HE following essay is an attempt to relate Rylands English MSS. 85 and 90 to the background of Wyclifite commentary by which both were strongly influenced. Section I of the essay will discuss the development of English manuals of religious instruction, and Section II the alterations carried out upon these compilations by the Wyclifite commentator. Sections III and IV will deal with the Pater Noster and Ten Commandments as perhaps the most notable examples of the confusions wrought by the process of Wyclifite revision. These sections will offer tentative catalogues, respectively of the Pater Noster and Ten Commandments, and will endeavour to indicate the positions of Rylands English MSS. 85 and 90 in the developing tradition of the Wyclifite commentary. Section V will present for the first time an edition of the highly interesting Ten Commandments of Rylands English MS. 85, and Section VI will be devoted to some concluding remarks.

I. THE ENGLISH MANUAL OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

The ultimate source of the kind of literature to be discussed in the present essay is the Lateran Council of 1215. The importance there accorded the cure of souls placed before the

1 Here and in the following discussion we are indebted to the excellent essay by the Rev. L. E. Boyle, O.P., S.T.L., "The Oculus Sacerdotis and Some Other Works of William of Pagula," Trans. Royal Hist. Soc., 5th ser., v (1955), 81-110.
Church a clearly defined educational duty. It must produce within the clergy as a whole a level of doctrinal knowledge adequate to the instruction of the laity in the basic principles of the Christian faith. However, during the years which followed the Lateran Council the English Church met this need only with varying diocesan legislation, and it was not until the Council of Lambeth in 1281 that a programme of general scope and effectiveness was introduced. This programme was set forth in the famous *Ignorantia Sacerdotum* 1 of Archbishop Pecham, at once a powerful indictment of the learning of the clergy and a clear statement of the level of competence the clergy was to be required to maintain. Four times a year, each priest entrusted with the cure of souls was to preach to his parishioners "vulgariter, absque cujuslibet subtilitatis textura fantastica", the essentials of the Christian faith. These essentials were the Articles of the Faith, the Commandments of the Old and New Testaments, the Seven Works of Mercy, the Seven Deadly Sins, the Seven Principal Virtues, and the Seven Sacraments. Shortly after the middle of the fourteenth century, this summary of doctrine became authoritative in the Province of York as well as in that of Canterbury. In 1357 John de Thoresby, Archbishop of York, reaffirmed almost verbatim in his own Ordinances the provisions of the Lambeth Constitutions noted above. Henceforth there was imposed upon the laity of both provinces a common duty of learning and upon the clergy a common duty of instruction.

As might be expected, much of the literature designed to furnish the parish priest with the knowledge demanded of him by archiepiscopal legislation was in Latin. The first and most notable effort in this genre was the *Oculus Sacerdotis* (c. 1320) of William of Pagula, 2 himself, appropriately enough, a parish priest of Berkshire. The excellence of this work is made clear by the number of imitations which followed it: the *Cilium Oculi Sacerdotis* (1330-40), the *Regimen Animarum* (1343), and the

---

1 David Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae* (London, 1737), ii. 54-6. The relevant chapter of the *Lambeth Constitutions* is also accessible in *Lay Folks Catechism*, ed. T. F. Simmons and H. E. Nolloth, EETS. OS. 118. 3 ff.

We follow Father Boyle in referring to the chapter by its *incipit*.

2 See Boyle, op. cit. p. 83. This is, of course, not to say there were no manuals anteceding Pagula and the Pecham Constitutions. See Boyle, p. 93.
Papilla Oculi of John de Burgh (1384). However, even though this same sort of Latin manual continued to appear during the course of the fifteenth century, the impulse to explain "vulgariter et absque subtilitate" was being felt as early as the fourteenth. The Latin Speculum Christiani (c. 1360-80), likewise based on the Lambeth Constitutions, contains English verse and an English sermon; a single manuscript, dating from the fifteenth century, is entirely in English. William of Wadington wrote his Manuel des Pechiez in Anglo-Norman, but by the early years of the fourteenth century it had become the Handlyng Syrne of Robert of Brunne. In 1279, two years before the Council of Lambeth, Frère Lorens composed his immensely popular Somme le Roi, which appeared in England in the fourteenth century as the Asenbite of Inwit and the Book of Vices and Virtues, and again in the fifteenth century as Caxton's Royal Book. Perhaps the best example of the power of this movement is to be found in Chaucer's "Parson's Tale", where just such a vernacular manual is accorded the honour of knitting up the "greet mateere" of the Canterbury Tales.

During the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the development discussed above is marked by two opposing tendencies. The first is to cover a vast number of topics in "schort wordes". Aside from the simplicity and clarity urged

2 The Regimen Animarum's paraphrase of Archbishop Pecham's phrase. See B.M. Harley MS. 2272, fol. 88r.
3 Ed. Gustaf Holmstedt, EETS. OS. 182. The single English translation is to be found in B.M. Harley MS. 6580. Since Holmstedt (p. xxxvi) does not believe this to be an original, there is very little basis on which to proceed in arriving at a date for the actual translation. Holmstedt's conclusions as to authorship, that the author of the original version was a Franciscan and the translator of the English a Lollard (pp. clxxix-clxxx), seem to have been arrived at in the absence of substantial evidence.
5 The translations cited are simply the most notable. W. N. Francis in his edition of the Book of the Vices and Virtues (EETS. OS. 217) points out the existence of eight translations of the Somme le Roi other than the Book of Vices and Virtues (op. cit. p. xxxii).
by the *Ignorancia Sacerdotum*, a sufficient reason for this tendency seems to have been the vast and growing list of items to be covered. One finds joined to the basic Pecham-Thoresby topics a considerable list of miscellaneous additions: the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Seven Virtues opposed to the Seven Deadly Sins, the Five Bodily Wits, the Five Ghostly Wits, the Pater Noster, Ave Maria and Creed. These last three—Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Creed—in fact constitute a separate group and are from the beginning of the thirteenth century found as a unit, usually in poetry, but sometimes in prose, or in a combination of prose and poetry.\(^1\) It seems likely that during the course of the thirteenth century, the Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Creed associated themselves with other standard devotional topics—the Ten Commandments, the Seven Deadly Sins, Seven Works of Mercy and thus formed a further grouping.\(^2\) In any case, after the promulgation of the Lambeth Constitutions, the Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Creed joined with the Pecham list to form an expanded grouping;\(^3\) and this grouping finally expanded again to include later accretions, such as the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Five Bodily Wits, Five Ghostly Wits, etc. It is probably not worth-while to multiply examples of this sort of collection, but one is certainly worth citing, if only as a kind of *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole "shoort wordes" approach.

\(^1\) Cf. Lambeth 487, fol. 21\(^v\) [Pater Noster BR 2709], fol. 25\(^v\) [prose Creed] (c. 1200); Arundel 292, fol. 3\(^r\) [Creed BR 1326], fol. 3\(^r\) [Pater Noster BR 787], fol. 3\(^v\) [Ave Maria BR 2100] (13th cent.); Cotton Cleopatra B 6, fol. 204\(^v\) [Pater Noster BR 2706], fol. 204\(^v\) [Ave Maria BR 1062]; fol. 204\(^v\) [prose Creed] (13th cent.); Caius Coll., Camb. 52, fol. 43\(^r\) [prose Creed, Pater Noster, Ave] (13th-14th cent.). The abbreviation "BR" is used to refer to the *Index of Middle English Verse*, ed. Carleton Brown and R. H. Robbins (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1943).

\(^2\) See Emanuel Coll., Camb. 27, fol. 162\(^r\) (late 13th cent.) where this exact grouping is found. The occurrence of the Ten Commandments, Seven Deadly Sins, and Seven Works of Mercy in this manuscript may reflect the influence of the *Ignorancia Sacerdotum*, but the time interval makes this seem rather improbable. It is more likely that the two groupings, both popular, became associated during the thirteenth century at a time antecedent to the publication of the Lambeth Constitutions.

\(^3\) Bodl. 2298 (Bodley 549, fol. 77\(^v\) [early 15th cent.]), and Bodl. 13679 (Rawl. D 913), fol. 10\(^r\) [15th cent.] offer examples of the Pater Noster and Creed linked to the whole of the Pecham list, with the single exception of the Fourteen Articles.
This is the magnificently titled *Tabula Compendiosa de Fide Christiana*,¹ which in two folios and no particular order contains virtually every topic mentioned above: the Seven Virtues, the Seven Deadly Sins, the Seven Virtues opposed to the Seven Deadly Sins, the Seven Acts of Bodily Mercy, the Seven Acts of Ghostly Mercy, the Seven Sacraments, the Seven Petitions of the Pater Noster, the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Two Principal Commandments, the Ten Commandments, and the Five Bodily Wits.

Opposed to this tendency toward inclusiveness at all costs was a second and equally vigorous tendency. This was to provide, in English, commentaries as full and informative as those contained in the Latin manuals. The *Azenbite of Inwit* and the *Book of the Vices and Virtues*, both drawn—as noted above—from the Dominican Frère Lorens and through him related to the great *Summae* of Pennafort and Peraldus, are both excellent examples of this tendency. However, for purposes of the present essay, these well-known works are of considerably less interest than more obscure compilations with which the Wyclifite adapter seems to have felt more at ease. Such compilations, examples of which will be discussed in detail below, usually contain tractates on the Pater Noster, Creed, Ten Commandments, Vices, and Virtues. As such they appear in subject matter to be quite similar to the *Tabula Compendiosa*, noted above, or indeed to the *Azenbite* itself. There are, however, important differences. Unlike the compendious collections, the commentaries in question were works of at least some size. As such they were capable of absorbing without undue disturbance the infusion of opinions, which, if stated baldly and alone, would have immediately appeared shocking or heretical. They were also, when revised, capable of serving as preaching handbooks for "treue prestis". Unlike the established works, these commentaries were, with a few striking exceptions, little enough known to permit unobtrusive alterations. The following section will discuss a few representative commentaries and the changes they underwent at the hands of the Wyclifite adapter.

¹ B.M. Add. 10106, fols. 40r-40v (15th cent.). For other similarly expanded treatments, see Bodl. 3054 (Bodley 938), and Bodl. 10027 (Tanner 201).
II. The Wyclifite Method

The appeal of the mother tongue was for Wyclif unlimited. His insistence upon preaching, his plan for the translation of the Bible, all testify to his faith in the power of the vernacular. The existence therefore of English commentaries on basic doctrine must have seemed to him and his followers an opportunity not easily ignored. If the "Ten Commandments" published by Thomas Arnold in his Select English Works of John Wyclif is, as it is generally taken to be, both genuine Wyclif and an early work, it would appear that the master himself showed the way. In any case, the technique, whether practised by master or disciple, is relatively uniform. Let us consider an example. British Museum Royal MS. XVII A 26, a fifteenth-century collection of religious tracts in English, has often been connected with the name of Wyclif and has even been displayed in a Wyclif exhibition. A reading of the manuscript, however, shows it to be singularly devoid of Wyclifite sentiments. The truth of the matter would seem to be that in Royal MS. XVII A 26 we have not a Wyclifite manuscript, but a most interesting example of the kind of manuscript on which the Wyclifite commentator delighted to operate. For instance, at fols. 22r-26v of this manuscript is found a brief treatise, outspoken but certainly not heretical, on the Seven Deadly Sins. If this short tractate is compared with the vast and discursive Seven Deadly Sins (c. 1385) once attributed to Wyclif but now more usually to Nicholas Hereford, a quite definite pattern emerges. Hereford, or whoever the adapter was, begins each section of his own commentary with a word by word transcription of his original. If the material encountered fails to impinge upon any

---

1 See H. B. Workman, John Wyclif (Oxford, 1926), ii. 201 ff.; ii. 149 ff. Hereafter referred to as "Workman".
2 Oxford, 1869-71; iii. 82-92. Hereafter referred to as "Arnold".
4 Edmund D. Jones was the first to make this attribution. See Anglia, xxx (1907), 267-8. He is followed in this by Workman, i. 330; ii. 135; and H. E. Winn, Wyclif: Select English Writings (Oxford, 1929), pp. 146-7. Workman assigns the Seven Deadly Sins to about the year of Hereford's return from Rome (1385). Cf. John Wyclif, ii. 135, and Winn, Wyclif, p. 147.
of Hereford’s prepared responses, he continues to the end of the section in his original and then proceeds to add comment of his own. Thus, in his treatment of Pride, he reproduces, virtually word for word, all of the commentary to be found on fols. 22r-23r of Royal MS. XVII A 26, and then adds a brief but uninspired diatribe on the “falshed of prelatis and prestis.” If, on the other hand, the material found in his original touches upon a favourite doctrinal theme, he extemporizes vigorously until his ingenuity is exhausted, and then returns meekly to his source. An example of this is to be found in Hereford’s treatment of the sin of Gluttony. For purposes of comparison, the entire passage as contained in Royal MS. XVII A 26, fols. 25r-25v is reproduced below:

The sixte synne of these seuene is clepid glotenye: and it falliþ to pe fleisch / but boþe pe fend and pe world tempten man to his synne / for bi fallyng in to his synne. Pei han a man liþtli to her propre synne bi cause of her temptynge. for glotenye falliþ þanne to man / whanne he takiþ mete or drynke more þan profitiþ to his soule / but certis it mai falle to man þat he synneþ in abstynence: as whanne he fediþ not his bodi þat schulde bere hym to serve his soule / and upon fyue maneris men synnen in excess of etynge and drynkynge / and comynli clerkis first / Whanne a man etiþ or drynkiþ bifoþ þe tyme þat resoun schulde axe. as glotouns of drynke wolen drynke in þe morewe / and þat as þei seien askiþ drunke-nesse ouer euene / sum man to hastili etiþ and drynkiþ / and þat is a þenus fisik and doiþ harm to his bodi / and sum man to tendirli norischen her bodies. and spenden goodis goodis in to costli metis and drynkis in glotenye / and sum men to lustfuli etiþ and drynkiþ: and þat distemperiþ a man in bodi and soule / and sum men taken hem a tyme to

1 Cf. Arnold, iii. 122.
2 The authors do not maintain that the tract in Royal XVII A 26 is necessarily the source of Hereford’s Seven Deadly Sins, but the correspondences are so exact that the actual source must have been something very close indeed to the tractate found in Royal XVII A 26.
If one examines this passage side by side with the *Seven Deadly Sins* printed by Arnold, Hereford’s procedure becomes apparent. He begins exactly as in his source “to sixte synne”¹ and follows it almost word for word until the conclusion of the first italicized passage (line 9-12), at which point he digresses for some 500 words on the abuses of abstinence.² He then returns to his text at the precise point at which he left it “upon fyue manere” (line 12),³ follows it verbatim until he reaches the second italicized passage (lines 28-31), where he finds clerks and others attacked for their excessive passion for food and drink. This is material precisely to his taste, for it provides an opportunity for an eloquent indictment of the gluttony of the religious, particularly monks. In Arnold’s text the passage reads:

And God woot whethepr proude clerkis synnen in þese maners ; þe, religiouse men, as mounkes or freris, wasten more meete or drinke þen profitis to hom. Ffor, as mony men seyn, mounkes haf grete kuppes, and purchascen pardoun to men þat

---

¹ Arnold, iii. 155 (CAP. XXV).
² Ibid. 155-156. The digression runs from 155, thirteen lines from bottom, to 156, four lines from bottom. It is interesting that Hereford alters “bodi” to “horse” and states his material in terms of a knight metaphor. See n. 3, p. 353 below and Arnold, iii. 130.
³ Ibid. 156 (four lines from bottom of page).
drinken depe of hom, and in hor bred and hor drinke asken þei a mesure, and
stryven for defaute þerof more þen defaute of virtues. As þei asken nombre
and grettenesse of eyren, so þei asken largenesse of flesche and of fische; and
þus þei harmen homself in mortheryng of meete.¹

Hereford's original, with its reference to "clerkis and religiouse
men and . . . men of þis world" (lines 29-30), also happily pro­
vides him with the main elements of the Wyclifite scheme he has
sporadically been pursuing, that of the three estates of the Church:
preachers, defenders, and labourers.² Thus, having disposed of
the clergy as above, Hereford now proceeds to the profession of
arms. For this discussion he finds no material at all in his original,
and is under the necessity of drawing it from other sources, largely,
perhaps, personal experience.³ However, when he reaches the
third estate, he returns again to his original for its discussion of
the excesses of the working man's Sabbath. The labourer,
Hereford declares, should not on that day devote himself to
imbibing, but should:

take sum drinke on werk day, and not spende al on holy day; ffor Þis Þing unables
hom to serve God on holy day, and makes hom to feght as wode men, ȝe, more
þen beestis done, ffor beestis kepen more mesure in etyng and drinkyng.⁴

A glance at the third italicized passage will, we think, reveal that
Hereford has recast this passage to form the conclusion of his
discussion of Gluttony.

A second opportunity for observing the Wyclifite commentator
at work is provided by MS. Bibliothèque Ste Genevieve, Paris,
3390. Like Royal MS. XVII A 26, this is a collection of devo­
tional tracts in English, written in the fifteenth century, but
containing materials clearly extant in the fourteenth century.
W. P. Cumming, the first to describe this manuscript,⁵ declared
that its interest lay "in the number of 'Wycliffite tracts' in a
non-Wycliffite form which it contains".⁶ Let us examine this
statement.

¹ Arnold, iii. 157 (eight lines from top).
² Ibid. 130; see also Workman, ii. 8, n. 3.
³ Jones considered that "the frequent references to knights and the nobility" pointed to "an author of high social standing, and, from what we can gather,
Nicolas Hereford . . . was such a person" (Anglia, xxx. 267-8).
⁴ Arnold, iii. 160 (twelve lines from top).
⁵ W. P. Cumming, "A Middle English MS. in the Bibliothèque Ste
⁶ Ibid. p. 864.
If the reader turns to fols. 30r-37r of MS. Bibl Ste Genevieve 3390, he encounters a short tractate on the three theological virtues. Cumming suggests this as the unaltered original of the Wyclifite “Faith, Hope, and Charity” printed by F. D. Matthew in his English Works of Wyclif. At first glance a comparison of the two texts would seem to bear out Cumming’s contention completely. To begin with, let us examine the discussion of Charity in fols. 34v-35r of the Bibl. Ste Genevieve manuscript:

> Pe pridde vertu of god is loue of charite / and it haþ two braunches / as loue of god and of man / and pe beste mene to kepe þis loue were a man to lere and loue to kepe two tables of godes hestes / for bi þis and ellus noþt: kepít man hym in charite / and þis uertu cloþ man at domusday wiþ bríst slotþes / and þis cloþ may neuere be lost in þis world ne in þe toþer / for no man may come to heuen : but ȝif he haue þis cloþing / ne no man may haue þis cloþing: but ȝif he come to heuene / and so men þat schul be damned haue but feyned charite. But lyue wel after godes lawe: and hope to have þis laste loue / for no man knowe ne schal trowe to haue hit: but god wille telle hym priueilie. The Wyclifite commentator follows exactly with only one slight variation (“bride-cloþis” for “bríst cloþis”), but then adds:

> and so freris, þat louen more her habite þat þei han ordeyned hem þan þe cloþ of charite þat god haþ schapen his sones, ben yuel disposid to haue þis cloþ of charite.²

To all appearances, one finds here the customary orthodox text plus Wyclifite addition. Nevertheless, despite the neat line it is here possible to draw between original and addition, it seems a little dangerous to suppose, as Cumming seems to, that because the addition is Wyclifite the original is orthodox.³ One observes, for instance, that the Bibl. Ste Genevieve discussion of Charity, as reproduced above, has a quite distinct predestinarianism not very different from that of Wyclif himself.⁴ To this necessary reservation, one must add

---

¹ EETS. OS. 74, 346-55. Matthew believed the tract to be an example of Wyclif’s simple evangelical teaching (p. 346). Jones rejected it and attributed it without much confidence to Hereford (Anglia, xxx. 266-7). Workman classes it only as a work not by Wyclif (Workman, i. 330).
² Matthew, p. 352 (three lines from top).
³ Cumming’s analogy to the orthodox Ten Commandments would seem to make it clear that he regards the Bibl. Ste Genevieve Faith, Hope, and Charity as completely orthodox and the version published in Matthew as Wyclifite (PMLA, xlii. 863).
⁴ Workman, ii. 9. Note in the Bibl. Ste Genevieve passage the presence of (1) unknowability of salvation, (2) man’s duty to hope.
the presence in this same manuscript of a Pater Noster and Apostles Creed, both attributed by Arnold to Wyclif. Of these, the first, the Pater Noster, is an ambiguous work which contains no clearly identifiable Wyclifite ideas, but, in numerous manuscripts, is found closely associated with Wyclifite tracts. The Apostles Creed, however, has, in the form published by Arnold, two quite definite Wyclifite outbursts. The Bibliothèque Ste Geneviève manuscript possesses the first (fol. 24r):

oure bileue teche? us : >at god ordeynede it al and bad >at men scholde kunne it and teche it to oj'ere and >at stones scholde crye as secular lords schulde schulde schulde schulde schulde schulde in defauete of prelats eure and teche >e lawe of god in hor moder tunge.

The second outburst is, however, lacking. As printed by Arnold, this reads:

And so, as sum menjynke, þese popys ne þese prelatys ar nat part of holy Chirche, but of synagoge ; sethen þey mot leve aftry Crist þif þey schul be savyd. þus techas oure beleve, howeyer Anticrist grucchis.

If one should again be tempted to discover orthodox commentary altered by Wyclifite intruder, a brief consultation of the Bibl. Ste Geneviève MS. at the point at which alteration commences will tend to remove the temptation. No earthly man, says the commentator of the Bibl. Ste Geneviève MS., is a part of the Church Triumphant:

but þif he com to heuen bi his holi liuyng. and þus men lakkeþ kunnyng and knowyng: wheder þei ben partyes of holi chirche. for þei scholde not boste: of hiȝenesse of hor prelacie.

1 Arnold, iii. 93 ; 114.
2 See discussion below, p. 359.
3 Arnold, iii. 114 (eight lines from beginning). Arnold's text reads "and secler lordys" rather than "as secular lordes".
4 Arnold, iii. 116 (ten lines from bottom).
5 The alteration actually begins with the interjected single sentence: "But þey mot leve aftry Crist þif þey schul be savyd; þor þus techs oure beleve, however Antecrist werke" (Arnold, iii. 116 [fourteen lines from bottom]). The two sentences which intervene between this single sentence and the attack on popes and prelates seem to be part of the base commentary, and are found both in the Arnold text and in the Bibl. Ste Geneviève MS. (f. 26v). The three divisions of the Church here stated, although traditional, is also a Wyclifite idea (see Workman, ii. 8, n. 3).
6 MS. Bibl. Ste Geneviève 3390, f. 26v. The passage quoted seems likewise to be part of the base commentary common to both the version printed by Arnold (see iii. 116, middle of page) and the Bibl. Ste Geneviève MS.
Once again the sentiments here stated sound very much like applied Wyclifite predestinarianism in a characteristic form.\(^1\) If one is correct in detecting in the supposed source an underlying Wyclifite tone, it seems likely that to the confusion arising from orthodox commentary altered by Wyclifite commentator, one must also add that of Wyclifite commentary altered by Wyclifite commentator.

The most dramatic and celebrated instance of Wyclifite adaptation is, of course, that of Archbishop Thoresby’s *Ordinances*. As already noted, these were published in 1357 as a kind of reaffirmation, for the Province of York, of Pecham’s *Ignorantia Sacerdotum*. At the same time, Archbishop Thoresby seems to have had the rather novel idea of giving his *Ordinances* greater circulation by accompanying them with an authorized English translation, said to be in alliterative unrhymed verse,\(^2\) by one John de Gaytryge, or Gaysteke, or Caterige, or more probably Graystok,\(^3\) a monk of St. Mary’s, York. This *Catechism* was duly published, and after an uncertain interval there appeared a Wyclifite adaptation, promising, with a rare burst of humour, forty days of indulgence to all who learned it.\(^4\) A comparison of the original *Catechism* and the adaptation reveals that the work in question was recast by much the same methods as those already observed. Ignoring the somewhat uncertain poetic medium of his original, the adapter inserted at appropriate

\(^1\) Workman, ii. 9. See also *Lay Folks Catechism*, EETS. OS. 118. 18.


\(^3\) “Graystok” would seem to be the most reasonable form yet suggested for the name of the Monk of York. We are indebted to Dr. J. S. Purvis, Director of the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York, for sending us this reading from the *Register* of Archbishop Thoresby.

\(^4\) The Latin of Pecham and Thoresby, together with the authorized English translation and the Wyclifite revision, are all published together by T. F. Simmons and H. E. Nolloth under the title *The Lay Folks Catechism*, EETS. OS. 118. The edition of the Wyclifite adaptation is said to be edited from Lambeth MS. 408, with additions from York Minster XVI L 12. However, Miss Elizabeth Brunskill, Assistant Librarian of the Dean and Chapter Library, has been kind enough to send us an analysis of York XVI L 12, and this fails to show the presence of the Wyclifite adaptation.
points prose commentary of his own choice.\footnote{According to Brown and Robbins (Index, No. 406), the Wyclifite adaptation is also in unrhymed alliterative verse. When, however, one observes the presence of a whole prose tractate like the \textit{Pater Noster} in an unaltered state, the principle upon which the poetry operates seems somewhat unclear.} Thanks to the parallel columns in which the two versions are printed, the adapter’s changes may be observed with welcome clarity. In the main, these changes constitute five insertions and one expansion. The insertions form a consecutive group (Pater Noster, Ave Maria, Creed, Five Bodily Wits, Five Ghostly Wits) and enter the text between Graystok’s introduction and the exposition of his first topic, the Fourteen Articles of the Faith. On the other hand, the Ten Commandments of the Wyclifite revision are not an addition but an expansion, and are found in the same position as in Graystok’s \textit{Catechism} ; i.e. as the second topic of exposition. The changes thus follow a recognizable pattern. The external appearance of the work is left intact, or, in this particular case, rendered more agreeable by a promise of indulgence, and the elements added give the revision the appearance of a standard popular manual. If, however, the general design of the revision is readily made out, the identity of the elements added remains puzzling. One would suppose that the additions made by a Wyclifite commentator would be works by Wyclif himself. Yet this appears only to a limited extent true. Of the works added, only one—the Ave Maria—can with any confidence be attributed to Wyclif himself.\footnote{\textit{Jones, Anglia}, xxx. 264 ; \textit{Winn, Selections}, p. xxxvi ; \textit{Workman}, i. 331.} Of the topics already present in Graystok (Ten Commandments, Seven Works of Mercy, etc.) only one is so materially altered as to become essentially a new tractate. This is, as indicated above, the Ten Commandments. Strangely enough, however, the alterations made in this topic are not made in terms of the tractate generally attributed to Wyclif himself, even though Wyclif’s own Ten Commandments, like the Ave Maria, is considered an early work.\footnote{\textit{Winn}, p. xxxvi.} Even stranger, perhaps, is the fact that the Pater Noster added to this acidly Wyclifite \textit{Catechism} is the same innocuous one contained in the Bibl. Ste Geneviève manuscript. The \textit{Lay Folks Catechism}, perhaps the
most celebrated of the Wyclifite revisions, remains certainly the most mysterious.

III. The *Pater Noster*

From the above discussion it will be apparent that clarity and simplicity are characteristics not to be looked for in the genealogy of the Wyclifite commentary. This principle may confidently be asserted with respect to the *Pater Noster*. Of this work we find three separate versions, all attributed to Wyclif himself. They are as follows:

*Version I*

Inc. "We schal beleue þat þis Pater Noster."
Des. "Delyvere us from yvel."

MSS.: (1) Bodl. 2643 (Bodley 789), fol. 97 (15th cent.); (2) Camb. Univ. Dd 1239, fol. 72v (late 14th cent.); (3) Harley 2385, fol. 2; (4) Brit. Mus. Add. 17013 [ *Book of the Vices and Virtues* ], fol. 36r (early 15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph]; (5) Lambeth 408 [ *Lay Folks Catechism* ], fol. 1v (15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph]; (6) Trinity Coll., Dublin C V 6, fol. 2r (early 15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph]; (7) York Cathedral XVI L 12, fol. 32r (2nd half 14th cent.) [lacks final paragraph]; (8) Bibl. Ste Geneviève, Paris, 3390, fol. 27r (early 15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph].

Pub.: Arnold, iii. 93-7; EETS. OS. 217.336-9.1

*Version II*

Inc. "Sypp[e] þe Pater Noster is þe beste prayer þat is."
Des. "in joye wiþoute eny ende ."

MSS.: (1) Bodl. 3054 [Bodley 938], fol. 24r (first half 15th cent.); (2) Harley 2398, fol. 166v (c. 1400-1410); (3) Rylands English 85, fol. 37r (early 15th cent.); (4) Rylands English 90. [Corser], fol. 63r (late 14th cent.); (5) Wext park 32 (location unknown).

Pub.: Arnold, iii. 98-100.

*Version III*

Inc. "Oure fadir þat art in heuenes ."
Des. "tauȝte þis schorte priere ."

MS.: Corpus Christi Coll., Camb. 296, p. 172 (14th cent.).


Version III may be disposed of briefly. It exists only in a single manuscript and is obviously related, as Matthew notes,2 to Version II. However, the exact nature of the relationship is not

1 The version published by W. N. Francis in EETS. OS. 217. 336-9 seems to be more typical in lacking the final paragraph than Bodley 789 in having it. Virtually all of the manuscripts here catalogued have been noted by Francis.

2 Matthew, p. 197.
readily made out. Both Version III and Version II are based on a schematization of the Seven Petitions of the Pater Noster (discussed below). However, the verbal resemblances they have in common are slight, and the order of Version III varies materially from that of Version II. It is therefore quite impossible that Version III should be a direct copy of Version II, or vice versa. Perhaps the most likely solution is that Version III borrowed his passage on the excellence of the Pater Noster from Version II, but followed his own schematization of the Petitions.

Version I presents a fascinating puzzle. It was attributed to Wyclif by Dr. Shirley and after him by Thomas Arnold, yet in reading it over one has a difficult time discovering a single expressly Wyclifite idea. This ambiguity is reflected by the manuscripts in which it occurs. It is found in strongly Wyclifite manuscripts like Lambeth 408, Trinity College, Dublin C V 6, and York Cathedral XVI L 12; in mixed manuscripts like Harley 2385, and in at least one entirely non-Wyclifite manuscript, Brit. Mus. Add. 17013 (Book of Vices and Virtues). On the basis of this evidence, one would hesitate to term it Wyclifite, much less attribute it to Wyclif himself. However, it must be remembered, that to be Wyclifite a work need not necessarily proclaim the hypocrisy of the friars or demand the reading of the whole Bible. The earlier Lollard position, shared by Wyclif,

1 For the single notable verbal resemblance, compare "Certis jis pater noster passi passi alle ojere preieriis in auctorite, in sotilte & profit" (Matthew, p. 201), with Arnold, iii. 99-100 (Version II) and with Arnold, iii. 93 (Version I). This latter passage is possibly the ultimate source of both. As regards order, Version II follows with one omission [Avarice] and one variation [reversal of Sloth and Avarice], the standard Gregorian listing of the sins. Hence in Version II the order is: Pride, Envy, Wrath, [Avarice], Sloth, Gluttony, Lechery. In Version III a captious hybrid order is followed: Pride, Envy, Avarice, Gluttony, Wrath, Temptation, Lechery. Perhaps the most convincing demonstration that Version III could not be a direct copy of Version II is that the Fourth Petition of Version II (Arnold, iii. 105-6) temporarily abandons the scheme and makes no mention whatsoever of either vice or virtue. Version III, however, does not at this point abandon its scheme, and discusses Gluttony and Prudence (Matthew, pp. 199-200).

2 Matthew, p. 201; Arnold, iii. 99-100.

3 See W. W. Shirley, A Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif (Oxford, 1865), No. 11.2: Arnold decided that 11.1 and 11.7 were not by Wyclif, but apparently considered 11.2 to be genuine (Arnold, iii. vi, 93).
was much more moderate. An often cited passage from an early tract by Purvey reads:

But if the ten commandments, the creed, pater noster and ave, that all Christian people ought to kunne, common things of holy writ, gospels and epistles read in church, be well translated and truly, sentence for sentence, with good declaration [i.e. exposition] whoso read it, he shall the better understand it, both in Latin and English.¹

It seems quite possible that the Pater Noster we have been discussing may be an early work corresponding exactly to Purvey's definition—"well translated . . . with good declaration". At least the Wyclifite compiler seems so to have understood it, for he constantly set it down side by side with expressly Wyclifite works. Thus it is quite true that this first and rather enigmatic version of the Pater Noster is found in all kinds of manuscripts, but in the great preponderance of them it is found associated with patently Wyclifite tracts.

The second version of the Pater Noster is entirely different from the first version in at least one important respect—not the slightest difficulty is encountered in classifying it as Wyclifite or non-Wyclifite. This second version contains diatribes against "symoniours, sillers of pardoun and indulgences"; against religious who take upon themselves the "colour of perfeccioun" and imitate the Pharisees; against those who hinder the preaching of the Word of God and " wolde Fat Fe gospel slepte".² However, one mystery is simply exchanged for another. In reading it, one wonders why, despite its vigorous and spirited sallies, this second version of the Pater Noster remains so difficult a work to get through. The answer to this problem would seem to be that it follows a now quite unfamiliar scheme of petitions, vices, and virtues, and that it follows this scheme in a fashion not readily apprehended.

The unfamiliar scheme in question is the once exceedingly popular one of dividing the Pater Noster into seven petitions and then equating these seven petitions with further heptamerologies.³

² Matthew, pp. 103, 109, 99.
³ See the interesting article by Maurice Hussey, "The Petitions of the Pater Noster in Mediaeval English Literature", Medium Aevum, xxvii (1958), 8-16.
For example, according to one very generally accepted arrange­ment, the Seven Petitions of the Pater Noster are answered by the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and these in turn confer the Seven Virtues Contrary to the Seven Deadly Sins, which, as their name rather distinctly implies, attack the Seven Vices. Thus, the First Petition "hallowed be Thy Name" is answered by the Gift of Dread (timor Dei), which confers Humility, which opposes Pride. This might be represented as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Gift</th>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Vice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallowed be Thy Name</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A variant of this scheme was made by Frère Lorens in his *Somme le Roi*, according to which the gift of God defeats the vice and plants a virtue in its place. As stated in terms of the First Petition: "Pe sifte of drede ... destroie pe rote of pride, and sett in his sted pe vertue of humblenesse."¹ This would appear as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Gift</th>
<th>Vice</th>
<th>Virtue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallowed be Thy Name</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Humility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite a certain strangeness, both of these schemes may be apprehended without great effort. The difficulty with the Wyclifite tract, however, is that the commentator, or the tractate he is following, attempts something rather original—he omits the Gifts of the Holy Ghost and doubles the virtues; that is, the Petition is answered, not by a gift of the Holy Ghost, but directly by a virtue, which opposes the sin, which leaves—although this is never clearly stated—a second virtue. Thus two sets of virtues are in use: a relatively flexible list of Virtues Opposed to the Seven Deadly Sins ("Mekenesse, Pacience, Charite, Besinesse, Mesure, Chastite, Largesse"),² and a relatively fixed list of Principal Virtues (Three Theological, Four Cardinal). The operation of this new schematization may be observed in the first two petitions of the Wyclifite *Pater Noster*.

As to the firste, we schulle ywyte pat Crist, whanne he tauȝte ous to seye oure Fader, he betoke ous meknese, and bad ous fle pryde. . . .

And ryȝte as we beþ tauȝte in þe first axynge, to destroye pryde by verraye mekenesse, whanne we seyeþ, Fader oure þat art in hevenys, halewede be þy name,

¹ *Book of the Vices and Virtues*, EETS. OS. 217. 126.
² C. Horstman, *Yorkshire Writers* (London, 1895-6), i. 111.
If taken together, these two passages come out somewhat as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petition</th>
<th>Virtue Opposed</th>
<th>Vice</th>
<th>Principal Virtue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallowed be Thy Name</td>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thy Kingdom come</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>Envy</td>
<td>Hope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be apparent from the above that the Petitions when completed are to be matched by the full list of the Virtues opposed, the Seven Deadly Sins, and the Three Theological and Four Cardinal Virtues.² It is, however, characteristic of the Wyclifite commentator that the theological scheme should, at points, be forced to yield ignominiously to declamation on favourite topics. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the Fourth Petition: "oure echeday bred 3ef ous to day", when interpreted on the spiritual level as the "lore of Godes worde", should lead to a spirited attack on the failure of the Church to carry out its duty of preaching, and with it a defence of the Wyclifite remedy:

And þus yf, þurgh ye neglescence of oure byschopes and prelatʒ, and oþer false techers þat be in holy Churche, þe truþe of Godes word be nouȝt ysowe in þe peple, praye we Jesus Crist byschope of oure soule, þat he ordeyne prechours in þe peple to warne hem of synne, and telle hem þe truþe of God.³

It is even less surprising to find that under the stress of powerful emotions the commentator has, in the Fourth Petition, completely forgotten his schematized vices and virtues.

The second version of the Pater Noster is a richly rewarding work for any study of the history of the Lollard movement, and unquestionably deserves thorough investigation. When such investigation is made, the holdings of the John Rylands Library will

---

¹ Arnold, iii. 101, 104.
² The scheme is actually carried through with some completeness. One finds towards the end treatments of Business vs. Sloth, of Abstinence vs. Gluttony, and of Chastity vs. Lechery (Arnold, iii. 107-8). The scheme of the Principal Virtues seems, however, to have dropped after Faith, Hope, and Charity. It is nevertheless continued throughout in Version III.
³ Arnold, iii. 106.
be found to be of great value, for the Rylands Library now possesses exactly half of the manuscripts of this rare work presently available for consultation.¹

IV. The Ten Commandments

The preceding discussion has from time to time pointed out the confusion introduced by the Wyclifite practice of rewriting existing commentary. In the Ten Commandments the problems attendant upon this practice are brought to their fullest development. The reason for the unhappy eminence attained by the Ten Commandments in this respect is the existence of at least three separate versions of this work, all possessing a virtually identical incipit: "Alle maner of men schulden holde Godes biddynge"; "Alle manere of men schulde holde be comaundementis of God"; "Alle manere men shulde holde Goddis comaundementis", etc. The first and most eminent victim of reliance upon this treacherous incipit was Dr. W. W. Shirley who, in his Catalogue of the Original Works of John Wyclif (1865),² listed works in five manuscripts, all possessing this incipit, as genuine Wyclif. By 1871, Thomas Arnold had, in his Select English Works, distinguished between Wyclif's own version and a "pre-existing commentary" which he took to be its source. Arnold's conclusions have met general acceptance, and from the time of his edition various scholars, notably W. P. Cumming and W. Nelson Francis, have continued Arnold's original effort to separate the manuscripts of the orthodox commentary from the version taken to be Wyclif's own.³ Within recent years, however, the validity of Arnold's conclusions has been questioned. In 1942, Mr. Samuel Ives described a manuscript, then in the possession of

¹ The Wrest Park manuscripts were sold at Sotheby's on 19-21 June 1922. Wrest Park 32 was contained in lot 641. At this date no list of purchasers is available. The manuscript appears at the present time to be in private hands. Rylands English 85 and 90 therefore constitute half of the manuscripts of this work available to scholars. For information relative to Wrest Park 32, we are indebted to Dr. R. W. Hunt, Keeper of Western Manuscripts, the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and to Professor S. Harrison Thomson, the University of Colorado.


³ Arnold, iii. 82; PMLA, xlii. 862; EETS. OS. 217. 317.
H. P. Kraus, which he declared to be the true and unpublished version of Wyclif's *Ten Commandments*, and the source of the text accepted by Arnold.¹ In 1954, Dr. Curt F. Bühler published a manuscript now in the Morgan Library (Morgan 861) which he said "may possibly be the 'pre-existing commentary' which Arnold believed Wyclif may have used".² To these recently noticed manuscripts, it is now possible to add a new and highly important one. This is John Rylands English MS. 85,³ which on fols. 2r-9r contains an unpublished version of the *Ten Commandments*, clearly related both to the generally accepted Wyclif version and to Morgan 861.

In view of the very considerable conflict of opinion concerning the relationship of the manuscripts of the *Ten Commandments*, it would seem useful to state the underlying problems and to attempt a solution. A procedure leading to this end might involve (a) a view of the manuscripts as a whole, (b) a study of the available evidence to determine which, if any, version was written by Wyclif, and what relationship the various manuscript groups have to this version. As a first step, a catalogue of the manuscripts is offered

³ Rylands English MS. 85 is described by Moses Tyson in his "Hand-List of English Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xiii (1929), 168. A somewhat more detailed analysis of the manuscript follows. Topics discussed in the present paper are italicized. The editors are indebted to Professor S. Harrison Thomson for bringing this extremely interesting manuscript to their attention.
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PATER NOSTER AND TEN COMMANDMENTS

herewith. Some of these are well known, others are here catalogued for the first time.

I. Orthodox or "Pre-Existing" Commentary

Inc. "Alle maner of men schuld holde goddys biddyngs".
Des. "too pat blisse god vs bryng".

MSS. (1) Bodl. 1049 (Laud Misc. 524), fol. 10r (15th cent.) ; (2) Univ. Coll. Oxford, 97, p. 169 (15th cent.) ; (3) Emmanuel Coll., Camb. 246, fol. 59r (late 14th cent.) ; (4) B.M. Harley 218, fol. 159 ; (5) B.M. Harley 2346, fol. 34 (mid 15th cent.) ; (6) Royal XVII A 26, fol. 4r (mid 15th cent.) ; (7) B.M. Add. 22283 [Book of Vices and Virtues], fol. 92r (late 15th cent.) (8) Westminster School 3, fol. 73 (c. 1420) ; (9) Bibl. Ste Geneviève, Paris, 3390 (early 15th cent.), fol. 1r ; (10) Garrett [Princeton Univ. Deposit 1459], fol. 1 (c. 1400) ; (11) Huntington HM 744, fol. 13r (15th cent.).


II. Wyclifite Commentary

A. Version Attributed to Wyclif

Inc. "Alle manere of men schulde holde }>e comaundementis of God ".
Des. "þou herdist not }>e word of þi Lord God ".

MS. Bodl. 2643 (Bodley 789), fol. 108 (first half 15th cent.).

Pub.: Arnold, iii. 82-92.

B. Expanded Versions

Inc. "Alle maner of men shulden holde Goddis biddyngis ".
Des. "out of boundes of helle " (Harley) : "þe blisse of heuene " (Trin. Coll.) ; unknown (York).

MSS. (1) Harley 2398, fol. 73 (c. 1400-1410) ; (2) Trinity Coll., Dublin CV 6, fol. 9r (early 15th cent.) ; (3) York Minster XVI L 12, fol. 1 (second half 14th cent.).

C. Compressed Versions

(1) Rylands English 85, fol. 2r (early 15th cent.).
Inc. "Alle manere men shulde holde Goddis comaundementis ".
Des. "alle oþer þat ony man doi? ".

1 Of the manuscripts here catalogued, only four have previously been noticed in this connection. Laud and University Coll. are pointed out by Arnold (iii. 82), and B.M. Add. 22283 by Francis (EETS. OS. 217. 317), and Bibl. Ste Geneviève by Cumming (PMLA, xlii. 862). Royal XVII A 26 (see above, p. 351, n. 2) and Huntington HM 744 (see De Ricci, Census) have been classified as Wyclifite. They both contain, however, the standard text of Laud and of the published B.M. Add. 22283. Huntington has the unusual incipit : "Alle cristene men."

2 The classification of York Minster XVI L 12 and Harley 2398 was made on the basis of extracts rather than a view of the entire manuscript. Acknowledgement for assistance is made to Miss Elizabeth Brunskill, Assistant Librarian of the Dean and Chapter Library, York, and to Dr. Dorothy M. Broome.
(2) Lambeth 408 [Lay Folks Catechism], fol. 6v (15th cent.).
Inc. “Thys ys pe fyrste of godys commaundementys”.
Des. “of suche wrongful coveytynge”.

(3) Morgan 861, fol. 1r (mid 15th cent.).
Inc. “Here begynneth the ten commaundementis of God”.
Des. “you schalt not coueite it wrongfully”.

(4) Plimpton Addenda 3 [Columbia Univ. Library], fol. 241v (c. 1400).
Inc. “I am þi lord God þat ledde þee”.
Des. “on suche wrongful coueytinge”.

(5) Bodl. 21820 (Douce 246), fol. 101v (15th cent.).
Inc. “This is þe first maundement”.
Des. “þis lawe sufficeth to þe”.

It will be observed that the manuscripts fall into various groups, some of them considerably less homogeneous than others. 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. The Wyclifite commentaries, on the other hand, seem to follow the pattern discussed above—source plus extemporization. This is, of course, less true of the compressed versions—where for instance Rylands 85 and Morgan 861 are consistently parallel in text—but for the longer versions like Trinity College, Dublin C V 6 the garrulous tone is evident.

With the various versions of the Ten Commandments roughly sorted out, one is faced with the problem of determining their relationship. This problem is by no means a simple one, because Wyclif abstained entirely from mentioning his English works, and the only evidence available is internal evidence. In

1 Douce 246 is catalogued at the end of this group because the basis for its inclusion is questionable. It does not translate the Commandments accurately, as do the other members of this group, but tends to paraphrase. Furthermore, it lacks the characteristic language of the Eighth Commandment: “Liars, glossers, and false questmongers”, which all four other manuscripts possess. However, its organization is very similar to the others, and its tone is, at points, rather Wyclifite. As for instance, at fol. 102v: “the þrid maundement of þis table is broken on many maners. And specially by þes men þat letten godes wil to love god as sche schuld and þis avoutrie is þe moste. The fourþe maundement is broken by many 5iftes þat men usen and generally whan men takyn goddes goodes þat al men schuld have and 3et serven not treuly to god ne to his cherche.” The whole small treatise sounds very much like a watered-down version of the others.
dealing with the Wyclifite commentary, the investigator, therefore, lacks any real assurance as to what, if any, works Wyclif himself wrote. The Ten Commandments, however, in the version printed by Arnold from Bodley 789, possesses the rare distinction of being one of the few works accepted as genuine Wyclif. In addition to Arnold, numerous scholars—Jones, Winn, and Workman—have stated its authenticity. Only Ives has disputed the attribution, but the passages he adduces as evidence are all to be found, for instance, in Trinity College, Dublin C V 6, and it is to be doubted that anyone reading the version of the Ten Commandments contained therein could believe it to be Wyclif.

If the Bodley Ten Commandments may with some assurance be regarded as a genuine work of Wyclif's, it is perhaps here that one may best begin to examine the relationships of the various manuscript groups. Was, for instance, Arnold right in believing the Bodley Ten Commandments to be derived from the orthodox or "pre-existing" commentary? A comparison of the Prologue and first three Commandments in Brit. Mus. Add. 22283 (Orthodox) and Bodley 789 (Wyclif) is revealing.

Brit. Mus. Add. 22283 (O) Bodley 789 (W)

Prologue

Alle maner of men schulden holde Godes biddynge. For w'outen holdynge of hem may no mon be saued. And so pe gospel telli? how oon askide of Crist: what he schulde do. forto come to heuene. And crist bad him. if he wolde entre into blisse: if he schulde kepe pe Comaundemens of God . . . (EETS 217.317)

1 Jones, Anglia, xxx. 264; Winn, Select English Writings, p. xxxvi; Workman, ii. 160.

2 Ives points out three passages in the Kraus manuscript which parallel passages in the Fifth, Seventh, and Tenth Commandments of Wyclif. These three passages are reproduced in Rare Books, iii. 7 and are matched respectively in Trinity College Dublin C V 6 by passages on fol. 19r, fol. 21r, and fol. 25v. Something of the tone of the Trinity College manuscript may be gathered from part of the discussion on the First Commandment. Gluttons, says the commentator, make their bellies their god, "for loue pat pei louen it. And bi pe same skile pes foule lecchours maken her god pe taile eende of an hoore" (fol. 10v).

3 Published as an appendix to Book of the Vices and Virtues, ed. W. N. Francis, EETS. OS. 217.317.
First Commandment
And so what thing enimon loue most: what manner of love he maketh his god, in as muche as in him is. beo hit wyf, or child, gold, or seluer, or any catel... Of pis folwepe. p. Pre manere of folk suwen pe sturyng of oure preo enemies: whuche ben pe flesch, pe world, and pe feond. ... As for pe furste. Lecherous, and gloterous men pei loue more heore wombes pei god, and so heore wombes pei make him heore god. Of hem spekep seint poul Ad philpenses. iiiij; and seip tus. Multi ambulant ... pat is. Monye gon. of pe w3uche. ofte I. haue seid to 3ou: and nou I seye wepynghe ... of whom heore wombe is heore god ... So yise men pt louen heore flesch, and Lecherie, or gloterie. pei make him heore wombe heore god ... pe secounde maner of men. pt breken pis comaundement. and also make hem false goddes: beon Couetouse men ... and pei make such worldly goddes. synfully heore false goddes for as seint poul seip. Ad ephesios v. Avarus quod est ydolorwn seruitus. pis. An auerous mon. or a couetous: is p3aldom of maumetes. For such a couetous mon ... do? maumetrie ... pe pridde maner of men. pt breken pis comaundement. pat folowen pe fend: beon po pat setten heore hertes most on worldly worschipes. and veyn glorie. and he3nesse of himself. (318-19)

Second Commandment
And Perfore crist him self in pe gospel of Seint matheu capitulo v: bidde tus. tus, tus, and nai, nay, Nolite iurare omnino ... pat is. swere 3e not on alle manere ... But 3oure word beo. 3e 3e. nay, nay. And pt. pat is more ouur pis: hit is of euel. Thise ben cristes wordes in the gospel ... And 3if 3e schullen swere: rule 3ow aftur pe lawe of god. in 3or swerynge. For god him self techept pe, pt when pu swerest: pu schalt kepe preo condiciouns. Iurabes inquir in ueritate, in iudicio. & Iusticia. Jeremye iiiijcapitulo. pat is. pou schalt swere in treupe. In dom. and in rihtwysnesse. (320)

what maner pt pat a man love most, he makip his god; and so, syppe al synne stondip in love, everi heed synne is brekyngpe of pis heeste ... And sipen pat ben pre synnes, as Seynt Joon seip, pat enwrappep alle opere, in pre maneris may a man breke pis maunde­ment,—in pes pre, love of fleische, and love of eije, and pride of liff. And so glotouns and lechouris breken pis heeste; as Poul seip, pat pes glotouns makyn hire beli hire god ... And on pe same wise pe coveytous man makip his mawmet pe temporal goodis, as Poul seip pat averyce is service of mawmetis. And so pe proude man makip pe feend his god. (83)
Third Commandment

For upon the Sunday God made His world, and on the Sunday God rose from death to live, and on the Sunday He sent the Holy Ghost, and, as clerks say, upon the Sunday shall be the last judgment that ever man shall have. (85)

The clear parallels to be noted here would seem strongly to support Arnold's belief in Wyclif's indebtedness to the orthodox commentary. However, since it has recently been suggested that the commentary on which Wyclif drew may in fact be Morgan 861,1 it is worth while to compare the Wyclif Ten Commandments with those of Morgan 861 and its related text, Rylands English 85.

Bodley 789 (W)  Rylands English 85  Morgan 861

Prologue
Alle manere of men schulde holde His commandementis of God, for wioute holdeynge of hem may no man be savyd. And so the gospel tellyth how oon askide Crist what he schulde do for to come to hevene. And Crist seide, as thou wolt come to blisse, kepe myn commandementis. (Arnold, iii. 82)

Alle manere men shulde holde Goddis commaundementis. for wioute kep­ing and rulyng bi hem: mai no man be saued / and so the gospel tellyth. hou oon askite Crist what he shulde do: forto come to heuene / and Crist bade him if he wolde entre in to blis: pat he shulde kepe His commaundementis of God. (p. 371)

First Commandment
as Poul seip pat averyce is service of mawmetis. (83)

as Poul seip / an avarous man is a servant of mawmetis. (p. 372)
as Poul seip . . . an avarous man is a servant of mawmentis. (PMLA, lxix. 689)

1 Bühler, PMLA, lxix. 688, n. 6.
**Second Commandment**

A man much sweringe schal be fulfilled with wickidnesse, and veniaunce schal not go awey with worst 3ildinge schal be fullilid ye hous of him. (84)

The results of these two comparisons are informative. First, it is apparent that the Wyclif commentary could well have been derived from the orthodox commentary, and the shorter commentaries in turn from the Wyclif work. This would seem a normal kind of development in terms of the popular “schort wordes” approach. The reverse process would obviously pose great difficulties. For instance, in the First Commandment indebtedness to the short tractates would involve Wyclif’s creating the whole 1 John ii. 16 passage: “love of fleisch, and love of ei3e, and pride of liif” from a single reference to “maumetis”, whereas the world, the flesh, and the devil, found in the orthodox commentary, are usual equivalents for the three sins of 1 John ii. 16.

A second result which follows from the above comparisons is the importance of Rylands English MS. 85. It is apparent that the Rylands manuscript is closer at virtually every point to the Wyclif original than Morgan 861, or indeed any of the group of manuscripts of which it is a part. Manuscripts of this group like Plimpton Addenda 3 have become so simplified as to become little more than lists. Were it not for the characteristically Wyclifite tone of the breakers of the Eighth Commandment, “liers, glosers, and false questmongers”, common to Rylands, Morgan, Plimpton, and the Wyclifite Lay Folks Catechism (Lambeth 408), one might be unaware of their Wyclifite origins. Fortunately, the Rylands manuscript, particularly by reason of its prologue, preserves this link in a distinct and recognizable form, and this same relationship is rendered more distinct
by the verbatim correspondences between the *Exodus* translations of the Late Version of the Wyclifite Bible (c. 1388-1400) and those of the Rylands manuscript. Since the *Ten Commandments* of Rylands English MS. 85 have not previously been published, an edition of them is here presented. The relationship of the text to the Wyclifite Bible, the *Lay Folks Catechism*, and the Morgan tract is recorded in the footnotes.

V. The Ten Commandments from Rylands English MS. 85

A Short Prolog on *pe Heestis* / ¹

Alle manere men shulde holde Goddis comamendementis. for wiȝoute keping and rulyng bi hem: mai no man be saued / and so pe gospel telliȝ. hou oon as [fol. 3r] kite Crist what he shulde do: forto come to heuene / and Crist bade him if he wolde entre in to blis: ȝat he shulde kepe ȝe comamendementis of God. ²

Almyȝti God seiȝ in his lawe on ȝis wise. who so seiȝ ȝat he loue me and kepiȝ not myn heestis: he is a lier. and truȝe is not in hym ³ / and as God seiȝ ȝe feend is fadir of alle lesyngis ⁴ / perfore lest we bicomen ȝe feendis children ȝoruȝ lesyngis: knowe we ⁵ sadli Goddis ten heestis. and kepe we hem bisili at al oure myȝt. as trewe men to Ihesus Crist / and wite you wel ȝat oure Lord Ihesus Crist haȝt not bodun us do: but ȝat we mai wel kepe wiȝ ȝe help of Goddis grace: if we doen oure bisynesse ȝerto. for ellis it hadde be aȝens resoun to haue boundun men vp peyne of her dampnacioun to haue kept hise heestis / and in oure God mai noon vnresoun be bi ony maner way [fol. 3v] and so God seiȝ in his gospel to alle manere men. my charge is Iiȝt. and my ȝoc is swete ⁶ / and Seynt lohn pe euangelist seiȝ ȝe charge of God is to kepe hise heestis / and ȝei ben not greuous ⁷ neiper heuy. ⁸

¹ Capitals are supplied for proper nouns and for names of the Deity, but since the punctuation of the scribe is understandable, it has been reproduced with only the slightest of changes. All paragraphs except the second are either preceded by a paragraph sign in the manuscript or follow rubrics. Rubrics are capitalized as headings.

² Matthew xix. 16-17; Luke x. 25.

³ 1 John ii. 4, changed to direct discourse.

⁴ John viii. 44.

⁵ Marginal insertion of "we".

⁶ Matthew xi. 30, before which the first words of the incipit are here repeated. See "my ȝoc is swete . . ./ and my charge liȝt ", EV, as well as " . . . charge is liȝt ", LV, MSS. EIKR. *The Holy Bible . . . in the Earliest English Versions made . . . by John Wycliffe and his followers*, ed. Josiah Forshall and Frederick Madden (Oxford, 1850), iv. 28.

⁷ The repetition of this word is deleted.

⁸ 1 John v. 3. The rendering does not agree with either of the Bible translations, in which, however, one finds "greuous" (EV) and "heuy" (LV). Forshall and Madden, iv. 628. Nothing in the Morgan tract corresponds to this second paragraph.
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The First Commandment of God is this:

The Lord spak alle these wordis / I am the Lord God that ledde thee out of the loud of Egypt: / thou shalt not haue alien goddis before me / thou shalt not make to thee a graun ymage. neper ony licensse pat is in heuene aboue. and which is in erpe bynephe: neper of ye pingis pat ben in watris vndir erpe: / thou shalt not herie pat: neper thou shalt worshippe / for I am the Lord God: a strong gelous lover / and I visite pat wickidnesse of fadris in sones: in to pe pridde and pe ferpe generacoun [fol. 4r] of hem pat haten me / and I do merci in to a pousynd: to hem pat louen me and kepyn myn heestis. 1

In pis first heeste it is tau3t pat thou shalt haue noone of irre God: but pe Lord God of Heuene / and him thou shalt loue of al pin herte: of al thi soule and of al thi mynde. 2

Who brekiþ pe first comaunderment / proude men. worldli men. and fleshli men / Whi proude men: for thei make pe deuel her god. as lob seip / pe deuel is king upon alle pe sones of pride // Whi worldli men: for pei make worldli goddis her god. as Poul seip / an aurorous man is a seruaunt of mawmetis: and shal not enherite pe kyngdom of heuene || Whi fleshli men: for pei make her wombe her god. as Poul seip / Be se my folowers. and a waite se hem pat walken so: / for many walken pat ben enemies to Cristis Cros / [fol. 4v] whos eend is deep and her wombe is irre god. 3

The Second Commandent of God

is pis /

Thou shalt not take in vayn: pe name of irre Lord God / for irre Lord shal not haue his giltles: pat taketh in veyn pe name of his Lord God. 4

And Crist seip pat is trupe / thou shalt not swere bi heuene: / pat is bi no ping pat is in heuene / neper bi erpe: / pat is bi noon erpe 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 irre membris ejer heer. 5

Who breken pis comaunderment / veyn spekers. Grete swerers. and wickid worchers. || Whi veyn spekers: for her wordis ben not needful / Off which Crist seip / Off every idil word pat men speken: pei shulen 3ilde rikenyg at pe dai of doom || Whi grete swerers: [fol. 5r] for her oopis ben not needful. as seip pe Wise Man / a man moche sweringe: shal be fulfild wiþ wickidnesse / and venance Ecc. 4x xxiiij. pat is to see. bi noon of irre membris ejer heer. 6

1 Exod. xx. 1-6. It agrees with LV except for "ony licensse pat", which agrees with EV. For the Rylands reading "Fadris in sones", see LV, MSS. A sec. m. CDGKMNQRTWX sec. m., as well as EV. Forshall and Madden, i. 238.

2 Luke x. 27.

3 In the list of "breakers" and in the triple explanations, the Morgan text has at first "feend" for "deuel" and, with Lay Folks Catechism (1), "bellyes" for "wombe", a reading which Morgan repeats in the confirmatory quotation. The Rylands use of "wombe" in both instances accords with EV and LV (Forshall and Madden, iv. 426).

4 Exod. xx. 7 agrees with LV.

5 Matt. v. 34-6, a paraphrase of the Biblical words.
PATER NOSTER AND TEN COMMANDMENTS

with worst 3ilding: shal not go fro his hous / Whi wikid worchers: for her werkis ben vnleeful / of whiche Poul seip / awaite 3e hem / pat letten pe lawe of God: and dele 3e not with hem / for bi softe speche. Pei disseuwen pe hertis of innocent men // ¹

Pe Pridde Comaundment of God

is Pis /

Haue pou mynde. pat pou halowe pe dai of pe Saboth / In sixe daies pou shalt worche: and do alle pi werkis / forsote pe in pe seuenpe dai of pe Saboth of pi Lord God: pou shalt not do ony seruyle werk / pou and pi sone and pi dou3tir. and pi seruaunt and pi handmaide / pi werkbeest: and pe comelyng. which is wi3inne pi 3atis / for in sixe daies God made heuene and erpe. [fol. 5 v] pe see and alle pingis pat ben in po: and restide in pe seuenpe dai ² and herfore pe Lord blesside pe dai of pe Saboth: and halowide it / ³

Who breken pis pridde comaudement: / po men pat penken not on God hertel. and pei pat preien Him not deuoutli, and pei pat doen not pe dedis of merci wysli // Whi po men pat penken not on God hertel: for pei ocupien her pou3tis with vanytes / to whiche God seip bi his prophete Michee / Wo to sou pat Penken vnprofitable pou3tis: worching yuel in 3oure couchis in pe morwe l3t // Whi po pat preien Him not deuoutli: For pei worshipen Him wiþ her lippis and not wiþ her hertis. as Crist seip bi Matheu /pis peple wiþ lippis worshipen me: but forso3e her hertis ben fer fro me // Whi po men pat doen not wiseli pe werkis of mercy: for pei leuen vertues and 3yl[fol. 6 r] uen hem to vicis as lohn seip / l3t cam in to pe world. and men loueden more derknessis pei l3t / for her werkis weren yuele.⁴

⁴ Written " daie ", but corrected.

Pe Fferpe Comaundement of God

is Pis /

Honoure pi fadir and pi modir: pat pou be long lyuynge on pe lond which pi Lord God shal 3yue to pee.⁵

¹ Matthew xii. 36: " euery idil ", agrees with Ev—" eny idil ", M; " riken-ynge "—" resoun Perof " EV, LV, M. Eccl. xxiii. 12: " with . . . 3ilding "—omitted in M. Ro. xvi. 18: For pei worshipen Him wiþ her lippis and not wiþ her hertis. as Crist seip bi Matheu /pis peple wiþ lippis worshipen me: but forso3e her hertis ben fer fro me // Whi po men pat doen not wiseli pe werkis of mercy: for pei leuen vertues and 3yl[fol. 6 r] uen hem to vicis as lohn seip / l3t cam in to pe world. and men loueden more derknessis pei l3t / for her werkis weren yuele.⁴

² Written " daie ", but corrected.

³ Exod. xx. 11 agrees with LV. For " and do all ", see LV, MSS. DKOS; for " seuen pe dai of pe Saboth ", see LV, MSS. BCDEKLMNOQRSTX; for " ony seruyle werk ", see LV, MS. I (note also MS. S; Wyclifite tract, p. 85; " seruyse werke " M).

⁴ Micah ii. 1: given incorrectly in M as " miache [?] . . . iii c ". Mt. xv: " with lippis worshipen me "—" worschipiþ me wiþ lippes ", M; " but forso3e her "—" but her ", M. John iii. 19: " derknessis "—" derkenesse ", M (" derknessis ", EV, LV).

⁵ Exod. xx. 12-13 agrees with LV.
Who breken pis ferpe comaunderment ¶ vnkynde men. froward men ¶ Whi vnkynde men : 1 ffor pei helpen not her eldris as pei shulden. of whiche pe wise Man seiþ / He pat worshipiþ fadir and modir : shal be maad myri in sones / and he is cursid of God : þat terþiþ hem to wrap ¶ Whi froward men : for pei wolen take no goostli teching. as Isaie seiþ / Sones of frowardnesse not willyng to heere þe lawe of God : þat sein speke to us plesaunt þingis. þouþ it be erroors ¶ Whi rebel men : for pei ben [fol. 6v] vnbusum to Crist and to his churche. as weren Dathan and Abiron / þat for vnbusumnesse to Moyses and Aaron : sanken down to helle alquyk. wyf. and child. wiþ al þat longide to hem. 2

þe Ffifþe Comaunderment of God is þis /

Thou shalt not slee. 3

Who breken þis fiftþe comaunderment, enuyouse men. wrapful men. and auarouse men ¶ Whi enuyouse men : for pei haten or bachiten her briferen / of whiche spekiþ John in his pistle / ech man þat hatiþ his broþer : is a mansleer / and he þat seiþ he loueþ God. and hatiþ his broþir : he is a lier ¶ Whi wrapful men : for pei smyten or dispisen her briferen. as Seint Austyn seiþ / 4 a wrapful man is hateful to God : and he is felowe to feendis ¶ Whi auarouse men : for þei releuuen not in rede þer euencristen. to whiche wiþ þe [fol. 7r] Wise Man / Haue mynde of pouert in tyme of plente. and þe neade of pouert 5 in þei dai of richesse / fro erli vnto euene þe tyme shal chaunge. 6

þe Sixte Comaunderment of God is þis /

Thou shalt do no lecherie.

Who breken þe sixte comaunderment : ffornycaries. auoutrers. and holours. ¶ Whi fffornycaries : for þei defoulen her bodies in lecherie. as Tobie seiþ / þe deuel Osmodus sloow seuene men 7 for þei tooken not her wyf after þe forme of clene wedloc ¶ Whi auoutrers : for iii. c. 8

1 Marginal insertion of “ men ”.

2 Ecc. iii. 6 : “ He . . . sones / and ”, omitted in M ; “ terþiþ þe fadir or moder ”, M. EV uses the words “ worshipiþ ”, “ terreth ”. Is. xxx. 9-101 : “ þat sein ”—“ sein ”, M ; “ speke ”—“ speke ye ”, M. EV uses “ not willende ”, LV “ nylen ”. Num. xvi. 27-33 : not cited in M, which reads “ for Goddis lawe tellith ” ; “ Dathan and Abiron / þat ”—“ þat Daton and Abiron ”, M ; “ wiþ al ”—“ and alle ”, M.

3 This and the sixth and seventh commandments agree with LV. Exod. xx. 14-15.

4 Bühler cites St. Augustine on 1 John iii. 15, PMLA, lxix. 690, n. 19.

5 Marginal insertion of “ in tyme . . . pouert ”.

6 1 John iii. 15 ; iv. 20 : “ ech man þat hatiþ ”—“ he þat is wroth to ”, M ; “ he is a lier ”—“ is a lier ”, M. St. Augustine : “ is felowe ”—“ is made felowe ”, M ; “ to feendis ”—“ of fenndis ”, M. Ecc. xviii. 25-26 : “ and þe neede ”—“ and of þe neede ”, M ; “ fro erli ”—“ for fro eery ”, M. The translation is nearer to EV than LV.

7 Marginal insertion of “ men ”.
PATER NOSTER AND TEN COMMANDMENTS

Pei breken pe hooli sacrament of matrmony, to whiche seip pe Wise Man / pe children of auoutrie per seed shal be outlawid: and if pei ben of long lyf. at nou3t pei shulen be acountid and in pe last eende. Pei shule faille speche 1 ¶ Whi holours: for pei waasten her bodies vnkyndli. of whiche Poul seip / pis ping wite 3e wel. pat holours han not eritage in pe kyngdom of heuene.2

Pe Seuenpe Co[fol. 7v]maundement of God is Pis / Thou shalt do no peffe. extorconners

Who breken pis seuenpe comauandement / michers. robbers. and torconners ¶ Whi michers: for pei stelen pruiel. as seip pe prophete Osee / trupe is not in erpe but cursidnesse and peffe. and mercie is awei and science of pe lord. for pis ping. alle pat dwellen pe inne shulen mourne ¶ Whi robbers: for pei robben opunli. to whiche seip God bi Isaie pe prophete / wo to pe pat robbist: wher pi sylf shal not be robbid. whamme you hast fulli robbid: pame shalt you be robbid ¶ Whi extorconners: for pei spuylen men of her goodis falsli. as pe Wise Man seip / pe vnpitous man seip. bigile we pe ri3twise man: for he is vnprofitable to us. and contrarie to oure werkis / bi moost foul dee? condempne we him: and so proue we pe pacience of him.3

Pe Ei3tpe Comaundement of God is Pis / [fol. 8r] Thou shalt not speke fals witness a5ens pi neizbore.4

Who breken pis comauandement ¶ liers. glosers. and false questmongers ¶ Whi liers: for pei haten trupe. of whiche speki pe Wise man / beter is a Peef. 3an pe bisynesse of a lier: for bope shulen eneritagen helle. ¶ Whi glosers: for pei hiden trupe. as seip Isecie pe prophete / [27]

1 Marginal insertion of “and in . . . speche”.
2 Tobit iii. 8: “pe deuel Osamideus”—“ how pe deuel Asmodeus ”, M; “for pei tooken . . . foorme”—“ for a woman. for pey token hir not in forme ”, M. Sa. iii. 16-18: “auotrie pe seed shal” “auotry schullen ”, M; “in Per last . . . speche”—“pe laste eeld of hem schal be wiPoute honoure and bileue “. M. M translates verse 17; R moves to verse 18, the translation of which is closer to EV than to LV: “ And if swiftliere thei shul ben dead, thei shul not han hope, ne in the dai of knouleching speche ”. EV (“ . . . nether alowyn in the dai of knowyng ”, LV). Eph. v. 5: “ wite 3e wel”—“ wite ye ”, M; “ not eritage”—“ noon eritage ”, M; “ heuene”—“ heuenes ”, M.
4 Exod. xx. 16 agrees with LV, except for “ witnesse”—“ witnessyng ”, LV (“ Thow shalt not spek a5ens thi neizbore fals witnes ”, EV).
VI. CONCLUSION

It is hoped that the above materials may have imparted some sense of the vigour and ingenuity of the Lollard movement. The

1 Eccles. xx. 27: closer to EV than to LV. "Betere is a thef than the besynesse of a man lieuer; forsothe the bothe shuln eritagen perdicioun", EV ("customableness of a man", "a leesynngmongere", LV). The quotation does not occur in M, which gives "Deedis of Apostles, xxj. c°". The Rylands quotation is more in keeping with the commentaries in both **LFC** (L) and the Wyclifite tract. *Is. xxxiii. 19*: closer to EV than to LV. "... puple of heis sermoun, so that thou mowe not vnderstonde the sleeynesse of his tunge..." EV ("hiȝ word", "the fair speking", LV). The quotation does not occur in M ("Tymothe. iii. c°"). *Is. lix. 14*: "Doom...backward"—"turned is backward doom" M, EV; "able to be"—"deemed worthy to be", M. Closer passim to EV than to LV.

2 Exod. xx. 17 agrees with LV.

3 Ecc. v. 1-2: "coueite wickidlie"—"wrongfully coueite", M; "never folowe" "ne folowe", M; "it shal not...veniaunce"—omitted, M. *Mt. v. 28*: "wiþ hir"—"bi hir", M. *Sap. iv. 12*: closer to EV than to LV. "vnstableenesse of coueiting overturneth wit oute malice", EV ("coueitise turneth ouer the", LV). Quotation absent in M. *1 John ii. 16*: "For al thing that is in the world, is coueite of fleisch, and coueite of iȝen, and pride of lyf", LV.
constant inclusion in Wyclifite manuscripts of the quite orthodox
Pater Noster, the composition of works like the Rylands Ten
Commandments, all illustrate the Lollard’s strong moral sense, his
belief in the Law. But it is difficult not to be equally impressed
by the skill with which the Lollard managed to insinuate his
heretical doctrines into highly pious and conventional works.
With the possible exception of Archbishop Thoresby, Richard
Rolle seems to have been his most distinguished victim. In
Rylands English MS. 90, for instance, one finds only two works:
Richard Rolle’s Prycke of Conscience and the virulent Wyclifite
Pater Noster. No finer tribute was ever paid to the effectiveness
of the Wyclifite reviser than the indignant lines prefixed to
Richard Rolle’s Psalter:

Copyed has pis Sauter ben of yvel men of Lollardry,
And aftirward hit has bene ympyd in wiþeresy.¹

¹ Arnold, iii. 3.