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#### Abstract

This is an edition of the ten commandments commentary found in BL Harley 2398 and the related version found in Trinity College Dublin 245, York Minster XVI.L. 12 and Harvard English 738. The edition includes notes and glossary, discussion of the historical background and of the date of the two versions, of the relationship between them, and of the language of each witness. Possible relationships with other Middle English commandments commentaries are discussed, with special attention being paid to passages of close verbal correspondence. These possibly related commentaries are classified according to form, and lists are given of the manuscripts which contain witnesses of each version.
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## ABBREVIATIONS

| A\&M | Foxe, Acts and Monuments. |
| :--- | :--- |
| AFr | Anglo-French |
| BIHR | Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research |
| BIRL | Bulletin of the John Rylands Library |
| BL | British Library, London |
| Bodl. | Bodleian |
| BVV | The Book of Vices and Virtues |
| C\&S | Councils and Synods |
| Census Sup. | Faye, C.U. and Bond, W.H, Supplement to the Census |
| CPR | Calendar of Patent Rolls |
| CS | Camden Series (London, 1838-) |
| CUL | Cambridge University Library |
| CYS | Canterbury and York Society |
| DCD | Wyclif, De Civili Dominio |
| DI | Discursive Version I (see Introduction pp.cxxxiii and cxli |
|  | ff.) |
| DMD | Wyclif, De Mandatis Divinis. |
| DNB | Dictionary of National Biography, ed. L. Stephen and |
| DOP | S.Lee (Oxford 1917-49) |
| Unless otherwise stated, this refers to the English |  |


| EETS | Early English Text Society (London, 1864-); os |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Original Series; es Extra Series; ss Supplementary |
|  | Series: where no series is given, the Original |
|  | Series may be assumed. |
| EHR | English Historical Review |
| EWS | English Wycliffite Sermons |
| EV | Early Version of the Wycliffite Bible |
| Floretum | This refers to the version contained in BL MS Harley |
|  | 401. |
| $F Z$ | Fasciculi Zizaniorum |
| HA | Walsingham, Historia Anglicana |
| HS | Robert of Brunne, Handlyng Synne |
| IMEP | Edwards, A.S.G.(ed.), The Index of Middle English Prose |
| IMEV | Brown, C. and Robbins, R.H. (eds.), Index of Middle English |
|  | Verse |
| IPMEP | Lewis, R.E. et al., Index of Printed Middle English |
|  | Prose |
| JEH | Journal of Ecclesiastical History |
| JTS | Journal of Theological Studies; n.s., new series |
| LAO | Lincolnshire Archives Office |
| Laud Misc. | Laud Miscellaneous |
| LFC | Lay Folks' Catechism |
| LL | Lanterne of List |
| LV | Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible |
| M $E$ | Medium Avum |
| MED | Middle English Dictionary, ed. H Kurath, S.M. Kuhn |


|  | et al. (Ann Arbor, 1952-) |
| :---: | :---: |
| MET | Middle English Texts |
| MMBL | Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries, for vols. i.-iii see Ker, N., for vol. iv see Ker, $\mathbf{N}$. and Piper, A.J. |
| MS | Medieval Studies |
| MV | The Metropolitan Visitations of William Courteney |
| $N Q$ | Notes and Queries, n.s. new series. |
| OED | Oxford English Dictionary (13 vols., Oxford, reissued 1933) |
| OFr | Old French |
| PC | Pore Caitif |
| $P G$ | Patrologia Graeca, ed. J.P.Migne (Paris, 1857-66) |
| PL | Patrologia Latina, ed. J.P.Migne (Paris, 1841-) |
| PMLA | Publications of the Modern Language Association of America |
| $P P$ | Piers Plowman |
| PR | Hudson, The Premature Reformation |
| RES | Review of English Studies |
| Rosarium | Unless otherwise indicated (i.e. by manuscript reference) this refers to the ME translation edited by von Nolcken. G indicates the ME version as it appears in Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College MS 354/581. References to the Latin Rosarium are taken from BL MS Harley 3226. |
| $R P$ | Rotuli Parliamentorum |
| RS | Rolls Series |
| SCH | Studies in Church History (London, 1964-) |


| SEWW | Selections from English Wycliffite Writings |
| :--- | :--- |
| ST | Aquinas, Summa Theologiae. |
| STC | Pollard and Redgrave, A Short-Title Catalogue |
| TCD | Trinity College, Dublin. |
| TWT | Two Wycliffite Texts, ed. Hudson |

# INTRODUCTION <br> DESCRIPTION OF MANUSCRIPTS 

B: BL MS Harley 2398 s.xv in.

For previous descriptions, see Knares (1808), pp.685-6; Knight (1967), pp.7-9; Kengen (1979), pp.7-8; Bremmer (1987) pp.xixviii.

Technical Description

Membrane, ff.vi+194+ii. Modern foliation in pencil: 1-127, $127^{*}$, 128-193. This foliation has been retained in this description. The first two endleaves and the rear endleaves are post-medieval paper. The first of the medieval endleaves has been almost cut out. Size: $191 \times 126 \mathrm{~mm}$. Written space: 139x79mm. Ruled in a single column of 31 lines. Pricking is visible at the outside edges, although some of this has been lost as a result of cropping. Writing normally begins under the first ruled line unless there are headings.

Collation
$1-23^{8}, 24^{10}$. Medieval quire signatures as follows: $1-9 / \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{i}, 10-$ $16 / \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{g}, 17-22 / \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{l}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{o}, \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{q}$. These are accompanied by leaf signatures in the form of small Roman numerals and, in the case of quires $10-16$, arabic numerals with the Roman numerals above. Some signatures have been partially lost as a result of cropping. Quire 23 has leaf signatures but no quire signatures. Quire 24 has
neither. Catchwords are visible in the usual place at the end of each gathering.

Contents

1. ff. $1^{\mathrm{r}}-69 \mathrm{r}$, headed Memoriale credencium; inc. Man and womman pat wylnep to fle synne; expl. be hy yhyeyzede in pe blysse of heuene. Amen. Explicit tractatus vocatus Memoriale Credencium auro preciosior. Edited J.H.L. Kengen (1979) (from Bodl. Tanner 201). IPMEP [448].
2. ff. $69^{\mathrm{v}}-72^{\mathrm{v}}$, inc. $A$ womman recluse and solitarye coueitynge to knowen; expl. on $\mathrm{f} .70^{\mathrm{v}}$ and bryngen his soule into heuene blisse.Amen per charite. Followed by the Latin text of the fifteen prayers referred to in the English section, ending on $\mathrm{f} .72^{\mathrm{v}}$.
3. $\mathrm{ff} .73^{\mathrm{r}}-106^{\mathrm{r}}$ Commentary on the Ten Commandments. This is the text of the present edition.
4. ff. $106^{\mathrm{V}}$-127r [The Fyve Wyttes]; inc. As it is byfore seyd so muche diligence no so gret bysynesse; expl. where pe holy gost techep and enspireth. Explicit bonus tractatus de quinque sensibus. Edited R.H. Bremmer (1987) (from this manuscript). F. $127^{v}$ is blank.
5. ff. $128^{\mathrm{r}}-140^{\circ}$, inc. It byhouep specialy to euery man pat desyrep; expl. bot brynge ous to our heritage pat is euerlastyng blysse. Amen. Edited in part by Fleming (1967) (from Princeton Garrett 143). (Jolliffe D.8).
6. ff. $140^{-}-153^{\text {r }}$, headed Sermo magistri Thome Wymyldoun apud crucem in cimiterio Sancti Pauli Londoun; inc. Redde racionem
villicacionis tue. Luce $16^{\text {mo }}$. My dere frendes; expl. and he ous graunte perof pis ioye parte. Amen. Edited Knight (1967) (from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 357). IPMEP [560].
7. ff.153r-155, rubric Here bygynnep pe exposicioun of pe Pater Noster; inc. Ech Cristen man owep to knowe; expl. in pe ioye of heuene. Amen. Here endep pe exposicioun of pe Pater Noster as Seynt Edmund expounyth in his Specuhum. This is an extract of The Myrrour of Seynt Edmonde, edited (i) Perry (1867), pp.15-47, revd. edn. (1914), pp. 16-62 (from Lincoln Cathedral 91); (ii) Horstmann i.219-40 (as in (i)). IPMEP [800].
8. ff. $156^{\mathrm{r}}-160^{\mathrm{v}}$, headed How men pat bep in hele scholde visite syke men; inc. My dere sone or douster in God; expl. in pyne mercyful hondes I putte it. Amen. Explicit visitacio infirmonum. Edited (i) Horstmann ii.449-53 (from Oxford, University College 97); (ii) Littlehales, pp.6-8 (from BL Additional 32320, ending imperfectly); (iii) Krochalis and Peters, pp.195-202 (from CUL Dd.1.17). IPMEP [460]
9. ff. $160^{v}-166^{v}$, headed Of Wedded Men and Wyues and here Childrene also; inc. Ovre Lord Ihesu Crist God almiy3ty spekep in his lawe; expl. Ihesu Crist in be blysse of heuene wiboute eny ende. Amen. Edited Arnold iii.188-201 (from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 296) IPMEP [521].
10. ff. $166^{\mathrm{\gamma}}$-174r [ Pe Pater Noster]; inc. Sypbe pe Pater Noster is pe beste prayer pat is; expl. bat we may come to him in blysse and wonye wip him in ioye wipoute eny ende. Amen. Edited Arnold iii.98-110 (from this manuscript). IPMEP [604].
11. ff. $174^{\mathrm{r}}-175^{v}$, inc. As witnesseb holy writ and holy doctours,
per bep two weyes; expl. sit it is wonder hard and bitter. (Jolliffe I.2).
12. ff. $175^{\circ}$ - $185^{\text {r }}$, headed Sermo in Die Pasche Ad Populum; inc. Ihesum queritis nazarenum crucifixum; expl. Crist brynge sow pat for sow schadde his blood. Amen. (For the final section of this, see Jolliffe K.9, noted by Bremmer p.xvii).
13. f.185r Memorandum by John Saruant: Memorandum. Thomas Saruant dyed the xxv daye of August in the fouwrthe and fyfte yeare of the raygne of Phyllype and Mary, by the grace of God kynge and queane of Yngglond, Frawnce, Napulle, Jerusaleme and Irlonde etc. In the yeare of oure Lord God 1599. John Saruant. F. $185^{v}$ is blank.
14. ff. $186^{\mathrm{r}}-188^{\mathrm{v}}$, inc. Cum autem oraveris etc. Mathei sexto. Whanne pou schapest pe to praye; expl. in paynes of purgatorie abydyng bere by mercy. Amen. Explicit excitacio optima ad orandum. Edited as part of the longer treatise Fervor Amoris in Horstmann ii.102-5 (from Wynkyn de Worde (1506) (STC 21259)). (Jolliffe H.15, M.15). IPMEP [362].
15. ff. $188^{\mathrm{v}}-190^{\mathrm{v}}$ rubric Here bygynnep a schort reule of lyf for euerych man in general and for prestes and lordes and laboreres in special how ech schal be saued in his degre; inc. First whan pou rysest or fully wakest; expl. for pe fals lyuynge of wyckede cristene men et cetera. Explicit regula Cristiana. Edited Arnold iii.204-8 (from Bodl. Laud Miscellaneous 174). IPMEP [203].
-xvi-

Handwriting.

One scribe throughout. The script shows many of the characteristics of bastard secretary of the early fifteenth century as illustrated by Parkes (1979) (Plate 14 (i), and see Bremmer p.xii). Abbreviations are not frequent, but the most common (apart from the abbreviation for and) are those for $n$ and $m$ and for er.

## Punctuation

The end of a major section of text is normally marked by a 7shaped positura, by a punctus, or by a small 'tick'-shaped stroke. The punctus elevatus is used for a medial pause. Paraphs are dealt with below.

Decoration and Presentation

Paraphs are coloured alternately red and blue. Marginal apparatus is normally in black, occasionally red, underlined and boxed in at the sides in red. Latin quotations are normally underlined in red, and there are red headings. Decorated capitals are normally blue with red decoration. Within the text these normally take up two lines (but occasionally up to four), at the beginning of a new text up to 5 . Spaces of between 3 and 6 lines have been left for capitals which have not been completed.

Correction

Marginal correction in the hand of the scribe is common, the place
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for insertion being indicated by means of a caret mark or, occasionally, by a small cross ( + ) or diple. Deletion and expunction are also used.

## Provenance

The third of the medieval endleaves, (modern pencil foliation 2*) bears on the recto side the following dedication (in the same hand as the inscription on f.191r mentioned above): To my Rob. Wilfam Oldisworth. This suggests that William Oldsworth presented the book to Sir Robert Harley, first Earl of Oxford (d.1725). (See Bremmer p.xviii [5] and for Oldsworth see DNB). The following note in a sixteenth century hand on $\mathrm{f} .192^{\mathrm{v}}$ has been transcribed by Bremmer (p.xviii): ..yn galle hathe a wiff and ye[t] he ys a woyng for more. What a Knaue ys tat. Subscrybyd by me Rycherd Seruant of Mychelldeane in the Countie of Glouster..... John Sarvant (see above item 13) and Richard Servant have not been identified. The names Watter Dave and Rycherd occur on f. 193 r and that of John on f.193*.

Marginalia

Marginalia occur in a later hand e.g. lucifer $\mathrm{f} . \mathbf{6}^{\mathrm{v}}$. A list in Latin of the seven works of bodily mercy in a hand of the later fifteenth century appears on $\mathrm{f} .190^{\mathrm{v}}$ and $\mathrm{f} .191^{\mathrm{r}}$ has an inscription in an eighteenth century hand, Make much of an old friend.

Binding

According to the second rear endleaf, the manuscript was rebound in 1951.

H: Harvard MS English 738 s.xiv ex.-s.xv in.

For previous descriptions see Census Sup p.225; Ives (1942), pp.39; Voigts (1985), pp 26-7.

As it has not been possible to see this manuscript except on microfilm, the reader is referred to the description given by Voigts for information which can only be obtained by handling the manuscript.

Modern foliation is present throughout: 1-71,71*, 72-85. This foliation has been retained in the description below. The material is written in a single column. There are 23 lines to a page.

## Contents

1. ff. $1^{\mathrm{r}}-30^{\mathrm{v}}$, headed Pe comaundementes. Commentary on the Ten Commandments, edited here.
2. f. $30^{\mathrm{v}}$, rubric Leccio: Resoum techep pat neiper etynge ne fastinge is medeful bi hitselfe, but goode entent and clene makep mans soule deuoute to Godde. Apparently the beginning of another text of which the remainder is missing. Voigts suggests (p.26) that, as f .31 is a new quire and the beginning of item 3, 'there may well be one or more gatherings missing on
which this text would continue'.
3. ff. $31^{\mathrm{r}}-76^{\mathrm{r}}$, headed Pe vij dedli synnes; inc. Sythe bileue techep vs pat eueri yuele is sinne; expl. for scharp veniance takib God for siche sinnes. Edited Arnold iii.119-67 (from Bodl. Bodley 647). IPMEP [596].
 Pe Seven Werkys of Mercy Gostly] (incomplete); rubric (i) Pis sentence teechep of pe werkes of mercy bope bodily and gosteli to pe which grete tente schIde be taken; inc. (i) Ife a man were sure pat he schulde tomorow cume before a iuge; expl. ellis vs faylep rist to dymes; rubric (ii) Her bene pe werkes of mercy goostely, inc. Sip we scholden serue oure parischenis in spinitual almes; expl. to bringe mennes soulis to blisse or elles to feede her bodye (catchwords) pat lastip (incomplete). Edited Arnold iii.168-82 (from Oxford, New College 95). IPMEP [331].

Handwriting

The body of the text is written in a single textura hand, with some anglicana influence. The forms for ' y ' and ' p ' are identical, although ' y ' is sometimes distinguished by a dot. Abbreviations, e.g. of $a, r a$, $u r$ and of $n$, are common. Headings and rubrics are written in a form of bastard anglicana and the forms for ' $y$ ' and ' p ' are distinct in this script.

## Punctuation

The punctus and the punctus elevatus are used for medial pauses and 7 -shaped positura for the end of a major section of text.

## Correction

Both marginal and interlinear corrections occur but these are rare.

T: Trinity College, Dublin MS 245 (C.5.6.) s.xv ${ }^{1}$

For previous descriptions see Abbott (1900), p.6; EWS ii.xxixxiii. I am grateful to Professor Scattergood for sending me material on this manuscript prepared for the forthcoming catalogue.

Technical description

Membrane, ff.iii+218+iii. Endleaves paper; first and last conjugate with pastedown. Modern foliation in ink (1-219) visible throughout, but 133 has been omitted and subsequent foliation corrected in pencil (September 1977). The corrected foliation has been used in the description which follows. The contents list on the second and third flyleaves, dated March 1936, is correct except in so far as it follows the old foliation. Size: $159 \times 108 \mathrm{~mm}$. Written space: $119 \times 77 \mathrm{~mm}$. Ruled in a single column of 32 lines. Pricking is visible at the outside
edges. Except for running titles, writing normally begins under the first ruled line.

Collation
$1-8^{8}, 9^{10}, 10-27^{8}$. Quire and leaf signatures ( $\mathrm{a} / \mathrm{i} \mathrm{etc}$ ) appear on ff.9-12 only i.e. on the second quire. Catchwords appear in the usual places, except that there is no catchword on $\mathrm{ff} .8^{v}$ or on f. $162^{\text { }}$.

Contents

1. $\mathrm{ff} .1^{\mathrm{r}}-2^{\mathrm{r}}$ [On the Apostles' Creed], headed Crede; inc. It is soop pat bileue is groumde of alle vertues; expl. and euere lyue in blisse. Explicit credo in deum patrem. Edited (i) Arnold, iii.114-16 (from Lambeth 408); (ii) LFCpp.14-18 (ibid.). IPMEP [403].
2. $\mathrm{ff} .2^{\mathrm{r}}-3^{\mathrm{v}}$, margin Pater Noster, inc. We shal bileue pat pis Pater Noster pat Crist hymsilf techip; expl. and panne shal we haue euerlastyng fredom Amen. Explicit Pater Noster. Edited (i) Arnold, iii.93-7 (from Bodl. Bodley 789); (ii) LFC, pp.7-11 (from Lambeth 408); (iii) $B V V \mathrm{pp} .337-9$ (from BL Additional 17013). IPMEP [810].
3. ff. $3^{\mathrm{v}}-4^{\mathrm{v}}$, margin Aue; inc. Men greten comounly oure lady Goddis moder, expl. and worshipe we Marie vp al oure myst. Explicit salutatio Sancte Marie Virgimis. Edited (i) Arnold, iii.111-13 (from Bodl. Bodley 789); (ii) LFC, pp.11-14 (from Lambeth 408). IPMEP [455]
4. ff. $4^{\mathrm{v}}-6^{\mathrm{v}}$, margin vij eresies; inc. For false men multiplien bokis of pe chirche; expl. but neiper is pis bileue ne groumdid in resoum. Expliciunt vij hereses contra patrem nostrem. Edited Arnold iii.441-6 (from Bodl. Douce 274). IPMEP [208]. ff. $7^{\mathrm{r}}-8^{\mathrm{v}}$ are blank.
5. $\mathrm{ff} .9^{r}-26^{\mathrm{v}}$, Commentary on the Ten Commandments, edited here.
6. ff.27r-30 [ Of Faith, Hope and Charity] headed Feip; inc. For it is seid in holdyng of oure haliday, expl. he myst listly come to heuene and wite who wente amys. Explicimt Feip, Hope and Charite. Edited Matthew (1880, repr. 1973), pp.347-55 (from Oxford, New College 95, collated with this manuscript). IPMEP [595].
7. ff. $30^{\text {v }}-35^{r}, 35^{r}-38^{r}$ [Pe Seven Werkys of Mercy Bodyly and Pe Seven Werkys of Mercy Gostly]; inc.(i) If a man were sure pat he shulde tomorewe come bifore a iuge; expl. And ellis, as me pinkip, vs failip riзt to dymes. Expliciunt opera misericordie corporalis; inc.(ii) Sip we shulden serue oure parishens in spiritual almes; expl. as mede and nede and kynde techen Cristen men. Expliciunt opera caritatia etc. Edited Arnold, iii.168-82 (from Oxford, New College 95). IPMEP [331]. 8. ff.38r-63r [Synne is for to Drede]; inc. Sip bileue techip vs pat euery yuel is oper synne; expl. for sharp veniaunce takip God of siche. Expliciunt septem peccata capitalia. Edited Arnold iii.119-67 (from Bodl. Bodley 647). IPMEP [596]. 9. ff. $63^{\mathrm{v}}-75^{\mathrm{v}}$ [Of pe Chirche and Hir Membris]; inc. Cristis Chirche is his spouse pat hab pre partis, expl. and panne is his
hiзest vertu stablid. Explicit tractatus de ecclesia et membris eius. Edited Arnold iii.339-65 (from Bodl. Bodley 788). IPMEP [132].
8. ff. $76^{r}-80^{v}$, headed De Apostasia Cleri; inc. Sip ilche Cristen man is holdon to sewe Crist, expl. pise clopis ben of charite pat eueremore shal last and here is an ende. Explicit tractatus de apostasia et dotacione ecclesie. Edited (i) Todd (1851), pp.lxxxi-cxii (from this manuscript; (ii) Arnold iii.430-40 (as in (i)). IPMEP[597]
9. ff.81「-95 [Tractatus de Pseudo-Freris]; inc. For many beren heuy pat freris ben clepid pseudo; expl. tume to treupe when it were taust. Amen. Explicit tractatus de pseudo-freris. Edited Matthew (1880, repr. 1973), pp.296-324 (from this manuscript). IPMEP [210].
10. ff. $96^{\mathrm{r}}-101^{\text {r }}$ [ Vae Octuplex]; inc. Crist biddip vs be waar wib pes false prophetis; expl. and putte vs not in straunge perelis pat we han no nede to trete. Here enden pe eiste woous pat God wishid to freris. Amen. Edited (i) Arnold, ii.379-89 (from Bodl. Bodley 788); (ii) SEWW, pp.75-83 (from BL Royal 18.B.IX); (iii) EWS ii.366-78 (from BL Additional 40672). IPMEP[127]. 13. ff. $101^{\mathrm{r}-116^{v}}$ [Of Mynistris in pe Chirche], headed Exposicio cuangelij Mt. 24 Egressus Ihesus de templo etc.; inc. pis gospcl tellip myche wisdom; expl. but not rauyshe her hope in Crist. Explicit Euangelium. Edited (i) Arnold, ii.393-423 (from Bodl. Bodley 788); (ii) EWS ii.328-65 (from BL Additional 40672). IPMEP [738].
11. $\mathrm{ff} .117^{\mathrm{r}}-124^{\mathrm{r}}$, headed Of Antecrist and his Meynee; inc.

Dauid seip, Lord, sett bou a lawe-maker vpon hem; expl. Crist graumt vs grace perto and heuen blisse. Amen. Edited Todd (1851), pp.cxv-cliv (from this manuscript). IPMEP [144]. 15. ff.124r-126r [On the Twenty-Five Articles, item 15], headed Of Antecristis songe in chirche; inc. Also prelatis, prestis and freres putten on symple men; expl. lest we taken pe grace of God in veyne. Edited Arnold, iii.479/24-482/36 (from Bodl. Douce 273). IPMEP [675]. 16. ff.126r-127r [On the Twenty-Five Articles, item 19], headed Of Praier a Tretys; inc. Also bischops and freres putten to pore men pat pei seyn; expl. bishops mayntenyng it opynly and stidfastly ben cursud heretikes. Explicit tractatus de orisone. Edited Arnold, iii.486/25-488/36 (from Bodl. Douce 273). IPMEP[675].
17. ff. $127^{\mathrm{v}}$-137r [Tractatus de Confessione et Penitentia], headed Nota de Confessione; inc. Two vertues ben in mannes soule; expl. so pei han no grounde in God. Explicit etc. Edited Matthew (1880, repr. 1973), pp.327-45 (from this manuscript). IPMEP[790].
18. ff. $137^{\mathrm{V}}-143^{\vee}$ inc. Crist forsobe did al pat he coupe; expl. pou shepherde and ydele forsakyng pi flok etc.
19. ff. $144^{\mathrm{r}}$ - $145^{\mathrm{v}}$, headed Nota de Sacramento Altaris; inc.

Cristen mennes bileeue taust of Ihesu Crist, expl. and here sotile ypocrisize and fals heresye. Amen. Edited SEWW, pp.110-12 (from this manuscript). IPMEP [131]. 20. ff. $145^{\text {² }}-151^{\mathrm{r}}$, inc. Crisostom seib pat fischers and buystouse men; expl. God for his endleles mercy to endure to pe last

```
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eende. Amen.
21. ff. $151^{\mathrm{r}}-153^{\mathrm{v}}$, inc. Seynt Barnard spekip pus to Eugenye pe Pope; expl. neypur he may pe fredam of Goddis kumnyng fynde. 22. ff. $153^{\mathrm{V}}-160^{\mathrm{r}}$, inc. God moueb Hooly Churche bi many maner of spechis; expl.pou schalt haue pe blis of heuen etc. Amen.
23. ff. $160^{r}-162^{v}$, inc. And for noipur man ne womman may parfitly do pe seuen werkis; expl. ful of my3t in tyme of nede to strengb his knyzt.
24. ff. 163r-217r [Apology for Lollard Doctrines], rubric Here are questiouns and ansueris pucte pat are writum hereaftir, inc. First I witnes bifor God almisty and alle trewe Cristum men; expl. and so I rede pes beggars do bityme and come to Crist. Amen. Amen. Edited Todd, CS, 20 (1842) (from this manuscript). IPMEP [188].
25. f.217 ${ }^{\mathrm{r}-\mathrm{v}}$, inc. Hit is writen in pe first book of holy writ ; expl. To pis trinite joye and blis nowe and euer. Amen. etc. (Jolliffe M.7).
26. ff. $217^{\mathrm{v}}-218^{\mathrm{r}}$, inc. Peis ben pe nyne poyntis pat oure lord Ihesu answerid; expl. And perfor loue God and pin euen Cristen for Goddis sake. Amen. (Jolliffe I.12(n)).
27. f.218r ${ }^{\text {v }}$, inc. Of pe dedis of mercy God will speke at pe dredful day; expl. lowly knowing hemsilf 3erpe and pouder sewid (catchwords) in charite. (Incomplete).

## Handwriting

The manuscript is written in a single anglicana hand with some slight secretary influence.

## Punctuation

The punctus or punctus elevatus is used for a medial pause; a single virgule to mark the end of a period. For paraphs see below.

## Correction

Marginal corrections appear in black, occasionally underlined in red. A diple (") or single mark ('), very occasionally a caret mark, is used to indicate the relevant place in the text.

## Decoration and Presentation

Red paraphs precede explicits. Running titles are occasionally written in red but are normally black with red underlining and red touching of initial capitals. Within the body of the text, decorated capitals are usually blue with red decoration. Red chapter marks appear either as marginal apparatus or within the body of the text. Smaller chapter marks in black appear in the margin (apparently to indicate to the scribe where red chapter marks should be inserted; the latter are not always present). Biblical quotations are occasionally underlined in red and biblical references with red underlining appear in the margins.

## Provenance

The manuscript was probably in the possession of Thomas Chamber in the sixteenth century (see above under Handwriting). Chamber, however, has not been identified. The manuscript was given to the University of Dublin library by Charles II.

Marginalia

There are sidenotes written in a tiny sixteenth century hand and Note this Chapter, same hand, larger writing on $\mathrm{f} .131^{\mathrm{r}}$, as well asoccasional pointing hands in brown plummet (e.g. on f. $66^{v}$ ). The name Thomas Chamber is written upside down on $\mathrm{f} .210^{v}$ in a sixteenth or seventeenth century hand.

Binding

The binding is post-medieval. The manuscript was re-backed in 1947.

Y: York Minster MS XVI.L. 12 s.xv med.

For previous descriptions see $I M E P$ vi.49-54; $M M B L$ iv.740-41.

Technical Description

Membrane ff.iii+87+ii. Endleaves paper. First endleaf conjugate with pastedown; this has been added since Ker's
description in MMBL. Modern foliation in ink: $1-59,59^{*}, 60-$ 86. This foliation has been retained in the description which follows. Size: $183 \times 123 \mathrm{~mm}$. Written space: $138 \times 82-101 \mathrm{~mm}$. ff. $51^{\mathrm{r}}-69^{\mathrm{v}}$ are ruled in a single column, the remainder in two columns. Quire 1 has 21-23 lines, ff. $51^{\text {r}}-69^{v} 21-22$ lines, the remainder 27 lines. Pricking is visible on the outside edges of quires $1,2,5-8$ and 10 , although some of this has been lost as a result of cropping. Writing normally begins under the first ruled line, unless there are headings.

## Collation

$1^{8}$ ( 3 and 6 are single leaves), $2-5^{8}, 6-9^{10}, 10^{8}$ (wants 8 (cut out)).
Leaf signatures are visible on quire 7 only. Catchwords appear in the usual places.

## Contents

1. $\mathrm{ff} .1^{\text {ra }}-27^{\text {ra }}$, Commentary on the Ten Commandments, edited here.
2. ff. $27^{\mathrm{ra}}-32^{\mathrm{ra}}$, rubric and bigynnep feip hope and charite; inc. For it is seid in holding of oure holiday, expl. he myste listli come to heuene and wite who wente amys. Edited Matthew, pp.347-65 (from Oxford, New College 95, collate with Dublin, Trinity College 245). IPMEP [595].
3. ff. $32^{\text {ra }}-33^{\text {vb }}$, Rubric Here bigynnep pe Pater Noster (the rubric on $\mathrm{ff} .32^{\mathrm{v}}-33^{\mathrm{r}}$ referring to the seven heresies against the Pater Noster refers to item [4], see IMEP p.50); inc. We shal bileeue
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pat pis Pater Noster pat Crist himsilf techip; expl. and pan shal we haue euerlastinge fredom. So be it. Edited (i) Arnold iii.9396/19 (from Bodl. Bodley 789); (ii) LFC, pp.7-11 (from Lambeth 408); (iii) $B V V$ pp.337-9 (from BL Additional 17013). IPMEP [810].
4. $\mathrm{ff} .33^{\mathrm{vb}}-36^{\mathrm{va}}$, [Septem hereses Contra Septem Peticiones/Speculum vite Christiane]; rubric Here bigynnep pe vij heresies on pe Pater Noster, inc. For fals men multiplien bookis of pe chirche; expl. neiber pis is bileeue ne groundid in resoum. Edited Arnold iii.441-6 (from Bodl. Douce 274). IPMEP [208].
5. ff. $36^{\mathrm{vb}}-37^{\mathrm{vb}}$, rubric Here bigynneb pe Aue Marie; inc. Men greten comynli oure ladi Goddis modir, expl. and worshipe we Marie wip oure mist. Edited (i) Arnold iii.111-13 (from Bodl. Bodley 789); (ii) LFC, pp.11-14 (from Lambeth 408). IPMEP [455].
6. ff. $37^{\mathrm{vb}}-39^{\mathrm{vb}}$, rubric Here bigynnep be crede capitulum primum; inc. It is sop pat bileeue; expl. and so euer lyue in blisse. Amen. Edited (i) Arnold iii.114-16 (from Lambeth 408); (ii) LFC, pp.14-18 (ibid.). IPMEP [403].
7. ff. $39^{\mathrm{vb}}-46^{\text {rb }}$, rubric Here bigynneb pe seuen werkis of merci bodili; inc. If a man were sure pat he shulde tomorewe come bifore a juge; expl. and ellis as me penkep vs failip rist to dimes. Edited Arnold iii.168-77 (from Oxford, New College 95). IPMEP [331].
8. ff.46rb-50ra , rubric Here bigynneb pe seuene goostly werkis; inc. Sip we shulden serue oure parischens in spiritual almes;
expl. as meede and neede and kynde techip Cristene men.
Edited Arnold iii.177-82 (from Oxford, New College 95).
IPMEP [331].
f. $50^{r b}$ and $\mathrm{f} .50^{\mathrm{v}}$ are blank.
9. ff.51r-53r, inc. In pe bigynnyng God made of noust heuene and erpe; expl. pat he schulde make in werke. Heere eendit pe lessoun on Estir euen. Genesis 1:1-2:2 (LV) (MMBL iv.740). 10. ff. $53^{\mathrm{r}}-57^{\mathrm{v}}$, rubric Here bigynneth pe holi sacrament of baptym; inc. Alle Cristene soulis pat seen or heeren pis litill tretise; expl. we schullen be partyners of pe baptym of cristis passioun.
10. ff. $58^{\mathrm{r}}-69^{\mathrm{v}}$, inc. Listenes to me and зe may heere ; expl. bryng us into pe blis of heuen. Amen. Amen for charitee. God graunt pat it so mote be. Explicit ypotyse. IMEV [220].
11. ff. $70^{\text {ra }} 73^{\text {vb }}$, rubric Here begynnep certeyn tretis drawen out of pe Bible; inc. The peple of Israel dwelled in deserte; expl. to whome pei liken in maneres. Tract on images. 13. $\mathrm{ff} .73^{\mathrm{vb}}-75^{\mathrm{vb}}$, inc. [I] beleue in God, fader almy3ti; expl. synnes ben slayne and clensid oute of man bi pe depe of Crist. Tract on the Creed.
12. $\mathrm{ff} .75^{\mathrm{vb}}-79^{\mathrm{vb}}$, inc. Blessid be God almy3ti pe fader of oure lord Ihesu Crist, expl. or panke men for pat pei do to hem for God seibe (catchword) bi abacuk (ends imperfectly).
13. ff. $80^{\text {ra }}-86^{\text {rb }}$, inc. (begins imperfectly) and dwel in his loue. If ony man sey pat he louip God; expl. pat God or his lawe or his ordinaunce. Amen. Tract on the commandments.
```
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Handwriting

The text is written in three separate hands, changing at $\mathrm{ff} .51^{r}$ and $70^{\text {r }}$ (MMBL iv.741).

## Punctuation

The colon is used with red colour touching in quires1-6 and without colour touching in quire 7. Virgules are used throughout, with colour touching in quires 1-6 and without in quires 7-10. For paraphs see below.

Decoration and Presentation
ff. $1^{\text {r- }} 50^{r}$ (i.e. quires 1-6) have running titles and rubrics in red, 2-line initials in red, red paraphs, and chapter marks in red, either in the margin or in the body of the text. Marginal apparatus includes biblical references in red, instructions to the reader (e.g. nota bene f. $16^{v}$ ) boxed in red, and numbering (e.g. of the properties of charity $\mathrm{f} .31^{r-v}$; some lost through cropping). No decoration occurs in quires 7 and 8. Red paraph marks, red rubric and a red initial occur of the first folio of quire 9 but otherwise quires 9 and 10 have no decoration. However, the places where red paraphs should be inserted have been marked with a double virgule.

## Correction

Correction is rare but deletion with correction in the margin
occurs on $\mathrm{f} .24^{\mathrm{r}}$, expunction and deletion on $\mathrm{f} .31^{\mathrm{r}}$ and marginal correction with a red caret mark in the text on $\mathrm{f} .43^{v}$.

Provenance
' $\mathrm{Cq} \mathrm{q}^{\text {to }} 2^{\prime} \mathrm{f} .1^{1}$ is the number assigned by Marmaduke Fothergill d.1731., who bequeathed his books to the parishoners at Skipwith on condition that they built somewhere to house the collection. They failed to do so, and, in 1737, his widow gave the books to York Minster Library. Fothergill has annotated the bottom of $\mathrm{f} .1^{\mathrm{r}}$ and (more extensively) f. $86^{\mathrm{v}}$, suggesting parallels with Lyndwood's Provinciale. 'William Lylster owe thys bowke' appears in a sixteenth century hand on $\mathrm{f} .86^{\text {r }}$.

Binding

The binding is post-medieval.
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## THE TEXTUAL TRADITION

The four manuscripts, B, H, T and Y, contain two overlapping, but nevertheless very different versions, one found in $\mathbf{B}$ and the other in $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{T}$ and Y . With the exception of the occasional phrase or line (usually additional material in H , see e.g. $\mathrm{T} 6 / 4, \mathrm{~T} 13 / 8$ ) H , T and Y contain almost exactly the same material. B, while overlapping heavily with HTY, has lengthy sections of independent material (e.g. B4/8-5/22) and does not contain certain passages found in HTY (e.g. T98/6-100/18). The HTY commentary is divided into numbered chapters: the discussion of the commandments of the first table into chapters numbered one to twelve, and the discussion of those of the second table into chapters numbered one to sixteen. The first three chapter headings also appear in $B$.

Before discussing the relationships of the manuscripts in more detail, it will be useful to consider certain problems connected with the identification of error. The initial section of the prologue, which is common to both our versions, also appears as the prologue of the commandments commentary printed in Appendix I of The Book of Vices and Virtues. This commentary (henceforth referred to as DI) is extant in twenty-one manuscripts, the majority of which share this particular prologue. As will become clear when we come to discuss the relationships of the various commandments commentaries in greater detail, $B$ at least must have had independent access to such a
commentary, and, in view of the evidence of its wide availability, the possibility of independent access by the $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{T}$ and Y scribes cannot be discounted. An example of a correction made in this section occurs in H (see T10/4) where the word God, omitted in the text, is added in the margin. ${ }^{1}$ A similar problem arises with Biblical and other quotations, especially those of the commandments. Although references are minimal in both B and the HTY group, ${ }^{2}$ earlier witnesses may have contained fuller references, making it possible for scribes to check and correct, while a scribe well versed in the Bible may well have been able to identify the source of a quotation even without such references. The wording of the commandments themselves, of course, would be particularly easy to check, and it is worth remembering that corrections of this kind could result in more accurate quotation than was present in the original. ${ }^{3}$

Further errors which a scribe could easily correct and which are therefore difficult to use as evidence of descent include errors of dittography, and certain errors of misreading

1. TY both have God, which is, however, not found in B (see B10/12).
2. B contains more references than HTY but these occur in sections drawn from other sources, notably DI.
3. See, for example, the discussion on this topic by Anne Hudson, EWS i.186-7.
where the context makes the error plain e.g. T69/5, H world, TY word; and B73/8, T73/9, Y halewe, BHT traueile. ${ }^{1}$

Isolative Error

Each of the four manuscripts contains independent errors viz:

Errors in B:

1) Errors due to eyeskip: B50/4-5, cf. T50/4; B55/4-5, cf. T55/4; B73/2-4 (with consequent alteration of stonden to wipstonde), cf. T73/2-3; B82/9, cf. T82/10-83/1; B85/9-10, cf. T85/8-9; B132/5, cf. T132/10, with consequent alteration of errour to eyper (B132/6, T132/11).
2) Error due to misunderstanding of the meaning: B85/7-8, T85/7-8, B: Pyn elde fader and elde moder beb byn fadres and modres eldres, cf. T: pin elde fader and elde moder ben pi fer eldris i.e. B appears to have misinterpreted fer as 'four', thus missing the point which is that your parents are your 'near' ancestors and your grandparents your 'far' ancestors.
3) Errors due to the replacement of a more difficult by an easier reading, or by misreading which is identifiable from the
context and from comparison with the other witnesses, but which could not easily be corrected: BT86/2, B vpon, HTY opun, with consequent addition of B it, BT102/2, B many, HTY may; BT118/1, B flee fro, HY fle fer, B126/7, T126/9, B pat bep vnder HTY suget vnto; BT151/7, B eche зer HTY eschete; BT153/2, B ynarke it to here lykynge, TH to marke it to her kychen.
4) Error identifiable from the source: B81/4, T81/4, B so plesynge, HTY plesyng, source valet. ${ }^{1}$
5) Error due to anticipation of a phrase found later in the text:

BT86/9, B Crist, God and man, HTY Crist cf. BT87/2.
6) Omission by $B$ of all chapter marks after the third.

In fact, the B scribe is clearly making use of two or more sources, a practice which occasionally causes him to repeat material. Thus, for instance, the passage on love and dread, with its image from St. Augustine of the bristle drawing in the thread, occurs first in $\mathbf{B}$ during the discussion of the first commandment (B15) and is then found jointly in all manuscripts (though in slightly different words) as part of the second (BT52). B also shows evidence of omitting material from his current exemplar in order to avoid such repetition. As part of his discussion of the first commandment, for instance, B has a passage on spiritual lechery (B41/15ff.) and he therefore omits any sixth commandment treatment of this topic with the
comment that he has dealt with it earlier (B120/22-3). The relationship of B to one particular version (DI) will be dealt with in more detail below.

## Errors in H :

1) Errors due to eyeskip: T11/2-4; T58/4-5; T58/10-59/1; T81/5; T97/7-9.
2) Error due to misunderstanding of the meaning: T58/9, H sif pat he be trew, BTY if pat he be cf. T58/4-5, where the point is that every man who exists bears God's name in his soul. The word trew however appears as a marginal emendation and it is therefore difficult to be certain exactly when it was added.
3) Errors due to the replacement of a more difficult by an easier reading or to misreading: T63/1, H ourcomen, BTY vencushid; T64/5, H is BTY stondip in; T100/3, H for to do, TY fordo; T101/8, H say, TY supposen; T139/3, H be don TY be bedum, cf. B by byddynge.
4) Error due to repetition of a word which has just been used: T48/6, H see ne fele, BTH feele; T70/8, H restid, BTY lay. 5) Errors due to anticipation of a word found later in the text: T50/4, H sumdele, TY soundely, cf. HTY sumdel 1.5; T61/8, H fallep, BTY failip; T154/8, H lede, TY teche.
5) Errors resulting in defective syntax: $\mathrm{T} 2 / 8, \mathrm{H}$ who, BTY for who; T6/5, H he, BTY as he, with consequent H addition of And.
6) Errors involving unnecessary expansion: T1/2, H men pat
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wullen be pe chiledren of Godde, BTY men, where H's addition provides an unnecessary qualification; T2/5, H loued and thankide, BTY loued, where H's addition obscures the emphasis on love on which the passage depends. For similar H additions see T6/4, T13/8, T30/1, T33/2, T50/5, T129/5.
7) Error due to grammatical confusion: T21/4, H hestis, BTY heest. This error is the result of confusion over the number of pis which H often uses as a plural.
8) Error resulting in the use of the wrong tense: T109/9, H mouep, TY moeuyde.
9) Omission of various chapter marks, e.g. at T6/7, T72/3, T80/1.

Errors in T:

1) Errors due to eyeskip: T88/2; T135/3-4.
2) Error due to the replacement of a more difficult by an easier reading or to misreading: T104/2, T listly, HY listlier.
3) Error due to repetition of a word or construction recently used:

T107/7, T traitours, BHY tirauntis, cf. traitours T107/1.
4) Errors resulting in defective syntax: T55/2, omission of BHY or, T109/17, omission of HY 3if.
5) Error due to omission with consequent alteration: T118/1, T for, HY fle fer.
6) Omission of chapter mark 9 in the discussion of the commandments of the first table (T61/2), and chapter mark 3 in the discussion of the commandments of the second table (T98/5).

Errors in Y

1) Error due to eyeskip: T134/3-4
2) Errors due to the replacement of a more difficult by an easier reading or to misreading: T87/5, Y weren, BHT wenen; T98/9-10, Y ouercomyng, HT ouer comyn (i.e. 'too common'); T108/2, Y an yuel tente, HT annuel rent, T140/3, Y wilfulli BHT leuefully, T147/7, Y peple, HT Pope; T149/9, Y is moost, BT is waxen, H waxip; T153/2, Y make hem to pus richen, HT to marke it to her kychen.
3) Errors resulting in alteration of the meaning, and thus in loss of the thread of the argument: T108/10, Y but if it be doon in charite ellis, HT but bi pis irregularite; T156/1, loss of not, T159/3, use of additional sum.
4) Errors causing problems with syntax: T21/4, Y so as, BHT so pes; T108/16, Y and, HT Ant sip.
5) Error due to mistaken interpretation of the meaning of a word: T155/2, Y knowe and leue, HT leeue i.e. Y has misinterpreted leeue as 'believe' rather than 'renounce' with consequent addition of knowe.
6) Error due to repetition of a term recently employed: T63/5, Y strengbe (i.e. a repetition of the preceding word), BHT streyne; T158/15, Y fadris, HT eldris.

Group Error

The question of group error is more complicated than that of individual error since the evidence is conflicting viz:
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## Possible BT joint error:

BT151/1, BT contrarye, HY traytorie, where the latter may seem the more difficult reading. (See, however, the note to this line).

Possible HY joint error:
BT68/8, the insertion of an unnecessary of ye.

Possible BY joint error:
BT58/9, BY be for HT he ${ }^{I}$.

Possible BH joint errors:

1) $\mathrm{BT} 3 / 2, \mathrm{BH}$ wel, TY wilfully, where the point is that God wishes his commandments to be kept not 'well' but 'freely' (cf. BT3/1). However, this error could be coincident, especially if an earlier witness had willi for wilfully.
2) BT53/8, omission (twice) of TY of yuel. Although the source for this passage is not clear, the TY version corresponds to the form used in the discussions of various commentators. ${ }^{1}$

However, even accepting that T and Y do have the original, coincident error seems possible, given that the construction of the sentence is awkward and the repetitions could be mistaken for dittography.

Possible TY joint errors:

1) $B T 2 / 3$ omission of more (found in both $B$ and $H$ although the word order differs). Note, however, that correction from the DI source would be possible.

[^1]2) T88/6, TY hem, BH him (referring back to fader).
3) $\mathrm{T} 134 / 1, \mathrm{TY}$ it, BH he.
4) T121/4, TY eche not found in H . This may well be an echo of the passage which immediately precedes it (Sip eche hedly synne etc. T121/2), but it does not make sense in the context, since the discussion referred to (which begins, after a digression on chastity, at $\mathrm{T} 122 / 5$ ) concerns $\sin$ in general rather than individual sins.

Possible BHY joint errors

1) B6/5, T6/4, BHY may, T may ay.
2) BT54/9, BHY grete, T greuouse, where T appears to have the more difficult reading and BHY may well be repeating an adjective already used (see BT54/5).
3) $\mathrm{BT} 44 / 3, \mathrm{BHY}$ and al onlyche he, T and also his neizbore, where T's version appears to represent the more difficult reading. It is, however, worth remembering that the view that the love of God and the love of one's neighbour are interdependent was something of a commonplace, and it is therefore not impossible that T's version is a correction.

Possible HTY joint errors:

1) BT62/5, HTY vtterli, B wytynglyche.
2) Loss of references to a $\operatorname{gret}(e \operatorname{clerk}(e$ (B81/2, B101/5).

Although the identity of the great clerk referred to in B101/5 is
unclear, the reference in B81/2 is plainly to Wyclif. ${ }^{1}$
3) Error due to eyeskip: T95/6, cf. B95/12 (although it is possible that this could be repetition by B).
4) BT97/6-7, HTY omission of men with consequent alteration of here to mennes.
5) B104/4, T104/7, HTY a, B eny.
6) BT118/3, HTY wysere, B holyer. It seems likely that the original instruction to the reader (BT118/1-2) warned against placing too much trust in strength, or holiness or wisdom and that the B and HTY readings represent two later stages of development: an earlier stage, represented by B, where the first reference to holiness has been lost due to anticipation of the reference to wisdom, and a second stage, represented by HTY where the epithet 'holier' has been altered to conform with the earlier reference to 'wit'. However, the possibility of a correction by B cannot be ruled out. ${ }^{2}$

Possible BHTY joint errors (i.e. errors in the common ancestor):

1) BT135/5, all byndip, original possibly blyndip.
2) BT118/2, all witt, see above HTY errors item 6.

The evidence outlined above is clearly conflicting,

[^2]2. For relevant quotations see note to this passage.
although it seems probable that the BY and HY groupings may be discounted. Of importance when considering the relationship of the HTY and B versions (and, in particular, whether the content of B's source corresponded to that of the HTY version or whether the HTY version might, for example, contain substantial additions not present in B's source) is the question of whether the HTY group shared a common ancestor which was not shared by B. Evidence for BH and BT joint errors (itself conflicting) argues against this as does the evidence for BHY joint errors. Evidence for these last three groupings is, however, quite weak compared to the evidence for HTY joint errors. If the HTY group did share a common ancestor not shared by B, this would raise the possibility that certain independent HTY passages not found in B might be later additions (i.e. not necessarily $B$ omissions). The discussion of the fifth commandment contains two interesting passages which illustrate the type of questions this might raise:

B:
And herfore men seyep pat men pat bep ykylled by mannes lawe beb noust slawe of men bot pe lawe sleyp hem and here yuele dedes.

HTY:
And herfor men seien pat men pat ben slayn bi mames lawe ben not sleyn of men but pe lawe sleep hem and her yuel dedis. But wolde God pat pe puple wolde worshipe Goddis lawe and seie pat it were ful soop and iust in hymsilf as bei supposen of mames lawe. Wipouten ony dout, bame shulden pei not be contrarie to Crist:
whame he seip pat pis breed is myn owne body pei reuersen him and seien pat pis may neper be breed ne pe body of Crist, as false freris gabben. But leue we pis now and speke we of pis maundement,
and suppose we bi oure
feip pat God biddip pus: pat we shulden sle no man wipoute autorite of him.
(T101-2)

## HTY:

And so, as me pinkip, no man shulde sle oper bi autorite of pe lawe but if he were siker pat Goddis lawe bad it; and panne myste he wite pat he brak not Goddis heest al if he slous him ne fel not fro charite. sip bope loue and sorowe shulde moeue him to do so and not his owne veniaunce. And pus, as me pinkip, a man may kille anoper, as men clepen hangmen and hederis in mamnes lawe. And pus Goddis lawe spekip whiche we shulden trowe. And pus men supposen pat bi londis lawe is no man sleyn but if God bidde it, for pei supposen pat pis is Goddis lawe. But it is wonder to men hou in mony londis men ben sleyn for a trespas, and for a myche more pei ben not punyshid so. but oper
passen fre or ben listl[ier] punyshid: bi money as men vsen. But we ben not sett to rist siche lawes.

For of pis lawe we bep certeyne pat it byddep noust kylle a man bot yf it be resoun and graciouse and profetable yf he takep it wel, so pat it were betere him to be kylled so pan for to lyue forpe vnpunesched

But of Goddis lawe bea we ful certeyn pat it biddıp not sle a man but if it be resoun and gracious and profitable if he take it wel, so pat him were betere pus to be sleyn pan to lyue forp vnpunyshid

In both the above passages, it seems clear that the independent HTY material is an addition. The irrelevance of the additional material to the topic under discussion is clearer in the first extract than in the second, but even in the second it is plain that the HTY discussion of the punishments employed in various lands and their possible unfairness interrupts the general flow of the argument, which is concerned with the responsibility of the executioner. Moreover, in both cases, the transition back to the original material (But leue we this now... But we ben not sett...) is abrupt enough to reveal the join. Whether B then redeleted these passages is more difficult to determine. It is easy to imagine, especially in the case of the first passage, that the views expressed were considered too extreme to be included. On the other hand, as far as the first extract is concerned, it does seem at least possible that B's references to a grete clerke were present in an earlier witness but were then lost
-xlvi-
in the HTY tradition as part of the process of making the transition back from the interpolated material to the original.

That the HTY group shared a common ancestor not shared by B thus seems at least a possibility, while the tendency for BH and TY to agree suggests the further possibility of a relationship between T and Y . However, the conflicting evidence makes it difficult to be absolutely certain of the textual tradition and may, perhaps, suggest contamination.

Choice of Base Manuscript for the HTY version

The uncertainty over textual relationships precludes selecting the base manuscript on these grounds, and, since the dialect of the original is unclear, it is not possible to select a copy text on this basis either. Moreover, given the nature of the material, the assumption that the original is bound to be 'better' than its descendants, especially where the 'errors' of such descendants consist of deliberate alterations, is of doubtful validity. In general, T seems to be the most suitable candidate for use as a base text. Its dialect is consistent and thus presents few difficulties for the reader, and it contains few errors which result in loss of sense.

## THE LANGUAGE

| Abbreviations Used |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| EME | Early Middle English |
| ME | Middle English |
| MS(S) | manuscript(s) |
| NE | New (i.e. Modern) English |
| OA | Old Anglian |
| OE | Old English |
| OK | Old Kentish |
| OI | Old Icelandic |
| WS | West Saxon |
| adj. | adjective |
| adv. | adverb |
| n. | noun |
| pa.t. | past tense |
| pl. | plural |
| pp. | past participle |
| pr. | present |
| pr.p. | present participle |
| sg. | singular |
| subj. | subjunctive |
| $v$. | verb |
| Atlas | A. McIntosh, M.L. Samuels and M. Benskin, |
|  | A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval |
|  | English, 4 vols. (Aberdeen, 1986). |

In the following description of the language of the manuscripts, the line references are to the first occurrence of a given form. When a form occurs only rarely, more references may be given.

Harvard MS English 738

The main points of interest in sounds and forms are as follows:

A In reflexes of OE stressed vowels:

1) OE $y$ appears as $i / y$ as in $k i n g$ (f. $1^{\Gamma} / 12$; T1/10), mynde (f. $2^{\mathrm{r}} / 11$; T7/5) but occasionally as $u$ in churche (f. 5 / $/ 12$; T33/8) beside chirche (f.2/8; T7/2). Euel (f.55/5; T33/2) beside yuelle (f.7/9; T53/6) and iuelle (f.16/6; T101/6) reflects EME lengthening in open syllables. NE 'worse' appears as worse (f. $11^{\mathrm{r}} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 72 / 8$ ) beside, once, wrse (f.11 $/ 9$; T75/2). NE 'work' v. appears with $i / y$ and with $o$ as in wirchip (f.20r/11; T121/16), wyrche (inf.) (f.2/4; T12/2), worche (inf.) (f. $9^{\mathrm{V}} / 16$; T67/1). NE 'worship' (n. and v.) normally appears with $i / y$ but also with $o$ : wyrschip (f. $2^{\mathrm{r}} / 7 ; \mathrm{T} 7 / 1$ ), wirschip (f. $11^{〔} / 12$; T73/5), worchipt (f. ${ }^{\text {r/ }} 18$; T2/4). Forms in wur- occur, as in wurse (f.11/7; T75/1) and wurschipe (f.8r/12-13; T60/6), but these are expansions and, as no wur-forms occur without abbreviation, it is difficult to be certain of their status. wur-forms with abbreviation are not recorded by the Atlas. OE pyncan 'to seem' appears with medial -e- as in thenkis (f.5r/2; T32/1), presumably because of confusion with the verb 'to think'. OE $\bar{y}$ appears as $i$ as in litill (f. $1^{\mathrm{v}} / 19$; T4/7), but once as ie in fier(f. $19^{\mathrm{v}} / 8 ; \mathrm{T} 118 / 5$ ) beside fire
-xlix-
(f.22「/12; T129/11).
2) $\mathrm{OE} i$ normally appears a $i$, as in biddyngs (f. $1^{\mathrm{T}} / 3 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ) but sometimes as $y$, as in myght (f.2²/6; T6/9). OE micel $/$ myċel appears as miche ( $\mathrm{f} .11^{\mathrm{V}} / 6$; T74/9) but more commonly as myche (f. $2^{\mathrm{r}} / 1$; see T6/4 and apparatus). The vowel in weke n. (f.10//6; T68/5) cf. OE wice is due to lowering associated with EME lengthening in open syllables. OE $\overline{1}$ appears as $i / y$, as in $l y f\left(f .1^{「} / 13 ; ~ T 1 / 11\right)$ ), life (f. $1^{1} / 15$; T4/3).
3) $\mathrm{OE} e$ appears as $e$, as in men ( $\mathrm{f} .1^{\mathrm{r}} / 1 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ). OE eg appears as ey as in weye (f. $5^{\mathrm{y}} / 8$; see T34/13 and apparatus) and as ay in way

 ез-: езеп (f.5/23; T34/8).
4) $\mathrm{OE} \boldsymbol{x}$ appears as $\boldsymbol{a}$ in badde ( $\mathrm{f} .1 \mathrm{r} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 5$ ), and as the first component of the digraph ay in day (f.5r/23; T34/7). OE $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$ appears as e as in teche (f.2r/4; T6/8) but as ee in heet (f.28r/10; T154/3). NE 'flesh' appears as flesche (f.4/5; T22/2). OE $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$ plus shortening appears as $e$ in ledde (f. $3 \mathrm{r} / 20 ; \mathrm{T} 15 / 5$ ), but as $a$ in lastid (f. $10^{\mathrm{v}} / 13$; $\mathrm{T} 71 / 3$ ) and any ( $\mathrm{f} . \mathrm{1}^{\mathrm{r}} / 15$; $\mathrm{T} 2 / 2$ ) beside one example of ony (f.13${ }^{\mathrm{\imath}} / 17$; T86/9).
5) OE $a$ appears as $a$ in asse (f.28/7; T153/10). OE a followed by a nasal appears as a as in noman (f. $1^{1 / 4} ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 3$ ). grauen (f.3T/6; T14/6) and name (f. $6^{v} / 3$; T50/8) have EME lengthening. OE $\bar{a}$ generally appears as $o$ as in more (f. $1 \mathrm{r} / 15 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 1$ ), but as 00 in $g 0 o$ (f. $11^{\mathrm{r}} / 21$; T74/2). LOE $\bar{a}$ from $a$ before lengthening groups generally appears as $o$ as in stonden ( $\mathrm{f} . \mathrm{4}^{\mathrm{r}} / 5$; T22/1) but also as a as in hande (f.3 ${ }^{\mathrm{r}} / 7$; T14/6). Retracted OA a plus lengthening group appears as $o$ as in
holde (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 2 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ). asked (f. $1^{\mathrm{T} / 5 ; ~ T 1 / 4) ~ h a s ~ L O E ~ s h o r t e n i n g . ~}$
6) $\mathrm{OE} o$ appears as $o$ as in godde (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 2$; see $\mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ and apparatus).

OE og appears as -ow in bowes (f.9r/8; T64/3). OE $\bar{o}$ normally appears as $o$ as in $d o\left(f .1^{5} / 6 ; T 1 / 4\right)$ but occasionally as $u$ in gude (f.1²/20; T4/8).
7) OE $u$ usually appears as $u$, as in cum (f. $1 \mathrm{r} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 5$ ). Forms such as woke (f.10r/22; T69/9) cf. WS and OA wucu and loued (f.1/20; T2/5) display lowering associated with EME lengthening in open syllables. Note also loue n . ( $\mathrm{f} . \mathrm{s}^{\mathrm{r}} / 14 ; \mathrm{T} 34 / 1$ ) beside $\operatorname{luf}(\mathrm{f} .2 \mathrm{r} / 14$; T10/3\&4) and loue v.inf. (f.4/12; T23/5) beside luf(f.2r/17; T11/1). w sometimes appears for $u$ or wu as in wnderstand ( $\mathrm{f} .7 \mathrm{r} / 18$; T54/4) and $w l t\left(\mathrm{f} .7^{\mathrm{V}} / 2 ; \mathrm{T} 54 / 10\right)$. founden (f. $\mathrm{1}^{\mathrm{v}} / 18 ; \mathrm{T} 4 / 5$ ) reflects LOE lengthening. OE $\bar{u}$ appears as $-o w$ as in howe (f. $1\ulcorner/ 5$; T1/4), but also as ou as in hou (f. $4^{\mathrm{V}} / 17$; T30/8).
8) OE eo appears as e as in heuen (f. $1^{\mathrm{r} / 6 ;} \mathrm{T} 1 / 5$ ). OE $\bar{e} O$ appears as e as in Prestes (f. $2^{\mathrm{r}} / 4$; T6/8) and in trew (f. $5^{5} / 7$; see T 34/13 and apparatus), treu (f.20/22; T122/8) beside $t r w\left(f .7^{\text {r }} / 7 ; \mathrm{T} 53 / 3\right.$ ), tru (f.22「/21; see T130/2 and apparatus), but as ee in weede (f. $25^{\mathrm{v}} / 12$; T144/5).
9) OE ea appears as $a$ as in alle (f. 1 r/1; T1/2). ea before
lengthening group appears as $e$ in selde (f.24r/16; T136/1) cf. WS and K sealde. OE ēa appears as $\boldsymbol{e}$ as in grete (f. $1^{\mathrm{v}} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 3$ ).

B In reflexes of certain OE consonants:

1) The form for ' p ', representing $\mathrm{OE} p$ is the same as the form for
' $y$. ${ }^{1}$ The symbol for ' $y$ ' is often distinguished by a dot, but this is by no means invariable and the dot occasionally appears where the symbol clearly means ' p ' as in pise 'these' (f.2r/9; T7/4). The form is $b$-like rather than $y$-like. ' p ' and ' y ' have been distinguished in transcription except where use is made of evidence drawn from the Atlas which transcribes all such symbols as $y$. The reflex of $\mathrm{OE} p$ is most frequently represented by this symbol as in $p^{t}$ (f. $\mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{r}} / 1$; see T1/2 and apparatus), but also by th as in wythouten (f.1r/3; T1/3). Forms in $p h$ also occur: phre (f.4r/4\&5; T22/1).
2) $\mathrm{OE} h w$ - appears as wh- as in what (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 5 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 4$ ).
3) OE $s c$ - appears as $s c h$ - as in schulden (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 2 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ).
4) OE palatal $c$ appears as $c h$ as in chirche (f. $2^{\mathrm{r}} / 8 ; \mathrm{T} / 2$ ) but as $k$ in reken (f.4r/3; T21/9) and seken (f.18/7; T110/9).
5) OE -ht normally appears as $-3 t$ as in nost (f. $2 \mathrm{r} / 23$; $\mathrm{T} 11 / 8$ ) but often, in the earlier part of the text, as -ght as in noght (f. $1^{\mathrm{v}} / 7 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 4$ ).
6) OE initial $f$ appears as $f$ as in for (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 4$ ).
7) OE initial palatal $g$ appears as 3 as in зeuen (f.8v/7; T62/2) but, in the early part of the text, often as $g$ as in $g i f\left(f .1^{v} / 8 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 5\right.$ )
8) The ax- of OE axian appears most commonly as ask- as in asked (f.1/5; $\mathrm{T} 1 / 4$ ) but note also axis (f.6/16; T51/9) and, once, aschep (f.1477; T88/2).
9) Metathesis of $r$ does not occur, hence NE 'bird', 'third' and 'burn' appear as briddis pl. (f.7²/23-f.8r/1; T59/5), thridde (f.3「/10; T14/10), and bren (f.18r/8; T109/6).
[^3]C The use which the H scribe makes of final -e shows no consistent pattern. Final -e appears in places where it would not historically be expected, for example on singular indefinite adjectives such as grete (f. $1^{\mathrm{V}} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 3$ ), in the reflexes of OE masculine and neuter nouns without ending such as godde (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 2$; see $\mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ and apparatus) and worde (f. $1^{1} / 21 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 6$ ), and on the singular preterites of strong verbs such as gafe (f. $2^{\text {r/ }} 15$; T10/4).

Unetymological -e is occasionally added to existing inflexions. Thus we find plural nouns ending in -ise and -ese as in partise (f.9//12; T64/7), trese (f.21/11; T127/4), past participles of weak verbs ending in -ide and -ede as in thankide (f.1r/20; see T2/5 and apparatus), chargede (f. 3 r/14; T15/1), and the third person singular present indicative ending in -pe/-ethe/-ythe as in thinkpe (f.12r/11; T80/8), liethe (f.11/6; T74/8), wonnythe (f.13「/4; T83/5)

On the other hand, final -e does not necessarily appear where it might historically be expected. Final -e does not appear in the possessive plural of his (f. $1^{\mathrm{v}} / 3$; T3/1), and forms of NE 'these' occur both with and without final $-e$ as in $p^{i} s$ (f. $1^{\text {¹/ }} 8$; T1/6), pise (f. $2^{\text {r } / 9 ; ~}$ T7/4). Nouns whose etymology would lead you to expect final -e do not always employ it consistently. Thus we find end (f. $\mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{v}} / 16$; T4/4) beside ende (f. $1^{ } / 20 ; \mathrm{T} 4 / 8$ ) and law ( $\mathrm{f} .5^{\mathrm{y}} / 17 ; \mathrm{T} 48 / 1$ ) beside lawe (f. $2^{\text {r/ }} 16 ; \mathrm{T} 10 / 5$ ).

D Other points of accidence include:

1) In nouns, the plural endings are usually -is/-es as in Iewis (f. $1^{\mathrm{T} / 8 ;}$ T1/7), sensures (f. $1^{\text {r} / 23 ; ~ T 2 / 8), ~ a l t h o u g h ~ f o r m s ~ i n ~}-s$ and occasionally -ys or -us (by abbreviation) also occur: biddyngs (f. $1^{\text {T/ }} 3$; T1/2), wittys (f. $6^{\mathrm{r}} / 19$; see $\mathrm{T} 50 / 3$ and apparatus), biddingus (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 23 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 7$ ). There is one example of an -ez ending: clothez (f.13 $/ 1 ;$ T83/2). Plural forms with additional final $-e$ have been dealt with above. There are still a few plurals in -en: breberen (f.17²/22; T108/14), eзen (f.5 ${ }^{\mathrm{T}} / 23$; $\mathrm{T} 34 / 8^{1}$ ) and also housen ( $\mathrm{f} .26^{\mathrm{V}} / 8$; $\mathrm{T} 147 / 15$ ) beside houses ( $\mathrm{f} .25^{\nu} / 7$; T144/1). The possessive forms of the noun ends in -is/-es/-s: goddis (f.1²/2; T1/2), goddes (f. $6^{1 / 20 ; ~ T 52 / 4), ~ m a n s ~(f . ~} 3^{\mathrm{r}} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 14 / 6$ ).
2) The pronoun system is less regular than in T (see below). Of interest are first person singular $I$ (f. $2^{\mathrm{r}} / 9 ; \mathrm{T} 7 / 2$ ); second person singular $p^{u}$ (f.1/22, T2/7), pow (f.3/4; T14/5), and bou (f. $3^{\mathrm{r}} / 5$; T14/6); third person singular he (f. $1^{\mathrm{r} / 5}$; T1/4), sche (f. $27 \mathrm{r} / 11$; T149/9), and hit (f.4/9; T23/3) beside the usual it (f. $1^{\mathrm{V}} / 8 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 5$ ). As we have already seen, both the singular and plural forms of NE 'his' appear as his, while the oblique case of the feminine singular pronoun appears as $\operatorname{hir}\left(\mathrm{f} .1^{r} / 20 ; \mathrm{T} 115 / 3\right.$ ). The third person plural pronoun appears as $p \mathrm{ai}(\mathrm{f} .1 / 14 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 11)$ with or without abbreviation, with pei (f.15/6; T100/2) and paie (f.22 $/ 6$; T130/9) each occurring once. NE 'their' and 'them' occur both with initial $p$ - and with initial $h$-, as in per (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 13 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 11$ ), $b^{e}$ ire (f. $2^{\mathrm{v}} / 19 ; \mathrm{T} 13 / 6$ ), peir (f. $3^{\mathrm{v}} / 11$; T20/5), pair (f. $5^{\mathrm{r}} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 33 / 3$ ), her (f. $2^{\mathrm{r}} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 6 / 9$ ), here (f.9 ${ }^{\mathrm{r} / 22 ; ~ T 65 / 6), ~}$ $\operatorname{pem}\left(\mathrm{f} .1^{\mathrm{r}} / 4 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 3\right.$ ), hem (f.3/11; T14/10). NE 'our' appears as oure
(f. $1^{\mathrm{v}} / 15$; T4/4) and ourur (f. $1^{\mathrm{v}} / 15$; T4/3). NE 'your' normally appears with initial 3 - as in 3oure (f. $7^{\mathrm{r}} / 5$; T53/1), 3ouur (f. $7^{\mathrm{r} / 8 ; ~ s e e ~ T 53 / 4 ~ a n d ~}$ apparatus), but once with initial $y$-: your (f. $10^{r} / 8$; see T68/6 and apparatus).
3) In verbs, third person singular present indicative endings in the first six folios are usually -es/-is, with occasional -s or -ys: telles (f. $1^{\mathrm{r} / 5 ; ~ T 1 / 4), ~ t e c h i s ~(f . ~} 1^{\mathrm{r} / 14 ; ~ T 2 / 1), ~ s t o n d y s ~(f . ~} 2^{\mathrm{r} / 13 ; ~ T 10 / 3), ~ a s k s ~}$ (f.4r/19; T24/6). The first instance of an ending in - th or $-p$ is knowyth (f.7r/21; T54/6). From this point onwards, the endings are generally -ip/-ep, with occasional forms in -pe or -th: puttip (f.77/8; T57/2), faylep (f.7/19; T58/10), bidpe (f.16/3; T101/3) and knowyth quoted above. Forms with additional ee have been dealt with above. Occasional forms in -es/-is do, however, occur in the later section of the text as in charges (f.13r/3; T83/4). There is one form in -ez: synnez (f.17/9; T105/9). Present plural endings are most commonly -en with occasional -in/yn: wullen (f.1 $1 / 1$; see T1/2 and apparatus), plesin (f. $3^{\vee} / 23$; T21/6), makyn (f. $4^{\mathrm{r}} / 8 ; \mathrm{T} 23 / 2$ ). Occasionally the $-n$ is missing, as in se (f. $\left.2^{\mathrm{V}} / 11 ; \mathrm{T} 12 / 7\right) .{ }^{1}$ The third singular present form of

[^4]the verb 'to be' appears as is (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 15 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 1$ ) and the plural form as ben (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 22 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 7$ ) or be (f. $1^{\mathrm{V} / 13} ; \mathrm{T} 4 / 2$ ). The present participle ends in -yng/-ing: walking (f. $5^{5} / 21 ;$ T34/6), knowyng (f. $6^{\text {r/ }}$; T49/2). In weak past participles the endings are generally -id/-ed: saued (f. $1^{\mathrm{r} / 4 ; ~ T 1 / 3}$ ), forfendid (f. $4^{\mathrm{V}} / 21 ; \mathrm{T} 30 / 12$ ). Forms with additional -e have been dealt with above. The usual inflexion of the past participle of strong verbs is -en as in beden (f. $1^{\mathrm{V}} / 5 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 3$ ), but there are isolated forms in $-e,-$ on and -yn: take (f.9r/21; T65/6), bedon (f. $9^{\mathrm{v}} / 13$; T66/8), vnknowyn (f.24r/17-18; T136/3). The $y$-prefix does not appear.
4) The adverbial ending is -ly/-li: trewly (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 10 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 8$ ), freli (f.1/3; T3/1).

## Dialects of the Scribe and his Exemplar

It is noticeable that certain changes in the language occur in the course of the text, the most striking being the sudden change in the form of the third person singular verb endings. If this were accompanied by similar sudden changes in other aspects of the language, it would be natural to assume a change in the scribe's exemplar. Other changes in dialect are, however, more gradual. Thus, in the first part of the text, the dominant form for NE 'them' is bem, although occasional forms in hem occur from f. $3^{r}$ onwards. The proportion of hem instances gradually increases, however, as the text progresses, so that by the end hem is the dominant form, although forms in pem still occur. Forms for NE 'their' show a similar, if less extreme, development, in that the first five folios of the text contain
eleven examples with initial $p$ - and only one with initial $h$-, while the last five folios contain eleven with initial $b$ - and eight with initial $h$-. Other items which occur in the early part of the text but not in the later include suche (f. $2^{\mathrm{v}} / 9 ; \mathrm{T} 12 / 5$ ) for NE 'such', later siche (f. $3^{\mathrm{v}} / 14$; T20/7) and sen (f.1²/22; T6/3)for NE 'since', later sip (f. $\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{r}} / 19$; T61/3). Forms such as gude/gode/goode and the changes from $g$ to 3 and from -ght to $-3 t$ have been dealt with above. schullen pl.v. with final $-n$ (f.15/17; see T100/11 and apparatus) appears only in the later part of the text. It seems likely that these changes have been caused by progressive translation ${ }^{1}$ and that the extent to which forms found in the exemplar were retained may reflect the degree to which they were present in the scribe's own dialect. The nature of the changes already discussed suggests that the scribe was copying from an exemplar written in a more northerly dialect than his own. The fact that suche occurs in the early part of the text but not in the later may seem to argue against this, but it is clear from the Atlas that this form occurred as far north as Yorkshire (Atlas i map 70, iv item 10). Forms such as luf alongside loue and gif alongside siue (see above) support the hypothesis of a northern exemplar. On the other hand, the occurrence of a comparatively southern form such as wullen in the first line suggests that the scribe's adherence to his exemplar may not have been absolute even at the very beginning of his transcription.

Assuming that the forms which are consistently used throughout the text, as well as those which appear only, or more frequently, in

[^5]the later sections, belong to the scribe's own dialect, this dialect can be identified as Midland. The reflexion of $\mathrm{OE} \bar{a}$ and $\mathrm{OE} \bar{o}$ in $o / o o$ together with the use of forms in $h$ for NE 'them' and 'their', and the inflexion of the third person singular in - $p$ rules out the north, while the use of the -en ending for the third person plural and the absence of the $y$-prefix for the past participle suggests that the south is unlikely. The reflexion of OE a plus nasal in a, the use of sche for the third singular feminine pronoun, and unrounding of $\bar{e} O$ and the reflexion of $\mathrm{OE} \bar{y}$ in $i$ further suggests that a West Midlands origin is unlikely.

Before we look more closely at the information contained in the Atlas, it will be useful to consider the forms for ' p ' and ' y ' as they have been mapped by Benskin. ${ }^{1}$ As has already been stated, the H scribe uses a single symbol for ' p ' and ' y '. As the use of this single symbol persists throughout the text (and, indeed, throughout the manuscript) it seems clear that it must reflect the practice of the H scribe himself, whether or not it also appeared in his exemplar. As the map provided by Benskin shows, ${ }^{2}$ this use of a single symbol characterised the writing of scribes from Scotland and from England north of a line running roughly from the southern edge of the Wash to the Mersey, together with parts of Norfork, Suffolk, Ely, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire, Rutland, Huntingdonshire and certain areas of Essex. It therefore seems likely that the H scribe

[^6]came from one of these areas.
In the following discussion of the evidence provided by the Atlas (and in this discussion only) this symbol has been transcribed as $y$, whether it represents ' $y$ ' or ' p '. This is in accordance with the practice followed by the Atlas, and reflects the fact that the resulting distinction between e.g. yai and pai (both NE 'they') is significant when considering the place of origin of the manuscript.

Assuming once more that forms which are used consistently and forms to which the scribe turns in the course of the text belonged to the scribe's own dialect, the Atlas indicates the following:

The occurrence of yai for NE 'they' suggests that Northamptonshire and Huntingdonshire, together with the Eastern halves of Norfolk and Suffolk are unlikely (Atlas i map 31). The persistent occurrence of forms for NE 'these' with medial -eitogether with the occurrence, towards the end of the text, of plural forms of NE 'shall' ending in -en suggests an area South of a line running eastwards from the Wash and further suggests that Rutland is unlikely (Atlas i maps 6 and 151). The area under consideration now comprises south Lincolnshire, Ely, Soke, the west side of Norfolk and Suffolk, possibly Cambridgeshire, and certain sections of Essex.

Turning to the item maps, we find that the occurrence of yeis(e and yai suggests that Essex and Cambridge are unlikely (Atlas ii, items 2 and 7). The occurrence of forms for NE 'will' with medial -u(if we accept that these belong to the scribe's own dialect rather than to that of his exemplar) suggests that, of the remaining area, south Ely is a strong possibility (Atlas ii , item 24). It is worth noting that the plural form wullen (f. $1 \mathrm{r} / 1$; see $\mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ and apparatus) is not recorded
much further north than this, although it is recorded further to the west (Atlas iv, item 24). On the other hand, the text does contain a cluster of forms which, within this area, are only recorded for south Lincolnshire: saiy for NE 'says' (f.10r.2; T68/1), seeye 'sees' (f.13/18; T84/8), seuenye 'seventh' (f.9²/22; T67/7), summ 'some' (f.30r/12; T159/2 ${ }^{1}$ ), yride 'third' (f.6r/15; T49/9), and most noticeably, because it occurs so often, siy 'since' (Atlas iv, items 210, 211, 220, 237, and 39). An area between south Lincolnshire and south Ely therefore seems a strong possibility. The use of selde for NE 'sold' pa.t.sg. might perhaps suggest that such a placement is too far north, but the Atlas does record instances of held(e for NE 'hold' in both Ely and Norfolk (Atlas iv.314).

It is difficult to be certain as to the dialect of H's exemplar. However, the combination of yem for NE 'them' with churche (Atlas i maps 43 and 386), neither of which appears to be part of the $H$ scribe's dialect, suggests the southern half of the West Riding of Yorkshire or Derbyshire, while the occurrence of worche v . (Atlas i map 315) suggests that the West Riding is the more likely. It is worth noting that lau 'law' (f.16\%/10; T103/9) is only recorded for the West Riding of Yorkshire, that aer'air' (f. ${ }^{\mathrm{r}} / 1$; T59/5) is recorded only for the North and West Ridings and for Northumberland, while stren3 'strength' n. (f.19²/3; T118/2) is recorded only for York (Atlas iv, items 164,69 , and 42).
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The principle points of interest in accidence and in the reflection of OE sounds in spelling are as follows:

A Reflexes of OE stressed vowels

1) OE $y$ appears as $y / i$ as in $k y n g(T 1 / 10)$ and chirche ( $\mathrm{T} 7 / 2$ ). OE $\bar{y}$ appears as $i$ in triste (T3/8) but as ie in fier (T118/5). 2) $\mathrm{OE} i$ appears as $i / y$ as in biddyngis (T1/2). OE myćel/mićel normally appears as myche (T12/7), but there is one example of miche (T80/12). OE I normally appears as $i / y$, as in wisely (T2/9), tyme ( $\mathrm{T} 4 / 3$ ), but also as $i j$ as in $\operatorname{lijf}(\mathrm{T} 1 / 11)$.
2) OE e appears as $e$, as in men ( $\mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ), but as $i$ between $g$ and $d$ in togidre (T15/3). The ee of eende (T13/1), beside ende (T4/4), perhaps reflects an earlier spelling showing LOE lengthening. OE $\bar{e}$ appears as $e$ as in kepe (T1/6). OA $\bar{e} g$ by smoothing appears as $y 3$ in yзen (T22/2).
3) $\mathrm{OE} æ$ generally appears as $a$ as in $\operatorname{bad}(\mathrm{T} 1 / 5)$ and in the first component of the digraph ay as in day (T34/7). OE $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$ appears as e as in teche (T6/8), but also, though less frequently, as ee as in heestis (T10/2). Before sh OE $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$ appears as $e i$ in fleish (T22/2). OE $\overline{\mathscr{x}}$ with shortening sometimes appears as $a$, as in lastide (T71/3), but also as $e$, as in lesse (T34/1). OE $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with shortening appears as oin ony (T2/2). late (T96/7) shows Scandinavian influence, cf. OI lāta.
4) OE $a$ appears as $a$ in asse (T153/10). OE $a$ followed by a nasal appears as $a$ as in man (T1/3). name (T50/8) and grauen (T14/6) have EME lengthening. OE ā appears as o/oo as in more (T2/1), woot ( $\mathrm{T} 2 / 4$ ). LOE $\bar{a}$ from a before lengthening groups appears as $o$ as in lond (T14/4). Retracted OA a plus lengthening group appears as $o$ as in holde ( $\mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ). axide ( $\mathrm{T} 1 / 4$ ) shows LOE shortening.
5) OE $o$ appears as $o$ as in goddis (T1/2) and in world (T13/1) (OE woruld but cf. also OE weoruld). OE $o g$ appears as $o w$ in bowes (T64/3). OE $\bar{o}$ appears as oloo as in do (T1/4), good (T11/7).
6) OE $u$ appears as $u$ as in kunned (T2/4), but is spelt as $o$ before a nasal in tonge (T54/10). Forms in o occurring in words such as loue (T10/3) and woke (T68/5) (cf. WS and OA wucu) reflect lowering associated with EME lengthening in open syllables. OE wur appears as wor as in worship (T13/4). groumd (T64/5), doumbe ( $\mathrm{T} 100 / 8$ ), and foumden ( $\mathrm{T} 4 / 5$ ) reflect LOE lengthening, but cf. bunden (T80/9). OE $\bar{u}$ normally appears as $o u$ as in $h o u$ (T1/4) but as ow in Now (T24/4).
7) OE eo appears as $e$ as in heuene ( $\mathrm{T} 1 / 5$ ). OE $\bar{e} O$ generally appears as $e$ as in Prestis (T6/8) but as ee in weed (T144/5). The $o$ of fourpe ( $\mathrm{T} 14 / 10$ ) reflects a rising dipthong.
8) OE ea generally appears as a as in alle ( $\mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ). The OE combination eax, however, appears as ex in wexen (T156/15). OE $\bar{e} a$ appears as e/ee as in $\operatorname{greet}(\mathrm{T} 3 / 3)$ and $\operatorname{dep}$ (T4/5) WS ea plus lengthening group appears as e in telden (T106/7).

B Reflexes of OE consonants

1) OE $h w$ - appears as wh- as in what (T1/4).
2) OE initial $s c$ - generally appears as $s h$ - as in shulden ( $\mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ), but once as sc-: sculdest (T124/5).
3) OE ht appears as $3 t$ as in list (T4/2).
4) OE axian appears with initial $a x$ - as in axide (T1/4).
5) Metathesis of $r$ does not occur, hence NE 'bird', 'third' and 'burn' appear as briddis (pl.) (T59/5), bridde (T14/10) and brenne (T109/6).
6) OE palatal $g$ normally appears as 3 as in $3 y u e(T 3 / 5)$, but consistently as $3 h$ in $3 h e$ 'indeed' (T10/1). forgete (T3/4) beside forsete (T49/2) shows Scandinavian influence cf. OI geta.
7) OE initial $f$ appears as $f$ as in for ( $\mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ).
8) $\mathrm{OE} \dot{c}$ appears as $c h$ as in chirche (T7/2).

C The Use of Final -e

The T scribe's use of final -e suggests that this ending still had some meaning. There is, for instance, evidence for its use as a plural inflexion in adjectives. Thus we find foule (p1.) (T23/3) beside foul (sg.) (T147/6). Such agreement does not, however, occur when the adjective in question is being used as a complement, thus hard (pl.) (T138/1) and even when the adjective immediately precedes its noun the use of final $-e$ is not invariable, thus deed (pl.) (T100/14). The possessive pronoun 'his' normally has final $-e$ in the plural but not in the singular, thus hise (T1/10), his (sg.) (T2/6) but note his (pl.) (T4/1) and hise (sg.)
(T110/16). There is little evidence for the use of -e as a definite inflexion. Singular definite adjectives such as greet (T4/2) and $\operatorname{good}(\mathrm{T} 11 / 7)$ occur without inflexion, while the use of final -e in such traditional phrases as pe olde testament (T31/1) and pe olde lawe (T48/1) may well represent a petrified rather than a functional form.

With a few exceptions, final $-e$ is not normally extended to forms which would not historically have employed it, and the scribe is not normally inconsistent. However, the OE feminine noun bliss appears both with and without final -e as in blisse (T1/6) and bliss (T3/8), while the OE neuter noun lim appears as lyme (T61/5) (this latter, however, sometimes appears in OE with a feminine adjective). OE willa appears twice as will (T12/6 and T49/9) beside the more usual wille (T59/7) but, since it is not the T scribe's usual practice to end a word with double 1 , it seems likely that the former are errors. badde (pa.t.sg.) (T152/8) beside the usual bad (T1/5) appears to show confusion with weak verbs while the final -e of bare (pa.t.sg.) (T85/7) is the result of an expansion. It is worth noting that the preterite of the NE verb 'to make' appears consistently as made (T67/7) while the past participle appears as maad (T31/2).

## D Other Points of Accidence

1) In nouns, the plural endings vary between -es and -is with -is somewhat more common; thus biddyngis (T1/2), iewes (T1/7). A
similar pattern is followed by the possessive form, thus kyngis (T2/7), mannes (T14/6). There are still a few plurals in -en: briperen (T108/14), узеп (T22/2).
2) The pronoun system is regular viz. singular pronouns: first person normally $y$ (T7/2) but twice $I$ (T14/3 and T75/4); second person normally pou (T2/7), sometimes $p^{u}$ (T14/6), once pow (T123/8); third person he (T1/4), she (T149/9), and it (T3/5). NE 'her' oblique appears as hir (T115/3). The third person plural appears as pei (T13/5), oblique hem (T1/3), possessive her (T13/6).
3) In verbs, third present singular endings are $-i p /-c p$ as in tellip (T1/4), techep (T2/1) with occasional -yp: makyp (T20/6). Present plural verbs end in -en as in kepen (T1/7), but occasionally in -e as in synne (T34/2). is (T2/1) is the third present singular form of the verb 'to be'and ben (T2/7) the plural. The present participle ending appears as -ing or -yng in walking (T34/6) and shynyng (T98/9). In weak past participles, the ending is -id or -ed as in saued (T1/3), worshipid (T2/4). Strong past participles most commonly end in $u n$, less commonly in -en as in bedun (T3/3), founden (T4/5). The $y$-prefix does not appear. Infinitives occur with final -e but without final -n, as in holde (T1/2). A possible inflected infinitive occurs in to bitokene (T72/2), although, given the date of the manuscript, this may seem unlikely.

Dialect
-lxv-
half of the Central Midlands. The Midlands is suggested by a combination of features. The reflexion of $\mathrm{OE} \bar{a}$ in oloo together with regular verbal endings of the third person singular present in $e p /-i p$ and present participle endings in -yng/-ing rule out the North, while present plural verb endings in -en, together with the absence of the $y$-prefix in past participles suggests the Midlands rather than the South. The overall absence of notably Northern or Southern features suggests the central rather than the extreme North or South of the Midlands area, although the continued use of final -e suggests the South rather than the North of this region. The use of she for the third singular feminine pronoun, together with the reflexion of OE a/o plus nasal in $a$, the unrounding of eo and the reflexion of $\mathrm{OE} \overline{\mathrm{y}}$ in $i / y$ further suggests that a West Midlands origin is unlikely.

Use of the Atlas also suggests the Central Midlands, for the following reasons:

That the Northernmost limit for this text is unlikely to be North of the Wash is established by the occurrence of eche (T15/10), fleish (T22/2) and hooli (T20/3) (Atlas i Maps 86, 420 and 807). The occurrence of al if for NE 'though' (T98/2), in conjunction with lijf (T1/11) and fier (T118/5) (Atlas i Maps 191, 1163, and 410) suggests the Northern section of the remaining area. The Central rather than the Eastern or Western section of this area is suggested by the distribution of al if and of worche (T64/7) (Atlas i Map 315). The area under consideration now consists of the Northern part of Warwickshire and Northamptonshire, the

Southern half of Leicestershire, Soke, Rutland, Huntingdonshire and, possibly, Ely.

Moving on to the item maps, the occurrence of siche (T12/5) and myche (T12/7) suggests that a placement in the more Western and Northern of these counties including Warwickshire, Leicester, Rutland and the North West section of Northamptonshire is unlikely, though not impossible (Atlas ii, items 10 and 16). The combination of fier, seie (T53/1), sip (T4/2), wolen with final -n (T97/3) and yзen appears to rule out much of the northern part of the area including north Warwickshire, much of Northamptonshire, Rutland and Soke (Atlas ii, items 124, 210, 39, 24 and 115), while the use of medial -o-in wolen together with yzen makes Ely seem unlikely (Atlas ii, items 24 and 115). Much of the Northern and Eastern section of the area appears to be ruled out by the occurrence pousend/pousynd (Atlas ii, item 236).

Thus the most likely location appears to be Huntingdonshire. It is true that Huntingdonshire does not show evidence of shal (pl.) (T4/4), but occurrences of this item are, in any case, sporadic for this region and examples occur in several surrounding counties i.e. in Cambridgeshire, Ely and Northamptonshire (Atlas ii, item 22). schal occurs in Huntingdonshire on the border with Northamptonshire and forms with sh for 'sh' are current throughout the county. If we consider the remainder of the material on the questionnaire, only a very few items do not occur in this area. The infinitive wite (T13/2) is not recorded for Huntingdonshire, but only one example of this verb (viz. wyte) is recorded for this county, while wite is recorded for the neighbouring counties of

Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire (Atlas iv item 257). Forms in seis- for the plural verb 'saw' (T13/6) are not recorded except for Cambridgeshire, Gloucestershire and Hertfordshire, and forms in sien (T34/5) occur sporadically over a wide area from Kent to Salop with sie occurring in Leicestershire, sye in Rutland and sien near the Huntingtonshire border in Cambridgeshire (Atlas iv item 211). breperen (T107/5), which occurs once beside the usual briperen (T108/14), is not recorded for Huntingdonshire, but occurs (with or without abbreviation) in the surrounding counties of Ely, Northamptonshire, Soke and Cambridgeshire (Atlas iv item 87), and the same is true of syuen (Atlas iv item 137). pepule (T126/9) occurs only once beside the usual puple (T6/9) and the rarity of this form (it is recorded only three times: in Northamptionshire, Staffordshire and Warwickshire) makes it difficult to establish any definite boundaries (Atlas iv item 203). There are occasional traces of a more northerly dialect, whether that of the scribe or that of his exemplar. Note, for example, callyng (T110/6) beside the more usual forms in clep- (T20/7) and seuent (T123/4) beside seuenpe (T67/1), although both these are also recorded for counties adjacent to Huntingdonshire (Atlas iv items 93 and 214). It is worth bearing in mind that seuent occurs as part of a heading introducing the seventh commandment i.e. in a section of the text which may not have appeared in the T scribe's exemplar, and it therefore seems possible that such forms were part of the T scribe's own dialect.

## York Minster MS XVI.L. 12

The following are the main points of interest in sounds and forms:
A. In reflexes of OE stressed vowels:

1. OE $y$ appears as $i, y$ as in $\operatorname{king}\left(\mathrm{f} .1^{\mathrm{rb}} / 4 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 10\right)$, mynde (f. $2^{\mathrm{rb}} / 18 ; \mathrm{T} 7 / 5$ ). OE swylc appears with medial i as in sich (f.3 ${ }^{\mathrm{ra} / 9 ;}$ T12/5) in the earlier part of the text, but later mainly with medial $u$ as in such (f. $11^{\text {va/3; }}$; T73/1). For NE 'much' see A. 2 below. NE 'worse', 'work' v. and 'worship' n. and v. appear consistently with $o$ as in worche (f. $2^{\mathrm{vb}} / 21 ; \mathrm{T} 12 / 2$ ), worse (f. $11^{\mathrm{vb}} / 19 ; \mathrm{T} 75 / 1$ ), worschip n. (f. $2^{\mathrm{rb}} / 10 ; \mathrm{T} 7 / 1$ ). OE $\bar{y}$ appears as $i$ as in litil (f. $2 \mathrm{ra} / 10 ; \mathrm{T} 4 / 7$ ) but as ie in fier (f.18 $8^{\mathrm{va}} / 11 ; \mathrm{T} 118 / 5$ ) beside fire (f.20va/5; T129/11).
2. OE $i$ appears most commonly as $i$ as in biddingis (f. $1^{\text {ra/ }} 5-6$;

T1/2) but as y in kny3tis (f.9rb/17; T62/2). NE 'if' (OE gif, gef) appears as if (f. $1^{\mathrm{ra}} / 13 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 5$ ). OE miċel, myċel appears commonly with medial $-i$ - as in miche (f. 3 ra/ 12 ; T12/7) but more commonly, especially in the later part of the text, with -y - as in myche (f.10 ${ }^{\mathrm{vb}} / 10 ; \mathrm{T} 69 / 3$ ). OE $\overline{1}$ appears as $i$ as in wiseli (f.1va/12; $\mathrm{T} 2 / 9$ ), but occasionally as $y$ next to minims as in tyme (f.2ra/2; $\mathrm{T} 4 / 3$ ) beside time (f. $2^{\text {ra/ }} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 4 / 5$ ). OE $\overline{1}$ also appears as $i j$ in lijf(f. $1^{\text {rb }} / 7$; $\mathrm{T} 1 / 11$ ) and wijf (f. $24^{\mathrm{vb}} / 19 ; \mathrm{T} 153 / 9$ ), and occasionally in other words: sijknessis (f.17 va/3; T109/12) and wijser(f. $18^{\text {va }} / 7$; see T118/3 and apparatus).

However, between $g$ and a dental and $r$ and a dental e appears as $i$
-lxix-
in togidere (f. $3^{\mathrm{va}} / 21 ; \mathrm{T} 15 / 3$ ), briberen (f.16 ${ }^{\mathrm{vb}} / 17 ; \mathrm{T} 107 / 5$ ). latten (f.11 va/3; T73/2) (pr.pl.), beside more usual letten (f. $3^{\mathrm{rb}} / 7 ; \mathrm{T} 13 / 7$ ) with $e$ due to i-mutation, may reflect the occasional OE restoration of $\mathfrak{x}$ before consonant groups or may show the influence of the adjective. ${ }^{1}$ eende (f. $2^{\text {ra }} / 3$; T4/4) beside less usual ende (f. $8^{\text {va }} / 12$; T58/10) reflects an earlier pronunciation with lengthening before consonant groups. OE $\bar{e}$ generally appears as $e$ as in kepe (f.1 ${ }^{\text {ra/ }} 15$; T1/6), occasionally as ee as in meede (f.1 $1^{\mathrm{va}} / 18 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 2$ ). OA ēg by smoothing appears as is in izen (f. $4^{\text {rb }} / 22 ; \mathrm{T} 22 / 2$ ).
4. $\mathrm{OE} æ$ appears as a as in $\operatorname{bad}\left(\mathrm{f} .1^{\mathrm{ra}} / 13 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 5\right)$ and in the first component of the digraph ay/ai (OE $æ \dot{g})$ as in may (f. $1^{\text {ra }} / 7 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 3$ ). Assuming that the double aa of $\operatorname{staaf}\left(\mathrm{f} .3^{\mathrm{vb}} / 3 ; \mathrm{T} 15 / 5\right)$ indicates a long vowel, it must reflect the levelling of the vowel of the inflected forms to the uninflected. OE $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$ appears as $e / e e$ as in techip (f. $1^{\mathrm{rb}} / 11 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 1$ ), heestis (f. $1^{\mathrm{vb}} / 7$; see T3/6 and apparatus) but as ei before sch in fleisch (f. $\mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{rb}} / 21$; T22/2) beside fleshe (f. $18^{\mathrm{va}} / 18$; T118/8). OE $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}$ plus shortening appears as $\boldsymbol{e}$ as in ledde pa.t. (f. $3^{\mathrm{rb}} / 16 ; \mathrm{T} 14 / 3$ ), lefte (f. $5^{\mathrm{va}} / 21 ; \mathrm{T} 33 / 9$ ), lesse (f. $5^{\mathrm{vb}} / 2 ; \mathrm{T} 34 / 1$ ), led pp.. (f. $18^{\mathrm{vb}} / 24$; T121/13), but also as $a$ as in lad pp. (f. $3^{\mathrm{vb}} / 4$; T15/5), lasse (f.17rb/24; T109/9). NE 'any' appears as ony (f.1T/12; T2/2).
5. OE a appears as $a$ in asse (f. $24^{\mathrm{vb}} / 21 ; \mathrm{T} 153 / 10$ ). OE a followed by a nasal appears as $a$ as in man (f. $1^{\text {ra/ }} / 8 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 3$ ). grauen (f. $3^{\mathrm{rb}} / 22$; T14/6) and name (f. $7^{\mathrm{ra}} / 7 ; \mathrm{T} 50 / 8$ ) have EME lengthening.
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OE a before lengthening groups generally appears as $o$ as in stondib (f.2 ${ }^{\text {va/ }} 3-4 ; \mathrm{T} 10 / 3$ ), but once as a in handis (f. $21^{\text {ra }} / 15$; T131/7). Retracted OA a plus lengthening group appears as $o$ as in holde (f. $1^{\text {ra/ }} / 5 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ). OE ā appears as $o / o o$ as in more (f. $1^{\text {rb/ }} 12 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 1$ ), woot (f. $1^{\text {rb }} / 20 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 4$ ).
6. OE $o$ appears as $o$ as in goddis (f. $1^{\mathrm{ra}} / 5 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ), but once as $o o$ in croos (f. $6^{\mathrm{rb}} / 7$; T47/6). OE og appears as ow as in bowis (f. $9^{\mathrm{vb}} / 8$ 9; T64/3). OE ō appears as $o, o o$ as in do (f. $1^{\text {ra/ }} 11$; T1/4), good (f.2ra/12; T4/8).
7. OE $u$ normally appears as $u$, as in ful (f. $1^{v b} / 20 ; T 4 / 2$ ). Forms such as loued (f. $1^{\mathrm{va}} / 1 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 5$ ) and woke (f.10 ${ }^{\mathrm{va} / 18 ; ~ \mathrm{~T} 68 / 5 \text { ) display }}$ lowering associated with EME lengthening in open syllables. foumden (f. $2^{\text {ra/ }} 7-8 ; \mathrm{T} 4 / 5$ ) reflects LOE lengthening. OE $\bar{u}$ normally appears as ou as in foule (f. $4^{\mathrm{va}} / 7$; T23/3) but as ow in now
 hou (f.3r/6; T13/6).
8. OE eo appears as e as in heuene (f. $1^{\text {ra/ }} / 12 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 5$ ). OE $\bar{e} O$ generally appears as e, occasionally ee, as in Prestis (f. $2^{\text {rb/4-5; }}$ $\mathrm{T} 6 / 8$ ), feend ( $\mathrm{f} .4^{\mathrm{vb}} / 19$; T26/1 ${ }^{1}$ ). The vowel of fille (f.24 ${ }^{\mathrm{va} / 6 ; ~}$ T151/6) beside fel (f.16 ${ }^{\text {ra/ }} 5$; T103/3) both pa.t.sg. is due to EME shortening. Note also trupe (f. $6^{\text {ra/ }} 13$; T34/13) beside (once each) troupe (f.8ra/21; T55/2) and treupe (f.17T/19; T109/7). tries ('trees') (f.20ra/18; T127/4) is not recorded by the NED before the sixteenth century and may be an error.
9. OE ea commonly appears as $a$ as in Alle (f. $1^{\text {ra }} / 3 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ), but as $e$ before $x$ in wexen (f. $25^{\text {vb }} / 8 ; \mathrm{T} 156 / 15$ ). WS and K ea plus lengthening appears as ee in teelden (f.16 ${ }^{\mathrm{vb} / 3 ;} \mathrm{T} 106 / 7$ ). OE èa
appears most commonly as ee as in greet (f. $1^{\mathrm{va}} / 20 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 3$ ) but also as $e$ in fewe (f. $16^{\mathrm{vb}} / 13$; see T107/3 and apparatus).
B. In reflexes of certain OE consonants:

1. OE $h w$-appears as wh- as in what (f. $1^{\mathrm{ra}} / 10 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 4$ ).
 (f. $3^{\mathrm{va}} / 3 ; \mathrm{T} 14 / 7$ ), the former appearing more frequently in the earlier part of the text.
2. OE -ht appears as -3t as in list (f. $1^{\mathrm{vb}} / 19 ; \mathrm{T} 4 / 2$ ).
3. OE palatal $\dot{c}$ normally appears as $c h$ as in techip (f. $1^{\text {rb }} / 11$; $\mathrm{T} 2 / 1$ ), but as $k$ in rekene ( $\mathrm{f} .4^{\mathrm{rb}} / 16 ; \mathrm{T} 21 / 9$ ).
4. OE palatal $g$ appears as 3 as in forsete ( $\mathrm{f} .1^{\mathrm{vb}} / 4 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 4$ ).
5. OE axian appears with initial ax - as in axide (f. $1 \mathrm{r} / 10 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 4$ ).
6. Metathesis of $r$ does not occur, hence NE 'bird, 'third' and 'burn' appear as briddis pl. (f. $8^{\mathrm{vb}} / 2 ; \mathrm{T} 59 / 5$ ), bridde (f. $3^{\mathrm{va}} / 8$;

T14/10), brend pp. (f.18 ${ }^{\mathrm{va}} / 10 ; \mathrm{T} 118 / 5$ ).
C. Use of final -e.

Final -e does not appear on the possessive his pl. (f. $1{ }^{\text {rb }} / 6$;
$\mathrm{T} 1 / 10$ ) but does appear in pese (f. $\mathrm{r}^{\mathrm{rb}} / 3 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 9$ ) beside more usual pes (f. $5^{\mathrm{va}} / 10 ; \mathrm{T} 33 / 4$ ), the former being more common in the earlier part of the text. Final -e is sometimes extended to forms which would not historically have employed it as in songe n . (f.24ra/10; T148/10) and souste pp. (f. $16^{\mathrm{vb}} / 12$; T107/2) but this is unusual. The distinction between the preterite and past participle of the verb 'to make' is maintained, as in maad pp. (f.5rb/18; T31/2), maade pa.t. (f. $10^{\mathrm{rb}} / 27$; T67/6). Residual traces of the definite inflexion
may be found in phrases such as pe olde lawe (f. $6^{\text {rb }} / 10 ; \mathrm{T} 48 / 1$ ) and pe firste maundement (f.7ra/1; T50/5), but the lack of inflexion in phrases such as oure good god (f. $2^{\mathrm{vb}} / 9 ; \mathrm{T} 11 / 7$ ) and pe first table (f. $2^{\mathrm{va}} / 10-11 ; \mathrm{T} 10 / 5$ ) suggests that the definite inflexion, where it occurs, is probably a petrified rather than a functional form. As far as the plural is concerned, NE 'all' normally appears as alle when qualifying plural (or notionally plural) nouns and as al in the singular: Alle maner of men (f. ${ }^{\text {ra/ }} / 3 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ), alle sectis (f. $1^{\text {ra/ }} 18$; T1/7), al synne (f.4r/3• T21/3). However, final -e does not necessarily appear as a plural inflexion in other adjectives. Thus, deed stokkis (f. $5^{\mathrm{va}} / 15 ; \mathrm{T} 33 / 6-7$ ), and pese greet swerers (f.8ra/5-6; $\mathrm{T} 54 / 5$ ) beside pese greete glotouns ( $\mathrm{f} . \mathrm{4}^{\mathrm{va}} / 3-4 ; \mathrm{T} 23 / 2$ ).
D. Other points of accidence include:

1. In nouns, the plural ending is usually -is, though -es (usually, but not invariably, following a vowel), $-s$, and (once) $-y s$ also occur: biddingis (f.1ra/5-6; T1/2), enemies (f.2²/13; T6/1), gynnes (f. $10^{\mathrm{rb}} / 2-3$; T66/4), resoums (f. $2^{\mathrm{vb}} / 5$; T11/5), almys (f. $24^{\mathrm{va}} / 24$;

T152/6). The possessive forms follow a similar pattern, -is being the usual form with -es and $-y s$ both occurring occasionally: goddis (f.1ra/5; T1/2), mannes (f.3rb/23; T14/6), mannys (f.16rb/12; T104/8). There is one example of a -us ending: mennus (f.19 ${ }^{v b} / 9$; T124/14), but this is the result of an expansion and it is therefore difficult to be certain of its status. No such ending occurs without abbreviation. There are still a few plurals in -en: briberen (f. $17^{\mathrm{rb}} / 1$; T108/14), iзen (f. $\mathrm{h}^{\text {rb/22; }} \mathbf{T} 22 / 2$ ).
2. As far as the pronoun system is concerned the following items
are of interest: $I\left(\mathrm{f} .2^{\mathrm{r}} / 14 ; \mathrm{T} 7 / 2\right)$, his sg. (f. $1^{\mathrm{va}} / 3 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 6^{1}$ ) and his pl. (f. $1^{\text {rib }} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 10$ ), sche (f.24「/4; T149/9), she (f.24rb/8; T150/2), it (f.4 ${ }^{\mathrm{va}} / 6 ; \mathrm{T} 23 / 3$ ). NE 'they' appears consistently as pei (f. $1^{\mathrm{r}} / 9$; $\mathrm{T} 1 / 11$ ), 'their' as $\operatorname{per}\left(\mathrm{f} .1^{\mathrm{rb}} / 7 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 11\right)$, occasionally her (f. $4^{\mathrm{va}} / 8$; $\mathrm{T} 23 / 2^{2}$ ), once ther (f.21 ${ }^{\text {ra/ }} / 2 ; \mathrm{T} 131 / 1$ ), 'them' consistently as hem/hem (f.1ra/7; T1/3).
3. In verbs, third singular present endings appear commonly as $e p$, but more frequently as $-i p$ : louep (f. $1^{\mathrm{va}} / 2 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 6$ ), tellip (f. $1^{\text {ra } / 9 ; ~}$ T1/4). ${ }^{-t}$ occurs occasionally and -th and -it once each: knowt (f. $6^{\mathrm{ra}} / 20 ; \mathrm{T} 47 / 2$ ), lith (f. $11^{\mathrm{vb}} / 16 ; \mathrm{T} 74 / 8$ ), kepit (f.25va/23;

T156/101). Present plural endings are most commonly -en/-en as in kepen (f.1ra/17; T1/7), with -e occurring occasionally: blemische (f.10 ${ }^{\mathrm{vb}} / 18$; T69/7). Endings in -ep/-ip occur very occasionally throughout the text, thus meenep (f. $\mathrm{f}^{\mathrm{ra} / 7-8 ; ~ T 20 / 4), ~ l e t t i p ~(f . ~} 11^{\text {va }} / 9$; T73/4), kepip (f.25b/23; T157/5). The third singular present form of the verb 'to be' is is (f. $1^{\text {rb }} / 12 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 1$ ) and the present plural ben/ben (f. $1^{\text {va }} / 6 ;$ T2/7), once be (f.17ra/20; T108/9). The present participle ends in -inge, -yng/yng, -ing: walkinge (f. $5^{\mathrm{vb}} / 14-15$; T34/6), knowyng (f.6 va/14-15; T49/2), plesing (f.12 ${ }^{\text {va } / 3 ; ~ T 81 / 4) . ~}$ In weak past participles the ending is usually -id, less frequently ed, but -ide and -de endings also occur: partid (f.2rb/19; T7/5),
 (f.18 ${ }^{\text {va }} / 18 ;$ T118/8). Strong past participles generally end in -en/en as in boden (f. $1^{\text {va/ }} 20 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 3$ ), with occasional forms in -e: knowe (f. $6^{\text {rb/ } / 5-6 ; ~ T 47 / 6) . ~ T h e ~} y$-prefix does not appear.

## Dialect

Traditional dialect analysis suggests that the scribe came from the South East Midlands. The reflex of both OE $\bar{a}$ and $\mathrm{OE} \bar{o}$ in $o / o o$ together with the third singular ending in $-\mathrm{i} p /-\mathrm{e} p$ rules out both the North and the North East Midlands. The use of -en as the plural verb ending together with the absence of the $\boldsymbol{y}$-past participle prefix rules out the South, ${ }^{1}$ while the reflex of OE a plus nasal in a together with the use of sche/she as the third person singular feminine pronoun suggests that the West Midlands is unlikely.

Evidence provided by the Atlas is as follows:
A combination of souen pp. (f. $1^{\mathrm{vb}} / 21$; T4/3), ech (f. $3^{\mathrm{vb}} / 15$; T15/10) and wher ('whether') (f.4ri/9; T21/6) (Atlas i maps 432, 86 and 571) suggests an area south of the Wash with the occurrence of wher further suggesting that the most northerly and central of the remaining counties, i.e. north Warwickshire and Leicestershire, are unlikely. The use of forms in worch- for the verb 'to work', together with the occurrence of lijf further suggests that much of East Anglia is unlikely (Atlas i maps 315, 819, and 1163). The occurrence of lijf suggests an area north of the Thames-Severn line (Atlas i map 1163), while the occurrence of al if for 'though' (f.13 ${ }^{\text {rb }} / 26$; see T86/1 and apparatus) suggests the northern part of the remaining area, i.e. south Warwickshire, Staffordshire,
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Worcestershire, Northamptonshire, Huntingdonshire, Ely, Soke, Rutland or Cambridge (Atlas i map 191).

Turning to the item maps, we find that the use of per for 'their' suggests that Warwickshire, Staffordshire and Worcestershire are unlikely, and that, of the counties remaining, Northamptonshire and Soke seem most probable (Atlas ii, item 9). The regular use of silf for 'self' (f. $1^{\text {rb }} / 16$; T2/3), beside two examples of self (f. $11^{\mathrm{vb}} / 23$ and $\mathrm{f} .14^{\mathrm{ra}} / 11 ; \mathrm{T} 75 / 2$ and T95/2), together with the use of $e c h$, further reinforces this hypothesis (Atlas ii, items 213 and 12). On the other hand, an origin in Huntingdonshire rather than Northamptonshire is suggested by the use of wher for 'whether' and of izen (Atlas ii, items 251 and 115).

The area which accounts for the largest number of forms seems to be somewhere near the Northamptonshire, Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire border, i.e. in the area containing linguistic profile locations 55, 754, 461, 518, 9480, 8160, 4276, 762, 562 (Atlas ii.387-8, see also grid references pp.375-379). The vast majority of items not recorded for this area take the form of abbreviations (or, occasionally, the lack of them). Thus myn is recorded, but not myn (Atlas iv, item 181), soure but not soure or soure (Atlas iv, item 263), shulden but not shulden (Atlas iv, item 23), wolen but not wolcn (Atlas iv, item 24), aзen but not azen (Atlas iv, item 36), whan but not whan (Atlas iv, item 55), heuen but not heuen (Atlas iv, item 145). It does not seem likely that the occurrence of any of these unrecorded forms rules out the suggested area. myn may not be recorded but pin is (Atlas iv, item 233). shulden may not be recorded, but we find schulden beside schulden and shulden (Atlas
iv, item 23).
Certain items are not recorded in any of the Atlas's linguistic profiles and therefore provide no evidence. Thus goddis for 'goods' (f. $9^{\mathrm{vb}} / 7$; T64/2), eiper...ellis for 'either...or' (f.7b/11-12; T53/7-8), eerpe for 'earth' (f.10rb/27; T67/6). Certain items are not recorded in any great numbers, i.e. they do not occur very often in the texts which supply the linguistic profiles on which the Atlas is based, and it is therefore not surprising that they are not recorded for this particular area. Thus only fourteen instances of 'worldly', Y worldli ( $\mathrm{f} . \mathrm{3}^{\mathrm{rb}} / 1-2 ; \mathrm{T} 13 / 4$ ), are recorded for the whole of the country and none at all for the area we are considering (Atlas iv, item 48). 'strengthen' v. Y strengbe (f. $9^{\text {va }} / 19$; possibly an error: see T63/5), 'busy' v. Y bisie (f.12 ${ }^{\text {vb}} / 3$; T82/4), 'can' v.pl. Y can (f.3 ${ }^{\text {va/ }} 17$; T15/1), 'gave' v.pl. Y $3 a f\left(f .24^{\mathrm{vb}} / 3\right.$; T153/1), are all likewise recorded in small numbers (Atlas iv, items 42, 90, 95, and 137). Forms for 'week', which appears in Y as woke (f. $10^{\mathrm{va}} / 18$; T68/5) are somewhat more plentiful, but nevertheless no form of this noun is recorded for any of the linguistic profiles which we are considering, although woke is recorded for the surrounding area (Atlas iv, item 246).

It is worth noting that forms from the MSS which provide the lingustic profilcs for the more northerly sections of Bedfordshire i.e. numbers 9480 and 8160 are not recorded where the items in question have been collected only for the northern corpus. ${ }^{1}$ Thus
-ide (weak pp.) is not recorded for our area, but is recorded in the linguistic profile of the most northerly of the Bedfordshire MSS used for the northern corpus viz. LP 749 (Atlas iv, item 63), and the same is true of seue ('give') (f. $\mathrm{1}^{\mathrm{vb}} / 5 ; \mathrm{T} 3 / 5$ ), and mai v.pl. (f. ${ }^{\text {rb }} / 1 ; \mathrm{T} 1 / 8$ ) (Atlas iv, items 137 and 176).

A certain number of forms are recorded just outside our area e.g. mani (f.4ra/12; T20/6), $n^{t}$ (f.3²/13; T12/8), -it (third person singular verb ending) (Atlas iv, items $13,45,59$ ). The distribution of other forms suggests that their occurrence in the area we are considering would not be unexpected. Thus lityl (f.8 ${ }^{\text {ra}} 16$; T54/10) occurs in none of the counties we are considering, but does occur in Cambridgeshire, Ely, Lincolnshire and Warwickshire (Atlas iv, item 170).
aweie (f.23ra/22; T144/6) is recorded only twice, in Buckinghamshire and Warwickshire, but, given the distribution of the forms aweye and awei its existence in the area under consideration seems not unlikely (Atlas iv, item 76). worsse (f.23va/25; T147/8), though an unusual form, is recorded over a wide area from Essex and Gloucestershire to Leicestershire (Atlas iv, item 259).

The possibilities of progressive translation or of a Mischsprache warrant consideration. Somc evidence for progressive translation can be drawn from the fact that the forms used for certain words alter during the course of the text. Thus, NE 'say' v. appears both with medial $a$ as in saied (f. $3^{\mathrm{rb}} / 13$; T14/2) and with medial $e$ as in $\operatorname{seip}\left(\mathrm{f} .1^{\mathrm{va}} / 1 ; \mathrm{T} 2 / 5\right)$ but the forms with medial $a$ are found only in the earliest part of the text. We have
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already noted similar changes in the forms for NE 'much', 'these' and 'such' and in the use of sch and sh. The possibility of a Mischsprache is suggested by the large number of variants and also by the occurrence of a number of forms which are more common further north than in the area under consideration, and which might, perhaps, be seen as suggesting that the Y scribe was drawing on a more northerly exemplar e.g. praie (f. $11^{\mathrm{vb}} / 3 ; \mathrm{T} 74 / 3$ ), felaw (f.18ra/5; T113/6) to 'two' (f.20 ${ }^{\text {ra }} / 2$; T126/7) and forms of 'without' with initial $W^{t}$ (f. $6^{\mathrm{va}} 13$; T49/1) (Atlas iv, items 205, 119, $242,258)$. It should be pointed out, however, that, while the change in the form of the verb 'to say' supports the hypothesis of a more northerly exemplar, changes from pes to pese, from forms of 'much' with medial $i$ to forms with medial $y$, and from forms of 'such' with medial $\boldsymbol{i}$ to forms with medial $\boldsymbol{u}$ tend to suggest the opposite (Atlas ii, 210, 2, 16 and 10). Since, in fact, all the forms in question occur within the general, if not the immediate, area under consideration, the hypotheses of progressive translation or of a Mischsprache remain unproven. ${ }^{1}$

[^9]
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BL Harley 2398

As BL MS Harley 2398 (B) has already been located by the compilers of the Atlas on the Gloucestershire/Herefordshire border, a placement which is supported by the reference within the manuscript to Mitcheldean (f.192"), it is unnecessary to discuss it further here. For B's linguistic profile see Atlas ii.148, LP 7200, and for its location see Attas iv. 337 grid reference 365218.

That three of our witnesses should appear to come from the East Midlands and one from the Herefordshire/Gloucestershire border, is scarcely surprising given the Lollard overtones of our texts. Lollard activity in the East Midlands is well documented and the implication of local Lollards in the Oldcastle rebellion has been dealt with in detail by McFarlane, while a comprehensive account of Lollardy in the Midlands after this period is provided by Thomson ${ }^{1}$ That some of the forms found in H suggest an exemplar with origins north of Derbyshire, possibly in the West Riding, is somewhat more surprising, since northern records reveal little evidence of heresy, although Richard Wyche and William Thorpe both spent time in the North and an expurgated version of the English sermon cycle appears to have been written just north of Richmond. ${ }^{2}$ It should also be remembered that one of the Lollard

[^10]knights, Sir William Neville, came from a county Durham family. ${ }^{1}$ As far as the Herefordshire/Gloucestershire border is concerned, Lollards were preaching in the Severn valley before the end of the fourteenth century, Bristol being a notable Lollard centre, while Oldcastle himself came from Herefordshire. ${ }^{2}$ Thomas Higons of Woolaston and Micheldean was tried by Mayer in 1511 and did penance for his offences in both Hereford and Micheldean. ${ }^{3}$

It is worth noting that these localisations correspond to the textual results in that T and Y , which the textual evidence shows to be close, correspond closely in dialect, while B, which appears to have a separate ancestor from HTY, comes from a quite different area.

1. McFarlane (1972b) p. 162.
2. See Thomson (1965) p.20ff., McFarlane (1972a) p.144ff,

Hudson, PR, p.122ff.
3. Thomson (1965), p. 48.
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## THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

As is by now well known, ${ }^{1}$ the manuals of religious instruction which proliferated in England during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries owed their existence to the movement for education and reform initiated by Pope Innocent III in the the Fourth Lateran Council (1215-16), the decrees of which were incorporated into the decretals of Gregory IX and were thus accepted into canon law. ${ }^{2}$ In particular, the twenty-first canon, Omnis utriusque sexus (which made it the duty of each member of the Church to confess to his parish priest at least once a year), resulted in increased concern over the educational standards of the clergy, since any priest offering confession needed sufficient learning to be able to question his parishoners on their sins and to inflict appropriate penances.

The influence of the Council can be clearly seen in the subsequent synodal constitutions. Latin tracts specifically aimed at the education of the clergy were often issued by the bishops, either separately or in conjunction with such constitutions and these were often specifically linked with the education, in turn, of the laity. There is an emphasis on the basic tenets of the

1. See, for example, the discussions by Boyle and Shaw, both in Heffernan, ed. (1985).
2. See Gibbs and Lang p.104. For the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council see DEC i.227-271.
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Christian faith, and especially on the the ten commandments. The first of the statutes (?1239) of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, for instance, begins by stating that, since the salvation of souls is not possible unless the ten commandments are kept, everyone with cure of souls should know the decalogue and should preach and expound it to his parishioners. ${ }^{1}$ The famous Ignorancia Sacerdotum (1281) of Archbishop Peckham states that the laity are to be instructed by their priests four times a year on the fourteen articles of faith, the ten commandments, the two precepts, the seven works of mercy, the seven deadly sins, the seven virtues and the seven sacraments. In order that ignorance should not excuse the priests from carrying out this task, Peckham supplies a brief summary of the important points. ${ }^{2}$

From the beginning, the teaching of the laity was carried out in English. Poore instructs priests to expound the articles of the faith to their parishioners 'domestico ydiomate'. ${ }^{3}$ Peter de Roches

[^11]
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enjoins his priests to carry out their instruction in the confessional 'saltem in materna lingua', ${ }^{1}$ a phrase repeated, for example, by Peter Quivel²; while Peckham states that such instruction should be carried out 'populo vulgariter absque cuiuslibet subtilitatis textura fantastica'. ${ }^{3}$ Instruction was given by preaching, in the confessional or in small groups. ${ }^{4}$

There was clearly a demand from the clergy for manuals which could be easily understood. As Vincent Gillespie has pointed out, ${ }^{5}$ works such as Pagula's Oculus Sacerdotis or John de Burgh's Pupilla Oculi, though aimed at the clergy, would only have been accessible to an elite. The result was the production of what Gillespie has described as 'simpler, cruder, humbler manuals' many of which were in English. Thus the Dextera Pars of the Oculus appears in English verse as John Mirk's Instructions for Parish Priests, a work explicitly aimed at the priest who is not a 'grete clerk', ${ }^{6}$ and further vernacular manuals included, for example, the Speculum Christiani. Vernacular manuals aimed specifically at the laity include Handlyng Synne and

1. C\&S ii. 134.
2. Ibid. p. 1076.
3. Ibid. p. 901.
4. For small group teaching, sce, for example, Poore's instructions that 'Pueros quoque frequenter convocent et unum vel duos instruant vel instrui faciant' ( $C \& S$ p.61). See also Gillespie (1981), p.11. For the use of pastoralia in sermons see Spencer (1993), pp.196-227.
5. Gillespie (1981), pp.1-2
6. Mirk p.68/13.

Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt. A major development occurred in 1357 when John Thoresby, Archbishop of York, put forward a plan for the improvement of priestly instruction of the laity which, while itself in Latin, was accompanied by a longer English version, written by John Gaytrig and authorised and commissioned by Thoresby himself. ${ }^{1}$ Thoresby's instructions were clearly expected to be passed on to the laity through the medium of the clergy, but it nevertheless seems likely that the circulation of the vernacular version and its inclusion in Thoresby's register may have been seen as implying archiepiscopal sanction for the production of vernacular manuals for the laity. It also seems likely - indeed almost inevitable - that, as Gillespie suggests, the literate laity may have consulted copies of the work, and, certainly, as he points out, at least one copy of the text found its way into lay ownership, since one appears in Robert Thornton's miscellany. ${ }^{2}$ The general increase in lay literacy during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries probably encouraged the production of vernacular material specifically for the laity. ${ }^{3}$ As P.Barnum says in the introduction

1. Printed from Thoresby's Register (York Borthwick Institute of Historical Research Reg. 13 ff. $295^{\mathrm{r}}-297^{\mathrm{v}}$ ) in LFC and from Lincoln Cathedral Library MS $91 \mathrm{ff} .213^{\mathrm{v}}-218^{\mathrm{v}}$ in Perry pp.1-15 and Blake pp.73-8. For a fascimile see The

Thornton Manuscript introduced by D.S. Brewer and A.E.B. Owen (London, 1977). For Thoresby's letter to Gaytrig (BL MS Cotton Galba E.x ff. $73^{\mathrm{V}}$ - $\mathrm{F4}^{\mathrm{r}}$ ) see Swanson (1991), the findings of which to some extent modify Hudson, 'A New Look at the Lay Folks' Catechism' and 'The Lay Folks' Catechism: a Postscript'.
2. Gillespie (1981), pp.27-8.
3. See Parkes, 'The Literacy of the Laity', esp. pp.564ff.
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to Dives and Pauper, 'Dives, the rich man, would seem to personify the intended audience of Dives and Pauper in the first decade of the fifteenth century - the growing number of newly literate, worldly, somewhat credulous yet pious laymen, whose importance in medieval ecclesiastical history it is, according to W.A. Pantin, "impossible to exaggerate"'. ${ }^{1}$

The use of the vernacular for lay education thus predated Lollardy, and it seems likely that Wyclif and his followers early recognised its advantages. ${ }^{2}$ Certainly complaints about preaching to the laity, which must of necessity have been in English, began before Wyclif's death. Even before the Blackfriars Council of 1382, the Bishop of Lincoln had issued citations against William Swinderby accusing him of running about and preaching without authority ${ }^{3}$ and in the same year William Courtnay, in a letter written after Wyclif's condemnation, refers to the fact that

1. $D P$ I.i.x.
2. It seems likely that the preaching against clerical abuses which Wyclif carried out on John of Gaunt's behalf in London in 1376 was in English, and Wyclif's 1378 defence against papal accusations was published in both Latin and English (see De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae i.350/7-9). See also the English confession on the Eucharist (SEWW pp.17-18), although the authorship of this is doubtful. Hereford and Repingdun preached in the vernacular in Oxford in 1382 (Hudson, 'Wyclif and the English Language' p.95), and Michael Wilks has suggested that a Wycliffite band of itinerant priests was probably in existence from as early as 1372/3 (Wilks, "'Reformatio Regini":Wyclif and Hus as leaders of religious protest movements', p.120).
3. LAO, Episcopal Register xii f.242r; see also McFarlane (1952), pp.121-5
unlicensed preachers are preaching 'nunullas propositiones et conclusiones ... haereticas, erroneas, atques falsas, olim ab ecclesia condemnatas'. ${ }^{1}$

Meanwhile, during that last twenty years of the fourteenth century, the Bible had been translated into English. ${ }^{2}$ Orthodox fears about this activity are clearly expressed in Knighton's Chrionicle where we are informed that, as a result, 'the pearl of the gospel is scattered abroad and trodden underfoot of swine. ${ }^{3}$ The Lollard vernacular tracts, which were a natural extension of Lollard preaching, were characterised by their use of the Bible and were thus open to the same orthodox objections. That the Church should disapprove of such tracts is not surprising since, as the passage from Knighton suggests, the attitude of the lettered towards those ignorant of Latin could be extremely patronising. As far as the Christian faith was concerned, the laity could be regarded as children with the clergy as adults. The author of the Lay Folks' Mass Book suggests that lay understanding of the gospel reading is unnecessary: 'ber understondyng fayles pe verrey vertu. 30w avayles porw grace. pat god 30w grauntes'. ${ }^{4}$

Lollard vernacular tracts, on the other hand, provided

1. $F Z$ p. 275
2. For the date of this translation see Hudson, $P R$ p.247.
3. Knighton ii.151-2.
4. Lay Folks' Mass Book p.41/431-48.
those who could neither read nor understand Latin with the wherewithal to decide for themselves on religious matters. Margaret Aston has given a vivid account of the eagerness with which Lollards read and listened to such material, ${ }^{1}$ and the enthusiasm for such texts may well be reflected in the numbers surviving. ${ }^{2}$

As we have seen, such educational vernacular tracts were not in themselves a new departure: the Lollards made use of a tradition and genre which the Church had conveniently already established. Indeed, one of the problems for the Church was the use Lollards made of originally orthodox material. As Anne Hudson says, 'It has long been recognised that a fruitful source of Lollard texts is the revision of earlier writing, with the introduction of new and usually more radical material. ${ }^{3}$ Although doubt has been cast on the Lollardy of the Lambeth version of the Lay Folks' Catechism, ${ }^{4}$ there remain, for instance, Lollard Psalter commentaries based on the orthodox English commentary by Richard Rolle and a Lollard

1. Aston, 'Lollardy and Literacy' pp.199-200.
2. On the numbers of Lollard vernacular tracts see Hudson, 'Some aspects of Lollard Book Production' p.181. As H.L. Spencer has pointed out to me, however, the evidence of what Anne Hudson has described as 'an organised attempt to supply books of Lollard instruction' (ibid. p.188) makes it difficult to be certain that the large amount of material is not the result of deliberate policy as much as of market forces.
3. Hudson, PR p. 27.
4. Hudson, 'A New Look at the Lay Folks' Catechism'.
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version of the Ancrene Riwle. ${ }^{1}$ Sr. M.Teresa Brady has described in detail the Lollard interpolations made to the original orthodox version of Pore Caitif. ${ }^{2}$ As Anne Hudson puts it, 'at a time of manual reproduction, with all its attendant fluctuations between copies of page or column division, of layout, of spelling of title or heading, and its admission of scribal interference which might extend in revision as far as complete scribal takeover, any attempt at verification of texts was doomed to failure. ${ }^{13}$ The only option open to the Church in the end was to be the banning of all such vernacular material.

The Church took some time, however, to organise itself effectively against Lollardy. Lack of direction from Rome can probably be blamed on the schism, the dampening effect of which can be gauged by the fact that the 1414-18 Council of Constance, which brought it to an end, also saw the burning of Hus and the condemnation of 260 of Wyclif's opinions, together with the order that his bones should be dug up and cast out of consecrated ground. ${ }^{4}$ In England, Walsingham's 1389 complaint about the

1. Hudson, $P R$ pp.27-8, 421-5. For discussion of the Lollard interpolated version of the Ancrene Riwle see Colledge (1939). See also the edition by J. Påhlsson, The Recluse (Lund,1911).
2. Brady, 'Lollard Interpolations and Omissions'.
3. Hudson, PR p. 422
4. Workman ii.318-20. For links by contemporary commentators between the schism and the increase in Lollardy see Harvey, 'Lollardy and the Great Schism'.
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inaction of all the bishops (except for Despenser) ${ }^{1}$ suggests that the increased cooperation between Church and state which took place during this period was not particularly effective. ${ }^{2}$

Moreover, the attitude of the lay power towards Lollardy was ambivalent, or at least perceived to be ambivalent. Wyclif had, after all, received the support of John of Gaunt, ${ }^{3}$ and although Gaunt's support may have cooled after the publication of Wyclif's views on the Eucharist, he nevertheless apparently intervened in 1382 on behalf of William Swinderby. ${ }^{4}$ Lollardy had apparently considerable support amongst the gentry and, while Richard II cannot himself be shown to be a supporter, it was nevertheless the case that several of the 'Lollard Knights' were his close friends or councillors. ${ }^{5}$ As long as Richard was king, despite pressure from the Pope following the posting of the Twelve Conclusions, and a petition by the Bishops, probably presented in 1397, ${ }^{6}$ the Church had no success in persuading the lay power to institute the death penalty for heresy.

Thus, during the late fourteenth century, it was possible to be interested in Lollard arguments and opinions - with the exception

1. Walsingham, HA ii. 188.
2. For this cooperation see Richardson, 'Heresy and the Lay Power'.
3. Workman i.275ff.
4. See Knighton ii. 193.
5. See McFarlane (1972), pp.160, 163ff; and McNiven (1987), p. 46.
6. See Richardson and Sayles, 'Parliamentary Documents from the Formularies' pp.152-4
of those on the eucharist - without necessarily defining oneself as a heretic. Anne Hudson contrasts this period 'where the people involved may have encountered Wyclif's ideas before they were condemned and when the significance of the Blackfriars decision for the church as a whole was not clearly understood' with the period immediately after 1401 'when consciousness of a divide between two opposing, and incompatible, groups was beginning to emerge', ${ }^{1}$ while McFarlane points out that, although 1382 saw the disciplining and scattering of univeristy Lollards, 'the obscurity that followed was not at first the obscurity of the hunted and concealed; it was still largely the obscurity of the tolerated and ignored; the turning point came slowly between 1401 and $1413^{\prime} .^{2}$

By 1401 the king was no longer Richard II. Henry IV, having taken the throne by force in 1399, had good reason to fear insurrection, and it was therefore in his interests and those of his supporter Arundel that any potential opposition should be discredited in advance by being identified with heresy and that it should be made clear to all such potential opponents that they were putting their lives at risk. ${ }^{3}$ The 1401 statute, De Heretico Comburendo, passed in response to a petition which stated that Lollards 'Populum nequiter instruunt \& informant \& ad

1. Hudson, $P R$ p. 394.
2. McFarlane (1972), p. 224.
3. See McNiven (1987), p.69ff.
sedicionem seu insurrectionem excitant quantum possunt', ${ }^{1}$ was, as Peter McNiven says, a measure which marked 'the final explicit recognition of the principle that heresy was a heinous crime against the state as well as an offence against the Church'. ${ }^{2}$ The statute was anticipated by the burning of William Sawtre, and, five days after his death, Wyclif's secretary, John Purvey, submitted to the authority of the Church. ${ }^{3}$

Nevertheless, the reign of Henry IV was not particularly noticeable for the persecution of Lollards. Apart from Sawtre, only one heretic was actually burnt during Henry IV's reign: John Badby in 1410. ${ }^{4}$ It was Henry V rather than Henry IV who was seen as a 'king dedicated to the extirpation of Lollardy, by force if necessary. ${ }^{5}$ For much of Henry IV's reign there was still felt to be a possibility that certain Lollard demands might be met by the lay power. ${ }^{6}$ Only after the Oldcastle revolt of 1413-14, when the secular government began to take a much more active role against Lollards, did such co-operation finally become impossible. ${ }^{7}$

Lollard vernacular tracts were also early recognised as a problem. In 1382 a commission to the chancellor and proctors of

1. $R P$ iii. 466 b
2. McNiven p.87.
3. For Sawtre's trial see e.g. McNiven pp.81-92; Wilkins, Concilia iii.255ff.
4. For an account of John Badby's trial and death see McNiven, pp.199-219.
5. Haines, 'Reginald Pecock', p. 135.
6. See McNiven pp.169ff.
7. See Thomson (1965), p.5, and for the act passed in the wake of the revolt see RPiv.24a. For additional measures taken by the Church during this period see Chichele Reg. iii.18; Thompson (1965), pp.6-19.

Oxford University gave them the power to search for and seize 'any book or treatise of the said Wyclif or Hereford's editing or compiling.' ${ }^{1}$ From March 30th 1388 onwards, as a result of the renewed consideration given during that year to the suppression of heresy, further commissions were issued forbidding the buying or selling of such 'books, booklets, schedules and quires'. ${ }^{2}$ The commission granted to the Bishop of Worcester on May 29th, which added the names of Aston and Purvey to those of Wyclif and Hereford, explicitly stated that such writing was compiled both in English and Latin. ${ }^{3}$ Similar commissions were issued in various parts of the country on May 23rd and September 30th 1388 and on January 18th $1389^{4}$, while the visitation of William Courtenay to the diocese of Lincoln in 1392 resulted in the confiscation of the books of William Smith. ${ }^{5}$

As well as instituting the death penalty, the act De Heretico Comburendo reflected a growing concern about Lollard educational practices. ${ }^{6}$ It forbade not only the establishment of unauthorised schools or conventicles, but also the production of any book which contradicted the Catholic faith or the teaching of Holy Church, and further ordered that heretical books should be delivered to the bishops at forty days' notice. The 1406 statute, reflecting the concerns of

1. CPR 1381-5, p.153; Hudson, PR, p. 177
2. Richardson, 'Heresy and the Lay Power', p.10; CPR 1385-89, p. 430.
3. Ibid. p. 448.
4. Ibid. pp.468, 550, 536.
5. Knighton ii. 313.
6. For De Heretico Comburendo see RPiii.467.
the time, forbade the preaching or writing of anything which might incite the people to remove Church possessions. ${ }^{1}$ Nevertheless, an interest in Wyclif and his writings persisted, in Oxford at least, even amongst the orthodox until 1407, and the question of the validity of biblical translation was still open for discussion in the early years of the century. ${ }^{2}$ The clampdown on such vernacular (and specifically Wycliffite) material came with Arundel's constitutions of 1407-9 ${ }^{3}$ which stated that 'no book or treatise newly made by John Wycliffe or any other in his time or since, or hereafter to be made' should be read in 'schools, halls, hostels or any other places within our province aforesaid'. No doctrine from any such book was to be taught unless it had first been examined and approved and unanimously passed - by at least twelve persons from the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, themselves approved by the Archbishop and his successors. The translation into English of Holy Scripture - even individual texts - was forbidden unless the translation was passed by the Diocesan or Provincial Council. ${ }^{3}$ The effectiveness of this legislation can be gauged by the fact that both Thomas Gascoigne and the author of the sermons of MS Longleat 4 complain of it inhibiting effect upon preachers. ${ }^{4}$
7. $R P$ ii. 583
8. Hudson, 'Debate on Bible translation', esp. pp.82-4.
9. Hudson, 'Lollardy: the English Heresy?' p.149. For the relevant sections of

Arundel's Constitutions see Lyndwood pp.284b-285b; Bullard and Bell pp.122-3.
4. Gascoigne pp.180-1; Hudson and Spencer pp.220-38, esp. pp.231-2.
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## THE COMMENTARIES IN CONTEXT

Of all the possible forms which a vernacular religious tract might take, that of a ten commandments commentary is perhaps especially suited to the expression of Lollard opinions. Not only did such a commentary provide, as Anne Hudson has pointed out, ${ }^{1}$ natural opportunities for the exposition of Lollard views on such matters as the shortcomings of one's spiritual directors and on images, but the commandments are, in a very special sense, 'God's law' and their exposition therefore provided many opportunities for the traditional Lollard contrast between God's law and man's law, whether canonical or secular. According to Wyclif, the existence of Biblical law made both secular and canon law unnecessary. ${ }^{2}$ The HTY group shows clear evidence of this attitude, commenting, for example, that 'sip lawe of pe Emperour and lawe of pe Pope ben worse pan pis lawe bi a pousyndfold and pes letten knowyng and doyng of Goddis lawe and ofte tymes ben eresies contrarie to pis lawe, many men penken pat Goddis lawe itsilf shulde be red and lerned and sued in dede. For per is no caas pat ne it wolde decide it, and stable rist and pees.' (T155/6-11). Canon law is criticised as a 'new lawe' created by Antichrist (i.e. the Pope) (T65/8). Such views, which were obviously unlikely to be welcomed by the Church, were early identified with

1. Hudson, PR p. 167.
2. $D C D$ i.118ff., 402-3 etc.

Lollardy. Knighton, for instance, records as item three of Wycliffite opinions held in 1388 that they believe "Quod papa non potest condere canones decretales seu constitutiones, et si quos condiderit nullus tenetur eos observare. ${ }^{11}$

The passages on canon law quoted above do not occur in $\mathbf{B},{ }^{2}$ but the B version does share with HTY various comments on the death penalty as administered by the secular power. As part of the discussion of the fifth commandment all manuscripts consider the legitimacy of this punishment and come to the conclusion that 'no man shulde sle oper bi autorite of pe lawe but if he were siker pat Goddis lawe bad it' (T103/12, cf.B103/1-2), and, further, that a condemned man should not be killed unless such a death could be seen to be profitable to his soul: 'so pat him were betere bus to be sleyn pan to lyue forb vnpunyshid for his trespas' (T104/6-7, cf.B104/3-4). The HTY group, typically, contains slightly more of this type of material, including a passage offering an alternative method 'groundid in Cristis lawe' for dealing with thieves (T131/13ff.). Lollard views on the death penalty were related to their views on fighting, a topic addressed by both versions as part of their eighth commandment discussion (B138/5ff., T138/5ff.). Although this passage

[^12]fails to come down firmly on one side or the other, the instinct of the writer is clearly to avoid fighting save in exceptional circumstances. We are told that God himself ordained fighting in the 'Olde Lawe' (B138/9, T138/9) and that it is is therefore permissible, but that nevertheless motives are important. No man should fight with his enemy 'but bi charite' (T139/1, cf.B139/1); it must be done at God's bidding and in God's cause and the final aim must be the worship of God. Present-day battles are characterised as being the result of incitement by the Devil. To some extent this discussion echoes the view put forward by Wyclif in De Mandatis Divinis 'quod nemo invadat vel occidat alium nisi ex caritate fraterna. ${ }^{11}$ Wycliffite pacifist views were coloured by the expensive disaster of the 1382 Despenser's Crusade which resulted in slaughter and failure and in the impeachment of the Bishop of Norwich. ${ }^{2}$ Such views were frequently expressed by Lollards. The tenth of the Twelve Conclusions published in 1395, for example, states that 'manslaute be batayle or pretense lawe of rythwysnesse for temperal cause or spirituel withouten special reuelaciun is expres contrarious to pe newe testament ${ }^{13}$, while Walter Brut at his trial in 1391 expressed his opposition to both war and execution. ${ }^{4}$ One of the articles cited against William White in 1428 was his belief 'quod nullibi in nova

1. $D M D$ p. 344 , and see the disussion in Hudson, $P R$ p. 368
2. See Workman ii.66ff. For comments by Wyclif on the crusade see Polemical Works ii.588ff.
3. SEWW p. 28.
4. Hereford Register, Trefnant p.361, items $4 \& 5$, and p. 316 ff .
lege Christus concessit latrones et malefactores suspendio vel aliquo alio modo occidi' ${ }^{\prime 1}$, a statement which is a very close to opinions expressed in our texts. For an orthodox response to the Twelve Conclusions see Dymmok. ${ }^{2}$

The HTY version makes more obvious use than B of the fourth commandment opportunities for criticism of the clergy, observing, with comprehensive forthrightness, 'if pi Pope, bi bisshop, pi parsoun or wiker be knowun of pee to draw in pe deuelis 3ok, worshipe him not as siche but hate him as pin enemye in pat pat he is synful, but loue him in soure kynde.' (T98/11-99/2), and asking why, since Christ reproves those whom he loves, 'if we louen men in God' we should not also 'telle hem Goddis lawe, and procure pat pei holde his lawe' (T99/14-17). ${ }^{3}$ B's fourth commandment material contains no such extreme passages, although his instruction to follow the priest's bidding 'in pat pat Godes lawe techep' (B95/1) seems to imply a willingness not to obey under certain circumstances.

In any case, both our versions show a willingness to carry out the HTY group's instructions and to criticise the clergy who fail to perform the duties which their office requires (B61/8-62/1, T61/9-62/1) and both condemn prelates for failing to teach and preach God's law (with the result that those who are dependent on them for such teaching suffer

1. $F Z$ p. 431 , item xxix.
2. Dymmok pp.255-6.
3. The clear break between the independent HTY material and the material shared with B once again makes it difficult to tell whether this section has been omitted by B or whether it is a later HTY addition.
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spiritual death), as well as for failing to stand up to tyrants (B107/4-10, T107/4-10). ${ }^{1}$ As Pantin points out, self criticism was a characteristic of the Church at this time and such comments were therefore not only made by Lollards. ${ }^{2}$ For instance, both the B and the HTY versions complain about priests who obtain their positions by worldly means, categorising them as both night thieves and day thieves, because they break in through the roof rather than entering through the door (i.e. Christ) (B126/3ff, T126/3ff.). ${ }^{3}$

The wording of this passage echoes one of Wyclif's sermons and may well have been drawn from it, ${ }^{4}$ but the issue was topical in the late fourteenth century amongst orthodox clerics. In 1391, for instance, Archbishop Courtenay sent a letter to all suffragan bishops including Braybrook, Bishop of London, complaining that some of the clergy 'negotiatione muneris gratiam Sancti Spiritus mercari non timent, cum ut ad ecclesias et ecclesiastica beneficia, quibus non nisi gratis et libere frui licet, praesententur, pretia donent, contractus simoniacos oculte

1. The HTY version contains rather more of this material, however, than B. See, for example the section on priestly idolatry (T30/1ff.).
2. Pantin p. 238.
3. The criticism of the clergy is initially less clear in $B$ because the reference to prelates has been lost as a result of eyeskip. B does, however, share the HTY group's reference to priests (B127/6, T127/6).
4. Sermones iv.502-5 and cf. EWS iii.319-21.
ineant', ${ }^{1}$ while Bishop Brinton complains that 'Auro beneficia impetrantur et officia procurantur. ${ }^{12}$ Such criticisms were, however, in Latin and intended for fellow clerics: to write them in the vernacular where the laity could read them was quite a different matter. ${ }^{3}$

It is true that, at one point in both versions of our commentary, the author appears to identify himself as a priest talking to priests (B6/9-7/2, T6/8-7/2), but it would be naive to imagine that the tract did not circulate among the laity, and, in any case, given the Lollard view that 'quilibet bonus homo, licet literaturam nesciat, est sacerdos ${ }^{\prime 4}$, it is difficult to be certain of the exact implications of this passage. Criticism of the clergy in material available to the laity (although with reference to preaching rather than writing) was firmly outlawed by Arundel's Constitutions of 1407-9. The Constitutions instruct the preacher to 'preach to the clergy of the vices that rise amongst them and unto the lay of their sin which is commonly used amongst them, and not contrary wise'.5 A passage

1. Wilkins, Concilia iii. 215.
2. Brinton ii. 417
3. For the threat posed by the use of the vernacular, see Hudson, Lollardy: The English Heresy?'.
4. View expressed in 1388 by the Leicester group of Lollards, see $M V$, p.164; Hudson PR p.325. Note also the comments about studying without priestly guidance (B75/976/1, T75/9-76/1, passage discussed below).
5. Sce Bullard and Bell p.127, Lyndwood p.295a.
similar to the independent HTY comment that 'if lordis louyde her eldris in soule, pei shulden quenche her errours and make hem more short, and folies pat pei bigan fordo hem at her myst' (T100/1-3) was omitted from the Latin abridgement of Wyclif's De Mandatis Divinis found in MS Bodl. Laud Misc. 524, apparently because of its Lollard overtones. ${ }^{1}$

Both the B and the HTY versions criticise clerical wealth. The Church, we are told, is like a tree and 'charge of temporal goodis knyttid bi coueitise makip pe bowes to bowe, and lettip pis tree to growe' (T64/2-4, cf. B64/2-4). Both versions accuse the clergy of being prepared to despoil labourers of the fruits of their labour: 'and bisynesse of her trauel, pat God bad hem do, turne to priuey raueyn as Antecrist techip hem' (T64/9-65/2, cf.B64/9-65/3). The Caesarean clergy, who obtain their appointments by means of worldly influence and who enjoy secular wealth and power, are criticised for their behaviour on the grounds that 'no synne is more derk pan to lie pus on Crist and seie pat he was worldli lord' (T126/10-127/2, cf. B126/9-127/1), a passage which echoes Wyclif's view as expressed in De Ecclesia. ${ }^{2}$ The first of these passages, in particular, might be considered to imply support for Church disendowment. Such support may well suggest Lollardy, but it should be noted that, partly as a result of the need of the secular arm for money,

1. See Pyper, 'An Abridgement of Wyclif's De Mandatis Divinis', p.308.
2. De Ecclesia p. 300.
the idea of disendowment was current right up to 1410 , not only amongst Lollards but amongst people who would not necessarily have counted themselves as Wycliffites. ${ }^{1}$ Two friars addressed the 1371 parliament to the effect that the government had the right not only to tax the clergy, but also to confiscate Church property should the need arise, ${ }^{2}$ and opposition to clerical taxation during the $1384 / 5$ parliament led to the demand by a number of knights for wholesale Church disendowment. ${ }^{3}$ A demand for the confiscation of Church temporalities, apparently without Lollard involvement, was made by the commons in the Parliament of 1404. ${ }^{4}$ Only with the failure of the Lollard disendowment bill in 1410 and the subsequent burning of John Badby did the issue become less prominent in mainstream politics. ${ }^{5}$

It is worth noting, however, that the passage dealing with the charge of temporal goods appears to imply a disapproval of Church wealth per se. The idea that Church temporalities might be confiscated for a particular purpose (for example, to finance a war) is one thing, but the idea that it is wrong for the clergy to have temporalities in the first place is quite another. ${ }^{6}$ This latter idea, while implicit in the B/HTY passage,

1. See McNiven pp.10-11, 49, 72-8, 102-5, 169-71; Hudson, PR pp.337-8; Aston, 'Lollardy and Sedition' pp.20-21.
2. Galbraith, 'Articles laid before the Parliament of 1375', pp.580-2.
3.. Walsingham, HA ii.139-40.
3. Walsingham, HA ii.265-7; Annales Ricardi Secundi et Henrici Quarti, p.393;

McNiven pp.169-71.
5. McNiven pp.185-219.
6. On this distinction, see, for example, Hudson, $P R$ p. 338 .
is even more forcefully expressed in HTY material not shared with B, notably in the final section of the fourth commandment where we are told that to give your spiritual father worldly wealth is heresy (T98/9). The HTY discussion of the seventh commandment includes the statement that there would be less reason for theft if the goods of the Church were shared out amongst seculer men (T131/6-8). The view that it was wrong for the ecclesiastics to have temporalities was early identified with Lollardy and the 1382 Blackfriars Council condemned it as heresy. ${ }^{1}$ HTY's independent fourth commandment material, attacking the Caesarean clergy, refers openly to this condemnation ('and at pe day of doom shal bosteris be doumbe pat now reuersen pis sentence and seien pat it is eresie' (T100/7-9)), thus making this particular version's stand on the matter clear beyond doubt. The statement that 'it is azens pe lawe of God pat bischopis and oper prelatis of pe chirche schulden have temperal possessions', a view very similar to the HTY opinion that 'lordis shulde not 3yue her bisshops lordshipis of pis world' (T100/4-5), was one of the Sixteen Points on which the bishops accused the Lollards. ${ }^{2}$

The call for Church disendowment was originally related to

1. $F Z \mathrm{p} .279$, item x .
2. $S E W W$ p. 19, item 9 .
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Wyclif's views on dominion. Wyclif believed that rightful possession could only be obtained through grace and that therefore if the Church abused its goods it was the duty of the state to remove them. Action of this kind, he argued was the will of God since God could not have failed to provide a remedy for such an evil. ${ }^{1}$ A section of the seventh commandment discussion found in both our versions clearly reflects such views, informing us that 'lordis of pis world, pat seruen God not treuly steilen Goddis goodis' (T126/1-2, cf.B126/1-2), an argument which is immediately applied, in the HTY version at least, ${ }^{2}$ to prelates of the Church. Leff believes that the use of arguments drawn from Wyclif's views on dominion were soon superseded by arguments on clerical poverty which were drawn from the Bible, ${ }^{3}$ and such passages might therefore be taken to imply a comparatively early date for our texts. However, as Anne Hudson points out, although the 1428 lists of questions to be asked during the examination of Lollards contain no reference to views on dominion, versions of this view were being expressed by Lollards as late as 1429.4 Arguments drawn from Wycliffite views on dominion are used by the HTY group to support somewhat extreme views on property rights not found in $B$; for instance to justify taking another man's goods in time of need, since God, who is

1. $D C D$ i. 267 .
2. The loss of the reference to prelates in $B$ is due to eyeskip.
3. Leff ii.549.
4. Hudson, $P R$ p. 362.
true lord of everything, is deemed to give permission (T124/2-4). ${ }^{1}$
Both our versions place the responsibility for rectifying clerical abuses firmly in the hands of the secular power. 'Kni3tis', we are told, 'shulde shewe pe power of Godhed and bi worldli strengbe mayntene Goddis lawe' (T62/9-63/1, cf.B62/9-63/1), and secular lords are blamed for protecting those clergy who obtain their positions by simony and who despoil the people (B127/4-6, T127/4-6). The various attempts made to achieve Church disendowment through the medium of Parliament, show that Lollard hopes for secular support remained current at least up to 1410. If, as Peter McNiven suggests, the burning of John Badby in 1410 was arranged as an object lesson for the Commons to make clear the implications of their conduct, ${ }^{2}$ it may well have been at this point that the Lollards ceased to believe in the possibility of working alongside the existing secular power. As Leff says, 'Only when Lollardy ceased to hope for lay support did it become subversive in the wider sense and challenge state as well as church'. ${ }^{3}$ The calls made by our texts for action by the secular arm may thus perhaps suggest a date before 1410 .
[^13]One clear manifestation of the wealth of the Church was the decoration of churches and, in particular, the use of images. Disapproval of images was early recognised as a Lollard trait and remained thereafter an important ground for suspicion. The Leicester Lollards apprehended by Courtenay in 1382 believed that 'ymagines non debent aliquo modo venerari, nec luminaria coram eis apponi' ${ }^{1}$; a group of Northampton Lollards who appeared before Bishop Buckingham in 1393 believed that you might as well kiss the stones in the fields as place lights or gifts before images ${ }^{2}$;and a question about the veneration of the cross and of images appears as item 26 on Bishop Polton's 1428 jurist's list. ${ }^{3}$

Neither of our commentaries is altogether unequivocal in its condemnation of images. Two noticeably orthodox statements are offered by the HTY group: first that images may do good when they are used like books to increase the love of God (T33/1-2); and, secondly, that they are permissible nowadays (as they weren't in the Old Testament) because Christ has been made man in the meantime (T34/37), an argument which Arundel himself puts to William Thorpe. ${ }^{4}$ However, the HTY' version's treatment of the topic begins on a negative note with a passage drawn from Holcot asking whether images are lawful and supplying the answer that it seems they are not (T30/11-31/1), and

1. $M V$ p. 164.
2. A.K. McHardy, 'Bishop Buckingham and the Lollards of the Lincoln Diocese', SCH 9 (1972), pp.131-45 (p.144).
3. Hudson, The Examination of Lollards' p.134, item 26.
4. TWT p.57/1103-6).
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each of the two concessions mentioned is followed by a warning. Images do good, we are told, but they also do evil, since men place all their hope and love on them, a sin which is common to both lettered and unlettered; priestly covetousness, too, is implicated in such practices (T33/2-9). Moreover, though it may be permissible to have images, nevertheless 'siche ape liknesse blyndip many men and mak[ip] hem, bi litil ping pat is ofte leueful, wade in depe errours' (T34/9-10). Possibly not all the HTY material would have pleased the more extreme Lollard iconoclasts, but there can be no doubt about this version's Lollard approach to the subject.

The B version's treatment of images has been discussed in detail by both Owst and Aston, ${ }^{1}$ who differ considerably in their assessment: according to Owst, B's treatment clearly shows 'the official attitude to images as set forth by the orthodox pulpit', while Aston considers that any close inspection of B's discussion would reveal its 'suspect character'. Anne Hudson describes B's views as 'outspoken'. ${ }^{2}$ The truth is that B's attitude varies, probably because he is making use of sources which themselves had differing attitudes. B quotes St. Gregory in support of the use of images as books for the unlettered (B35/8-12); and his emphasis on the value of the images of St. Lawrence and St. Catherine (which we are told serve as reminders of the passions they suffered for love of God (B36/9ff.)) would scarcely have attracted

1. Owst (1961), pp.141-3; Aston, 'Lollards and Images' pp.153-6.
2. Hudson, PR p. 425.
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the approval of men like William Smith and Richard Wayestaythe who apparently burnt an image of the latter in order to cook their dinner. ${ }^{1}$

It is difficult to be certain of the extent to which B's use of material drawn from Wyclif would necessarily imply Lollardy. ${ }^{2}$ De Mandatis Divinis is not an extreme work and Wyclif's views on the matter did not attract adverse criticism within his own lifetime. Much probably depends on the date of the tract and the extent to which the compiler or the reader would be likely to recognise the source. Two sections in particular, however, do seem to indicate Lollardy: the opposition (in a passage drawn from Holcot) ${ }^{3}$ to the offering of Iatria (i.e. worship due only to God) to the cross (B35/18ff.) and the suggestion that worship should be offered, not to images, but to the 'meke, trewe, poure man pat ys pe trewe ymage of $\operatorname{God}^{\prime}(\mathrm{B} 37 / 14)$. As we have already seen, questions on the worship of the Cross were asked at Lollard interrogations, and the

1. Knighton ii.182-3, and see the discussion in Hudson, $P R$ p. 76.
2. For passages drawn from Wyclif see notes to B31/1, B32/18. Aston herself, though using the passages from Wyclif as evidence of B's Lollardy, nevertheless recognises that Wyclif's treatment is 'noteworthy both for its lack of extremism and also for it historical awareness' (Lollards and Images', pp. 154 and 138).
3. The use by both HTY and B of different sections of the same Holcot discussion suggests the possibility of a common ancestor containing both. The textual evidence, however, is insufficient for this to be in any way certain, and they may simply have used similar sources.
practice was accepted by the more orthodox commentators. ${ }^{1}$ As Deveros observes in his treatise on images written at the end of the fourteenth century, 'omnis reuerencia que ymagini Christi offertur Christo offertur et propter ea cultus latrie debet ymagini Christi exhiberi', ${ }^{2}$ a view supported by Roger Dymmok. ${ }^{3}$ Deveros further offers arguments against the worship of man: the devil too is made in the image of God and if it is permissible to worship man it is therfore presumably also permissible to worship the devil. Moreover, since man is a rational creature, it is not really possible to see him as a sign of anything else, but as a thing in himself and therfore, if he is worshipped, he is likely to be worshipped for himself and not as a sign and this would be idolatry. ${ }^{4}$

It should be noted, however, that Deveros' introduction to his treatise suggests that the whole question of images was still a matter for dicussion in the later years of the fourteenth century since he states that he came to write his orthodox account in response to arguments put to him by a nobleman, while the publicity given to his views elicited a response from an Oxford opponent'5. As Anne Hudson observes, citing the topics of images and biblical translation as examples, 'many opinions

1. See Aston, 'Lollards and Images' pp. 155 and 157-8.
2. BL MS Royal 6.E.III f.59vb.
3. Dymmok, p. 188.
4. BL.MS.Royal 6.E III f. $60^{\text {rb }}$.
5. Ibid.f.59rb.
later identified with Lollardy could be questions of neutrality in the earlier years of the movement'. ${ }^{1}$ It is also worth remembering that the offering of latria to the cross was criticised in Dives and Pauper ${ }^{2}$, a work copied for the library of St. Alban's Abbey, something which suggests that the perception of such material as heretical or otherwise probably depended not only on its date but also on who was thought to be going to read it. ${ }^{3}$

The same cannot be said for Lollard views on the Eucharist, views which are clearly expressed by the HTY group. ${ }^{4}$ As part of the discussion on images the HTY version observes that we see the body of Christ each day but 'wip yzen of soule and not with yзe of body' (T34/8), while, as part of the discussion of the fifth commandment, it contains a section expressing the wish that the people would worship God's law and consider it to be just as they suppose man's law to be, in the hope that 'pame shulden pei not be contrarie to Crist: whanne he seip bat pis breed is myn owne body pei reuersen him and seien pat pis may neper be breed ne pe body of Crist, as false freris gabben' (T101/6-12).

Both these opinions can be traced back to Wyclif. Wyclif repeatedly discussed the question of whether or not the body of

1. Hudson, 'The Debate on Bible Translation, Oxford 1401', p. 83 and note.
2. $D P$ I.i.83-5, 87-9.
3. See Hudson, PR p. 418.
4. For Wyclif's view of the cult of the Eucharist as a form of idolatry, see Catto (1985), esp. pp.275-82.

Christ is seen 'corporaliter' in the eucharist and he came to the conclusion that we perceive Christ's body with our mental rather than bodily eye. ${ }^{1}$ The official Church view of the eucharist, dating from the time of Innocent III, held that, after the act of consecration, only the 'accidents' of the bread and wine remained - their appearance, their smell etc. - but not their substance, the substance having been changed into that of the body and blood of Christ. In Wyclif's view, it was simply not possible for the bread to become non-existent in this fashion, ${ }^{2}$ and nor was it possible for accidents to be separated from their substance. To maintain that this was what was happening, to say that Christ's body was present in substance, while the accidents were those of bread, was in effect to say that there was nothing there. As he tells us in the Trialogus under the heading De Fratrum Haeresibus, in a passage which may be the source of the second of the HTY passages quoted above, the logical result of holding such a view is that 'ipsum non potest esse panis vel corpus Christi. ${ }^{13}$ This view, as the HTY passage implies, also owed a

1. See, for example, De Eucharistia pp 20-21, 230, 307, and the second of Wyclif's opinions listed $F Z$ p. 105.
2. See Leff ii.551-2.
3. Trialogus $\mathrm{p} .339 / 14$.
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great deal to the Lollard dependence on the authority of scripture. Wyclif quotes Luke 22:19 ('And he took bread and gave thanks and broke it and gave it to them saying "This is my body"') and argues that when Christ said 'this' he was indicating the bread which he had already received, i.e. the implication is that the bread still remained. ${ }^{1}$

There was no time at which Wycliffite views on the eucharist were acceptable to the Church. Wyclif's theses on this subject were condemned at Oxford in $1381^{2}$ and may also have resulted in a certain cooling of relations between John of Gaunt and the Lollard movement. ${ }^{3}$ The first three Wycliffite views condemned by the Blackfriars Council concerned the eucharist ${ }^{4}$ and, as Anne Hudson has pointed out, the first question in the list to be asked of Lollards in Bishop Polton's register dealt with the same subject. As she says 'From 1382 onwards a rejection of transubstantiation was typical of Wycliffite writings and trials, and it seems clear from the vehemence of the condemnation that [for] any text or suspect in England from then at least until the mid-1520s to reiterate that rejection must be regarded as Wycliffite'. ${ }^{5}$ Wycliffite views on

1. De Eucharistia p.34.
2. Lechler pp.367-71.
3. For Gaunt's attitude, see FZ pp. 114 and 318.
4. Ibid. pp.277-8.
5. Hudson, $P R$ pp.281-2.
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dominion, Lollard views on images may have been acceptable during the early years of Lollardy but there was no time after 1382 when this was true of Wycliffite views on the eucharist.

The content of the HTY version's comments on this topic thus clearly identifies it as a Lollard text. Once again, however, the B version's position is a great deal less clear. B does not share either of the HTY group's passages on this topic, although there is once again no evidence that B was making deliberate expurgations. ${ }^{1}$ As far as the second and more clearly Wycliffite passage on the eucharist is concerned (i.e. the section occurring at the beginning of the fifth commandment), it appears at least possible that this was a later addition, postdating the break with B. ${ }^{2}$

B's only independent comment on the eucharist is ambiguous. B defines the sacrament of the altar as 'Cristes body in forme of bred' (B36/1). While this might not appear to be a particularly extreme view,

1. For examples of such expurgations made to Lollard texts see Spencer, The Fortunes of a Lollard Sermon Cycle' and Hudson, The Expurgation of a Lollard Sermon Cycle'.
2. See the discussion of this passage in the chapter on the textual tradition.
it is possible that the expression 'forme of bred' was a deliberate evasion. When Richard Wyche appeared before Bishop Walter Skirlawe in 1402 he too stated that the consecrated Host was 'verum corpus Domini in forma panis', but, when pressed as to whether bread actually remained after consecration, he was troubled and appears to have been unwilling to commit himself. ${ }^{1}$ In response to the archdeacon's comment that he appeared to be faltering in his faith, he repeated his definition only to be told that it was false and that the consecrated host was 'corpus Christi in specie panis, non in forma'. A similar definition was made by Oldcastle. ${ }^{2}$

B's reference to the Eucharist could therefore possibly contain overtones of Lollardy, but it is also possible that the ambiguity of the term 'forme of bred' would not necessarily be recognised by all readers. After all, the use of the term by Lollards at their trials must imply that they felt they had some grounds for hoping that their questioners might be satisfied with it, and it is possible that it was only over a period of time, as their interlocutors gained experience, that suspicion was aroused.

One other definition made by $\mathbf{B}$ might be considered to have Lollard implications: that of the Church as 'alle trewe Cristene peple' (B9/6). Wyclif believed that the Church consisted not of the hierarchical

1. 'The Trial of Richard Wyche' pp.532ff. For further discussion of this topic see Hudson, PR p. 284.
2. $F Z$ p. 438 .
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Roman Catholic Church but of the whole body of the predestined. ${ }^{1}$ Officials of the hierarchical Church might or might not be part of this body. As part of the examination of Hus, this doctrine was condemned by the Council of Constance in 1415. ${ }^{2}$ The belief was held by Oldcastle when he appeared before Arundel in 1413. ${ }^{3}$ The doctrine was not, however, condemned by either Gregory XI or the Blackfriars Council and it is possible that it took some time for its implications to be understood. By the second quarter of the fifteenth century, however, it was clearly recognised as a Lollard opinion since question number 40 in Bishop Polton's jurist's list, 'an mali sint pars ecclesie catholice?', is evidently based on some such argument. ${ }^{4}$

The only other sacrament to be dealt with at any length by both versions is confession. Both B and the HTY group criticise the clergy for indulging in simoniacal practices in connection with their confessional duties. 'Mercymentis of prelatis', i.e. fines imposed as penance (T152/8, cf.B152/10), are condemned because the clerics concerned keep the proceeds for themselves instead of using them for the benefit of the poor, and the practice of selling people permission to remain in their $\sin$ is

1. See e.g. De Ecclesia p.2.
2. Spinka, pp. 183 and 260.
3. Pollard (ed.), p.184, cited by Hudson, PR p. 321 .
4. Hudson, 'The Examination of Lollards', p.134, item 40.
characterised as a new form of theft established by Antichrist (B150/7-9, T150/7-8). ${ }^{1}$ Wyclif himself complains about the simony associated with confession, ${ }^{2}$ but such complaints were not confined to Lollards. The Myrour to Lewde Men and Wymmen, for example, categorises priests who require such payment as being 'liche to Iudas pat solde oure Lord Ihesu Crist'. ${ }^{3}$ More obviously heretical is the view expressed by all four manuscripts that such absolution is invalid not only because of the simony involved but also because the prelate in question is in any case in no position to judge the state of a man's soul: 'But soop it is pat lordis synnen ofte tymes and fallen fro lordship pat her God hap syuen hem, but pes blynde leches knowen pis not, ne whame pei turnen azen bi grace of her God' (T151/7-152/1, cf. B151/7-152/1).

The question of the power of the Church to bind and to loose first arose as a result of Wyclif's views on disendowment, since such acts by the secular power might well have led to excommunication. Wyclif's view was that the Pope could only bind and loose when he was acting in accordance with the ordinance of Christ. Such beliefs were unacceptable to the Church from the beginning and they appear as items 9 and 14 in the list of accusations against Wyclif drawn up by Pope Gregory XI in 1377. ${ }^{4}$ As far as priests in general were concerned, Wyclif believed that

1. For additional HTY material see T108/1-2.
2. See e.g. Opera Minora pp.318-9.
3. Myrour to Lewde Men and Wymmen p.138/37.
4. Walsingham, HA i.354-5.
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they too had no powers of absolution: God absolved, the priest merely spoke the words, since only God knew the state of a man's soul. ${ }^{1}$ Opposition to confession was early identified as a characteristic of Lollards and consistently remained one of the means of identifying heresy, appearing, for example, as one of the the conclusions condemned as heretical by the Blackfriars Council and as one of the 44 conclusions to which Wyclif replied in 1383. ${ }^{2}$ Questions on confession appear as items 5 and 6 on Bishop Polton's list. ${ }^{3}$ The expression of such views in these manuscripts thus very definitely suggests heterodoxy, although it is worth noting that the $B$ compiler is also prepared to incorporate the more orthodox view expressed in his DI source's discussion of the third commandment: that part of each Sunday should be devoted to oral confession (B78/16-18).

Having been deprived by the Lollards of much of his sacramental function, all that was left to the priest was preaching and teaching. Although our texts recommend such practices, they also contain the suggestion that even this priestly function may be unnecessary. As part of the discussion of the third commandment, we are told, for instance

1. See Wyclif Sermones ii.62-3, 138-9, and Hudson, $P R$ p. 294.
2. FZ p.278, Opera Minora p.252; for the date of the Responsiones see Hudson PR, p. 45 .
3. Hudson, 'Examination of Lollards' p. 133.
that 'discrecioun and studiyng in Goddis lawe shulden teche a man betere to holde his haliday pan don pes propre prestis' (T75/9-76/1, cf.B75/976/1). The implication of this view was that a man could act as his own priest and more reliably than the priest provided by the Church. Naturally the Church did not care for this, and, as early as 1388 , one of the articles cited against the Leicester group which included William Smith stated that 'quilibet bonus homo, licet literaturam nesciat, est sacerdos. ${ }^{11}$

Both the HTY and the B versions, then, contain recognisably Lollard material. In particular, HTY's material on the eucharist leaves no doubt as to the heterodoxy of this version. The B compiler's position is less clear but, while the perceived heterodoxy of certain of his views, for example on images, or some of his definitions (the eucharist as Christ's body in 'forme of bred', the Church as 'trewe Cristene peple'), may have depended on the date and audience, the cumulative effect, supported by the shared passages criticising clerical wealth and throwing doubts on the clerical ability to bind and loose, is of a definitely Lollard text.

One aspect of the $\mathbf{B}$ discussion may perhaps provide a clue to $B^{\prime}$ 's identity. The HTY version contains several sections of material critical of friars. Friars are condemned as manslayers (T108/12ff., a passage which will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter), and they are
also criticised for begging. Antagonism to friars was characteristic of Lollardy. Although Wyclif had earlier been on good terms with the friars, who sympathised with his views on Church endowment, they had no sympathy at all with his stand on the eucharist, and by the time of the Blackfriars Council, which Wyclif described as 'their council', the relationship had degenerated into bitterness. ${ }^{1}$ The group of Leicester Lollards investigated by William Courtenay in 1389 believed that it was a $\sin$ to bestow anything by way of charity on the friars, ${ }^{2}$ and William Taylor, burnt at Smithfield in 1423, believed the friars' begging to be damnable. ${ }^{3}$ Lollards did not, however, simply object to fraternal abuses, they objected to the friars' very existence. As one Lollard tract explains, only three sects are necessary, sects corresponding to the three persons of the Trinity: lords to the Father, priests to the Son and the common people to the Holy Ghost. ${ }^{4}$ The private religions had no right to exist because they could not be grounded in the gospel. ${ }^{5}$ This attitude is clearly expressed by the HTY group (T110/4-7), but the B version contains no criticism of friars whatsoever. For a Lollard text this was unusual, and there is one passage which suggests that such omissions may perhaps

1. See Workman ii.262; Wyclif, Trialogus pp.374, 445.
2. $M V$ p. 164 .
3. $F Z$ p. 413.
4. MS CUL Ff.6.2. f.1 ${ }^{\mathrm{v}}$.
5. See Hudson, PR p.349; Wyclif, Polemical Works p.17.
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have been deliberate. As part of the general introduction to the commentary in both versions, we are told that God has bidden us to keep these commandments on pain of damnation and, further, that he may not forget this punishment. The HTY version then goes on to say 'ne freris ne preieres may bowe him fro pis purpos' (T3/6-7), but the B version reads simply 'Ne no pyng may bowe him fro his purpos' (B3/6-7). Since the T version is clearly the difficilior lectio it seems clear that T has the original reading. Assuming B's alteration to be deliberate, this would then suggest that B himself may perhaps have been a friar. ${ }^{1}$
[^14]
## THE DATES OF THE COMMENTARIES

In our consideration of the possible dates of these two versions, we will deal first with the HTY group. As far as the date post quem is concerned the antagonism towards friars suggests a date after 1381. The close relationship to Wyclif's works, and especially to his views on dominion, suggests a comparatively early date, although this is not of course conclusive. As regards the date ante quem, the continually expressed hope for the support of the secular power may perhaps suggest a date before 1410 .

The main evidence for dating this version, however, comes from a series of comments on the possible burning of heretics. During the discussion of the fifth commandment in a passage which is shared by the B version, we are told that any man who fails to object to murder (including the failure to provide spiritual sustenance) consents to manslaughter and is himself a manslayer. The text then carries on:

And herfore pe prophetis of pe Olde Lawe telden men perels til pei suffriden deeb and for pis cause
apostolis of Crist weren martrid; and we shulden if
we weren trewe men, but cowardise and defaut of loue of oure God makip vs to sterte abak as traitours don.
(T106/6-107/1, cf. B106/6-107/1)
This is the only mention of the death penalty to occur in all four manuscripts, but a similar reference occurs in the HTY group alone as part of the commentary on the fourth commandment (i.e. as part of the discussion of one's relationship with one's spiritual father) where we are told that

Me pinkip bat we shulden seie, to suffre herfor deep, pat if pi Pope, bi bisshop, pi parsoun or wiker be knowun of pee to draw in pe deuelis 30k, worshipe him not as siche
(T98/10-99/1)
Both these references are, however, a little too vague to be of definite help to us. They might be critical references to the general willingness of Lollards to recant whenever threatened with the death penalty (an approach whose perceived morality is discussed in some detail by Anne Hudson) ${ }^{1}$, in which case they would imply a date post 1401 . On the other hand, they might just as easily be examples of those anticipatory references to the death penalty which occur so frequently before 1401, presumably at least in part because of the well-known use of burning

[^15]both in Ireland ${ }^{1}$ and on the continent (the 1397 petition of the Bishops to parliament requesting such a penalty refers to the fact that in other Christian countries, 'quant aucuns sont condempnez par leglise de crime de heresie ils sont tantost liuerez a seculer iuggement pour estre mys a mort'). ${ }^{2}$ Anne Hudson cites, for example, references to burning which occur in the Opus Arduum, a text which shows clear evidence of having been written in $1390{ }^{3}$ As both Lechler and Wilks point out, Wyclif himself frequently refers to the possibility of martyrdom. ${ }^{4}$ We have a more genuine cause for martyrdom nowadays if we wish, he tells us, than had the many saints who have been canonised by the Church. ${ }^{5}$ Moreover, he clearly regards the possibility of such a martyrdom as being extremely real. 'We have,' he says 'only to preach persistently the law of Christ in the hearing of rich and worldly prelates, and instantly we shall have a flourishing martyrdom, if we hold out in faith and in patience. ${ }^{16}$ In fact Wyclif gives his fear of such a fate as his reason for failing to appear before the Archbishop in St. Paul's in January 1378. He

1. See Richardson, 'Heresy and the Lay Power', p. 4 note 2.
2. Richardson and Sayles (eds.), 'Parliamentary Documents from Formularies', p.154.
3. Hudson, PR pp.15-16.
4. See Lechler p.331; Wilks, 'Wyclif and the Great Persecution', pp.40-1.
5. $D C D$ ii. 274 .
6. Lechler p. 417.
had heard, he said, that Sudbury had quoted the word of Christ given in John 16:16. 'A little while and you see me no more; again a little while and you will see me', words which he took as implying that he was about to die. People had been instructed, he believed, that it would be a work of alms-giving ('elemosina') if he were to be done away with 'combustione, occisione vel morte alia'. ${ }^{1}$

The HTY group, in addition, contains a more specific reference, also during the discussion of the fifth commandment, when the writer refers to the 'wickid wille' of the friars 'bat was now late shewed at Londoun and Lyncolun to breme trewe prestis for pes prestis grauntiden pe treupe of pe Gospel' (T109/5-7), a plan which was apparently frustrated by the intervention of noble lords. Anne Hudson, discussing Y, suggests that this must imply that the commentary dates from 'after 1401 and probably from after the Oldcastle revolt. ${ }^{2}$ Taking the passage to refer to an actual burning, she points out that there is no record of any such execution in Lincoln before the date of the revolt. However, as we have seen, no actual burnings took place. The writer is concerned, on the contrary, to make the point that the sin committed by the friars was just as great in spite of their failure to kill anyone: 'Ne mansleyng is neuer be lesse pat

1. De Veritate Sacre Scripture i. 374 and see also Workman i.308.
2. Hudson, $P R$ p. 5 and note.

God moeuyde lordis to lette pe wille of pes freris pat pei slowen hem not (T109/9-10). True, it is implied that the death penalty was a possibility, but, as we have seen, the idea of burning was in the air long before the 1401 act. And in fact, considerably before this, there was an incident in Lincoln to which the writer could have been referring. The register of Bishop Buckingham of Lincoln records action taken against William Swinderby, one of a group of Lollards active around Leicester in $1382 .{ }^{1}$ On 5th March, the Bishop issued an order against a certain William the hermit from the chapel of St. John near Leicester, who had been preaching without authority errors contrary to the Catholic faith. Despite this injunction, Swinderby continued to preach over the Easter period, the rectors being apparently unable to stop him because he had the favour of the people. On 12th May Buckingham ordered the investigation of accusations brought against Swinderby by three friars. Swinderby was examined at Lincoln. Sixteen points were brought against him and he abjured on 11th July after which he left the Leicester district and moved westward. During the years 1389-91 Swinderby came into conflict with John Trefnant Bishop of Hereford and, when he appeared before Trefnant in 1390, he gave the following account of what happened towards the end of his earlier examination:

1. For the proceedings against Swinderby, see LAO, Episcopal Register xii, f. $236^{\mathrm{v}}$ and ff.242r-244r; Knighton ii.192-7; McFarlane (1952), p.107ff.; Hudson PR p.74;

Walsingham, HA ii.55.

Bot when I schulde hafe made my purgacyon ther stoden forthe fyfe freres or mo .....poursyewyng bysyle and cryinge, with many an other frere with great instance, to gif ye dome upon my to berne my, and bouhten dry wode byfore, as men tolden in that towne. ${ }^{1}$

According to Swinderby, he only revoked the conclusions which he was accused of promulgating 'for dryde of deth and fleyschly consail'. Swinderby records the presence in Lincoln, at the time, of the Duke of Lancaster, the earl of Derby and 'other mony grete' and, according to Knighton, the Duke intervened on Swinderby's behalf requesting that this particular punishment should be replaced by another. ${ }^{2}$ As Peter McNiven says, neither the friars nor Swinderby 'appear to have regarded capital punishment for heresy as specifically contrary to the law of the land. ${ }^{13}$

I have been unable to discover any account of a similar event taking place in London. Commentators such as McFarlane and Thomson suggest that Lollardy was not particularly prevalent in London. ${ }^{4}$ On the other hand, much of the earliest action against Wyclif and his followers

1. Hereford Register, Trefnant, pp.238-239.
2. Knighton ii. 193.
3. McNiven p. 45.
4. McFarlane (1952), pp.123-4; Thomson, 'Clergy and Laity in London, 1376-1531', (D.Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1960), p. 335.
did in fact take place in London, and, as we have already seen, in some of it at least the friars were deeply involved. Wyclif himself links London and Lincoln together as being places where friars were particularly active against Lollards. As he says in the Trialogus the friars 'tam Londoniis quam Lincolniae laborant assidue ad sacerdotes fideles et pauperes extinguendum' and Lechler concludes from this and from a letter of thanks written by the Archbishop that Robert Braybrook of London was as zealous as John Buckingham in his action against Lollards. ${ }^{1}$ Moreover De Blasphemia contains a specific reference to an attempt by at least one London friar to have a heretic burnt without trial. Discussing the recent Peasants' Revolt and the murder of Archbishop Sudbury, Wyclif observes that the punishment inflicted by the people, though deserved, was excessive, giving as one of his reasons the fact that the Archbishop was executed without due process of justice. He adds, however, that a certain London friar has anticipated ('prophetavit') this action 'cum asseruit publice hominem sine responso conburendum tanquam hereticum', an event which must have taken place before Sudbury's death in $1381 .{ }^{2}$ It is thus clear
5. Trialogus p .379 , and see Lechler p .399 .
6. De Blasphemia p.197.
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that references to burnings in both London and Lincoln were current from a very early date and certainly cannot be taken to imply a date after De Heretico Comburendo.

In fact the HTY version clearly belongs to that period when, as H.G. Richardson puts it, 'Lollards, or at least instructed Lollards, spoke of death by burning as inflicted by the pope and his cardinals on those who maintained God's law, not as a penalty exacted in England. ${ }^{11}$ As the HTY group says as part of its discussion of the seventh commandment:


#### Abstract

Also bi pe Popis lawe men ben ofte brent for pei susteyne $n$ be lawe pat Thesu Crist 3af, as who seip pat pe Pope shulde not pus be lord bi title of Crist shal be brent anoon.


(T129/4-7)
Given that this passage immediately follows a comment on the English use of the death penalty for theft ('For bi pe lawe of Englond men ben hanged for peft for a litel ping'), it is difficult to believe that the writer would have failed to refer to the similar use of the death penalty for heresy, had De Heretico Comburendo been on the statute book. It therefore seems likely that the HTY version was written before 1401.

[^16]Determining the date of the B version is somewhat more difficult. Both the closeness to Wycliffite views in general and more particularly the use of material on dominion may perhaps suggest an early date, while the hopes for action by the lay power suggest a date before 1410. The discussion of the fourth commandment contains a reference to the death of children in the Plague which is shared with the DI version (B89/1417), but the so-called 'Children's Plague' occurred in 1361-2 and, although the outbreaks of 1369 and 1379 also tended to affect children, all these are rather too early to be helpful. ${ }^{1}$

A date before 1407 is perhaps suggested by a passage from B's prologue which informs us that lords and ladies should teach the commandments to their children and servants and to 'lewed peple pat connep no letterure.' (B9/3-8). Emphasis on teaching was, as we have seen, a characteristic of Lollardy. One of the articles cited against the Northampton Lollards who appeared before Bishop Buckingham in 1393 was that of believing that it was permissible for every Christian to inform his brethren concerning the ten commandments and the gospels and that every head of household was responsible for himself and the deeds of his family. ${ }^{2}$ Margaret Aston, in her discussion of the B version, identifies

1. McKisack p.331-2.
2. McHardy, A.K., 'Bishop Buckingham and the Lollards of the Lincoln Diocese', p. 144.
the promotion of such household practices with Lollardy. ${ }^{1}$ From the point of view of date, however, what is interesting about this particular passage is not what it says but what it fails to say. There is no suggestion that such teaching might be be liable to arouse disapproval. In this respect it is interesting to compare the $B$ passage with the similar discussion which occurs in Dives and Pauper where Dives observes that 'now men seyyn pat ber schulde no lewyd folc entrymettyn hem of Godis lawe ne of be gospel ne of holy writ, neyper to connyn it ne to techyn it', an argument refuted by Pauper. ${ }^{2}$ This passage appears either to result from or to anticipate Arundel's Constitutions of 1407-9 and the lack of such material in $B$, while not of course conclusive, may appear to suggest a somewhat earlier date for this version.
3. Aston, 'Lollards and Images', p.153, note 64.
4. DPI.i.327, Cap. xi/3-5.

## RELATED COMMANDMENTS COMMENTARIES

The following discussion is concerned with the possible relationships of the various late Middle English prose commandments commentaries to the commentaries found in the B/HTY group. ${ }^{1}$ The list is divided into groups according to the categories established by Martin, viz. rhetorical, discursive and mixed. ${ }^{2}$ In the rhetorical versions the treatment of each commandment generally begins with a statement of the commandment itself followed by a query (e.g. 'Who brekyth this heeste?'). The answer to this (a list of breakers) leads to further questions (e.g. 'Why mycheris', 'Why robbers', 'Why extorcioners') each of which receives a brief answer (e.g. 'Why mycheris. for pei stelen priuely'). ${ }^{3}$ Trinities of breakers are listed for each commandment. The discursive versions have a much more flexible structure, and are often considerably longer, being, as Martin has observed, both digressive and exegetical. ${ }^{4}$ Mixed discursive/rhetorical versions are, as their name suggests, a combination of these two types.

I have not dealt with commentaries, which do not, as far as I can tell, bear any relationship to the BHTY group. Thus I have not dealt

1. I am particularly grateful to Dr. A.I. Doyle, without whose help the list of manuscripts containing such commentaries would have been considerably shorter.
2. For these definitions see Martin, pp.202-3, 205-6 and 211.
3. Bühler, ed., The Middle English Texts of Morgan MS 861', p.691.
4. Martin, pp.205-6.
with the second of Y's commentaries, nor with the Lacy versions viz. the commentary found in MS St. John's College Oxford 94 which has been edited by Royster, nor with that found in MS Ashmole 751 which appears to be a shorter version of this. Nor have I dealt with the Rolle versions contained in MSS Hatton 12 and Lincoln Cathedral 91; nor with the version contained in MSS Cambridge University Library Bb.14.54 and Bodl. Laud Misc. 656 (basically a collection of biblical supporting material). The commentaries contained in MSS Pembroke College Cambridge 285, Glasgow Hunterian 512 and British Library Additional 10036 are all very short - little more than lists - and therefore difficult to classify. As far as I can tell, the version contained in the Lanterne of List is not directly related to the B or the HTY versions, although it naturally deals with topics similar to those contained in the HTY group.

Group I: Rhetorical Versions (R)

Type RI
(M) Morgan $861 \mathrm{ff} .1^{\mathrm{r}}-3^{v}$ (C.Bühler (ed.), 'The Middle English Texts of Morgan 861', PMLA 69 (1954), pp.686-92)
( $\mathrm{Tc}_{1}$ ) Trinity College Dublin $70 \mathrm{ff} .174^{\mathrm{v}}-181^{\mathrm{r}}$

Type RIIa
( $\mathrm{Rw}_{1}$ ) Bodl. Rawlinson C. $209 \mathrm{ff} .2^{\left.\mathrm{r}-7{ }^{\mathrm{r}} \text { (imperfect) }\right) ~}$

# Type RIIb <br> ( $\mathrm{Ca}_{1}$ ) Cambridge University Library Ii. $6.43 \mathrm{ff} .3^{\mathrm{r}}-9^{\mathrm{v}}$ <br> <br> Type RIII <br> <br> Type RIII <br> $\left(\mathrm{N}_{1}\right) \quad$ New College Oxford $67 \mathrm{ff} .1^{\mathrm{v}}-2^{\mathrm{r}}$ <br> (Ty) Trinity College Oxford 86 f.54² (fragment) 

## Type RIV

$\left(\mathrm{Ed}_{1}\right)$ Edinburgh University Library 93, ff. $1^{\mathrm{r}} \mathbf{3}^{\mathrm{v}}$ (imperfect)

Type RVa<br>$\left(\right.$ Ad $\left._{1}\right)$ British Library Additional 28026 ff. $187^{\mathrm{ra}}-187^{\mathrm{vb}}$

Type RVb
( $\mathrm{Lm}_{1}$ ) Bodl. Laud Misc. 699 ff.78r-79 ${ }^{\text {² }}$

## Type RVc

(Wi) Dr. Williams Library Ancillary 3 ff. $130^{\text {ra }}-131^{\text {ra }}$

## Type RVd

( $\mathrm{Bo}_{1}$ ) Bodl. Bodley 938 ff. $16^{\mathrm{r}}-17^{\mathrm{v}}$
$\left(\mathrm{Lm}_{2}\right)$ Bodl. Laud Misc. 30 ff. $193^{\text {}}-195^{\vee}$

Type RVI
(Tn) Bodl. Tanner 336 ff. $141^{\text {r }}$ - $145^{v}$

## Type RVII

$\left(\mathrm{Ro}_{1}\right)$ British Library Royal 18.A.X ff.83r-85r (imperfect)
( $\mathrm{Rw}_{2}$ ) Bodl. Rawlinson C. 288 ff. $92^{\text {r-9 }}{ }^{\text {r }}$

## Group 2 Discursive Versions (D)

## Type DI

( $\mathrm{Ar}_{1}$ ) British Library Arundel 286 ff. $179{ }^{\text {r }}-191^{v}$ (abbreviated)
$\left(\mathrm{Ca}_{2}\right)$ Cambridge University Library Kk.1.3. item 22 (imperfect)
( $\mathrm{Ha}_{1}$ ) British Library Harley 218 ff. $159^{\text {r }}$ - $167^{\text {r }}$
( $\mathrm{Ha}_{2}$ ) British Library Harley $2250 \mathrm{ff} .88^{\mathrm{r}-91^{v}}$
( $\mathrm{Ha}_{3}$ ) British Library Harley $2346 \mathrm{ff} .34^{\mathrm{r}}-47^{v}$
(Hn) Huntington HM $744 \mathrm{ff} .13^{v}-23^{v}$
(Lb) Leeds University Brotherton Collection $501 \mathrm{ff} .74^{\mathrm{v}}$ - $81^{\text {r }}$
$\left(\mathrm{Lm}_{3}\right)$ Bodl. Laud Misc. $210 \mathrm{ff} .147^{\mathrm{r}}$ - $147^{\mathrm{v}}$ (imperfect)
$\left(\mathrm{Lm}_{4}\right)$ Bodl. Laud Misc. 524 ff. $11^{\mathrm{r}}$ - $\mathbf{1 7}^{\mathrm{v}}$
(Pr) Garrett 143 (Princeton University Deposit 1459) ff.1r-21 ${ }^{\text {v }}$
$\left(\mathrm{Ro}_{2}\right)$ British Library Royal 17.A.XXVI ff. $\mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{r}}-22^{\text {r }}$
$\left(\mathrm{Rw}_{3}\right)$ Bodl. Rawlinson A. $381 \mathrm{ff} .107^{\mathrm{r}}-111^{\mathrm{v}}$
$\left(\mathrm{Rw}_{4}\right)$ Bodl. Rawlinson A. 423 ff. $1^{\mathrm{r}}-6^{\mathrm{v}}$ (imperfect)
(S) British Library Additional 22283 (the Simeon MS) ff.92r$93^{v}$ (W.N. Francis (ed.), Book of Vices and Virtues, EETS, os 217 (1942), Appendix i.316-33)
(Si) Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge $74 \mathrm{ff} .181^{\text {r}}$ - $189^{\text {v }}$
(So) London Society of Antiquaries 687 pp.412-30
(St) Bibliothèque Ste. Geneviève Paris 3390 ff. $1^{\text {r }}-23^{v}$
$\left(\mathrm{Tc}_{2}\right)$ Trinity College Dublin 69 ff. $79 \mathrm{r}-82^{\mathrm{v}}$
(U) University College Oxford $97 \mathrm{ff} .85^{\mathrm{r}}-93^{v}$
(Ve) British Library Cotton Vespasian A.XXIII ff. 107²-115 ${ }^{\text { }}$
(W) Westminster School 3 ff.73r-88r

## Type DII

$\left(\mathrm{Bo}_{2}\right)$ Bodl. Bodley $789 \mathrm{ff} .108^{\mathrm{v}}-123^{r}$ (T.Arnold (ed.), Select English Works of John Wyclif (Oxford, 1869-71) iii.82-92)

## Type DIII

$\left(\mathrm{G}_{1}\right) \quad$ Glasgow University General 223 ff .213r-2175

Type DIV
( $\mathrm{Do}_{1}$ ) Bodl. Douce $246 \mathrm{ff} .101^{\mathrm{v}}-103^{\mathrm{v}}$

## Type DV

(Ha ${ }_{4}$ ) British Library Harley 2406 ff. $1^{\mathrm{r}}-3^{\mathrm{r}}$

## Type DVI

Pore Caitif

## Type DVII

( $\mathrm{Ad}_{2}$ ) British Library Additional $27592 \mathrm{ff} .42^{\mathrm{r}}-45^{\mathrm{v}}$
$\left(\mathrm{Bo}_{3}\right)$ Bodl. Bodley 85 ff. $110^{\mathrm{r}}$ - $122^{\text {r }}$
$\left(\mathrm{Ca}_{3}\right)$ Cambridge University Library Nn.4.12 ff. $3^{\mathrm{r}-7^{v}}$
( Hu ) Glasgow University Hunterian $472 \mathrm{ff} .71^{\mathrm{v}}-76^{v}$

## Type DVIII

(Em) Emmanuel College Cambridge $246 \mathrm{ff} .59^{\mathrm{v}}-62^{\mathrm{v}}$

Type DIX
$\left(\mathrm{Do}_{2}\right)$ Bodl. Douce $274 \mathrm{ff} .1^{\mathrm{r}}-7^{\mathrm{v}}$

Type DX
( $\mathrm{Ha}_{5}$ ) British Library Harley 211 ff.47r-63 ${ }^{\text {v }}$
( $\mathrm{Lm}_{5}$ ) Bodl. Laud Misc. 23 ff.3r-23r
(Sa) St. Albans Cathedral Library Catechetica $\mathrm{ff} .5^{\mathrm{v}}-43^{v}$
(Ti) British Library Cotton Titus D XIX ff. $120^{r}-147^{r}$

## Type DXI

( Lm $_{6}$ ) Bodl. Laud Misc. 524 ff. 18 - $-18^{v}$

Group 3: Mixed Discursive/Rhetorical Versions (DR)

## Type DRI

( $\mathrm{Ed}_{2}$ ) Edinburgh University Library $93 \mathrm{ff} . \mathrm{4}^{\mathrm{r}}-10^{\mathrm{v}}$
(Tr) Trinity College Cambridge R. $3.21 \mathrm{ff} .2^{\mathrm{vb}}-6^{\mathrm{ra}}$

## Type DRII

(L) Lambeth $408 \mathrm{ff} .6^{\mathrm{v}}-11^{\mathrm{r}}$ (T.F. Simmons and H.E. Nolloth (eds.), The Lay Folks Catechism, EETS, os 118 (1901, Kraus repr. 1975), pp.33-57)

## Type DRIII

(J) John Rylands University Library of Manchester, English $85 \mathrm{ff} .2^{\text {v }}$ $8^{v}$ (A.L. Kellogg and E.W. Talbert (eds.),'The Wyclifite Pater Noster and Ten Commandments', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 42 (1960), pp.371-6)

Because all these texts are ten commandments commentaries. there is naturally a considerable overlap of subject matter, including the use of supporting quotations, both from the Bible and from other authorities. This is confusing and can sometimes give the impression of a relationship where none may, in fact, exist. As Martin observes, 'analogous references, and vaguely similar content, are of little value in establishing textual connections. ${ }^{1}$ I have therefore attempted to base my suggestions of relationships on more definite textual evidence, if possible on close verbal correspondence.

## Rhetorical Versions

The various rhetorical versions are all closely inter-connected and representatives of all except RVII have been discussed by Martin. Version RI has been edited by Bühler, and version RII by Martin. The general pattern of the rhetorical versions has been outlined above, but it

[^17]
## -cxxxvii-

may be helpful to quote the commentary on the first commandment as it appears in RI:

> Who brekith pis commaundement. proude men. worldly men. and fleischly men. \$Why proude men. for pei maken pe feend her god. as lob seip in pe .xlj. $\mathrm{c}^{\mathrm{o}}$, The deuel is prince ouer alle pe children of pride. Why worldly men. for bei maken worldly goodys [?her god?]. as Poul seip to Effesices pe.v. co. an auerouse man is a seruaunt of mawmentis. TWhy fleischly men. for bei maken her belyes her god. as Poul seid to Philipenses .iij. $c^{0}$, per ben many pat waiken pat ben enemyes of Cristis Cros whoos end is deep. and her bely is her god. (Bühler p.689)

The RI and RII commentaries share the same form but differ in their treatment of the eighth commandment, RI using supporting quotations from Ecclesiastes and Isaiah whereas RII uses quotations from Acts and Paul to Timothy. RI has a brief prologue, while RIIb contains short passages relating the first three commandments to the three members of the Trinity and the last seven to our 'euen cristen'. The version contained in RIII corresponds to that found in RI and RII but with the omission of all Biblical supporting material. ${ }^{1}$

The RIV version lacks both the statement of the commandment and the question 'Who brekib', beginning each discussion simply with a statement of breakers e.g. 'And so vnkynde men, froward men \& rebel men breken pis heste'.

[^18]-cxxxviii-

The RV versions list all the commandments first and follow these with material about breakers. RVa has a statement instead of the 'Who brekith' question (eg. 'Pese men breken pe firste comaundement') and follows the citation of the second commandment with a quotation from Matthew 5:37. RVc has brief commentaries following the first, second and third commandments. RVd resembles RVa and $b$ in form but with deliberate shortening of the quotations of the commandments (the $\mathrm{Bo}_{1}$ commentary begins 'Here bigymmen pe comaundementis of God schortly declarid').

The RVI version is clearly descended from a version corresponding in form to RV, but from one with somewhat fuller material (it includes biblical supporting quotations not found in RV). The RVI version has, however, lost the initial list of commandments and, from the fifth commandment onwards, it incorporates the statement of the commandment into the body of the text, following this by a statement about breakers corresponding to that found in RIV, i.e., as Martin suggests, RVI appears to be a conflation of two different types of rhetorical version. ${ }^{1}$

RVII has the same format as the RI/RII group, but with slightly shorter versions of the commandments. It is distinctive in that its supporting biblical quotations are generally longer than the norm and are given in both Latin and English, and in that it does not necessarily

[^19]confine itself to one Biblical supporting quotation per category of breaker. The actual quotations are also occasionally different from those of the other rhetorical versions.

The lists of breakers occasionally vary. Thus, while the majority of versions list the breakers of the sixth commandment as adulterers, fornicators and 'holours', the RVII version combines fornicators and 'holours' and has as its third definition deadly sinners who break the holy bond of matrimony between Christ and his soul i.e. indulge in spiritual lechery.

Kellogg and Talbert have suggested that what they term 'the shorter commentary' as it appears in Rylands English 85 (i.e., according to my classification, DRIII) is an abbreviation of the discursive commentary as it appears in DII (i.e. in $\mathrm{Bo}_{2}$ ). As this would imply that the related rhetorical commentaries were a further abbreviation (DRIII is basically a rhetorical version with additional material), it will be appropriate to deal with this question now. As far as the specific relationship between DII and DRIII's rhetorical material is concerned, Kellog and Talbert's argument may be partially convincing if we restrict our consideration to the discussion of the first commandment. Two of the three biblical quotations which appear in the rhetorical section of DRIII's first commandment discussion (and in RI) also appear in DII (although the quotation from Job is missing). This degree of correspondence does not, however, persist throughout the commentary; the DRIII and DII commentaries on the second commandment share only one biblical quotation and those on the third and fourth none.
-cxl-

In fact, none of the extant discursive versions contains anything like a full list of breakers and the quotations which go with them as they appear in the rhetorical versions. It would require a very persistent scribe to go through any of the extant discursive versions sorting out lists of breakers and he would, in addition, have had to supply the vast majority of the supporting quotations. It is, therefore, in many ways, easier to imagine that the rhetorical versions, with their trinities of breakers, were gradually expanded and that, in the process, certain categories of breakers and many of the quotations were lost as other sections of the discussion received more emphasis. Certainly Kellogg and Talbert's argument that the lack of full Biblical quotations in DRII (and in the related rhetorical commentaries) implies that such versions must have been drawn from one of the discursive versions rather than vice versa is less than convincing given that one rhetorical version (RVII) does contain very full biblical quotations. The RVII version does appear, in fact, to be quite a convincing example of the type of source material from which discursive commentaries could have developed, and it is worth quoting the first section of its commentary on the fifth commandment as an illustration of this:

Who brekip pe fifbe commaundement? Enuyous men, wrapfull men and couetouse men. Why enuyous men? For pei haten or bacbiten her breperen. For Johun seip in his first pistell, iij capitulo, 'Eche man bat hatep his brother is a manqueller.'
'Ommis qui odit fratrem suum homicida est.' Et in iiij capitulo, 'He pat seip he louep Godd and hatip his broper is a lier.' 'Si quis dixerit quam deum diligo (sic) et fratrem suum odit, mendax est. Whi wrapfull men? For bei smyten or
-cxli-
sleen her briperen and Crist seide to Petir in $\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{~ X x v j}$
capitulo, 'He pat takep veniaunce bi swerd bi swerd schall be perissche.' 'Omnes enim qui acceperunt gladium
gladio...' Iterum, Apoc xiij capitulo, 'Qui in gladio
occiderit oportet eum gladio occidi; hic est paciencia et fides sanctorum.' Iterum ge.ix, 'Quicunque effunderit sanguinem' etc.

$$
\left(\mathrm{Ro}_{1} \mathrm{f} .83^{\mathrm{v}}\right)
$$

It seems likely that there may originally have been rhetorical versions in Latin, and that the RVII version represents an intermediate state when the translation into English had been completed but the Latin versions of the Biblical quotations had not yet been discarded (possibly as a matter of principle: as the Royster commentary says: 'neuer man ne woman lete departe pe engleliche from pe latyn, for diuers causes pat been good \& lawful to my felynge'). ${ }^{1}$

## Discursive Version I (DI)

The DI version may be considered to be exemplified by the text which is to be found in the Simeon manuscript ( S ) as printed in the Book of Vices and Virtues. Certain short sections of this commentary echo material found in Wyclif, Sermones i, ${ }^{2}$ but the passages concerned

1. Royster, ed., p.9.
2. See e.g. $B V V$ p.318/15-18, Sermones i.90/23-25; $B V V$ p.325/29-33, Sermones i.118/19-22.
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are in no way heretical and it seems safe to agree with Kellogg and Talbert that the subject matter of this version is orthodox. ${ }^{1}$ The vexed question of images receives no attention and the only criticism of members of the clergy is a section on lecherous priests ( $B V V \mathrm{p} .327 / 1 \mathrm{ff}$.). (The latter is, however, missing from some versions of DI viz. $\mathrm{Rw}_{3}, \mathrm{Rw}_{4}$ and So, possibly as the result of expurgation). The commentary has a prologue (incipit 'Alle maner of men. schulden holde Godes biddynges' explicit 'And so pise preo. and seuene: maken ten Comaundemens' (BVV p.317/8 and 33-4)) which refers to Christ's instruction to keep the commandments (Matthew 19:17), tells us that we should obey God because he is our lord and also for love, and establishes the ten-fold and two-fold division. The epilogue recaps this two-fold division and promises ('I. dar wel seye' ( $B V V$ p.333/16)) that those who keep the commandments will go to heaven. Each section of the commentary normally begins with a short Latin quotation of the commandment in question, followed by a somewhat fuller version in English. The subsequent discussion often takes the form of the exegesis of Latin biblical quotations. Apart from this, the discussion of each commandment follows no set pattern, although there is a general tendency to divide topics into threes: three types of men who break the first commandment, three conditions for swearing, three ways of
-cxliii-
spending the sabbath etc.
The popularity of this commentary is clear from the number of extant copies and from its use in various sermon collections, notably in those contained in MSS Trinity College Dublin 241, St. John's College Cambridge G. 22 and Cambridge University Library Additional 5338. Material drawn from the DI commentary on the first commandment also appear in the Ross sermons and in the sermons found in MS Shrewsbury School III. The decalogue material which appears in the sermon collections is discussed by Spencer, ${ }^{1}$ who suggests that the decalogue treatise used is that found in B. However, as the only B material to appear in these collections is that shared with DI, and as the sermon discussion of the first commandment corresponds much more closely to DI than to B , it is clear that the treatise being used is in fact DI. ${ }^{2}$

The majority of the DI commentaries are very closely connected and offer, as Kellogg and Talbert have pointed out, a quite consistent text. ${ }^{3}$ A number do, however, display certain noticeable variations. Thus, for example, $\mathrm{Ha}_{2}$ and Ve differ from the usual DI version in their prologues, which describe life as a pilgrimage leading either to heaven or hell, with the commandments as a necessary guide. Si, which also has a different

1. Spencer (1993), pp.225-6, $455 \mathrm{nn} .112-14,475 \mathrm{n} .39,489 \mathrm{n} .122$.
2. For the lack of first commandment correspondence between the sermon material and B see Spencer pp.310-11.
3. Kellogg and Talbert p. 366 .
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prologue, divides the commentary into two sermons based on the twofold division, and shares with $\mathrm{Ca}_{2}, \mathrm{Lm}_{3}$ and Ve additional material, not in the DI norm, on the obligations of the preacher to teach and of his congregation to listen. Lb's prologue, while corresponding in subject matter and clearly closely related to that of the DI norm, nevertheless differs somewhat in wording, ${ }^{1}$ and Lb has, in addition, several independent passages, e.g. a diatribe against lechery, and a passage warning against giving alms to various unworthy recipients, including pardoners and 'neyce newe fundacions'. Lb's commentary on the ninth commandment, which deals with the ill-effects of covetousness in various walks of life, is completely independent of the DI norm, while his tenth commandment commentary combines material from the DI discussions of both the ninth and tenth commandments.

As we have seen, the DI version shows some evidence of the threefold division which is found in the rhetorical versions. Thus the DI commentary deals with three types of people who break the first commandment (those who follow the flesh, the world and the fiend, cf. $B V V$ p. 318 and compare with the RI passage quoted above); three types of manslaughter (by hand, by tongue and by heart); three types of theft (by robbery/stealing, by false use of the law, and by these two together); and three types of bearing false witness (in word, in deed and in these two together). Further commandments give a more positive slant to the three types. Thus, for example, the three ways of spending the Sabbath listed in the DI discussion of the third commandment (thinking of God,

1. For the initial words of the Lb prologue, see the discussion by Pickering, 'Brotherton Collection MS 501', p. 158.
praying to God, and doing works of mercy ( $B V V \mathrm{pp} .322-3$ )) bear an obvious relationship to the RI definition of the three types of breakers as 'men pat penken not on God hertely. ne $\mathrm{p}[\mathrm{r}]$ eyde Him not deuoutly. and don not pe werkys of mercy iustly.' (Bühler p.690)). One of the rhetorical versions, RVb , has a prologue (incipit 'All men scholyn kepe the commaundementes' explicit 'vppon payne of euerlastyng dampnacioun') which is close in argument and to some extent in wording to the DI prologue, including, as well as the initial section quoting Christ, a section on the handing over to Moses of the two tablets of stone (cf.BVVp.317/27ff.).

However, not all the three-fold divisions found in DI correspond closely to the definitions of breakers as they appear in the extant rhetorical versions, and it is also true that the DI commentaries on certain commandments (e.g. the ninth and tenth) do not display the three-fold definition, while the definitions which do exist could sometimes have been obtained from other sources (in the case of DI's commentary on the first commandment, for instance, from Wyclif). The most that can be said, therefore, is that the rhetorical versions provide a possible source for the discursive versions in general (both Latin and English) but that lack of more definite textual evidence, such as a close verbal correspondence, makes it impossible to establish any definite links between any of the extant rhetorical and discursive versions.

Both our commandments commentaries, i.e. both the B and the HTY versions, show clear evidence of a relationship with the usual DI version and with the different but related version to be found in Lb. Both share passages of word-for-word correspondence with the usual DI prologue
(not found in Lb ) and both also share certain passages of Lb's ninth commandment discussion (not found in the DI norm). While the HTY version's sections of word for word correspondence with DI are confined to these passages, however, word-for-word correspondence between B and DI persists throughout the commentary, and such correspondences are recorded in the notes. The fact that the B version's relationship with DI is so much more extensive might perhaps appear to suggest that the HTY compiler might have obtained his DI material from B, omitting certain passages. If this were the case, however, we would expect a far greater degree of overlap between the HTY and DI versions than does, in fact, exist in the body of the commentary. It would be unlikely that the HTY compiler would so consistently omit material which appears in both B and DI, while consistently retaining B's independent material; the following examples of transition between the two are typical (material which shows word-for-word correspondence with HTY is underlined; material which shows word for word correspondence with DI is in italics):

[^20]-cxlvii-

> vertu of pis name, ne neuere schal be
> (B54/10-55/10 (unemended), cf.BVV p. $321 / 2 \mathrm{ff}$ )
b) Pledynge and scomynge ys harde to do wel; and no man dob bis leffullyche bot yf he kepe charite to him bat he pledeb wib and him pat he scomeb, as yf he trowe to purge him of his olde synne by bis. It is lefful to plede wib him or scorne him syb at be barre of Crist pledyde hys seynt3, and Crist himself scorneb, as be Salme seyb. Bot lyenge openlyche azenseyb trowbe and herfore Crist himself may noust lye, for he loueb it noust bot hateb. Bot for to knowe pis commamdement pe betere зe schulle vnderstonde pat a man may bere false wytnesse azens his neyzebore in pre maneres, pat is to seye in worde, in dede, and in pes bope togedere. In worde a man or womman berep fals wytnesse whanne he makep lesynges of him to byreue him of his goede name or fame, as some yhered for mede or for 3eftes or elles for hate or enuye berep fals wytnesse azenst here neyzebores
(B140/2-141/8, cf. $B V V$ p.329/38-330/6)
Further passages of joint B/DI material which do not appear in HTY include the following: B26/4ff. (cf. $B V V$ p.319/5ff.), B76/5ff. (cf. $B V V$ p.322/6ff.), B88/9ff. (cf. $B V V$ p.324/33ff.).

It thus seems likely that any link between HTY and the DI version predated $B$, and that the $B$ compiler then went on to make his own independent use of DI, something which may have been suggested to him by the similarities of the DI and HTY prologues. It also seems clear that HTY (or possibly an earlier version of this commentary) may be considered to be B's primary source (he begins the discussion of each commandment with the use of HTY material), and that his DI material
may be considered an addition. It thus does not appear that B took an orthodox commentary and added unorthodox material, but rather that he took an unorthodox commentary and added orthodox material. Material drawn neither from DI nor from the HTY version is used by B during his discussion of the first commandment, notably the section on images discussed above and various passages of material from the Fathers. It is possible that the $\mathbf{B}$ compiler originally had a more ambitious project in mind, involving the use of material from a number of sources, but in fact, from the beginning of the commentary on the second table, his material is drawn almost entirely from DI and HTY.

The HTY relationship to DI is, as we have seen, more restricted. The HTY version includes the whole of the material to be found in the prologue of the DI norm, corresponding passages being as follows (these passages are also found in $B$ ):
i) The initial section explaining why the commandments should be kept incipit 'Alle maner of men' explicit 'kepe his word, bat is his biddyng' (T1/2-2/6 cf. BVVp.317/8-24).
ii) The section on the two-fold division incipit 'Bes comaundementis, for pei shulden be freishlier in mynde' explicit' and pes pre and seuene maken ten comaundmentis (T7/4-11/4, cf. BVVp.317/24-35).

Although it is true that the initial section of the 'Alle maner of men' commentary appears in a number of versions, it is, nevertheless, the case that the HTY prologue is more closely related to the DI prologue than is the prologue of any other version (with the exception of B). These two
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versions share subject matter which does not appear in the prologue of any other version. Only HTY and DI (and B) contain the section stating that the Jews keep these commandements. Only they contain the section beginning 'A lord sif a kyng beede a ping to ben kept of alle his lyge men' (BVVp.317/16ff; T1/10ff.). There is thus no room for doubt about the relationship between the DI and HTY prologues.

The question of a possible relationship within the body of the commentary is, however, more problematic. Kellogg and Talbert have pointed out certain correspondences between the DI and Bodley 789 (DII) treatments of the first, second and third commandments, and have suggested, on the basis of this evidence, that Arnold may well have been correct in his belief that the DII version was derived from DI. ${ }^{1}$ Since the passages cited from DII also occur in the HTY version (and, as I shall argue later, appear to be drawn from it) it will be appropriate to deal with them here. It is worth reproducing the passages cited by Kellogg and Talbert, with quotations from T replacing those from DII, and with the addition of a section drawn from the fourth commandment.

## S: <br> T:

First Commandment

And so what ping enimon louep most: $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{t}}$ ping he makep his god. in as muche as in him is. beo
what kyn ping bat a man louep moost he makip his god. And so, sip al synne stondib in loue, euery
-cl-
hit wyf. or child. gold. or seluer. or eny catel

Of pis hit foleweb. $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{t}}$ bre manere of folk suwen pe sturynge of oure preo enemys: whuche ben pe flesch. pe world . and pe feond

As for pe furste. Lecherous. and gloterous men pei loue more heore wombes per god. Of hem spekep seint poul Ad philipenses .iij. and seip pus. Multi ambulant.... $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{t}}$ is.

Monye gon. of pe wauche. ofte I. haue I.seid to $30 u$ : and nou I. seye wepynge ...of whom heore wombe is heore god ...So pise men $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{t}}$ louen heore flesch. and Lecherie. or gloterie. pei maken heore wombe heore god....

PE secounde Maner of men. $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{t}}$ breken pis comaundement. and also maken hem false goddes: beon Couetouse men... and pei maken such worldly goodes synfully heore false goddes. For as seint poul seib. Ad ephesios. v. Avarus quod est ydolonum seruitus. $\mathrm{p}^{\mathbf{t}}$ is. An Auerous mon. or a couetous: is praldam of maumetes. For such a couetous mon.... dop maumetrie... PE pridde maner of men $\mathrm{p}^{t}$ breken pis comaundement. pat folewen pe fend: beon po pat setten heore hertes most on worldly worschipes. and veyn glorie.
heed synne drawep wip him brekyng of pis heest.
And sib per ben pre synnes, as Seynt Ion seib, bat wlappen alle oper synnes..... on pre wise may man breke pis commaundment. pes pre synnes stonden in pes pre loues: loue of fleish, and loue of yzen, and pride of pis lijf.
And so glotouns and lecchours breken pis heest

And herfor seip Poul pat bes greete glotouns
maken her here bely her god, for loue pat pei louen it and, bi pe same skile, pes foule lecchours maken her god pe taile eende of an hoore.... ......

And on pis wise pe coueitous man pat synnep in coueitise of worldly goodis makip his mawmet pes worldli goodis. And herfore seip Poule pat auarice of siche ping is senuyse of mawmetis, as to false goddis.

And myche more pe proud man makib pe fend his god, sip pe fend is kyng of alle proude children
(T21/2-26/2)
and heisnesse of hemself.
( $B V V \mathrm{p} .318$ 1.8-p. 3191.7 )

## Second Commandment

And berfore crist him self in pe gospel of seint matheu capitulo $v$ : biddep pus.

Nolite iurare omnino ... Pat is. swere se not on alle manere ... But soure word beo. зe зe. nay. nay. And $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{t}}$. pat is more ouur pis: hit is of euel. Pise ben cristes wordes in the gospel... And sif 3e schullen swere: rule sow aftur be lawe of god. in 3or swerynge. For god him self techep be. $\mathbf{p}^{\mathrm{t}}$ whon $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{u}}$ swerest: pu schalt kepe preo condiciuns. Iurabis inquid in ueritate. in iudicio. \& Iusticia. Ieremye. iiij capitulo. pat is. pou schalt swere in treupe. in dom. and in rihtwysnesse.
( $B V V \mathrm{p} .320 / 2-27$ )

## Third Commandment

$\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{u}}$ schalt penken hou god made pe world of noust on a sunday. And hou he sette wit. and wisdam on a sunday in to eorpe. And $\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{t}}$ he a ros fro dep to lyf. on a sunday. And $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{t}}$ schulde fere $30 u$ alle: and perse $30 r$ hertes. And vppon a sunday as clerkes seyn: schal beo domes day.
( $B V V \mathrm{p} .322 / 34-\mathrm{p} .323 / 1$ )

## Fourth Commandment

But se schullen vnderstonde.
$\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{t}}$ pe worschupe of fader and

Crist techip in pe Gospel to haue oure word pus:'3he, she. Nay, nay', wibouten ony oth......

For as God techip bi Ieremie pe prophet, wip pre condiciouns is leueful men to swere: first pat pei ben war pat pei sweren treupe, and pe cause of her oop be to shewe rist and, sip, pat in iugement be it nede to swere. (T52/6-54/2)
for on pe Sumeday God made pe world; and also on pe Sumeday he roos fro dep to lijf; and on pe Sumeday he sende pe Hooli Goost; and, as clerkis seien, on pe Sumeday shal be his last iugement and rest in pe bliss of heuene.
(T81/13-82/2)

And so worship in God
moder. stondep not al onliche in bodili reuerence. as in knelinge or in doinge doun of hodes. pous pis beo good:

But hit stondeb in dede. as in caas. pi fader. and pi moder ben comen to neode. or to mischeef bi age. or bi auenture. $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{u}}$ art bounde to helpen hem bi pi seruise. bope wip pi bodi and eke to socoure hem $w^{t}$ bi catel. And 3if pei beon in synne. or han neode of gostly techyng or cumfort: $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{u}}$ art holden sif $\mathbf{p}^{\mathbf{u}}$ canst to techen hem. and to cumforten hem.
( $B V V \mathrm{p} .324 / 32-\mathrm{p} .325 / 2$ )
Discounting biblical quotation, there is very little word-for-word correspondence here and it may well be that the HTY compiler made use of the DI prologue in order to disguise his unorthodox material with an orthodox opening and that the relationship did not extend beyond this. On the other hand, there are certainly verbal echoes of DI in the HTY version, particularly in the commentaries on the third and fourth commandments, and, since it is clear that the HTY compiler did take orthodox material and rework it to give it a more unorthodox slant, the possibility that this orthodox material came from DI, while unproven, cannot be altogether discounted.
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It is, in any case, interesting to compare the different uses to which the DI and HTY authors put very similar material. As we have seen, the DI and HTY treatment of the three breakers of the first commandment is in many respects very similar. Both the passages quoted above are orthodox; certainly neither is extreme in any way. The HTY version, however, then proceeds to expand this basic outline with a section of determinedly anti-clerical material. Each type of breaker is illustrated by an erring priest: the first by priests who preach more for worldly fame than for worship of God; the second by priests who preach more for worldly gain than for glory of God; and the third by priests who preach more to please their lusts than to please God ( T p.30). Likewise, in the discussion of the fourth commandment, both HTY and DI define the second type of father as parish priest $\left(\operatorname{Ro}_{2} \mathrm{f} .13 \mathrm{r} / 14-15 ; \mathrm{T} 98 / 6\right),{ }^{1}$ a definition which conforms to that of the rhetorical versions. However, in the HTY version, the emphasis, far from being on the parishoner's duty to learn from his parish priest (this type of breaker, according to RI
-cliv-
'wollen take no goostly techinge', Bühler p.690)', is now, instead, on the duty of lords to point out the errors of their 'eldris in soule' (T100/1-2).

A similar process can be seen in the HTY discussion of the fifth commandment, part of which reads as follows:

But wite wel pis maundemert is sib to many symes. For Seynt Jon seip pat eche bat hatip his broper is a mansleer, she, ofte tymes more to blame pan he pat sleep his body, for be synne is more. And bi pis skile a bacbiter is a mansleer (T105/2-6)

This passage deals with two types of manslaughter, by heart and by tongue, but it does not deal with the third type (usually the first to be discussed), i.e. manslaughter by hand (see, for example $B V V$ p.326/1718 where this is defined as smiting a man so that death follows by violence). The HTY passage which precedes this passage does, however, deal with one particular type of such manslaughter: capital punishment. Thus, once again, the HTY commentator adapts orthodox material to suit his own agenda.

The B/HTY fifth commandment commentary provides clear evidence of the fact that B's use of DI material was independent of and in addition to the use made by HTY of similar orthodox material. B shares the majority of the HTY material outlined above, including the orthodox section, with the result that, when he later turns to his DI source,

[^21]he repeats both the last two definitions of manslaughter and the quotation from John (B112/4ff., the wording of the two passages is, however, different).

It does not seem likely that any of the extant DI witnesses was the immediate source of the DI material found in either B or HTY. ${ }^{1}$ However, the relationship between $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{HTY}$ and Lb is worth considering more closely. As we have seen, both the B and the HTY versions share material with Lb which does not appear in any of the other DI versions. Lb differs from the DI norm in that it includes a certain amount of somewhat less orthodox material, at least one section of which, the criticism of new foundations, appears to suggests Lollard affiliations. Lb's ninth commandment discussion is made up of material found in $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{HTY}$ (but not in the DI norm) together with some independent material. Lb does not, however, contain the prologue material which B/HTY shares with the DI norm and it is therefore clear that it could not be the source of HTY's DI prologue material. The Lb commentary on the ninth commandment is composed of the following (B/HTY

[^22]references are to T but, unless otherwise stated, passages also appear in B):

1) A section shared with B/HTY dealing with covetousness as the 'grounde of euyl hauyng' (Lb f.80'/8-14, cf.T144/1-9).
2) An independent section, not found in B/HTY on the effects of covetousness in various walks of life (Lb f.80//14-36).
3) A final section, shared with B/HTY, explaining that it is permissible to covet 'vppon good manyr', but complaining about great men who covet lesser men's goods and dealing with the question of the right to charge rents and to impose 'mercymentys' (Lb f.80「/36-f.80%/6, cf. T148/2149/7).

It is difficult to decide whether the HTY version drew on an earlier version of Lb for this shared ninth commandment material or vice versa. It is certainly perfectly possible that an earlier version of Lb did share the prologue material of the DI norm and this earlier version could then have been the source for HTY's DI material. On the other hand, the somewhat extreme tone evident in this shared material is found only intermittently in Lb but is characteristic of the HTY version. Moreover, as we have already seen, the HTY version's treatment of the death penalty in the discussion of the fifth commandment shows almost exactly the same attitude towards punishment as is shown in the shared Lb/B/HTY ninth commandment material (viz. that it should be inflicted in a spirit of charity towards the recipient) and the passage therefore seems more likely to have developed as an integral part of the HTY commentary. The relevant Lb section is quoted below:
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Mercymentys out of resoun is a preuy spoyling, for noman shulde mercye othyr but by wey of charite, to amende in manyr the man pat is mercyed. And this may be weel doon in many caas, but sif it be do for coueytyse of the mercyment and not for charyte, than it is moche azens this comaundement.

$$
\text { (Lb f. } 80^{\vee} / 2-6 ; \mathrm{cf.} \text { T149/5-8) }
$$

At any rate, whether HTY drew on an earlier version of Lb or vice versa, it seems clear that the Lb ninth commandment material must be closer to the original than that of either B or HTY. The Lb discussion of the ninth commandment contains the following passage:

In this onskylfull coueytyse stondith moche pepyll, as lordys that for coueytyse of rentys and lordshepis sellen ther mens lyuys and sendyn many soulys to helle to make her place redy. For suche coueytise Popis werryn, prystis pletyn at Rome, clerkys som go to scole. For as a lewde man trespasith azens this comaundement to coueyte wyth wronge anoper man's hous, so thes somoners coueytym wyth wronge the hous of God and all the parysh, and pletyn longe therfor by many fals tytlys. I dare not sey that thes religious pat coueytym so many cherchis to shere the sheep and lede awey the wolle ben in this hest of blameles (sic). Idiotys therfor takym the ordyr of prysthod, by fals suggestyon to go to scole, and aftyr to leue in ydylnes and lewdenes all her lyf tyme. Laborers vppon lond lepyn fro her werk to the crafte of pelours; God woot, not for loue of kyngis ryst, but for coueytyse of ther good, kyllyn her neybours. What makyth all this pletyng at Londone and othyr placis, but for the pepyll for coueytyse wolde wrongefully dysheryte his neyzbour of londe or godis, or ellys the defendaurt wolde wrongfully holde his neyzbours londe or gode for coueytise. And herto arun thes trauenterys of lawe redy on bothe sydys, God woot, not
-clviii-
for loue of ryghtwysnes, but only for coueytyse: they rek not who hath ryght, who haue wronge. Sysowris that somtyme were chosyn of the wysest and trewest men in contreis for to make ryghte knowyn fro wronge, now for coueytyse beth corrupte for mede of the toon party and somtyme of bothe. And so onnethe from the heyst state to the lowest shal a man fynde o man that ne is smytyd by coueytyse in wyll azens this comaundement. But 3it is no drede that ne yt is lefull to coueyte mens godis vppon good manyr.
(Lb f.80r/14-37)
With the exception of the final sentence, neither the B nor the HTY version contains this material. The HTY version does, however, contain material which is apparently connected, in content if not in wording, with the Lb material. Two passages drawn from HTY will illustrate the point:
i) And no man may excuse men of religioun pat ne pei breken pis nynbe maundement: as freris bi her beggyng coueiten amys pe goodis of her nei3boris, as her dede shewep, pe chirche pat is dowed coueitip amys pe rentis and pe housis of seculer men. Sip God hap forbode hem to be siche lordis, as bope pe Olde Lawe and pe Newe beren witnesse, and sib pis is so opun azens Hooli Writt and so stefly defendid, it is eresie. And so comounly prelatis ben eretikis, and more deply pan opere men ben. And sip men pat consenten to hem ben eke eretikis, pe more hedis of be Chirche ben smyttid wip eresie and, bi pe lawe of eresie, oper men bope, sip goostly dedis of siche prelatis blemyshen her doers and hem pat approueb hem And sip it is a3ens pe maundemeart of God pus for to coueite pe hous of pi neisbore, myche more it is azens Goddis wille to coueite pus pe hous of pi God. For chirche is not oonly hous to pi God, but it is comoun hous to many of pi neisboris.
(T146/1-17)
of lesse, bat is doon bi pe Pope is so myche pe worse.
For he may not fordo resoun, ne maundement of God, ne he may not grounde bi resoun siche propring of chirches. Siche bullis ben eresies sip pei ben fals techyng, contratie to Goddis lawe and stifly defendid, and, bi pis same skile, eche bulle of a fals prest. Pis sentence seip Grosthed, and drawep it out of Greke. Lord, wheper be witt of God forbedde siche coueitise of pore housis of men and not worse coueitise of his owne hous pat shulde be Hooli Chirche!
(T147/6-16)
These two passages have an obvious connection with that section of the Lb passage quoted above which deals with clerical covetousness. In the Lb version, however, this discussion is part of a balanced account of covetousness as it appears in all sections of society. The various representatives of the clergy receive due consideration, but so do lords, labourers and lawyers, and the passage is a logical development of the assertion that covetousness is the root of all evils (T144/8-9, Lb f.80\%/1314). The HTY discussion, on the other hand, is unbalanced, dealing only with the clergy, and it reads as if it were a digression. It is noticeable, moreover, that Lb's reference to the covetousness of lords for rents (passage quoted above 1.2) has been lost in the HTY version, becoming, instead, a reference to the covetousness of the endowed church (passage (i) above, ll.4-5). The reference to lords is, however, picked up both by Lb and by HTY in the final shared passage ('Soop it is pat lordis shal haue rentis of her tenauntis' etc. T149/1-2, cf. Lb f.80/42-3). It therefore
seems clear that Lb has the earlier version and that the HTY version is a later development, one in which the topic of clerical covetousness has been selected for expansion at the expense of any discussion of covetousness in the other estates. Thus, whatever the relationship between the two versions, this development illustrates the tendency of the HTY commentator to rewrite material in a more extreme form and, in particular, to emphasise the short-comings of the clergy.

The B version contains no material corresponding to the $\mathrm{Lb} / \mathrm{HTY}$ passages on clerical covetousness, but has, instead, a passage drawn from the DI norm (incipit 'For as se seep coueytyse makep debates' explicit 'And berfore coueyte зe no mannes goedes wip wrong' (cf. $B V V$ p.332)), followed by a short independent section quoting St. Gregory (B144/9-145/13). As a result, the Lb reference to the covetousness of lords for rents has been lost in B although B , like the other versions, picks up this reference in the final shared passage (B149/1). It seems possible that the witness used by B postdated the alteration of the material as it appears in Lb to the more extreme version found in HTY and that B turned to his DI witness because of a distaste for this extreme section, rejoining the HTY version at the next chapter mark (T148/1). It is worth noting that the first sentence of the independent HTY material contains a reference to begging friars and that, as we have already seen, the B version, while it shares with the HTY version much general criticism of the clergy, has no criticism whatsoever of the mendicant orders.

## Discursive Version II (DII)

The B/HTY version, as has been noted above, has definite Lollard overtones and it is clearly closely related to type DII, the version contained in Bodley $789\left(\mathrm{Bo}_{2}\right)$ which has been edited by Arnold. DII has a brief prologue, corresponding to the first section of the B/HTY/DI prologue incipit 'Alle manere of men' explicit 'kep myn comaundementis'. The DII epilogue shows initial overlap with the HTY epilogue but consists mainly of an abridged translation of Deuteronomy 28. DII's relationship appears to be with HTY rather than B. Passages of DII material which appear in HTY but not in B are as follows:
i) A section on priests who break the first commandment by preaching for fame, for worldly gain and to feed their lusts (T30/19, Arnold iii.83)
ii) A section reminding the reader how God made the world, rose from death, sent the Holy Ghost, and will give his last judgement on a Sunday (T81/13-82/2, Arnold iii.85). This topic is also discussed in B, but B shows closer correspondence with DI than with the DII/HTY version (B77/17-22, BVVp.322/34-p.323/5). iii) A passage on prelates who sell men's $\sin$ for an annual rent (T108/1-10, Arnold iii.87).
iv) A passage on spiritual lechery (T114/7-13, Arnold iii.87).
v) A section stating that the ten commandments are the surest
law of all and that this law should be held and other laws despised (T154/10-155/10, Arnold iii.90).

DII appears, in fact, to be a shorter version of HTY. As far as their exact relationship is concerned, there are clearly two possibilities: first that the DII version is an abridgement of the HTY version, and, second, that the HTY version is an expansion of the DII version. The following evidence suggests the former: i) As part of its discussion of the first commandment, the HTY group has a passage stating that priests who preach more for their reputation than for worship of God and for profit of his Church make themselves a false likeness in heaven; that he who preaches more for worldly gain than for worship of God makes himself a false likeness in earth; and that he who preaches more to feed his lusts than to please God makes himself a false likeness in water. The corresponding DII passage reads as follows:

## And so preestis

pat prechen moore to have a loos, opir for wynnynge of worldli goodis, opir lustis of hire beli, makyn fals leeknesse in hevene and erbe and water.
(Arnold iii.83/25-8; my italics)
The use of the word 'moore' here arouses expectations of some sort of comparison which are not, in fact, fulfilled. They are, however, fulfilled in the corresponding HTY passage and it therefore seems likely that the DII version is an abridgement, and that the comparative elements have been lost in the process.
ii) As part of its discussion of the third commandment, DII
contains the following passage:
for pe moost
hise service pat man can serve God perinne, schulde he schape him to do on pe holidai. But God wole pat freedom of his lawe be kept, and specialli as Poul techip. But be war pat pou kepe piise four feestis principalli, Christemasse and Estre, Ascension and Whitsountide, and pe Soneday pours pe seer.
(Arnold iii.85 com.III.15-20; my italics; cf. T76/4-5, T81/1-2)
The sense of this passage, and especially of the section in italics, is obscure. Consideration of the corresponding passage in HTY (T73-5, 80-81), however, offers clarification. The HTY discussion of the third commandment deals with two topics not mentioned by DII: the possibility of certain types of work being permissible on the Sunday (supported by the example of Christ's miracles on the sabbath), and the question of the large number of holy days and the number which should be observed. The use of Paul as an authority makes sense in either or both these contexts. The reference is to Galatians 4:8-10, where Paul equates the observation of 'days, and months, and seasons, and years' with a return to the bondage of paganism (T80/13-15).
iii) As Ives points out, ${ }^{1}$ the two-fold division of the commandments into those which teach us to love God and those which teach us to love our neighbour, a constant theme of the HTY version, is not found in DII. There is clear evidence, however, that DII's original, or an ancestor of his original, did contain
such a division. The first few lines of the commentary on the fourth commandment in DII reads as follows:

Pe fourpe comaundement is pis. Pou schalt worschipe pi fadir and pi moder, pat pou be longe lyved upon erpe, and pi neizbore as pi self. And whoevere lovep his neizebore, lovep his God, and dwellip in God and God in him. And so pes twei brannchis of charite mowe not be departid, as Seynt Joon seip in his firste pistil. (Annold iii.86 com.IV.1-6; cf. T83-4).

Something has clearly gone wrong here. The fourth commandment does not instruct us to love both our parents and our neighbour. In fact, what we are clearly seeing are traces of the two-fold division as it is found in HTY. The corresponding passage in HTY reads:

The secound table of opere manndemertis of God conteynep seuene maundementis and techip be to loue pi neizbore as pisilf; and pat pou shalt kume by pe pre manndementis of first table, for what man euer kepeb pes pre maundement is he lonep himsilf and also his neizbore. And pus pes ten comanodement is ben knytid togidre, pat whoeuer louep his neisbore he lonep his God etc.
(T83/9-84/5)
iv) As part of the discussion of the fifth commandment, DII contains the following passage:

But witep wel, bis maundement is sibbe to many symes. For Seynt Joon seip, he pat hatip his bropir is a mansleer, she ofte tymes moore to blame pan he pat sleep his bodi, for be syme is moore. And bi pis skile a bac-bitere is a man-sleer. But, as clerkis seyen, upon sixe maneris is pis consent doon, and men schulden wel knowe it
followed by a list of the types of consent.
The change of subject matter in the final sentence here is abrupt, while the use of 'pis' suggests that something has been omitted (there has been no consent mentioned in DII to which 'bis' could refer). And, in fact, if we look at the HTY version, we find that it does contain a passage, not found in DII, which ends with the following sentence:

For whoeuer consentip to siche mansleyng symeb a3ens pis maundement and is a mansleer. But, as clerkis seien....
(T105/8-10)
v) As part of the treatment of the eighth commandment, the HTY version asks whether it is lawful to lie 'in mesure for a bette eende.' 'and it is craft,' the passage continues, 'to knowe pe vertu of liyng, for many men lyen to myche and many men to litel, and he pat holdip him in a mene hap pe vertu of liyng' (T136/7-137/1). The DII version does not contain this passage, but it does share the HTY group's response viz. that wise men say that lying is unlawful because it comes from the devil, and if it were lawful it would worship Christ who is the first truth, but, in fact, nothing goes against Christ more than lying (Arnold iii. 89 com.VIII.16ff., passage beginning 'But her seyn wise men.' cf.T137/1-2). Although DII's version is possible, the conjunction 'But', which does not lead on particularly naturally from what has gone before, suggests an omission.

It seems likely, then, that the DII scribe was condensing his source. There is, however, a certain amount of material in

DII which does not appear in HTY viz. a passage on the various types of theft (Arnold iii.88, commandment VII), a certain amount of biblical supporting material within the body of the commentary drawn from Acts 13, Ecclesiasticus 23 and Zacharius (Arnold iii. 83,84 and 89) and the section of the epilogue drawn from Deuteronomy 28. Of these, perhaps the most interesting is the seventh commandment commentary material on theft. This passage instructs the reader not to desire his neighbour's goods 'unskilfulli .... pryue ne apeert' and lists the ways in which the commandment can be broken (Arnold iii.88). A similar passage is found in B, in a section drawn from his DI source, which reads as follows: 'And pis takynge of godes may be do on meny maneres. On ys in takynge by neyзebores goedes fro him a3enst his wylle, oper by pryuey stelynge, by ny3te or by daye, by londe or by water, oper by open robbynge' (B125/1-4).

It does not, however, seem likely that the DI passage was actually drawn from B. It is clear from DII's relationship with HTY that, where he was not actually making an omission, the DII scribe normally followed his source extremely closely. The B and DII passages on theft, however, do not show this type of close correspondence, indeed the overlap is minimal. This, then, leaves us with the problem of accounting for this particular passage of DII material. There seem to be two possible explanations. The first is that the DII abridger may perhaps have disliked the material which appears at this point in the HTY version (viz. the section telling us that a man may, in time of need, take his neighbour's goods, even
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if the neighbour is unwilling) and have turned to another version (eg. something similar to DI) to find alternative material. This is perfectly possible and I will in fact later suggest the the DII scribe may well have intended to take a similar line of action with his ninth commandment commentary, The other possibility is that the material found in DII represents an earlier version of HTY i.e. is left over from a stage when the HTY version retained more traces of the original orthodox commentary (whether this was DI or not).

The fact that the DII version is an abridgement of HTY does not necessarily mean that his exemplar contained all the material which is now to be found in HTY. In a number of instances, for example, the point at which the DII commentary either joins or leaves the HTY commentary coincides with the beginning or end of a chapter. Although it is, of course, possible that the chapter boundary provided a natural starting or breaking off point for the DII scribe, it appears equally possible that a change of chapter in the HTY group may have marked the boundary between sources and might therefore indicate the point at which additional material, added after the split with DII, either began or ended. There are also certain places where the boundaries between the material which HTY shares with DII and that which it shares with B coincide, and this may well suggest that the version of HTY used by B and the DII scribe had in common the lack of certain later additions which appear in the extant HTY version. Places where this approach might lead us to suspect that the extant HTY commentary contains such additions are as follows:
i) The beginning of chapter eight in the HTY version (T p.57) coincides with the return to material shared with DII (i.e. the section on breaking the second commandment by actions rather than words cf. Arnold iii.85/7) after a B/HTY digression on the excuses made by 'greete swerers' and on the reputation for falsehood acquired by such people (T54/5ff.). It seems possible that the independent $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{HTY}$ material was a later addition, made after the break with the DII version.
ii) Neither B nor DII contains any of the material found in Chapter 3 of the HTY discussion of the commandments of the second table viz. the section on worshipping your spiritual fathers ( T p.98ff.). It is possible that this section was omitted because it was considered too extreme (it explicitly argues, for instance, against the condemnation as heretics of those opposed to the granting of lordships to bishops (T100/8-9), but it is also possible that this whole chapter was a later HTY addition.
iii) As part of its discussion of the sixth commandment, the HTY version contains a passage on virginity and the consequences of $\sin$ (T121ff.). This section appears in neither B nor DII (both break off immediately before it) and, since there seems to be no particular reason for its omission, it seems likely that it is a later addition.
iv) Both B and DII break away from the HTY version at the same point in the discussion of the seventh commandment viz. after the comment that 'Crist, pat may not lye, seip pes ben peues, sip pei taken Cristis goodis wibouten his leeue' (T127/8-
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128/1; cf. Arnold iii.89/2-3). The HTY version follows this with a further comment on clerics who obtain their positions dishonourably and then by a section on whether people should be hanged for theft or burnt for heresy. It is possible, of course, that both B and DII omitted the HTY material on the death penalty because it was so extreme, but this argument would be more convincing if they had broken away from HTY at the beginning of the chapter. As it is, the passage reads as follows; the section shared with B and DII is in italics: but bes Antecristis
clerkis breken pe roof and comen yn aboue bi pride of pis world, and Crist pat may not lye, seip pes ben peues, sip pei taken Cristis goodis wipouten his leeue. But sit treupe nedip hem to write in her lettris pat bi suffryng of God pei ben siche maistris. Pe moost peef of alle pes, and moost Antecrist, is pe chefteyn of pes pat ledip hem alle, for he stelip moost falsely moo goodis of Crist.

## Capitulum Decimum

Lord wheper it be Goddis lawe to sle men for beft?..... (T127/7-129/2)

The fact that B and DII both break away from HTY at exactly the same point and not at a chapter mark or at the beginning of the extreme material, suggests that, at one stage, this point represented the end of the HTY commentary on this particular commandment and that the later, more extreme material is an addition.

This does not mean that the DII scribe was never moved to omit material because he disapproved of or disliked it. The $\mathrm{Bo}_{2}$
manuscript contains the first section of the HTY material on the ninth commandment viz. the passage dealing with covetousness as the root of evil possession (T143/1-144/9; Arnold iii.90) but follows this with a blank page (Arnold iii. 90 note). The point at which the $\mathrm{Bo}_{2}$ manuscript breaks away from the HTY material coincides with the point at which B ceases to follow the HTY discussion of this particular commandment, and possibly for the same reason, i.e. that both scribes disliked the subsequent HTY criticism of the religious and perhaps particularly that of friars. It seems likely that the $\mathrm{Bo}_{2}$ scribe left the page blank intending to fill it later with less extreme material. Whether the $\mathrm{Bo}_{2}$ scribe was himself a friar is, of course, impossible to determine, but whether he was or not, he seems, like B, to represent a stage in the development of Lollard ideas when, despite the fact that Lollardy had become strongly anti-fraternal, those who sided with the friars were still willing to promulgate Lollard views on dominion (Arnold iii. 88 commandment VII.12ff.) and on the failings of the regular clergy (Arnold iii.83/25ff.).

If it is true that passage (i) cited above (i.e. the passage on great swearers) was not present in DII's exemplar but was present in the exemplar used by B, this would in turn imply (assuming no further split in the tradition) that, where DII contains material shared with HTY but not found in B, then the B scribe (or his ancestor) must have made an omission. This generally seems a convincing explanation. The only problem occurs in the discussion of the fifth commandment where there is no particular
reason for B to break away from the HTY version just where he does (BT107/10) since the passage which immediately follows, while extremely anti-clerical, is not noticeably more so than passages which B does share with HTY (note, for example, the similar material on confession p.150ff.). On the other hand, there is no reason why B should not, at this point, move, as he does, to his DI source. The rest of B's putative omissions are more easily explained. B's omission of the passage on priests who break the first commandment (T30/1-9, Arnold iii.83/25-8) may well have occurred because the immediately preceding passage, on the love of the flesh, the love of worldly goods and on pride, reminded him of his DI source. B has a perfectly good reason for his omission of the HTY passage on the importance of Sunday (God made the world, rose from death, sent the Holy Ghost, will hold judgement day on a Sunday (T81/12ff.)) since he has already dealt with this topic in a section drawn from his DI source (B77/17ff.), and the same consideration is explicitly stated to have led to B's failure to deal with spiritual lechery as part of the sixth commandment discussion (T114/7ff, see comment by B p.120/22-3)

It is interesting to compare part of the section on images found in these three versions. It seems likely that B's reference to the 'gret clerk' i.e Wyclif (B32/18, see note to this line) appeared in an earlier version of HTY and has subsequently been lost, possibly as the HTY commentary became more extreme, (note the similar HTY argument that images do both good and harm (T32/1)), and this would in turn suggest that the whole of the passage drawn
from Wyclif (i.e. the section up to B33/6) may have appeared in an earlier version of HTY. Moreover the DII version, though it overlaps very little with this section, contains a phrase which seems closer to material found in B than in HTY: 'in hope of help or helpe in a maner neede' (Arnold iii.83/30-31; cf. B33/6-7, T33/3) which suggests that this material too may have appeared in an earlier version of HTY, and been lost for a similar reason. It is also interesting to note that the process of abridgement has made the DII material on images more extreme than that of either B or HTY, since any qualification of their condemnation (that they may do good as well as harm) has been omitted.

## Discursive Versions III, IV, and V (DII, DIV, DV)

The DIII version is extant in one manuscript: Glasgow University General $223\left(\mathrm{G}_{1}\right)$. This version has a short prologue, corresponding to the first few lines of the DI/B/HTY prologue incipit 'Alle maner of men' explicit 'he schulde kepe pe maundementis of God' (cf. $B V V$ p.317, T1/2-8), but it has no epilogue. The DIII version appears to be, at least in part, an abbreviation. Certain sections of the commentary are introduced by terms such as 'and generaly', 'and algatis' or 'as' (meaning 'for example'), terms which suggest either the selection of the most important point or a summary. DIII shows clear signs of a relationship with the B/HTY version. Passages of word for word
correspondence are as follows (although references are to T, such passages also appear in B unless otherwise stated):
i) The DIII prologue material mentioned above.
ii) A section on the three ways of worshipping the Trinity ( $\mathbf{G}_{1}$
f.213/9-22; T59/7-60/9)
iii) Part of the DIII discussion of the second commandment dealing with Christ's observations on swearing ( $\mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f} .214 \mathrm{I} / 3 \mathrm{ff}$.; cf. T52/6ff. and especially T53/7-9).
iv) The DIII third commandment material on the keeping of the

Sabbath and especially on the avoidance of servile works ( $\mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f}$. 214「/30-f.214T/10; cf. T72/6-73/5).
v) A section on offering bodily and spiritual help to your parents ( $\mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f} .214^{\mathrm{V}} / 25-29$; T88/5-8).
vi) Two clauses from the DIII fifth commandment commentary:
a) 'and it vndirstondip vnskilful sleyng' ( $\mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f} .215 \mathrm{~F} / 6-7$; cf.

T101/3-4).
b) 'eche man of pe world is bropere to opere, and also neisbore by be ordenaunce of God' ( $\mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f} .215 \mathrm{r} / 19-21$; cf. T102/5-6).
vii) A section on lechery, showing word for word correspondence with HTY and some overlap with B (G1 f.215r/27-215/2; T114/15 and 7-8).
viii) A section on the consequences of false witness (some men are unjustifiably hanged, some lose their inheritance) ( $\mathrm{G}_{1}$ f. 216r/8-15 and 19-20; T132/10-12 (some difference in wording).
ix) DIII ninth commandment material dealing with men's desire for things which are not alive and with such covetousness as the
root of evil possession ( $\mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f} .216^{\mathrm{v}} / 4-10 ; \mathrm{T} 144 / 1-9$ ).
x) DIII material on the tenth commandment stating that people often desire live things more than those which are dead and dealing with the root of $\sin$ in the will ( $\mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f} .216^{\mathrm{V}} / 23-28 ; \mathrm{T} 154 / 2-6$ ). The closer correspondence between DIII and HTY in item vii above, together with the fact that the DIII commentary does not contain any independent B material, suggests that DIII's relationship is with the HTY group rather than with B. The majority of these passages show some overlap with the DII version extant in $\mathrm{Bo}_{2}$, although the lack in $\mathrm{Bo}_{2}$ of, for example, part of the shared HTY/DIII material on the third commandment and the material on bodily lechery (presumably omitted from $\mathrm{Bo}_{2}$ because of squeamishness) shows that the DIII version cannot be drawn from $\mathrm{Bo}_{2}$. The degree of overlap nevertheless suggests that the DIII commentary may have been drawn from a version related to HTY which corresponded more closely to DII than does the present HTY version, and, in particular, that this source may have lacked some of the material found in HTY but not in DII. Thus, for example, neither the DII nor the DIII version contains the HTY third commandment material analysing the wording of the commandment and discussing the change of the sabbath from Saturday to Sunday (T67-72). Since it seems likely that the latter passage was an integral part of the HTY commentary (see note to T70/1-72/2), it seems clear that this material must, at some
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stage, have been omitted. This would further suggest that the witness drawn on by DIII represented an intermediate stage between HTY and DII, i.e. a stage when these particular passages had been lost but other sections of HTY material, not found in DII, still remained. The fact that the quotations of the commandments in DIII correspond closely to those in B/HTY but not so closely to those found in DII also suggests such an intermediate stage.

It is noticeable that the DIII commentaries on the fifth and seventh commandments do not show word-for-word correspondence with HTY but contain instead passages on the three types of manslaughter (by hand, tongue and heart) and on the various types of theft ('priuy and apert', 'by maystre and raueyn' etc.). This material is similar to that found in DI and in B, but does not show word-for-word correspondence with either. It is possible that these passages result from the DII commmentator's desire to avoid the somewhat extreme HTY material on the death penalty and on the right, in time of need, to take your neighbour's goods without permission (T pp.102-4, T p.124), although they may equally reflect material found in an earlier and less extreme version of HTY (note, however, the residual material on the death penalty found in DII (Arnold iii.86/31-3)).

The DIII commentary is also related to DIV. The DIV version is extant in one manuscript: Bodley Douce 246 (Do ${ }_{1}$ ). This version lists all the commandments first and follows this list with a short commentary on each (The prid maundement is broken' etc.)

The structure of DIV is thus similar to that of RV and may have been suggested by it, but no attempt is made to organise breakers into groups of three. The DIV version has no prologue, but it does have an epilogue stating that whoever breaks one commandment is culpable in all and that, therefore, few are unblemished ('clene') in the sight of God.

The DIV commentary shows considerable overlap with DIII, for example:
i) A section explaining that concentration on worldly business and worldly love is the same as making false gods ( $\mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f} .213$ r/29-

ii) A passage stating that those who say they are true Christian men but in fact do not follow Christ break the second commandment ( $\left.\mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f} .213^{\mathrm{V}} / 28-214 \mathrm{r} / 1 ; \mathrm{Do}_{1} \mathrm{f} .102^{\mathrm{v}} / 7-10\right)$.
iii) A sentence stating that both greater and lesser men of the Church break the third commandment ( $\mathrm{G}_{1}$ f.214 ${ }^{\mathrm{r}} / 27-30, \mathrm{Do}_{1}$ f.102 ${ }^{\mathrm{V}} / 11-16$ ).
iv) A section on loving God and Holy Church in Christ's manner and not in a worldly manner ( $\mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f} .214^{\mathrm{v}} / 18-23, \mathrm{Do}_{1} \mathrm{f} .102^{\mathrm{v}} / 18$ 103 $\quad$ /2).
v) A section defining theft as taking God's goods which all men should have and yet not truly serving God or his Church.
(G215/22-5; $\mathrm{Do}_{1}$ 103 ${ }^{\mathrm{r}} / 13-16$ ).
The DIV commentary appears to be made up almost entirely of summary material. Both the passages shared with DIII and
those which are independent tend to begin with one of the phrases we noted above ('and generaly' etc). The degree to which the material is summarised means that it is impossible to establish any textual connection with any other discursive version, although clearly the material in item i above, for example, could be a summary of first commandment material found in various commentaries. The Lollard overtones of DIV are revealed by item (v) above and by a tenth commandment passage criticising begging friars. Both these passages express opinions similar to those found in HTY but the lack of any close verbal correspondence once again makes it impossible to establish a textual connection. The fact that the DIV commentary does not overlap with the DIII passages of word for word correspondence with HTY, together with the fact that not all the DIV material appears in DIII, suggests that DIII may be a compilation made up of material drawn from a version related to HTY/DII and material drawn from DIV. It is noticeable that, whereas the DIII compiler is quite happy to include material critical of churchmen in general (see item (iii) above) he does not include DIV tenth commandment material criticising begging friars.

DIII also shares certain passages of correspondence with the DV version. This version is extant in one manuscript: British Library Harley $2406\left(\mathrm{Ha}_{4}\right)$. It has no prologue and only a very brief epilogue instructing the reader to keep the commandments
and to flee sin. The DV commentary is brief, but it does contain one Latin quotation at the beginning of each commandment, quotations which correspond not to those found in the rhetorical versions (although there is a certain amount of overlap) but to supporting quotations found in two other manuscripts, Tr and $\mathrm{Lm}_{5}$. Thus the commentary as a whole is preceded by a quotation from Proverbs VII and the discussion of the third commandment ends with a quotation from Jeremiah XVII. The passages of correspondence with DIII consist of the comment that 'we sholde kepe oure holyday, and allegatis oure Sonday' $\left(\mathrm{Ha}_{4} \mathrm{f} .2^{\mathrm{r}} / 8-9\right.$; cf. $\mathrm{G}_{1}$ f. $214^{\mathrm{y}} / 3-4$ ) and of the instruction in the discussion of the eighth commandment instructing the reader not to bear false witness for love or for hate, for winning or losing ( $\mathrm{Ha}_{4} \mathrm{f} .2^{\mathrm{v}} / 23-4 ; \mathrm{G}_{1} \mathrm{f} .216^{\mathrm{r}} / 2-$ 5). These passages are, however, so brief that it is difficult to use them as evidence of any textual connection. In places, notably in the discussion of the third commandment where the reader is instructed to think on God heartily and pray to him devoutly (cf. Bühler p.690), DV appears to be related to the rhetorical versions; on other occasions it seems that it may be a summary of one of the longer discursive versions. It is, however, difficult to be certain, without further evidence, just exactly what this link was.
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## Discursive Version VI (DVI); Pore Caitif

A further commandments commentary with which the B/HTY version shares passages of word-for-word correspondence is that contained in Pore Caitif. Pore Caitif has a prologue quoting Matthew 19:16-17, dealing with the circumstances under which Moses received the two tables, and explaining the two fold division. The Pore Caitif epilogue, 'be charge off pe heestis', instructs people to learn the commandments and teach them to their children and follows this with passages from Deuteronomy 28. The text of Pore Caitif as it occurs in MS Harley 2336 has been edited by Sister Mary Teresa Brady and references given below are to this edition unless otherwise stated. This commentary and that which appears in the majority of other Pore Caitif manuscripts is orthodox. However, as Sister Brady has shown, certain Pore Caitif manuscripts show evidence of Lollard interpolations. ${ }^{1}$

The B/HTY version shares the following material with the orthodox version of Pore Caitif (once again, references are to T, but the material is also found in the corresponding passges in $B$ unless otherwise stated):
i) A comment that God's word, in the first commandment, is 'chargid wip witt more pan we kan telle' (T15/1-2, passage not found in B; cf. Pore Caitif p.26/16-17).

[^23]ii) Passages on love and dread (T15/5-9, passage not found in B; T51/752/4; cf. Pore Caitif pp.34-5). Part of this, the section quoting Augustine, is also found separately in B (pp.14-15), although the wording of the $B$ passage is not particularly close.
iii) The instruction 'and be зe trewe men' (T53/3-4; cf. Pore Caitif p.42/3-
4).
iv) Section on being a coward as far as lechery is concerned and avoiding situations which might lead to this $\sin$ (T117/3-118/6; cf. Pore Caitif p.63).
v) Passages on the eighth commandment:
a) Lines equating bearing false witness with forsaking God for the devil (T135/1-5; Pore Caitif p.70/17-20).
b) Comment that nothing is more contrary to Christ than lying and that, even if a man could save the whole world by lying, he should nevertheless refrain (T137/7-10; Pore Caitif p. 70/23-5, 72/7-9).
vi) Section on covetousness as the ground of evil possession (T144/1-9;

Pore Caitif p.74/14-23).
vii) Observation that 'ofte tymes it fallip pat pe synne is more groundid in yuel wille pan pe dede wibouteforp' (T154/5-6; Pore Caitifp.78/14-16).

The HTY version (but not B) also shares material with the later, less orthodox versions of the Pore Caitif commentary, what Sister Brady has described as 'manuscripts that evidence Lollard infiltration.' Three manuscripts of Pore Caitif (British Library Additional 30897, University of Glasgow Hunterian 520, and Cambridge University Library Ff.vi.55)
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contain the passage on images found in HTY which begins 'and pe same God is now, wip pe same maundementis', and which ends with a comment on the covetousness of priests (T31/3-33/7). ${ }^{1}$ Since the addition of this passage to the Pore Caitif commentary clearly postdated any B/HTY/Pore Caitif relationship implied by the passages of correspondence listed above, a shared Lollard compendium seems the most likely explanation for this overlap.

It is difficult, in fact, to use any of the passages as evidence of a textual relationship. For one thing, the majority appear to be quotations and are accompanied in Pore Caitif (and once in B/HTY) by references to 'a greet doctour' or 'a greet clerk' (Pore Caitif p.63/1; p.70/16 \& 23; p.74/18-19; p.78/16-17; T117/3). Passage (iv) of those cited above, for instance, has been taken from Wyclif. Material of this nature was widely disseminated in commandments commentaries and, as we have already noticed, the B compiler clearly found St. Augustine's comment on the bristle and the thread in more than one of his sources. Once again, a shared compendium seems the most likely explanation.

## Discursive Versions VII and VIII (DVII and DVIII)

A possible connection between DII and DVII (and thus between DVII and HTY) has been suggested by Martin. ${ }^{2}$ The DVII version is extant in four manuscripts: $\mathrm{Ad}_{2}, \mathrm{Bo}_{3}, \mathrm{Ca}_{3}$ and Hu . The commentary

1. Brady, 'Lollard Interpolations', p. 186.
2. Martin p.207ff. and especially pp.209-11.
found in a separate version (DVIII extant in one manuscript, Emmanuel College Cambridge 246 (Em)) corresponds to the DVII version for the first few lines of the prologue (after this a page is missing) and then for the final section of the discussion of the first commandment. The remainder of DVIII appears to be a summary of the DI version. $\mathrm{Bo}_{3}, \mathrm{Ca}_{3}$ and Hu have a prologue (incipit 'Alle manere of men shuld holde Goddis biddyngis', explicit 'And Seynt Jon euangelist seip be charge of God is to kepe his hestis and pei ben not greuous ne heuy') part of which is missing from $\mathrm{Ad}_{2}$. The first section of the prologue corresponds to the first section of the DI/B/HTY prologue and to the prologue as it appears in DII and DV. The second section quotes I John 2 (those who say they love God but fail to keep his commandments are liars) and then explains the reasonable nature of the instruction to keep the commandments. The epilogue consists of material drawn from Deuteronomy 28. $\mathrm{Ca}_{3}$ contains chapter and verse references which are not found in the other manuscripts. As part of the discussion of the second commandment $\mathrm{Ad}_{2}$ and Hu contain a much fuller quotation from Matthew V than do $\mathrm{Ca}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{Bo}_{3}$.

Notable passages in DVII include the condemnation of the worship of 'dede ymages' rather than God as a 'cursed auoutry' and sections of outspoken criticism of 'vicious prests' who support this adultery and of friars who bear the outward signs of holiness ('girdles and here cowped schon, and no3t handeling mone') when in fact they too are vicious ('wher is a fouler ypocricy or lesingmonger and fals witnesse berer pan such on
is').
As Martin points out, direct textual relationship between this version and any of the other discursive versions is difficult to prove. There is very little evidence of word-for-word correspondence. The first sentence of the DVII prologue (incipit 'Alle maner of men' explicit 'kepe pe maundementis of God') corresponds, as we have seen, to the first sentence of the prologue as it appears in other versions, but it is impossible, without further evidence, to trace any line of descent. Establishing a relationship of the main body of DVII's commentary to the main body of any other commentary is also difficult since the evidence is conflicting. Thus, part of the discussion of the the first commandment concerns the question of spiritual lechery (dealt with in B , but not in HTY or DI), and the link between images and the covetousness of priests (dealt with in HTY and the Lollard infiltrated Pore Caitif, but not in B or DI).

It should be noted, in view of Martin's discussion, that a relationship between DVII and HTY seems more likely than a relationship between DVII and DII. The DVII commentary on the first commandment, for instance, corresponds more closely to that found in HTY (and to the Lollard infiltrated version of Pore Caitif) than to the DII commentary since, in DVII, the criticism of priests is preceded by the discussion of images and explicitly linked with it (priestly avarice encourages people to worship such images) a connection which is not made in DII since the DII version does not contain the final section of the HTY discussion.

However, the correspondences outlined above are not really consistent or close enough for it to be possible to extablish a textual relationship. The DVII version does, however, share one short passage of word-for-word correspondence with Pore Caitif viz. the section stating that no child should consent to sin for love of his parents because bowing to sin is not obedience but the greatest rebellion that man may do against God (Pore Caitif p.51/19-23; Ad 1 f/44「/5-10).

## Discursive Versions IX and X (DIX and DX)

The HTY version also shares a certain amount of subject matter with the DIX commentary. This version is extant in one manuscript: Bodley Douce $274\left(\mathrm{Do}_{2}\right)$. The DIX commentary has no prologue, but it does have an epilogue promising damnation to those who break the commandments 'pof pou haue a thowsande bulles of pardoun, lettres of fraternite and chauntrees after pi dethe' (f.7r/25-7) and the bliss of heaven to those who keep them even if they lack bulls of pardon etc. The treatment of each commandment begins with a short Latin rendering, e.g. 'Non adorabis deos alienos' (f. $1^{\text {¹/1). Noteworthy passages include the }}$ comment that the reader must study and keep God's commandments and law 'bifore alle oper preceptis and lawes made of man, for ellis pou louest not his lawe byfore oper and so not hymselfe byfore alle oper pinge' (f.1 $1^{v / 14-17), ~ a n d ~ t h e ~ o b s e r v a t i o n ~ t h a t ~ t h e ~ r e a d e r ~ s h o u l d ~ ' h e r e ~ G o d ' s ~}$ seruyce taust pe in pi moder tunge, for pat is better to pe pen to here mony masses' (f.3r/15-17). The commentary includes a great deal of criticism of priests and the religious, including the comment that a
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priest who performs his office badly is a thousand times more cursed than subjects who withhold their tithes ( $\mathrm{f} . \mathrm{4}^{\mathrm{r}}$ ) as well as criticism of those who lie about Christ and say that he was a worldly lord and those who say that he was a beggar ( $\mathrm{f} .6^{\mathrm{v}}$ ). The opinion 'pat newe religions foundid of seyntis is better pen clene religion of presthod pat Crist made hymselfe' is characterised as false witness (f. $6^{\circ} / 26-30$ ).

The DIX version is clearly related to DX. This version is extant in four manuscripts: $\mathrm{Ha}_{5}, \mathrm{Lm}_{5}, \mathrm{Sa}$ and Ti . All have prologues, but that contained in $\mathrm{Ha}_{5}$ is shorter lacking the first section of the $\mathrm{Lm}_{5} / \mathrm{Sa} / \mathrm{Ti}$ prologue. The $\mathrm{Lm}_{5} / \mathrm{Sa} / \mathrm{Ti}$ prologue (incipit 'Where is any man nowodayes pat askyth how I shal loue God and myne euene Cristen' $\left(\mathrm{Lm}_{5} \mathrm{f} .3\right.$ ), explicit 'berfore if pu wylt eschewe bys dredful cursyng of God, lerne to kepe hys ten comaundementis' $\left(\operatorname{Lm}_{5} \mathrm{f} .4^{\mathrm{v}}\right)$ ) laments the general lack of knowledge of the basics of the Christian faith and particularly of God's law. The DX epilogue warns against relying for salvation on pardoners, chantries and pilgrimages. Noteworthy passages in the main body of the commentary include a section on dead images which cannot help themselves or other men ( $\mathrm{Lm}_{5} \mathrm{ff} .5^{\mathrm{r-v}}$ ) and a criticism of those who set more value on the ordinances of sinful men than on the law of $\operatorname{God}\left(\mathrm{Lm}_{5} \mathrm{f} .7^{\mathrm{r}}\right)$. $\mathrm{Lm}_{5}$ contains Latin quotations corresponding to those found in $\mathrm{Ha}_{4}$ and Tr . These appear to be a later addition and to have been added somewhat carelessly since the quotations accompanying the discussions of the ninth and tenth commandments do
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not correspond to the DX division of the types of covetousness. Sa lacks critical references to friars found in the other witnesses.

DX shows considerable overlap with the DI norm. The DX discussion of the ninth and tenth commandments in particular is made up almost exclusively of material also found in DI. It seems likely, in fact, that DX is a compilation with DI as its basic source. Evidence that the DX version has resulted from the combination of DI and other material can be found, for example, in the section dealing with the first commandment. Both DI and DX inform us that anyone who loves anything at all more than God, be it wife or child, gold or silver or any other goods (catel) makes that particular item his God $\left(\mathrm{Lm}_{5} \mathrm{f} .5^{\mathrm{r}}, B V V\right.$ p.318). In DI this leads naturally into an account of the three main types of people who thus break the first commandment: lecherous and gluttonous people who love their flesh more than God, covetous people who love the world more than God, and proud men who love the devil more than God. 'Of pis,' runs the DI version 'hit folewep. $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{t}}$ bre manere of folk suwen pe sturynge of oure preo enemys: whiche ben pe flesch. pe world. and pe feond'. In DX, however, a passage on the worship of images is inserted between the first statement on the love of wife, child etc. and its expansion into the three types so that the link between them is lost and the second section has to be introduced as a completely separate topic: 'Ouer pys pre maner of folk breken pys comaundement' $\left(\mathrm{Lm}_{5}\right.$ f. $5^{\text {² }} / 9-10$ ).

Some of the additional material introduced into the DX version (the section on dead images, for example, and that comparing man's ordinances with God's law) has Lollard overtones. It is by no means clear, however, that the compiler's main aim is the expression of such unorthodox opinions. The DX commentary does not display the overall sense of committment to a cause found in, say, the HTY commentary. His choice of sources is eclectic, and leads to a great variety in tone. Some of the DX material is vividly anecdotal (as part of the discussion of the fourth commandment, for instance, we are offered the exemplum drawn from Isodorus, of the badly brought up child, eventually condemned to death, who bites off his father's nose as a reproach for his upbringing). Other passages, however, appear to be drawn from a more mystical tradition. The man who is tempted to lechery is advised, for example, to
rede wel in hys soule pe rede boke
of Cristis body al to woundid, fro pe heiest place of pe
hed til pe sole of pe fot
( $\operatorname{Lm}_{5} \mathrm{f}$.18r/1-3).
Apart from the connection with DI, DX's clearest textual connection is with DIX. Parallel passages occur, for instance, in the discussion of the first commandment where the two versions have very similar passages on the Trinity, in the discussion of the fourth commandment where both have similar passages dealing with one's relationship with one's spiritual father, and in the epilogue where, as we have seen, both versions deal with the uselessness of pardons, chantries etc. to those who have not kept the commandments.

Since the DX version is so clearly a compilation, it seems, at first, possible that the DX compiler might have been using DIX as one of his sources. It is certainly true that the DIX version of, for example, the shared epilogue material, seems to be somewhat fuller than that found in DX. However, consideration of the commentary on, for example, the first commandment, suggests the opposite, i.e. that DIX may have been, at least in part, an abbreviation of DX. All the main elements found in the DX commentary on the first commandment (the section on pride, covetousness and gluttony; the reminder of the prospect of God's punishment; the section on the trinity; and the prohibition on witchcraft) appear in DIX. Moreover, the first of these passages is drawn from DI material quoted word for word in DX and summarized in DIX (the DIX comment at the end of this section, 'Perfore proude men worschippen pride and so pe fende for her fals God, ande so of alle oper synnes $\left(\mathrm{Do}_{2}\right.$ f. $1^{r} / 21-23$, my italics) makes this abbreviation clear).

It therefore seems possible that the DIX commentator drew on DX rather than vice versa, and probably on an earlier version of DX, one which did not contain the additional material on images, since this fits in so well with the overall tone of DIX that it seems an unlikely omission. This pattern is not, however, consistent. The DIX and DX commentaries on certain commandments (e.g. the second) do not show this kind of close correspondence. It is possible, however, that the two commentaries did once correspond more consistently and that their subsequent
development has obscured the connection. Since the DIX version is more outspoken than DX, it seems possible that one of these developments was the increased extremity of DIX, especially in terms of criticism of the clergy. Thus, for example, there is very little overlap in the discussion of the seventh commandment where DIX condemns as false witness both the beliefs that Christ was a worldly lord and a beggar, and the support for the new religious ( $\mathrm{Do}_{2} \mathrm{f} .6^{\mathrm{V}} / 20 \mathrm{ff}$.). DLX's second commandment commentary includes criticism of priests who say God's service in haste and without reverence and for covetousness and vainglory, none of which appears in DX, while DIX's fourth commandment commentary describes a priest who fails to carry out his duties correctly as being worse than any of his subjects who fail to pay their tithes. There are repeated echoes of HTY subject matter in this material, although it is worth noting that such corresponding passages do not necessarily appear under the heading of the same commandment in the two commentaries. For instance, the DIX passage on priests who preach for worldly gain etc. could well be a summary of the HTY first commandment discussion but it appears in DIX under the heading of the second. Moreover, not all DIX's more extreme material could have been drawn from HTY (there is nothing in HTY, for instance, corresponding to the DIX material on tithes), and, in general, the correspondences seem to reflect a shared attitude rather than a textual relationship.

## Discursive Version XI (DXI)

The DXI version is extant in one manuscript, Bodley Laud Miscellaneous $524\left(\mathrm{Lm}_{6}\right)$. This version has no prologue, but it does have an epilogue summarising material drawn from Deuteronomy 28. Much of the DXI commentary is brief (the commentary on the third commandment, for instance, merely instructs people to spend the sabbath in holiness of life), but the commentaries on the first and last commandments are longer. DXI shows evidence of overlap with DI and, to some extent, with the B/HTY version. The first part of DXI's first commandment commentary, for instance, corresponds to DI (passage beginning 'pys ys vnderstond pus, for cause pat nopyng schulde be loued moste bote pat pat is best and most worthy to be loued' ( $\mathrm{Lm}_{6} \mathrm{f} .18^{\mathrm{r}} \mathrm{cf}$. BVV p.318/5ff.)), a passage which occurs neither in B nor in HTY. The commentary on the last commandment combines material from the DI commentaries on the ninth and tenth commandments (see discussion of Lb above). DXI's overlap with B/HTY is confined to brief comments viz. the definition of lecherous men as those who make their god 'pe taylende of a strumpet' ( $\operatorname{Lm}_{6}$ f.18/12,; cf. B23/11-12, T23/4, although the expression has been altered in B to the somewhat more innocuous 'fleslyche baly of a lecherous womman'); and the observation that the devil is king of all the children of pride ( $\mathrm{Lm}_{6} \mathrm{f} .18 \mathrm{r} / 13-14$; $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{T} 26 / 1-2$ ). In general, any relationship with B/HTY remains unproven. As far as the relationship with DI is concerned, it is worth remembering that this is the second vernacular commandments commentary to appear in this
-cxci-
manuscript and that it is immediately preceded by the DI commentary $\mathrm{Lm}_{4}$. It therefore seems possible that the scribe may merely have added material from his first commentary to the much shorter second commentary.

## Mixed Discursive/Rhetorical Version I (DRI)

The longest and most complex of the DR versions is DRI. This version, which is extant in two manuscripts ( $\mathrm{Ed}_{2}$ and Tr ), has been extensively discussed by Martin. ${ }^{1}$ The DRI version has a prologue and a brief epilogue corresponding to those found in DVII. Within the commentary, the general pattern is for the citation of each commandment to be followed by discursive material and then by rhetorical material. In addition, Tr has Latin quotations corresponding to those found in $\mathrm{Lm}_{5}$ and $\mathrm{Ha}_{4}$, which do not appear in $\mathrm{Ed}_{2}$, as well as a passage of discursive first commandment commentary, following the rhetorical material, also absent from $\mathrm{Ed}_{2}$. It thus seems likely that $\mathrm{Ed}_{2}$ has the earlier version, and that the Tr scribe made additions. The form of the DRI rhetorical material (statement about the breakers plus 'Why' question) corresponds most closely to that of RIV but the material could clearly have been drawn from other rhetorical versions. The DRI discursive material shares passages of word for word correspondence with two discursive
versions, DVII and Pore Caitif. There is no overlap between these two areas of correspondence. The commentaries on the second, third, fourth and sixth commandments contain both material corresponding to Pore Caitif and material corresponding to DVII, although the section of the fourth commandment commentary which corresponds to DVII is extremely brief. The commentaries on the first, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth commandments contain material corresponding to Pore Caitif, but none corresponding to DVII while that on the fifth contains material corresponding to DVII but not to Pore Caitif. There is also a certain amount of additional material.

Martin has suggested that, where there is no overlap between DVII and DRI, this may be because the DVII commentaries on certain commandments have been altered, becoming, as Martin says, more caustic, and that an earlier version of DVII may well have had commentaries on these particular commandments which did share passages of correspondence with DRI. ${ }^{1}$ However, comparison with Pore Caitif suggests that this may not have been the case. The whole of the DRI first commandment discursive material, for instance, consists of material found in Pore Caitif. As there is no overlap between DRI's Pore Caitif and DVII material in the rest of the commentary, it seems unlikely that there was overlap here. It seems possible, in fact, that the reason no DVII material appears in certain sections of the DRI commentary was precisely because of the caustic nature of the DVII material. It would then be the case that the DRI commentary was made up of material
drawn from at least three sources: one of the rhetorical versions (possibly RIV), DVII and Pore Caitif, or, possibly, a source shared with Pore Caitif.

Mixed Discursive/Rhetorical Versions II and III (DRII and DRII)

The remaining discursive/rhetorical versions need be dealt with only briefly. As Anne Hudson has already suggested, ${ }^{1}$ DRII is, in the main, a combination of material drawn from RI and DIX. Each section begins with a short rhyming version of the commandment in question accompanied by a brief Latin rendering. This is followed first by the discursive material and then by the rhetorical. The majority of the discursive material is drawn from DIX but the first commandment does contain an additional section describing the breaking of this commandment by the Israelites. ${ }^{2}$

The DRIII version is classified by Martin as rhetorical. It appears, however, to be a combination of RI with the discursive prologue as it appears in DVII and DVIII. There may well be some link with DRI here, but, as there is no overlap between DRI and DRIII's discursive material after the prologue, it is difficult to be certain. The rhetorical section of DRIII includes a certain amount of additional material (viz. the instructions, in the first commandment discussion, to love God with heart and soul and mind and, in the second, not to swear by heaven, earth,

[^24]2. For this section see Hudson, ibid. p. 252.

Jerusalem or one's head (Matthew 5:34-36)). These passages of commentary on the first and second commandments do not appear in DVII but the second does appear in DVIII (the relevant DVIII section of the first commandment commentary is missing) and it therefore seems possible that the relationship is with DVIII rather than DVII, although it should be noted that the existing evidence suggests that the DVIII shared DVII's first commandment material.

## Editorial Practice

The edition of the B version is necessarily based on the commentary found in MS BL Harley $2398 \mathrm{ff} .73^{\mathrm{r}}$ - ${ }^{\text {106r }}$, while that of the HTY version is based, as explained above, on the commentary found in MS Trinity College Dublin $245 \mathrm{ff} .9^{r}-26^{\nu}$. Modern punctuation has been substituted for that in the manuscripts and modern paragraphing and word division have been used. Marginal or interlinear additions are indicated by curly brackets $\{$...\}; letters or words which have become unclear are enclosed in angle brackets <...>. Emendations in the form of addition to, or alteration of, the reading of the base manuscript are shown by square brackets [...]. Emendations which take the form of the suppression of words or letters found in the manuscript are recorded in the variants. In the case of the HTY version, variant readings found in H and/or Y are also so recorded, as are all emendations made in accordance with the readings of these manuscripts. All such emendations are converted into the dialect of the base manuscript. Marginal material written by the original scribes is recorded in the variants. Emendations are only made where there is a clear reason for believing the reading of the base manuscript to be an error.

Italics are used for the translation of biblical material where this is underlined in red in the manuscript. Expansions of abbreviations are indicated by italics or, in cases like the above, where the main body of the text is in italics, by the lack of them. Abbreviations of books of the Bible have been expanded in accordance with the practice of the scribe
of the base manuscript where there is evidence for this. Where there is no such evidence, expansions correspond to the forms used in the Early Version of the Wycliffite Bible. Superscript letters which correspond to the scribe's usual form have been normalised without notice. Superscript a, however, appears in italics.

As far as expansions are concerned, the following problems have been encountered (all concern possible final -e):

In B:
i) Small tails frequently occur on a number of letters. If we consider the first two lines of $\mathrm{f} .73^{\text {r }}$, for example (B1/1-2), we find that each of the following words ends in such a tail: Alle, maner, scholde, holde, Godes, wiboute, holdyng, of. Although certain of these words or forms do occur elsewhere in B with written final -e e.g. manere (f. $100 / / 16, \mathrm{~B} 125 / 15$ ), comynge (f.74 $/$ /8, B5/22) and lyuynge (f. $75^{\mathrm{r}} / 22, \mathrm{~B} 10 / 2$ ), the fact that this tail is of such frequent occurrence (and that it is found on final-e itself) suggests that it may be regarded as otiose. It is also worth noting that the short tail occurs in conjunction with the curved hook which clearly does indicate final $-e$ in where (f.76r/11, B15/1). The more elaborate flourish involving a loop which occurs occasionally on final -g, e.g. in bytoknynge (f.81//12, B31/10), has, however, been interpreted as indicating a final $-e$.
ii) The bar through final -ch has also been considered to be otiose. Such a bar does occur in words and forms which also occur with final -e e.g. ech (f.75/17, B9/20) cf. eche (f.75/18, B9/21), euerych (f.73/25,

B5/8) cf. erpeliche (f.73г/14, B2/2), and frelych (f.75r/2B9/5) cf. trewcliche (f.73r/9, B1/7). However the bar also occurs as part of the ch of ich (e.g. f.74r/26, B7/6), a word which never appears with written final -e. In fact the bar through final -ch is invariable and this suggests that -ch plus bar is in functional contrast to -che and not equivalent to it. ${ }^{1}$

## In H :

Final -II almost always appears with a small curved mark about half way up the second 1 , as in Al ( $\mathrm{H} \mathrm{f.1r/1} \mathrm{cf} . \mathrm{T} 1 / 2$ ) and such a mark also occurs very occasionally after single $l$, both medially and finally, as in $f u$ (H f.23 $/ 2 \mathrm{cf} . \mathrm{T} 132 / 11$ ) and $\sec$ er (H f.23r/1 cf. T131/7). This combination might possibly be interpreted as le with biting such as occurs with de in lorde (H f.1「/12 cf. T1/10). It is, however, worth noting that the loop appears further above the line than would be expected if it represented written final $-e$ and the possibility that it does so has therefore been discounted. The possibility of an abbreviation, however, remains. Arguing against this is the fact that al e(H f.21/22 cf. $\mathrm{T} 128 / 4$ ) occurs with both the curved mark and with written final -e. On the other hand the fact that final -II always occurs either with this mark or with written final $-e$ while final single -1 normally occurs without any such mark (as in wol (H f. $1^{\mathrm{v}} / 11 \mathrm{cf} . \mathrm{T} 3 / 7$ )) tends to suggest that the mark

[^25]does indicate final $-e$ and that, where doubling of final $-I$ occurs, it has been caused by the existence of such an -e. The mark has therefore been treated as an abbreviation and appears in italics in the variants.

Chapter headings which appear in the base manuscript in the margin only have been centred and enclosed in curly brackets $\{. . .$.$\} . Where$ chapter headings occur in the body of the text they have been centred and any additional marginal chapter headings have been recorded in the variants. Chapter headings in Y normally appear in the body of the text with the number in Roman numerals. Chapter headings in H normally appear in abbreviated form in the margin, although they are occasionally found in the body of the text. In both cases only omissions have been recorded.

The beginning of a new folio in the base manuscript is marked by a line / in the text and by details in the margin.

The following conventions are used in the variants:
] a single square bracket separates lemma from variant. , a comma separates variants of the same line.
canc. cancelled, either by subpunction or crossing out.
corr.int. interlinear correction made by the scribe.
corr.mar. marginal correction made by the scribe.
(mar:) marginalia alongside the text at the point indicated by the line number(s) given. Unless otherwise indicated, the reference is to the base manuscript.
om. omitted.
trs. transposed.
-cxcix-
/ change of line.
\{...\} insertion, above the line or in the margin,.
$<$ l...> letters lost through damage, restored in editing.
[...] editorial addition or alteration.
It should be noted that neither om. nor trs. should be considered to imply any judgement as to the comparative nearness or otherwise of a particular reading to the presumed original.
-cc-

## B

Alle maner men scholde holde Godes byddynges, for wipoute
holdyng of hem may no man beo saued. And so pe Gospel tellep how on axede Crist what he scholde do for to come to heuene and Crist bad him, if he wolde entre into blysse, pat
\{Capitulum Primum \}
Alle maner of men shulden holde Goddis biddyngis, for wypouten holdyng of hem may no man be saued. And so pe Gospel tellip hou oon axide Crist what he shulde do for to lege men vpon peyne of her lijf, hou bisily wold pei

B: 3 (mar. Matheu 19) 9 (mar. Exemplum)
T: (rubric: Here bigynnep pe ten comaundementis Y) 1 Capitulum Primum] om. HY, mar.T 2 men] men pat wullen be pe chiledren of Godde H 3 hem] pem $\mathrm{H} \quad 6$ blisse] be blisse H , maundemertis] comaundementis Y , and] for T 7 pe om. HY 8 pis] pus Y , we may] trs. $\mathrm{H} \quad 10 \mathrm{O}$ ] $\mathrm{A} Y$, bid] bad Y , to be] bidone or H , be Y 11 vpon ] vp HY , her] ber HY

## B

kepe pis commaundement. Bot byleue techep ous pat God is more lord pan eny erpeliche man may beo in pis world; and wel we wytep bat, as a lord ys more in himself, so scholde his byddyng beo more ykeped and yworscheped. Bot who wotep not

T
[ k ]epe pis maundement. But bileue techep vs pat God is more Lord pan ony erpeli man may be in pis world; and wel we witen pat, as pe lord is more in himsilf, so [pe more] shulden hise biddyngis be kumed, kept and worshipid. But who woot not pat ne God shulde be moost loued? And Crist seip pat what man louep him wel shal kepe his word, pat is his biddyng. And if pou seye pat sharplier ben kyngis biddyngis execute and more sharppe sensures ben putt vpon men pat breken hem (for who techep or suep pe maundementis of God?), O penke wisely pe witt

B: 5 (mar: John 14)
T: 1 kepe] hepe T , pis maundement] pat biddyng H 2 Lord] om. Y 3 pat] om. Y, so] om. Y, pe more] om. TY 4 biddyngis] biddyng H , 5 loued] loued and thankide $\mathrm{H} \quad 7$ kyngis] pe kingis $\mathrm{H} \quad 8$ vpon] on HY , hem] bem $\mathrm{H}, \quad$ for] om. H

## B

pe Lord, how pat he wolde pat frelyche his commaundements were ykept, for bot pey beo [wilfullyche] ykept be mede is aweye.

And wyte pou wele pat he hap ybede pe vpon grete peyne \{to kepe pes commaundements: bat is vpon peyne\} of dampnacioun
in helle. And he may noust forgete or fayle for to syue it to whomeuere bat kepep noust hys hestes pat he byddep. Ne no byng may bowe him fro his purpos, for it were expresse a3en his owne word pat ys yrad yn be Holy Gospel, whare he seyp himself /pat he schal seue treweliche to eueryche man ryst as he hap deserued. And oure beleue witnessep pe same; for as he wole ous lyue in hope to haue heuene blysse, so he wole pat

## T

of pis Lord, hou he wolde pat frely hise maundmentis weren kept, for but if pei be wilfully kept pe mede is awey.

And wite pou wel pat he hap bedun vpon greet peyne to kepe pes maundmentis: vpon dampnyng in helle; and he may not forgete pis peyne or faile for to syue it to whomeuer pat kepib not pe bihestis pat he biddip, ne freris ne preieres may bowe him fro pis purpos. But as he wole vs to lyue in hope of hauyng of his bliss, so he wole pat we triste pat alle men

B: 2 wilfullyche] wel 4 to kepe pes commaundements bat is vpon peyne] corr.mar. 9 (mar. Matheu 16 ratio 20)

T: 1 pis] pe $H$, he wolde pat frely] freli pat he wold $H$, maundmentis] comaundementis $Y 2$ be] \{be\} corrint. $Y$, wilfully] wele $H \quad 3$ vpon] vp $H$, on $Y 4$ maundmentis] comaundementis she $Y$, vpon darmpnyng in] and pat peyn is pe peyn of H , not] noght H 5 pis] pat H , whomeuer] whom H , kepip] kep H 6 pe] his HY , bihestis] heestis $Y$, pat he biddip] om. H 7 pis] pat H , vs to] pat we H , us $\mathrm{Y} \quad 7-8$ of hauyng of] for to haue $\mathrm{H} \quad 8$ he wole] trs. HY

## B

we triste pat alle men schal beo dampned pat kepep noust his commaundements, syp bey bep pure lyste. Bot pis grete Lord, syp he ys ful of mercy, hap зeue ous tyme to kepe hem for tyme of oure lyf, and speciallyche in oure ende, if we schulle beo seruyse.

And wite pou wel pat it is litil ynow to kepe contynu\{e\}ly hise heestis to make a good ende:

## B

whanne Crist schal aly3te to deme pay scha<l> sodeynliche aryse azeyn. For Seynt Bernard \{sei<p>\}, 'It <ys>certeyn pat pou schalt deye, bot it is vncerteyn whann<e>, oper how, oper where, for oueral dep abydep pe, bot, and pou beo wyse, pe lord his seruant. And namelyche whanne gret hast ys, he is worpy blame pat is penne vnredy; bot gretter hast no man redep of pan schal beo in comynge of Crist. And pus pou mayst

B: 2 sei<p>] corr.int. 14 (mar. [Mark] 13 [Mark] 14] Mathea 13
Matheu 14) 19 pe] om. 21 blame] pis canc.

## B

wel yknowe pat it is lytel ynow to kepe continuelliche Godes hestes to make a goed ende: by gostlyche enemys, and specialliche pe fendes, beop faste aboute to tempte pe in pe oure of deep, bot syp God may noust bydde bot skylful pyng
and lyst, wete we wel pat we may [ay] kepe pes ten commaundements; for as he pat brekeb oon offendeb in alle, so he pat kepep wel oon kepep hem alle.

## Capitulum Secundum

Prestes scholde teche pes commaundements of God and publissche hem wip al here myst to the commune peple, for pis

## T

pi goostli enemyes, and specialy pe fend, ben faste aboute to tempte pee in our of pi dep, but sip God may not bidde but skilful ping and list, wite we wel pat we may ay kepe pes ten comaundmentis; for as he pat brekip oon offendip in alle, so he pat wel kepip oon kepip hem alle.

## Capitulum Secundum

Prestis shulden teche pes comaundementis of God, and puplishe hem at her myst to be comoun puple, for bis is be

B: 2 py] for py 5 ay om.
T: 1 pil for pi T 2 our] be ouur HY 3 pi] pe Y , sib] sen H 4 ay] om. HY, kepe] kepe truli Y , pes ten comaurdementis] pem and we wille; and so myche pe more we ben to blame and we brek any oun of pem H , pese comaundementis Y om. Y, 5 as] om. H, so] and so H , wel] om. HY 6 hem om. H 7 Capitulum Secundum] om. H 9 hem] pem H, at] with alle $H$, her] ber $Y$

## B

is pe moste worschep pat we do here to God and pe most profit pat we do here to his Chirche. Bot I drede me pat we beo bailleys of erroure for pes commaundement3. And, for pay scholde beo freschliche in mynde, bey bep departed in ten, and God spake hem noper of hem pat bep in wateres vnder pe eorpe. Pou /schalt
noust worschepe ne herye hem. Ich am py Lord by God a strange louer gelouse. Ich visyte pe wykkednesse of fadres into here children into pe prydde and ferpe generacioun of hem pat hatep me, and I do mercy into a pousand kynredenys of hem pat louep me and kepep myn hestes.

Pou schalt noust take pe name of py Lord God in vayn; T
moost worship pat we don here to God and po moost profijt pat we don to his Chirche, but y drede me pat we ben bailies of errour.

Pes comaundementis, for pei shulden be freishlier in mynde, ben partid in ten and in two bope.

B: 6 (mar. Primum mandatum) 13-14 fadres into] pe prydde canc. 17 (mar. Secundum)
T: 4 comaundementis] maundementis Y , for] om. Y , freishlier] frescher Y 5 bobe] om. H

## B

for sope pe Lord God schal noust haue him gultelys pat takep Godes name yn ydel.

Haue mynde to halewe pe day pat is Godes Sabote. In syxe dayes pou schalt worche and do alle pyne owne workes, bot pe seuepe day ys reste of by Lord God, and pat day schalt pou do no seruyle workes; noper by sone ne douster, py seruant noper py mayde, by worke best ne py straunger pat dwellep in pyn hous. For in syxe dayes God made heuene and eorpe and see, and alle pyng pat is wipynne hem and reste pe seuepe day; and herfore he blessede pe Sabot, and maked pis day holy.

Worschepe py fader and by moder, pat pou beo in longe lyf vpon eorpe pat by Lord God schal seue pe.

Pou schalt noust slee.
Pou schalt noust do lecherye.
Pou schalt noust do pefpe.
Pou schalt noust speke fals wytnesse azens by neyzebore.
Pou schalt noust coueyte py neyzebores hous.
Pou schalt noust desyre pe wyf of py neyebore, ne his seruant, ne his mayde, ne his oxe, ne his asse, ne eny pyng pat is his."'

Pes beop pe ten commaundements pat God spake as it is yseyd before. And alle men hauep noust ryst vnderstondyng of hem. Wharfore take hede wip clene soule

## B

and goed entent, and ofte rede oper hyre pe scripture bat folwep and, grace of God helpynge, pou mayst of hem beo broust to goed vnderstondyng. And pus wolde God pat lordes, ladyes and oper /gentyles, bope of men and wommen, wolde of hem take kepe and f.75r
speke to pe pis day schal beo in pyn heorte, and pou schalt telle hem to py children, and pou schalt penke hem syttynge in byn hous and goynge in pe wey, and pou schalt bynde hem in pyn hond as a tokyn, slepyng and arysyng, and hy schullep be meued bytwene pyne eyzes, and pou schalt write hem in py dores of pyn

15 hous.' And pus alle men, by heste of God, bep yholde in here spekyng, seyng, hyryng, goyng, syttyng, stondyng, and in alle here dedys doyng, to haue Godes commaundements fresliche in here mynde, to reule hemself by hem and to goed informacioun of here children and of alle oper dwellyng aboute hem.

20 For if ech man wolde bysy himselfe to lerne and comene Godes hestes eche wip opere, as Cristen men scholde do, as bysyliche as many men dop aboute folyes and diuerse vaniteys pat neuere turnep to profest bot to moche meschief and

B: 5 to] om. 7 and om., comenynge] comyn 9 (mar. Deutronomie 6)

## B

myspendyng of tyme, pe peple scholde noust beo so vicious in here lyuynge azens Godes lawe, ne here children to hem so rebelle and vnbuxom as hy al day bep bycome. Perfore dop as pe wyse man conseilep and folwe him. He seyp, 'Be al py narracioun,
stondcp in pes two branches: in loue /of God as pou scholdest and in loue of by neysebore; and herefore [God] saf Moyses two tables of pe lawe. Pe fyrste table techep men to

## T

3he, pei ben gederid in oon, as Seynt Poul techep, for kepe pee in charite and pou kepest pes ten heestis. Charite stondip in pes two braunchis: in loue of God as pou shuldest, and loue of pi neisbore; and herfore God saf Moyses two tables of pe lawe. Pe first table techep men for to

B: 8 (mar: Matheu 22) 9 (mar: Romayns.13) 12 God] om.
$\mathrm{T}: 1$ pei ben gederid in ] and $\mathrm{H} \quad 2$ pes ten heestis] alle pe oper H , ten] om. Y 3 braunchis] branches only H , loue] pe luf $\mathrm{H} \quad$ 3-4 as pou shuldest] om. H 4 God] [God\} corr.mar. H, (mar. Exodus 20 T)

## B

loue God and conteynep pre commaundement3, as Godes lawe techep. Pe secunde table conteynep pe oper seuene commaundements, and techep for to loue by neyzebore as pou scholdest, and pes seuene and pe operpre of pe fyrste table makep ten
commaundements. We haue no myst to telle pe auctorite of pes hestes ne alle pe resons pat scholde meue men to holde hem, but on pyng scholde we knowe of oure goede God: pat he byddyth no man do [bot] for vauntage of himself ne noust bot pat we may ly3tliche performe, for Crist himself seip pat his soke is softe and his charge ly3t. And Seynt Austyn T
loue God and conteynep pre maundementis as Goddis lawe techep. Pe secound conteynep opere seuene maundementis, pat techep pe for to loue pi neizbore as pou shuldest, and pes pre and seuene maken ten comaundmentis. We han no myst to telle autorite of pes heestis, ne alle pe resouns pat shulden moeue men to holde hem, but oo ping shulden we knowe of oure good God: pat he biddip no man do [but] for vauntage of hymsilf, ne noust pat he may not listly performe, for Crist himsilf seip pat his sok is soft and charge is lizt

B: 1 (Capitulum Tercium) 5 auctorite] auctorites 8 bot] om. 9 (mar. Matheu xi)

T: 1 maundementis] comaundementis $\mathrm{H} \quad 1-2$ as Goddis lawe techep] om. H 2 secourd] secunde table Y , maundement is] comaundementis Y 2-4 pat techep pe for to loue pi neisbore as pou shuldest and pes pre and seuene maken ten comaundmentis] om. H 3 techep] techen Y, for] om. Y 4 We] And we H, to] for to HY 5 autorite] pe autorite H , alle] alle pe halfe $\mathrm{H} \quad 6$ holde] kepe H , hem] pem H , shulden we] trs. Y 7 but] om. HTY 8 noust] no3t bote H , not] om. H 9 and] and his HY

## B

seyp, 'If we wollep deserue meydes of euerlestyng lyf hye we wip alle oure strengpes to fulfille Godes hestes,' for his hestes bep heuy to hem pat nellep kepe hem and ly3t to hem pat wollep. And so studye wyselyche wat were pe beste for for we se noust al. And perfore it is nedful to be grounded T to men pat louen him. Ande so studie wisely what were best for pee to kumne and to worche, and pat pi Lord biddip pee do.

Blessid be pis riche Lord and hende in his biddyng. He is riche for he hap no nede of oure seruyse. He is hende for pe to kunne and to worche and pat by Lord byddep pe.

Iblessed be pis ryche Lorde and hende in his byddynge. He is ryche for he hap no nede to oure seruise. He is hende for he axep pat most profitep ous. Who wolde noust loue suche a Lord and serue him wip goed wille? Bot penke pat we bep children and coueytep ofte pynges pat were moche azens ous, he axep pat pat moost profitip to /vs. Who wold not loue sichef. $10^{r}$ a Lord and senue him wip will? But penke pat we ben children, and coueiten ofte pingis pat weren myche azens vs, for we seen not al. And perfor it is nedeful to be groundid in bileue,

[^26]B
in byleue and se [afer] in byleue to pe ende of pe wordle; and so we may wyte what were goed for ous. For oftymes men desyrep pat doep hem moche harm, as children pat bep wantone and men pat bep on feueres; and so many wenep bat worliche
worschep and rychesse of pe worlde were best hem to haue, bot, yf pey seye here ende and pe commaundements of God and how pes pynges lettep hem to kepe Godes hes/tes, pey myste wel yse bat $\quad$ f.76 suche pynges noyep many men.

## T

and se afer in bileue to eende of pe world; and so may we wite what were good for vs. For ofte tymes men desiren pat doip hem myche harm, as children pat ben wantoun and men pat ben in feueres; and so many wenen pat worldii worship and
seis her eende and comaundementis of God and hou pes pingis letten hem to kepe Goddis heestis, pei my3ten wel se pat siche pingis noyen many men.

B: 1 afer] after
T: 1 afer] fer $\mathrm{H} \quad 2$ ofte tymes] oftyme $\mathrm{H} \quad 3$ hem] pem $\mathrm{H} \quad 4 \mathrm{in}$ ] in pe H , many] many men $\mathrm{H}, \quad 4-5$ worship and richessis of pe world] richesse and worchipes $\mathrm{H} \quad 5$ richessis] richesse Y , hem] for pem H , if] and H 6 her] peire HY, and comaurdementis of God and] om $\mathrm{H} \quad 7 \mathrm{hem}]$ pem H , Goddis heestis] be hests of God H 8 men ] men. And maken men often more to tak hede on pe fends biddiugis pen onn pe comaundements of Gode H

Pe fyrste commaundement of ten pat God himself spake seyp pus: 'Ich am py Lord God pat ladde pe out of Egypt of pe hous of praldom.' Bot ar we passe any forber here in pis
commaundement, pou mayst aske a questioun why Crist in Godes lawe ys ycleped by pes two names 'Lord' and 'oure God', and for what cause pys name 'Lord' is ynemmed byfore? And I may answere pat he is ynemned by pes two names for two kynnes pynges: pat is, drede and loue pat we scholde haue to him. And herefore God askep in

T
[Capitulum Tercium] Primum Mandatum

Pe first comaundment of ten is seid pus of God: God himsilf spak alle pes wordis: I am pe Lord pi God, pat ledde pee out of pe lond of Egipt, and broust pee out of pat place pere pou punyshe hem peraftir, and y do mercy to a pousend kynredis of men pat louen me and kepen myn hestis.

[^27]
## B

boke of his prophete: 'If I am Lord, where ys my drede? And if he be God, where ys his loue?' And, forpermore, why pis name 'Lord' is yput byfore: for in pis name 'Lord' is vnderstonde drede. And Seynt Austyn seyp pat drede bryngep in loue as brystyl bryngep in prede, and herefore Godes lawe puttep pis name \{'Lord'\} byfore. And pus pou schalt loue py God and drede him; for Austyn, pe goede clerk, seyp, 'Vnderstonde se pe power of God. Vnderstonde 3 pe mercy of God. Drede зe his power. Loue зe his mercy. Ne presume se so moche of his mercy pat se sette noust of his power, noper drede $3 e$ so moche his power bat se falle into dyspere of his mercy. For in him is power, in him is mency and al goednesse.'

## T

Pis word of oure God is chargid wip witt more pan we kan telle, or may for pis tyme, but oo ping shulde we take of Goddis lawe: pat he medlip togidre wordis of loue and drede; for bi loue and drede ledip he hise children, and chastisip hem bi pes two, as bi serde and staff. But sip man shulde kyndly be led bi loue, he medlip more of loue pan he doip of drede; and herfore, he strecchip his veniaunce to men vnto pe pridde and fourpe generacioun, but hise werkis of loue he strecchip til a pousend; and so witt and strengbe he medlip togidre, to tokene pat eche man is holden to /loue him, and bat no man may $\mathrm{f} .10^{\mathrm{v}}$ asterte knowleche of him ne, if he do amys, peyne pat he is worbi.

B: 5 Lord] corr.mar.
T: 1 God] Lorde $\mathrm{HY} \quad 2$ oo] on H 3 drede] of drede $\mathrm{H} \quad 5$ sib] sipen H 7 fourpe] pe furpe HY 8 til] to HY 9 pousend] thousand generacion H , to] o Y 10 to] for to $\mathrm{H} \quad 11$ knowleche] pe knowleche H

## B

Wherefore we scholde haue freliche in mynde pat oure hendy Lord God, by power, wysdome and his benygne and mercyful grace, ladde pe children of Israel out of Egypte, of pe hous of praldome, fro pe power of Pharao; and how also, by his power, wysdome and benigne and mercyful grace, he ledep ous fro Egypte, fro pe hous of praldome and fro pe power of Pharao. For by pis word 'Egypte' beb vnderstonde derkenesses. And by dedly synne, God, pat is lyste of mannes soule and al cunnynge, pas/sep fro mannes soule, and penne he is in 'Egypte', pat is
to mene: in derkenesse of ignorance and vncumnynge to knowe pynges pat my3te him helpe. For his soule, as pe Gospel tellep, is pe hous of an vnclene spirit, and penne is he vnder pe power of 'Pharao', by wham is vnderstonde pe deuel, pat is lord and prince of alle men and wommen pe wyche knowep hemself vnderput and sogest to dedly synne.

And pe holy clerk Seynt Austyn seyp bat a man ys seruant of so many lordes as he dop synnes. And also Criste in pe Gospel seyp pat he pat dop synne is seruant to synne. And so, for luste and lykynge pat meny men and wymmen hauep in here synne, bryngep hemself wip hcre owene fre wil in pe deuel of helle hous, bat is an hous of gret praldome. For Jon Crisostome, be worschepful clerk, seyp pat we alle, byfore tyme ar we falle into syme, we hauep

## B

a fre choyse whaper we wollep suy pe deuel or no. Bot if we ones, synwynge, bynde ous, he seyp in his werkes, penne we may noust, by oure owene vertue, astyrt his bondes; bot ryst as a schype, whenne his helme pat he is lad by is tobroke, ys
ydryue whoder pe tempest wole, ryst so a man pat by synne hap ylost pe helpe of grace of God almysty dope noust pat he wolde himself, bot pat his lord pe deuel wole. And bot God, he seyp, wip strong honde of his mercy vnbynde him, anone to pe dep he schal dwelle in pe bondes of his synnes. For ryat as a fyssch gop into pe wyle whenne pat he wole bot, whenne he ys inne, he may noust oute whenne he wolde, ryat so a man, ar he synwy, hap liberal arbitrement wheper he wole be vnder pe deueles kyngdom oper no; bot whenne, purgh synne, he hap yput himself vnder his kyngdom, penne he may noust, by his owen vertu, go oute of his power. Berfore God/spekep by f.77 ${ }^{5}$ pe prophete and seyp: 'Pou, man, py lo[s]te is of pyself and onlyche byn helpe is of me.' And so, wheme a man forsakep his synne by contricioun [and] confessioun, and dop, by hys power, satisfaccioun, purposynge hollyche to kepe him fro dedly synne, and mckelyche ponkep his God, knowlechynge pat noust by vertu of himself bot by fre grace of God goynge byfore he aloped and forsoke pe horpe of synne, and penne seyeb, as dyde Paule, 'By [pi] grace ich am pat ich am,' and, forber, byseche[b] grace of God to contynue his lyf in goede werkes, pat he may

B: 16 (mar. Osee 13), loste] lofte 18 and] om. 22 (mar. 1 Corinthis
15), pi] pe, bysechep] byseche

## B

seye forper wip Poule, 'And his grace in me was noust voyde', to alle pat pus, by pe grace of God, conteynep here lyf me may seye wip pe apostol, 'By grace зe beb made saue.' And so man pat for synne ys in power and kyngdome of pe fende may [noust],
by vertu of himself, be delyuered of his power, bot onlyche by pe mercyful honde and power of God, for noust of pe werkes of ry3tfulnesse, seyeb Poule, bat we haueb ywroust bot after his mercy he hap made ous saue. And so alday he ledep mankynde out of Egypte of pe hous of praldome and fro pe power of Pharao.

The boke tellep how clerkes seyp pat a childe, byfore pat it ys cristened, it hap a wykked spiryt dwellynge in hys soule, pe whiche wykked spiryt is acomered and yscomfyted purgh grace of God and by prayere of pe preste byfore pe churche dore whanne pe child schal be cristned; pe whiche sacrament of baptisme is ground and begynnyng of alle sacrament3, as was veryliche betokened in pe passioun of Criste by water pat ran out of his syde whame al his blod was go. So pat, by pis sacrament of baptisme, he is delyuered fro pe fendes power and ymade Godes childe, and he receyuep ber parte of pe passioun of /Criste and of alle sacrament3 and prayeres pat bep ydo f.77* in Holy Churche, and parte of alle goede dedes pat bep ydo among

[^28]
## B

alle Cristene folke. And so, in makynge of pe couenaunte pat he makep pere wip God, whenne he forsakep pe fendes pride and alle his werkes and, by grace of God, knowelechep to beo Godes childe, God, by his power, wysdome and his benigne and mercyful grace, ledep him oute of Egypte, of pe hous of praldom and fro pe power of Pharao. And pus oure Lord God hap ylad ous graciousliche of pe lond of Egypte.

And alle pes worchynges and goednesses pat oure Lord God alday continuelliche schewep to ous men scholde teche here children pat hauep discrecioun, to make hem pe more beter to loue here God and pe more tenderloker and bysyloker to lerne and to kepe Godes commaundements, as pe Holy Gost techep ous, as it is wryte in pe fyfpe boke of Holy Wryt where, after rehersyng of pe ten commaundements pe whiche he hotep pe to teche py childe, he seyep pus: 'Whanne py chylde schal axe pe seyyng, what wollep alle pes wytnesses, sermonyes and domes pat oure Lord God hap yhote to ous do to him, pou schalt answery azen to by childe, and telle him pus: "We were Pharao seruant3 in Egipte, and oure Lord God, wip strong honde, hap ylad ous out of Egypte."' And, forpermore, he scholde telle him of the plages, toknes and of grete merueilles pat God schewed a3enst Pharao in Egypte, and pe goednesse pat God byheyste hem if pey wolde kepe his hestes.

Here we scholde take goed hede how oure goede Lord God wilnep for to tolle ous into his loue as a boner fader dop his childe, for we scholde frelyche, wiboute seruyle drede, kepe his hestes and trewelyche serue him. And /for

## B

pis cause, byfore pe comaundements he rehercep pe benefetes pat he hap ydo \{to ous and seyp: 'Ich am py Lord God pat ladde pe oute of Egypte of pe hous of praldome.' In pes wordes bep vnderstonde mo benefytes pat he hap ydo\} for ous

## T

And so pis comaundement bitokenep God pe Fader, for oonhed, bi sum cause, is propred to pe Fader, and pis maundement biddip pee to haue but oon God, for Fadir and Sone and Hooli Goost ben pe same God, and pes pre maundementis of pe first table menen pes pre persones
pan manmes wyttes mowe suffice to schewe oper vnderstonde.
And, next folwynge, he commaundep and seyep, 'Pou schalt haue none alyene godes byfore me. Pou schalt noust make pe an ymage graue by mannes honde, ne no lykenesse pat is in heuene aboue and pat is in erpe bynepe, noper of hem pat bep in wateres vnder eorpe. Pou schalt noust worschepe hem ne hery hem. Ich am by Lord God a strange louer gelouse et cetera.

Meny men wenep pat pey kepep pis commaundement, and
in maner of her speche. And so, sip noping may be verrey God but oon, whoeuer makyp him many goddis mut haue summe false, and, for pis is straunge fro resoun of oure God, wel ben siche clepid aliene goddis.

## Capitulum Quartum

But for men wenen pat pei kepen pis comaundment, and

B: 2-4 to ous....hap ydo] corr.mar.
T: 1 pis comaundement bitokeneb] pis comaundementis betokenen $H \quad 3$ Fadir]
pe Fader H, Sone] pe Sonn H, Hooli] be Holi HY 4 pes $^{2}$ ] om. H, pe Y
5 her] peir HY, sib] sen H 6 mut] hym most H 10 (mar. Capitulum Quartum T)

## B

sitt on many wyse pey lyuep per azen. Perfore we schullep ywyte pat what kynnes pyng a man louep most he makep his god and, syppe alle synne stondep in loue, eueryche heed synne drawep wip him brekynge of pis heste. For alle dedly synnes bep
forbode in pis heste, and who pat synwep in eny dedly synne he brekep pis commaundement and makep him a false god. And so pes ten commaundements bep as ten myrours pat men may se hemself perinne, wheper pey plese God or no; for if pou holde eny of hem pou plesest py God. And syp per be pre synnes, as Seynt Jon seyep, pat wrappep alle oper synnes pat eny man can rekene, [herefore] on pre wyse may a man breke pis

## T

3itt on many wise pei lyuen perazens, berfore we shulden wite pat what kyn ping pat a man louep mo\{o\}st he makip his god. And so, sip al synne stondip in loue, euery heed synne drawep wip him brekyng of pis heest. And so pes ten heestis ben as ten myrouurs pat men may se hemsilf ynne, wheper pei plese God; for if pou holde ony of hem pou plesist pi God. And sip per ben pre synnes, as Seynt Ion seip, bat wlappen alle oper synnes pat ony man kan rekene, herfore on pre wise may man breke pis

B: 11 herefore] wherefore
T: 1 wise] wyses H , perasens] nost perafter H , perasen Y 2 pat a] om. H , moost] corr.int. T, he] pat he H 3 sip ] sen H , synne stondib] sinnes standen H 4 pis heest] pis hestis H , bes] as Y 5 hemsilf] bemseluen H 6 hem] pem $\mathrm{H} \quad 7$ pi] om. H , sip] sen H , ben] is H 8 wlappen] wrapen in H

## B

commaundement. Pes pre synnes stondep in pes pre loues: loue of flessche, or loue of eyzen, oper pryde of pis lyff. Bot desyre of flesche is oure on enemy, as wytnessep Seynt Bernard and seyp of him pus: 'I may noust fle my body ne
glotenye and lecherye pat/comep of glotenye.
To coueyti\{se\} of eyze syst sterep pe secunde enemy, pat is pe world, and so into pe loue of two oper synnes, pat bep coueytise of pe worlyche godes and so into slowpe; for comenlyche ryche men bep slowe in Godes seruyce and lustep hem in lykynges of here godes, as a sowe or a swyn dop in pe myre and mukke. To pride of lyf, pat stondep in loue of worschep of pe world, styrep pe fend of helle, and so into two oper synnes, pat bep wrepe and enuye. And so in loue of pes pre synnes bep wrapped alle maner synnes pe whiche bep forbode in pis heste where God hotep pe pat pou scholdest

## T

comaundment. Pes pre synnes stonden in pes pre loues: loue of fleish, and loue of yзen, and pride of pis lijf.

B: 11 coueytise] corr.int.
T: 2 ysen and] yzen and luf pat is H , pis] om. H

## B

haue none alyene godes byfore him, ne make pe no lyknesse pat is in heuene aboue, and pat is in erpe bynepe, ne of hem pat bep in wateres vnder pe erpe; pou schalt noust worschepe hem ne herye hem. Pis is vnderstonde pus: for cause pat no pyng scholde be loued
foule lechours makep here god pe fleslyche baly of a lecherous womman. For God byddep pe loue him ouer alle pyng; bot eche man and womman louep pat pyng more pan God for pe whiche pyng, whateuer it be, pay brekep Godes heste. And

## T

And so glotouns and lecchours breken pis heest. And herfor seip Poul pat pes greete glotouns maken her here bely her god, for loue pat pei louen it and, bi pe same skile, pes foule lecchours maken her god pe taile eende of an hoore. For

5 God biddip pee loue him ouer al ping,

B: 12 womman] For man and womman louep bat pyng more pan God for pe whiche pyng whateuere it be canc.

T: 2 maken her here] makyn peir HY, her god] peir god $\mathrm{H} \quad 3$ loue] pe luf $H$, be] pis HY 4 her god be taile eende of an hoore] be tail end of a hore peir god ffor luf pat he loues it H , For] And H .

## B

pus pay mowe yknowe pat hy louep noust God ouer alle pyng. And syb bat God byddep ous noust do bot pat pat is goed and moste profyst to ous, we scholde put his byddynge byfore alle ober pynges and byddynges. For whas byddynge pat a man
puttep byfo/re oper, in pat he louep him more pan he dop pat oper pyng whas byddyng he puttep byhynde and seruep pat oper fyrst. Now God byddep pe fede pe wip mete and drynke and oper sustynaunce in mesure; and yf pou passe pis mesure for luste of by bely, pe meuyng and luste of py flesche styrep pe more to do pat py flesche axeb pan meuynge of God. And so, whanne pou consentest to do pe wil and desyre of pe flesche and puttest byhynde pe heste and desyre of God, pou makest falslych py bely py god and dost azenst pis commaundement, in pe whiche God byddep pe pat pou scholdest make pe no

## T

and what ping he biddip pee do, putte it bifore oper. For whos biddyng pat a man puttip bifore opere, in pat he louep him more pan pat operping whos biddyng he puttip bihynde and senuep pat oper first. Now God biddip pee fede pe in mesure; and if pou passe pis mesure for lust of pi bely, pe moeuyng of pi fleish stirip pee more to do pat pi fleish axip pan moeuyng of God, /and so pou makest falsly pi bely pi god.

## B

lyknesses of hem pat bep yn wateres vnder pe erpe. For in pes bep vnderstonde flesclyche lustes pat glotons and lecherous men and wommen most louep.

And in pis wyse coueytouse men and wommen makep hem

## T

And on pis wise pe coueitous man pat synnep in coueitise of worldly goodis makip his mawmet pes worldli goodis. And herfore seip Poule pat auarice of siche ping is semyse of mawmetis, as to false goddis. And myche more pe proud man

## B

and wommen makep pe fend here god, for pe fend is kyng of alle proute children, and in pat bat a man oper womman seuep him to pryde and leuep mekenesse of herte pat Criste Ihesu byddep him to lerne he makep pe fend his god and forsakep Crist. And

Trist wel perto, it wole noust be. Bot also syker as God is in heuene, pe heyзer pat pou makest pyself purgh pryde a3enst

## T

makip pe fend his god, sip pe fend is kyng of alle proude children, and in pat pat a man syuep hym to pride and leeuep mekenesse of herte pat Ihesu Crist biddip he makip pe fend his god and forsakip Crist. Pus we don in dede, houeuer oure moup blabere.

T: 1 sib] sen H , kyng] fader H , of] to $\mathrm{H} \quad 3$ biddip] biddis kepe H

## B

pe wyl of God, bot if pou amende pe here bytyme in pis lyfe, bou schalt euene after by pryde be pe nerre Lucyfer and deppur in helle. And herefore lerne of Crist pat is humyl and meke to sette pyn herte in lowenesse. For pe lower pat pou holdest pe in berynge, be heyer pou art in syst of God; and pe more heyer pat pou holdest pe in py berynge, pe more lower and fowler pou art in pe syst of God. For alle suche proute men and wommen forsakep Criste pat is humel and meke and make here god pe proute fende of helle and folwep him. Wherefore hy brekep pis commaundement in pat pat hy dope azens Godes byddynge whare he seyp: 'Pou schalt make pe no lyknesse pat is in heuene aboue.'

Also alle manere wychecraftes, enchauntements and alle operdyuerse incantaciouns pat bep ydo by conseylyng of wykked spirits bep forbode in pis comaundement. For Seynt Austyn byddep trewe prestes to warne pe peple pat suche maner craftes mowe noust helpe to helpe of syke men, noper of syke bestes, lame or sore, bot /bes manere craftes bep greuous and foly waytynges of pe olde enemy pe fende, by pe whiche he purposep to bygyle mankynne. And whosoeuere vse pes, he seyp, if he be a clerke he is to be put doune of his ordre, and if he be a lewed man or womman he is to be cursed.

Also pe same doctour seyp pat we scholde noust kepe dayes bat beb ycleped 'Egypcians' pe whiche, as ich vnderstonde, bep pe dayes pat men now clepep 'dysmale dayes', and pes

B: 5 God] for alle suche canc.

## B

dayes no Cristene peple scholde spare in bygynnyng of eny worke or iorney, neper kepe pe kalendys of Januarie in pe whiche me зeueb siftes eche to oper as, in begynnynge of be 3ere, by enchauntyng of goede hansel, as pough hy seyde oper
pouste, 'We bylyuep and trystep purgh pis hansel of pis newe sere spede wel al pe sere folwynge.' And if pey haue non hansel in pe bygynnynge of pe newe зere hy vnderstondep to spede pe wors al pe sere after. And in pis maner synne fallep alle pat in pis manere belyuep and tristep into fangynge of hansel in eny chaffaryng. And pough eny man seye pat he knowep some men fare oper spede pe betere by suche hansel, wyte he wel pat it is noust so, but it is pe sotylte of pe fende to brynge hem into mysbyleue. Bot here se schal vnderstonde pat goede Cristene folk mowe syue syftes eche to oper for to encresse and norysche loue pat is charite, bot noust into pat tryst and bylyue pat ys yspoke byfore, neyper into suche entente to haue a grettour syfte asen, for pat were vsure.

Also, Seynt Austyn seyp bat we schal noust kepe tymes, oper 3eres, oper dayes, oper course of mowene, oper of sonne (pat is to mene for bygynnyng oper worchynge of eny profitable and lawesom worke oper for spouselle or weddynges); or, in gaderynge of herbes for eny medicyne, seye eny charmes; /oper for eny sykenesse putte eny scripture vpon man or bestes, bot if it be pe Crede, or elles pe Pater Noster. For

## B

pay pat kepep, oper takep hede, oper consentep to hem pat kepep suche tymes and pes foreseyden pynges oper eny maner dyuynaciouns or destynees oper eny maner enchauntements, oper bylyuep to hem, or axe hem for pynges bat bep ylost oper
ystole or to knowe by here crafte pynges tocomynge, oper ledep hem into here hous, bycause of suche pynges forsakep God, errynge azenst Cristene feyp. And bot pey by penaunce of Holy Churche beo to God reconsyled, hey ynrennep euerlestyng wrepe of God in peynes of helle wipoute ende. Perfore do we after pe holy apostel Poule pat seyp, 'Whaper ze ete oper drynke oper what ouper pyng euer 3 d do, doo зe it in pe name of oure Lord Ihesu Crist in wham we lyue[b] and dayeb.' And elles we dop a3enst Godes commaundement and errep in pe feyp of Holy Churche, makynge pe fendes of helle oure godes.

5 For and we were stedefast on goede byleue pat God of heuene is almy3ty we wolde noust for helpe of oure bodyes or bestes, oper for eny worldlyche godes ylost oper ystole, oper elles for to knowe pynges to comynge, or for eny cause, axe helpe of pes forseyden pynges pat dyuerselyche and sotellyche bep ydo by worchynge of certeyn fendes. For, as pe prophete seyp, alle godes of folke bep fendes and pay bep ycleped stronge godes oper alyen godes, for by pryde pay bep ymaked alyens and stronge fro God. And pou, amysbeleued man or womman,

[^29]

## B

worschepede eny suche false godes, were it neuere so priuey as to pe worlde, it moste nedes beo openlyche yknowe and yseye of God, to wham alle pynges bep most opene and to him nopyng may be hydde. Perfore he seyp,'Pou schalt haue none alyene mannes /honde.'

Here by pis commaundement sume men paraunter wenep pat it beo forbode to make eny ymages; bot of pis spekep pe

## T

and so pes prestis pat prechen more to gete a loos pan for worship of God and profijt of his Chirche maken hem a fals symylitude in heuene; and he pat prechip more for worldli wynnyng pan for worship of God synnep azens pis maundement, sip pat he makip him a similitude in erpe; and, bi pe same resoun, bat prest pat prechip more for to fede hise lustis pan to plese God, he brekip \{pis\} heest on pe pridde maner, for he makyp hym a falss liknesse in watir. And pus may we se hou comounly pis maundement is brokun, bope of prestis and seculers.
\{Capitulum Quintum \}
Bvt here moeuen clerkis wheper ymagis [ben] leueful, and it semeb nay, for ymagis ben forfendid bope in pis

B: 5 (mar: nota de ymaginibus)
T: 1 prechen] prechin in pe chirche H , gete] have $\mathrm{H} \quad 2$ worship] pe worschip H , and] or H , hem] pein H 4 asens] asein HY , maundemert] comaundmert HY, sip] sen $\mathrm{H} \quad 5$ a om. HY 6 for] om. HY 7 pis] corr.mar. T, heest] hestis $\mathrm{H} \quad 8$ a] om. Y , falss] fals wittnes and a fals H 9 and] and of H, 10 Capitulum Quintum] mar. T 11 ben] om. T, leueful] lefful or non H, 12 (mar: Capitulum Quintum T (this occurs twice))

## B

noble clerke Bede in exponyng pe temple of Salomon where he seyp pus: 'It is to knowe,'he seyp, 'bat per bep sume men pat wenep pat it be by pe lawe forbode pat we scholde nou3t graue ne peynte lyknesse of men or of bestes oper lyknesse

Holy Churche, as dyde Moyses in pe tabernacle by heste of God. And as Moyses, by Godes heste, also made a brasen serpent for pat pe peple pat by oper wylde fyry serpentes were enuemned byholdynge him scholde be heled and lyue, by moche more it 15 is lausom to ous to haue pe ymage of Crist in pe cros pat we, in hauynge mynde on pe dep of Crist, mowe ouercome pe temptaciours and pe venym of pe fende, pe olde serpent. And

## T

maundement and many opere places. For in pe Olde Testament God was eschewe pat ony ymage shulde be maad among pe Iewes, and pe same God is now wip pe same maundementis.
$\mathrm{T}: 1$ and] and in $\mathrm{H} \quad 2$ ymage] ymages $\mathrm{H} \quad 3$ maundementis] maundement Y

## B

answeryng to pe twelfe ymages of pe twelfe oxen and to ober pynges pat entyred be temple, it is lausom to peynte in Holy Churche ymages of pe twelfe apostoles and of oper seintes as we dop worschepfullyche and presabyllyche in Holy Churche. 5 Wherfore if we dylygentlyche take hede of pe wordes of pis commaundement, we mowe wel yknowe pat we beo noust forbode to make ymages. For into pis euydence he seyp byfore, "Pou schalt haue none alyene godes byfore me," and after pe schonynge of ymages and lyknesses he seyp, "Pou schalt nou3t worschepe ne herye hem," as pough he seyde openliche,"Pou schalt noust make suche ymages for to herye hem or worschepe hem as God." Ellys, forsope,' seyp pis grete clerke/Bede, 'Crist Thesu oure sauyoure, seynge be ymage of Cesar be emperoure on a peny, scholde noust haue yhote, "3ylde to Cesar pynges pat

15 bep his," bot raper haue reprehended pe ymage of Cesar bycause of ydolatrie pat myste be to pe ymage in a peny.'

Bot here we schal vnderstonde pat ymages mowe be occasioun of goed and also of yuel. For a gret clerk seyp T

But here me pinkip pat ymagis don bope good and harm:

## B

pat ymages mowe be maked wel and eke ylle: wel to lyste and haunte and to styrye oper meue pe soules of goede Cristene folke forte pe more bysyloker and deuouteloker worschepe her God; and ylle whenne pat, by occasioun of ymages, me errep
fro pe sopenysse of feyp so pat pylke ymage be worscheped as God, as yf enybody tryste endelyche to be holpe or relyued by hem in eny sykenesse or in eny oper nede or dysayse, and perfore offere and praye to hem [and] worscheped hem wip worschep pat is onlyche ypropred to God and to no mo.

## T

good to siche men to whom pei ben bokis to more [loue] God pan pei shulden ellis; yuel pei don to siche men whom pei moeuen pus to sette here hope eendely $i n$ help of pes ymagis, or ellis to scatere her loue folily in ymagis. And in pes
synnes traueilen many folk, bope lerid and lewed, and coueitise of prestis scaterip ofte her loue vpon pes dede stokkis, so pat me pinkip, saaf betere iugement, pat it were more profijt vnto Hooli Chirche /pat alle pes ymagis weren f.11 ${ }^{\vee}$ left, as God bad pe Iewes. Pan shulden pei knytte more clenly

[^30]
## T

her loue in her God, and lesse erre in mawmetrie and coueitise bope. For lewed men in pilgrimage synne myche in mawmetrie, and clerkis synnen myche more for coueitise of offryng. But we seien sip Crist for vs was maad man it is leueful to haue ymage bi be resoun of his manhed, sip men sien his body walking on erpe and, as Seynt Poul seip, 'In pat his Godhed'; and in pe breed of pe auter we seen eche day his body, but bope pes wip yzen of soule and not wip yзe of body. But certis siche ape liknesse blyndip many men and mak[ib] hem, bi litil ping bat is ofte leueful, wade in depe errours and do more pan pei shulden, as peyntouurs of ymagis openly techen vs. And so charmes and many pingis, takun bi experience, maken hem to trowe hem to myche and leeue troupe of God. 3he, bullis and absoluciouns marren many men and maken hem to erre in feip of Ihesu Crist.

T: 1 her loue] pair loue $H$, her God] peir Lord Godde H, per God Y 2 in pilgrinage synne myche in mawmetrie] sinnen in pilgrimage in mawmentrie ful oft $\mathrm{H} \quad 4$ sip] sen H , leueful] leueful for vus H 5 ymage] ymages HY , pe] om. HY, sip] sipen H ( 6 ] upon $Y$, and] om. $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{In}$ ] and in H 7 of] оп $\mathrm{H} \quad 8$ узеп] ізе Y , узе] узеп $\mathrm{H} \quad 9$ makip] maken $\mathrm{T} \quad 10$ hem] pem $H$, depe] depnes of HY 11 ymagis] ymagis taken bi experiens $Y$ 12 experience] erperiens H 13 maken hem] maken men HY , trowe hem] trow pem H , troupe of God] pe trew weye to God H 14 hem ] pern H $\quad 15 \mathrm{in}]$ in pe H

## B

Therfore techep Seynt Gregorye in a lettere pat he wrot to a byschop and seyp pus: 'Leue broper, late it was yschewed to ous pat pou, seynge some folke worschepynge ymages, wherfore pou breke pe ymages and castest hem out of churche, the whiche zele or loue pat pou haddest pat pate pat was ymaked wip mannes hondes scholde noust be worscheped we preysep, bot pat pou scholdest noust haue ybroke hem we demep.' For Gregorie seyp, 'Herefore peynture ys maked in churche: pat pay namelyche pat cunnep no letterure scholde rede in walles pate pat pey mowe noust in bokes. And so if a clerk schal worschepe his boke, panne may anoper man worschepe an ymage.' In anoper lettre pe same Gregorie seyp, 'Whoso wole make ymages let him nou3t bot in alle manere schone hem to be worscheped. And warne alle men bysyliche pat pey take hete and charite (pat is loue of compunccioun) by be syste of pyng ydo, [and] pat pey be put adoune oper pat pey knele adoune into /pe worschepe of onlyche Trinite.'

Herefore seyp a gret clerke, 'I worschepe noust be ymage of Crist for pat it is tre, noper for it ys pe ymage of Crist, bot ich worschepe Crist byfore pe ymage of Crist for it is pe ymage of Crist and meuep me to worschepe Crist.' And so, whenne we comep into eny churche, mekelyche we scholde knele vpon pe grounde, and yf pou vnderstonde pat pe holy sacrement of pe

## B

auter, pat ys Cristes body in forme of bred pat was ybore of pe Virgyne Marye and by pe depe vpon pe cros bouste ous yf we kepe his hestes fro peynes of helle, be presaunte aboue pe auter or elles vpon be auter, worschepe it wip al byn heorte, soule and mynde. And whanne pou seyst pe cros, penke wip gret sorowe and compunccioun of heorte what depe he suffrede for mankynde. And so byfore pe cros pat meuep pe to deuocioun, worschepe pou Crist wip al py myst.

And pus, by ymages and peynture ymaked by mannes honde, pou mayste yse and knowe how holy seyntes of heuene louede almysty God, and how grete and dyuerse passiouns bey suffrede for loue pat pey hadde to him; as by pe ymage of Seynt Lauerence pat is ypeynte or ygraue holdynge a gredel in his honde, bytoknyng and schewyng how Laurence was yrosted vpon a gredel; and also by ymage of Seynte Kateryne pat ys ypeynt holdyng in here hond a whel and a swerd, schewyng what passioun be holy virgyne Kateryne suffrede. And so by ymages of oper seyntes pou myst somdel yknowe what passioun bey suffrede for loue pat pey hadde to almy3ty God. And pus by syste of pes pynges yseye, as Gregorye meneb byfore, we schul putte ous adoune into worschep of onlyche Trynyte. And pis scholde be grete worschep to pe seyntes in heuene for as muche pat, by pe sy3te of here ymages, oure deuocioun ys ymeued pe more deuouteloker to worschepe God. And yf /we do offrynge and

## B

worschep pat is onlyche ypropred to God to here ymages, we noust onlyche penne offendep God, brekynge his heste, bot also we offendep alle pe holy seyntes of heuene, for bey hatep, as wytnessep Seynt Austyn, if suche pynges be do to hemself. For pey wollep nou3t vsurpe to hem suche pynges pat bep onlyche ypropred to God; penne muche more hy hatep yf suche bynges be do to here ymages, bat bep bot here schadues ymaked of tre or stone. For Holy Wryt wytnessep how pe angel of God wolde noust suffre Jon pe Euangeliste to worschepe him bot bad him worschepe God. And yf pou wolt worschepe in his trewe ymage, do after pe conseile of Thobye and ete pou py bred wip hungry and nedy, pat is to mene: syf parte of py sustenaunce, after by power, to hem pat nedep, and namelyche to pe meke, trewe, poure man pat ys pe trewe ymage of God and moche may helpe pe wip his prayere. For pe holy apostel Seynt Jame seyp pat a bysy prayere of pe rystful man is moche worpy, and herefore pe wyse man byddep pe hyde pyn almesse in pe poure mannes bosum and pes, he seyp, schal praye for pe.

Of pis ymage of God meny men and wommen takep lytel kepe, and wip dyuerse horpes of synnes menyfoldlyche pis noble ymage defoulep, into gret dysplesance and offense of God. Wherefore

## B

pe holy clerke Seynt Bernard spekep to pis ymage and seyp pus: 'O my soule, yf pou wolt be loued of God egrey pou in pe pyne ymage and he schal louy be. Reparel his lyknesse in pe and he schal loue pe and desyre pe. For sope,' seyp Seynt Bernard, 'by
conseyle of pe Holy Trynyte by makere made pe to his owne ymage and lyknesse, pe whiche ymage and lyknesse he toke neuere to oper creature, pat pou scholdest loue him in so moche pe feruentloker by how moche pou knewe pe of him merueillyche ymade. Perfore,' he seyp, 'vnderstonde py noblete; for ry3t as God is oueral /ful and hoole, makynge al bynge quyke, meuynge $\mathrm{f} .83^{\text {r }}$ and gouemynge it ryst, so py soule ys ful and hoole in eche party of by body, makynge it quyke, meuynge and gouemynge it. And ry3t as in God beb persones pre: Fader, Sone and Holy Goste, so pou hast dignytees pat bep pre: vnderstondynge, wyl and mynde. And ryst as pe Sone ys ygete of pe Fader and of hem two (pat is of Fader and Sone) gop forp pe Holy Goste, so of vnderstondynge ys ygete a wille, and of pes two (pat is of vnderstondynge and wil) comep forpe a mynde. And ryst as pe Fader ys God, pe Sone ys God, be Holy Goste ys God and zit per bep noust pre godes bot on God and hap pre persones, ry3t so vnderstondynge ys pe soule, wyl ys pe soule and mynde is pe soule, and sit per bep noust pre soules bot on soule and

B: 14 hast] hast pre

## B

hap pre dignytees wip be whiche we bep yhote to loue God, as wip al oure vnderstondynge, wip al oure wyl and wip al oure mynde. For not onlyche vnderstondynge of God sufficep to heuenelyche blysse bot yf per be a wyl yset in loue; ne pes two sufficep not bot yf ber be a mynde alwey in me vnderstondynge and wilnynge, in pe whiche mynde God moste dwelle. For ryst as ber nys no stounde pat a man nys ysusteyned by pyte and mercy of God, ryst so per scholde be no moment pat a man ne scholde haue him present in his mynde.' And so man pat is in charite ys pe quyke ymage of God. 'For ryst as py makere,' seyth Bernard, 'pat made pe after his lyknesse ys charite, goed, ry3tful, swete and meke, pacient and mercyful; ryst so pou art ymaked to haue charite, and for pou scholdest be clene, holy, fayre, meke and humyl. And so pe more pat a man pat is Godes ymage hap of suche vertues, pe more ys bat ymage ylyche to God.' For pe grete clerke Crysostom seyp pat he ys noust a trewe disciple pat folwep nou3t his mayster, ne it is nou3t a trewe ymage pe/whichef. $83^{v}$ is noust liche to his makere. Wherefore what man oper womman pat hap most of vertues ys be ymage most lyche to God.
'And perfore,' seyp Seynt Clement, 'if 3e wollep honoury

## B

trewelyche pe ymage of God, we schewep,' he seyp, 'to sow pat pat ys trewe pat $3 e$ do wel.' And pis ys to mene pat $3 e$ do almys dedes, and reuerence and worschep to man pat ys ymaked to pe ymage of God. 'Mynystre зe or зyue зe mete,' he seyp, 'to him pat hungrep, drynke to him pat prystep, clopynge to pe naked, seruyse to pe syke, herbourgh to pe pylgryme or to pe weyfarynge man, and mynstre зe or зуие зе nedeful pynges to him pat ys in prysoun.' And pis ys an offerynge and a pylgremage so heylyche plesynge to God pat, as he himself wytnesseb in pe Gospel, pat pate we dope to one pe leste of his he holdep it ydo to him. Bot we redep in no place of al Holy Wryt pat Crist wytnessep pat he holdep it ydo to him pat ys ydo to any ymage ymade of mannes hondes. Also pe forseyden Seynt Clement axep, 'What worschep of God,' he seyp, 'ys it to renne aboute by stonyn and treyn ymages and to worschepe vayne ymages and wipoute soules as godes and dyspyse oper sette man at noust, in wham ys pe verray ymage of God?' But pis ys noust yseyde for pat eny man scholde despyse ymages of holy seyntes and sette hem at noust, bot for bey scholde trewelyche worschepe God in pe trewe, meke, poure man, pat ys a quyke ymage of God, seruynge him, as y tolde byfore, and noust suffre h[i]m

## B

be naked and cold, hungry and pyrsty and in oper dysayses, and clope, vysyte and fede dede ymages pat neyper byrstep ne hungrep ne feleb no coldnesse, neyper suffrep dysaise for bey mowe noust fele, ne see, ne heere, ne speke, ne loke, ne helpe eny

## B

in knowleche and loue of God pys worby spouse, so
proporcionabeliche he resceyuep plentenouser ernesses into wytnesse of doueres of heuenelyche blessednesse, be whiche, as a queyne, he schal resceyue in heuene. Bot pis spousel is
betere pan bodylyche spousel. And God and pe holy soules of trewe men bep betere pan mennes bodyes. And so pis wedloke is broke for a tyme by brekynge of feyp and defaute of rystwesse lyuynge. And herefore God seyp ofte by his prophetes pat his peple dyde fornicacioun and auoutrye for pay worschepede false godes. And Seynt Jame seyp pat men pat louep pis wordle bep gostlyche auouteres, for pis seyp he: 'Зe auouteres, knowe se noust pat frendschepe of pe worlde ys enemy to God?' And pus alle men pat louep more worldelyche worschepe oper goedes of pe worlde pan God and his lawe and trewe lyuynge bep auouteres gostlyche, yf pey were Cristene before. And herefore men scholde drede pe power of pys spouse pat seyp /pus: 'Ich am a stronge louere,' knowynge wel pat his f. $84^{v}$ power ys so strong pat he ne may noust lette to putte suche auouteres into euerelestynge prysoun of helle bot yf pay in pis lyf be to him newe reconsyled.

Bot here pey scholde vnderstonde pe humylite and mekenesse

B: 1 knowleche] knowle/leche

## B

of pis spouse pat ys a louere gelouse, and mekelyche turne to hym azen. For of gret loue he clepep hem to be reconsyled as pe boke recordep in meny place. And in on place he spekep to synful mannes soule by his prophete Jeremye and seyp pus: 'Pou hast ydo lest louep erpelyche pynges louep most God, and he pat most

B: 4 (mar: Capitulo tertio) 15 зe] he
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\{louep\} erpelyche pynges louep lest God.' And pus whenne pey resceyucp by loue into pe ynmuste chambre of here heorte eny maner creature wham hy louep euene wip God or more preciouslyche pan God here spouse, bay bep gostelyche
spousebrekeres and so, lyuynge in auouterye, /getep and norschep bastarde childrene. For ryst as goede, meke men [pat] trauaylep to lyue in treupe and sobernesse, kepynge pe commaundements of here spouse Ihesu Crist, getep lausom and gostlyche children and norschep hem in vertues by example of here goede contynuel conuersacioun, to make hem trewe heires of pe euerelestynge kyngdom of heuene; ry3t so pes worldlyche loueres, gostlyche spousebrekeres, getep proute bastarde children and, by example of here wykked lyuynge, norschep hem in pride, wrepe and enuye, sleupe, coueytise, glotenye and lecherye, and techep hem false and sotel worldlyche ymagynaciouns, as grete cautel opes, lesynges and oper false fraudys, to make hem grete and ryche by false worldlyche goedes, into gret dampnacioun of suche fadres and of here children pat hem folwep. And herefore God seyp here in pis commaundement pat he vysytep (pat ys to mene 'punyschep'

20 by peyne) pe synnes of faderes into here children into pe prydde and ferpe generacioun of hem pat hatep hym and pat bep

[^31]
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pylke pat wollep noust kepe his hestes. For Crist seyp in pe Gospel, 'He pat louep noust me kepep noust my wordes,' be whiche bep his hestes. And zite pe prophete Ezechiel seyp pat pe sone schal noust bere pe fadres gulte ne pe fader schal noust bere pe sones gulte, and in pis commaundement God seyp pat he punyschep pe synnes of faderes in here childrene into pe prydde and pe ferpe kynreden. For so longe tyme, as a gret clerke tellep, fadres bep ywoned leue vpon erpe wip here children, and ry3t as pe children, bycause of myslyuyng of here faderes and faute of chastement, takep parte and commeneb wip here faderes in synnes, folwynge hem in maneres, so, by rystfulnesse of God, pey schal take parte of dyseyse and commeny wip hem in peyne more or lasse after pe quantyte pat pey commenep wip hem in synnes. But per pe prophete seyp bat pe sone schal noust be punysched for pe fader ne pe fa/der for pe sone, pis pou most vnderstonde: pat yf pe fader be a ry3tful man, kepynge Godes hestes, and hatep synne and louep vertues, and techep and chastep his child by his power after pat pat Godes lawe techep, and penne, pough pe chyld be rebelle to pe fader and wole noust lyue as he techep him but folwep his owene luste a3enst Godes hestes, in pis case, as pe prophete

## B

seyp, be fader schal noust be punysched for pe childe. And yf pe fader be an vnrystful lyuere asenste Godes commaundement and his sone, seynge and knowynge pe wykkednesses of him, doep noust after him, but dredep God forsakyng falsenesse and hatep synnes folwynge vertues, and in alle his dedes kepep Godes byddynges, pat chylde pat doep pus, as pe prophete seyp, schal nou3t bere pe faderes gult but yf he folwe pe fader in wykkednesse. And so God punyschep synnes of fadres into here childrene pat folwep hem in here synnes into pe prydde and ferpe kynredene of hem pat hatep him and punyschep hem perafter. 'But,' he seyp, 'I do mercy into a pousande kynredenes of men pat louep me and kepep myne hestes.' Pis word of oure Lord God is charged wip moche more pan we kunne telle, bot o pyng scholde we take of Godes lawe: pat he mellep togedre wordes of loue and drede. For by loue and drede he ledep his children and chastezep hem by pes two as by serde and staf. Bot syp man scholde kyndelyche be ladde by loue, he medlep more of loue pan he dop of drede, and perefore he strecche[b] hey vengeaunce to men into prydde and to pe ferpe generacioun, bot his wordes of loue he strecchep tyl a pousand. And so wit and strengbe he medlep togedere into

B: 3 doep] and doep 6 byddynges] byddynges and 19 strecchep] strecche
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tokene pat eueryche man ys holde to loue him and pat non may asterte pe knoweleche of him ne, yf he do amysse, peyne pat he ys worpy. And so pys commaundement bytokenep God pe /Fader, f. $86^{r}$ for onheede by som cause ys propryd to pe Fader and pis
commaundement byddep pe to haue bot on God, for Fader and Sone and Holy Gost bep pe same God. And pes pre commaundements of pe furste table menep pes pre persones in manere of here speche. And so, syppe nopyng may be verrey God bot on, whosoeuere makep him many godes mote haue some false. And for pis ys stronge fro resone of oure God, wel bep suche cleped alyene godes.

O Lord, syppe no man louep hys God bot after pat he knowep him, [syppe] knowynge mesureth loue, how warly scholde we trauayly for to knowe oure God and fle alle errores pat

15 fallep in pis knowynge. And herefore seyp Poul pat yf pe Iewes hadde yhad pis knowynge pey hadde neuere doo on pe cros T

## Capitulum Sextum

O Lord, sip no man louep his God but aftir pat he knowep him, sip knowyng mesurip loue, hou warly shulde we trauele for to knowe oure God and fle alle errouris bat fallen in pis knowyng. And perfor seip Poul pat if pe Iewes had knowen, pei had neuere don on crosse Ihesu, Kyng of Glorie

B: 13 sypbe] suche
T: 2 sip] sen H 3 sib] sipen H, (mar. Capitulum Sextum T) 5 perfor] herefore HY 6 on] on be Y Kyng] be King H
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Ihesu Kyng of blysse. And pis ys pe cause why chyldrene of pe Olde Lawe were forfended for to worschepe God in his ymages, and herefore God was schewed to Moyses in a busche. For we scholde wyte by resoun pat pynges pat bep vnsensyble may be, pe wisest and pe moost iust pat ony man may penke

T: 1 children] pe childer $H$, in] of $H Y \quad 2$ forfendid] defended $H$, to] for to HY 3 wite] wititt $H \quad 6$ feele] see ne fele $H \quad 9$ pe] om. Y 11 may] is or may H , wisest] wisest ping Y , pe moost] moost Y
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So he ys eueremore, wipoute eny bygynnynge and wipoute endynge, knowyng alle pynges; and he may noust forsete ne noust may ascape him, bot eueremore he ordeynep alle pyng pat ys goede.

And so, syp he hadde power to knowe himsylf and euene after
his power ys engendryd his knowynge and of pes two pynges comep reste in himsylf, he mot nede be pre pynges and al on God: power, pat /ys fyrst, pe Fader of heuene; knowynge or wysdom, pat is pe secunde persone; pe prydde ys goede wyl pat we clepep pe Holy Goste. And of pis Holy Trynyte comep alle kenne T
on, and so he is euermore wipouten ony bigynnyng and wipouten ende. Knowyng al ping, he may noust forsete, ne noust may askape him, but euermore he ordeynep all ping pat is good. And so, sip he hap power to knowe
himsilf, and euene aftir his power is gendrid his knowyng and of pes two pingis comep rest in himsilf, he mote nede be pre pingis and al oon God: power, bat is first, Fader of heuene; knowyng or wisdom, pat is pe secound persone; pe pridde persone is good will, bat we clepen 10 pe Hooli Goost. And of pis Hooli Trinite comen alle kyn

T : 1 so] also T , euermore] om. H , ony] om. H, and] and schal be H 2 ende] endyng $H$, noust] not $Y \quad 3$ askape] scape $H \quad 4$ sip] sen $H$ 6 mote] most $H \quad 7$ nede] nedis $Y, \quad 00 n] 00 H$, first] be first $H$ 8 Fader] pe Fader HY , or] alle $\mathrm{H} \quad 9$ clepen] calle H

## B

creatures. And as pis Holy Trynyte may fayle in no stede, so he may noust faylle in no kyn mesure. Bot syppe pes wordes bep ferre fro bodylyche wyttes, men scholde be war to kepe hem [soundelyche, for bodylyche pynges distractep men to kepe hem] ryst. And pis ys somdel pe resoun of pe fyrste commaundement.
pe secunde commaundement parteynep to pe Sone pe secunde persone in Trynyte, and ys in pes wordes ywryte in his lawe: 'Pou schalt noust take pe name of by Lord God in vayne' (noper in wordes ne in maner of lyuynge) 'for God schal noust haue pat man wipoute gylt pat takep pe name of his T creatures. And as pe Hooli Trinite may [faile] in no stede, so he may not faile in no kyn mesure. But sip pes wordis ben fer fro bodili witt, men shulden be war to kepe hem soundely, for bodili pingis distracten men to kepe hem rist. And pis is sumdel pe resoun of be first maundement [Capitulum Septimum] The secound maundment of God pertenep to his Sone and is in pes wordis writun in his lawe: Pou shalt not take pe name of pi Lord God in veyn, neiper in wordis ne in maner of lyuyng. For God shal not haue pat man wipouten gilt pat takip pe

B: 4-5 soundelyche for bodylyche pynges distractep men to kepe hem] om. T: 1 pe] pis HY, faile] corr.mar. T, not faile $\mathrm{H} \quad 2$ not] noght H , sip] sen H 3 witt] wittys HY, shulden] schulen Y, hem] bem H 4 sourdely] sumdele H , pingis] wittes and bodili pings H , hem] paim H 5 sumdel pe resoun] pe reson sumdele $H$, maundement] comaundement pe whiche resoun pe we alle schulde knowe H 6 Capitulum Septimum] om. T 7 (mar: Secundum mandatum T) 8 writun] and writen Y , lawe] lawe pus $\mathrm{H}, \quad$ not] nogst $\mathrm{H} \quad 9$ pi Lord God] pe Lord pi God Y 10 not nost H , haue] \{have\} corr.mar. H, takib] take Y

## B

Lord God wipoute cause.' Pe name of God ys pe wysdom of pe Fader for, as phylosophres seyp, be propre name of a pyng ys pe forme pat ys yfounded in pat and non oper, bot pis wysdom of God ys forme of God one. And herefore seyp Poul pat

Criste, be secunde persone, ys in forme of God as Sone in his Fader, and so pis secunde commaundement ys propred vnto Crist. Bot forbermore scholde we note pat Godes lawe clepeb Criste 'Lord' and 'oure God' for two kynnes pynges, as y tolde before in pe fyrste commaundement, and pat ys drede and loue pat we scholde haue to him. And herefore God axep in boke of his

## T

name of his Lord God withouten cause. Pe name of God is pe wisdom of pe Fadir for, as philosephris seien, be propre name of ping is be foorme pat is founden in bat and in noon oper. But pis wisdom of God is foorme of God one, and herfor seip Poul pat Crist, pe secound persone, is in forme of God as Son in his Fader. And so pis secound maundement is proprid vnto Crist. But ferpermore shulden we note pat Goddis lawe clepip Crist 'Lord' and 'oure God' for two kynnes pingis: pat is drede and loue pat we shulde haue to him. And herfore God axip

T: 1 Lord] om. Y, of God] of/of God H $3 \mathrm{in} \mathrm{n}^{1}$ ] om. HY 4 foorme] pe forme H , one] alle one $\mathrm{H} \quad 6$ vnto] onto $\mathrm{Y} \quad 7$ clepip] callis H 8 kymes] kin HY

## B

prophete, 'Sypbe I am Lord, wher ys my drede? And yf he be God where ys his loue?' Bot Austyne seyp bat drede bryngep ynne loue as brystyl bryngep yn smalnesse of prede, and herefore Godes lawe putteth 'Lord' byfore. And so eche man takep Godes name in veyn pat swerep by his name more pan it is nede. Criste techeb ous in Gospel to haue oure word pus: '3e, зe. Nay, nay', wipoute eny ope. For no man schal speke no maner treupe /bot it be 'зe' or 'nay' pat he spekep. Bot for Crist wolde pat oure wyt and word acorded togedre
in speche to oure neyzebores, perfore he doublep pes wordes

## T

in book of his prophet, 'Sip y am Lord, where is my drede? And if he be God, where is his loue?' But /Austyn seip pat drede bryngip in loue as bristel bryngip [in] pe smalnesse of pe pred. And herfore Goddis lawe puttip to vs 'Lord' bifore.

And so eche man takip Goddis name in veyn pat swerip bi his name more pan is nede. Crist techip in pe Gospel to haue oure word pus: '3he, she. Nay, nay', wipouten ony oth. For no man shal speke no maner treupe but if it be 'zhe' or 'nay' bat he spekip. But for Crist wolde pat oure witt and word accordiden togidre

10 in speche to oure neizbore, perfore he doublide pes wordis

```
T: in] in pe H, Sip] Sen H 2 if] 3if pat H, (mar: Augustinus T)
3 as) right as a H, in pe] pu pe T, of pe} of HY 4 to vs] bis Y
6 techib] teches us HY, pe] om. H, his Y 8 maner] maner of H
9 word] ouur worde H, accordiden] acorde Y
```


## B

as pough he wolde seye, 'Yf it be "зe" in soure soule, seyep "зе" in зoure word and make pes two acorde; and yf se seyep "nay" in soure soule, seyep "nay" wip soure moup; and be se trewe men.' And pus 'зe, зe' and 'nay, nay' scholde be oure speche, for yf we swerep oust it comep of yuel. Crist seyde noust pat alle swerynge ys yuel, for God himsylf swore and Crist wip his apostoles. Bot Crist seyp wyslyche pat more ys of yuel [oper of yuel] of him pat swerep or elles [of yuel] of him to wham he swerep.For as God techep by Jeremye pe prophete, wip pre condiciouns ys lefful men to swere: fyrst pat pey be

## T

as he wold seie, '3if se wolde seie "зhe" in soure soule, seiep "3he" in soure word and make pes two acorde; and if se seie "nay" in soure soule, seie "nay" in soure moup; and be se trewe men.' And pus 'she, she' or 'nay, nay' shulde be oure speche, for if we sweren oust it is of yuel. Crist seip not pat al sweryng is yuel, for God himsilf swoor and Crist wip hise apostlis. But Crist seip wisely pat more is of yuel, oper of yuel of hym pat swerip or ellis of yuel of him pat herip. For as God techip bi Ieremie pe prophet, wip pre condiciouns is leueful men to swere: first pat pei ben

B: 8 oper of yuel] om., of yuel ${ }^{2}$ ] om.
T: 1 as] as 3if H , 3if] 3if pat HY, wolde seie] seyn HY 3 in soure moub] with soure mow the HY 4 or] and HY , oure] soumr H 5 is] comys HY 7 oper] oweper $H$, eiper $Y 8$ of yuel of hym] of hym H , or] om. Y , of yuel of him] of hym $\mathrm{H} \quad 10$ men] om. H , first] pe first $H$, pei ben] he be $Y$

## B

war pat bey swere trowpe, and pe cause of pe ope be to schewe ry3t and, syp, bat by iuggement it be nede to swere. And elles scholde alle men kepe hem fro opes bot, I vnderstonde pe iuggement of God, opes in mesure as Holy

Wryt lymytep. And pes grete swereres wenep to excuse hem bot bey accusep hem to God pat knowep alle sop. Pey seye pat noman wolde trowe hem bot yf pey swere so; and pus, by here lesynge, pey greggep here synne, for pe worlde wole wytnesse pat suche gre[uous]e swereres bep more false of here tunge pan men pat swerep lytel. And herfore yf pou wolt be

## T

war pat pei sweren treupe, and pe cause of her oop be to shewe rist and, sip, pat in iugement be it nede to swere. And ellis shulden alle men kepe hem fro oopis but, y vndurstonde pe iugement of God, oopis in mesure as Hooli Writt lymytip. And pes greete swerers wenen to excuse hem, but pei accusen hem to God pat knowep al pe sobe. Pei seien pat no man wolde trowe hem but if pei sworen so; and pus, bi pis leesyng, pei aggregen her synne, for pe world wole wittnesse pat siche greuouse swerers ben more false of her tonge pan men pat sweren litil. And herfor if pou wolt be

B: 4 God] God and 9 greuouse] grete
$\mathrm{T}: 1$ pei sweren] he swere $Y$, her] peir $H Y \quad 2$ rist] arist $Y$, sip] sipen $H \quad 3$ hem] peim $H$, oopis] othis wele $H \quad 4$ God] God and HTY 5 hem] pem H 6 hem] pem H, pe] om. HY 7 hem] pem $H$ 8 aggregen] groggen $Y$, her] per $Y 9$ greuouse] grete $H Y$, her] per $Y$

## B

holde trewe of tunge, auyse pe pat pou be discrete in py wordes and speke noust bot trowpe or pat pou mayste performe; and whanne by wyse worde ys yspoke of pyn herte, be aboute to fulfille it, [and make pe noust false, and pis scholde shewe

## T

holden trewe of tonge, auyse pee pat pou be discret in pi wordis, and speke not but treupe [or] pat pou maist performe. And whanne pi wise word is spokun of pi hert, be aboute to fille it, and make pe not fals, and pis shulde shewe pi fame and make bee py fame] and make pe trewe man.

Me pynkep pat pre causes scholde meue ous to kepe pis commaundement and to take pe name of God wib gret worschep and drede. On cause ys for ber was neuer man ne womman pat dyde synne pat myste be saue bot in vertu of pis /name, ne neuere f. $87^{v}$ schal be, as wytnessep Seynt Peter in Actis of pe Apostoles. 'Per ys non oper name,' he seyp, 'vnder heuene yзeue to men in pe whiche pey moste be saued, bot in pis name, Ihesu Crist.' Bot how schal eny synful wrecche be bolde to stonde byfore Crist at pat dredful day of dome, wip hys hondes and feet and sydes and his woundes opene, and wayte to be saued at pat a trewe man.

B: 4-5 and make pe noust false, and bis scholde shewe py fame] om.
11 (mar. Actis Quarto)
T : 1 pee] om. $\mathrm{H} \quad 2$ not] nost H , or] om. $\mathrm{T} \quad 3$ fille] fulfille H
5 a] om. Y

## B

dredful stounde in vertu of Cristes name and of pis harde woundes, pe whiche name and woundes he hadde so orriblyche despysed al his lyf in vayne and orryble opes swerynge, and wolde noust amende him. Tryste he wel perto, it wole noust be bot he amende him in pis lyf.

The secunde cause pat scholde meue ous to spare grete and vnlawful opes ys pat pe name of Ihesu ys so worschepful pat, as seyp Seynt Poul, In pe name of Ihesu euery kne of heuenelyche creatures, or erpelyche, or of helle ys ybowed. For it ys so heyze and so worschepful pat pe cursede fend in helle scholde tremble to hyere it ynemned. And perfore it semep pat pe man pat swerep so orriblyche by pat blessed name despysep pat name more boldlyche pan dorste pe cursede fende of helle.

The prydde cause pat scholde meue alle men to leue here grete opes ys pis: it semep pat suche swereres pat so dysmembrep Crist, swerynge by his heorte and his soule and blod and bones, hem semep pat pe cursede Jewes dyde neuere Crist tourmentes ynowe bot yf pey, wip here gryslyche and cursede opes, alto drawe Crist lyme by lyme by here power, and so dyde neuere pe cursede

Jewes. And perfore, bot yf pis synne be amended, wipoute eny doute it schal haue harde vengeaunce. For the wyse man seyp pat vengeaumce schal noust go fro pat mannes hous pat swerep

[^32]
## B

moche. Bot paraunter here pou seyst pat al day pou seest pe contrarie, for pat pou /seest ofte suche grete sweryeres haue f.88r muche worldlyche prosperite, and opere pat bep esy men and none sweryeres suffery grete wordlyche aduersite. Wherefore pou
vengeaunce. And so vengeaunce schal noust go fro pat man oper womman hous pat swerep moche bot yf he amende him here. And perfore for drede and loue of pis blessede name, Thesu, leue 3 e suche opes, and take we pys name wip al honour and worschepe.

Bot syp kepynge of alle commaundements puttep out

## T

[Capitulum Octavım
/ Sip kepyng of alle comaundmentis puttip out eche hed

B: 3 muche] more prosperite canc.
T: Capitulun Octavum] mar. T

## B

eche hede synne and yf pou breke on pou trespacest in alle, it were for to wyte how large pis heste ys. Bot we scholde ywyte fyrst pat bope prayere and speche stondep more in dede pan in worde of moupe. Eueryche man in erpe berep name of his God preynted in his soule, for elles he myst noust be, and so, whan eny man leuep pat he scholde do or dop pat he scholde noust do vpon peyne of hate of God, he takep in vayn pis holy name. For noman ys ordeyned bot for to serue God and his name mote [he] take yf pat he be, and so he takep his name in vayne whan he faylep of pis ende. So God hap ordeyned pis ende to T
synne and if pou breke oon pou trespassist in alle, it were for to wite hou large pis heest is. But we shulden wite first pat bope preier and speche stonden more in deede pan in word of moup. Euery man in erpe berip pe name of his God prentid in his soule, for ellis he myste not be. And so whame-euer a man leeuep pat he shulde do or doip pat he shulde not vpon peyne of hate of God, he takip in veyn pis hize and hooli name. For no man is ordeyned but for to serue God and his name mot he take if pat he be. And so he takip his name in veyn whanne he failip of pis eende, sip God hap

B: 9 he] be
T: 2 shulden] shulen Y 4 be] om. Y $4-5$ his God preatid in] om. H 7 vpon] vp HY 9 he take] be take Y, be] be \{trew\} corr.mar. H 10 sip God hap] om. H

## B

eche pat hap pis name, as God hap ordeyned speche of moupe to commune wyth py /neyzebore bope in trewpe and in loue, as bestes dop kyndelyche. And yf pou faylle of pis ende, pou blabrest al in vayne falsloker pan bestes or bryddes in pe

T
ordeyned pis eende to eche pat hap pis name, as God hap ordeyned speche of moup to commune wip pi neisbore bope in treupe and in loue, as beestis don kyndely. And if pou faile of pis eende pou blaberist in veyn falslier pan beestis or briddis in pe eyr. O Lord, pi soule is maad to ymage of pi God and perfor techip Austyn pat it is pre pingis: mynde, resoun and wille, and alle ben oo su\{b\}staunce. And so, as pe Gospel techip, pou shuldest on pre maneres worshipe pe name of God pat pou hast wip pee: pou shuldest loue pi God of al pi herte

T: 1 ordeyned pis eende] om. H , as] and as $\mathrm{Y} \quad 5 \mathrm{pi}$ ] sip Y 700 ] oon H , substaunce] corr.int. T 8 God] pi God HY

## B

in al py soule, and eke pou scholdest loue him in al by mynde. Pan pou louest God of al byn heorte whanne py wyt and py power ys onlych yset on him, noust pat pou ne mayst do leffullyche worldlyche pynges, bot loke pat pe ende of
py worke be worschep to py God; pou louest God in al py soule whan pou ordeynest al by lyf to worschep of by God; and so pou louest God in al by mynde whanne pou forzetest no wyse to penke in by God, bot penkynge ys in dede as it ys in mynde. On pys wyse scholde me worschepe pe Trynyte and panne pou takest noust in vayn pe holy name of God pat ys

## T

and also loue him in al pi soule, an eke pou shuldest loue him in al pi mynde. Panne pou louest God of al pin herte whame pi witt and pi power is oonly sett on him, noust pat pou ne mayst leuefully do worldli pingis, but loke pe eende of
pi werk be worship of pi God; pou louest pi God in al pi soule whame pou ordeynest al pi lijf to worship of pi God; and so pou louest God in al pi mynde whame pou forzetist on no wise pus to penke on pi God, but penkyng is in dede as it is in mynde. On pis wise shulden men worshipe pe Trinite and pame pei taken not in veyn pe hooli name of God pat is

[^33]
## B

nedylyche preynted wipynne by soule.
And syp God hap yordeyned hys hous to wandre wyselyche in his offyce ydelnesse ys dampned bope of God and of kynde. God hap ordeyned offyce to eche lyme of his

Chirche; and so eche man of Cristes Chirche takep Godes name in pis offyce, syp he ys Godes offycer in vertu of his name; and so eche Cristen man takep pis name in veyn pat fayllep of his seruyce pat fallep to his offyce; and so eche prelate or prest of pe Chyrche takep Godes name in veyne pat knowep nou3t pis offyce pat Godes lawe hap

## T

nedely printid wibinne in pe soule.
[Capitulum Nonum]
Sip God hap ordeyned his hous to wandre wisely and ydelnesse is dampnyd bope of God and kynde, /God hap ordeyned f.13v office to eche lyme of his Chirche; and so eche man of his Chirche takip Goddis name in pis office, sip he is Goddis officer bi vertu of pis name; and so eche Cristen man takyp Goddis name in veyn pat failip in Goddis seruyce pat fallib to his office; and so eche prelat or prest of be Chirche takyp Goddis name in veyn pat knowep not his office pat Goddis

T: 1 in ] om. H, be] pi HY 2 Capitulum Nonum] om. T 5 man of bis] man of Cristis HY 8 failib] fallep $H \quad 10$ not] nost $H$, his] pis HY

## B

lymyted to him and dop it noust in dede. Bot pre maner of office God hap syue to his Chyrche: cler/kes and knystes and
laboreres. Bot clerkes scholde be heyzest and lest of despense and most bysy in Godes lawe and ferrest from pe worlde;
and yf pey leue wytynglyche bys maner of lyuynge no man in bys worlde takep falsoker Godes name. And some seyp pat Antecrist hap changed alle pes offices, for he chalengep to be kyng of pe chyrche of wykked men.

Kny3tes scholde schewe pe power of pe Godhede and by

## T

lawe hap lymyted him and doip it not in dede. But pre maner of office hap God souen to his Chirche: clerkys and kny3tis and laboreris also. Clerkis shulden be hizest and leest of dispense and moost bisiest in Goddis lawe and ferrest fro pe world.

And [if] pei leue [wittingly] pis maner of lyuyng, no man in pis worlde takip falslier Goddis name. And summe seien pat Antecrist hap chaungid alle pes offices, for he chalengib to be kynge of pe chirche of wickid men.

Kny3tis shulde shewe pe power of Godhed and bi worldli


## B

worldelyche strengbe meyntene Godes lawe, and yf Antecriste hap vencu[ss]ed pes lordes by his ypocrisy and falshede of his prestes pes bep perelous men to destrye Crystes Chyrche. Pes kny3tes scholde trewelyche knowe Godes lawe and offyceres
in his Churche and what pey scholde do, and by strengbe streyne hem to trauaylle in here offyce, and ydele men in pe Churche pat God puttep noust yn\{ \}ne lymytep hem to pe offyce pat pey feynep hem haue, putte hem oute by strengbe and lymyte hem to labore. And panne scholde Cristes Churche be purged of trewauntes

## T

strengbe mayntene Goddis lawe, and if Antecrist hap vencushid pes lordis bi ypocrisie and falshed of hise prestis pes ben perelouse men to destrie Cristis Chirche. Pe knyztis shulden treuly knowe Goddis lawe and officers in his Chirche and what pei shal do, and bi strengbe streyne hem to trauele in her office, and ydel men in pe Chirche, bat God puttip not $y$ me ne lymytip hem pe office pat pei feynen hem to haue, putte hem out bi strengbe, and lymyte hem her labore. And panne shulde Cristis Chirche be purgid of triuauntis and riztly

B: 2 vencussed] vencubed 7 yn ne] corr.int.
T: 1 hap vencushid] haue ourcomen $H \quad 2$ bi] by his HY 3 Pe] Pise HY 5 shal] schulden $H$, streyne] strengpe $Y$, hem] peim $H \quad 6$ her] pair HY, men] men pat bene $\mathrm{H} \quad 7$ hem pe] pern H , feynen] semen Y , hem] pem H , to] om. HY 8 hem $^{1}$ ] pem H , hem her] pem pair office and pair H , hem per $Y 9$ be] welle be $H$

## B

and rystlyche growe to heuene as an euene tree, for bastard braunches lettep pe growynge of pis tree, and charge of temporal goedes yknytte by coueytyse makep pes bowes to bowe and lettep pis tre to grewe.
ydel of oper for here sensible trauayl, for bey bep neded to worche and berep vp o[per] partyes. And as pey scholde be taust by clerkes to kepe Godes lawe, so scholde pey be defended by lordes in here ry3t. For it may falle pat prestes

## T

growe to heuen as an euene tree, for bastard braunchis
letten pe growyng of pis tree, and charge of temporal goodis knyttid bi coueitise makip be bowes to bowe, and lettip pis tree to growe.
be ground of pis hous pat stondip in laborers is leest ydel of opere for her sensible traueil, for pei ben nedid to worche and bere vp opere partis. And as pei shulden be taust bi clerkis to kepe Goddis lawe, so shulden pei /be defendid
bi lordis in her rist. For it may falle pat prestis wolen

B: 5 in] and 7 oper] oure
T: 2 letten] lettid $Y$, goodis] goddis $Y$ 3 makip] maken $Y$, be] pise HY, to] for to H 5 stondip in] is $\mathrm{H} \quad 6$ her] pair HY 9 bi] wip $H$, her] pair $H$

## B

wole spoyle hem by ypocrisye and bysynesse of here trauayl, pat God bad hem do, turne it to pryuey raueyn as Antecrist techep hem.

O Lord, yf charite were ysprad in pis Churche and eche
man trauailed trewelyche in pe office pat God hap syue hym, how clene scholde pe Churche be, wipoute wem or wryn/kele.f. $89^{\text {v }}$

## T

spoyle hem bi ypocrisie and bisynesse of her trauel, pat God bad hem do, turne to priuey raueyn as Antecrist techip hem.

O Lord, if charite were spred in pe Chirche and eche man trauelide treuly in po office pat God hap syuen him, hou clene shulde pe Chirche be, wipouten wem or wrynkel. But Goddis name is takun in veyn and men seken her owne ping, as if pei wold reule Cristis Chirche and not bi Goddis lawe. And herfor Antecrist hap cast to make him a new lawe and preyse it more pan lawe of Hooli Writt for, as he seip, Goddis lawe is falsest of alle opere. O God, 3if lordis wolden penke on her bileue and on her office sip pei ben Cristis kny3tis, and mayntene bi strengbe prestis in trewpe pat stonden for

T: 1 hem] pem $H \quad 2$ hem] pem $H$, to] into $H, \quad$ hem] pem $H \quad 3$ pe] pis $H Y$ 4 traclide] traueile Y, po] be HY 6 her] per Y 8 a new] new HY 9 more] myche more HY, lawe ${ }^{1}$ ] pe law HY 10 God] Lorde $H$, her] peir HY 11 her] per Y

## B

And penne noper clerkes, ne kny3tes, noper laboreres scholde take pus pis holy name an ydel and wipoute cause as false Cristene men now dop many tyme, brekynge pys secunde commaundement. and ys bode in pes wordes in pe boke of Godes lawe: 'Haue mynde to halewe pe day pat ys Godes Sabote. In syxe dayes

## T

Cristis lawe and hisen it ouer ober! But Antecrist hap blyndid so pes seculer lordis pat he takip fro hem heuenli help and help of pe world, for thechyng of Goddis lawe and lordship of pe world is sutely reft hem bi gynnes of pe fend. And

5 bus false Cristen men taken Goddis name in veyn.

## \{Capitulum Decimum \} Tercium mandatum

The pridde comaundement of God is to kepe oure haliday and is bedun in pes wordis in book of Goddis lawe: 'Haue mynde to halewe pe haliday pat is Goddis Sabot. In sixe dayes

[^34]
## B

schalt pou worche and doo pyne owene workes, bot in pe seuepe day ys reste of py Lord God; and pat day schalt pou do no seruyle workes and fro pes workes schal bes syxe kepe hem: py sone and py douster, py seruant and py mayde, py worke beste and

## T

shalt pou worche and do pin owne werkis, but in seuenpe day is rest of pi Lord God; in pat day shalt pou do no seruyle werkis and fro pis werk shulen pes sixe kepe hem: pi sone and pi douster, pi seruaunt and pi mayden, pi werke beest and pi straunger pat dwellip in pin hous. For in sixe daies made God heuene and erpe and al pat is wipynne it and restide in seuenpe day; and herfor he blesside pe Sabot and made pis day hooli.'

Pre pingis shulden we note in pis maundement: first

```
T: 1 in] inpe HY 2 no] noon Y 3 werk] werkis Y 4 pi seruaumf
and pi seruaunt Y, mayden] maide Y 5 and pi] and pe H, pi Y
6 made God] lrs.Y, it] bem H, hem Y 7 in] in pe HY
```


## B

fyrst why Godes lawe seyp, 'Bepenke pe to holde py Sabot'; and how men halwep tyme, syp tyme may neuere be groped ne knowe of bodylyche wyt. As to pe fyrste, we saye pat pe prydde commaundement byndep men for tymes, as on day in pe wyke, and
noust contynuellyche as pis opere commaundement3, and herefore God byddep ous to haue mynde to holde oure halyday. And also pis prydde commaundement ys propred to pe Holy Gost, and he ys mynde of pe Fader and wyt of pe Sone; and also in pis commaundement we scholde penke on Godes workes. Herfore

## T

whi Goddis lawe seip, 'Bipenke to holde pi Sabot'; sip, what is pe Sabot; and hou men halowen tyme, sip tyme may neper be gropid ne knowen of bodili witt. As to pe first, we seien /pat pis pridde maundement byndib men for tymes, as oon day
in pe woke, and not contynuely as pes opere maundementis; and herfor God biddip vs haue mynde to holde oure haliday. And also pis pridde maundement is proprid to pe Hooli Goost, and he is mynde of pe Fader and witt of pe Sone; and also in pis maundment we shulden penke on Goddis werkis. Herfor be
T: 1 Sabot] haliday H sib] sipen H , and sip $\mathrm{Y} \quad 2$ pe Sabot] pis
haliday $H$, Sabath $Y$, neper] not $Y 4$ maundement] comaundement $H$,
as] and as H , oon] o $\mathrm{Y} \quad 6$ oure] your $\mathrm{H} \quad 8$ witt] of pe witte HY
$9 \mathrm{on}]$ of $Y$

## B

pe wysdom of God byddep alle seuene persones to haue mynde to halwe pus oure Sabote. As to pe secunde worde, we schulle vnderstonde pat neuere we halewep ne blemeschep pe tyme in hys kende, bot pen bep we yseyde to halewe pe tyme
when/ne we kepep reste in holynesse in tyme; and pus scholde f.90r we do ones in pe woke, as vpon pe Saturday, and penke on Godes workes.

## T

wisdom of God biddip alle seuene persones to haue mynde for to halewe pus oure Sabot. As to pe secound word, we shal vnderstonde pat 'Sabot' in Ebrew speche is as myche as 'rest'; and for God restide him on pe seuenpe day herfor pe seuenpe
day is clepid 'Sabot'. Opere wittis of pis word mot we nede leeue. As to pe pridde word, we shal vndurstonde pat neber we halewen ne blemyshen pe tyme in his kynd, but parme ben we seid to halowe pe tyme whanne we kepen rest and hoolynesse in tyme, and pus shulden we do onys in pe woke, as vpon pe Satirday, and penke on Goddis werkis.

B: 1 byddep] byddep ous wip
T: 2 halewe] holde and halowe H 4 him om. HY , on] om. H 5 Sabot] pe Sabot HY word] world H, nede] nedis Y

## B

Bot here may men doute, syp no man hap leue to change pis commaundement ordeyned of God, how my3t we change oure Sabote fro Saturday to Soneday? Bot we schulle vnderstonde pat holdyng of pis commaundement in somdel ys fygure and moralte in somdel; and anemtys be fygure men mote nede chaunge it in pe Newe Testament and kepe generalyche oure Sabote. Among oper causes, restynge on pe Saterday fygureb pe restynge of Criste pat he lay in sepulcre; and for pis bynge ys passed we scholde noust kepe pe fygure. Also, syb T

But here may men doute, sip no man hap leeue to chaunge pes maundementis ordeyned of God, hou my3te we change oure Sabot fro Saturday to Soneday? But here we shal vndurstonde pat holdyng of pis maundement in sumdeel is figure and moralte in sumdeel; and anentis pe figure men moten nedis chaunge it in pe Newe Testament and kepe generaly oure Sabot. Among opere causis, restyng on pe Saturday figurip pe restyng of Crist pat he lay in pe sepulcre; and for pis ping is passid we shulden not kepe pe figure. Also, sip

## B

we beb nere pe tyme of pe resurreccioun pan were pe Jewes in pe Olde Testament, we kepep be eystepe age as bey kepte pe seuepe. Pe fyrste age lestep fram Adam to Noe; pe secunde from Noe into pe tyme of Abraham; pe prydde from pe tyme

Dauyd to pe weyndynge into Babiloyne; pe fyfpe from pat tyme into pe burpe of Crist; pe sexpe tyme from pe burpe of Criste tyl pe day of dome; pe seuebe tyme of reste rennep wip pes sexe, bot be eystepe tyme ys after pe day of dome

## T

we ben nerrer pe tyme of resurreccioun ban weren pe Iewes in pe Olde Testament, we kepen pe eistbe age as pei kep[t]en pe seuenpe. Pe first age lastide from Adam vnto Noe; pe secound fro Noe vnto pe tyme of Abraham; pe pridde fro tyme of Abraham vnto pe tyme of Dauib; pe fourpe fro tyme of Dauip to wendyng into Babiloyne; pe fyuepe fro pat tyme til birpe of Crist; pe sixte fro birpe of Crist til pe day of doom; be seuenpe tyme /of rest remnyb wip

T: 2 kepten] kepen T, 2-3 (mar. Etates mundi T) 3 vnto] to H 5 tyme ${ }^{1}$ ] be tyme HY 6 tyme] be time Y , to] vnto H , into] vnto Y 7 til] vnto $H Y$, birpe] be birpe $H Y 8$ rest] rest pat $H \quad 9$ be day] day $H$

## B

whan al Holy Churche schal fullyche reste in blysse, and in tokene pis tyme we restep pe eystepe day.

Now were it to wyte how men scholde kepe here halyday. And sype seruyle worke ys worke of synne eche man scholde on pe halyday kepe him out of synne, sype Crist hymself seyp pat whosoeuere doo synne he makep him seruante to synne, and nopyng ys worse. Bot for we scholde spende pe halyday in herynge of God and elles we synnep gretlyche in faylynge of

## T

whanne al Hooli Chirche shal fully rest in bliss, and to bitokene pis tyme we resten pe eiztpe day.

## Capitulum Undecimum

Now were it to wite hou men shulden kepe her haliday.
And sip moost seruyl werk is worchyng of synne eche man shulde on haliday kepe him out of synne, sip Crist himsilf seip pat whoeuer doip synne he makip him seruaunt to synne, and noping is worse. But for we shulden spende pe haliday in heriyng of God and ellis we synnen greetly in failyng of his

T: 3 Capitulum Undecimum] om. H 4 to] for to H , her] pair H, (mar. Capitulum Undecimum T) 6 out of] fro H 8 worse] worpe Y , spende] kepe $Y \quad 9$ and om . Y

## B

his /seruyce, herefore we scholde on pe halyday kepe ous fro suche workes [pat lettep pe seruyce of God fullyche in oure soule and suche workes bep ycleped seruyle workes and stondep moost in] suche pat occupiep mannes soule and lettep it to penke

## T

senuyse, herfore we shulden on pe haliday kepe vs fro siche werkis pat letten pe seruyse of God fully in oure soule, and siche werkis ben clepid seruyle werkis and stonden moost in siche pat occupien mennes soule and letten it to penke on on God and worschepe him and loue him; and so dop more tellynge of moneye and countynge of worldlyche goede pan goynge to pe plowe. Bot eche man scholde on pe holyday schappe him such reste pat most scholde quyete his soule and able him to serue God, and herefore pe Jewes kepte for a rule to trauely on pe Saterday no more pan a myle. Nepeles, yf per be bodylyche trauel pat ys nedful to God and worshipe him and loue him; and so doip more harm telling of money and countyng of worldly good pan goyng at pe plow3.

But eche man shulde on pe haliday shape him siche rest pat moost shulde quyete his soule and able him to senue God, and herfor pe Iewes kepide it for a reule to traueile on be Saturday no more but a myle. If per be bodili traueil

B: 2-4 pat lettep pe seruyce of God fullyche in oure soule and suche workes bep ycleped seruyle workes and stondep moost in] and wipstonde most T: 4 memes] marmes H 5 harm] om. HY 6 worldly] worldis $Y$, good] godes H, pan] more pane H, at be] to $\mathrm{Y} \quad 9$ a] [a\} corr.int. H , traueile] halewe Y 10 but] pan HY

## B

man, he may wel on pe halyday take it in mesure, as he may on pe halyday clope him, go and fede him, and so praye and preche and do bodylyche pynges pat scharpep a man to serue God more pan he scholde elles. And here we may see how pes
false Jewes repreued Criste of brekynge of his halyday, for he dyde communelyche myracles on pe halyday, for, as himself seyp pat ys most resoun, 'If it be lefful to drawe out on pe halyday by neyzebores best pat lyp in pe myre, moche more it ys lefful to do a betere dede.' And pus we blame T
pat is nedeful to man, he may wel on be haliday take it in mesure, as man may on pe haliday clope him, go and fede him, and so preie and preche and do bodili pingis pat sharpen a man to senue God more pan he shulde ellis. And here may we se hou pes false Iewes reprouyd Crist for brekyng of his haliday, for he dide myraclis comounly on pe haliday, for, as he himsilf seip pat is moost resoun, 'If it be leueful to drawe out on pe haliday pi neizbores beest pat liep in pe myre, myche more it is leueful to do a betere dede.' And pus we blamen

[^35]
## B

worse pan Jewes fele bodylyche werkes and punysche men for hem, and worse werkes we suffere and do worse ous-syf, as many vnleffulle pleyes we vse on pe halyday and many fleschelyche symes as yf bey were panne lefful. Ich wote wel pat God, of his grete curtesye, wole pat man solace him on pe halyday, bot algate kepe from synne for perynne ys non solas. And yf pou wole knowe synne lerne pes ten commaundement3, for no man may synwe bot azenst hem. And so discrecioun and studye in Godes lawe scholde teche a man

## T

worse pan Iewes many bodili werkys and punyshen men for hem, and worse werkis we suffren and don worse ouresilf, as many vnleueful pleies we vsen on pe haliday and many fleisli synnes as if pei weren pame leueful. I woot wel pat God, /of his greet curtesie, wole pat man solace him on f.15v pe haliday, but algatis kepe him fro synne for perynne is no solace. And if pou wolt knowe synne lerne pes ten comaundementis, for no man may synne but a3ens hem. And so discrecioun and studiyng in Goddis lawe shulden teche a man

T: 1 manyl fele HY 2 ouresilf] vsself HY $\quad 6$ pe] om. H 8 aзens] aзen $Y 9$ studiyng] studie $H Y$.

## B

betere to holde his halyday pan dop his propre preste. For it ys medful to do workes in pe weke and on pe Soneday suche werkes scholde be lefte, for pe moste heyse werke pat/a man f. $91^{\text {r }}$ can serue God ynne scholde he schappe him to doo on pe halyday.

5 For it ys a gret curtesye of God pat grauntede ous to worche sexe dayes in pe woke to gete ous oure bodylyche sustynaunce pat in schort tyme schulle be wormes mete and rotye. Pan skyleful it ys pat on day in pe woke, and pat ys in pe halyday, men bysy hem principalyche for gostlyche goedes, to helpynge of here soules pat schal laste euere wipoute ende. And perfore God also byddep pe haue mynde to halwe pyn halyday.

Halewynge of pe halyday ys lyuynge holylyche vpon pe holyday. Bot it semep now on dayes pat be holyday may skylfullyche be yclepyd pe sory day, for of alle dayes pe

15 holydayes bep most cursedelyche yspend in pe deueles seruyse and in despyte of God and alle seyntes of heuene. And pough

## T

betere to holde his haliday ban don pes propre prestis or clerkis of pe chapitre. For ofte tyme it were [m]edeful to do werkis in pe woke and on pe Sunneday siche werkis shulden be left, for pe moost hize werke pat man kan serue

5 God yme shulde he shape him to do on pe haliday.
T: 1 pes] his HY 2 pe] om. HY, medeful] nedeful T 3 to] om. HY
5 shape] scharpe $Y$

## B

per were no mo synnes ydo vpon be eorbe bot brekynge of pes two commaundements of vayne and false and orryble opes swerynge and of cursede lyuynge vpon halydayes, it ys wondere pat God suffreb pe peple vpon pe erpe to lyue, saue for to loke wheper bey wolde amende hem, for elles depe dampnacioun schal falle vpon hem. And pe lengere pat he abydep hem pe sorer he schal smyte, bot yf bey amende hem. For Seynt Bernard seyp pat pe lengere pat God abydep ous pat we scholde amende, by so moche pe straytur he schal deme ous yf we be necgligent. Bot forpere we schulle vnderstonde pat in pre maneres of occupaciouns we schulle spende oure halyday, as holy doctores seyp: in mynde or in soule, in moup and in werk. Fyrst in mynde or soule vpon pe halyday, whan pou hast hadde py bodylyche reste, rysynge vp and goynge to churche, noust to iangle noper to iape pere, noper to mertchaundyse in pe churche noper in pe churche hey, syp it ys a place yordeyned to praynge fer fro wordlyche bysynesse. And pere on pe halyday and speciallyche on pe Soneday pou schalt penke how God made pe wordle of noust on a Sonneday, and pat he aroos fro dep to lyuc on a Sonneday, and how he sende wytt and wysdom into erpe on a Sonneday, and vpon a Sonneday, as clerkes seye, schal be domes day. For Sonneday was pe first day pat God made and

## B

schal beo pe laste euerelastynge, in ioye and blysse and lyst to hem pat schullep be sauued in heuene and euerelestynge sorwe and derkenesse to hem pat schullep be dampned in helle. Penke hertelyche on pis, and forperemore penke how God hap made pe of noust and how pou haddest forsake him purgh synne and ytake pe to pe fend of helle wipoute ende hadde noust Crist, God and man, suffrede dep. Penke pe forpermore how ofte and how vnkyndelyche pou hast purgh dedlyche synne forsake Ihesu Criste and alle his kyndenesse and alle his goednesse and ytake pe to pe fende and his seruice. And panne for byn vnkyndenesse be ynwardlyche sory and ponke God of his grace and of his kyndenesse and crye him hertelyche mercy of pyne wykkedenesse and foule vnkyndenesse. And bypenke pe how pou mayst best in tyme tocomynge serue God and mende py wykkede lyuynge and encresse in goednesse.

Pe secunde tyme pou schalt spende pyn holyday wip moup spekynge, in knowelechynge and in schryuynge pe of by synnes yf pou se pe agreuyd in eny notable synne; and parne in praynge to God of grace and mercy and socour now and in tyme comynge; and in seyynge deuoute bedes and pankynge God of alle his syftes and his goednesse; and also wip by moup speke al goednesse. And yf bou be a prest and hauest kunnynge and auctoryte preche and teche Godes worde to his peple, and yf /bou be no prest noperf. $92^{r}$

## B

clerke bot on of pe peple penne bysy pe in pe halyday to here prechynge of Godes worde, and be aboute wip by goede spekynge and styrynge to brynge py neyzebores to betere lyuynge, and yf bey be at debate brynge hem by py power to loue and charite and rewarded to pe in pe rewarde of rystful men in pe blisse of heuene.'

B
Pus to spende pe halydayes and principalliche Sonnedayes Cristene men scholde lerne by techynge of prestes; and amang T

## \{Capitulum Duodecimum \}

It were to wite ouer pis of multitude of halidaies and whame pei shulden bigyme and whame pei shulden eende. Wel y woot pat hooli men shulden euere holde haliday; and in tokene

15 Poul techip. And perfor it is ful perelous to bynde men

T: 1 Capitulum Duodecimum] mar. T, om. H 5 her] ber Y 7 not] nost H, men] a man $\mathrm{H} \quad 8$ pinkeb] penke Y , of men] om. Y 9-10 in be woke to kepe] to kepe in pe woke $\mathrm{Y} \quad 10-11$ ofte tyme] often $\mathrm{H} \quad 11$ good] myche goode H , here] peir HY 12 not] no3t $\mathrm{H} \quad 13$ But] But welle HY 14 wole] wold H , be] wer H

## B

alle oper festes loke pat pou kepe wel pes foure: Crystemasse.
Ester, Ascensyon and Wytsonneday. For a gret clerk seyp
pat non feste ne seruyse pat is of oper seynts is
plesynge to God, bot in as muche as $\{$ hyt \} scharpep \{pe more \} man
5 to loue oure Lord Ihesu Crist.

## T

ouer resoun. But be war pat pou kepe pes foure feestis:
Cristemasse and Estren, pe Ascencioun and Wittsonday. For [a greete clerk seip pat] no feest ne seruyse pat is of opere seyntis is plesyng to God, but in as myche as it sharpip a man to
loue oure Lord Ihesu Crist. And herfor whame we [se]ien of ony oper seynt, we bigynnen and eenden wip pis name of pis Lord.

As anentis bigymyng and eendyng of pe haliday, God tauste pe lewes to bigyme /at euensong and eende at tyme of euensong in pe secound day. Ne charge not to myche 10 bigynnyng or eendyng of pe seruyse of God, for he is Lord of tyme, and in eche tyme shulden men serue him and so, in a maner, holde euere haliday. But more passyngly on pe Sunday, for on be Sumneday God made pe world; and also on pe Sunneday he roos fro dep to lijf; and on pe Sunneday he

B: 3-4 is plesynge] is so plesynge 4 hyt corr.int., be more] corr.int.
T: $\mathbf{2}$ pel om. HY, Wittsonday] Wittesourtide HY 2-3 a greete clerk seip pat] om. HTY 4 as it] pat it HY, a man] man H, men Y 5 oure Lord] om. H, we seien] weien T. 5-6 seien of ony oper seynt] saint $\mathrm{H} \quad 6$ pis name] pe name HY 7 pe] om. HY $\quad 8$ to bigyme] bigyme $\mathrm{H} \quad 11-12$ and so in a maner holde euere haliday but more] om. H 13 on] vpon HY, also] eke HY

## B

Wherfore we scholde bysye ous deuoutelyche on halydayes, and studye on vertues and on pes ten commaundements, on /pe seuene workes of mercy bodylyche and gostlyche. And speche wip men scholde be of heuenlyche pynges and so scherpe oure wyttes to wexe into pe loue of oure Lord Ihesu Crist. And putte away gyles, wronges and oper synnes, for elles pe halyday of men ys turnede into pe workeday, sypbe be worste workeday ys by seruyse of synne. Ne take nou3t to muche hede to signes, [as Jewes, for Ihesu Crist ys yryse: treupe and ende of signes].

## T

sende pe Hooli Goost; and, as clerkis seien, on pe Sumeday shal be his last iugement and rest in be bliss of heuene.

Cristen men shulden lerne bi techyng of prestis to bisie hem deuoutly on pe haliday, and studie on vertues and synnes and on ten comaundementis, on seuene werkis of mercy bodily and goostli, and speche wip men shulde be of heuenli pingis. And putt awey giles, wrongis and oper synnes, for ellis pe haliday of men is turned into werkday, sip be worst werkday is be senyyse of synne. Ne take we not to myche hede to signes as Iewes, for Ihesu Crist is risen: treuep and

B: 9 as Jewes for Thesu Crist ys yryse treupe and ende of signes] om.
T: 1 on] vpon HY 2 pe] om. H 3 men] \{men\} corr.int. H
4 on pe] of pe $\mathrm{H} \quad 5$ ten] pe ten Y , seuene] pe seuen Y
7 for] and $Y \quad 8$ sip] siben $Y \quad 9$ of] to HY, we] om. HY
10 as] of $Y$

## B

for I am certayn pat he despysep to costelewe clopes and to costelcwe metes. For alle pyng scholde be don in resoun and mesure, and Crist chargep more clennesse of soule pan clennesse of body, for in a clene soule wonep he hymself and
elles he forsakep it. And so in goed kepynge of pes pre commaundements scholde we lerne to loue God in parfyt charite.

Pe secunde tabule of pe oper commaundements conteynep seuene commaundements and techep pe to loue by neysebore as

## T

ende of signes. And y am certeyn pat he dispisip to costly clopis, vestymentis or chirchis, or to costly metis. For al ping shulde be don in resoun and mesure, and Crist chargip more clennesse of soule pan clemnesse of body, for in a clene soule wonep himsilf yme and ellis he forsakip it. And so in good kepyng of pes pre maundementis shulen we leme to loue God in parfijt charite.

## Capitulum [Primum]

The secound table of opere maundementis of God conteynep seuene maundementis and techip pe to loue pi

[^36]
## B

pyself; and pat pou schalt kunne by pe pre commaundements of be fyrst table, for what man pat euere kepep pes pre commaundements he louep himself and al onlyche he. And pus pes ten commaundements bep knyt togedere pat whoeuere loue his neysebore louep his God, syppe pes two braunches of charite mowe noust be departed. And herefore seyp Seynt Jon in his fyrste epystel, 'He pat louep noust his broper bat he seep at eyзe, how may he louy his God pat he seep noust?'

And syppe pes ten commaundements suep resoun of more

## T

neizbore as pisilf; and pat pou shalt kume by pe pre maundementis of first table, for what man euer kepep pes pre maundementis he louep himsilf and also his neizbore. And pus pes ten comaundementis ben knyttid togidre, bat whoeuer
louep his neizbore he louep his God, sip pes two braunchis of charite may not be partid. And perfor seip Seynt Jon in his first epistle, 'He pat louep not his broper whom /he seep at yзe, hou louep he his God pat he seep not?'

And sipe pes maundementis suen resoun of more kepyng,

[^37]
## B

kepynge, be fyrste of pes seuene byddep be loue pyn elderes, and ys ywryte in Godes lawe by forme of pes wordes: 'Worschepe py fader and also py moder pat pou be in longe lyf vpon erpe bat py Lord God schal seue pe.' Here fyrst

## T

pe first of pes seuene biddip pee loue pin eldris and is writen in Goddis lawe bi foorme of pes wordis: Worshipe pi fader and also pi moder, pat pou be of lon[g] lijf on pe erpe pat pi Lord God shal syue pee. First moten we wite of fader and moder pat summe ben of kynde nerrer and ferper. Pi next fader is he pat bodily gate pee, and pi next moder pat bodily bare pee; pin elde fader and elde moder ben pi fer eldris; and alle pes shuldest pou wo[r]shipe if pei ben on lyue and, if pei ben deed, worshipe hem in soule.

B: 8 fer] fadres and modres eldres and also pyn 9 worschepe] worsche 9-10 yf bay be on lyue and yf pay be dede worschepe hem] om. T: 1 and] and it Y 1-2 is writen in Goddis lawe] in boke of Goddes law is writen H 3 long] lon T , on pe erpe] vpon erpe H , om. Y 4 pi Lord God] be Lord pi God HY, pee] to pee Y 5 and ferper] or ferper HY 6 gate] bigaate $Y 7$ elde $^{1}$ ] elder $Y 8$ alle] om. $H$, worshipe] woschipe $T$

## B

And alle yf eche commaundement of God is resonable, nepeles [opene] resoun nedep to kepe pis commaundement. For resoun and kynde meuep to loue him pat louep pe in goednesse and trauelyp muche for pe, bot by werke and suffrynge pyn eldres hauep broust pe forp and yordeyned for pe wonynge and rychesse. What man scholdest pou loue bot yf pou louedest hem? And for God hap more resoun of loue for he made pe of noust and kepep pe and medep pe, berfore pou scholdest loue more God pan eny creature. And herefore seyp Crist pat he pat

## T

And if eche maundement of God is resonable, nepeles opun resoun nedib to kepe pis maundement. For resoun and kynd moeuen to loue him pat louep pee in goodnesse and trauelip myche for bee, but in werk and suffryng pin eldris han broust pee forp and ordeyned for pee in teching and richess. What man shuldest pou loue but if pou louedist hem? And for God hap more resoun of loue, for he made pee of noust and kepip pee and medip pee, perfor pou shuldest loue more God pan ony creature. And herfor seip Crist pat he pat louep
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## B

louep more his eldres pan him is noust worpy to haue him, syppe Crist, God and man, hap more resoun of loue. Pes bep be eldres pat pou scholdest worschepe, and oper maner fadres wip modres also. Bot it were to wyte how pou scholdest worschepe hem, for many wenep to worschepe hem and dyshonurep hem. Some men ber bep pat worschepep in God and some worschepep onlyche to pe worlde. Pis fyrst maner of worschepe ys bede of God and pe secunde worschepe forfendep he to be do. He

## T

hise eldris more pan him is not worpi to haue him, sip Crist, bope God and man, hap more resoun of loue. Pes ben pe eldris pat pou shuldest worshipe, and opere maner of fadris wip moder[s] also. But it were to wite hou pou shuldest worshipe hem, for many men wenen to worshipe and dishonoren.

## Capitulum Secundum

Sum men per ben pat worshipen in God and summe pat worshipen oonly to pe world. Pis first maner of worship is bedun of God and be secound worship forfendip he to be don.

[^38]
## B

worschepep in God pat obeschyp to man and dop pat resoun axep to profyt to the man. And so worschep in God stondep noust al in lowtyng, ne gretynge, ne knelynge, ne suche worldelyche signes, ne it forfendep noust suche signes in resoun. And so he worschepep his fader as he scholde doo pat helpep him in nede bope bodylyche and gostlyche. And so pou scholdest worschepe py fader in bodyliche helpe and algates help hym gostlyche, for berof he hap nede.

And so worschepynge of fader and moder stondep
10 principalyche in dede, as in caas by fader and moder bep come T

He worshipip in God pat obeshep vnto man and doip pat resoun axep to [profijt to] po man. And so worship in God stondip not al in loutyng ne in gretyng, ne knelyng, ne siche worldly signes, ne it forfendip not siche pingis in mesure. And so he worshipip his fader as he shulde do pat helpip $\mathrm{h}[\mathrm{y}] \mathrm{m}$ in nede /bope bodily and goostly. And so pou shuldest worshipe pi fader in bodili help and algate helpe hym goostly, for perof hap he nede.
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## B

to nede and myschef by age or by auenture, bou art ybounde to helpe hem by seruyce, bope wip /by body and sucoure wip py f. $93^{\text {v }}$ catel. And yf pey be in synne, or haue nede to gostelyche techynge or comfort, pou art yholde, yf pou kunne, to teche hem and comforte hem. If pou kunne noust pou art yholde by py power to gete oper to helpynge of hem. And yf pay be dede pou art holde to lyue wel, to praye nyst and day to God to delyuere hem out of peyne. bis is pe reuerence and worschep in dede pat pe childe scholde do to pe fader and moder and pis lessoun scholde eueryche bodylyche fader and moder (and namelyche gostlyche fadres and also godfadres and godmodres) teche to here chyldren. And yf pis lessoun hadde be taust and ykept in Engelond I trowe pe londe hadde ystonde in more prosperite pan it hap ystonde many day. And it may be pat [for] vengeaunce of pis synne of vnworschepynge and despysynge of fadres and modres God sleep children by pestylence as зe seep al day. For in pe Olde Lawe children pat were rebelle and vnbuxom to here fadres and modres were ypunysched by dep, as pe fyfthe boke of Holy Wryt wytnessep in pis wyse: 'If a man,' he seyp, 'hap ygete a sone pat is rebelle oper wykked and nel noust \{hyre\} here fadres and modres heste and he yconstrayned despysep

B: 15 for] om. 21 hyre] corr.mar.

## B

to obesche, pey schal take him and lede him to pe elderes of pulke cyte and to pe sate of pe dome, and panne hy schal seye to hem, "Peyse oure sone is wykkede and rebelle and despyse[p] oure techynges and take[b] hede to vnmesurable etynges as to lecherye and festes." Panne he schal be stenede and so he schal deye pat al pe peple, hurynge pis peyne, scholde drede to be rebelle to fader or moder.' And pough God wole noust now pat pis payne of bodylyche dep beo execut in manere as it was pulke tyme vpon suche trespassures, pe peyne is neuere pe lasse, bot raper he schal be more hardere and lengere dure. For but suche children /pat bep rebelle, wyckede and vnbuxom amende hem here in tyme of here lyf, God schal smyte hem wip swerde of vengeaunce in pe oure of here dep, puttynge here soule into helle peyne, and in pe laste day of dome he schal putte bope body and soule togedre into peyne of helle euerlestynge. Herefore do after pis commaundement and suwe pe noble techer Poul pat seyp pus: 'Children, obesche se to soure fader and moder, for it is rystful to worschepe py fader. Pat is pe fyrste commaundement in byhest pat it be wel to pe and pat pou be longe lyuynge vpon erpe. And se fadres nel 3 stere soure children to wrappe bot norysche hem and brynge hem forb in

## B

disciplyne or lore and chastynge of God.'
Here men and wommen mowe lerne to teche here children Godes lawe in fayre and aysy manere whyles pey bep songe, to encresse in goednesse and vertues. And perfore Poul byddeth pat pe fader norysche his children in his lore and chastyng of God and God commaundep in pe Olde Lawe pat pe fadres scholde telle to here children Godes hestes and pe wondres and pe myracles pat he dyde in pe londe of Egypte and in pe Rede See and in water of Jordan and in pe londe of beheste. And muche more now in pe Newe Lawe bep fader and moder holde to teche here children pe byleue of pe Trynyte and of Ihesu Crist, how he is verray God wipoute bygynnynge and was made man purgh most brennynge charite to saue mankynde by stronge penaunce and harde turment and byter dep, and alle commune poynts of byleue. Bot pay bep most holde to teche hem Godes hestes and pe workes of mercy and poyntes of charite, to goueme wel here wyttes and to drede God byfore alle oper pynges and to loue him most of alle pynges, for he is endeles wysdom, endeles my3t, endeles goednesse, mercy and charite. And yf pey trespasse azenst Godes hestes pey owne /to blame hem perfore scharplyche, and chasty hem a f.94v pousandfolde more pan for trespasse and despyte or vnkyndenesse

## B

ydoun a3enste here owene persone. And pis techynge and chastyng scholde in fewe seres make goede Cristene men and wommen; and namelyche goede ensample of holy lyf of olde men and wommen, for pat is best techynge to here children and to oper Cristene folke aboute hem.

Many prestes chargep godfadres and godmodres to teche here children pe Pater Noster and pe Crede and pis is wel ydo, bot it ys most nede to teche hem pe ten hestes of God and seue hem goede ensample by here owene lyuynge. For pough pey be Cristene and knowe pe commune poyntes of byleue, sit scholde pay noust be saued wipoute kepynge of Godes hestes bot be dampned deppere in helle pan hepene men; and it hadde be betere to hem neuere haue resceyued Cristendom bot yf pey ende trewelyche in Godes commaundement3, as Seynt Peter techeth passynglyche. Bot som men settep here chyldren to lerne jestes of batailles and of cronycles, and nouelleryes of songes pat sterep hem to iolyte and to harlatrye. And some settep hem to nedeles craftes, for pryde and coueytyse pat harmep here soules. And some settep hem to lawe for wymnyng of worldlyche worschepe and herto costep hugelyche in many weyes. Bot in al pis Godes lawe is put behynde, and berfore spekep vnnepe eny man a goed worde to magnefye God in saluacioun of

## B

mennes soules. Some techep here children to swere and stare and fyste and to bescherewe alle men aboute, and of pis pey haue gret ioye in here herte; bot certes pey bep Sathanas ys techers and procuratours to lede hem to helle by here cursede ensample and techynge and noryschynge and meynteynynge in synne, and bep cruel sleers of here children-3e, more cruel pan pough pey /hackede here children as smal as mosselles to here pot - for f.95r pis cursede techynge. And, endynge perynne, here children, bodyes and soules, bep dampned wipoute ende in helle. And pough here bodyes were yhackede neuere so smal, bope body and soule scholde be in blesse of heuene, so pat pey kepe truwelyche Godes comaundement3. And of suche necglygent fadres and modres pat techep noust here children Godes lawe and chastep hem noust whanne pey trespassep azenst Godes hestes, Seynt Poule spekep a dredful word: 'He pat hap noust cure of his owne, and most of his homely and his housholde, hap forsake pe feyp, and he is worse pan a man oute of Cristenedome.' And suche fadres and modres pat menteynep wytynglyche here children in synne and techep hem schrewednesse bep worse pan pe cursede fadres pat cullep here children and offrep hem vp to stockes, worschepynge fals mamettrye. For bey children were dede in here soupe and dyde

## B

no more synne, bot pes children of cursede fadres and modres pat techep hem pryde, pefpe and lecherye, wrappe, coueytyse and sloupe and glotenye and menteyne hem perynne bep holde on longe lyf and in encresynge of synne, to more dampnacioun of eche partye. And no wondere pough God take vengeaunce on pe peple bope olde and songe, for alle communelyche despyse[b] God in pis: pat pey hauep ioye and merpe \{of synne, harlatry and vnclamis \} and despysep correcciouns and repreuynges. And perfore God mote punysche pis synne for his rystful mageste.

Bot also in pis commaundement se schullep vnderstonde pat per bep pre manere of fadres and modres pe whiche зe bep holde to worschepe. Pe fyrste is bodylyche fader and moder whos worschepe stondep principalyche in dede as it is ytold before.

Pe secunde fader pat pou schalt worschepe ys by gostly fader pat hap $\mathrm{cu} / \mathrm{re}$ of py soule, to helpe him and menteyne him f.95* in Godes lawe and in goed gouemayle of Godes peple and to do after him in pat pat Godes lawe techep, and elles pou dysworscheppest him and brekest Godes commaundement; and alle his pareschenes bep as oure moder. And pus alle men and wommen scholde do worschep ech to oper, and namelyche to here parsoun, or vicary, ober prest pat hap cure of here soules, and folwynge

[^39]
## B

his byddynges in pat pat Godes lawe techep.
Pe prydde fader pat is principal of alle ys Crist, bobe God and man, and Holy Churche, pat is Cristes spouse, is py moder; and hem pow schalt worschepe and loue and be obedient to hem in
kepynge here hestes and here conseyles wip al by myste. And penne worschepest pou pyn eldres as Godes lawe ys, and pus scholde eche man worschepe oper, as Seynt Poule techeth.

And in bis commaundement me may see pe resoun of mede pat God himself behotep ous for kepynge of pis heste: syp pou hast by bodylyche lyf of pyn eldres, yf pou worschepest pis cause more, vpon resoun skyle wole pat pou haue more of pis lyf; and yf pou worschepest in God more, skyle wole pat pou haue more of lyf in God. And here

T

Pus shulde eche man worshipe oper, as Seynt Poul techip.
And here may we se pe resoun of mede pat God himsilf hetip vs for kepyng of pis heest: sip pou hast pi bodili lijf of pin eldris, if pou worshipist pis cause more, vpon resoun skile wole pat pou haue more of pis lijf; and if pou worshipist in God [more, skile wole pat pou haue] more of lijf in God. And here may we se
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## B

may we see pat he worschepep noust in God his fader and moder pat rychep hem to pe worlde and seuep hem worldelyche goedes more pan resoun axep. And pis scholde men of pe Churche note pat rychep to muche men and wommen of here kynne: if by kyn be nedy, help hem in resoun, bot make nou3t py kyn ryche to gete pe a name. Yf pay suffycep to fynde hemself by here owene trauayle, lete hem lyue by here owene trauayle. For Crist cam of pore men and he pat is almy3ty and wytty and willefulle lete his moder be pore and his pore cosynes; and whan pay axede

## T

pat he worshipip not in God his fadir and moder pat richep hem to pe world and syuep hem worldli goodis more pan resoun axip. And shulden men of pe Chirche note pat richen to myche men of her kyn: if pi kyn be nedy, helpe hem in resoun, but make not pi kyn riche to gete pee a name. If pei suffisen to fynde hemsilf bi her owne trauel, late hem lyue bi her trauel. For Crist cam of pore men and he pat is almysti, alwitty and al willeful lete his moder be pore and hise pore cosyns; and whanne pei axiden

## B

wor/schep and heynesse of pis worlde he deneyde hem pat and
ordeynede hem passioun; and byleue techep ous he dyde al for pe betere. And so scholde we sue him, yf we wille be his children, and loue him more pan pe worlde or oure veyn name.

And so God forbedep noust bodylyche worschep, bot penke on manere of \{it\} and mesure it by resoun. And so it is laweful men to procure for here children rychesse of pe worlde more pan pey to hem. For as Seynt Poul seyp, 'Fadres tresourep to children more pan children dop to hem, for pay louep hem more, as God louep

## T

worship and hiznesse of pe worrld he denyede hem pat and ordeynede hem passioun; and bileue techip vs he dide al for pe bettere. And so shulden we sue him, if we wolen be hise children, and loue him more pan pe worlde or oure veyn name. 5 And so God forbedip not bodili worship, but penke on maner of it and mesure it bi resoun. And so it is leueful [men] to procure for [her] children richesse of pe world more pan pei to hem. For as Seynt Poul seip, 'Fadris tresouren to her children more pan children don to hem, for pei louen hem more, as God louep
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## B

man more pan man may loue God.' And herefore man may neuer loue God to moche. Herefore pis Fader God and Holy Churche oure moder we scholde worschepe nyst and day, praynge to God oure Fader to encresce and to fulfille pe nombre of alle pat schal be saued. In pis manere pou schalt worschepe py fader and moder and pyn eldres bodylyche and gostlyche, and pis is pe fyrste commaundement of pes seuene.

## T

man more pan man may loue God'. And herfor man may neuer loue God to myche, al if men may faile in foly maner of worship and wene he worshipip God whame he dispisip him; and so it fallip more in worship of pi fader.

## [Capitulum Tercium]

Worship of pi goostli fader, as pi prelat or prest, is ofte tyme takun amys, euen to pe contrarie. For pe worlde iugip hym moost worshipe [siche fader] pat makip him moost shynyng /and riche to pe world; but pis is an eresie, ouer comyn pis day. Me pinkip pat we shulden seie, to suffre herfor deep, pat if pi Pope, bi bisshop, bi parsoun or wiker be knowun of pee to draw in pe deuelis 30k, worshipe him not as
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## T

siche but hate him as pin enemye in pat pat he is synful, but loue him in soure kynde. And ofte tyme richesse and worship of pe world aggregip syn of siche and makip men vnworshipe hem. And so it harmep in soule pe child and pe fader. For bi oure
bileue we shulden loue hem in God and not to pe world, for pame we haten hem. We louen hem in God if pat we moeuen hem to holde Goddis reule and ordre pat Crist hap souen hem, But, as it is shewed bi ten faire witnessis, Crist hap beden hem be pore and forbeden hem worldli worship. And sip pat

10 lordis of pis world shulden worshipe moost siche fadris, if bei putt pis lordship on hem pei don hym more dispijt; and if pei dispise pus her God pei shal be maad vnnoble. For he pat fuylip pus his prelat dispisip him more pan if he defoylide alle hise vestimentis wip dritt. O, sip Crist hymsilf seip pat him pat he louep he reprouep and chastisip, whi shulden not we do so: if we louen men in God, telle hem Goddis lawe, and procure pat pei holde his lawe? For
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ellis we haten hem. And pus, if lordis louyde her eldris in soule, pei shulden quenche her errours and make hem more short, and folies pat pei bigan fordo hem at her myst. And so, if pis maundement were kept bi Goddis lawe, lordis
herof azens oure worldli doyng, but God syue grace pat sumdel be put sone in practise. And pus men shulden be aboute to worshipe /her dede eldris and reise vp Goddis lawe pat pei han put doun. And so, if y durst seie, y kan not now se pat ne sepulcris ne abbeis profiten now to deed patrouns.

15 But whame al is lokid aboute, pe best of al were pat pure ordenaunce of Crist were mayntened in his Chirche, and pane shulden many officeris be put fro Cristis Chirche as an ydel couent of Antecristis clerkis.
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Pe secunde commaundement of seuene of pe secunde table byddcp pe schortly noust slee py broper and it vnderstondep vnskylful sleynge. And herefore men seyep pat men pat bep ykylled by mannes lawe bep noust slawe of men bot pe lawe

T

## [Capitulum Quartum] Pe Fyfth Comaundment

The secound maundment of seuene of pe secound table biddip pee shortly not sle pi broper, and it vnderstondip vnskilful sleyng. And herfor men seien pat men pat ben slayn
bi mannes lawe ben not sleyn of men but pe lawe sleep hem and her yuel dedis. But wolde God pat pe puple wolde worshipe Goddis lawe and seie pat it were ful soop and iust in hymsilf as pei supposen of mames lawe. Wipouten ony dout, pame shulden pei not be contrarie to Crist: wharme he seip pat

10 pis breed is myn owne body pei reuersen him and seien pat pis may neper be breed ne pe body of Crist, as false freris gabben.

But leue we pis now and speke we of pis maundement,
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Suppose we, he seyp, by oure feyp, bat God byddep pus: bat we scholde kylle no man wipoute auctorite of him. And so [may] men kylle bestes and wykkede men bope, by auctorite of lawe, and elles no wyse. Resoun dryuep men to holde pis commaundement: syp eche man of pis worlde is broper to oper and eke neyzebore to oper by ordynaunce of God, who scholde panne oper wyse vnkyndelyche kylle his broper? For as we bep alle pe children of Adam oure fa/der, so we bep alle pe children of God, and alle f.96 pat schal be saued hap Holy Churche here moder. And so, as me

## T

and suppose we bi oure feip pat God biddip pus: pat we shulden sle no man wipoute autorite of him. And so may men kille beestis and wikid men bope, bi autorite of lawe, and ellis no wise. Resoun dryuep men to holde pis comaundment: sip eche man of pe world is broper to oper and eche neisbore to oper bi pe ordenaunce of God, who shulde pame oper wise vnkyndly sle his broper? For as we ben alle children of Adam oure fader, so we ben alle children of God, and alle pat shal be sauyd han Hooli Chirche her moder. And so, as
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penkep, no man scholde kylle ober by auctorite of pe lawe bot yf he were sykere pat Godes lawe bad it; and panne myzte he ywyte pat he brake noust Godes heste al yf he kyllede him ne fel noust fro charite, syp bope loue and sorwe scholde meue hem man may kylle anoper as men clepep hangemen and hederys of mannes lawe. And pus Godes lawe spekep, wham we scholde lyue.

## T

me pinkip, no man shulde sle oper bi autorite of pe lawe but if he were siker pat Goddis lawe bad it; and parne myste he wite pat he brak not Goddis heest al if he slous him ne fel not fro charite, sip bobe loue and sorowe shulde mo\{e\}ue him to do so and not his owne veniaunce. And pus, as me pinkip, a man may kille anoper, as men clepen hangmen and hederis /in f. $18^{v}$ mannes lawe. And pus Goddis lawe spekip whiche we shulden trowe.

And pus men supposen pat bi londis lawe is no man sleyn but if God bidde it, for pei supposen pat pis is Goddis lawe. But it is wonder to men hou in mony londis
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For of pis lawe we bep certeyne pat it byddep noust kylle a man bot yf it be resoun and graciouse and profetable yf \{he\} takep \{it\} wel, so pat it were betere him to be kylled so pan for to lyue forpe vnpunesched for his trespasse. And so yf eny peyne on men wipoute autorite of God.
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Bot wete we wel pis commaundement is syb to many synnes. For Seynt Jon seyp pat ech man pat hatep his broper is a mansleer, 3e, ofte tymes more to blame pan he pat sleep his body for pe synne is more. And by bis skyle a bacbyter is a mansleer, and he that scholde seue gostlych fode and feylep perynne; and so eche man pat synnep in eny dedly synne synnep azenst pis commaundement, as it is of oper. For whosoeuere consentep to sleynge synneb a3enst pis commaundement and is a mansleer. Bot, as clerkes seyp, vpon syxe maneres ys pis

## T

\{Capitulum Quintum \}
But wite wel pis maundement is sib to many synnes. For Seynt Jon seip pat eche pat hatip his broper is a mansleer, she, ofte tymes more to blame pan he pat sleep his body,

T: 1 Capitulum Quintum] mar. T, om. H 2 pis] pat pis H 3 eche] he H 6 he] om. H 7 in ony heed synne] om. T, in ony hedli syme $Y$ 9 aзens] aзein HY 10 consent] pis consent HY

## B

consentynge do, and men scholde knowe it: he consentep to pe yuel pat worchep wip perto; he pat defendep and conseylep perto; he by whos auctorite ys pe yuel ydoo; he pat wipdrawep his helpe or scharp repreuyng whan /he my3te do it and scholde by f.97r non ys more sutyl pan suche consente. And herefore pe prophetes of pe Olde Lawe tolde men pereles tyl pay suffrede dep and in pis cause pe apostoles of Crist were martyred; and we scholde yf we were trewe men, bot cowardyse and defaute of loue of oure God T
and men shulden wel know it: he consentip to yuel bat worchip wip perto; he pat defendip it and conseilip perto; he bi whos autorite is pe yuel don; he pat wipdrawep his help or sharp reprouyng wharme he myzte do it and shulde bi Goddis
lawe. And among alle synnes bi whiche pe fend bigil[ib] men, noon is more sutel pan siche concense. And herfore pe prophetis of pe Olde Lawe telden men perels til pei suffriden deep and for pis cause apostolis of Crist weren martrid; and we shulden /if we weren trewe men, but cowardise and defaut of
$\mathrm{T}: 1$ to] to pe HY, (mar, nota bene Y ) 2 and] and pat Y
3 his] om. Y 5 bigilip] bigilide $T \quad 6$ concense]
consente $\mathrm{Y} \mathbf{8}$ for] in HY, apostolis] pe apostelis HY

## B

makep ous sterte abak as traytours doo.
And so yf pe grounde were sowt in remes per were fewe prestes ober seculeres pat ne were mansleeres vpon som maneres, and specialy prelat3 pat sleep here broper in many

10 lordes and communes and brekep pis commaundement.

## T

loue of oure God makip vs to sterte abak as traitours don.
And so if pe ground were soust in oure reumes per weren lite prestis or seculers oper pat ne pei weren mansleers vpon sum maner, and specialy prelatis bat sleen
her breperen many weies. For pei shulden preche hem and teche hem Goddis lawe, and bi necligence of hem ben pei goostly sleyn.

And pes shulde stonde as postis azens [tirauntis] and telle hem bi Goddis lawe pei shulden lede pe puple; and pis is a priuey synne pat prelatis recchen not, and herbi pei sleen

10 ofte bope lordis and comyns.

```
T: 1 God] Lorde \(H\), to] om. HY 2 reumes] rewme Y 3 lite] feu HY oper] ouper H 5 her] pair HY, weies] wises H , and ] om. Y 6 hem Goddis] berm Goddes H 7 asens] azenst \(Y\), tirauntis] traitours \(T\)
8 bi] hou bi H , pei] hou pei Y 9 not] not of \(\mathrm{Y} \quad 10\) lordis] pe lordis Y
```


## T

And what trowe we of pes prelatis pat sillen mennes synne and syuen hem leue to laste perynne for amuel rent? And parsones pat leeuen to trauel in her office bi power of lordis and syuyng of money ben suffrid to lyue wipoute world, but bi pis irregularite ben prelatis dampned.

## \{Capitulum Sextum \}

And vpon siche maner ben many freris mansleers, as speciali we may se on pes pre maneres: first pei haten her briperen as mansleers don, for ellis pei wolden not pus picke lie on hem, for siche lesyngis comen not but if hate wente bifore. Ant sip Seynt Jon seip pat whoeuer hate his

T: 2 amuel rent] an yuel tente Y 3 her] per HY 4 ben] but Y , lyue] lif pus $H Y \quad 5$ prechyng] pechyng $T$, ofte tyme] often $H$ 6 sleen] killen HY $\quad 7$ pis] pis is $\mathrm{Y} \quad 8$ tyme] times $\mathrm{Y} \quad 10$ bi pis irregularite] if it be doon in charite ellis $\mathrm{Y} \quad 11$ Capitulum Sextum] mar. T, om. H 12 maner] maners HY , as] and $\mathrm{H} \quad 13 \mathrm{we}$ ] as we Y , on] of HY , peij pes Y , her] per Y 14 pei wolden] trs. HY 15 wente] go HY 16 sib] om. Y, hate] hatep HY

## T

broper he is a mansleer, how many freris ben siche! Pe secound degree of mansleyng stondip in wille of freris, for pei han ofte tyme wille to sle her briperen bodily. Leeue we sleyng of her owne briberen in her prisoun, and speke of her wickid wille pat was now late shewed at Londoun and Lyncolun to breme trewe prestis for pes prestis grauntiden pe treupe of pe Gospel. And sip pis wickid wille cam bi alle pes foure ordris it/is licly pat pei ben alle mansleers.

Ne mansleyng is neuer pe lesse pat God moeuyde lordis to
10 lette pe wille of pes freris pat pei slowen hem not. For whame God hap an erbere of erbis and seedis to heele many cuntreis of many sikenessis it were a greet synne to kitte pes seedis and vndermyne pes erbis bifore tyme were; and herfore we supposen pat God himsilf ordeynede pes erbis to laste til pei hadden more profited. Be pridde maner of sleyng, to general in freris, stondip in here prechyng, comounly venemed. For [if] pei flateren and fagen, bobe prechyng and

T: 1 he] om. H 3 ofte tyme] often tymes $H$, her] ber HY 4 her owne] per ouen HY, in her] in pair HY, speke] speke we HY 5 her] pair HY, and] at $Y 9$ moeuyde] mouep H 10 not] no3t H 11 and] of $\mathrm{H} \quad 12 \mathrm{a}$ om. $\mathrm{H} \quad$ 15-16 maner of sleyng] mansleing HY 16 general] generalli $Y$, herel peir $\mathrm{HY} 17 \mathrm{if]}$ om. T

## T

shryuyng, in pont of memnes soules helpe, what venym is worse? For pis wise may Antecrist moost venyme memes soulis and sende hem to Sathanas, fadir of siche freris. Sum men seien pat freris forsaken for to preche pe Gospel iapis left. And God for hise grace graunte it so be, for moost perel of mansleyng stondip in false freris.


## B

Alle pes seuene commaundement3 of pe secunde table techep a man how he schal haue him anemtys his euene Cristene, bope to his frende and to his enemy, bot per is nopyng more contrarious to pis pan is wrongful manslawte. berfore euery
man skillefullyche and kyndelyche scholde fle and enchewe suche manslawt. For as seyp be wyse man in his boke, 'Eueryche best louep pat best pat is lyche to him.' Muche more, by weye of kynde, scholde man pat is resonable in alle pynges: he scholde do none manslawt. And pis we scholde knowe by pure resoun.

10 For resoun wolde, syp alle onlyche God 3euep and puttep in lyf into pe body whan him lykep, so to him alone it longep to take pe soule out of pat body whan him lykep. For pou wost neuere whanne it is goed to py soule to be take oute, whan to abyde; whan it is ordeyned to ioye, whan to peyne; for it 15 is longynge /to God to knowe pat knowep alle pyng and noust to pe. Wherefore to him alone it longep to syue lyf and to sle whan it best lykep. And in tokene of pat pis synne ys so orryble and vnkyndely, pis [is] on of pe synnes pat in Holy Wryt cryep to God vengeaunce, as wytnessep God himself in pe

20 fyrste boke of Holy Wryt. 'Lo,' seyp God to Caym, 'pe voys of pe blod of py broper cryeb to me from pe erpe.'

For pis commaundement, se schulle vnderstonde pat per is pre maner of manslawt, pat is to seye bope of honde and of tunge and

B: 18 is] om. 22-23 (mar, nota bene de triplici homicidio)

## B

of herte or of wyl. Pa[t] man sleep a man with his honde pat smytep his broper in violence, wherepurgh his bodyly strengbes bep enfybled and his lyf yschorted, oper wrongfullyche wipdrawep his bodylyche sustynaunce. And he sleep a man wip
his tunge pat conseylep or procurep his dep or falslyche lyep on him wherfore his profyt is lette or abreched. Also he sleep a man wip his tunge pat for hate, enuye or mede bryngep a goed man or a womman out of here goede name or fame, wip fals sclandrynge of here tunge. And alle suche, in as muche as in him is, byfore God pey sleep hem. He sleep a man in herte and wyl pat wylnep or desyrep mannes dep for eny worldlyche goed, or eny worldlyche cause or trespas ydo to his persone, or hatep him in herte. For Seynt Jon seyp, 'He pat hatep his broper is a mansleer.' And pus whan a man oper womman berep enuye or haterede in herte to here euene Cristene, willynge wrongfullyche or enuyouslyche pat myschyf or vengeaunce falle vpon hem, and perto cursep in herte and in moup, he is a mansleer; and alle suche, in pat pat in hem ys, pay dop perylous manslawt, for bey sleep here owene soule and also here euene Cristene. And perfore God byddep pat pou schalt noper wip honde, ne wip tunge, ne wip herte do no manslawt.

B: 1 Pat] Pan, his] his/his

B
/Pe prydde commaundement of God in pis secunde table f.98r forfendep men and wommen to synne in eny manere of lecherye. And pis commaundement of God sewep wel pat oper goynge next byfore, pe whyche forfendep to sle man in his persone, and pis forfendep to sle man in his felawe. For, as pe Gospel techep, man and womman wedded bep on persone by pe lawe of God. And perfore pes lechours pat foulep on of pes sleep in a maner pe felawe of it. And as we seyde of mansleynge, so it ys of lecherye: som is bodylyche and oper is gostlyche. Bodyliche T

## Capitulum Septimum

The pridde maundement of God of pis secound table forfendib men to synne in ony maner leccherie. And pis maundment of God suep wel pe toper, for pe next forfendip
to sle man in his persone, and pis forfendip te sle man in his felowe. For, as pe Gospel techip, man and womman /weddid ben oo persone bi pe lawe of God. And herfor pis lecchour pat foulip oon of pes sleep in a manerpe felowe of it. And [as] we seiden of mansleyng, so it is of leccherie: sum is bodily

T: 1 Capitulum Septimum] om. H 2 The] Pe pride hest of pe secunde table. The H, of pis] in pis HY 3 in ony maner leccherie] in lecherie any maner $H$ 5 his] om. Y 7 ood on $\mathrm{H} \quad 8$ foulip] filip Y , a] om. Y 9 as] om. T , seiden] seyn $H$, is of] is $H$

## B

lecherye is in many maneres. Somtyme vnwedded man foulep vnwedded womman and pis is cleped communlyche symple fornycacioun.

## T

and sum is goostly. Bodili leccherie is in many maner.
Sumtyme vnweddid man foulip vnweddid womman, and pis [is] clepid comounly simple fornicacioun. If pat oo part be weddid, or ellis bope \{t\}wo, panne pat is auoutrie, as comoun speche techip. Opere parties of pis synne is taust in opere places, (for pes partis sufficen now) wip techyng of her membris. Goostly leccherie is whame a man forsakip pe loue of his God for loue of a creature, and pis is a leccherie moost for to charge, for no leccherie is synne but if pis be pere.

10 And sipe eche mames soule shulde be Cristis spouse, what lecchour pat synnep pus he synnep in avoutrie, for he brekip pe maryage pat shulde be bitwenne Crist and him pat pus synnep, as myche as in him is.

T: 1 sum] oper HY , in] on H , maner] maners HY 2 is] om. T 3 pat ood pe to H , pe toon Y 4 two] corr.int. T, pat] it HY 5 is] ben HY 6 her] opere $Y 8$ a leccherie] lecherie HY 12 bitweme] bitwixe $\mathrm{Y} \quad 13$ in him is] is in him Y

## B

And pis word 'lecherye', enemy contrarye to pe vertue of contynence and of chastyte, is a brennynge appetyte, oper a coueytyse, of a lecherouse wyl, hyynge fulfille pe lecherous delectacioun of consentynge of resoun. For whenne pat resoun hure on herte.' (And pis same resoun may be vnderstonde of wommen). T

And wille stondip for dede comounly in siche synnes and herfor seip Crist in pe Gospel of Matheu, 'He pat seep a womman for to coueite hir hap don leccherie wip hir now in his herte.'

[^40]
## B

Pe secunde manere ys whenne /man oper womman delyteb himself in lecherous dedes, as in kyssynge and grypynge, byholdynge [and] spekynge, and in takynge hede to wyckede and vnclene speches, and in oper vnlawesom touchynges onlyche, by schrewede delectacioun, and in oper dyuerse lecherous fykelynges and ragynges, into fulfyllynge of his wyckede desyres. And pis is more grettere synne pan pe fyrste maner bycause of his felawe and of more delectacioun pat ofte tymes he takep by suche vnlawesom feylynge of his membres and lymes.
pe prydde manere is whenne an vnwedded man and vnwedded womman trespassep in dede doynge. And pis is so gret synne pat pough pey trespassed neuere peron bot ones, bot yf bey hadde ones grace to amende hem here, pey scholde be excluded of be kyngdom of heuene euere wipoute ende, as wytnessep wel Seynt Poule in his epistle wher he seyp bus: 'Noper lecheours noper spousebrekeres schal haue pe kyngdom of heuene' (pat is to mene, bot pey amende hem here). And in pis worde pat God byddep ous do no lecherye, he commaundep pat noper wedded noper sengul man or womman scholde do eny maner lecherye. For no doute it is foul, dedly and dampnable in alle maneres forseyde, and it is moche more greuous synne bytwene a wedded man or womman for

B: 3 and] in 4 unlawesom] speches canc.

## B

pe cursed brekyng of be heyze sacrament of wedlok. Bot yf prestes pat scholde lyue as angeles synwep in lecherye pey bep spousebrekeres brekynge pe vowe of chastite, and penne per is sorwe vpon sorwe, for pey scholde be a myrour to pe peple

10 And perfore kepe clene pyn herte from /assentynge to lecherye, by moup from lecherous kyssynge or spekynge, and by membres from alle lecherous dedys doynge. For wyte we wel pat lecherye is harde for to [v]encusse in men pat bep stronge in here kynde, for kynde meuep to pat dede bot noust to pat synne. And herfore seyp T

But wite we pat leccherie is hard for to vencushe in men pat ben stronge in her kynde, for kynde moeuep to pe dede and not to pe synne. And herfor seip a clerk on pis wise, pat specialy in pis synne mot a man be coward

B: 7 lykynge] lyuynge 13 vencusse] encusse
T: 2 her] ber Y , for kynde] for kynre Y 3 and not] bot not HY

## B

coward and flee f[er] occasioun pat meuep to pis synne. And triste noust to strengbe, ne [holynesse], ne wysdome. For what man was euere strengere pan Sampsoun? Who of ous alle was holyer pan Dauyd? Who was more wysere pan Salomon his sone? And alle pes pre were brend wyp pe fyre of lust of pis synne. And so yf pou wolt be Cristes clene childe flee as Cristes coward be companye of folyes wommen, ne be pou noust to famylyer wip non maner wommen.

Pe secunde medycyne azenst pis synne were to kepe by
10 body fro lusty fode, for flesch pat ys yuele yfed synwep

## T

and [fle] f[e]r occasioun pat moeuep to pis synne. And trist not to strengbe, ne [hoolynesse], ne wisdom. For what man was euer strenger pan Sampson? Who of vs alle was [hoolyer] pan Dauid? Who was more witti pan Salamon his sone? And alle pes pre weren
brent wip pe fier of lust. And so, if pou wolt be Goddis clene child, fle as Cristis coward cumpenye of wymmen.

Pe secound medicyne pat helpip azens pis synne were to kepe pi body fro lustful fode, for fleish pat is yuel fed

B: 1 fer] fro 2 holynesse] wytt 9 were to] man and womman bysye hemself canc.
T: 1 fle fer] for $T$, trist] striste $Y \quad 2$ strengbe] stren 3 H ,
hoolynesse] witte HTY 3 hoolyer] wysere HTY 6 coward] cowardis Y 7 aзens] aзen $Y$, pis] om. $Y 8$ lustful] lustlye $H$, lusti $Y$

## B

noust pus communelyche.
Pe prydde medycyne azenst pis synne were to man and womman bysye hemself in clene occupacioun, for suche lust comep noust bot yf poust go before. And herefore occupye py poust and py body in clene occupaciouns and so flee pis synne.

Syppe adultery is gretter synne pan symple fornycacioun for it is a distruyng and a brekynge of pe holy sacrament of wedloke pat God made in Paradyse at bygynnynge of pe worlde ar eny synne was ydo, perfore eche Cristene man and womman scholde be sore adradde to breke it or mysvse it or turne it into eny synne, for pe same Lorde pat made it wole haue a rekenynge perof. Take hede how gretlyche God hatep pis synne. Holy Wryt wytnessep pat God spake to Dauyd by pe prophete Nathan and seyde pus: 'For pou hast ydo auoutry wip T synnep pus not comounly.
be prid medicyn azens pis synne were a man to occupie /hym in clene occupacioun, for siche lust comep not but if poust go bifore. And herfor occupie pi poust and pi body in clene occupaciouns, and so fle pis synne.

B: 9 perfore] and berfore
T: 1 pus not] trs. HY 2 asens] asen Y , occupie] bisi HY

## B

Vrye is wyf, /pe swerde of vengeaunce schal neuere go fram byn hous and I schal make pe enemyes of pyn owen body.' And al pis he fonde sobe. For he was afterward euermore in anguyssch and myschef; and Absolon, his owen sone, drof him out of his lond, and, ouer pis, God sende into Dauydys londe a gret pestylence, and slowe seuenty pousand folke of pe peple in pre dayes.

Also per bep foure peynes pat euerych man and womman pat brekep pis holy sacrament of wedloke by adultery schal suffre on perof in pis worlde or he daye, ouer alle oper peynes. Oper he schal be pore and yput adoun in pis worlde; or elles he schal deye sodeynlyche; or elles, by som hurte, he schal loste on of his lymes; oper he schal be ysclaundred and be yprysoned perfore. Also it is grettere synne to byneme a mayde here maydenhod, oper defouly a clene wydue oper eny womman pat ys of lynage to pe trespasser, by kynreden or affynyte oper gosseprede oper elles by oper frendeschep of benefyts and kendenesse, pan symple fornycacioun by an vnclene stronge womman, pough it be a gret dedly synne in pre maneres, as it is foreseyde. And alle pes maneres of synnes beb forfended of God in pis prydde commaundement of pe secunde table, whare pat he seyp, 'Pou schalt do no lecherye' (bat is to mene noper bodylyche noper gostlyche; and of gostlyche lecherye I tolde byfore in pe fyrst commaundement, wel toward pe ende).

## Capitulum Octavum

Sip eche hedly synne makip men gilty azens pis maundement and Crist pat we shulden spouse, general speche of synne may be touchid here. And it helpip to penke on pis: hou good Crist is, and hou clene and profitable were it to be weddid wip him, and hou seyntis in heuene ben alle virgyns. Alle seyntis in heuene and Hooli Chirche ben virgyns in a maner, as Crist is virgyn; and so Crist ordeynede him to be born of a virgyn and alle hise seyntis in bliss kepen virgynite. And so virgynite is betere pan wedlok, for wedlok here in eerpe lastip but a while and berip heggyng of synne, as doip not virgynite. And pis shulde moeue a man led bi resoun for to loue castite, sip God louep it, and pe eende of getyng of children in pis lijf lastip but a while and eendip in chastite. And shame we of pes resouns pat pes lecchours maken, pat God worchip wip hem to brynge for[pe] men, ne pe Chirche myste not be wipoute her werkis. Soop it is

[^41]
## T

pat be Chirche stondit wipoute hem, sip many ben in chastite and in spoushed [begetun]. And pat God worchip wip hem preise God of his grace, and blame her vnkyndnesse pat pei don to God, ne preise hem not herfore, for God worchip wip fendis. And so shulden we penke hou synne displesip God, for noping displesip God but synne or bi synne sip fendis and wickid men may not displese God but bi her synne, as trewe men knowen wel; ne no man may departe fro God but he bicome seruant to synne. And so al oonly synne 10 may not serue God, for God may not make synne to be his creature. Synful creaturis, as fendis and wickid men, moten serue God bi kynde pat he syuep hem, or doyng bat he biddip hem, or suffryng pat he shapip hem; /but sit God hap ordeyned lawes of synne, as he may not leeue punyshyng [nepeles] his mercy was real cause perof. Many siche treupis shulde make men to hate synne and loue oure good

## T: 2 begetun] ben getun T 3 God] him H , her] per $\mathrm{H} \quad 4$ herfore]

 perfore H 5 displesip] despisep $\mathrm{H} \quad 6$ noping displesib] per dop noping desplese $\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{God}]$ him HY 7 her] ber $\mathrm{H} \quad 9$ but] but aif HY 11 wickid] sinful H 13 pat] pat pat T (second of these marked for omission) 15 was] wer H 16 nepeles] neuepes T 17 tol om. H, good] Lord Y
## B

Pe ferpe commaundement of pe secunde table suep in pis ordre and in pes wordes: 'Pou schalt do no pefpe.' Bat ys to seye, bou schalt kepe pe fro pefpe, syppe py God is trewe, and so pou scholdest noust noye by broper, noper in his body, ne in his felawe (pat is his spouse), ne in his worldlyche goedes. Bot here we schulle vnderstonde what pyng is pefpe. Pefpe ys ta/kynge of goede wipoute leue of pe lord.

## T

God bi fleyng perfro, for he is pe best spouse pat any man may haue, ne no man may proprely bi weddid wip him but if he kepe him euermore fro synne wipouten eende.
[Capitulum Nonum ] Pe Seuent Comaundment
The fourpe comaundment of pe secound table suep in pis ordre and in pes wordis: Pou shalt do no peft. Pat is to seie pat pou shalt kepe pee fro peft, sip bi God is trewe, and so pow shuldust not noye pi broper neper in his bodi, neper in his felowe (bat is his spouse), ne in hise worldli goodis. But here shulden we wite what ping is peft. Peft is takyn $[\mathrm{g}]$ of goodis wipoute leeue of pe lord. But wite we wel pat God

T: 4 Capitulum Nonum] mar. T, om. HY, pe Seuent Comaundement] pe iiij heste of pe ij table $H$, iiij comaundment of pe ij table $Y$ 5 comaundment]
maundement $Y \quad 6$ shalt] schalt not $Y \quad 7$ pat] om. HY, is] is is $H$, trewe] treupe HY 8 bodi neper] body ne HY 10 we] \{we\} corr.int. H takyng] takyn T 11 we] om. Y, wel] om. HY

## T

is Lord of alle lordis, and so God is cheef Lord of euery man. And so may a man in tyme of nede take of his nei3boris good, al if he grucche a3en, for God pat is cheef Lord syuep him leeue perto. And so leeue of pis Lord
sculdest pou algatis knowe and perbi peft and leueful vss of ony kymnes goodis. And so bileue techip vs pat whoso haue leeue of God, and al oonly siche, hap verrey possessioun.

And herfor was it seid comounly sumtyme pat al oonly he pat stondip in grace is verrey lord of pingis and whoeuer

10 failip rist bi defaut of grace him failip ritwise title of what ping pat he occupiep. And cause of pis is for God pat is cheef Lord approuep not his hauyng, sip it is vnskilful. And herfor Crist techip in his Gospel book pat of him pat hap not and hap to memnes semyng shal it be takun to

15 hym pat hap Goddis wille.
And here may we se hou many men ben peues. For

T: 2 al om. HY 4 leeve] be leue $Y \quad 7$ haue] hap $Y 8$ ald om. Y 10 him failip] hym lackip H 14 and] and/and T , tol bi HY

## B

And pis takynge of godes may be do on meny maneres. On ys in takynge py neyзebores goedes fro him aзenst his wylle, oper by pryuey stelynge, by ny3te or by daye, by londe or by water, oper by open robbynge; and pat is whenne men openlyche takep menne godes azenst here wille, or wipholdep wip maystry pat hem fallep to haue by ry3t, as men pat wipholdep pe hyre of trewe seruantes, and also pe seruants pat serueth noust trewelyche here maystres or wastep here goedes a3enst pe worschep of God and profyt of here maystres: per may nopyng

10 excuse hem pat pay ne dope pefpe. And so no doute pat eche man pat hap enypyng wipoute goede tytle brekep pis commaundement. And syb no man hap ryst to pyng bot he pat seruep trewelyche pe Lord of alle pynges, eche man scholde be bysy to kepe pis byddynge.

Pe secunde manere ys by reuynge py neyzebore ys goede wrongfullyche by false sleypes of mannes lawe, as by false playntes, by false attachement3, or by eny oper wrong manere. And alle vniuste men pat occupyep Godes goedes dop pefpe. And T
alle pes vniust men pat han Goddis goodis [don pefte]. An so

T: 1 Goddis] om. Y, don pefte] om. HTY

## B

so lordes of \{pe\} worlde pat seruep nou3t God trewelyche stelep Godes goedes and occupyep Cristes goedes wipoute his leue perto bep bope nyst peues and day peues also. And herefore seyp Crist, herde of alle herdes, pat alle pat comep noust \{in\} by pis dore bep stronge peues in pes two maneres: bay bep ny3t peues pat derkep in synne, and by fals tytle pat pey fayneb on Crist pey spoylep pe peple pat bep [sogest vnto] hem; and bes may be ny3t peues for derkenesse of synne, for no synne ys more derke

## T

lordis of pis world, pat senuen God not treuly steilen Goddis goodis, for pingis pat pei occupien pei han wipoute his leeue, and panne pese ben peues. And so, more generally, prelatis of pe Chirche /pat occupien Cristis goodis wipoute his leeue perto ben bope nyst peues and day peues also. And herfor s[e]ip Crist, herde of alle herdis, pat alle pei pat comen not yn bi pis dore ben stronge peues on pes two maneres: pei ben ny3t peues pat darken in synne, and bi false title pat pei feynen vpon Crist pei spuylen pe pepule suget vnto hem; and pes may be nyst peues for derknesse of synne, for no synne is more

B: 1 pe] corr.int. 4 in] corr.int. 7 sogest to] vader
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## B

pan lye pus on Criste and seye pat he was worldlyche lord, as Antecryst feynep, syp he clepep pe fende Prynce of pis worlde.

Day peues pay bep pat lorkep in wodes and more openlyche spoylep trewe men. Seculer lordes bep /trees of pis wode f. $100^{v}$ whos power pei lurken and spuylen pe puple, and noon is more contrarious to Crist. Crist is pis dore bi whom prestis comen yn, but pes Antecristis clerkis breken pe roof and comen yn aboue bi pride of pis world, and Crist, pat may not lye, seip pes ben peues, sib pei taken Cristis goodis wibouten

B: 9 wipoute] leue canc.
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## B

his leue.
Pe prydde manere of stelynge ys in pes bope maneres, as by maistryes and by sleype of mannes lawe. And generalyche in pis commaundement God forbedep to his peple alle manere of dampnacioun, beb war in alle 3oure byynge and syllynge of opes swerynge, for communelyche pat on is forswore in suche swerynge or bope. And perfore, in worde and in dede, do no wrong ne pefbe.

## T

his leeue. But sit treupe nedip hem to write in her lettris pat bi suffryng of God pei ben siche maistris. Pe moost peef of alle pes, and moost Antecrist, is pe chefteyn of pes pat ledip hem alle, for he steli[p] moost falsely moo goodis of Crist.

[^42]
## T

## Capitulum Decimum

Lord wheper it be Goddis lawe to sle men for peft? And it semep '3is'. For bi pe lawe of Englond men ben hanged for peft for a litel ping. Also bi pe Popis lawe men ben ofte 5 brent for pei susteynen pe lawe pat Ihesu Crist 3af, as who seip pat pe Pope shulde not pus be lord bi title of Crist shal be brent anoon. And so it is of many poyntis pat Goddis lawe witnessit. But pe Gospel of Crist contrariep pis doyng. For pe Gospelle of Luk tellip hou Crist cam porou

10 Samarie vnto Ierusalem and pe puple wolde neper herborowe him ne fede him; and his disciplis axiden pat fier shulde come from heuene and deuoure hem; but Crist seide, 'Nay,' and reprouid his apostlis, and seide pei knewen not whos spirit pei weren, /sip he himsilf cam not for to lese memnes lyues but for to saue hem. But Antecrist hap ordeyned euen contrarie lawe pat he may not grounde in pe lawe of God: pat who pat tellip him his synne, hou he contrariep Crist, he settip him faste afyre

[^43]
## T

(for pat is sharpest deep) and seip he is an eretik contrarie to his Chirche. But God wolde men wolde studie wel Cristis lawe, and y am certeyn pei shulde not fynde pat pis were leeueful to pe viker of Crist. But Antecrist doib pis bi
his worldly power and power of his fader. Wel y rede pat blasfemes in pe Olde Lawe shulde be stoned to deep, for pei ben moost eretikes. But in pe Newe Testament y trowe pat men shulden caste stoones of pe Gospel, whiche is oure bileue, and telle hem sharply hou pei shulden trowe; and if pei wolen (not) assente forsake hem as hepen men.

As anentis pe lawe of Englond, it is seid bifore pat it is not oure craft to iustifie it but iustifie Goddis lawe and pat shulden alle men do. But oo ping y trowe: pat more defaut is seyn in execucioun of pis lawe pan in pe lawe itsilf. For it fallip ofte tymes pat peues ben more punyshid for her peft of God pan hangyng bi her nekke. And ofte tymes it may be pat God wole pat pei be tumed bi sorowe of herte and make good

[^44]
## T

for her syme.
But here men replien for lawe of oure lond, and seien pe rewme shulde not be kept in pees but if siche iewesse were ordeyned for peues. But here may men se bi pe lawe of God pat

10 Goddis word, as pe apostlis diden; and pat wolde conuerte moo pan hangyng or sleyng, as more peues of pe Chirche ben suffrid and mayntened and fewe men dar telle hem defautis pat pei don. But pe pridde medicyn, groundid in Cristis lawe, azens alle siche men pat don a3ens God shulde be siche medicyn: bi

15 lawe of pe Gospel pei shulden be warned /pries, as Crist f. $22^{v}$ himsilf biddip; and at be fourp tyme pei shulden be exilid fro trewe memnes cumpany as hepene or pubplicans; and, os Seynt

T: 1 her] pair HY 4 may men] trs. Y 5 rewme] rewmo $T \quad 8$ pe nede] here nede H , pe lesse] lesse $\mathrm{HY} \quad 9$ aзens] aзen $\mathrm{Y} \quad 10$ Goddis]
Cristis HY 12 defautis] pe defautis $\mathrm{H} \quad 13$ aзens] aзen $\mathrm{Y} \quad 14$ aзens] asen $Y \quad 15$ lawe] pe lawe $Y \quad 17$ hepene] hepen men $Y$

## B

Pe fyfpe commaundement of God in pe secunde table forbedeb alle men to speke false wytnesse a3enst here neyzebore. And pis ys nedful to execute pe lawe, for Godes lawe and mannes lawe axep wytnesse, and of suche wytnesse comep
iuggement of men, [and falshede of wytnesse makep false iuggement].
And so [erroure in] wytnesse strecchep wel fere, for manye /bep f. $101^{\text {r }}$ dysherted and meny bep hanged by suche false wytnesse and of pis spryngep many false heyres and oper synnes

## T

Jon techip, men shulden not heile hem for whoeuer heilip hem shal part of her synnes. And men of pe Gospel trowen pat pes medicynes shulde purge rewmes of wickid men bettere pan mannes lawe.

Capitulum Undecimum
The fifpe maumdement of God in pis secound table forfendip al men for to speke fals witnesse azens her neizbore. And pis is nedeful to execute pe lawe, for Goddis lawe and mennes lawe axen witnesse, and of siche witnesse comep iugement of man, and falshed of witnesse makip fals iugement. And so errour in witnesse strecchip ful fer, for many ben disheritid and many ben hanged bi siche fals wittnesse, and of pis springip many fals eyris and opere many synnes, for

B: 5 and falshede of wytnesse makep false iuggement] om. 6 erroure in] eyper
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## B

manye, for pe whiche God takep vengeaunce of men. For as be rote of vertues spryngep ful fer, bope in places and tymes, so it ys of synnes; and pis scholde meue men to leue false wytnesse. For whoso wytnessep false, he wytnessep a3enst trewpe and syb

5 God himself ys trewe he wytnessep azens him. And so what man dop eny dede pat himself grauntep he dop it on Godes half. And so whanne he wytnessep fals he takep God to wytnesse pat pat pyng pat he seyp is trewe and of God and, syb pat byng ys fals, as muche as in him ys he makep his God false and bryngep him

## T

whiche God takip vengeaunce of men. For as pe roote of vertues springip ful fer bope in places and tymes, so it is of synnes; and pis shulde moeue men to leeue fals wittnesse. Whoso witnessip fals, he witnessip azens treupe and sip God himsilf is treupe he witnessip azens God. And also what man doip ony dede pat hymsilf grauntip he doip it on Goddis half. And so wharme he witnessip fals he takip God to witnesse pat pat ping pat he seip is trewe and of God and, sip pe ping is fals, as myche as in hym is he makip his God fals and bryngip

T: 4 asens] asein H $\quad 6$ hymsilf] ne hymsilf HTY 8 pe] bat $Y$

## B

to nou3t. For God may noust be bot yf he be trewe. And pus no man berep fals wytnesse bot he reuerse God and alle pe seynts of heuene, зe and alle creatures. For alle seynt 3 in heuene and alle creatures wytnessep trewpe of here God azenst him pat
lyep. And so he pat lyep forsakep his God, as he forsakep himself syp he asenseyp him. He mote forsake his God syp he forsakep trewpe; and he forsakep himself syp he seyp kendelyche pat God himself ys trewe, [al] yf he seye pe contratye. And syb he mot nede in [lyynge] haue an auctor, it is no drede pat in

## T

him to noust. For God may not be but if [he] be trewe, and noon berip fals witnesse but if he reuerse God and al pe seyntis of heuene, she and alle creaturis. For alle seyntis in heuene and alle creatures witnessen treupe of her God azens him pat liep. And so he pat liep forsakip his God, as he forsakip himsilf, sip he asenseip him. He mot forsake his God sip he forsakip pe treupe; and he forsakip himsilf sip he seip kyndely pat [God] himsilf is treupe, al if he seip pe contrarie. And sip he mot nede in liyng haue an autour, it is no drede

B: 8 all and 9 lyynge] lyuynge
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## B

pis he holdep wip pe fader of falshede. O how orryble it is a man to forsake his God and take him to pe fende in body and in soule, bot pus dop pes men pat berep fals wytnesse. And so eueryche man pat bereb fals wytnesse blasphemep in God and seyp
pat he is fals, bot specialyche pat $\mathrm{b}[1]$ yndep him to Godes lawe and seyp pat it is falsest of alle oper lawes, and more he pat dampnep a man as an eretyke for he holdep Cristes worde and seyp pat it is sope. And yf we take hede, pes pat syllep pe trewpe, oper for worlde worschep or fauour ober moneye, passep

## T

pat in pis he holdip wip pe fader of falshed. O hou horrible it /is man to forsake his God and take him to pe fend in body and in soule, but pus don pes men pat beren fals witnesse. [And so euery man pat berip fals witnesse] blasfemep in God and seip
pat he is fals, but specialy pat man pat b[1]yndip him to Goddis lawe and seip it is falsest of alle opere lawes, and more he pat dampnep him an eretik for he holdip Cristis word and seip it is soop. And so, if we take hede, pes pat sillen pe troupe, oper for worldis worship or fauour or money, passen

B: 5 blyndep] byndep 6 more] more pan
T: 1 be] om. $\mathrm{H} \quad 2$ to forsake] forsake $H \quad$ 3-4 And so... ...witnesse] om. T 5 pat he] he H , blyndib] byndep HTY 6 seip] saip pat HY, more] moreoure H 7 him a man HY, an] as HY 8 seib] seip pat $Y 9$ oper] owber H , or Y , worldis] worldli Y , passen] he passep H

## B

Judas Scaryoth in syllynge of Crist. Sca/ryot solde his mayster for on of pes pre whanne his body was vnknowe and dedlyche and noust ygloryfyed as it was after be resurreccioun. Bot he pat syllep now Crist pat is trewpe on alle pes wyses, syllep Crist whanne he ys ygloryfyed and vndedlyche and yknowe Lord and oure Sauyour.

Bot here men meuep communelyche wher it be lefful to lye. And summe seyeb pat it is lefful for to lye in mesure for a beter ende and it is crafte to knowe pe vertue of lyenge, for meny lyep to muche and meny to lytel, and he pat holdep him

## T

Judas Scarioth in sillyng of Crist. Scarioth solde Crist his maister for oon of pes pre whame his bodi was vnblissid and vnknowen, but he pat now sillip Crist on alle pes pre wises, sillip Crist whame he is blissid and knowen Lord and Saueour.

## Capitulum Duodecimum

But here men moeuen comounly wheper it be leueful to lye.
And many religious seien pat it is leueful for to lye in mesure for a bette eende and it is craft to knowe pe vertu of liyng, for many men lyen to myche and many men to litel, and he

T: 1 Crist his] his HY 3 now sillip] trs. HY 5 Capitulum
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## B

in a mene hap vertue of lyenge. Bot here seyp alle wyse men, by wytnesse of seynt3, pat pe craft of lyenge is euermore vnlefful for it comep bot of pe fende pat fyrst makede lessyngges, and yf it were lefful it worschepede Crist pe mene
persone of God pat is pe fyrste trewpe. And perfore ich dar wel seye, by wytnesse of byleue, pat nopyng contraryep more Crist pan dop lesynges; so pat yf a man myste, by a pryuey lesynge, saue al pis worlde pat elles scholde perysche, sit scholde he noust lye for sauynge of pis worlde.

## T

pat holdip him in a mene hap pe vertu of liyng. But here wyse men seien, bi witnesse of seyntis, bat pe craft of liyng is euermore vnleueful for it comep but of pe fend pat first made lesyng, and if it where leueful it worshipid Crist pe mene persone of God pat is pe first trewpe. And perfor y dar seie, bi witnesse of bileue, pat noust more contrariep Crist pan doip lesyng; so pat if a man myste, bi a priuey leesyng, saue al pis world pat ellis shulde perisshe, sit shulde he not lie for sauyng of al pis world.
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## B

And so pre craftes, as seyp men, bep hard bot pe [ferpe] craft ys algate vnlefful. Fystynge and pledynge and scornynge ys harde, bot sit may a man do alle pes in charyte. Bot for to lye vpon trewbe sownep neuere charite, for lyenge on

5 God may he neuere preyse. Sopely it is hard to fy3te wip man by charite, bot 3 it it may be doo syp God byddep slee men. And here it is doute communelyche where it be lefful to fyste; and we mote nedelyche seye so, syp God himself hap ordeyned it and bede it in pe Olde Lawe, as many ensamples tellep. And pis mote T

And so pre craftys, seien men, ben hard but be fourbe craft is algate vnleueful. Fistyng and pletyng and skomyng ben hard but a man may do alle pes in charite. But for to lie vpon troupe sounep neuer charite, for liyng on God may 5 [he] neuer preise. Sopeli it is hard to fiste wip man bi charite, but 3it it may be don sip God biddip sle men. And here it is douted comounly wheper it be leueful to fiste; and we moten nedely seie so, sip God /himsilf hap ordeyned it and bedun it in pe Olde Lawe, as many samplis tellen. And pis
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## B

we graunte, bot holde pis byleue: pat no man bot by charite scholde fyste wip his enemy. And so, as me semep, yf fystynge be lefful it mot be by byddynge of /God and in Godes cause, f. $102^{\text {r }}$ and ende of pe fystynge scholde be Godes worschep. Bot now men fystep in mannes cause, for pryde and coueytyse and noust for Godes worschep. And herfore it is lyckle pat batailles ydo nowpe a day bep ydo out of charite and by be fendes meuynge. For Crist we clepeth trewelyche a pesable kyng, and fro pe tyme pat he was man he bad no suche batailles bot bope bad and procured pacience

## T

moten we graunte, but holde pis bileue: pat noon but bi charite shulde fyste wip his enemye. And so, as me pinkip, if fistyng be leueful it mut be bedun of God and in Goddis cause, and eende of pe fiztyng shulde be Goddis worship. But now men fisten in marnes cause left biddyng of God, for pride and for coueitise and not for Goddis worship. And herfore it is licly pat batels doon today ben don out of charite and bi pe fendis moeuyng. For Crist we clepen treuly a pesible kyng, and fro tyme pat he was man he bad ne siche batels but bope bad and procuride paciens

T: 2 pinkip] semep HY 3 be bedun] be don $\mathrm{H} \quad 5$ cause] cause and T 7 fendis] deuels $\mathrm{H} \quad 8$ tyme] be tym HY 9 was] was maad $Y$, ne] no $H Y$, bope] om. H

## B

and pees and suffre iniuryes and so bye ous pees.
Pledynge and scornynge ys harde to do wel; and no man dop pis leffullyche bot yf he kepe charite to him pat he pledep wip and him pat he scornep, as yf he trowe to purge him of his olde

## T

and pees and suffre iniuries and so bie vs pees.
Pletyng and skornyng ben hard to do wel; and no man doip pes leuefully but if he kepe charite to him pat he pletip wib and him pat he scornep, as if he trowe to purge synne by pis. It is lefful to plede wip him or scorne him syp at be barre of Crist pledyde hys seynt3, and Crist himself scornep, as pe Salme seyp. Bot lyenge openlyche azenseyp trowpe and herfore Crist himself may noust lye, for he louep it noust bot hatep. him of his olde synne. Bi pis it is leueful to plete him or scorne him, sip at pe barre of Crist pleden hise seyntes and Crist himsilf scornep, as pe Salm seip. But liyng openly azenseip pe treupe and herfor God himsilf may not lye ne bidde his seruaunt to lye, for he louep it not.

[^45]
## B

Bot for to knowe pis commaundement pe betere $3 e$ schulle vnderstonde pat a man may bere false wytnesse azens his neyzebore in pre maneres, pat is to seye in worde, in dede, and in pes bope togedere. In worde a man or womman berep
fals wytnesse whanne he makep lesynges of him to byreue him of his goede name or fame, as some yhered for mede or for zeftes or elles for hate or enuye bereb fals wytnesse azenst here neyzebores to make hem loste here herytage or oper worldelyche goedes, or elles byreue hem of here goede name or fame for enuye or mede. And perfore we scholde be war what pat we speke of oure neyзebores and to oure neyzebores, so pat we noper apeyre hem wrongfullyche noper enuyouslyche wib oure tunges noper wip oure hertes; noper pat we generalyche bere fals wytnesse azenst hem to blamynge of hem, noper to accusynge, noper to /excusynge of hem falslyche, noper of ousself. For God souereynlyche hatep lesynges, for he ys souereyn trowpe himself and eueryche lesynge is azenst trowpe. And perfore whanne $3 e$ schullep speke seyeb pe trowpe or pe sope. And yf se wolle noust seye pe sope bep stylle, or elles makep no lesynge noper berep no fals wytnesse wip soure moup.

B

In dede men berep fals wytnesse azenst here neyзebores whanne pey dope grete synnes and so wipdrawep falslyche here helpe pat pey scholde doo to here euene Cristene, helpynge hem by here goede lyuynge toward pe blysse of heuene. For ze schulle vnderstonde pat orryble synweres harmep alle opere synweres, and also pay wipdraweb falselyche here helpe pat pay scholde doo to Cristene men and to goede men by here goede lyuynge. For by vertue of pis article of oure byleue, 'Credo in sanctorum communionem' (bat is to seye, 'Ich byleue into communynge of alle holy seynts'), [we byleuep], and sop it is, pat alle goede men in erpe and alle seynt in heuene helpep euerych oper to be ful blessed in heuene in body and in soule. And so alle goede communep here goednesse togedere and alle schrewes communep here schrewednesse togedere. And perfore, 15 syp a mannes dede berep more redylyche and more verrayliche wytnesse what he ys, yf he wipdrawe falselyche his helpe and his goede lyuynge fro his neyzebore to helpe hem bope to heueneward, and yf he so purgh synne be aboute in dede to drawe him and his neyzebore to helleward, pan pat man

20 falselyche in dede berep fals wytnesse azens his ncyзebores. Pan, yf a man bope in word and in dede bere fals wytnesse azens

B: 10 we byleuep] om.

## B

his neyzebores to be aboute to vndo his body, to leese his goedes, to byreue him his name and his fame falslyche and to brynge his soule to helleward, pan he most sch\{r\}ewedelyche berep wytnesse in worde and in dede, and also in bope /two

## T

Capitulum Tertium Decimum et Nonum Mandatum
The sixte maumdement of pis secound table forfendip pee to coueite pi neizboris hous. And men vnderstonden herby comounly pat pou shuldest not coueite amys goodis of pi neisbore pat ben vnmoeuable and ben siche pingis pat ben not on lyue ne of power to moeue hemsilf fro oon [place] to anober
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## B

anoper, as bep hous and clopynge and oper ornament3. And pis commaundement touchep pe grounde of alle yuel hauynge of suche maner goedes. For no man hap wronglyche eny suche goedes bot yf pe grounde of his hauynge be fals coueytyse.

5 And so, as a weed ys pan wel ypurged of a londe whanne pe rote ys drawe awey, so pes foure commaundements beth panne wel ykept whanne pe fals coueytyse ys ful qwenched. And herfore seyp Poul pat pe rote of al wyckedenesse is wyckede coueytyse in a mannes herte. For as se seep coueytyse makep debates

## T

as bope housis and cloping and opere ournementis. And pis maundement touchip pe ground of al yuel hauyng of siche maner good. For no man hap wrongly ony siche goodis but if pe ground of his hauyng be fals coueitise. And so, as a 5 weed is panne wel purgid of a londe whame pe roote is drawen awey, so pes foure comaundementis ben pan wel kept whanne pe fals coueitise is /fully quenchid. And herfor seip

Poul pat pe roote of alle yuelis is wickid coueitise in a mames soule.

> T: 1 bope] ben HY, housis and] housis or H, $\begin{array}{llll} & \text { cloping] clopes HY } \\ 3 \text { goodl godes H } & 4 \text { his] pis HY } & 5 \text { a] om. HY } & 8 \text { pe] om. HY, } \\ \text { a] om. Y } & & \end{array}$

## B

bytwene reme and reme, cytee and cytee, toun and toun, man and man. And communelyche alle stryues and bryges and debates bep caused of coueytyse, and of vnlefful loue of worldlyche goedes and forsetynge of God and of heuenelyche goedes.

And perfore wip al myn herte ych conseyle alle men and wommen in God pat se coueyte no mannes goedes wip wrong bot holde sow apayde of pat pat God hap sende 3ow trewelyche ygete. For yf $3 e$ lytle haue, of lytle зe schulle rekene; yf зe muche haue, of muche se schulle seue rekenynge, to pe leste 10 peny oper halpeny pat $3 e$ receyue of God here in erpe how pat 3 e spende it. Perfore wel is him pat hap lytel and holdep him apayed of lytele and ponkep God. For a dredful rekenynge schal ryche selde. And perfore coueyte se /no mannes goedes wip wrong.

For Seynt Gregory wytnessep of pe ryche man pat Crist spekep
15 of in pe Gospel, pat he was noust punsched in peynes of helle for rauyschynge and mystakynge of oper mennes goedes, as some oper peues dop, bot for he saf noust of his owene goodes to hem pat nedede. What peyne, perfore, schal he be punsched pat wrongfullyche takep or coueytep oper mennes goodes wip wrong?

## T

And no man may excuse men of religioun pat ne pei breken pis nynpe maundement: as freris bi her beggyng coueiten amys pe goodis of her neizboris, as her dede shewep, pe chirche pat is dowed coueitip amys pe rentis and pe housis of seculer

For chirche is not oonly hous to pi God, but it is comoun hous to many of pi neizboris. And so alle symonyeris and

```
T: 2 maundement] comaundement HY, her] paire HY, beggyng] goyng Y
3 her neisboris] paire neizebore HY, her dede] pere dede HY 4 pe housis]
housis Y 6 beren] berep H 7 azens] asen Y, stefly] stiftli Y
8 prelatis] pise prelates H 10 hedis] hede H, wip] wip pis Y
12 her] ber Y 13 approuep] approuen Y, sip] sip sip H, sip bat Y,
asens] om. H, aзen Y 14 for] om. H, pe hous of pi neizbore] pin
nesebores house H 15 asens] asen Y 16 chirche] pe chirche Y, to]
of HY 17 so] om.Y
```


## T

properis of chirchis synnen azens pis maundement as depe eretikis, and he pat autorisip siche dedis is principal eretik. Ne trowe not pes folis pat speken as pies and seien pat sum symonye is opun eresie and sum is noon (but pei tellen
not whiche). For clerkis knowen wel if symonye in his kynde be foul eresie eche symonye is siche. And so symonye of chirches, of more or of lesse, pat is doon bi pe Pope is so myche pe worse. For he may not fordo resoun, ne maundement of God, ne he may not grounde bi resoun siche

10 propring of chirches. Siche bullis ben eresies sip pei ben fals techyng, contrarie to Goddis lawe and stifly defendid, and, bi pis same skile, eche bulle of a fals prest. Pis sentence seip Grosthed and drawep it out of Greke. Lord, wheperpe witt of God forbedde siche coueitise of pore

15 housis of men and not worse coueitise of his owne hous pat shulde be Hooli Chirche! But pe Gospel seip pa[t] Pharisees /sy[u]en pe gnatt, but pe camel pei deuouren hool .

T: 1 asens] asein HY, depe] depe as $T \quad 2$ autorisib] astorip $Y$ 4 opun] om. $\mathrm{H} \quad 5$ his] om. H $\quad 7$ Pope] peple $\mathrm{Y} \quad 11$ techyng] techingis Y , stifly] stiftli Y 13 out] om. H 16 pat] ba T 17 syuen] syen HTY, deuouren] deuoureden H

## B

Bot here men may doute where it be lefful to coueyte oper mennes goodes vpon alle manere. And it is no drede pat ne it ys lefful to coueyte opon goed manere, for pus alle seruants seruep here lordes to haue of here goodes for to lyue wip. Bot pe rote of many synnes stondep in pis: pat grettere men coueytep lasse menne goedes and faylep in here seruyce, for fewe men dar axe hem. And pus Salomon seyp bat pe waterleche hap two dousteres pat syngep pis sang: 'Bryng, bryng' (of [3]oure goedes), for pat pey coueyteb most. Sop it is T

## Capitulum Quartum Decimum

But here may men doute wheper it be leueful to coueite opere mennes goodis vpon al maner. And it is no drede pat ne it is leueful to coueite obere mennes godis vpon good
of here goodis for to lyue wip. But be roote of many synnes stondip in pis: pat gretter men coueiten lesse mennes goodis [and] failen in her senuiyse, for fewe men dar axe hem. And pus Salamon seip pat pe watirleche hap two doustris pat syngen pis song: 'Brynge bryng' (of soure goodis), for pat pei coueiten

B: 9 soure] oure
T: 1 Capitulum Quartum Decimum] om. H, 3 goodis] good $Y$
5 her] per HY 6 here] paire HY, pe] om. HY
7 stondib] stonden $H \quad 8$ and] pat $T$, her] per $Y$

## B

pat lordes schal haue rentes of here tenaunt3 whanne pay dop pe seruyce pat pe chef Lord axep, pat is whanne pay ledep here tenaunts in resoun and defendep Godes lawe a3ens pe fend, and whanne pay faylep herynne bey bep tyraunt3. And
amercements wipoute resoun ys a pryuey spoylynge, for non scholde amercy oper bot by pe wey of charite to amende in maneres pe man pat ys amerced; and pis may be wel ydone ry3t in many causes. Bot pat oper douster of pis waterleche synwep more in pis synne meny wyse. Fyrst he ys waxe grete by

## T

moost. Soop it is pat lordis shal haue rentis of her tenauntis whame pei don pe seruyce pat be cheef Lord axib, pat is whame pei leden her tenauntis in resoun and defenden Goddis lawe azens pe fend; and whanne pei failen heryme pei ben tyrauntis. And mercymentis out of resoun is a priuey spuylyng, for no man shulde amercy opere but bi law of charite, to amende in maneris pe man pat is amercyed; and pis may be wel don rist in many casis. But pe toper douster of pis waterleche synnep more in pis syme in many wise. First she is waxen greet bi

T: 1 her] paire HY 2 cheef] cheel $Y \quad 3$ her] pair HY 4 asens] asen Y, heryme] perime Y 6 amercy] mercy HY, law] pe way HY 7 amercyed] mercied HY, be wel] trs. HY 8 casis] a caas Y, be toper] pis oper $H$, pat oper $Y 9$ syme] tyme $H$, is waxen] waxib $H$, is moost $Y$

## B

lordschep of pis worlde asens pe wyl of God. And pis dop muche harme, for by pis bey leuep seruyce to here suggets and [bysyep] hem many weyes to souke blode of hem, for pey sechep here rychesse and noust helpe of here soules. And as
he turnep Godes lawe /to pe lawe of pe fende so he clepep 'correcciouns' robbynge of here suggets and syllep hem leue azen to duelle in here synne. And pis ys a newe pefpe pat Antecryst hap founde azens pis commaundement for pis fendes coueytyse. And here pey syllep trewpe and hele of mannes soules, T
lordship of pis world a3ens pe wille of God. And pis doip myche harm, for bi pis she leeuep seruyce to her sugetis and bisiep her many weies to souke blood of hem, for she sekip her richesse and not helpe of her soule. And as she turnep

5 Goddis lawe to lawe of pe fend so she clepip 'correcciouns' robbyng of her sugetis and sillip hem leeue azen to dwelle in her synne. And pis is a newe pefte pat Antecrist hap founden azens pis maundement for pis fendis coueitise. And here pei sillen treupe and hele of mennes soulis, and pis is

B: 3 bysyep] byseyuep
T: 1 aзens] aзen Y 4 richesse] rychessis Y , helpe] heele HY , her soule] pair soule H , her soulis Y 6her] per Y , hem] pem H 7 her] pair HY 8 asens] and aзen Y , maundement] comaundement HY

## B

and pis is most contrarye azenst God and his Churche. Bot here pes fendes children arguep for here partye and seyp bat by lesynge of grace men fallep fro iuste tytle of goodes pat pey occupyep of here chef Lord. And by pis colour it is yseyde pat pe Pope

5 Innocent pe prydde axep of Engelond nyne hundred marke by sere, for Kyng Jon, as he seyp, fel azens God and herefore Cristes vycarye scholde axe pis [eschete]. Bot sop it is pat lordes synwep ofte tymes and fallep fro pe worschep pat here God hap seue hem, bot pes blynde leches knowep pis noust,

## T

moost contrarie azens God and his Chirche. But here pes
fendis children arguen for her part and seien bi leesyng of grace men fallen fro iust title of goodis pat pei occupien of her cheef lord. And bi pis colour it is seid pat

5 Innocent pe pridde axide of Englond nyne hundrid mark /bi зeer,
for Kyng Jon, as he seip, fel azens God and herfor Cristis viker shulde axe pis eschete. But soop it is pat lordis synnen ofte tymes and fallen fro lordship pat her God hap зуuen hem, but pes blynde leches knowen pis not, ne whame

[^46]
## B

ne whanne pey turne azen by grace of here God. And herfore no creature is ferper fro his offyce pan beb prelats of pe Churche, for Crist hath put it fro hem bope by here blyndenesse and forbedynge of pes rychesses. And so God wole men occupye

## T

pei turnen azen bi grace of her God. And herfor no creature is ferper fro pis office pan ben prelatis of pe Chirche, for Crist hap put it fro hem bope bi her blyndenesse and forbedyng of pes richessis. And so God wole men occupie richesse of pis world, al if pei ben in greet synne, and bi it bi her almes. And sumtymes he ordeynep to putte hem fro her lordship, but noon shulde do pis office but whame God badde him. And pus mercymentis of prelatis were sumdel

T: 1 her] ber HY 3 Crist] God $Y$, her] pair HY 4 pes richessis] pis riches $\mathrm{H} \quad 5$ richesse] richessis $\mathrm{Y} \quad 6$ bi] wip Y , her] per HY , sumftymes] sumtyme $Y$, ordeyneb] ordeined $Y$ her] ber $Y$, lordship] lordeschippes H

## B

grounded in resoun yf pay saf to pore men pes goodes pat pay takep. Bot [marke] it to here [kychen] is no goed almesse, bot harmep bope partyes and noryschep more synne and makep pes prelats forfete pe more a3enst God. And bot pey amende hem, angeles schullep bynde hem bope hondes and feete and caste hem into helle et cetera.
/Be laste commaundement of God ys bede in pes wordes:
'Pou scha[1]t noust desyre pe wyf of py neysebore, ne his seruante, ne his mayde, ne his oxe, ne his asse, ne al pat ys

## T

groundid in resoun if pei saf to pore men pes goodis pat pei taken. But to marke it to her kychen is no good almes, but harmep bope parties and noriship more synne and makip pes prelatis to forfete in more azens God. And but pei amend hem, aungels shal bynde hem bope hond and feet and cast hem into helle.
\{Capitulum Quintum Decimum \} Decimum mandatum The last maundement of God is bedun in pes wordis: Pou shalt not desire pe wijf of pi neizbore, ne his seruant, ne his mayden, ne his oxe, ne his asse, ne al pat is his.

B: 2 marke] ynarke, kychen] lykynge 8 schalt] schat
T: 1 pore] pe pore $\mathrm{Y} \quad 2$ to marke it to her kychen] make hem to pus richen Y 3 more] be more H 4 to] om. HY, asens] asen Y, God] here God H, ber God Y 5 feet] fote $\mathrm{H} \quad 6$ hem] pem H , into] to H

7 Capitulum Quintum Decimum] om H, mar. T, Decimum mandatum] om. H, pe vij comaudement of pe secunde table $Y \quad 8$ maundement] comaundement $Y \quad 10$ mayden] maide HY, al] no ping at al $\mathrm{Y}, \quad$ is his] trs. H

## B

his.' And so in pis commaundement is desyre forbode pat ys vnskylful of pes syxe bynges. And for men coueytep more pes pan bay dop dede pynges, herfore hete of coueytyse ys wyslyche forbode. And here we may see pat synne of mannes wylle was
forbode to pe fadres of pe Olde Lawe, for ofte tymes it fallep pat pe synne ys more grounded in yuel wyl pan pe dede wipouteforb and herfore Crist, oure heuenlyche leche, forfendep suche desyre.

## T

And so in pis maundement is desijr forbedun pat is vnskilful of pes sixe pingis. And for men coueiten more pes pan deed pingis, herfor hete of coueitise is wisely forbedun. And her may we se pat synne of mamnes wille was forbedun to fadris of pe Wolde Lawe, for ofte tymes it fallip pat pe synne is more groundid in yuel wille pan pe dede wipouteforp and herfore Crist, oure heuenly leche, forfendip siche desijr. For he were vnwaar leder pat shulde teche men pe weie and ledde hem vnto pe pitt bank whame suyrer weie were biside.

And so pes ten comaundementis ben lawe suyrest of alle

T: 2 And] om. Y 6 yuel] ille H 8 teche] lede $H$, be] om. H 9 hem] bem $H, \quad$ vnto] to $Y, \quad$ pitt] pittes $H, ~ s u y r e r] ~ s u r e ~ H Y ~$ 10 lawe suyrest of alle] surest of alle pe lawe $Y$

## T

and of moost autorite and eke of moost mede. And herfor shulden men leeue al priuat religioun and wandre /in pis
weie pat God hap put vs ynne. And sip pes ten lawes techen al pe wille of oure Lord, pis lawe shuld be holden and opere be red and lerned and sued in dede. For ber is no caas pat ne it wolde decide it, and stable rist and pees bitwixe men in pis weie, and brynge hem to blisse of heuene pat is oure best eende.

## \{Capitulum Sextum Decimum \}

15 But here men douten comounly, sip Goddis lawe is trewe bi eche part of it and no falshed is peryme, hou seip Seynt Jame pat he pat brekip oon of pes maundementis of God he is gilti of hem alle; but it semep nay, bi many resouns. For many men knowen oon and knowen not anoper and

T 2 leeue] knowe and leue Y , religioun] religions H , religiouse Y 5 lawes] lawe $Y 6$ sib lawe] syth pe law HY, and lawe] and pe law HY, ben] is HY 9 many] may $Y \quad 11$ bitwixe] bitwen $\mathrm{H} \quad 12 \mathrm{in}$ ] and H 14 Capitulum Sextum Decimum] mar. T, om. H 17 maundementis] comaundementis Y 18 gilti] in alle canc. Y , of $]$ in H

## T

skilful God wole not blame men for pat pat pei knowen not.
But here shulde we trowe pat al Goddis lawe is fulliche trewe, or ellis God were fals, and more eresie of fendis was neuer noon foundoun. And so shal we trowe pat pe same God
alle and whoso brekip oon he is gilty of eche. And so noon may excuse him of vnknowyng of pes. For be he neuer so song a child and faile not in his parsone ne in men pat shulden syue him pe sacramentis of God, God techip hym 15 to loue God and herof holdeb him payed. And so as men wexen in elde so shulden pei /wexe in kumyng and kepyng of pes comoundementis, til pei come to heuene. And so in many

## T

degrees kepe men pes maundementis. But necligence is perelous sip it makip men breke summe. And so no man shulde lerne but pes maundementis or pat disposip to hem, as oper Goddis lawe. But here laweris grucchen and seien pis is not
soop, as many men per ben pat kepen not her Sabot for pei come not te pe Sabot; but hou shulden pei kepe it, but if God had broust hem perto and herto syuen hem power? Also many men per ben pat han no fadris; and if pei hadden eldris it were vnresonable pat pei shulden neuer do oust but worshipe he[r] eldris, for summe heestis, bi her kynde, bynden not for euer. And also, if pis were soop, eche man were holden to lerne pes hestes ten and noon operping, and so marmes lawe shulde tume to noust for noon shulde lerne it ne kepe it, but what were it parne? Here shulden we trowe, as it is seid bifore, pat eche man shulde kume pes ten heestis of God, ne God failip him not pat ne God techip hym pes but if pe defaut be in man, for God may not faile; ne
T: 2 breke] to breke H $\quad 3$ or] or ellese $\mathrm{H} \quad 4$ seien] seien pat Y.

## T

God axip neuer kepyng of pes ten maundementis but now more and now lesse, as resoun wole telle men. And to pe first resoun we answeren on pis wise: pat eche man, be he neuer so song and what tyme pat he dye, shulde kepe pis pridde heest. For

10 a man pat is deed bifore he come to haliday, bi general penkyng he holdip pis heest. And so afti[r] pe day of doom he kepip pis last Sabot. To pe secound resoun we answeren pus: pat eche man in pis world shulde worshipe his fadir. For if he haue noon eerpeli fader, as Adam hadde 15 noon, ne if he hadde noone /siche eldris, sit alle han we God and pan shulden we worshipe God as oure Fader. And sip alle pingis [pat shal] be ben present to God and whoso doip pe

[^47]
## T

wille of God is broper to Crist, sisterre and moder, euery man in pis world hap sum maner of eldris. And so summe maundementis bynden euere and for euere, and summe bynden euer but specialy for sum tyme; as maundementis pat God hap zouen man is litel ynow to lerne Goddis lawe and studiyng in mames lawe lettip lernyng of Goddis lawe.

T: 3 for] sum for $Y \quad 5$ affimatyues] aftir matynes $Y \quad 6$ secound table] secunde $Y 8$ louep] wirschipep and louep $H$, not canc. $Y 9$ answere] answe $T$ 10 but] bot pe HY, heest] heestis Y, his] om. H 13 heest] hestes HY

## T

And so men synnen greuously bi lernyng of mames lawe, but more pes pat ordeynen it and mayntenen it and suen it. For soop it is pat aftir a man louep a lawe he louep be autour of it and eende of pis lawe. But he is cursid of God

5 bat as myche loueb man or richesse or worship pat comen of marmes lawe as he louep God or pe blisse of heuene.

Expliciunt Mandata, Amen.

T: 3 he louep] trs. HY 5 worshipl worschippes H 7 Expliciunt Mandata Amen] Expliciumt Mandata Dei H, Here eendip be x comaundements and bigymeb Feip Hope and Charite $Y$

## B

And in pis word, 'Pou schalt noust desyre pe wyf of by neyzebore', as seyp Seynt Austyne, ys forbode alle manere of coueytyse or wille to do lecherye. For I tolde 30w byfore in pe prydde commaundement pat God forbedep alle 5 manere of dede of lecherye, bot some foles paraunter wenep pat, yf pay do noust pe dede, pat it were no perel pough pey wylnede oper assentede perto. And God wole pat men ywete pat it is noust so. Bot for al so muche pat God knowep fullyche bope body and soule, to pe leste poust of mannes herte, and more 10 verraylyche seep eueryche poust in wylle of oure hertes pan eny of ous seep operes workes; and also for suche as a man ys in his herte and in his soule and in his wille, suche he ys byfore God pat knowep bope body and soule (for God wole haue alle clene wipoute and wipinne bope), whanne God byfore

15 hadde forbode alle fleschelyche dede out of trewe wedloke, in pis comaundement God forbedep alle manere of vnclene and vnlefful coueytynge and desyrynge of dedes of flesche, and byddep pat pou schalt noust coueyte py neyzebore seruant ne his mayde, [and] for of a mannes housholde after himself a mannes wyf is most precious to him, yf bay be bope wel yrewled, perfore

B: 19 and om.

## B

God byd/dep specialyche pat pou schalt noust coueyty py
neyzebores wyf ne non oper womman for lecherye. And ryzt as God forbedep ous alle manere lecherye in body and in soule, in dede and in wil, ry3t so herebyfore God forbedeb euerych man and womman alle manere of pefpe. Bot for meny wolde stele and pay dorste for pe galewes and pay wenep pat it be no synne bot pey dyde it in dede, God schewep pe contrarye and byddep pat pou schalt noper stele ne coueyty wrongfullyche oper menne goedes. And pis is pe te[n]be commaundement of God, so pat in pes seuene commaundements of pe secunde table pat techep ous how we schulle haue ous to oure euene Cristene, and in pe pre commaundements of pe fyrste table pat techep ous to loue God aboue alle pynges, ys al Godes lawe. And as pis lawe was ywryte in two tables, so it ys fulfylled in pes two loues, pat ys in loue of almy3ty God and in loue of oure euene Cristene. And pes two loues bep two hestes of pe Gospel.

Cryst in pe Gospel fulfillep al pe lawe in pes two hestes and seyp pus: 'Loue py God and by neyзebore.' In pis wyse pou schalt loue py God: fyrst wip al pyn herte, pat nopyng be nyr in pyn herte pan God; pou schalt loue God in al by soule, pat pou ne soffre no synne abyde in py soule for loue and

## B

drede of by God; in al by mynde, pat nopyng be so muche in py mynde as God; and pou schalt loue him wip al by my3t, pat pou ne spare for no myschef to queme God.

Pe secunde precepte of pe Gospel ys pat pou schalt

10 pat pou loue eche man in body and soule more pan worldelyche wele or goed; gostlyche as pyself, so pat pou/schalt loue by neyзebore ys soule more pan pyn owen lyf and raper leue pyn owen lyf pan soffre a dedly synne be do, lettynge by by power; also wel as pyself bodylyche, pat pou helpe him in his nede as pou woldest pat he helpe pe in py nede, for lawe of kynde techep pat no man scholde do oper wyse to his neyzebore pan he wolde skylfullyche pat his neyzebore dyde to him in pe same caas, and pis byddep Crist in pe Gospel and seyp pus: 'Alle pynges bat se wole pat men do to sow dop se pe same to

20 hem.' And yf pou loue by neyzebore in pis wyse pou louest God, for Seynt Bernard seyp bat God is noust yloued wipoute loue

## B

pat man schal haue to his neyzebore, ne pe neyzebore ys nou3t yloued wipoute loue pat man schal haue to God. Bot and we wol come to loue of God wham we seyp nou3t, ous nedep to loue oure neysebore wham we seep, and herfore axeb pe apostel

15 I haue no charyte,' he seyp, 'it profytep me noust.' (Pat ys to mene it profytep me noust into encresynge of blysse in heuene, bot it helpep to haue more plentepe of erpelyche goedes and to haue grace pe raper to come to amendement, and yf he be dampned to peyne of helle he schal suffre be lasse
Seynt Jon, 'How may he loue God wham he seep noust, pat louep noust his broper wham he seep?' And pus yf pou loue py neyзebore, by pe whiche neyzebore bep alle maner men and wommen of what degre or countre oper londe euer bay be, frende or enemy, vnderstonde..... For who pat hatep on man of alle pe wyde worlde, he hatep Crist pat ys God and man. For Seynt Bernarde seyp bat he pat hatep a man hatep Crist, and also he seyp pat whateuere in goede werkes he offere to God he schal loste it. For Seynt Poule seyp, 'Yf I schal seue alle my goedes into metes of poure men and my body to brenne in pe fyre, and peyne). And so goede dedys, workes, prayeres and almesse dedys pat bep ydo out of charyte schal ne/uere brynge a man to

## B

blysse of heuene bot yf he haue grace to amende him here.
And perfore loue зe зoure neyzebore as se scholde and pen зe kepep pes ten commaundements of God. For Seynt Poule seyp pat he pat louep his neyzebore hap fulfilled pe lawe, for he pat come to ous, and make his dwellyng place wip ous: pat schal be in heuene blysse per ys Godes dwellynge, in ioye and blysse euerelestynge wip God and his holy angeles and alle holy seynt3, in pe whiche ioye and blysse he ous graunte place to dwelle

20 pat brouste Adam out of boundes of helle. Amen Explicit Bonus Tractatus de Decem Mandatis.

## NOTES

Where both $B$ and $T$ have a witness, lemmata are taken from $B$.
B1/1-2/6, T1/1-2/6 Alle.....byddyng] This passage corresponds to the first section of the DI Prologue, cf. $B V V$ pp.317/8-24.

T1/2 men] For H's expansion see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (7).

B1/2, T1/3-4 pe Gospel] Matthew 19:16-19.
B2/1, T2/1 bylcue] In general the Christian faith, but perhaps referring specifically to the first article of the Apostles' Creed, cf. $B V V$ pp.6/337/2.

T2/3 be more] For this emendation, see chapter on the textual tradition, possible TY joint errors (1).

T2/5 loued] For H loued and thankide see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (7).

B2/5, T2/5 Crist seip] John 14:23.
T2/8 for who] For H who see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (6).

B3/1, T3/1 frelyche] See e.g. Deuteronomy 30:15-20.
B3/2 wilfullyche] For this emendation see chapter on the textual tradition, possible BH joint errors (1).

B3/5, T3/4 helle] See Matthew 13:37-43, 25:41-42.
B3/8 yn be Holy Gospel] Matthew 16:27.
T3/6 freris ne preieres] For Lollard objections to prayers for the dead see Twelve Conclusions, SEWW p.26/73-92 and note; Arnold ii.212-13; Hudson, $P R$ pp.309-10. For Wyclif's views on prayers performed for money see Polemical Works i.346/28ff. The 1382 Blackfriars Council condemned as erroneous Wyclif's opinion that 'speciales orationes
applicatae uni personae, per prelatos, vel religiosos, non plus prosunt cidem personae, quam generales orationes, ceteris paribus, eidem' ( $F Z$ p.281, item xix). For Wyclif's response and his insistence that general prayer was more efficacious than that offered on behalf of an individual see Sermones iii. 380ff. As Anne Hudson points out, the objections expressed in the Twelve Conclusions were three-fold: that prayers for specific persons were contrary to the law of charity which should not be exclusive; that praying for those who may be damned appears to question God's judgement; and that the offering of money for prayers was simony (SEWW pp.26, 153). For later Lollards the issue was related to the question of purgatory, since it was clear that if a man went straight to hell no prayers could possibly help him (Hudson, $P R$ pp.309-10). Even for those in purgatory, however, the preferred Lollard method of assistance was through the 'preier of good liif' (Arnold ii.212/31).

Such prayers could be provided both by friars and by other clerics (Arnold ii.212/28). Other abuses were specific to friars. One such complained of by Wyclif was the issue (for money) of letters of fraternity which purported to offer the recipient a share in the benefits accruing from the friars' good works both in life and in death. As Wyclif points out (Trialogus pp.349-50), this implies that the friars had the power to preserve both themselves and others from damnation and is therefore not only simony but blasphemy (see also Workman ii.107-108 and, for two examples of such letters cited by Workman, see Ord (ed.) (1794), pp.8587). It was also possible to be buried in friars' clothing (Wyclif, Polemical Works i.35/7), a practice described in $L F C$ as a 'ful parlows heresy'(p.82/1225), since it encouraged people to live in $\sin$ in the belief that wearing these clothes would lead to forgiveness. For further Lollard
references to this practice see Workman ii.108.
B3/10 And oure beleue] See articles 8 and 12 of the Apostles' Creed BVVpp.8, 9.

B4/2, T4/1-2 syp pey bep pure lyste] cf. Matthew 11:30.
B4/8 Seynt Austyn] Augustine, Sermones de Scripturis, Sermo xxxix (PL 38.241).

B4/11 Seynt Austyn] Augustine, De Civitate Dei xx,c. 20 (PL 41.687ff.)

B5/2 Seynt Bernard] Pseudo-Bernard, Meditationes Piissimae de Cognitione Humanae Conditionis, c.iii (PL 184.491.C).

B5/5 pe wyse man] Ecclesiasticus 14:12.
B5/11 seyntes seggep] e.g. Augustine, De Civitate Dei xiii, c. 10 (PL 41. 383); Bernard, Sermones de Tempore, Sermo xvii (PL 183.250.C).

B5/14 seyp be Gospel] Mark 13:33-35, Mark 14:38
B5/15-17 wheper........oper openlyche] These lines gloss the remaining section of Mark 13:35 'nescitis enim quando dominus domus veniat, sero an media nocte an galli cantu an mane', interpreting it as an instruction for man to live his life in a state of continual preparedness for his death and judgement. For this interpretation see the quotation from Theophylus in Aquinas, Catena Aurca ii.271. For a discussion of the practice of viewing man's life as divided into three such watches see Burrow (1986), pp.66-72. Sermons on the topic were preached by Bishop Brinton (Sermons ii. 326 and 462) and by a Wycliffite contemporary (Arnold i.266) (both cited by Burrow).

B6/2, T6/1 The meaning of this passage is slightly obscure but it seems to be clearer without the conjunction for (see apparatus), and BT have therefore been emended in accordance with the HY reading.

B6/2, T6/1 gostlyche enemys] For the presence of fiends at the death bed see Hoccleve, Learn to Die (EETS, es 61, 73, p.203/271-2).

T6/4 H's expansion is a possible reading, but, given that unnecessary expansions are characteristic of H (see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in $\mathrm{H}(7)$ ) it has not been felt necessary to emend the reading found in $T$.

T6/5 as] For H omission of as and consequent addition of And see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (6).

B6/6-7, T6/4-6 for as he.....alle] James 2:10
B6/9, T 6/8 Prestes] For the importance placed by Lollards on the teaching and preaching function of the priest see Introduction pp.xcviixcviii and for Lollard emphasis on the commandments Introduction pp.xciv-xcv. For the preacher's function see also Rosarium pp.85-92. B7/2 T7/3 we beo bailleys] See Luke 16:1-13, the parable of the steward. LV translates the Vulgate vilicum as baili (EV uses fermour but offers baily as an alternative in v.1). According to the common interpretation of this parable, each man on earth is a bailif with a particular office to perform (see, for example, the sermon on this text in MS Trinity College Dublin 241, f.4raff.). The use of the pronoun 'we' suggests that the passage was originally written by a priest.

T7/4-11/4 Pes comaundementis.....ten comaundmentis] Passage corresponding to DI cf. $B V V$ p.317/24-35, B10/8ff.

B7/5 Holy Wryt] Exodus 20:1-17.
T7/5 in two bope] see Matthew 22:37-40.
B9/1 ofte rede] For Lollard reading practices see Aston, 'Lollardy and
Literacy', p. 197ff.
B9/3 ff. For similar exhortations see $D P$ I.i.327-8, $P C$ pp.81-2 The
passage in $B$ shows no sign of the concern over restrictions on the teaching of religious matters evident in $D P$ (I.i.327/3-5), which may either result from or anticipate Arundel's Constitutions of 1407-9 (see Hudson, $P R$ p. 418 and notes).

B9/6 Holy Churche] For Lollard views on the nature of the Church see Introduction p.cxiii ff. The definition of the Church as 'alle trewe Cristene peple' suggests that the Church referred to here is the first of those described in $L L$ (pp.35-44) i.e. not the physical building (p.36/10), nor the members of the present hierarchical Church (p.43/31ff.) but the body of those predestined for salvation (p.35/11ff.). See Hudson, $P R$ $\mathrm{pp} .318-19$ where these passages are discussed, and for a similar division see Rosarium pp.66/22-67/19. Whether men who were evil (and therfore not predestined for salvation) were part of the Church was one of the questions used in the interrogation of Lollards. See, for example, item 40 in the list of questions in the register of Thomas Polton (Hudson, 'The Examination of Lollards', p.134). The orthodox answer to the question was 'Yes'.

B9/7 comenynge] Emended in accordance with comene B9/20.
B9/8-9 pe fyfpe boke of Holy Wryt] Deuteronomy 6:6-9.
B10/4-5 Be al.....God] Ecclesiasticus 9:22.
B10/8-11/5 in to bope.....ten commaundements] Passage corresponding to DI cf. $B V V$ p.317/24-35. See note to T7/4 above. For the two-fold division see Matthew 22:37-40.

B10/9, T10/1 as Seint Poul techep] Romans 13:8-10.
T11/2-4 pat.....comaundmentis] H's omission of this passage is due to eyeskip.

B11/9, T11/9 Crist himself seip] Matthew 11:30

## B11/10 Seynt Austyn] Not traced but see Augustine, In Joannis

Evangelium, tract. iii/19,20 (PL 35.1404-5).
B12/9-11, T12/6-8 we bep.....noust al] cf. I Corinthians 13:11-12. B12/11, T12/8 grounded] See MED sense 3(c) 'learned' or possibly sense 3(a) 'fixed'. Ground as both noun and verb was frequently used by Lollards to reflect their view that the only true basis or ground for belief was scripture. For a discussion of this usage and of the possibility that this was one of a group of words forming a distinctive Lollard vocabulary see Hudson, 'A Lollard Sect Vocabulary?', pp.171-2. T13/6 In some ways the H reading here is appealing. However, the BTY reading makes sense if seye/seis is translated as 'considered' and it has therefore been retained.

T13/8 H's addition here is a possible reading, but, as there seems no reason for a TY omission and as H characteristically adds explanatory material (see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (7)), the T version has not bcen emended.

B15/1 prophete] Malachi 1:6.
B15/4 Seynt Austyn] Augustine, In Epistolam Joannis ad Parthos, tract. ix, c. 4 (PL 35.2047).

B15/6 Austyn] Augustine, Enarratio in Psalmum lxi, c. 20 (PL 36.743) (abridged).

B16/1-15 A similar interpretation of the escape from Egypt appears as part of the first commandment commentary in $P C$ (pp.26-28), and see also Arnold iii.18-23.

B16/11 as pe Gospel tellep] Luke 4:33-36.
B16/16 Seynt Austyn] Not traced, but see e.g. Augustine In Joannis
Evangelium, tract.xli (PL 35.1693ff.).

B16/18 in be Gospel] John 8:34.
B16/22 Jon Crisostome] Pseudo-Chrysostom, Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum, Homilia xxxvii (PG 56.835). Instead of the simile of the fish, the passage as printed in $P G$ contains the following:

Sicut enim videmus in istis mundialibus regnis, quomodo in primis quidem nemo potest facere seipsum regem, sed populus creat sibi regem quem elegerit; cum rex ille fuerit factus et confirmatus in regno, jam habet potestatem in hominibus, et non potest populus jugum ejus de cervice sua repellere: nam primum quidem in potestate populi est, facere sibi regem quem vult, factum autem de regno repellere jam non est in potestate ejus, et sic voluntas populi postea in necessitatem convertitur.

B17/16 pe prophete] Hosea 13:9 cf. EV: 'Thi losse, Yrael; oonly of me thin help'; LV: 'Israel thi perdicioun is of thee; thin help is oneli of me'. B17/17ff. The discussion on confession here appears to be orthodox; it expresses none of the characteristic Lollard doubts about oral confession to a priest (see Introduction p.cxiv ff.). For contrition, confession and satisfaction (all three of which the Church considered necessary) see the tract issued by Bishop Alexander of Stavensby for the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield ( $C \& S$ ii.220), and $B V V$ p.171/22ff.

B17/22 aloped] This is not recorded elsewhere, but it appears to be an ancestor of NE elope. Aloper did exist in fourteenth century AFr and the OED suggests a possible ancestor in ME *alope(n, past participle of either *aleapen or leapen (OED elope).

B17/23 Paule] I Corinthians 15:10. In this and the preceding verse Paul confesses to the sin of persecuting the Church, demonstrates his repentence, and provides us with an example of how to make satisfaction ('et gratia eius in me vacua non fuit sed abundantius illis omnibus
laboravi'). His acknowledgement that his condition is the result of God's grace exemplifies the avoidance of vain-glory, identified in $B V V$ as the greatest of the dangers to beset the newly shriven ( $B V V \mathrm{pp} .186-7$ ).

B18/1 B and so appears to have been added because the sentence is long and the scribe has lost track of the syntax.

B18/3 pe apostol] Ephesians 2:5,8.
B18/7 Poule] Titus 3:5.
B18/11 The boke] Not identified, but probably a priest's manual. For the rites of baptism, including that of exorcism, see Manuale ad usum percelebris ecclesiae Sarisburiensis, section on baptism, printed in translation in E.C. Whitaker, Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy (London, 1970), pp.231-53, and also The York Manual, published by the Surtees Society (vol. $63.1^{*}-154^{*}$ ). The spirit is usually described as immundus, i.e. 'unclean', but is referred to in Gratian's Decretum as malignus (iii, De Consecratione, D.iv, c. 61 (Friedberg i.1383)).

B's discussion of baptism is orthodox, with no hint of distinctively Lollard views. Wyclif distinguished between two kinds of baptism: by water and by fire (i.e. with the Holy Spirit) (Opera Minora pp.177-8), and although he did not take a consistent view on whether the former was necessary (compare Trialogus p. 282 and Sermones iii.42) it was clear that he thought the second type the more important. Only the predestined were baptised with fire, whereas Judas Iscariot and many other limbs of the devil had been baptised with water (Opera Minora p.177, cf. Lollard views on the Church, note to B9/6 above). Some later Lollards believed that baptism was unnecessary if a child was born to Christian parents, while others considered that, while baptism with fire was necessary for
salvation, baptism with water was not (see Hudson, $P R$ pp.291-2).
B18/16 ground and begynnyng of alle sacrament3] For baptism as a necessary precondition for other sacraments, especially the Eucharist, see C\&S ii.634.[1]; Aquinas, Summa Theologiae iii,q.65,a.3.

B18/17-18 See John 19:33-34. The water and blood issuing from the side of Christ symbolize the baptism and the eucharist; see Chrysostom, Baptismal Instructions pp.61-2; Augustine, In Joannis Evangelium, tract. Cxx (PL 35.1953).

B18/20-21 For baptism as representing man's participation in the passion of Christ see Romans 6:3-7. The person being baptised undergoes a kind of burial (cf. the original Greek sense of baptism as a 'going down') and is resurrected into a new life without sin (Cramer p.78; Aquinas, Summa Theologiae iii, q.66, a.9; Wyclif, Sermones iii.332-3). B18/21 sacrament3] For Lollard views on the sacraments in general see Introduction p.cix ff.

B18/21 prayeres] There is no sign here of a distinctively Lollard viewpoint. Lollards often expressed doubts about the value of prayer, seeing it as a possible vehicle for hypocrisy. As one sermon writer puts it, 'And so algatis ri3twis lyf ys pe beste in mannys preyere, for such lif preyep betture to God ban hyse voyses of ypocrites' (EWS i.456). See also $L L$ p.50/29 ff. and note to T3/6 above.

B18/22 Holy Churche] See note to B9/6 above. The definition of the Church here appears to be orthodox, i.e. that it consists of the members of the present hierarchical Church.

B19/5 For the crossing of the Red Sea as a figure of baptism (with the death of the Egyptians symbolising the death of sin) see Augustine, Sermones de Diversis, Sermo ccclxiii (PL 39.1635).

B19/13 Holy Wryt] Deuteronomy 6:20-25 (part summary).
B19/16-17 wytnesses, sermonyes and domes] Translating the Vulgate 'testimonia haec et praecepta atque iudicia' i.e., according to the New English Bible, 'precepts, statutes and laws'. For the various divisions see Wyclif, DMD p. 53.

T20/1 oonhed] According to Augustine the Father is the principle of the whole divinity, 'totius divinitatis, vel, si melius dicitur, deitatis, principium Pater est' (De Trinitate iv, c. 20.29 (PL 42.908)). Alternative reasons for relating the first commandment to the Father were possible. Thus, according to Wyclif, the first commandment concerns God's majesty 'que originaliter est in patre' (DMD p.200/25). B21/2, T21/2 pat.....god] cf. Wyclif, Sermones i.90/15-17, BVV p.318/8-9.

B21/7, T21/5 myrours] cf. Augustine, Enarratio in Psalmum cxviii, Sermoiv (PL 37.1510), discussing James 1:23-5.

B21/10, T21/7-8 Seynt Jon seyep] I John 2:15-16.
T22/2 H's reading is in some ways appealing, but it could also be an error resulting from anticipation of a description of a third kind of love and it has not therefore been felt necessary to emend $T$.

B22/3-4 Seynt Bernard] Bernard, Pro Dominica V Post Pentecostem, Sermo iii. 5 (PL 183.343B) (slightly abridged).

B22/14 ryche men bep slowe] cf. $H S$ p.143/4241ff.
B23/4-7 Pis is vnderstonde.....here God] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. $B V V$ p.318/5-9.

B23/6-7 what.....God] See note to B21/2 above.
B23/9, T 23/2 seyp Poul] Philippians 3:19.
B25/11, T25/2 wordlyche] Although HY temporalle may appear to be
marginally the more difficult reading, this has not been felt to be a clear enough case of error to warrant emendation.

B25/6-7 londes.....catel] cf. $B V$ p p.318/35.
B25/12, T 25/3 Poule] Colossians 3:5.
B26/1-2, T 26/1-2 pe fend is kyng of alle proute children] Job 41:26.
B26/3, T26/3 Criste Ihesu byddep] Matthew 5:5.
B26/4-27/3 And so pay pat settep.....deppur in helle] passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV319/5-25.

B26/8-13 he pouste.....put of helle] Isaiah 14:13-15.
B26/13 Seynt Gregory] This reference comes from the DI version cf. BVVp.319/17-18: 'And perfore seip seint gregori. In libello de conflictu uicionum \& uirtutum.' The authorship of this work is, however, in doubt. It was often thought to be by Augustine and appears as part of his collected works in PL, but with a note suggesting that the actual author may have been Ambrose Autpert, abbot of St. Vincent on the Volturno near Beneventum ( $P L$ 40.1091-2). For this quotation see PL 40.1093. B27/13-29/12 This section is taken from the Gratian, Decretum ii, C.xxvi, q.vii, cc.15-16 (Friedberg i.1045-6). The material also appears in the ME Rosarium under the heading Sortilegi (G f.121v), but the Rosarium version is less full than that found in B. See also Floretum f. $296^{v}$. For the attributions to Augustine see notes to the relevant sections of the Decretals.

B27/15-22 For Seynt.....cursed] Gratian, Decretum ii, C.xxvi, c. 15
(Friedberg i.1045).
B27/23-28/3 Also.....eche to oper] Gratian, Decretum ii, C.xxvi, c. 16
(Friedberg i.1045) (with explanatory additions).
B27/24-25 'Egypcians'.....'dysmale dayes'] Egyptian days were two
days in each month linked with the exile of the Jews in Egypt and therefore considered to be particularly unlucky. 'Dysmale' (<OFr dis mal, 'unlucky days') was an alternative term.

B28/2 kalendys of Januarie] i.e. New Year's day. For the giving of 'hansel' (a present given especially in the New Year as a good luck token) see Sir Gawain and the Green Knight p.3/66. For objections to placing too much faith in such tokens see $H S$ p.14/369, and DPp.182/22 ff. Objections to magic and superstition were traditional in commentaries on the first commandment, see e.g. $L F C$ p.34/175-81, $D P$ p.167-8, $H S$ p.13/339ff.

B28/19-29/12 Also.....dayeb] Gratian, Decretum ii, C.xxvi, c. 16
(Friedberg i.1045) (partial summary).
B29/10 Poule] I Corinthians 10:31
B29/20 as pe prophete seyb] Psalm 95:5, cited by Rabanus, De
Magicis Artibus (PL 110.1097) in a passage quoted in Gratian's
Decretum ii, C.xxvi, q.ii, c. 7 (Friedberg, i.1023) where it is attributed to Augustine, hence the attribution in the Floretum (f.295v).

B30/7ff., T30/11ff. For Lollard attitudes to images and discussion of the B and HTY treatment see Introduction p.cv ff.

T30/11-31/1 Bvt here moeuen.....opere places] cf. Holcot, Super
Librum Sapienti, cap. xii, lectio clvii B. Holcot's discussion of images, of which the T passage (slightly abridged) is the beginning, is quoted more fully in the Floretum (f.332r, section 10) and in the Latin Rosarium (f.152 ${ }^{\text {rit }}$. A fuller version of the Holcot passage appears in B (see below note to $\mathrm{B} 35 / 18$ ).

B31/1 Bede] Bede, Liber de Templo Salomonis, c. 19 (PL91.790C791C) (partial summary). This passage is quoted by Grosseteste, De

Decem Mandatis pp.13-15 and by Wyclif, DMD pp.159-60. The form of the abridgement, together with the use of 'he seyp' (B31/1-2 cf. DMD p.159/13), makes it clear that the passage has been drawn from Wyclif. B32/11 worschepe hem as God] i.e. with latria. For the definition of latria as reverence due to God alone, of dulia as reverence due to creatures, and of yperdulia as reverence due to Christ, in accordance with his double nature as both creator and creature, see Rosarium, G f. 6 . B32/18-33/6 For a gret clerk.....as God] As Margaret Aston has pointed out, this too is Wyclif, see Aston, 'Lollards and Images', p.154, DMD p.156/14ff., passage beginning: 'Et patet quod ymagines tam bene quam male possunt fieri'. The same passage also appears in the Floretum (f. $331^{\mathrm{v}} / 13 \mathrm{ff}$.), in the Latin Rosarium ( $\mathrm{f} .151^{\mathrm{rab}}$ ) and in the English Rosarium (p.99/30ff.), although the last has no reference. Note the similar view expressed in T32/1. T33/1-2 good to siche men.....pei shulden ellis] For a similar view see DPI.i.90/22-3, Rosarium 101/4-10, citing Gregory, Epistolanum Libri Quatuordecim xi, epist. 13 (PL 77.1129). For fuller use of this passage by B see B35/1ff. and note. For the view that the use of images as books would not be necessary if priests would give a better example, both by teaching and in their lives, see Thorpe's testimony, TWT p.58/1133-8.

T33/6 coueitise of prestis] i.e. they benefited from the offerings made to images, see below T 34/3. For a similar complaint see Thorpe's testimony, TWT p.58/1138-40. For the money wasted adorning images see Wyclif, Sermones i.92. For the decoration of images to obtain more money from pilgrims who travelled to see them, see Rosarium 100/1316.

T33/6-7 dede stokkis] For similar descriptions of images see $S E W W$ p.88/199, DP I.i.105/31ff.

T33/7-9 cf. Wyclif Sermones i.91/18-19 'securum foret, ut in lege veteri, quod omnes tales ymagines sint delete', quoted in the Floretum (f.166r/6) as part of the discussion of the first commandment.

T34/6 Seynt Poul] Colossians 2:9.
T34/7 breed of pe auter] See Introduction p.cix ff., T 101/8-12 below and note.

T34/12 charmes and many pingis] See B28/2 above and note.
T34/14 bullis and absoluciouns] i.e. indulgences. These were of course an easy target and subject to orthodox as well as Lollard attack (see e.g. Chaucer's Pardoner's Tale).

B35/1 Seynt Gregorye] Gregory, Epistolarum Libri Quatuordecim xi, epist. 13 (PL 77.1128) (partial summary). This passage is cited in Gratian's Decretum iii, De Consecratione, D.iii, c. 27 (Friedberg i.1360). See also Rosarium 100/35ff.

B35/12 anoper lettre] Actually the same letter. This error may have originated in the Rosarium, all versions of which state that this passage comes from letter 69 rather than letter 13 (Rosarium 101/10 and note). B35/18 a gret clerke] Holcot, see above note to T30/11-31/1. The authorship of this passage was pointed out by Margaret Aston ('Lollards and Images', p.155).

B36/1 in forme of bred] For the use of this expression see Introduction p.cxii ff.

B36/10 seyntes] The opinions expressed here are orthodox. For Wyclif's doubts about more recently canonised saints see Sermones ii.12, part quoted below (see B 81/2-5, T81/2-6 and notes). The author of
the Twenty-Five Articles observes that many of the saints whose holidays the Church celebrates are now in hell (Arnold iii.466/11-14). B36/12 Seynt Lauerence] One of the seven deacons who served the Roman Church, St. Laurence was martyred in 258 following the edicts against Christians published by the Emperor Valerian on the fourth day after the death of the Pope, St. Sixtus. According to the tradition, Laurence, anticipating his death, gave all his money to the poor, and the prefect of Rome, seeing such generosity and thinking he must be wealthy, instructed him to hand over the wealth of the Church. Laurence gathered together all the poor, maimed, lepers etc. who supported the Church and, at the appointed time, presented them to the prefect, maintaining that they were the wealth of the Church. As a punishment he was slowly roasted to death on a specially made gridiron. See Butler, iii.297-9, Speculum Sacerdotale pp.179-82.

B36/15 Seynte Kateryne] St. Catherine was born to a patrician family in Alexandria and was converted by a vision of the Virgin and Child. She was condemned to death by Maxentius, but not before she had converted his wife. The spiked wheel on which she was sentenced to be killed broke, its spikes flying off and killing many of the onlookers, and she was then beheaded (hence the sword as well as the wheel). See Butler, iv.420-1, Speculum Sacerdotale pp.243-4.

B37/1 worschep pat is onlyche ypropred to God] i.e. latria, see
B32/11 above and note.
B37/4 Seynt Austyn] Augustine, Enarratio in Psalmum xcvi, c. 12 (PL 37/1245).

B37/8 Holy Wryt] Revelations 22;8-9.
B37/11 pe conseile of Thobye] Tobias 4:16.

B37/14 pe meke.....of God] For the definition of man as the true image of God, see pseudo-Clement, Recognitiones v, c. 23 ( $P G 1.1341$ ), quoted in Rosarium (p.99/7-29), the Floretum (f.332r/7ff) and in B40/14-17 below. See also Arnold iii.463/11ff., SEWW, p.85/91-6.

B37/15-16 Seynt Jame] James 5:16.
B37/17 pe wyse man] Ecclesiasticus 29:15.
B38/1 Seynt Bernard] Pseudo-Bernard, Tractatus de Interiori Domo, cc.38-9, sections 79-80 (PL 184.546D-547D).

B39/17 Crysostom] Pseudo-Chrysostom, Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum, hom. xxxv (PG 56.832), quoted in Rosarium p.99/1-2.

B39/21 Seynt Clement] Pseudo-Clement, Recognitiones v, c. 23 (PG
1.1341), quoted in Rosarium, (p.99/12ff).

B40/10 in pe Gospel] Matthew 25:40,45.
B40/14 Seynt Clement] loc.cit, see Rosarium p.99/24ff.
B40/18-19 noust....seyntes] For a similar view see Rosarium 100/33ff.:
'Ymages of seyntis bene nost to be dispised' and cf. Floretum f. 331 ¹/2.
B41/5 holy prophetes] See e.g. Isaiah 46:5-7, Habakkuk 2:18-19.
B41/15 as pe boke seyp] i.e. the Bible, see B41/17-20.
B41/15-16 as clerkes mowep schewe] See e.g. Bernard, Sermones in Cantica, Sermo 32, section 2 (PL 183.946), Wyclif, DMD p.168/16ff..

B41/17-18 by pe prophete Osee he spekep] Hosea 2:19.
B41/20-21 a gret clerke] Wyclif, $D M D$ p.168/19-22 (see notes to B43/10 and 43/13 below).

B42/9 prophetes] e.g. Jeremiah 3:8-9, Ezekiel 16:17, Hosea 3:1.
B42/10 Seynt Jame] James 4:4.
B43/4 Jeremye] Jeremiah 3:1.
B43/10 a gret clerke] Grosseteste, De Decem Mandatis p.18/8-9,
quoted by Wyclif, $D M D$ p.168/28-30.
B43/13 Crisostome] Pseudo-Chrysostom, Opus Imperfectum in Mattheum, hom. xlii (PG 56.873) (abridged), quoted by Wyclif, $D M D$ p.169/10-16. Since the passage from Grosseteste quoted above and the passage from Chrysostom occur together in DMD, and since the Chrysostom passage is abridged in exactly the same way in both B and $D M D$, it seems clear that $D M D$ was an intermediate source for these passages.

B45/1 Crist seyp] John 14:24.
B45/3 Ezechiel] Ezekiel 18:20.
B45/7-8 a gret clerke] Wyclif, DMD p.184/19-21.
B46/12 ff. cf. B51/7ff., T51/7ff.
B47/4 onheede] See T20/1 above and note.
B47/12-13, T47/2-3 O Lord.....mesureth loue] See Wyclif, DMD
p.96/22: 'Sed cum nihil amatur nisi cognitum, patet quod ordo vere noticie de Deo inducit racionem in eius amorem'.

B47/13 sybpe] B suche has been emended in accordance with the HTY reading and with the demands of the syntax.

B47/15, T47/5 seyp Poul] I Corinthians 2:8.
B48/3, T48/3 Moyses in a busche] Exodus 3:2. For the persistent desire of Moses (and mankind in general) to be permitted to perceive God with the senses, see Exodus 33:18-20 and the discussion of this passage in $D M D$ p.100. For a similar discussion of the sensible and the insensible see Wyclif, Sermones iv.412, DMD p.96/28ff. (a continuation of the passage already quoted, see note to B47/12-13, T47/2-3 above, but without the reference to Moses or the examples of health and life). T48/6 feele] For H see ne fele see chapter on the textual tradition,

Errors in H (4).
B48/8-9, T48/8-9 But for..... pe lasse] This sentence occurs in some versions of $P C$ where it is attributed to 'a greet doctour' (Brady, 'Lollard Interpolations' pp.188-9). The same opinion is expressed by Wyclif, DMD pp.96ff., a discussion which includes the view that 'istas imperfectas noticias consequiter proporcionabiliter dileccio' (DMD p.100/23-4), but the shared wording of the B/HTY and PC passages suggests an intermediate or an alternative source.

B49/4-6, T49/4-6. And so.....in himsylf] For this definition of the Trinity, interpreting the phrase Dominus Deus tuus, see Wyclif, DMD p. 82

B49/6ff., T49/6ff. he mot nede be pre pynges....] See Wyclif, $D M D$ pp.98-9, quoting Grosseteste: 'Tria sunt, inquit, invisibilia Dei; scilicet potencia, sciencia et benignitas, ex quibus procedunt omnia'. B50/2-3, T50/2-3 Bot sybpe.....bodylyche wyttes] cf. note to B48/3, T48/3.

T50/4 soundely] For H sumdele see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (5).

T50/4 bodili pingis] For H bodili wittes and bodili pings see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (4).

B50/4-5 soundelyche.....hem] For this emendation, see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in B (1).

T50/5 H provides additional material here (see apparatus). However, as unnecessary additions are characteristic of H (see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (7)) and as there appears to be no reason for a TY omission, T has not been emended.

B50/6, T50/7 Pe secunde.....pe Sone] See Wyclif, DMD p.200/21ff.

The association of the second commandment with Christ results from his characterisation as the Word made flesh (John 1:14). Thus, according to Wyclif, the commandment concerned with the name of God pertains to the Son 'quia secundum Augustinum in libro suo de grammatica nomen et verbum sunt idem, et per consequens nomen divinum est realiter verbum Dei' (DMD p.200/27-30).

B50/8ff, T50/8ff. Exodus 20:7.
B51/1-3, T51/1-3 be name of God.....non oper] See Wyclif, DMD p.187/4-6 (i.e., as in B/HTY, the initial section of the discussion on the second commandment): 'Et autem nomen proprium secundum Linconiensem dicto LXII colleccio proprietatum rei quam non est in alio reperire.' cf. also Sermones i.39/1-17, Sermones iii.496/29-38.

B51/4, T51/4 seyp Poul] Philippians 2:6.
B51/7-52/4, T51/7-52/4. See B14/4-15/5 and notes.
B52/6, T52/6 Criste techep] Matthew 5:37.
T53/5 Although HY comys (see apparatus) may appear to be the more difficult reading, it could be an explanatory correction and as T is corresponds more closely to the later version of Christ's words (cf. T53/7), this reading has been retained.

B53/5, T53/5 of yuel] Matthew 5:37: 'a malo est'. Swearing is not evil in itself but is the result of evil, of the fact that we are in a state of sin rather than in a state of innocence and are therefore not automatically to be believed (DMD p.202/15-22). Swearing can also result from the evil of the listener if he is unwilling to be convinced without it, 'ab audientis incredulitate, que mala est' (Grosseteste, De Decem Mandatis p.28/2-3 cf. Wyclif, DMD p.202/30-32). See also Augustine, De Mendacio i, c. 16.37 (PL 40.512). It is thus not evil to swear 'veraciter, utiliter et
honeste' (Wyclif, DMD p.202/18). The attitude to swearing here is not particularly extreme when compared, for example, with Walter Brut's view that 'Non est licitum in aliquo casu iurare' (Hereford register, Trefnant p.374, passage discussed by Hudson, $P R$ p.371). It should, however, be noted that the question of swearing an oath by a creature is not discussed. For Lollard objections to the latter see Wyclif, DMD p.202/5ff., TWT p.74/1637-8 and note.

B53/6-7, T53/6-7 God.....apostoles] For instances of God swearing see Genesis 22:16, Isaiah 45:23, Jeremiah 49:13, 51:14, Amos 6:8 etc. For Christ swearing see Wyclif, DMD p. 196 and Opus Evangelicum iii.212, both citing John 3:3. For swearing by Paul see Galatians 1:20, II Corinthians 11:31, Romans 1:9, all cited by Wyclif, $D M D$ pp.194-5. B53/8 For the emendations in this line see chapter on the textual tradition, possible BH joint errors (2). B53/9, T53/9 Jeremye pe prophete] Jeremiah 4:2. BT54/4 If BHTY and (see apparatus) is retained, the sentence does not make sense. and has therefore been omitted and bot/but (BT54/3) taken to mean 'except for'.

B54/5, T54/5 pes grete swereres] Complaints about excuses made by swearers were a common theme, cf. PCpp.39-40, DPI.i.227-9, Wyclif Sermones iv.415, DMD p.203ff., TWTp.76/1712-77/1725. B54/9 greuouse] For this emendation, see chapter on the textual tradition, possible BHY joint errors (2). T55/2 or] For this emendation, see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in T (4).

B55/4-5 and make.....by fame] For this emendation, see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in B (1).

BT55/5 trewe man] Anne Hudson suggests that the term trewe men may have been part of a distinctively Lollard language ('A Lollard Sect Vocabulary?', pp.166-7), originating in Wyclif's own reference to himself as quidam fidelis, and emphasising the need to be true to God's law. However, the obvious relevance of the term in the context of keeping your word makes it difficult to draw such a conclusion here. See, however, 'trewe men' (B/T 106/9).

B55/6-56/21 Me pynkep.....harde vengeaunce] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV 321/2-37.

B56/8 Seynt Poul] Philippians 2:10-11.
B56/21 the wyse man] Ecclesiasticus 23:12.
B57/6 Poul seyp] Hebrews 13:14.
B57/11 pe prophete] Psalm 49:12. For a similar gloss on this passage see Rolle's Psalter p.176, 'and thaire sepulcres ere thare howsis. that is, thai wene that thaire faire and dere graues may last til menynge of thaim eucrmare. thof thai be in hell. noght in sepulcres: for thare the saule is. thare is the mast parte of the man.'

T58/4-5 H's omission here appears to be due to eyeskip from one his to another.

B58/4-10, T58/4-10 A similar argument is put forward by Wyclif, $D M D$ pp.187-8. Quoting Exodus 3:14, 'Ego sum qui sum', Wyclif asserts that the name of God is esse. He further argues with the support of Jerome (Epistola xv, (PL 22.357)) that only God exists 'substancialiter'. Everyone else, 'fidelis vel infidelis', only exists by assuming God's name, i.e. by participating in his esse, cf. Aquinas $S T \mathrm{i}, \mathrm{q} .61, \mathrm{a} .1$ : 'Solus enim Deus est suum esse: in omnibus autem aliis differt essentia rei et esse eius... Et ex hoc manifestum est quod solus Deus est ens per suam
essentiam: omnia vero alia sunt entia per participationem'.
T58/9 For H trew see the chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (2). T58/10-59/1 sip.....eende] H's omission of this material is due to eyeskip.

B59/6-7, T59/6-7 This passage is taken from Augustine, De Trinitate x, c. 10.18 (PL 42.983), but see also Bernard, Sermones in Cantica, Sermo xi (PL 183.826B). It is possible that the reference to Bernard has been lost from HTY, but, given B's frequent citations of Bernard in his independent passages (see e.g.B22/4, 38/4), it seems more likely that the reference originates with $B$.

B59/8, T59/7 as pe Gospel techep] Matthew 22:37, Mark 12:30, Luke 10:27.

B61/2ff., T61/3ff. The reference here is to the spiritual house, i.e. the Church, see Proverbs 9:1: 'Sapientia aedificavit sibi domum,' glossed in LV as follows: 'Wisdom, etc; that is, Goddis Sone.....; an hous; that is, holy chirche, which he bildide bi word and ensaumple in manhed takun.' B61/2, T61/3 to wandre wyselyche] See Proverbs 9:6 'et ambulate per vias prudentiae' and cf. LV: ' of prudence; that is, of comaundementis and councelis of God'. See also Colossians $4: 5$ 'In sapientia ambulate' and, for similar instructions to walk or wander in the ways of the Lord or his commandments, Leviticus 18:4, 26:3, Deuteronomy 5:33. For the interpretation of the verb ambulare as an instruction to avoid idleness see Wyclif, Sermones iii.166, where he makes the following comment on Ephesians 5:2, 'ambulate in dilectione': 'non ociari ut segnes nec adhuc quiescere benefice in termino bravii et beati, sed ambulare continue merendo ecclesie ut viantes.'

B61/3, T61/4 ydelnesse ys dampned] The Bible's first instruction to
work occurs in Genesis 3:19. For the comment that those who will not work should not eat, see II Thessalonians 3:8-10. A number of such passages are listed in the Rosarium under the heading Labor (G $\mathrm{ff} .60^{\mathrm{V}}$ $\left.62^{r}\right)$. The failure to work was one of the most common Wycliffite accusations against the friars, see e.g. Wyclif Polemical Works i.197, SEWW p.95/68ff, Arnold iii.234, 371. Lollard suspects were questioned on this topic, see Hudson, 'The Examination of Lollards', p.134, item 17. B61/9ff., T61/9ff. For the effect of giving the cure of souls to a prelate who is 'vnmy3ty, vnkonnyng or no3t wyllyng goueme' see Rosarium, G f.105r. The same manuscript states that the office of a priest is to know the law of our Lord, to act in accordance with that law, and to answer questions concerning it. If he does not know this law he proves himself not to be a priest of our Lord (f.113r/5-8). Hudson points out that the name prelate often has condemnatory overtones when used in Lollard writings as an equivalent for 'bishop' ('A Lollard Sect Vocabulary?', pp.172-3).

B62/1-2, T62/1-2 pre maner of office] This division into the three estates is the traditional one, cf. Mann p.3, MED estat definitions 14a,b, R. Mohl, The Three Estates in Medieval and Renaissance Literature (New York, 1933), pp.97-139. The last includes a discussion of Wycliffite treatments of this topic (pp.100-2). For a similar description of the duties of the three estates see Jack Upland p.54/11-17. B62/3-4, T62/3 lest of despense] cf. Arnold iii.213: 'Opyn techynge and Goddis lawe, old and newe, opyn ensaumple of Cristis lif and his glorious apostlis.....schulde stire alle prestis and religious to lyve in gret mekenesse and wilful povert of pe gospel'. For further emphasis on Christ's example and for Old Testament support for clerical poverty see

Wyclif, Trialogus pp.297-9. For Lollard attitudes to clerical wealth and endowment see Introduction p.c ff.

T62/5 if] Emended in accordance with the BHY reading. Although it is possible that And here might mean 'if', there is no evidence elsewhere in T for such a usage.

T62/5 wittingly] Emended in accordance with B which is the more difficult reading and which also makes better sense.

B62/7, T62/7 Antecrist] cf. von Nolcken, Rosarium p.107: 'The concept of Antichrist was extremely useful to Wyclif and his followers, and proved flexible enough to embrace several definitions. Antichrist was ultimately for them the source or symbol of all evil, and wherever anything was to be denounced could be used with little precision'. For the Pope as Antichrist see SEWW p.122/2-7. $L L$ describes the court of Rome as the head of Antichrist, archbishops and bishops as his body and the sects of monks, canons and friars as his venemous tail (p.16/10-15). von Nolcken suggests (loc.cit.) that as far as Wyclif and his followers were concerned the concept of Antichrist was not normally associated with an apocalyptic vision, but see M. Wilks, 'Wyclif and the Great Persecution,' SCH, Subsidia 10.39-63.

B62/9ff., T62/9ff. For Lollard views on the relationship between the Church and the secular leader and for the obligations of the latter to correct errant clergy see Hudson, PR pp.362-66, Introduction p.civ Wyclif condemns clerical simonists and apostates as heretics and cites canon law to the effect that temporal lords have a duty to destroy such heretics, since those who cease to oppose a manifest crime are thereby associated with it (Polemical Works ii.431-2, and see Gratian's Decretum ii, C.ii, q.vii, c. 55 (Friedberg i.501)).

T63/1 hap vencushid] For H haue ourcomen see the chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (3).

T63/5 shal] For the use of 'shall' to express obligation see Visser
III.i.§1486. Given the possibility of such a meaning, it has not been felt necessary to emend in accordance with BH 'should'.

B63/7, T63/6-7 pat God puttep noust yn] See B126/3-5, T126/5-7 and note.

T64/5 stondip in] For H is see the chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (3).

B65/2, T65/2 turne it to pryuey raueyn] Compare Wyclif, Polemical Works i.149: 'Unde iste videtur locus blaspheme heresis, quo anticristi discipuli seducunt multum populum et spoliant stolidos de virtutibus et meritoriis laboribus et singulariter de bonis temporalibus pro suffragiis false fictis', a passage which forms part of a discussion on the deceptions of the Church concerning ways of escaping purgatory such as indulgences and alms given in perpetuity.

T65/8 a new lawe] i.e. Canon law as opposed to God's law.
T66/1-4 But Antecrist.....pe fend] i.e. Lords are deceived by their priests so they lack heavenly help and their worldly lordship is undermined by clergy who refuse to recognise it.

B68/6, T68/6 haue mynde] cf. T 158/2-12. Although you only keep the Sabbath on one particular day in the week, the intention must always be present.

B69/1 Emended in accordance with the HTY reading. There are only seven people in total (see B 67/3-5 above). B70/1-72/2, T70/1-72/2 Bot here may men doute.....pe eystepe day] This passage also occurs as part of a treatise on the change of the

Sabbath from Saturday to Sunday to be found in MS BL Harley 2339, of which it forms the initial section (ff. $104^{\mathrm{v}} / 11-105^{\nu} / 16$ ). For a discussion of this manuscript see A.I Doyle, 'A Treatise of the Three Estates', Dominican Studies iii (1950), pp.351-8. Doyle suggests that the treatise on the Sabbath is 'directed against an aberration......that might be expected to follow from the principles of Wycliffite scriptural interpretation' (pp.352-3), but in fact the section which Harley 2339 shares with B/TYH appears to be a summary of part of Wyclif's discussion of the Sabbath ( $D M D$ p.208ff.). It is not possible to determine whether one version was drawn from the other and they may have shared an independent source. However, the fact that the B/TYH version continues, as does $D M D$, with a discussion of servile work may suggest that the $\mathrm{B} / \mathrm{TYH}$ version was the source for the Harley 2339 version rather than vice versa.

T70/8 lay] For H restid see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (4).

T71/2 kepten] Emended in accordance with the BHY reading. Although kepen (referring to contemporary Jewish practice) is a possible reading, the context suggests that the past tense is preferable. B71/2, T71/2 pe eystepe age] See Wyclif, $D M D$ p. 211 ff . This account of the ages of the world is drawn from St. Augustine, see De Genesis Contra Manichaeos i, c. 23 (PL 34.190-93), De Diversis Quaestionibus 1xxxiii.i, q. 58 (PL 40.43), and cf. Burrow (1986), pp.80-5. In order to obtain seven ages before the day of judgement, Wyclif has added an extra age of rest viz. the age of those resting incompletely in purgatory (in our MSS the time of rest which 'remnyp wip pes sixe' (T71/8-9) and cf. $D M D$ p. 212 1.2). For Wyclif's attachment to the seven-
age scheme because it made it possible for him to claim that he was living in the Saturn-day of the world week, i.e. the worst of all times, see Wilks, 'Wyclif and the Great Persecution' p.49.

B72/4, T72/5 sype.....synne] cf. Augustine, In Joannis Evangelium, tr. $\mathrm{xxx}(P L 35.1635)$, cited by Wyclif, $D M D \mathrm{p} .216$. T's version here is closer to the $D M D$ reading than is B 's $\mathrm{cf} . \operatorname{DMD}$ p. 217 11.11-12: 'opus peccati est opus maxime servile'.

B72/5, T72/6 Crist hymself] John 8:34, cited by Wyclif, DMD p. 217. B73/2-4 pat lettep.....moost in] For this emendation, see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in B (1).

BT73 6 goynge to pe plowe] For exceptions made for agricultural work see B. Harvey, 'Work and Festa Ferianda in Medieval England', JEH 23 (1972), pp 289-308. For exceptions made specifically for ploughing see the statutes of Bishop Fulk Basset (C\&S ii.656, item 105) and the statutes of Bishop Walter de Cantilupe for Worcester ( C\&S ii.324). These exceptions, however, apply to particular feast days and not to Sundays and, although the use of ploughing as an example probably arose from such constitutions, the argument here is simply that some w rks are not as bad as others; cf. the following passage from Augustine quoted by Wyclif and in the Floretum: 'Melius .....faceret Iudeus in sabbato in agro suo aliquid utile quam in theatro sediciosus existeret.' (DMD p.222, Floretum f.99v, Augustine, Sermones de Scripturis ix, c. 3 (PL 38.77)).

B73 9-10, T 73/10 no more pan a myle] cf. Wyclif, $D M D$ p.224, defining the iter sabbatio Acts $1: 12$ (i.e. from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives).

B73/10, T74/1 nedful] For similar accounts of what is permissible, see

DMD p.217/7-11, Gregory, Decretals ii, tit.ix, c. 3 (Friedberg ii.271). B74/5, T74/5 false.....Criste] Matthew 12, cited by Wyclif, DMD 217/27-32.

B75/1-2, T 75/1-2 and punysche men for hem] Whether Sundays and the principal feast days were to be observed was one of the questions asked at Lollard interrogations (Hudson, 'The Examination of Lollards', p.134, item 38) and his views on the matter were one reason for the condemnation of William White at the diocesan synod in Norwich on 13th September 1428 (FZ 428, item xxii). For White's teaching on this topic see Aston, 'William White's Lollard Followers', pp.94-5 and for variation in Lollard belief see Hudson, $P R$ pp.147-8. The reference to punishment need not necessarily, however, imply punishment of Lollards. As Anne Hudson has pointed out ( $P R$ p.147) concern about the lack of Sabbath observance predated Lollardy. Thus the synodal statutes of Bishop Fulk Basset for the diocese of London (1245x1259) provide for the punishment of those attending markets on Sundays and feast days ( $C \& S$ ii.647), while the statutes of Bishop Peter Quinel for the diocese of Exeter in 1287 forbid such behaviour on pain of excommunication ( $C \& S$ ii.1021).

B75/2, T75/2 and do worse ous-syf] For examples see $D M D \mathrm{pp} .220-1$. B75/9, T75/9 discrecioun and studye in Godes lawe] Perhaps with the implication that attendance at Church is unnecessary and that reading the Bible for oneself is preferable to listening to a priest; see Introduction pp.cxvi-cxvii.

T76/2 clerkis of pe chapitre] The suggestion is that Church law is less reliable than God's law; cf. Arnold ii. 76 where the writer complains about the new chapter laws which prevent criticism ('snybbing') of the
new orders; Arnold ii. 400 where we are told that 'men of pe chapitre lawe chargen more traveile on pe Sondaie pan pei done a deedli synne, done panne or in opir tyme'.

B76/2, T 76/2 medful] cf. $D M D$ p.217/17: 'possunt bene fieri', which suggests that $T$ 'nedeful' is an error.

B76/5-79/22 For it ys......pe blisse of heuene] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. $B V V$ p.322/6-324/19.

B76/13-15 Bot it semep.....deueles seruyse] cf. DMD 219/15-19: 'Et patet quomodo dies festi ex condicionibus in nobis oppositis vertuntur in dies lugubres.'

B77/7 Seynt Bernard] Pseudo-Bernard, Meditationes Piissimae de Cognitione Humanae Conditionis c.ii (PL 184.488B).

B77/11-12 as holy doctores seyp] See Wyclif $D M D$ p. 219 citing Grosseteste. The three ways described by B correspond to the three components of confession (contrition, confession of mouth and satisfaction). See note to B17/17 above.

B77/15-17 noper to.....bysynesse] For the use of churches for the sale of goods see J.G. Davies, The Secular Use of Church Buildings (1968), pp.55-6. The practice was periodically condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities, e.g. by Thoresby and Braybrooke (cited by Davies).

B77/21 as clerkes seye] See Grosseteste, De Decem Mandatis p.32/24-
7, cited by Wyclif, DMD p.210/17-21.
B78/21-79/5 And yf.....acord] This division between priests and laity, with its emphasis on the need for the priest to possess authority, is orthodox. Believing that anyone, even a deacon or a presbyter, was permitted to preach without authority was one of the errors of which Wyclif was convicted at the 1382 Blackfriars Council (FZp.280, item
xv ), and questions on this topic were asked at Lollard interrogations: see Hudson, 'The Examination of Lollards', p.133, item 12.

B79/17 in pe Gospel] Luke 14:13-14 The passage in the Vulgate reads as follows: 'voca pauperes, debiles, claudos, caecos' i.e. instead of 'poor' qualifying the other categories it forms a category of its own. Lollard use of 'poor' as a qualifying adjective in this context has been noted by Aston ('"Caim's Castles"', p.70,n.22). In addition to the references given by Aston see Taylor's sermon, TWT p.15/451-9 and note. As B states here and as Wendy Scase points out ('Piers Plowman' and the New Anticlericalism (Cambridge, 1989), p.63, noted by Hudson, TWT p.100), this usage derives from Fitzralph, see e.g. the Defensio Curatorum in Trevisa's translation, p.88/8ff.: 'Parme pore men pat bep stalworpe and stronge schulde noust be cleped to pe feeste of beggers, for bei mowe quyte hit wip her trauail. Noper riche feble men, noper riche halt men, noper riche blynde men schuld be cleped to pe feeste of beggers, for pei mowe quyte hit wip her catel.' The reference to Fitzralph is drawn from the DI version; see $B V V$ p.324/15. For Fitzralph as a Lollard saint see Hudson, $P R$ pp.171-2; Walsh (1981), pp.452-68. T80/5 haliday clopis] For Wycliffite objections to costly clerical clothing see $D O P$ p.434, $L L$ p.41/19. As Arundel recognised in his interrogation of William Thorpe (TWTp.73/4-7), Lollards considered such dress to be evidence of clerical pride, and it was also, as the context of the Thorpe passage shows, connected with the vexed question of the misuse of tithes.

T80/11-12 foure greete feestis] i.e. Passover (Exodus 12:14 etc.), Pentecost (Exodus 23:16 etc.), Trumpets (Leviticus 23:24,25), and Tabernacles (Leviticus 23:24).

T80/14 fredom of his lawe] See MED fredom, sense 1 b (c): 'the inward compulsion of the New Testament (as a subsitute for the external compulsion of the Mosaic law)'.

80/14-15 Seynt Poul techip] Galatians 4:8-10
B81/2-5, T81/2-6 The source of both these passages, i.e. the 'gret clerk' is Wyclif, see Sermones ii.1/7-15. The T version has been emended to include this reference which is only found in B. The corresponding passage in Wyclif reads as follows: 'In cuius signum in quacunque oracione sanctorum Deus principaliter adoratur, ut ad oracionem talis sancti populus adiuvetur. Et in signum quod hoc fit per mediatorem Dei et hominum Christum Jesum, oraciones tales finiuntur communiter per dominum nostrum Jesum Christum.'

B81/4 plesynge] For this emendation (i.e. the omission of B so see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in B (4).

T81/5-6 seien.....oper] The omission of this passage by H appears to be due to eyeskip.

T81/7-8 God tauste pe Iewes] Leviticus 23:32.
T82/1 as clerkis seien] See Wyclif, $D M D$, p.210, citing Grosseteste. B82/8ff., T82/9ff. cf. EWS iii.11/31-4: 'And sip al pat fel in pe olde lawe was figure of Iesu Crist, and he made hymsilf man, it is sop pat treupe is maad bi Iesu Crist whanne he was man, for panne figures ceessiden, and Crist was come ende of hem'.

B83/1-2, T83/1-2 I am certayn.....metes] For Lollard criticism of costly vestments see T80/5 and note. For criticism of adornment see Rosarium, Ornatus (G ff. $89^{v}-900^{r}$ ), and for criticism of ornate churches see Rosarium, p.71/2-4, quoting Jerome: 'Wat profete is it pe wallez for to schyne wip gemmez and Crist in pore men for to dye for hungre?' i.e.
once again the money which should be given to the poor is being misappropriated. Friars were often considered to be especially guilty of spending too much money on their churches, see $S E W W \mathrm{p} .117,79-83$, Aston, '"Caim's Castles"', pp.47-8. Such complaints were not, of course, confined to Lollards (see e.g. PPp.26/60-72). For criticism of clerical expenditure on food see T153/2 and note.

T83/7 shulen] See note to T63/5 above.
T84/3 also his neisbore] For this reading and that of BHY see chapter on the textual tradition, possible BHY joint errors (3).

B84/3-6, T84/3-6 And pus.....departed] For the interdependency of the three forms of love (i.e. the argument put forward by T) see Wyclif, DMD, pp.114-5, Augustine De Trinitate viii, cc.7,8 (PL 42.956-9). For the argument that only those who love God love themselves (i.e. an argument closer to the BHY version) see Augustine, De Trinitate xiv, c. 14 (PL 42.1049-51).

B84/6, T84/6 Seynt Jon] I John 4:20.
B84/9-85/1, T84/9 suep resoun of more kepynge] i.e.'follow the order of the importance of observing'.

B85/8 fer] For this emendation, see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in B (2).

B85/9-10 yf bay.....worschepe hem] For this emendation, see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in B (1).

B86/2 opene] For this emendation of B's vpon resoun it see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in B (3).

B86/9 Crist] For this emendation of B's Crist God and man see the chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in B (5).

BT87/2 God and man] For Wyclif's emphasis on the humanity of Christ
and its relationship to his realism see Workman i.138-9, and see also the fifth of Wyclif's heresies listed by Netter (FZp.2). For Wyclif's response to the argument that Christ was so perfect that he must be a different species see Trialogus pp.230-1.

T88/2 profijt to] T appears to have an eyeskip error here and has been emended in accordance with the HY reading.

B88/2-89/8, T88/2-7 See Wyctif, Sermones i.112: 'Consistit autem honor iste non precipue in decapuciacione, in declinacione vel aliis nutibus secundum hominem introductis, sed reverenter dando parentibus in casu quo egeant subsidium ac ministerium temporale; sed precipue posito quod egeant ministerio virtutum in via Domini et posito quod sint mortui ministrando illis suffragium spirituale'.

T88/4-5 pingis] BHY signes may appear to be the more difficult reading, but it could also simply be a repetition of a word found earlier in the same line. In view of the difficulty of deciding between the two, the readings of $B$ and $T$ have both been allowed to stand.

B88/9-89/17 And so worschepynge..... seep al day] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. $B V V$ p.324/35-325/11.

B89/16 God sleep children by pestylence] The so-called 'Children's Plague' occurred in 1361-2, but there were further outbreaks in 1369 and 1379 both of which, in contrast to the initial outbreak of 1348-9, tended to draw their victims from the younger members of the population (McKisack, pp.331-2).

B89/19 Holy Wryt wytnessep] Deuteronomy 21:18-21 (partial paraphrase of final verse).

B90/4-5 takep hede.....festes] Translating the Vulgate 'comissationibus vacat et luxuriae atque conviviis potatorum', cf. LV, 'he syueth tent to
glotonyes, and letcherie, and feestis'.
B90/16 Poul] Ephesians 6:1-4.
B91/2-94/9 This passage has been taken from the Wycliffite tract Of
Weddid Men and Wifis and of Here Children Also, which appears later in B (ff. $160^{v}-166^{v}$ ). (Edited Arnold iii.188-201, from Cambridge, Corpus Christi MS 296).

B91/6 in pe Olde Lawe] Deuteronomy 4:9, 6:7, 11:19.
B92/7 Pater Noster and pe Crede] See the instructions to godparents given in the Sarum rite, E.C. Whitaker, Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy (London, 1970), p.239/24-30.

B92/8 ten hestes] For the central importance of the commandments to Lollards, see Introduction p.xciv ff.

B92/14-15 Seynt Peter techeth] II Peter 2:21.
B92/15ff. som men settep here chyldren] A similar comment appears in the DX version cf. Bodl.MS Laud Misc. $23 \mathrm{ff} .1^{\mathrm{v}}$ - $13^{\mathrm{r}}$ : 'Certis sich faderes and modris ben more cruel to hemself and to her childery pan pous pey al tohakkeden here songe childryn whame pey were cristenyd as smale as fleys to pe pot.' The whole of this DX passage is similar to that found in B.

B93/14 Seynt Poule spekeb] I Timothy 5:8.
B94/10ff. Passage related to DI cf. $B V V$ p. 325/11ff. Only the definition of the first type of father and mother corresponds exactly to that found in $B V V$, but it nevertheless seems possible that the whole of this section was taken from a DI witness; see notes to B94/18-19 and B98/2-7.

B94/11 pre manere of fadres and modres] For a similar division see Wyclif, DMD p.294-5.

B94/14 ff. Note that B's instruction to obedience here is qualified: one
should obey ones priest only 'in pat pat Godes lawe techep'.
B94/18-19 alle his pareschenes bep as oure moder] This comparison does not occur in the DI version as it appears in $B V V$ (i.e. the witness found in the Simeon manuscript) but it does appear in some others; see, for example BL MS Royal 17.A.xxvi f.13r/16.

B95/10-11, T95/4-5 vpon resoun skyle] H opyn skille is a possible reading, but it seems more likely that the BTY reading is original and that resoun was lost because the scribe felt it duplicated skyle, with subsequent change of opyn to vpon.

T95/6 more skile wole pat pou haue] This omission by HTY is due to eyeskip. The emendation is in accordance with the $\mathbf{B}$ reading. B95/8ff., T95/2ff. For a similar argument see Grosseteste, De Decem Mandatis, p.40/19ff. B96/3ff., T96/3ff. cf. DOP p.439/10-440/3:

> [I]t were forto wite ouer hou curatis wasten pore mermus godis in makinge per kyn riche; bisyde pat pey spenden in per oune persone; \& pus ben many in englond maad riche fro ful symple staat. \& it semyp pat pe kyng of pride hap taust pis bi his firste syme, for many curatis han delit to haue riche men of perkyn.....but pe bileue of iesu crist shulde teche men to quenche pis pride. crist louyde ful wel his kyn, as his modir \& his cosyns, but he louyde hem not to be worldly riche but forto lyue a pore lif.

For the fact that Christ chose to live in a poor family see Rosarium, G f.93r 11.35-7. For Christ's refusal to make James and John rich, see Matthew 20:20-8 and the sermon on this passage, EWS iii.92-3. T97/6-7 For emendations to these lines see chapter on the textual tradition, possible HTY joint errors (4).

T97/7-9 to hem.....pan children] H's omission of this passage is due to
eyeskip.
B97/8, T97/8 Seynt Poul seyp] II Corinthians 12:14.
B98/2-7 Passage corresponding to DI , cf. $B V V \mathrm{p} .325 / 20-26$. This is a continuation of the passage defining the three types of parents; see note to B94/10ff.

T98/6ff. An attack on financial provision for the clergy. For similar complaints about clerical wealth see $D O P$ pp.410-11, 434-5. For the view that the clergy should follow Christ's example of poverty and should live by their own labour and alms freely offered by their parishioners rather than by tithes see Thorpe's testimony, TWT pp.66-74; DOPp.414. Again, the argument is that priests misappropriate money which should be spent on the poor (TWTp.70). That the clergy should not have temporal possessions but should go on foot preaching the word of God was one of the sixteen points on which the Bishops accused the Lollards (SEWW p.19/22-24). For the right of parishioners to judge their clergy see $D M D$ p.301, $D O P$ p.418. In the latter case a critical judgement is to result in the withholding of tithes.

T99/8 ten faire witnessis] See e.g. Matthew 10:9-10, Mark 6:8, Luke 10:3-4, all cited by Wyclif, $D C D$ iii.133; Luke 22:25-27, cited by Wyclif, $D C D$ iii.187. For the view that 'nomen clerici est nomen oneris et non nomen honoris vel commodi secularis' see $D C D$ p. 245 . T99/10 lordis of pis world] For the Caesarean clergy, of whom one of the most notable was Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester and Chancellor, see Workman ii.108ff. For the evils arising from such secular appointments see Arnold iii.215.

T99/14-15 Crist hymsilf seib] See Hebrews 12:6.

T100/1ff. For the duties of the secular lord with regard to errant clergy see note to B62/9ff., T62/9ff.

T100/3 fordo] For H for to do see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (3).

T100/5 shulde not syue her bisshops lordshipis of pis world] See T99/10 above and note.

T100/9 seien pat it is eresie] Wyclif's view that churchmen should have no temporalities was condemned as a heresy at the Blackfriars Council in 1382 ( $F Z$ p.279, item x). For earlier condemnations by Gregory XI of the suggestion that ecclesiastics might be deprived of their temporalities see $F Z$ p. 248 item vi; p.254, item xvi; pp.255-6 item xvii. T100/14 sepulcris ne abbeis] cf.T3/6 above and note. The argument here is against the granting of perpetual alms for the good of one's soul. B101/3-104/8, T101/4-104/8 And herefore.....of God] For Lollard views on the death penalty see Hudson, $P R$ p.370. Certain Lollards held more extreme views than those expressed here. Walter Brut, for instance, argued that the idea that men might kill ex officio had its foundation in the Old Law but that Christ wished mercy to be shown to sinners (A\&M iii.159-63). In general, however, Lollards acknowledged the legality of the death penalty, although they worried about the possibility of misjudgement (see An Apology for Lollard Doctrines p.64: 'for now are iust men oft wrongid, and schrewis vnpunischid') and about the whole problem of anticipating God's judgement (cf. Wyclif, Sermones i.119). See also T103/11-104/3 and note.

B101/5 a grete clerke] Although it seems likely that this reference was present in a BHTY ancestor, the fact that it appears to have been lost in the HTY tradition as part of the process of making the transition from the
interpolated section on the eucharist back to the original, means that it is no longer appropriate to restore the reference in $T$.

T101/8 supposen] For H say see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (3).

T101/8-12 Wibouten ony dout.....as false freris gabben] For Wycliffite views on the Eucharist see Introduction p.cix ff., Kenny (1985), pp.82-90. Workman argues that Wyclif's main objections to the Eucharist were metaphysical (Workman ii.30), but see Catto p.274ff. for Wyclif's emotional reaction to what he saw as the idolatry of the Eucharist. Keen argues that Wyclif's original objections were scriptural (Keen in Kenny (1986), p. 11 ff.). For Wyclif's view that a consecrated host which had accidents but no substance was nothing, see Keen in Kenny (1986), p.9/31-2, and cf. Wyclif, Sermones iii.410/13-15. B101/5-102/2, T102/1-2 I have not been able to identify the 'grete clerke referred to here. For a similar view see Wyclif, Sermones i.118/31-5: 'Cum ergo principium fidei debet esse fidelibus quod in omni operacione hominis, ubi est a voluntate divina difformitas, est peccatum, patet quod nemo presumeret fratrem suum occidere nisi ex caritate et casu quo hoc sibi fuerit revelatum.' The usual authority cited for the legality of killing men with God's authorisation is Augustine, cf. De Civitate Dei i, c. 21 (PL 41/35): 'Quasdam vero exceptiones eadem ipsa divina fecit auctoritas, ut non liceat hominem occidi', cited in Rosarium ( $\mathrm{G} \mathbf{f} .46^{\text {r }}$ ). B102/2 may] B many has been emended in accordance with the HTY reading. The emphasis is not on how many people kill, but on when it is permissible to do so.

T103/11-104/3 But it is.....as men vsen] For a response to this argument as presented in the Twelve Conclusions see Dymmok p.255-6.

The view originated with Wyclif, who observes that the reasons for doubting the validity of the death penalty are three-fold: first that its use varies from kingdom to kingdom although the crimes do not differ; secondly that whether the death penalty is imposed or not bears no relation to the seriousness of the offence (the discussion here focuses on theft); and, thirdly, that crimes against God are not punished so severely (DCD i.435).

T104/2 listlier] Thas been emended in accordance with HY which appears to have marginally the more difficult reading.

T104/7 ony] Thas been emended in accordance with B which appears to have marginally the more difficult reading.

B105/2, T105/3 Seynt Jon] I John 3:15.
T105/7 in ony heed synnc] Thas been emended in accordance with the BHY reading. Since the sinful example is equivalent to manslaughter it seems clear that a deadly sin is implied.

B105/7, T105/8 as it is of oper] i.e. as he does against all the others. The person who sins against one commandment sins against them all: see below T155/15ff. Any person who sins breaks the fifth commandment by leading his neighbour astray and thus risking his spiritual death.

B105/9, T105/10 as clerkes seyb] For the types of consent see Floretum f. $58^{\mathrm{r}} / 41 \mathrm{ff}$. which presents the following as a metrical summary of material drawn from canon law: 'cooperans, defendens, consilium dans, ac auctorizans, non iuuans, nec reprehendens'. A similar list appears in the Rosarium ( $\mathrm{G} \mathbf{\mathrm { f }} .4^{r}$ ), although the fifth type, corresponding to B's 'wipdrawep his help', appears here as 'lettep or helpep'. See also Wyclif, De Officio Regis pp.83-90, which, though it deals with only five
types of consent, nevertheless includes all those listed here, failure to correct appearing as one aspect of defence. Wyclif's order, however, is different.

B106/6-7 pe prophetes of pe Olde Lawe] See Wyclif, Sermones iii.88-
9: 'Et ista racio movebat prophetas in veteri lege usque ad mortem verba Domini publicare et moverent nostros presbyteros quantumcunque mundo simplices intrepide predicare'.

BT 106/9 trewe men] See note to B55/4, T55/5.
B107/4, T107/4 prelat3] For the critical overtones of the word 'prelate' when used by Lollards see note to B61/9. T107/7 tirauntis] Emended in accordance with the BHY reading. For T traitours see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in T (3).

B107/7, T107/7 postes a3enst tyrauntes] Although it is difficult to be certain that this passage refers to any particular event, it is perhaps worth noting that Wyclif put at least some of the blame for the Peasant's Revolt on the clergy, accusing them of encouraging the war which made the Poll Tax necessary and suggesting that the friars were restrained by simoniacal greed from giving good advice to those lords to whom they were confessors (De Blasphemia pp.191-2). As far as H triuauntes is concerned, spelling with initial $t r$ - is characterised by Hudson as distinctively Lollard (TWTp.115, note to 1.750 ). For T traitours see the chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in T (3).

T108/2 annuel rent] For a a similar use of this term see Arnold
iii.296/19. For criticism of flattering friars who will absolve a man 'falsely for a litel money by зeere' even though he is not willing to make restitution or to abandon his sin see Arnold iii.394.

T108/12 ff. For the relationship between Wyclif and the friars see

Introduction p.cxvii ff.
T108/16 Seynt Jon] I John 3:15.
T109/4 sleyng of her owne briberen in her prisoun] For Wyclif's frequent accusations that his supporters amongst the friars were being incarcerated after secret trials and dying from their maltreatment see M . Wilks, 'Wyclif and the Great Persecution', SCH, Subsidia 10 (1994), p.41. In Sermones ii. 83 Wyclif suggests that such deaths were caused not only by the imprisonment itself ('per incarceracionem') but also 'alios modos manualiter'. See also Sermones iv. 498 ff . The order of the material in the HTY verson, viz. a) the accusations about imprisonment, b) accusations about persecution, and c) accusations about Friars' teaching and their use of the confessional, suggests that this last may have been the original source for this passage.

T109/5-6 Londoun and Lyncolun] See Introduction p.cxxiii ff. The passage on persecution in Sermones iv ( p .499 , see note to T109/4) mentions no particular incident, but Wyclif does observe that not only those who perform the deed but also those who consent to it are murderers.

T109/15-110/3 Pe pridde maner.....fadir of siche freris] cf. Wyclif, Sermones iv 499/9ff. The T version is, however, more extreme. For a similar accusation see Arnold iii.376-7.

T109/17 if] For this emendation see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in T (4).

T110/4ff. For friars' inability to 'ground' themselves in the Gospel see Hudson, PR p.349; Arnold iii.353/15ff. For the preaching of 'lesyngus and japes plesynge to pe peple' see Arnold iii.180/5-6.

T110/11 ordris pat Crist made] In the Lollard view, these
corresponded to the three estates (knights, clergy and labourers) but did not include the 'private religions' i.e. monks, friars, canons. For the failings of the secular clergy see Workman ii.108-18.

B111/1-112/21 Alle pes.....do no manslawt] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. $B V V$ p.325/29-326/32. B112/10-14 ('He sleep.....a mansleer') does not, however appear in any of the extant DI witnesses. B111/1-7 appears to have been drawn from Wyclif, Sermones i.118/19-25. B111/6 pe wyse man] Ecclesiasticus 13:19.

B111/10-21 This section corresponds in argument, though not exactly in wording, to Wyclif, Sermones i.119/5-14: 'Nam proprium est Deo animam creare et secundum disposicionem soli Deo cognitam ipsam corpori copulare et alias secundum indisposicionem sibi soli cognitam a corpore separare.....Ideo inter quatuor peccata ad Deum clamancia homicidium est primum atque precipuum. Nam Genesis IV $^{\mathbf{0}}, 10$ legitur quomodo Dominus dixit ad Caym.....'

B111/20 Holy Wryt] Genesis 4:10.
B112/6 abreched] not recorded but presumably a form of abbregen, 'to diminish'.

B112/13 Seynt Jon] I John 3:15.
B113/5, T113/6 as pe Gospel techep] Matthew 19:5.
T114/5 Opere parties of pis synne] For these sce e.g. Wyclif, $D M D$ pp.347-8, Rosarium, G f.68-69², Wenzel (ed.), Fasciculus Morum, p.667ff.

B115/1-4 And pis word.....delectacioun] This passage appears in the Floretum at the beginning of the section on Luxuria ( $\mathrm{f} .159^{\mathrm{v}} / 10-12$ ). B115/8ff. cf. the questions to be asked in the confessional, Mirk, Instructions for Parish Priests pp.138-41.

B115/12 pe wyse man seyp] Wisdom 1:3.
B115/13-14, T115/2 Crist.....seyp] Matthew 5:28.
B116/11-14 And pis is.....wipoute ende] For a similar opinion see PC p. 60.

B116/14-15 Seynt Poule] I Corinthians 6:9.
B116/17-117/12 And in pis worde.....lecherous dedys doynge]
Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVVp.326/34-327/11.
B117/14-15, T117//3 seyp a clerke] See Wyclif, DMD p.444/2-9 (part of the discussion of the ninth commandment), quoting Peraldus.

B118/1 fer] B fro has been emended in accordance with HY, which appear to have the more difficult reading.

T118/1 fle fer] T for is possible (be a coward as far as the occasion of such a $\sin$ is concerned), but it seems more likely that the HY reading is original and that fle was omitted because of eyeskip and the ee- of fer subsequently misread as -o-.

B118/2, T118/2 holynesse] For this emendation see chapter on the textual tradition, possible HTY joint errors (6).

T118/3 hoolyer] For this emendation see ibid.
B118/9, T118/7 pe secunde medycyne] See Wyclif, DMD p.448/12:
'Luxuriat raro non bene pasta caro.'
B119/6-9 Sypbe adultery.....was ydo] cf. Grosseteste, De Decem
Mandatis p.65/14-17.
B119/13 Holy Wryt wytnessep] II Samuel 12:9-10.
B120/4 Absolon....lond] II Samuel 15ff.
B120/5-6 God sende.....dayes] II Samuel 24:15.
B120/23 I tolde byfore] See B41/15ff.
T121/4 For TY eche and emendation see chapter on the textual tradition,
possible TY joint errors (4).
B123/6ff., T123/9ff. This section expresses Wycliffite views on Dominion, see Introduction pp.ciii ff.; Kenny (1985), pp.42-55; Hudson, $P R$ pp.359-62; and cf. Wyclif, $D M D$ p.365/16-18: 'Generaliter autem omnis iniustus cuiuscumque status fuerit fur dicitur apud Deum, et eo fur gravior quo fuerit apud Deum iniustior', Sermones i.130-1: 'cum Deus sit universalis dominus tocius mundi et quilibet imperator vel rex est servus huius Domini vel ballivus, patet quod quicunque, consumendo bona huius Domini et non ministrando sibi fideliter, de tanto est huic Domino fur et latro'. As Hudson points out (pp.360-2), in a discussion which quotes from Y, Lollards (and Wyclif himself) commonly applied these theories of dominion to the Church rather than (as here) to secular rulers, cf. the view expressed in T151/1-4 and see also Matthew pp.229-30 where it is argued that, although it is permissible to withold tithes and offerings from sinful clerics, it is not permissible to withold rents from sinful lords.

T124/8-11 And herfor......he occupiep] cf. Wyclif, $D C D$ i.62-3 and passim.

B125/1-4 And pis.....open robbynge] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVVp.329/8-11

B125/15-17 Pe secunde manere.....wrong manere] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. $B V V$ p.329/12-15.

B125/18-126/3, T125/1-126/3 alle vniuste men.....day peues also]
Apparently a summary of Wyclif, DMD p. 365.
B126/3-4, T126/5-6 seyp Crist] John 10:1. For a possible source for this discussion see the similar argument based on this text by Wyclif, Sermones iv.502-5, an English version of which is printed in the

Appendix to EWS iii (pp.319-21).
B126/7 pey spoylep be peple] cf. the definition of day thieves in the English sermon (EWS iii.319/13-16) as 'pese men pat aftir pis entre robben pe peple pat pei schulden kepe bope of dymes and of offringis'. B126/7 sogest vnto] B vnder has been emended in accordance with TY, which appear to have the more difficult reading.

B127/1-2, T127/1-2 lye pus.....feynep] See the bull of John XXII, Cum inter nonnullos (November 1323), issued as part of an argument with the Spirituals and the Beguines (Denzinger (1963), pp.288-9), which states that Christ and the Apostles possessed goods both individually and in common. For a discussion of this bull see Wyclif, De Potestate Pape pp.81-2, and for the context in which the bull was issued and for reaction to it see Workman ii.100-1

B127/2, T127/2 he] i.e. Christ, see John 12:31.
B127/8, T127/8 Crist, pat may noust lye] See Wyclif, Sermones
iv.502/4: 'Christus qui mentiri non poterit'. This description is, however, so common that it is not really possible to use this correspondence as evidence of textual relationship.

T128/1 in her lettris] See e.g. Wykeham's register II.4[1b]: 'Willelmus, permissione divina Wyntoniensis episcopus'.

B128/2-18 Pe prydde manere.....ne pefpe] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV p.329/15-33.

T129/2ff. For discussion of this passage see Introduction p.cxxvii.
T129/9 pe Gospelle of Luk] Luke 9:54-6.
T129/15-17 But.....afyre] For the use of the death penalty on the continent see Workman ii.100, Richardson, 'Heresy and the Lay Power', p. 20 .

T130/5 his fader] i.e. the Devil.
T130/6 in pe Olde Lawe] Leviticus 24:16.
T130/7 in pe Newe Testament] Matthew 18:15-17. See Wyclif, Sermones i.118/35-9.

T130/11 ff. For Lollard attitudes to execution see note to B101/3-104/8, T101/4-104/11

T131/5ff. For Lollard views on Church endowment see Introduction pp.cff., Hudson, $P R$ pp.337-42 and, for the Lollard Disendowment Bill, $S E W W$ pp.135-7. For Wyclif's views and Gregory XI's reaction see note to T100/9.

T131/9-12 For the duty to criticise clerical failings see Wyclif, $D C D$
ii.88ff. Part of this argument, the passage on the criticism of ecclesiastics including the Roman pontiff ( $D C D$ ii.94/34-6), appeared on the schedule of Wyclif's propositions condemned by Gregory XI (Walsingham, HA i.355, item 19).

T131/15-16 as Crist himsilf biddib] See note to T130/7 above.
T131/17-132/1 os Seynt Jon techip] II John v.11.
T132/2 men of pe Gospel] See Pecock, Repressor i.36/24-5 (cited by Hudson, 'A Lollard Sect Vocabulary', p.168), where Lollards are referred to as 'Bible men whiche holden hem so wise bi the Bible aloone, she, bi the Newe Testament aloon.'

B132/5 and.....iuggement] For this emendation see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in B (1).

B132/6 erroure in] B eyper refers back to the two types of witness (that demanded by God's law and that demanded by man's) but the use of the phrase suche false wytnesse later in the sentence suggests that erroure (see also HTY) is the better reading.

B133/4ff., T133/4ff. See Wyclif, DMD p.205/7 ff. Grosseteste, De Decem Mandatis p.28, section 12. The passage is slightly closer to the former than the latter.

T134/3-4 Y's omission here is due to eyeskip.
B135/1, T135/1 pe fader of falshede] i.e. the Devil, who lied to Eve (Genesis 3), and see also John 8:44.

T135/3-4 And so.....fals witnesse] T eyeskip error, emended in accordance with the HY reading.

B135/6, T135/6 falsest of alle ober lawes] For despisers of God's law (in the context of the argument over endowments), see Matthew pp.2869, especially p. 289.

B136/7ff, T136/6ff. For this topic see Wyclif, De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae ii.1-33.

B137/2, T137/2 by wytnesse of seynt3] See e.g. Augustine, De Mendacio i, c. 21 (PL 40.516): 'Quisquis autem esse aliquod genus mendacii quod peccatum non sit putaverit, decipiet se ipsum turpiter' and similarly Enchinidion c. 22 (PL 40.243), De Doctrina Christiana i, c. 36 (PL 34.34), all cited by Wyclif, De Veritate Sacrae Scripturae ii.13-14. B137/5, T137/5 pat is pe fyrste trewpe] i.e. Christ is the Word of God. B138/lff., T138/1ff. cf. EWS i.402: 'But hit is seyd comunly pat pre pingus ben harde to men: to scorne men meedfully, or medfully plede wip men, or ellis for to fiste wip men by be weye of charyte.'

B138/6, T138/6 God byddep slee men] See e.g. Joshua 8:1-2,18, II Samuel 5:23-5. For Lollard attitudes to warfare see Hudson, $P R$ pp.36770. Wyclif's view in $D M D$ is that wars are permissible in a just cause but he quotes Matthew 5:10 in favour of suffering for the sake of righteousness (p.344).

T139/3 be bedun] For H be don see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (3).

B139/6-7, T139/6-7 batailles ydo nowpe a day] For the effect of the Despenser's Crusade on Wycliffite views on warfare see Introduction p.xcvi; Hudson, $P R$ p. 368.

B139/8-140/1, T139/8-140/1 cf. Arnold iii.138/29-32: 'bot I rede not in Gods lawe pat Cristen men schulden cum byfore in feghting or batel, bot in meke pacience. And pis were po mene whereby we schulden have Gods pees.'

B140/7, T140/7 as pe Salme seyp] Psalm 2:4.
B141/1-143/7 Bot for to knowe.....a3ens py neyzebore] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. $B V V$ p.329/38-331/8. For a possible source for this passage see Wyclif, Sermones i.139-40.

B141/3 in pre maneres] The same three are listed (though without the detail) in Wyclif, Sermones i.138/28-30.

B142/1ff. For a similar argument see Wyclif, Sermones i.138-9.
B142/9 Credo in sanctorum communionem] Article ten of the Apostles' Creed, see BVVp.9.

B144/6, T144/6 pes foure commaundements] i.e. the last two and the closely related sixth and seventh commandments. B144/8, T144/7-8 seyp Poul] I Timothy 6:10.

B144/9-145/13 For as se seep.....wip wrong] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. $B V V \mathrm{p} .332 / 24-39$. Note that in $B V V$ this passage is immediately preceded by the quotation from Paul's letter to Timothy which may therefore have directed B's attention to it. The passage appears in DI as part of the discussion of the tenth commandment. B145/14 Seynt Gregory wytnessep] Gregory, Homiliae in Evangelia ii,
hom. xl (PL 76.1304D), discussing Luke 16:19-31.
T146/1ff. For clerical greed and endowments see notes to T98/6ff., B127/1-2, T127/1-2, T131/5ff. For criticism of mendicants see e.g. SEWW pp.93-96.

T146/11 bi pe lawe of eresie] See Gratian, Decretum ii, C.xxiv, q.iii, c. 32 (Friedberg i.999): 'Qui aliorum errorem defendit multo est dampnabilior illis, qui errant, quia non solum ille errat, sed etiam aliis offendicula preparat erroris et confirmat. Unde quia magister erroris est, non tantum hereticus, sed etiam heresiarcha dicendus est', quoted in the Floretum (f.58r/38-40) under the heading Consensus.

T147/1ff. Church appropriation was the annexation of a benefice by a religious house or institution, typically a monastery or a collegiate church. The appropriating body drew on the income of the living and replaced the parish priest with a less expensive vicar. See Workman ii.95ff., Matthew pp.425-6, Wyclif, De Simonia pp.88-9. Objections to appropriations centred on the fact that they led to increased wealth for monasteries at the expense both of the church buildings and of the parish priest, and that the vicars themselves were often incompetent. Not only Lollards objected to this practice, see e.g. Gascoigne pp.21, 106-15, 198, cited by Workman. For the whole question of the use of vicars (both as replacements for non-resident clergy and in appropriated churches) and for the condemnation of the Pope's approval of such practices as heresy see $D O P$ pp.424-8, a discussion which seems a possible ultimate source for the HTY material.

T147/13 Grosthed] Robert Grosseteste (c.1170-1253), Bishop of Lincoln. For his definition of heresy, see his last words as reported by Matthew Paris (Chronica Majora v.401-2, discussed by Southern (1992),
p.292). In this passage Grosseteste defines heresy as 'choice' ('Haeresis Gracce, electio Latine') and applies this definition to the failure of friars to denounce the sins of the rich and to the practise of papal provisions. Southern suggests that there may also have been a treatise on heresy by Grosseteste which has not survived (Southern (1992), p. 301 n.10, cf. Wyclif, $D C D$ ii.58-9: 'Docet Lyncolniensis in quodam libello speciali istius materie quod heresis est dogma falsum scripture sacre contrarium pertinaciter defensatum.....et istum sensum dicit Lyncolniensis se extraxisse a Grecorum sentenciis; et concordant Latini catholici'). T147/16 pe Gospel seip] Matthew 23:24. B148/7, T148/9 Salomon seyb] Proverbs 30:15 The daughters of the water-leech were seen as types of avarice, in this case two types of avaricious lord, the first secular, the second clerical.

B149/5, T149/5 amercement3/ mercymentis] i.e. fines, in this case by secular lords. For similar criticisms see Matthew, p.233/31-3, Arnold iii. 331 .

B150/2 pey] HTY she gives a more consistent reading. However, the passage is concerned with the covetousness of clerics in the plural and some confusion is therefore natural, in which case the HTY reading may be a correction. As it seems impossible to tell which was the original, the pronouns of this passage have not been emended.

B150/4-7, T150/4-7 And as.....here synne] See T108/2 and note.
BT 151/1 contrarye] HY traytorie may appear to be the more difficult reading. However, as it also seems possible that this reading may have arisen because of a misreading of contrarye with initial abbreviation, the BT reading has not been emended.

B151/1-4, T151/1-4 Bot here.....chef Lord] Compare T123/11ff. and
note. The argument here assigned to the children of the fiend is in fact implicit in T's earlier argument, i.e. T is being inconsistent. The unwillingness to apply strict laws about dominion to secular lords appears to be based on the view that their wealth and power had been assigned to them by God (Matthew p.364). Christ was therefore willing to pay tribute to Caesar even though Caesar was a heathen emperor (Matthew p.230/3-4).

B151/4-7, T151/4-7 For a detailed account of the conflict between John and Innocent III see R.V. Turner, King John (London and New York, 1994), pp.147-74. This conflict concerned the Canterbury succession. John refused to accept the Pope's candidate, Stephen Langton, and forced the monks who had elected him into exile. In 1208 the Pope in turn pronounced an interdict, with the result that John confiscated ecclesiastical property (thus gaining a considerable income). In 1209 John was excommunicated. Trouble at home and the fear of French invasion eventually forced him to come to terms with Innocent in 1213, surrendering his crowns of England and Ireland and putting himself and his realms under apostolic suzerainty. By paying an annual tribute he received the territories back as fiefs. The interdict was finally lifted in 1214.

B151/7 eschete] B eche ser has been emended in accordance with the more technical HTY reading.

B151/7-152/1, T151/7-152/1 For the inability of priests to judge the state of a man's soul see e.g. Wyclif, Sermones ii.138, Matthew p.333/16-18.

B152/8-9, T152/6-7 And.....lordschep] The B/Y version may be considered the less extreme since it puts such removal of secular lordship
firmly in the past. In general Lollards were not in favour of rebellion against secular authority (see Hudson, $P R$ pp.366-7), although Wyclif believed that it was right to withold tribute from a tyrant if by doing so you could end his reign ( $D C D$ i.201)

BT153/2 marke it to here kychen] B's reading, ynarke it to here lykynge, has been emended in accordance with that of HT. B's reading does not make sense, but it is easy to see how marke could have been misread as inarke and hence ynarke. The HT reading has been preferred to that of $Y$ because it is more specific. For clerical gluttony see e.g. Arnold iii.156-8.

B154/4-7, T154/3-7 cf. Wyclif, Sermones i.144/18-21: 'origo tocius nequicie est in mente, nec facit opus extrinsecum ad gravamen criminis, nisi de quanto auxerit culpam mentis'.

B154/7-8, T154/7 Crist.....suche desyre] Matthew 5:28.
T154/8 teche] For H lede see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H(5).

T155/2 priuat religioun] i.e. the new sects, see note to T110/11. T155/9 many men penken] For Lollard use of this expression, see

Hudson, 'A Lollard Sect Vocabulary?', p.171.
T155/15ff. For a similar discussion of the third commandment see Wyclif, Sermones i.106. For affirmative commandments see $D M D$ p. 75 . T155/17 Seynt Jame] James 2:10.

T156/4 shal] See note to T63/5 above.
B161/1-162/9 And in pis word.....menne goedes] Passage corresponding to DI , cf. $B V V \mathrm{p} .331 / 13-332 / 6, \mathrm{p} .332 / 13-22$ (the first passage from the DI discussion of the ninth commandment and the second from the discussion of the tenth).

B161/2 Seynt Austyne] cf. Wyclif, Sermones i.144: 'ubi secundum sentenciam Augustini prohibetur universaliter volucio ad mechandum'. It is not entirely clear which passage from Augustine is referred to here, but see Augustine, Quaestiones in Pentateuchum ii, q.lxxi (PL 34.621).

B162/17 Cryst in pe Gospel] Mark 12:29-33
B163/21 Seynt Bernard seyp] Not found, but see Pseudo-Bernard, Liber de Modo Bene Vivendi c.5. 13 \& 14 (PL 184.1207-8).

B164/13 Seynt Poule seyp] I Corinthians 13:3.
B165/3 Seynt Poule seyb] Romans 13:8.
B165/6-17 And herfore.....in ioye] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. $B V V$ p.333/16-28.

B165/8 Crist seyp] John 14:23.
B165/11-12 in pe Gospel of Seynt Jon] John 13:34, 15:12.

## GLOSSARY

In view of the comparatively late nature of the text, the glossary is not comprehensive i.e. it does not record common words used in their modern senses. This often means that not all forms of a particular word are recorded. Where a word has a wide range of forms and assigning a meaning to each would lead to considerable repetition, the sense is recorded only alongside the first of the forms it glosses. $y$ representing a vowel has been treated as $i ; i$ representing a consonant has been treated as $\dot{j}$, and $u$ and $v$ have been treated as $u$ when representing a vowel and as $v$ when representing a consonant; 3 appears after $g$, and $b$ after $t$. The $y$ prefix of the past participle has been ignored; thus yrad appears under $r$ The following abbreviations have been used: inf. (infinitive), pr. (present), sg. (singular), pl. plural, subj. (subjunctive), imp. (imperative), pr.p. (present participle), pa.t (past tense), pp. (past participle), vbl.n. (verbal noun), v. (verb), adj. (adjective), adv. (adverb), n. (noun), prep. (preposition), pron. (pronoun). *indicates an emended form.
abac, abak adv. back B107/1, T107/1; gon ~ regressed T110/11-12 abyde v. await B5/5; remain B162/21. abydep pr.3sg. awaits B5/4, forbears B77/6,8. abyde pr.subj.sg. B5/19
able $v$. enable B73/8, T73/8
aboute adv. as adj. be $\sim$ be diligent B55/3, T55/3, B79/2
abreched v.pp. diminished B112/6 (see note).
absoluciouns n.pl. indulgences T34/14
acomered v.pp. overwhelmed, defeated B18/13
adoune see put(te $v$.
adradde v.pp. afraid B119/10
affynyte $n$. relationship by marriage B120/16
affirmatyues adj.pl. positive, affirmative T159/5
after, aftir prep. in accordance with, according to B18/7, B37/11,13, B45/18; according to the teachings of B29/10; commensurately with B27/2, B45/13, B49/4, T49/5; do ~ keep B90/15; doep ~ copies B46/4 after, aftir conj. to the degree that, in so far as T160/3; ~ pat B47/12, T47/2
aggregip v.pr.3sg. aggravates T99/3. aggregen pr.p1. T54/8 agreuyd v.pp. troubled B78/18
a3en adv. in return B150/7, T150/6; back B152/1, T152/1 asens prep. against $\mathrm{B} 8 / 16, \mathrm{~B} 10 / 2$; harmful to $\mathrm{B} 12 / 10, \mathrm{~T} 12 / 7$; contrary to T146/7
a3enseyp, azenseip v.pr.3sg. contradicts B134/6, T134/6, B140/7, T140/8
aysy see esy adj.
al(le adj. every B38/10, B83/2, T83/3
al adv. entirely B49/6, T49/7
alday adv. all the time, again and again B18/8, B19/9
algate(s, algatis adv. especially B75/6, T75/6, B88/7, T88/8; in
every respect, altogether B138/2, T138/2
alyen(e, aliene adj. false B7/8, T14/5, B20/7, T20/7, B23/1
alyste $v$. descend B5/1
almes(se n. alms B37/17, B79/17, B152/6, T152/6; ~dedys
benevolent or charitable actions, deeds of mercy B164/20; almys B40/2
aloped pa.t.sg. escaped B17/22 (see note)
also adv. just as B26/16; as B128/12
alto adv. completely B56/18
alperheyzest sup.adj. most high B26/11
alwitty adj. omniscient T96/8
amende v. improve B149/6, T149/6; refl. mend ones ways B56/4.
amende pr.subj.sg. B27/1, B56/5. amende pr.subj.pl. B77/7, B90/11; amend T153/5. amended pp. corrected B56/20
amendement $n$. come to $\sim$ become a good Christian B164/18 amercements n.pl. penalties imposed at the discretion of the court (as distinct from statutory fines) B149/5
amercy v. fine B149/6, T149/6. amerced, amercyed pp. B149/7, T149/7
amys(se adv. wrongfully, sinfully T15/11, B47/2, B143/10; takun ~ misunderstood T98/7
amysbeleued pp.as adj. faithless, idolatrous B29/23
and conj. if B5/4, B29/15,23, B164/2
anentis prep. as regards T70/5; as ~ T80/7, T81/7; anemtys as regards
B70/5, with respect to B111/2
anguyssch $n$. distressing circumstances, hardship B120/3
ano(o)n, anone $a d v$. at once B115/7,15, T129/7; ~ to unto B17/8
answeryng v.pr.p. corresponding B32/1
apayde, apayed v.pp. content, satisfied B145/7, B145/11
ape n. as adj. false, deceptive T34/9
apeyre v.pr.subj.pl. injure (the reputation of) B141/12 ar conj. before B14/4, B16/23, B17/12
arbitrement $n$. liberal $\sim$ free will B17/12
as conj. for example B44/15, B79/15; since T131/11
ascape, askape $v$. escape the notice of B49/3, T49/3
a-se v.imp.sg. consider B10/6
asterte v. escape, avoid T15/11, B47/2, astyrt B17/3
attachement3 n.pl. sequestrations B125/17
auctorite, auctoryte, autorite $n$. authenticity, legal validity
B11/5*, T11/5; permission, authorisation B78/22, B102/2,3, T102/2,3;
by ~ with authoritative support (from Scripture) B41/16.
auenture $n$. chance, misfortune $B 79 / 15, B 89 / 1$
auyse v.refl.imp.sg. resolve B55/1, T55/1
auouteres n.pl. adulterers B42/11,12,15
auoutry(e, auoutrie $n$. adultery B42/9, T114/4, B119/14; auouterye
B44/5; avoutrie T114/11
auter $n$. altar B36/3,4; breed,sacrement of pe $\sim$ the Host T34/7, B35/12-36/1
autorisip v.pr.3sg. gives official sanction to, approves T147/2 autorite see auctorite $n$.
autour n. author T156/5, T160/4; teacher T134/9; auctor B134/9 awake v.imp. keep watch B5/14
awey(e adv. as adj. is $\sim$ is lost $\mathrm{B} 3 / 2, \mathrm{~T} 3 / 2$
axe v. ask B19/16, B29/18; demand B151/7, T151/7. axep, axip pr.3sg. B12/8, T12/5, B24/10, T24/6. axep, axen pr.pl. B132/4, T132/9. axede, axide pa.tsg. B1/3, T1/4. axede, axiden pa.t.pI. B96/9, T96/9, T129/11
bacbyter, bacbiter $n$. slanderer B105/4, T105/5
bailleys, bailies n.pl. bailifs B7/2, T7/3
baly $n$. belly B23/11
barre $n$. bar (in court) B140/6, T140/6
bastard adj. ~ braunches, braunchis wild shoots or suckers B64/1, T64/1
bedes n.pl. prayers B78/20
begetun* v.pp. conceived T122/2
beheste see byhest $n$.
behotep v.pr.3sg. promises B95/9. byhey3te pa.t.sg. B19/23
benefytes, benefytz n.pl. favours B20/4; friendly behaviour B120/17, benefetes B20/1
benygne, benigne adj. generous, merciful B16/2,5
beo v. be B1/2,6,9. bep, ben pr.pl. B2/7,8, T2/7,8; beop B6/3, B8/20; be B21/9. be pr.subj.sg. B15/2, B23/14, T52/2; beo

B5/4,17, B8/11. be pr.subj.pl. T3/2, B35/16, B37/4; beo B3/2
bere $v . \sim v p$ support T64/7. berep pr.pl. B64/7
berynge vbl.n. behaviour B27/5,6
bescherewe $v$. curse, speak ill of B93/2
best(c, beest $n$. beast, animal B8/7, B67/4, T67/4, bestes pl.
B27/18, B28/25, B29/16
bette comp.adj. better T136/8
bepenke see bipenke $v$.
by, bi prep. for B47/4; per B151/5, T151/5
bydde, bidde $v$. command B6/4, T6/3; pray B79/9. byddep, biddip, byddyth, byddeth pr.3sg. B3/6, T3/6, B11/8, B91/5. byt, bid
pr.3sg. B1/9, T1/10. bad pa.t.sg. B1/4, T1/5. badde pa.t.subj.sg. T152/8. y)bede, bedun, beden pp. B3/3, T3/3, B87/7, T99/8 byddynges, biddyngis n.p1. commandments $\mathrm{B} 1 / 1, \mathrm{~T} 1 / 2, \mathrm{~T} 2 / 4$ bye, bi(e v. obtain, secure B140/1, T140/1; pay for, atone for B152/5, T152/5. bouste pa.t.sg. redeemed B36/2 bygyle $v$. deceive, dupe B27/20, B128/6. begylep, bigilip* pr.3sg. B106/5, T106/5
byheyste see behotep $v$. byhest, beheste n. promise, pledge B90/19; londe of $\sim$ Promised Land B91/10. bihestis pl. commandments T3/6 byleue, bileue $n$. (Christian) faith, Creed B $2 / 1, \mathrm{~T} 2 / 1$; belief B139/1, T139/1; doctrine B91/11; beleue B3/10, B48/9 bynde $v$. obligate T80/15; fetter, chain T153/5. byndep, byndip pr.3sg. B68/4, T68/4. bynden pr.pl. T159/3,5,6. bynde pr.subj.pl. B17/2. ybounde pp. B22/6; bunden obliged T80/9 byneme $\boldsymbol{v}$. deprive of B120/13 byreue $\boldsymbol{v}$. deprive of B141/5,9, B143/2
bysy adj. diligent B5/17, B62/4, B125/14; devoted B37/16. bisiest sup. T62/4
bysye, bisie v.refl. occupy self B79/12-13, B82/1, T82/4. bysyeb ${ }^{*}$, bisiep pr.3sg. B150/3, T150/3. bysy pr.subj.pl. B76/9. bysy imp.sg. bestir self B79/1
bysyliche, bisily adv. diligently $\mathrm{B} 1 / 10, \mathrm{~T} 1 / 11$. bysyloker comp. B19/11, B33/3
bytyme adv. in good time, early enough B27/1
bitokene $v$. symbolize T72/2. bitokenep, bytokeneb pr.3sg. T20/1, B47/3. bytoknyng(e pr.p. presaging B31/10; representing B36/13.
betokened pp. symbolized B18/17
bitwixe prep. between T155/11
bipenke, bypenke, bepenke v.refl.imp.sg. remember B68/1, T68/1;
consider B78/13
blabrest, blaberist v.pr.2sg. talk foolishly B59/4, T59/4.
blabere pr.subj.sg. T26/5
blame v. censure B91/21. blame(n pr.pl. B74/9, T74/9. blame imp.sg. T122/3
blasfemes n.pl. blasphemers T130/6
blemeschep, blemyshen v.pr.pl. dishonour B69/3, T69/7, T146/12
blissid pp. in glory, revered T136/4
bode v.pp. commanded B66/6
boldlyche adv. arrogantly, blasphemously B56/13
boner adj. kind B19/25
boolde adj. sturdy B5/8
bot, but conj. unless B3/2, B56/4, B90/10; except B81/4; ~if,yf unless $\mathrm{B} 1 / 8, \mathrm{~T} 1 / 9$; quasi prep. other than $\mathrm{B} 6 / 4, \mathrm{~T} 6 / 3$; except for B54/3, T54/3; quasi adv. only B37/7, B121/11, B137/3, T137/3
bope adj. as well T146/11
boundes n.pl. land, territory B165/20
bowe v. turn aside B3/7, T3/6
brenne $v$. burn T109/6, B164/14. brennynge pr.p. fervent B91/13, B115/2. brend, brent pp. burnt B118/5, T118/5, T129/5,7
bryges n.pl. disputes B145/2
bryngep, bryngip v.pr.3sg. ~in draws in, through B15/4, B52/3, T52/3. brynge imp.pl. $\sim$ for $p$ bring up B90/21. brou3t pa.tsg. $\sim$ forth brought up B86/5, T86/5; ~ ynne introduced T110/13
brystyl, bristel $n$. needle made of bristle B15/4, B52/3, T52/3
bulle $n$. edict T147/12. bullis n.pl. indulgences T34/14; official papal documents,edicts T147/10
but see bot conj.
caas n. circumstance B128/8, B163/18; instance, dispute in law T155/10; in ~in the event that B88/10. casis pl. T149/8
callyng vbl.n. command T110/6
camen see comep $v$.
casten v.pr.pl.refl. $\sim$ hem set themselves $\mathrm{T} 110 / 10$; cast $p$ p. determined, plotted T65/8
catel n. property, worldly goods B25/7, B89/3,
causis n.pl. (legal) cases B149/8
cautel(e $n$. trick, deceit B128/13; as adj. deceptive B44/15
censures, sensures n.pl. judgements, sentences B2/8, T2/8.
certis, certes adv. certainly T34/9, B93/3, T110/7
chaffaryng vbl.n. business affairs or dealings B28/10
chalengep, chalengip v.pr.3sg. claims B62/7, T62/7
charge $n$. burden B11/10, T11/9, B64/2, T64/2
charge $v$. for to $\sim$ blameworthy T114/9. chargep, chargip pr.3sg.
values $B 83 / 3, T 83 / 4$. chargep pr.pl. instruct B92/6. charge
imp.sg. attach importance to T81/9. chargid, charged $p p$. packed
T15/1, B46/13; censured T108/8
chastesep v.pr.3sg. disciplines B46/16
chastement $n$. discipline B45/10
chastep v.pr.3sg. disciplines B45/18. chastep reprimand pr.pl.
B93/13
chasty v. reprimand B91/21
chastyng(e vbl.n. (proper) training, discipline B91/1,6, B92/1 cheffare $n$. trade B128/10 chynches n.pl. misers B25/10
clene adj. pure, guiltless, innocent B8/22, B39/14, T65/5; excellent T121/5; complete B152/6
clenly adv. completely, thoroughly T33/9
clennesse $n$. purity B83/3, T83/4, B117/5
clepep, clepip v.pr.3sg. calls B43/2, T51/7. clepep, clepeth, clepen pr.pl. B49/9, T49/9, B139/8. clepe imp.sg. B79/18.
(y)cleped, clepid, (y)clepyd pp. B14/6, B47/10, T69/5, B76/14
clerk(e n. scholar, master B15/7, B31/1, B32/12; member of the clergy B27/21. clerkis, clerkys, clerkes pl. T30/11, B62/2, T62/2,3
colour $n$. argument B151/4, T151/4
comenynge see commune $\mathbf{v}$.
comep v.pr.3sg.ind. ~of comes from B53/5; originates with B137/3, T137/3. camen pa.t.pl. $\sim$ yn came about T110/6
commune v. communicate B59/2, T59/2; comene B9/20; commeny participate B45/12. commencp, communep pr.pl. B45/10,14; ~ togedere share with one another B142/13,14. comenynge* pr.p. communicating B9/7
commune adj. usual, general B91/15, B92/10; comyn T98/10 comoun shared T146/16
communes, comyns n.pl. the common people B107/10, T107/10 communynge vbl.n. fellowship, community B142/10
compunccioun n. compassion B35/15; contrition B36/6
conferme v. endorse T100/6
conseyle v.pr.1sg. advise B145/5. conseilep, conseylep, conseilip pr.3sg. B10/4, B106/2, T106/2
conseil(1)e, conseyle $n$. advice B5/7, B37/11, B38/5. conseyles pl. instructions B95/5
concense $n$. acquiescence in or tacit encouragement of (sin) T106/6
yconstrayned v.pp. pressed B89/21
conteyncp v.pr.pl. continue, carry on with B18/2
contraryep, contrariep v.pr.3sg. contradicts T129/8,17; offends B137/6, T137/6
contrarious adj. ~to at variance with B111/4; contrary to T127/6
conuersacioun $n$. manner of living, conduct $B 44 / 10$
correcciouns n.pl. punishments B94/8. B150/6, T150/5
costelewe adj. costly B83/1
costeb v.pr.pl. spend B92/20
coueytise, coueityse, coueytyse $n$. covetousness $\mathrm{B} 25 / 12, \mathrm{~T} 25 / 1, \mathrm{~T} 33 / 6$, B115/3
couent $n$. company T100/18
craft(e $n$. art B29/5, B136/9, T136/8; affair T130/12; activity
B138/2, T138/2. craftes, craftys pl. arts, devices B27/17;
skills, branches of learning B92/18; activities B138/1, T138/1
creature $n$. created person or thing $B 44 / 3, \mathrm{~B} 86 / 9, \mathrm{~T} 86 / 9$; creation
T122/11. creatures, creaturis pl. B50/1, T122/11, B134/3
crokede adj. crippled B79/19
cullep v.pr.pl. kill B93/19
cure $n$. spiritual responsiblity B93/15, B94/15,21
cursed v.pp. excommunicated B27/22
curtesye, curtesie $n$. kindness B75/5, T75/5, B76/5
day n.as adj. ~peues those who steal in the daytime, robbers, bandits B126/3, T126/5, B127/3, T127/3
daye(b see deye $v$.
dalyance $n$. conversation B10/5
debate $n$. at $\sim$ in conflict B79/4. debates pl. quarrels, strife,
conflict B144/9, B145/2
declare v.pr.subj.sg. proclaim T155/5
dede $n$. in ~ actively T155/10
dedlyche adj. mortal, human B136/3
dedlyche adv. mortally B115/7,9
defaut(e $n$. lack B42/7, B106/9, T106/9; error T130/13. defautis pl. sins T131/12
defendep, defendip v.pr.3sg. makes excuses for, speaks in support of B106/2, T106/2. defendid pp. forbidden T146/7, 147/11
defouly v. defile, have sexual intercourse with, seduce B120/14. defoulcb pr.pl. pollute B37/21
defoylide v.pa.t.subj.sg. dirtied B99/14
degre(e n. manner, type T109/2; rank B164/8. degrees pl. ways T157/1
deye $v$. die B4/12, B5/3, B90/5. dayep pr.pl. B29/12. daye pr.subj.sg. B120/9
delectacioun $n$. desire B43/15; pleasure in contemplating sin
B115/4,11; pleasure B116/5,8
deme $v$. judge B5/1, B77/9
departe $v$. separate self T122/8. departep pr.pl. separate
B115/13. departed v.pp. divided B7/4; separated B84/6
departyng vbl.n. sharing T131/6
depe adj. grievous T34/10, B77/5, T147/1. deppest sup. deepest B26/13 deply adv. grievously T146/8
derk(e adj. wicked, evil B126/8, T127/1
derkep, darken v.pr.pl. are in darkness B126/6, T126/8
despense, dispense $n$. expenditure B62/4, T62/3
despyseb, dispisip v.pr.3sg. treats with contempt B56/12, B89/21,
T99/13. despysep pr.pl. B94/6* ${ }^{*}$, dispise pr.subj.pl.
T99/12, despysed pp. B56/3
despyte, dispijt $n$. contempt, defiance B76/16, B91/22; harm
T99/11
destynees n.pl. predictions of a person's fate B29/3
dignytees n.pl. excellent qualities, attributes B38/14, B39/1
dyrere comp.adv. more dearly, for more money B128/10
dysayse, dysaise $n$. hardship, misfortune, tribulation B33/7,
B41/3; desayse B41/5; dyseyse B45/12
discrecioun $n$. moral discernment or judgement B19/10, B75/9, T75/9
discret(e adj. prudent, morally disceming B55/1, T55/1
dysherted, disheritid v.pp. disinherited B132/7, T132/12
dysmale adj. unlucky B27/25
dysplesance $n$. displeasure B37/21
dyuynaciouns n.pl. the art of foretelling the future B29/3
dome, doom $n$. judgement B4/12, B55/14, T100/8. domes day day of judgement B77/22. domes pl. laws, commandments B19/17
dorste v.pa.t.sg. dared B56/13; dorste pa.t.subj.pl. B162/6
doueres n.pl. life interest of spouse in husband's property,
dower B42/3
douster $n$. daughter B8/6, T67/4. dousteres, doustris pl. B148/8.
T148/9
doute $\boldsymbol{v}$. be uncertain B70/1, T70/1. douten pr.pl. T155/15.
doute(d pp. considered uncertain B138/7, T138/7
dowid, dowed v.pp. endowed T131/7, T146/4
draw(e v. pull B74/7, T74/7; pull in harness T98/12; lead
B142/19. drawep pr.3sg. brings B21/3, T21/4; leads B163/7; ~ out of derives from T147/13. drawe pr.subj.pl. tear, pull apart

B56/18. drawe(n pp. ~ awey pulled up B144/6, T144/6
drede $n$. it is no $\sim$ unquestionably, without doubt B134/9, T134/9
dritt $n$. dung, dirt B99/14
dude v.pa.t.subj.sg. did B128/8. doo, don pp. placed B47/16, T47/6
dure $v$. last B90/10
cende $n$. taile $\sim$ pudendum T23/4
endelyche, eendely adv. greatly B33/6, T33/3
Egypcians adj.pl. unlucky B27/24 (see note)
egrey v.refl.imp.sg. arouse self B38/2
еузе sее узе $n$.
eyris n.pl. heirs T132/13
eke adv. also B33/1, B60/1, T60/1
elde n. age T156/16
elde adj. ~ fader grandfather B85/7-8, T85/7; ~ moder grandmother B85/8, T85/7
eld(e)res, eldris n.pl. forefathers B85/2,8, T85/1,8; ~in soule spiritual fathers, priests T100/1-2
elles, ellis adv. otherwise B29/13, T33/2. B54/3
enchauntements n.pl. acts of magic or witchcraft B27/13, B29/3
enchauntyng vbl.n. magic properties B28/4
enchewe $v$. eschew B111/5
enhaunce $v$. raise up, exalt B26/9
eny adj. any $\mathrm{B} 2 / 2, \mathrm{~B} 8 / 19, \mathrm{~B} 21 / 5$; ony $\mathrm{T} 2 / 2, \mathrm{~T} 21 / 6,8$
ensample $n$. example B92/3,9, B93/4. ensamples n.pl. passages of scripture used to teach a lesson B138/9
entent(e $n$. spiritual attitude B9/1; aim, wish B28/17, B115/14
entyred v.pa.t.pl. decorated, decked out B32/2
enuemned v.pp. poisoned, corrupted B31/13
enuyouslyche adv. in a spirit of enmity B112/16, B141/12
erbere $\boldsymbol{n}$. garden T109/11
erbis n.pl. medicinal plants T109/11,13,14
ernesses n.pl. foretastes B42/2
erre v. $\sin \mathrm{T} 34 / 1 ; \sim$ in $\sin$ against T34/14. errep pr.3sg. strays
B33/4. errep pr.pl. B29/13. errynge pr.p. B29/7
errour(e $n$. deviation from the truth $\mathrm{T} 132 / 11$; of $\sim$ sinful, unsound $B 7 / 3, T 7 / 3$. errours $p l$. false or heretical beliefs or practices T34/10, T100/2, errores B47/14
eschete $n$. escheat, confiscation of land $\mathrm{B} 151 / 7^{*}, \mathrm{~T} 151 / 7$ (see note)
eschewe adj. loath, disinclined T31/2
esy adj. restrained, peaceable B57/3; aysy gentle B91/3
euene adj. perpendicular, upright B64/1, T64/1; ~ Cristene fellow Christian B79/6, B111/2, B112/15
euen(e adv. exactly B49/4, T49/5, T129/15; ~ after in exact accordance with B27/2; ~ wip as much as B44/3
cuenelyche $a d v$. equally B163/9
euydence $n$. into pis $\sim$ as an indication of this B32/7
execut(e pp. carried out B2/7, T2/7, B90/8
exponyng vbl.n. expounding B31/1
expounnep v.pr.3sg. expounds B79/18
fagen v.pr.pl. flatter, deceive with false praise T109/17
fayl(1)e, faile $v$. be absent B50/1, T50/1; be lacking B50/2,
T50/2; err T98/2. failip pr.3sg. fails T105/6; lacks T124/10, feylep B105/5.
faynep see feynep $v$.
fayre, faire adj. morally good B39/14; kindly B91/3; excellent T99/8
falle $v$. happen B64/9, T64/9. fallep, fallib pr.3sg. T98/4, $\mathrm{T} 130 / 15, \mathrm{~B} 154 / 6 ; \sim$ to haue is allotted to B125/6. fallep, fallen pr.pl. $\sim$ in pertain to $\mathrm{B} 47 / 15, \mathrm{~T} 47 / 4$. fel pa.t.sg. sinned B151/6, T151/6
falsenesse $n$. that which is contrary to truth, vanity B46/4
fals(e)lych(e) adv. wickedly, wrongly B24/13, B142/6,20;
fals(e)ly T24/7, T128/4. falslier comp. more falsely T59/4, T62/6; falsloker B59/4; falsoker B62/6
fame n . good character B55/5*, T55/4; good reputation B112/9, B141/6,10
fangynge vbl.n. receiving B28/9
faste adv. instantly T129/17; ~ aboute diligent B6/3, T6/2
faute $n$. lack B45/10
feylep see fayl(l)e $\boldsymbol{v}$.
feylynge vbl.n. touching, handling B116/9
feynep v.pr.3sg. pretends B127/2, T127/2. feynep, feynen pr.pl. B63/8, T63/7; ~ vpon invent concerning T126/8; faynep ~ on invent concerning B126/6
felawe, felowe $n$. spouse, companion B113/5,8, T113/6,8, B116/8
fele adj. many B75/1
fend(e $n$. Satan, the Devil T6/2, B27/9,19. fendes, fendis pl. devils B6/3, T122/7,11
fer adj. far T50/3, B77/16; distant T85/7. ferre comp. B50/3.
ferrest sup. B62/4, T62/4
fer(e adv. far B118/1*, T118/1*, B132/6, T132/11
feruentloker comp.adv. more ardently B38/8
fygure, figure $\boldsymbol{n}$. symbol B70/4,5,9, T70/4,5,9
fygurep, figurip v.pr.3sg. symbolizes B70/7, T70/7
fykelynges vbl.n.pl. blandishments B116/5
flesch(e)lyche adj. bodily, carnal B22/9, B75/4, B163/7; ~
dede sexual intercourse B161/15; fleslyche plump B23/11;
flesclyche bodily, carnal B25/2; fleisli T75/4
fleschlyche adv. carnally B163/7
foly adj. sinful B27/19, T98/2
folyes, folies n.pl. foolish acts, sins B9/22, T100/3
folyes adj. foolish B118/7
folily adv. wickedly, sinfully T33/4
fonde v.pa.t.sg. found B120/3. founde(n pp. devised B150/8,
T150/8; foundoun encountered, met with T156/4
for conj. in order that B4/9, B7/3, T7/4; because B35/19; ~ pat because B35/19
forbedeb, forbedip v.pr.3sg. forbids B97/5, T97/5, B117/7.
forbedde pr.subj.sg. T147/14. forbode pp. B21/5, B22/20, B27/15; forbeden T99/9; forbedun T154/1,3,4
forbedyng(e vbl.n. prohibition B152/4, T152/4
forbode n. prohibition B31/8
fordo v. put a stop to T100/3; discard, invalidate T147/8
forfendep, forfendip v.pr.3sg. forbids B87/8, T87/9, B88/4, T88/4. forfendid, forfended $p p$. T30/12, B48/2, T48/2
forfete $v$. transgress, $\sin$ B153/4, T153/4
forsetynge vbl.n. disregard B145/4
fo(o)rme $n$. the archetype of a thing as it exists in the mind of God, the essence of a thing B51/3,4,5, T51/3,4,5
forte adv.and particle in order to B33/3
foul(e adj. evil, wicked B23/11, T23/3, B78/13. fowler comp. more
sinful, more vile B27/7
foulep, foulip $v . p r .3 s g$. defouls B114/1, T114/2. foulep, foulip
pr.pl. B113/7, T113/8
fraudys n.pl. dishonest acts B44/16
fre adj. generous, abundant B17/21
freris n.pl. friars T3/6, T101/12, T108/12
freslyche, fresliche adv. clearly B9/5, B9/17; freschliche B7/4.
freishlier comp. T7/4
fuylip v.pr.3sg. defiles T99/13
ful adj. complete, perfect B38/10
ful adv. very T132/11, B133/2, T133/2; completely B144/7
gabben v.pr.pl. lie T101/12
gentyles n.pl. members of the nobility B9/4
getep v.pr.pl. beget B44/5,8,12. gate pa.t.sg. B85/6, T85/6.
ygete pp. B38/15, B89/20; obtained B145/8
getyng, geetynge vbl.n. begetting T121/14; acquiring B128/5
gyles, giles n.pl. lies, deceit B82/6, T82/7
gynnes n.pl. tricks T66/4
goed(e $n$. goodness, virtue B32/18; benefit B41/9, B112/12;
property, goods B123/7, B125/15; good people B142/13. goedes pl. B25/16, B42/14, B44/17
goed(e adj. good B4/8, B6/2, B11/7; virtuous B9/1
goednesses n.pl. kindnesses, favours B19/8
gosseprede $n$. spiritual kinship brought about by sponsership at baptism or confirmation B120/16
gostlych(e adj. spiritual B6/2, B42/11,15; ~ fadres priests
B89/11; goostli, go(o)stly T6/1, T82/6, B94/14
gostlyche adv. spiritually B88/8, B163/6; goostly T88/8
gop v.pr.3sg. ~ forp proceeds B38/16
gouernayle n. rule, protective guidance, guardianship B94/16
gracious(e adj. caused by God's grace, kindly B104/2, T104/5 graciousliche adv. mercifully B19/7
graue v. carve, sculpt B31/4. graue(n, ygraue pp. B7/9, T14/6, B36/13
graues n.pl. carved works, statues B31/10
grauntep, grauntip v.pr.3sg. consents to B133/6, T133/6
gredel n. gridiron B36/13, B36/14
greggep v.pr.pl. aggravate B54/8
grete, greet adj. important B44/16; swollen with importance B149/9, T149/9
greuous(e adj. deadly B27/19; serious B116/21
grypynge vbl.n. holding, embracing B116/2 gryslyche adj. horrible, dreadful B56/18 groped, gropid v.pp. touched B68/2, T68/3
gropclyche, gropeli adj. that can be touched B48/6, T48/6
gros(se adj. coarse B48/7, T48/7
ground(e n. foundation B18/16, B64/5, T64/5; basic facts B107/2, T107/2
grounde $v$. find a basis for T110/6, T129/16; justify themselves by showing T110/13; justify T147/9. grounded, groundid pp. learned, rooted B12/11, T12/8; ~ in based on T131/13, B153/1
grucchen v.pr.pl. complain T157/4. grucche pr.subj.sg. ~a3en complains, grumbles T124/3 3e, she adv. indeed B10/9, T10/1, B105/3, T105/4

3eftes n.pl. gifts B141/7
selde $v$. render B145/13. 3ylde imp.sg. B32/14
зег(e, зeer n. year B28/4, B151/6, T151/5. зeres pl. B5/10
serde $n$. stick or rod used for punishment T15/5, B46/16 3if, if , yf conj. if B2/7, T2/6, B13/6, T53/1, T65/10; al(le ~although B86/1, T98/2; even if T124/3

3it(e, sitt adv. yet B21/1, T21/1, B45/3
syue $v$. give $\mathrm{B} 3 / 5, \mathrm{~T} 3 / 5, \mathrm{~B} 28 / 14$; зeue $\mathrm{B} 3 / 9, \mathrm{~B} 8 / 12$, $\mathrm{B} 85 / 4$. зeuep, зуucp pr.3sg. B5/6, B26/2, T26/2. зyue pr.subj.sg. T100/10. зyf imp.sg. B37/12. syue imp.pl B40/4,7. 3af pa.t.sg. B10/12, T10/4. 3af pa.t.subj.pl. B153/1, T153/1. 3yue(n pp. T4/3, B62/2, T65/4;

зeue B4/3, B151/9; 3ouen T62/2, T99/7, T159/16
3yuyng vbl.n. giving T108/4
30k(e n. yoke B11/10, T11/9, T98/12
song adj. young T156/13, T158/3
half $n$. behalf $\mathrm{B} 133 / 6, \mathrm{~T} 133 / 7$
halyday, haliday $n$. day consecrated to religous observance e.g.
Sunday B66/5, T66/7,9; holyday B76/13. halydayes, halidaies pl. B77/3, B80/1, T80/2; holydayes B76/15
halpeny $n$. halfpenny B145/10
hal(e)we $v$. hallow, sanctify B66/7, T66/9, B69/2. hal(e)wep, halewen pr.pl. B68/2, B69/3, T69/7
han see haue $v$.
hansel n. something given as a token of good luck, a New Year's gift B28/4,5,7
hard(e adj. severe B56/1, B91/14; harsh B56/21. hardere comp. B90/10
hardylyche adv. with confidence B165/6
harlatry(e $n$. obscene behaviour, sexual immorality B92/17, B94/7
hate $n$. wrath B58/7, T58/7
haue v. consider B50/10, T50/10; ~ him behave B111/2. han pr.pl. have T80/5. T86/5
haunte $v$. stir, rouse B33/2
he pron. she B149/9
he(e)d, hede adj. capital, dcadly B21/3, T21/3, T57/2, B58/1
hederys, hederis n.pl. executioners B103/6, T103/6
hedly adj. capital, deadly T121/2
heggyng vbl.n. enticement T121/11
hey see by pron.
hey n. yard B77/16
hey, heyse adj. great B46/19, B56/10; virtuous B76/3; honourable

B117/1; hise T58/8, T76/4. heyзest sup. B62/3; hisest T62/3
heile $v$. shelter, protect T132/1. heilip pr.3sg.T132/1
heynesse, hiзnesse $n$. honour, power B97/1, T97/1; ~ of hemself self-importance B26/6
hele $n$. health B150/9, T150/9, B163/8
hem pron. them B2/8, T2/8; refl. themselves B22/15, B37/5, T54/5
hemself refl.pron. themselves B16/14, B21/8, B37/4; hemsilf T21/5
hende adj. gracious, merciful, loving B12/6, T12/3
hendy adj. gracious B16/2
herborowe $v$. give shelter to T129/10
herbourgh $n$. lodgings, shelter B40/6
herde $\boldsymbol{n}$. shepherd B126/4, T126/6. herdes, herdis pl. B126/4, T126/6
her(e pron. their B7/14, B33/4, T34/1, B36/23
yhered v.pp. hired B141/6
her(e)for(e adv. therefore B21/11 ${ }^{*}$, T21/9, B48/3, T48/2
hery(e v. worship, show reverence towards B7/12, B20/10, B32/10
herynge, heriyng vbl.n. worshipping, praise B72/8, T72/9
herytage, heritage $n$. inheritance B141/8, B165/8
hertelyche adv. eamestly B78/4,12
heste, heest $\boldsymbol{n}$. commandment B9/15, T21/4. hestes, he(e)stis pl. B3/6, B4/8, T4/8
hete n. enthusiasm B35/15; ardour B154/3, T154/3
hetip see hotep $v$.
heuy adj. burdensome B12/3
by pron. they B9/13, B24/1, B37/6, hey B29/8
hye v.pr.subj.pl, be diligent B12/1. hyynge pr.p. cager to B115/3
hyere, hyre $v$. hear B56/11; listen to B89/21; hyre imp.sg. B9/1, hurynge pr.p. hearing of B90/6
hisen v. pr.pl. esteem, honour T66/1
him pron. it B22/4; refl.pron. himself T75/6, B134/6, T134/6 hyryng vbl.n. listening B9/16
his pron. its T147/5
holdest v.pr.2sg. $\sim$ pe conduct yourself B27/5,6. holdeb, holdip pr.3sg. considers B40/11,12, T156/15; ~ him in a mene behaves in manner midway between B136/10, T137/1; ~wip sides with B135/1, T135/1. holde pr.subj.pl. B145/7. yholde, holde(n pp. obliged B9/15, T15/10, B47/1; considered B55/1, T55/1;
kept, detained B94/3; constrained T157/12
holpe v.pp. helped B33/6
homely adj.as n. members of family, household B93/16
honde $n$. hand B7/9, B17/8. hondis, hondes pl. T14/6, B35/6; hond T153/5
horpe $n$. filth, defilement B17/22. horpes pl. B37/20
hotep v.pr.3sg. commands, bids B19/15, B22/20; hetip promises
T95/2. yhote pp. B19/17, B32/14
humyl, humel adj. humble B27/3, B27/8, B39/14
hure pron. her B115/15,16
ydel n. yn,an ~ in vain B8/2, B66/2
ydel(e adj. worthless, idle B63/6, T63/6, B64/6, T64/6
if,yf see $\mathbf{3 i f}$ conj.
yзe n. eye T34/8; at ~ clearly, with ones own eyes T84/8; eyze
B84/8. yзen pl. T34/8
ylle adv. sinfully B33/1, B33/4
ymagynaciouns n.pl. falsehoods, fabrications B44/15
in prep. on, concerning B10/5; to the B92/22; against B135/4, T135/4
incantaciouns n.pl. sorcery, charms B27/14
informacioun $n$. instruction, teaching B9/18
iniuryes, iniuries n.pl. injustices, insults B140/1, T140/1
ynow $n$. enough T80/9, T156/6
ynow adv. enough B4/7, T4/7, B6/1
ynowe adj. sufficient B56/17
ynrennep v.pr.pl. (will) incur B29/8
into prep. ~pis euydence as an indication of this B32/7; ~ wytnessse as evidence B42/2-3
ypocrisy(e, ypocrisie $n$. trickery, hypocrisy B63/2, T63/2, B65/1
irregularite $n$. violation of the laws of the Church
T108/7,10
irreguler adj. unfit to perform clerical or priestly duties, violating the laws of the Church T108/6,9
yscomfyted v.pp. defeated B18/13
yse $\boldsymbol{v}$. see B13/7
yuel(e adv. poorly B118/10, T118/8
ywete. ywyte see wyte $v$.
iangle v. chatter, gossip B77/14
iape $v$. bchave foolishly, tell jokes B77/15
iapyng vbl.n. joking, foolery T110/9
iapis n.pl. folies T110/16
jestes n.pl. tales B92/16
iewesse $n$. judicial punishment T131/3
iolyte n. revelry B92/17
iorney n. undertaking B28/2
kalendys $n$. first day (of month) B28/2
kendenesse friendliness, benevolence B120/17
kepe $n$. heed, notice B9/4, B37/19
kepe $v$. observe, celebrate $\mathrm{B} 28 / 19, \mathrm{~T} 80 / 10, \mathrm{~T} 81 / 1$. kepep, kepip
pr.3sg. protects B86/8, T86/8. kepep, kepen pr.pl. observe
B69/5, T69/8; maintain T121/9. kepe pr.subj.sg. B140/3, T140/3
kyn suff. $\operatorname{kind}(\mathrm{s})$ of $\mathrm{T} 21 / 2, \mathrm{~T} 49 / 10, \mathrm{~B} 50 / 2, \mathrm{~T} 50 / 2$; kenne $\mathrm{B} 49 / 9$
kynd(e $n$. nature B61/4, T69/7, B86/3, T86/3; heart T99/2; carnal nature, natural instincts B117/13,14, T117/2; by weye of $\sim$ in accordance with ones nature B111/8; in his $\sim$ by definition T147/5; of ~ by their nature B85/5, T85/5; kende nature B69/4 kynd(e)ly, kyndelyche adv. naturally T15/5, B46/17, B59/3, T59/3; innately T134/8; kendelyche B134/7
kyngdom $n$ kingship B17/13,14
kynnes suff. sorts of B21/2, T124/6
kynreden(e $n$. generation (of descendents) B45/7, B46/10; blood relationship B120/15. kynredenys, kynredenes pl. generations B7/16, B41/14, kynredis T14/11
kitte $v$. cut T109/13
knowelechep v.pr.3sg. professes B19/3. knowlechynge pres.part. acknowledging, confessing B17/20
knowelcchynge vbl.n. acknowledgement, confession B78/17, B152/7
kunne v. learn, be informed about B12/5, T12/2, T157/15; know
B84/1, T84/1; conne B10/7. kunne pr.pl. are able to B46/13; connep, cunnep ~no letterure are illiterate B9/8, B35/9. kunne pr.subj.sg. have the capability,skill B89/4,5. cunnynge pr.p.

B16/8. kunned pp. T2/4
kunnyng(e vbl.n. competence B78/22; knowledge, understanding T156/16
lad(de v.pp. guided, steered B17/4; led B46/17.
large adj. comprehensive, wide-ranging B58/2, T58/2
lasse, lesse comp.adj. lesser B148/6, T148/7
laste v. continue T108/2, go on living T109/15; leste last B57/8
late v.imp.sg. let T96/7
late adv. recently B35/2
lausom, lawesom adj. lawful, permissible B22/6, B31/15;
legitimate B28/22, B44/8
leche $n$. physician (healing the soul) B154/7, T154/7
leches n.pl. leeches B151/9, T151/9
lefful adj. lawful, permissible, legitimate B53/10, B74/7,9.
le(e)ueful T30/11, T34/4,10, T74/7
leffullyche, leuefully adv. lawfully, legitimately B60/4, T60/4
lerid ppl.adj. lettered, educated T33/5
le(e)se $\boldsymbol{v}$. destroy T129/14, B143/1
lesyng(e, leesyng vbl.n. ${ }^{1}$ lie B54/8, T54/8, T137/5. lesynges,
lesyngis pl. B44/16, T108/15, B137/7
lesyng(e, leesyng vbl.n. ${ }^{2}$ loss B151/2, T151/2
leste adj.sup. ${ }^{1}$ last B145/9
leste adj.sup. ${ }^{2}$ least B40/10, B161/9
lette $\mathbf{v}$. forbear B42/18; prevent T109/10. lettip pr.3sg. T159/17.
lettep, letten pr.pl. B13/7, T13/7, B64/4. lette pr.subj.sg.
T158/6. let imp.sg. B35/13. lettynge pr.p. B163/13. let(te pp.
B112/6, B115/8
letterure $n$. letters, learning B9/8, B35/9 (see kunne v.)
le(e)ue n. permission, authority B70/1, T70/1, B123/7, T123/11
le(e)ue $v_{.}{ }^{1}$ abandon T34/13; desist from B56/14; omit, fail to carry out T122/14; renounce B133/3, T133/3, T155/2. le(e)uep pr.3sg. B26/3, T26/3; lecuen pr.pl. cease T108/3; leuep abandon B150/2. leue pr.subj.pl. B62/5, leue imp.pl. B57/17. left(e pp. T33/9, B76/3, T76/4; set aside T110/16; disregarded T139/5
leue $v^{2}{ }^{2}$ live B45/8
leue adj. dear B35/2
le(e)ueful see lefful adj.
leuefully see leffullyche $a d v$.
lewed adj. uneducated, unlettered B9/8, T33/5
liberal adj. free B17/12
liche, lyche adj. ~ to equal to B26/11; like B39/19,20; a member of the same species as B111/7
lyckle adj. likely B139/6
lyst(e $n$. light B16/8, B78/2
lyst(e, list adj. easy to bear, perform B4/2, T4/2, B6/5, T6/3, B11/10
lyste v. enlighten B33/1
lystlyche, lystliche, listly adv. easily B10/7, B11/9, T11/8; listlier* comp. T104/2
lijf $n$. life T1/11, T22/2, T48/6; lyue B41/9,21, B77/20
likip, lykep v.pr.3sg. delights, takes pleasure in $\mathrm{T} 110 / 8$;
impers. pleases B111/11,12
lykynge vbl.n. pleasure B16/19, B25/10; lykynge* sexual pleasure
B117/7. lykynges pl. enjoyment B22/15
lymyte $v$. assign B63/8, T63/8. lymytep, lymytip pr.3sg. specifies

B54/5, T54/5; assigns B63/7, T63/7. lymyted pp. B62/1, T62/1
lynage $n$. family B120/15
lyue $v$. believe, trust B103/7
loke v. see B41/4, B77/4. loke imp.sg. see to it that, take care B5/17, B60/4, T60/4. lokid pp. ~ aboute considered T100/15
londe $n$. piece of land, field B144/5, T144/5
longep v.impers.pr.3sg. $\sim$ to is the prerogative of $\mathrm{B} 111 / 11,16$.
longynge pr.p. B111/15
loos $n$. good reputation T30/1
lore $n$. teaching, commandments B91/1, B91/5
lorkep v.pr.pl. lurk B127/3,5; lorken T127/3; lurken T127/5
loste ${ }^{*}$ n. perdition, damnation B17/16
loste $v$. lose B120/12, B141/8, B164/12
loute $v$. bow down before T14/8
lowenesse $n$. humility B27/4
lower comp.adj. more dishonourable B27/7
lower comp.adv. more humbly B27/4
lowtyng, loutyng vbl.n. bowing down, kneeling B88/3, T88/3
lust(e, n. pleasure B16/19, B24/9, T24/5; desire B45/21. lustes,
lustis pl. pleasures B25/2; bodily appetities T30/6
lustep v.refl.pr.pl. ~hem take pleasure B22/14
lustful adj. pleasant, delicious T118/8
lusty adj. pleasant, delicious B118/10
magnefye $\boldsymbol{v}$. praise B92/22
mayden n. maidservant T67/4, T153/10
mayntene $v$. uphold, support T63/1, T65/12; meyntene B63/1;
menteyne B94/15. menteyne(b pr.pl. B93/18, B94/3; mayntenen

T160/2. mayntened $p p$. T100/16, T131/12
maystry $n$. force B125/5. maistryes pl. acts of force B128/3
maistris n.pl. officials (of the Church) T128/2
makip, makep v.pr3sg. tells B141/5. makep imp.pl. B141/20;
makede, made pa.t.sg. B137/3, T137/4
malice $n$. sinful nature T110/8
mamettes see mawmet $n$.
maner(e n. type(s) (of) B111/23, B113/2, T113/3; way B148/3,
T148/5; in ~as in the same way as B90/8; in, vpon al(le ~in every way B128/15, B148/2, T148/3; in many ~ of many kinds T114/1. maneres, maneris pl. habits, ways of behaving, practices B45/11; in ~ in various ways B149/7, T149/7; in many ~ of many kinds B114/1
mark(e n.pl. marks (monetary units equivalent to two thirds of a pound B151 5, T151/5
marke $v$. all $t$, set aside $B 153 / 2^{*}$, T153/2
marren v.pr.pl. ruin, corrupt T34/14
materyel adj. physical B57/6
maund(e)ment $n$. commandment $T 2 / 1, T 30 / 4,9, T 50 / 7$. maund(e)mentis pl. T1 6,9, T31/3
mawmet n. idol T25/2. mamettes, mawmetis pl. B25/13, T25/4
mawmetric n. idolatry T34/1,2; mamettrye B93/21
me indef.pron. one, someone, people, B18/2, B28/3, B33/4
mede n. ment B3/2, T3/2; reward, payment B95/8, T95/2, B11277,
B141 6. meydes pl, spintual reward B12/1
medep, medip v.pr.3ng. rewards B86/8, T86/8
$\operatorname{med}(e) f$ ful adj, meritonous, spiritually bencficial B76/2, T76/2*, B1044/6
medlip, medlep v.pr.3sg. mixes, blends T15/3,6,9, B46/18,21
meydes see mede $n$.
meynteynynge vbl.n. supporting B93/5
mellep v.pr.3sg. mixes, blends B46/14
membris, membres n.pl. parts, components T114/6; genitalia B116/9,
B117/11; preuy ~ private parts B117/8
mene n. position midway between two extremes B137/1, T137/1
mene adj. middle B137/4, T137/5
mene v. say B16/10, B28/21, B37/12. menep pr.3sg. advises B36/20.
menen, menep pr.pl. signify, symbolize T20/4, B47/7
menyfoldlyche adv. in many ways, repeatedly B37/20
mende $v$. amend $B 78 / 14$
menteyne( b see mayntene v .
merchaundyse $n$. trade, commerce B128/10. merchaundyses pl.
business transactions B128/11
merchaundyse $v$. engage in commerce, trade B77/15
mercymentis, mercyment3 n.pl. fines, penalties collected in money or goods T149/5, B152/10, T152/8
merpe $n$. delight, enjoyment B94/7
merueillyche $a d v$. wonderfully, miraculously B38/8
mesurabelyche adv. in moderation B128/14
mesure n. moderation B24/8, T24/4,5; proper proportion, balance, harmony B50/2, T50/2; measurement B128/7
mesureth, mesurip v.pr.3sg. determines B47/13, T47/3. mesure imp.sg. regulate B97/6, T97/6
mete $n$. food B40/4. metes, metis pl. B83/2, T83/2; into $\sim$ of to feed B164/14
meue $v$. move B11/6, B33/2, B55/6; moeue T11/6, T103/4, T133/3. meuep pr.3sg. moves B35/21, B36/7, B117/14; tempts B118/1; moeuep T117/2, T118/1. moeuen pr.pl. wonder, raise the question of T30/11; prompt T33/3; T86/3, T136/6; meuep B86/3, B136/7. meuynge pr.p. controlling B38/10,12. moeuyde pa.t.sg. prompted T109/9. meued pp. placed as phylacteries B9/13
meuyng(e, moeuyng vbl.n. prompting B24/9, B24/10, T24/5, T24/7 myche $n$. see muche $n$.
myche, miche adj. see moche adj.
myche adv. much, greatly T25/4, T34/2,3; moche B15/9,10; muche
B37/6, B86/4; as ~as in him,hym is,ys as far as he can
B112/10, T114/13, B133/9
mynde $n$. memory as one of the three constituents or powers of the soul B38/15, B38/18, B38/21; haue ~ take thought B5/6; remember B8/3, B66/7, T66/8
mynystre v.imp.pl. give help B40/4, B40/7
myschef $n$. hardship, affliction, misfortune B79/10,16, B89/1,
B120/4; myschyf B112/16; meschief wickedness B9/23
myslyuyng $n$. sinful living B45/9
myst see mowe(b v.
mystakynge vbl.n. wrongful taking B145/16
mo comp. adj. more B33/9, B77/1
moche adj. great, much B9/23, B13/3, B43/19; myche T13/3, T82/9;
miche T80/12
moche adv. see myche adv.
moeue, moeuep, moeuen see meue $v$.
moralte n.as adj. of moral significance B70/5, T70/5
more comp.adj. greater B2/3, T2/3; worse T131/11; pe $\sim$ the majority of T146/10
mosselles n.pl. small pieces of food B93/7
mot(e, v.pr.3sg. must B49/6, T49/6, B58/9; mut T20/6, T139/3. $\operatorname{mot}(\mathrm{e}(\mathrm{n}$ pr.pl. T69/5, B70/5, T70/5, B85/5, T85/4. most(e pa.t.sg. must B30/2; may B39/6. moste pa.t.pl. B55/12
mowene n. moon B28/20
mowe(p v.pr.pl. may B20/5, B24/1, B27/17, B41/16. myst pa.t. B36/17
muche $n$. for as ~as,pat in so far as, since B31/5, B36/22; for al so $\sim$ pat B161/8; myche as $\sim$ as equivalent in meaning to T69/3; in as $\sim$ as to the extent that T81/4
namelyche adv. especially B5/20, B35/9, B89/10; and ~ that is B37/13
narracioun $n$. speech B10/4
ne adv. not B2/5, T2/5, B5/6
ne conj. nor B3/6, B7/9; ~....ne neither.....nor T3/6, T100/14
nede $n$. necessity, need B33/7
nede adv. necessarily B49/6, T49/7, T69/5, B70/5
nedeles adj. vain, idle, useless B92/18
nedely adv. necessarily T61/1, T138/8; nedylyche B61/l; nedelyche B138/8
nedes, nedis adv. necessarily $\mathrm{B} 30 / 2, \mathrm{~T} 70 / 5$
ned(e)ful adj. necessary B12/11, T12/8, B22/5
nedep, nedip v.pr.3sg. requires B86/2, T86/2; impers. is necessary
B164/3
neysest sup.adj. closest B85/7
neyзep pr.3sg. draws near to B5/9
nel v.pr.3sg. will not B89/20. nellep pr.pl. do not wish to B12/3. nel imp.pl. be unwilling to B90/20
ynemmed, ynemned v.pp. mentioned B14/7; called B14/8; named B56/11
ner(r)e, nerrer, neer comp.adj. nearer, closer B27/2, B71/1,
T71/1, B85/5; nyr ~ in closer to B162/20
nere adv. nearer B5/9
nepeles adv. nevertheless B43/5,8, B73/10
next adj.sup. closest B85/6, T85/6; preceding T113/4
next adv. goynge $\sim$ byfore immediately preceding B113/3
ny3t n.as adj. ~ peues robbers who operate by night, burglars,
sneak thieves B126/3,8, T126/5,10
noye v . harm B123 4, T123/8. noyep, noyen pl.pres.ind. B13/8, T13 8
norysche $v$. foster B28/15. norychep, noriship pr.3sg. B153/3, T153/3. norschep pr.pl. bring up, raise B44/9,13. norysche pr.subj.sg. B91 5. noryshe imp.pl. B90/21
noryschynge vbl.n. educating, rearing B93/5
notable adj. blameworthy B78/18
noper, neper conj. nor B7/11, B20/9, B35/19; ~.....ne
nether.... nor B8/7, B50/9, B66/1, T68/2-3; ne..... ~ neither.....nor
B15/8-10; ~....~ neither .....nor T123/8
nouelleryes n.pl. new types B92/16
noust adv. not B1/7, B3/5,6
nowpe adv. n w B31/10, B43/17; ~ a day nowadays B139/7
obesche $v$. bey $\mathrm{B} 90 / 1$. obeschyp, obeshep pr.3sg. B88/1, T88/1.
obesche imp.p/. B90/17
obrect a. bjection T159/9
occasioun $n$. cause B32/18, B33/4; situation B118/1, T118/1 occupye, occupie $v$. possess, enjoy the use of B152/4, T152/4. occupiep pr.3sg. T124/11. occupyep, occupien pr.pl. B125/18, B126/2, T126/2, T126/4
of prep. by $\mathrm{B} 4 / 5, \mathrm{~T} 30 / 9, \mathrm{~T} 130 / 16$; for $\mathrm{T} 122 / 3$
offyce, office $n$. official position, duties, function B61/4,6, T61/5,6. offices pl. B62/7, T62/7
offycer, officer $n$. agent, official B61/6, T61/7. offyceres, officers, officeris pl. ecclesiastical officials B63/4, T63/4, T100/17
on adj. own, particular B22/3
on, oon num.as adj. one B11/7, T20/3, B38/22; one alone T51/4 on, oon pron. someone $\mathrm{B} 1 / 3, \mathrm{~T} 1 / 4$; one $\mathrm{B} 6 / 6, \mathrm{~T} 6 / 5$
ones, onys adv. once B17/2, B69/6, T69/9
onhcede see oonhed $n$.
ony see eny adj.
onlyche adj. alone B35/17, B36/21, B39/3
oo adj. one T11/6, T15/2, T59/7; o B46/14
oonhed, onheede $n$. unity T20/1, B47/4
open(e, opun adj. clear, plain B86/2*, T86/2, T147/4; visible B30/3;
brazen, unconcealed B125/4
opun adv. clearly T146/6
ordeynest v.pr.2sg. direct B60/6, T60/6. ordeynep pr.3sg. decrees T152/6. ordeynen pr.pl. devise T160/2. ordeynede pa.t.sg. ordained, decreed B97/2, T97/2, T109/14; caused T121/8.
(y)ordeyned pp. created B58/8, T58/8; decreed, ordained B58/10, T59/1, B61/2; provided B59/1, T59/2, B86/5, ; assigned B61/4,

T61/4; destined B111/14
ordenaunce $n$. rule T100/16; decree T102/6; ordynaunce B102/6 ordre $n$. ccclesiastical rank, put doune of his $\sim$ demoted B27/212; ~ pat Crist hap souen role in the Church as ordained by Christ T99/7; sequence B123/2, T123/6; order rule B165/14. ordris pl. religious orders T109/8, T110/6,11
ornament3, ournementis n.pl. apparel, equipment B144/1, T144/1 oper(e, pron. le(e)st ydel of ~ less idle than any other B64/6, T64/6
oper conj. or B2/9, B5/3,4; ~.....or either....or B53/8*,T53/7-8,
B120/10; ~..... ~ either....or B79/15, B125/3-4
ouer prep. in addition to B120/5,9
oucral adv. everywhere B5/4, B38/10
our(e $n$. hour B5/15, B6/4, T6/2
ous-syf, ousself pron. ourselves B75/2, B141/16
out prep. ~ of without B139/7, T139/7, B164/21
owne v.pr.pl. ought B91/21
payed v.pp. satisfied T156/15
paraunter adv., perhaps B30/7, B57/1, B161/5
pareschencs n.pl. parishioners B94/19
part $v . \sim$ of share T132/2. partid pp. divided T7/5; separated
T84/6
part(e n. party T114/3; take $\sim$ of share B45/12. partis pl. sections
of society, social classes T64/7
parteyncb, pertencp, v.pr.3sg. belongs to B41/7; is associated with B50/6, T50/7
party $n$. amount B43/20. partyes, parties pl. sections of society,
social classes B64/7; divisions, sections T114/5
passeb, passip v.pr.3sg. surpasses B48/6,7, T48/6,7. passep, passen pr.pl. B48/5, T48/4; do worse than B135/9, T135/9. passe pr.subj.sg. exceed B24/8, T24/5; passe pr.subj.pl. go B14/4 passyngly, passynglyche adv. especially T81/12; very well B92/15 passioun $n$. suffering, torment $B 18 / 17$, $B 36 / 16,18$. passiouns pl. B36/11
peyne $n$. torment of purgatory or hell B89/8, B111/14; punishment, penalty B90/6, B145/18; vpon $\sim$ under threat of punishment B3/3, $\mathrm{T} 3 / 3$; vp(on $\sim$ of on penalty of losing B1/10, T1/11; under the threat of B3/4, B58/7, T58/7; payne B90/7. peynes pl. B29/9, B120/7,10,B145/15
ypeynte v.pp. painted, depicted B36/13
peynture n. painting(s) B35/8, B36/9
penaunce $n$. punishment, suffering B91/14
perel n. spiritual danger B161/6. perel(e)s pl. B106/7, T106/7
perelous(e adj. spiritually dangerous $\mathrm{B} 63 / 3, \mathrm{~T} 63 / 3, \mathrm{~T} 80 / 15$;
perylous B112/19
persone n. his ~himself B112/13, B113/4, T113/5
pesable, pesible adj. peace-loving, peace-making B139/8, T139/8 pies n.pl. magpies T147/3
plages n.pl. disasters, afflictions B19/21
playntes n.pl. accusations, legal complaints B125/17
plede $v$. contend legally B140/5. pledep pr.3sg. B140/3. pleden pr.pl. T140/6. pledyde pa.t.pl. B140/6
pledynge vbl.n. legal dispute, litigation B138/2, B140/2
pleyes, pleies n.pl. amusements, diversions B75/3, T75/3
plentenouser adj.comp. more plentiful, more abundant B42/2 plentepe n. abundance B164/17
plesance $n$. gratification, pleasure B25/9
plete v. contend legally T140/5. pletip pr.3sg. T140/4
pletyng vbl.n. legal dispute, litigation T138/2, T140/2
pont $n$. in $\sim$ of as far as .... is concerned T110/1. poyntes, poynt3, poyntis n.pl. branches B91/17, B92/10; items T129/7; ~ of byleue articles of faith B91/15, B92/10
postes, postis n.pl. defenders B107/7, T107/7
powdrid v.pp. bespattered T159/14
preynted, prentid, printid v.pp. imprinted B58/5, T58/5, T61/1
prelat(e n. ecclesiastic of high rank, bishop B61/9, T61/9, T98/6. prelat3, prelatis pl. B107/4, T107/4, T108/1
presabyllyche adv. in a laudable manner, admirably B32/4 pryde, pride $n . \sim$ of (bis) lyf(f),lijf love of worldly pomp B22/2,16, T22/2; ~ of pis world(e worldly wealth, exalted worldly position B127/8, T127/8
priuat adj. ~ religioun religious orders e.g. monks, friars T155/2
priuey, pryuey adj. hidden, secret B30/1, B65/2, T65/2; particular, special T107/9; pryuy B107/8
pryucliche adv. stealthily B5/16
procuratours n.pl. agents B93/4
procured, procuride v.pa.t.sg. urged, brought about B139/9, T139/9
profyt, profijt, profit $n$. spiritual benefit T30/2, T33/8, B88/2;
interest B112/6, B125/9; profe3t B9/23; profy3t B24/3
profitable adj. useful, B28/22; advantagous T121/5
profited v.pp. grown stronger T109/15
properis n.pl. appropriators T147/1
proporcionabeliche adv. in proportion B42/2
propre adj. ~ preste,prestis confessor(s) B76/1, T76/1
(y)propred, proprid, propryd, v.pp. assigned B33/9, B37/1; ~ to associated with T20/2, B47/4, B68/7, T68/7
propring vbl.n. appropriation T147/10
proute adj. proud B25/16, B26/2, B27/8
pubplicans n.pl. tax collectors T131/17
punsched v.pp. punished B145/15,18
pure adv. absolutely, altogether B4/2, T4/2
ypurged, purgid v.pp. removed, stripped B144/5, T144/5
put n. pit, abyss B26/13
put(te v. ~adoune refl. prostrate self, kneel B36/20; ~ fro deprive of B152/8, T152/6; ~ out(e turn out of office B63/8, T63/8. puttep, puttip pr.3sg. ~yn(ne appoints B63/7, T63/6-7; ~ out expels B57/19, T57/2. putt pr.pl. bestow T99/11. put(te imp.sg. ~ away, awey renounce, forsake B82/5-6, T82/7. y)put(t pp. ~ a)doun(e demoted B27/21, B120/10; abandoned T100/13; ~ fro expelled from $\mathrm{T} 100 / 17$; denied to $\mathrm{B} 152 / 3, \mathrm{~T} 152 / 3$; be $\sim$ adoune kneel, prostrate self B35/16
queme $v$. please or serve $B 163 / 3$
quyete $v$. satisfy $B 73 / 8, T 73 / 8$
quyke adj. living B39/10, B40/20; makynge ~ giving life to B38/10
yrad v.pp. read, taught B3/8
ragynges vbl.n.pl. amorous daliance, flirtation B116/6
raper comp.adv. pe $\sim$ the more easily B164/18
raueyn n. robbery B65/2, T65/2
rauyschynge vbl.n. theft B145/16
recchep, recchen v.pr.pl. care, are concerned about B107/9, T107/9
redylyche adv. fully B142/15
reft $v . p p$. stolen from T66/4
rehercep v.pr.3sg. narrates, runs through B20/1
rehersyng vbl.n. enumerating B19/14
reise $v . \sim v p$ restore T100/12
rekene $v$. list, enumerate $\mathrm{B} 21 / 11, \mathrm{~T} 21 / 9$; give an account $\mathrm{B} 145 / 8$ rekenynge vbl.n. settlement of accounts B119/12, B145/9,12
religioun $n$. men of $\sim$ people in holy orders T146/1; priuat $\sim$ see priuat adj.
religious n.pl. clerics T136/7
relyuynge vbl.n. helping, relieving (from hardship) B79/14
remes see rewme $n$.
rennep, rennyp v.pr.3sg. ~ wip accompanies B71/8-9, T71/8
rent $n$. payment, fee T108/2. rentes, rentis pl. properties yielding revenue B25/6, T146/4
reparel v.imp.sg. renew, restore B38/3
reprehended v.pp. deplored B32/15
resceyued v.pp. ~ Cristendom been baptised B92/13
resonabelyche adv. in a reasonable manner B79/11
resonable adj. endowed with reason B111/8
resoun $n$. exhortation, law T20/7; argument T30/5, B115/16;
meaning B50/5, T50/5; just or reasonable behaviour B104/2,

T104/5; justice, reason T147/8,9, B153/1, T153/1; bi pe ~of because of T34/5; in,by $\sim$ in a reasonable manner B83/2, T83/3, B97/6; is ~ is reasonable B74/7, T74/7; wipoute,out of ~ unreasonable, injust B149/5, T149/5; resone exhortation, law B47/10. resouns pl. arguments T121/15
reste v.pa.t.sg. rested B8/9
reuersen v.pr.pl. contradict T100/8, T101/10. reuerse pr.subj.sg.
B134/2, T134/2
reuynge vbl.n. stealing B125/15
reule $n$. regulations governing a religious order T99/7
reule $v$. conduct (self) B9/18. yrewled pp. B161/20
rewme, reme $n$. realm T131/3,5*, B145/1. remes, reumes, rewmes $p l$. B107/2, T107/2, T132/3
rychesse, richess(e $n$. wealth, worldly goods B86/5, T86/5, B97/7, T97/7. rychesses, richessis pl. B152/4, T152/4
ry3t, rist n. truth B54/2, T54/2; righteousness T124/10; justice T155/11
ry3t, rist adv. exactly, just B38/18, B39/7, B163/5; well B50/5, T50/5;
virtuously, properly B149/7, T149/7
ry3tful adj. virtuous, righteous B37/16, B39/12, B45/17; just B94/9
ry3tfulnesse $n$. virtue, goodness B18/7; just judgement B45/12
ry3twesse adj. virtuous B42/8; ritwise just T124/10
rote n. root B133/2, B144/6,8
rotye $v$. rot $\mathrm{B} 76 / 7$
saaf prep. subject to $\mathrm{T} 33 / 7, \mathrm{~T} 80 / 8$
Sabot(e n. Sabbath B66/7, T66/9, B67/7, T67/7
samplis n.pl. passages from Scripture used to teach a lesson T138/9
saue adj. saved, redeemed, safe $B 18 / 3,8, B 55 / 9$; sauf $B 4 / 5$, saaf T4/4
sauter adj. ~ book book of psalms B57/12
scatere $v$. squander, waste T33/4. scaterip pr.3sg. T33/6
schadues n.pl. images, likenesses B37/7
s(c)hal v.pr.3sg. must, shall, ought to B2/6, T2/6. schullep B4/10, B9/13, B21/1
scholde, shulde pa.tsubj.sg. would B32/14, B65/6, T65/5. shulden pa.t.subj.pl. T33/2
schappe, shape $v$. arrange, ensure $B 73 / 7, T 73 / 7$. shapip pr.3sg. ordains for T122/13; refl. set oneself B76/4, T76/5
scharp, sharppe adj. severe B2/8. T2/8; sharpest sup. most painful T130/1 scharploker, sharplier comp.adv. more eagerly, more swiftly B2/7, T2/7
scherpe $v$. make keen B82/4. scharpep, sharpip pr.3sg. B81/4, T81/4. scharpep, sharpen pr.pl. encourage B74/3, T74/3
schewe, shewe $v$. see, perceive, describe B20/5; make known B54/2, T54/2; demonstrate, make manifest B62/9, T62/9. scheweb pr.pl. teach, instruct B40/1. schewed pa.t.sg. displayed B19/22,
schone v.imp.sg. prevent, guard against B35/13
schonynge vbl.n. prohibition B32/8
schrewed(e adj. wicked B115/11, B116/5
schrewedelyche adv. wickedly B143/3
schrewednesse $n$. wickedness, depravity B93/19, B142/14
schrewes n.pl. wicked people, evildoers B142/14
schryfte n. confession B152/7
s(c)hryuyng(e vbl.n. confessing B78/17; giving confession T110/1
schulle(p see $s(c) h a l v$
sclandrynge vbl.n. slandering, calumny B112/9
ysclaundred v.pp. slandered, disgraced B120/12
scornynge, skornyng vbl.n. contemptuous treatment B138/2, T138/2,
B140/2, T140/2
scripture $n$. writing, document B9/1, B28/24
sechep v.pr.pl. seek B57/9, B150/4
seculer adj. lay T66/2, B127/4, T127/4, T131/7
seculer(e)s n.pl. members of the laity T30/9, B107/3, T107/3
seynge v.pr.p. seeing B32/13. sien v.pa.t.pl. saw T34/5; seye, seis pa.t.pl. considered B13/6, T13/6. yseye pp. seen B30/2
semeliche adv. appropriate, fitting B5/19
semyng vbl.n. judgement T124/14
sende v.pa.t.sg. sent B77/20, B120/5. sende pp. B145/7
sensyble, sensible adj. capable of being perceived by the senses
B48/5, T48/5; bodily B64/6, T64/6
sensures see censures n.pl.
sentence $n$. (authoritative) opinion T100/9, T147/13
sermonyes n.pl. words (of God) B19/16 (see note)
seruyce $n$. assistance, help B89/2
seruyl(e adj. ~ worke(s), wirk(is) work done for personal gain,
forbidden on the Sabbath B8/6, B67/3, T67/3
sete $n$. throne B26/9
sette $\boldsymbol{v} . \sim$ at noust despise B40/16-17,19. sette pr.subj.pl. $\sim$ noust of think nothing of, discount B15/9. yset, sett pp. grounded,
rooted B39/4; focused, fixed B60/3, T60/3; ordained T104/3 sewep see sue $v$. sh- see also sch-
shame v.pr.subj.pl. be ashamed T121/15 sharpip see scherpe $v$.
short adj. transitory, of short duration T100/3
syb, sib n. ~ to related to B105/1, T105/2
siche adj. such $\mathrm{T} 12 / 5, \mathrm{~T} 13 / 8, \mathrm{~T} 33 / 2$
siche pron. such T20/7, T73/4
sien see seynge $v$.
syker adv. surely B26/16
sykere, siker adj. certain B103/2, T103/2
sylle $v$. sell B128/10. syllep, sillip pr.3sg. betrays for gain
B136/4,5, T136/3,4; sells B150/6, T150/6. sillen, syllep
pr.pl. T108/1, B135/8, T135/8. solde pa.t.sg. B136/1, T136/1
syllynge, sillyng vbl.n. betraying for gain B136/1, T136/1;
selling B128/6,16
similitude, symylitude $n$. image, idol T14/7, T30/3,5
symonyeris n.pl, simoniacs T146/17
synweres n.pl. sinners B 142/5,6
synwy v. $\sin$ B115/9. synwep pr.3sg. B21/5, B115/7, B118/10.
synwep pr.pl. B117/2, B151/8. synwy pr.subj.sg. B17/12. synwynge
pr.p. B17/2. synwed pa.tsg. B26/7
syp, sip adv. next, then B54/2, T54/2
syp(be, sype, sib(e conj. since B4/2, T4/1, B21/3, B72/4; ~ pat
since B24/2
syuen* v.pr.pl. strain at, gag at T147/17
skyle, skile $n$. argument B23/10, T23/3, B105/4, T105/5; reason B95/11,12, T95/5
skyl(e)ful, skilful adj. reasonable, just B6/4, T6/3, B76/8
skylfullych(e adv. reasonably B76/14, B128/7,14; skillefullyche properly, fittingly B111/5
sleye see slowen $v$.
sley(3)pe $n$. trickery B128/3, B128/13. sleypes pl. tricks
B125/16, B128/6
sleupe n. sloth B44/14
slowe adj. slothful, sluggish B22/14
slowen v.pa.t.pl. killed T109/10. sleye pp. B107/6
smalnesse n. slenderness, thinness B52/3, T52/3
smyttid v.pp. tainted T146/10
so conj. ~ pat provided that B93/11
sobernesse $n$. moderation, temperance B44/7
socour $n$. help B78/19
sodeynliche adv. at once, instantly B5/1
soft(e adj. easy to endure, not burdensome B11/10, T11/9
sogest, suget adj. in bondage, enslaved B16/15; ~ vnto under the spiritual guidance of B126/7*, T126/9
solace v.refl.pr.subj.sg. enjoy,comfort self B75/5, T75/5
solas, solace $n$. pleasure, spiritual comfort B75/7, T75/7
somdel, sumde(e)l n. part B70/4,5, T70/4,5, T100/11
somdel, sumdel adv. partly, to some extent B36/17, B50/5, T50/5
somtyme see sumtyme adv.
soop, sop(e adj. true T101/7, B120/3, T121/17, B148/9
sore adj. in pain, hurt B27/18,
sore adv. greatly, very much B119/10. sorer comp. more harshly B77/6
sory adj. sinful, accursed B76/14
sorowe contrition T130/17
sotel adj. deceitful B44/15; sutyl, sutel insidious B106/6, T106/6
sotellyche adv. ingeniously B29/19; sutely treacherously T66/4
sotylte $n$. stratagem B28/12
sop(e n. truth B54/6, T54/6, B141/19; for ~ truly B8/1. soop truth T156/6
sopely, sopeli adv. truly B138/5, T138/5
sopenysse $n$. spiritual truth, steadfastness B33/5
souereyn adj. supreme B141/17
souereynlyche adv. above all B141/16
sownep, sounep v.pr.3sg. is consonant with B138/4, T138/4
spare $v$. avoid B28/1; refrain from B56/6. spare pr.subj.sg. cease
B163/3
speche $n$. in maner(e of her (e $\sim$ in the form of words, symbolically T20/5, B47/7-8
spede $\boldsymbol{v}$. fare $B 28 / 6$
spille $v$. kill B22/6
spoyle v. rob B65/1, T65/1. spoylep pr.pl. plunder B126/7;
spuylen T126/9
spoylynge vbl.n. theft B149/5; spuylyng T149/5
spouse $v$. marry B41/18; enter into spiritual communion with T121/3
spousebrekeres n.pl. adulterers B44/5,12, B116/16
spousel(le $n$. marriage $B 28 / 22, B 42 / 4,5$
spoushed $n$. marriage T122/2
stable v. establish T155/11
stede n. place B50/1, T50/1
stefly, stifly adv. strictly T146/7, T147/11
stenede v.pp. stoned B90/5
stere $\boldsymbol{v}$. guide, lead B90/20. stereb pr.3sg. B22/8. sterep
pr.pl. B92/17
sterres n.pl. stars B26/10
sterte $v . \sim a b a k$ shrink back B107/1, T107/1
stylle adj. silent B141/19
styrye $v$. prompt, inspire B33/2. styrep, stirib pr.3sg. tempts
B22/17, B24/9, T24/6
styrynge vbl.n. encouragement B79/3
stokkis, stockes n.pl. wooden idols, posts, logs T33/7, B93/20
stondep, stondip v.pr.3sg. stands firm, is steadfast T124/9; ~
for is equivalent to $\mathrm{T} 115 / 1$; ~ in consists of $\mathrm{B} 10 / 11, \mathrm{~T} 10 / 3$, $\mathrm{B} 22 / 16$; is rooted in $\mathrm{B} 21 / 3, \mathrm{~T} 21 / 3$; arises from $\mathrm{T} 110 / 17$; stondit T122/1. stondep, stonden pr.pl. B22/1, T22/1, B58/3, T58/3; ~ for defend T65/12
stounde $n$. moment B39/7; time B56/1
straytur comp.adv. more severely B77/9
strange adj. haughty, condescending B7/13
straunger $n$. guest B8/7, T67/5; stroungere B67/5
strecchep, strecchip v.pr.3sg. ~ fer(e has far reaching
consequences B132/6, T132/11
streyne v. constrain B63/5, T63/5
stryues n.pl. disputes, conflicts B145/2
strong(e adj. ${ }^{1}$ sturdy, healthy B5/8; severe B91/14
stronge adj. ${ }^{2}$ alien, foreign $\mathrm{T} 20 / 7, \mathrm{~B} 29 / 21,23$; unrelated B120/18;
straunge T20/7
stude v. study T159/15
substaunce, $n$. entity B59/7, T59/7
sucoure v. assist, help B89/2
sue v. follow B97/3, T97/3; result T100/9; suy B17/1; suwe
B90/16. suep pr.3sg. B2/9, T2/9; sewep B113/3. suep, suen pr.pl.
B84/9, T84/9. suyng pr.p. T110/15. sued pp. T155/10
suffre v. allow B37/9, B40/21. suffrep pr.3sg. B77/4. suffere, suffren pr.pl. B75/2, T75/2. suffrid pp. T108/4, T131/11
suget see sogest adj.
sugget3, sugetis n.pl. her(e ~ those under their spiritual guidance B150/2,6, T150/2,6
suyrer adj.comp. safer T154/9. suyrest sup. most spiritually safe T154/10
sum adj. a particular T159/4
sumde(e)l see somdel $n$.and $a d v$.
sumtyme, somtyme adv. formerly T124/8; on occasion B152/8
susteyne v. nourish B22/6; support B128/14. susteynen pr.pl.
uphold T129/5
sustenaunce $n$. income, wealth B37/13
sutely see sotellyche adv.
sutyl, sutel see sotel adj.
swete adj. mild, of gentle disposition B39/12
tables n.pl. tablets B10/13, T10/5
take v. understand T15/2, B46/14; refl. commit self B135/2, T135/2; ~ parte (of) share B45/12. takep pr.pl. B45/10. toke pa.t.sg. gave B38/6. toke pa.t.subj.pl. ~ to mynde considered B31/8. takun pp. understood T98/7; ~ by experience as experience shows T34/12; ~ to taken away and given to T124/14. ytake pe committed yourself B78/6,10
takynge vbl.n. ~hede paying attention B116/3
teche v. show T154/8
teching, techyng vbl.n. tutelage, guidance T86/5; illustration
T114/6. thechyng teaching T66/3
tellynge, telling vbl.n. counting B73/5, T73/5
temporal adj. worldly B64/3, T64/2, T131/6
tenderloker comp.adv. more earnestly, more diligently B19/11
tymes n.pl. specific times B68/4, T68/4
title, tytle $n$. justification of claim, right, entitlement
T124/10, B125/11; bi~of with the support,sponsership of T129/6
to num. two B10/8
to adv. too T109/16
to prep. in the eyes of T98/9
tobroke v.pp. broken into pieces B17/4
tocomynge v.pr.p. coming, going to happen B29/5, B57/9
toged(e)re, togidre adv. together B46/15, B84/4, T84/4
tokene $n$. in $\sim$ in remembrance of $\mathrm{B} 72 / 2$; as a sign $\mathrm{T} 80 / 4, \mathrm{~B} 111 / 17$;
(in)to ~as a sign T15/10, B47/1; tokyn sign B9/13. toknes pl.
B19/21
tolle $\boldsymbol{v}$. attract B19/25
toper pron. the other (of two) T113/4
touchep, touchip v.pr.3sg. pertains to, has bearing upon B144/2, T144/2. touchid pp. touched on T121/4
trauayl(e, trauaille n. work B64/6, B96/7, B128/15; traueil T64/6, trauel T65/1
trauayly, trauaylle, traueile v. labour, work B47/4, B63/6; travel T73/9; trauel(e T63/5, T108/3; trauely B73/9.
trauelyb, trauelib pr.3sg. B86/4, T86/4. traueilen, trauaylep pr.pl. toil T33/5; strive B44/7. trauailed, trauelide pa.t.subj.sg. B65/5, T65/4
tre $\boldsymbol{n}$. wood B35/19, B37/8
treyn adj. wooden B40/15
tresourep, tresouren v.pr.pl. ~ to store up treasure for B97/8, T97/8
trespas(se $\boldsymbol{n}$. transgression B91/22, comparatively limited offence T104/1; offence T104/7, B112/12; $\sin$ B152/8
trespasse $\mathbf{v}$. sin, offend B115/15. trespassist pr.2sg. T58/1; trespacest B58/1. trespasseb pr.3sg. B116/11. trespasseb pr.pl. B93/14, B116/11. trespassed pa.t.subj.pl. B116/12
trespasser $n$. offender B104/5, T104/8; sinner B120/15. trespassures pl. B90/9
treupe, trewpe $n$. righteousness, virtue B44/7; truth T55/2, T65/12; troupe T34/13, T135/9; trowpe B54/1, B55/2; treuep spiritual reality T82/10
trewe adj. faithful B9/6; trusty B27/16; virtuous B37/14, B42/6,15; rightful B44/10; honest B53/3, B55/1, T55/1 treweliche, trewelyche adv. justly B3/9; faithfully B19/27, B125/8,13; honestly B145/7
trewauntes n.pl. those who neglect their duty B63/9; triuauntis T63/9
triacle $n$. medicine, remedy T131/9
trystep v.pr.3sg. trusts, believes B41/6. trystep, tristep pr.p1. B28/5,9. tryste pr.subj.sg. put faith in B33/6, trust B56/4.
triste pr.subj.pl. T3/8, B4/1. trist(e imp.sg. B26/16, B118/1, T118/1
tryst(e n. trust B25/6, B28/16
trowe v. believe (in) B31/7, B54/7, T54/7; trust T34/13; think T108/1. trowe pr.1sg. T130/7,13. trowen pr.pl. T132/2. trowe pr.subj.sg. trusts, hopes B140/4. trowe imp.sg. T147/3
turnep v.pr.pl. $\sim$ to result in B9/23; turne(n pr.subj.pl. ~azen return to a more godly life B152/1, T152/1
pat rel.pron. what B13/3, T13/3; with which B23/10, T23/3
pat conj. so that B31/15, T109/10
pe refl.pron. yourself B27/1, B78/17
pefpe $n$. theft $\mathrm{B} 8 / 15, \mathrm{~B} 94 / 2, \mathrm{~B} 123 / 2$
pey pron.as dem.adj. those B93/21
pey conj. though B115/8
penk(e v. consider, think about B9/11, B77/18; ~ on imagine B48/11; think about, consider T65/10, B68/9, T68/9; ~ in think about B60/8. penken pr.pl. T155/9. penke imp.sg. B2/10, T2/9, B12/9
penkyng(e vbl.n. thinking B60/8, T60/8; opinion T158/11
per(e conj. where T14/4, B165/17
peraftir, perafter adv. accordingly T14/11, B46/11
peron adv. in that B116/12
picke adv. frequently T108/14
pylke dem.adj. that same B33/5, B115/6; pulke B90/2,8
pylke dem.pron. those B45/1
pinkip, pinkep v.impers.pr.3sg. me $\sim$ it seems to me T32/1, T33/7, T80/8; pynkep B55/6; penkep B103/1,5
ponkep v.pr.3sg. thanks B145/12. ponke imp.sg. B78/11
porou see purgh prep.
praldom n. captivity B14/4
prydde, pridde adj. third B66/5, T66/7
prystep v.3sg.pres.ind. is thirsty B40/5
pulke see bylke dem.adj.
purgh prep. through B4/11, B17/13, B18/13; porou T129/9
vnblissid v.pp. not yet glorified T136/2
vnbuxom adj. disobedient B10/3, B89/18, B90/11
vnclannis $n$. moral impurity B94/8
vnclene adj. impure B116/4, B120/17; ~ spirit wicked spirit, demon B16/12
vncunnynge vbl.n. ignorance B16/10
vndedlyche adj. immortal B136/5
vadermyne $v$. dig up T109/13
vnderput v.pp. under the power of B16/14
vaderstondynge $n$. faculty of understanding and reasoning
B38/14,16,17
vneuen adj. unequal T131/5
vniust(e adj. sinful B125/18, T125/1
vnkyndely adj. unnatural B111/18
vnkyndelyche $a d v$. ungratefully $\mathrm{B} 78 / 8$; with unnatural enmity
B102/7; vnkyndly T102/7
vnkyndenesse $n$. ingratitude $B 78 / 11,13$; lack of consideration B91/22, T122/3
vnlawesom adj. not permissible B116/4,9
vnlefful(le adj. illicit, not permissible B75/3, B137/2, B138/2;
vnleueful T75/3, T137/2, T138/2
vnmesurable adj. immoderate B90/4
vnmeuable adj. immovable B143/11; vnmoeuable T143/5
vnnepe adv. hardly B92/22
vnnoble adj. maad ~ deprived of rank T99/12
vnrystful adj. unrighteous B46/2
vnsensyble, vnsensible adj. not capable of being perceived by the
senses B48/4, T48/4
vnskylful, vnskilful adj. unreasonable B101/3, T101/4, T124/12
vnwaar adj. incautious T154/8
vnwexep v.pr.3sg. wanes, declines B5/10
vnworshipe v.inf. dishonour T99/3
vse(n v.pl.pres.ind. pursue B75/3, T75/3; are in the habit of doing T104/3
vss n. practice T80/5; use T124/5
vauntage $n$. advantage $\mathrm{B} 11 / 8$, T11/7
veyn adj. worthless B97/4, T97/4; vayne B40/16
veyneglorye $n$. unwarranted pride in (worldly) accomplishments
B26/6
vencusse ${ }^{*}$ v. overcome B117/13; vencushe T117/1. vencussed ${ }^{*} p p$.
B63/2; vencushid T63/1
venemed v.pp. as adj. harmful, noxious T109/17
veniaunce $n$. vengeance T15/7; desire for vengeance T103/5
venyme $\boldsymbol{v}$. corrupt T110/2
verrayliche, verraylyche adv. truly B142/15, B161/10; veryliche B18/17
verrey, verray adj. true T20/5, B40/17, B91/12
vertu(e n. power B17/3; in,bi ~of through the power of B55/9, T61/7
vycarye $n$. Cristis $\sim$ the Pope B151/7
viker n. ~ of Crist, Cristis $\sim$ the Pope T130/4, T151/6-7
visyte, visite v.pr.1sg. avenge B7/13, T14/9; vysytep pr.3sg.
B44/19
voyde adj. vain, wasted $B 18 / 1$
vouchep v.pr.3sg. ~ sauf condescends B41/16-17
wayte $v$. expect B55/15
waytynges n.pl. ambushes B27/19
wandre $v$. walk B61/2, T61/3, T155/2
wantone adj. naughty, undisciplined B13/3; wantoun T13/3
war adj. careful B50/3, T50/3, B54/1, T54/1
warly adv. carefully B47/13, T47/3
warne v.imp.sg. advise, caution B35/14. warned pp. cautioned
T131/15
waterleche, watirleche $n$. waterlecch B148/8, T148/9
weye $n$. by $\sim$ of in accordance with (his) B111/7
weke see woke $n$.
wel adv. very B132/6
wele n. prosperity B163/9,11
wem n. moral defilement, stain (of $\sin$ ) B65/6, T65/5
wendyng(e vbl.n. journey B71/6, T71/6; turning B115/10
wene $v$. think T98/3. wenep, wenen pr.pl. B13/4, T13/4, B30/7;
intend B87/5, T87/5
werk(e n. work T60/5, T76/4. werkis, werkes, werkys pl. work T67/1; deeds B75/1, T75/1; workes B8/4,6
wete see wyte $v$.
wexe $v$. increase, advance $\mathrm{B} 82 / 5, \mathrm{~T} 156 / 16$. wexep pr.3sg. $\mathrm{B} 5 / 10$.
wexen pr.pl. T156/15. waxe(n pp. grown B149/9, T149/9
what adj. whatever $\mathrm{B} 2 / 5, \mathrm{~T} 2 / 5, \mathrm{~T} 114 / 10$
wher(e conj. whether B136/7, B138/7, B148/1
whyles conj. whilst B91/3
who pron. whoever T129/6
whoso pron. whoever T124/6
wydue $n$. widow B120/14
wy3ttes n.pl. weights B128/7
wyke see woke $n$.
wyle $n$. wicker trap for catching fish B17/10
wilfullyche ${ }^{*}$, wylfullyche $\operatorname{adv}$. freely B3/2; intentionally
B115/10; wilfully T3/2
wille $n$. favour T124/15
willeful(le adj. full of purpose B96/8, T96/8
willen $v$. have the intention, wish T158/7. wolt pr.2sg. wish to B37/10, B38/2, T75/7. wole pr.3sg. will B26/16, B54/8, T54/8; decrees B95/11,12, T95/5. wole pr.3sg. wishes B3/11, T3/7; wole pr.subj.sg.

B75/7. wollep pr.pl. B12/1,4, B17/1; mean B19/16. wol(e(n, pr.subj.pl.
T64/9, B65/1, T97/3, B164/3; wille B97/3. willynge pr.p. B112/16
wylne $\boldsymbol{v}$. wish, desire B128/8. wilnep, wylnep pr.3sg. B19/25,
B112/11. wilnynge pr.p. B39/6. wylnede pa.tsubj.pl. B161/7
wynne $v$. gain, profit B128/11,12,13
wynnyng vbl.n. gain T30/3
wyse, wise $n$. ways B21/1,11, T21/1,9; manner B60/9, T60/9; no ~ not at all B60/8, T60/8; oper ~ under any other conditions B102/6, T102/6. wyses pl. manners B136/4 wyte, wite $v$. know B48/4, T48/3; ywyte B21/1, B58/3; ywete B161/7. wote, woot pr.1sg. B75/4, T75/4. wost pr.2sg. B5/14, B111/12. wytep, witen pr.pl. B2/3, T2/3. wyte pr.subj.sg. be assured B28/12. wete, wite, wyte pr.subj.pl. be assured B105/1, T123/11; be aware B117/12. wite imp.sg. T105/2
wit(t, wyt(t $n$. wisdom B2/10, T2/9; the faculty of reasoning, intellect T15/9, B46/21; thought, intention B52/9, T52/9; attention, mind B60/2, T60/3; sense B68/3, T68/3; bodili ~ the senses T50/3. wyttes pl. mental faculties, intellectual powers B20/5, B82/4; senses B50/3, B91/17; wittis meanings T69/5
wytty, witti adj. wise B96/8, T118/4
wytynglyche adv. deliberately B62/5; wittingly* T62/5
wlappen v.pr.pl. enclose, envelop T21/8
wo n. misfortune B163/9
woke n. week T68/5, B69/6; weke B5/11, B76/2; wyke B68/4
wole, wolt, wollep, wole(n see willen $v$.
wonep v.pr.3sg. dwells B83/4, T83/5. wonep pr.pl. B57/6. ywoned pp. accustomed B45/8
wonynge vbl.n. somewhere to live B86/5
worche $v$. work B8/4, B64/7, T64/7; do B12/5, T12/2. worchip, worchep pr.3sg. T121/16, T122/2,4; ~ wip helps B106/2, T106/1-2
worchyng(e vbl.n. carrying out, performance B28/21, T72/5;
action, contrivance B29/20; actions B79/8. worchynges pl. deeds B19/8
word $n$. speech T110/10
wordle $n$. world B42/11, B77/19; worlde n.as adj. worldly B135/9 word(e)lyche adj. worldly B25/5,11; worliche B13/4; worlyche B22/13
worschep(e $n$. honour, renoun B13/5, B26/5; honourable position B151/8; worship T13/4
worschepe, worshipe v.inf. honour $\mathrm{B} 87 / 3,5, \mathrm{~T} 87 / 3,5$. worschepest, worshipist pr.2sg. B95/10, T95/6. worschepep, worshipip pr.3sg. B96/1, T96/1. worschepep, worshipen pr.pl. B87/6, T87/7,8. worschepe imp.sg. B8/11, B85/3; worshipe T85/2
worschepful adj. distinguished B16/22
worschepfullyche adv. in an honourable manner B32/4
worschepynge vbl.n. honour B88/9
worby adj. powerful B37/17
wost see wyte $\boldsymbol{v}$.
wrepe $n$. wrath B22/18, B29/9
wrynkel(e $n$. moral stain or blemish B65/6, T65/5
wrong n. wip ~ wrongly B145/6,13,19
wrongful adj. unjust, sinful B128/5
wrongfullyche adv. sinfully B112/3,16; unjustly B125/16, B141/12
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[^1]:    1. For possible sources see note to this line.
[^2]:    1. cf. Sermones ii.1/7-10: 'cum non valet festum vel devocio cuiuscunque sancti citra Dominum, nisi de quanto in eius devocionem supereminenter persona sollemnizans accenditur'.
[^3]:    1. This is not true, however, of the script used in H for headings etc., in which the forms for ' p 'and ' y ' are clearly distinguished.
[^4]:    1. It seems unlikely that either clepip (f. $16^{v} / 7$ ) or strecchep (f. $23^{v} / 2$ ) can be taken to indicate that $-p$ endings for plural verbs were part of the dialect either of the $H$ scribe or of his exemplar. The subject of strecchep ('errors') is singular in all other witnesses and seems likely to be a mistake on the part of the H scribe who then went on to copy the singular form of the verb correctly. This is not the case with clepib but it seems at least possible that this may have been attracted into the singular because of the influence of the preceding verb, especially since the clauses (as me penkeb and as men clepib) are similar.
[^5]:    1. On progressive translation, see Atlas i.16.
[^6]:    1. Benskin, M., The letters $\langle\mathrm{p}>$ and $<\mathrm{y}>$ in later Middle English, and some related matters', Journal of the Society of Archivists, 7 (1982), 13-30.
    2. Ibid. p. 15.
[^7]:    1. For the occasional restoration of $\boldsymbol{x}$ in this position in OE see Campbell p. 76 §
[^8]:    1. The form teelden for NE 'told' pl. might appear to suggest the South but it is worth noting that the Atlas records forms of 'hold' with medial -e- as far north as Norfolk, Cambridge and Ely (Atlas iv.314).
[^9]:    1. For discussion of progressive translation, see Atlas i.15 section 3.3.2. For discussion of Mischsprachen see Atlas i.19ff. section 3.5. Section 3.5.1. deals with the various possible reasons for a large number of variants, not all of which imply a Mischsprache.
[^10]:    1. See McFarlane (1952), p. 157 ff., Thomson (1965), p. 95 ff .
    2. See Thomson (1965), p.192ff., Hudson, PR, pp.126-7.
[^11]:    1. $C \& S$ p.268. Grosseteste's statutes were influential, and this particular instruction also appears, for instance, in the statutes of William Raleigh, Bishop of Norwich and subsequently of Winchester, and in those of Nicholas Farnham, Bishop of Durham, while the Worcester statutes of 1240 emphasise the importance of the commandments for the confessional ( $C \& S \mathrm{pp} .304,345,403$, 423).
    2. $C \& S 900-905$.
    3. C\&S p. 61 .
[^12]:    1. Knighton ii.261, quoted by Hudson, $P R$ p. 378 .
    2. It is, however, difficult to tell whether B is making deliberate omissions. He has turned to his DI source before the HTY passage cited above, but this may be because he wishes to expand on the HTY version's extremely brief commentary on the tenth commandment.
[^13]:    1. The HTY argument is more coherent than that found in $B$ and it seems likely that $B$ has lost some sections of the HTY discussion on dominion as part of the process of inserting his DI material. The passage on taking goods without leave may have been omitted because it was too extreme but it is difficult to be certain.
    2. McNiven p. 201.
    3. Leff ii. 585 .
[^14]:    1. For evidence that some friars did continue to support Wyclif even after the break caused by his views on the eucharist see note to T109/4, and the discussion in Hudson, $P R$ p. 384 and note.
[^15]:    1. Hudson, PR pp.158-9.
[^16]:    1. Richardson, 'Heresy and the Lay Power', p. 20.
[^17]:    1. Martin, pp.210-11.
[^18]:    1. $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ does, however, at least in the beginning, include the relevant Biblical references in the margin.
[^19]:    1. See Martin p.205, the discussion of the manuscript he refers to as $\mathrm{Tn}_{1}$.
[^20]:    a) And herfore yf bou wolt be holde trewe of tunge, auyse be bat bou be discrete in by wordes and speke noust bot trowbe or pat pou mayste performe: and whanne by wyse worde ys yspoke of byn herte, be aboute to fulfille it, and make be trewe man.

    Me pynkep pat pre causes scholde meue ous to
    kepe pis commamdement and to take pe name of God wip gret worschep and drede. On cause ys for per was neuer man ne womman pat dyde synne pat myste be saue bot in

[^21]:    1. The instruction to learn from your priest has become obscure in many of the DI versions but is still present in, for example, $\mathrm{Rw}_{\mathbf{4}}$ -
[^22]:    1. MSS $\mathrm{Pr}, \mathrm{Si}$ and $\mathrm{Ha}_{2}$ and Ve , for instance, all have completely different prologues, while $\mathrm{So}, \mathrm{Ar}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{Tw}_{3}$ lack the passage which states that the Jews keep the commandments. None of these, therefore, could be the source of the HTY group's prologue material. The material on lecherous priests is missing in $R w_{3}, R w_{4}$ and So, while the reference to the Black Death is missing from $\mathrm{Ca}_{2}$ and Ve , so none of these can be the source for B . The remainder of the manuscripts are ruled out by the fact that they lack readings which appear in the HTY prologue or in B as well as in other DI witnesses.
[^23]:    1. Brady, 'Lollard Interpolations'.
[^24]:    1. Hudson, 'A New Look at the Lay Folks' Catechism' pp.252-3.
[^25]:    1. This is in accordance with the interpretation adopted in the Atlas which records ich but not iche for this manuscript (Atlas ii.148).
[^26]:    T: 1 wisely] om. H 2 for pee] om. H , do] om. Y 3 Blessid] Nowe blesside H , biddyng] biddyngs H 5 axep] askes nothing of vs bot H , pat pat] pa Y, loue] serue H ( serve him wip will] herteli luf him H , pat we ben] we pat we H 7 ofte] ofte tym H , asens] ageyn H

[^27]:    T: 1 Capitulum Tercium] om. T, Primum Mandatum] om. HY 2 God himsilff for God hymself H 3 pe Lord pi God] Lord pi God Y, God pi Lord $\mathrm{H}, 4$ pe lond of] om. $\mathrm{H}, \quad$ pat] pe HY 5 men] inne T , not] no3t $\mathrm{H} \mathbf{6}$ not] no3t $\mathrm{H}, ~ t o] \mathrm{om} . \mathrm{H}$, hondis] hande HY 7 m ] of HY , erpe] of erthe H, not] noght $\mathrm{H} \quad 8$ loute hem] lout pem H , worshipe hem] wyrschip pein H , be] om. HY 9 gelous louyer] luf geluse HY 10 fourpe] pe furpe HY, hatiden] haten HY 11 hem] pem H

[^28]:    B: 1 (mar. 1 Corinthis 15), voyde] voyde and so 4 noust] om.

[^29]:    B: 1 hem pat kepep] oper takep hede canc. 12 we] bep canc., lyuep] lyued

[^30]:    B: 8 and $]$ it
    T: 1 more loue God] luf God more H , more God T 2 yuel] euel and harm H 3 here] psir H 4 her] peir HY 5 folk] folkis Y 6 her] peir HY, pes] siche $\mathrm{H} \quad 7$ me pinkip] men wold thenk H , me wolde penke Y
    9 shulden pei] misten men Y , clenly] kindeli H

[^31]:    B: 1 louep] corr.int. 6 pat] om.

[^32]:    B: 6 cause] cause ys 8 (mar. Philipenses 3 )

[^33]:    T: 2 louest] louedest pi H 3 noust] not HY $3-4$ pou ne] trs. H 4 pingis] thing H , loke] loke pat $\mathrm{H} \quad 6$ God] God in al pi soule Y 7 God] pi God HY, on] om. H, in Y 8 to] om. Y 10 pei taken] pou takist HY, not] no3t H

[^34]:    T: 2 hem] pem H 4 hem] bem H 6 Capitulum Decimum] mar. T, om. H, Tercium mandatum] om. HY 7 comaundement] maundement HY, (mar. Tercium mandatum T) 8 book] pe book Y 9 pe] pin H , haliday] dai Y

[^35]:    T: 1 be] om. H 2 pe] om. $\mathrm{H} \quad 3$ preie and preche] preche and pray H 5 for] of HY $\quad 6$ be] om. H 9 is leueful] trs. H a] om. Y

[^36]:    T: 1 y amJ trs. Y , certeyn] seker H , to] to ech Y 3 ping shulde] pingis schulden $Y \quad 4$ of] of/of $Y \quad 7$ shulen] schulden $H Y$, charite] charite. De secunde table H , charite first comaundement of pe secunde table Y 8 Capitulum] om. H, Primum] Tertium Decimum T, om. H 9 opere] pe oper H, (mar. Mandsta secunde table T) 10 (mar. Capitulum Primum T)

[^37]:    T: 1 pou shalt] trs. HY, pre] pre firste $T 2$ first] pe first HY, man] man pat HY 3 also his neisbore] alle onely he HY 4 pus] om. Y, comaurdemertis] maundementis Y 5 his ${ }^{1}$ ] his his H , twol om. H 6 partid] departid Y, perfor] herefore HY 7 whom] pat HY

[^38]:    T: 2 bope] om. HY 3 of] om. HY 4 moders] moder T 5 men] om. H, wenen] weren Y 6 Capitulum Secundum] om. H 7 (mar. Capitulum Secundum T), summe pat] sum men $H Y \quad 8$ Pis] be $H$

[^39]:    B: 6 despysep] despysede
    7-8 of synne....vnclarmis] corr.mar.

[^40]:    B: 10 tol om.
    T: 1 comounly in siche synnes] in such symmes comynli $Y$ 2 pe] om. H 3 hap] hap now Y, now] om. Y

[^41]:    T: 1 Capitulum Octavum] om. H 2 aзens] asen $Y \quad 4$ of] of eche TY, to] om. Y 5 were it] trs. H 6 alle] om.H 7 Hooli] alle Holi HY 9 hise] om. Y 13 castite] chastite HY 14 in pis lijf lastip but a while] lastip bot a while in pis life $\mathrm{H} \quad 15$ pes resouns] pis reson $\mathrm{H} \quad 16$ forpe] for $T$

[^42]:    T: 2 bi] bi pe $\mathrm{Y} \quad 3$ moost] pe most H , pat] and HY 4 stelip] stcliy T

[^43]:    T: 1 Capitulum Decimum] om.H 2 (mar. Capitulum Decimum T)
    4 for] of HY $4-5$ ofte brent] trs. H $\quad 5$ 3af] made and 3 af $H$
    6 who] whoso HY 11 axiden] seyden Y 14 himsilf cam] trs. H
    16 who pat] whoso H

[^44]:    $\mathrm{T}: 1$ is $^{1}$ ] his Y , seip] seip pat $\mathrm{Y} \quad 2$ God wolde] trs. H, men] pat tru men HY, wel] om. HY 4 tol of H , pe] om. HY 6 blasfemes] blasfemeres H , blasfemyes Y , in pe Olde Lawe shulde be stoned to deep] schulden be stoned to dep in pe Old Lawe $\mathrm{H} \quad 7 \mathrm{pe}$ om. $\mathrm{H} \quad 8$ is oure] us must H 10 not] corr.int. T 11 As ] om. HY 15 her] per H 16 her] pair HY 17 pat] om. Y, herte] pair hert HY

[^45]:    T: 2 Pletyng] Pleding HY, ben] is HY 3 pes] pis Y , leuefully] wilfulli $Y 4$ pletib] pledip HY , to] om. $\mathrm{H} \quad 5$ plete] plede H 6 pleden] pleten Y 9 not lye] neuermore lie HY , he] he himself H , it not] trs. Y

[^46]:    B: 7 eschete] eche зer
    T : 1 moost] pe moost Y , contrarie] traytorie HY , asens] aseine H , [asen) corr.mar. Y , pes] pis Y 2 her] per $Y 4$ her] ber $Y 5$ nyne] nynpe $Y$, bi] bi pe $Y 6$ azens] asen $Y$, (mar. nota T) 8 lordship] pe lordeschipe $H$, per lordship Y, her] per $Y$

[^47]:    T: 1 ten] om. HY 3 eche] eueri HY 5 and to] and so H
    7 willen] wilne H , fulfillyng] fillinge HY 8 Goddis] as Goddis Y 10 bifore] or lijf Y 11 aftir] aftip T 12 pis] his HY 15 eldris] fadris $Y$, han we] trs. H 17 pingis] pinge HY , pat shal] phal T , ben] is HY

[^48]:    1. Manuscripts which have only been consulted in the form of a printed edition are not listed here. The editions in question appear under Other Primary Sources.
