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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFr</td>
<td>Anglo-French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIHR</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJRL</td>
<td>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>British Library, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodl.</td>
<td>Bodleian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVV</td>
<td>The Book of Vices and Virtues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;S</td>
<td>Councils and Synods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Sup.</td>
<td>Faye, C.U. and Bond, W.H, Supplement to the Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Calendar of Patent Rolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Camden Series (London, 1838-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>Cambridge University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYS</td>
<td>Canterbury and York Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCD</td>
<td>Wyclif, De Civili Dominio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>Discursive Version I (see Introduction pp.cxxxiii and cxli ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMD</td>
<td>Wyclif, De Mandatis Divinis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOP</td>
<td>Unless otherwise stated, this refers to the English version of De Officio Pastorali edited by Matthew in The English Works of Wyclif, pp.405-57.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Dives and Pauper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

FZ  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

MAE  Medium Ævum

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, N.
and Piper, A.J.

**MS** Medieval Studies

**MV** *The Metropolitan Visitations of William Courteney*

**NQ** *Notes and Queries*, n.s. new series.


**OFr** Old French

**PC** *Pore Caiatif*


**PL** *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.P.Migne (Paris, 1841-)

**PMLA** *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*

**PP** *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.

**RP** *Rotuli Parliamentorurn*

**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
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.xi-xviii.

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 x 126mm. 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

1-23⁸, 24¹⁰. Medieval quire signatures as follows: 1-9/a-i, 10-16/a-g, 17-22/k,l,m,o,p,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


2. ff.69'–72', inc. *A woman recluse and solitare coueitynge to knowen*; expl. on f.70' and *brynge 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 f.72'.

3. ff.73'–106' Commentary on the Ten Commandments. This is the text of the present edition.

4. ff.106'–127' [*The Fyve Wytttes*]; inc. *As it is byfore seyd so muche diligence no so gret bysynesse; expl. where pe holy gost techepe and enspireth. Explicit bonus tractatus de quinque sensibus*. Edited R.H. Bremmer (1987) (from this manuscript).

F.127' is blank.

5. ff.128'–140', inc. *It byhoue specealy to every man pat desyre; 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', headed *Sermo magistri Thome Wymyldoun apud crucem in cimicertio Sancti Pauli Londoun*; inc. *Redde racionem*

7. ff.153'-155"n, rubric Here bygynnep þe exposicioun of þe Pater Noster; inc. Ech Cristen man oweþ to knowe; expl. in þe ioye of heuene. Amen. Here endeþ þe exposicioun of þe Pater Noster as Seynt Edmund expounyth in his Speculum. 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].


10. ff. 166'-174" [Pe Pater Noster]; inc. Syþ þe Pater Noster is þe beste prayer þat is; expl. þat 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'-175", inc. As witnessep holy writ and holy doctours,
for bep two weyes; expl. sit it is wonder hard and bitter. (Jolliffe I.2).

12. ff.175r-185r, headed Sermo in Die Pasche Ad Populum; inc. Ihesum queritis nazarenun crucifixum; expl. Crist brynge sowe bat for sowe 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 xcv daye of August in the fourthe and fift 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. 185r is blank.


15. ff.188v-190r 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 þou rysest or fully wakest; expl. for þe fals lyuyng of wyckede cristene men et cetera. Explicit regula Cristiana. Edited Arnold iii.204-8 (from Bodl. Laud Miscellaneous 174). IPMEP[203].
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 7-shaped 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
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.191' mentioned above): To my Rob. William Oldsworth. 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 f.192' 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 Servant of Mycheldeane 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' and that of John on f.193'.

Marginalia

Marginalia occur in a later hand e.g. lucifer f.6'. A list in Latin of the seven works of bodily mercy in a hand of the later fifteenth century appears on f.190' and f.191' 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.3-9; 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


2. f.30v, rubric Leccio: Resoun techeb pat neiper etynge ne fastinge is medeful bi hitselfe, but goode entent and clene makeb 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'-'76', headed *Pe vij dedli synnes*; inc. *Sythe bileue techeb vs pat euerti yuele is sinne*; expl. for scharp veniance *takip God for siche sinnes*. Edited Arnold iii.119-67 (from Bodl. Bodley 647). IPMEP[596].

4. ff.76'-'84', ff.84'-85' [*Pe Seven Werkys of Mercy Bodyly and Pe Seven Werkys of Mercy Gostly*] (incomplete); rubric (i) *His sentence teccheb of pe werkes of mercy bope bodily and gosteli to pe which grete tente schilde be taken*; inc. (i) *If e a man were sure pat he schulde tomarow cume before a iuge*; expl. *ellis vs fayleb rist to dymes*; rubric (ii) *Her bene pe werkes of mercy goostely*; inc. *Sip we scholden serue oure parischenis in spiritual almes*; expl. *to bringe mennes soulis to blisse or elles to feeede 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 'þ' are identical, although 'y' is sometimes distinguished by a dot. Abbreviations, e.g. of *a, ra, ur* and of *n*, are common. Headings and rubrics are written in a form of bastard anglicana and the forms for 'y' and 'þ' 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.xv¹

For previous descriptions see Abbott (1900), p.6; EWS ii.xxi-xxiii. 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 x 108mm. Written space: 119 x 77mm. 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, 9, 10-27. Quire and leaf signatures (a/i 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 ff.8 or on f.162.

Contents

1. ff.1'-2' [On the Apostles' Creed], headed Crede; inc. It is soop pat bileue is grounde of alle vertues; expl. and euer e lyue in blisse. Explicit credo in deum patrem. Edited (i) Arnold, iii.114-16 (from Lambeth 408); (ii) LFC pp.14-18 (ibid.). IPMEP[403].

2. ff.2'-3', margin Pater Noster; inc. We shal bileue pat pis Pater Noster pat Crist hymsilf techij; expl. and panne shal we haue everlastyng fredom Amen. Explicit Pater Noster. Edited (i) Arnold, iii.93-7 (from Bodl. Bodley 789); (ii) LFC, pp.7-11 (from Lambeth 408); (iii) BVV pp.337-9 (from BL Additional 17013). IPMEP[810].

3. ff.3'-4', margin Aue; inc. Men greten comounly oure lady Goddis moder; expl. and worshipe we Marie vp al oure myst. Explicit salutatio Sancte Marie Virginis. Edited (i) Arnold, iii.111-13 (from Bodl. Bodley 789); (ii) LFC, pp.11-14 (from Lambeth 408). IPMEP[455]
4. ff.4r-6r, margin vij eresies; inc. For false men multiplien bokis of pe chirche; expl. but neiper is pis bileue ne groundid in resoun. Expliciunt vij hereses contra patrem nostrem. Edited Arnold iii.441-6 (from Bodl. Douce 274). IPMEP [208].

ff.7r-8r are blank.

5. ff.9r-26r, Commentary on the Ten Commandments, edited here.


7. ff. 30v-35r, 35r-38r [Pe Seven Werkys of Mercy Bodyly and Pe Seven Werkys of Mercy Gostly]; inc.(i) If a man were sure pat he shulde tomorwe come before a iuge; expl. And ellis, as me pinkip, vs failip rist to dymes. Expliciunt opera misericordie corporalis; inc.(ii) Sib we shulden serue oure parishens in spiritual almes; expl. as mede and nede and kynde techen Cristen men. Expliciunt opera caritativa etc. Edited Arnold, iii.168-82 (from Oxford, New College 95). IPMEP [331].

8. ff.38r-63r [Synne is for to Drede]; inc. Sib bileue techip vs pat every yuel is ofer 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.63v-75v [Of pe Chirche and Hir Membris]; inc. Cristis Chirche is his spouse pat hap hare partis; expl. and hanne is his

10. ff.76r-80v, headed De Apostasia Cleri; inc. Sip ilche Cristen man is holdon to sewe Crist; expl. fise eloqis ben of charite pat eueremore shal last and here is an ende. Explicit tractatus de apostasia et dotacione ecclesie. Edited (i) Todd (1851), pp.lxxxix-cxii (from this manuscript; (ii) Arnold iii.430-40 (as in (i)). IPMEP[597]

11. ff.81r-95v [Tractatus de Pseudo-Freris]; inc. For many beren heuy pat freris ben clepid pseudo; expl. turne 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].

12. ff.96r-101v [Vae Octuplex]; inc. Crist biddip vs be waar wip pes false prophetis; expl. and putte vs not in straunge pereis fiat we han no nede to trete. Here enden pe eiste wocus 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.101v-116v [Of Mynistris in be Chirche], headed Exposicio evangelij Mt.24 Egressus Ihesus de templo etc.; inc. pis gospel tellip myche wisdom; expl. but not rauyshe her hope in Crist. Explicit Evangelium. Edited (i) Arnold, ii.393-423 (from Bodl. Bodley 788); (ii) EWS ii.328-65 (from BL Additional 40672). IPMEP[738].

14. ff.117v-124v, headed Of Antecrist and his Meynee; inc.
Dauid seip, 'Lord, sett pou a lawe-maker vpon hem; expl. Crist graunt vs grace perto and heuen blisse. Amen. Edited Todd (1851), pp.cxv-cliv (from this manuscript). IPMEP[144].

15. ff.124v-126 [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.126v-127r [On the Twenty-Five Articles, item 19], headed Of Praier a Tretys; inc. Also bishops and freres putten to pore men pat pei seym; expl. bishops mayntenyng it opynly and stidfastly ben cursd heretikes. Explicit tractatus de orisone. Edited Arnold, iii.486/25-488/36 (from Bodl. Douce 273). IPMEP[675].

17. ff.127r-137v [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.137r-143r inc. Crist forsope did al pat he coupe; expl. pou shepherde and ydele forsakyng bi flok etc.

19. ff.144r-145v, headed Nota de Sacramento Altaris; inc. Cristen mennes bileue taust of Ihesu Crist; expl. and here sotile ypocrsi3e and fals heresy. Amen. Edited SEWW, pp.110-12 (from this manuscript). IPMEP[131].

20. ff.145r-151v, inc. Crisostom seip pat fischers and buystouse men; expl. God for his endleles mercy to endure to pe last
eende. Amen.

21. ff.151r-153r, inc. Seynt Barnard spekiþ bus to Eugenye þe Pope; expl. neþpur he may þe fredam of Goddis kunnyng fynde.

22. ff.153³-160r, inc. God moueþ Hooly Churche bi many maner of spechis; expl.þou schalt haue þe blis of heuen etc. Amen.

23. ff.160r-162r, inc. And for noþpur man ne womman may parfitly do þe seuen werkic; expl. ful of myst in tyme of nede to streng his knyst.

24. ff. 163³-217r [Apology for Lollard Doctrines], rubric Here are questiouns and ansueris pacte þat are writun hereafter, inc. First I witnes bifor God almiþty and alle trewe Cristun men; expl. and so I rede þes beggers do bityme and come to Crist. Amen. Amen. Edited Todd, CS, 20 (1842) (from this manuscript). IPMEP[188].


26. ff. 217r-218r, inc. Peis ben þe nyne poynþis þat oure lord Ihesu answerid; expl. And þerfor loue God and þin euuen Cristen for Goddis sake. Amen. (Jolliffe I.12(n)).

27. f.218v, inc. Of þe dedis of mercy God will speke at þe dredful day; expl. lowly knowing hemsift ærþe 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 f.131r, as well as occasional pointing hands in brown plummet (e.g. on f.66v). The name Thomas Chamber is written upside down on f.210r 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 IMEP vi.49-54; MMBL 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: 183x123mm. Written space: 138x82-101mm.

*ff.51r*-69v* are ruled in a single column, the remainder in two columns. Quire 1 has 21-23 lines,* ff.51r*-69v 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**

1⁸ (3 and 6 are single leaves), 2-5⁸, 6-9¹⁰, 10⁸ (wants 8 (cut out)).

Leaf signatures are visible on quire 7 only. Catchwords appear in the usual places.

**Contents**


2. *ff.27r*-32⁸*, rubric and *bigynne feip hope* and *charite*; inc. *For it is seid in holding of oure holiday; expl. he myste listli come to heuene and wite who were amys*. Edited Matthew, pp.347-65 (from Oxford, New College 95, collate with Dublin, Trinity College 245). *IPMEP*[595].

3. *ff.32r*-33vb*, Rubric *Here bigynne pe Pater Noster* (the rubric on *ff.32r*-33r referring to the seven heresies against the Pater Noster refers to item [4], see *IMEP* p.50); inc. *We shal bilecue*
4. ff.33\(^{vb}\)-36\(^{va}\), [Septem hereses Contra Septem Peticiones/Speculum vite Christiane]; rubric Here bigynne\(\) he vij heresies on \(\)he Pater Noster; inc. For fals men multiplien bookis of \(\)he chirche; expl. nei\(\)per \(\)his is bileeue ne groundid in resoun. Edited Arnold iii.441-6 (from Bodl. Douce 274). 

5. ff.36\(^{vb}\)-37\(^{vb}\), rubric Here bigynne\(\) he Ave Marie; inc. Men greten comynli oure ladi Goddis modir; expl. and worshipe we Marie wi\(\)p oure mist. Edited (i) Arnold iii.111-13 (from Bodl. Bodley 789); (ii) LFC, pp.11-14 (from Lambeth 408).  

6. ff.37\(^{vb}\)-39\(^{vb}\), rubric Here bigynne\(\) he crede capitulum primum; inc. It is sof \(\)hat bileeue; expl. and so euer lyue in blisse. Amen. Edited (i) Arnold iii.114-16 (from Lambeth 408); (ii) LFC, pp.14-18 (ibid.). 

7. ff.39\(^{vb}\)-46\(^{vb}\), rubric Here bigynne\(\) he seuen werkis of merci bodili; inc. If a man were sure \(\)hat he shulde tomorewe come before a juge; expl. and ellis as me \(\)penkep vs faili\(\)p rist to dimes. Edited Arnold iii.168-77 (from Oxford, New College 95). 

8. ff.46\(^{vb}\)-50\(^{va}\), rubric Here bigynne\(\) he 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.50vb and f.50v are blank.


10. ff.53r-57v, rubric Here bigynneth þe holi sacrament of baptym; inc. Alle Cristene soulis þat seen or heeren þis litill tretise; expl. we schullen be partyners of þe baptym of cristis passioun.

11. ff.58r-69r, inc. Listenes to me and se may heere; expl. bryng us into þe blis of heuen. Amen. Amen for charitee. God graunt þat it so mote be. Explicit ypotyse. IMEV[220].

12. ff.70r-73vb, rubric Here begynneþ certeyn treñs drawen out of þe Bible; inc. The peple of Isniel dwelled in deserte; expl. to whome þei liken in maneres. Tract on images.

13. ff.73r-75vb, inc. [I] beleue in God, fader almy3ti; expl. synnes ben slayne and clensid oute of man bi þe depe of Crist. Tract on the Creed.

14. ff.75vb-79vb, inc. Blessid be God almy3ti þe fader of oure lord Ihesu Crist; expl. or þanke men for þat þei do to hem for God seiþe (catchword) bi abacuk (ends imperfectly).

15. ff.80r-86vb, inc. (begins imperfectly) and dwel in his loue. If ony man sey þat he louip God; expl. þat God or his lawe or his ordinaunce. Amen. Tract on the commandments.
Handwriting

The text is written in three separate hands, changing at ff.51r and 70r (MMBL iv.741).

Punctuation

The colon is used with red colour touching in quires 1-6 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.1r-50r (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.16r) boxed in red, and numbering (e.g. of the properties of charity f.31r-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 f.24r, expunction and deletion on f.31r and marginal correction with a red caret mark in the text on f.43v.

Provenance

'C q[to 2' f.1r 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 f.1r and (more extensively) f.86v, suggesting parallels with Lyndwood's Provinciale. 'William Lylster owe thy bowke' appears in a sixteenth century hand on f.86v.

Binding

The binding is post-medieval.
THE TEXTUAL TRADITION

The four manuscripts, B, H, T and Y, contain two overlapping, but nevertheless very different versions, one found in B and the other in H, T and Y. With the exception of the occasional phrase or line (usually additional material in H, see e.g. T6/4, T13/8) 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 H, 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. 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, 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.

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:


2) Error due to misunderstanding of the meaning: B85/7-8, T85/7-8, B: Pyn elde fader and elde moder bep hyn 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

¹. Readings without error are given in the spelling of T, or, where T has the error, in the spelling of Y. Erroneous readings shared by two or more MSS are given in the spelling of the first MS cited.
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 3er HTY eschete; BT153/2, B ynarke it to here lykyng, 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 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 (BTS2). 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

¹ For the full quotation see below, note to possible HTY joint errors item 2.
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 siʃ \textit{pat he be trew}, BTY \textit{if pat he be} cf. T58/4-5, where the point is that every man who \textit{exists} bears God's name in his soul. The word \textit{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 \textit{ourcomen}, BTY \textit{vencushid}; T64/5, H \textit{is} BTY \textit{stondip in}; T100/3, H \textit{for to do}, TY \textit{fordo}; T101/8, H \textit{say}, TY \textit{supposen}; T139/3, H \textit{be don} TY \textit{be bedun}, cf. B by byddynge.

4) Error due to repetition of a word which has just been used: T48/6, H \textit{see ne fele}, BTH \textit{feele}; T70/8, H \textit{restid}, BTY \textit{lay}.

5) Errors due to anticipation of a word found later in the text: T50/4, H \textit{sumdele}, TY \textit{soundely}, cf. HTY \textit{sumdel} l.5; T61/8, H \textit{fallep}, BTY \textit{failip}; T154/8, H \textit{lede}, TY \textit{teche}.

6) Errors resulting in defective syntax: T2/8, H \textit{who}, BTY \textit{for who}; T6/5, H \textit{he}, BTY \textit{as he}, with consequent H addition of \textit{And}.

7) Errors involving unnecessary expansion: T1/2, H \textit{men pat}
wullen be pe chiledren of Godde, BYT men, where H's addition provides an unnecessary qualification; T2/5, H loued and thankide, BYT 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.

8) Error due to grammatical confusion: T21/4, H hestis, BYT heest. This error is the result of confusion over the number of pis which H often uses as a plural.

9) Error resulting in the use of the wrong tense: T109/9, H moueþ, TY moeyde.

10) 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 sif.

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 overcomyng, HT ouer comyn (i.e. 'too common'); T108/2, Y an yuel tente, HT annuel rent; T140/3, Y wilfully BHT leuefully; T147/7, Y peple, HT Pope; T149/9, Y is moost, BT is waxen, H waxib; T153/2, Y make hem to bus 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 leue i.e. Y has misinterpreted leue 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:
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 hel.

Possible BH joint errors:
1) BT3/2, 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.\textsuperscript{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) BT2/3 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.

\textsuperscript{1} For possible sources see note to this line.
2) T88/6, TY hem, BH him (referring back to fader).
3) T134/1, 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 (Sit 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 T122/5) 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) BT84/3, BHY and al onlyche he, T and also his nei3bore, 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 gret(e 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 cyn.

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,

¹. cf. Sermones ii.1/7-10: 'cum non valet festum vel devocio cuiuscunque sancti citra Dominum, nisi de quanto in eius devotionem supereminenter persona sollemnizans accenditur'.

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 seye þat
men þat beþ ykylled by mannes
lawe beþ nont slawe of men
bot þe lawe sleþ hem and her
yuele dedes.

HTY:

And herfor men seien þat
men þat ben slayn bi maennes
lawe ben not sleyn of men
but þe lawe sleþ hem and her
yuel dedis. But wolde God
þat þe puple wolde worshippe
Goddis lawe and seie þat it were
ful soþ and iust in hymself as
þei supposen of maennes lawe.
Wipouten ony dout, þame shulden
þei not be contrarie to Crist:
Bot what seyþ a grete clerke?
Suppose we, he seyþ, by oure feyþ, þat God bydde þus: þat we scholde kylle no man wipoute auctorite of him.

(B101-2)

And so, as me þenkeþ, no man scholde kylle þer by auctorite of þe lawe but if he were siker þat Godes lawe bad it, and þanne myste he wryte þat he brake nouþt Godes heste al yf he kylled þe him ne fel nouþt fro charite syþ boþe louþ and sorowe scholde meue hem to do so and nouþt his owene vengeaunce. And þus as me þenkeþ, a man may kyle anoþer as men clepeþ hangemen and hederys of mannes lawe. And þus Godes lawe spekeþ, wham we scholde lyue.

HTY:
And so, as me þinkþ, no maþ shulde sle ðer bi auctorite of þe lawe but if he were siker þat Goddis lawe bad it; and þanne myste he wite þat he brak not Goddis heest al if he slouþ him ne fel not fro charite. siþ boþe louþ and sorowe shulde moeue him to do so and not his owene veniaunce. And þus, as me þinkþ, a maþ may kille anoþer, as men clepeþ hangmen and hederis in mannes lawe. And þus Goddis lawe spekþ whiche we shulden trowe. And þus men supposen þat bi londis lawe is no maþ sleyþn but if God bidde it, for þei supposen þat þis is Goddis lawe. But it is wonder to men hou in mony londis men ben sleyþn for a trespas, and for a myche more þei ben not punyþid so. but oþer
For of this lawe we be

certeyne pat it bydde

kylle a man bot yf it be

resoun and graciose and

profitable yf he take it wel,

so pat it were betere him to

be kyllde so pat for to lyue

forpe vnpunyshed

(B102-4)

But of Goddis lawe bea we ful

certyn pat it bidd not

sle a man but if it be

resoun and gracious and

profitable if he take it wel,

so pat him were betere but to

be slyen pat to lyue

forpe vnpunyshid

(T102-4)

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
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EME</td>
<td>Early Middle English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Middle English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS(S)</td>
<td>manuscript(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>New (i.e. Modern) English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>Old Anglian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Old English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Old Kentish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>Old Icelandic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>West Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa.t.</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pp.</td>
<td>past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr.</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr.p.</td>
<td>present participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Atlas*  
A. McIntosh, M.L. Samuels and M. Benskin,  
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 king (f.1r/12; T1/10), mynde (f.2r/11; T7/5) but occasionally as u in churche (f.5r/12; T33/8) beside chirche (f.2r/8; T7/2). Euel (f.5r/5; T33/2) beside yuelle (f.7r/9; T53/6) and iuelle (f.16r/6; T101/6) reflects EME lengthening in open syllables. NE 'worse' appears as worse (f.1r/6; T72/8) beside, once, warse (f.1r/9; T75/2). NE 'work' v. appears with i/y and with o as in wirchip (f.20r/11; T121/16), wyrche (inf.) (f.2r/4; T12/2), worche (inf.) (f.9r/16; T67/1). NE 'worship' (n. and v.) normally appears with i/y but also with o: wyrship (f.2r/7; T7/1), wirschip (f.11r/12; T73/5), worchip (f.1r/18; T2/4). Forms in wur- occur, as in worse (f.11r/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 þyncan 'to seem' appears with medial -e- as in thenkis (f.5r/2; T32/1), presumably because of confusion with the verb 'to think'. OE ñ appears as i as in litill (f.1r/19; T4/7), but once as ie in fier (f.19r/8; T118/5) beside fire.
2) OE i normally appears as i, as in *biddyngs* (f.1r/3; T1/2) but sometimes as y, as in *myght* (f.2r/6; T6/9). OE *miôl/myôl* appears as *miche* (f.1r/6; T74/9) but more commonly as *myche* (f.2r/1; see T6/4 and apparatus). The vowel in *weke* n. (f.10r/6; T68/5) cf. OE *wice* is due to lowering associated with EME lengthening in open syllables. OE l appears as i/y, as in *lyf* (f.1r/13; T1/11), *life* (f.1r/15; T4/3).

3) OE e appears as e, as in *men* (f.1r/1; T1/2). OE eg appears as ey as in *weye* (f.5r/8; see T34/13 and apparatus) and as ay in *way* (f.28r/18; T154/9). OE ê appears as e in *kepe* (f.1r/7; T1/6). OA ëg by smoothing appears as y- in *yen* (f.4r/16; T22/2), but also once as e3-: *eien* (f.5r/123; T34/8).

4) OE æ appears as a in *badde* (f.1r/6; T1/5), and as the first component of the digraph ay in *day* (f.5r/23; T34/7). OE â 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.4r/5; T22/2). OE â plus shortening appears as e in *ledde* (f.3r/20; T15/5), but as a in *lastid* (f.10r/13; T71/3) and *any* (f.1r/15; T2/2) beside one example of *ony* (f.13r/17; T86/9).

5) OE a appears as a in *asse* (f.28r/7; T153/10). OE a followed by a nasal appears as a as in *noman* (f.1r/4; T1/3). *grauen* (f.3r/6; T14/6) and *name* (f.6r/3; T50/8) have EME lengthening. OE â generally appears as o as in *more* (f.1r/15; T2/1), but as oo in *goo* (f.11r/21; T74/2). LOE â from a before lengthening groups generally appears as o as in *stonden* (f.4r/5; T22/1) but also as a as in *hande* (f.3r/7; T14/6). Retracted OA a plus lengthening group appears as o as in
holde (f.1r/2; T1/2). asked (f.1r/5; T1/4) has LOE shortening.

6) OE o appears as o as in godde (f.1r/2; see T1/2 and apparatus). OE og appears as -ow in bowes (f.9r/8; T64/3). OE o normally appears as o as in do (f.1r/6; T1/4) but occasionally as u in gude (f.1r/20; T4/8).

7) OE u usually appears as u, as in cum (f.1r/6; T1/5). Forms such as woke (f.10r/22; T69/9) cf. WS and OA wucu and loued (f.1r/20; T2/5) display lowering associated with EME lengthening in open syllables. Note also loue n. (f.5r/14; T34/1) beside lu (f.2r/14; T10/3&4) and loue v.inf. (f.4r/12; T23/5) beside lu (f.2r/17; T11/1). w sometimes appears for u or wu as in wnderstand (f.7r/18; T54/4) and wit (f.7r/2; T54/10). founden (f.1r/18; T4/5) reflects LOE lengthening. OE ù appears as -ow as in howe (f.1r/5; T1/4), but also as ou as in hou (f.4r/17; T30/8).

8) OE eo appears as e as in heuen (f.1r/6; T1/5). OE eо appears as e as in Prestes (f.2r/4; T6/8) and in trew (f.5r/7; see T 34/13 and apparatus), treu (f.20r/22; T122/8) beside trw (f.7r/7; T53/3), tru (f.22r/21; see T130/2 and apparatus), but as ee in weede (f.25r/12; T144/5).

9) OE ea appears as a as in alle (f.1r/1; T1/2). ea before lengthening group appears as e in selde (f.24r/16; T136/1) cf. WS and K sealde. OE ëa appears as e as in grete (f.1r/6; T3/3).

B In reflexes of certain OE consonants:

1) The form for 'b', representing OE ñ is the same as the form for
'y'. 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 'prise 'these' (f.2/9; T7/4). The form is -like rather than -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 OE p is most frequently represented by this symbol as in ' (f.1/1; see T1/2 and apparatus), but also by th as in wythouten (f.1/3; T1/3). Forms in ph also occur: phre (f.4/4&5; T22/1).

2) OE hw- appears as wh- as in what (f.1/5; T1/4).

3) OE sc- appears as sch- as in schulden (f.1/2; T1/2).

4) OE palatal c appears as ch as in chirche (f.2/8; T7/2) but as k in reken (f.4/3; T21/9) and seken (f.18/7; T110/9).

5) OE -ht normally appears as -st as in noast (f.2/23; T11/8) but often, in the earlier part of the text, as -ght as in noght (f.1/7; T3/4).

6) OE initial f appears as f as in for (f.1/6; T1/4).

7) OE initial palatal g appears as s as in seuen (f.8/7; T62/2) but, in the early part of the text, often as g as in gif (f.1/8; T3/5).

8) The ax- of OE axian appears most commonly as ask- as in asked (f.1/5; T1/4) but note also axis (f.6/16; T51/9) and, once, asche (f.14/7; T88/2).

9) Metathesis of r does not occur, hence NE 'bird', 'third' and 'burn' appear as briddis pl. (f.7/23-f.8/1; T59/5), thridde (f.3/10; T14/10), and bren (f.18/8; T109/6).

---

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.
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.1r/6; T3/3), in the reflexes of OE masculine and neuter nouns without ending such as godde (f.1v/2; see T1/2 and apparatus) and worde (f.1v/21; T2/6), and on the singular preterites of strong verbs such as gafe (f.2v/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.9r/12; T64/7), trese (f.21v/11; T127/4), past participles of weak verbs ending in -ide and -ede as in thankide (f.1v/20; see T2/5 and apparatus), chargede (f.3v/14; T15/1), and the third person singular present indicative ending in -be/-ethe/-ythe as in thinkbe (f.12v/11; T80/8), liethe (f.11v/6; T74/8), wonnythe (f.13v/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.1r/3; T3/1), and forms of NE 'these' occur both with and without final -e as in þís (f.1r/8; T1/6), þise (f.2v/9; T7/4). Nouns whose etymology would lead you to expect final -e do not always employ it consistently. Thus we find end (f.1v/16; T4/4) beside ende (f.1r/20; T4/8) and law (f.5v/17; T48/1) beside lawe (f.2v/16; T10/5).
Other points of accidence include:

1) In nouns, the plural endings are usually -is/-es as in lewis (f.1 v/8; T1/7), sensures (f.1 v/23; T2/8), although forms in -s and occasionally -ys or -us (by abbreviation) also occur: biddynge (f.1 v/3; T1/2), wittys (f.6 v/19; see T50/3 and apparatus), biddingus (f.1 v/23; T2/7). There is one example of an -ez ending: clothez (f.13 v/1; T83/2). Plural forms with additional final -e have been dealt with above. There are still a few plurals in -en: breperen (f.17 v/22; T108/14), ezen (f.5 v/23; T34/8) and also housen (f.26 v/8; T147/15) beside houses (f.25 v/7; T144/1). The possessive forms of the noun ends in -is/-es/-s: goddis (f.1 v/2; T1/2), goddes (f.6 v/20; T52/4), mans (f.3 v/6; T14/6).

2) The pronoun system is less regular than in T (see below). Of interest are first person singular I (f.2 v/9; T7/2); second person singular y (f.1 v/22, T2/7), pow (f.3 v/4; T14/5), and pou (f.3 v/5; T14/6); third person singular he (f.1 v/5; T1/4), sche (f.27 v/11; T149/9), and hit (f.4 v/9; T23/3) beside the usual it (f.1 v/8; T3/5). 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 hir (f.19 v/20; T115/3). The third person plural pronoun appears as pai (f.1 v/14; T1/11) with or without abbreviation, with pei (f.15 v/6; T100/2) and pai (f.22 v/6; T130/9) each occurring once. NE 'their' and 'them' occur both with initial p- and with initial h-, as in per (f.1 v/13; T1/11), peire (f.2 v/19; T13/6), peir (f.3 v/11; T20/5), pair (f.5 v/6; T33/3), her (f.2 v/6; T6 v/9), here (f.9 v/22; T65/6), pem (f.1 v/4; T1/3), hem (f.3 v/11; T14/10). NE 'our' appears as oure
(f.1v/15; T4/4) and ouur (f.1v/15; T4/3). NE 'your' normally appears with initial s- as in soure (f.7v/5; T53/1), souur (f.7v/8; see T53/4 and apparatus), but once with initial y-: your (f.10r/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.1v/5; T1/4), techis (f.1v/14; T2/1), stondys (f.2v/13; T10/3), asks (f.4v/19; T24/6). The first instance of an ending in -th or -p is knowyth (f.7v/21; T54/6). From this point onwards, the endings are generally -ip/-ep, with occasional forms in -pe or -th: puttip (f.7v/8; T57/2), faylep (f.7v/19; T58/10), bidpe (f.16v/13; T101/3) and knowyth quoted above. Forms with additional -e have been dealt with above. Occasional forms in -es/-is do, however, occur in the later section of the text as in charges (f.13v/3; T83/4). There is one form in -ez: synnez (f.17v/9; T105/9). Present plural endings are most commonly -en with occasional -in/yn: wullen (f.1r/1; see T1/2 and apparatus), plesin (f.3v/23; T21/6), makyn (f.4v/8; T23/2). Occasionally the -n is missing, as in se (f.2v/11; T12/7). The third singular present form of

1. It seems unlikely that either clepib (f.16v/7) or streccheb (f.23v/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 streccheb ('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.
the verb 'to be' appears as *is* (f.1r/15; T2/1) and the plural form as *ben* (f.1r/22; T2/7) or *be* (f.1r/13; T4/2). The present participle ends in *-ynG/-lng*: *walking* (f.5r/21; T34/6), *knowynG* (f.6r/8; T49/2). In weak past participles the endings are generally *-id/-ed*: *saued* (f.1r/4; T1/3), *forfendid* (f.4r/21; T30/12). 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.1r/5; T3/3), but there are isolated forms in *-e, -on* and *-yn*: *take* (f.9r/21; T65/6), *bedon* (f.9r/13; T66/8), *vknowyn* (f.24r/17-18; T136/3). The *y*-prefix does not appear.

4) The adverbial ending is *-ly/-li*: *trewly* (f.1r/10; T1/8), *freli* (f.1r/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 *pem*, although occasional forms in *hem* occur from f.3r 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 *p*- and eight with initial *h*-. Other items which occur in the early part of the text but not in the later include *suc*he (f.2*V*9; T12/5) for NE 'such', later *siche* (f.3*V*14; T20/7) and *sen* (f.1*V*22; T6/3) for NE 'since', later *sip* (f.8*V*19; T61/3). Forms such as *gude/gode/goode* and the changes from *g* to *ʒ* and from -*ght* to -*ʒt* have been dealt with above. *schullen* pl.v. with final -*n* (f.15*V*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 translation1 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 *suc*he 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 *ziue* (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

1. On progressive translation, see *Atlas i.16.*
the later sections, belong to the scribe's own dialect, this dialect can be identified as Midland. The reflexion of OE ā and OE ā in ā/ā 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 ēo and the reflexion of OE ğ in ī 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 'b' and 'y' as they have been mapped by Benskin.1 As has already been stated, the H scribe uses a single symbol for 'b' 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

2. Ibid. p.15.
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 *pái* (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 -ei- together 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.1/1; see T1/2 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: sai\(y\) for NE 'says' (f.10v.2; T68/1), see\(y\) 'sees' (f.13r/18; T84/8), seus\(n\)ye 'seventh' (f.9v/22; T67/7), summ 'some' (f.30v/12; T159/2'), yr\(i\)de 'third' (f.6r/15; T49/9), and most noticeably, because it occurs so often, si\(y\) '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 sel\(d\)e 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 worch\(e\) v. (Atlas i map 315) suggests that the West Riding is the more likely. It is worth noting that lau 'law' (f.16v/10; T103/9) is only recorded for the West Riding of Yorkshire, that aer 'air' (f.8r/1; T59/5) is recorded only for the North and West Ridings and for Northumberland, while strens 'strength' n. (f.19v/3; T118/2) is recorded only for York (Atlas iv, items 164, 69, and 42).
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 ɨ appears as y/i as in kyng (T1/10) and chirche (T7/2). OE ɨ appears as i in triste (T3/8) but as ie in fier (T11/5).
2) OE i appears as ɨy as in biddyngis (T1/2). OE mycel/mičel normally appears as myche (T12/7), but there is one example of miche (T80/12). OE Ĩ normally appears as ɨy, as in wisely (T2/9), tyme (T4/3), but also as ij as in lijf (T11/1).
3) OE e appears as e, as in men (T1/2), but as i between g and d in togidre (T15/3). The ee of cende (T13/1), beside ende (T4/4), perhaps reflects an earlier spelling showing LOE lengthening. OE ē appears as e as in kepe (T1/6). OA ĕg by smoothing appears as ys in yæn (T2/2).
4) OE æ generally appears as a as in bad (T1/5) and in the first component of the digraph ay as in day (T34/7). OE Æ appears as e as in teche (T6/8), but also, though less frequently, as ee as in heestis (T10/2). Before sh OE æ appears as ei in fleish (T2/2). OE Æ with shortening sometimes appears as a, as in lastide (T71/3), but also as e, as in losse (T34/1). OE Æ with shortening appears as o in ony (T2/2). late (T9 6/7) shows Scandinavian influence, cf. Ol lātā.
5) 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* (T2/4). LOE ā 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* (T1/2). *axide* (T1/4) shows LOE shortening.

6) OE o appears as o as in *goddis* (T1/2) and in *world* (T13/1) (OE *woruld* but cf. also OE *weoruld*). OE og appears as ow in *bowes* (T64/3). OE ɵ appears as o/oo as in *do* (T1/4), *good* (T11/7).

7) 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). *ground* (T64/5), *doumbe* (T100/8), and *founden* (T4/5) reflect LOE lengthening, but cf. *bunden* (T80/9). OE ū normally appears as ou as in *hou* (T1/4) but as ow in *Now* (T24/4).

8) OE eo appears as e as in *heuene* (T1/5). OE ēo generally appears as e as in *Prestis* (T6/8) but as ee in *weed* (T144/5). The o of *fourpe* (T14/10) reflects a rising diphthong.

9) OE ea generally appears as a as in *alle* (T1/2). The OE combination eax, however, appears as ex in *wexen* (T156/15). OE ēa appears as e/ee as in *greet* (T3/3) and *dep* (T4/5) WS ea plus lengthening group appears as e in *telden* (T106/7).
B Reflexes of OE consonants

1) OE hw- appears as wh- as in what (T1/4).
2) OE initial sc- generally appears as sh- as in shulden (T1/2), but once as sc-: sculdest (T124/5).
3) OE ht appears as st as in list (T4/2).
4) OE axian appears with initial ax- 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 s as in yue (T3/5), but consistently as sh in she 'indeed' (T10/1). forgete (T3/4) beside foræte (T49/2) shows Scandinavian influence cf. Of geta.
7) OE initial f appears as f as in for (T1/2).
8) OE c appears as ch 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 (pl.) (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 his (T1/10), his (sg.) (T2/6) but note his (pl.) (T4/1) and hise (sg.)
There is little evidence for the use of -e as a definite inflexion. Singular definite adjectives such as greet (T4/2) and good (T11/7) 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 l, 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: brieren (T108/14), yen (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 (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 -ip/-e as in tellip (T1/4), teche (T2/1) with occasional -yp: maky (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 -un, 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 bitoke (T72/2), although, given the date of the manuscript, this may seem unlikely.

Dialect

Traditional methods of dialect analysis suggest the Southern
half of the Central Midlands. The Midlands is suggested by a combination of features. The reflexion of OE $\ddot{a}$ in o/oo together with regular verbal endings of the third person singular present in -ep/-ip 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 ëo and the reflexion of OE ñ 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), *sib* (T4/2), *wolen* with final -*n* (T97/3) and *yæn* 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 *yæn* 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 *pouzend/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 *sei-* 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 Huntingdonshire 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.
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 king (f.1\(^{rb}\)/4; T1/10), mynde (f.2\(^{rb}\)/18; T7/5). OE swylec appears with medial \( i \) as in sich (f.3\(^{va}\)/9; T12/5) in the earlier part of the text, but later mainly with medial \( u \) as in such (f.11\(^{vy}\)/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\(^{vb}\)/21; T12/2), worse (f.11\(^{vb}\)/19; T12/5), worship n. (f.2\(^{vb}\)/10; T7/1). OE \( y \) appears as \( i \) as in litil (f.2\(^{va}\)/10; T4/7) but as \( ie \) in fier (f.18\(^{va}\)/11; T118/5) beside fire (f.20\(^{va}\)/5; T129/11).
2. OE \( i \) appears most commonly as \( i \) as in biddingis (f.1\(^{ra}\)/5-6; T1/2) but as \( y \) in kny3tis (f.9\(^{rb}\)/17; T62/2). NE 'if' (OE gil, get) appears as \( if \) (f.1\(^{ra}\)/13; T1/5). OE miel, myel appears commonly with medial -\( i \)- as in mich (f.3\(^{ra}\)/12; T12/7) but more commonly, especially in the later part of the text, with -\( y \)- as in myche (f.10\(^{vb}\)/10; T69/3). OE \( i \) appears as \( i \) as in wiseli (f.1\(^{va}\)/12; T2/9), but occasionally as \( y \) next to minims as in tyme (f.2\(^{va}\)/2; T4/3) beside time (f.2\(^{va}\)/6; T4/5). OE \( i \) also appears as \( ij \) in lijf (f.1\(^{rb}\)/7; T1/11) and wijf (f.24\(^{vb}\)/19; T153/9), and occasionally in other words: sijknessis (f.17\(^{va}\)/3; T109/12) and wijser (f.18\(^{va}\)/7; see T118/3 and apparatus).
3. OE \( e \) generally appears as \( e \) as in men (f.1\(^{ra}\)/4; T1/2). However, between \( g \) and a dental and \( r \) and a dental \( e \) appears as \( i \)
in *tigider* (f.3²/21; T15/3), *brīperen* (f.16⁴b/17; T107/5). *latten* (f.11²²/3; T73/2) (pr.pl.), beside more usual *letten* (f.3⁴b/7; T13/7) with *e* due to i-mutation, may reflect the occasional OE restoration of *æ* before consonant groups or may show the influence of the adjective.¹ *eende* (f.2³/3; T4/4) beside less usual *ende* (f.8⁴n/12; T58/10) reflects an earlier pronunciation with lengthening before consonant groups. OE *ē* generally appears as *e* as in *kepe* (f.1⁴n/15; T1/6), occasionally as *ee* as in *meede* (f.1³n/18; T3/2). OA *ēg* by smoothing appears as *is* in *isēn* (f.4¹b/22; T22/2).

4. OE *æ* appears as *a* in *bad* (f.1³n/13; T1/5) and in the first component of the digraph *ay/ai* (OE *æg*) as in *may* (f.1³n/7; T1/3). Assuming that the double *aa* of *staaf* (f.3⁴b/3; T15/5) indicates a long vowel, it must reflect the levelling of the vowel of the inflected forms to the uninflected. OE *ē* appears as *e/ee* as in *techip* (f.1⁴b/11; T2/1), *heestis* (f.1³b/7; see T3/6 and apparatus) but as *ei* before *sch* in *fleisch* (f.4⁴b/21; T22/2) beside *fleshe* (f.18⁴n/18; T118/8). OE *ē* plus shortening appears as *e* as in *ledde* p.a.t. (f.3⁴b/16; T14/3), *lefte* (f.5³n/21; T33/9), *lesse* (f.5³b/2; T34/1), *led* pp. (f.18⁴b/24; T121/13), but also as *a* as in *lad* pp. (f.3⁴b/4; T15/5), *lasse* (f.17⁴b/24; T109/9). NE 'any' appears as *ony* (f.1³b/12; T2/2).

5. OE *æ* appears as *a* in *asse* (f.2⁴b/21; T153/10). OE *a* followed by a nasal appears as *a* as in *man* (f.1³n/8; T1/3). *grauen* (f.3⁴b/22; T14/6) and *name* (f.7³n/7; T50/8) have EME lengthening.

---

¹. For the occasional restoration of *æ* in this position in OE see Campbell p.76 § 194.
OE a before lengthening groups generally appears as o as in *stondip* (f.2½/3-4; T10/3), but once as a in *handis* (f.21½/15; T131/7). Retracted OA a plus lengthening group appears as o as in *holde* (f.1½/5; T1/2). OE ā appears as o/oo as in *more* (f.1½/12; T2/1), *woot* (f.1½/20; T2/4).

6. OE o appears as o as in *goddis* (f.1½/5; T1/2), but once as oo in *croos* (f.6½/7; T47/6). OE og appears as ow as in *bowis* (f.9½/8-9; T64/3). OE õ appears as o, oo as in *do* (f.1½/11; T1/4), *good* (f.2½/12; T4/8).

7. OE u normally appears as u, as in *ful* (f.1½/20; T4/2). Forms such as *loued* (f.1½/1; T2/5) and *woke* (f.10½/18; T68/5) display lowering associated with EME lengthening in open syllables. *founden* (f.2½/7-8; T4/5) reflects LOE lengthening. OE ū normally appears as ou as in *foule* (f.4½/7; T23/3) but as ow in *now* (f.4½/21; T24/4) and in *howe* (f.1½/9-10; T1/4) beside more usual *hou* (f.3½/6; T13/6).

8. OE eo appears as e as in *heuene* (f.1½/12; T1/5). OE ēo generally appears as e, occasionally ee, as in *Prestis* (f.2½/4-5; T6/8), *feend* (f.4½/19; T26/11). The vowel of *fille* (f.24½/6; T151/6) beside *fel* (f.16½/5; T103/3) both pa.t.sg. is due to EME shortening. Note also *trufe* (f.6½/13; T34/13) beside (once each) *troufe* (f.8½/21; T55/2) and *treufe* (f.17½/19; T109/7). *tries* ('trees') (f.20½/18; 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.1½/3; T1/2), but as e before x in *wexen* (f.25½/8; T156/15). WS and K ea plus lengthening appears as ee in *teelden* (f.16½/3; T106/7). OE ēa
appears most commonly as ee as in *greet* (f.1*rb/20; T3/3) but also as e in *fewe* (f.16*vb/13; see T107/3 and apparatus).

B. In reflexes of certain OE consonants:
1. OE *hw-* appears as *wh-* as in *what* (f.1*rb/10; T1/4).
2. OE *sc* appears as *sch, sh* as in *schulden* (f.1*rb/4; T1/2), *shalt* (f.3*va/3; T14/7), the former appearing more frequently in the earlier part of the text.
3. OE *-ht* appears as *-st* as in *list* (f.1*rb/19; T4/2).
4. OE palatal ę normally appears as *ch* as in *techip* (f.1*rb/11; T2/1), but as k in *rekene* (f.4*rb/16; T21/9).
5. OE palatal ą appears as *s* as in *forsete* (f.1*rb/4; T3/4).
6. OE *axian* appears with initial *ax* as in *axide* (f.1*rb/10; T1/4).
7. Metathesis of r does not occur, hence NE 'bird, 'third' and 'burn' appear as *briddis* pl. (f.8*vb/2; T59/5), *pridde* (f.3*va/8; T14/10), *brend* pp. (f.18*va/10; T118/5).

C. Use of final -e.

Final -e does not appear on the possessive *his* pl. (f.1*rb/6; T1/10) but does appear in *pes* (f.1*rb/3; T1/9) beside more usual *pes* (f.5*va/10; T33/4), 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.24*va/10; T148/10) and *souste* pp. (f.16*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.5*rb/18; T31/2), *maade* pa.t. (f.10*vb/27; T67/6). Residual traces of the definite inflexion
may be found in phrases such as *pe olde lawe* (f.6b/10; T48/1) and *pe firste maundement* (f.7a/1; T50/5), but the lack of inflexion in phrases such as *oure good god* (f.2b/9; T11/7) and *pe firste table* (f.2a/10-11; T10/5) 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.1a/3; T1/2), *alle sectis* (f.1a/18; T1/7), *al synne* (f.4b/3; T21/3). However, final -e does not necessarily appear as a plural inflexion in other adjectives. Thus, *deed stokkis* (f.5a/15; T33/6-7), and *pese greet swerers* (f.8a/5-6; T54/5) beside *pese greete glotouns* (f.4a/3-4; T23/2).

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) -ys also occur: *biddingis* (f.1a/5-6; T1/2), *enemies* (f.2a/13; T6/1), *gynnes* (f.10b/2-3; T66/4), *resouns* (f.2b/5; T11/5), *almys* (f.24a/24; T152/6). The possessive forms follow a similar pattern, -is being the usual form with -es and -ys both occurring occasionally: *goddis* (f.1a/5; T1/2), *mannes* (f.3b/23; T14/6), *mannys* (f.16b/12; T104/8). There is one example of a -us ending: *menmus* (f.19b/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: *briperen* (f.17b/1; T108/14), *isen* (f.4b/22; T22/2).

2. As far as the pronoun system is concerned the following items
are of interest: I (f.2ª/14; T7/2), his sg. (f.1ª/3; T2/6) and his pl. (f.1ª/6; T1/10), sche (f.24ª/4; T149/9), she (f.24ª/8; T150/2), it (f.4ª/6; T23/3). NE 'they' appears consistently as bei (f.1ª/9; T1/11), 'their' as ber (f.1ª/7; T1/11), occasionally her (f.4ª/8; T23/2), once ther (f.21ª/2; T131/1), 'them' consistently as hem/hem (f.1ª/7; T1/3).

3. In verbs, third singular present endings appear commonly as -ep, but more frequently as -ip: loup (f.1ª/2; T2/6), tellip (f.1ª/9; T1/4). -i occurs occasionally and -th and -it once each: know (f.6ª/20; T47/12), lith (f.1ª/16; T74/8), kep (f.25ª/23; T156/10). Present plural endings are most commonly -en/-en as in kep (f.1ª/17; T1/7), with -e occurring occasionally: blemische (f.1ª/18; T69/7). Endings in -ep/-ip occur very occasionally throughout the text, thus meene (f.4ª/7-8; T20/4), letip (f.1ª/9; T73/4), kep (f.25ª/23; T157/5). The third singular present form of the verb 'to be' is is (f.1ª/12; T2/1) and the present plural ben/ben (f.1ª/6; T2/7), once be (f.1ª/20; T108/9). The present participle ends in -inge, -yng/yng, -ing: walkinge (f.5ª/14-15; T34/6), knowyng (f.6ª/14-15; T49/2), plesing (f.1ª/3; T81/4).

In weak past participles the ending is usually -id, less frequently -ed, but -ide and -de endings also occur: partid (f.2ª/19; T7/5), saued (f.2ª/5-6; T4/5), lokide (f.1ª/23; T100/15), fedde (f.1ª/18; T118/8). Strong past participles generally end in -en/en as in boden (f.1ª/20; T3/3), with occasional forms in -e: knowe (f.6ª/5-6; T47/6). The y- prefix does not appear.
Dialect

Traditional dialect analysis suggests that the scribe came from the South East Midlands. The reflex of both OE ā and OE ō in o/oo together with the third singular ending in -iʃ/-eʃ 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 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.1v/21; T4/3), ech (f.3v/15; T15/10) and wher ('whether') (f.4v/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.13v/26; see T86/1 and apparatus) suggests the northern part of the remaining area, i.e. south Warwickshire, Staffordshire,

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).

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 *sylf* for 'self' (f.1/16; T2/3), beside two examples of *self* (f.11v/23 and f.14r/11; T75/2 and T95/2), together with the use of *ech*, 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 *iën* (*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), *zure* but not *zure* or *zure* (*Atlas* iv, item 263), *shulden* but not *shulden* (*Atlas* iv, item 23), *wolcn* but not *wolcn* (*Atlas* iv, item 24), *aen* but not *aen* (*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* i...
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\(^{11}/7\); T64/2), eiper...ellis for 'either...or' (f.7\(^{11}/11-12\); T53/7-8), eerpe for 'earth' (f.10\(^{11}/27\); 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 (f.3\(^{11}/1-2\); T13/4), 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 strenghe (f.9\(^{11}/19\); possibly an error: see T63/5), 'busy' v. Y bisie (f.12\(^{11}/3\); T82/4), 'can' v.pl. Y can (f.3\(^{11}/17\); T15/1), 'gave' v.pl. Y zaif (f.24\(^{11}/3\); 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\(^{11}/18\); 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 linguistic profiles 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. Thus

1. For northern survey points see Atlas i.568 map 2b and compare with map 3b.
-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.1rb/5; T3/5), and mai v.pl. (f.1rb/1; T1/8) (Atlas iv, items 137 and 176).

A certain number of forms are recorded just outside our area e.g. mani (f.4^m/12; T20/6), n' (f.3^m/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 liyl (f.8^m/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.23^m/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.23^m/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. Some 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^m/13; T14/2) and with medial e as in seip (f.1^m/1; T2/5) but the forms with medial a are found only in the earliest part of the text. We have
already noted similar changes in the forms for NE 'much', 'these' and 'such' and in the use of schw 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. prai (f.11v/3; T74/3), felaw (f.18v/5; T113/6) to 'two' (f.20v/2; T126/7) and forms of 'without' with initial w-f (f.6°/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 peše, from forms of 'much' with medial i to forms with medial y, and from forms of 'such' with medial i to forms with medial 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. 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.
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.192v), it is unnecessary to discuss it further here. For B's linguistic profile see Atlas ii.148, LP 7200, and for its location see Atlas iv.337 grid reference 365 218.

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. 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. It should also be remembered that one of the Lollard

---

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.  
As is by now well known, 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 Fourth Lateran Council (1215-16), the decrees of which were incorporated into the decretals of Gregory IX and were thus accepted into canon law. 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 parishioners 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* 1.227-271.
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.\footnote{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 pp.304, 345, 403, 423).} 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.\footnote{2. C&S 900-905.}

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'.\footnote{3. C&S p.61.} Peter de Roches
enjoins his priests to carry out their instruction in the confessional 'saltem in materna lingua', a phrase repeated, for example, by Peter Quivel; while Peckham states that such instruction should be carried out 'populo vulgariter absque cuiuslibet subtilitatis textura fantastica'. Instruction was given by preaching, in the confessional or in small groups.

There was clearly a demand from the clergy for manuals which could be easily understood. As Vincent Gillespie has pointed out, 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', and further vernacular manuals included, for example, the *Speculum Christiani*. Vernacular manuals aimed specifically at the laity include *Handlyng Synne* and

---

2. Ibid. p.1076.
3. Ibid. p.901.
4. For small group teaching, see, 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.
Dan Michel's *Ayenbite of Inwy*.

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

---


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 authority³ and in the same year William Courtnay, in a letter written after Wyclif's condemnation, refers to the fact that

1. *DPI* 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 Repindon 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.242'; see also McFarlane (1952). pp.121-5
unlicensed preachers are preaching 'nunullas propositiones et conclusiones ... haereticas, erroneas, atques falsas, olim ab ecclesia condemnatas'.

Meanwhile, during that last twenty years of the fourteenth century, the Bible had been translated into English. Orthodox fears about this activity are clearly expressed in Knighton's *Chronicile* where we are informed that, as a result, 'the pearl of the gospel is scattered abroad and trodden underfoot of swine.' 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: 'per understondyng fayles e verrey avayles orw grace. at god grauntes'.

Lollard vernacular tracts, on the other hand, provided

1. *FZ* p.275
2. For the date of this translation see Hudson, *PR* p.247.
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'.

version of the *Ancrene Riwle*.

Sr. M. Teresa Brady has described in detail the Lollard interpolations made to the original orthodox version of *Pore Caitif*. 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.' 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.

---

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'.

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.
⁶. See Richardson and Sayles, 'Parliamentary Documents from the Formularies' pp.152-4.
of those on the eucharist - without necessarily defining oneself as a
eretic. 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 university 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'.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 requiter instruunt & informant & ad

¹. Hudson, PR p.394.
sedicionem seu insurrectionem excitant quantum possunt',\textsuperscript{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'.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.'\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{7}

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

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item RPiii.466b
\item McNiven p.87.
\item For Sawtre's trial see e.g. McNiven pp.81-92; Wilkins, Concilia iii.255ff.
\item For an account of John Badby's trial and death see McNiven, pp.199-219.
\item Haines, 'Reginald Pecock', p.135.
\item See McNiven pp.169ff.
\item 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.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
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'. 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'. 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. Similar commissions were issued in various parts of the country on May 23rd and September 30th 1388 and on January 18th 1389, while the visitation of William Courtenay to the diocese of Lincoln in 1392 resulted in the confiscation of the books of William Smith.

As well as instituting the death penalty, the act De Heretico Comburendo reflected a growing concern about Lollard educational practices. 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
3. Ibid. p.448.
5. Knighton ii.313.
6. For De Heretico Comburendo see RP iii.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 1407-9³ 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

¹ RPii.583
² Hudson, 'Debate on Bible translation', esp. pp.82-4.
³ 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.
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 'siȝ lawe of þe Empearour and lawe of þe Pope ben worse þan þis lawe bi a þousyndfold and þes letten knowyng and doyng of Goddis lawe and ofte tymes ben eresies contrarie to þis lawe, many men þenken þat Goddis lawe itsilf shulde be red and lerned and sued in dede. For þer is no caas þat ne it wolde decide it, and stable riȝt 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

---

2. *DCD* 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 considerit nullus tenetur eos observare."\(^1\)

The passages on canon law quoted above do not occur in 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 oפר bi autorite of þe lawe but if he were siker þat Goddis lawe bad it' (T103/1-2, 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 þat him were betere þus to be sleyn þan to lyue forþ vpunyshid 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

---

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.
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.'¹ 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 be
newe testament'³, 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. DMD p.344, and see the discussion in Hudson, PR p.368
². See Workman ii.66ff. For comments by Wyclif on the crusade see Polemical
Works ii.588ff.
³. SEWW p.28.
lege Christus concessit latrones et malefactores suspendio vel aliquo alio modo occidi', 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 bi Pope, bi bishop, bi parson or wiker be known of pee to draw in pe deuels 3ok, worship 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 tcheb' (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. FZp.431, item xxix.
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.
spiritual death), as well as for failing to stand up to tyrants (B107/4-10, T107/4-10). 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. 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.).

The wording of this passage echoes one of Wyclif's sermons and may well have been drawn from it, 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 simoniaacos 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).
ineant',¹ while Bishop Brinton complains that 'Auro beneficia
impetrantur et officia procurantur.'² 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'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 MV, p.164; Hudson
PR p.325. Note also the comments about studying without priestly guidance (B75/9-76/1, T75/9-76/1, passage discussed below).
⁵. See Bullard and Bell p.127, Lyndwood p.295a.
similar to the independent HTY comment that 'if lordis lousy her eldris
in soule, þei shulden quenche her errours and make hem more short, and
folies þat þei 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 makib be bowes to bowe, and letiþ þis 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, þat God bad hem do, turne to priuey raueyn as Antecrist
techib 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 ban to lie bus on Crist and seie þat
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,

---

³ Walsingham, HA ii.139-40.
⁴ 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, PR 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 secular 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 þe day of doom shal bosteris be doumbe þat now reuersen þis sentence and seien þat it is eresie' (T100/7-9)), thus making this particular version's stand on the matter clear beyond doubt. The statement that 'it is aens þe lawe of God þat bishopis and oþer prelatis of þe chirche schulden have temperal possessions', a view very similar to the HTY opinion that 'lordis shulde not syue her bishops lordshipis of þis 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 FZ p.279, item x.
² SEWW p.19, item 9.
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 senuen 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. DCD i.267.
2. The loss of the reference to prelates in B is due to eyeskip.
3. Leff ii.549.
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. 'Knistis', we are told, 'shulde shewe þe power of Godhed and bi worldli strengþe 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.

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.
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'; 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; and a question about the veneration of the cross and of images appears as item 26 on Bishop Polton's 1428 jurist's list.

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 (T34/3-7), an argument which Arundel himself puts to William Thorpe. 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. MV p.164.
4. TWT p.57/1103-6).
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 blyndiþ many men and mak[iþ] hem, bi
litil þing þat is ofte leueful, wade in depe errors' (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

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 *latria* (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 þat ys þe trewe ymage of God' (B37/14). 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, *PR* 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 its 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 therefore 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 therefore, 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 discussion 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 opponent⁵. 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.60vb.
⁵. Ibid f.59rb.
later identified with Lollardy could be questions of neutrality in the earlier years of the movement.\textsuperscript{1} It is also worth remembering that the offering of \textit{latria} to the cross was criticised in \textit{Dives and Pauper}\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{3}

The same cannot be said for Lollard views on the Eucharist, views which are clearly expressed by the HTY group.\textsuperscript{4} As part of the discussion on images the HTY version observes that we see the body of Christ each day but ‘\textit{wip yæn of soule and not with yæ 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 ‘\textit{parne shulden þei not be contrarie to Crist: whanne he seib þat ðis breed is myn owne body þei reuersen him and seien þat ðis may neþer be breed ne þe 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

\begin{itemize}
\item \\textsuperscript{1} Hudson, ‘The Debate on Bible Translation, Oxford 1401’, p.83 and note.
\item \\textsuperscript{2} DPI.i.83-5, 87-9.
\item \\textsuperscript{3} See Hudson, \textit{PR} p.418.
\item \\textsuperscript{4} For Wyclif’s view of the cult of the Eucharist as a form of idolatry, see Catto (1985), esp. pp.275-82.
\end{itemize}
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. 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, 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. 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 FZ p.105.
2. See Leff ii.551-2.
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 1381² 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 eucharist⁴ 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.
3. For Gaunt's attitude, see FZ pp.114 and 318.
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,
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 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. FZ p.438.
Roman Catholic Church but of the whole body of the predestined.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{2} The belief was held by Oldcastle when he appeared before Arundel in 1413.\textsuperscript{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 44) in Bishop Polton's jurist's list, 'an mali sint pars ecclesie catholice?', is evidently based on some such argument.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{enumerate}
\item See e.g. \textit{De Ecclesia} p.2.
\item Spinka, pp.183 and 260.
\item Pollard (ed.), p.184, cited by Hudson, \textit{PR} p.321.
\item Hudson, 'The Examination of Lollards', p.134, item 40.
\end{enumerate}
characterised as a new form of theft established by Antichrist (B150/7-9, T150/7-8).\textsuperscript{1} Wyclif himself complains about the simony associated with confession,\textsuperscript{2} but such complaints were not confined to Lollards. The \textit{Myrour to Lewde Men and Wymmen}, for example, categorises priests who require such payment as being 'liche to Judas þat solde oure Lord Ihesu Crist'.\textsuperscript{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 sook it is þat lordis synnen ofte tymes and fallen fro lordship þat her God haþ syuen hem, but þes blynede leches knownen þis not, ne wharnæ þei turnen æsen 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.\textsuperscript{4} As far as priests in general were concerned, Wyclif believed that

\textsuperscript{1} For additional HTY material see T108/1-2.
\textsuperscript{2} See e.g. \textit{Opera Minora} pp.318-9.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Myrour to Lewde Men and Wymmen} pp.138/37.
\textsuperscript{4} Walsingham, \textit{HA} i.354-5.
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

---

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 kan don kes propre prestis' (T75/9-76/1, cf.B75/9-76/1). 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.'

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 B discussion may perhaps provide a clue to B'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

1. See Hudson, PR p.325 and note.
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.\footnote{See Workman ii.262; Wyclif, Trialogus pp.374, 445.} 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,\footnote{MV p.164.} and William Taylor, burnt at Smithfield in 1423, believed the friars' begging to be damnable.\footnote{lZp.413.} 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.\footnote{MS CUL Ff.6.2. f.1v.} The private religions had no right to exist because they could not be grounded in the gospel.\footnote{See Hudson, PR p.349; Wyclif, Polemical Works p.17.} 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
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 his purpos' (T3/6-7), but the B version reads simply 'Ne no þyng 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

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, *PR* p.384 and note.
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 be prophetis of þe Olde Lawe telden men perils til þei suffrideren deep and for þis cause"
apostolis of Crist weren martred; and we shulden if we weren trewe men, but cowardise and defect of love of oure God makij 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 ħinkij ħat we shulden seie, to suffre herfor
deep, ħat if ś Pope, ś bishhop, ś parsoun or wiker be knowun of ħee to draw in ś deuelis 3ok, 
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), 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

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.'\(^6\) 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

---

2. Richardson and Sayles (eds.), *Parliamentary Documents from Formularies*, p.154.
5. *DCD* ii.274.
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'.

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 wile' of the friars 'pat was now late shewed at Londoun and Lyncoln to breme treue prestis for þes prestis grauntiden þe treuþe of þe 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'. 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 þe lesse þat

1. De Veritate Sacre Scripture i.374 and see also Workman i.308.
2. Hudson, PR p.5 and note.
God moeyde lordis to lette þe wille of þes freris þat þei 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.236v and 
ff.242v-244v; 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 for the fyfe freres or mo....poursyewynq bysyle and cryinge, with many an other frere with great instance, to gif ye done upon my to berne my, and bouthen 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.'³

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.
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

2. *De Blasphemia* p.197.
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.'¹ As the
HTY group says as part of its discussion of the seventh commandment:

_Also bi þe Popis lawe men ben ofte brent for
þei susteynen þe lawe þat Ihesu Crist saf, as
who seiþ þat þe Pope shulde not þus 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 þe lawe of Englond men
ben hanged for þeft for a litel þing'), 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.

¹. Richardson, 'Heresy and the Lay Power', p.20.
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 (B89/14-17), 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.
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 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 þat þer schulde no lewyd folc entrymetyn hem of Godis lawe ne of þe gospel ne of holy writ, neyþer 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.

¹. Aston, 'Lollards and Images', p.153, note 64.
². DP1.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. The list is divided into groups according to the categories established by Martin, viz. rhetorical, discursive and mixed. 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 bai stelen priuely'). 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. 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.
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
(Tc₁) Trinity College Dublin 70 ff.174'-181'

Type RIIa
(Rw₁) Bodl. Rawlinson C.209 ff.2'-7' (imperfect)
Type RIIb
(Ca1) Cambridge University Library II.6.43 ff.3r-9v

Type RIII
(N1) New College Oxford 67 ff.1r-2r
(Ty) Trinity College Oxford 86 f.54v (fragment)

Type RIV
(Ed1) Edinburgh University Library 93, ff.1r-3r (imperfect)

Type RVa
(Ad1) British Library Additional 28026 ff.187ra-187rb

Type RVb
(Lm1) Bodl. Laud Misc. 699 ff.78r-79v

Type RVc
(Wi) Dr. Williams Library Ancillary 3 ff.130ra-131ra

Type RVd
(Bo1) Bodl. Bodley 938 ff.16r-17v
(Lm2) Bodl. Laud Misc. 30 ff.193v-195v

Type RVf
(Tn) Bodl. Tanner 336 ff.141r-145v
Type RVII

(Ro₁) British Library Royal 18.A.X ff.83r-85r (imperfect)

(Rw₂) Bodl. Rawlinson C.288 ff.92r-95r

Group 2 Discursive Versions (D)

Type DI

(Ar₁) British Library Arundel 286 ff.179r-191v (abbreviated)

(Ca₂) Cambridge University Library Kk.1.3. item 22 (imperfect)

(Ha₁) British Library Harley 218 ff.159r-167r

(Ha₂) British Library Harley 2250 ff.88r-91v

(Ha₃) British Library Harley 2346 ff.34r-47v

(Hn) Huntington HM 744 ff.13v-23v

(Lb) Leeds University Brotherton Collection 501 ff.74r-81r

(Lm₃) Bodl. Laud Misc. 210 ff.147r-147v (imperfect)

(Lm₄) Bodl. Laud Misc. 524 ff.11r-17v

(Pr) Garrett 143 (Princeton University Deposit 1459) ff.1r-21v

(Ro₂) British Library Royal 17.A.XXVI ff.4r-22r

(Rw₃) Bodl. Rawlinson A.381 ff.107v-111v

(Rw₄) Bodl. Rawlinson A.423 ff.1r-6v (imperfect)

(S) British Library Additional 22283 (the Simeon MS) ff.92r-93v (W.N. Francis (ed.), Book of Vices and Virtues, EETS, OS 217 (1942), Appendix i.316-33)

(Si) Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge 74 ff.181r-189v

(So) London Society of Antiquaries 687 pp.412-30

(St) Bibliothèque Ste. Geneviève Paris 3390 ff.1r-23v
(Tc₂) Trinity College Dublin 69 ff.79r-82r
(U) University College Oxford 97 ff.85r-93v
(Ve) British Library Cotton Vespasian A.XXIII ff.107r-115v
(W) Westminster School 3 ff.73r-88v

Type DII
(Bo₂) Bodl. Bodley 789 ff.108r-123r (T.Arnold (ed.), Select
   English Works of John Wyclif (Oxford, 1869-71) iii.82-92)

Type DIII
(G₁) Glasgow University General 223 ff.213r-217v

Type DIV
(Do₁) Bodl. Douce 246 ff.101r-103v

Type DV
(Ha₄) British Library Harley 2406 ff.1r-3v

Type DVI
Pore Caitif

Type DVI
(Ad₂) British Library Additional 27592 ff. 42r-45v
(Bo₃) Bodl. Bodley 85 ff.110r-122r
(Ca₄) Cambridge University Library Nn.4.12 ff. 3r-7v
(Hu) Glasgow University Hunterian 472 ff.71r-76v
Type DVIII
(Em) Emmanuel College Cambridge 246 ff.59r-62r

Type DX
(Do2) Bodl. Douce 274 ff.1r-7r

Type DX
(Ha5) British Library Harley 211 ff.47r-63r
(Lm5) Bodl. Laud Misc. 23 ff.3r-23r
(Sa) St. Albans Cathedral Library Catechetica ff.5r-43r
(Ti) British Library Cotton Titus D XIX ff.120r-147r

Type DXI
(Lm6) Bodl. Laud Misc. 524 ff.18r-18r

Group 3: Mixed Discursive/Rhetorical Versions (DR)

Type DRI
(Ed2) Edinburgh University Library 93 ff.4r-10v
(Tr) Trinity College Cambridge R.3.21 ff.2vb-6ra

Type DRII
(L) Lambeth 408 ff.6r-11r (T.F. Simmons and H.E. Nolloth (eds.), The Lay Folks Catechism, EETS, os 118 (1901, Kraus repr. 1975), pp.33-57)
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'. 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

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

Who brekith his commanuement, proude men. worldly men. and fleischly men. ¶Why proude men. for ðei maken ðe feend her god. as Iob seïp in ðe .xlj. c°.
The devel is prince ouer alle ðe children of pride.
Why worldly men. for ðei maken worldly goodys [ðer god?].
as Poul seïp to Effesices ðe .v. c°. an aeronuse man
is a seruaunt of mawmentis. ¶Why fleischly men. for ðei maken her belyes her god. as Poul seid to Philipenses .iii.
c°, ðer ben many þat walken þat ben enemies 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 brekiþ', beginning each discussion simply with a statement of breakers e.g. 'And so vnkynde men, froward men & rebel men breken þis heste'.

---

¹. N₁ does, however, at least in the beginning, include the relevant Biblical references in the margin.
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. 'bese men breken þe 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 Bo₁ commentary begins 'Here bigyñen þe 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

¹ See Martin p.205, the discussion of the manuscript he refers to as Tn₁.
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 Bo₂). 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.
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 brekiþ þe fife commaundement? Enuyous men, wraþfull men and couetouse men. Why enuyous men? For ðei hate or bachiten her breþeren. For Johun seþ in his first pistell, iij capitule, 'Eche man þat hateþ his brother is a manqueller.' 'Omnis qui odit frature suum homicida est.' Et in iiiij capitule, 'He þat seþ he loveþ Godd and hatiþ his broþer is a lier.' 'Si quis dixerit quan deum diligo (sic) et frature suum odit, mendax est. Why wraþfull men? For ðei smyten or
sleenn her brijeren and Crist seide to Petir in M\- xxvj
capitulo, 'He þat takeþ veniunce bi swerd bi swerd schall
be perisseche.' 'Omnes enim qui acceperunt gladium
gladio...' Iterum, Apoc xiiij capitulo, 'Qui in gladio
occiderit oportet eum gladio occidi; hic est paciencia
et fides sanctorum.' Iterum ge.ix, 'Quicunque
effunderit
sanguinem' etc.
(Ro\l f.83")

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 þe engeliche from þe latyn, for diuers causes þat been good &
lawful to my felynge').

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

---
2. See e.g. BVV p.318/15-18, Sermones i.90/23-25; BVV p.325/29-33, Sermones
   i.118/19-22.
are in no way heretical and it seems safe to agree with Kellogg and Talbert that the subject matter of this version is orthodox.\textsuperscript{1} The vexed question of images receives no attention and the only criticism of members of the clergy is a section on lecherous priests (\textit{BVV} p.327/1ff.). (The latter is, however, missing from some versions of DI viz. \textit{Rw}_3, \textit{Rw}_4 and \textit{So}, possibly as the result of expurgation). The commentary has a prologue (\textit{incipit} 'Alle maner of men. schulden holde Godes biddynges' \textit{explicit} 'And so pise þreo. and seuene: maken ten Comaundemens' (\textit{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' (\textit{BVV} 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

\textsuperscript{1} Kellogg and Talbert p.365.
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, Ha₂ 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

---

2. For the lack of first commandment correspondence between the sermon material and B see Spencer pp.310-11.
prologue, divides the commentary into two sermons based on the two-fold division, and shares with Ca₂, Lm₃ 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 three-fold 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. BVV 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, thinking of the world, and thinking of the flesh).

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 (BVV pp.322-3)) bear an obvious relationship to the RI definition of the three types of breakers as 'men þat þenken not on God hertely. ne þ[ey]de Him not deuoutly. and don not þe 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. BVV p.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):

a)  

\textit{And herfore yf bou wolt}
\begin{quote}
be holde trewe of tunge, anyse be bat bow be discrete in by wordes and speke nouzt bot trowbe or bat bow mayste performe: and whanne by wyse worde ys yspoke of bryn herte, be aboute to fullille it, and make be trewe man.
\end{quote}

\textit{Me lynkep bat pre causes scholde meue ons to kepe his commandement and to take be name of God wip gret worschep and drede. On cause ys for fer was neuer man ne womman bat dyde sywe bat myste be saue bot in}
vertu of his name, ne neuer schal be
(B54/10-55/10 (unemended), cf. BVV p.321/2 ff)

b) Pledynge and scornynge ys harde to do wel; and no man doh
his leffulyche bot yf he kepe charite to him bat he pledeh
wib and him pat he scorneb, as yf he trowe to purge him
of his olde syrne by his. It is lefful to plede wib him
or scorn him syb at be barre of Crist pleyde hys
seynz, and Crist himself scorneb, as be Salme seyb. Bot
lyenge openlyche aensureb trowbe and herfore Crist himself
may noust lye, for he lounep it noust bot hateb.

Bot for to knowe his commandement be betere se schulle
vnderstonde pat a man may bere false wytnesse aensure his
neysebore in bre maneres, pat is to seye in worde, in dede, and
in fres bohe togedere. In worde a man or womman bereh
fals wytnesse whanne he makeb lesynges of him to byreue
him of his goode name or fame, as some yhered for
mede or for setfes or elles for hate or enuye bereh fals
wytnesse aensure hery neysebores
(B140/2-141/8, cf. BVV p.329/38-330/6)

Further passages of joint B/DI material which do not appear in HTY
include the following: B26/4ff. (cf. BVV p.319/5ff.), B76/5ff. (cf. BVV
p.322/6ff.), B88/9ff. (cf. BVV 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 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, þat is his biddyng'
(T1/2-2/6 cf. BVV p.317/8-24).

ii) The section on the two-fold division incipit 'þes comaundementis, for þei shulden be freishlier in mynde' explicit 'and þes þre and seuene maken ten comaundmentis' (T7/4-11/4, cf. BVV p.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
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 commandments. Only they contain the section beginning 'A lord sif a kyng beede a þing to ben kept of alle his lyge men' (BVV p.317/16ff; Ti/lOff.). 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:  
T:

First Commandment

And so what þing enimon loueþ most: þþ þing he makeþ his god.  
in as muche as in him is.  

what kyn þing þat a man loueþ moost  
he makiþ his god.  
al symne stondiþ in loue, euery

1. See Kellogg and Talbert, pp.367-70, Arnold iii.82
hit wyf. or child. gold. or
seluer. or eny catel
Of pis hit folewep. 4\[1\] pre 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 pei god. Of hem spekep seint
poul Ad philipenses .iij. and seip
\[1\]

Monye gon. of pe wauche. ofte I. haue
I.seid to 3ou: and nou I. seye wepynge
...of whom heore wombe is heore god
...So pise men pei louen heore flesch.
and Lecherie. or gloterie. pei maken
heore wombe heore god....

PE secounde Maner of men. \[1\] breken
pis comaunderment. and also maken hem
false goddes: beon Couetouse men...
and pei maken such worldly goddes
ynfully heore false goddes. For as
seint poul seip. Ad ephesios. v.
Avarus quod est ydolorum servitus. \[1\]
is. An Auerous mon. or a couetous: is
\[1\]
praedam of maumetis. For such a
couetous mon.... dop maeumreic... PE
\[1\]

hit wyfe. or child. gold. or
seluer. or eny catel
Of his hit folewep. \[1\] pre manere
Of folk suwen he sturynde of owre preo
enemys: whuche ben he flesch. he
world. and he feond

As for his furste. Lecherous. and
gloterous men hei loue more heore
wombes hei god. Of hem spekep seint
poul Ad philipenses .iij. and seip
pis. Multi ambulant...\[1\] is. 5

Monye gon. of he wauche. ofte I. haue
I. seid to you: and now I. seye wepyng
...of whom heore wombe is heore god
...So these men hei louen heore flesch.
and Lecherie. or gloterie. hei maken
heore wombe heore god....

PE second Maner of men. \[1\] breken
his commandment. and also make him
false gods: be an covetous men...
and he make such worldly goods
sinfully heore false gods. For as
sayn poul seip. Ad ephesios. v.
Avarus quod est ydolorum seruitus. \[1\]
is. An Avarous mon. or a covetous: is
preyed of maunetis. For such a
covetous man.... doth maumetrie... PE

hit wyf. or child. gold. or
seluer. or eny catel
Of his hit folewep. \[1\] pre manere
Of folk suwen he sturynde of owre preo
enemys: whuche ben he flesch. he
world. and he feond

And so glotouns and lecchours
breken his heest
And herfor seip Poul that hee greete
glotouns

And on his wise hee covetous man
that sylvania in covetise of worldly
goods make his maumet these worldly
goods. And herfore seip Poul that
avarice of siche ping is seruyse of
maunetis. as to false goddis.

PE fride maner of men \[1\] breken his
commandment. that followen hee fend:
beon to that setten heore hertes most
on worldly worschipes. and veyn glorie.

And myche more hee proud man make
he fend his god. syp he fend is kyng
of alle proude children

(T21/2-26/2)
Second Commandment

And perfere crist him self in pe gospel of seint mathen capitulos v: bidde he sus.

Nolite iurare omnino ...

... But owere word beo. se. nay. Nay. And þi þat is more owur þis: hit is of euel. Rise ben cristes wordes in the gospel...

And aif se schullen swere: rule swerme. For god him self techil þe. Þi whon þon swerést: þu schalt kepe þeo condiciouns. Jurabis inquit in veritate, in iudicio, & iusticia. Jeremya. iiiij capitulos. Þat is. Þou schalt swere in treuþe. in dom. and in rihtwysnesse.

(BVV p.320/2-27)

Third Commandment

þi swalt penken hou god made þe world of nouȝt on a sunday. And hou he sette wit. and wisdum on a sunday in to eorþe. And þi he a ros fro deþ to lyf. on a sunday. And þi schulde fere sou alle: and perse sor hertes. And vpon a sunday as clerkse seyn: schal beo domes day.

(BVV p.322/34-p.323/1)

Fourth Commandment

But se schullen vnderestonde. Þi þe worschupe of fader and

And so worship in God
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.
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 (Ro₂ f.13/14-15; T98/6),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

¹. S (i.e. the BVV version) has an error here, and this definition is lost.
'wollen take no goostly techinge', Bühler p.690)\(^1\), 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 þis maundemeot is sib to many symes. For Seynt Jon seip þat eche þat hatip his broþer is a mansleer, 
> ahe, ofte tymes more to blame þan he þat sleþ his body, 
> for þe synne is more. And bi þis 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 BVV p.326/17-18 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,

---

1. The instruction to learn from your priest has become obscure in many of the DI versions but is still present in, for example, Rw\(_4\).
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. However, the relationship between B/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 suggest Lollard affiliations. Lb’s ninth commandment discussion is made up of material found in B/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

---

1. MSS Pr, Si and Ha2 and Ve, for instance, all have completely different prologues, while So, Ar1 and Tw3 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 Rw3, Rw4 and So, while the reference to the Black Death is missing from Ca2 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.
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.80r/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.80r/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.80r/36-f.80v/6, cf. T148/2-149/7).

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:
Mercymenys out of resoun is a preuy spoyling, for
noman shulde mercye othyr but by wey of charite, to
amende in manyr the man hat is mercyed. And this may
be weel doon in manyr caas, but sif it be do for
coueytyse of the mercyment and not for charyte, than it
is moche aens this comaundement.
(Lb f.80v/2-6; cf. 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 onskylful 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 aens this comaundement to coueyte
wynge wronge anober man's hous, so thes somoners coueytym
wynge wronge the hous of God and all the parysz, and pletyn
longe therfor by many fals tytlys. I dare not sey that
thes religious hat coueytym so many cherchis to shere the
sheep and lede awey the wolfe ben in this best of blameles (sic).
Idiots 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 ry3t, but for coueytyse of ther good,
kyllyn her neybours. What makyth all this pletyng at Londone
and othyr placis, but for the pepyll for coueytise wolde
wrongefull dysheryte his ney3bour of londe or godis, or
ellys the defendaunt wolde wrongfully holde his ney3bours
londe or gode for coueytise. And herto arun thes
trauenterys of lawe redy on bothe sydys, God woot, not
for loue of ryghtwysnes, but only for couehtyse: 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 couehtyse beth
corrupte for mede of the toon party and somtyme of bothe.
And so oonethe from the heyst state to the lowest shal a
man fynde o man that ne is Smytyd by couehtyse in wyll aens
this comaundement. But sitt is no drede that ne yt is lefull
to coueht men godis vppon good manyr.

(Lb f.80/14-37)

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 religiouz pat ne þei
breken þis nynte maundement: as freris bi her beggyng
coueitn amys þe goodis of her nei3boris, as her dede
shewþþ, þe chirche þat is dowed coueitiþ amys þe
rentis and þe housis of seculer men. Siþ God hap forbode
hem to be siche lordis, as boþþ þe Olde Lawe and þe Newe
bereau witnesse, and siþ þis is so opun æsans Hooli Writt
and so stefly defendid, it is eresie. And so comounly
prelatis ben eretikis, and more deply þan obere men ben.
And siþ men þat consenten to hem ben eke eretikis, þe more
hedis of þe Chirche ben smytid wiþ eresie and, bi þe lawe
of eresie, oþer men boþþ, siþ goostly dedis of siche
prelatis blemyshen her doers and hem þat aproouch hem
And siþ it is æsans þe maundement of God þus for to
coueite þe hous of þi nei3bor, myche more it is
æsans Goddis wille to coueite þus þe hous of þi God.
For chirche is not oonly hous to þi God, but it is
comoun hous to many of þi nei3boris.

(T146/1-17)
ii) 

*And so symonye of chirches, of more or of lesse, þat is doon bi þe Pope is so myche þe 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 siþe bi ben fals techyng, contrarie to Goddis lawe and stifly defendid, and, bi þis same skile, eche bulle of a fals prest. Bis sentence seiþ Grosthed, and draweþ it out of Greke. Lord, wheþeþ þe witt of God forbedde siche coueitise of pore housis of men and not worse coueitise of his owne hous þat 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.80r/13-14). 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 ('Sooþ it is þat lordis shal haue rentis of her tennauntis' etc. T149/1-2, cf. Lb f.80r/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 Lb/HTY passages on clerical covetousness, but has, instead, a passage drawn from the DI norm *(incipit 'For as e seep coueytyse makep debates' explicit 'Andeifore coueyte e no mannes goedes wiþ wrong' (cf. BVV 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 (Bo2) 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 (T30/1-9, 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, BVV p.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
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 prestis

bat prechen moore to have a loos, oþir for wynynge of worldli goodis, oþir lustis of hire beli, makyn fals leeknesse in hevene and erpe 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 he moost
hise service pat man can serve God perinne, schulde he schape
him to do on he holidai. But God wole pat freedom of his
lawe be kept, and specialli as Paul techip. But be war pat
pou kepe hise four feestis principalli, Christemasse and Estre,
Ascension and Whitsountide, and pe Soneday poure 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, 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

1. Ives, p.5.
such a division. The first few lines of the commentary on the fourth commandment in DII reads as follows:

Debe fourthe commandement is his. Dou schalt worshippe thi fadir and thi modest, bat dou be longe lyved upon erfe, and thi neibore as thi self. And whoeuer loveh his neibore, loveh his God, and dwellich in God and God in him. And so these two branches of charite mowe not be departid, as Seynt Joon seip in his firste pistil. (Arnold 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 second table of the manedements of God conteyne
seven manedements and techip he to lune
thi neibore as hisilf; and bat dou shalt koune by he pre manedements of firste table,
for what man euer kepeh thes pre manedements
he loungh himself and also his neibore. And pas thes ten comanedements bea knytyid togidre, bat whooeuer
loungh his neibore be loungh his God etc.

(T83/9-84/5)

iv) As part of the discussion of the fifth commandment, DII contains the following passage:

But witeh wel, his manedement is sibbe to many synnes. For Seynt Joon seip, he bat hatip his broipir is a man-sleer, she ofte tymes moore to blame than he bat slepp his biod, for the synne is moore. And bi his skile a bac-bitcre is a man-sleer. But, as clerkis seyen, upon sixe maneris is his consent doon, and men schulden wel knowe it

(Arnold iii.86-7)
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 'his' suggests that something has been omitted (there has been no consent mentioned in DII to which 'his' 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 consentiþ to siche mansleyng symneþ æns his
mandement and is a mansleer. But, as clerkys 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 þe vertu of liyng, for many men lyen to myche and many men to litel, and he þat holdip him in a mene haþ þe 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.VII.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 gode might be do on meny maneors. On ys in takynge by neysebores goedes fro him azenst his wylle, oþer by pryuey stelynge, by nyste or by daue, by londe or by water, oþer by openrobbynge' (B125/1-4).

It does not, however, seem likely that the DII 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
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 B/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, þat may not lye, seip þes ben þeues, sîþ þei taken Cristis goodis wiþouten his leeue' (T127/8-
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 þes Antecristis

clerkis broken þe roof and comen yn aboue bi pride
of his world, and Crist þat may not lye, seip þes
hen þeues, sip þei taken Cristis goodis wipouten his
loewe. But sit treuþe nedþem to write in her lettris
þat bi suffryng of God þei ben siche maistris. Þe moost
þeef of alle þes, and moost Antecrist, is þe chefteyn of þes
þat ledþem alle, for he stelþ moost falsely moo goodis of
Crist.

Capitulum Decimum

Lord wheþer it be Goddis lawe to sle men for þeþt?.....

(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 Bo₂
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 Bo2 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 Bo2 scribe left the page blank intending to fill
it later with less extreme material. Whether the Bo2 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 cler' 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 (DIII, DIV, DV)

The DIII version is extant in one manuscript: Glasgow University General 223 (G1). 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. *BVV* 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 (G₁ f.213v/9-22; T59/7-60/9)

iii) Part of the DIII discussion of the second commandment dealing with Christ's observations on swearing (G₁ f. 214r/3ff.; 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 (G₁ f. 214r/30-f.214v/10; cf. T72/6-73/5).

v) A section on offering bodily and spiritual help to your parents (G₁ f.214v/25-29; T88/5-8).

vi) Two clauses from the DIII fifth commandment commentary:
   a) 'and it vndirstond≠ vnskillful sleyng' (G₁ f.215v/6-7; cf. T101/3-4).
   b) 'eche man of þe world is broedere to ophere, and also neursebor by þe ordenaunce of God' (G₁ f.215r/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/27-215v/2; T114/1-5 and 7-8).

viii) A section on the consequences of false witness (some men are unjustifiably hanged, some lose their inheritance) (G₁ 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 (G₁ f.216'/4-10; T144/1-9).

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 (G₁ f.216'/23-28; T154/2-6).

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 Bo₂, although the lack in Bo₂ of, for example, part of the shared HTY/DIII material on the third commandment and the material on bodily lechery (presumably omitted from Bo₂ because of squeamishness) shows that the DIII version cannot be drawn from Bo₂. 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
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 ('priu 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 DIII commentator'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 (Do1). This version lists all the commandments first and follows this list with a short commentary on each ('The brid 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 (G₁ f.213v/29-213v/6; Do₁ f.102v/20-102v/4).

ii) A passage stating that those who say they are true Christian men but in fact do not follow Christ break the second commandment (G₁ f.213v/28-214v/1; Do₁ f.102v/7-10).

iii) A sentence stating that both greater and lesser men of the Church break the third commandment (G₁ f.214v/27-30; Do₁ f.102v/11-16).

iv) A section on loving God and Holy Church in Christ's manner and not in a worldly manner (G₁ f.214v/18-23; Do₁ f.102v/18-103r/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. (G215r/22-5; Do₁ 103r/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 (Ha4). 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 Lm₃. 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' (Ha₄ f.2v/8-9; cf.G₁ f.214r/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 (Ha₄ f.2v/23-4; G₁ f.216r/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.
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 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 passages in B unless otherwise stated):

i) A comment that God's word, in the first commandment, is 'chargid wib witt more ban we kan telle' (T15/1-2, passage not found in B; cf. *Pore Caitif* p.26/16-17).

¹ Brady, 'Lollard Interpolations'.
ii) Passages on love and dread (T15/5-9, passage not found in B; T51/7-52/4; 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 þe 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 falliþ þat þe synne is more groundid in yuel wille þan þe dede wþouteforþ' (T154/5-6; *Pore Caitif* p.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)
contain the passage on images found in HTY which begins 'and þe same God is now, wib þe same maundementis', and which ends with a comment on the covetousness of priests (T31/3-33/7). 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. The DVII version is extant in four manuscripts: Ad₂, Bo₃, Ca₃ and Hu. The commentary

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. Bo₃, Ca₃ and Hu have a prologue (incipit 'Alle manere of men shuld holde Goddis biddyngis', explicit 'And Seynt Jon euangelist sei ke charge of God is to kepe his hestis and þei ben not greuous ne heuy') part of which is missing from Ad₂. 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. Ca₃ contains chapter and verse references which are not found in the other manuscripts. As part of the discussion of the second commandment Ad₂ and Hu contain a much fuller quotation from Matthew V than do Ca₃ and Bo₃.

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 nost handeling mone') when in fact they too are vicious ('wher is a fouler ypocricy or lesingmonger and fals witnesse berer þan such on
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 be 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 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 establish a textual relationship. The DVH 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; Ad1 f.44r/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 (Do2). The DIX commentary has no prologue, but it does have an epilogue promising damnation to those who break the commandments 'hot thou haue a thowsande bulles of pardoun, lettres of fraternite and chauntrees after thi 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.1r/1). Noteworthy passages include the comment that the reader must study and keep God's commandments and law 'bifore alle oþer preceptis and lawes made of man, for ellis þou louest not his lawe byfore oþer and so not hymselfe byfore alle oþer þinge' (f.1r/14-17), and the observation that the reader should 'here God's seruyce tauȝ þe in þi moder tunge, for þat is better to þe þen 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
A priest who performs his office badly is a thousand times more cursed than subjects who withhold their tithes (f.4r) 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 (f.6v). 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.6v/26-30).

The DIX version is clearly related to DX. This version is extant in four manuscripts: Ha, Lm, Sa and Ti. All have prologues, but that contained in Ha is shorter lacking the first section of the Lm/Sa/Ti prologue. The Lm/Sa/Ti prologue (incipit 'Where is any man nowodayes pat askyth how I shal loue God and myne euene Cristen' (Lm5 f.3r), explicit 'perfore if pu wylt eschewe pys dредful cursyng of God, lerne to kepe hys ten comaundementis' (Lm5 f.4r)) 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 (Lm5 ff.5v) and a criticism of those who set more value on the ordinances of sinful men than on the law of God (Lm5 f.7r). Lm5 contains Latin quotations corresponding to those found in Ha 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
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 (Lm₅ f.5', BVV 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 his,' runs the DI version 'hit folewe. þe manere of folk suwen þe sturynge of oure þpreo enemys: whiche ben þe fleisch. þe world. and þe 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 ðys þre maner of folk breken ðys comaundement' (Lm₅ f.5'/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 commitment 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 þe rede boke
of Cristis body al to wouadid, fro þe heiest place of þe
hed til þe sole of þe fot
(Lm5 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 (Do₂ f.1r/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 (Do₂ f.6v/20ff.). DIX'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 (Lm6). 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 kus, for cause pat noyng schulde be loued moste bote pat pat is best and most worthy to be loued' (Lm6 f.18r 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 'be taylende of a strumpet' (Lm6 f.18r/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 (Lm6 f.18r/13-14; B/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
manuscript and that it is immediately preceded by the DI commentary Lm₄. 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 (Ed₂ and Tr), has been extensively discussed by Martin. 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 Lm₅ and Ha₄, which do not appear in Ed₂, as well as a passage of discursive first commandment commentary, following the rhetorical material, also absent from Ed₂. It thus seems likely that Ed₂ 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

1. Martin p.211ff.
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

¹. Martin p.215.
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 DRIII)

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,

---

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.
The edition of the B version is necessarily based on the commentary found in MS BL Harley 2398 ff.73r-106r, while that of the HTY version is based, as explained above, on the commentary found in MS Trinity College Dublin 245 ff.9r-26r. 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 f.73', for example (B1/1-2), we find that each of the following words ends in such a tail: Alle, maner, scholde, holde, Godes, wipoute, holyng, of. Although certain of these words or forms do occur elsewhere in B with written final -e e.g. manere (f. 100'/16, B125/15), comynge (f.74'/8, B5/22) and lyuynge (f.75'/22, B10/2), 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.76'/11, B15/1). The more elaborate flourish involving a loop which occurs occasionally on final -g, e.g. in bytoknyng (f.81'/12, B3/10), 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.73'1/14, B2/2), and frelych (f.75'/2B9/5) cf. treweliche (f.73'/9, B1/7). However the bar also occurs as part of the -ch of ich (e.g. f.74'/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 -ll almost always appears with a small curved mark about half way up the second l, as in Al (H f.1'/1 cf. T1/2) and such a mark also occurs very occasionally after single l, both medially and finally, as in fu (H f.23'/2 cf. T132/11) and sec er (H f.23'/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. T128/4) occurs with both the curved mark and with written final -e. On the other hand the fact that final -ll always occurs either with this mark or with written final -e while final single -l normally occurs without any such mark (as in wol (H f.1'/11 cf. T3/7)) tends to suggest that the mark

¹. This is in accordance with the interpretation adopted in the Atlas which records ich but not iche for this manuscript (Atlas ii.148).
does indicate final -e and that, where doubling of final -l 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.
/ change of line.

{...} insertion, above the line or in the margin.

<...> 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.
THE TEN COMMANDMENTS
Alle maner men scholde holde Godes byddynge, for wipoute holdyng of hem may no man beo saued. And so þe Gospel telleþ how on axede Crist what he scholde do for to come to heuene and Crist bad him, if he wolde entre into blysse, þat he scholde kepe þe commaundements of God; and þes kepeþ Jewes, as alle sectes scholde, for alle we scholde beo Cristene men and treweliche serue God, bot þis may we nouȝt do bot if we kepe þes commaundements.

O Lord, if a kyng byt a þyng beo kepéd to alle hys lyge men vp peyne of here lyf, how bysylciche wolde þey...
B

kepe his commandement. Bot byleue techþ ouþ þat God is more lord þan eny erþeliche man may beþ in þis world; and wel we wyteþ þat, as a lord ys more in himself, so scholde his bydþyng beþ more yþeþed and yþworsþeþed. Bot who woteþ not þat God ne scholde beþ most loued? And Crist seþ þat what man loueþ him wel schal keþe his word, þat is his bydþyng. And if þou seye þat scharþloker beþ kynges bydþynges execut and more scharþ censures beþ put on men þat breþeþ hem þan for breþyng of Godes bydþynges (for who techþ oper sueþ pe commandements of God?), O þenke wyslyche þe witt of

T

[k]eþe þis maundement. But byleue techþ vs þat God is more Lord þan ony erþeliþ man may beþ in þis world; and wel we witen þat, as þe lord is more in himself, so þe more shulden hise biddþyngis be kurned, kept and worshipid. But who woot not þat ne God shulde be moost loued? And Crist seþ þat what man loueþ him wel shal keþe his word, þat is his biddþyng. And if þou seye þat sharþlier ben kyngis biddþyngis execute and more sharþpe sensures ben putt vpon men þat breþeþ hem (for who techþ or sueþ þe maundementis of God?), O þenke wisely þe witt

B: 5 (mar. John 14)
B

\(\text{be Lord, how } \text{he wolde } \text{pat frelyche his } \text{commandments } \) were ykept, for bot \(\text{he ple beo [wilfullyche] ykept } \text{he mede is aweye.}\)

\(\text{And wyte } \text{you wele } \text{pat he hop ybede } \text{he vpon grete peyne}\)

\{to kepe } \text{hes commandments: } \text{hat is vpon peyne } \) of damnacioun

in helle. And he may noust forgete or faile for to syue it to whomeuer \(\text{hat kepe noust hys hestes } \text{hat he byddepe.}\) Ne no byng may bowe him fro his purpos, for it were expresse azen his owne word "\(\text{hat ys yrad yn } \text{he Holy Gospel, whare he sey}\) himself /\(\text{hat he schal } \text{seue treweliche to eueryche man ryat as}\) f.73v

he hop desuered. \(\text{And oure beleue witnessep } \text{he same; for as he wole ous lyue in hope to haue heuene blysse, so he wole } \text{hat}\)

T

of \(\text{his Lord, hou he wolde } \text{hat frely his maundmentis weren kept, for but if } \text{he be wilfully kept } \text{he mede is aweye.}\)

\(\text{And wite } \text{you wel } \text{pat he hop bedun vpon greet peyne to kepe } \text{hes maundmentis: vpon dampnyng in helle; and he may not forgete}\)

\(\text{his peyne or faile for to syue it to whomeuer } \text{hat kepi}\)

\(\text{not } \text{he bihestis } \text{hat he biddi, ne freris ne preieres may bowe him fro } \text{his purpos. But as he wole vs to lyue in hope of hauyng of his bliss, so he wole } \text{pat we triste } \text{pat alle men}\)

B: 2 wilfullyche] wel 4 to kepe ]hes commaundments ]hat is vpon peyne] corrig mar. 9 (mar: Mathen 16 ratio 20)

we triste þat alle men schal beo damnd þat kepe nouþ his
commaundements, syþ þey beþ pure lyste. Bot þis grete Lord, syþ
he ys ful of mercy, haþ sceue ous tyme to kepe hem for tyme of
oure lyf, and specially in oure ende, if we schulle beo

sauf; for al onelyche he ys saued of God þat in tyme of his
derþ is founde in his seruyce.

And wyte þou wel þat it is lytel ynow to kepe continuelliche
his hestes to make a goed ende; for Seynt Austyn seþ þat oure
laste day is to ous vnknowe for we scholde spende wel alle óper
dayes. And we scholde haue yn oure mynde þat alle we schulleþ
passe þurgh þe sate of deþe; for Seynt Austyn seþ þat alle men
þat lyueþ on eorþe in þe day of dome schal dyeþ bodylyche, and

shulen be damnd þat kepen not his maundementis, siþ þei
ben pure list. But þis greet Lord, siþ he is ful of mercy,
haþ syuen vs tyme to kepe hem for tyme of oure lijf, and
specialy in oure ende, if we shal be saaf; for al oonly he
is sauþd of God þat /in tyme of his deþ is founden in his
seruyse.

And wite þou wel þat it is litil ynow to kepe
contynu[e]ly his heestis to make a good ende:

B: 8 (mar: Augustinus)
T: 1 nō ēglit H, maundementis comauendes HY, siþ sythen H
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whanne Crist schal alyste to deme þay schaDL> sodeynliche aryse a3eyn. For Seynt Bernard {sei<b>}, 'It <ys> certeyn þat þou schalt deye, bot it is vncerteyn wham<e>, oper how, opera where, for oueral deþ abyde þe, bot, and þou beo wyse, 
þou schalt abyde him.' Perfore, þe wyse man warneþ þe and seyp, 'Haue mynde, for deþ schal nou3t tarye.' And he ne 3eueþ nou3t þis conseille onlyche for oolde men and feble and syke, bot also for 3oonge men and boolde and stronge. For euerych day a man ney3eþ to his deþ nere and nere; for þe more a man in his lyf wexþ in dayes and æres, þe more he vnwexeþ, for, as seyntes seggeþ, þe furste day in þe weke þat a man is ybore ys þe furste day of his deþ, for eueryche day he is deyng whyle he is in þis lyf.

And þerfore seyp þe Gospel: 'Awake, for þou wost neuere whiche oure God is to come,'wheþer in þy sone age, oþer in þy mydel age, oþer in þy lasse dayes, or pryueliche, oþer openlyche. And, þerfore, loke þou beo alwey bysy in his seruyse and þenne, what tyme euer he come, þou mayst beo to him redy; for it is semeliche þat þe seruant abyde þe lord, and nou3t þe lord his seruant. And nameliche whanne gret hast ys, he is worþy blame þat is þenne vnredy; bot gretter hast no man redeþ of þan schal beo in comynge of Crist. And þus þou mayst
wel yknowe þat it is lytel ynow to kepe continuelliche Godes
hestes to make a goed ende: þy gostlyche enemys, and
specialliche þe fendes, beoþ faste aboute to tempte þe in þe
oure of deþ, bot syþ God may nouþ bydde bot skylful þyng
and lyst, wete we wel þat we may [ay] kepe þes ten commaundements;
for as he þat brekeþ oon offendep in alle, so he þat kepeþ
wel oon kepeþ hem alle.

Capitulum Secundum

Prestes scholde teche þes commaundements of God and publische
hem wiþ al here myst to the commune peple, for þis

Capitulum Secundum

Prestis shulden teche þes commaundementis of God, and
puplishe hem at her myst to þe comoun puple, for þis is þe
is þe moste worschief þat we do here to God and þe most profit þat we do here to his Chirche. Bot I drede me þat we beo bailleys of erroure for þes commaundements. And, for þay scholde beo freschliche in mynde, þey beþ departed in ten, and God spake hem as þey beþ ywryte in þe secunde boke of Holy Wryt, and þere þe boke spekeþ þus: 'God hab yspoke alle þes wordes: "Ich am þy Lord God þat haue ylad þe out of þe lond of Egypte of þe house of þraldom. Pou schalt haue none alyene godes before me. Pou schalt nouþt make þe an ymage graue by mannes honde, ne no lykenesse þat is in heuene aboue and þat is in eorþe byneþe, noþer of hem þat beþ in wateres vnder þe eorþe. Pou /schalt f74v nouþt worschepe ne herye hem. Ich am þy Lord þy God a strange louer gelouse. Ich visyte þe wykkednesse of fadres into here children into þe þrydde and ferþe generacioun of hem þat hateþ me, and I do mercy into a þousand kynredenys of hem þat louþþ me and keþþ myn hestes. Pou schalt nouþt take þe name of þy Lord God in vayn;

moost worship þat we don here to God and þo most profijt þat we don to his Chirche, but y drede me þat we ben bailies of errour.

Þes comauedementis, for þei shulden be freishlier

in mynde, ben partid in ten and in two boþe.
B

for sope þe Lord God schal noust haue him gultelys þat takeþ
Godes name yn ydel.

    Haue mynde to halewe þe day þat is Godes Sabote. In
syxe dayes þou schalt worche and do alle þyne owne workes,
bot þe seueþe day ys reste of þy Lord God, and þat day schalt
þou do no seruyle workes; noþer þy sone ne douster, þy seruant
noþer þy mayde, þy worke best ne þy straunger þat dwelleþ in
þyn hous. For in syxe dayes God made heuene and eorþe and see,
and alle þyng þat is wiþynne hem and reste þe seueþe day; and
heðore he blessede þe Sabot, and maked þis day holy.

    Worschepe þy fader and þy moder, þat þou beo in longe
lyf vpon eorþe þat þy Lord God schal seue þe.

    Þou schalt noust slee.

    Þou schalt noust do lecherye.

15    Þou schalt noust do þefþe.

    Þou schalt noust speke fals wytnesse æns þy neyþeboare.

    Þou schalt noust coueyte þy neyþebores hous.

    Þou schalt noust desyre þe wyf of þy neyþeboare, ne his seruant,
ne his mayde, ne his oxe, ne his asse, ne eny þyng þat is his.”

20    Þes beþ þe ten commawmdements þat God spake as it
is yseyd before. And alle men haueþ noust ryst
vnderstondyng of hem. Wharfore take hede wiþ clene soule

For if ech man wolde bysy himselfe to lerne and comene Godes hestes ecche wiþ opere, as Cristen men scholde do, as bysyliche as many men dop aboute folyes and diuerse vaniteys þat neuere turneþ to profeþ bot to moche meschief and

B: 5 to] om. 7 and] om., comenynge] comyn
9 (mar. Deutonomie 6)
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mystandyng of tyme, þe peple scholde nouȝt beo so vicious in
dere lyuynge aȝens Godes lawe, ne here children to hem so
rebell and vnbusóm as hy al day þeþ bycome. Perfore død as þe
wyse man conseileþ and folwe him. He seyþ, 'Be al þy narracioun,
or þy dalyance, in þe hestes of almesty God.'
And þen a-se þe goedenesse of him þat putteþ alle his
commaundements in ten, þat þou scholdest lystlyche conne hem and
haue hem in þy mynde, as I tolde before, and also in to boþe.
3e, þey beþ gadred into on, as Seint Poul techeþ, for kepe þe
in charite and þou kepest þe ten commaundements. Charite
stondeþ in þes two branches: in loue of God as þou
scholdest and in loue of þy neyȝebore; and herefore [God] sæf
Moyses two tables of þe lawe. Þe fyrste table techeþ men to
T
þe, þei ben gederid in on, as Seynt Poul techeþ, for
kepe þee in charite and þou kepest þes ten heestis.
Charite stondeþ in þes two braunchis: in loue of God as þou
shuldest, and loue of þi neizbore; and herfore God sæf Moyses
two tables of þe lawe. Þe first table techeþ men for to
Bloue God and conteyne þre commaundements, as Godes lawe techæþ. 
Þe seconde table conteyne þe oþer seuene commaundements, and techæþ for to loue þy neþebore as þou scholdest, and þes seuenne and þe oþer þre of þe fyrste table makeþ ten 
commaundements. We haue no myst to telle þe auctorite of þes hestes ne alle þe resouns þat scholde meue men to holde hem, but on þyng scholde we knowe of oure goede God: þat he byddyth no man do [bot] for vauntage of himself ne nouȝt bot þat we may lyȝtliche performe, for Crist himself seib 
þat his ȝoke is softe and his charge lyȝt. And Seynt Austyn 

T 
Bloue God and conteyne þre commaundements as Goddis lawe techæþ. Þe seconde table conteyne oþere seuene commaundements, þat techæþ þe for to loue þi neþebore as þou shuldest, and þes þre and seuene maken ten commaundements. We han no myst to telle 
autorite of þes heestis, ne alle þe resouns þat shulden 
moeue men to holde hem, but oo þing shulden we knowe 
of oure good God: þat he biddþ no man do [but] for vauntage 
of hymself, ne nouȝt þat he may not listly performe, for 
Crist himself seib þat his ȝok is soft and charge is list
B

seyð, 'If we wolde deserue meydes of euerleystynge lyf hye we wip alle oure strenges to fulfille Godes hestes,' for his hestes beþ heuy to hem þat nelleþ kepe hem and lyst to hem þat wolleþ. And so studye wyselyche wat were þe beste for þe to kume and to worche and þat þy Lord bydþ þe.

Iblessed be þis ryche Lorde and hende in his byddynge. He is ryche for he hab no nede to oure seruise. He is hende for he axeþ þat most profiteþ ous. Who wolde nouȝt loue suche a Lord and serue him wip goed wille? But þenke þat we beþ children and coueyteþ ofte þynges þat were moche aens ous, for we se nouȝt al. And þerfore it is nedful to be grounded to men þat louen him. Ande so studie wiselye what were best for þee to kume and to worche, and þat þi Lord biddþ þee do.

Blessid be þis riche Lord and hende in his biddyng. He is riche for he hab no nede of oure servyse. He is hende for he axeþ þat þat moost profitþ to /vs. Who wolde not loue siche a Lord and serue him wip will? But þenke þat we ben children, and coueiten ofte þinges þat weren moche aens vs, for we seen not al. And þerfor it is nedful to be groundid in bileue,

in blysbe se [afer] in blysbe to þe ende of þe wyrde;
and so we may wyte what were goed for ous. For oftymes men
desyreþ þat doþ hem moche harm, as children þat beþ wantone
and men þat beþ on feueres; and so many wenþ þat worliche
worschip and rychesse of þe worlde were best hem to haue, bot,
yf þey seye here ende and þe commaundements of God and how þes
þynges letteþ hem to kepe Godes hes/tes, þey myste wel yse þat f.76r
suche þynges noyþ many men.

T
and se afer in blysbe to eende of þe world; and so may we
wite what were good for vs. For ofte tymes men desiren
þat doþ hem myche harm, as children þat ben wantoun and men
þat ben in feueres; and so many wenþ þat wroldli worship and
richessis of þe world weren best hem to haue, but, if þei
seþ her eende and commaundements of God and hou þes þyngis
letten hem to kepe Goddis heestis, þei mysten wel se þat
siche þyngis noyen many men.
B

Capitulum Tercium

Pe fyrste commaundement of ten pat God himself spake say' bus: 'Ich am pe Lord God pat ladde pe out of Egypt of pe hous of praldom.' Bot ar we passe any forper 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 ynemmed by pes two names for two kynnes bynges: pat is, drede and loue pat we scholde haue to him. And herefore God aske in

T

[Capitulum Tercium] Primum Mandatum

Pe first commaundment of ten is seid bus of God: God himself spak alle pes wordis: I am pe Lord pi God, pat ledde pee out of pe lond of Egip4 and brou3t pee out of pat place here pou

5 seruedist [men]. Pou shalt not haue bificre me aliene goddis. Pou shalt not make to pee an ymage grauen bi mannes hondis, ne similitude in heuene, ne erpe, ne of water. Pou shalt not loute hem ne worshipe hem as God. Y am pe Lord pi God, a strong, gelous buyer. Y visite wickidnesse of fadris to

10 pe pridded and fourpe children of hem pat hatiden me, and punyshe hem peraftir, and y do mercy to a housend kynredis of men pat louen me and kepen myn hestis.

boke of his prophete: 'If I am Lord, where ys my drede? And if he be God, where ys his loue?' And, forpermore, why þis name 'Lord' is yput byfore: for in þis name 'Lord' is vnderstonde drede. And Seynt Austyn seyþ þat drede bryngeþ in loue as brystyl bryngeþ in þrede, and herefore Godes lawe putteþ þis name ['Lord'] byfore. And þus þou schalt loue þy God and drede him; for Austyn, þe goede clerk, seyþ, 'Vnderstonde ðe þe power of God. Vnderstonde ðe þe mercy of God. Drede þe his power. Loue þe his mercy. Ne presume þe so moche of his mercy þat þe sette nouȝt of his power, noþer drede þe so moche his power þat þe falle into dyspere of his mercy. For in him is power, in him is mercy and al goednesse.'

T

Þis word of oure God is chargid wiþ witt more þan we kan telle, or may for þis tyme, but oo þing shulde we take of Goddis lawe: þat he medliþ togidre words of loue and drede; for bi loue and drede lediþ he hise children, and chastisiþ hem bi þes two, as bi þerde and staff. But siþ man shulde kyndly be led bi loue, he medliþ more of loue þan he doiþ of drede; and herfore, he strecchiþ his veniaunce to men vnto þe þridde and fouþe generacioun, but hise werkis of loue he strecchiþ til a þousend; and so witt and strengeþ he medliþ togidre, to tokene þat eche man is holden to /loue him, and þat no man may asterte knowleche of him ne, if he do amys, peyne þat he is worþi.
Wherefore we scholde haue freliche in mynde þat oure hendy Lord God, by power, wysdome and his benygnge and mercyful grace, ladde þe children of Israel out of Egypte, of þe hous of þraldome, fro þe power of Pharaþ; and how also, by his power, wysdome and benigne and mercyful grace, he ledeb ous fro Egypte, fro þe hous of þraldome and fro þe power of Pharaþ. For by þis word 'Egypte' beþ vnderstonde derkenesses. And by dedly synne, God, þat is lyste of mannes soule and al cunnynge, pas/seþ fro mannes soule, and þenne he is in 'Egypte', þat is to mene: in derkenesse of ignorance and vncumynge to knowe þynges þat myȝte him helpe. For his soule, as þe Gospel telleþ, is þe hous of an vnclene spirit, and þenne is he vnder þe power of 'Pharao', by wham is vnderstonde þe deuel, þat is lord and prince of alle men and wommen þe wyche knoweþ hemself vnderput and sogeþ to dedly synne.

And þe holy clerk Seynt Austyn seþ þat a man ys seruant of so many lordes as he dop synnes. And also Criste in þe Gospel seþ þat he þat dop synne is seruant to synne. And so, for luste and lykynge þat meny men and wymmen haþþ in here synne, bryngþ þemself wip here owene fre wil in þe deuel of helle hous, þat is an hous of gret þraldome. For Jon Crisostome, þe worscheþful clerk, seþ þat we alle, byfore tyme ar we falle into synne, we haþþ
a fre choyse whaþer we wolle þe deuel or no. Bot if we
ones, synwynge, bynde ous, he seyþ in his werkes, þenne we may
nouþ, by oure owene vertue, astyrt his bondes; bot ryþt as a
schype, whenne his helme þat he is lad by is tobroke, ys

ydryue whoder þe tempest wole, ryþt so a man þat by synne
hæþ ylost þe helpe of grace of God almyþy doþ þenne þat he
wolde himself, bot þat his lord þe deuel wole. And bot God,
he seyþ, wiþ strong honde of his mercy vnbynde him, anone to
þe deþ he schal dwelle in þe bondes of his synnes. For ryþt

as a fyssch gøþ into þe wyle whenne þat he wole bot, whenne
he ys inne, he may nouþ ous whenne he wolde, ryþt so a man,
ar he synwy, hæþ liberal arbitrement wheþer he wolde be
vnþer þe deuelles kyngdom oþer no; bot whenne, þurgh synne, he
hæþ yput himself vnþer his kyngdom, þenne he may nouþ, by

his owen vertu, go ous of his power. Perfore God /spekeþ by
þe prophete and seyþ: 'Pou, man, þy loþte is of þysself and
onlyche þyn helpe is of me.' And so, whenne a man forsakeþ
his synne by contricioun [and] confessioun, and doþ, by hys
power, satisfaccioun, purposynege hollyche to kepe him fro dedly

synne, and mecklyche þonkeþ his God, knowlechyng þat nouþ by
vertu of himself bot by fre grace of God goynge byfore he
aloped and forsoke þe horþe of synne, and þenne seyeþ, as dyde
Paule, 'By [þi] grace ich am þat ich am,' and, forþer, bysecheþ þat
grace of God to contynue his lyf in goede werkes, þat he may
B

seye forper wib Poule, 'And his grace in me was nou3t voyde',
to alle ṭat ṭus, by ṭe grace of God, conteynep here lyf me
may seye wib ṭe apostol, 'By grace ṭe bep made saue.' And so man ṭat for synne ys in power and kyngdome of ṭe fende may [nou3t],
by vertu of himself, be delyuered of his power, bot onlyche by ṭe mercyful honde and power of God, for nou3t of ṭe werkes
of rystfulnesse, seyeb Poule, ṭat we hauep ywrou3t bot after
his mercy he ḥap made ous saue. And so alday he ledeb mankynde
out of Egypte of ṭe hous of praldome and fro ṭe power of
Pharaoh.

The boke tellep how clerkes seyeb ṭat a childe, byfore
بطل it ys cristened, it ḥap a wykked spiryt dwellynge in hys
soule, ṭe whiche wykked spiryt is acomered and yscomfyted þurgh
grace of God and by prayere of ṭe preste byfore ṭe churche
dore whanne ṭe child schal be cristned; ṭe whiche sacrament
of baptisme is ground and begynnyng of alle sacraments, as was
erlyche betokened in ṭe passioun of Criste by water ṭat
ran out of his syde whanne al his blod was go. So ṭat, by ṭis
sacrament of baptisme, he is delyuered fro ṭe fended power and
ymade Godes childe, and he receyuep ṭer parte of ṭe passiou
of /Criste and of alle sacraments and prayers ṭat ṭe ydo
in Holy Churche, and parte of alle goede dedes ṭat ṭe ydo among

B: 1 (mar. 1 Corinthiūs 15), voyde] voyde and so 4 nou3t] out.
alle Cristene folke. And so, in makyng of þe couenaunte þat he makeþ here wip God, whenne he forsakeþ þe fendes pride and alle his werkes and, by grace of God, knowelecheþ to beo Godes childe, God, by his power, wysdome and his benigne and mercyful grace, ledeþ him oute of Egypte, of þe hous of þraldom and fro þe power of Pharao. And þus oure Lord God haf ylad ous graciousliche of þe lond of Egypte.

And alle þes worchynges and goednesses þat oure Lord God alday continuellichë scheuþ to ous men scholde teche here children þat haueþ discrecioun, to make hem þe more beter to loue here God and þe more tenderloker and bisyloker to lerne and to kepe Godes commaundements, as þe Holy Gost techeþ ous, as it is wryte in þe fyfþe boke of Holy Wyt where, after rehersyng of þe ten commaundements þe whiche he hoteþ þe to teche þy childe, he sayþ þus: 'Whanne þy chylde schal axe þe seyyng, what wolþe þeþ wytnesses, sermonyæs and domes þat oure Lord God haf yhote to ous do to him, þou schalt answery aþen to þy childe, and telle him þus: "We were Pharao seruanta in Egipte, and oure Lord God, wip strong honde, haf ylad ous out of Egypte."' And, forþermore, he scholde telle him of the plages, toknes and of grete merueilles þat God scheuþed aþenst Pharao in Egypte, and þe goednesse þat God byheyþe hem if þey wolde kepe his hestes.

Here we scholde take goed hede how oure gode Lord God wilþe for to tolle ous into his loue as a boner fader döþ his childe, for we scholde frelyche, wipoute seruyle drede, kepe his hestes and treweþliche serue him. And /for
B

His cause, byfore he comauuement he reherceb he benefetes that he hab ydo { to ous and seyb: 'Ich am by Lord God that ladde he oute of Egypte of he hous of praldome.' In his wordes beu vnderstonde mo benefytes that he hab ydo for ous

That mannes wyttes mowe suffice to schewe opeu vnderstonde. And, next folwynge, he comauuandeb and seyeb, 'Pou schalt haue none anye godes byfore me. Pou schalt noust make he an ymage graue by mannes honde, ne no lykenesse that is in heuene aboue and that is in erpe bynepe, noper of hem that bep in wateres vnder eorpe. Pou schalt noust worschepe hem ne heru hem. Ich am by Lord God a strange lover gelouse etcetera.

Meny men weneb that they kepeb his comauuament, and

T

And so his comauuement bitokene God he Fader, for oonned, bi sum cause, is propred to he Fader, and his maundement biddib hee to haue but oon God, for Fadir and Sone and Hooli Goost ben he same God, and hes pre maundementis of he first table menen hes pre persones in maner of her speche. And so, sip nopung may be verrey God but oon, whoeuermakyb him many goddis mut haue summe false, and, for his is straunge fro resoun of oure God, wel ben siche clepid aliene goddis.

Capitulum Quartum

But for men wenen pat hei kepen his comauuement, and
B

sitt on many wyse þey lyueþ þeraþen. Þefore we schulleþ ywytþ þat what kynnes þyng a man loueþ most he makeþ his god and, syþþe alle synne stondeþ in loue, eueryche heed synne draweþ wip him brekyng of þis heste. For alle dedly synnes beþ forbode in þis heste, and who þat synweþ in eny dedly synne he brekeþ þis commaundement and makeþ him a false god. And so þes ten commaundements beþ as ten myrouþs þat men may se hemself þerinne, wheþer þey plese God or no; for if þou holde eny of hem þou plesest þy God. And syþ þer be þre synnes, as Seynt Ion seþþ, þat wrappeþ alle oþer synnes þat eny man can rekene, [herefore] on þre wyse may a man breke þis

T

sitt on many wyse þei lyuen þeraþens, þerfore we shulden wite þat what kyn þing þat a man loueþ mo{e}st he makþ his god.
And so, siþe þiþ synne stondeþ in loue, euery heed synne draweþ wip him brekyng of þis heest. And so þes ten heestis ben as ten myrouþs þat men may se hemself synne, wheþerþei plese God; for if þou holde ony of hem þou plesist þi God. And siþ þer beþ þre synnes, as Seynt Ion seþþ, þat wlappeþ alle oþer synnes þat eny man kan rekene, herfore on þre wyse may man breke þis

B: 11 herefore] wherefore
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commandment. These seven stonden in these seven:
love of flesh, or love of eyes, or pride of life.
But desire of flesh is our enemy, as witnesseth Saint
Bernard and sayeth of him thus: 'I may not flee my body ne

drye him away. It is needful to bear him about, for it is
ybound to me. To spill him it is so lausomy. To susteyne
him ich am constrained. Whenne ich make him fatte my enemy
against me ich norysche.' And so this enemy stereth man's soul
into love of two sins that be fleshly, that be
gluttony and lecherye that come of gluttony.

To covetise (set) of eyes sight stereth the secondary enemy, that is
this world, and so into the love of two other sins, that be
covetise of the worldly goddes and so into slowe; for
comelyche riche men be slowe in Godes servyce and luse

hem in likynge of here goddes, as a sowe or a swyne dop in this
myre and mukke. To pride of lyf, that stondeth in love of
worschep of this world, styreth the fend of helle, and so into
two other synnes, that bepe wrepe and enuye. And so in love of these
these synnes bepe wrapped alle maner synnes that whiche bepe

forbode in this heste where God hoteb that thou scholdest

T

commandment. These seven stonden in these seven:
love of fleish, and love of y3en, and pride of pis lijf.

B: 11 coueytise] corr.int.
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haue none alyene godes byfore him, ne make þe no lyknesse þat is in heuene aboue, and þat is in erþe byneþe, ne of hem þat beþ in wateres vnder þe erþe; þou schalt noust worschepe hem ne herye hem. Pis is vnderstonde þus: for cause þat no þyng scholde be loued most bot þat þat is best and most worþy to be loued, and þat is God alone, þerfore scholde God most be loued; and so, what þyng eny man or womman loueþ most, þat þey makeþ here God.

And so glotouns and lechours brekeþ pis heste. And herfor seþ Poul þat þes grete glotons makeþ here bely here god for loue þat þey loueþ it and, by þe same skyle, þes foule lechours makeþ here god þe fleslyche baly of a lecherous womman. For God byddeþ þe loue him ouer alle þyng; bot eche man and womman loueþ þat þyng more þan God for þe whiche þyng, whateuer it be, þay brekeþ Godes heste. And

T

And so glotouns and lechours breken þis heest. And herfor seþ Poul þat þes grete glotouns maken her here bely her god, for loue þat þei louen it and, bi þe same skyle, þes foule lechours maken her god þe taile cende of an hoore. For

5 God biddip þee loue him ouer al þing,
Bus hāy mowe yknowe þat hy loueþ nouȝt God ouer alle þyng. And syþ þat God bydde ous nouȝt do bot þat þat is goed and moste þrofyst to ous, we scholde put his byddynge byfore alle oþer þynges and byddyngeþ. For whas byddynge þat a man putþeþ byfoþre oþer, in þat he loueþ him more þan he dop þat oþer þyng whas byddynge he putþeþ byhynde and serueþ þat oþer fyrst. Now God bydde þe fede þe wip mete and drynke and oþer sustynaunce in mesure; and yf þou passe þis mesure for luste of þy bely, þe meuyng and luste of þy flesche styreþ þe more to do þat þy flesche axþ þan meuyngþe of God. And so, whanne þou consentest to do þe wil and desyre of þe flesche and putþest byhynde þe heste and desyre of God, þou makest falslych þy bely þy god and dost þænst þis commaundement, in þe whiche God bydde þe þat þou scholdest make þe no

and what þing he biddip þee do, putte it bifore oþer. For whos biddyng þat a man putþip bifore oþere, in þat he loueþ him more þan þat oþer þing whos biddyng he putþip byhynde and serueþ þat oþer first. Now God biddip þee fede þe in mesure; and if þou passe þis mesure for luste of þi bely, þe meuyng of þi fleish stirþ þee more to do þat þi fleish axþ þan moeuyng of God, /and so þou makest falsly þi bely þi god.
lyknesses of hem þat bêp yn wateres vnder þe erpe. For in
þes bêp vnderstonde flesclyche lustes þat glotons and
lecherous men and wommen most louþp.

And in þis wyse coueytouse men and wommen makeþ hem
false godes of wordelyche godes þe whiche þey louþp most and
setteþ most here herte and tryste on hem, as on londes, rentes
gold, seluer, óper in eny óper catel for þe whiche, wheþer it
be for luste óper wynnyng, þey brekeþ Godes commaundement;
or on wyue, childe, óper eny óper creature for whas plesance
or lykyngþ þay dop āëns Godes hestes. And so alle chynches and
coueþtous men makeþ þes wordelyche godes synfulliche here
false godes. And herfore seþ Poule þat coueþtyse in suche
þyngeþ is seruise of mamettes and so of false godes, and herfore
alle suche brekeþ þis commaundement where God byþþþ þem
make no [l]ykenesse of þynge þat is on erpe, in þe whiche bêp
vnderstonde þes erþelyche goedes. And moche more proute men

And on þis wise þe coueþitous man þat synþþþ in coueþtise
of worldly goodis mabþþ his mawmet þes worldli goodis. And
herfore seþ Poule þat auarice of siche þing is seruise of
mawmetis, as to false goddis. And myche more þe proud man
B

and wommen makeþ þe fend here god, for þe fend is kyng of alle
proute children, and in þat þat a man oþer womman ȝeuþeþ him
to pryde and leueþ mekenesse of herte þat Criste Ihesu byddeþ
him to lerne he makeþ þe fend his god and forsakeþ Crist. And
so þay þat setteþ here /hertes most on worldelyche worschepe
and on veyneglorye and heynesse of hemself brekeþ þis
commaundement. In þis synne of pryde synwed Lucyfer þe hey
angel of heuene, whanne he þouste in his herte þus: 'I schal
go vp into þe heuene and I schal enhaunce my sete aboue þe
sterres (þat is to seye, þe angeles of heuene) and I schal be
lyche to him þat is alþerheyeþest (þat is God himself).' Bot for
he wolde make himself so heyeþe, þerfore he fel lowest into
þe depeþest put of helle. And þerfore seþ Seynt Gregory in
a boke: 'If Lucyfer, þurgh pryde, felle adoun out of heuene
into helle, how schalt þou, by pryde, come vp into heuene?'
Trist wel þerto, it wolde nouþt be. Bot also syker as God is
in heuene, þe heyeþer þat þou makeþ þyself þurgh pryde æsenst
T
makib þe fend his god, sþ þe fend is kyng of alle
proute children, and in þat þat a man ȝeuþeþ hym to pride and
leueþ mekenesse of herte þat Ihesu Crist biddib þe makib þe
fend his god and forsakib Crist. þus we don in dede, howeuer
oure mouþ blabere.
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Be wyl of God, bot if thou amende þe here bytyme in þis lyfe, thou schalt euene after þy pryde be þe nerre Lucyfer and deppur in helle. And herefore lerne of Crist þat is humyl and meke to sette þyn herte in lowenesse. For þe lower þat þou holde þe in berynge, þe heyer þou art in syȝt of God; and þe more heyer þat þou holde þe in þy berynge, þe more lower and fowler þou art in þe syȝt of God. For alle suche proute men and wommen forsakeþ Crist þat is humel and meke and make here god þe proute fende of helle and folweþ him.

Wherefore hy brekeþ þis commaundement in þat þat hy doþe asens Godes byddynghe whare he seþ: 'Þou schalt make þe no lyknesse þat is in heuene aboue.'

Also alle manere wychecraftes, enchauntemens and alle oþer dyuere incantaciouns þat beþ ydo by conseylyng of wykked spirites beþ forbode in þis commaundement. For Seynt Austyn bydde þrewe prestes to warne þe peple þat suche maner craftes mowe nouȝt helpe to helpe of sycke men, noþer of syke bestes, lame or sore, bot þes manere craftes beþ greuous and foly waytyngeþ of þe olde enemy þe fende, by þe whiche he purposeþ to bygyle mankynne. And whosoþere vse þes, he seþ, 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 þe same doctour seþ þat we scholde nouȝt kepe dayes þat beþ ycleped 'Egypcians' þe whiche, as ich vnderstonde, beþ þe dayes þat men now cleþþ 'dysmale dayes', and þes
dayes no Cristene peple scholde spare in bygynnynge of eny worke or iorney, neper kepe þe kalendys of Januarie in þe whiche me þeuep sifte to oþer as, in begynnynge of þe æere, by enchauntynge of gode hansel, as þough hy seyde oþer pouste, 'We bylyueþ and trystþ burgh þis hansel of þis newe æere spede wel al þe æere folwynge.' And if þey haue non hansel in þe bygynnynge of þe newe æere hy vnderstondep to spede þe wors al þe æere after. And in þis maner synne falleþ alle þat in þis manere belyueþ and tristeþ into fangynge of hansel in eny chaffaryng. And þough eny man seye þat he knoweþ some men fare oþer spede þe betere by suche hansel, wyte he wel þat it is nouȝt so, but it is þe sotylte of þe fende to brynge hem into mysbyleue. Bot here ze schal vnderstonde þat gode Cristene folk mowe seyþe swyte eche to oþer for to encresse and norysche loue þat is charite, bot nouȝt into þat tryst and bylyue þat ys yspoke byfore, neþer into suche entente to haue a grettour syfte æen, for þat were vsure.

Also, Seynt Austyn seyþ þat we schal nouȝt kepe tymes,
oþer æeres, oþer dayes, oþer course of mowene, oþer of sonne (þat is to mene for bygynnynge oþer worchynge of eny profitable and lawesom worke oþer for spouselle or weddynges); or, in gaderynge of herbes for eny medicyne, seye eny charmes; /oþer for eny sykenesse putte eny scripture vpon man or bestes, bot if it be þe Crede, or elles þe Pater Noster. For
Bay bat kepe, ower takeb hede, ower consenteb to hem bat kepe suche tymes and pes forseyden hynges ower eny maner dyuynaciouns or destynees ower eny maner enchauntments, ower bylyueb to hem, or axe hem for hynges bat bebp ylost ower ystole or to knowe by here crafte hynges tocomynge, ower ledebp hem into here hous, bycause of such hynges forsakeb God, errynge aesen Cristene feyp. And bot Pey by penaunce of Holy Churche beo to God reconsyled, hey yrenneb euerestynge wrepe of God in peynes of helle wipoute ende. Perfore do we after he holy apostel Poule bat seyb, 'Whaber se ete ower drynke ower what ouer hyng euer se do, doo se it in he name of our Lord Ihesu Crist in wham we lyue[h] and dayebp.' And elles we doep aesen Godes commaundement and erreb in he feyp of Holy Churche, makyng he fendes of helle oure godes. For and we were stedefast on gode byleue bat God of heuene is almy3ty we wolde nou3t for helbe of oure bodyes or bestes, ower for eny worldlyche godes ylost ower ystole, ower elles for to knowe hynges to comynge, or for eny cause, axe helpe of pes forseyden hynges bat dyuerselyche and sotellyche bep ydo by worchynge of certeyn fendes. For, as he prophete seyb, alle godes of folke bep fendes and pay bep ycleped stronge godes ower alyen godes, for by pryde pay bep ymaked alyens and stronge fro God. And show, amysbeleued man or womman,
worschepede eny suche false godes, were it neuere so priuety
as to the worlde, it moste nedes beo openlyche yknowe and yseye
of God, to wham alle pynges beþ most opene and to him noþyng
may be hydde. Perfore he seyb,'Pou schalt haue none alyene
godes byfore me. Pøu schalt nouȝt make þe an ymage graue by
mannes/honde.'

Here by þis commaundement sume men paraunter weneþ
þat it beo forbode to make eny ymagies; bot of þis spekeþ þe

and so þes prestis þat prechen more to gete a loos þan for
worship of God and profiȝt of his Chirche maken hem a fals
symylitude in heuene; and he þat prechþ more for worldli wynnyng
þan for worship of God synne þæns þis maundement, siþ þat
he makiþ him a similitude in erpe; and, bi þe same resoun, þat
prest þat prechþ more for to fede his lustis þan to plese
God, he brekiþ {þis} heest on þe þridde maner, for he makyþ
hym a fals liknesse in watir. And þus may we se hou comounly
þis maundement is brokun, boþe of prestis and seculers.

{Capitulum Quintum}

Bvt here moeuen clerkis wheþer ymagis [ben] leueful, and
it semeþ nay, for ymagis ben forfendid boþe in þis
noble clerke Bede in exponyng þe temple of Salomon where he seyþ þus: 'It is to knowe, he seyþ, þat þer bëp sume men þat weneþ þat it be by þe lawe forbode þat we scholde nouȝt graue ne peynte lyknesse of men or of bestes ðer lyknesse of eny oþer þynge in Churche, for as muche as, in þe ten hestes, it is commanded þat þou scholdest make to þe non ymage ygraue ne no lyknesse; þe whiche scholde nouȝt trowe þat forbode yf þey toke to mynde þe werke of Salomon. For Salomon, in temple of þe Olde Lawe, made dyuerse peyntynges and graues bytoknyng ymages þat we haueþ nowþe in Holy Churche, as dyde Moyses in þe tabernacle by heste of God. And as Moyses, by Godes heste, also made a brasen serpent for þat þe peple þat by ðer wylde fyry serpentes were enuamed byholdynge him scholde be heled and lyue, by moche more it is lausom to ous to haue þe ymage of Crist in þe cros þat we, in hauynge mynde on þe deþ of Crist, mowe ouercome þe temptacions and þe venym of þe fende, þe olde serpent. And maundement and many oþere places. For in þe Olde Testament God was eschewe þat ony ymage shulde be maad among þe Iewes, and þe same God is now wþ þe same maundementis.
B

answeryng to þe twelfe ymages of þe twelfe oxen and to oþer Þynges þat entyrred þe temple, it is lausom to peynte in Holy Churche ymages of þe twelfe apostoles and of oþer seintes as we dop worscheveloplyche and presabyllyche in Holy Churche. 5  
Wherfore if we dylygentlyche take hede of þe wordes of þis commaundement, we mowe wel yknowe þat we beo nouȝt forbode to make ymages. For into þis euydence he seyb byfore, "Þou schalt haue none alyene godes byfore me," and after þe schonynge of ymages and lyknesses he seyb, "Þou schalt nouȝt worschepe ne herye hem," as pough he seyde openliche,"Þou schalt nouȝt make suche ymages for to herye hem or worschepe hem as God." Ellys, forsoþe,' seyb þis grete clerke /Bede, 'Crist Ihesu oure sauþoure, seynge þe ymage of Cesar þe emperoure on a peny, schole nouȝt haue yhote, "Ʒylde to Cesar þynges þat beþ his," bot raþer haue reprehended þe ymage of Cesar bycause of ydolatrie þat myȝte be to þe ymage in a peny.' 15  
Bot here we schal vnderstonde þat ymages mowe be occasioun of goed and also of yuel. For a grete clerk seyb T

But here me þinkþ þat ymagis don boþe good and harm:
B

\[\text{that ymages mowe be maked wel and eke ylle: wel to lyate and haunte and to styrye oper meue pe soules of goede Cristene folke forte pe more bysyloker and deuouteloker worschepe her God; and ylle whenne \text{that}, by occasioun of ymages, me erre}\]

\[\text{fro pe sopenysse of fey\text{p} so \text{that} bylke ymage be worschepeped as God, as yf enybody tryste endelyche to be holpe or relyued by hem in eny sykencesse or in eny oper nede or dysayse, and perfore offere and praye to hem [and] worschepeped hem wib worschepe \text{that} is onlyche yp\text{propred} to God and to no mo.}\]

T

good to siche men to whom \text{pei ben bokis} to more [loue] God \text{han pei shulden ellis; yuel pei don to siche men whom pei moeuen bus to sette here hope eendely in help of \text{hes ymagis, or ellis to scatere her loue folily in ymagis. And in \text{hes}\]

\[\text{synnes trauceiln many folk, bope lerid and lewed, and couectise of prestis scatert\text{ip} ofte her loue vpon \text{hes dede stokkis, so \text{bat} me pinkip, saaf betere iugement, \text{bat} it were more profijt vnto Hooli Chirche /pat alle \text{hes ymagis were left, as God bad \text{pe Iewes. Han shulden pei knytte more clenly }}\]
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her loue in her God, and lesse erre in mawmetrie and coueitise bope. For lewed men in pilgramage synne myche in mawmetrie, and clerkis synnen myche more for coueitise of offryng. But we seien siþ Crist for vs was maad man it is leueful to haue ymage bi þe resoun of his manhed, siþ men sien his body walking on erpe and, as Seynt Poul seþ, 'In þat his Godhed'; and in þe breed of þe auter we seen eche day his body, but bope þes wiþ y3en of soule and not wiþ y3e of body. But certis siche ape liknesse blyndþ many men and mak[þ]
Therefore techeth Seynt Gregorye in a lettere that he wrot to a byschop and sayd thus: Leue broper, late it was yschewed to ous that you seynge some folke worscheypynge ymages, wherfore you breke the ymages and castest hem out of churche, the which zeale or loue that you haddest that pate that was ymaked with mannes hondes scholde nouȝt be worscheped we preysep, bot that you scholdest nouȝt haue ybroke hem we demep.' For Gregorie sayd, 'Herefore peynture ys maked in churche: that pay namelyche that cunne no letterure scholde rede in walles pate that pey moveth nouȝt in bokes. And so if a clerk schal worschepe his boke, panne may anoper man worschepe an ymage.' In anoper lettre the same Gregorie sayd, 'Whoso wolde make ymages let him nouȝt bot in alle manere schone hem to be worscheped. And warne alle men byslyche that pey take hete and charite (that is loue of compunccioun) by the syste of pyng ydo, [and] that pey be put adoune ober that pey knele adoune into /the worschepe of onlyche Trinite.'

Herefore sayd a gret clerke, 'I worschepe nouȝt the ymage of Crist for that it is tre, noper for it ys the ymage of Crist, bot ich worschepe Crist byfore the ymage of Crist for it is the ymage of Crist and meuep me to worschepe Crist.' And so, whenne we comep into eny churche, mekelyche we scholde knele vpon the grounde, and yf you vnderstonde that pe holy sacrament of the
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auter, þat ys Cristes body in forme of bred þat was ybore of þe
Virgyne Marye and by þe deþe vpon þe cros bouste ous yf we kepe his
hestes fro peynes of helle, be presaunte aboue þe auter or elles
vpon þe auter, worchepe it wiþ al þyn heorte, soule and
mynde. And whanne þou seyst þe cros, þenke wiþ gret sorowe and
compunccioun of heorte what deþe he suffrede for mankynde.
And so byfore þe cros þat meueþ þe to deuocioun, worchepe þou
Crist wiþ al þy mynde.

And þus, by ymages and peynture ymaked by mannes honde,
þou mayste yse and knowe how holy seyntes of heuene louede almysty
God, and how grete and dyuerse passiouns þey suffrede for loue þat
þey hadde to him; as by þe ymage of Seynt Laurence þat is
ypeyte 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 þat ys ypeynt holdynge in here hond a
whel and a swerd, schewyng what passioun þe holy virgyne Kateryne
suffrede. And so by ymages of oþer seyntes þou myst somdel
yknowe what passioun þey suffrede for loue þat þey hadde to
almysty God. And þus by synte of þes þynges yseye, as
Gregorye meneþ byfore, we schul putte ous adoune into
worschepe of onlyche Trynyte. And þis scholde be grete
worschepe to þe seyntes in heuene for as mueche þat, by þe
syste of here ymages, oure deuocioun ys ymeued þe more
deuouteloker to worschepe God. And yf /we do offrynge and
worschepe that is onlyche ypŏpŏred to God to here ymages, we
nouȝt onlyche ðenne offendeþ God, brekyng his heste, bot also
we offendeþ alle þe holy seyntes of heuene, for þey hateþ, as
wytnesseþ Seynt Austyn, if suche þynges be do to hemself. For
þey wolde nouȝt vsurpe to hem suche þynges þat beþ onlyche
ypŏpŏred to God; þenne muche more hy hateþ yf suche þynges
be do to here ymages, þat beþ bot here schadues ymaked of
tre or stone. For Holy Wryt wytnesseþ how þe angel of God
wolde nouȝt suffre Jon þe Euangeliste to worschepe him bot
bad him worschepe God. And yf þou wolt worschepe in his
trewe ymage, do after þe conseile of Thoby and ete þou
þy bred wiþ hungry and nedy, þat is to mene: þy part of þy
sustenaunce, after þy power, to hem þat nedep, and namelyche
to þe meke, trewe, poure man þat ys þe trewe ymage of God and
moche may helpe þe wiþ his prayere. For þe holy apostel Seynt
Jame seyb þat a bysye prayere of þe ryȝtful man is moche
worpy, and herefore þe wyse man byddep þe hyde þyn almesse in
þe poure mannes bosum and þes, he seyb, schal praye for þe.

Of þis ymage of God meny men and wommen takeþ lytel kepe,
and wiþ dyuerse hørpes of synnes menyfoldlyche þis noble ymage
defouleþ, into gret dysiplesance and offense of God. Wherefore
Be holy clerek Seynt Bernard speke to biis ymage and sey be bus:
'O my soule, yf byou wolt be loued of God egrey byou in be byne ymage and he schal louy be and he schal loue be and desyre be. For sophe,' sey by Seynt Bernard, 'by conseyle of be Holy Trynyte by makere made be to his owne ymage and lyknesse, be whiche ymage and lyknesse he toke neuere to oper creature, bat byou scholdest loue him in so moche be feruentloker by how moche byou knewe be of him meneillyche ymade. Perfore,' he sey, 'vnderstonde be by noblete; for ry3t as

5 God is oueral /ful and hoole, makynge al bynge quyke, meuynge and gouemynge it ry3t, so by soule ys ful and hoole in eche party of by body, makynge it quyke, meuynge and gouemynge it. And ry3t as in God bep persons pre: Fader, Sone and Holy Goste, so byou hast dignytees bat bep pre: vnderstondynge, wyl and

10 mynde. And ry3t as be Sone ys ygete of be Fader and of hem two (bat is of Fader and Sone) gop forp be Holy Goste, so of vnderstondynge ys ygete a wille, and of jes two (bat is of vnderstondynge and wil) comep forpe a mynde. And ry3t as be Fader ys God, be Sone ys God, be Holy Goste ys God and ait

15 per bep nouat pre godes bot on God and hap pre persons, ry3t so vnderstondynge ys be soule, wyl ys be soule and mynde is be soule, and ait per bep nouat pre soules bot on soule and

B: 14 hast] hast pre
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hath these dignities with which we behot to love God, as
with all our understanding, with all our will and with all our
mind. For not only the understanding of God suffices to
heavenly bliss but if your will set in love; not these
two suffices not but your will be always in me
understanding and will, in which will God most dwell.
For right as your is not sustained by the pity and mercy of God, right so
shall be no moment at a man shall not have him present in his mind. And so
man that is in charity is the quick image of God. 'For right as
he make,' saith Bernard, 'that made he after his likeness is
charity, good, right, sweet and meek, patient and merciful;
right so you are made to have charity, and for you
shall be clean, holy, fair, meek and humble. And so the
more that a man that is God's image hath of such virtues, the
more you that image is like to God.' For the great clerk
Crysostom says that he is not a true disciple that folweth
nóst his master, ne it is not a true image which is not like to his maker. Wherefore what man oper
woman that hath most of virtues that your image most like to God.
'And therefore,' saith Saint Clement, 'if he wollep honoury
B
trewelyche þe ymage of God, we scheweþ,' he seyþ, 'to saw þat
þat ys trewe þat se do wel.' And þis ys to mene þat se do almýs
dedes, and reuerence and worcheþ to man þat ys ymaked to þe
ymage of God. 'Mynystre se or ȝyue se mete,' he seyþ, 'to him
þat hungreþ, drynke to him þat þrysteþ, cloþynge to þe
naked, seruyse to þe syke, herbourgh to þe pylgryme or to
þe weyfarynge man, and mynstre se or ȝyue se nedeful þynges to
him þat ys in prysoun.' And þis ys an offerynge and a
pylgrimage so heylýche plesynge to God þat, as he himself
wytnesseþ in þe Gospel, þat þate we doþe to one þe leste of
his he holdeþ it ydo to him. Bot we redeþ in no place of al
Holy Wryt þat Crist wytnesseþ þat he holdeþ it ydo to him
þat ys ydo to any ymage ymade of mannes hondes. Also þe
forseyden Seynt Clement axeþ, 'What worscheþ of God,' he seyþ,
'ys it to renne aboute by stony þreyn ymages and to worscheþ
vayne ymages and wipoute soules as godes and dyspyse oþer sette
man at nouȝt, in wham ys þe verray ymage of God?' But þis ys
nouȝt yseyde for þat eny man scholde dyspyse ymages of holy
seyntes and sette hem at nouȝt, bot for þey scholde trewelyche
worscheþe God in þe trewe, meke, poure man, þat ys a quyke ymage
of God, seruynge him, as y tolde byfore, and nouȝt suffre h[i]m
be naked and cold, hungry and thirsty and in order disayses, and
cloke, vysyte and fede dede ymages þat neyþer þyrste þat ne hungrþ
ne feleþ no coldnesse, neyþer suffreþ dysaïse for þey mowe
nouþ fele, ne see, ne heere, ne speke, ne loke, ne helpe eny
man of eny desayse, as þe holy prophetes wytnesseþ. And so
who þat trysteþ on hem, worscheypyng þem wiþ worschepe þat
onlyche parteyneþ to God, he makeþ to him false and alyene
godes and brekeþ þe commaundement of God. And þat scholde no
man do for deþ ne lyue, ne for none oþer worldlyche goed.

For God seyþ here in þis fyrste commaundement, 'Ich am þy
lord God, a strange louere gelouse. Ich vysyte þe
wykkednesse of fadres into þe bridde and ferþe generacioun of
hem þat hateþ me, and I do mercy into a þousande
kyndredenes of hem þat louþe me and keþe myne hestes.'

We schal vnderstonde, as þe boke seyþ and as clerkes
mowþe scheue by auctorite, þat oure almyþy Lord God voucheþ
sauf to be þe spouse of mannes soule. For by þe prophete
Osee he spekeþ to mannes soule and seyþ þus: 'Ich schal spouse
þe or wedde þe to me in ryþtwysnesse, in dome, in mercy and
in feþe, and I schal wedde þe wþoute ende.' And, as a gret
clerke wytnesseþ, þat as a man or womman in þis lyue encresseþ
B

in knowleche and loue of God þys worpy spouse, so

proporcionableliche he rescueyueþ plentenouser ernesses into

wytnesse of doueres of heuenelyche blessednesse, þe whiche,
as a queyne, he schal rescueyue in heuene. Bot þis spousel is

betere þan bodylyche spousel. And God and þe holy soules of
trewe men beþ betere þan mennes bodyes. And so þis wedloke
is broke for a tymne by brekyng of feyb and defaute of
rystwesse lyuynge. And herefore God seyþ ofte by his

prophetes þat his peple dyde fornicacioun and aunoutrye for þay

worschepede false godes. And Seynt Jame seyþ þat men þat

loueþ bis wordle beþ gostlyche auouteres, for þis seyþ he:

'3e auouteres, knowe 3e nouȝt þat frendschepe of þe worlde ys
enemy to God?' And þus alle men þat loueþ more worldelyche

worschepe oþer goedes of þe worlde þan God and his lawe and
trewe lyuynge beþ auouteres gostlyche, yf þey were Cristene
before. And herefore men scholde drede þe power of þys spouse
þat seyþ/pus: 'Ich am a stronge louere,' knowynge wel þat his

power ys so strong þat he ne may nouȝt lette to putte suche

auouteres into euerelestenyne prysoun of helle bot yf þay

in þis lyf be to him newe reconsyled.

Bot here þey scholde vnderstonde þe humylite and mekenesse
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of his spouse that ye a louere gelouse, and mekelyche turne to hym azen. For of gret loue he clepe hem to be reconsyled as he boke recordep in meny place. And in on place he spekep to synful mannes soule by his prophete Jeremye and seye þus: 'Pou hast ydo fornycacioun wip meny loueres. N þeles,' he seye, 'turne azen.'

And þis ys to mene as þough he seyde þus: 'Þou hast yloued many þynges more þan me, and for loue of hem many tymes ybroke my commaundement, bot sit, neþeles, forsake þe loue of hem and come azen to me, louynge me aboue alle þyng, and I schal rescuyue þe.'

For as a gret clerke seye, þat a stronge louere gelouse ys he þat wole þat alle loue be turned into him. Wherefore it folweþ þat he wole þat noþyng be loued bot he hymself, or elles for loue of him. And þe noble clerke Crisostome acordynge to þe Gospel seyeþ, 'Þou schalt loue God wip al þyn heorte, þat [þe] beo nouþt enclyned to delectacioun of enyþyng more þan of God.' And afterward he seyeþ, 'If þe loue of þyn herte be occupiþd wip eny of þes erþelyche þynges nowþe, þou louest nouþt God of al þyn heorte. Forsoþe,' he seyeþ, 'þyne heorte ys by so moche party lasse to God by how moche party he ys yknyt by loue to anoþer þyng; so þat he þat lest loueþ erþelyche þynges loueþ most God, and he þat most

B: 4 (mar: Capituló tertio) 15 3e] he
{ loue\} erpelyche þynges loue\lp lest God.' And þus whennon þey rescueyp by loue into þe ynmuste chambre of here heorte eny maner creature wham hy loue\lp euene wiþ God or more preciouslyche þan God here spouse, þay beþ gostelyche spousebrekeres and so, lyuynge in auouterye, /geteþ and norscheþ bastarde childrene. For ryst as gode, meke men [bat] trauaylep to lyue in treuþe and sovernesse, kepynge þe commaundements of here spouse Ihesu Crist, geteþ lausom and gostlyche children and norscheþ hem in vertues by example of here gode contynuel conversacioun, to make hem trewe heires of þe euerelystype kyngdom of heuene; ryst so þes worldlyche loueres, gostlyche spousebrekeres, geteþ proute bastard children and, by example of here wykked lyuynge, norscheþ hem in pride, wreþe and enuye, sleþe, coueýtise, glotenye and lecheiye, and techeþ hem false and sotel worldlyche ymagynaciouns, as grete cautel òþes, lesynges and òþer false fraudys, to make hem grete and ryche by false worldlyche goedes, into gret dampnacioun of suche fadres and of here children þat hem folweþ. And hereforþ God seþþ here in þis commaundement þat he vysyteþ (þat ys to mene 'punyscheþ') by peyne) þe synnes of faderes into here children into þe prydde and ferþe generacioun of hem þat hateþ hym and þat beþ
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þylke þat wolde nouȝt kepe his hestes. For Crist seyþ in þe Gospel, 'He þat louȝe nouȝt me kepe nouȝt my wordes,' þe whiche þe þis his hestes. And þite þe prophete Ezechiel seyþ þat þe sone schal nouȝt bere þe fadres gulte ne þe fader schal nouȝt bere þe sones gulte, and in þis commaundement God seyþ þat he punyscheth þe synnes of faderes in here childrene into þe þrydde and þe fader schal nouȝt bere þe sones gulte, and in is commaundement God seyþ at he punyscheth e synnes of faderes in here kynreden. For so longe tyme, as a grete clerke teleþ, fadres beþ ywoned leue vpon erþe wiþ here children, and ryȝt as þe children, bycause of myslyuyng of here faderes and faute of chastement, takeþ parte and commeneþ wiþ here faderes in synnes, folwyng hem in maneres, so, by ryȝtfulnesse of God, þey schal take parte of dyseyse and commeny wiþ hem in peyne more or lasse after þe quantyte þat þey commeneþ wiþ hem in synnes. But þer þe prophete seyþ þat þe sone schal nouȝt be punysched for þe fader ne þe fa/der for þe sone, þis þou most vnderstonde: þat yf þe fader be a ryȝtful man, kepynge Godes hestes, and hateþ synne and louþe þer synnes of faderes, and techeþ and chastþeþ his child by his power after þat þat Godes lawe techeþ, and þenne, þough þe chyld be rebellþ to þe fader and wolde nouȝt lyue as he techeþ him but folweþ his owene luste aȝenst Godes hestes, in þis case, as þe prophete
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seyþ, þe fader schal nouȝt be punysched for þe childe. And yf þe fader be an vnryȝtful lyuere aȝenste Godes commaundement and his sone, seynge and knowynge þe wykkednesses of him, doeþ nouȝt after him, but dredeþ God forsakyng falsenesse and 5 hateþ synnes folwyng vertues, and in alle his dedes kepeþ Godes byddinges, þat chylde þat doþ þus, as þe prophete seþ, schal nouȝt bere þe faderes gult but yf he folwe þe fader in wykkednesse. And so God punyscheþ synnes of fadres into here childrene þat folweþ hem in here synnes into þe þrydde and 10 ferþe kynredene of hem þat hateþ him and punyscheþ hem þerafter. 'But,' he seþþ, 'I do mercy into a þousande kynredenes of men þat loueþ me and kepeþ myne hestes.' Þis word of oure Lord God is charged wiþ moche more þan we kunne telle, bot o þyng scholde we take of Godes lawe: þat he melleþ togedre wordes of loue and drede. For by loue and drede he ledeþ his children and chastexeþ hem by þes two as by ærde and staf. Bot syþ man scholde kyndelyche be ladde by loue, he medleþ more of loue þan he doþ of drede, and þerefore he strezczeþþ þey vengeaunce to men into þrydde and to þe ferþe generacioun, bot his wordes of loue he strezczeþ tyl a þousand. And so wit and strengþe he medleþ togedere into
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tokene ṭat everyche man ys holde to loue him and ṭat non may
asterte ṭe knoweleche of him ne, yf he do amysse, peyne ṭat he
ys worpy. And so ṭys commaundement bytokene ṭat God ṭe /Fader,
for onheede by som cause ys propre to ṭe Fader and ṭis
commaundement bydde ṭe to haue bot on God, for Fader and Sone
and Holy Gost bep be same God. And ṭes ṭre commaundements of
be furste table mene ṭes ṭre persones in manere of here
speche. And so, sypphe noṭynyng may be verrey God bot on,
whosoeuere makep him many godes mote haue some false. And for
ṭis ys stronge fro resone of oure God, wel bep suche cleped
alyene godes.

O Lord, sypphe no man loue ṭis God bot after ṭat he
knowep him, [sypphe] knowynge mesureth loue, how warly scholde
we trauayly for to knowe oure God and fle alle errores ṭat
fallep in ṭis knowynge. And herefore seyp Poul ṭat yf ṭe
Iewes hadde yhaf ṭis knowynge ṭey hadde neuere doo on ṭe cros

T

Capitulum Sextum

O Lord, siṗ no man loue ṭis God but aftir ṭat he knoweṗ
him, siṗ knowyng mesuriṗ loue, hou warly shulde we trauele
for to knowe oure God and fle alle erroirs ṭat fallen in
ṭis knowyng. And ṭe for seip Poul ṭat if ṭe Iewes had
knowen, ṭei had neuere doo on crosse Ihesu, Kyng of Glorie
B

Ihesu Kyng of blysse. And þis ys þe cause why chyldrene of þe Olde Lawe were forfended for to worschepe God in his ymagis, and herfore God was schewed to Moyses in a busche.

For we scholde wyte by resoun þat þynges þat ben beþ vnsensyble pasþ in goednesse þynges þat ben beþ sensyble; as helþe, þat we may noust see, pasþi gropelyche þynges, and lyf, þat we may noust fele, pasþi gros bodyes; so God, þat we may noust see, pasþi worldly þynges. Bot for we knowþ him lytel þerfore we louþ him þe lasse. And by oure beleue we scholde knowe him and loue him. For we scholde byleue þat he ys þe beste þyng þat may be, þe wyseste man and most iuste þat eny man may þenke on.

T

and þis is þe cause whi children in þe Olde Lawe weren forfendid to worshipë God in hise ymagis, and herfor God was shewed to Moyses in a bussh. For we shulden wite bi resoun þat þingis þat ben vnsensible passen in goodnesse þingis þat ben sensible; as helþe, þat we may not se, passi gropeli þingis, and liþf, þat we may not feelë, passi grosse bodyes; so God, þat we may not se, passi worldly þingis. But for we knowen him litil, þerfore we louen him þe lesse. And bi oure bileue we shulden knowe him and loue him. For we shulden trowe þat he is þe best þing þat may be, þe wisest and þe moost iust þat eny man may þenke
B

So he ys euere more, wipouten eny bygynnynge and wipouten endynge, knowyng alle þynges; and he may noust forsete ne noust may ascape him, bot euere more he ordeynep alle þyng þat ys goede.

And so, syþ he hadde power to knowe himysylf and euene after his power ys engendryd his knowynge and of þes two þynges comep reste in himysylf, he mot nede be þre þynges and al on God:

power, þat /ys fyrst, þe Fader of heuene; knowynge or wysdom, þat is þe secund persone; þe þrydde ys goede wyl þat we clepeþ þe Holy Goste. And of þis Holy Trinite comeþ alle kenne

T

on, and so he is euermore wipouten ony bigymyng and wipouten ende. Knowyng al þing, he may noust forsete, ne noust may askape him, but euermore he ordeynep all þing þat is good. And so, syþ he hath power to knowe himysylf, and euene aftir his power is gendrid his knowynge and of þes two þingis comep rest in himysylf, he mot nede be þre þingis and al oon God: power, þat is first, Fader of heuene; knowynge or wisdom, þat is þe secound persone; þe þrydde persone is good will, þat we clepen þe Hooli Goost. And of þis Hooli Trinite comen alle kyn

creatures. And as his Holy Trinity may fail in no stede, so he may not fail in no kyn mesure. But sith these wordes be ferre fro bodylyche wyttes, men scholde be war to kepe hem [soundelyche, for bodylyche bynges distracte] men to kepe hem] ryst. And his ys somdel the resoun of the fyrste commaundement.

The secunde commaundement partyne to the Sone the secunde persone in Trinity, and ys in these wordes ywrighte in his lawe: 'Pou shalt not take the name of thy Lord God in vayne' (nofer in wordes ne in maner of lyuyng) 'for God schal nyst haue that man wipoute gylt that take the name of his creatures. And as the Hooli Trymite may {faile} in no stede, so he may not faile in no kyn mesure. But sith these wordes ben fer fro bodili witt, men shulden be war to kepe hem soundely, for bodili pingis distracten men to kepe him ryst. And this is somdel the resoun of the first commaundement.

[Capitulum Septimum]

The secound commaundement of God pertene to his Sone and is in these wordis writun in his lawe: 'Pou shalt not take the name of thy Lord God in veyn, neiher in wordes ne in maner of lyuyng. For God shal not haue that man wipouten gylt that take the name of his Lord.'
B

Lord God without cause. The name of God is the wisdom of the Fader for, as philosophers say, the proper name of a being is the form that is founded in that and not other, but this wisdom of God is form of God one. And therefore say Poul that

5 Criste, the second person, is in form of God as Son in his Fader, and so his second commandment is properd unto Crist. But furthermore scholde we note that God's lawe calleth Crist 'Lord' and 'oure God' for two kynnes beings, as ye tolde before in the first commandment, and that is dreade and loue that we scholde haue to him. And herfore God axeb in boke of his

T

name of his Lord God withouten cause. The name of God is the wisdom of the Fadir for, as philosophris seien, the propre name of bing is the foorme that is founden in that and in noon ooper. But his wisdom of God is foorme of God one, and herfor seib Poul

5 that Crist, the secound persone, is in forme of God as Son in his Fader. And so his secound maundement is proprid vnto Crist. But ferpermore shulden we note that Goddis lawe clepeb Crist 'Lord' and 'oure God' for two kymes binges: that is dreade and loue that we shulde haue to him. And herfore God axeb
B

prophete, 'Sybpe I am Lord, wher ys my drede? And yf he be God where ys his loue?' Bot Austyne seyß ðat drede bryngeþ ynne loue as brystyl bryngeþ yn smalnesse of þrede, and herefore Godes lawe putteth 'Lord' byfore. And so eche man takeþ Godes name in veyn ðat swereþ by his name more ðan it is nede. Criste techeþ ous in Gospel to haue oure word þus: '3e, 3e. Nay, nay', wiþoute eny oþe. For no man schal speke no maner treuþe /bot it be '3e' or 'nay' þat he spekeþ. But for Crist wolde þat oure wyt and word acorded togedre in speche to oure neibores, þerfore he doublide þes wordes

T

in book of his prophet, 'Sib y am Lord, where is my drede? And if he be God, where is his loue?' But /Austyn seib ðat drede brynþ brynþ in loue as bristel brynþ [in] þe smalnesse of þe þred. And herfore Goddis lawe puttik to vs 'Lord' biffer. And so eche man takeþ Goddis name in veyn þat sweriþ bi his name more þan is nede. Crist techiþ in þe Gospel to haue oure word þus: '3he, 3he. Nay, nay', wiþouten ony oþ. For no man shal speke no maner treuþe but if it be '3he' or 'nay' þat he spekiþ. But for Crist wolde þat oure witt and word accordiden togidre in speche to oure neibore, þerfore he doublide þes wordis

3 as] right as a H,  in þe} þu þe T,  of þe} of HY  4 to vs] þis Y
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9 word] onur worde H,  accordiden] acorde Y
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as though he wolde seye, 'Yf it be "se" in soure soule, seyep "se" in soure word and make þes two acorde; and yf þe seyep "nay" in soure soule, seyep "nay" wiþ soure mouþ; and be þe trewe men.' And þus 'se, se' and 'nay, nay' scholde be oure speche, for yf we swereþ oust it comeþ of yuel. Crist seyde nouþ þat alle swerynge ys yuel, for God himself swore and Crist wiþ his apostoles. Bot Crist seyþ wyslyche þat more ys of yuel [oþer of yuel] of him þat swereþ or elles [of yuel] of him to wham he swereþ. For as God techeþ by Jeremye þe prophete, wiþ þre condicioiuns ys leeful men to swere: fyrst þat þey be

T

as he wold seie, '3if þe wolde seie "she" in soure soule, seieþ "she" in soure word and make þes two acorde; and if þe seie "nay" in soure soule, seie "nay" in soure mouþ; and be þe trewe men.' And þus 'she, she' or 'nay, nay' shulde be oure speche, for if we sweren oust it is of yuel. Crist seiþ not þat al sweryng is yuel, for God himself swoor and Crist wiþ his apostles. But Crist seiþ wisely þat more is of yuel, oþer of yuel of hym þat sweriþ or elles of yuel of him þat heriþ. For as God techiþ bi Jeremie þe prophete, wiþ þre condicioiuns is leueful men to swere: first þat þei ben
war þat þey swere trowþe, and þe cause of þe oþe be to
schewe ryst and, syþ þat by iugement it be nede to swere.
And elles scholde alle men kepe hem fro oþes bot, I
vnderstonde þe iugement of God, oþes in mesure as Holy

Wryt lymyteþ. And þes grete swereres wenþ to excuse hem
bot þey accusþem hem to God þat knowþalle soþ. þey seye
þat noman wolde trowe hem bot yf þey swere so; and þus, by
here lesynge, þey greggeþ here synne, for þe worlde wole
wyntnesþ þat suche greþþe swereres þe þep more false of here
tunþe þan men þat swereþ lytel. And herþore yf þou wolt be

war þat þei sweren treuble, and þe cause of her oþe be to
schewe rist and, siþ, þat in iugement be it nede to swere.
And ellis shulden alle men kepe hem fro oþis but, y
vndurstonde þe iugement of God, oþis in mesure as Hooli

Writt lymytþ. And þes grete swerers wenþ to excuse hem,
but þei accusen hem to God þat knowþel þe soþe. þei seien
þat no man wolde trowe hem but if þei sworen so; and þus, bi
þis leesyng, þei aggregen her synne, for þe world wolþe
witnesþ þat siche greþþe swerers ben more false of her
tonge þan men þat sweren litil. And herþor if þou wolt be

B: 4 God] God and 9 greuouse] grete
holde trewe of tunge, auyse þe þat þou be discrete in þy
wordes and speke nouȝt bot towpe or þat þou mayst performe;
and whanne þy wyse worde ys ysppoke of þyn herte, be aboute
to fulfille it, [and make þe nouȝt false, and þis scholde shewe
þy fame] and make þe trewe man.

Me þynke þat þre causes scholde meue ous to kepe þis
commandement and to take þe name of God wiþ gret worschep and
drede. On cause ys for þer was neuer man ne womman þat dyde
synne þat myȝte be saue bot in vertu of þis /name, ne neuere f.87'
schal be, as wytnesþ Seynt Peter in Actis of þe Apostoles.
'Per ys non oper name,' he seþ, 'vnder heuene yeue to men
in þe whiche þey moste be saued, bot in þis name, Ihesu Crist.'
Bot how schal eny synful wrecche be bolde to stonde byfore
Crist at þat dreyful day of dome, wiþ hys hondes and feet and
sydes and his woundes opene, and wayte to be saued at þat

holden trewe of tonge, auyse þee þat þou be discret in þi
wordis, and speke not but treuþe [or] þat þou maist performe. And
whanne þi wise word is spokun of þi hert, be aboute to hide
it, and make þe not fals, and þis shulde shewe þi fame and make þee

5 a trewe man.
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dредful stounde in vertu of Cristes name and of þis harde
woundes, þe whiche name and woundes he hadde so orriblyche
despysed al his lyf in vayne and orryble oþes swerynge, and wolde
nouȝt amende him. Tryste he wel þerto, it wolde nouȝt be bot
he amende him in þis lyf.

The secunde cause þat scholde meue ous to spare grete and vnlawful oþes ys þat þe name of Ihesu ys so worschepful þat,
as seyþ Seynt Poul, In be name of Ihesu every kne of heuenelyche creatures, or erpelyche, or of helle ys ybowed. For
it ys so heyȝe and so worschepful þat þe cursede fend in helle
scholde tremble to hyere it ynymned. And þerfore it semep þat þe man þat swereþ so orriblyche by þat blessed name despyþeþ
þat name more boldlyche þan dorste þe cursede fende of helle.

The þrydde cause þat scholde meue alle men to leue here
grete oþes ys þis: it semep þat suche swereres þat so dysmembreþ
Crist, swerynge by his heorte and his soule and blod and bones, hem
semep þat þe cursede Jewes dyde neuere Crist tormentes ynowe
bot yf þey, wip here gryslyche and cursede oþes, alto drawe
Crist lyme by lyme by here power, and so dyde neuere þe cursede
Jewes. And þerfore, bot yf þis synne be amended, wipoute eny
doute it schal haue harde vengeaunce. For the wyse man seþþ
þat vengeaunce schal nouȝt go fro þat mannes hous þat swereþ

B: 6 cause] cause ys 8 (mar: Philipenses 3)
moche. Bot parunter here þou seyst þat al day þou seest þe contrarie, for þat þou /seest ofte suche grete sweryeres haue muche worldlyche prosperite, and ðe þat beþ esy men and none sweryeres suffery grete worldlyche aduensite. Wherefore þou schalt vnderstonde þat Scripture spekeþ nouȝt onlyche of ðis materȝel hous þat we woneþ yyne. Herefore Poul seþ þat we haue here no dwellyng cyte, þat ys to mene: into comparisoun of þe cyte oþer hous þat schal leste euere. 'Bot we secheþ,' he seþ, 'on tocomynge.' Perfore when þe wyse man seþ þat vengeaunce schal nouȝt go fro þe mannes hous þat swereþ moche, he spekeþ principalyc of þe hous þat þe prophete spekeþ of in þe sauter boke and seþ þe seþþeþere (þat ys to vnderstonde 'of helle') þeþ here euerlestynge hous. And alle þat schulleþ dwelle in þat hous schulleþ fele euerlestynge vengeaunce. And so vengeaunce schal nouȝt go fro þat man oþer womman hous þat swereþ moche bot yf he amende him here. And þerfore for drede and loue of þis blesseþe name, Ihesu, leue 3e suche oþes, and take we þys name wiþ al honour and worschepe.

Bot seþ kepynge of alle commaundements putteþ out

T

\{Capitulum Octavum\}

/ Siþ kepyng of alle commaundmentis puttiþ out eche hed

B: 3 muche] more prosperite canc.
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eche hede synne and yf þou breke on þou trespassest in alle,
it were for to wyte how large þis heste ys. Bot we scholde
ywyte fyrst þat bope prayere and speche stondeþ more in dede
þan in worde of mouðe. Euerche man in erþe bereþ name of
his God preynted in his soule, for elles he myȝt nouȝt be, and
so, whan eny man leueþ þat he scholde do or doþ þat he scholde
nouȝt do vpon peyne of hate of God, he takeþ in vayn þis holy
name. For noman ys ordeyned bot for to serue God and his name
mote [he] take yf þat he be, and so he takeþ his name in vayn
whan he fayleþ of þis ende. So God haþ ordeyned þis ende to

T

synne and if þou breke oon þou trespassist in alle, it were
for to wite hou large þis heest is. But we shulden wite
first þat boþe preyer and speche stonden more in deede þan
in word of mouþ. Euer man in erþe berþ þe name of his God
prentid in his soule, for ellis he myȝte not be. And so
whanne-euer a man leueþ þat he shulde do or doþ þat he
shulde not vpon peyne of hate of God, he takþ in veyn þis
hise and hooli name. For no man is ordeyned but for to serue
God and his name mot he take if þat he be. And so he takþ his
name in veyn whanne he failþ of þis eende, siþ God haþ
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eche pat hap his name, as God hap ordeyned speche of moupe
to commune wyth hy /neysbore bope in treupe and in loue,
as bestes do kyndelyche. And yf pou faylle of his ende, pou
blabrest al in vayne falsloker pan bestes or bryddes in pe
eyer. O Lord, hy soule ys made to ymage of God and forfere
techeph Austyn and Bernard also pat it ys pre pynges:
vnderstondynge, wyl and mynde, and alle bep on substauence.
And so, as pe Gospel techeph, pou scholdest on pre manerres
worschepe pe name of hy God pat pou hast wip pe: pou
scholdest loue hy God wip al hyne hearte and also loue him

T

ordyne spyke speche of moupe to commune wip hy neisbore bope in
treupe and in loue, as bestis don kyndely. And if pou faile of
his ende pou blaberist in veyn falslier pan bestis or
briddis in pe eyr. O Lord, hy soule is maad to ymage of hy God
and perfere techeph Austyn pat it is pre pyngis: mynde, resoun
and wille, and alle ben oo su{b}staurence. And so, as pe Gospel techeph,
pou shuldest on pre manerres worshipe pe name of God pat
pou hast wip pe: pou shuldest loue hy God of al hy herte

T: 1 ordeyned his eende] om. H,  as] and as Y  5 [i]sib Y  7 oo]
on H,  substaunce] corr.int. T  8 God] [i] God HY
in al þy soule, and eke ðou scholdest loue him in al þy 
mynde. ðan ðou louest God of al þyn heorte whanne þy wyt 
and þy power ys onlych yset on him, noust þat ðou ne mayst 
do leffullyche worldlyche þynges, but loke þat þe ende of 
þy worke be worschep to þy God; ðou louest God in al þy 
soule whan ðou ordeynest al þy lyf to worschep of þy God; 
and so ðou louest God in al þy mynde whanne ðou forsetest 
no wyse to þenke in þy God, bot þenkyng ys in dede as it 
ys in mynde. On þys wyse scholde me worschepe þe Trynyte and 
þanne þou takest noust in vayn þe holy name of God þat ys 
and also loue him in al þi soule, an eke þou shuldest loue 
him in al þi mynde. Þanne þou louest God of al þin herte 
whanne þi witt and þi power is oonly sett on him, noust þat þou 
ne mayst leuefully do worldli þingis, but loke þe eende of 
þi werk be worship of þi God; ðou louest þi God in al þi 
soule whanne ðou ordeynest al þi lijf to worship of þi God; 
and so ðou louest God in al þi mynde whanne ðou forsetist on no 
wise þus to þenke on þi God, but þenkyng is in dede as it is 
in mynde. On þis wise shulden men worship þe Trinite and 
þanne þei taken not in veyn þe hooli name of God þat is
And syn God haþ ordeyned hys hous to wandre wyselyche in his offyce ydelnesse ys dampned boþe of God and of kynde. God haþ ordeyned offyce to eche lyme of his Chirche; and so eche man of Cristes Chirche takeþ Godes name in þis offyce, syn he ys Godes offycer in vertu of his name; and so eche Cristen man takeþ þis name in veyn þat faylleþ of his seruyce þat falleþ to his offyce; and so eche prelate or prest of þe Chyrche takeþ Godes name in veyne þat knoweþ not his offyce þat Godes lawe haþ

Sþ God haþ ordeyned his hous to wandre wisely and ydelnesse is damnyd boþe of God and kynde, /God haþ ordeyned

5

office to eche lyme of his Chirche; and so eche man of his Chirche takþ Goddis name in þis office, syn he is Goddis officer bi vertu of þis name; and so eche Cristen man takþ Goddis name in veyn þat faiþ in Goddis seruyce þat faiþ to his office; and so eche prelat or prest of þe Chyrche takþ Goddis name in veyn þat knoweþ not his office þat Goddis

2 Capitulum Nonum] om. T
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lymyted to him and dŏp it nouȝt in dede. Bot þre maner of office God hapyd syuȝ to his Chyrche: clerkys and knyȝtys and laboreres. Bot clerkys scholde be heȝest and lest of despense and most bysy in Godes lawe and ferrest from þe worlde;

5 and yf þey leue wytynglyche þys maner of lyuyng no man in þys worlde tækeþ falsoker Godes name. And some seþ þat Antecrist hapy changed alle þes offices, for he chalengeþ to be kyng of þe chyrche of wykked men.

Knyȝtys scholde schewe þe power of þe Godhede and by

T lawe hapy lymyted him and dŏp it not in dede. But þre maner of office hapy God ouȝen to his Chirche: clerkys and knyȝtys and laboreres also. Clerkis shulden be hisest and leest of dispense and moost bysiest in Goddis lawe and ferrest fro þe worldi.

5 And [if] bei leue [wittingly] þis maner of lyuyng, no man in þis worlde tækeþ falslier Goddis name. And summe seien þat Antecrist hapy chaungid alle þes offices, for he chalengid to be kyng of þe chyrche of wickid men.

Knyȝtys shulde shewe þe power of Godhed and bi worldli

T: 2 officeis Y 4 bisiest bised Y, ferrest ferpest Y
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worldelyche strenge meyntene Godes lawe, and yf Antecriste
haþ vencu[ss]ed þes lordes by his ypocrisy and falshede of his
prestes þes beþ perelous men to destroye Crystes Chyrche.
Þes knyßtes scholde trewelyche knowe Godes lawe and offyceres
in his Churche and what þey scholde do, and by strenge streyne
hem to trauaylle in here offyce, and ydele men in þe Churche
þat God putteþ nouð yn{ }ne lymyþeþ hem to þe offyce þat þey
feynþeþ hem haue, putte hem oute by strenge and lymyte hem to
labore. And þanne scholde Cristes Churche be purged of trewauntes

T
strenge meyntene Goddis lawe, and if Antecrist haþ vencushid
þes lordis bi ypocrisie and falshed of hise prestis þes ben
perelouse men to destrie Cristis Chirche. Þe knyßtes
shulden treuly knowe Goddis lawe and officers in his Chirche
and what þei shal do, and bi strenge streyne hem to trauele
in her office, and ydel men in þe Chirche, þat God putþip not
yme ne lymyþip hem þe office þat þei feynen hem to haue,
putte hem out bi strenge, and lymyte hem her labore. And þanne
shulde Cristis Chirche be purgid of trivauntis and ristly
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and ryȝtlyche growe to heuene as an euene tree, for bastard braunches letteþ pe growynge of þis tree, and charge of temporal goedes yknytte by coueyeysse makeþ þes bowes to bowe and letteþ þis tre to grewe.

5 Pe grounde of þis hous þat stondeþ [in] laboreres ys lest ydel of oþer for here sensible traual, for þey beþ neded to worche and bereþ vp oþer partyes. And as þey scholde be taust by clerkes to kepe Godes lawe, so scholde þey be defended by lordes in here ryȝt. For it may falle þat prestes

T
growe to heuen as an euene tree, for bastard braunchis letten þe growynge of þis tree, and charge of temporal goodis knyttid bi coueitise makþ þe bowes to bowe, and lettþ þis tree to grewe.

5 Pe ground of þis hous þat stondip in laborers is leest ydel of oþere for her sensible truoue, for þei ben nedid to worche and bere vp oþere partis. And as þei shulden be taust bi clerkis to kepe Goddis lawe, so shulden þei be defendid bi lordis in her riȝt. For it may falle þat prestis wolen
wole spoyle hem by ypocrisy and bysynesse of here strauayl, 
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 strauailed trewelyche in pe office pat God hp syue hym, 
how clene scholde pe Churche be, wipoute wem or wrynkele. f.89v

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

O Lord, if charite were spred in pe Chirche and eche man 
strauailed treuly in po office pat God hp syuen him, hou clene shulde pe Churche 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 hp 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, sif lordis wolden penke on her bileue and on her office sip pei ben Cristis kny3tis, and mayntene bi strengpe prestis in trewpe pat stonden for
B

And þenne noþer clerkes, ne kny3tes, noþer laboreres scholde
take þus þis holy name an ydel and wipoute cause as false
Cristene men now dop many tyme, brekyng þys secunde
commaundement.

5  Þe þrydde commaundement of God ys to kepe oure halyday,
and ys bode in þes wordes in þe boke of Godes lawe: 'Haue
mynde to halewe þe day þat ys Godes Sabote. In syxe dayes

T

Cristis lawe and hisen it owre oþer! But Antecrist hæþ blyndid
so þes seculer lordis þat he takþ fro hem heuenli help
and help of þe world, for thechyng of Goddis lawe and lordship
of þe world is sutely reft hem bi gynnes of þe fend. And
5  þus false Cristen men taken Goddis name in veyn.

{Capitulum Decimum} Tercium mandatum

The þridde comaundement of God is to kepe oure haliday
and is bedun in þes wordis in book of Goddis lawe: 'Haue mynde
to halewe þe haliday þat is Goddis Sabot. In sixe dayes
B

schalt þou worche and doo þyne owene workes, bot in þe seuepe
day ys reste of þþ Lord God; and þat day schalt þou do no
seruyle workes and fro þis workes schal þes syxe kepe hem:
þþ sone and þþ douster, þþ servaunt and þþ mayde, þþ worke beste and
stroungere þat dwelleþ in þyn hous. For in syxe dayes made
God heuene and erbe and al þþng þat ys wipynne hem and reste
þþ seuepe day; and herfore he blessede þe Sabote and makede
þþs day holy.'

þþ þynges scholde we note in þþ commaundement:

T

shalt þou worche and do þin owene werkis, but in seuenpe day
is rest of þþ Lord God; in þat day shalt þou do no
seruyle werkis and fro þis werk shulen þes sixe kepe hem:
þþ sone and þþ douster, þþ servaunt and þþ mayden, þþ werke beest
and þþ straunger þat dwelleþ in þþ hous. For in sixe daies
made God heuene and erbe and al þþt is wipyme it and restide
in seuenpe day; and herfor he blesside þe Sabot and made
þþs day hooli.'

þþ þingis shulden we note in þþ maunderment: first
B

fyrst why Godes lawe seyþ, 'Bibenke þe to holde þy Sabot'; and
how men halweb tyme, syþ tyme may neuere be groped ne knowe
of bodylyche wyt. As to þe fywrst, we saye þat þe þrydde
commaundement byndeþ men for tymes, as on day in þe wyke, and
nouþ contynuelllyche as þis opere commaundements, and herefore
God bydde ous to haue mynde to holde oure halyday. And also
þis þrydde comaundement ys propred to þe Holy Goost, and he
ys mynde of þe Fader and wyt of þe Sone; and also in þis
commaundement we scholde þenke on Godes workes. Herefore
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whi Goddis lawe seiyþ, 'Biþenke to holde þi Sabot'; siþ, what
is þe Sabot; and hou men halowen tyme, siþ tyme may neþer be
gropid ne knowen of bodili witt. As to þe first, we seien /
pat þis þridde maundement byndiþ men for tymes, as oon day  f.14°
in þe woke, and not contynuely as þes opere maundementis;
and herfor God biddiþ vs haue mynde to holde oure haliday.
And also þis þridde maundement is propred to þe Hooli Goost,
and he is mynde of þe Fader and witt of þe Sone; and also in þis
maundement we shulden þenke on Goddis werkis. Herfor þe
B

The wisdom of God biddeth all seven persons to have mynde
to holwe þus oure Sabote. As to þe secunde worde, we
schulle vnderstonde þat neuere we halewe þe blemesche þe
tyme in his kende, but þen þe þe þe yseide to halewe þe tyme
when/ne we kepe þe reste in holynesse in tyme; and þus scholde we do ones in þe woke, as vpon þe Saturday, and þenke on Godes
workes.

T

Wisdom of God biddeth all seven persons to have mynde
for to halewe þus oure Sabot. As to þe second word, we shal
vnderstonde þat 'Sabot' in Ebrew speche is as myche as 'rest';
and for God restide him on þe seuen þe day herfor þe seuen þe
day is clepid 'Sabot'. Opere wittis of þis word mot we nede
lecue. As to þe þridde word, we shal vndurstonde þat neþer we
halewen ne blemyshen þe tyme in his kynd, but þanne þen we seid
to halowe þe tyme whame we kepen rest and hoolynesse in tyme,
and þus shulden we do onys in þe woke, as vpon þe Satirday, and
þenke on Goddis werkis.

B: 1 byddeþ byddeþ ous wiþ
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Bot here may men doute, siþ no man haþ leue to change 
þis commaundement ordeyned of God, how myȝt we change oure 
Sabote fro Saturday to Soneday? Bot we schulle vnderstonde 
þat holdyng of þis commaundement in somdel ys fygue and 
moralte in somdel; and anemtys þe fygyure men mote nede 
chaunge it in þe Newe Testament and kepe generalyche oure 
Sabote. Among oþer causys, restyng on þe Saterday fygyrep 
þe restyng of Criste þat he lay in sepulcre; and for þis 
þyng þe ys passed we scholde nouȝt kepe þe fygyure. Also, siþ 

But here may men doute, siþ no man haþ leue to chaunge 
þes maundementis ordeyned of God, hou myȝte we change oure 
Sabot fro Saturday to Soneday? But here we shal vndurstonde 
þat holdyng of þis maundement in sumdeel is figure and 
moralte in sumdeel; and anentis þe figure men moten nedis 
chaunge it in þe Newe Testament and kepe generaly oure 
Sabot. Among oþere causys, restyng on þe Saturday figuriþ 
þe restyng of Crist þat he lay in þe sepulcre; and for þis 
þyng þe is passid we shulden not kepe þe figure. Also, siþ
we bëp nere þe tyme of þe resurreccioun þan were þe Jewes in þe Olde Testament, we kepþe þe eysteþe age as þey kepþe þe seueþe. Þe fyrste age lastþe fram Adam to Noe; þe secundþe from Noe into þe tyme of Abraham; þe tyme of Abraham into þe tyme of Dauyd; þe fyrþe from þe tyme of Dauyd to þe weyndynge into Babiloyne; þe fyrþe from þat tyme into þe burþe of Crist; þe seueþe tyme from þe burþe of Criste tyl þe day of dome; þe seueþe tyme of reste renneþ wip þes sexe, bot þe eysteþe tyme ys after þe day of dome

we bën nerrer þe tyme of resurreccioun þan weren þe Iewes in þe Olde Testament, we kepþe þe eistþe age as þei kepþen þe seuenþe. Þe first age lastide from Adam vnto Noe; þe secoundþ fro Noe vnto þe tyme of Abraham; þe þridde fro tyme of Abraham vnto þe tyme of Dauïþ; þe fouþþe fro tyme of Dauïþ to wendynge into Babiloyne; þe fyuþþe fro þat tyme til birþe of Crist; þe sixte fro birþe of Crist til þe day of doom; þe seuenþe tyme /of rest renþþ wip þes sixe, but þe eistþe tyme is aftir þe day of doom
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whan al Holy Churche schal fullyche reste in blysse, and in
tokene þis tyme we reste þe eysteþe day.

Now were it to wyte how men scholde kepe here haliday.
And syþe seruyle worke ys worke of synne eche man scholde
on þe haliday kepe him out of synne, syþe Crist hymself
seyþ þat whosoeuer doo synne he makeþ him seruante to
synne, and nopyng ys worse. Bot for we scholde spende þe haliday
in heriyng of God and elles we synneþ gretlyche in faylynge of
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whanne al Hooli Chirche shal fully rest in bliss, and to
bitokene þis tyme we resten þe eistþe day.

Capitulum Undecimum

Now were it to wite hou men shulden kepe her haliday.
And sþe moost seruyl werk is worchyng of synne eche man
shulde on haliday kepe him out of synne, sþ Crist himsilf
seyþ þat whoeuer doþ synne he makeþ him seruante to synne,
and nopyng is worse. But for we shulden spende þe haliday in
heriyng of God and ellis we synnen gretly in faiyte of his
his /seruyce, herefore we scholde on þe halyday kepe ous fro suche workes [þat letteþ þe seruyce of God fullyc in oure soule and suche workes beþ ycleped seruyle workes and stondeþ moost in] suche þat occupieþ mannes soule and letteþ it to þenke on God and worschepe him and loue him; and so doþ more tellynge of moneye and countynge of worldlye goode þan goynge to þe plowe. Bot eche man scholde on þe holyday schappe him such reste þat most scholde quyete his soule and able him to serue God, and herefore þe Jewes kepide for a rule to trauely on þe Saterday no more þan a myle. Neþelles, yf þer be bodylyche trauel þat ys nedful to seruyse, herfore we shulden on þe haliday kepe vs fro suche werkis þat letten þe seruyse of God fully in oure soule, and siche werkis þen yclepid seruyle werkis and stonden moost in siche þat occupien mernes soule and letten it to þenke on God and worschepe him and loue him; and so doþ more harm telling of moneye and countynge of worldly good þan goynge at þe plows. But eche man shulde on þe haliday shape him siche rest þat moost shulde quyete his soule and able him to serue God, and herfor þe Jewes kepide it for a reule to trauiele on þe Saturday no more but a myle. If þer be bodili traueil
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 bynges pat scharpe a man to serue God more pan he scholde elles. And here we may see how pes false Jewes reproued Criste of brekynge of his halyday, for he dyde communelyche myracles on pe halyday, for, as himself sey pat ys most resoun, 'If it be lefful to drawe out on pe halyday by neysebores best pat lyb in pe myre, moche more it ys lefful to do a betere dede.' And pus we blame

pat is nedeful to man, he may wel on pe halyday take it in mesure, as man may on pe halyday clope him, go and fede him, and so preie and preche and do bodili byngis pat sharpen a man to serue God more pan he shulde ellis. And here may we se hou pes false Jewes reprouyd Crist for brekyng of his haliday, for he dide myraclis comounly on pe halyday, for, as he himself seip pat is moost resouz, 'If it be leueful to drawe out on pe halyday bi nei3bores beest pat lieb in pe myre, myche more it is leueful to do a betere dede.' And pus we blamen

worse þan Jewes fele bodylyche werkes and punyshen men for hem, and worse werkes we suffere and do worse ous-syf, as many vnleffulle pleyes we vse on þe halyday and many fleschelyche symes as yf þey were þanne lefful. Ich wote wel þat God, of his grete curtesye, wole þat man solace him on þe halyday, bot algatis kepe from synne for þerynne ys non solas. And yf þou wolde knewe synne lerne þes ten commaundementis, for no man may synne bot aenst hem. And so discrecioun and studye in Godes lawe scholde teche a man  

worse þan Jewes many bodili werkys and punyshen men for hem, and worse werkis we suffren and don worse ousesilf, as many vnleuful pleies we vse on þe halyday and many fleisli synnes as if þei weren þanne leueful. I woot wel þat God, of his greet curtesie, wole þat man solace him on þe halyday, but algatis kepe him fro synne for þerynne is no solace. And if þou wolde knewe synne lerne þes ten commaundementis, for no man may synne but aens hem. And so discrecioun and studyng in Goddis lawe shulden teche a man
betere to holde his halyday ṭan dop his propre preste. For it ys medful to do workes in ṭe weke and on ṭe Soneday suche werkes scholde be lefte, for ṭe moste heye werke ṭat /a man can serue God ynne scholde he schappe him to doo on ṭe halyday.

For it ys a gret curtesye of God ṭat grauntede ous to worche sexe dayes in ṭe woke to gete ous oure bodlyche sustynaunce ṭat in schort tyme schulle ṭe wormes mete and rotye. ṭan skyleful it ys ṭat on day in ṭe woke, and ṭat ys in ṭe halyday, men bysy hem principalye for gostlyche goedes, to helpynge of ous soules ṭat schal laste euere wipoute ende. And þerfore God also bydده ṭe haue mynde to halwe þyn halyday.

Halewynge of ṭe halyday ys lyuynge holylyche vpon ṭe halyday. Bot it seeme new on dayes ṭat ṭe halyday may skylfullyche be yclepyd ṭe sory day, for of alle dayes ṭe holydayes beþ most cursedelyche yspend in ṭe deueles seruyse and in despyte of God and alle seyntes of heuene. And þough

betere to holde his haliday ṭan don þes propre prestis or clerkis of þe chapitre. For ofte tyme it were [m]edeful to do werkis in ṭe woke and on ṭe Sumeday siche werkis shulden be left, for þe moost hîse werke þat man kan serue God ymeye shulde he shape him to do on þe haliiday.
B

There were no more synnes ydo upon the eorpe, but brekyng of these two commandments of vayne and false and erryble offences, and of cursed lyuynges vpon halydayes, it ys wondere that God suffre pe peple vpoun pe erpe to lyue, saue for to loke wheather he wolde amende hem, for elles depe dampnacioun schal falle vpon hem. And to lengere that he abyde hem pe sorere he schal smyte, bot ye that amende hem. For Seynt Bernard sey that to lengere that God abyde ous that we scholde amende, by so moche that he strayttur he schal deme ous ye we be necgligent.

Bot forperere we schulle vnderstonde that in these maneres of occupaciouns we schulle spende oure halyday, as holy doctores sey: in mynde or in soule, in moue and in werk. Fyrst in mynde or soule vpon he halyday, whan thou hast hadde by bodylyche reste, rysynge vp and goynge to churche, noust to iangle nother to iape per, nother to merschauedye in he churche nother in he churche hey, sy what ys a place yordeyned to praynge fer fro wordlyche bysysnesse. And here on he halyday and speciallyche on he Sonneday you schalt penke how God made he wordle of noust on a Sonneday, and that he aroos fro dep to

lyue on a Sonneday, and how he sende wytt and wysdom into eorpe on a Sonneday, and vpon a Sonneday, as clerkes seye, schal he domes day. For Sonneday was he first day that God made and
B

schal beo þe laste euerelastynge, in ioye and blysse and
lyst to hem þat schulleþ be sauued in heuene and euerelastyng
sorwe and derkenesse to hem þat schulleþ be damned in helle.
Þenke hertelyche on þis, and forþeremore þenke how God haþ
made þe of nouþ and how þou haddest forsake him þurgh synne
and ytake þe to þe fende of helle wiþoute ende hadde nouþ
Crist, God and man, suffrede deþ. Þenke þe forþeremore how ofte
and how vnkyndelyche þou hast þurgh dedlyche synne forsake
Ihesu Criste and alle his kyndenesse and alle his goednesse and
ytake þe to þe fende and his seruice. And þanne for þyn
vnkyndenesse be ynwardlyche sory and þonke God of his grace and
of his kyndenesse and crye him hertelyche mercy of þyne
wykkedenesse and foule vnkyndenesse. And byþenke þe how þou
mayst best in tyme tocomynge serue God and mende þy wykkede
lyuynge and encresse in goednesse.

Þe secunde tyme þou schalt spende þyn holyday wiþ mouþ
spekynge, in knowelechynge and in schryuynge þe of þy synnes yf
þou se þe agreuyd in eny notable synne; and þanne in praynge to
God of grace and mercy and socour now and in tyme comynge; and in
seyynge deoute bedes and þankynge God of alle his syftes and his
goednesse; and also wiþ þy mouþ speke al goednesse. And yf þou
be a prest and hauest kunnynge and auctoryte preche and teche
Godes worde to his peple, and yf þou be no prest noþer
B

clerke bot on of þe peple þenne bysy þe in þe halyday to here
prechynge of Godes worde, and be aboute wip þy gode spekyng and
styrynge to brynge þy neyȝebores to betere lyuynge, and yf þey
be at debate brynge hem by þy power to loue and charite and
acord. And þus spende þy mouþ and þy speche on þe halyday to
worschep of þy God and help and comfort of þyn euene Cristene.
Be þrydde tyme þou schalt spende þyn holyday in þy
dedes and worchynge, as ich seyde byfore, goynge wip þy body to
churche to here Godes seruyse and bydde þy deuoute prayeres,
after to vysite hem that beþ syke and in myschef, to conforte
and to releue hem resonabelyche after þy power and after here
nede. And so vpon þe holyday þe schulleþ specialyche bysye
3ow in þe workes of charyte and of mercy, to helpynge of ȝoure
soules and to relyuynge of ȝoure pore neyȝebores, and specialyche
þat God hæþ made nedy öþer by age öþer by auenture, as by
sykenesse or by myschef. For to hem byddeþ Crist to do þyn
almesse, þat is to seye, as Crist seþ in þe Gospel and as Seynt
Richard expourmeþ, ‘Whanne þou makest a feste, clepe pore
feble, pore crokedþ and pore blynde and þou schalt þe blessed,
for þey haueþ nouȝt to rewarde þe, and þan for soþe it schal þe
rewarded to þe in þe rewarde of rystful men in þe blisse of
heuene.’
B

Pus to spende þe halydayes and principalliche Sonnedayes

Cristene men scholde lerne by techynge of prestes; and amang
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{Capitulum Duodecimum}

It were to wite ouer þis of multitude of halidaies and

whame þei shulden bigyme and whame þei shulden eende. Wel

y woot þat hooli men shulden euere holde haliday; and in tokene

5 herof summe prestis han þis vss, to vse her haliday clobis

boþe haliday and werkday; but wel y woot þat siche signes

maken not men hooly. As anentis þe multitude of þes

halidaies, me þinkeþ, saaf betere iugement of men, þat it were

ynow generaly to laboreris to be bunden in þe woke to

10 kepe þe Sumneday. But wel y woot þat oþere festis don ofte

tyme good as þe Iewes hadden in here lawe foure greete

feestis. Ne y seie not þat ne feestis of seyntis don miche

good and ofte many of hem don myche harm. But y woot þat

God wole þat fredom of his lawe be kept specialy, as Seynt

15 Poul techib. And þerfor it is ful perelous to bynde men
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alle oher festes loke pat þou kepe wel þes foure: Crystemasse.

Ester, Ascensyon and Wytsouneday. For a grete clerk seþ
pat non feste ne seruyse þat is of oher seynts is
pleseyng to God, but in as muche as {hyt} scharpeþ {þe more} man
to loue oure Lord Ihesu Crist.

T
ouer resoun. But be war þat þou kepe þes foure feestis:
Crystemasse and Estren, þe Ascencioun and Wittsonday. For [a
grete clerk seþ þat] no feest ne seruyse þat is of oþere
seynts is plesyng to God, but in as myche as it sharpþ a man to
loue oure Lord Ihesu Crist. And herfor whame we [se]ien of ony
oþer seynt, we bigynnen and eenden wip þis name of þis Lord.

As anentis bigymynge and eendyng of þe haliday, God
tauste þe Iewes to bigymne /at euensong and eende at tyme
of euensong in þe secound day. Ne charge not to myche
bigymynge or eendyng of þe senyse of God, for he is Lord
of tyme, and in eche tyme shulden men serve him and so,
in a maner, holde euere haliday. But more passyngly on þe
Sunday, for on þe Sumeday God made þe world; and also on
þe Sumeday he roos fro deþ to lijf; and on þe Sumeday he
Wherfore we scholde bysye ous deuoutelyche on halydayes, and studye on vertues and on þes ten commaundements, on /pe seuen workes of mercy bodylyche and gostlyche. And speche wip men scholde be of heuenlyche þynges and so scherpe oure wyttes to wexe into þe loue ofoure Lord Ihesu Crist. And putte away gyles, wronges and ober synnes, for elles þe halyday of men ys turned into þe workeday, syþþe þe worste workeday ys by seruyse of synne. Ne take nouþt to mucche hede to signes, [as Jewes, for Ihesu Crist ys yryse: treuþe and ende of signes].

Cristen men shulden lerne bi techyng of prestis to bisie hem deuoutly on þe haliday, and studie on vertues and synnes and on ten commaundementis, on seuen werkis of mercy bodily and gostli, and speche wip men shulde be of heuenli þingis. And putt awey gyles, wrongis and ober synnes, for ellis þe haliday of men is turned into werkday, siþ þe worst werkday is be seruyse of synne. Ne take we not to myche hede to signes as Jewes, for Ihesu Crist is risen: treuþe and...
for I am certayn þat he despisþ to costelewe cloþes and to
costelewe metes. For alle þyng scholde be don in resoun and
mesure, and Crist chargeþ more clennesse of soule þan
clennesse of body, for in a clene soule woneþ he hymself and
elles he forsakeþ it. And so in goed kepyng of þes þre
commaundements scholde we lerne to loue God in parfyt charite.

The secound table of opere commaundements conteyneþ
seuene commaundements and techþ þe to loue þy neysebore as
ende of signes. And y am certeyn þat he dispisþ to costly
cloþis, vestymenþis or chirchis, or to costly metis. For
al þyng shulde be don in resoun and mesure, and Crist
chargþ more clennesse of soule þan clennesse of body,
for in a clene soule woneþ himsilþ yme and ellis he
forsakþ it. And so in good kepyng of þes þre maundements
shulen we lerne to loue God in parfyt charite.

Capitulum [Primum]
The secound table of opere maundements of God

B
Byself; and that thou shalt know by these commandments of the first table, for what man that ever keepeth these commandments he loveth himself and all onlyche he. And thus these ten commandments be knytt togedere that whoeuer

lovet his neighbour love his God, syppe these two branches of charite may not be departed. And herefore sayd Seynt Jon in his firste epistle, 'He that love not his brother that he see at eye, how may he love his God that he see not?'

And syppe these ten commandments suep resoun of more

neibore as hisilf; and that thou shalt know by these maundements of first table, for what man ever keepeth these pre maundements he loveth himself and also his neibore. And thus these ten commandements ben knyttid togidre, that whoeuer

love his neighbour he love his God, syp these two branches of charite may not be parted. And herefore sayd Seynt Jon in his first epistle, 'He that love not his brother whom /he see at eye, how love he his God that he see not?'

And syppe these maundements suep resoun of more kepyng,
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kepynge, þe fyrste of þes seuene bydde þe loue þyn
elderses, and ys ywryte in Godes lawe by forme of þes wordes:
'Worschepe þy fader and also þy moder þat þou be in longe
lyf vpon erpe þat þy Lord God schal þeue þe.' Here fyrst

5
mote we wyte of fader and moder þat some beþ of kynde neer
and some ferþer. By next fader is he þat bodylyche gate
þe and þy neyœst moder þat bodylyche /bare þe. Pyn elde
fader and elde moder beþ þyn [fer] eldres, and alle þese
scholdest þou worscheþe[þe] [ yf þay be on lyue and, yf þay

10 be dede worschepe hem] in soule.
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þe first of þes seuene biddþ þe loue þin eldris and is
writen in Goddis lawe bi foorme of þes wordis: Worshipe þi
fader and also þi moder, þat þou be of lon[g] lijf on þe erpe
þat þi Lord God shal syue þee. First moten we wite of

5 fader and moder þat summe ben of kynde nerrer and ferþer. Þi
next fader is he þat bodily gate þee, and þi next moder
þat bodily bare þee; þin elde fader and elde moder ben þi fer
eldris; and alle þes shuldest þou wof[r]shepe if þei ben on lyue
and, if þei ben deed, worshipe hem in soule.
And alle ye eche commaundement of God is resonable, nepeles [open] resoun necep to kepe his commaundement. For resoun and kynde meuep to loue him that loue he in goednesse and trauelyp muche for he, bot by werke and suffrynge yyn eldres hauep broust he forp and yordeyned for he wonynge and rychesse. What man scholdest pou loue bot yf pou louedest hem? And for God hab more resoun of loue for he made he of nouzt and kepep he and medep he, perfere pou scholdest loue more God pan eny creature. And herefore seyp Crist pat he pat

And if eche mauldement of God is resonable, nepeles opun resoun nedip to kepe his maundement. For resoun and kynd moeuen to loue him pat louepee in goodnesse and trauelip myche for hee, but in werk and suffryng pin eldris han broust hee forp and ordeyned for hee in teching and richess. What man shuldest pou loue but if pou louedist hem? And for God hab more resoun of loue, for he made pee of nouzt and kepep hee and medip hee, perfere pou shuldest loue more God pan ony creature. And herfor seip Crist pat he pat louepee
love more his elders than him is not worthy to have him, 
syph the Crist, God and man, haþ more resoun of loue. Pes beþ þe 
eldres þat þou scholdest worchepe, and oþer maner fadres wiþ 
modres also. Bot it were to wYTE how þou scholdest 
worsehepe hem, for many men wereþ to worsehepe hem and dyshonureþ 
hem. Some men þer beþ þat worsehepeþ in God and some worsehepeþ 
onlyche to þe worlde. Pis fyrst maner of worsehepe ys bede 
of God and þe secunde worsehepe forfendeþ he to be do. He 

hys eldris more þan him is not worþi to haue him, siþ 
Crist, boþe God and man, haþ more resoun of loue. Pes ben þe 
eldris þat þou shuldest worshipe, and oþere maner of fadris 
wiþ moder[s] also. But it were to wite hou þou shuldest 
worshipe hem, for many men wenþ to worshipe and dishonoreþ. 

Capitulum Secundum 
Sum men þer ben þat worshipen in God and summe þat 
worshipen oonly to þe world. Þis first maner of worship is 
bedun of God and þe secound worship forfendiþ he to be do.
B
worschepe in God ūpat obeschyp to man and dop ūpat resoun
axeþ to profyt to the man. And so worschepe in God stondeþ
nouȝt al in lowtyng, ne gretyng, ne knelynge, ne suche
worldelyche signes, ne it forfendeþ nouȝt suche signes in
resoun. And so he worschepe his fader as he scholde dop ūpat
helpeþ him in nede boþe bodylyche and gostlyche. And so þou
scholdest worschepe þy fader in bodyliche helpe and algates
help hym gostlyche, for þerof he hap nede.

And so worschepeþng of fader and moder stondeþ
principalych in dede, as in caas þy fader and moder beþ come

T
He worshipiþ in God ūpat obesheþ vnto man and dop ūpat resoun
axeþ to [profyt to] þo man. And so worship in God
stondiþ not al in loutyng ne in gretyng, ne knelynɡ,
ne siche worldly signes, ne it forfendiþ not siche þingis
in mesure. And so he worshipiþ his fader as he shulde
do þat helpiþ h[y]m in nede /boþe bodyly and gostly. And
so þou shuldest worshepe þi fader in bodili help and
algate helpe hym gostly, for þerof hap he nede.

T: 1 obesheþ obs/schyp Y, vnto] to Y, dop ūpat] dop as H 2 to
profyt to] to T, þo] he HY 3 stondiþ] and stondiþ Y, in gretyng]
gretyng H 4 siche] in siche H 4-5 þingis in mesure] signes in
reson HY 6 hym] hem TY, bodily and gostly] gostli and bodili Y
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to nede and myschef by age or by auenture, kou art ybounde to
helpe hem by seruyce, boke wi /y body and sucoure wik ky
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catel. And yf hey be in synne, or haue nede to gostelyche
techynge or comfort, bou art yholde, yf bou kunne, to teche
5 hem and corn forte hem. If bou kunne nou3t bou art yholde by hy

power to gete oker to helpynge of hem. And yf bay be dede ou
art holde to lyue wel, to praye ny3t and day to God to delyuere
hem out of peyne. Ns is be reueience and worschep in dede bat
be childe scholde do to be fader and moder and his lessoun
10 scholde eueiyche bodylyche fader and moder (and namellyche
gostlyche fadres and also godfadres and godmodres) teche to here
chyidren. And yf his lessoun hadde be tau3t and ykept in
Engelond I trowe be londe hadde ystonde in more
prpeñte ban it hap ystonde many day. And it may be bat
15 [for] vengeaunce of his synne of vnworschepynge and despysynge
of fadres and modres God sleek children by pestylence as 3C
seek al day. For in be Olde Lawe children bat were rebelle and
vnbuxom to here fadres and modres were ypunysched by deb, as be
fyfthe boke of Holy Wryt wytnesse in his wyse: 'If a man,' he
20 seyk, 'hab ygete a sone hat is rebdlle ober wykked and nd flOU3t
{ hyre) here fadres and modres heste and he yconstrayned despyse



to obesche, þey schal take him and lede him to þe elderes of þulke cyte and to þe sate of þe dome, and þanne hy schal seye to hem, "þeyse oure sone is wykkede and rebelle and despyse[þ] oure techynges and take[þ] hede to vnmesurable etynges as to lecherye and festes." Þanne he schal be stenede and so he schal deye þat al þe peple, hurynge þis peyne, scholde drede to be rebelle to fader or moder.' And þough God wolde nouȝt now þat þis payne of bodylyche dep beo execut in manere as it was þulke tyme vpon suche trespassures, þe peyne is neuere þe lasse, bot raper he schal be more hardere and lengere dure. For but suche children /þat beþ rebelle, wyckede and vnbuxom amende hem here in tyme f.94r of here lyf, God schal smyte hem wiþ swerde of vengeaunce in þe oure of here dep, puttynge here soule into helle peyne, and in þe laste day of dome he schal putte boþe body and soule togedre into peyne of helle euerlestenye. Herefore do after þis commaundement and suwe þe noble techer Poul þat seyb þus: 'Children, obesche se to soure fader and moder, for it is ryȝtful to worschepe þy fader. Þat is þe fyrste commaundement in byhest þat it be wel to þe and þat þou be longe lyuynge vpon erþe. And se fadres nel se stere soure children to wráþþe bot norysche hem and brynge hem forþ in
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 þey beþ aonge, to encresse in goednesse and vertues. And þerfore Poul byddeth þat þe fader norysche his children in his lore and chastynge of God and God commaundèþ in þe Olde Lawe þat þe fadres scholde telle to here children Godes hestes and þe wondres and þe myracles þat he dyde in þe londe of Egypte and in þe Rede See and in water of Jordan and in þe londe of beheste. And muche more now in þe Newe Lawe þeþ fader and moder holde to teche here children þe byleue of þe Trynyte and of Ihesu Crist, how he is verray God wiþoute bygynnynge and was made man þurgh most brenynge charite to saue mankynde by stronge penaunce and harde turment and byter deþ, and alle commune poynþ of byleue. Bot þay beþ most holde to teche hem Godes hestes and þe workes of mercy and poynþes of charite, to goueme wel here wyttes and to drede God byfore alle oþer þynges and to loue him most of alle þynges, for he is endeles wysdom, endeles myþt, endeles goednesse, mercy and charite. And yf þey trespassæ æsenst Godes hestes þey owne /to blame hem þerfore scharplyche, and chasthy hem a thousandfolde more þan for trespassæ and despyte or vnkyndenesse
ydoun a3enste here owene persone. And þis techynge and chastynge scholde in fewe seres make goede Cristene men and wommen; and namelyche goede ensample of holy lyf of olde men and wommen, for þat is best techynge to here children and to oþer Cristene folke aboute hem.

Many prestes chargeþ godfadres and godmodres to teche here children þe Pater Noster and þe Crede and þis is wel ydo, bot it ys most nede to teche hem þe ten hestes of God and ñeue hem goede ensample by here owene lyuynge. For þough þey be Cristene and knowe þe commune poyntes of bylue, sit scholde þay noust be saued wipoute kepynge of Godes hestes bot be dampned deppere in helle þan helene men; and it hadde be betere to hem neuere haue rescyued Cristendom bot yf þey ende trewelyche in Godes commaundements, as Seynt Peter techeth passynglyche. Bot som men setteþ here chyldren to lerne jestes of batailles and of cronycles, and nouelleries of songes þat strenþ hem to iolte and to harlatrye. And som setteþ hem to nedeles craftes, for pryde and coueytyse þat harmþ here soules. And som setteþ hem to lawe for wymyng of worldlyche worschepe and herto costþ hugelyche in many weyes. Bot in al þis Godes lawe is put behynde, and þerfore spekeþ vnneþe eny man a goed worde to magnefyre 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
5 techynge and noryschynge and meyteynyng in synne, and bep cruel
sleers of here children - se, more cruel pan pough pey
/hackede here children as smal as mosselles to here pot - for f.95'
pis cursede techynge. And, endynge þerynne, here children, bodyes
and soules, bep damnped wipoute ende in helle. And pough here
bodyes were y hackede neuere so smal, boþe body and soule scholde
be in blesse of heuene, so þat þey kepe truwelyche Godes
comauudement3. And of suche necglygent fadres and modres þat
techep nouȝt here children Godes lawe and chasteþ hem nouȝt
whanne þey trespassþ æsenst Godes hestes, Seynt Poule spekeþ
10 a dredful word: 'He þat hæp nouȝt cure of his owne, and most of
his homely and his housholde, hæp forsake þe feyp, and he is worse
þan a man oute of Cristenedome.' And suche fadres and modres þat
menteyneþ wytynglyche here children in synne and techep hem
schrewednesse beþ worse þan þe cursede fadres þat culleþ here
children and ofþrep hem vp to stockes, worcheþynge fals
mamettrye. For þey children were dede in here souþe and dyde

B: 15 (mar. Primi Thimotei 5)
no more synne, bot þes children of cursede fadres and modres þat techeþ hem pryde, þefþe and lecherye, wræþe, coueytyse and slouþe and glotenye and menteyne hem þerwynne beþ holde on longe lyf and in encresynge of synne, to more dampnacioun of eche partye. And no wondere þough God take vengeaunce on þe peple boþe olde and young, for alle communelyche despyse[þ] God in þis: þat þey haueþ ioye and merþe {of synne, harlatry and vnclannis} and despyseþ correcciouns and repreuyngeþ. And þerfore God mote punysche þis synne for his ryþful mageste.

Bot also in þis commaundement æ schulleþ vnderstonde þat þer beþ þre manere of fadres and modres þe whiche æ beþ holde to worschepe. þe fyrste is bodylyche fader and moder whos worschepe stondeþ principalyche in dede as it is ytold before. þe secunde fader þat þou schalt worschepe ys þy gostly fader þat haþ cu/þre of þy soule, to helpe him and menteyne him in Godes lawe and in goed gouernayle of Godes peple and to do after him in þat þat Godes lawe techeþ, and elles þou dysworschepeþ him and brekest Godes commaundement; and alle his pareschenes beþ as oure moder. And þus alle men and wommen scholde do worschepe ech to ðeper, and namelyche to here parsoun, or vicary, ðeper prest þat haþ cure of here soules, and folwynge
his byddynge in þat þat Godes lawe techþ.

Þe þrydde fader þat is principal of alle ys Crist, boþe 

God and man, and Holy Churche, þat is Cristes spouse, is þy moder; 

and hem þow schalt worschepe and loue and be obedient to hem in 
 kepynge here hestes and here conseyles wiþ al þy myste. And 
þenne worschepest þou þyn eldres as Godes lawe ys, and þus 
scholde eche man worschepe òper, as Seynt Poule techeth. 

And in þis commaundement me may see þe resoun of mede þat 
God himself behoteþ ous for kepynge of þis heste: syþ þou hast þy 
bodylyche lyf of þyn eldres, yf þou worschepest þis cause more, vpon 
resoun skyle wole þat þou haue more of þis lyf; and yf þou worschepest 
in God more, skyle wole þat þou haue more of lyf in God. And here 

Þus shulde eche man worshipe òper, as Seynt Poul techþ. 

And here may we se þe resoun of mede þat God himself hetþ 
vs for kepynge of þis heest: syþ þou hast þi bodili lijf of 
þin eldris, if þou worshipist þis cause more, vpon resoun 
skyle wole þat þou haue more of þis lijf; and if þou 
worshipist in God [more, skyle wole þat þou haue] more of 
lijf in God. And here may we se 

B: 8 þat/þat/þat
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may we see that he worshipped not in God his father and mother that riches is hem to the worldly and sewage hem worldly goodes more than reason asked. And his scholde men of the Church note that riches to much men and women of here kynne: if his kyn be nedy, help hem in reason, but make not by kyn riches to gete be a name. If they suffice to find hemself by here owene trauayle, let hem lyue by here owene trauayle. For Crist cam of pore men and he that is almighty and witty and willeful lete his moder be pore and his pore cosynes; and when they axede

If they suffice to find hemself by her owene travel, late hem lyue by her travel. For Crist cam of pore men and he that is almighty, alwitty and al willeful let his moder be pore and his pore cosynes; and when they axiden
wor/schep and heynesse of þis worlde he deneyde hem þat and ordynede hem passioun; and byleue techeþ ous he dyde al for þe betere. And so scholde we sue him, yf we wille be his children, and loye him more þan þe worlde or oure veyn name.

And so God forbedeþ nouȝt bodylyche worschep, bot þenke on manere of þit and mesure it by resoun. And so it is laweful men to procure for here children rychesse of þe worlde more þan þey to hem.

For as Seynt Poul seiyþ, 'Fadres tresoureþ to children more þan children doþ to hem, for þay loueþ hem more, as God louþeþ

T
worschep and hisnesse of þe worlde he deneyde hem þat and ordynede hem passioun; and byleue techeþ vs he dide al for þe beterere. And so shulden we sue him, if we wolen be hise children, and loye him more þan þe worlde or oure veyn name.

And so God forbedeþ not bodili worship, but þenke on maner of it and mesure it bi resoun. And so it is leueful [men] to procure for [her] children richesse of þe world more þan þei to hem.

For as Seynt Poul seþ, 'Fadris tresoure to her children more þan children doþ to hem, for þei loueen hem more, as God louþeþ
man more than man may love God.' And therefore man may never love God to moche. Herefore pis Fader God and Holy Churche oure moder we scholde worchepe nyzt and day, praynge to God oure Fader to encresse and to fulfille pé nombre of alle pat

schal be saued. In pis manere pou schalt worchepe by fader and moder and byn eldres bodylyche and gostlyche, and pis is þe fyrste commaundement of þes seuene.

man more than man may love God'. And herfor man may neuer love God to myche, al if men may faile in foly maner of worship and wene he worshipþ God whanne he dispisip him;

and so it fallip more in worship of þi fader.

[Capitulum Tercium]

Worship of þi goostli fader, as þi prelat or prest, is ofte tyme takun amys, euen to þe contrarie. For þe worlde iugþ hym moost worshiphe [siche fader] þat makþ him moost shynyng /and riche to þe world; but þis is an eresie, ouer f.17r

comyþ pis day. Me þinkþ þat we shulden seie, to suffre herfor deepþ, þat if þi Pope, þi bisshop, þi parsoun or wiker be knowun of þee to draw in þe deuelis 3ok, worshiphe him not as

9 shynyng and riche] riche and schining HY 9-10 ouer comyn] ouercomyng Y
11 þi Pope] þei Pope (e1 canc.)T, wiker] þi wiker HY 12 in þe] in Y
siche but hate him as pin enemye in bat bat he is synful, but
loue him in soure kynde. And ofte tyme richesse and worship of
be world aggregi syn of siche and makiŋ men vnworshipe hem.
And so it harmeŋ in soule be child and be fader. For bi oure
bileue we shulden loue hem in God and not to be world, for
bane we haten hem. We louen hem in God if bat we mœuen
hem to holde Goddis reule and ordre bat Crist hap 3ouen hem,
But, as it is shewed bi ten faire witnessis, Crist hap beden
hem be pore and forbeden hem worldli worship. And siŋ bat
lordis of þis world shulden worshipe moost siche fadris,
if þei putt þis lordship on hem þei don hym more dispijt;
and if þei dispise þus her God þei shal be maad vnnoble.
For he þat fuyliŋ þus his prelat dispisiŋ him more þan if
he defoyliţe alle hise vestiments wip dritt. O, siŋ Crist
hymself seŋ þat him þat he loueŋ he reproueŋ and chastisiŋ,
whi shulden not we do so: if we louen men in God, telle
hem Goddis lawe, and procure þat þei holde hislawe? For
ellis we haten hem. And þus, if lordis louyde her eldris
\textit{in soule}, þei shulden quenche her errours \textit{and} make hem more
short, and folies þat þei bigan fordo hem at her myst.

And so, if þis maundement were kept bi Goddis lawe, lordis
shulde not syue her bisshops lordshipis of þis world ne
\textit{confirme hem þeryme}, but take hem hastely from hem. And
houeuer þe world speke, þis is Goddis lawe; and at þe day
of doom shal bosteris be doumbe þat now reuersen þis
sentence \textit{and} seien þat it is eresie. Many þingis wolen sue
herof aenum oure worldli doyng, but God syue grace þat
sumdel be put sone \textit{in practise}. And þus men shulden be
aboute to worshipe /her dede eldris \textit{and} reise vp Goddis lawe
þat þei han put doun. And so, if y durst seie, y kan not now
se þat ne sepulcris ne abbeis profiten now to deed patronis.

But whanne al is lokid aboute, þe best of al were þat pure
ordenaunce of Crist were mayntened \textit{in} his Chirche, \textit{and} þane
shulden many officeris be put fro Cristis Chirche as an
ydel couent of Antecristis clerkis.
B

Pe secunde commaundement of seuene of pe secunde table bydde pe shortly nouat slee by broper and it vnderstonde pe vnskylful sleynge. And herefore men seyc pat men pat beþ ykylled by mannes lawe beþ noust slawe of men bot pe lawe sleþ hem and here yuele dedes. Bot what seþ a grete clerke?

T

[Capitulum Quartum] Pe Fyth Comaundment

The secound maundment of seuene of pe secound table biddib pe shortly not sle þi broper, and it vnderstondib vnskilful sleyn. And herfor men seien þat men þat ben not slawen bi mannes lawe ben not sleyn þat man þat seien þat it were ful soþ and just in hymsilf as þei supposen of mannes lawe. Wipouten ony dout, þame shulden þei not be contrarie to Crist: wharme he seþ þat þis breed is myþ owne body þei reuersen him and seien þat þis may neþer be breed ne þe body of Crist, as false freris gabben.

But leue we þis now and speke we of þis maundement,
Suppose we, he sey, by oure fey, that God bydde þus: þat we scholde kylle no man wiþoute auctorite of him. And so [may] men kylle bestes and wykkede men boþe, by auctorite of lawe, and elles no wyse. Resoun dryueþ men to holde þis commaundement: syþ eche man of þis worlde is broþer to ðe për and eke neysebore to ðe për by ordynaunce of God, who scholde þanne ðe për wyse vnkyndelyche kylle his broþer? For as we beþ alle þe children of Adam oure fader, so we beþ alle þe children of God, and alle þat schal be saued han Holy Churche here moder. And so, as me

and suppose we bi oure fey þat God biddip þus: þat we shulden sle no man wiþoute auctorite of him. And so may men kille beestis and wikid men boþe, by autorite of lawe, and ellis no wise. Resoun dryueþ men to holde þis comaindment: sjþ eche man of þe world is broþer to ðe për and eche neisbore to ðe për bi þe ordenaunce of God, who shulde þame ðe për wise vnkyndly sle his broþer? For as we ben alle children of Adam oure fader, so we ben alle children of God, and alle þat shal be sauyd han Hooli Chirche her moder. And so, as
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penkep, no man scholde kylle oper by auctorite of pe lawe bot
yf he were sykere pat Godes lawe bad it; and hanne myaste he
ywyte pat he brake noust Godes heste al yf he kyllede him ne
fel noust fro charite, syþ boþe loue and sorwe scholde meue hem
to do so and noust his owene vengeaunce. And þus, as me þenkep, a
man may kylle anoþer as men cleþep hangmen and hederys of
mannes lawe. And þus Godes lawe spekep, wham we scholde lyue.

T

me þinkip, no man shulde sle oper bi autorite of pe lawe
but if he were siker þat Goddis lawe bad it; and þanne myste
he wite þat he brak not Goddis heest al if he slous him ne fel
not fro charite, siþ boþe loue and sorwe shulde mo[e]ue him
to do so and not his owene veniaunce. And þus, as me þinkip, a
man may kylle anoþer, as men cleþen hangmen and hederys /in
mannes lawe. And þus Goddis lawe spekiþ whiche we shulden
trowe.

And þus men supposen þat bi londis lawe is no man

sleyn but if God bidde it, for þei supposen þat þis is
Goddis lawe. But it is wonder to men hou in mony londis

T: 1 sle] kille HY 2 he] we H 3 he wite] we witte H, heest]
corr. int. T 6 cleþen] cleþip H 7 whiche] whom HY 10 sleyn]
killide HY
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For of pis lawe we bek certeyne pat it byddep noust kylle a man
bot yf it be resoun and gracieuse and profetale yf {he} takep
{it} wel, so pat it were betere him to be kylled so pan for to
lyue forhe vnpuneshed for his trespasse. And so yf eny
trespasser æsæ mannes lawe taketh his deþ in charite it
ys medful for him. Bot muche more peyne deserueþ man for
synne. Bot I can noust see þat eny man scholde putte þis
peyne on a man wiþoute auctorite of God.

T
men ben sleyn for a trespas, and for a myche more þei ben not
punyshid so, but oþer passen fre or ben listles[ier] punyshid: bi
money as men vsen. But we ben not sett to riþt siche lawes.
But of Goddis lawe ben we ful certeyn þat it biddij not sle
a man but if it be resoun and gracious and profitable if he
take it wel, so þat him were betere þus to be sleyn þan
to lyue forþ vnpunyshid for his trespas. And so if [ony]
trespasser æsæ manes lawe takih his deep in charite it
is medful for him. But myche more peyne deserueþ man
for synne. But þy kan not se þat ony man shulde putte þis
peyne on men wiþoute auctorite of God.
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Bot wete we wel þis commaundement is syb to many synnes. For Seynt Jon seib þat eche man þat hateþ his broþer is a mansleer, 3e, ofte tymes more to blame þan he þat sleþ his body for þe synne is more. And by þis skyle a bachbyte is a mansleer, and he that scholde 3eue gostlych fode and feyleþ þerynne; and so eche man þat synneþ in ony dedly synne synneþ aþenst þis commaundement, as it is of ȝper. For whosoeuere consentþ to sleynge synneþ aþenst þis commaundement and is a mansleer. Bot, as clerkes seþ, vpon syxe maneres ys þis

\[Capitulum Quintum\]

But wite wel þis maunderment is sib to many symnes. For Seynt Jon seþ þat eche þat hateþ his broþer is a mansleer, she, ofte tymes more to blame þan he þat sleþ his body, for þe synne is more. And bi þis skile a bachbyte is a mansleer, and he þat shulde ȝythe goostli fode and failþ þerynne; and so eche man þat synþ þyn þy
B

consentynge do, and men scholde knowe it: he consenteb to þe yuel þat worcep wip perto; he þat defendeb and conseyleb þerto; he by whos auctorite ys þe yuel ydoo; he þat wipdraweb his helpe or scharp reprouyng whan /he myste do it and scholde by Godes lawe. And among alle synnes by whiche þe fend begyleb men non ys more sutyl þan suche consente. And herefore þe prophetes of þe Olde Lawe tolde men perceles tyl þay suffrede deþ and in þis cause þe 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 consente to yuel þat worcep wip perto; he þat defendeb it and conseileb þerto; he by whos auctorite is þe yuel don; he þat wipdraweb his help or sharp reprouyng whame he myste do it and shulde bi Goddis lawe. And among alle synnes bi whiche þe fend bigil[þ] men, noon is more sutel þan siche concense. And herfore þe prophetis of þe Olde Lawe telden men perels til þei suffrilden deþ and for þis cause apostolis of Crist weren martrid; and we shulden /if we weren trewe men, but cowardise and defaute of

B

makep ous sterte abak as traytours doo.

And so yf þe grounde were sowt in remes þer were
defewe prestes oþer seculeres þat ne were mansleeres vpon som
maneres, and specialy prelats þat sleep here broþer in many
weyes. For þey scholde preche hem and teche hem Godes lawe,
and by negcligence of hem þey beþ gostlyche sleye. And þes
scholde stonde as postes æænst tirauntes and telle hem how by
Godes lawe þey scholde lede þe peple; and þis is a pryuy synne
þat prelates reccep nouȝt, and herby þay sleep ofte boþe
lordes and communes and brekþ þis commaundement.

T

loue of oure God makþ vs to sterte abak as traitours don.

And so if þe ground were souȝt in oure reumes þer
weren lite prestis or seculers oþer þat ne þei weren
mansleers vpon sum maner, and specialy prelatis þat slee
her breþeren many weies. For þei shulden preche hem and teche
hem Godes lawe, and bi necligence of hem ben þei goostly sleyn.
And þes shulde stonde as postes ææns [tirauntes] and telle
hem bi Godes lawe þei shulden lede þe puple; and þis is a
priuë synne þat prelatis recchen not, and herbi þei slee
ofte boþe lordis and comyns.

þem Goddes H 7 ææns] æænst Y, tirauntes] traitours T
And what trowe we of þis prelatis þat sillen mennes synne
and syuen hem leue to laste þerynne for annuel rent? And
parsones þat lecuen to trauel in her office bi power
of lordis and syuyng of money ben suffrid to lyue wipoute
[a]echyng of prelatis. And so prelatis ben ofte tyme
irreguler for þe multitude of soulis þat þei sleen þus,
and þis irregulate is more for to drede þan irregulate
chargid of þe world. For ofte tyme it fallip þat bi a
medeful dede men ben maad irreguler bi iugement of þe
world, but bi þis irregulate ben prelatis dampned.

{Capitulum Sextum}

And vpon siche maner ben many freris mansleers, as
speciali we may se on þes þre maneres: first þei haten her
briheren as mansleers don, for ellis þei wolden not þus þicke
lie on hem, for siche lesyngis comen not but if hate wente
bifore. Ant siþ Seynt Jon siþ þat whoeuer hate his
broþer he is a mansleer, how many freris ben siche! Þe secound degree of mansleyng stondip in wille of freris, for þei han ofte tyme wille to sle her briþeren bodily. 

Leeue we sleyng of her owne briþeren in her prisoun, and speke of her wickid wille þat was now late shewed at Londoun and Lyncolun to breme trewe prestis for þes prestis grauntiden þe treupe of þe Gospel. And sip þis wickid wille cam bi alle þes foure ordis it /is licly þat þei ben alle mansleers.

Ne mansleyng is neuer þe lesse þat God moeuyde lordis to lette þe wille of þes freris þat þei slowen hem not. For whame God haþ an erbere of erbis and seedis to heele many cuntreis of many sikenessis it were a greet synne to kitte þes seedis and vndermyne þes erbis before tyme were; and herfore we supposen þat God himself ordeynede þes erbis to laste til þei hadden more profited. Þe þridde maner of sleyng, to general in freris, stondip in here prechyng, comounly venemed. For [if] þei flateren and fagen, boþe prechyng and

shryuyng, in pont of mennes soules helpe, what venym is worse? For his wise may Antecrist moost venyme mennes soulis and sende hem to Sathanas, fadir of siche freris.

Sum men seien that freris forsaken for to preche þe Gospel of Crist for þes two causis: oon, in al þe Gospel freris may not grounde her ordris, ne hou þei camen yn bi callyng of Crist; and certis, if [it be] so, þei ben alle þeues.

The second cause is þat malice of þe puple likip more in iapyng þan in wordis of þe feip, and freris seken more memes good þan hemself, and herfore þei casten hem in word to plese þe puple. And sib ordris þat Crist made ben þus gon abac, what wondre if freris faile in short tyme, sib þei kan not grounde hou Crist brouȝt hem ynne? Summe disseyuen þe puple bi her ypocrisie, and summe may be goode men,

bileeuyng of her falsshed and syuyng of Goddis lawe, her owne iapis left. And God for his grace graunte it so be, for moost perel of mansleyng stondip in false freris.
Alle þes seuenecommaundements of þe secunde table
techeþ a man how he schal haue him anemtys his euene Cristene,
boþe to his frende and to his enemy, bot þer is noþyng more
contrarious to þis þan is wrongful manslawte. Perfore evey
man skillefullyche and kyndelyche scholde fle and enchewe suche
manslawt. For as seyþ þe wyse man in his boke, 'Eueryche best
loueþ þat best þat is lyche to him.' Muche more, by weye of
kynde, scholde man þat is resonable in alle þynges: he scholde
do none manslawt. And þis we scholde knowe by pure resoun.

For resoun wolde, syþ alle onlyche God seyþ and putteþ in lyf
into þe body whan him lykeþ, so to him alone it longeþ to
take þe soule out of þat body whan him lykeþ. For þou wost
neuere whanne it is goed to þy soule to be take oute, whan
to abyde; whan it is ordeyned to ioye, whan to peyne; for it
is longynge /to God to knowe þat knoweþ alle þyng and nouþt to
þe. Wherefore to him alone it longeþ to syue lyf and to sle
whan it best lykeþ. And in tokene of þat þis synne ys so
orrible and vnkyndely, þis [is] on of þe synnes þat in Holy
Wryt cryþ to God vengeaunce, as wytnesseþ God himself in þe
fyrste boke of Holy Wryt. 'Lo,' seyþ God to Caym, 'þe voys of
þe blod of þy broþer cryþ to me from þe erþe.'

For þis commaundement, æ schulle vnderstonde þat þer is
þre maner of manslawt, þat is to seye boþe of honde and of tunge and

B: 18 is] om. 22-23 (mar, nota bene de triplici homicidio)
of herte or of wyl. Þat man sleek a man with his honde þat
smyteþ his broþer in violence, wherþurgh his bodyly
strengthes beþ enfybled and his lyf yschorted, ðerÞ wrongfullynam
wiþdraweþ his bodylycyne sustynaunce. And he sleek a man wiþ
his tunge þat conseyleþ or procureþ his deþ or falslyche
lyeþ on him wherfore his profyt is lette or abreched. Also
he sleek a man wiþ his tunge þat for hate, enuye or mede
bryngeþ a goed man or a womman out of here gode name or
fame, wiþ fals sclandrynge of here tunge. And alle suche, in as
much as in him is, byfore God þey sleek hem. He sleek a man
in herte and wyl þat wylneþ or desyreþ mannes deþ for eny
worldlycne goed, or eny worldlycne cause or trespas ydo to
his persone, or hateþ him in herte. For Seynt Jon seyb, 'He
þat hateþ his broþer is a mansleer.' And þus whan a man oþer
womman bereþ enuye or haterede in herte to here euene Cristene,
willynge wrongfullycne or enuyouslycne þat myschyf or
vengeancia falle vpon hem, and þerto curseþ in herte and in mouþ,
he is a mansleer; and alle suche, in þat þat in hem ys, þey deþ
perlyous manslawt, for þey sleek here owene soule and also
here euene Cristene. And þerfore God byddeþ þat þou schalt noþer
wiþ honde, ne wiþ tunge, ne wiþ herte do no manslawt.
forfende þem men and wommen to synne in eny manere of lecherye.
And þis commaundement of God sewe þat oper goynge next byfore, þe whyche forfende þe to sle man in his persone, and þis forfende þe to sle man in his felawe. For, as þe Gospel techeth, man and womman wedded be þe on persone by þe lawe of God. And þerfore þes lechours þat foule þe of þes sleeþ in a manner þe felawe of it. And as we seyde of mansleynge, so it ys of lecherye: som is bodylyche and oper is gostlyche. Bodyliche

Capitulum Septimum

The þride maundement of God of þis secound table forfendi þen to synne in ony maner leccherie. And þis maundement of God sewe þe toper, for þe next forfendiþ to sle man in his persone, and þis forfendiþ te sle man in his felowe. For, as þe Gospel techeth, man and womman /weddid ben oo persone bi þe lawe of God. And herfor þis lechour þat fouliþ oon of þes sleeþ in a maner þe felowe of it. And [as] we seiden of mansleynge, so it is of leccherie: sum is bodily

lecherye is in many manere. Somtyme vnwedded man fouleþ
vnwedded womman and þis is cleped communlyche symple
fornycacioun.

T

and sum is goostly. Bodil leccherie is in many maner.
Sumtyme vnweddid man foulib vnweddid womman, and þis [is] clepid
comounly simple fornicacioun. If þat oo part be weddid,
or ellis boþe [t]wo, þame þat is auoutrie, as comoun speche
teþ. Obere parties of þis synne is tua in obere places,
(for þes partis sufficen now) wiþ techyng of her membris.
Goostly leccherie is whame a man forsakip þe loue of his
God for loue of a creature, and þis is a leccherie moost
for to charge, for no leccherie is synne but if þis be þere.

And siþe echame soule shulde be Cristis spouse, what
lecchour þat synneþ þus he synneþ in auoutrie, for he brekiþ
þe maryage þat shulde be bitweme Crist and him þat þus synneþ,
as myche as in him is.
And this word 'lechery', enemy contrary to the virtue of continence and of chastity, is a burning appetite, of a lecherous will, hving fulfill the lecherous delectation of consent, of resoun. For when that resoun wip that whiche every Christian man and woman scholdes govern himself without that alike lecherous appetite but seek full consent to do such sinful deeds, anon he synwel dedlychely he be let from doing. For in crenfolds manere a man or woman may synwy dedlyche on lechery. Furst on herte wendynge and turnynge wytynglyche and wyfullyche [to] vnclene and wykkede lecherous poultes bycause of schrewed delectacioun in poulte. For he wyse man sey in his boke that wykked poultes departeth a man from God. Also Crist himself in his Gospel sey, 'He that see a woman in suche entente to coueity to trespass wip hure anon,' he sey, 'that man haf ydo lecherye wip hure on herte.' (And this same resoun may be vnderstonde of wommen).

And wille stondieth for deed comounly in suche synnes and herfor sey Crist in his Gospel of Matheu, 'He that see a woman for to coueite hir haf don leccherie wip hir now in his herte.'
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Be secunde manere ys whenne /man oper womman delytep himself in lecherous dedes, as in kyssynge and grypynge,
byholdynge [and] spekyenge, 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 fulsylyngge of his wyckede desyres.
And pis is more grettere synne ban be fyrste maner bycause of
his felawe and of more delectacioun pat ofte tymes he takep by
suche vnlawesom feylynge of his membres and lymes.

Be prydde manere is whenne an vnwedded man and vnwedded
womman trespassep in dede doynge. And pis is so gret synne pat
bough they trespassed neuere person bot ones, bot ye hadde
ones grace to amende hem here, they scholde be excluded of they
tyngdom of heuene euere wipoute ende, as wytnessep wel Seynt

Poule in his epistle wher he seybp bus: 'Noper lecheours noper
spousebrekeres schal haue they tyngdom of heuene' (pat is to mene,
bot they amende hem here). And in pis worde pat God bydde pous
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
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be cursed brekyng of be heyse sacrament of wedlok. Bot yf
prestes þat scholde lyue as angeles synweþ in lecherye þey
þe spousebrekeres brekyng þe vowe of chastite, and þenne þer
is sorwe vpon sorwe, for þey scholde be a myrour to þe peple
of alle clennesse.

Here þou schalt vnderstonde þat in þis general worde, 'Þou
schal do no lecherye', God forbedeþ al maner vnlaweful ly[k]ynge
and touchynge of mannes preuy membres or wommannes, and also al
maner gostlyche lecherye and bodylyche in wyl, or word, or dede.

And þerfore kepe clene þyn herte from /assentynge to lecherye,
y mouþ from lecherous kyssynge or spekynge, and yþ membres from
alle lecherous dedys doynge. For wyte we wel þat lecherye is
harde for to [v]encusse in men þat þe þe þronge in here kynde, for
kynde meueþ to þat dede bot nouþ to þat synne. And herfore seþ
a clerke in þis wyse, þat specialycye in þis synne mot a man beþ
t

T

But wite we þat leccherie is hard for to vencushe
in men þat ben þronge in her kynde, for kynde moeþ to
þe dede and not to þe synne. And herfor seþ a clerk on
þis wise, þat specialy in þis synne mot a man be coward
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coward and flee f[value]r occasioun þat meueþ to þis synne. And triste
nouþt to strengþe, ne [holynesse], ne wysdome. For what man was euere
strengere þan Sampson? Who of ous alle was holer þan
Dauyd? Who was more wysere þan Salomon his sone? And alle þes
þre were brenþ wyþ þe fyre of lust of þis synne. And so yf þou
wolt be Cristes clene childe flee as Cristes coward þe
companye of folyes wommen, ne be þou nouþt to famylyer wyþ
non maner wommen.

Pe secunde medycyne æsenst þis synne were to kepe þy
body fro lusty fode, for flesch þat ys yuele yfed synweþ

T
and [fle] f[value]r occasioun þat meueþ to þis synne. And trist
not to strengþe, ne [holynesse], ne wisdom. For what man was euer
strenger þan Sampson? Who of vs alle was [hooly]er þan Dauid?
Who was more witti þan Salamon his sone? And alle þes þre were
brent wyþ þe fier of lust. And so, if þou wolt be Goddis
clene child, fle as Cristis coward cumpenye of wymmen.

Pe secound medicine þat helpþ æsen þis synne were
to kepe þi body fro lustful fode, for fleish þat is yuel fed
B

noust þus commonlyche.

Þæ þrydde medycyne aœnste þis synne were to man and womman bysyen himself in clene occupacioun, for suche lust comeþ noust bot yf þouþt go before. And herefore occupye þ þouþt and þy body in clene occupaciouns and so flee þis synne.

Syþþe adultery is gretter synne þan symple fornycacioun for it is a distruying and a brekyng of þe holy sacrament of wedloke þat God made in Paradyse at bygynnynge of þe worlde ar eny synne was ydo, þerfore eche Cristene man and womman scholde be sore adradde to breke it or mysse it or turne it into eny synne, for þe same Lorde þat made it wolde haue a rekenynge þerof. Take hede how gretlyche God hateþ þis synne. Holy Wryt wytnesseþ þat God spake to Dauyd by þe prophete Nathan and seyd þus: 'For þou hast ydo auoutry wiþ
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þynneþ þus not comounly.

Þæ þrid medicyn aœns þis synne were a man to occupie /hym in clene occupacioun, for suche lust comeþ not but if þouþt go bifoþre. And herfor occupie þ þouþt and þi body in clene occupaciouns, and so fle þis synne.
Vrye is wyf, /e swerde of vengeaunce schal neueie go fram þyn hous and I schal make þe enemies of þyn owen body.' And al þis he fonde sope. For he was afterward euermore in anguyssch and myschief; and Absolon, his owen sone, drof him out of his lond, and, ouer þis, God sende into Davydys londe a gret pestylence, and slowe seuenty housand folke of þe peple in þre dayes.

Also þer bët foure peynes þat euerych man and womman þat brekþ þis holy sacrament of wedloke by adultery schal suffre on þerof in þis worlde or he daye, ouer alle ðer peynes. Oper he schal be pore and yput adoun in þis worlde; or elles he schal deye sodeynlyche; or elles, by som hurte, he schal loste on of his lymes; ðer he schal be ysclaundred and be yprysoned þerfore. Also it is grettere synne to byneme a mayde here maydenhod, ðer defouly a clene wydue ðer eny womman þat ys of lynage to þe trespasser, by kynreden or affynyte ðer gosseprede ðer elles by ðer frendeschep of benefyt3 and kendenesse, þan symple fornycacioun by an vnclene stronge womman, þough it be a gret dedly synne in þre manere, as it is foreseyde. And alle þes maneres of synnes bët forfended of God in þis þynde commaundement of þe secunde table, whare þat he seyþ, 'þou schalt do no lecherye' (þat is to mene ðer bodilyche ðer gostlyche; and of gostlyche lecherye I tolde byfore in þe fyrst commaundement, wel toward þe ende).
Capitulum Octavum

Siā eche hedly synne makib men gilty aēns ipsis maundement and Crist þat we shulden spouse, general speche of synne may be touchid here. And it helpiþ to þenke on þis: hou good Crist is, and hou clene and profitable were it to be weddid wiþ 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 þan wedlok, for wedlok here in eerpe lastiþ but a while and beriþ heggyng of symne, as doiþ not virgynite. And þis shulde moewe a man led bi resoun for to loue castite, siþ God louþ it, and þe eende of getyng of children in þis lijf lastiþ but a while and eendiþ in chastite. And shame we of þes resouns þat þes lecchours maken, þat God worchip wiþ hem to brynge for[þe] men, ne þe Chirche myste not be wipoute her werkis. Soþþ it is
T

pat pe 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 benke hou synne displesi God, for nojing displesi God but synne or bi synne sip fendis and wickid men may not displesi God but bi her synne, as trewe men knowen wel; ne no man may departe fro God but he become servant to synne. And so oonly synne may not serve God, for God may not make synne to be his creature. Synful creaturis, as fendis and wickid men, moten serve God bi kynde pat he syue hem, or doyng pat he biddip hem, or suffryng pat he shapip hem; /but sit God hap ordeyned lawes of synne, as he may not leeue punyshyng perof. And so, al if synne was cause of Cristis passioun, [nepeles] his mercy was real cause perof. Many siche treupis shulde make men to hate synne and loue oure good good.
B

The seconde comaunderment of the secunde table suep in pis ordre and in pis wordes: 'Pou schalt do no pefpe.' Pat ys to seye, pou schalt kepe pe fro pefpe, syfphe by God is trewe, and so pou scholdest noust noye by broñer, noñer in his body, ne in his felawe (pat is his spouse), ne in his worldlyche goedes. Bot here we schulle vnderstone what þynge is þefpe. Peþe ys ta/kynge of goede wiþoute leue of þe lord.  £100
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God bi flyng þefro, for he is þe best spouse þat any man may haue, ne no man may proprely bi weddid wiþ him but if he kepe him euermore fro synne wiþouten eende.

[Capitulum Nonum] Pe Seuent Comaunderment

The fourbe comaunderment of þe secound table suep in pis ordre and in þes wordis: 'Pou shalt do no þeft. Pat is to seie þat pou shalt kepe þee fro þeft, sip þi God is trewe, and so þow shuldust not noye þi broñer neþer in his bodi, neþer in his felowe (þat is his spouse), ne in his worldli goedes. But here shulden we wite what þing is þeft. þeft is takyn[g] of goedis wiþoute leeeue of þe lord. But wite we wel þat God
This 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 neiboris good, al if he grucche aSEN, for God þat is cheef Lord ȝyue þim leue þerto. And so leue of þis Lord sculdest þou algatis knowe and þerbi þeft and leueful vss of ony kyymes goodis. And so bileue techiþ vs þat whoso haue leue of God, and al oonly siche, hap verrey possessioun. And herfor was it seid comounly sumtyme þat al oonly he þat stondiþ in grace is verrey lord of þingis and whoeuer failiþ rist bi defaut of grace him failiþ ritwise title of what þing þat he occupiþ. And cause of þis is for God þat is cheef Lord approueþ not his hauynge, sip it is vnskilful. And herfor Crist techiþ in his Gospel book þat of him þat hap not and hap to mennes semyng shal it be takun to hym þat hap Goddis wille.

And here may we se hou many men ben þeues. For

And pis takynge of godes may be do on meny maneres. On ys
in takynge þy neysæbore godes fro him æsenst his wylle,
oþer by pryuey stelynge, by nyæte or by daye, by londe or by
water, oþer by open robbynge; and þat is whenne men openlyche
take þen menne godes æsenst here wille, or wiþholdeþ wiþ maystry
þat hem falleþ to haue by ryæt, as men þat wiþholdeþ þe hyre
of trewe seruanutes, and also þe seruantes þat serueth nouþ
trewelyche here maystres or wastþe here godes æsenst
þe worcesþep of God and profyt of here maystres: þer may noþyng
excuse hem þat þay ne doþe þepþe. And so no doute þat eche
man þat haþ enþyng wiþoute goode tytle brekeþ þis
commaundement. And syþ no man haþ ryæt to þyng bot he þat
serueþ trewelyche þe Lord of alle þynges, eche man scholde be
bysy to kepe þis byddynge.

Pe secunde manere ys by reuyng þy neysæbore ys goede
wrongfullyche by false sleyþes of mannes lawe, as by false
playntes, by false attachements, or by eny oþer wrong manere.
And alle vniuste men þat occupyeþ Godes goedes doþ þepþe. And
t
alle þes vniust men þat han Goddis goodis [don þeþe]. An so
so lordes of ñe world & ñat serue ñouȝt God trewelyche stelë
Godës goedes and occupyeþ Cristës goedes wipoute his leue
þerto beþ boþe nyȝt ñeues and day ñeues also. And herefore seþ
Crist, herde of alle herdes, þat alle þat comen ñouȝt {in} by
þis doþe beþ stronge ñeues in þës two maneres: þay beþ nyȝt
þeues þat derkeþ in synne, and by fals tyte þat þey fayneþ
on Crist þey spoyleþ þe peple þat beþ [sogest vnto] hem; and þës may
be nyȝt þeues for derkenesse of synne, for no synne ys more derke

lordis of þis world, þat seruen God not treuly steilen Goddis
goodis, for þingis þat þei occupien þei han wipoute his leue,
and þame þese ben þeues. And so, more generally, prelatis of
þe Chirche /þat occupien Cristis goodis wipoute his leue
þerto beþ boþe nyȝt þeues and day þeues also. And herfor seþ
Crist, herde of alle herdis, þat alle þei þat comen not yn bi
þis doþe ben stronge þeues on þës two maneres: þei ben nyȝt
þeues þat darken in synne, and bi false tite þat þei feynen
vpon Crist þei spuyleþ þe pepule suget vnto hem; and þës may
be nyȝt þeues for derkenesse of synne, for no synne is more
B

\( \text{þan lye þus on Criste and seye þat he was worldlyche lord, as} \)
\( \text{Antecryst fayneþ, syp he cleþþ þe fend Prynce of þis worlde.} \)
\( \text{Day þeues þay beþ þat lorkeþ in wodes and more openlyche} \)
\( \text{spoyleþ trewe men. Seculer lordeþ beþ /trees of þis wode} \)

vnder whos power þey lorkeþ and spoyleþ þe peple; and no þyng ys

more contrarye to Crist. Cryst ys þis dore by wham prestes
comeþ ynne, bot þes Antycristes clerkes brekeþ þe roof and comeþ
ynne aboue by pryde of þis worlde and Crist, þat may nouþt lye,
seþ þat þes beþ þeues, for þey takeþ Cristes goedes wiþoute

T

derk þan to lie þus on Crist and seie þat he was worldly lord,
as Antecrist fayneþ, syp he cleþþ þe fend Prince of þis
world. Day þeues þei ben þat lorken in wodis and more openly
spuylen trewe men. Seculer lordis ben trees of þis wode vnder

whos power þei lurken and spuylen þe puple, and noon is more
contrarious to Crist. Crist is þis dore bi whom prestis
comen yn, but þes Antecristis clerkis breken þe roof and comeþ
yn aboue bi pride of þis world, and Crist, þat may not lye,
seþ þes ben þeues, siþ þei taken Cristis goodis wiþouten
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his leue.

De pryde manere of stelynge ys in þes boðe maneres, as by maistries and by sleþe of mannes lawe. And generalyche in þis commaundement God forbedep to his peple alle manere of wrongful geetynge of worldlyche goodes, oþer by stelynge oþer by false sleþes in byynge and syllynge, wytynglyche to bygyle þyn euene Cristene in wyattes or mesure, þan þou woldest skylfullyche wylne þat þy neynæbore dude to þe in þe same caas. For þe schulleþ vnderstonde here þat it is lefful a man or womman þat lyueþ by cheffare or merchauñdyse to sylle dyrere þan he byþ and for to wynne by here merchauñdyse. Bot vnderstondeþ wel alle þat þey schulle nouȝt wynne, ne coueyte to wynne, also mucche as þay mowe gete wiþ eny sleþe or cautele, bot al onlyche to wynne skylfullych and mesurablyche to susteyne hem resonablyche in here trauaille. And in alle manere, for drede of dampnacioun, beþ war in alle sōure byynge and syllynge of oþes swerynyge, for communelyche þat on is forswore in suche swerynyge or boþe. And þerfore, in worde and in dede, do no wrong ne þeþþe.
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his leue. But sit treuþe nedþ þem to write in her lettris þat bi suffryng of God þei ben siche maistris. Pe moost þeef of alle þes, and moost Antecrist, is þe chefteyn of þes þat ledþ þem alle, for he steliþþ moost falsely moo goodis of Crist.
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Capitulum Decimum

Lord whether it be Goddis lawe to sle men for theft? And it seemeth '3is'. For by the lawe of England men ben hanged for theft for a litel ping. Also by the Popis lawe men ben ofte brent for kei susteynen by the lawe bat Ihesu Crist saff, as who seib that the Pope shulde not bus be lord bi title of Crist shal be brent anoon. And so it is of many poynitis that Goddis lawe witnesseth. But the Gospel of Crist contrarie his doyng. For the Gospelle of Luk tellip hou Crist cam porou

Samarie unto Ierusalam and the puple wolde neper herborowe him ne fede him; and his discipulis axiden that fier shulde come from heuene and deuoure hem; but Crist seide, 'Nay,' and reprovid his apostlis, and seide thei knewen not whos spirit thei weren, /sif he himsilf cam not for to lese memes lyues but for to f.22r

saue hem. But Antecrist hab ordeyned euen contrarie lawe that he may not grounde in the lawe of God: that who that tellip him his synne, hou he contrarie Crist, he settip him faste afyre

16 who] that] whoso H
(for that 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 þei shulde not fynde þat þis were leueful to þe viker of Crist. But Antecrist doíþ þis bi his worldly power and power of his fader. Wel y rede þat blasfemes in þe Olde Lawe shulde be stoned to deep, for þei ben moost eretikes. But in þe Newe Testament y trowe þat men shulden caste stoones of þe Gospel, whiche is oure bileue, and telle hem sharply hou þe shulden trowe; and if þe wolen {not} assente forsake hem as heþen men.

As anentis þe lawe of Englond, it is seid bifore at it is not our craft to iustifie it but iustifie Goddis lawe and þat shulden alle men do. But oo þing y trowe: þat more defaut is seyn in execucioun of þis lawe þan in þe lawe itsilf. For it falliþ ofte tymes þat þeues ben more punyshid for her þeft of God þan hangyng bi her nekke. And ofte tymes it may be þat God wole þat þei be turned bi sorowe of herte and make good
T

for her synne.

But here men replien for lawe of oure lond, and seien þe rewme shulde not be kept in pees but if siche iewesse were ordeyned for þeues. But here may men se bi þe lawe of God þat greet cause of þeues in þe rewme of Englond is vneuen departyng of temporal goodis. So if alle goodis þat oure Chirche is dowid wiþ weren in seculer memes hondis, as it shulde be, þeues wolden be fewer, for þe nede were þe lesse. But þe secound triacle æens siche þeues were to preche Goddis word, as þe apostlis diden; and þat wolde conuerte moo þan hangyng or sleyng, as more þeues of þe Chirche ben suffrid and mayntened and fewe men dar telle hem defautis þat þei don. But þe þridde medicyn, groundid in Cristis lawe, æens alle siche men þat don æens God shulde be siche medicyn: bi lawe of þe Gospel þei shulden be warned /pires, as Crist himsylf biddip; and at þe fourþ tyme þei shulden be exilid fro trewe memes cumpany as heþene or pubplicans; and, os Seynt
B

The fifth commandment of God in his second table

forbad all men to speak false witness against their neighbour. And his is needful to execute his lawe, for God's lawe and men's lawe ask witness, and of suche witness come judgment of men, [and falsede of wytnesse make false iugement].

And so [errore in] wytnesst streche wel fere, for manye /be/ dysherted and men be hanged by suche false wytnesse and of his spryng many false heyes and other synnes

T

Ion techip, men shulden not heile hem for whosuer heilip hem shal part of her synnes. And men of his Gospel trowen hat his medicines shulde purge rewmes of wickid men betere han mannes lawe.

Capitulum Undecimum

The fifte maundement of God in his secound table

forfend al men for to speke fals witnesse asens her

neisbore. And his is nedeful to execute his lawe, for Goddis lawe and mens lawe axen witnesse, and of siche witnesse come judgment of man, and falsed of witnesse makip fals iugement.

And so errour in witnesse strechipe ful fere, for many

ben disheritid and many ben hanged bi siche fals witnesse,

and of his springip many fals eyris and operse many synnes, for
manye, for pe whiche God takep vengeaunce of men. For as pe rote of vertues spryngē ful fer, bope in places and tymes, so it ys of synnes; and þis scholde meue men to leue false wytnesse.

For whoso wytnesseþ false, he wytnesseþ æsenst trewe þe and syþ God himself ys trewe þe he wytnesseþ æsenst him. And so what man dop eny dede þat himself graunteþ he dop it on Godes half. And so whanne he wytnesseþ fals he takeþ God to wytnesse þat þyng þat he seþ is trewe and of God and, syþ þat þyng ys fals, as mucche as in him ys he makeþ his God false and bryngeþ him whiche God takþ vengeaunce of men. For as pe roote of vertues spryngþ ful fer boþe in places and tymes, so it is of synnes; and þis shulde moeue men to leewe fals witnesse.

Whoso witnessþ fals, he witnessþ æsenst treuþ and sip God hymself is treuþ he witnessþ æsenst God. And also what man dop eny dede þat hymself grauntþ he dop it on Goddis half. And so whanne he witnessþ fals he takþ God to witnesse þat þyng þat he seþ is trewe and of God and, sip þe þyng is fals, as myche as in hym is he makiþ his God fals and bryngeþ
to nouȝt. For God may nouȝt be bot yf he be trewe. *And ãus*
no man berep fals wytnesse bot he reuerse God and alle þe seyntȝ
of heuene, se *and* alle creatures. For alle seyntȝ in heuene
*and* alle creatures wytnessep trewȝe of here God aȝenst him þat
lyȝp. And so he þat lyȝp forsakþ his God, as he forsakþ
himself syp he aȝensyeþ him. He mote forsakþ his God syp he
forsakþ trewȝe; *and* he forsakþ himself syp he seyþ kyndeleche
þat God himself ys trewe, [al] yf he seye þe contrarye. And syp
he mot nede in [lyynge] haue an auctor, it is no drede þat in

him to nouȝt. For God may not be but if [he] be trewe, *and*
noon beriep fals witnesse but if he reuerse God *and* al þe
seyntis of heuene, she *and* alle creaturis. For alle seyntis in
heuene *and* alle creatures witnessen treuȝe of her God aȝens him
þat lyȝp. *And* so he þat lyȝp forsakþ his God, as he forsakþ
himself, sip he aȝensyeþ him. He mote forsakþ his God sip he
forsakþ þe treuȝe; *and* he forsakþ himself sip he seiep
kyndele þat [God] himself is treuȝe, al if he seip þe contrarie.
And sip he mot nede in liyng haue an auctor, it is no drede
B

Bis he holde \( wib \) fader of falshed. O how orryble it is a man to forsake his God and take him to \( fende \) in body and in soule, bot \( dus \) dop \( pes \) men \( pat \) berep fals wytnesse. And so eueryche \( pat \) berep fals wytnesse blasphemep in God and sey\( p \)

\( pat \) he is fals, bot specialyche \( pat \) b[1]yndep him to Godes lawe and sey\( p \) \( pat \) it is falsest of alle o\( per \) lawes, and more he \( pat \) dampne\( p \) a man as an ere\( tyke \) for he hol\( dep \) Cristes worde and sey\( p \) \( pat \) it is so\( pe \). And ye we take hede, \( pes \) \( pat \) sillep \( pe \) trew\( pe \), o\( per \) for worlde worschep or fa\( ou \)r o\( per \) mone\( ye \), passep
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\( pat \) in bis he holde\( p \) \( wib \) fader of falshed. O hou horrible it \( fise \) man to forsake his God and take him to \( fende \) in body and in soule, but \( dus \) dop \( pes \) men \( pat \) beren fals witnesse. [And so euery man \( pat \) ber\( e p \) fals witnesse] blasphemep in God and sey\( p \)

\( pat \) he is fals, but specialy \( pat \) man \( pat \) b[1]yndep him to Goddis lawe and sey\( p \) it is falsest of alle o\( per \) lawes, and more he \( pat \) dampne\( p \) him an eretik for he hol\( dep \) Cristis word and sey\( p \) it is so\( pe \). And so, if we take hede, \( pes \) \( pat \) sillep \( pe \) trou\( pe \), o\( per \) for worldis worship or fa\( ou \)r or money, passen

B: 5 blyndep] bynde\( p \) 6 more]\( p \) more \( pat \) an

T: 1 \( pe \) om. H 2 to forsake] forsake H 3-4 And so...

...witnesse] om. T 5 \( pat \) he] he H, blyndip] byndep HTY 6 seip]\( p \)
saip \( pat \) HY, more]\( e \) moreoure H 7 him]\( p \) a man HY, an] as HY 8 seip]\( p \)
seip \( pat \) Y 9 o\( per \) ow\( per \) H, or Y, worldis] worldli Y, passen] he passep H
Judas Scaryoth in syllynge of Crist. Scaryoth solde his maister for on of þes þre whanne his body was vnknowe and dedlyche and noust ygloryfyed as it was after þe resurreccioun. Bot he þat sylleþ now Crist þat is trewþe on alle þes wyses, sylleþ Crist whanne he ys ygloryfyed and vndedlycþe and yknewe Lord and oure Sauyour. But here men meueþ communelycþe wher it be lefful to lye. And summe seyþ þat it is lefful for to lye in mesure for a beter ende and it is crafte to knowe þe vertue of liyng, for meny lyþþ to mucche and meny to lytel, and he þat holdeþ him

Judas Scarioth in syllynge of Crist. Scarioth solde Crist his maister for oon of þes þre whanne his bodi was vnblissid and vnknown, but he þat now sillþ Crist on alle þes þre wises, sillþ Crist whanne he is blissid and knosen Lord and Saueour.

But here men moeuen comounly wheþer it be leueful to lye. And many religious seien þat it is leueful for to lye in mesure for a bette eende and it is craft to knowe þe vertu of liyng, for many men liyen to myche and many men to litel, and he
B

in a mene hāp vertue of liyenge. Bot here seyþ alle wyse men, by wytnesiþ of seynt3, þat þe craft of liyenge is euermore vnlefful for it comeþ bot of þe fende þat fyrst makede lessyngges, and yf it were lefful it worshipide Crist þe mene persone of God þat is þe fyrste trewþe. And þefore ich dar wel seye, by wytnesiþ of byleue, þat nōpyng contraryþe more Crist þan dop lessyng; so þat yf a man myste, by a pryuey lesyngge, saue al þis worlde þat elles scholde perysche, sit scholde he nouþt lye for sauynge of þis worlde.

T

þat holdeþ him in a mene hāp þe vertu of liyng. But here wyse men seien, bi witnesse of seyntis, þat þe craft of liyng is euermore vnleueful for it comeþ but of þe fend þat first made lesyng, and if it where leueful it worshipid Crist þe mene persone of God þat is þe first trewþe. And þefor y dar seie, bi witnesse of bileue, þat nouþt more contrarieþ Crist þan dopþ lesyng; so þat if a man myste, bi a priuy lesesynge, saue al þis world þat elles shulde perisshe, sit shulde he not lye for sauynge of al þis world.

And so þre craftes, as seyþ men, beþ hard bot þe [ferþe] craft ys algate vnlefful. Fystynge and pleynge and scornynge ys harde, bot sit may a man do alle þes in charyte. Bot for to lye vpon treþ þowe sownþ þewe charite, for lyenge on God may he neuer þyreþe. Soþely it is hard to fyþte wiþ man by charite, bot sit it may be doo sþ God bydde þlee men. And here it is doute communelyche where it be lefful to fyþte; and we mote nedelyche seye so, sþ God himself haþ ordeyned it and bede it in þþ Olde Lawe, as many ensamples telleþ. And þis mote

And so þre craftys, seien men, ben hard but þe fourþe craft is algate vnleueful. Fistyng and pletyng and skornyng ben hard but a man may do alle þes in charite. But for to lie vpon trouþe sowneþ neuer charite, for liyng on God may [he] neuer þrise. Soþeli it is hard to fiþte wiþ man bi charite, but sit it may be don sþ God biddþ sle men. And here it is douted comounly wheþer it be leueful to fiþte; and we moten nedely seie so, sþ God /himþilþ haþ ordeyned it and bedun it in þþ Olde Lawe, as many samplis tellen. And þis
we graunte, but holde his byleue: þat no man bot by charite
scholde fyste wip his enemy. And so, as me semþ, yf fystynge
be lefful it mot be by byddynge of /God and in Godes cause,
and ende of þe fystynge scholde be Godes worschep. Bot now
men fystþe in mannes cause, for pryde and coueitse and noust
for Godes worschep. And herfore it is lyckle þat batailles ydo
nowþe a day þeþ ydo out of charite and by þe fendes meuynge. For
Crist we clepeth trewelyche a pesable kyng, and fro þe tyme þat he was
man he bad no suche batailles bot boþe bad and procured pacience

moten we graunte, but holde þis bileue: þat noon but bi charite
shulde fyste wip his enemye. And so, as me þinkþ, if fistyng
be leueful it mut be bedun of God and in Goddis cause, and eende
of þe fistyng shulde be Goddis worship. But now men fisten in
mannes cause left biddyng of God, for pride and for coueitise
and not for Goddis worship. And herfore it is licly þat batels
doon today ben don out of charite and bi þe fendis moeuynge.
For Crist we clepen treuly a pesable kyng, and fro tyme þat he
was man he bad ne siche batelles but boþe bad and procuride paciens
B

and pees and suffre iniuryes and so bye ous pees.

Pledyne and scornynge ys harde to do wel; and no man dop his leffulyche bot yf he kepe charite to him pat he pledip wip and him pat he scornep, as yf he trowe to purge him of his olde

5 synne by his. It is lefful to pled wip him or scorne him

syv at pe barre of Crist pleyde hys seyntes, and Crist himself scornep, as pe Salme seyp. Bot lyege openlyche aensecyv
trowpe and herfore Crist himself may noust lye, for he loueyp it noust bot hatep.

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 wip and him pat he scornep, as if he trowe to purge

5 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 himsylf scornep, as pe Salm seip. But

liyng openly aenseci he treupe and herfor God himsylf may

not lye ne bidde his seruaunt to lye, for he loueit not.
B

Bot for to knowe his commandment he betere se schulle vnderstonde pat a man may bere false wytnesse aens his neysebores in pre maneres, pat is to seye in worde, in dede, and in pes bope togedere. In worde a man or woman 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 seftes or elles for hate or enuye berep fals wytnesse aenst here neysebores to make him loste here herytage or ober worldlyche 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 ourne neysebores and to ourne neysebores, so pat we nober aepyre hem wrongfullyche nober enuyouslyche wip ourne tunges nober wip ourne hertes; nober pat we generalyche bere fals wytnesse aenst hem to blamyng of hem, nober to accusynge, nober to /excusynge of hem falslyche, nober of ousself. For God soueynlyche hatep lesynges, for he ys soueyn trowpe himself and eucryche lesynge is aenst trowpe. And perfore whanne se schullep speke seyep he trowpe or he sope. And yf se wolle noust seye he sope bep stylle, or elles makep no lesynge nober berep no fals wytnesse wip soure moup.
In dede men bereb fals wytnesse aens t here neyæbores
whanne ðey dope grete synnes and so wipdraweb falslyche here
helpe ðat ðey scholde doo to here euene Cristene, helpynge
hem by here gode lyuynge toward ðe blysse of heuene. For
se schulle vnderstonde ðat orryble synweres harmeb alle
opere synweres, and also ðay wipdraweb falselyche here helpe
ðat ðay scholde doo to Cristene men and to gode men by here
goede lyuynge. For by vertue of ðis article of oure byleue,
'Credo in sanctorum communionem' (ðat is to seye, 'Ich byleue
into communynge of alle holy seynt3'), [we byleue], and sob it
is, ðat alle gode men in erpe and alle seynt3 in heuene helpeb
euerych opor to be ful blessed in heuene in body and in soule.
And so alle gode communeb here goednesse togedere and alle
schrewes communeb here schrewednesse togedere. And þerfore,
syb a mannes dede bereb more redylyche and more verrylyche
wytnesse what he ys, yf he wipdrawe falselyche his helpe and
his gode lyuynge fro his neyæbore to helpe hem bope to
heueneward, and yf he so þurgh synne be aboute in dede to
drawe him and his neyæbore to helleward, þan ðat man
falselyche in dede bereb fals wytnesse aens his neyæbores.
þan, yf a man bope in word and in dede bere fals wytnesse aens

B: 10 we byleueþ] om.
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his neyæbores to be aboute to vndo his body, to leese his goedes, to byreue him his name and his name falslyche and to brynge his soule to helleward, þan he most schrewedelyche bere wytnesse in worde and in dede, and also in bope /two falslyche ænset his neyæbore. And þerfore God bydde þat þou scholdest nouȝt in word ne in dede nouȝt in þes bope two bere ne speke fals wytnesse æns þy neyæbore.

Þe syxte commaundement of þis secunde table forfendeþ þe to coueyte þy neyæbores hous. And men vnderstondeþ þerby communely þat þou scholdest nouȝt coueyte amys goedes of þy neyæbore þat þep vnmeuable and þep suche þynges þat þep nouȝt alyue ne of power to meue hemself fro on place to

T

Capitulum Tertium Decimum et Nonum Mandatum

The sixte maundement of þis secound table forfendþ þee to coueite þi neisboris hous. And þen vnderstonde þerby comounly þat þou shuldest not coueite amys goodis of þi neisbore þat þen vnmeuable and þen siche þingis þat þen ben not on lyue ne of power to moeue hemsilf fro oon [place] to anóþer

B: 3 schrewedelyche] corr.int.
anoper, as beþ hous and clopynge and óper ornamentals. And þis commandement toucheþ þe grounde of alle yuel hauynge of suche maner goedes. For no man hap wronglyche eny suche goedes bot yf þe grounde of his hauynge be fals coueytyse.

And so, as a weed ys þan wel ypurged of a londe whanne þe rote ys drawe awey, so þes foure commandements bet þanne wel ykept whanne þe fals coueytyse ys ful qwenched. And herfore seþ Poul þat þe rote of al wyckedesenesse is wyckede coueytyse in a mannnes herte. For as seþ coueytyse makeþ debates

as boþe housis and cloping and ópere ornementis. And þis maundement touchþ þe ground of al yuel hauyng of siche maner good. For no man hap wrongly ony siche goodis but if þe ground of his hauyng be fals coueitise. And so, as a weed is þanne wel purgid of a londe whame þe roote is drawen awey, so þes foure comaundementis ben þan wel kept whame þe fals coueitise is /fully quenchid. And herfor seþ Poul þat þe roote of alle yuelis is wickid coueitise in a mannes soule.
bytwene reme and reme, cytee and cytee, toun and toun, man and man. And communelyche alle stryues and bryges and debates beþ caused of coueytyse, and of vnlefful loue of worldlyche goedes and forsetyng of God and of heuenelyche goedes.

And þerfore wiþ al myn herte ych conseyle alle men and wommen in God þat þe coueyte no mannes goedes wiþ wrong bot holde 30w apayde of þat þat God haþ sende 30w trewelyche ygete. For yf 3e lytle haue, of lytle 3e schulle rekene; yf 3e muche haue, of muche 3e schulle þeue rekenynge, to þe leste peny opher halpeny þat 3e receyue of God here in erpe how þat 3e spende it. þerfore wel is him þat haþ lytel and holdeþ him apayed of lytele and þonkeþ God. For a dredful rekenynge schal ryche 3elde. And þerfore coueyte 3e /no mannes goedes wiþ wrong.

For Seynt Gregory wytnesseþ of þe ryche man þat Crist spekeþ of in þe Gospel, þat he was noust punsched in peynes of helle for rauyschynge and mystakynge of opher mannes goedes, as some opher þeues dop, bot for he 3af noust of his owene goodes to hem þat nedede. What peyne, þerfore, schal he be punsched þat wrongfullyche takeþ or coueyteþ opher mannes goedes wiþ wrong?
And no man may excuse men of religioun that ne he breken
his nynpe maundement: as freris bi her beggyng coueiten amys
be goodis of her nei3boris, as her dede shewep, pe chirche
hat is dowed coueitihp amys pe rentis and pe housis of seculer
men. Siþ God hab forbode hem to be siche lordis, as boþe pe
Olde Lawe and pe Newe beren witnesse, and siþ his is so opun
æsens Hooli Writt and so stefly defendid, it is eresie.
And so comounly prelatis ben eretikis, and more deply þan
ópere men ben. And siþ men þat consenten to hem ben
eke eretikis, þe more hedis of þe Chirche ben smyttid wiþ
eresie and, bi þe lawe of eresie, óber men boþe, siþ goostly
dedis of siche prelatis blemyshe her doers and hem þat
approueþ hem. And siþ it is æsens þe maundement of God þus
for to coueite þe hous of þi nei3bore, myche more it is
æsens Goddis wille to coueite þus þe hous of þi God.
For chirche is not oonly hous to þi God, but it is comoun
hous to many of þi nei3boris. And so alle symonyeris and
properis of chirchis synnen æns þis maundement as depe eretikis, and he þat autorisib siche dedis is principal eretik. Ne trowe not þes folis þat speken as pies and seien þat sum symonye is opun eresie and sum is noon (but þei 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, þat is doon bi þe Pope is so myche þe 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 sib þei ben fals techyng, contrarie to Goddis lawe and stifly defendid, and, bi þis same skile, eche bulle of a fals prest. Þis sentence seib Grosthed and draweþ it out of Greke. Lord, wheþer þe witt of God forbedde siche coueitise of pore housis of men and not worse coueitise of his owne hous þat shulde be Hooli Chirche! But þe Gospel seib þa[t] Pharisees /sy[u]en þe gnatt, but þe camel þei deuoure hool. f.24
Bot here men may doute where it be lefful to coueyte oþer mennes goodes vpon alle manere. And it is no drede þat ne it ys lefful to coueyte opon goed manere, for þus alle seruantis serueþ here lordes to haue of here goodes for to lyue wib. Bot þe rote of many synnes stondeþ in þis: þat grettere men coueyteþ lasse menne goedes and fayleþ in here seruyce, for fewe men dar axe hem. And þus Salomon seyþ þat þe waterleche haþ two dousteres þat syngeþ þis sang: 'Bryng, bryng' (of þoure goedes), for þat þey coueyteþ most. Soþ it is

**Capitulum Quartum Decimum**

But here may men doute wheþer it be leueful to coueite opere mennes goodis vpon al maner. And it is no drede þat ne it is leueful to coueite opere mennes goodis vpon good maner, for þus alle seruantis seruen her lordis to haue of here goodis for to lyue wib. But þe roote of many synnes stondeþ in þis: þat gretter men coueiten lesse mennes goodis [and] faien in her seruiyse, for fewe men dar axe hem. And þus Salamon seþ þat þe watirleche haþ two doustris þat syngen þis song: 'Brynge brynge' (of þoure goodis), for þat þei coueiten
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pat lordes schal haue rentes of here tenaunt3 whanne pay
dop he seruyce pat he chef Lord axep, pat is whanne pay
ledep here tenaunt3 in resoun and defendep Godes lawe aens he fend, and whanne pay faylep herynne hey bep tyraunt3. And
amercememts wipoute resoun ys a pryuey spoylynge, for non
scholde amercy oper bot by he wey of charite to amende in
maneres he man pat ys amerced; and pis may be wel ydone ryst in
many causes. Bot pat oper dou3ter of pis waterleche synwe
more in pis synne meny wyse. Fyrst he ys waxe grete by
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moost. Soop it is pat lordis shal haue rentis of her
tenauntis whame pei don pe seruyce pat pe cheef Lord axip,
pat is whame pei leden her tenauntis in resoun and defenden
Goddis lawe aens pei fend; and whame pei failen heryme pei

ben tyrauntis. And mercymentis out of resoun is a priuey spuylyng,
for no man shulde amercy oper but bi law of charite, to amende
in maneris pe man pat is amercyd; and pis may be wel don rist in
many casis. But pe toher douster of pis waterleche synne
more in pis symne in many wise. First she is waxen greet bi
lordship of his world asens pe wyl of God. And pis doph muche harme, for by pis pey leeuep seruyce to here sugget3 and [byseye] hem many weyes to souke blode of hem, for pey secheb 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 sugget3 and syllep hem leue aesen to duelle in here synne. And pis ys a newe péfpe þat Antecryst hab founde aensen þis commaundement for þis fendas coueýtise. And here þey syllep trewþe and hele of mannes soules, lordship of his world asens pe wille of God. And pis doph myche harm, for bi þis she leueþ seruyce to her sugetis and bisieþ her many weies to souke blood of hem, for she sekiþ her rychesse and not helpe of her soule. And as she turnep Goddis lawe to lawe of þe fende so she clepiþ 'correcciouns' robbynge of her sugetis and silleþ hem leue aesen to dwelle in her synne. And þis is a newe þefþe þat Antecrist hab founden aensen þis maundement for þis fendis coueitise. And here þei sillen treuþe and hele of mennes soulis, and þis is
and his Church. But here his children argue for their party and say that by laying off grace men fall from just title of goods that they occupy of their chief Lord. And by his colour it is said that the Pope

5 Innocent he pridde axed of Englund nine hundred marke by seer, for Kyng Jon, as he say, fell asens God and therefore Cristes vycarye scholde axe his [eschete]. But soo it is that lords synwe ofte tymes and fallen fro his worship that his God have them, but his blynde leches knowen his noust, moost contrarie aens God and his Chirche. But here his children arguen for her part and seinen bi leesynge of grace men fallen fro iust title of goodis that bei occupiuen of her cheef lord. And bi his colour it is seid that

5 Innocent he pridd axede of Englund nine hundrid mark /bi seer, f.25r for Kyng Jon, as he sey, fel asens God and herfor Cristis viker shulde axe his eschete. But soo it is that lordis synnen ofte tymes and fallen fro lordship that her God hap syuen hem, but his blynde leches knowen his not, ne whame
ne whanne þey turne ðæn by grace of her God. And herfor no creature is ferfer fro his offyce þan ben þe prelates of þe Churche, for Crist hath put it fro hem boþe by her blyndenesse and forbedyng of þes rychesses. And so God wole men occupye rychesses of þis worlde, al if þey be in greet synne, and bye it by her almesse, and to haue grace of verry repentaunce and clene schryfte, for hope of mercy and forœuenesse is in knowelechynge of her trespas. And somtyme he ordeynede to putte hem fro her lordship, but none scholde do þys offyce bot whanne God bad him. And þis mercyments of prelatis were sumdel

þei turnen ðæn bi grace of her God. And herfor no creature is ferfer fro þis office þan ben þe prelates of þe Chirche, for Crist hav put it fro hem boþe by her blyndenesse and forbedyng of þes riches. And so God wole men occupye riches of þis world, al if þei ben in greet synne, and bi it bi her almes. And sumtymes he ordeyned to putte hem fro her lordship, but noon shulde do þis office but whanne God badde him. And þis mercyments of prelatis were sumdel

grounded in resoun ye pay 3af to pore men ȝes goodes ȝat
ȝay takeþ. Bot [marke] it to here [kychen] is no goed almesse,
bot harméþ boþe partyes and noryscheþ more synne and makeþ ȝes
prelates forfete ȝe more aソンst God. And bot ȝey amende hem,
angeles schulleþ bynde hem boþe hondes and feete and caste hem
into helle et cetera.

'Pe laste commaundement of God ys bede in ȝes wordes:
shalt not desyre pe wyf of ȝi neyþebore, ne his
seruante, ne his mayde, ne his oxe, ne his asse, ne al ȝat ys

amend hem, aungels shal bynde hem boþe hond and feete and cast
hem into helle.

{Capitulum Quintum Decimum} Decimum mandatum
The last maundement of God is bedun in ȝes wordis:
shalt not desire pe wiȝf of pi neisborne, ne his seruant,
ne his mayden, ne his oxe, ne his asse, ne al ȝat is his.
B

his. 'And so in pis commaundement is desyre forbode þat ys
vnskylful of þes syxe þynges. And for men coueyteþ more þes
þan þay dop dede þynges, herfore hete of coueutyse ys wyslyche
forbode. And here we may see þat synne of mannys wylle was
5
forbode to þe fadres of þe Olde Lawe, for ofte tymes it
falleþ þat þe synne ys more grounded in yuel wyl þan þe
dede wipouteforþ and herfore Crist, oure heuenlyche leche,
forfendeþ suche desyre.

T

And so in þis maundement is desijr forbedun þat is vnskilful
of þes sixe þingis. And for men coueiten more þes þan deed
þingis, herfor hete of coueitise is wisely forbedun. And
her may we se þat synne of mannes wille was forbedun to
5
fadris of þe Wolde Lawe, for ofte tymes it falliþ þat þe
synne is more grounded in yuel wille þan þe deede wipouteforþ
and herfore Crist, oure heuenly leche, forfendþ þiche desijr.
For he were vnwaar leder þat shulde teche men þe weie and
ledde hem vnto þe pitt bank whanne suyrer wwere þe biside.
10
And so þes ten commaundementis ben lawe suyrest of alle
and of moost autorite and eke of moost mede. And herfor shulden men leeue al priuat religioun and wandre in pis weie in God hap put vs ynne. And siþ þes ten lawes techen al þe wille of our Lord, þis lawe shuld be holden and operen lawes dispisid, but if it be groundid in þis and declare þis lawe. And so, siþ lawe of þe Emperour and lawe of þe Pope ben worse þan þis lawe bi a þousyndfold and þes letten knowyng and doyng of Goddis lawe and ofte tymes ben eresies contrarie to þis lawe, many men þenken þat Goddis lawe itsilf shulde be red and lerned and sued in dede. For þer is no caas þat ne it wolde decide it, and stable rist and pees bitwixe men in þis weie, and brynge hem to blisse of heuene þat is oure best eende.

{Capitulum Sextum Decimum}

But here men douten comounly, siþ Goddis lawe is trewe bi eche part of it and no falshed is þeryme, hou scip Seynt Jame þat he þat brekip oon of þes maundementis of God he is gilti of hem alle; but it semeþ nay, bi many resouns. For many men knowen oon and knowen not anoþer and
skilful God wole not blame men for that pei knowen not.

But here shulde we trowe that al Goddis lawe is fulliche trewe, or ellis God were fals, and more eresie of fendis was never noon foundoun. And so shal we trowe that pe same God that spak in oon autour spak in hem alle. And so James seip soop, if we take hede. Ne it is not ynow, as many men seien, that he that brekip oon kepip not hem alle, for it is more to seie 'he is gylyt in alle' than it were to seie 'he kepip not hem alle'. And so Goddis comaundementis ben knyttid togidre, that whoso kepip oon wel he kepip hem alle and whoso brekip oon he is gylyt 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 parsonne ne in men that shulden yue him the sacraments of God, God techip hym to loue God and herof holde him payed. And so as men wexen in elde so shulden pei /wexe in kummyng and kepyng of pes comaundementis, til pei come to heuene. And so in many
degrees kepe men þes maundementis. But negligence is perelous
siþ it makiþ men breke summe. And so no man shulde lerne
but þes maundementis or þat disposiþ to hem, as oþer
Goddis lawe. But here laweris grucchen and seien þis is not
soþ, as many men þer ben þat kepen not her Sabot for þei
come not te þe Sabot; but hou shulden þei kepe it, but if
God had broȝt hem þerto and herto ȝuyen hem power? Also
many men þer ben þat han no fadris; and if þei hadden eldris
it were vnresonable þat þei shulden neuer do ouȝt but
worshipe her[ r] eldris, for summe heestis, bi her kynde, bynden
not for euer. And also, if þis were soþ, eche man were
holden to lerne þes heestes ten and noon oþer þing, and so
marnes lawe shulde turne to nouȝt for noon shulde lerne it
ne kepe it, but what were it þame? Here shulden we trowe,
as it is seid bifore, þat eche man shulde kume þes ten
heestis of God, ne God failiþ him not þat ne God techiþ hym
þes but if þe defaut be in man, for God may not faile; ne
God axiþ neuer kepyng of þes ten maundementis but now more and now lesse, as resoun wole telle men. And to þe first resoun we answeren on þis wise: þat eche man, be he neuer so song and what tyme þat he dye, shulde kepe þis þridde heest. For eche man hab mynde, syuen of God, to þenk on his God and to plese him. And so, if a man lette not himself, he shulde willen to plese God, and þat God takip for fullfilyng of his biddyng. And so if þou haue mynde Goddis lawe biddip þee 'haue mynde' to kepe þin haliday and not for to kepe it. And so a man þat is deed bifoare he come to haliday, bi general þenkyng he holdip þis heest. And so aftir þe day of doom he kepip þis last Sabot. To þe secound resoun we answeren þus: þat eche man in þis world shulde worshipe his fadir. For if he haue noon eerþeli fader, as Adam hadde noon, ne if he hadde noon /siche eldris, sit alle han we God and þan shulden we worshipe God as oure Fader. And siþ alle þingis [þat shal] be ben present to God and whoso doip þe
T

wille of God is brôper to Crist, sisterre and moder, euer
ing man in his 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

5 affirmatyues and opere bynden for euere, as pe last of pe
first table and pe first of pe secound table bynden euemore
men but not for euere to do siche dedis þat þe heest
specifieþ. But whoeuer loueþ his God he worshipiþ his e
eldris. To þe þridde obiect we answeþre on þis wise: þat

10 no man shulde lerne but heest of his God or þat helpiþ to
kepe Goddis heestis. And so no man shulde here ne lerne
opere þing þat were contrarie to kepyng of þes heestis.
And sib alle false lawes ben contrarie to Goddis heest and
lawes maad of men ben powdrid wip eresie, it semþ ful

15 perelous to stude þes lawes, and specialy sib power
þat God hap souen man is litel ynow to lerne Goddis lawe
and studyng in mamæs lawe lettþ lernþing of Goddis lawe.

T: 3 for] sum for Y 5 affirmatyues] afir matynes Y 6 secound table]
secuude Y 8 loueþ] wirschipeþ and loueþ H, not cauc. Y 9 answer] answere T
And so men synnen greuously bi lernyng of mannes lawe, but more þes þat ordeynen it and mayntenen it and suen it.

For soþ it is þat aftir a man loueþ a lawe he loueþ þe autour of it and eende of þis lawe. But he is cursid of God þat as myche loueþ man or richesse or worship þat comen of manmes lawe as he loueþ God or þe blisse of heuene.

Expliciunt Mandata, Amen.

T: 3 he loueþ] trs. HY 5 worship] worshiþes H 7 Explicit Mandata
Amen] Expliciunt Mandata Dei H, Here eendiþ þe x comandements and bigyneþ
Feiþ Hope and Charite Y
And in his word, 'Thou shalt not desire the wife of thy neighbour, as say the Saint Augustine, y's forbidden all manner of covetise or will to do lechery. For I tolde sov byfore in the prydde commandement that God forbed all manner of deed of lechery, but some foole paraunter wene that, yat, if thou do not that deed, that it were not peril enough. And whilome that men ywete that it is not so. But for al so muche that God knoweth fully the bothe body and soul, to be lest of man's herte, and more verraylyche see elected every deed of our herte than eny of our 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 that knoweth bothe body and soule (for God wole haue alle clene wipoute and winne bothe), whanne God byfore hadde forbode alle fleschelyche deed out of trewe wedloke, in his commandement God forbed all manner of vnclene and vnlefful coueytyng and desyrynge of dedes of flesche, and byddeth that thou shalt not coueyte thy neysebore servant ne his mayde, [and] for of a mannes housholde after himself a mannes wyf is most precious to hym, if he be bothe wel yrewled, therefore

B: 19 and om.
God byd/dep specialyche þat þou schalt nouȝt coueyty þy neyȝebores wyf ne non ȝer womin man for lecherye. And ryȝt as God forbedeþ ous alle manere lecherye in body and in soule, in dede and in wil, ryȝt so herebyfore God forbedeþ euerych man and wooman alle manere of þefpe. Bot for menȝ wolde stele and þey dorste for þe gale wes and þay weneþ þat it be no synne bot þey dyde it in dede, God scheweþ þe contrarye and bydþep þat þou schalt noþer stele ne coueyty wrongfullych þe mer ne goedes. And þis is þe te[n]þe commaundement of God, so þat in þes seuene commaundements of þe secunde table þat techeþ ous how we schulle haue ous to oure euene Cristene, and in þe þre commaundements of þe fyfte table þat techeþ ous to loue God aboue alle þyngeþ, ys al Godes lawe. And as þis lawe was wyryte in two tables, so it ys fulfylled in þes two loues, þat ys in loue of almyȝty God and in loue of oure euene Cristene. And þes two loues beþ two hestes of þe Gospel. Crist in þe Gospel fulfilleþ al þe lawe in þes two hestes and seþþ þus: 'Loue þy God and þy neyȝebores.' In þis wyse þou schalt loue þy God: fyrst wiþ al þyn herte, þat nopyng be nyr in þyn herte þan God; þou schalt loue God in al þy soule, þat þou ne soffre no synne abyde in þy soule for loue and

B: 9 tenþe teþe 19-21 (mar: Matheu 22, Mark 12, Luc 10)
B

drede of by God; in al by mynde, bat noþyng be so muche in by mynde as God; and þou schalt loue him wip al by myst, þat þou 5 ne spare for no myschef to queme God.

Pe secunde precepte of þe Gospel ys þat þou schalt loue by neyþebore ryst as þyself, in goed and noust yn yuel noþer in synne, bot as þyself gostlyche and noust fleschlyche; for fleschlyche loue drawep to synne and þat ys hate. And þou schalt loue him as muche as þyself in hele and sykenesse, in wele and in wo; also eueneleþe wip þyself, so þat þou loue eche man in body and soule more þan worldelyche wele or goed; gostlyche as þyself, so þat þou /schalt loue by neyþebore ys soule more þan þyn owen lyf and raper leue þyn owen lyf þan soffre a dedly synne be do, lettynge by þy power; also wel as þyself bodylyche, þat þou helpe him in his nede as þou woldest þat he helpe þe in þy nede, for lawe of kynde techeþ þat no man scholde do oþer wyse to his neyþebore þan he wolde skylfullyche þat his neyþebore dyde to him in þe same caas, and þis byddek Crist in þe Gospel and seþ þus:

'Alle þynges þat 3e wole þat men do to 3ow dop 3e þe same to hem.' And yf þou loue by neyþebore in þis wyse þou louest God, for Seynt Bernard seþ þat God is noust yloued wipoute loue
Bat man schal haue to his neyæbore, ne þæ neyæbore ys nouȝt yloued wiþoute loue þat man schal haue to God. Bot and we wol come to loue of God wham we seþ nouȝt, ous nedþæ to loue oure neyæbore wham we seþ, and herþore axeþ þæ apostel Seynt Jon, 'How may he loue God wham he seþ nouȝt, þat loueþ nouȝt his broþer wham he seþ?" And þus yf þou loue þy neyæbore, by þe whiche neyæbore beþ alle maner men and wommen of what degre or countre oberlonde eueray be, frende or enemy, vnderstonde..... For who þat hateþ on man of alle þe wyde worlde, he hateþ Crist þat ys God and man. For Seynt Bernarde seþ þat he þat hateþ a man hateþ Crist, and also he seþ þat whateuer in gode werkes he offere to God he schal loste it. For Seynt Poule seþ, 'Yf I schal æue alle my godeþ into metes of poure men and my body to brende in þe fyre, and I haue no charyte,' he seþ, 'it profyþæ me nouȝt.' (Pat ys to mene it profyþæ me nouȝt into encresynge of blysse in heuene, bot it helþæ to haue more plenteþæ of erþelyche godeþ and to haue grace þe raþer to come to amendement, and yf he be damþned to peyne of helle he schal suffre þe lasse peyne). And so godeþ dedþæ, workes, prayerþæ and almesse dedþæ þat beþ ydo out of charyte schal ne/uere brynge a man to £106}
blysse of heuene bot yf he haue grace to amende him here.

And perchore loue ȝe ȝoure neyseqe bore as ȝe scholde and þen ȝe kepeþ þes ten commaundements of God. For Seynt Poule seyþ þat he þat louë þis neyseqe bore hæp fulfilled þe lawe, for he þat louë þis neyseqe bore dop non yuel; wharfore fulllyng of þe lawe ys loue. And herfore I dar hardylyche seye yf we kepe þis lessoun into oure lyues ende þat heuene blysse schal be oure heritage. For, as Crist seyþ himself þat may noust lye, 'Whoso louë me he schal kepe my worde,' þat ys to seye þes ten commaundements ybede of Godes owene moup. And þes we kepeþ wel whame we dop as he byddeþ ous in þe Gospel of Seynt Jon whare he seyþ þus: 'Þis ys my byddenge, þat ȝe loue togedere as ych haue yolued þow.' And þus we louëþ eche oþer yf we kepeþ þe order of loue forseyde, for þis ys Godes worde. And þenne þe Fader of heuene schal loue ous, and come to ous, and make his dwellyng place wiþ ous: þat schal be in heuene blysse þer ys Godes dwellynge, in ioye and blysse euerelestynge wiþ God and his holy angeles and alle holy seyntþ, in þe whiche ioye and blysse he ous graunte place to dwelleþ þat brouþte 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....byddynge] This passage corresponds to the first section of the DI Prologue, cf. BVV pp.317/8-24.

T1/2 men] For H's expansion see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (7).
B2/1, T2/1 byleue] In general the Christian faith, but perhaps referring specifically to the first article of the Apostles' Creed, cf. BVV pp.6/33-7/2.

T2/3 pe 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).
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).

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, PR 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 eidem personae, quam generales orationes, ceteris paribus, eidem' (FZ 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, PR pp.309-10). Even for those in purgatory, however, the preferred Lollard method of assistance was through the 'preier of good lif' (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.85-87). It was also possible to be buried in friars' clothing (Wyclif, Polemical Works i.35/7), a practice described in LFC 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 TVV pp.8, 9.


B4/11 Seynt Austyn] Augustine, De Civitae Dei xx, c.20 (PL 41.687ff.)


B5/5 þe wyse man] Ecclesiasticus 14:12.

B5/11 seynnes seggeþ] e.g. Augustine, De Civitae Dei xiii, c.10 (PL 41.383); Bernard, Sermones de Tempore, Sermo xvii (PL 183.250.C).


B5/15-17 wheþer......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 Aurea 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.
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 H (7)) it has not been felt necessary to emend the reading found in T.

T6/5 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 For the importance placed by Lollards on the teaching and preaching function of the priest see *Introduction* pp.xcvii-xcviii 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 See Luke 16:1-13, the parable of the steward. LV translates the Vulgate *vilicum* as *baili* (EV uses *fermour* but offers *bally* 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.4"ff.). The use of the pronoun 'we' suggests that the passage was originally written by a priest.

T7/4-11/4 For Lollard reading practices see Aston, 'Lollardy and Literacy', p.197ff.

B7/5 For similar exhortations see *DP* 1.i.327-8, *PC* pp.81-2 The
passage in B shows no sign of the concern over restrictions on the teaching of religious matters evident in DP (I.327/3-5), which may either result from or anticipate Arundel's Constitutions of 1407-9 (see Hudson, PR 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 LL (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, PR 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 therefore 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.


B10/4-5 Be al.....God] Ecclesiasticus 9:22.

B10/8-11/5 in to bope......ten commaundements] Passage corresponding to DI cf. BVV 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 techeıp] Romans 13:8-10.

T11/2-4 pat.....commaundmentis] H's omission of this passage is due to eyeskip.


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 been emended.


B16/1-15 A similar interpretation of the escape from Egypt appears as part of the first commandment commentary in *PC* (pp.26-28), and see also Arnold iii.18-23.


B16/16 Seynt Austyn] Not traced, but see e.g. Augustine *In Joannis Evangelium*, tract.xli (*PL* 35.1693ff.).
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.

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'.

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 BVV p.171/22ff.

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).

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 BVV as the greatest of the dangers to beset the newly shriven (BVV 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 [ep 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, *PR* pp.291-2).

B18/16 **ground and begynnynge of alle sacraments**] 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.


B18/20-21 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 **sacraments**] 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 ristwis lyf ys þe beste in mannys preyere, for such lif preyeþ betture to God þan hyȝe voyses of ypocrítes' (*EWS* i.456). See also *LL* 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).

B19/16-17  **wytnesses, sermonyes and domes**] Translating the Vulgate 'testimonial haec et praecpta 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).


B21/10, T21/7-8  **Seynt Jon seyeb**] 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).


B23/4-7  **Pis is vnderstone.....here God**] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. *BVV* p.318/5-9.

B23/6-7  **what.....God**] See note to B21/2 above.

B23/9, T23/2  **seyb 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. BVV p.318/35.

B25/12, T 25/3 Poule] Colossians 3:5.


B26/3, T 26/3 Criste Ihesu bydde] Matthew 5:5.

B26/4-27/3 And so hye pat settep.....deppur in helle] passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV 319/5-25.


B26/13 Seynt Gregory] This reference comes from the DI version cf. BVV p.319/17-18: 'And þerfo seip seint gregori. In libello de conflictu uiciorum & 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 Voltunno near Beneventum (PL 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.296v. For the attributions to Augustine see notes to the relevant sections of the Decretals.


B27/23-28/3 Also.....eche to oþer] Gratian, Decretum ii, C.xxvi, c.16 (Friedberg i.1045) (with explanatory additions).

B27/24-25 'Egyptians'.....'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 HS p.14/369, and DP p.182/22 ff. Objections to magic and superstition were traditional in commentaries on the first commandment, see e.g. LFC p.34/175-81, DP p.167-8, HS p.13/339ff.

B28/19-29/12 Also.....dayep] Gratian, Decretum ii, C.xxvi, c.16 (Friedberg i.1045) (partial summary).

B29/10 Poule] 1 Corinthians 10:31

B29/20 as ðe prophete seyþ] 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.295r).

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.....ôbere 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.152r). A fuller version of the Holcot passage appears in B (see below note to B35/18).

B31/1 Bede] Bede, Liber de Templo Salomonis, c.19 (PL 91.790C-791C) (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 seyf' (B31/1-2 cf. DMD p.159/13), makes it clear that the passage has been drawn from Wyclif.

B32/11  worschep 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.6v.

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 imagines tam bene quam male possunt fieri'. The same passage also appears in the Floretum (f.331v/13ff.), in the Latin Rosarium (f.151ra-b) 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.....[bei shulden ellis] For a similar view see DPLi.90/22-3, Rosarium 101/4-10, citing Gregory, Epistolarum 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 100/13-16.
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T33/6-7 ddc stokkis] For similar descriptions of images see SEWW p.88/199, DP I.i.105/31ff.

T33/7-9 cf. Wyclif Sermones i.91/18-19 'securem foret, ut in leges veteri, quod omnes tales ymagines sint delete', quoted in the Floretron (f.166r/6) as part of the discussion of the first commandment.


T34/7 breed of be 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.i.iii, c.27 (Friedberg i.1360). See also Rosarium 100/35ff.

B35/12 anoper lettere] 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.1-2, 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 Laurence] 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 yproperd to God] i.e. latria, see B32/11 above and note.


B37/11 pe conseile of Thoby] 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 (PG 1.1341), quoted in Rosarium (p.99/7-29), the Floretum (f.332'/7ff) and in B40/14-17 below. See also Arnold iii.463/11ff., SEWW, p.85/91-6.
B40/18-19 noust....seyntes] For a similar view see Rosarium 100/33ff.: 'Ymages of seyntis bene no3t to be dispised' and cf. Floretum f.331'/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 mowe 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.
B43/10 a gret clerke] Grosseteste, De Decem Mandatis p.18/8-9,

B43/13 Crisostome] Pseudo-Chrysostom, *Opus Imperfectum in Mattheum, hom. xlii* (*PG* 56.873) (abridged), quoted by Wyclif, *DMD* 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 *DMD*, it seems clear that *DMD* was an intermediate source for these passages.


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 syppc] 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 *DMD* 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..... [he lasse] This sentence occurs in some versions of PC 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 himyslf] 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 [he] pres [he] ynges....] See Wyclif, DMD pp.98-9, quoting Grosseteste: Tria sunt, inquit, invisibilia Dei; scilicet potencia, sciencia et benignitas, ex quibus procedunt omnia'.


T50/4 soundely] For H sumdele see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (5).

T50/4 bodili p[ingis] 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.

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).


B51/1-3, T51/1-3 Pe 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.


B51/7-52/4, T51/7-52/4. See B14/4-15/5 and notes.

B52/6, T52/6 Criste teche] 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, *PR* 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., *TWTP* p.74/1637-8 and note.


**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. *PC* pp.39-40, *DP* i.i.227-9, Wyclif *Sermones* iv.415, *DMD* p.203ff., *TWTP* p.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).
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).

*Me fynke...harde vengeaunce*] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV 321/2-37.

*Philippians 2:10-11.*

*Ecclesiasticus 23:12.*

*Hebrews 13:14.*

For a similar gloss on this passage see Rolle's *Psalter* p.176, 'and thaire sepulcrs ere thare howsis. that is, thai wene that thaire faire and dere graues may last til menyng of thaim eucrmare. thof thai be in hell. noght in sepulcrs: for thare the saule is. thare is the mast partes of the man.'

H's omission here appears to be due to eyeskip from one *his* to another.

A similar argument is put forward by Wyclif, *DMD* 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 'substantialiter'. Everyone else, 'fidelis vel infidelis', only exists by assuming God's name, i.e. by participating in his *esse*, cf. Aquinas *ST*i,q.61,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 *sib.....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.


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 ff.60v-62v). 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 wyilyng gouerne' see Rosarium, G f.105v. 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.113v/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 he gospel'. For further emphasis on Christ's example and for Old Testament support for clerical poverty see

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. LL 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 hat 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 rauelyn] Compare Wyclif, *Polemical Works* i.149: 'Unde iste videtur locus blaspheme heresis, quo anticristi discipuli seducent multum populum et spoliayt 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.....e 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 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.104v/11-105v/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 (*DMD* 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 *DMD*, with a discussion of servile work may suggest that the B/TYH version was the source for the Harley 2339 version rather than *vice versa.*

T70/8  laz] For H restid see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (4).

T71/2 kep9] 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  bce cystepc age] See Wyclif, *DMD* 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* lxxxiii.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 'rmyþ wip þes sixe' (T71/8-9) and cf. *DMD* p.212 l.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. xxx (PL 35.1635), cited by Wyclif, DMD p.216. T's version here is closer to the DMD reading than is B's cf. DMD p.217 ll.11-12: 'opus peccati est opus maxime servile'.


B73/2-4 pat lettep.....moost in] For this emendation, see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in B (1).

BT73 6 goynge to be 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 works 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.99', Augustine, Sermones de Scripturis ix, c.3 (PL 38.77)).

B73 9-10, T 73/10 no more than a myle] cf. Wyclif, DMD p.224, defining the iter sabbati of 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
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, PR pp.147-8. The reference to punishment need not necessarily, however, imply punishment of Lollards. As Anne Hudson has pointed out (PR 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).

For examples see DMD pp.220-1.

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.

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 the chapitre lawe chargen more traveile on the Sondaie than thei done a deedli synne, done thanne or in opir tyme'.

B76/2, T 76/2 medful] cf. DMD p.217/17: 'possunt bene fieri', which suggests that T 'nedeful' is an error.

B76/5-79/22 For it ys......the blisse of heuene] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV 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.'


B77/11-12 as holy doctores seyp] See Wyclif DMD 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 nofer 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).


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 (FZ p.280, item
and questions on this topic were asked at Lollard interrogations: see Hudson, 'The Examination of Lollards', p.133, item 12.

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.: 'pame pore men þat beþ stalworpe and stronge schulde nouȝt be cleped to þe feeste of beggers, for þei mowe quyte hit wip her trauail. Noþer riche feble men, noþer riche halt men, noþer riche blynde men schuld be cleped to þe feeste of beggers, for þei mowe quyte hit wip her catel.' The reference to Fitzralph is drawn from the DI version; see *BV* p.324/15. For Fitzralph as a Lollard saint see Hudson, *PR* pp.171-2; Walsh (1981), pp.452-68.

For Wycliffite objections to costly clerical clothing see *DOP* p.434, *LL* p.41/19. As Arundel recognised in his interrogation of William Thorpe (*TWT* p.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.

*foyre 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 1b(c): 'the inward compulsion of the New Testament (as a substitute for the external compulsion of the Mosaic law').

80/14-15 Seynt Poul techiþ] 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 adiuverit. 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.....öper] The omission of this passage by H appears to be due to eyeskip.

T81/7-8 God tauste be Iewes] Leviticus 23:32.

T82/1 as clerkis seien] See Wyclif, DMD, p.210, citing Grosseteste.

B82/8ff., T82/9ff. cf. EWS iii.11/31-4: 'And sîþ al þat fel in þe olde lawe was figure of Iesu Crist, and he made hymself man, it is sôþ þat treuþe is maad bi Iesu Crist whanne he was man, for þanne 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.89v-90r), and for criticism of ornate churches see Rosarium, p.71/2-4, quoting Jerome: 'Wat profete is it þe waldez for to schyne wiþ 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 SEWW p.117, 79-83, Aston, "'Caim's Castles'", pp.47-8. Such complaints were not, of course, confined to Lollards (see e.g. PP p.26/60-72). For criticism of clerical expenditure on food see T153/2 and note.

T83/7 shulent 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 bus.....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 pay.....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 (FZ p.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 Wyclif, 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. BVV p.324/35-325/11.

B89/16 God sleek 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 'comissionibus
vacet et luxuriae atque conviviis potatorium', cf. LV, 'he syueth tent to
glotonyes, and lecherie, and feestis'.


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"-166"). (Edited Arnold iii.188-201, from Cambridge, Corpus Christi MS 296).


B92/8 ten hestes] For the central importance of the commandments to Lollards, see *Introduction* p.xciv ff.


B92/15ff. som men setteþ here chyldren] A similar comment appears in the DX version cf. Bodl.MS Laud Misc. 23 ff.12'-13': 'Certis sich faderes and modris ben more cruel to hemself and to her childery þan þous þey al tohakkeden here songe childryn whame þey were cristenyd as smale as fleys to þe pot.' The whole of this DX passage is similar to that found in B.

B93/14 Seynt Poule spekeþ] I Timothy 5:8.

B94/10ff. Passage related to DI cf. *BVV* p.325/11ff. Only the definition of the first type of father and mother corresponds exactly to that found in *BVV*, 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 þre 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 one's priest only 'in ðat ðat Godes lawe techep'.

B94/18-19 alle his pareschesen bep as oure moder] This comparison does not occur in the DI version as it appears in BVV (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 ðat þou haue] This omission by HTY is due to eyeskip. The emendation is in accordance with the 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:

[1] it were forto wite ouer hou curatis wasten pore memus

godis in makinge þer kyn riche; bisyde ðat þey spenden in þer
ounue persone; & þus ben many in englond maad riche fro ful
symple staat. & it semyþ ðat þe kyng of pride haþ tauþ þis bi
his firste syme, for many curatis han delit to haue riche men
of þer kyn.....but þe bilewe of iesu crist shulde teche men to
quezche þis 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 ll.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.....þan 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. BVV 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 DOP 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; DOP p.414. Again, the argument is that priests misappropriate money which should be spent on the poor (TWT p.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 DMD p.301, DOP p.418. In the latter case a critical judgement is to result in the withholding of tithes.


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.

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 do see chapter on the textual tradition, Errors in H (3).

T100/5 shulde not syue her bishops lordshipis of his 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 (FZ p.279, item x). For earlier condemnations by Gregory XI of the suggestion that ecclesiastics might be deprived of their temporalities see FZ 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, PR 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** Wipouten 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 Wyelif's main objections to the Eucharist were metaphysical (Workman ii.30), but see Catto p.274ff. for Wyelif's emotional reaction to what he saw as the idolatry of the Eucharist. Keen argues that Wyelif's original objections were scriptural (Keen in Kenny (1986), p.11ff.). For Wyelif'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. Wyelif, *Sermones* iii.410/13-15.

**B101/5-102/12, T102/1-2** I have not been able to identify the 'grete clerke referred to here. For a similar view see Wyelif, *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* (G f.46').

**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 Dymok 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] T has been emended in accordance with HY which appears to have marginally the more difficult reading.

T104/7 ony] T has 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 synne] T has 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 sey] For the types of consent see Floretum f.58'41ff. 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 (G f.24'), although the fifth type, corresponding to B's 'wiȝdraweþ his help', appears here as 'letteþ or helpeþ'. 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 be prophetes of be 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'.


B107/4, T107/4 prelate] 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 asenst 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 triuautes is
concerned, spelling with initial tr- is characterised by Hudson as
distinctively Lollard (TWT p.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 seere' 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.


T109/4 sleyng of her owne briperen 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.498ff. The order of the material in the HTY versoin, 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 De 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 ordis hat 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. BVV 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 be 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 dispositionem soli Deo cognitam ipsam corpori copulare et alias secundum indispositionem sibi soli cognitam a corpore separare.....Ideo inter quatuor peccata ad Deum clamancia homicidium est primum atque precipuum. Nam Genesis IV, 10 legitur quomodo Dominus dixit ad Caym....'


B112/6 abreched] not recorded but presumably a form of abbrege, 'to diminish'.

B112/13 Seynt Jon] I John 3:15.

B113/5, T113/6 as be Gospel techep] Matthew 19:5.

T114/5 Opere parties of his synne] For these see e.g. Wyclif, DMD pp.347-8, Rosarium, G f.68'-69v, Wenzel (ed.), Fasciculus Morum, p.667ff.

B115/1-4 And his word.....delectacioun] This passage appears in the Floretum at the beginning of the section on Luxuria (f.159v/10-12).

B115/8ff. cf. the questions to be asked in the confessional, Mirk, Instructions for Parish Priests pp.138-41.
B115/12 *be wyse man sey[y] *Wisdom 1:3.
B116/11-14 *And his is.....wipoute ende*] For a similar opinion see PC p.60.
B116/17-117/12 *And in his worde.....lecherous dedys doyne*]
Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV p.326/34-327/11.
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 -e- 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 *be secunde medyczne*] See Wyclif, DMD p.448/12: 'Luxuriat raro non bene pasta caro.'
B119/6-9 *Sypp[e adultery .....was ydo] cf. Grosseteste, De Decem Mandatis p.65/14-17.
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 *echo* and emendation see chapter on the textual tradition,
possible TY joint errors (4).

B123/ff., T123/9ff. This section expresses Wycliffite views on
Dominion, see Introduction pp.ciii ff.; Kenny (1985), pp.42-55; Hudson,
PR pp.359-62; and cf. Wyclif, DMD 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 quiilibet 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 withhold tithes and
offerings from sinful clerics, it is not permissible to withhold rents from
sinful lords.

T124/8-11 And herfor......he occupiep] cf. Wyclif, DCD i.62-3 and
passim.

B125/1-4 And bis.....open robbynge] Passage corresponding to DI, cf.
BVV p.329/8-11

B125/15-17 Pe secunde manere.....wrong manere] Passage
corresponding to DI, cf. BVV p.329/12-15.

B125/18-126/3, T125/1-126/3 alle vniuste men.....day beues 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 spoyleþ þe peple* cf. the definition of day thieves in the English sermon (*EWS* iii.319/13-16) as 'pese men þat aftir þis entre robben þe peple þat þei schulden keþe boþe 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 kus...*feyneJ) See the bull of John XXII, *Cum inter nonnulos* (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, þat 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 þefpe*] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV p.329/15-33.

T129/2ff. For discussion of this passage see *Introduction* p.cxxvii.


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.


T130/11 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, PR pp.337-42 and, for the Lollard Disendowment Bill, SEWW 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, DCD ii.88ff. Part of this argument, the passage on the criticism of ecclesiastics including the Roman pontiff (DCD 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 himself biddip] 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] Byber 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 falsheede* 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.286-9, 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 seynts* 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 *Enchiridion* 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.

B138/1ff., T138/1ff. cf. *EWS* i.402: 'But hit is seyd comunly pat pre þingus ben harde to men: to scorne men needfully, or medfully plede wiþ men, or ellis for to fiste wiþ men by þe weye of charyte.'

B138/6, T138/6 *God byddeþ slee men* See e.g. Joshua 8:1-2,18, II Samuel 5:23-5. For Lollard attitudes to warfare see Hudson, *PR* pp.367-70. Wyclif's view in *DMD* 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 now[be a day] For the effect of the Despenser's Crusade on Wycliffite views on warfare see Introduction p.xcvi; Hudson, PR p.368.

B139/8-140/1, T139/8-140/1 cf. Arnold iii.138/29-32: 'bot I rede not in Gods lawe þat Cristen men schulden cum byfore in feghting or batel, bot in meke pacience. And þis were þo mene whereby we schulden have Gods pees.'

B140/7, T140/7 as þe Salme seyþ] Psalm 2:4.

B141/1-143/7 Bot for to knowe.....asens þy neysebore] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV p.329/38-331/8. For a possible source for this passage see Wyclif, Sermones i.139-40.

B141/3 in þre 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 BVV p.9.

B144/6, T144/6 þes foure commaundements] i.e. the last two and the closely related sixth and seventh commandments.

B144/8, T144/7-8 seyþ Poul] I Timothy 6:10.

B144/9-145/13 For as se seeþ.....wip wrong] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV p.332/24-39. Note that in BVV 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.


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 [e 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.58'/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 DOP 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 Graece, 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, DCD ii.58-9: 'Docet Lyncofoliensis in quodam libello speciali istius materie quod heresis est dogma falsum scripture sacre contrarium pertinaciter defensatum.....et istum sensum dicit Lyncofoliensis se extraxisse a Grecorum sentenciis; et concordant Latini catholici').

B148/7, T148/9  Salomon seyp] 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  amercements/ 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).

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.

*eschete*] B *eche ser* has been emended in accordance with the more technical HTY reading.

For the inability of priests to judge the state of a man's soul see e.g. Wyclif, *Sermones* i.138, Matthew p.333/16-18.

*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, PR pp.366-7), although Wyclif believed that it was right to withhold tribute from a tyrant if by doing so you could end his reign (DCD 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'.


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 benken] 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 DMD p.75.


T156/4 shal] See note to T63/5 above.

B161/1-162/9 And in his word.....menne goedes] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV p.331/13-332/6, 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).


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.


B165/6-17 And herfore.....in ioye] Passage corresponding to DI, cf. BVV p.333/16-28.


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 j; and u and v have been treated as u when representing a vowel and as v when representing a consonant; s appears after g, and p 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
abide v. await B5/5; remain B162/21. abide pr.3sg. awaits B5/4, forbears B77/6,8. abide pr.subj.sg. B5/19
able v. enable B73/8, T73/8
aboute adv. as adj. be ~ be diligent B55/3, T55/3, B79/2
abreched v.pp. diminished B112/6 (see note).
absoluciuons 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; doeb ~ copies B46/4
after, aftir conj. to the degree that, in so far as T160/3; ~
pat B47/12, T47/2
agregip v. pr. 3sg. aggravates T99/3. aggregen pr. pl. T54/8
agreuyd v. pp. troubled B78/18
aSen adv. in return B150/7, T150/6; back B152/1, T152/1
asens prep. against B8/16, B10/2; harmful to B12/10, T12/7; contrary to
T146/7
asenseyp, asenseip 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
alooped _pat.sg._ escaped B17/22 (see note)
also _adv._ just as B26/16; as B128/12
alto _adv._ completely B56/18
alperheyst _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
amendment _n._ come to ~ become a good Christian B164/18
amercements _n.pl._ penalties imposed at the discretion of the
    court (as distinct from statutory fines) B149/5
amery _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
anguysscn _n._ distressing circumstances, hardship B120/3
ano(o)n, anone _adv._ 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 ~ 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
attachements 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 B79/15, B89/1
auyse v.refl.imp.sg. resolve B55/1, T55/1
auouteres n.pl. adulterers B42/11,12,15
auoutrye n. adultery B42/9, T114/4, B119/14; auouterye
   B44/5; avoutrie T114/11
auter n. altar B36/3,4; breed, sacrament of pe ~ the Host T34/7,
   B35/12-36/1
autorisip v.pr.3sg. gives official sanction to, approves T147/2
autorite see auctorite n.
auforiae v.imp. keep watch B5/14
awey(e adv. as adj. is ~ is lost B3/2, T3/2
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,
   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
behest see byhest n.
behoteb v.pr.3sg. promises B95/9. byheyste pa.t.sg. B19/23
benefytes, benefyts 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. beþ, ben pr.pl. B2/7,8, T2/7,8; beþ 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. ~ vp support T64/7. bereþ pr.pl. B64/7
berynge vbl.n. behaviour B27/5,6
bescherewe v. curse, speak ill of B93/2
best(e, beest n. beast, animal B8/7, B67/4, T67/4, bestes pl.
B27/18, B28/25, B29/16
bette comp.adj. better T136/8
beþenke see biþenke v.
by, bi prep. for B47/4; per B151/5, T151/5
bydde, bidde v. command B6/4, T6/3; pray B79/9. byddeeþ, biddip,
byddyth, byddeth pr.3sg. B3/6, T3/6, B11/8, B91/5. byt, bid
bygyle v. deceive, dupe B27/20, B128/6. 
bygylep, bigilip* pr.3sg. B106/5, T106/5
byheyste see behoteþ v.
byheyste n. promise, pledge B90/19; "londe of ~ Promised
Land B91/10. 
byleue, billeue n. (Christian) faith, Creed B2/1, T2/1; belief
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

byneme v. deprive of B120/13
byreue v. deprive of B141/5,9, B143/2
bysy adj. diligent B5/17, B62/4, B125/14; devoted B37/16. 

bysye, bisie v.refl. occupy self B79/12-13, B82/1, T82/4.

bysyep*, bisieþ pr.3sg. B150/3, T150/3. 

bisy imp.sg. bestir self B79/1

bysyliche, bisily adv. diligently B1/10, T1/11. 
bisyloker comp.
bytyme adv. in good time, early enough B27/1

bitokene v. symbolize T72/2. 
bytokene, bytokene 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 B78/13, 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 B1/8, T1/9; quasi prep. other than B6/4, T6/3; 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. brenynge 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, bryngep v.pr.3sg. ~ in draws in, through B15/4, B52/3,
   T52/3. brynge imp.pl. ~ for bring up B90/21. broust pa.t.sg. ~ forth
   brought up B86/5, T86/5; ~ ymne introduced T110/13
brystyl, bristle 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 comeb v.
casten v.pr.pl. refl. ~ hem set themselves T110/10; cast pp. 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
certis, certes adv. certainly T34/9, B93/3, T110/7
chaffaryng vbl. n. business affairs or dealings B28/10
challengib, challengib v.pr.3sg. claims B62/7, T62/7
charge n. burden B11/10, T11/9, B64/2, T64/2
charge v. for to ~ blameworthy T114/9. chargib, chargib pr.3sg. values B83/3, T83/4. chargib pr.pl. instruct B92/6. charge imp.sg. attach importance to T81/9. charged, charged pp. packed T15/1, B46/13; censured T108/8
chastescib v.pr.3sg. disciplines B46/16
chastement n. discipline B45/10
chastib v.pr.3sg. disciplines B45/18. chastib reprimand pr.pl.
B93/13
chasty v. reprimand B91/21
chastyng(e) vb.l.n. (proper) training, discipline B91/1, 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
clepe, clepi v.pr.3sg. calls B43/2, T51/7. clepe, clepeth,
   (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,
   T62/3
colour n. argument B151/4, T151/4
comenynge see commune v.
comcep v.pr.3sg.ind. ~ of comes from B53/5; originates with B137/3,
   T137/3. camen  pa.t.pl. ~ yn came about T110/6
commune v. communicate B59/2, T59/2; comene B9/20; commeny
   participate B45/12. commeneb, communeb 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(l)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
conteynep 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 B44/10
correcciouns n.pl. punishments B94/8, B150/6, T150/5
costelewe adj. costly B83/1
costep v.pr.pl. spend B92/20
coueytise, coueityse, coueytyse n. covetousness B25/12, T25/1, T33/6,
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 B44/3, B86/9, T86/9; creation
T122/11. creatures, creaturis pl. B50/1, T122/11, B134/3
crokedede adj. crippled B79/19
cullep v.pr.pl. kill B93/19
cure n. spiritual responsibility 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. ~ heues those who steal in the daytime, robbers, bandits B126/3, T126/5, B127/3, T127/3
daye(<p> see d eye v.
dalyance n. conversation B10/5
debate n. at ~ 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. defaultis pl. sins T131/12
defende(<p>, defendi(<p>) 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.
defoule(<p>) pr. pl. pollute B37/21
defoylidyde 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. daye(<p) pr. pl. B29/12. dayc 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. departe(<p) pr. pl. separate B115/13. departed v. pp. divided B7/4; separated B84/6
departynge vbl. n. sharing T131/6

depe adj. grievous T34/10, B77/5, T147/1. deepest sup. deepest B26/13
depley adv. grievously T146/8
derkep, darken v.pr.pl. are in darkness B126/6, T126/8
despense, dispense n. expenditure B62/4, T62/3
despysèp, dispisèp v.pr.3sg. treats with contempt B56/12, B89/21, T99/13. dispesèp pr.pl. B94/6. dispise pr.subj.pl.
despysèd pp. B56/3
despysète, dispijtt n. contempt, defiance B76/16, B91/22; harm T99/11
destynëes n.pl. predictions of a person's fate B29/3
dignytes n.pl. excellent qualities, attributes B38/14, B39/1
dyire 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 discerning B55/1, T55/1
dysherted, disheritèd v.pp. disinherited B132/7, T132/12
dysmale adj. unlucky B27/25
dysplersance 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


T148/9

doute v. be uncertain B70/1, T70/1. **douten** pr.pl. T155/15.

  devout(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. ~ away** pulled up B144/6, T144/6

drede n. *it is no ~ 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

eende n. taile ~ pudendum T23/4

eendelyche, eendely adv. greatly B33/6, T33/3

  Egyptians adj.pl. unlucky B27/24 (see note)

egrey v. **refl.imp.sg. arouse self B38/2

  eyse see yse n.

eyris n.pl. heirs T132/13

ekke 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

enchauntments 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 B2/2, B8/19, B21/5; ony T2/2, T21/6,8

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

entryred 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 n. garden T109/11

erbis n.pl. medicinal plants T109/11,13,14

ernesses n.pl. foretastes B42/2


errour(e n. deviation from the truth T132/11; of ~ sinful, unsound B7/3, T7/3. errours pl. false or heretical beliefs or practices T34/10, T100/2, errores B47/14

eschete n. escheat, confiscation of land B151/7*, T151/7 (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(ε adv. exactly B49/4, T49/5, T129/15; ~ after in exact accordance with B27/2; ~ wiþ as much as B44/3
euenelelyche adv. equally B163/9

euydence n. into pis ~ as an indication of this B32/7
execut(e pp. carried out B2/7, T2/7, B90/8
exponyng vbl.n. expounding B31/1
expounne v.pr.3sg. expounds B79/18
fagen v.pr.pl. flatter, deceive with false praise T109/17
fayl(l)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, fallip pr.3sg. T98/4,
T130/15, B154/6; ~ to haue is allotted to B125/6. fallep, fallen
pr.pl. ~ in pertain to B47/15, T47/4. 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. falsier comp. more falsely T59/4,
T62/6; falsoker 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 v.
feylynge vbl.n. touching, handling B116/9
**feyne** v.pr.3sg. pretends B127/2, T127/2. **feyne**p, **feynen** pr.pl.
B63/8, T63/7; ~ vpon invent concerning T126/8; **fayne** ~ 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

**ferruentloker** comp.adv. more ardently B38/8

**fygure, figure** 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 sexaul intercourse B161/15; **flesclyche** 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

**forbedep, 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
forfendeþ, forfendid v.pr.3sg. forbids B87/8, T87/9, B88/4, T88/4. forfendid, forfended pp. 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
fou(e adj. evil, wicked B23/11, T23/3, B78/13. fowler comp. more sinful, more vile B27/7
fouleþ, fouliþ v.pr.3sg. defouls B114/1, T114/2. fouleþ, fouliþ 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
fuyliþ 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
geteþ 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 sponsorship 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, ygrauc 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
gredcl 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
grypyngę vbl.n. holding, embracing B116/2

gryslıche 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. ~ aen complains, grumbles T124/3

se, she adv. indeed B10/9, T10/1, B105/3, T105/4

seftes n.pl. gifts B141/7

selde v. render B145/13. sylde imp.sg. B32/14

ser(e, seer n. year B28/4, B151/6, T151/5. seres pl. B5/10

serde n. stick or rod used for punishment T15/5, B46/16

sif, 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

sit(e, sitt adv. yet B21/1, T21/1, B45/3

saf pa.tsubj.pl. B153/1, T153/1. syue(n pp. T4/3, B62/2, T65/4;
seeue B4/3, B151/9; souen T62/2, T99/7, T159/16

syuyng vbl.n. giving T108/4

sok(e n. yoke B11/10, T11/9, T98/12
song adj. young T156/13, T158/3
half n. behalf B135/6, T133/7
halyday, haliday n. day consecrated to religious 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)web,
  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
hardelyche adv. with confidence B165/6
harlatry(e) n. obscene behaviour, sexual immorality B92/17, B94/7
bate 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, deadly B21/3, T21/3, T57/2, B58/1
hederys, hedgecris n.pl. executioners B103/6, T103/6
hedly adj. capital, deadly T121/2
beggyng vbl.n. enticement T121/11
hey see hy 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. heysest sup. B62/3; hisest T62/3
heile v. shelter, protect T132/1. heilip pr.3sg.T132/1
heynesse, hisnesse 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; hemself 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 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
her(e v. worship, show reverence towards B7/12, B20/10, B32/10
herynge, heriying vbl.n. worshipping, praise B72/8, T72/9
herytage, heritage n. inheritance B141/8, B165/8
hertelyche adv. earnestly B78/4,12
heste, heest 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 hotip v.
beuy 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. eager 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. ~ he conduct yourself B27/5,6. holdeþ, holdþ
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.
oblided 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. horþes pl. B37/20
hoteþ v.pr.3sg. commands, bids B19/15, B22/20; heti 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 sif conj.
yse n. eye T34/8; at ~ clearly, with ones own eyes T84/8; eyse
B84/8. ysen 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
injuryes, injuries 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
ynrenncp v.pr.pl. (will) incur B29/8
into prep. ~ his 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 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. behave 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 B28/19, T80/10, T81/1. kepeð, kepið
pr.3sg. protects B86/8, T86/8. kepeð, kepen pr.pl. observe
B69/5, T69/8; maintain T121/9. kepe pr.subj.sg. B140/3, T140/3
kyn suff. kind(s) of T21/2, T49/10, B50/2, T50/2; kenne B49/9
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 ~ in
accordance with ones nature B111/8; in his ~ 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;
ninnately 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. kynredens, 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
knowlechynge 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;
conneð, cunneð ~ no letterure are illiterate B9/8, B35/9. kunne
pr.subj.sg. have the capability,skill B89/4,5. cunynyge pr.p.
kunnepp. 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

lass(e, l esse comp adj. lesser B148/6, T148/7

laste v. continue T108/2, go on living T109/15; lest(e last B57/8

late v.imp.sg. let T96/7

late adv. recently B35/2

lausom, la wowom adj. lawful, permissible B22/6, B31/15;

le(e)ueful T30/11, T34/4,10, T74/7

lefffullyche, leuefully adv. lawfully, legitimately B60/4, T60/4

lerid ppl.adj. lettered, educated T33/5

le(e)se v. destroy T129/14, B143/1

lesyng(e, leesyng vbl.n.1 lie B54/8, T54/8, T137/5. lesynges,

lesynegis 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 v. forbear B42/18; prevent T109/10. lett( e) pr.3sg. T159/17

lette, letten pr.pl. B13/7, T13/7, B64/4. lette pr.subj.sg.


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)ueb
pr.3sg. B26/3, T26/3; leeuen pr.pl. cease T108/3; leueb abandon
T33/9, B76/3, T76/4; set aside T110/16; disregarded T139/5
leue v.² live B45/8
leue adj. dear B35/2
le(e)ueful see lefful adj.
leuefully see leffullyche adv.
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
lycke 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, lykeb v.pr.3sg. delights, takes pleasure in T110/8;
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. lymyteb, lymytib pr.3sg. specifies
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
longeþ v.impers.pr.3sg. ~ to is the prerogative of B111/11,16.
longyng pr.p. B111/15
loos n. good reputation T30/1
lore n. teaching, commandments B91/1, B91/5
lorkeþ 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
lusteþ v.refl.pr.pl. ~ hem take pleasure B22/14
lustful adj. pleasant, delicious T118/8
lusty adj. pleasant, delicious B118/10
magnefye 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. menteyneþ pr.pl. B93/18, B94/3; mayntenen
T160/2. mayntened pp. 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

makin, makev.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.

mane(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 B153/2*, T153/2

marren v.pr.pl. ruin, corrupt T34/14

materyel adj. physical B57/6

maund(e)ment n. commandment T2/1, T30/4,9, T50/7. 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 undef.pron. one, someone, people, B18/2, B28/3, B33/4

mede n. ment B3/2, T3/2; reward, payment B95/8, T95/2, B112/7,

B141 6. medies pl. spiritual reward B12/1

medep, medi v.pr.3sg. rewards B86/8, T86/8

med(e)ful adj. meritorious, spiritually beneficial B76/2, T76/2*,

B104/6
medle, medle v.pr.3sg. mixes, blends T15/3,6,9, B46/18,21
meydes see mede n.
meynteynge vbl.n. supporting B93/5
melle 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. mene pr.3sg. advises B36/20.
menen, mene pr.pl. signify, symbolize T20/4, B47/7
menyfoldlyche adv. in many ways, repeatedly B37/20
mende v. amend B78/14
menteyneg see mayntene v.
merchaundyse n. trade, commerce B128/10. merchaundyses pl.
   business transactions B128/11
merchaundyse v. engage in commerce, trade B77/15
mercyments, mercyments n.pl. fines, penalties collected in money
   or goods T149/5, B152/10, T152/8
merbe n. delight, enjoyment B94/7
merucillyche adv. 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, mesur3 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 ~ 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;
moecuep T117/2, T118/1. moecuen 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
meuynge(e, mocuyng 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; myschyt B112/16; meschief wickedness B9/23
myslyuyng n. sinful living B45/9
myst see mowe(p 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.
moecue, moeuep, moecuen 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; be ~ 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.
  mot(e)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(b v.pr.pl. may B20/5, B24/1, B27/17, B41/16. myst pa.t. B36/17
much(e n. for as ~ as,hat in so far as, since  B31/5, B36/22; for
  al so ~ hat B161/8; myche as ~ as equivalent in meaning to
  T69/3; in as ~ 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
nedeleles adj. vain, idle, useless B92/18
nedely adv. necessarily T61/1, T138/8; nedylyche B61/1; nedelyche
  B138/8
nedes, nedis adv. necessarily B30/2, T70/5
ned(e)ful adj. necessary B12/11, T12/8, B22/5
nedep, nediþ v.pr.3sg. requires B86/2, T86/2; impers. is necessary
  B164/3
neysest sup.adj. closest B85/7
neyseþ 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

tere 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 ~ byfore immediately preceding B113/3

nyst 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. noype, noyen pl.pres.ind. B13/8, T13 8


noryschynge vbl.n. educating, rearing B93/5

notable adj. blameworthy B78/18

nofer, neber conj. nor B7/11, B20/9, B35/19; ~......ne

neither..... nor B8/7, B50/9, B66/1, T68/2-3; ne.....~ neither.....nor B15/8-10; ~.....~ neither ......nor T123/8

nouellcryes n.pl. new types B92/16

nouzst adv. not B1/7, B3/5,6

nowpe adv. n w B31/10, B43/17; ~ a day nowadays B139/7

obesche v. hey B90/1. obeschyp, obeshep pr.3sg. B88/1, T88/1.
obesche imp.pl. B90/17

object n. hjection T159/9
occupioun n. cause B32/18, B33/4; situation B118/1, T118/1
occupye, occupie v. possess, enjoy the use of B152/4, T152/4.
occupiē pr.3sg. T124/11. occupyeī, occupiēn pr.pl. B125/18,
B126/2, T126/2, T126/4
of prep. by B4/5, T30/9, T130/16; for T122/3
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 B1/3, T1/4; one B6/6, T6/5
ones, onys adv. once B17/2, B69/6, T69/9
onheede 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. ordeyneī pr.3sg. decrees
T152/6. ordeynen pr.pl. devise T160/2. ordeyndeī pa.t.sg.
ordained, decreed B97/2, T97/2, T109/14; caused T121/8.
(y)ordeyndeī pp. created B58/8, T58/8; decreed, ordained B58/10,
T59/2, B61/2; provided B59/1, T59/2, B86/5, ; assigned B61/4,
ordenaunce n. rule T100/16; decree T102/6; ordynaunce B102/6
ordre n. ecclesiastical rank, put doune of his ~ demoted B27/21-
2; ~ put 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
ornaments, ornementis 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
oueral adv. everywhere B5/4, B38/10
our(e n. hour B5/15, B6/4, T6/2
ous-syf, ousseif 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
pareschens n.pl. parishioners B94/19
part v. ~ of share T132/2. partid pp. divided T7/5; separated
T84/6
part(e n. party T114/3; take ~ of share B45/12. partis pl. sections
of society, social classes T64/7
parteyneh, perteneb, 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

**passep**, **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.s cupcakes. 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 B18/17, B36/16,18. **passiouns pl.**
B36/11

**peyne** n. torment of purgatory or hell B89/8, B111/14; punishment,
penalty B90/6, B145/18; vpon ~ under threat of punishment B3/3,
T3/3; vp(on ~ 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 B63/3, T63/3, T80/15;

**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. **pledepl pr.3sg.** B140/3. **pleden**
pr.pl. T140/6. **pleedyde 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
plentenouscr 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
pletying vb.l.n. legal dispute, litigation T138/2, T140/2
pont n. in ~ of as far as .... is concerned T110/1. poyntes,
poynt3, poynsis 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. prelats, prelatis pl. B107/4, T107/4, T108/1
presabyllyche adv. in a laudable manner, admirably B32/4
prydc, pride n. ~ of (bis) lyf(f),lijf love of worldly pomp
B22/2,16, T22/2; ~ of bis 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
pryueliche 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; profest B9/23; profyst B24/3
profitable adj. useful, B28/22; advantageous T121/5
profited v.pp. grown stronger T109/15
properis n.pl. appropriators T147/1
proporcionableche 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
publicans n.pl. tax collectors T131/17
punished 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. putte, putti 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, awaye 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 T100/17; denied to B152/3, T152/3; be ~ adoune
kneel, prostrate self B35/16
queme v. please or serve B163/3
quyete v. satisfy B73/8, T73/8
quyke adj. living B39/10, B40/20; makyng ~ giving life to B38/10
yrad v.pp. read, taught B3/8
ragynge vbl.n.pl. amorous dalliance, flirtation B116/6
raper comp. adv. pe ~ the more easily B164/18
raucyn n. robbery B65/2, T65/2
rausynge vbl. n. theft B145/16
recche, recchen v.pr.pl. care, are concerned about B107/9, T107/9
redylyche adv. fully B142/15
reft v.pp. stolen from T66/4
rehercep v.pr.3sg. narrates, runs through B20/1
reheresyng vbl.n. enumerating B19/14
reise v. ~ vp restore T100/12
rekene v. list, enumerate B21/11, T21/9; give an account B145/8
rekenynge vbl. n. settlement of accounts B119/12, B145/9,12
religioun n. men of ~ people in holy orders T146/1; priuat ~ see priuat adj.
religious n.pl. clerics T136/7
relyuynge vbl.n. helping, relieving (from hardship) B79/14
remes see rewme n.
renne, renny 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
resonablyche 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 þe ~ of
because of T34/5; in, by ~ in a reasonable manner B83/2, T83/3,
B97/6; is ~ is reasonable B74/7, T74/7; wipoute, out of ~
unreasonable, unjust 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
reuyngge vbl. n. stealing B125/15

reule n. regulations governing a religious order T99/7
rewme, reme n. realm T131/3,5*, B145/1. remes, reumes, rewmes pl.
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

ryst, rist n. truth B54/2, T54/2; righteousness T124/10; justice
T155/11

ryst, rist adv. exactly, just B38/18, B39/7, B163/5; well B50/5, T50/5;
virtuously, properly B149/7, T149/7

rystful adj. virtuous, righteous B37/16, B39/12, B45/17; just
B94/9

rystfulnesse n. virtue, goodness B18/7; just judgement B45/12

rystwesse adj. virtuous B42/8; ritwise just T124/10

rote n. root B133/2, B144/6,8

rotye v. rot B76/7

saaf prep. subject to T33/7, T80/8

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 B18/3,8, B55/9; sauf B4/5, saaf

T4/4

sauter *adj.* ~ book book of psalms B57/12

scatere *v.* squander, waste T33/4, scatere *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, schulle *B4/10,

B9/13, B21/1

scholde, shulde *pa.t.subj.sg.* would B32/14, B65/6, T65/5. shulden

pa.t.subj.pl. T33/2

schappe, shape *v.* arrange, ensure B73/7, T73/7, shapi *pr.3sg.*

ordains for T122/13; refl. set oneself B76/4, T76/5

scharp, sharpe *adj.* severe B2/8. T2/8; sharpest *sup.* most painful T130/1

scharploker, sharplier *comp.adv.* more eagerly, more swiftly B2/7,

T2/7

schewel, shewe *v.* see, perceive, describe B20/5; make known B54/2,

T54/2; demonstrate, make manifest B62/9, T62/9, schewe *pr.pl.*

teach, instruct B40/1. schewed *pa.t.sg.* displayed B19/22,

schone *v.imp.sg.* prevent, guard against B35/13

schonyng *vbl.n.* prohibition B32/8

schrewed(e) *adj.* wicked B115/11, B116/5

schrewedlyche *adv.* wickedly B143/3

schrewednesse *n.* wickedness, depravity B93/19, B142/14

schrewes *n.pl.* wicked people, evildoers B142/14
schrifte n. confession B152/7
s(c)hruyng(e vbl.n. confessing B78/17; giving confession T110/1
schulle(p see s(c)hal v
sclandrynge vbl.n. slandering, calumny B112/9
ysclaudred v.pp. slandered, disgraced B120/12
scornynge, skornynge vbl.n. contemptuous treatment B138/2, T138/2, B140/2, T140/2
scripture n. writing, document B9/1, B28/24
seche(pr) pl. seek B57/9, B150/4
seculer adj. lay T66/2, B127/4, T127/4, T131/7
seculer(es) n.pl. members of the laity T30/9, B107/3, T107/3
seyng 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), wyrk(is) work done for personal gain,
forbidden on the Sabbath B8/6, B67/3, T67/3
sete n. throne B26/9
sette v. ~ at noust despise B40/16-17, 19. sette pr.subj.pl. ~ 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

sharpiп see scherpe v.

short adj. transitory, of short duration T100/3

syb, sib n. ~ to related to B105/1, T105/2

siche adj. such T12/5, T13/8, T33/2

siche pron. such T20/7, T73/4

sien see seynge v.

syker adv. surely B26/16

sykerc, siker adj. certain B103/2, T103/2

sylle v. sell B128/10. sylleп, silliп pr.3sg. betrays for gain

B136/4,5, T136/3,4; sells B150/6, T150/6. siller, sylleп

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 B142/5,6


pr.p. B17/2. synwed pa.t.sg. B26/7

syп, sib adv. next, then B54/2, T54/2

syп(пc, syпe, sip(e conj. since B4/2, T4/1, B21/3, B72/4; ~ hat

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, skiful adj. reasonable, just B6/4, T6/3, B76/8
skylfullych(e adv. reasonably B76/14, B128/7,14; skillefullych(e
   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. ~ bat 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. so**r**er **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,

so**tellyche** **adv.** ingeniously B29/19; sute**ly** treacherously T66/4

sotylte **n. stratagem** B28/12

so**ph(e n.** truth B54/6, T54/6, B141/19; for ~ truly B8/1. soo**p**

truth T156/6

so**pely, sophe**li **adv.** truly B138/5, T138/5

so**pennyse** **n.** spiritual truth, steadfastness B33/5

souereyn **adj.** supreme B141/17

souereynlyche **adv.** above all B141/16

sownep, sounefp **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 ~ in the form of words,

symbolically T20/5, B47/7-8

spede **v. fare** B28/6

spille **v. kill** B22/6

spoyle **v. rob** B65/1, T65/1. spoylefp **pr.pl.** plunder B126/7;

spuylen **T126/9**

spoylynge **vbl.n.** theft B149/5; spuylng **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 B28/22, B42/4,5
spoused 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 v. guide, lead B90/20. stereb pr.3sg. B22/8. stereb
pr.pl. B92/17
sterres n.pl. stars B26/10
sterete v. ~ abak shrink back B107/1, T107/1
style adj. silent B141/19
styrye v. prompt, inspire B33/2. styrep, stirip 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 T115/1; ~ in consists of B10/11, T10/3,
   B22/16; is rooted in B21/3, T21/3; arises from T110/17; 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
streccheb, strecchib v.pr.3sg. ~ fer(e has far reaching
   consequences B132/6, T132/11
streyne v. constrain B63/5, T63/5
stryuces _n.pl._ disputes, conflicts B145/2

strong(e _adj._1) sturdy, healthy B5/8; severe B91/14

stronge _adj._2 alien, foreign T20/7, B29/21,23; 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. suwp _pr.3sg._ B2/9, T2/9; sewep B113/3. suwp, 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._

suggets, sugetis _n.pl._ here ~ 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 adv._

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. take p.pr.pl. B45/10. take pa.t.sg. gave B38/6. take pa.t.subj.pl. ~ to mynde considered B31/8. take pp. understood T98/7; ~ by experience as experience shows T34/12; ~ to taken away and given to T124/14. take be committed yourself B78/6,10

takynge vbl.n. ~ hede paying attention B116/3

tech v. show T154/8

teching, techyng vbl.n. tutelage, guidance T86/5; illustration

T114/6. thechyng teaching T66/3
tellyng, 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, sponsorship 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 ~ in remembrance of B72/2; as a sign T80/4, B111/17;
(in)to ~ as a sign T15/10, B47/1; tokyn sign B9/13. toknes pl.

B19/21
tolle v. attract B19/25
tober pron. the other (of two) T113/4
toucheb, touchiþ v.pr.3sg. pertains to, has bearing upon B144/2, T144/2. touchid pp. touched on T121/4

trauayl(e, trauelle 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.
trauelyþ, traueilþ pr.3sg. B86/4, T86/4. traueilen, trauyleþ
pr.pl. toil T33/5; strive B44/7. trauailed, trauelide
pa.t.subj.sg. B65/5, T65/4

tre n. wood B35/19, B37/8

treyn adj. wooden B40/15

tresourecþ, tresouren v.pr.pl. ~ to store up treasure for B97/8,
T97/8

trespas(se n. transgression B91/22, comparatively limited offence
T104/1; offence T104/7, B112/12; sin B152/8

trespasse v. sin, offend B115/15. trespassist pr.2sg. T58/1;
trespacest B58/1. trespassþ pr.3sg. B116/11. trespassþ 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

treúpe, trowþe n. righteousness, virtue B44/7; truth T55/2,
T65/12; trouþe T34/13, T135/9; trowþe B54/1, B55/2; treueþ
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
trewauntcs n.pl. those who neglect their duty B63/9; triuauuntis T63/9

triacle n. medicine, remedy T131/9

trysteþ v.pr.3sg. trusts, believes B41/6. trysteþ, tristep pr.pl.
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

turneþ v.pr.pl. ~ 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

pey n. theft B8/15, B94/2, B123/2

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
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
\[\text{\textit{Pylke}} \text{\textit{dem.adj.}} \text{that same B33/5, B115/6; \textit{Pulke}} \text{B90/2,8}\]
\[\text{\textit{Pylke}} \text{\textit{dem.pron.}} \text{those B45/1}\]
\[\text{\textit{Pinkip}, \textit{Pinke}} \text{\textit{v.impers.pr.3sg. me}} \text{~ it seems to me T32/1, T33/7, T80/8; \textit{Pynke}} \text{B55/6; \textit{Penke}} \text{B103/1,5}\]
\[\text{\textit{Ponke}} \text{\textit{v.pr.3sg. thanks B145/12. \textit{Ponke imp.sg.}} \text{B78/11}\]
\[\text{\textit{Porou} see \textit{Purgh prep.}\]
\[\text{\textit{Praldom} n. captivity B14/4}\]
\[\text{\textit{Prydde}, \textit{Pridde adj.}} \text{third B66/5, T66/7}\]
\[\text{\textit{Pryste}} \text{\textit{v.3sg.pres.ind.}} \text{is thirsty B40/5}\]
\[\text{\textit{Pulke} see \textit{Pylke dem.adj.}\]
\[\text{\textit{Purgh prep.}} \text{through B4/11, B17/13, B18/13; \textit{Porou} T129/9}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vnblissid} v.pp. not yet glorified T136/2}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vnbuxom} adj. disobedient B10/3, B89/18, B90/11}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vnclanis} n. moral impurity B94/8}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vnclene} adj. impure B116/4, B120/17; \textit{spirit} wicked spirit, demon B16/12}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vncunnynge} vbl.n. ignorance B16/10}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vnedelyche} adj. immortal B136/5}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vndermyne} v. dig up T109/13}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vnderput} v.pp. under the power of B16/14}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vnderstondynge} n. faculty of understanding and reasoning B38/14,16,17}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vneuen} adj. unequal T131/5}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vniust(e} adj. sinful B125/18, T125/1}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vnyndely} adj. unnatural B111/18}\]
\[\text{\textit{Vnyndelyche} adv. ungratefully B78/8; with unnatural enmity B102/7; \textit{Vnyndly} T102/7}\]
vnkyndenesse n. ingratitude B78/11,13; 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

vnry3tful 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 B11/8, 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* pp. 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 v. corrupt T110/2
verrayliche, verrylyche adv. truly B142/15, B161/10; verryliche 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 ~ the Pope B151/7
viker n. ~ of Crist, Cristis ~ the Pope T130/4, T151/6-7
visyte, visite v.pr.1sg. avenge B7/13, T14/9; vysyteb pr.3sg. B44/19
voyde adj. vain, wasted B18/1
voucheb 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. waterleech B148/8, T148/9
weye n. by ~ 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. weneþ, wenen pr.pl. B13/4, T13/4, B30/7; intend B87/5, T87/5
werk(e n. work T60/5, T76/4. werkis, werkës, werkys pl. work T67/1; deeds B75/1, T75/1; workes B8/4,6
wete see wyte v.
wexe v. increase, advance B82/5, T156/16. wexep pr.3sg. B5/10.
  wexen pr.pl. T156/15. waxe(n pp. grown B149/9, T149/9
what adj. whatever B2/5, T2/5, T114/10
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
wysttes n.pl. weights B128/7
wyke see woke n.
wyle n. wicker trap for catching fish B17/10
wilfullyche*, wylfullyche 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. wolleþ pr.pl. B12/1,4, B17/1; mean B19/16. wole(n, pr.subj.pl.
  T64/9, B65/1, T97/3, B164/3; wille B97/3. willynge pr.p. B112/16
wylne v. wish, desire B128/8, wilnep, wylneþ pr.3sg. B19/25,
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. wyteþ, 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, woldeþ, wole(n see willen v.
woneþ v.pr.3sg. dwells B83/4, T83/5. goneþ pr.pl. B57/6. ywoned
pp. accustomed B45/8
wonyngge vbl.n. somewhere to live B86/5
worche v. work B8/4, B64/7, T64/7; do B12/5, T12/2. worship,
worcheþ pr.3sg. T121/16, T122/2,4; ~ wþ 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 B87/3,5, T87/3,5. worschepest, worshipist pr.2sg. B95/10, T95/6. worschepe, worshipip pr.3sg. B96/1, T96/1. worschepe, 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

worpy adj. powerful B37/17

wost see wyte v.

wrcpe n. wrath B22/18, B29/9

wrynkel(e n. moral stain or blemish B65/6, T65/5

wrong n. wijb ~ 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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