

THE WYCLIFITE *PATER NOSTER* and *TEN*
COMMANDMENTS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE
TO ENGLISH MSS. 85 AND 90 IN THE JOHN
RYLANDS LIBRARY

By A. L. KELLOGG, Ph.D.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH AT RUTGERS UNIVERSITY,
NEW JERSEY

AND

ERNEST W. TALBERT, M.A., Ph.D.

PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

THE 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 1215.¹ 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.

Pupilla 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,¹ the impulse to explain “vulgariter et absque subtilitate”.² 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.³ 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 Synne* of Robert of Brunne.⁴ 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 *Azenbite of Inwit* and the *Book of Vices and Virtues*, and again in the fifteenth century as Caxton’s *Royal Book*.⁵ 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

¹ H. G. Pfander, “Some Medieval Manuals of Religious Instruction in England,” *JEGP*, xxxv (1936), 246.

² The *Regimen Animarum*’s paraphrase of Archbishop Pecham’s phrase. See B.M. Harley MS. 2272, fol. 88^r.

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.

⁴ See J. E. Wells, *Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (New Haven, 1916), p. 342. D. W. Robertson, however, considers it a confessional rather than a general manual (*Speculum*, xxii (1947), 162-190).

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 “schort 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 Pennaforte 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. 40^r-40^v (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.¹ 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*² 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.³ 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. 22^r-26^v 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,⁴ 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".

³ E. M. Thompson, *Wycliffe Exhibition* (London, 1884), p. 52.

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. 22^r-23^r of Royal MS. XVII A 26, and then adds a brief but uninspired diatribe on the "falshed of prelatis and prestis".¹ If, on the other hand, the material found in his original² 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. 25^r-25^v is reproduced below :

The sixte synne of þese seuene is clepid	1
glotenyē : and it falliþ to þe fleisch /	
but boþe þe fend <i>and</i> þe world tempten	
man to þis synne / for bi fallyng in to	
þis synne. þei han a man liȝtli to her	5
propre synne bi cause of her temptyngē.	
for glotenyē falliþ þanne to man / whanne	
he takiþ mete or drynke more þan profitiþ	
to his soule / but certis <i>it mai falle to</i>	
<i>man þat he synneþ in abstynence : as whanne</i>	10
<i>he fedþ not his bodi þat schulde bere hym</i>	
<i>to serue his soule / and upon fyue maneris</i>	
<i>men synnen in excess of etyngē <i>and</i> drynkyng /</i>	
<i>and comynli clerkis first / Whanne a man etiþ</i>	
<i>or drynkiþ bifore þe tyme þat resoun schulde</i>	15
<i>axe. as glotouns of drynke wolen drynke in</i>	
<i>þe morewe / and þat as þei seien askiþ drunke-</i>	
<i>nesse ouer euene / sum man to hastili etiþ</i>	
<i>and drynkiþ / and þat is aȝenus fisik <i>and</i></i>	
<i>doiþ harm to his bodi / and sum man to tendirli</i>	20
<i>norischen her bodies. <i>and</i> spenden goddis</i>	
<i>goodis in to costli metis <i>and</i> drynkis in</i>	
<i>glotenyē / and sum men to lustfuli etiþ <i>and</i></i>	
<i>drynkiþ: <i>and</i> þat distemperiþ a man in bodi</i>	
<i>and soule / and sum men taken hem a tyme to</i>	25

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.

ete sauereli / *and ai þe more þat þei wasten :*
 þe betere be þei paied / *ʒhe þei holden it a*
boost to ete myche or drynke / and god woot
wher proude clerķis and religiouse men and
riche and proude men of þis world synnen 30
in þis maner of glotenye / as listi men in
delicat metis and drynkis and myspenden
goddis goodis in þis synne / and also laboreris
ben smytid wiþ þis glotenye. and speciali
in drunknesse on þe halidai / and þus þei 35
leesen her wit and ben maid lik to. vn-
reasonable beestis / but beestis mesuren hem
betere in etynge and drynkyng ean þei doon /
and so þei Vnablen hem to serue god on
halidai and to worschipe hym as þei schulden / 40
and many oþer synnes comen of þis drunkenesse :
as fyʒting bacbityng and mansleyng / and þertfor
siche men schulden mesure hem in etynge and
algatis in drynkyng on þe halidai. and take
sum on þe werk dai whanne þei trauelen : and 45
not spende al on þe halidai in sich glotenye /

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 "þo 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 maneris" (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 wot wheþer proude clerkes synnen in þese maners ; ʒe, religiouse men, as mounkes or freris, wasten more meete or drinke þen profitis to hom. Ffor, as mony men seyn, monkes 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 noumbre 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 religiose men and . . . men of þis world" (lines 29-30), also happily provides 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 fecht as wode men, 3e, 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 Geneviève, Paris, 3390. Like Royal MS. XVII A 26, this is a collection of devotional 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 Geneviève, Paris", *PMLA*, xlii (1927), 862-4.

⁶ Ibid. p. 864.

If the reader turns to fols. 30^r-37^r of MS. Bibl Ste Geneviève 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*.¹ 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. 34^v-35^r of the Bibl. Ste Geneviève manuscript:

þe þridde vertu of god is loue of charite / and it haþ two braunches / as loue of god and of man / and þe 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 noȝt : kepit man hym in charite / and þis uertu cloþeþ man at domusday wiþ briȝt cloþes / 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 dampned haue but feyned charite.

But lyue wel after godes lawe : and hope to haue þis laste loue / for no man knoweþ ne schal trowe to haue hit : but god wille telle hym priueily.

The Wyclifite commentator follows exactly with only one slight variation ("bride-cloþis" for "briȝt cloþis"), but then adds:

and so freris, þat louen more her habite þat þei han ordeyned hem þan þe cloþe of charite þat god haþ schapen his sones, ben yuel disposid to haue þis cloþe 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 Geneviève 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 Geneviève *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 Geneviève 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.¹ 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.² 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. 24^r):

oure bileue techeþ us : þat god ordeynede it al *and* bad þat men scholde kunne it *and* teche it to oþere and 3if prelates fayle in þis : cryst seyde þat stones scholde crye as secular lordes schulde in defaute of prelates lere and teche þe lawe of god in hor moder tunge.³

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

And so, as sum men þynke, þese popys ne þese prelatys ar nat part of holy Chirche, but of synagoge ; sethen þey mot leve aftyr Crist 3if þey schul be savyd. Þus techis oure beleve, howeyr Anticrist grucchis.⁴

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 commences⁵ 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 3if 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 hi3enese of hor prelacie.⁶

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 aftyr Crist 3yf þey schul be savyd ; ffor þus techis 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. 26^v). 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. 26^v. 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.

² See Brown and Robbins, *Index*, No. 406. The poetic nature of the translation seems, at times, open to question.

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.¹ 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 *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.² 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.³ Even stranger, perhaps, is the fact that the Pater Noster added to this acidly Wyclifite *Catechism* is the same innocuous one contained in the Bibl. Ste Geneviève manuscript. The *Lay Folks Catechism*, perhaps the

¹ 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 *Pater Noster* in an unaltered state, the principle upon which the poetry operates seems somewhat unclear.

² Jones, *Anglia*, xxx. 264; Winn, *Selections*, p. xxxvi; Workman, i. 331.

³ Winn, p. xxxvi.

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. 72^v (late 14th cent.) ; (3) Harley 2385, fol. 2 ; (4) Brit. Mus. Add. 17013 [*Book of the Vices and Virtues*], fol. 36^r (early 15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph printed Arnold, iii. 96-7] ; (5) Lambeth 408 [*Lay Folks Catechism*], fol. 1^v (15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph] ; (6) Trinity Coll., Dublin C V 6, fol. 2^r (early 15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph] ; (7) York Cathedral XVI L 12, fol. 32^r (2nd half 14th cent.) [lacks final paragraph] ; (8) Bibl. Ste Geneviève, Paris, 3390, fol. 27^r (early 15th cent.) [lacks final paragraph].

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

Version II

Inc. " Syþþe þe Pater Noster is þe beste prayer þat is."

Des. " in joye wiþoute eny ende "

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

Pub. : Arnold, iii. 98-100.

Version III

Inc. " Oure fadir þat art in heuenes "

Des. " tauʒte þis schorte preiere "

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

Pub. : Matthew, pp. 198-202.

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.¹ 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,² 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,³ 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 þis pater noster passiþ alle oþere preieris 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 þat þe 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

¹ Margaret Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible* (Cambridge, 1920), p. 272. Cited by Workman, ii. 156.

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 :

<i>Petition</i>	<i>Gift</i>	<i>Virtue</i>	<i>Vice</i>
Hallowed be Thy Name	Fear	Humility	Pride

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 : "þe 3ifte of drede . . . destroyeþ þe rote of pride, and sett in his sted þe vertue of humblenesse."¹ This would appear as :

<i>Petition</i>	<i>Gift</i>	<i>Vice</i>	<i>Virtue</i>
Hallowed be Thy Name	Fear	Pride	Humility

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 þat Crist, whanne he tau3te ous to seye oure Fader, he betoke ous *mekenesse*, and bad ous fle *pryde*. . . .

And ry3t as we beþ tau3t 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.

ryȝt so we beth ytauȝt in þys secunde axynge to destroye *envye* aȝens oure evene Cristen with parfite *charite*, whanne we seyeþ, Come to þe þy kyngdom. And as it is nedeful in þe firste axynge specialyche to have parfyt *feyþ*, þat God oure Fader is in hevenys, so it nedeþ specialyche in þis secunde axynge þat we have *hope*, þat alle þylke þat we supposeþ be his kyngdom schulde regne wiþ him in blysse of Hevene.¹

If taken together, these two passages come out somewhat as follows :

<i>Petition</i>	<i>Virtue Opposed</i>	<i>Vice</i>	<i>Principal Virtue</i>
Hallowed be Thy Name	Humility	Pride	Faith
Thy Kingdom come	Charity	Envy	Hope

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 ȝef 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, þurghe necligence of oure byschopes and prelatȝ, and oþer false techers þat be in holy Churche, þe truþe of Godes word be nouȝt ysowe in þe peple, praye we Jesus Crist byschepe 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 þe comaundementis of God"; "Alle manere men schulde 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.

² Bodl. 789, Laud Misc. 524, Trinity Coll., Dublin, C.V. 6, Royal XVII A 26, Univ. Coll., Oxford, 97. See *Catalogue*, No. 40.

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. 2^v-9^r 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

¹ Samuel A. Ives, "The Genuine and Unpublished Version of Wyclif's Treatise on the Ten Commandments", *Rare Books*, iii (New York: H. P. Kraus, 1942), 3-9.

² Curt F. Bühler, "The Middle English Texts of Morgan MS. 861", *PMLA*, lxi (1954), 686-91.

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.

2 ^r Prologue and Alphabet	16 ^r Seven Gifts of Holy Ghost
2 ^r Pater Noster	18 ^v Seven Sacraments
2 ^r Ave Maria	19 ^r Prologue on Order of Topics
2 ^r Creed	19 ^v Twelve Lettings of Prayer
2 ^v <i>Ten Commandments</i>	24 ^v Prologue on Belief
9 ^r Seven Deadly Sins	25 ^v Diverse Degrees of Love
13 ^r Five Bodily Wits	37 ^r <i>Pater Noster</i>
13 ^v Five Ghostly Wits	54 ^v Mirrour of Sinners
13 ^v Seven Virtues	64 ^r Charter of Heaven
15 ^r Seven Works Bodily Mercy	72 ^v Three Arrows
15 ^v Seven Works Ghostly Mercy	

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 biddyns".

Des. "too þat blisse god vs bryng".

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

Pub. : EETS. OS. 217.317 (ed. W. N. Francis).

II. *Wyclifite Commentary*

A. *Version Attributed to Wyclif*

Inc. "Alle manere of men schulde holde þe comaundementis of God".

Des. "þou herdist not þe 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 C V 6, fol. 9^r (early 15th cent.); (3) York Minster XVI L 12, fol. 1 (second half 14th cent.).²

C. *Compressed Versions*

(1) Rylands English 85, fol. 2^v (early 15th cent.).

Inc. "Alle manere men schulde holde Goddis comaundementis".

Des. "alle oþer þat ony man doiþ".

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. 6^v (15th cent.).
 Inc. "Thys ys þe fyrste of godys comaundementys".
 Des. "of suche wrongful coveytynge".
 Pub. : EETS. OS. 118. 33 (ed. Simmons and Nolloth).
- (3) Morgan 861, fol. 1^r (mid 15th cent.).
 Inc. "Here begynneth the ten commaundementis of God".
 Des. "þou schalt not coueite it wrongfully".
 Pub. : *PMLA*, lxi (1954), 686-92 (ed. C. F. Bühler).
- (4) Plimpton Addenda 3 [Columbia Univ. Library], fol. 241^v (c. 1400).
 Inc. "I am þi lord God þat ledde þee".
 Des. "on suche wrongful coueytinge".
- (5) Bodl. 21820 (Douce 246), fol. 101^v (15th cent.).
 Inc. "This is þe first maundement".
 Des. "þis lawe sufficeþ to þe".¹

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: "Liers, glosers, 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. 102^v: "the þrid maundement of þis table is broken on many maners. And specially by þes men þat letten godes wif to love god as sche schuld and þis avoutrie is þe moste. The fourþe maundement is broken by many ziftes 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.¹ 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.²

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)³ 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^touten holdynge of hem. mai no mon beo saued. And so þe gospel telleþ. hou on askede of Crist: what he schulde do. for to come to heuene. And crist bad him. if he wolde entre into blisse: þ^t he schulde kepe þe Comaundemens of God . . . (EETS 217.317)

Alle manere of men schulde holde þe comaundementis of God, for wiþouten holdynge of hem may no man be savyd. And so þe gospel telliþ how oon askide Crist what he schulde do for to come to hevene. And Crist seide, 3if þou wolt come to blisse, kep myn comaundementis (III, 82).

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. 19^r, fol. 21^r, and fol. 25^v. 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 þat þei louen it. And bi þe same skile þes foule lecchours maken her god þe taile eende of an hoore" (fol. 10^v).

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 þing enimon loueþ most : þ^t þing he makeþ his god. in as muche as in him is. beo hit wyf. or child. gold. or seluer. or eny catel . . . Of þis foleweþ. þ^t þre manere of folk suwen þe sturyng of oure þreo enemys : whuche ben þe flesch. þe world. and þe feond. . . . As for þe furste. Lecherous. and gloterous men þei loue more heore wombes þen god. and so heore wombes þei maken heore god. Of hem spekeþ seint poul *Ad philipenses. iiij* ; and seiþ þus. *Multi ambulans. . .* þat is. Monye gon. of þe wꝛuche. ofte I. haue seid to 3ou : and nou I seye wepyng . . . of whom heore wombe is heore god . . . So þise men þt louen heore flesch. and Lecherie. or gloterie. þei maken heore wombe heore god . . . þe secounde maner of men. þ^t breken þis comaundement. and also maken hem false goddes : beon Couetouse men . . . and þei maken such worldly goodes. synfully heore false goddes for as seint poul seiþ. *Ad ephesios v. Avarus quod est ydolorum seruitus.* þ^t is. An auerous mon. or a couetous : is þraldom of maumetes. For such a couetous mon . . . doþ maumetrie . . . þe þridde maner of men. þ^t breken þis comaundement. þat folowen þe fend : beon þo þat setten heore hertes most on worldly worschipes. and veyn glorie. and heiꝝnesse of hemsself. (318-19)

Second Commandment

And þerfore crist him self in þe. gospel of Seint matheu *capitulo v* : biddeþ þus. *Nolite iurare omnino . . .* þat is. swere 3e not on alle manere . . . But 3oure word beo. 3e 3e. nay. nay. And þ^t. þat is more ouur þis : hit is of euel. These ben cristes wordes in the gospel . . . And 3if 3e schullen swere : rule 3ow aftur þe lawe of god. in 3or sweryng. For god him self techeþ þe. þ^t when þu swerest : þu schalt kepe þreo condicions. *Iurabis inquit in ueritate. in iudicio. & Iusticia. Ieremye iiij capitulo.* þat is. þou schalt swere in treuþe. In dom. and in rihtwysnesse. (320)

what maner þing þat a man loueþ moost, he makeþ his god ; and so, syþþe al synne stondiþ in love, everi heed synne is brekyng of þis heeste . . . And siþen þei ben þre synnes, as Seynt Joon seiþ, þat enwrappeþ alle oþere, in þre maneris may a man breke þis maundement,—in þes þre, love of fleische, and love of eiꝝe, and pride of liif. And so glotouns and lecchouris breken þis heeste ; as Poul seiþ, þat þes glotouns makyn hire beli hire god . . . And on þe same wise þe coveytous man makeþ his mawmet þe temporal goodis, as Poul seiþ þat averyce is service of mawmetis. And so þe proude man makeþ þe feend his god. (83)

Crist techiþ in þe gospel to have oure wordis þus, 3he, 3he, and nai, nay, wiþouten ony oop . . . For God techiþ bi Jeremie þe prophete, wiþ þre condicions it is leefful to swere. First þat þei be war þat þei swere treuþe, and þat þe cause of hire oþ be to schewe riꝝt, and siþen, þat in jugement be it need to swere ; and ellis schulde alle men kepe hem from oþis. (84)

Third Commandment

þu schalt þenken hou god made þe world of nouȝt on a sunday. And hou he sette wit. and wisdam on a sunday in to eorþe. And þ^t he a ros fro deþ to lyf. on a sunday. And þt schulde fere ȝou alle : and perse ȝor hertes. And vpon a sunday as clerkes seyn : schal beo domes day. (322)

For upon þe Sunday God made þe worlde, and on þe Sunday God roos fro deeþ to lyve, and on þe Sunday he sente þe holi Goost, and, as clerkis seyn, upon þe Sundai schal be þe laste jugement þat ever man schal 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 þe comaundementis of God, for wiþouten holdynge of hem may no man be sawyd. And so þe gospel telliþ how oon askide Crist what he schulde do for to come to hevene. And Crist seide, ȝif þou wolt come to blisse. kep myn comaundementis. (Arnold, iii. 82)

Alle manere men schulde holde Goddis comaundementis. for wiþoute keping *and* rulyng bi hem : mai no man be saued / and so þe gospel telliþ. hou oon askite Crist what he schulde do : forto come to heuene / and Crist bade him if he wolde entre in to blis : þat he schulde kepe þe comaundementis of God. (p. 371)

First Commandment

as Poul seiþ þat averyce is service of mawmetis. (83)

as Poul seiþ / an avarous man is a seruaunt of mawmetis. (p. 372)

as Poul seiþ . . . an auerouse man is a seruant of mawmentis. (PMLA, lxix. 689)

¹ Bühler, *PMLA*, lxix. 688, n. 6.

Second Commandment

A man much sweringe
schal be fulfilled with
wickidnesse, and veni-
aunce schal not go away
fro his hous. For soþe
wiþ werst zeldinge schal
be fulfillid þe hous of
him. (84)

a man moche sweringe :
shal be fulfilled wiþ wick-
idnesse / and veniaunce
with worst zilding : shal
not go fro his hous
(p. 372)

a man myche swerynge
schal be fulfilled wiþ
wickydnes. and veni-
aunce schal not go fro
his hous (689).

Third Commandment

þou schalt do no servile
werk. (85)

þou shalt not do ony
seruyle werk. (p. 373)

þou schalt do no seruise
werke. (690)

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 eiþe, 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 þe Heestis / ¹

Alle manere men shulde holde Goddis comaundementis. for wiþoute keping *and* rulyng bi hem : mai no man be saued / and so þe gospel telliþ. hou oon as [fol. 3^r] kite Crist what he shulde do : forto come to heuene / and Crist bade him if he wolde entre *in* to blis : þat he shulde kepe þe comaundementis of God.²

Almyȝti God seiþ in his lawe on þis wise. who so seiþ þat he loueþ me *and* kepiþ not myn heestis : he is a lier. *and* truþe is not in hym ³ / and as God seiþ þe feend is fadir of alle lesyngis ⁴ / þerfore lest we bicomē þe feendis children þoruȝ 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 þou wel þat oure Lord Ihesus Crist haþ not bodun us do : but þat we mai wel kepe wiþ þe help of Goddis grace : if we doen oure bisynesse þerto. 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. 3^v] and so God seiþ in his gospel to alle manere men. my charge is liȝt. *and* my ȝoc is swete ⁶ / and Seynt Iohn þe euangelist seiþ þe charge of God is to kepe hise heestis / *and* þei ben not greuouȝ ⁷ neþer 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 " greuouȝ " (EV) and " heuy " (LV). Forshall and Madden, iv. 628. Nothing in the Morgan tract corresponds to this second paragraph.

Þe Ffirst Comaundement of God is Þis /

The Lord spak alle þese wordis / I am þi Lord God þat ledde þee out of þe loud of Egipt : fro þe hous of seruage / þou shalt not haue alien goddis bifore me / þou shalt not make to þee a grauun ymage. neþer ony licnesse þat is in heuene aboue. *and* which is in erþe byneþe : neþer of þo þingis þat ben in watris vndir erþe : þou shalt not herie þo : neþer þou shalt worshiþe / for I am þi Lord God : a strong gelous louer / and I visite þe wickidnesse of fadris in sones : in to þe þridde *and* þe ferþe generacioun [fol. 4^r] of hem þat haten me / and I do merci in to a þousynd : to hem þat louen me *and* kepen myn heestis.¹

In þis ffirst heeste it is tauzt þat þou shalt haue noon oþir God : but þe Lord God of Heuene / *and* him þou shalt loue of al þin herte : of al þi soule *and* of al þi mynde.²

Who brekiþ þe first comaundement / proude men. worldli men. *and* fleshli men // Whi proude men : for thei maken þe deuel her god. as Iob seiþ / þe deuel is king vpon alle þe sones of pride // Whi worldli men : for þei maken worldli goodis her god. as Poul seiþ / an auarous man is a seruaunt of mawmetis : *and* shal not enherite þe kyngdom of heuene ¶ Whi fleshli men : for þei maken her wombe her god. as Poul seiþ / Be 3e my folowers. *and* a waite 3e hem þat walken so : for many walken þat ben enemyes to Cristis Cros / [fol. 4^v] whos eend is deeþ *and* her wombe is þer god.³

Iob. xlj.º
[25]

Ephe. v.º
[5]

Phip. iij.º
[17-19]

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 giltles : þat takiþ in veyn þe name of his Lord God /⁴

And Crist seiþ þat is truþe / þou shalt not swere bi heuene : þat is bi no þing þat is in heuene / neþer bi erþe : þat is bi noon erþeli þing / neþer bi Ierusalem : for it is þe grete citee of þe Lord. which is mannes soule / neþer bi þin heed : þat is to seie. bi noon of þi membris eþer heer.⁵

Who breken þis comaundement / veyn spekers. Grete swerers. *and* wickid worchers. ¶ Whi veyn spekers : for her wordis ben not needful / Off which Crist seiþ / Off euery idil word þat men speken : þei shulen 3ilde rikenyng at þe dai of doom ¶ Whi grete swerers : [fol. 5^r] ffor her oopis ben not needful. as seiþ þe Wise Man / a man moche sweringe : shal be fulfild wiþ wickidnesse / *and* veniaunce

Mt. xij.º
[36]

Ecc.º xxij.º
[12]

¹ Exod. xx. 1-6. It agrees with LV except for "ony licnesse þat", which agrees with EV. For the Rylands reading "Fadris in sones", see LV, MSS. A sec. m. CDGKMNOQRTWX 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.

with worst zilding : shal not go fro his hous / ¶ Whi wickid
 worchers : for her werkis ben vnleeful /. of whiche Poul seiþ / Ro. xvj.^o
[18]
 awaite 3e hem þat letten þe lawe of God : and dele 3e not with hem /
 for bi softe speche. þei disseiuen þe hertis of innocent men // ¹

De Þridde Comaundment of God
 is Þis /

Haue þou mynde. þat þou halowe þe dai of þe Saboth / In sixe daies þou
 shalt worche : and do alle þi werkis / forsoþe in þe seuenþe dai of þe Saboth of
 þi Lord God : þou shalt not do ony seruyle werk / þou and þi sone and þi dou3tir.
 and þi seruauant and þin handmaide / þi werkbeest : and þe comelyng. which is
 wiþinne þi 3atis / for in sixe daies God made heuene and erþe. [fol. 5^v] þe see
 and alle þingis þat ben in þo : and restide in þe seuenþe dai ² and herfore þe Lord
 blesside þe dai of þe Saboth : and halowide it / ³

Who breken þis þridde comaundement / þo men þat þenken not on God
 herteli. and þei þat preien Him not deuoutli, and þei þat doen not þe dedis of
 merci wysli ¶ Whi þo men þat þenken not on God herteli : for þei
 ocupien her þou3tis with vanytees / to whiche God seiþ bi his ij. c.^o
[1]
 prophete Michee / Wo to 3ou þat þenken vnprofitable þou3tis :
 worchinge yuel in 3oure couchis in þe morwe li3t ¶ Whi þo þat
 preien Him not deuoutli : For þei worshipen Him wiþ her lippis xv. l^o 1
[8]
 and not wiþ her hertis. as Crist seiþ bi Matheu / þis peple with lippis
 worshipen me : but forsoþe her hertis ben fer fro me ¶ Whi þo men ij. c.^o
[19]
 þat doen not wiseli þe werkis of mercy : for þei leuen vertues and
 3y[fol. 6^r] uen hem to vicis as Iohn seiþ / li3t cam in to þe world.
 and men loueden more derknessis þan li3t : for her werkis weren
 yuele. ⁴

De Fferþe Comaundement of God
 is Þis /

Honoure þi fadir and þi modir : þat þou be long lyuyng on þe lond which
 þi Lord God shal 3yue to þee. ⁵

¹ *Matthew xii. 36* : “ euery idil ”, agrees with Ev—“ eny idil ”, M ; “ riken-
 ynge ”—“ resoun þerof ” EV, LV, M. *Eccl. xxiii. 12*: “ with . . . zilding ”—
 omitted in M. *Ro. xvi. 18*: “ softe speche ”—“ her soft speche ”, M ;
 “ innocent men ”—“ innocent men and wymmen ”, M.

² Written “ daie ”, but corrected.

³ *Exod. xx. 11* agrees with LV. For “ and do all ”, see LV, MSS. DKOS ;
 for “ seuen þe dai of þe Saboth ”, see LV, MSS. BCDEKLMNOQRSTX ; for
 “ ony seruyle werk ”, see LV, MS. I (note also MS. S ; Wyclyfite tract, p. 85 ;
 “ seruylse werke ” M).

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

⁵ *Exod. xx. 12-13* agrees with LV.

Who breken þis ferþe comaundement ¶ vnkynde men. froward men : *and* rebel men ¶ Whi vnkynde men : ¹ ffor þei helpen not her eldris as þei shulden. of whiche þe wise Man seiþ / He þat worshipiþ fadir *and* modir : shal be maad myri in sones / *and* he is cursid of God : þat terriþ hem to wraþ ¶ Whi froward men : for þei wolen take no goostli teching. as Isaie seiþ / Sones of frowardnesse not willynge to heere þe lawe of God : þat seien speke to us plesaunt þingis. þouȝ it be errours ¶ Whi rebel men : for þei ben [fol. 6^v] vnbuxum to Crist *and* to his churche. as weren Dathan *and* Abiron / þat for vnbuxumnesse to Moyses *and* Aaron : sanken doun to helle alquyk. wyf. *and* child. wiþ al þat longide to hem.²

[Ecc. iii. 6, 18]

xxx.°
[9-10]Numerj. xvi.°
[27-33]

Þe Ffifþe Comaundement of God is Þis /

Thou shalt not slee.³

Who breken þis ffifþe comaundement, enuyouse men. wraþful men. *and* auarouse men ¶ Whi enuyouse men : for þei haten or bacbiten her briþeren / of whiche spekiþ Iohn 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 wraþful men : for þei smyten or dispisen her briþeren. as Seint Austyn seiþ / ⁴ a wraþful man is hateful to God : *and* he is felowe to feendis ¶ Whi auarouse men : for þei releueen not in nede þer euencristen. to whiche wiþ þe [fol. 7^r] Wise Man / Haue mynde of pouert in tyme of plente. *and* þe nede of pouert ⁵ in þe dai of richesse / fro erli vnto euen þe tyme shal chaunge.⁶

[1 Jn. iii. 15, iv. 20]

Ecc. xviii.°
[25-26]

Þe Sixte Comaundement of God is Þis /

Thou shalt do no lecherie.

Who breken þe sixte comaundement : fflornycaries. auoutrers. *and* holours. ¶ Whi fflornycaries : for þei defoulen her bodies in lecherie. as Tobie seiþ / þe deuel Osmodus slow seuene men ⁷ for þei taken not her wyf after þe foorme of clene wedloc ¶ Whi auoutrers : for

iiij. c.°
[8]

¹ Marginal insertion of "men".

² *Ecc. iii. 6* : "He . . . sones / *and*", omitted in M ; "terriþ hem"—"terriþ 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 nede"—"and of þe neede", M ; "fro erli"—"for fro eerly", M. The translation is nearer to EV than LV.

⁷ Marginal insertion of "men".

þei breken þe hooli sacrament of matrymony. to whiche seiþ þe Wise Man / þe children of auoutrie þer seed shal be outlawid : *and* if þei ben of long lyf. at nouȝt þei shulen be acountid *and* in þer last eende. þei shule faille speche ¹ ¶ Whi holours : for þei waasten her bodies vnkyndli. of whiche Poul seiþ / þis þing wite ȝe wel. þat holours han not eritage in þe kyngdom of heuene.²

Sap. iij.^o
[16-18]

Eph. v.^o
[5]

þe Seuene Co[fol. 7^v]maundement of God is þis /
Thou shalt do no þefte.

Who breken þis seueneþe comaundement / michers. robbers. *and* extorconners ¶ Whi michers : for þei stelen priueli. as seiþ þe prophete Osee / truþe is not in erþe but cursidnesse *and* þefte. *and* mercie is awei *and* science of þe lord. for þis þing. alle þat dwellen þer inne shulen mourne ¶ Whi robbers : for þei robben opunli. to whiche seiþ God bi Isaie þe prophete / wo to þee þat robbist : wher þi silf shal not be robbid. whanne þou hast fulli robbid : þanne shalt þou be robbid ¶ Whi extorconners : for þei spuylen men of her goodis falsli. as þe Wise Man seiþ / þe vnþitous man seiþ. bigile we þe riȝtwise man : for he is vnprofitable to us. *and* contrarie to oure werkis / bi moost foul deeþ condempne we him : *and* so proue we þe pacience of him.³

iiij.^o c.^o
[1-3]

xxxiiij. c.^o
[1-2]

Sap. ij.^o
[12, 20, 19]

þe Eiztþe Comaundement of God is þis / [fol. 8^r]

Thou shalt not speke fals witnessse aȝens þi neiȝbore.⁴

Who breken þis comaundement ¶ liers. glosers. *and* false questmongers ¶ Whi liers : for þei haten truþe. of whiche spekiþ þe Wise man / beter is a þeef. þan þe bisynesse of a lier : for boþe shulen eneritagen helle. ¶ Whi glosers : for þei hiden truþe. as seiþ Iseie þe prophete /

Ecc.^{ct} xx.^o
[27]

¹ Marginal insertion of “ *and* in . . . speche ”.

² *Tobit* iii. 8 : “ þe deuel Osmodeus ”—“ how þe deuel Asmodeus ”, M ; “ for þei tooken . . . foorme ”—“ for o woman. for þey token hir not in forme ”, M. *Sa.* iii. 16-18 : “ auoutrie þet seed shal ” “ avoutry schullen ”, M ; “ in þer last . . . speche ”—“ þe laste eelde of hem schal be wiþoute 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 alowyng in the dai of knowyng ”, LV). *Eph.* v. 5 : “ wite ȝe wel ”—“ wite ye ”, M ; “ not eritage ”—“ noon eritage ”, M ; “ heuene ”—“ heuenes ”, M.

³ *Hosea* iv. 1-3 : “ and mercie ”—“ mercy ”, M ; “ alle . . . mourne ”—“ shulen morne alle . . . ”, M. EV, “ science, or kunnyng ”. *Is.* xxxiii. 1-2 : “ wher þi silf ”—“ whether thou ”, M. EV, “ whan thou shalt han ful endid robbing ”. *Sa.* ii. 12, 20, 19 : “ bigile ”—“ vigile ”, M ; “ he is vnprofitable ”—“ vnprofitable he is ”, M ; “ so proue we ”—“ priue we so ”, M. EV rather than LV (cf. EV, “ Bigile ”).

⁴ *Exod.* xx. 16 agrees with LV, except for “ witnessse ”—“ witnessyng ”, LV (“ Thow shalt not spek aȝens thi neiȝbore fals witness ”, EV).

þis peple is of hiȝ sermon. so þat we moun not vnderstonde þe
 sliȝnesse of her tunge in which is no wisdom ¶ Whi fals quest-
 mongers : for þei sillen þe truþe. as Isaie seiþ / Doom is turned
 backward. for truþe is fallun in þe street : and equite mai not go
 yn / and he þat ceesiþ fro synne : is able to be dispisid / ¹

xxx. iij.^l

[19]

lix.^o c.^o

[14]

De Nynþe and þe Tenþe Comaundementis
 ben þese /

Thou shalt not coueite þe hous of þi neiȝbore neþer þou shalt desire his wyf.
 not seruauant. not hand [fol. 8^v]maide. not oxe not asse : neþer alle þingis þat
 ben hise.²

Who breken þese comaundementis / þo þat wrongfulli coueiten in herte. þouȝ þei
 doen it not in dede. to whiche seiþ þe Wise Man / wole þou not coueite
 wickidli possessiouns. neþer folowe þou in þi strenkþe þe coueting of
 þin herte / it shal not profite þe in tyme of veniaunce / Also þo men
 breken þese two comaundementis : þat wrongfulli coueiten in herte.
 and to her power doen it in deed. for Crist seiþ bi Matheu / Eueri
 man þat seeþ a womman to couette hir : haþ now do lecherie wiþ hir in
 his herte / and also þei breken þese heestis þat han lust and likyng in
 such wrongful coueting. as þe Wise Man seiþ / vnstablesse of
 coueting ouerturneþ þe witt withoute malice / Also Seint Iohn seiþ /
 þo þinges ben of þe world. couetise of iȝen. and lustis of fleish. and pride of lyf /
 [fol. 8^v] and þese þre synnes : innwlappen alle oþer þat ony man doiþ.³

Ecc.^{et} v.^o

[1-2]

v. c.^o

[28]

Sap. iij.^o

[12]

[1 Jn. ii. 16]

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 lier ; forsothe bothe shuln eritagen perdicion ", EV (" cus-
 tomablenessse of a man ", " a leesyngmongere ", LV). The quotation does not
 occur in M, which gives " Deedis of Apostles. xxj. c^o ". 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 heiȝ 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 (" Ty-
 mothe. iij. c^o "). *Is. lix. 14* : " Doom . . . backward "—" turned is bacward
 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 ; " neþer
 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.
 " vnstablesse of coueiting ouerturneth wit withoute malice ", EV (" coueitise
 turneth ouer the ", LV). Quotation absent in M. *1 John ii. 16* : " For al
 thing that is in the world, is coueitise of fleisch, and coueitise of iȝen, and pride
 of liif ", 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* :

Copied has þis Sauter ben of yvel men of Lollardry,
And aftirward hit has bene sene ympyd in wiþ eresy.¹

¹ Arnold, iii. 3.