, the attitude of the whole of Chaucer’s treatment of the friars is paralleled in the writings of William and FitzRalph” (“Chaucer and the Friars” 513). Similarly, both the *Rejoinder* and *Piers Plowman* capture the moral quality of the fox in their allegorical representation of the deceitful devil and crafty heretic.

As religious exegetes described signs that indicated the appearance of Antichrist, the “most popular sign of the end is the universal moral and religious decay resulting in a great increase of evil... [from which decay] in the church will be prevalent, for evil priests, prophets, and teachers will deceive Christians” (Emmerson 84). The issue of friars as pseudo-prophets of the Antichrist forms a significant thread throughout much of the *Rejoinder*. William of St. Amour’s *De Antichristo et eius ministris* attacks friars in a manner similar to that of the *Rejoinder* and *Piers Plowman* in that they charge friars for their lack of charity, refusal to do physical labor, and proclivity for begging, which lead to the internal weakening of the church. Upland glosses 1 Cor. 4.11 to stress Paul’s message on discipleship: “For Poule laborid with his

hondes, and other postilles also” (32). The exegetical interpretations of the Antichrist varied during the middle ages and depended on complex but contradictory beliefs taken from enigmatic biblical scripture in the books of 1 John, 2 John, Daniel, and Matthew.⁷¹ The medieval church associated Antichrist with apocalyptic and eschatological characterizations that identify Antichrist with the last days, the end of the world, those that deny Christ, and false teachers of the Gospel. Where the Antichrist became affiliated with numerous types of symbols and numerological explanations, *Piers Plowman* describes the coming of the Antichrist with the traditional language found in the *Rejoinder*:

For Antecrist and hise al the world shul greve,
 And acombre thee, Conscience, but if Crist thee helpe.
 And false prophetes fele, flatereris and gloseris,
 Shullen come and be curatours over kynges and erles.
 And thanne shal Pride be Pope and prynce of Holy Chirche,
 Coveitise and Unkyndenesse Cardinals hym to lede.
 Forthi, ' quod Grace, "er I go, I wol gyve yow tresor,
 And wepne to fighte with whan Antecrist yow assailleth. (IXX.220-227)

The prophecy of the Antichrist in *Piers' Passus IXX* predicts the arrival and corruption of the church in *Passus XX*, which describes the Antichrist as one who comes “in mannes forme” (XX.52) and “kutte away truthe” (XX.56) – “Freres folwede that fend, for he gaf hem copes” (XX.58), but “oonly fooles... [who chose to not follow him] were wel gladdere to deye” (XX.61-2). In *Passus XX* of *Piers Plowman*, Will dreams that he sees the entrance of Antichrist, which is followed by the friars.

Antecrist cam thane, and al the crop of truthe
 Torned it [tid] up-so-down, and overtilte the roote,
 And made fals sprynge and sprede and spede mennes nedes.
 In ech a contree ther he cam he kutte away truth,
 And gerte gile growe there as he a god weere. (20.55-57)

⁷¹ See chapters 1 and 2 of Emerson's *Antichrist in the Middle Ages*. U of W Press, 1981.

The Antichrist embodies the common anti-fraternal trope that friars sow seeds of deceit and remove all truth, which leads mankind to succumb to earthly desires. The friars follow the Antichrist because

...he gaf hem copes,
 And religiouse revered hym and rongen hir belles,
 And al the covent cam to welcome a tyraunt,
 And alle hise as wel as hym — save oonly fooles;
 Whiche fooles were wel gladdere to deye
 Than to lyve lenger sith Leute was so rebuked,
 And a fals fend Antecrist over alle folk regnede. (58-64)

Langland emphasizes criticisms of friars' clothing that the authors of *Jack Upland* and the *Reply* repeat years later. In the *Rejoinder*, Upland describes the "ypocrites habit" (176) as one that does more harm than good; he claims their "coloure... signifieth sadnes" (178) and that their "disformed shap... signifieth your holiness...", (180) which does "litol help make an ape a seint!" (182), and "blyndith many foles" (186). *Piers Plowman* depicts the Antichrist's army as one that "includes the vicious clergy, especially the friars, the archetypal hypocrites condemned throughout the poem" (Emerson 199).

Like Langland, Upland states that "lewed men prechen not, as thou canst saye bot if the list lye" (77).⁷² Upland supports his claim with a gloss of Matthew 24:11: *Surgent multi pseudoprophete*" (82),⁷³ and grounds his case against Daw in a gloss of Isaiah 5:20: "*Ve vobis qui dicitis bonum malum, et malum bonum*" (95).⁷⁴ Upland declares Daw a "pseudo" (99), a Pharisee who lives in hypocrisy, an unprofitable apostate that speaks with a perverse mouth, and a one who "hast light conscience... [to judge and] ...damnest men to helle with-out any condicion" (105-6). To further emphasize Daw's behavior, Upland paraphrases Daniel 14, where

⁷² But ignorant men don't preach, as thou realize unless you choose to lie. (Dean 206)

⁷³ "And many false prophets shall arise."

⁷⁴ Woe to you that call evil good, and good evil.

the priests of Baal beguiled the king and stole food to illustrate that friars steal from the rich and poor, but say they worship God. He insists that Daw

...broylist up many lesynges,
 For grounde of thin ordre not groundid in the Gospel.
 For see thes thre vertues, whiche thou here rehersist,
 Faylen in thin ordre welny in every persone.
 For in obedience, and chastite, and poverte also,
 Ye folowen more Anticrist than Jesu Christ our Lorde.
 Ye ben more obedient to your owene reules
 Than to the ruelas of Crist groundid in lawe. (131-137)

Passus XX of *Piers Plowman* also attacks the friars' abuse of mendicancy and demonstrates their "rejection of the world and reliance on alms, [which] seems to lead inevitably to the destruction of the church" (Simpson 244), and also "as a tool of reform [to show the] manner of living which he (Langland) portrays his dreamer as leading..." (Kirby-Fulton 160). Langland's attitude towards the friars' false begging, which he defines as harmful to the spirit and a threat to the church becomes evident in Passus XX when Need associates Will with the abuse of mendicancy: Forthi be nought abashed to bide and by nedy, / Sith he that wroghte al the world was wilfulliche nedy, / Ne nevere noon so nedy ne povere deide" (48-50). Upland's attitude towards the behavior and false teachings of the friars grows in intensity as he claims their words are "medled with venym" (204), and that they "laborist fast to lede thi-self to helle, And blyndest many lewde foles with thi stynkyng brethe." (217-218). As the *Rejoinder* continues to list complaints about the friars' false teaching and begging, he likens them to the Antichrist: "For ye begge or ye preche, many tymes oft," (285) "And Daw, truly your dedes contrarie Crist" (289). Upland repeats common complaints about the friars' lack of knowledge, lying, simony, and false preaching:

Daw, thou has lerned so long to lye, thou wenest thou saist soth
 Whan thou liest most lowed and sclauderist the truthe.
 Thou saidist thou were no lettred man; thou prevest thi-self fals,

For thou spekist of jerarchies, of hersies also.
 Thou art gilty in alle thes poyntes, and thi brether both;
 That I wolde preve apertly if that the tyme suffrid.
 Lok your lyvyng, your prechyng, with other opun dedes,
 And laye it by the apostles lyf, and se how thai acorde;
 And, as I wene, the Holigost appreveth nether nouthur. (311-319)

Upland “translates us into the simplistic world of reformist propaganda... [where truth] has become an exposition of the corruption of the friars” (Nolcken 94).

Where friars “come to represent everything that detracts from love, repentance, and the pursuit of grace – and hence from the possibility of salvation [Langland] turns to the issue of the friars’ faulty administration of penance – in effect, their theft – the burden of the remainder of the poem” (Barney 236). Langland presses his concern that “...parissh preestes, that sholde the peple shryve” (XX.281) and the implications bound up in an ineffectual confession when people “fleen to freres,” (285) to avoid the feeling of shame, but then “suffre the dede in dette to the day of doome” (294). The matter of shame raises a conflict that FitzRalph advances in the *Defensio*: “for a man is more schamfast to schryue hym to his ordinarie þan to eny frere, for a man is more schamfast to shewe his synnes to hym þat he seeþ al day þan to hym he seeþ but ones a zere” (Trevisa 53). Langland personifies the Friars as *greed* in the guise of *material need*, through which they transform the sacrament of penance and destroy the church.

Of A pryvee paiement, and I shal praye for yow,
 And for al[le hem] that ye ben holden to, al my lif tyme,
 And make yow [and] my Lady in masse and in matins
 As freres of oure fraternytee for a litel silver. (XX.365-368)

Friars collects payments, glosses scripture, and makes false promises until Contrition “...hadde clene foryeten to crye and to wepe, / And wake for hise wikked werkes as he was wont to done.” (XX.370-1). Langland illustrates the power of Antichrist to weaken the conscience and endanger the position of the church – the *modus operandi* that sustains one’s spiritual strength. Upland

recapitulates his view on mendicancy: “namely, that begging is permissible provided the beggar be both poor and needy” (Dean 224).

Begged never Crist ne non of His membres.
 For Crist, that is truthe, may in no wise
 Contrarie Him-self, ne God that is His Fadir,
 For in many places thai damnen suche sturdy begging. (335-8)

Upland’s position concurs with two Wycliffite conclusions that Gregory XI condemns in *De haretico comburendi* (1401) and includes article 23: “Item quod fratres teneantur per laborem manuum, et non per mendicationem, victum suum acquirere” (Netter 282)⁷⁵; and article 24: “Item quod conferens eleemosynam fratibus, vel fratri praedicanti, est excommunicatus; et recipiens” (282).⁷⁶ Upland, and well as Langland, regard the friars’ iniquity, which they measure against Christ’s absolute poverty, as their insistent need to beg.

Whereas the Lollard figure of Upland shares his complaints against the Antichrist’s followers “less subtly than Langland’s friars and a sentimentalized version of his plowman” (96), both authors expose a disintegration of social order. In any case, the friars’ mendicancy emblemizes a consistent eschatological premise; the end of times and the church – apocalypse. From William of St. Amour’s *De periculis*, FitzRalph’s *Defensio*, and the variety of sermons, treatises, and literary works consonant with the Wycliffite movement, friars converge with an eschatological discourse on the end of the world and the entrance of Antichrist.

6 CONCLUSION

The Upland series, though largely ignored, exemplifies an antifraternality literary tradition that criticizes friars from the 1250’s to the mid-fifteenth century. The poems represent an era of

⁷⁵ Friars should their means for living in manual work, not by begging.

⁷⁶ Any person who contributes alms to friars, or a friar who preaches, be excommunicated along with the recipient.

complex historical and theological significance that pervades the poetry of major authors such as Chaucer and Langland in vernacular poetry, but also theology texts, eschatology, sermons, chronicles, and Biblical exegesis. As authors of the late medieval period became concerned with the decay of human society, the subject of friars grew into an even greater disquietude about the End of times. *Jack Upland*, *Friar Daw's Reply*, and *Upland's Rejoinder* come not at the beginning or end, but in the middle of a long period of religious turmoil and proto-reformation efforts, as they limned the outlines of a growing reformist impulse only later realized under Henry VIII.

The establishment of friars in 1209 under Pope Innocent III constituted the first religious group to operate outside the hierarchy of the church, which led to a series of significant reform efforts by secular clergy. William of St. Amour, a master in the Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris,⁷⁷ argued against the inclusion of friars in the university and the church. William of St. Amour's *De periculis*,⁷⁸ an exegetical treatise "On the Dangers of the Last Times," advanced the theory that mendicant friars posed a threat to the world. Rooted in Scripture, *De periculis* does not perform a direct attack on friars; it glosses Scripture in order to list behaviors of those associated with the arrival of Antichrist. Archbishop Richard FitzRalph held a position among the secular clergy as a master theologian and gained a reputation as the fiercest opponent of friars since William of St. Amour. FitzRalph's *Defensio Curatorum* takes up the fiery condemnation initiated by William of St. Amour, glosses Scripture, condemns the friars, considers them cursed, charges St. Francis of Assisi with their very existence, and argues

⁷⁷ The *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* documents the medieval records of the University of Paris and contains vital communications between faculty, students, and authorities of government and religion. Volume 1 details disputes between William of St. Amour, Pope Innocent IV, and Pope Alexander IV.

⁷⁸ *Tractatus de periculis novissimorum temporum ex Scripturis sumptus*.

for the immediate removal of their privileges by Pope Alexander IV. Although John Wyclif was ordained as a priest in 1351, his polemical works against the friars did not take up the antifraternial banner until 1379. Wyclif's *Summa Theologie*, which argued that "the foundation of all human law in God's law and its implications for secular politics, ecclesiology, scriptural interpretation, and crimes against God's commands" (Lahey 14), angered the English bishops and led to his condemnation in 1377, when the ire of the church was rendered in a papal bull by Gregory XI. His *De Blasphemia*, claimed that friars divided the Body of Christ, erroneously presumed to hear confessions, and absolve people from sin, and they committed sins of lechery, adultery, extortion, robbery, and usury. Deriving a consonance of vision from William of St. Amour, FitzRalph, and Wyclif, the Upland series attacks the ecclesiastical privileges of friars, glosses Scripture in order to catalogue the behaviors of those associated with the arrival of Antichrist, making enquiries concerning property, lordship, possessions, and right of use, and recognizing that friars should live in a state of poverty and virtue according to St. Peter.

Jack Upland, *Friar Daw's Reply*, and *Upland's Rejoinder* reflect virtually identical attitudes towards mendicant friars that appear in the antifraternial and anti-mendicant poetry composed in the vernacular by secular poets such as Chaucer and Langland, and anonymous Wycliffite or Lollard writers following the promulgation of Wyclif's Eucharistic heresies (1380-1382). *Jack Upland* embraces the notion of common profit that appears in the works of Chaucer and Langland. In Chaucer's political dream vision, the *Parliament of Fowles*, the narrator exhibits anxiety for the welfare of the community and the duty of the individual, and in the *Prologue* of Langland's *Piers Plowman*, rats convene to discuss the construction of a collar for their common profit, fasten a bell to it, and hang it on the cat's neck to avoid him. *Jack Upland* also critiques the three estates, which Chaucer criticizes in the characters of the Knight, Parson,

and Plowman. *Friar Daw's Reply* answers *Jack Upland* in a "point-for-point rebuttal... [as a] fraternal answer to a Lollard work" (*Six Ecclesiastical* 145), and shares an affinity with the anonymous poems *Defend Us From All Lollardry* and *The Friar's Answer*, which present mendicant replies⁷⁹ that respond to *The Layman's Complaint*, an anonymous poem that comments on the virtues of poverty. *Friar Daw's Reply* displays commonly disparaged qualities about friars in that they adopt and appropriate Scripture, which lends to their ability to preach sermons and sell sacraments. *Upland's Rejoinder* appears as a singular work in the margins of *Friar Daw's Reply* and shares common themes such as the apocalypse and the entrance of Antichrist with Langland's *Piers Plowman*. Although Langland composed the B-text approximately 70 years earlier⁸⁰, the *Rejoinder* picks up where *Piers Plowman* leaves off, with the entrance of Antichrist, which exposes the dangers of the friars' mendicancy. The Upland series realizes Langland's apocalyptic ending of *Piers Plowman* as a vanguard army of friars threatens the church and ushers in Antichrist.

As I have shown, the Upland series finds its roots in the complex history of antifraternal literature and the Wycliffite movement, and through the examination of both religious and historical documents alongside the literary counterparts through which they found more popular expression. Given the tensions created by the evolving social and economic landscape of Western Europe, these persistent attitudes towards friars embodied perceptions that were symbolic, theological, and dealt with what friars were – *sub specie aeternitatis* – men who lived

⁷⁹ *Defend Us From All Lollardry* and *The Friar's Answer* show the mendicant's concerns for the Lollards and the translated Bible; the availability of the Bible in the vernacular allows for laypersons to question the authority of mendicants.

⁸⁰ Langland composed the A-text from 1367-70, the B-text between 1377-9 where he adds additional material, and the C-text in the 1380's where he makes revisions to all but the final sections. This chapter focuses on Langland's B-text.

contrary to Christ and posed a danger to the eternal state of man's soul. As the Upland series represent numerous anonymous works of poetry and exegetical treatises, and reflects decades of religious proto-reformation efforts in the late medieval period, their relevance and importance highlight the need for updated examination of analogous texts amid this period of continuously evolving religious thought.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aers, David. *Beyond Reformatoin?, An Essay on William Langland's Piers Plowman and the End of Constantinian Christianity*. U of Notre Dame P, 2015.
- "Apostatā, N 1, 3". *MED*, Univeristy of Michigan, 2013,
<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED1858>.
- Aston, Margaret. *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion*. Hambleton, 1984.
- Barney, Stephen A. *The Penn Commentary on Peirs Plowman*. vol. 5, U of Pennsylvania P, 2006.
- Bonser, Wilfrid. *The Medical Background of Anglo-Saxon England: A Study in History, Psychology, and Folklore*. Wellcome Historical Medical Library, 1963.
- Bostick, Curtis. *The Antichrist and the Lollards: Apocalypticism in Late Medieval and Reformation England*. Brill, 1998.
- Bowers, John M. "Piers Plowman and the Police: Notes toward a History of the Wycliffite Langland." *The Yearbook of Langland Studies*, vol. 6, 1992, pp. 1-50.
- Brown, Ortuinus Gratius and Edward. *Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum Et Fugiendarum*. vol. 2, Impensis Richardi Chiswell, 1690.
- Burrow, J.A. *Thomas Hoccleve*. Variorum, 1994.
- Bury, Richard de. *The Philobiblon of Richard De Bury Bishop of Durham Treasurer and Chancellor of Edward Iii*. edited by Ernest C. Thomas, Kegan Paul, Trench and Co, 1888.
- Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*. edited by Heinrich Denifle and Emile Chatelain, vol. 1, Delalain, 1889.

- Chaucer, Geoffrey. "Parliament of Fowls." *The Riverside Chaucer*, edited by Larry D. Benson, 3rd edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987, pp. 383-394.
- . "The Parson's Prologue." *The Riverside Chaucer*, edited by Larry D. Benson, 3rd edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987, pp. 287-288.
- . *The Riverside Chaucer*. edited by Larry D. Benson, 3rd edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987.
- . "The Wife of Bath's Tale." *The Riverside Chaucer*, edited by Larry D. Benson, 3rd edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987, pp. 116-122.
- Cigman, Gloria. *Lollard Sermons*. Oxford UP, 1989.
- "Clēpen, V 2b". *MED*, University of Michigan 2013, <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED7971>.
- Cole, Andrew. "Langland and Lollardy: The Form of the Matter." *The Yearbook of Langland Studies*, vol. 17, 2003, pp. 3-6.
- . *Literature and Heresy in the Age of Chaucer*. Cambridge UP, 2008.
- . "William Langland's Lollardy." *The Yearbook of Langland Studies*, vol. 17, 2003, pp. 25-54.
- . "William Langland and the Invention of Lollardy." *Lollards and Their Influence in Late Medieval England*, Edited by Fiona Somerset, et al., Boydell, 2003, pp. 37-58.
- "Cōlōur, N. 5b". *MED*, University of Michigan 2013, <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED8462>.
- Dahlberg, Charles. "Chaucer's Cock and Fox." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, vol. 53, no. 3, 1954, pp. 277-90.
- "Defend Us from All Lollardry." *Historical Poems of the Xivth and Xvth Centuries*, edited by Russell Hope Robbins, Columbia UP, 1959, pp. 152-157.

- Denery, Dallas G. II. "From Sacred Mystery to Divine Deception: Robert Holkot, John Wyclif and the Transformation of Fourteenth-Century Eucharistic Discourse." *Journal of Religious History*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2005, pp. 129-144.
- "Dialogue between a Friar and a Secular." *Four Wycliffite Dialogues*, edited by Fiona Somerset, Oxford UP, 2009, pp. 32-42.
- Dobson, R.B. *The Peasants Revolt of 1381*. Macmillan, 1983.
- Dolan, T. P. "Langland and FitzRalph: Two Solutions to the Mendicant Problem." *YLS*, vol. 2, 1988, pp. 35-45.
- Emmerson, Richard Kenneth. *Antichrist in the Middle Ages: A Study of Medieval Apocalypticism, Art, and Literature*. U of Washington P, 1981.
- The English Works of Wyclif: Hitherto Unprinted*. edited by F.D. Matthew, Trubner & Co, 1880.
- Epstein, Steven A. *An Economic and Social History of Later Medieval Europe 1000-1500*. Cambridge UP, 2009.
- Evans, Edward Payson. *Animal Symbolism in Ecclesiastical Architecture*. Henry Holy & Co., 1896.
- Fiona Somerset, Jill C. Havens, and Derrick G. Pitard, editor. *Lollards and Their Influence in Late Medieval England*. Boydell, 2003.
- "FōL, N. 1a, 2". *MED*, University of Michigan, 2013,
<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED16528>.
- Foxe, John. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe: A New and Complete Edition*. edited by Stephen Reed Cattley, vol. 3, R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837.
- "Friar Daw's Reply." *Six Ecclesiastical Satires*, edited by James Dean, Medieval Institute Publications, 1991, pp. 145-200.

"The Friar's Answer." *Historical Poems of the Xivth and Xvth Centuries*, edited by Russell Hope Robbin, Columbia UP, 1959, pp. 166-167.

Gayk, Shannon. "As Plou3men Han Preued: The Alliterative Work of a Set of Lollard Sermons." *The Yearbook of Langland Studies*, vol. 20, 2006, pp. 43-65.

Geltner, G. *The Making of Medieval Antifraternalism*. Oxford UP, 2012.

---, editor. *William of Saint-Amour De Periculis Novissimorum Temporum*, translated by G. Geltner. Peeters, 2008.

Ghosh, Kantik. *The Wycliffite Heresy*. Cambridge UP, 2002.

Gower, John. *The Complete Works of John Gower*. Edited by G.C. Macaulay, Clarendon, 1902.

---. "Vox Clamatis." *The Complete Works of John Gower*. Edited by G.C. Macaulay, Clarendon, 1902, pp. 3-313.

"HabĭT, N. 1, 2". *MED*, University of Michigan, 2013,

<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED19738>.

Hanna, Ralph III. "The Difficulty of Ricardian Prose Translation: The Case of the Lollards."

Modern Langauge Quarterly, vol. 51, no. 3, 1990, pp. 319-340.

Heyworth, P. L. *Jack Upland, Friar Daw's Reply, and Upland's Rejoinder*. Oxford UP, 1968.

Heyworth, P.L. "The Earliest Black-Letter Editions of Jack Upland." *Hunting Library Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 4, 1967, pp. 307-314.

---. "Jack Upland's Rejoinder: A Lollard Interpolator and Piers Plowman." *Medium Aevum*, vol. 36, 1967, pp. 242-248.

Hoccleve, Thomas. "Address to Sir John Oldcastle." *Hoccleve's Works: The Minor Poems*, edited by Frederick J. Furnivall and I Gollancz, Oxford UP, 1970, pp. 8-24.

---. *The Regiment of Princes*. edited by Charles R. Blyth, Medieval Institute Publications, 1992.

- Hornbeck, J. Patrick. *What Is a Lollard? Dissent and Belief in Late Medieval England*. Oxford UP, 2010.
- Horner, Patrick J., editor. *A Macaronic Sermon Collection from Late Medieval England: Oxford, Ms Bodley 649*. Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2006.
- Howard Thomas, Jayne Elisabeth Archer, and Richard Marggraf Turley. "Remembering Darnel, a Forgotten Plant of Literary, Religious, and Evolutionary Significance." *Journal of Ethnobiology*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2016, pp. 29-44.
- Hudson, Anne. *English Wycliffite Writings*. Cambridge UP, 1978.
- . "Five Problems in Wycliffite Texts and a Suggestion." *Medium Aevum*, vol. 80, no. 2, 2011, pp. 301-324.
- . "Langland and Lollardy?" *The Yearbook of Langland Studies*, vol. 17, 2003, pp. 93-105.
- . "A Lollard Compilation and the Dissemination of Wycliffite Thought." *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1972, pp. 65-81.
- . *Lollards and Their Books*. The Hambledon Press, 1985.
- . *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History*. Oxford UP, 1988.
- . *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings*. Toronto UP, 1997.
- "Jack Upland." *Six Ecclesiastical Satires*, edited by James Dean, Medieval Institute Publications, 1991, pp. 115-144.
- Jack Upland Friar Daw's Reply and Upland's Rejoinder*. edited by P. L. Heyworth, Oxford UP, 1968.
- John Trevisa, et al. *Dialogus Inter Militem Et Clericum: Richard Fitzralph's Sermon: 'Defensio Curatorum' and Methodius: Be Bygynnyng of Be World and Be Ende of Worldes*. H. Milford, 1925.

- Kaminsky, Howard. *A History of the Hussite Revolution*. U of California P, 1967.
- Kirby-Fulton, Kathryn. *Reformist Apocalypticism and Piers Plowman*. Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Knapp, Ehtan. *The Bureaucratic Muse: Thomas Hoccleve and the Literature of Late Medieval England*. The Pennsylvania UP, 2001.
- Knighton, Henry. *Chronicon*. edited by Joseph Rawson Lumby, vol. 2, Eyer and Spottiswoode, 1895.
- Kretzmann, Norman. "Continua, Indivisibles, and Change in Wyclif's Logic of Scripture." *Wyclif in His Times*, edited by Anthony Kenny, Clarendon, 1986, pp. 31-65.
- Lahey, Stephen E. *John Wyclif*. Oxford UP, 2009.
- Langland, William. *The Vision of Piers Plowman*. edited by A.V.C. Schmidt, Charles E. Tuttle Co. Inc, 1998.
- "The Lantern of Light: Prologue and Chapters 3-5." *Medieval English Political Writings*, edited by James Dean, Medieval Institute Publications, 1996, pp. 75-91.
- Lawrence, C.H. *The Friars*. Longman, 1994.
- Lawton, D.A. "Lollardy and the Piers Plowman Tradition " *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 76, no. 4, 1981, pp. 780-793.
- "The Layman's Complaint." *Historical Poems of the Xivth and Xvth Centuries*, edited by Russell Hope Robbins, Columbia UP, 1959, p. 166.
- Little, Lester K. *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*. Cornell UP, 1978.
- "Mainten, V". *MED*, University of Michigan, 2013, <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED26544>.

- Man, Jill. *Chaucer and Medieval Estates Satire: The Literature of Social Classes and the Genreal Prologue*. Cmabirdge UP, 1973.
- Maxfield, Ezra Kempton. "Chaucer and Religious Reform." *PMLA*, vol. 39, no. 1, 1924, pp. 64-74.
- McCormack, Frances M. "Chaucer and Lollardy." *Chaucer and Religion*, edited by Helen Phillips, D.S. Brewer, 2010.
- McFarlane, K.B. *England in the Fifteenth Century*. The Hambledon Press, 1981.
- . *The Origins of Religious Dissent in England*. Macmillan, 1966.
- Medieval English Political Writings*. edited by James Dean, Medieval Institute Publications 1996.
- Mitchell, Jerome. *Thomas Hoccleve: A Study in Early Fifteenth-Century Poetic*. U of Illinois P, 1968.
- Mudroch, Vaclac. *The Wyclif Tradition*. Ohio UP, 1979.
- Mudroch, Vaclav. *The Wyclif Tradition*. Ohio UP, 1979.
- Netter, Thomas. *Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wycliff Cum Tritico*. edited by Walter Waddington Shirley, Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1858.
- Newman, Francis X. *Social Unrest in the Late Middle Ages*. Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1986.
- Nolcken, Christina von. "Piers Plowman, the Wycliffites, and Pierce the Plowman's Creed." *The Yearbook of Langland Studies*, vol. 2, 1988, pp. 71-102.
- Oakden, J.P. *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English: The Dialectal and Metrical Survey*. Archon Books, 1968.

- Owst, G.R. *Preaching in Medieval England: An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the Period C. 1350-1450*. Russell & Russell, 1965.
- Pearsall, Derek. "Langland and Lollardy: From B to C." *The Yearbook of Langland Studies*, vol. 17, 2003, pp. 7-23.
- "Piers the Plowman's Crede." *Six Ecclesiastical Satires*, edited by James Dean, Medieval Institute Publications, 1991, pp. 1-50.
- "The Plowman's Tale." *Six Ecclesiastical Satires*, edited by James Dean, Medieval Institute Publications, 1991, pp. 51-114.
- "Scapulārī(e), N". *MED*, University of Michigan, 2013,
<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED38754>.
- Scase, Wendy. *Piers Plowman and the New Anti-Clericalism*. Cambridge UP, 1989.
- Scattergood, V.J. *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century*. Barnes & Noble, 1972.
- "Schrewe, N. 1, 2". *MED*, University of Michigan, 2013,
<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED40106>.
- Simpson, James. *Piers Plowman: An Introduction to the B-Text*. Longman, 1990.
- Six Ecclesiastical Satires*. edited by James Dean, Medieval Institute Publications 1991.
- Skelton, John. "The Image of Ipocrysy." *The Poetical Works of John Skelton*. Edited by Alexander Dyce, vol 2, James R. Osgood and Company, 1871, pp. 388-427.
- Stacy, John. *John Wyclif and Reform*. The Westminster Press, 1964.
- Staley, David Aers and Lynn. *The Powers of the Holy: Religion, Politics, and Gender in Late Medieval English Culture*. The Pennsylvania State UP, 1996.
- Steinberg, Theodore L. "Jack Upland and the Fishy Friar." *The Fifteenth Century, ACTA*, vol. 12, 1988, pp. 41-50.

Strohm, Paul. "Chaucer's Lollard Joke: History and the Textual Unconscious " *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, vol. 17, 1995, pp. 23-42.

"Swēten, V. 2". *MED*, University of Michigan, 2013, <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/m/mec/med-idx?type=id&id=MED44161>.

Swinburn, Lillian M. *The Laterene of Li3t*. Kraus Reprint Co, 1971.

Szittyta, Penn R. *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature*. Princeton UP, 1986.

Thomson, Willliell R. *The Latin Writings of John Wycliff*. Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1983.

Three Middle English Sermons from the Worcester Chapter Manuscript F.10, Edited by D.M. Grisdale, Leeds School of English Language Texts and Monographs 5, 1939.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay. *England in the Age of Wycliffe*. Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912.

Walsh, Katherine. "Archbishop Fitzralph and the Friars at Papal Court in Avignon, 1357-60." *Traditio*, vol. 31, 1975, pp. 223-245.

---. *A Fourteenth Century Scholar and Primate: Richard Fitzralph in Oxford, Avignon and Armagh*. Clarendon, 1981.

Walsingham, Thomas. *Chonicon Angliae: Ab Anno Domini 1328 Usque Ad Annum 1388*. *Auctore Monacho Quodam Sancti Albani*. edited by Edward Maunde Thompson, Longman & Co., 1874.

---. *The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham* edited by David Prest, Boydell, 2005.

Williams, Arnold. "Chaucer and the Friars." *Speculum*, vol. 28 no. 3, 1953, pp. 499-513.

---. "Relations Between the Mendicant Friars and the Secular Clergy in England in the Later Fourteenth Century." *Annuale Medievale*, vol. 1, 1960, 22-95.

William of St. Amour. "De Antichristo et eius ministris." *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum.*

Edited by Edmund Martene and Ursini Durand, vol. 9, Burt Franklin, 1968.

Workman, Herbert B. *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church*, vol. 1, Wipf & Stock, 2001.

Wyclif, John. "De Apostasia." *Select English Works of John Wyclif*. Edited by Thomas Arnold, vol. 3, The Clarendon Press, 1881, pp. 430-440.

---. "De Blasphemia." *Select English Works of John Wyclif*. Edited by Thomas Arnold, vol. 3, The Clarendon Press, 1881, pp. 402-429.

---. *De Domino Divino Libri Tres to Which Are Added the First Four Books of the Treatise De Pauperie Salvatoris by Richard Fitzralph Archbishop of Armagh*. Edited by Reginald Lane Poole, Trubner & Co, 1890.

---. *De Eucharistia Tractatus Major: Accedit Tractatus De Eucharista Et Poenitentia Sive De Confessione*. Edited by Johann Loserth, Trubner & Co., 1892.

---. "Fifty Heresies and Errors of Friars." *Select English Works of John Wyclif*. Edited by Thomas Arnold, vol. 3, The Clarendon Press, 1881, pp. 366-401.

---. *Opus Evangelicum* Edited by Johann Loserth, vol. 1, 2, Trubner and Co, 1895.

---. *Operis Evangelici Liber Tertius Et Quartus Sive De Antichristo Liber Primus Et Secundus*. Edited by Johann Loserth and F.D. Matthew, vol. 3, 4, Trubner & Co, 1896.

---. *Opera Minora*. Edited by Johann Loserth and F.D. Matthew, C.K. Paul & Co, 1913.

---. *Tractatus De Civili Dominio Liber Primus*. edited by Reginald Lane Poole, Trubner & Co, 1885.

---. *Tractatus De Logica*. Edited by Michael Henry Dziewicki, vol. 1, Trubner & Co, 1893.

---. *Tractatus De Logica*. Edited by Michael Henry Dziewicki, vol. 2, Trubner & Co., 1896.

- . "Tractatus De Pseudo-Freres." *The English Works of Wyclif: Hitherto Unprinted*, Edited by F.D. Matthew, Trubner & Co, 1880.
- . *Triologus*. Translated by Stephen E. Lahey, Cambridge UP, 2013.
- . "Vae Octuplex, or Eight Woes Denounced against the Friars " *Select English Works of John Wyclif*. Edited by Thomas Arnold, vol. 2, Clarendon, 1881, pp. 379-392.
- "The Wycliffite Bible: From the Prologue." *Medieval English Political Writings*, edited by James Dean, Medieval Institute Publications, 1996, pp. 60-74.
- "Upland's Rejoinder." *Six Ecclesiastical Satires*, edited by James Dean, Medieval Institute Publications, 1991, pp. 201-226.
- Utley, Francis Lee. "The Layman's Complaint and the Friar's Answer." *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 38, no. 2, 1945, pp. 141-7.