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L. Kellogg and E. W. Talbert in their suggestive article on the Wycliffite Pater Noster and The Ten Commandments consider in some detail the textual relationships existing among various extant versions of these treatises. The first part of this paper relates to that section of their article treating of the versions of The Ten Commandments; it is devoted both to clarifying the textual relations within their group ‘compressed versions’, and to a comparison of several of these texts with other texts hitherto unnoticed. In the second part, I discuss and offer a revised classification of The Ten Commandments arranged according to textual and structural, or architectonic, principles. Also in this section I provide an account of several possible scribal methods of composition of the different versions of the treatise.

1

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

1 I should like to thank Professor Angus McIntosh for reading and offering helpful comments on an earlier version of this article.


MS 861' suggests that 'the present tract ['The Ten Commandments'] may possibly be the “pre-existing commentary” which Arnold believed Wyclif may have used'. Bühler's suggestion is rejected by Kellogg and Talbert, who state that Rylands English MS 85 'is closer at virtually every point to the Wyclif original than Morgan 861'. The Kellogg–Talbert argument is, as shown in some detail in the first part of this article, a weak one, for both the Rylands and the Morgan texts are, in structure and content, very similar. Also, the readings used to connect the Rylands text with that of Bodley 789 are quoted out of context and without regard to the larger structural dissimilarities separating the texts of the two treatises. Before beginning a critique of parts of this article it may be helpful to review Kellogg and Talbert's main conclusions, as well as the methods they use in reaching them.

Kellogg and Talbert distinguish two types of commentaries on the Ten Commandments: type I is called the 'Orthodox or "Pre-Existing" Commentary', and type II the 'Wyclifite Commentary'. The 'Wyclifite Commentary' is sub-divided into

A. Version Attributed to Wyclif,
B. Expanded Versions,
C. Compressed Versions.

With regard to 'I. Orthodox or "Pre-Existing" Commentary' Kellogg and Talbert conclude: 'Generally speaking, the manuscripts of orthodox commentary or, to use Arnold's term, “pre-existing commentary” are demonstrably all closely related and offer a quite consistent text' (p. 366); this statement does not hold true for Emmanuel Coll., Camb. MS 246 (E), [MS 3 in Kellogg and Talbert's catalogue of manuscripts].

---

1 P.M.L.A., lxix (1954), 688 n. 6. Hereafter referred to as 'Bühler'.
2 Kellogg and Talbert, p. 370.
3 'The Ten Commandments' text of E, f. 59r (not f. 59v, as Kellogg and Talbert state) does not belong among the 'Orthodox or "Pre-existing"' commentaries. It is, however, related to the 'orthodox' commentary: (i) it has the first three lines of the 'Prologue' (there is a folio missing), and (ii) it follows the orthodox commentary for part of the second commandment, but this dependence upon an orthodox text is not a necessary one as the following comparison
With regard to 'll. Wyclifite Commentary', Kellogg and Talbert conclude that (i) 'A. Version Attributed to Wyclif—MS Bodley 789, (B) is indeed, on the balance of evidence, authentic, and that this manuscript is, as suggested by Arnold, derived from a 'pre-existing' commentary. Kellogg and Talbert then turn their attention to various other extant treatises on the ten commandments, of which Ryl. English MS 85 (J) is a “highly important one" (p. 364) and compare J with selective fragments and sentences from B: they conclude "that the Rylands [J] manuscript is closer at virtually every point to the Wyclif original than Morgan 861 [M], or indeed any of the group of manuscripts of which it is shows. The extract, below, is from the second commandment, and is the text (Matthew 5: 34–7) which most closely follows that of the orthodox version.

E:

Swere ye not I seie to you on al wise, neper by heuene, for it is the trone of god, neper by eorpe, for it is the stole of his feet, neper by iurusalem, for it is the citee of a greet kyng, ne swer you not bi pin heed, for you miȝte not make an heer peof white or blak. But your word shal be yehe ye & nay nay & pat is more ouere it comep of yuel.

Wycliffite Bible, Earlier Version:

Forsothe Y say to you, to nat swere on al manere; neither by heuene, for it is the trone of God; neither by the erthe, for it is the stole of his feet; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the citee of a greet kyng; neither thou shalt swere by thin heued, for thou maist not make oon heer whyt, or blak; but be your word 3ea, 3ea; Nay, nay; forsothe that is more than this, is of yuel.

BL Add. MS 22283: ‘orthodox’

Pat is. swere ye not on alle manere. Pat is to vndurstonde. swere ye not for eueri cause resonable. or vn resonable. Neper by heuene: for hit is the trone of god. Ne bi eorpe: for hit is the fororme or the benche of goddes feet. Ne bi lerusalem: for hit is the citee of a gret kyng. Ne swere not bi thin heued: for hit maigt not make on her whit, or blak. But your word beo. ye, nay. nay. And pat is more ouur pis: hit is of yuel.

From the third commandment on the text of E is highly condensed: that is, the commandment itself is given, and a very short comment appended; for example: ‘The eorpe comandement of god is pis: worshippe þi fadir & þi modir þat þou be of longe liiþ vpon eorpe, þat þi lord god shal þyue to þee. And þis worshippe stondþ not oneli in lowtyng & knelyng but also in þi fadir & modir seruynge, releuynge & helpynge, boþe worldli & goostli to wheþþ þeir þei han more nede.’ The text of E, apart from the above noted similarities, bears little resemblance to the orthodox text of BL Add. MS 22283 [edited by W. Nelson Francis, The Book of Vices and Virtues, E.E.T.S., O.S., cxxvii, 316–33], Bibl. Ste. Geneviève, Paris, MS. 3390, or Univ. Coll., Oxford, MS 97.
In summary, their main conclusions are these: (i) acceptance of Arnold's distinction between 'pre-existing commentary' and Wyclif's own version; (ii) the dependence of Wyclif's version on that 'pre-existing commentary', and (iii) the dependence of J on a Wyclif or Wyclif-like original. It is not the purpose of this article to controvert conclusions (i) and (ii), but in arriving at conclusion (iii) Kellogg and Talbert have selected various passages and fragments for comparison, and it is the uneven application of this comparative method that weakens, in the end, the argument for the dependence of J on the Wyclif text of B₁.

Kellogg and Talbert, intent on showing that J is closer to the 'Wyclif original' than M, "compare the Wyclif Ten Commandments with those of Morgan 861 [M] and its related text, Ryl. English 85 [J]" (p. 369). The 'Prologue' of B₁ is compared with J's 'Prologue' and is found to be (with minor variations) the same; the text of M is silent here, and this silence is used to reinforce the alleged close connection between J's 'Prologue' and that of B₁. Two points are worth noting: (i) the J 'Prologue', like that of B₁, also resembles the 'orthodox "Prologue"', so the connection between the J text and the B₁ text is not a necessary one; that is, given the evidence of the prologues, the J text could have had as its immediate or distant source an orthodox 'Prologue' and not B₁. (ii) M's omission of the 'Prologue' can be used to establish the probable priority of manuscripts: that is, the fact that M does not have the 'Prologue' excludes it from consideration as the source for B₁ and J, but since both J and M are said to be 'compressed' versions of the Wyclif original (the omission in M being a form of radical compression?) the priority of B₁ is assumed. So one is left with the conclusions that J seems to be a textual descendant of B₁ and that M may be a descendant, but with

1Throughout Kellogg and Talbert's discussion of 'The Ten Commandments' the words 'Wyclif original', 'Wyclif Ten Commandments', and 'Wyclif commentary' are used for the text of B₁; Kellogg and Talbert do not refer to B₁ as being 'Wyclif's own' or 'Wycliffite'.

Kellogg and Talbert next compare extracts from the first, second, and third commandments, and again find that the J text is closer to the Wyclif original than is the M text. The evidence, one may suggest, does not sustain the conclusion. For brevity’s sake, I have selected the second commandment for comparison; a similar comparison could be made with either of the other commandments selected for comparison by Kellogg and Talbert and similar conclusions would be reached. In the following extracts the selections of Kellogg and Talbert are italicized, thus allowing one to compare their selections with the possible range of selections. In addition to the M, J and B texts, the following related texts of the second commandment are included: Edinburgh University Library MS 93, (Ed) f. 5v and CUL MS Nn. 4.12, (C3), ff. 4v–5r.

M:2

Thou shalt not take Goddis name in veyne. for God wole not haue him vnpunyschyd. pat takith His name in ydel. Who brekyth this heest. veyn spekers. idil swereres. and wickyd worchers. Why veyn spekers. for her wordes ben not meedful for Crist seip Matheu .xij. c. of eny idil word pat men spoken. pei schullen yelde resoun þeroft at þe day of doome. Why idyl swereres. for her opis ben not needful for þe Wise Man seip Ecc'.xxij. c. a man myche swerynge schal be fulfilled wip wickydnes. and veniaunce schal not go fro his hous. Why wyckyd worcheris. for her werkys ben unlefulle. for Poul seip to þe Romayne. .xiv. c. awaite ye hem þat letten the lawe of God. and dele ye not with hem for by her softe speche þey disseyuen þe hertys of innocent men and wymmen.

J:3

Þe Secunde Comaundement of God is þis/
Thou shalt not take in vayn: þe name of þi Lord God/ for þe Lord shal not haue him gittles: þat takip in veyn þe name of his Lord God/ And Crist seip þat is

1It is possible that the exemplar used by the scribe of M contained a ‘Prologue’, and that for reasons of economy the scribe omitted it. The Wyclifite ‘Prologue’ of J has an interesting and complex textual history of its own; for a brief account of this see Section II below.

2The entire treatise edited and printed by Bühler, pp. 688–92; this extract is from his text, pp. 689–90.

3Edited by Kellogg and Talbert; this extract is from their text, pp. 372–3.
trupel pou shalt not shere bi heuene: pat is bi no ping pat is in heuene/ neper bi erpe: pat is bi noon erpel bi ping/ neper bi Jerusalem: for it is pe grete citee of pe Lord, which is mannes soule/ neper bi pin heed: pat is to seie. bi noon of pi membris eper heer.

Who breken pis comandement/ veyn spekers. Grete swerers. and wickid worchers. Whi veyn spekers: for her wordis ben not needful/IMS meedfull Off which Crist seip/ Off every idil word pat men speken: pei shulen gilde rikenytng at pe dai of doom Whi grete swerers: ffor her oopis ben not needful. as seip pe Wise Man/ a man moche sweringe: shal be fulliid wip wickidnesse/ and veniaunce with worst zilding: shal not go fro his hous/ Whi wickid worchers: for her werks ben vnleeful/. of whiche Poul seip/ awaite pe hem pat letten pe lawe of God: and dele pe not with hem/ for bi softe speche. pei disseuenn pe hertis of innocent men//

B1:1

2 Comaundement

Pe secounde maner maundement of God pertynep to pe Sone. Pou schalt not take pe name of pi Lord God in veyn, neper in word neper in lyvynge. Eche man takip Goddis name in veyn, pat swerip bi his name more lan is need. Crist techip in pe gospel to have ourer wordis pus, 3he, 3he, and nai, nay, wiouten ony oop. Pere he doublip his wordis, as if he wolde seie,—3if pe seie 3he in 3oure seie, seie 3he wip 3oure moup, and be pe trewe men. For God techip bi Jeremie pe prophete, wip pre condiciouns it is leefful to swere. First pat pei be war pat pei swere treupe, and pat pei cause of hire op be to schewe ri'jt, and sipen, pat in jugement be it need to swere; and ellis schulde alle men kepe hem from opis. For it is writen in Ecclesiasticus, pe pre and twenti chapitre, pehe seip 3us; A man much sweringe schal be fulfilled with wickidnesse, and veniaunce schal not go away fro his hous. For sope wip worst zeldinge schal be fulliid pe hous of him. But we schullen witte afterward, pat everi man berip pe name of God printid in his soule, for ellis he migtte not be, as Seynt Austyn seip;—in pre pingis, mynde, resoun, and willen, and alle ben o substance. And so pe gospel techip pat pou schuldist on pre maners worschipe pe name of pi God, pat pou hast wip pee. Pou schuldist love pi God of al 3in herte, of al pi soule, and of al pi mynde. Panne pou lovest pi God of al 3in herte, whanne pi witte and pi power is oonli set on him, pat everi eende of pi werk is worschip to pi God. Pou lovest God of al pi soule, whanne pou oderenest al pi li to worschip of pi God. Also pou lovest pi God of al pi mynde, whanne pou forgetist not 3us to penke on pi God; but penkinge is in dede as it is in mynde. Of pi wise worschipe men worschipe pe Trinite. And whanne a man dop pat he schulde not do, or levep pat he schulde do, he takip in veyn pis hige and holi name. For no man is maad but to serve God, in doynghe his wille or suffrynge peyne.

Ed, f. 5rv:2

1This extract is from Arnold, pp. 84–5.
2Edited by C. A. Martin, Edinburgh University Library MS 93: an annotated
The second commandment
Thou shalt not take the name of thy Lord God in vain for God calleth him guilty that taketh his name in vain. Jeremiah the prophet saith to a just othe longth. iij. thyngs. The first is truth, the second good profite, and the third reasonable doome, and if any of these iij. thynges fail from thine othe, then thine othe is idle and a great synne displeasing God. And so in need God & the holy doom should be true othe, & by no membre, ne by noon oter creature of God shalt thou swear on any wise, as Christ chargeth us saying in his gospel: If ye seith the he in your heart, seip the with your mouth & be ye true men and make no leseyng. And thus the, the, & nay, nay shulde be cristenn mens wordys with out eny yveyn sweryng by God, or by eny of his creatures. Also yveyn spekers, ydel swerers & wykked worchers breken pis heeste. Why yveyn spekers? For her wordes bene not medefull. Why ydil swerers? For oopis be not medefull. Why wiked worchers? For her werkes bene vnlefull.

When the different versions of the second commandment are compared it is clear that J and M have more in common with each other than either one has with the text of B1:

(i) Both J and M have the same ‘rhetorical’ structure: that is, both have a statement of commandment plus a variation on the question of ‘Who brekyth this heeste?’ plus a list of ‘breakers’ with
scriptural authority for each 'breaker'; the B₁ text does not have this rhetorical structure.

(ii) Both J and M have, with one exception and minor variations, the same scriptural citations. J, like the above noted C₅ and Rw, has a close paraphrase of Matthew 5: 34–6 following the opening statement of commandment; this reference to a New Testament authority is omitted in M and may be attributed to scribal editing. The minor variations in the biblical text of M (variations with reference to J) can be explained as scribal attempts at clarification; both C₅ and Rw agree with these M variants, so the M readings are not unique, and, when considered with the C₅ and Rw readings, the M text probably represents one stage of revision, but one still very close, in structure and content, to the J text.

Several points worth noting, and not mentioned by Kellogg and Talbert, are the obvious differences in content of the B₁ text when compared with the J–M version.

(i) The B₁ text opens with a statement of the commandment, but following this it has a paraphrase of Matthew 5: 37, not Matthew 5: 34–6 as have J, C₅, and Rw. This biblical paraphrase is followed by a short commentary, which does not appear in J, M and C₅, but does survive, along with the biblical passage, in the Ed-T version, and in the orthodox commentary.

(ii) The B₁ text has a reference to Jeremias 4: 2; and the "pre condiciouns it is leefful to swere"; this is omitted in J, M and C₅, and survives in the Ed-T version, as well as in the orthodox commentary, and two other texts.

¹J and M are not the only extant manuscripts containing this version: CUL MS li. 6.43, (C₅), ff. 3⁴–9⁹, and Bodl. MS Rawlinson C. 209, (Rw), ff. 2⁴–7⁷ have the same version, though they, like M, are devoid of the J 'Prologue'. See discussion in Section II, below. (Rw is defective at the beginning.)

²This explanation does not exclude the possibility that the scribe of M (as well as the scribes of C₅ and Rw, see n. 1 above) had access to a Wycliffite biblical version no longer extant: the M text may contain readings of a now lost revision of one of the versions of the Wycliffite Bible; for a fuller discussion of this possibility with regard to a different kind of devotional text see Henry Hargreaves, 'The Middle English Primers and the Wycliffite Bible', M.L.R., li (1956), 215–17; and see Appendix II of Thesis Edinburgh, pp. 497–513, where extracts from versions of the Wycliffite Bible in meditative treatises are discussed.
(iii) The B₁ text is unique in its reference to St. Augustine and his comment on the nature of the soul.

(iv) The B₁ text is unique in its reference to Matthew 22: 37 (or Luke 10: 27) and how one should in "pre maners worschipe pe name of . . . God".

(v) The conclusion to the B₁ commentary is also unique, no part of which appears in any of the ‘compressed’ versions of ‘The Ten Commandments’; a similar conclusion is to be found in the ‘orthodox’ commentary, but the B₁ text is far more concise.

These are, I suggest, important differences in structure and content, and they must be carefully considered when studying the textual histories, and inter-relationships, of manuscripts. Given the structure and content of B₁ (the second commandment is representative of the structure and the variety of biblical and patristic sources of the whole), and given the structure and content of J and M, the definite textual connection of the latter two to B₁ is not certain, and, as shown, is very dubious: a convincing case for the closeness of J to B₁ cannot be built upon four highly selective extracts, three of which are fragments of biblical passages whose specific textual character is rendered even more ambiguous by the possible existence of various revisions of the Wyclifite Bible. The conclusion “that the Rylands [J] manuscript is closer at virtually every point to the Wyclif original than Morgan 861 [M], or indeed any of the group of manuscripts of which it is a part” (p. 370), is not true. A better case, with considerable, but fewer, reservations, can be made for the Wyclifite character of the Ed-T text,¹ for these two manuscripts preserve the structure and some of the content of the Wyclif original. However, any final determination regarding the Wyclif-influenced character of the various surviving treatises of ‘The Ten Commandments’ must first attend to the agreement in structure and general content before moving on to the congruities of particular biblical readings.

The following somewhat wider discussion is concerned pri-

¹The textual relations and possible Wyclifite character of these two texts are discussed in detail in the following sections.
marily with establishing different textual groups among the various manuscripts catalogued by Kellogg and Talbert, those noted by Dr A. I. Doyle, and those others hitherto unnoticed. The possible textual relationship of different manuscripts to the Wyclif original of Bodleian 789 will be commented on, but only in so far as the occurrence of certain readings is possibly attributable to the existence of a Wyclif original or Wyclif-like original: the central concern of this paper is with the versions of 'The Ten Commandments', and not with the dependence of any one text on some original to which access cannot be proven.

In the first section of this paper I questioned the usefulness of Kellogg and Talbert's discriminatory categories 'Version attributed to Wyclif', 'Expanded Versions', and 'Compressed Versions'. I should like now to suggest that a classification of the versions of 'The Ten Commandments' be made using the categories 'Rhetorical Version', 'Discursive Version', and 'Mixed', or 'Discursive-rhetorical Version'. These are, as will be shown, of more practical value in characterizing and classifying the different extant versions of 'The Ten Commandments', for they allow one to discriminate between them and to classify them with regard to major and obvious structural elements, rather than to the alleged author, and the length of the tract. At a later stage, and with a more restricted purpose, it may be useful to think in terms of Wyclif-influenced texts.

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

1For manuscripts catalogued by Kellogg and Talbert, see their article, noted above, pp. 365–6. Dr A. I. Doyle, in a personal letter of 22 June 1975, supplied the following list of manuscripts: 'A number of other texts I have noted, however, beginning "God hym self . . ." but not as continuing in the same way, some uncertain, some "Who brekp pese commaundementes . . .?" e.g. Hunter v. 8. 15, Bodley 938, Trin. Oxford 86, New College 57, Dr Williams Anc. 3, Add. 28026, Cambridge U.L. ii. vi. 43, Trin. Dublin 70 . . .'. In addition to Kellogg and Talbert's catalogue and Dr Doyle's list the following manuscripts also contain relevant versions of 'The Ten Commandments' and were located in the course of research: Bodl. MS Rawl. C. 209, ff. 2v–7v; EUL MS 93, ff. 1r–3, 4r–10v; Bodl. MS Tanner 336, ff. 144r–145v: Trinity Coll., Cambridge, MS R.3.21 (601), ff. 2v–6v.
Versions of 'The Ten Commandments'
A Catalogue of Manuscripts

**Rhetorical Versions**

**Type I**

- **(Tc)** Trinity College, Dublin MS 70, ff. 174r–181r.
- **(C5)** CUL MS li.6.43, ff. 3r–9r.
- **(Rw)** Bodl. MS Rawl. C. 209, ff. 2r–7r.

**Type II**

- **(Ed)** EUL MS 93, ff. 1r–3r.
- **(Tn)** Bodl. MS Tanner 336, ff. 141r–145r.
- **(B)** Bodl. MS 938, ff. 16r–17r.
- **(N1)** New College, Oxford MS 67, ff. 1r–2r.
- **(Ty)** Trinity College, Oxford MS 86, f. 54r (fragment).

**Discursive Versions**

**Type I**

- **(Hn)** Huntington MS HM 744, f. 13r*.
- **(L2)** Bodl. MS Laud Misc. 524, f. 11r–19.
- **(U)** University College, Oxford, MS 97, ff. 85r–93r.
- **(W)** Westminster School MS 3, ff. 73r–88r.
- **(Pr)** Garrett MS [Princeton Univ. Deposit 1459], f. 1*.
- **(Hs)** BL Harley MS 218, f. 159* [f. 83r in Harleian catalogue].
- **(H6)** BL Harley MS 2346, f. 34r*.
- **(Ra)** BL Royal MS XVII A 26, f. 4r*.

A new catalogue incorporating the above manuscripts, list, and catalogue is included in this article.
Type II

Type III
(C₃) CUL MS Nn.4.12, ff. 3r–7v.
(A₃) BL Add. MS 27592, ff. 42r–45v.
(E) Emmanuel College, Cambridge MS 246, ff. 59v–61v.

Mixed or Discursive-Rhetorical Versions
Type I

Type II
(Ed) EUL MS 93, ff. 4r–10v.
(T) Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.3.21 (601), ff. 2r–6v.

*An asterisk indicates that the manuscript has not yet been consulted, and is included on the authority of Kellogg and Talbert and their catalogue.

I. Rhetorical Versions

'Rhetorical' is here used to describe a kind of text that is compact (when compared to other and different extant texts), rigidly organized, and, with respect to the internal structure of each commandment, repetitive.¹ Texts of the rhetorical version type are organized thus:

¹The term 'rhetorical' is adopted with some hesitation, but as the texts under consideration seem to fulfill in part Aristotle's criteria for good rhetorical prose style the term has been used as descriptive of the texts. See The Rhetoric of Aristotle, tr. R. C. Jebb, ed. J. E. Sandys (Cambridge, 1909), p. 164 (Book III, viii–ix) and the discussion of the 'language of prose'. For the influence of Aristotelian rhetoric on, and its fate in, the medieval sermon see Étienne Gilson, 'Michel Menot et Le Technique du Sermon Médiéval', Les Idées et les Lettres, deuxième ed. (Paris, 1955), 93–154; and the following articles by Harry Caplan, 'Classical Rhetoric and the Mediaeval Theory of Preaching', Classical Philology, xxviii (1933), 73–96, esp. pp. 77 ff.; "Henry of Hesse" on The Art of Preaching', P.M.L.A. Iviii (1933), 340–61, for a useful tract on the art of preaching; and 'Rhetorical Invention in some Mediaeval Tractates on Preaching', Speculum, ii (1927), 288–95.
MIDDLE ENGLISH VERSIONS: TEN COMMANDMENTS

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

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

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

The above structure, or organization, is used throughout the various individual commandments. A good example of this type of text is provided by C₅ below; other samples from different commandments and manuscripts can be found above, in Section I.

C₅, ff. 7r–8r.¹

¹Since no printed edition of this text exists, the following edited text is provided, and with the following editorial changes: abbreviations are expanded and marked; modern punctuation, capitalization, and lineation are provided; emendations are made where necessary and enclosed in square brackets. Other texts, either accessible in Thesis Edinburgh, or available in print, are presented without editorial treatment.
The seventh commandment of God is this: Thou shalt do no theft. And this breaken michers, robbers & extortioners. Whi michers? For dei stelen priueli, as pe prophete osee seip .ij. c": Trupe is not in erpe, but cursidnesse & theft, & mercie is awey, and science of pe lord, for pis ping schal mourne alle pat dwellen peere ynne. Whi robbers? ... [Tn₁, from this point on, follows, for the most part, the version of C₅, J and M.]

Several similarities and dissimilarities, not confined to the seventh commandment, are worth noting: (i) The Ed and Tn₁ texts have the same structure as C₅, J and M: this structure is characterized by its dependence upon the question (and its response) as an organizing element within the treatise itself. (ii) The Ed and Tn₁ texts also have the same supporting biblical and patristic material and in the same order as the version of C₅, J and M. However, while the structure and general content are similar, there are important distinctions within the texts of Ed and Tn₁ that set them apart textually from the other version.

(i) The rhetorical version texts of Ed and part of Tn₁ do not have the statement of commandment and supporting biblical text; for example, the Ed text begins the fourth commandment without mention of the commandment, or the question of who breaks it:

And so vnkynde men, froward men & rebel men breken pis heste. Why vnkynde men?

Likewise, the Tn₁ text begins the fourth commandment without reference to the content of the commandment itself:

Who breken pe fourp commandement? Vnkynde men, frowarde men & rebel men. Whi vnkynde men?

However, Tn₁ is not consistent in this, for with the fifth commandment (and those subsequent) the full commandment is mentioned:

¹The editing of this text follows the conventions set out above in note 1, p. 203.
This abrupt shift in Tn₁ may well be the result, ultimately, of the mixture, or conflation, of two different types of rhetorical versions: one type organized around the question “Who breken pe commandment?” and another type built upon the statement of the commandment, plus the assertion, “And pis [pus] breken men, men, & men.” It is fairly clear that Ed depends upon this latter kind of rhetorical version, for each of its commandments begins: “And so [pus, pies] men, men, & men breken pis heste.” The Ed text, like that of Tn₁, goes on to ask the question “Whi men?” and supplies the answer; in this respect, as well as in the citation of biblical and patristic texts, Ed and Tn₁ follow the main tradition of the rhetorical version.

(ii) There is one other unique feature that suggests that the text of Tn₁ is a distinct type of text within the rhetorical version tradition: The Tn₁ tract begins, formally, with the incipit: “Here is declarid breueli who breken pe ten comaundementis of god”, and ends formally with the explicit: “Here eendip pe X comaundementis schortli declarid. Almiʒti ihesu graunte us grace to kepe hem.” It seems that by design ‘The Ten Commandments’ of Tn₁ were to be “declarid breueli”, and the text, at least through the fourth commandment, follows this design: the text is shorn of the commandments and the biblical material cited in support of them, and the focus is on the breakers of the commandments.

II. Discursive Versions

‘Discursive’ is used here to describe texts which have as their general organizing principle the movement from a premise (in this case the statement of a commandment) to a conclusion (that it is in the interest of God and the sinner that the commandment be obeyed). Generally, the internal structure of each commandment (beyond premise and conclusion) is best described as digressive and, with regard to the cited biblical text,
Specifically, the internal structure of the commandments of the discursive versions can be formally characterized as dialectical in the sense that the commandment itself is a ‘proposition’ to be analysed for its truth; the ‘proofs’ cited in support of the truth of the proposition are biblical and patristic authorities, and the ‘conclusion’ is the restatement of the initial proposition, usually with an expanded tropological sense.

However, while this dialectical structure is not adhered to rigidly in all of the commandments, it is perhaps the most obvious of the various exegetical methods used in the different commandments and in the several treatises. The function of each commandment may, in the end, be that stated by the writer of B1: ‘And so piise ten hestis ben as ten mirouris pat men may se hemsilf ynne’; in the making of the “mirouris” the writer is at liberty, within the allowable conventions of homiletic prose, to use whatever structural or organizing principles were available. It is worth remarking that the actual verbal structure of the discursive versions is not, as in the rhetorical versions, repetitive: there is not the reliance upon the question “Who breken the commandment?”, nor upon its sequel, “And pis [pus] breken ____ men, ____ men, & ____ men.”

The discursive versions, as stated above, are less rigid in internal structure, less rhetorical (in the sense suggested earlier), and perhaps as a result but not a necessary consequence of this looser organization there is greater variation among the various extant texts of the discursive versions of ‘The Ten Commandments’ than among the rhetorical versions texts. It is possible, however, to distinguish two types of discursive versions

---

1With respect to matters of form, and the movement from ‘premise’ to ‘conclusion’, the ‘Discursive Versions’ are best seen as products of the artes praedicandi, which as Caplan points out ‘owe as much eventually to Aristotle’s logical works as to the doctrines of the art of rhetoric proper’ (‘“Henry of Hesse” on The Art of Preaching’, 343).

2Henry of Hesse, among others, identifies four methods in preaching: (1) The oldest, and this Christ used, as well as many holy doctors after him. (2) The modern. (3) The old, which flourished after Christ and the saintly theologians, and before the moderns. (4) The substitute, gathered from all these methods I have mentioned.’ (‘“Henry of Hesse” on The Art of Preaching’, 347; The methods are discussed on pp. 348–59).
texts: Type I\(^1\) represented by S and Type II represented by B\(_1\) (hereafter referred to as Type I and Type II respectively). The two types of texts differ, usually, in content, and when the content is occasionally the same the arrangement of the content will differ; the two texts also have different conclusions. Kellogg and Talbert have compared the two types of texts,\(^2\) and have concluded that B\(_1\) (Type II) is indeed indebted to an S-like text (Type I) for much of its content, and perhaps structure. What Kellogg and Talbert have failed to note, however, is the major, and distinctive addition of Type II, the conclusion to each commandment.

The conclusion to the first commandment of Type II reappears, in a much reworked form, in two other treatises\(^3\) on 'The Ten Commandments'—C\(_3\) and A\(_1\). These two treatises are, with the exception of the first commandment, closely connected with the second Ed treatise on 'The Ten Commandments'. Apart from the conclusion to the first commandment, there are also other points of contact between these two treatises and Types I and II, notably in the first part of the 'Prologue', and in the second commandment (see discussion above, in Section I). A brief discussion of the textual relationships, 'Prologue', second commandment, and conclusion is provided below.

(i) The connection between Type I, Type II, and C\(_3\) is not a purely textual one; that is, if the scribe of the common source of C\(_3\) and A\(_1\) used a Type I or II text it was not so much as an exemplar to be copied as a text to be responded to, to be inspired by. Given the diversity of the texts it is not possible to establish a certain textual connection. However, as the following observations suggest it is possible to note similarities in the subject matter and its treatment, and thus to establish possible lines of

\(^1\)Arnold, iii. 82, distinguished between the commentary of B\(_1\) and 'the mild and colourless commentary of the Laud [L\(_2\)] MS.' and U; Kellogg and Talbert, pp. 367–9, suggest that B\(_1\) may be derived from a version close to that of S (to which L\(_2\) and U are related).

\(^2\)Kellogg and Talbert, pp. 367–9.

\(^3\)Dr Doyle, in a letter of 22 June 1975, furnished references to these two manuscripts, but with regard to 'The Seven Deadly Sins', 'The Five Wits' and 'The Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost'. C\(_3\) and A\(_1\) also have the same version of 'The Seven Deadly Sins'.

influence within specific sections of the treatise. It must be noted though that these lines of influence do not preclude the possibility that $C_3$ and $A_1$ represent a third type of text, a Type III as it were. The following points consider various lines of influence which suggest that this possible third type may have its beginnings in Types I and II.

(ii) The first paragraph of the ‘Prologue’ of $C_3$ ($A_1$ does not have the first paragraph) parallels Type I (S); the ‘Prologue’ of Type II appears to be a reworking of the Type I ‘Prologue’, and is unique. The second paragraph of the ‘Prologue’ of $C_3$ parallels that of $J$, as does the text of $A_1$. In $T$, the ‘Prologue’ is treated as a separate item (with incipit and explicit) and as such it may well have a separate textual history. One textual feature is clear, however, with the exception of $J$, the ‘Prologue’, in its various forms, usually appears in discursive and mixed versions, and not rhetorical versions.

(iii) Likewise, the second commandment of $C_3$ (see Section I, above) and $A_1$ also appears to be connected with the discursive versions, but again the attempt to assign it to any one type within the discursive versions meets with difficulties. In these two treatises the entire commentary on the second commandment is devoted to “Jeremias be prophet seip: pat to a iuste othe longip thre thinges”; if we assume ultimate descent from a Type I or Type II text, then either the commentary is a collapsed version of Type I, or it is a slightly condensed version of Type II, itself a condensation of Type I. The substance and structure of the commentary seem to argue for dependence upon a Type II text: focus on Jeremias 4: 2; paraphrase of Matthew 5: 37 (rather

---

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

2 Manuscripts having the ‘Prologue’ of $J$, in whole or part, are: $T$, ff. 2'-3'; $C_3$, f. 3'; Ed, f. 4' (part); $A_1$, f. 42' (part).

3 See Kellogg and Talbert, p. 370, and Arnold, iii. p. 82.
than a literal translation of Matthew 5: 34-7); and an argument-
commentary constructed around the above biblical texts in
English rather than around a more expansive treatment in Latin
and English as in Type I (which adds Acts 4: 12, and Philippians
2: 10).

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

Type II (B₁, Arnold, iii, pp. 83-4) conclusion to first commandment:

And so pe proude man makip pe feend his god. Pus it is in dede, howeveure oure moublablare. And so preestis pat prechen moore to have a loos, opir for wynnyngge of worldli goodis, opir lustis of hire beli, makyn fals leeknesse in hevene and erpe and water. And pus mai men knowe howe these maundementis ben brokyn, bope of preestis and of seculeres. And so in trust of ymagis many disceyved, in hope of help or helpe in a maner neede, as pe olde lawe and pe newe witnyssen. Pe Dedis of Apostlis, in pe seventenpe chapter, seib pus; Sìpen God is Lord of hevene and of erpe, he wonep not in templis maad wip hondis, ne he is worschipid wip mannys honde, for pat he haþ neede of any ÿinge pat man dop, sìpen he 3iveþ unto alle lii, and wynde ensiprynge, and al opir ÿing. . . . And sìpe we ben pe kyn of God, us auȝte not suppose pat pat perteynep unto God is like unto gold or silver or ston, of pe craft of gravynge, or of mannis hond-worcychynge. For pat ÿing pat is hyge to men, is abhominacioun biforn God. But, for we knowyn him litil, we loven him pe lesse.

A₁ and C₃ (text), f. 4ʳ, conclusion to first commandment:

And as it is a cursede avoutrie a man to drawe a weie some of is loue from his trwe wife and sette it on is concubynes, so it is gostli a cursed avoutrie to god a man to drawe ony part of his loue, opir of `his' truste and sette it on opir dede ymages, or on dremes, or on ony opir fantasyes. For god wilnot pus be worschiped in dede ymages, bot in quicke men, ÿi whiche ben oneli goddes ymages, and lickenesse of ÿe holi trynite; ÿis is ÿe treuth, al ÿi auaryce of worldli prestes and blynye customes of ÿe lewed peple, bi illusions of ÿe feend, faste and myȝtylich defendynge ÿe contrarie of ÿis matere, more trauaylynge for ofrynge of wordly godes ÿan for helpe of mannens soule or pore mennes profite, as her dede schewip. And suche viciouse prestes ben vnable to be cleped herdes of mannens soules, for holy writte cleþep wicked prestes blynye lederes in ÿe gospelle of matheu, ÿe fifetep chapitur [mᵗ. xv⁴., marginalium]. . . . And suche viciouse prestes folow þou nouȝt, neiþep leue hem nouȝt liȝtli to þei despice her synne, and go vertuesliche þe riȝt weie to heuene.

C₃ and A₁, like B₁ (Type II), mention priests, and the often bad example they set: “And so preestis þat prechen moore to have a loos, opir for wynnyngge of worldli goodis, opir lustis of hire beli,
makyn fals leeknesse in hevene and erpe and water”, (B₁); “And suche viciouse prestes ben vnable to be cleped herdes of mannes soules, for holy writte clepe wicked prestes bynde lederes in pe gospelle of matheu” (text of C₃, see also A₁). No other extant texts mention priests.

Another feature shared by these three texts is the linking of false gods with images: “And so in trust of ymagis many ben discyveyd, in hope of help or helpe in a maner neede, as pe olde lawe and pe newe witnyssen... Siþen God is Lord of hevene and of erpe, he wonep not in templis maad wiþ hondis, ne he is worshchipid wiþ mannys honde...” (B₁); “so it is gostli a cursed avoutrie to god a man to drawe any part of his loue, oiper of ‘his’ truste and sette it on oþer dede ymages, or on dremes, or on any oþer fantasyes. For god wilnot pus be worchiped in dede ymages...” (text of C₃, see also A₁). C₃ and A₁ are, admittedly, more virulent in their denunciations of priests, and the suggestion of an image (in the notion of the “straunge goddes” of the first commandment) receives far more attention in them than it does in B₁, but the vehement tone, and the unbalanced discussion, do not materially affect the possible literary connection between B₁ and C₃ A₁: these three texts, for this one commandment and its conclusion, agree in substance and tone. It is not possible, with the evidence available, to state with any certainty that the C₃ and A₁ texts were influenced by the text of B₁, but the evidence adduced does at least suggest that behind the text of C₃ and A₁, and at some stage, there lay a B₁-like text.

Of equal uncertainty is the extent of their debt to the Type I text. It can be argued that the common source of a much condensed version like that of C₃ and A₁ may have been influenced by a fuller text at some stage in the composition of the treatise (note reference to “leremy pe prophet”)¹. If this did occur then the texts of C₃ and A₁ may preserve an abridged version (with interpolations) of a one-time longer version. A problem arises, however, when suitable longer versions are being sought out as possible influential sources. The analogous references, and

¹See Thesis Edinburgh, pp. 110–12, for additional evidence of probable access to a fuller text.
vaguely similar content, are of little value in establishing textual connections. At best one is left with possible lines of influence, and for the texts of C3 and A1 these lines of influence run through both Type I and Type II. It is well to keep in mind that much of what has been said regarding the texts of C3 and A1 will hold true for the discursive section of the second Ed treatise on 'The Ten Commandments', a text to which a separate section will be devoted.

III. The Mixed (or Discursive–Rhetorical) Versions

'Mixed' is used to describe a text which in its structure is composed of specific portions of discursive and rhetorical version texts. That is, any given commandment in the mixed version text will have two separate and distinct sections: (i) the commentary, or argument, will be discursive, and perhaps related to one of the established discursive versions; and (ii) the conclusion will be rhetorical, and usually a condensation of one of the rhetorical versions.¹

The following is a study of the structure and content of the treatise on 'The Ten Commandments' found in both the Ed and T manuscripts; it is an account, in so far as this is possible, of the way this treatise took the shape it has in this version. In this study of the treatise, the various ways in which it is similar to or dissimilar from the other extant treatises on 'The Ten Commandments' will be considered. Such a study will allow one to place the texts of Ed and T relative to these and it will also provide the necessary background material for a more speculative account of the way the text took shape.

It has already been noted in the catalogue above that the treatise of Ed and T is a mixed or discursive–rhetorical version, and that such versions have a discursive commentary and a rhetorical conclusion, and that each section is separate. Such a

¹The present structural classification does not rule out the possibility that there might be mixed texts which do not fit the above criteria; when (and if) such texts are found then the criteria, and perhaps the idea mixed, will have to be reinterpreted in light of the new evidence.
structure is apparent in the following extract from the commentary and conclusion¹ of the first commandment:

Ed (f. 4r):

Thys is þe first heest of god almyghty, commaundyng all affeccions, all loue, all worshype, and all þe ioy of mannes hert be doon to our lord lhesu crist.

Here god commaundith þat all mannes bileue, trust, and loue be set onely in god & in none ðoper thyng ayenst his wil. And here he forfendith all bileue & trust in all maner wichecraftes, sweuences, charmes, coniurisons, for þo þat putten her bileue or trust in cny suche, withdrawyng somewhat of her bileue & trust fro god, & so brekyng þis heste. Also proude men, worldly men, and fleshly men breken þis heest. Why proude men? For þei maken þe deuel her god. Why worldly men? For þei make worldly goodys her god. Why fleshly men? For þei maken her belies her god.

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

Lb (Lay Folks’ Catechism, E.E.T.S., O.S., cxviii, p. 35)

Þou most loue hym with al þyn herte. and seke his worschipe. and plese hym be fore alle ðoper thyngys. If þou do þis wel. þou most stody to kepe his comaundementys and his lawe be-fore alle ðoper preceptys and lawes maad of men for ellys þou louyst not hys lawe be-fore ðoper. and so not hym-self be-fore ðal ðoper thyngys Also þou most forsake al maner wychecraftys. and coniyrnge of fendys. and þat þou seke nat trewthe of dede spiritys. but only of god. and his lawe as he comaundys hym-self in his lawe.


¹A comparison of the various statements of commandments might prove useful in identifying and clarifying textual connections; but as such a comparison involves the added, and as yet unsettled, textual complexities of the Earlier and Later Versions of the Wyclifite Bible, it is best that such complexities be set aside, and that the lesser textual complexities of the commentary and conclusion be dealt with: see p. 198, n. 2 above, and references there cited.
for they make worldly godys here god. and why fleschly Men for they make here bely here god.

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

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

(i) The rhetorical sections of Lb begin with the question of "Who brekys pe ______ maundement?" The EdT text begins its rhetorical sections with the assertion "Also ______ men, ______ men, and ______ men breken pis heest." In all other respects the three texts—Lb, Ed and T—are virtually alike, and among the various rhetorical versions these three texts are unique for their concision, and catechetical-like form. For the rhetorical sections the three texts probably drew from the same common source, with the text of Lb retaining a feature—the introductory question—usually associated with the more expansive and didactic rhetorical versions.

(ii) In the discursive section, however, the Lb text appears to have had access to a source distinct from that of Ed and T, and indeed distinct from the other texts previously considered. Lb preserves vestiges of another text, and one not too distant from Type I: these are most clearly seen in the fourth commandment where Lb elaborates on the comment "Holy wryt spekys of pre fadys"; a similar elaboration is to be found in Type I (S) and it is introduced, and partially summed up as well, by a similar comment "But heere 3e schullen vndurstonde p' per beon preo maners of fader and mooder". Both texts then go on to develop,
in their own distinctive ways, the three sources of "fader and mooder": "bodili fader and mooder"; "pe secounde maner of fader and mooder . . . is crist and his blessede moode[rl]. vr ladi seinte Marie"; "And also god is oure cheef fader. and al holy chirche p4 is pe noumber of alle gode angels".¹ The texts of Ed and T do not deal explicitly with "pre fadyrs" or "preo maners of fader and mooder", nor do the closely related texts of C3 and A1. A comparison of each commandment of the Lb text with the corresponding commandment in a Type I or II text suggests that the dependence of the Lb text upon one type or another is tenuous. This is also true of a similar comparison with the texts of Ed and T, and the C3 and A1 texts: the version of Lb, like B1, appears to be unique, both in the sources it has tapped, and in the comment appended to them.

The possible textual relationship of C3 and A1 to Types I and II has been considered in the section on discursive versions and as stated there any consideration of the texts of C3 and A1 is, implicitly, a consideration of the texts of Ed and T so close are the two types. In general, it has been suggested that C3 and A1 show signs of having drawn on both Type I and II texts, but that definite textual connections could not be established. This is true of the Ed and T texts as well. In Section I, above, there are set out extracts of the second commandment from the Ed, C3, S (Type I), and B1 (Type II) texts; the comparison there indicates that for the second commandment the EdT, and C3A1 texts are closer to a Type II than to a Type I version, but, again, the evidence for a textual connection is lacking. Perhaps more revealing in the comparison is the closeness of the C3 text to that of Ed. A closer study of the texts of C3A1 and their relationship to those of Ed and T might be useful in illuminating a possible method of composition of the EdT version.

With the exception of the first commandment, and setting aside the comparison of the second commandment noted above, the closeness, the textual similarity, of C3 and A1 to EdT has only been asserted. The following points cover the range of similarities and dissimilarities among the four texts:

(i) The second, third, fifth and sixth commandments of C3 and

¹Vices and Virtues, Appendix I, p. 325.
A\textsubscript{1} parallel, in whole or part, the EdT version: of these parallel texts only the fifth follows the EdT version completely. The other parallel texts either are shorter (being compressed by omission), or they parallel the Ed text for a number of lines, and then diverge. The following commandment, with commentary, is cited to illustrate the degree of similarity of the commandment closest to that of the Ed text:

\begin{verbatim}
C\textsubscript{3}, f. 5\textsuperscript{v}:
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{pis is \textit{pe fyuep heeste of god. De fyuep heeste. Pou schalt slee no man. And pis heeste forbede\textit{p al vnskilful sleeynge, pe whiche is seide in foure maneres, as bodili man-slaughter, and bacbitynge & wip-holdynge of worldli goodes or gostely from hem pat nedep \textit{pese goodes, and yuel ensaumple of lyuynge to pe peple. Alle \textit{pese braunches ben before god greuouse manslaught\textit{ters, pe whiche as seynt poule seip in pe first epistel to pe corinthes in pe sext chapitur: haue\textit{p no part in pe kyngdom of heuen.}

The fifte commandment of god is \textit{pis. Thou shalt not slee no man wilfully, neiper with euel wil in hert. Ffor \textit{pis is one of the iij. synnes pat euer cryeth vengeance before all myghty god. And now \textit{pis syn is seid of iij. maners, as bodely manus slaughter, bakbytyng, with holding of worldely goodis or gostely fro hem pat nedith \textit{pies goodis, and euel ensample of lyuyng of \textit{pe peple. All \textit{pies braunchyes bene before god greuous manslaughters, pe whiche, as seyth seynt poule, haip no parte in pe kyngdom of heuen. And pus enuyous men... [Rhetorical Version text follows].}

For this particular commandment, as well as for those which partially parallel the Ed text, it is clear that both texts depend, ultimately, upon the same common source. However, this dependence is not complete, as the following establishes.

(iii) The first, fourth, seventh, eighth, and the ninth and tenth\textsuperscript{1} commandments do not parallel the Ed text. It seems that for these commandments the scribe, or in this context the author, of the common source of A\textsubscript{1} chose to interpolate, or rather to adapt the text to his own particular, and caustic, ends. The eighth commandment is an exemplary adaptation:

\begin{verbatim}
C\textsubscript{3}, ff. 6\textsuperscript{v}–7\textsuperscript{r}:
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{De ei3tep heest of god almighti. Pe ei3tip heeste is \textit{pis. Dou schalt bere no fals wittennesse. And heere al manere of lesynges ben forbode, for eche lesyng is
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{1}The ninth and tenth commandments of C\textsubscript{3} and A\textsubscript{1} are highly condensed, and thus bear little resemblance to the relatively full text of Ed. The tenth commandment parallels the Ed text for the final six lines.
The above interpolation, and the previously noted dissimilarities, point towards a common source for C₃ and A₁ distinct from that of the Ed and T texts. Yet behind this common source there lies a text which in its discursive sections resembles the probable common source of the texts of Ed and T. This surmise is based upon the following observations:

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

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

(iii) C₃, A₁ and T have the same ‘Prologue’, with Ed having the conclusion to this ‘Prologue’. Again, the presence of such a text in two separate versions strongly suggests that all four of these depend upon a common source for their text of the ‘Prologue’.

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