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ABSTRACT

Matthew Thomas Sullivan D.Phil, thesis St. Catherine's College Hilary Term, 1990

The Original and Subsequent Audiences of the Manuel des Péchés and its Middle English Descendants

Chapter I examines the text of the Manuel des Péchés. A new concept of the genuine structure and subsequent corruption of the poem is evolved with close reference to internal and external (MS.) evidence. Previous claims that the Manuel was designed for the edification of laypeople are shown, with detailed attention to the text, to be indefensible. The poem is a tract which promotes observance of a sacramental law and which was designed for repeated study and absorption by a general clerical readership.

Chapter II begins with an unprecedented positive identification and biography of the author of the Manuel. William of Waddington was a secular canon and a prominent figure in the legal hierarchy of the Diocese of York. The MS. circulation is thereafter investigated. Copies of the work almost instantly reached clerical individuals and institutions throughout England. Waddington's intended and achieved audiences are nearly identical.

Chapter III considers the text of Handlyng Synne. It is demonstrated that this poem was not, as some have claimed, intended for systematic use in a program of education of the laity. It does not promote the sacrament of confession and it removes much of the reformative material in the Manuel. It was designed for random and selective group and individual reception by unsophisticated laypeople and clergers from the author's region. Through local stories, a familiar tone, and an uncomplicated and leisurely style Robert Mannyng, the author, transformed the Manuel into a local story-book/directory of sin.

Chapter IV traces the MS. circulation of Handlyng Synne. The poem was received for the most part by the ordinary lay and religious people for whom it was intended.

Chapter V studies the text and MSS. of the stanzaic redaction of Handlyng Synne by Peter Idley. It is demonstrated for the first time that the work commonly called Idley's Instructions to His Son seems in fact to be two independent and internally unrelated poems (the second being the redaction of Mannyng's work) which initially circulated separately and which were subsequently fused by a scribe. A biography uncovering Idley's connections with literary society is provided. He transformed Mannyng's poem into a guide to prosperity for the prosperous. Deft additions to and deletions from his source often cunningly reassure men of position that wealth is a product of virtue, and largely irrelevant borrowings from Lydgate's Fall of Princes are appropriately fashionable. The MSS. indicate that the poem achieved geographically wide circulation among the prosperous laity for whom it was intended.

These three poems were in practice received by the audiences for whom they were intended. While the texts share a common core of content, they are extremely different from each other in purpose and audience. There is, however, a fringe audience of interconnected northern landed families who took an interest in all three texts. At the center of this network is a family closely connected with the village of Waddington, Lancashire, the birthplace of the author of the Manuel, and more distantly linked with Mannyng's birthplace and with apparent ancestors of associates of Idley. These and other matters are developed in the nine appendices which conclude the thesis.
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A Note on the Presentation of Textual Quotations

When citing from printed editions I have often found it necessary, in the interest of sense, to alter or abandon the editors' punctuation. I have also regularized capitalization when necessary (e.g., at the beginning of verse lines). Such adjustments are undertaken without warning throughout this thesis. When citing directly from manuscripts, pointed brackets <> are used to enclose letters which, because of the physical state of the manuscript, are no longer absolutely clear. In all citations, square brackets [] enclose either emendations or italicized editorial comments.
Introduction

Methods and Results

If one were alone in the world, one would not need to write. Regardless of the circumstances of composition, writing is almost always a social impulse ultimately intended for absorption by others. The presence of a potential audience is one of the primary stimuli of composition, and the audience itself is the collective entity through which most of the effects of a text are received and registered. Ignorance of the nature of the audience of a work can therefore lead to ignorance of a good deal of the work's purpose, and if the purpose of a text is misunderstood so too is much of its meaning. An accurate picture of the intended and actual audiences of a given text is, therefore, an essential key to comprehension of the text itself.1

In order to gain such understanding, one must first establish the authentic text. In the case of modern printed works, this prerequisite would seem laughably self-evident, but students of texts composed before the advent of printing appreciate how difficult a task it can be when the content of the text varies from manuscript to manuscript. Occasionally one has the good fortune of studying a work which has been edited by a competent critic who has established an authentic version. Ordinarily, however, if the text has been edited, the editor has concerned himself with printing a text, rather than with establishing the text. Unfortunately, the poems with which we shall be concerned fall into the latter category.

The Manual des Péchés, the first text to be discussed in this study, was printed in its entirety in 1862 from an extremely poor manuscript, the editor adding but a meagre complement of variant notes from a few of the copies known then.2 In first decade of this century part of the same edition (albeit
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(corrected) was presented alongside a printing of Robert Mannyng's redaction of the *Manuel, Handlyng Synne.* No serious attempt to establish the authentic text was made until 1940, when two independent full-length studies of the textual tradition were completed. It was at this point that the complexities of the poem's history became apparent.

Through their study of the manuscript versions these critics were prompted to observe that the text consisted of a stable core of five 'books' (on the articles of the faith, the commandments, the sins, sacrilege, and the sacraments) followed by an unstable group of two to four 'books' (a sermon on the fear and love of God, a tripartite treatment of the practice of confession, an examination of the theory and practice of prayer, and a group of prayers to Christ and the Virgin, the sermon and the prayers not always being present). Distracted by the same structural irregularities which confused some scribes, the critics judged that everything after the first section of the book on confession was spurious. This was an extremely simple solution, and an equally inaccurate one. The critics failed to assess logically and systematically the steps by which the purportedly spurious particles became associated with the text, and failed to take full account of the relative stability of the particles and of the stylistic similarities and differences between the particles and the unquestionably authentic sections of the text. Had they taken these measures, their conclusions would have been vastly different. In this study those measures have been taken, and in consequence a new and defensible reconstruction of the textual history of the *Manuel* has evolved.

In particular, it has been determined that, of the four unstable 'books,' the second and third (on confession and prayer) are, on the grounds of internal and external (i.e., MS.) evidence, without question the work of the *Manuel*-poet, while the sermon and the prayers, on the same grounds, are of independent origin, having entered the tradition at points of structural confusion during
Introduction

the early stages of the text's evolution, and thereafter having been gradually kneaded into the text by scribes of indifferent skill. The book on confession is the locus for almost all of the structural alterations which occur, and its metamorphosis in the manuscripts, explained logically for the first time here, clarifies the stages of the Manuel's corruption. The authentic Manuel, then, consisted of the first five 'books' plus the 'books' on confession and prayer, and one's search for authentic signals concerning the intended audience of the poem must be restricted to those 'books.'

The text of Mannyng's Handlyng Synne is fortunately less troubled than that of its source, but certain points must be recognized before an approach to its content can be made. Previous critics have attempted to describe the form of Mannyng's Anglo-Norman exemplar, but their findings have been colored by a flawed vision of the textual history of the source, and thus now require substantial readjustment. It would seem almost certain that Mannyng's exemplar contained the full nine-'book' version of the corrupt Manuel and that Mannyng consciously omitted two authentic 'books' (on the articles of the faith and on the theory and practice of prayer) and the two spurious ones (the sermon and the prayers). While what he chose not to translate is of interest (particularly since these omissions show some critical acumen), that material in his text which is strictly derivative is of course of no consequence in an assessment of the poem's audience and therefore is not to be considered. Thus the Manuel-poet's work must be weeded from Mannyng's before any profitable discussion of the M.E. text can take place.

We are fortunate enough to have a modern critical edition of HS of questionable value, but which in any event provides us with the readings from which a judgement of the relative merits of the few available versions can be drawn. It is a rather odd tradition, with the latest manuscript actually appearing to reflect the earliest known stage, and it is made clear here that
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the modern editor had more than likely selected an inferior text on the grounds of convenience. Citations from the texts examined in this study are regularly accompanied by variants, and explanations are often offered for the particular patterns of variation which emerge.

Another point which has not been emphasised, and which is brought to light here, is that Mannyng, unlike the Manuel-poet, appears to have composed HS in stages, and the surviving manuscripts attest to a certain degree to the independent circulation of particles of the text. The commandments section and the treatment of the sacrament of the altar (the latter of which was clearly designed for potential independent circulation) each appear independently in two manuscripts, and it would appear from internal evidence that Mannyng ended his original text with Book V of the Manuel (on the sacraments) and later resumed with Book VII (on confession). This structural hesitation is a significant initial indication of the author's purpose, which is quite different from that of his predecessor.

The textual tradition of Peter Idley's redaction of Handlyng Synne was completely misjudged by the modern editor of the text, who, like the critics who examined the history of the Manuel, followed the lead of scribes with consistent uninquisitiveness. It is established here that what has been known since 1935 as Idley's "Instructions to his Son" is in fact two independent poems which initially circulated separately and which were later fused by a scribal transition which is so manifestly inept that one wonders that its authenticity has never been questioned before. Idley's redaction of HS is internally unrelated to his other poem (drawn from the works of Albertanus of Brescia), and, unlike his other poem, never refers to his son.

The greatest textual difficulty with Idley's redaction is that no complete version of it has survived, and that some of the copies are now so damaged as to be rendered almost useless. The modern editor chose a poor text, but really
had no alternative, and it was not until very recently that another copy of the poem was discovered which reveals that Idley re-worked all of Mannyng's poem. There are some 2,000 unique lines in this manuscript, and here for the first time selections from these lines are presented.

Establishment of the text should be followed by establishment of the context, the historical and intellectual milieux in which the author wrote, and this cannot be done thoroughly if the author's identity is unknown. Although most of the non-fragmentary manuscripts of the Manuel include an epilogue in which prayers are requested for a William of Waddington, no concerted effort has been made to identify this person, and he has regularly been dismissed (without supporting evidence) as a scribe or even as the composer of the spurious material which became attached to the text. Certain historical material suggestive of his identity was alluded to and rejected by one of the commentators on the Manuel-tradition; a later observer accepted the allusion but did not examine the evidence. In the present study a logical argument in favor of the authenticity of the epilogue (and thus of the ascription of the poem to Waddington) is followed by a positive identification of the man by means of detailed reference to historical sources. William of Waddington, from Waddington, Lancashire, was a secular canon of Beverley and a prominent member of the legal team of the Archdiocese of York for nearly thirty years, serving as an itinerant justice and as seneschal of Archbishop Gray. He was one of the Archbishop's favorite servants, and received several grants and honoraria in the Archbishop's manor at Southwell. Late in his life he founded a chantry in Southwell Minster, and an apparently lost manuscript of his poem was kept at the Minster during the fourteenth century. There are close connections between Southwell and the Gilbertine house at Sixhills, Lincolnshire, where Robert Mannyng lived for some time. Waddington was clearly well-placed to aid
on a large scale the diocesan reformatory movement spawned by the rulings of the Fourth Lateran Council.

Robert Mannyng was a simple country canon of the Gilbertine Order who spent perhaps thirty years working on his redaction of the *Manuel*, while living for the most part at two prominent Gilbertine establishments at Sempringham and Sixhills. It has long been suggested that early in his life he spent some time at the Gilbertine Order's college at Cambridge and that later he acted as a chaplain among the laity of Lincoln. New evidence presented here may indicate that his exposure to the laity was more consistent, for it seems now possible that he was active in several rural parishes in the vicinity of Lincoln during the early years of his career, and one of the two extant copies of his metrical chronicle of English history was owned by a later rector of one of these parishes. Mannyng may have served a brief apprenticeship in the household of Bishop of Lincoln Oliver Sutton, but most of his time seems to have been spent in rustic villages much like the one in which he was born, and also with his fellow Gilbertines. He was not on the cutting edge of any great change, but was qualified to satisfy the needs of ordinary folks who were beginning to acquire the rudiments of vernacular literacy.

Peter Idley was a secular man of means and position associated with a literary set in Oxfordshire which included descendants of Geoffrey Chaucer and patrons of Lydgate. He married a wealthy woman and rose quickly in the service of Henry VI, finally being appointed Comptroller of the King's Works, a department in which Chaucer himself once worked. Idley's second wife was at one point mistress of the nursery in the household of the future Richard III, and it is quite possible that a copy of Idley's redaction of *Handlyng Synne* was owned by Henry VI. Idley was a servant whose success was measured in the gaining of favors, and one needs to view the composition of his redaction with this fact in mind.
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Once the texts and contexts have been settled, one is poised to consider carefully the content of the texts, though such consideration should be rendered three-dimensional by close attention to tone and style, which can alter or even contradict direct statements concerning audience or method of reception. The *Manuel des Pêchées* was not, as has been thought, designed for the edification of the laity, but rather was intended for repeated study and absorption by a general clerical audience. It is noted here for the first time that the author admits in the epilogue that a friar or brother asked him to write the poem, and, with reference to Waddington's career, there would seem little reason to doubt that that patron was a superior figure in the Diocese of York. The Anglo-Norman language of the poem limits severely even the outside possibility of reception by ordinary laymen, though it expands the potential clerical audience to include those ignorant of Latin but conversant in the vernacular language common to religious life during the middle of the thirteenth century. One cannot challenge the relevance of such a text to the clergy, since many of them were ignorant of even the most basic catechetical facts and the whole impetus of the reformative movement of the thirteenth century was to eradicate that ignorance before attempting to uproot the much more entrenched form of unawareness lodged for centuries in the minds of the common laity.

Waddington quite properly approaches his broad clerical readership with distance and formality, only occasionally taking strong personal views on topics of particular interest to him (e.g., the conduct of the legal system), except in Books VII and VIII, where his aim to induce his readers to confess and pray properly (and to hear confessions properly) requires a more intimate approach. The poet had a serious reformative purpose, and his unadorned style reflects and aids it well. His *exempla* are classic proofs of argument bereft of entertainment value and often charged only with their literary authority, to which the poet makes frequent reference. The concision of his argument, which
can lead to incoherence and underdevelopment of important topics, suggests an authorial presupposition of his readers' familiarity with some of the material under discussion. He provided ample internal cross-referencing for his readers, and expected manuscripts of his works to present organizational aids to selective reference, though he asks his readers first to read the text several times.\textsuperscript{23} The \textit{Manuel} is a no-nonsense tract designed to promote clerics' observance of a sacramental law.

\textbf{Handlyng Synne} is a story-book/directory of sin written in order to entertain, inform, and advise an audience of simple lay and religious country folk on the subject of sin. Mannyng does not promote the practice of confession. He removed most of the reformative content and tone from his source, and expected his audience of listeners as well as readers to receive random selections from the poem.\textsuperscript{24} It is illogical to suggest, as others have, that this text was in any way designed to be employed in an official or unofficial program of reformative education of the laity.\textsuperscript{25} Although in his prologue he addresses his poem to the people of his home town and of his monastery (in this case the one at Sempringham), one now suspects that his local contacts were wider than this and when one appreciates that many of the twelve stories which he himself composed emit a particularly local flavor (often being set in Lincolnshire and Norfolk), it would seem probable that his intended audience consisted exclusively of people from the rural places in which he had lived. His metrical chronicle was written for a similarly limited audience.\textsuperscript{26}

Mannyng was writing for people he knew, and addressed them directly, frankly, and frequently, regularly placing his addresses to groups (to the ordinary laypeople in general, to fathers of children, and to priests) before the stories, which he seems to have expected would be of primary interest to his listeners, and placing his advice to individuals in the argument, where he
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seems to have expected the solitary reader, at least, to browse. His addresses to women and to the rich are rabble-rousing and rhetorical. He wrote for common men. His patterned placement of addresses to listeners (near stories) and readers (in the argument) threatens to create an impression of duality of purpose which might serve neither group of receivers, but Mannyng demonstrates considerable foresight by mixing reception signals in order to soften this impression, for example by mentioning his readers and listeners at the same time, by asking in the argument for his receivers to listen, by providing cross-referencing aids for readers during the stories, and by referring to stories during the argument. These skillful devices prevent critical internal division in the text and accommodate the uninhibited browsing by readers and listeners which Mannyng encourages in his prologue. 27

Since his principal aim was to entertain, Mannyng took pains to transform Waddington's dry exempla into diverting tales by giving dialogue to characters and motive to actions; he also provided a dozen of his own stories which show clearly his talent for portrayal of the human scene and even on occasion his capacity for eloquence. He recognized that his unsophisticated audience could not be expected to comprehend the concise argument of the Manuel, and he simplified the text for his receivers by adding explanatory transitions at logical gaps in the source; in particular he greatly improved the links between the argument and the stories. Another feature of this process of simplification was his regular addition of local content into the text, for example by citing from his own experience, by referring to local customs and gossip, by claiming that he heard stories locally even when his sources were in fact literary, by setting many of his own stories in the audience's region, and by imposing regional settings upon some of the stories he drew from the Manuel. 28 Mannyng tailored the content, tone, and style of Handlyng Synne to the precise requirements of his intended audience.
Peter Idley extended the same service to the well-heeled readership for whom he catered, but with motivations which differed from those of his predecessor. He transformed Mannyng's poem into a guide to prosperity for the prosperous. The main theme of Idley's material additions to his source is that wealth is a product, if not a symbol of virtue, and that (it follows, therefore), the people for whom he wrote must be virtuous. Sin is to be avoided because it causes poverty, Idley advises his receivers. In this and in other themes, for example that people of position should protect their own interests by keeping the rabble down, that a rigid social order must be kept in order to maintain the prosperity of the upper classes, Idley was carefully enunciating precisely what his intended audience wanted to hear. He was exceedingly cunning in his selective use of Handlyng Synne, choosing to pass over anything said by Mannyng which might upset his audience, for example Mannyng's observations on the greed of legal officials (not surprising since Idley was at one point employed as a bailiff), the prevalence of theft by servants of their masters' goods, the quest for wealth and public favor, and the pernicious lying by rich men in court. Most significantly, however, almost all of Mannyng's treatment of the deadly sin of covetousness is missing from Idley's redaction. In addition, the most frank descriptions of sexual indiscretions in HS are not found in the redaction, and neither is a good portion of Mannyng's advice to clerics, which was clearly irrelevant under the new circumstances. Hackneyed anti-feminist and anti-clerical grumblings and the internal evidence discussed above suggest that Idley's intended readership consisted of secular men who shared or exceeded his social position.29

Idley's tone is arrogantly subservient to everything that is in favor, and thus incapable of ruffling the feathers of his set. His largely irrelevant insertions of passages from Lydgate's Fall of Princes seem merely a protracted attempt to ingratiate himself with his betters through fashionable cooings, and
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this motivation would seem also to be behind his selection of Albertanus of Brescia's works as the source of his other poem, for an influential neighbor of Idley is known to have been an admirer of Albertanus, and furthermore Chaucer's having drawn from a French translation of Albertanus during the Canterbury Tales would not have been likely to work to Idley's disadvantage.

Writing in stylish rhyme royal for the discerning reader, Idley sensed that the rustic simplicity running through Mannyng's stories would somehow fail to charm the aesthetic sensibilities of his readership, and he took skillful steps to satisfy these anticipated expectations. The logical gaps in Mannyng's tales are frequently filled by Idley, and odd and enriching descriptive and conversational details are constantly introduced. Human touches are deftly added to actions. Despite the cynicism in which his writing is steeped, one is unable to make light of Idley's narrative talents, or of the tremendous care which he took in constructing this mouthing of the beliefs of his class for his class.

Having established the text and context and having assessed the internal evidence which the text provides, one needs then to determine the degree of similarity between the intended and the actual audiences, and in order to do this one must examine in detail the historical, textual, and physical features of the surviving manuscripts of the text. The manuscripts of our three texts have never before been studied closely with this end in mind. The Manuel des Pêchés, which survives in twenty-four copies, was circulated almost instantly to religious institutions throughout the country. It achieved the general clerical readership for which it was intended, and was read in greater (Durham, Bury) and lesser (Isle of Wight) places, as the author seems to have wished. The manuscripts are almost all classic examples of clerical book-production, being presented in an orderly fashion as the author had recommended and being spared from disfiguring annotation. The texts surrounding the Manuel in the MSS. are
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ordinarily characteristic of the interests of the clergy. There are only two extant copies which appear to have been originally owned by the laity, and these laypeople seem to have been, as one might expect when one recalls that the text was written in French, people of considerable means and stature.32

Mannyng transformed a national poem into a local one, and his Handlyng Synne enjoyed limited and localized circulation. Only four copies attest to the complete poem, and most of the ten surviving MSS. containing the text in part or in whole were produced in the central regions of the country. Mannyng wrote for ordinary lay and religious country folk, and most of the surviving manuscripts are unremarkable, and often sloppy, compilations ordinarily owned by unremarkable people, for example a country rector (who also may have owned a copy of Mannyng’s metrical chronicle) and a backwater mayor from Norfolk, a Leicestershire family man, and a rural Buckinghamshire house of the obscure Bonshommes canons.33

Idley wrote for comfortable people like himself and his redaction of Handlyng Synne was read from London to Cumbria by such people. Three landed gentlemen from Cheshire and Cumbria owned copies, as apparently did two merchants from the City, and a further manuscript seems to have been copied by a tenant of Idley’s influential friend who admired Albertanus of Brescia. Most of the seven surviving copies appear to have been professionally produced and later changed hands frequently, with each successive owner contributing further to the degradation of the copy through haphazard annotation.34

The general similarity between the intended and actual audiences of each of these works is startlingly close; indeed this is quite as startling as the marked differences between the audiences of these interrelated texts. The same basic material was used to create three strikingly different texts, a tract promoting the observance of the law of confession designed for study by a general clerical audience, a story-book/directory of sin designed to entertain,
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inform, and advise ordinary secular and religious, rural, browsing listeners and readers, and a guide to prosperity designed to soothe the consciences of the prosperous. In theory these three intended audiences would appear to be almost mutually exclusive, and in general the manuscript evidence suggests that in practice they were.

Latent in the MS. evidence, however, lies a point of contact between the three achieved audiences. A group of interrelated landed families, principally from the northern regions of the country, owned copies of all three texts. The Tempest family held the lordship of the village of Waddington, Lancashire (the birthplace of the author of the Manuel) from 1268; they owned three manuscripts containing versions of the Manuel, none of which can be certainly linked with the consignment of Durham Priory books they received from monks after the dissolution. The line of the Tempests connected with the village of Waddington may have had contacts with the Gilbertine house at Sixhills during Mannyng's lifetime, and a member of this line may have been related to Robert Mannyng. There is some evidence to suggest that Mannyng consulted one of the extant copies of the Manuel, a MS. which contains a roll of arms referring to the Cockfelds, perhaps the same family who during the fifteenth century owned a copy of the Manuel, and apparently to Robert, prior of the Gilbertine house at Malton, the man who asked Mannyng to write his metrical chronicle. This roll is related to the contemporary Boroughbridge Roll, which refers to the Cockfelds again, to the Curzons, perhaps the Staffordshire family who seem to have owned a copy of Handlyng Synne, to the Hollands, probably the Norfolk family who by the seventeenth century owned a copy of the Manuel, to the Cliffords of Cumbria, who owned a copy of Idley's redaction of Handlyng Synne, to the Marleys, perhaps ancestors of the Durham monks by that name who gave manuscripts to the Tempests after the dissolution, possibly to the Yorkshire Nortons, who may have owned a manuscript of the Manuel, and to John of Clinton.
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possibly the prior of the Gilbertine house at Sempringham under whom Mannyng himself lived for a time.37

The Norton family of Yorkshire was maritally allied with the Tempests, and the fact that the apparent Norton family MS. of the Manuel is closely related to the source of the Middle English prose translation of the Manuel (which survives in only one MS. and which is merely a verbatim translation) is of particular interest, for the unique M.E. MS. was owned by a man living near an Abbey which had close business contacts with the Tempests. The Washington family of Co. Durham, who can be connected with the Tempests, with the Bowes family of Durham (who owned a copy of Handlyng Synne), and with the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Durham, seem to have owned at least by the seventeenth century one of the most spectacular surviving copies of the Manuel. The Hollands of Norfolk, who owned another beautiful copy of the Manuel, were maritally allied with the family of Sir Thomas Knyvett, the Elizabethan book collector who owned another surviving copy of the Manuel.38 The Boweses, who, like the Durham line of the Tempests and the Washings of Durham, were frequently involved in the business of or employed by the Diocese of Durham, actually participated in a bibliographical transaction with the Tempests during the early fifteenth century, and later commissioned one of the most authentic extant exemplars of Handlyng Synne. The Cliffords of Cumbria (owners of a copy of Idley's works who can be connected with the Boweses and Washings) were from the early fourteenth century neighbors of the West Riding line of the Tempests (the line connected with the village of Waddington) and were maritally and officially allied with the Tempests at least from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century.39 A member of the Strickland family of Cumbria who married a Tempest related to the Marley monks of Durham seems to have owned one of the most beautiful copies of Idley's works.40
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Wealthy northerners have of course long been associated with the promotion and reception of the affective and fashionable northern mysticism of the later Middle Ages, but the manuscript evidence brought to light for the first time in this study broadens our vision of the duration and magnitude of their interests, for it is apparent that perhaps from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries they at least acquired copies of downright commonplace texts which (with the exception of Idley's redaction) were hardly designed to suit their tastes. One cannot, of course, determine the extent of their interest in the texts merely from their ownership of copies of them, and there are some people of position from other areas who owned MSS. of the texts, for example the Knyvetts and Hollands of Norfolk, a Lord Hungerford of Somerset who owned a copy of the Manuel during the fifteenth century, and the Cloptons of the West Midlands who may have owned a MS. of Handlyng Synne. Nevertheless one cannot deny that these northern families represent a fringe which connects the otherwise unrelated achieved audiences of the three texts.

This issue is, however, just one of many raised in this study, and the aim of the work has been to explore all of the available evidence with patience and reason. This introduction, which, as might be expected, also serves as the formal conclusion to this thesis, highlights some of the contributions made in these pages to our understanding of these texts. The study of the reception of medieval English literature is developing and it is hoped that the method of inquiry established and followed flexibly here will help others in their studies of other texts.
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'All of the points about to be discussed in this introduction are developed at length and with full annotation in the body of the study.

2F.J. Furnivall, ed., *Robert of Brunne's Handlyng Synne* (London, 1862 (Roxburghe Club)).


5On the matters described in the next two paragraphs see Chapter I of this study.

6A guide to the structural variants of the text designed to ease comprehension of this history is presented in Appendix II.

7See Appendix V ('Mannyng's Anglo-Norman Exemplar').

8I. Sullens, ed., *Handlyng Synne* (Binghamton, New York, 1983). Textual issues are discussed from time to time throughout Chapters III and IV. See also Appendix V and Appendix VII ('Notes on Mannyng's Dialect').

9On the manuscripts of the text, see Chapter IV.

10This structural issue is examined in Appendix V. A comparative study of the purpose of HS and that of its source appears at the beginning of Chapter III.

11The text was edited by C. D'Evelyn, *Peter Idley's Instructions to His Son* (Boston and London, 1935). On the topics covered in this and the next paragraph, see Chapter V and Appendix VIII ('A Scribal Attempt to Fuse the Works of Idley') of the present study.

12On these previous critical views, see note 18 of Chapter I.

13See the final section of Chapter I and the opening section of Chapter II.

14Mannyng's career is examined in the second section of Chapter III and in Appendix IV ('Historical Notes on Mannyng and His Associates').

15This new evidence is presented in Appendix IV.

16This important topic is examined in Appendix I ('Vernacular Literacy in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries').

17See Chapter V on all of these matters.

18For the views of previous critics, see note 2 of Chapter I.

19See esp. the analysis of the Prologue of the text, in Chapter I.

20See esp. the final section of Chapter I.

21See esp. the end of Chapter II.

22On the currency of the Anglo-Norman language during the thirteenth century, see Appendix I. For more on the relevance of the text to clerics, see the treatment of the Prologue of the text, in Chapter I.

23The tone and style of the text are discussed fully in Chapter I.

24On these points, see esp. the first section of Chapter III, in which the purpose of the text is established.

25On others' opinions, see Appendix VI ('Previous Estimations of the Purpose and Audience of *Handlyng Synne*').

26The final section of Chapter III examines Mannyng's localization of the Manuel.

27Mannyng's tone, and the issue of textual duality, are studied in separate sections of Chapter III.
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The last two sections of Chapter III are devoted to Mannyng's narrative style and to the local content of his poem.

For more on the matters touched upon in this paragraph, see Chapter V.

See Appendix IX ('Idley's Use of Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*'). On Idley's neighbor Edmund Rede, see the opening discussion of Idley's career in Chapter V.

Two brief sections on Idley's narrative style appear in Chapter V.

The history of the MSS. of the *Manual* is presented in Chapter II.

On the MSS. of HS, see Chapter IV.

The final section of Chapter V covers the MSS. of Idley's redaction.

For a history of the Tempests' connections with the village of Waddington and of the family's literary interests, see Appendix III ('Historical Notes on Readers of the *Manual* and its Descendants').

A history of the Tempests' activities in Lincolnshire is presented at the end of Appendix IV.

See the examination of MS. B.L. Harley 337 in Chapter II.

On the points brought up in this paragraph so far, see Chapter II. Connections between the Nortons, Washingtons, Boweses and Tempests are explored in Appendix III.

On the Boweses and the Cliffords, see Appendix III. The Bowes MS. is discussed in Chapter IV and the Clifford volume in Chapter V.

See the analysis of the MSS. in Chapter V.

The last two owners are mentioned in Chapters II and IV, respectively.
Chapter I

The Text of the Manuel des Pêchés

(a) Introduction

The Manuel, which was compiled during the middle of the thirteenth century, has rarely attracted the attention of critics who have treated its descendants, and the few scholars who have studied the text itself have offered only brief and vague statements concerning its audience. Yet before we can ask for whom the Manuel-poet wrote, we must establish what he wrote. The textual history of the Manuel is exceedingly complex and will be reassessed in this study. The printed text, from MS. Harley 273, represents the final stage in that history, after a series of scribal expansions had left the author's own work somewhat obscured. It consists of the following Books:

[Prologue].
I. Twelve Articles of the Faith.
II. Ten Commandments.
III. Seven Deadly Sins.
IV. Sacrilege.
V. Seven Sacraments.
VI. Sermon which explains why one should not sin and why one should love God (not found in MSS. Royal 20.B.XIV, Arundel 288, or Leeds 15).
VII. Confession: Virtues, Things to Avoid, Points, and General Conclusion to the Points (this is the authentic 'edition' of the Book; two other 'editions' existed).
VIII. Theory and Practice of Prayer (a brief epilogue to the text as a whole appears at the end of this Book in MS. Royal6).
IX. Prayers to Christ and the Virgin (not found in Royal or Arundel7).
[Epilogue (position varies; all unadulterated versions contain a request for prayers for the author, and provide the author's name [William of Waddington]; not found in Royal or Arundel8)].

Books VI and IX, which differ generically from the other Books and which are not found in the earliest MSS. (Royal and Arundel), immediately seem suspect. The three forms of Book VII, and the possible multiple conclusions
to the poem (e.g., the General Conclusion to the Points in Book VII, Royal's epilogue to Book VIII, and the Epilogue) likewise immediately seem puzzling. These are only the most obvious textual difficulties.

Lines 13-30 of the Prologue assure us that at least Books I-V were part of the Manuel-poet's original plan. As we shall make clear, the textual history, tone, style, content, and purpose of Book VI indicate that it was not written by the Manuel-poet. It is likely that the poet's decision (in Book VII) to borrow a few lines from the latest version of a widely-circulated 'sermon' (which probably was originally two sermons) led scribes to associate that 'sermon' with the Manuel, and eventually to insert it into the Manuel.

The history of Book VII has never been logically explained. The Manuel-poet planned at least to write on both the theory and practice of confession:

A vus teus choses cy mustre
Dunt hume se put confesser,
E ausi en queu manere.  E a.l. Surketut, York 13; q.l la q., 12 MSS.
^A vus les ch. ben m., Harley 273; Ke nus pussum ben m., Harley 4657; Pur deus ch. a vus m., York 13; A vus devoms ch. m., HH 903; E nous doint les ch. bien m., Leeds. t...ch.l deus ch., 10 MSS. cy1 om. 11 MSS. (11. 3-5 [Arnould]).

Books I-V treat the theory (what to confess), Book VII the practice (how to confess). A reasoned assessment of the style of the four sections of Book VII prohibits one from arguing, as previous critics have, that more than one poet wrote them. It will be shown that the Book was circulated in three 'editions,' whose contents were as follows:

First 'edition': Points.
General Conclusion to the Points.
Virtues.
Things to Avoid.

Second 'edition': Points.
Virtues.
Things to Avoid.

Third 'edition': Virtues.
Things to Avoid.
Points.
General Conclusion to the Points.
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The first 'edition' confused scribes (and critics). Scribes regarded the General Conclusion to the Points as the text's conclusion, and gradually inserted spurious material after it (notably fragments of Book IX). The second 'edition' eliminated the confusion by eliminating the General Conclusion; this 'edition' also removed the spurious material which scribes had inserted into the Book and placed it after the authentic end of the text (Book VIII). The content of the prologue to the Virtues (which appears in all three 'editions') suggests that the third 'edition' reflects accurately the author's intended design of the Book. Manuscript evidence indicates that all three 'editions' were in circulation at the earliest known stages of the text's history. It would seem probable that an unsanctioned or inadvertant 'early release' of an imperfect version (perhaps a draft) of the *Manuel* containing the first 'edition' of VII began the textual tradition, that very shortly thereafter there appeared a second 'edition' of VII which attempted to limit efficiently the confusion in VII which the first 'edition' encouraged, and that very shortly after that the authentic third 'edition' was released. The surviving manuscripts of the *Manuel*, which attest in almost equal numbers to each of the three 'editions,' suggest that these 'editions' circulated (and influenced each other), without any one 'edition' gaining dominance over the others, from their respective inceptions to the point at which circulation of the *Manuel* ceased.

This logical explanation of the textual history of the Book, which has eluded previous critics, allows one to explain the history of the subsequent Books with equal reason.

Book VIII was almost unquestionably the final Book of the original *Manuel*. Detailed analysis of the manuscript and textual evidence provides no reason to doubt its authenticity. The *Manuel* probably originally ended with a brief epilogue to VIII which is preserved in one of the earliest surviving MSS.
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Book IX was not written by the Manuel-poet. It entered the Manuel tradition in two fragments, which scribes inserted after the General Conclusion to the Points of Book VII (first 'edition'). These fragments were fused in later first 'edition' texts. The 'second' edition of VII shifted the fused fragments (and associated material) behind Book VIII. Thereafter the fusion was refined and expanded into the form in which it appears in the later second and later third 'edition' texts (including the printed text). The content, tone, and style of Book IX are thoroughly alien to those of the Books known to have been written by the Manuel-poet.¹⁷

The person who wrote the Epilogue was either the Manuel-poet himself, or someone who was able to replicate his style precisely, and who was thoroughly familiar with the structural movement of the Manuel, its style, the method by which it was meant to be received, the circumstances surrounding its composition, the social identity of its patron, and the nationality, religious status, and name of the author. Thus it is probable that the Epilogue was either an original component of the Manuel (originally placed after Book VIII), or was inserted (after Book VIII) shortly after the text was composed. Since the Epilogue does not appear in two of the earliest surviving MSS. (Royal and Arundel), the latter option would seem the likelier. We shall prove beyond reasonable doubt that William of Waddington wrote the Manuel.

Close examination of the text of the Manuel indicates that it was written for a general clerical audience of varied intellectual ability. In Chapter II it will be demonstrated that the poem was predominantly received by such an audience. In the latter Chapter the identity of William of Waddington is established, and the historical details of the surviving manuscripts are considered. The poem was received nationally. Within little more than a half-century of its composition, the Manuel was being read throughout the country.
Waddington's position within the ecclesiastical 'establishment' helps to explain this phenomenon.¹⁰

(b) The Prologue

The Manual's general Prologue provides important evidence of the method by which the author intended the text to be received. At once the Manual-poet appears to anticipate an audience of readers:¹³

Tuz pechez ne poiim conter c.l nomer, Royal.
Mes partaunt se pot remembrer Par ce ferum r., York 13.
E ses pechés mut amender, mut l e, Arundel; om. Be.1.20.
Ky cest escrit veut regarder.
(11. 9-12).

The following detailed instructions on the proper method of reception of the text indicate clearly that the author wished his readers to read carefully and frequently:

Par perograffes iert destinctés,
Ke nus mustrent divers pechés.
(Si parlire desiretz Re.1.20 only).
Deu fez le deit rehercer Deu l Dis, 9 MSS, including Royal and Arundel; le d.J se doit, Leeds.
Ky s'älme vodra amender, s'a.J la aüme, Royal; ta alme, Harley 4971.
La ou il trovera divers peché t.J troverunt, Arundel; line om. Royal.
Si cum il iert perograffé. c...p.J trovera un perograf posé, Harley 4657; line om. Royal.
(71-8).

The poet appears to have expected that exemplars would include organizational aids (paragraph-markers) specifically designed to ease readers' reference to the text, and that his receivers would take advantage of them (viz., of course, by reading).²⁰ He advises his readers that the text should be read slowly, studiously, possibly gradually (by paragraphs, e.g.), and repeatedly. Nine MSS., including two of the earliest ones (Royal and Arundel), suggest that readers
The Text of the Manuel des Péchés

should read the text ten times. The last two lines of the passage seem also to recommend selective reading.

The tone of the poet's declaration of authority seems strained:

Riens ne direy par trop treter
Mes seulempt pechez cunter.
Que dust trestut descrivere. (from Harley 273) Ke tuz ces choses dust del
tut descrivere, Harley 4657; Ki toz ces
dchoes dust descrivere, St. John's; d.J yceo
escriver, HM.

Ore me doynt Deu, par sa pité,
Confermer par auctorité
Les pechez ke yci mettray,
Si cum de seins estret les ay.
Rien del mien ne y mettray,
For si cum je apris les ay.

Nule fausine n'i troveret.
Plus volenters le liset.

(49-62).

The last line of the passage reveals once again that the author anticipated an audience of readers. Although the Manuel-poet never implies that the text could be presented orally, it would seem that at least one scribe, that of MS. York 13 (which reads uniquely 'l'escotez' in this line) may have allowed for such presentation.

The poet stresses that the Manuel is a manual, a handbook, which should be

Le Manuel serra apelé
Kar en meyn deit estre porté.
L'alme aprent rectifier:
A chescun deit estre le plus chier.

He included exempla in order to make the text more delightful to read:
Ke plus en lisaunt seit delitus, Ke il seient en lisaunt plus d., Arundel; Ki plus lisaunt est d., Gg.1.1; E q'en lisaunt soit d., Leeds.

Cuntes nus metrum vus aucuns Sicum les seins nus unt cunté, Pur plus fere hâyr peché. vusl om. B.N.; a.J controus plusours, HM.

(79-82).

All of the preceding passages suggest that the author's intended audience was literate and had the leisure to read the text repeatedly. At the time of the poem's composition, of course, there were few literate people (in the vernaculars or in Latin) who were not either members of the clergy or of the 'ruling' secular 'classes' (i.e., the gentry, nobility, and royalty). The few 'ordinary' laypeople who were literate at this time (e.g., some merchants probably were) ordinarily possessed only the most rudimentary skills; they may have been able to recognize a few key words in one or another language which were relevant to their work; they probably could not write. The repeated and careful reading of the Anglo-Norman text which the author recommends would have been an impossible task for almost all 'ordinary' English laypeople at this time. The author's recommendations cannot but be directed to those capable of carrying them out, viz., the clergy and perhaps some members of the 'ruling classes.'

After an expected passage in which we are told that private sins will not be discussed (ll. 83-90), there follows an assertion that during the course of the poem the sins of the religious will be considered private sins, since the religious know their sins and how to confess them:

Pechez ke tuchent religiun
Entre privetez lerrum.

Pur ce ne voil je traveyler
Ici lur pechez rehercer.

Kar checun set serteinement
K'a religius meuz apent

Bus confesser plus menument
Ke ne fut la laye gent.

Kar tant cum sunt plus pres de Dé,
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E les clerks ke sunt bien lettré  Mes cl. qe cheent en peché, Creaves; N'ad il clerq qe seyt lettré, Be.1.20; El Mes, 5 MSS.; bienl cm. Arundel, York 13.

Sevent kaunt cheûnt en peché.  Mieuq s. quant sont en p., Leeds; Se confessfunt de lur p., York 13; S. quant que sunt ben lettré, Creaves; Qe sovent ne chet en p., Be. de e.l cm. St. John's; e.l teus, York 13; t.l dirrai, Be.1.20, Leeds; trerai, Royal; lerrai, HM.

Pur ce, de eus teray de gré, Ke vers mey ne seyent curucé

Mes tant lur di certaynement, Plus blamez sunt ke laye gent

F...s.l Mult p. peccent, Leeds; l.l autre, Harley 273.

Si eus pechent ausi sovent Quant se portent si follement, Leeds.

Cum fet celi ke rens s'entent. cel.l 11 lai, Arundel.

Kar plus est certes a blamer e. c.l fet celui, Royal; c.l cil, Leeds.

Kant un humme ke veit cler  Ki de ses oiz vait ben e cler, Harley 4657, St. John's; Cil home ke mult veit cler, York 13; Home cu femme qi veit bien cler, Leeds.

Trebuche en un ord fossé, Ke cil ke a les euz crevé.

K...k.l Devant celui qui, Arundel; les e.l la veu, HM.

(91-112).

This connection with private sins could summon up unsavory connotations; the absence of the passage from five MSS. suggests strongly that it was not the work of the *Manuel*-poet. The passage implies that the scribe who penned it anticipated a clerical component in his audience and attempted (awkwardly and repetitively) to placate it. The first four lines of the following passage are also probably not the author's; the common reading of the fifth line probably does not reflect the author's own words:

Pur la laye gent iert fet;  Plus ke lay cler chaste soit, York 13; f.l l'escrit f., Arundel; cest escrit f., Harley 4657; la ley f., HM.

Deu le parface, si ly plest,  Par sa grace Deu l'otroit, York 13.

K'eus ver pussent apertime  Ke clerq veent apertime, York 13.

Kauft eus trespassent e kauft nient.

Si aukun del cyr seitt amendé, c.l evere, Be.1.20.

Deu de cyel en seitt grâcié. c.l cil, 5 MSS.

(113--18).

Lines 91-116 and the common reading of line 117 are probably of scribal origin.
The connection between private and clerical sins is far more controversial than line 113, which claims that the text was made for the 'laie,' i.e., those who could not read Latin, for of course readers of the Manual would not need to know Latin. Since the reading of ll. 113-15 in York 13 continues on the topic of ll. 91-112 (clerical sin), whereas the common reading of these lines does not, one might suspect that York reflects the earlier form of these lines. The appearance of the verb oxy in line 117 contradicts all evidence concerning the reception of the text by implying that the text might be received by a listening audience. The more complex reading in Be.1.20 ('del evere,' i.e., through comparison or analysis (presumably self-analysis with the help of the text)) seems more in line with the author's recommendations that readers should read the text several times and that the text should be a reader's constant companion. The spurious common readings of ll. 113-17 provide the only instance in the text in which the audience is characterized as 'laie,' and also the only instance in which the possibility of oral presentation appears to be implied.

The unfortunate connection between private and clerical sins is probably an adulteration of the author's (lost) original statement on clerical sin. In Handlyng Synne's Prologue, the following lines appear on this subject:

Of pys clerkys wyl y nou3t seye.
To greue hem y haue grete eye.
For pey wote pat ys to wetyn,
And se hyt wel before hem wrytyn. well ofte, Dulwich.
(37-40 [E.E.T.S.]).

Here the reason given for the avoidance of the topic is that clerics would presumably already be familiar with it through their wide reading. In the middle of the Manuel, during a discussion of simony, the Manuel-poet says something quite similar to this:

Clers qe bien s'entendent.
Veient quant il mesperpent.
Lur pech63 qe trecouent en liure.
Ne volum pas ci descriure;

C.I C. lettrès, Harley 4657 (hereafter B).
V.I V. mult bien, B.
qel k'il, B.
d.I escriuere, B.
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Pur ceso les passerai de grée,
Qe vers moi ne seient corucé,
Nepurquant plus erant blamé3
Qe laye gent pur lur pechez,
Car il veient apartement v.J v. tut, B.
Qei fet a fere, & qei nient. Kuant il pechent, & kuant nent, B.
(5285-94 [cp. Prologue II: 101-12]).

The four highlighted lines of this passage seem substantively identical to the lines cited from Handlyng Synne's Prologue, and both of these passages are substantively different from the spurious lines in the Manuel's Prologue which link clerical sins with private ones. It seems probable that the lines from the Prologue of Handlyng Synne reflect the Manuel-poet's original statement in the Prologue on the subject of clerical sin, which the Manuel-poet thereafter repeated in similar terms in the simony section. It seems equally probable that the scribal adulteration of this statement which appears in all surviving Ms. versions of the Manuel's Prologue was devised in complete ignorance of the Manuel-poet's remarks in the simony section. This is of course an hypothesis, since no extant version of the Manuel's Prologue contains a statement on this subject which precisely resembles that in Handlyng Synne's.25

The Manuel-poet clearly anticipated an audience of readers who would read the text frequently. During the thirteenth century the use of Anglo-Norman was primarily confined to the south of England, and to literate society (viz., the 'ruling classes' [for business and legal purposes and leisure reading], the clergy, [especially those connected with the 'ruling classes' and those involved in commerce], and a portion of the few literate 'ordinary' laypeople [e.g., some tradesmen]). During the fourteenth century the employment of the language became geographically more dispersed, but gradually less frequent as the literary use of English increased.26

The poet was in holy orders and his native tongue was English:

De franceis ne del rimer f.J fauz f., Mr.6.4.
Ne me deit nul hume blamer,
Kar en Engletere estai né,
E nuri lais e ordiné. n.J om. 4 MSS.; o.J pus o., Harley 273; l...o.J
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De une vilette sui nomé

Ke n'est burg ne cîte.

(12736-41 [Epilogue (Arnould)]).

He wrote at the request of a 'brother' or 'friar':

Si l'escrist ne plet a acun,

Blamer ne me deit par reisun.

De fol enprise sui escusë,

Kar del fere sui preiè.

(12728-31 [Epilogue]).

One of the passages which confirms the accuracy of the Epilogue is the following (notably on the very subject of excusing sin), in which the author addresses a brother or friar directly:

GardeS bien, tresduS frere,

De vus escuser en nule manere

Al hure quant vus confessës,

Car vostre dammage mult fre3.

(9313-16 [Book VII, Things To Avoid {E.E.T.S.}]).

It is of course possible that the poet's patron, rather than the poet, wanted the poem to be written in Anglo-Norman.

This acknowledgement of a friar's or brother's patronage and the supporting evidence for it in Book VII would seem, with reference to the internal evidence from the Prologue discussed here, to confirm that the author wrote for clerical readers who had the leisure and the degree of literacy necessary to read the poem as the poet wished it to be read. Surely the text would be useful for clerics. They, like all Christians, had to confess their sins regularly. Legislation issued around the time of the poem's composition reiterates this simple fact, and of course the creation of such legislation indicates that clerics were not universally performing their required duties. Likewise, the plethora of legislation designed to combat clerical ignorance of the most rudimentary catechetical subjects indicates that clerics did not
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universally (or perhaps even ordinarily) have a command over such basic material.²⁹ That a text written for a clerical readership should appear in a vernacular tongue also is unsurprising, since it is clear that clerics did not universally share a knowledge of Latin.³⁰ Ignorance of Latin may have been particularly pronounced among religious of gentle birth professed in nunneries and chivalric orders, among members of agrarian orders like the Cistercians, and among lower-ranking secular clergy (e.g., 'ordinary' parish priests).³¹ If the poet wanted his work to be read by clerics who could not read Latin as well as by those who could, then, of course, he would have to write it in the vernacular. Since in the thirteenth century Anglo-Norman appears to have been used both formally and informally among clerics, it would seem to be an effective language in which to write such a work for such a readership.³²

(c) The tone, style, and content of Books I–V

(i) Tone

A poet selects a manner of approach to his audience and will not alter it purposelessly. In a poem compiled from various sources, as the Manuel is,³³ alterations in tone can be the product of imperfect assimilation of source material. If we suspend consideration of the treatment of the fourth Article, Book I introduces us to the terse, practical, and often impersonal tone which characterizes the Manuel-poet's work. The poet regularly refers to the person who should heed his advice as 'the sinner', 'each man', or 'every man', as can be seen from the following examples:

Vere poez apertement
Par tant, qe le pechur ment
Si il ad dit qe il creit en dee,
E gyse en mortel pechie.
(147-50 [Roxburghe]).
Hunte deit auer home mortel
Qe sun seignur ne ult sure ciel,
Qant en enfern home uint quere
Qe reis esteit de ciel e terre.
(451-4).

Deu, cum funt folement
Qe confession deslaient. Ky se confesser ne volent nent, B.
Par tant est home souent deceu,
E comande a ardre en feu. c...f.) iuge a enfer pulent, B.
(734-7).

The description of the fourth Article consists of a prolonged and fervent account of the Passion (ll. 295-446) whose tone is foreign to that of the rest of the Book.34 The Manuel-poet commonly avoids the emotional and personal tone which marks, for example, the following passage:

Iesu notre duz seignur,
Qei vus rendrum pur cest amur?
Griez ne seit e merciez,
Qe gracie seiez tutdis.
Certes ne dey ublier mie
Tuz les iurs de ma vie,
Allas, ta peine si tresdure,
Qe pur moi sufriestes, ta creature:
Tun sanc noble et precious
Set fiez espandi pur nous,
Pur destruire les set pechiez
Qe mortels sunt apelez.
En qeor de home sene
Ne ert ceo iames ublie.
(313-26).

Were the expression as inspiring as the theme, one might consider this the work of the author of Book IX.35 The Manuel-poet is not one for rhetorical outbursts and personal entreaties such as these:

Las! tant fu batu malement
Al piler, qant si largement
Sun sanc rea al pavement.
(337-9).

Duz iesu, qe dire purrum
Qe tute iur en peche cheum,
E poy de vus ou nient pensum,
Ne de pechier ne cessum?
Certes pecher tant ne dussum,
Car peche honist l'alme et hom.
(367-72).
The alien tone of this section suggests that the Manual-poet culled it from an independent source and did not bother to revise it for its new context. The final prayer for contemplation and the vague transition ('we have other things to attend to') would seem an appropriate closure for a short piece in a contemplative collection, but an inappropriate one for a passage of little significance in a long tract on confession:35

Plus de la passion ne dirrum,
Car a autres choses attendum.
Prrium pur cee comunement
Deu pere omnipotent,
Qe il nus doine souent penser
La passium sun füz pur plus amer.
Ne crei mie qe peche post durer
En cely qe de li vodra remembrer.
(437-44).

The author offers further instructions on reception at the end of this Book:

Les articles de la fey auum cunte
Sicum deu nus ad graunte.
Ore, cum auum premis,
Mettrum les commandemens diz,
E apres, les trespas,
Cum encnentre funt les vns allaz.
Garde pernez en oiant,
Car le profit est molt grant.
Si chose oiez qe fet auez,
Cel degree plus souent lisez.
N'est pas fet de vanite,
Einz est de verite proue.
Sachez qe deu honurez
Qant de bon entente le regardez.

(The author clearly expected his audience to listen, and was read to.)
be hearing or listening while they read. While it is possible that the author is referring to the apparent medieval practice of sounding out words while reading, it would seem far more likely that he is simply instructing his readers to pay attention when they read. The last two lines of the variant reading are probably an adulteration of the remark on paragraphs which the poet made in the Prologue.

The poet's tone in Books II-V is ordinarily impersonal, and occasionally remote. Examples follow, in the first of which the author treats a clerical sin:

Home a ki tesmoine sun qeor
Qe il ne peot femme espuser,
Ou pur ceo qe il est ordené,
E a chasteté par tant lié,
De treis ordres nomement,
Ki ordres sein3 apelent la gent
Sodekene, deakene, & presbiter.
...
Trestu3 ceus vnt peché
Si il unt femmes espusé
Ky isei sunt a f. e., B.
(2199-205; 2213-14 [6th Commandment (E.E.T.S.)]).

On the topic of covetousness, he warns that

Ne home ne deit autre angusser
Pur sun terrien chatel auer.
(5189-90).

On clerical lechery at Mass, he advises that

E clerse se dussent chaustier
Cel hure femmes regarder;
Car, sache3, ne est mie sage
Qe a la messe ad les ois volage.
(6857-60 [Sacrilege]).

The author can be remote and harshly judgemental:

Cil qe est si dur de qeor,
Si tricherus & si auer,
Qe ou les poures ne veut partir
Quant il mesise les veit suffrir,
Meus vaut lessir ces pains musir,
E desu3 li ces biens purrir,
Qe del surplus partir od Deu--
Poi uaut plus qa vn iudeu.
(5191-8 [Covetousness]).
If the poet expected the text to travel beyond his immediate intended audience (and when we see [in Chapter II] how quickly the poem was circulated throughout the country, we shall have no doubt of this), then some degree of formality of approach would be essential. The status of the poet's patron, which is unknown, could also have influenced the poet's choice of tone.

The author's use of a more personal approach is uncommon in these Books. Occasionally, as in the passage below, he tries to boost the confidence of readers:

Si tant aue3 trespasce3,  
Merci de fin qeor prie3.  
Plein est deu de pite3.  
Desesperer ne vus deue3.  
Merci vncore purre3 trouver,  
Si vus le uole3 demander.  
(931-6 [1st Comm.]).

A practical writer must select a tone which serves his purpose. Books I-V dispense unalterable theoretical information (i.e., 'what to confess') for a practical educative purpose which demands the tonal concentration on the subject which the poet supplies. Personal remonstrances or appeals are some of the many distracting static interferences from which lines of information should be free. Book VII, however, which instructs on a variable (human conduct in the confessional) by means of constant theories of practice (Points and Things to Avoid) for a practical response-inducing purpose (viz., to induce receivers to confess) demands the occasional foray into tonal intimacy in which, as we shall see, the poet embarks.

Yet even in the informative Books the poet can let slip a direct address indicative perhaps of an underlying preoccupation. He warns churchmen, for example, to prohibit carolling:

Sache3 ausi de verité,  
E sachez de fin, B.  
Qe malement vnt trespasé  
Qe karoles par feires menent,  
E cels ausi qe par folie les veent.  
Mult ulent mal de tiel iuer.  
Pur ceo, defendre les ad mester.
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(1489-94 [3rd Comm.]).

**Judges must observe the Sabbath:**

Garde3 ausi de larun iuger  
Par iur qe deue3 feirer.  
As houres de pes & de seintete3  
Vus sunt vos oures grante3.  
(1531-4 [3rd Comm.]).

**Servants must not steal:**

Ceo dust entendre le sergent  
Qe plus prent qe sun couenant--  
Manger, beuure, ou petite chose,  
Quide qe prendre peot & ose.  
Par custume ne prenge tant ne grant,  
Car mu3 des peti3 funt un grant.  
(2765-70 [7th Comm.]).

**Judges, advocates, and assessors must not compromise their impartiality:**

Vee3 bien si, pur pour,  
Pur auer, ou pur amur,  
Faus iuge futes a nul iur,  
Ou advucat ou assessor;  
Ou facine desturber poe3,  
E pur tort fere nel volie3.  
Mult deue3 estre a dreit blame,  
Quant pour ne auez de Dee.  
(4695-4702 [Covetousness]).

**Bailiffs must not steal:**

Baiilif ne se deit apruer  
Pur prou sun seignur amenuser.  
Prendre ne deit or ne argent,  
Pur fere encuentre sun serement.  
Ceo vus di ieo nomement  
La ou gist le priuement  
Sun seignur--petit ou grant--  
Ensi ert il bon sergent.  
(4763-70 [Covetousness]).

**Executors must not steal:**

Garde3 si vnques executur  
De aucun fusssez a nul iur,  
Quant peniblement ne feisse3  
Qe fere pur luy dusse3  
Choses ke pur le mort fere dussex--  
Trop greuosement as pêche3,  
E couent ke les amendes face3, B.  
Kar trop est led coueitise, B.  
(5295-300 [Covetousness]).
Everyone should be sinless at communion:

En l'ubblé dunt le cors est fet,
Vere poes, ci vus plest,
Coment sanJ peche deux estre,
Quel que seieJ, lay ou prestre.

(7385-8 [Sacrament of the Altar]).

(Of Shrive and Penance: 'In pe ubley 3e mowe se how 3e schulde be wypowe synne, wheper 3e be clerk*** or lewod.' [186/10-11]).

These directives, which in general encourage responsible conduct by those in positions of (esp. legal) trust, are quite what one might expect an archiepiscopal legal servant to have on his mind. The poet's long official career undoubtedly provided him with first-hand knowledge of a menagerie of swindlers.45

(ii) Style

The style of the practical writer must also serve his purpose. Pointless digression, useless adornment, and uncertain narrative progression are some other static interferences from which lines of information need to be free, and from which the first five Books of the Manuel are free. The poet's exempla are clipped proofs of his argument, rather than entertaining intermissions.47 The author frequently reconfirms their authenticity:

Deus ad mult souent mustré
Qe de lur pecheJ est mau payé,
Cum en vn sermun oy cunter,
Qe ben fet a remembrer. Ke bon est ore a rehercer, B.

(3357-60 [exemplum 21: Proud Lady Burnt to Ashes on a Wheel]).49

The poet advises his readers that exemplum 41 (The Priest's Concubine) should be believed more (than other exempla, presumably) because the action took place in England (cf. li. 6267-8); he claims that he heard exemplum 32 (The Death of Lucretius) in Church (cf. li. 5147-8); exemplum 15 (St. Fursey), he tells us, is from Peraldus's Summa de Vitiis et Virtutibus (cf. li. 2831-4.); the Summa is also one of the main sources of the Manuel as a whole, though the poet never
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states this. Near the middle of the text the author pledges once again (cp. 11. 49-62 of the Prologue) his adherence to established authorities:.

Ces autres racines vus cunterai
Sicum de nos mestres apris ay.  ap.J trouvé, B.
Rien vus dirrai san3 bon garant,  v.J ne, B.
Ceo vus premis ieo bien avant.
(6679-82).

The precision with which the poet can express a subject is particularly evident in his descriptions of the properties of the Host and the law of confession, interlinked topics (observance of the latter making appreciation of the former possible) discussed in the Sacrament of the Altar section:

Ki de ceo dust parler a clers
Mettre purreit en dou3 vers.
Cest set propretes del uble
Qe al auter de prestre est sacré:
Candida, triticea, tenuis, non magna, rotunda,
Expers fermenti, non mixta, sit hostia Christi.
(7469-74).

(Qassage omitted in B; 9 other MSS. omit the two Latin lines, while they appear in the margin of Ms.6.4).%

Qe a la pasche ne receiuent le cors Dee,  c.J fi3, B.
E issi vnt l'an vtrpass3,  l'anl le an tut, B.
Teus ad Deu mult manass3.
E ceo est resun & equt3:  r.J dreit, B.
Par la viel lai & le xouel  lai om., B.
Mustre peot estre lur pech3 mortel  peot...Juri ke coe [sic] est, B.
Ki al meins vnt trespass3,  K...m.J Al commencement, B.
Qe seint eglise ad command6
Qe home de age chescun ané
Seit confes de tut sun pech3,  tut sun chescun, B.
E en signe de creistieneté
Seit vne feize acomunié.
(7499-510).

The Manuel-poet's taste for concision can yield narrative incoherence.

Sometimes an exemplum is pasted in without a proper introduction:

Ki seure vie veit demener,
Mu3 deniers ne peot amasser.
Un hermite iadi3 esteit,
Qe en vne wastine maneit. Ky loin3 en vne gastine m., B.
(5217-20; transition to exemplum 33 [Hermit Who Gave His Money Away]).%

Conclusions to exempla can also be scanty:

De sunges vus ai ceo cuntes3,
Qe vus trop ne les cree3.  Ke en eus trop ne vus afiez, B.
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Even major topics can be left underdeveloped:

Al comandement vnt trespassé
Encontre que deu ad commandé,
Cels que escuer de sur syrneine
Funt le iur de dymeyne,
Ou par autre iur fairé
Que saint eglise ad commandé.

The Manuel is not a work of art, but rather is practical in purpose and design: its form presumably fulfilled a perceived public need, and satisfied the expectations of its spiritually 'needy' readership. Nevertheless, the poet made few concessions for the intellectually sluggish, and seems to have presupposed his audience's familiarity with at least some of his material.

(iii) Content

In this category, again, the practical writer serves his purpose best by avoiding the 'static cling' of padding. The poet's barrenly-plotted and virtually dialogue-free exempla are quite different from his follower's tales:

E al moygne demanda
Que cele symeine veu aueit.
Maintenant li respundiet
Que la columbe sur sa teste seeit,
De la main prendre la poeit. E il de se main p. le volait, B.
Mes la columbe se est leue,
E en sa buche est entré est l apres, B.
(1054-60; exemplum 3 [Tempted Monk]).

And asked pe munke of pe sprytye,
pe munke seyde, 'y haue hyt seyn,
And on my hede syttyyn and beyn.
Y sagh hyt so mylde and spake, pat with my hande y myght hyt take.
He poght hyt was pat fro me steyye, A3eyn ynto my moupe hyt fleye.'
(316-22).

The exempla of the Manuel are bulletins of confirmation; the poet occasionally seems to wish to rouse his audience during these communications:

Ore oye3 la vengance dée
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Quant la cote out fuble,
Va fu surd de ly trop ardant.    ly t.j la cote, B.
(3481-3; exemplum 22 [Monk Who Loved New Fashions]).

Ore oie3 miracle, qu le mu3 parla
E le surd cy; mes Peres s'en ala.
(5071-2; exemplum 31 [Pers Tollere]).

Ore, escute3 grant pité
Sicum le prestre out Deu prie,
D.J om. B.
L'an entier vnt karolé.
(6959-61; exemplum 47 [Sacrilegious Carollers]).

Since it is clear that the poet wrote for readers, and since these formulae may
very well have been present in the sources of the exempla, one cannot regard
these passages as evidence of possible oral presentation of the text.

Proverbs sometimes encapsulate the final message of these bulletins:

Certes, bien dust estre blâmé,
E ceo ad la veniance ben mustré.
Clerk contine ordené,     co.J cue cointise, B.
Baneour est al maufé.
(3493-6; exemplum 22 [Monk Who Loved New Fashions]).

Nul home peot messuer,
Si il mult ne seme premer.
Ne en ciel ne purra nul regner,
Si en tere ne desere le luer. leJ son, B.
(5093-6; exemplum 31 [Pers Tollere]).

They can also provide an image for a topic:

Prestre ne deit estre trop leger
Ces parochiens escomenger.
Ne est mie manere de bon pastur,
Ces ouailles comander al lu.    Lur berbiz deliuerer a les lous, B.
Pur chescune musche oscir,     cm. B.
Ne treie3 espé, cum sunt il.     cm. B.
(7747-52 [Sacrament of Penance]).

Since the *Manuel* is a description of a spiritual ritual and was meant to
be an educative ritual (for repeated reading), a certain degree of recapitulation
is to be expected:

Si vus a deu ne rendez
Ceo qe par vou promis le aue3,
Greuement aueras peché,
Si del rendre ne espleite3.
(3015-18 [8th Comm.]).

Nul enfant n'out fors luy.
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... 
Qe sun pere n'out autre enfant, 
De tant sun desl fu plus grant. 
(3067, 3089-90; exemplum 19 [Jephthah and His Daughter]).

Retrospective cross-references are particularly useful for readers of long texts:

A tiels choses fey doner, 
Ne poe3 vus sans pecher. 
Les poins de la fei vus dis auant. 
(1105-7 [1st Comm.]).

De usure auum nus auant dit, 
Ki garde prent de cest escrit, 
Quant del sime comandement 
Tretames, qe Deu liure a la gent. 
(4789-92 [Covetousness]).

Of the seven cross-references in the first five Books, only two are prospective.62

The tone, style, and content of the informative Books serve the poet's purpose by establishing clear lines of communication, and enlarge our understanding of the poet, his audience, and the manner in which the text was meant to be received. When the poet becomes more personal in his approach to the audience, he seems to reveal some natural preoccupations of an archiepiscopal servant and justice. When he becomes extremely concise, he seems to expose a presupposition of his concerning the intelligence of his audience. When he introduces retrospective cross-references, he seems to confirm that he is writing for readers.

(d) The Sermon

The textual history, tone, style, and content of 'Book VI' indicate that the Manuel-poet did not compose it. One may hypothesize with confidence that the 'sermon' which appears in some texts of the Manuel was originally two sermons, which consisted of the following:63
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Sermon I: Why you should not sin.
Prologue.
(i) Because of the fear of death.
(ii) Because of the fear of the Last Judgement.
(iii) Because of the fear of Hell.
Conclusion, with instructions on reception.\(^2\)

Sermon II: Why we should love God.
Prologue.
(i) Because God made us.
(ii) Because God died for us.
(iii) Because God is always kind to us.
Final Prayer.

The earliest attempt to combine these sermons seems to have been executed by a remarkably inept scribe whose intended audience was apparently comprised of female readers. His work does not appear in any version of the Manuel. It survives in seven manuscripts, two of which elsewhere contain a version of the Manuel which lacks 'Book VI' (MSS. Royal and Arundel) and another of which contains selected exempla from the Manuel, as well as Book VIII (MS. Rawlinson).\(^5\) This early and confused combination of the two sermons is ordered as follows:\(^6\)

I. Scribal Prologue (11. 1-122).\(^6\)

II. Sermon II:
   Part (i) (11. 123-52).\(^6\)
   Part (ii) (153-318; 281-318 were almost certainly written by the scribe who wrote the Prologue).\(^5\)

III. Sermon I:
   Prologue, fragmentary at beginning (319-48).\(^7\)
   Part (i) (349-430).\(^7\)
   Part (ii) (431-556; includes an address to a female receiver).\(^7\)
   Part (iii) (557-606).\(^7\)
   Conclusion (607-37), including an address to a female receiver and a recommendation that the text be reflected upon by those who 'regard it'.\(^7\)

IV. Sermon II:
   Prologue (638-53).\(^7\)
   Epilogue to part (ii) (654-8).\(^7\)
   Part (iii) (659-774).\(^7\)
   Final Prayer (775-780).\(^7\)
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This early attempt to combine the sermons seems subsequently to have undergone an independent and thorough revision by a particularly adept compiler who anticipated a more general readership than that of the earlier redaction (cf. notes 72 and 74). It is this later redaction which appears in some texts of the Manuel. It consists of the following sections:

I. Sermon I:
Prologue, slightly reduced (7794-7817 [Roxburghe]).
Part (i) (7818-95).
Part (ii) (7896-8021).
Part (iii) (8022-71).
Conclusion, including the recommendation that readers reflect upon the text (8072-98).

II. Sermon II:
Prologue (8099-8115).
Part (i) (8116-47).
Part (ii) (8148-8323; 8256-8315 are the spurious lines attributable to the scribal compiler of the earlier redaction (cf. note 67)).
Part (iii) (8324-8440).
Final Prayer, greatly expanded (8441-66 [see note 78]).

III. General instructions to readers on the reception of the text as a whole, which make reference to both I. and II. Not found in the earlier redaction. (8467-74).

An early redaction of the sermons thus appears to have been revised and then inserted into some texts of the Manuel. The initial location in the Manuel of this later redaction may have been in the midst of Book VII (first 'edition').

The structure of the earliest 'edition' of VII, as we have noted, encouraged scribal introduction of spurious material after the General Conclusion to the Points. In two first 'edition' MS. versions of Book VII some of the final lines of the later redaction of the sermons (including the General Instructions on Reception which conclude the later redaction) are appended to a fragment of the unquestionably spurious Book IX, that fragment of that Book being set in one of these two versions (Ee.1.20) after the General Conclusion to the Points, and in the other (St. John's) after the Points.

The later redaction of the sermons does not appear in three non-fragmentary MS. versions of the Manuel (Royal, Arundel, and Leeds). We have
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previously remarked that Royal and Arundel are two of the earliest surviving volumes containing the Manuel.²⁴ Only one MS., Harley 273, refers to Book VI in its Prologue. Harley's version of the Manuel reflects the final stage of the Manuel's gradual fusion with various spurious additions.²⁵ At the end of Book V the scribe of Harley 4971 makes reference to what will follow, namely, to a text on the Passion, and then to the 'sermon.' He apologizes to his receivers for interrupting the plan of the text set out in the Prologue:

Mes de la passiun voil ore dire,
Ke suffri pur nus Nostre Sire.
E apres cee, un sarmun
Ke mut poet aider a meint hum.
E ces deus choses ne vus premis nient;
Mes pur cee ke mut poet valer,
E al ouant e entendaunt profiter,
Jeo les vus ore dirray.²⁶

There is no reason to believe that the later redaction of the sermons was part of the original plan of the Manuel.

There is also no reason to believe that the Manuel-poet had a hand in inserting the later redaction of the sermons into the Manuel. The transitions to and from the later redaction seem to be of scribal origin. The text of MS. Royal, which seems at several points to reflect the authentic structure of the Manuel,²⁷ offers the following conclusion to Book V:

Jesu Crist seït gracié,
Ke les sacremenz avum terminé.
Ore dirrum de confessiun.
Deu nus eide par sun nun.²⁸

This expresses precisely what has ended and what, according to the plan in the Prologue, should follow (viz., Book VII). Royal then proceeds immediately to Book VII.

All other MSS. have, instead of Royal's lines, the following ones:

Jesu Crist seït gracié,
Qe nus ad si auant mené
Qe les sacremens avum terminé.
E plus ne dirrum de peché.
(7953-6 (E.B.T.S.).)
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This passage does not mention what will come next. Its final line is theoretically accurate, since the informative books describing 'what to confess' end with Book V. After these lines Arundel and Leeds proceed directly to Book VII. Yet any reader recalling at this point that the poem is called *Le Manuel des Pêchés* (see the Prologue, l. 69) might consider l. 7956 the final line of the poem. Were a scribe to misinterpret the line in this way, he would doubtless feel free to add anything he pleased thereafter, just as scribes who had misjudged the ending of Book VII ended up inserting spurious material (including part of the 'sermon') in the midst of it (see note 83).

Keeping in mind that the later redaction disturbs the expected layout of the *Manuel*, the apologetic reference to Book VII in the thoroughly unconvincing transition from Book V to the redaction seems unsurprising:

> Mes auant qe mette confessium,  
> Ainz ke vus die de c., B.  
> Vus dirrai vn petit sermun,  
> d. I frai, B.  
> 'Pur qei vus ne deue3 pecher,'  
> Si ducement vole3 escuter.  
> 7960  
> Mal fist pechê, & tu3 iurs fra.  
> Ki crere me uout, se gardera.  
> (7957-62 [E.E.T.S.]).

All thirteen of the extant versions of the text which include the later redaction of the sermons include this transition. The words 'Mes auant' clarify the structure of the forthcoming text. Needless to say, there would be no need for such clarification if the structure of the forthcoming text mirrored the one enunciated in the Prologue. The transition would appear to signal a 'paste-in' of the most obvious sort. The presence of the verb 'escuter' (l. 7960), of course, contradicts the *Manuel*-poet's own recommendations concerning the reception of his work.

The later redaction of the sermons ends definitively at the conclusion of the General Instructions on Reception (see Roxburghe I. 8467-74, cited in note 81). The lines which follow this passage attempt to link the redaction to Book VII:
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Ki vnqe sun peche harra,
A usle de ly l'engettera.
Ceo pet par confessiun,
Dunt ore parler deuom.
Deu de ciel couient reque
Sans ki rien ne purrum fere--
Chose dire-- dunt il set paie.  

*om. HM*
*Par confessiun je mustra, 7 MSS.; line om. HM*
*De confessiun pur coe dirrum, 7 MSS.*
*Si cum promis vus suom, 6 MSS.*
*co.| deuom, B.*

The first line of this passage seems suspiciously similar to l. 8469 of the General Instructions on Reception (see note 81). The variants to the next three lines epitomize the strained, awkward, and apologetic character of blatant scribal transitions. The more common reading of these lines seems subtler than the variants because it does not feature the 'as we have promised you' apology (cf. the variant to l. 8478). It would seem likely that the more common reading is the product of a scribal smoothing of the rough initial attempt to connect the redaction to Book VII. Of course, if we disregard the first four lines of this transition as spurious, accept F's reading of *fere* for *dire* in the final line, and tack the final four lines on to the General Instructions on Reception, we have a passage which ends the later redaction sensibly and does not foreshadow anything.

The textual history of the redaction indicates that it was not part of the original plan of the *Manuel* and that it was almost certainly not inserted into the *Manuel* by the *Manuel*-poet. The tone, style, and content of the redaction suggest strongly that it was not written by the *Manuel*-poet. When comparing the following passages, one might notice that one of the apparent purposes of the later redaction seems similar to the stated purpose of the *Manuel's* *exemples*:

La premere chose ceo vous di
*Ke plus en lisaunt seti delitus,*
*Qe fet peche estre hay*
*Cuntes nus metrum vus aucuns*
*Est de deu parfite pour.*
*Sicum les seins nus unt cunté,*
*L'autre est verrei araur.*  
*Pur plus fere hayr peché,*
*(7798-801 [Roxburghel]).*  
*(79-82 [Prologue (Arnould)].)*

*Lines 7800-1 are transposed in B.*
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The presence of recommendations that at least Sermon I be reflected upon by those who 'regard' the text (cf. ll. 8092-5, cited in note 74) and possibly that the entire redaction was intended for a reading audience (see the General Instructions on Reception, cited in note 81, esp. l. 8467) certainly do not contrast violently with the Manuel-poet's own recommendations concerning the reception of his poem. The appearance in the redaction of several formulaic requests that the audience 'listen' seems in line with the Manuel-poet's practices (esp. in the exempla, as we have noted):

Ore escutez del iugement
Dunt pour vient ensement.
(7896-7 [Roxburghe (the first lines of Sermon I, part [ii])].)

Duce gent, avez oye
Del iugement vne partie. i.l vengement, B.
(8008-9 [the first lines of the conclusion to Sermon I, part (ii)].)

Ore escutez des grans dolurs,
E des peines et des langurs,
Qe les cheitifs receuerunt,
Qe en enfern punis serrunt.
(8022-5 [the first lines of Sermon I, part (iii)].)

Ore oiez les fors turmenz
Qe auerunt les cheitifs dolenz.
(8034-5 [Sermon I, part (iii)].)

Ore oiez vn autre resun   oiez l veez, B.
Pur qei deu amer deuum.
(8148-9 [the first lines of Sermon II, part (ii)].)

Oiez cum il sunt male gent
Qe pus qe l'alme esteit issu,
Le destre coste l'unt fendu.
(8221-3 [Sermon II, part (ii)].)

The concentration of these requests (the later redaction contains less than 700 ll.), is, however, unlike the Manuel-poet's practice, and requires one to recall that the redaction was probably originally two sermons, that sermons usually are recited, and that the General Instructions on Reception in the later redaction do not appear in the earlier redaction and almost certainly were not
associated with the original two sermons. Thus it would seem possible that the two sermons were originally designed to be recited.

It would seem most perplexing if sermons which promote sinlessness and love of God did not contain some reference to confession:

Dunc ert tut demustre
Qe vnqes fut dit, fet, ou pense,
Vnqes si priue rien ne fu,
Qe apartement ne serra veu,
Ki le fist, quant, et coment,
Ou, et cum longement,
Fur qei, ouek, et cum souvent.
Tut serra veu apartement.
E nepurquant de nul peche
Dunt home seit avant purge,
Ni auera hunte ne hydur.
Einz auera ioie et honur
Qe ceo qe il est delivere.
Mult icisus serra et mult lee.
(7934-47 [Sermon I, part (ii)]).

Allaz, qe vnqes furent nez
Qe ensi celent lur pechez.
Parunt ileoc deu perderunt,
E od le deable s'en irrunt.
...
Meus ualt estre ci confes
A vn home, et sauf aprés,
Qe deuant tuz ileoc hony
E pus dampne al enimi.
(7992-5; 8004-7 [Sermon I, part (ii)]).

Ia nel serrum si contraire,
Ne ia nel poum tant mesfere,
Si del mesfet nus repentum,
E a luy de fin qeor turum,
Qe n'est prest de parduner,
Et tut le mal vblier.
(8330-5 [Sermon II, part (iii)]).

Likewise, sermons without exempla would seem odd. The following passage on the Last Judgement seems fairly exemplary:

Iur de grant amerete,
Iur de grant cheitiuete,
Iur de ire et de coruz,
Iur de pleinte et de gruz,
Iur de lermes et de plur,
Iur de peine et de dolur,
Iur oscur et de grant toneire,
Iur de angusse et de grant escleire,
Qant tuz pechez puni serrunt,
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Qant les esteilles de ciel cherrunt,
Le solail cum sanct devendra,
E la lune pale serra,
Quant le iur enneircira,
E tut le mundre fremira.
Qatre ministres de ciel vendrunt,
E des qatre pars le mund irrunt.
E qatre busines sonerunt,
A dunk vendra le feu ardant,
Si tres horrible et si grant,
Qe trestut ardera par mi,
Qe par peche serra blemi.

As that explains why one should fear God, this explains why one should love Him:

Dunc aeurum poeste plenere,
Amur, concord, science entiere,
Repos sans labur, et seurte,  seJ seintete, B.
Delit plenere et volunte,
Honur, richesse, et beaute,
Cloire, loenge, et pite,
Ducur, leesce, et charite,
Vertues beles od verite,
Undisable duz odur,
E tres delitable sauour.
Trestut ert a notre voler,
Qe de qeor sauerum penser.

The later redaction of the sermons is, in an extremely broad (and essentially insignificant) way, similar to the *Manuel*. One of its apparent aims, like the aim of the *Manuel's* exempla, is to inspire hatred of sin; it, like the *Manuel*, alludes to confession; both texts may have been intended for reading audiences; both contain calls to listen, the *Manuel's* being formulaic, the redaction's possibly being indicative of the method by which the two sermons were originally received; both contain exempla.

The dissimilarities between the redaction and the *Manuel* are so startling that they require minimal comment. Every passage recorded in the above treatment of the 'similarities' between the texts also illustrates the differences between them. The tone of the redaction is persistently personal,
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emotional, rousing. None of these adjectives may be applied with confidence in a description of the tone of the known work of the Manuel-poet. The style of the redaction is intricately descriptive, rhetorically eloquent, well-paced, and occasionally soaring. Again, we could hardly describe what we have seen of the Manuel-poet's style in similar terms. The contents of the redaction are matters of primal significance (Death, Judgement, Hell, Creation, Crucifixion, Heaven) which can only be contemplated. The contents of the Manuel-proper are informative facts and practical pieces of advice which can be put to use in the confessional. The aim of the redaction is to inspire thought. The aim of the Manuel is to promote action. In every significant comparative criterion the redaction differs almost diametrically from the work known to have been written by the Manuel-poet. It is almost inconceivable that the same poet wrote both works.

Nevertheless, fourteen lines in the Manuel-poet's analysis of fifth Point of Confession (in Book VII) were drawn from Sermon I, part (ii):[^26]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Original Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7934)</td>
<td>Car, ausi cum en le sermun disei om. B MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7935)</td>
<td>Quant del iugement parlai, cm. B MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7936)</td>
<td>Qui quenques fut, dit, ou pensé, Q. d.J Kuant quf fu dist, fet, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7937)</td>
<td>Quen ses si privé rien ne fu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7938)</td>
<td>Ki le fist, quant &amp; comert,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7939)</td>
<td>Ou &amp; cum longement, cm. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7940)</td>
<td>Purqef, ouek, &amp; cum souent. o.J o. ky, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7941)</td>
<td>Tut serra veu apertement. B. adds here, 'A cel grant assemblment.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7942)</td>
<td>Ni ad si petite pensé om. 10 MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7943)</td>
<td>Qe del deable pet estre escuseé,cm. 10 MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7944)</td>
<td>Si ci primes ne seist couert om. 10 MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7945)</td>
<td>Qe la ne serra veu apert. cm. 10 MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7946)</td>
<td>E nepurquant de nul peché</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7947)</td>
<td>Dunt home seist avant purgé,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7948)</td>
<td>Ni auera hunte ne bydur, h...n.J grant ioie &amp; B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7949)</td>
<td>Bind auera ioie &amp; honur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7950)</td>
<td>Qe cem qe il est delivéré. Q.J De, B., line om. Royal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7951)</td>
<td>Ert il folous à mult lée, om. Royal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7952)</td>
<td>Qe la hunte qe il aueit, Q.J Kar, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7953)</td>
<td>Quant il a prestre se confessait, il al om. B; sel ly, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7954)</td>
<td>Qe couera cum vn beal mantel Q.J Ly, B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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D'escharlet, ou de vn vermail cendal. vn v.J o.m. B. (9949-72).

The first two lines of the passage are almost certainly of scribal origin. That these two lines probably entered the Manuel-tradition after the redaction is indicated by their absence in six MS. versions of the Manuel which include the redaction.101 Disregarding these lines, then, as well as ll. 9959-62, which are absent from the same six MSS., it seems clear that the Manuel-poet culled from Sermon I, part (ii) a passage of fourteen consecutive lines which he must have considered useful for his purposes.102 These lines differ substantially from their counterparts in the early redaction of the sermons, but are identical to those in the later redaction of the sermons.103 The presence of this passage (without the six spurious lines we have mentioned) in the Arundel MS., again, one of the earliest extant copies of the Manuel, indicates that the passage probably entered the Manuel-tradition before the later redaction, for Arundel, of course, does not contain the redaction. Thus we can conclude with some confidence that the later redaction existed as an independent text at the time of the Manuel's composition, and that the Manuel-poet drew from it once.

This minor borrowing had enormous effects on the later textual development of the Manuel. It seems more than likely that a scribe identified the source of the borrowing, that thereafter the later redaction entered the Manuel-tradition, possibly initially within Book VII (first 'edition'), as we noted earlier, and that subsequently the spurious transitions were devised in order to place the later redaction between Books V and VII. It seems quite clear that the later redaction was not part of the original plan of the Manuel, was not inserted into the Manuel by the Manuel-poet, and was not written by the Manuel-poet.
As we have noted, some versions of the first 'edition' of this Book place spurious material after the General Conclusion to the Points. By assuming that the original Manuel ended with the General Conclusion to the Points, critics have repeated the errors of scribes. The following detailed cross-reference in the Things to Avoid section to exemplum 29 (Carpus the Priest's Vision of Hell [Inc. 1. 4583; Seven Deadly Sins (Sloth)]) testifies to the Manuel-poet's authorship of the Things section (the final section of Book VII in first 'edition' texts), and thus most likely also to the Virtues of confession section which precedes it in all 'editions:"

Quant leco de accidie tretai,        Avant, kuant de ac. parlai, B.
Dunc vne cunte vus cuntai             cm., B.
De seint Denis de France,             F.J. F. cuntai, B.
Qe vaut enccontre desesperance.      
E si auer le vole3,                   La le trouerez ben sans dotance, B.
La, si vus plest, le quere3.          cm. B.
(G303-8 [First Thing to Avoid (Despair)].)\textsuperscript{10s}

The authenticity of the Points and General Conclusion has never been questioned in the past, and cannot be challenged rationally. With reference to the above passage, it seems almost certain, then, that the Manuel-poet wrote all three sections of Book VII (plus, of course, the General Conclusion to the Points).

The theoretical reconstruction of the textual history of Book VII presented in the introduction to this Chapter accounts in practice for every known form of the Book.\textsuperscript{10s}

We also noted earlier that the prologue to the Virtues section, which all 'editions' contain, foreshadows a structure of the Book (Virtues, Things to Avoid, Points) which is fulfilled in practice only in the third 'edition,' and thus that, although the first two 'editions,' which were probably the result of an unsanctioned or inadvertant 'early release' of the text, appear to have circulated as widely as the third 'edition' (judging from the number of
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surviving copies containing each 'edition'), it would seem clear that the third 'edition' was the authentic one:

Le prologue de confession

Lumere indecifien

Qe neselent en cest mund dolent,

Nomement de la seinte gent,

Funtaine des biens originel

Qe reis est de tere à de ciel,

Tei aurent les mortels,

Si sunt certes les nent mortels,

Qe de tres biens estes auctur,

Ihesu, li riche empereur:

Ma alme, du3 sire, enlumine3,

E choses dire me grante3

Dunt vus, Ihesu, a paié3

Sei3 à tun people amendé3,

De confession nomement,

Dunt mester vnt tant souent

Treis choses desir dire,

Si pleasant vus fust, du3 sire.

Confessiun lire tant avant,

E mustrer la bunte grant,

Pus vodrei mustrer

Des quels choses se deit garder

Ki dreit se vodra confesser

E de peche aquiter.

La tierce chose qe voil cunter

Est cum bien des choses deit auer

Ki dreit ces pêchés vout cunter,

Quant il se deit confesser.

Commencum dune de par Ihesu

De confessiun dire la vertu.

(rubric; 8649-78 [E.E.T.S.D]).

As we pointed out earlier, the tone and purpose of Book VII are still as practical, yet nevertheless somewhat more intimate than those of the first five Books. We can see in the passage above that the poet strikes this intimate yet practical tone immediately; he begins with a rather emotional prayer, but then proceeds to plod through the contents of the Book (just as he plodded in the general Prologue to the text). The change of tone at the outset signals a change of purpose from the outset.114

Although the theory and practice of confession are clearly interdependent topics, they are not absolutely inseparable, and their possible separability may
account for the poet's decision to begin Book VII as one would a separate text. While an author's expectation that all of his readers would patiently wade through some eight thousand lines of theory before getting to the practice might seem unreasonable, his recognition that some might skip over the theory to get to the practice seems shrewd. The sharp division signalled by the prologue to Book VII seems to invite scribal excision of the Book; it should not surprise us, then, that a manuscript should survive which reflects such an excision, viz., Harley 3860 (see Appendix II).

On the other hand, one probably can assume from the absence of recommendations on reception in this Book that the author had intended his initial pointers in the general Prologue and at other early stages of the poem to apply to the text as a whole. Two passages in Book VII imply quite expectedly that the author anticipated an audience of readers:

De tuz pechez re sauums, r.7 ke, B.
E qe en cest escrit trouve auums,
Est pur veir obstinaciun
Vn des mauels qe trouum.
(Roxburghe 11341-4 [5th Thing To Avoid (Excessive Self-Consciousness)].)

Dunt vus duez confesser,
En ceste liure poez trouver
Solun ceo qe a ley apent.
(Roxburghe 11351-3 [5th Thing to Avoid]).

These are some of the final lines of the first two 'editions' of the Book, appearing at the very end of the Things to Avoid section. In both passages, of course, the verb *trover* is in the active voice.

One by-product of the more intimate aim of Book VII is an increased use of formulaic appeals for attention:

Ore oie3 ces proprete3     oie3 c.j escotez de confession les, B.
Qe meu3 confession desore ase3.
(8695-6 [1st Virtue (E.E.T.S.)]).

Ore oie3 cum il fut grant folie
Qe ne lessent entrer lur vie
Quant lur buche ne veilent ouerir
De lessir le peche issir.     le p.j lur mort, B.
(8715-18 [1st Virtue]).
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Ore oie3 dou3 choses d'escusurs.
L'un est qe il sunt menturs.
L'autre qe escusent lur creatur,
Qe d'asseS est peche greignur.
(9373-6 [2nd Thing to Avoid]).

Ore oie3 cum Deu accusa
E tute sa coupé vers Deu turna.  Supplied from B; om. Harley 273.
(9324-5 [2nd Thing to Avoid; part of an allusion to the story of Adam]).

Ore oie3 vne cunte k'en sermun
Oy cunter de un prodrom
Coment le deable se confessa.
(9463-5 [4th Thing to Avoid, exemplum 57 (Confession of the Devil)]).

Par ensample vus voil mustrer
A ces qe voillent escuter.
(9732-3 [2nd Point]).

Ore oie3 le orgulus vilain.
...
Oie3 cum Deu prist a mal  O.J Ore oie3, B.
Ceo qe li orgullius vassal
De ces biens se aunanta.  a.J evanca, B.
(10116, 10135-7 [3th Point, exemplum 59 (The Pharisee)]).

Ore oiez meruaile grant.
(10349 [12th Point, exemplum 61 (A Woman Whose Sins Flew From Her Mouth)]).

It can be clearly seen that this stylistic feature of the Manuel-poet's work appears in all three sections of Book VII.

The following set of passages illustrates the poet's greater intimacy of tone in this Book:

Le deable pur veir est confundu
Par confession & sa vertu.
Pur ceo, si le maufe haie3,
Volunters vus confesse3.
(8819-22 [4th Virtue]).

Mal espece en confession
Est diminucion.
Quant confession ne est entere,
Ceo est en doule manere,
Quant vus peche3 lesse3 cuunter,
Ou circumstances neis vblier.
(9377-82 [3rd Thing to Avoid]).

De auter part, pur oreisuns,
Dunt nus grant mester auums.
Car cil qe ta confession orrunt
Pur vus prier tenu serrunt,
E cum plus auere3 intercessurs,
Plus de pardun seiez seurs.

... 
Il ausi tesmoignent
Qe confession aurunt Qe Ky vostre, B.
Deuant le iuge dreiturel,
Quant al drein iur vendra iuger.
Qe confessiun orrunt
Dunc passere3 plus seurement.
(9841-6; 9851-6 [3rd Point]).

Ta confessiun deit estre entere,
E cee en duble manere.
Primes, qe entierement
Ta vie mustre3 vtement
A vn prestre, ou plusieurs
Fur estre de pardun plus seur3.
(10307-12 [12th Point]).

Yet when the poet comes to explain certain theories of the practice of
confession, he returns to the distantly informative tone which characterized the
first five Books:

La seconde bien est deschargance,
Qe confessiun est san3 dotance. estJ fet, B.
Car, pur chescune pech3 qe home fra,
Peine rendre couendra. De gref peine charg3 seera, B.
(8743-6 [2nd Virtue]).

Le pech3, par tropologie,
Par le trunk est signifie.
Les branches de cest trunk malure
Sunt les circumstances de cest pech3.
Home peut estre encumbre
Quant il les cele de gree. gr.J sun gr., B.
Car ausi vet de pech3 cele v.J est, B.
Cum de feu en sein musce.
Al drein dammage fra Al damage se mustra, B.
A ceoluy qe en sein le portera. p.J auera, B.
(9395-404 [3rd Thing to Avoid]).

Derisorie en confessiun
Ne deit fere nul hom.
(9443-4 [4th Thing to Avoid]).

Home deit auer seine conscience.
Ceo est de confessiun la sentence.
(Roxburghe 11295-6 [5th Thing to Avoid]).

Chescun obeir deuera
A ceoluy qe se confessera, seJ le, B.
E receiure deit de bon seor
Quant il le demande, iuner il...d.J ke ly comandera, B.
E autre peine ensement,
The mixed (intimate/distant) tone is clearly a feature of all three sections of Book VII.

That the intended audience of Book VII is identical to that of Books I-V is suggested by the following direct address to a 'frere':

Gardez bien, tres duc frere,
De vous escuser en nule manere
Al hure quant vous confessez,
Car vostre dammage mult frez.

The vernacular language of the poem, as we have previously observed, suggests that the poet intended his work to be received by an intellectually diverse clerical readership, which would include those who understood Latin and those who did not. It seems quite appropriate that the author should assume that at least some of his readers would have had experience of hearing confessions, just as he himself appears to have had:

Signe de cel emmortissement
En confesiun ueum sovent.
Car aucuns venent enmorti3 v. deuenent si, B.
Qe de lur pechie3 ne sunt contri3.
Les mortels plaies de pechés
Ne sentent, dunt sunt plaié3.
Mes sodeinemment en confessant
Receiuent grace maintenant.
Si vnt dolur de lur peché3,
Qe signe est de vie, ne dute3.

Later, he appears to advise confessors directly:

Tu3 qe vnt ordre de prestragé
Ne sunt mie oelement sage.
Ne chescun n'ad nient le poer
Chescun home confesser.
Vostre prestre parochien
Vus purra assoudre bien,
E nul autre san3 cungé,
Si il ne seient priuilegé,
Cum sunt austins, prechurs, & menurs, a.J om. B., Royal.
Euesqes, qe sunt greignurs,
E ki de eu3 sunt licencie3, om. Royal.
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Seculers ou reulers. prestres ou ordinez, B.; line om. Royal.
Royal adds: E cil ke del esueke vnt conge
Cyer confessiun & assoudre de pecche,
Le quel ke il seent seculers,
V gent de religiun, ke sunt rulers.117

*Seculers ou reulers.*
Car mu3 vunt le siecle deceuant.
(10081-94 [7th Point]).

Sage seie3 en lisant,
Car mu3 vunt le siecle deceuant.

If the last two lines of the passage advise penitents to vet their confessors
(an absurd notion), then the author here encourages his audience not to observe
the codes of penitential conduct which he outlines in the Points section.119 It
seems more likely that he is recommending that confessors read (possibly this
text) wisely, so that they might avoid the deception of which unqualified
shrivers are guilty.

The General Conclusion to the Points, with which the authentic third
'edition' closes, seems to confirm that the author expected his poem to be read
by those who understood Latin as well as by those who did not:119

Plus de confessiun ne dirai.120
Kar suffist, sicum jeo crai. K.J K. ce, Harley 273 (hereafter A); remainder of
the passage om. Leeds.121
Nepurkant, matere les voil donner, om. Be.1.20; 1.J om. A.
Ki plus vodrunt rimer, om. Be.1.20;122
Vers en latin ici metrai,
Sicum des mestres apris ai.
Le clerk ke les vus lira
A vus de buche les espundera.
Plus plainement vus purra dire
Je keo par rime ne pus escrire.
Quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando.
Agravat ordo, locus, peccata, scientia, tempus,
Etas, condicio, numerus, mora, copia, causa,
Et modus in culpa, status altus, lucta pusilla.
Exposition primi versus: Quis, ut dicantur circumstancie peccantis et cum qua
peccavit*. Quid, genus peccati et species, et individuum si necessc fuerit. Ubi,
ut dicantur* circumstancie loci aggravantes. Quibus auxiliis, an solus, an cum
sociis; gravius enim peccat qui alios secum pecasse fecit. Cur, qua suggestione,
temptacione, intentione. Quomodo, si naturaliter, vel aliter. Quando, id est,
quo tempore, quocien, et quanta tempore.

(The General Conclusion does not appear in the 'second edition texts', viz., B,
Arundel, Harley 3860, Nottingham, [Harley 4971], nor in St. John's, a first
'edition' text influenced by the second 'edition' [see Appendix III]).
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The word 'les' in the first two highlighted lines refers only to the Latin verses. The first highlighted line reveals an authorial assumption that not all of his intended readers would understand Latin. The word 'vus' in the first three highlighted lines (which does not appear in MS. A's version of them) suggests that the author anticipated that readers without knowledge of Latin would have a competent person readily available to read and explain the verses to them, and thus that he anticipated that his poem would be received by members of a community whose skills varied and who had free access to each other. Such anticipations broadly agree with the signals elsewhere in the poem that the poet wrote for a clerical readership.

The appearance of these scholastically- and canonically-sanctioned questions at the conclusion of the Book comes as no surprise when it is recalled that the *Manuel* is a vernacular derivative of the scholastic *summa* tradition, and that its aim was to promote, through theoretical and practical illustration, the understanding and observance of a sacramental law:

Dunt vus deuez confesser
En ceste liure poez trouer
Solun ceo qe a ley apent.
(Roxburghe 11351-3 [5th Thing to Avoid]).

(f) Book VIII

MS. Arundel, which lacks Books VI and IX and contains the second 'edition' of Book VII, ends its version of the *Manuel* with Book VIII. MS. Royal, which also lacks VI and IX, and contains the authentic third 'edition' of Book VII, also ends its version of the poem with Book VIII; in addition, it is the only version which mentions VIII in its main Prologue. We have pointed out that
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These are two of the earliest surviving copies of the text. The forms of their texts suggest that the entrance of Book VIII into the *Manuel*-tradition preceded that of Book VI and that of Book IX. Arundel's text suggests that Book VIII was firmly within the tradition before the third 'edition' of Book VII was released, and Harley 4971, which also contains the second 'edition' of VII, and which places the Epilogue (which does not appear in Arundel or Royal) after Book VIII (Book IX appears thereafter), seems to endorse this conclusion. The Taylor version is intensely confused, but, despite its inclusion of VI, plus an early version of IX (which appears after the General Conclusion to the Points of VII), its presentation of the first 'edition' of VII and its conclusion with VIII suggest, in light of the other MSS. discussed above, that VIII's entrance into the tradition preceded the entrance of VI, IX, and the second 'edition' of VII, and thus that VIII was a stable component of the *Manuel* during the earliest (if not original) stages of the poem's development.

Book VIII appears in a textually stable form and position in every extant non-fragmentary version of the *Manuel*. We have established that the *Manuel*-poet did not write Book VI. We have explained the structural metamorphosis of Book VII. We shall see that Book IX entered the *Manuel*-tradition as a dispersed collection of fragments which were not composed by the *Manuel*-poet, and which were later fused and embellished by scribes. Like Books I-V, and unlike Books VI, VII, and IX, Book VIII is a structural constant in the *Manuel*'s textual tradition. By assuming that the original *Manuel* ended with a version of Book VII which contained only the Points and General Conclusion to the Points (a theory which only repeats the errors of scribes, as we have demonstrated), critics have had to consider inauthentic every word of the text which appears after the General Conclusion, and thus to work frequently and futilely against the weight of evidence. We have shown that one cannot deny the *Manuel*-poet's
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authorship of any part of Book VII. His authorship of Book VIII likewise seems certain. As contrition and confession lead to satisfaction, so Book VII should logically lead to VIII. The exceedingly lucid transition from VII to VIII at the beginning of VIII highlights this logical movement:

Apres verraie confessiun
Dait venir saint oreisun.
Confessiun alme purifie,
Mes oreisun la sainterie.
Par confessiun, de mort releuez.
Del deble, par confessiun, eschapez.

Oreisun vus garde ke vus ne chaiez.
Par oreisun estes a deu liez.
Confessiun vus releue gisant.
Oreisun vus garde en esteant.
Oreisun ad ben le poer
Tuz bens a hom purchacer.
Kar, si hors de peche seez,
E en deu vus delitez,
Oreisun vus purchacera
Kant ke votre quer desira.

Sur dame deu ad poer,
Ne seit ia si carouce,
Ne tant vus ait manace,
Apres sufsisante contriciun
E verraie confessiun,
Ke ne l'apese seint oreisun.
(11357-72; 11394-9 [Roxburgh].)

Unlike the transitions to and from Book VI, which merely apologize for the presence of the 'sermon,' this transition to Book VIII is clear and unapologetic. It states precisely why prayer should follow confession. Nothing in it would prompt one to question the authenticity of Book VIII. The reasoned connection between Books VII and VIII, when one takes into account the separability of VII (practice) from I-V (theory), could explain why the scribe of Harley 3860 did not copy I-V, but kept VII and VIII together (see Appendix II).

The thematic connection between confession and prayer is maintained after the initial transition from Book VII:

Le plus haut e riche present
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Ke a deu enuiom surement
Est de peche espirit contrit,
E en amant deu de quer parfit.
(11735-8).

Ce est a dire, ke me entendez,
Si wus seez en nul pechez
Vos pechez primes acupez.
...
...par ta male vie
Amendement dunk promettrez
En votre quer...
(11769-71; 11774-6).

The structural movement of Book VIII mirrors that of the authentic third 'edition' of Book VII: an initial treatment of the virtues of the activity under discussion is followed by an analysis of the theories which govern its practice:

(Book VIII, prologue)

Deus choses vus dirrai
De oreisun, si cum apris le ai
La primer est sa grant vertu
Ke ele ad vers dame deu.
Quei hom dait prier et coment  transp. with next 1., Mm.173
Est le secunde enseignement.
A la primer revenum,
E le profist vus dirrum.
*Cp. Prologue II. 3-5.*
(11383-90).

(Book VII, prologue to the Virtues section)

Confessiun lire tant auant,  La primere est confessiun loer, B.
E mustre la bunte grant.  E sa grant bunte demustre, B.
Pus vodrei mustre  La secunde chose dont voil parler, B.
De quels choses se deit garder.  c.J c. hom, B.
...
La tierce chose qe voil cunter
Est cum bien des choses deit auer  cm. Greaves.
Ki dreit ces peches vout cunter  cm. Greaves (see note 110); cu.J mustre, B.
Quant il se deit confesser.  cm. HM, Ee.1.20, and St. John's (see note 111).
Commencum duc de par Ihesu  cm. HM.
De confessiun dire la vertu..  cm. HM (see note 112).
(8667-70; 8673-9 [E.E.T.S.]).

As we have seen in our treatment of the 'sermon,' the presentation of a new set of indications of audience and recommendations on reception is one of the more reliable signals of the original independence of a section of a text from the material which surrounds it. No such set is presented in Book VIII,
and nowhere in the Book is there a hint that it may have circulated separately from Books I-V and VII.

As usual, the poet includes a few formulaic calls for attention:

Ore oiez uertu de oreisun. (11427 [ Roxburgh; exemplum 62 (Hezekiah's Prayers)].)

Olez de oreisun la uertu. (11449 [exemplum 62]).

Ore avez oy la manere
Quele dait estre priere. (11807-8).

Ore escotez le oreisun
Ke les sauua de honesun. (11903-4 [exemplum 64 (The Monk and the Knight's Wife)]).

He also, again, appears to assume that at least some of his readers could understand Latin:

Aue et gaude maria, mater dei et domini nostri iesu cristi, regina celi, domina mundi, Inferni imperatrix; miserere mei, et totius populi cristiani. Amen. (exemplum 64, after 1. 11904).

Since, like Book VII, this Book instructs on a variable (human behavior at prayer) by means of constant theories of practice (Points) for a practical response-inducing purpose (viz., to induce receivers to pray properly), the tone of the Book, like that of VII, is necessarily occasionally intimate:

Vne chose vus di sanz dotance:
Coe ne est mie signe de repentance
Ne ke aiez grant desir
Al regne dame deu venir. (11686-9).

E a les angles nomeememt
Dusum fer beu present,
Ki a deu offrire nos oreisuns
E tuz les biens nus fesons. (11721-4).

Bone fai wus couent auer,
Si uerrament volez deu prier. (11739-40).

E ceo fet deu par sa pite, Ce vient de la piete die, A.
Ki seet notre enfermeet,
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En priant, aiez humilité,  
Ke racin est de chescun bunte.  
(11767-8).

E si ta prier ne sait pas faint,  
Me souener, devote, e saint,  
E hors de mortel peche seez,  
E ferm de creance en deu avez,  
Hardiement wus afiez  
Ke votre priere auerez.  
a.I receuerez, A.  
(11801-6).

Yet, as in Book VII, when theoretical topics arise, the poet reverts to the 
distant tone common in the early Books:

Chescun hom en vie mortel  
Ky desire venir al ciel  
De creisun ad grant mester.  
(11379-81).

Deuote deit estre creisun.  
Ce set ben chescun hom.  
...

Kar dreit resun condune  
Ke en priaunt, chescun hom  
Ki graunt chos desir aver,  
Deuotement deit prier.  
(11701-2; 11705-8).

E ki plus la [i.e., creisun] enveiera largement  
Plus le merciera devotement.  
(11719-20).

The aim of this Book, like that of all of the other authentic Books, is  
ultimately practical, and the argument of the Book, like that of the rest of the  
poet's work, progresses from point to point in an orderly style:

(i)
Ore vus dirrai v choses ou vi  
De creisun, cum vus promis,  
Ke chescun hom deit auer,  
Ky en priant uoet purchacer.  
Primes, verraie couent estre.  
(11660-4).

(ii)
Creisun deit estre souenere.  
(11682).
Whereas in the first five Books the informative content being dispensed required the poet frequently to describe (often in the first person) how he came across his sources and what those sources were, the advisory content of this Book (and of Book VII\textsuperscript{138}) allows for a more casual approach to annotation:

```plaintext
Kar dauid le prophete dit,
Si cum trouum en sun escrit.
(11373-4).

Ezechie de la veille lay
Prodhom fu, et ben prese,
Cum en escrit auom troue.
(11402-5 \textit{exemplum 62}).

Greindre miracle pur ly fist
Si cum trouom en escrist.
(11437-8 \textit{exemplum 62}).

En la bible auom troue
Ke Elie vn prophet de
La pluuie treis anz suspendeit.
(11465-7 \textit{exemplum 62}).

Pur coe nus ad deu amoneste,
En \textit{i. liure ke trenies\textsuperscript{a} est apele,}
Ke nus en seint oreisun
Nos quers ou nos mains leuom. \textit{m.J euims, A.}
\textsuperscript{11674-7).}
```

\textit{Exempla} appear on the average of one every two hundred or so lines throughout the authentic Books of the \textit{Manuel} (there are 54 in some 8,000 ll. of the first five Books, 7 in some 1,600 ll. of Book VII, and 3 in some 600 ll. of Book VIII). The \textit{exempla} of VIII, like those of the other authentic Books, act as proofs of the argument:
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Par seint escrit coe proverum.
(11400 [introduction to exemplum 62]).

Ore wus mustrum maintenant
Ke [i.e., oreisun] sur hom ad poer grant.

Mustre wus ai, si wus est a gre,
Ke oreisun sur hom ad pouste.
(11491-2; 11653-4 [introduction and conclusion to exemplum 63 (Julian the Apostate)]).

Mess ore vus dusum mustrer
Ke le deble ne poest rester
Nes ses angles ne poent valer a.) engins, A.
Kant oreisun est fet de bon quer.  Contre oreisun fet de cuer, A.
(11809-12 [introduction to exemplum 64]).

And, as in the other authentic Books, repetition can drive a point home:

Lur seintete turna en folie.
...

Seint amur en folie changa.
...

Les deus ky furent en fol purpos.
(11834; 11840; 11886 [exemplum 64]).

Like the earlier *exempla* of the *Manuel*-poet, those in this Book often feature actions without motives and actors without characters:

Quant Iulien vit ki il fu feru
Del messager dampne deu,
Sa main prist plein de la poudrere
Li escumege emperur,
Ver munt en le air le getta.
En gettant, issi vers deu parla:
'Vencu me avez, nazariens,
Ki sire estes de cristiens.'
...

Quant mercurie aueit son message
E parfet out son vaiage,
Arere se est returne, A.) Mercurus, A.
E en sa tombe recouche.
(11609-16; 11621-4 [exemplum 63]).

'Ore,' dit le abbe, 'ueez
Si la dame a l'ostel trouez.'
Le chivaler issi fesait,
E la dame en sa chambre seait.
'Par seint ordre,' dit le abbe,
'Malement avez peche.'
...

Ensemble en sa chambre alerent, en sa c.J a l'ostel, A.
E ses cofres enteres trouerent.
Le chivaler par tant creait
Enterement ki'il sungait.
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A la grange sunt pus ale
E .ii. debles i vnt troue
...
En furme de moingnie l'un seait,
E l'autre une dame ressemblait.
(11943-8; 11959-64; 11967-8 [exemplum 64]).

Like the earlier authentic exempla, those in Book VIII are brief (48, 155, and 167 li., respectively) and are drawn from common sources (the Bible, the Vitae Patrum, and Jacques de Vitry, respectively). Although the passages cited immediately above illustrate that the exempla of this Book, unlike those of the earlier authentic Books, frequently include dialogue, this unusual stylistic feature may have been inherent in the compiler's sources.

Both the external and internal evidence suggest strongly that the Manuel-poet wrote Book VIII. The Book was a stable component of the Manuel before Books VI and IX entered the textual tradition, and most likely during the earliest, if not original, stages of the tradition. The thematic connection between Books VII and VIII is enunciated clearly in the prologue to VIII, and is maintained thereafter. The 'virtues-then-practice' structural movement and the mixed tone of VIII are also features of VII. The orderly progression of the argument, and the frequency, brevity, and common sources of the exempla match the Manuel-poet's practices.

The MS. evidence suggests that Book VIII was the final Book of the original Manuel. Royal and Arundel, the two earliest MSS., end with VIII and lack the Epilogue. The original conclusion to the Manuel appears to survive in the final lines of VIII uniquely preserved in the Royal MS.:'

Prium dunkes Deu le Fere,
E Dus Jhesu, e sa mere,
Ke il de nus eint merci,
E nus garde de nostre enemi. Amen.
Ore devum Deu mercier
Devoutement de tut queor,
Ke fini avum la treté,
Ke Manuel de pechë est apelé,
E Nostre Seignur Jhesu Crist
Li mercie ke l'ad escrit. Amen.
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The concision of this conclusion is what we should expect from the *Manuel*-poet. There is a communal prayer to the Father, Son, and Virgin, a restatement of the title, and a request for prayers for the author. The Epilogue, we shall see, does not refer to the title of the text. The anonymity of Royal’s conclusion cannot certainly be said to follow the wish of the poet, since lines 121-4 of the general Prologue do not appear in Royal’s and do not denote a wish for perpetual anonymity:

Mun nun ne voil ici cunter,  
Kar de Deu sul je quer luer.  
Bien say ke checun recevera  
De Deu cum meus traveilera.  

(121-4 [Arnould]).

The word 'ici' could merely refer to the Prologue. Nevertheless, it seems probable that Royal’s anonymous conclusion to the *Manuel* was written by the *Manuel*-poet and ended the earliest form of the *Manuel*.

(g) The Prayers

Absent from MSS. Royal and Arundel, not referred to in any manuscript’s Prologue, of fragmentary origin, from multiple sources, of shifting position and size, begun with an absurdly inept transition, and featuring a content, tone, and style alien to those of Books I-V and VII-VIII, 'Book IX' is unquestionably spurious. The two prayers which eventually came to form the 'Book,' the first (11995-12078 [Roxburgh]) derived from Bernard’s *Jesu Dulcis Memoria* and (12079-332) a prayer perhaps composed by St. Edmund, the second (12333-699) a complaint to the Virgin containing a version of the Charter of Christ, seem to have entered the *Manuel*-tradition fragmentarily during the early stages of the poem’s history.
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(i) The first stage of the Book's growth appears to be reflected in MSS. Ee.1.20 and St. John's, which contain versions of the first 'edition' of Book VII that were influenced by other 'editions' (by the third 'edition' in the case of Ee, and by the second in the case of St. John's). Ee inserts after the General Conclusion to the Points of Book VII a fragment of the first prayer (confounded with the conclusion to the later redaction of the sermons). This insertion would appear to be the earliest product of the confusion which the General Conclusion to the Points encouraged in first 'edition' texts of Book VII. St. John's offers a refined version of the first prayer after the Points of VII (it lacks the General Conclusion through exposure to the second 'edition'). The manuscripts proceed thereafter with the Virtues and Things to Avoid of Book VII, then Book VIII. Then Ee presents further lines from the first prayer, and then part of the second prayer, followed by a defective version of the Epilogue derived from exposure to stage (iv). St. John's, on the other hand, presents the expanded fusion of the two prayers, which reveals its exposure to a stage (iv) MS. (see below); it concludes thereafter with the Epilogue.

The fragmentary form and dual position of the prayers in Ee would appear to reflect the earliest stage in the evolution of the prayers within the *Manuel*. St. John's seems to present a slightly later form within VII, plus a far more advanced structure after Book VIII. The Epilogue, which does not appear within VII in Ee, would seem to have made its first perceptible appearance in the textual tradition during stage (ii) of Book IX's development, within Book VII (first 'edition').

(ii) The second stage is illustrated by Taylor, B.N., and York 7, which also feature versions of the first 'edition' of Book VII. All three MSS. place the Epilogue immediately after the General Conclusion to the Points. This would appear to be the first perceptible location of the Epilogue in the tradition, though, as we shall see in our treatment of the Epilogue, below, it is likely that it was originally placed after the genuine conclusion to the text (Book VIII), and was drawn into Book VII as confusion grew within first 'edition' texts. Taylor's Epilogue (within VII) contains the ascription of the poem to Waddington; York's and B.N.'s (most likely defective) versions of the Epilogue do not. Obviously, the entrance of the Epilogue had to displace the first prayer of IX. In Taylor, after the Epilogue, there appears a long transition to Book IX, and an initial fusion of the two prayers, after which appear corrections for Books I-V, then the Virtues and Things to Avoid of VII, and, finally, Book VIII.

So in this stage the prayers were unified and placed after the Epilogue, in the midst of VII.

B.N. and York 7 were influenced by stage (iv). After the Epilogue, they do present the long transition to IX, but do not follow up with the initial fusion of the two prayers. Instead, they proceed directly to the Virtues, Things to Avoid, Book VIII, and thereafter present the expanded fusion of the two prayers, which derives from stage (iv). As in all MSS. containing stage (iv) versions of IX, the Epilogue appears after IX in B.N. (York breaks off near the end of IX). This second Epilogue in B.N., unlike its (defective) first one, contains the Waddington ascription. The Taylor MS., however, reveals that the ascription was a feature of the Epilogue when it made its first perceptible appearance in the tradition.

The first two stages seem to have developed within the tradition of the *Manuel* which features the first 'edition' of Book VII.

(iii) The third stage of the Book's history is represented by Harley 4971, which appears to reflect the earliest stage of the second 'edition' of Book VII, in which the gap between the Points and the Virtues section was closed, and the material within that gap was placed after the authentic conclusion of the
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**Manuel** (Book VIII). The material which appeared in the midst of VII in Taylor (the Epilogue [with the Waddington ascription], the long transition to IX, and the initial fusion of the prayers), appears in precisely the same order, but after Book VIII, in Harley. This shifting of material, which seems to have been the sole purpose of the second 'edition' of VII, clearly implies that the shifted material was misplaced or spurious. It also incidentally implies that the last two sections of VII (Virtues and Things to Avoid), and Book VIII, were authentic components of the Manuel, an implication which, as we have seen, is resoundingly supported by internal and external evidence.

Stage (iii) seems to have been a product of the second 'edition' of Book VII.

(iv) In the fourth and final stage of IX's evolution the material shifted behind Book VIII in stage (iii) was recast into a superficially reasonable form and order. The Epilogue, which in all stage (iv) MSS. contains the Waddington ascription, was shifted behind Book IX. The most obviously and absurdly awkward lines of the long transition to IX were eliminated (begetting a short transition to IX), and the initial fusion of the prayers was fortified with additional lines (begetting the expanded fusion of the prayers). We find such an arrangement in MSS. Harley 4657 and Nottingham (which contain the second 'edition' of Book VII) and in all of the manuscripts containing the third 'edition' of Book VII (except in Royal, of course, which contains nothing after Book VIII).

Stage (iv) was compiled in the textual tradition which features the second 'edition' of Book VII, and strongly influenced the form of the later exemplars of the tradition featuring the (authentic) third 'edition' of VII.¹⁴⁶

This reasoned reconstruction of the evolution of Book IX eliminates the need for a protracted confirmation of the Book's spuriousness. Eleven¹⁴⁷ of the first twelve lines of the long transition to IX appear to have been purloined directly from the (convincing) prologue to Book VIII, from other points in Book VIII which relate prayer to contrition, and from an unusual passage in the Manuel-poet's treatment of the first Commandment, in which he encourages contrite prayer.¹⁴⁸ The last four lines of the long transition to IX (which later formed the short transition) are simply adulterations of Royal's conclusion to VIII (i.e., of the original conclusion to the Manuel):¹⁴⁹

(long transition) (lines from Book VIII)

Sachez ke deu ad mat chere
De prodome la priere.
Kar ne seit li ia si corouce,
Pur nule manere de pecche,
Si merci crium de bon quer,
E uuler eu moins de amender.
Apres parfite contriciun

Ke nul ne poet sa i.e., prayer's vertu parcunter (11392).
Sur dame deu ad poer (11394).
We seilt ia si carouce (11395).
We tant vus ait manase (11396).
Amendement dunk prometrez (11775).
En votre quer, e si le facez (11776).
Apres suffisante contriciun (11397).
The above passage offers us one of the most inanely unconvincing scribal transitions that we shall encounter in this study. This transition, of course, initially appeared in the midst of Book VII. The compiler of the transition thus did not need to justify a second treatment of prayer, since Book VIII lay behind the point chosen for the insertion of the transition. His only obligation was to justify the presence of the initial fusion. He did so with incompetence and dishonesty, lifting various useful lines from the admirable prologue to VIII and other points in that Book, and from a brief interlude on prayer in Book II. The lingering problem he faced, however, was that the initial fusion did not treat the theory and practice of prayer, but was itself two prayers, one to Christ, the other to the Virgin. Conveniently, however, the authentic conclusion to the Manuel at the end of Book VIII (as witnessed in MS. Royal), appeals for three prayers, one each to the Father, Son, and Virgin. All the compiler of the long transition needed to do, and all that he did, was to take these lines from the conclusion to VIII and remove from them the request for a prayer to the Father.

We need not dwell on the fact that the content, tone, and style of Book IX are thoroughly different from those of Books I-V and VII-VIII. The first prayer is an emotive entreaty to Christ delivered in the first-person, the second a similar entreaty to the Virgin delivered likewise and including some shrill
The admirable stylistic qualities of the prayers may explain why they were maintained in the tradition after the second 'edition' of VII was executed.
In our analysis of the textual history of Book IX we noted that the Epilogue seems to have made its first perceptible appearance in the Manuel-tradition during stage (ii) of the development of IX (and within the textual tradition which features the first 'edition' of Book VII). At least two explanations can be offered for this:

(a) The Epilogue was composed in response to the confusion encouraged by the General Conclusion to the Points of Book VII (in the first 'edition' of that Book), after that confusion was exacerbated by the scribal introduction (after the General Conclusion) of a fragment of the first prayer of IX. The introduction of this fragment led to a structural crisis. The Epilogue was an *ad hoc* scribal response to that crisis, which attempted to force the text to conclude with the General Conclusion.

(b) The Epilogue initially appeared after the original ending of the Manuel (i.e., after Book VIII). An *ad hoc* scribal response to the structural crisis alluded to in (a) caused the Epilogue to be shifted from its original position after VIII to its first perceptible position after the General Conclusion to the Points of VII. The aim of this movement was to force the text to end with the General Conclusion.

Explanation (a) is a reasoned deduction drawn solely from the manuscript evidence, which, as we have said, suggests that the Epilogue made its first appearance after the General Conclusion to the Points. There is no MS. evidence to support the second explanation, for no manuscript survives which closes with Book VIII and the Epilogue.

Nevertheless, the second explanation seems more probable when one takes into account the actual contents of the Epilogue, which reveal that its composer had a precise understanding of (i) the structural movement of the text, of (ii) its style, of (iii) the method by which the author intended it to be received, of (iv) the method by which the author composed it, of (v) the motivation for its composition and the social identity of its patron, and of (vi) the modest poetic skill, the native tongue, the birthplace, the religious status, and the name of the author. The Epilogue does not at any point display the character of an *ad hoc* scribal improvisation. On the contrary, it consistently presents an informed summary of the Manuel and the circumstances of its composition.
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Its content, tone, and style lead one to the reasoned conclusion that its composer either knew the poet and how the poem came to be, or was the poet himself. The logical original location for such an Epilogue would be at the end of the original form of the Manuel (i.e., after Book VIII).

(i) a) After presenting thanks to God for allowing the text to reach its completion, the author of the Epilogue claims that those with a clear understanding and memory of the text will have a clear understanding of the works of the devil (i.e., sin), and should thereby be neither overcome nor disgraced by those works. This appears to allude to the informative Books II-V, which specifically treat sin:

> Li haut Sire de eel e tere,
> En ki devums tretuz crere,
> Sait suvent regracie,
> Si seyt tuz iurs,
> Ki par sa grace nus ad grante
> A parfere cest escrit,
> Dunt le pru n'est pas petit.
> Kar ki le voldra regarder
> E en memoire bien aver,
> Mar dutera l'encumbrement,
> Sur seez de la veu serpent.
> De ses enginz serra garni,
> Ke vencu ne seit ne huni.

(12700-12 (Arnould)).

> Cp. Royal's conclusion to Book V (cf. Arnould, p. 83, note): 'Jesu Crist sei gracié/ Ke les sacremenz avum terminé.' Cp. also Royal's conclusion to Book VIII (i.e., the original conclusion to the Manuel (Arnould, p. 99)): 'Ore devum Deu mercier/ Devoutement de tut queor,/ Ke fini avum la treté/ Ke Manuel de peché est apélé.' Cp. also the General Instructions on Reception which conclude the later redaction of the sermons (Roxb. 8469-74): 'Peche de plus fin qeor harra,/ E offendre plus se dutera / Par pour ou par amiste./ Deu, nus grante par sa pite/ Qe ne seum encumbrez/ Cum en cest sermon ci auez.'

b) The author of the Epilogue adds, however, that if one happens to fall from grace, the text shows how one may recover through confession. This is a clear reference to Book VII.

> U si par le deble seit deceu,
> E par peché mortel vencu,
> En cest escrit purra truver
> Cument il deit relever.

(12712-17).

> Cp. the conclusion to the Things to Avoid of VII: 'Dunt vus devez confessier/ En ceste liure poez truver/ Solun ceo qe a ley apeat' (Roxb. 11351-3; see note 125). Cp. also 11. 3-5 of the Prologue.

(ii) The style of the writing, the Epilogue-author continues, is 'willfully small,' so that no one should feel aggravated when reading it, since it will be better remembered if it does not bore readers. This probably alludes to the Manuel-poet's consistently concise expression and orderly layout of topics (which, the Manuel-poet claims in the Prologue, may be sampled by using the
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paragraph-markers), and perhaps also to his limited subject matter (namely, broadly speaking, the sacrament of Penance), rather than to the overall length of the text:

L'escrit est petit fet de gre, Ke ke mez sez sanz eu E ke meuz sezt sans eu E pur ce sons enny sezt lu, Nm. En memoire retenu.\(^n\) (12718-21):

\(^{\text{aCp. 11. 9-10 of the Prologue (Arnould): 'Tuz pechez ne poium conter,/ Nes partaunt se pot remembrer.' Cp. also 11. 49-52: 'Riens ne direy par trop treter,/ Nes sulement pechez conter./ Fere covendroit trop grant livre/ Que dust trestut descrivre.'\))\(^{\text{a}}\)

(iii) While (ii) reveals that the composer of the Epilogue assumed that the Manuel would be received by readers, the following passage advises readers that they should read the Manuel willingly, because it is drawn from sound sources. The Manuel-poet, of course, took pains to assure his readers of the reliability of his sources, especially in the Prologue and at other early points in the text:

Voluntiers le lisez, 1.1 parllsez, Ifm. and B (for B see Roxburghe).
Kar estret est de auctoritez, A (12722-3).

\(^{\text{aCp. II. 54-62 of the Prologue: 'Confermer par auctorite/ Les pechez ke yd mettray,/ Si cum de seins estret les ay./ Pur ce, tut ert auctorite,/ Tut ne seint les seins nomé./ Rien del mien ne y mettray,/ For si cum Je apris les ay./ Nule fausine n'i troveret./ Plus volenters le Hset.'\})\(^{\text{a}}\)

(iv) The Epilogue-poet then includes a formulaic request for corrections, and explains that he, a relatively uninformed sinner, compiled the text. When we recall the Manuel-poet's apparent occasional grafting of exempla into the text, his apparent borrowing of the treatment of the fourth Article (Book I) from an independent text, and his verbatim presentation in Book VII of a few useful lines from another independent text (the later redaction of the sermons), it would seem appropriate to characterize the Manuel as a compilation:

Si defautez i trovez, d.J faucete, A.^{\text{\textsuperscript{a}}}

Pur Deu vus pri, les amendez.
Kar pechur suy hi le compilai, s.J om. B.N.(1)^{\text{\textsuperscript{a}}}, York 7.
E d'autre part poi de ben sai, (12724-7).

\(^{\text{aCp. 1. 61: 'Nule fausine n'i troveret.' B.N. contains two Epilogues (see Appendix II).\}}\)

Wholesale borrowings appear to be admitted in the following lines:
Kant d'autre hum chose trouvai
Ke meuz dist ke je ne savai,\(^{\text{a}}\)
Par orgoil nel resusai Son dit, sacez, ne r., Leeds. P.J Sun dit p., all but 3 MSS.

Ke en cest escrist nel entai.\(^{\text{\textsuperscript{a}}}\) (12732-5).

\(^{\text{\textsuperscript{a}}\text{Cp. these 11. from the General Conclusion to the Points of VII (Arnould, p. 92): 'Le clerk ke les vus lira/ A vus de buche les espundera./ Plus plainement vus purra dire/ Ke jeo par rime ne pus escrire.' \text{\textsuperscript{a}}Cp.: 11. 54-62, cited in (iii), above.\})\)

(v) Again using the first-person singular, the Epilogue-poet asks not to be blamed for the text's shortcomings, and declares himself excused from the
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"foolish task", since a brother (or friar) requested him to write it (see note 27, above).

Sl l'escrist ne plet a acun,  
Blamer ne me deit par reisun.  
De fol enprise sui excusé  
Kar del fere sui prêlé.

(12728-31).
The variants for the final line of the passage read (Ee) 'the sweet brother requested it,' and (B) 'the writing was requested by the brother.' 'Fere' may bear the sense of the verb faire in the common reading, which one could thus construe as 'for I was asked to do it.' On the other hand, the sense of faire cannot be applied intelligibly to the variants in Ee and B. MS. Pal. Lat., of course, seems to indicate which sense of 'fere' is intended (i.e., frère), and reading 'fere' as frère yields intelligible constructions in the common reading and in all variants. Pal. Lat. is a s. xiii ex. MS. (see note 9). The orthographical evolution ('frère' to 'fere') could reflect a scribally-inspired evolution (and dilution) in sense (frère to faire), which may have been encouraged by the passage of time, the widening circulation of the text, and the possibly consequent increasing lack of scribal awareness of or concern for the local circumstances of the original composition.

The Epilogue-poet's apparent allusion to the social identity of the Manuel's patron seems accurate when we recall the Manuel-poet's direct address to a 'very sweet brother (or friar)' in the Things to Avoid section of Book VII:

Garde bien, tresduS frere,  
De vus escuser en nule manere  
Al hure quant vus confesseS.

(vi) The Epilogue-poet explains, once again in the first-person, that no one should blame him for his French or rhyme, since he was born, raised, and ordained in England, and was named after a little village:

De francies ne del rimer  
Ne me deit nul hume blamer,  
Kar en Engletere estai né,  
E nur i lais e ordine.  
De une vilette sui numé,  
Ke n'est burg ne cité.

N.B. 1. 121 of the Prologue (Arnould): 'Kun nun ne voil id cunter' (not in Royal; see notes 141-2).

We might recall that the Manuel-poet himself implied his clerical background when he revealed an assumption that some members of his intended audience would have had experience of hearing confessions, as he himself appears to have had:

Signe de eel enmortissement  
En confessiun ueum souent.  
...sodeinement en confessant  
Receiuent grace maintenant.  
Si vnt dolur de lur pech3,
The striking verbal similarities between the Epilogue and the Prologue have been demonstrated in the footnotes to the various passages cited above. The Epilogue-poet's reference to Book VII (see [1 (b)]) markedly resembles some of the concluding lines of the first 'edition' of Book VII (i.e., lines which appear at the end of the Things to Avoid section). His description of the poem's patron (see [v]) as a '(sweet) brother (or friar)' verbally mirrors a direct address to a 'very sweet brother (or friar)' in the Things to Avoid section of Book VII. His initial thanks to God and allusion to Books II-V (see [1 (a)]) seem in general to echo stylistically the Manuel-poet's method of thanking God as shown at the end of Books V and VIII, and perhaps even to resemble slightly the General Instructions on Reception in the later redaction of the sermons (an independent text from which the Manuel-poet elsewhere [Book VII] borrowed, as we have seen). The comparative footnotes also illustrate that the author of the Epilogue did not simply select lines from various parts of the Manuel and combine them, but rather that he skilfully, convincingly, and accurately described the text and the circumstances surrounding its composition without drawing verbatim from earlier points in the text.

When we recall that in its first perceptible appearance in the textual tradition the Epilogue was placed after the General Conclusion to the Points, in the first 'edition' of Book VII, and thus before the Things to Avoid section, the Epilogue's crisp echoes of passages within the Things to Avoid section might suggest that the Epilogue's original location was not in the midst of the first 'edition' of Book VII, but rather either at the end of VII or further back in the text. There is no evidence to suggest that the Epilogue ever appeared at the
end of Book VII (in any 'edition'). We have shown that Book VIII was almost
certainly the final Book of the original Manuel. One would suspect that the
original location of the Epilogue was after Book VIII.

Thus it would seem that the Epilogue was a component of the Manuel when,
or shortly after, the poem was composed, and that the Epilogue-poet was either
the Manuel-poet himself, or someone intimately familiar with the text, who was
capable of replicating the Manuel-poet's style precisely, who was aware of the
social identity of the poem's patron, and of the nationality, religious status,
and name of the Manuel-poet.

The absence of the Epilogue from MSS. Royal and Arundel, two of the
earliest surviving copies of the poem, and the brief conclusion to Book VIII
which survives in Royal, suggest that the Epilogue was not an original
component of the Manuel. Twenty-two other copies of the Manuel exist. Of
these, seven are fragmentary texts whose imperfections explain their lack of
the Epilogue. Of the fifteen remaining copies, all of which contain the
Epilogue, only two present the Epilogue in an anonymous form only, and these
anonymous versions appear to be products of scribal interference:"4

(i) York 7, like B.N., features the first 'edition' of Book VII. When we
examined stage (ii) of Book IX's development, we noted that these volumes and
Taylor present the Epilogue immediately after the General Conclusion to the
Points of Book VII. Taylor, we said, replicates stage (ii) precisely, by placing
the Epilogue, the long transition to IX, and the initial fusion of the prayers
after the General Conclusion to the Points. Its Epilogue contains the
Waddington ascription.

York 7 and B.N., we noted, represent a contamination of stage (ii) with
stage (iv). After the General Conclusion to the Points these MSS. nonsensically
present the Epilogue (in an anonymous form) and the long transition to IX
without the initial fusion of the prayers. They continue thereafter with the
Virtues and Things to Avoid of VII, Book VIII, and then offer the expanded
fusion of the prayers (a product of stage (iv)). York breaks off near the end
of the expanded fusion. B.N. places another Epilogue (this time with the
Waddington ascription) after the expanded fusion. The remarkable structural
similarity of B.N. and York 7 leads one to suspect that the fragmentary York
version originally closed, as B.N. does, with an Epilogue which included the
Waddington ascription.
The Text of the Manuel des Pêchés

The significance of the anonymity of the Epilogue in York and in the first Epilogue in B.N. (hereafter B.N. [ii]) seems slight. The following lines appear after 1. 12741 in all manuscripts which contain the Epilogue:

Pur ceo vus pri, pur Jesus Crist,
Ki ces ki lirrunt* cest escrit.
Pur Deu m'alient en mémoire,
E pur moi prient le rai de gloire,
Ke la joie me doint de parai'z,
U sanz fin veie sun cler vis,
E me pardoint mes pechez
Jesus ke de Marie fu nez. 

(12742-9).

*N.B.: another indication of the Epilogue-poet’s anticipation of a reading audience. *Cp. the first two lines of IX: ‘Duz sire, ray de glolre,/ Cum est de tai duz la memoire’ (11995-6 (Roxburgh)). It seems remotely possible that this couplet from the Epilogue could have led a scribe to recall a text (viz., the first prayer) which begins with a prayer to the ‘king of glory,’ i.e., that the Epilogue caused a scribe to consider adding the first prayer of IX. The initial perceptible appearance of the first prayer after the General Conclusion (rather than after the Epilogue) suggests that the decision by the responsible scribe to place the prayer there was ultimately influenced more by the distracting confusion of VII than by the position of the Epilogue, which seems likely to have been originally after Book VIII, as we have said. We have already noted how the request for prayers in Royal’s conclusion to VIII was borrowed and altered by the compiler of the long transition to IX in order to facilitate the attempted integration of the initial fusion of the prayers into Book VII. *Cp. the last two lines of Royal’s conclusion to VIII (Arnould, p. 99): ‘E nostre Seignur Jhesu Crist/ Li mercle ke 1’ad escrit. Amen.’

After reading line 12740 (‘De une vilette sui nume’), one might expect that the Epilogue-poet would at some point reveal the name of the little village. Thirteen of the fifteen MSS. which contain the Epilogue present this disclosure of the name after 1. 12749, in what will be referred to as couplet (a):

(a)
De Deu seit beneit checun humme
Ke prie pur Willam de Widendone.

(12750-1).

The couplet below follows these lines in eleven of these thirteen manuscripts (and appears in all fifteen manuscripts which contain the Epilogue):
Harley 4971 and Taylor, the other two of these thirteen MSS., simply place couplet (b) before (a), then move directly to the long transition to IX. 68

Twelve of the fifteen MSS. close their Epilogues with the following couplet:

(c)
En Deu finisse cest escrit
En Pere e Fiz e Seint Espirit. a (12754-5) 139

"Cp. II. 1-2 of the Prologue (Arnauld): 'La vertu del seint Espirit/ Nus seint aydaunt en set escrit.'

Harley and Taylor quite logically do not include couplet (c), since their texts do not 'finish' with the Epilogue: Taylor (stage [ii] of Book IX) proceeds, as we have said, with the long transition, initial fusion, Virtues, Things to Avoid, and Book VIII; Harley (stage [iii] of Book IX), as we have noted earlier, places the Epilogue, long transition, and initial fusion after Book VIII.

The Epilogue in York 7 and the first one in B.N. offer a slightly adulterated version of the stage (ii) Epilogue as seen in Taylor. Like Taylor and Harley, they do not include couplet (c). Unlike Taylor and Harley, they also do not include couplet (a), which names the man named after the little village. They thus present couplet (b) and move directly to the long transition.

One can reasonably hypothesize concerning the absence of couplet (a) in these two versions of the Epilogue.

Both volumes were influenced at least after Book VIII by stage (iv) of Book IX. That stage, as we have said, was compiled in the textual tradition which features the second 'edition' of Book VII, i.e., the 'edition' which removes the material which had been erroneously inserted into the middle of VII in the first 'edition.' York and B.N. are thus first 'edition' texts which were probably exposed to a version of the second 'edition.' It would seem plausible that a (hypothetical) first 'edition' stage (iii) scribe who was exposed to a second 'edition' stage (iv) MS. after Book VIII would take note of the comparative orderliness of VII in his new exemplar. An industrious scribe might return to his own first 'edition' version of VII and make some adjustments.

This would seem to be what the (hypothetical) scribe responsible for the form of the Epilogue in York 7 and B.N. (i) did. His adjustments, not surprisingly, were incomplete. He eliminated the initial fusion from his version of VII, but kept the Epilogue and long transition, perhaps because of simple oversight, perhaps because he still believed that the Manuel-proper ended with the General Conclusion to the Points. The opening line of the Epilogue ('Li haut Sire de cel e tere' [12700 (Arnauld)]) and that of IX ('Duz sire, ray de gloire' [11995 (Roxburghe)]) may have encouraged an especially careless
eyeskip, leading to the maintenance of the Epilogue and long transition. Yet, when we consider that the General Conclusion, which ends with Latin prose, would probably be quite easy to spot, and thus that it would prove a simple matter to excise from that point until the beginning of the Virtues of confession (and thus to create an ad hoc version of the second 'edition'), eyeskip seems an improbable explanation of the form of VII we see in these MSS.

The balance of probability seems to weigh in favor of a deliberate scribal decision to keep the Epilogue (and, inexplicably, the long transition), and, again, the only rational explanation for such a decision would seem to be the (hypothetical) scribe's continued belief that the text ended after the General Conclusion of VII.

The absence of couplet (a) from the Epilogue in York and B.N. (i) likewise may have been caused by simple oversight or by deliberate choice. It seems probable that, as in Taylor, couplet (b) would have preceded couplet (a) in the original stage (ii) ('first edition') exemplar of York 7 and B.N. (or in that of one of its descendants). The first line of couplet (b) ('which begins in B.N. (i) 'Ki pur autre prie...' [12753]) and the second line of couplet (a) ('which begins 'Ke prie pur...' [12751]) may have encouraged a simple eyeskip of couplet (a). Alternatively, the responsible (hypothetical) scribe could simply have rubbed out couplet (a) from the first Epilogue after becoming exposed to a stage (iv) second 'edition' exemplar which contained at the very end of its text an Epilogue which included couplet (a). The appearance of an author's name is an obvious signal of closure. The removal of that name from the first Epilogue would be the simplest cosmetic alteration that a scribe could make to that ill-placed Epilogue to indicate that it did not represent the conclusion of the text.

We cannot say whether the absence of couplet (a) from the Epilogue in York 7 and B.N. (i) was caused by a scribal error or by a deliberate scribal decision. Reasonable arguments can be constructed to support either option. What does seem clear, however, is that that absence was scribally-induced.

(ii) Ee.1.20 is the other MS. which presents only an anonymous version of the Epilogue. It contains a text reflecting stage (i) of Book IX which was exposed to the stage (iv) tradition (as were York 7 and B.N.). Like all Epilogues in stage (iv) MSS. (and unlike the stage (ii) and (iii) MS. versions—B.N.(i), York 7, Taylor, Harley 4971), its Epilogue appears at the very end of the text and contains couplet (c). Yet like York's Epilogue and B.N. (i), its Epilogue lacks couplet (a).

The Epilogue in Ee may be the product of a (hypothetical) scribal revision of the second Epilogue in a MS. like B.N. That is, a (hypothetical) scribe confronted with two Epilogues exactly like B.N.'s may have favored the first one (lacking couplet [a]) and corrected the second one accordingly (by removing couplet [a] from it). This arrangement yields a final-position Epilogue precisely like Ee's. The only evidence of Ee's exposure to stage (iv) is its final-position Epilogue, so clearly the scribe of Ee, or that of an ancestor of it, could have culled the anonymous final-position Epilogue from a stage (iv) MS. without ever being exposed to the form of the Epilogue which includes couplet (a).

These hypothetical explanations for the absence of couplet (a) in York 7, B.N. (i), and Ee consider logically a reasonable range of possible scribal errors, deliberate corrections, and critical recastings.
The Text of the *Manuel des Péchés*

The internal evidence suggests that the person who composed the Epilogue was either the *Manuel*-poet himself, or someone who was able to replicate his style precisely, and who was familiar with the structural movement of the text, its style, the method by which it was meant to be received, the circumstances surrounding its composition, the social identity of its patron, and the nationality, religious status and name of its author. The Epilogue was probably added to the end of Book VIII very shortly after the text was composed and before the spurious Books VI and IX began to enter the textual tradition. The manuscript evidence suggests that couplet (a), which provides the name of the author, was an original component of the Epilogue. There is no reason to doubt that the author of the *Manuel* was William of Waddington.
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1 See E.J. Arnould, *Le Manuel des Pêchés*, op. cit., p. 256 concerning the approximate date of the Manuel, which he judges to be ca. 1260.
2 The main studies of the Manuel to date have been Arnould's and the contemporaneous one by C.G. Laird, 'The Source of Robert Mannyng of Brunne's *Handlyng Synne*,' op. cit. (hereafter referred to as 'Source'). Laird condensed some of his results in two articles, 'Character and Growth of the *Manuel des Pêchés*,' *Traditio* 4 (1946), pp. 253-306 (hereafter referred to as 'Character'), and 'Manuscripts of the *Manuel des Pêchés*,' in H. Craig, ed. *Stanford University Studies in Language and Literature*, vol. 1 (Stanford, 1941), pp. 99-123 (hereafter 'MSS.'). Arnould initially takes (the almost certainly spurious) L. 113 ('Pur la laye gent iert fet') as a guideline for commentary on the text's audience. He does, however, seem uneasy with the equation of A.N. 'lai' with the modern notion of 'laypeople' (a matter to which we shall soon return) and remarks that the text probably was not only intended for 'les simples fidèles,' but also for the parochial clergy who lacked knowledge of Latin (p. 34). On p. 59 he once again cites the spurious L. 113 and warns his readers not to forget that the author was addressing 'simples laïcs.' Later (pp. 289-91) he refers to the circulation of the poem among religious houses, characterizes three owners of MSS. as 'simple laïcs,' though their backgrounds, as we shall see later, make such a description appear inaccurate, and mentions in passing that the language of the poem probably restricted its audience. Laird ('Source,' p. 155) claims that the author 'was making a handbook for laymen...most of the extant copies of the Manuel come to us in collections of religious material...the work became not a manual but a popular encyclopedia of sin; perhaps it was useful in monasteries for those brothers whose Latin was not of the best, or who were somewhat troubled with intellectual indolence. For our particular purpose the question is of secondary importance.' He refines this view slightly in his 'Character' (p. 259), in the following highly speculative passage: 'The manuscripts leave us in no doubt that the Manuel became popular as a reference book for preachers...In short, the Manuel...was frequently treated as an encyclopedia for clerics, not as a manual for laymen. Perhaps it was useful to brothers whose Latin was rusty, or to preachers who needed a sermon in a hurry; whatever its function...' Dr. A.I. Doyle, in 'A Survey of the Origins and Circulation of Theological Writings in English in the 14th, 15th, and early 16th Centuries with Special Consideration of the Part of the Clergy Therein' (Cambridge University Ph.D. thesis, 1953; hereafter 'Survey'), restricts his observations on the Manuel to one paragraph, in which he says (vol. I, p. 59) that it circulated 'in the hands of the parochial clergy, in monasteries, some nunneries, and even with lay owners. The recorded copies confirm that it served (as the text suggests that it was meant) for supererogatory reading, so to speak, communal more often than solitary, outside ordinary ecclesiastical circumstances, possibly in church but quite likely elsewhere, in suitable communities, convents, and households. It was a work of popular education for readers and listeners of every class understanding French; not, therefore, universal, though perhaps reaching further down and through the social strata than we might think.'

op. cit.) reproduces only those sections adapted by Hannyng (viz., the Prologue, Books II-V, and most of Book VII). Arnould presents a critical edition of the Prologue (pp. 399-408) and Epilogue (pp. 430-6). We shall cite from all of these editions, i.e., from Arnould for the Prologue and Epilogue, from the E.E.T.S. for the Books it reproduces, and from the Roxburghe Club edition for all material not found in the E.E.T.S. Reminders will appear when confusion might arise.

The next few pages condense some of the findings of this and the next Chapter.

See Arnould, p. 86. The structures of all of the surviving versions are discussed in Appendix II, below.

The epilogue is printed in Arnould, p. 99.

Cf. Arnould, p. 100, and Appendix II.

The dates of the manuscripts are presented below. Arnould's judgements occasionally require alteration. A full study of the MSS. appears in Chapter II:

BRITISH LIBRARY:
Arundel 288. S. xiii, third quarter (Arnould, p. 373), but more likely s. xiii, last quarter.
Arundel 372 (contains a tiny fragment of the text). S. xiv (Arnould, p. 387). This MS. will not be the subject of much commentary. In Chapters I and II of this study the phrase 'Arundel MS.' will, unless otherwise indicated, refer to Arundel 268.
Harley 273. Ca. 1300 (Arnould, p. 365), but a more cautious estimate would be s. xiv, first quarter.
Harley 3860. S. xiv inc. (Arnould, p. 386), but more likely s. xiv, first quarter.

CAMBRIDGE:
Be.1.20. S. xiv inc. (Arnould, p. 379), but probably s. xiv, first quarter.
Gg.1.1. S. xiv, first half (Arnould, p. 391), but more accurately s. xiv, first quarter.
Mm.6.4. S. xiv med. (Arnould, p. 378), but actually s. xiii ex. (see the discussion of this MS. in Chapter II).
St. John's College, 167. Ca. 1300 (Arnould, p. 380), but a more cautious date would be s. xiv, first quarter.

BODLEIAN LIBRARY:
Greaves 51. S. xiv, first half (Arnould, p. 376), but probably s. xiv 'early' (Laird, 'Source,' p. 16).

YORK MINSTER:

OTHER LOCATIONS:
NOTTINGHAM UNIVERSITY, M.I.M.4 (formerly Middleton MS., Birdsell House, Walton, Yorks.). S. xiii, 'late' (Laird, 'Source,' p. 16). Dr. R.G. Biggar kindly advised
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me of this manuscript's latest location; see his review, 'Robert Mannyng of Brunne, Handlyng Synne, ed. Idelle Sullens,' Speculum 62 (1987), p. 971.


PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, TAYLORIAN COLLECTION (formerly Phillipps 2223, Thirlestane House, Cheltenham). S. xiii 'late' (Laird, 'Source,' p. 16). Dr. Biggar again kindly advised me of this manuscript's latest location; see his review, op. cit., p. 971. This MS. will be referred to as 'Taylor.'


'Of Arnould, p. 104 and Laird, 'Character,' p. 257 on this obvious point. Lines 13-30 list the first five topics that will be discussed. Fourteen manuscripts erroneously place the Sacraments before Sacrilege in this list (see Arnould, p. 401). Royal and Harley 273 have the correct order (Sacrilege then Sacraments). Arnould's edition of the Prologue becomes unnecessarily confused at this point, and since other than the simple error in the fourteen MSS. there are few variants in this passage, we shall avoid replicating Arnould's jumble by citing from the E.E.T.S. edition:

Primes dirrum la dreite fey,  
Qe fundament ert de nostre ley,  
En qel ad dusze poins proue,  
Qe sunt artikels apelé.  
Pus mettrum les comamendens  
Qe garder deuuent tute gens.  
Pus les set pechies mortals  
Desquels surdent tans mals.  
Vbler ne deuuum, en nule guise,  
Les dreitures de seint eglise.  
Pur ceeo de sacrilege apraes dirrum,  
Sicm des mestres apris auum.  
Pus i trouere3, ci vus ples3,  
De seint eglise les sacramen3 seet,  
Per quels sole ert tute gouerne3,  
Qe en confessiun ne seient cele3.  
Dunk purra vere qe ad trespassé  
Chescun, & amender ces pechiéz.  

(13-30).

See the treatment of Book VI, below. Arnould (pp. 206-7), was 'inclined' to regard the Book as the work of the Manuel-poet, and later (p. 221) suggested that it was an authentic authorial addition. Laird ('Source,' p. 202) contends (without producing much detailed evidence) that 'there is no reason to suppose that Book VI was a part of the original Manuel.' He does, however seem to think (p. 203) that the 'Sermon' was written specifically for insertion into the Manuel, though he qualifies this (p. 203, note) by adding that 'as a matter of fact it would seem to matter little for our conclusions in this study whether the redactor [of Book VI] had the Manuel in mind...If my argument on this point seems fallacious, little that follows is upset thereby.' Laird ('Source,' p. 208) appears to think that the Book was not the work of the Manuel-poet.

Arnould noted this (pp. 84 and 104).

Arnould (p. 98) claimed that the Manuel-poet only wrote the Points and General Conclusion to the Points of Book VII, and that the Manuel itself probably originally ended with the General Conclusion, and possibly some form of an epilogue. After his examination of the sources of all of the sections of
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VII, he overturns his previous remarks and suggests that the Virtues and Things to Avoid sections of VII were products of a genuine authorial revision of the Book (see p. 235). Laird ('Source,' p. 257) argues that 'the Points are the original portion of Book VII, [and] that the remaining portions...[Virtues and Things to Avoid] were added later.' He makes little of the General Conclusion to the Points, whose appearances and disappearances, as we shall see, lead to a clear explanation of the Book's history. In his 'Character' (p. 294), Laird states more clearly his belief that Book VII originally contained only the Points, and that the original Manual ended with the Points, and possibly an anonymous version of the Epilogue. There is thus little distinction between Arnould's conclusions and Laird's.

See note 13. It must be stressed that Arnould's and Laird's theory on Book VII required them to question and in the end to deny (though not always confidently) the authenticity of all of the material in the Manual which follows the Points and General Conclusion to the Points (i.e., as these two sections appear in what we have called the first 'edition' of VII).

Arnould's and Laird's ideas on Book VII, of course, demanded that they reject Book VIII. Laird rejects it on the basis of its 'suspicious surroundings' ('Source,' p. 266), while Arnould simply places his analysis of the Book under the heading 'Les Additions' (see pp. 205, 235-6) without explaining why the Book should be considered an addition (see esp. p. 105). See also note 128, below.

Viz., Royal. See the treatment of Book VIII, below. This epilogue does not name the poet, but, as we shall see, the lines in the Prologue commonly considered to be the poet's declaration of perpetual anonymity in fact cannot be interpreted as such, and do not appear in Royal.

See the discussion of Book IX for a detailed reconstruction of the four stages of the Book's evolution. Arnould and Laird recognized the varied forms of the Book and also considered the Book a spurious addition (see Arnould, pp. 99-102 and 236-43; Laird, 'Source,' esp. pp. 270-3). Their observations on the development of the Book lacked coherence. Laird, for example, concludes a winding commentary on the forms of the Book (in which conclusion scant reference is made to MS. evidence) by suggesting various possible explanations and adding that 'anything might have happened' ('Source,' p. 273). Arnould mentions the early forms of the Book, but says it would take too long to explain the situation (p. 101). As we shall see, the logical explanation of the development of Book VII presented in this study considerably clarifies the stages by which IX developed.

All of the matters summarized after note 17 will be treated in detail later. Laird ('Source,' pp. 303-17) made an attempt to identify Waddington and speculated that he may have been a scribe or a composer of some 'later material' ('Source,' p. 316). Arnould noted one instance in which the name Tempest is connected with the village of Waddington (p. 246), and alluded vaguely (loc. cit.) to certain entries concerning a man called William of Waddington in Archbishop Gray's register (ed. J. Raine, Surtees Society [hereafter SS] 56 [1872 for 1870]), before dismissing the evidence and rejecting Waddington's authorship (p. 249). Again, it would seem likely that Laird and Arnould's theory on Book VII discouraged them from considering Waddington's authorship, since the only evidence of it appears in the Epilogue, which they were forced to consider spurious. Dr. Doyle, however, under no such restrictions in his general description of the text, does attribute the text to Waddington and describes him ('Survey,' vol. I, pp. 56-9) as 'an official of the archiepiscopal court of York in the middle of the thirteenth century.' He provides no evidence to support this statement and inexplicably refers back to Arnould's work, which of course has nothing to say on this point. It would seem clear that Doyle had examined Gray's register with a greater degree of care than that employed by Arnould. Nevertheless his description of the author
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is suggestive rather than identifying, and he does not pursue the matter further. In this study the poet is identified, and his career and the role of his official connections in the circulation of his poem are investigated.

Unless otherwise noted, the text of the Prologue is drawn from MS. Mm.6.4, as edited by Arnould, pp. 399-408.

A brief check of the pattern of paraph use in Book I of the Manuel in Hatton 99 and Greaves 51, which respectively reflect the first and third 'editions' of Book VII, shows remarkable regularity of paraph position. The author himself provided internal cross-references, which are of course a far more stable referential aid. The MSS. ordinarily have a full complement of rubrics and are as easy to use for general reference as the printed text.

M.T. Clanchy, in From Memory to Written Record (London, 1979), draws attention (pp. 149-50) to the slow growth in literacy during the thirteenth century and to the relative rarity of people who could write. He also remarks (pp. 182-96) upon the dearth of accomplished readers (and one would need to be accomplished to read the Manuel ten times) during the thirteenth century and their presence almost exclusively among the clergy, as well as upon the rare and almost always 'practical' literacy of the laity. The author of the Manuel seems to recommend a repetitive and disciplined absorption of the text and thus seems to presuppose that his readers had some training in systematic reading. Such training would, of course, have been held almost exclusively by members of the clergy during the thirteenth century. It would seem that the ancient monastic practice of trained and systematic reading (lectio divina) is similar to the manner in which our author wishes his text to be read. D. Knowles, in The Monastic Order in England (Cambridge, 1949), pp. 5-6, 211-12, and 470, makes frequent mention of this practice. The author is not recommending the sort of impressionistic perusal of texts which became a common approach during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries among the growing population of literate laypeople, who had not, of course, the training for systematic study (on this practice, see V.A. Gillespie, 'Lukyng in Haly Bukes' Lectio in Some Late Medieval Spiritual Miscellanies,' Analecta Cartusiana 106 (1984), pp. 1-27).

Laird presents in his 'Source,' p. 446. Laird presents in his 'Source' a lengthy appendix in which lists of variants for individual MSS. appear. The variants of each MS. are columned idiosyncratically according to their relation or lack of relation to the three textual groupings which he devised. Many of the lists are far from complete, and Laird's method of searching for variants changes from MS. to MS. There is no overall general index of variants, which probably would have been far simpler to compile than what Laird decided to offer. It certainly would also have been simpler to search. A search for all MS. variants for a particular passage requires sifting through each individual list, and can take an extraordinary amount of time to complete. It was decided early on in the preparation of this study that passages cited merely for illustrative purposes would not draw a search through Laird's thesis, while passages of crucial importance in the argument would. Even so, several hundred searches have been undertaken. Regarding this particular search, it should be noted that in the midst of Book VII in the most unusual Taylor MS. certain passages (probably derived from a second exemplar) are presented as corrections to the early Books, and among these appear 11. 91-116 (see Laird, 'Source,' p. 125).


Til laude men pat er unkunnond.
pat can na latyn understand,
(11. 338-9).


25 Setting aside the issue of the form of the author's statement, it is clear that the statement was rhetorical. The author persistently discusses clerical sins, e.g., neglect of the tonsure (11. 3547-8), defiance of the confessional seal (3669-96), clerical jousting (4287-8), clerical staging of miracle plays (4292-4), lending vestments (4333-5), clerical lechery (5915-16 and 6351-62), mismanagement of church property (6705-6), celebration of the Eucharist while in sin (7481-2), and skipping Mass (7511-4), to name a few. Among the exempla which specifically address clerical sins and/or describe clerical sinners are numbers 20 (The Hypocritical Monk, inc. 1. 3290), 23 (The Backbiting Monk, inc. 1. 3607), 29 (Carpus the Priest's Vision, inc. 1. 4583), 33 (The Hermit and his Treasure, inc. 1. 5219), 35 (The Drunken Priest, inc. 1. 5377), 38 (Bishop Troilus, inc. 1. 5669), 41 (The Priest's Concubine, inc. 1. 6267), 45 (St. John Cryscotom's Deacon, inc. 1. 6799), and 64 (The Monk and the Knight's Wife, inc. 1. 11813). The numbering of the Manual's exempla employed in this study represents that set out in the chart after p. 382 of Sullens's edition of Handlyng Synne.

See Appendix I, below ("Vernacular Literacy in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries").

27 Cf. Anglo-Norman Dictionary, s.v. 'frere.' Fere is a variant spelling of frere. The passage is analyzed fully in the treatment of the Epilogue, below.


29 Of course before the Fourth Lateran Council's intentions concerning the education of the laity could be fulfilled, the clergy themselves needed to be taught. The thirteenth-century diocesan statutes in England repeatedly demand and sometimes supply such instruction for clerics. That they continued to be copied after the thirteenth century obviously suggests that they were not immediately successful. C.R. Cheney provides an overview of the statutes in 'Some Aspects of Diocesan Legislation in England during the Thirteenth Century,' in his Medieval Texts and Studies (Oxford, 1973), pp. 186-202 (see esp. p. 191), and discusses the diocesan acts specifically designed to correct clerical ignorance in English Synodalia of the Thirteenth Century (Oxford, 1941), pp. 40-43. Among the statutes (printed in Powicke and Cheney, part I) which outline the matters a cleric should understand and/or which provide further elementary instruction for clerics are the statutes of Bishop Alexander of Stavensby (Coventry and Lichfield), 1224-37 (pp. 207-26; esp. 220-6); the statutes of Bishop Robert Grosseteste (Lincoln), ca. 1229 (pp. 265-79, esp. p. 268); and the statutes of Bishop Walter de Causilulle (Worcester), 1240 (pp. 294-325, esp. pp. 305, 320-1). L.E. Boyle provides a brief overview of the numerous manuals for clerics which appeared in the wake of the statutes in his 'The Fourth Lateran Council and Manuals of Popular Theology,' in T.J. Heffernan, ed., The Popular Literature of Medieval England (Knoxville, 1985), pp. 30-43. R.H. Haines has reviewed the diocesan efforts to improve clerical education in his 'Education in English Ecclesiastical Legislation of the Later Middle Ages,' Studies in Church History 7 (1971), pp. 161-75, and has examined in detail the late-thirteenth-century emergence of the cum ex eo papal provision for clerical education in
his 'Education of the English Clergy During the Later Middle Ages,' *Canadian Journal of History* 4 (1969), pp. 1-22. This provision was intended to encourage the 'uncommitted,' and often unlettered (in Latin), ordinary cleric to improve his education; in practice however, people of privilege (esp. already well-educated people) frequently snapped up these educational offers (CJH 4, pp. 10 and 15-17). Such abuse of the privilege led to its being all but phased out within a half-century of its conception (p. 14). The lower clerical ranks remained largely unaffected by the provisions, and as late as the mid-fifteenth century we find (p. 13) Bishop Bekynton of Bath and Wells demanding that priests understand Latin and have "some acquaintance with the Scripture." One could argue whether the lower-ranking clergy, who dealt with the daily lives of parishioners, really needed the sort of education they were offered but in the main ended up not receiving (pp. 15-17), but perhaps the important point is that the lower clerical ranks did not benefit dramatically from the scheme, and appear largely to have remained unlettered.

See the previous note. There appears to be indirect evidence that a substantial proportion of regular clergy were also unlettered. Legge notes that though orders were unlikely to draw attention to such matters, one probably can glean from the monastic practice of using A.N. in 'business' documents, and from the existence of some A.N. sermons addressed to monks, that steps were taken to accommodate unlettered members (*Anglo-Norman in the Cloisters*, (Edinburgh, 1950), p. 122). Far more direct evidence is provided by the patterns of ownership of A.N. MSS.: Legge (*Cloisters*, pp. 111-16) presents a list which strikingly illustrates how many A.N. MSS. were originally owned by religious houses. As we shall see in Chapter II, the majority of *Manuel* MSS. which provide evidence of medieval ownership were owned by regular or secular clerical institutions or individuals.

Legge alludes to the Cistercians' intellectual life (*Cloisters*, pp. 4, 52-3, 122, 125), while Knowles (*The Religious Orders in England*, part I [Cambridge, 1948], pp. 64-77) describes their daily life. Dr. Gillespie points out that nuns were commonly considered to be on the intellectual par of the laity ('"Lukynge,"' op. cit., p. 4), while E. Power describes the aristocratic stronghold in nunneries (*Medieval English Nunneries* [Cambridge, 1922], pp. 4 and 13), and Legge examines the aristocratic presence within the Knights Templars (*Cloisters*, p. 122). The *cum ex eo* decree of course vastly expanded the number of absentee clerics (see Haines, CJH 4, op. cit, p. 12), leaving a body of lower-ranking substitutes to attend to the duties of the absentee.

See note 30. Legge (*Cloisters*, p. 53) draws attention to an A.N. letter from a monastic scribe to a nunnery as further evidence of the 'everyday' use of A.N. in religious houses during the thirteenth century.

See 1. 12726 of the Epilogue (Arnould): 'Kar pechur suy ki le compilai.'

Arnould (p. 65) notices this, and likens the tone of this section to that of Books VI and IX. See note 26.

See the discussion of Book IX, below.

Laird devotes an inordinate amount of space ('Source,' pp. 161-83) to this Book, whose authenticity he challenges inconclusively. It is clear that the Book was part of the author's plan, that it appears in all non-fragmentary versions of the *Manuel*, and that its tone (when the fourth Article section is set aside) is identical to that of Books II-V. Laird suggests, probably accurately, that the account of the Passion derives from a fluid tradition of A.N. complaint literature ('Source,' pp. 167-72).

See Arnould, p. 68.


Cp. 11. 75-8 (Arnould), which were cited earlier.
Notes for Chapter I

40 Mannyng's tone on this subject is strikingly more personal than the Manuel-poet's:

3yf pou hast auowyd pe
py lyfe to holde yn chastyte,
Or pou art yn state of prest,
Or yn two ordrys alper nest,
Suddake ne or dekene by,
pys lettyp weddying & dede fleschly.
(1677-82).

41 Cp. Handlyng Synne, 11. 6049-50:
3e ryche men, 3e ryche purchasours,
3e wene pat al pe worlde be 3ours.

42 Cp. Handlyng Synne, 11. 8893-4; 8898-9:
And 3e clerkes nedep to be wyse,
3ow nedep cune 3ow self chastyle.

43 A few of the many places in which this tone appears include 11. 1339-42, 1877-86, 2047-52, 2355-7, 2475-80, 2641-4, 4405-6, and 5997-6002.

44 The reference to Jews is not found in Handlyng Synne.

45 The poet's career will be examined in Chapter II.

46 This is, of course, how exempla by definition should be employed. See F. Kemmler, Exempla in Context (Tübingen, 1984), pp. 88, 90, and 192.

47 The source of this exemplum is unknown; Arnould (pp. 138-9) discusses its analogues.

48 This exemplum is in fact drawn from the life of St. Beatrice (Acta Sanctorum, 29 July, p. 47), as Arnould (p. 152) notes.

49 See Arnould, pp. 134-5, concerning the exemplum, and p. 194 concerning the Summa. Exemplum 22b (Woman with a Long Train), a scribal addition which appears only in Harley 4657 and St. John's, is also derived from Peraldus's Summa (see Arnould, p. 140; the exemplum is printed in the E.E.T.S. edition, p. 119, note).

50 An exhaustive investigation into the sources of the exempla appears in Arnould, pp. 107-84.

51 See Laird, 'Source,' p. 367.

52 Mannyng clearly seems to have sensed the deficiency of this passage:
pou ryche man, pou lestene weyl.
pou gettyst but sorow of euery deyl.
syky ryme shalt pou noun lede.
pyn herte ys per for euer yn drede.
And here y shal telle a lyte,
A wyrde of a gode Ermyte.
(6105-10).

Other examples of insufficient introductions to exempla in the Manuel include 11. 5301-4, 6721-4, 7017-22, 7609-12, and 10325-30.

54 Mannyng provides a seventy-five line introduction to the third commandment (see Handlyng Synne 11. 801-76).
Notes for Chapter 7

As we shall see, the first two 'editions' of Book VII ended with a statement that one can find in the text all one needs to know about the law of confession.

Mannyng appears to have found at least exempla 15 (St. Fursey [11. 2831-56]), 47 (Sacrilegious Carollers [6925-941]), and 52 (Chained Captive [7585-7602]) unsatisfactorily brief. His version of 15 (HS 11. 2473-2590) derives from Bede rather than from Peraldus (see note 50, above); his version of 47 (HS 9015-9252) is drawn apparently from Goscelin's 'Life of St. Edith of Wilton,' rather than from the briefer and possibly Continental version from which the Manuel-poet drew; his version of 52 (HS 10519-704) is drawn from Bede, rather than from Gregory. On exemplum 15 see Arnould, pp. 134-5; on 47 see Arnould, pp. 164-6, 302-3, Furnivall's edition of HS, p. 284, note, and K. Sisam, Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose (Oxford, 1985), pp. 3 and 204-5; on 52 see Sullens's chart of sources after p. 382.

Two exempla which seem unusually well-developed, number 7 (Three Dishonest Executors) and 22b (Woman with a Long Train) are almost certainly scribal additions. On 7 see Arnould, pp. 121-2; on 22b see note 50, above.

The Stonyhurst and Rawlinson MSS. contain different selections of Manuel exempla, removed from the context of the argument. See Appendix II, below, for further discussion of these MSS.

See also 11. 1241-2, 4999-5000, and 7312.


Further cross-references to earlier points in the text appear in 11. 6465-9, 7483-4, and 7978-90.

See 11. 5279-84 and 7763-6.

There is no extant evidence of the separate circulation of each of these sermons, provided that we discount the existence of fragments of Sermon I which appear in MS. St. John's College, Cambridge 3 (reflecting 11. 7802-7975 of the Manuel's version of the sermons [i.e., Sermon I, Prologue, part (i), part (ii [imperfect])]) and in MS. Lambeth Palace 522, in which a long poem on Advent reflects at one point 11. 7898-905 and 7910-17 of Sermon I. On these two MSS., see Arnould, pp. 218-21. For the general opinions of Laird and Arnould on the authorship of Book VI, see note 11, above. The theory of the textual history of VI espoused in this study has never been suggested before.

These instructions appear at this point (in differing forms) in both of the extant versions of the fused sermons. See note 74, below.

The other four MSS. are Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 405, Trinity College, Dublin D.4.18, B.L. Cotton Domitian A.XI, and B.N. fonds fr. 902. An edition of this early redaction of the sermons (from MS. Rawlinson) appears in P. Meyer's 'Notice du MS. Rawlinson Poetry 241 (Oxford),' Romania 29 (1900), pp. 5-21 (the entire article covers pp. 1-84). Variant versions of the prologue and conclusion shared by the B.N., T.C.D., and B.L. MSS. are edited from the B.N. MS. on pp. 83-4 of Meyer's article. See p. 5 of that article for a list of the extant MSS. containing this early fusion of the sermons.

All line references to and citations from this early fusion draw from Meyer's edition of it, op. cit., Romania 29.
The Prologue varies in form and length (compare 11. 1-122 with the variant version on p. 83 of Meyer's article). The awkwardly repetitive style of the Prologue compares unfavorably with the eloquently concise sermons (see below). The author of this Prologue, for example, uses nominal and verbal forms of the word 'amour' no less than fifty-five times in these 122 lines. An example of his fixation on the word follows (the italics are the present writer's):

Et cil [quel] après la mort remaynt,
D'amor dunkes rien ne [se] faýnt.
Et, certes, amer unkès ne sout
A qui la mort amour tout.
Et ne doit estre amour dite
Que après la mort ne est parfait.
Et ceco n'est pas d'amour la mestrie
D'amor homme en sa vie,
Nes celui ayme veraiment
Que ayme quant nul bien actent.
Tel amour est douce et leal
Que ayme et le bien et le mal.
(27-38).

In contrast, the author of the sermons uses variants on the word 'amour' only five times in 11. 153-260 (i.e., part [ii] of Sermon II). The Prologue-author's habit allows one to hypothesize that 11. 261-318, in which variants on 'amour' are used 21 times in 57 lines, are also his work. One can note immediately the stylistic similarities between these lines and the Prologue in the following passage:

A touz deivent amour et pées,
Mès as bons plus que a mauveys,
Et Dieux amez plus que homme,
Car il est des touz bienz la summe.
Et une chose sachez certaine,
Que seint Austyn nous enseigne,
'Qui Dieux,' fet il, 'amat a dreit,
Une houre vivre ne purreit.
Le cuer lui fenderoit d'amour,
Que droit amast son creatour.
Et qui vers Dieux eut amour tendre,
Moltz harroit vers lui offrendre.
(305-16).

Whereas the scribal Prologue to this early fusion of the sermons does not appear in the version of the sermons which is sometimes included in the Manuel, these internal lines (261-318) do (see Manuel 11. 8259-8315 [Roxburghe]). It seems reasonable to conclude, then, that the early version of the fused sermons printed by Meyer preceded and was the source of the superior version of the fusion which is sometimes included in the Manuel.

This section comprises 11. 8148-8315 of the Manuel-version. The pre-Manuel-version does not differ from each other significantly in this section.

This section comprises 11. 7794-7817 of the Manual-version. The pre-Manuel-version does not reflect 11. 7794-7 of the Manuel-version, lines which do not obviously appear to be inauthentic:

Douz chases ad deu establiz
Pur meuz gardir ces amis
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En l'alme chescun creistien.
Ki garde pernt, il fet bien.

(7794-7).

The Manuel-version does not reflect 11. 319-26 of the pre-Manuel-version. These lines are quite fitting to the theme of Sermon I and contain implications concerning the method of reception which mirror the direct recommendations at the end of Sermon I (compare the following 11. with 11. 8092-5 of the Manuel, cited in note 74, below):

Moltz des reisons vous purrai dire
Pur quaï pecché l'en deit despire,
Mès jeo vous dirrai soulement
Pur acomplir plus brievement.
Ore un poi entendez,
Car ensi est, ne dotez,
Del homme que list et rien ue entend,
Come cil que chace et rien ne prend.

(319-26).

Lines 337-8 of the pre-Manuel-version form an awkward apology for the poor organization of this version (which at this point interrupts Sermon II with Sermon I, as we have seen):

Un poi m'estut d'amour cesser,
Et de pour un poi parler.

(337-8).

The Manuel-version, whose organization is superior to that of its predecessor, does not, of course, reflect these lines.

This section comprises 11. 7818-95 of the Manuel-version. The pre-Manuel-version does not reflect 11. 7822-3 of the Manuel-version. Lines 359-60 of the pre-Manuel-version do not appear in the Manuel-version. The line preceding these last is reflected in 1. 7829 of the Manuel-version.

Line 364 of the pre-Manuel-version ('Que ameient le monde si tendrement') appears in an altered form in the Manuel-version, 1. 7833 ('Qu'le mund auvent a talent'). It is worth noting that the pre-Manuel-line features the verb 'amer' (upon which the scribal editor of that version appears to have been fixated), while the Manuel-line does not.

Lines 383-6 of the pre-Manuel-version do not appear in the Manuel-version:

Car hommes sumes et murrum,
Coment ne quant nous ne savom.
Car temps de homme si trespace
Come fait nue que vent chace.

(383-6).

The final line of this passage seems suspiciously similar to 1. 326 of the pre-Manuel-version ('Come cil que chace et rien ne prend'), which is not reflected in the Manuel-version, but which was probably part of the original Prologue to Sermon I (see note 70).

Lines 7864-7 of the Manuel-version ('Tu abates vn et vn / Riches, pources, en comun/ Tu fas chair le prodome/ Qe travaile de custume') seem to be an unimpressive compression of the following lines from the pre-Manuel-version:

Tu tous as mauveys sen et veue
Pur la doute de ta venue.
Tu abbas plais et guere.
Tu ne obliez nulle tere.
Tu abbas en un soul jour
Auxi le riche en sa tour.

(399-404).

Lines 393-462 (Manuel-version 11. 7858-95) are largely thematically-derived from Hélinit's Vers de la Mout (see Meyer's edition of the early

Lines 426-8 of the pre-*Manuel*-version ("Car ta pour purge et sace,/ Aussi comme par mi tamys,/ L'alne ou Dieux n'ad pour mys") do not mention confession, while their counterparts in the *Manuel*-version do:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Qe tel murra demain qe ore se lasse.} \\
\text{Ta pour purge et delivre des fes,} \\
\text{Chescun qe se fet de tut confes.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(7889-91).

This section comprises 11. 7896-9021 of the *Manuel*-version. Line 471 of the pre-*Manuel*-version ("Ne ci privé rien en coer conceu") creates an unusual triplet and does not appear in the *Manuel*-version.

Line 543 of the pre-*Manuel*-version ("Ma bele soere, ore as oët") clearly indicates that the intended audience of this version was female, while its counterpart in the *Manuel*-version ("Duce gent, avez oye," 1. 8008) suggests that that version was intended for a more general audience.

This section comprises 11. 8022-71 of the *Manuel*-version. The pre-*Manuel*-version and the *Manuel*-version do not differ from each other substantially in this section.

This section comprises 11. 8072-98 of the *Manuel*-version. Lines 617-8 of the pre-*Manuel*-version ("Quel que soit, ou joie ou peyne,/ De ceo devez estre certayne") do not appear in the *Manuel*-version.

Lines 619-22 of the pre-*Manuel*-version ("Del jugement, ma bele soer,/ Est ore le secund penser./ Le jugement est ordynez/ Les uns sauves, les autres dampez") clearly indicate again that this version was intended for a female audience, while their counterparts in the *Manuel*-version ("Le scund [sic] penser, ma duce gent,/ Est del drein iugement;/ Qe ert eel hure ci ordene,/ Les vns perdu, les auters sauve") [11. 8080-31] suggest again that that version was intended for a more general audience.

Lines 631-4 of the pre-*Manuel*-version recommend that readers reflect on the text:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Qui cest escrlt soungast suvent,} \\
\text{De peccher n'avereit talent.} \\
\text{Car poir le freist trestourner,} \\
\text{Si cest escrit vousit regarder.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The corresponding *Manuel*-version lines read similarly:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Si cest escrit runiast souent,} & \quad r. \text{so.1 uocet garder, B.} \\
\text{De pecheir ne auereit talent.} & \quad \text{Pecher deit par drait refuser, B.} \\
\text{Car pour li freit tresturner,} & \quad \text{om. B.} \\
\text{Si cest escrit vouit regarder.} & \quad \text{om. B.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(8092-5).

This section comprises 11. 8099-8115 of the *Manuel*-version. Lines 649-53 of the pre-*Manuel*-version attempt to explain the considerable textual confusion which readers once again must endure at this point:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A poir aver ne put suffire} \\
\text{Cest escrit, mès plus vous voil dire} \\
\text{D'amour dont aynz vous tuchai.} \\
\text{E dez resons monstre vous ai} & \quad 652 \\
\text{Pur quai homme deit Dieux amer.} \\
\text{The *Manuel*-version, which is well-organized, reads differently, of course:} \\
\end{align*}
\]

A pour auer pust suffire

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{E ge est ia dit, mes ore voil dire} & \quad E...ditl Cest escrit, B. \\
\text{De amur dont vus tuchai.} \\
\text{Treis resuns vus musterai} & \quad 8113 \\
\end{align*}
\]
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Fur qel home deit deu amer.
(6110-14).

Line 8115 of the Manuel-version does not appear in its predecessor.

This section comprises ll. 3319-23 of the Manuel-version. Meyer (p. 19) assumed that ll. 652-3 of the pre-Manuel-version (cited in previous note) reflected directly ll. 8317-18 of the Manuel-version's Epilogue to part (ii) ('Douz resums tuche vus ay/ Fur qel home deit deu amer'). It would seem clear, however, from the use of moustrer in ll. 652 and 8113, that 652 was part of the Prologue to Sermon II, and that 8113 (also in the Prologue to II) simply altered 652 so that it would reflect the new organization of the fusion in the Manuel-version.

This section comprises ll. 8324-8440 of the Manuel. The pre-Manuel-version does not differ substantially from the Manuel-version in this section.

This section comprises ll. 8441-66 of the Manuel-version. Lines 8443-58 and 8461-6 of the Manuel-version do not appear in its predecessor (ll. 8443-4 appear in the variant Epilogue of the pre-Manuel-version (see Meyer, p. 84)). Both the base and variant Epilogues of the pre-Manuel-version conclude with a tag line (see Meyer, p. 84) which is not reflected in the Manuel-version.

The Manuel-version does not reflect the almost certainly authentic ll. 319-26 of the pre-Manuel-version, which were cited in note 70, above.

See ll. 8092-5, which were cited in note 74, above.

The lines read as follows:

Ky cest sermun souent lirra
En sun qeor ben l'entendra,
Fech de plus sin qoei barra,
E offedere plus se dutera--
Par pour ou par amiste.
Deu, nus grante par sa pite
Qe ne seum encumbrez
Cum en cest sermun oI auez.

Lines 8468 and 3470 do not appear in Harley 273, Ee.1.20, St. John's, B.N., Hatton, and York 7 (see Laird, 'Source,' p. 530).
(8467-74).

See the introduction to this chapter for a broad overview of the structural development of the Manuel.

These presents at the end of the first of two fragments of Book IX the final lines of Sermon II, part (iii) (viz., 8437-40), the first line of the final prayer (viz., 8441), and ll. 8467-78 (8467-74 are the General Instructions on Reception, and 8475-8 are the beginning of the spurious transition to the topic of confession (which we shall discuss soon)). St. John's presents at the end of its fragment of Book IX ll. 8437-78 inclusive. Laird transcribed the lines from St. John's on pp. 543-4 of 'Source,' but did not identify them as lines from VI. Arnould (p. 101, note) transcribed the lines from Ee., and noted their origin.

Both Ee. and St. John's contain the complete 'Book VI' after V. The structure of all extant MSS. of the Manuel is examined in Appendix II, below.

See notes 5 and 9, above.

Arnould (pp. 63-4) notes that lines 31-48 of the Prologue as printed in Furnivall's E.E.T.S. edition appear only in Harley 273. They include the following statement:

Pus trouere3 un sermua de pour,
E coment vus devez pour aeur & amur.
(31-2).

See the introduction to this chapter for a broad overview of the structural development of the Manuel.
Appendix II, below, for more on the structure of this MS. version. P. Meyer prints the Passion fragment in his 'Sur la Pièce Stropheque Dieu Omnipotent,' Romania 36 (1907), pp. 111-14. This text is no. 23 in J. Vising's Anglo-Norman Language and Literature (London, 1923), and appears in two other MSS.

See esp. the treatment of Book VIII, below.

Printed by Arnould, p. 83, note.

See Arnould (p. 83) on Arundel, and Laird ('Source,' p. 410) on Leeds. Arnould (p. 84) draws attention to the plan in the Prologue. He then (same p.) notes the conclusiveness of 11. 7953-6, and the presence of added material thereafter, but does not explain why the former might lead to the latter. The scribes of MS. Pal.Lat. may have switched at the end of Book V from an exemplar which lacked VI to one which included it. See Laird's 'Palatinus Latinus 1970, a Composite Manuscript,' MLR 36 (1943), pp. 117-21. In Appendix V ('Mannyng's Anglo-Norman Exemplar'), below, we shall note that Mannyng seems originally to have concluded his poem at the end of Book V.

Arnould (p. 83) claims that 12 MSS. have the reading. The transition also appears in MS. Taylor (f. 85r), a copy Arnould had not been able to examine (as he points out, p. 360, note).

On the omissions in HM, see Laird, 'Source,' p. 403. The three variant lines appear in B, Ee.1.20, B.N., Hatton, York 7, and Pal.Lat. St. John's contains only the first two of the variant lines. Pal.Lat. places the three lines after 1. 8479, while Ee.1.20 places them after 1. 8482. See Laird, 'Source,' pp. 367 and 509.

Lines 79-82 were cited, with variants, in the treatment of the Prologue, above.

Arnould (p. 86) and Laird ('Source,' p. 201) claim that 'Book VI' contains no exempla.

Arnould discusses the main source of this passage on p. 212, and the sources of 'Book VI' in general on pp. 205-21.

See Arnould (p. 213) on the source of this passage.

Arnould (pp. 104-5 [note]) drew attention to this passage, and believed that it could indicate that the Manuel-poet wrote 'Book VI' (see p. 104). He believed (p. 105, note) that all lines in the passage were found in all MSS. That is not the case (see below).

The first two lines are omitted in Arundel, B, St. John's, Harley 3860, B.N., Hatton, and York 7. See Laird, 'Source,' p. 524, where he misprints the line numbers as 9950-1. The present writer has found that the lines are also wanting in MS. Taylor.

The line references to the left of the passage denote identical (Roxburghe) lines in Sermon I, part (ii).

These four lines are omitted by the eight MSS. mentioned in note 97, and by Ee.1.20 and HM. See Laird, 'Source,' p. 524. MS. Taylor was checked by the present writer.

Royal's omission of these two lines is noted by Laird ('Source,' p. 439).

Viz., B, St. John's, B.N., Hatton, York 7, and Taylor. With the exception of B, these MSS. reflect the first 'edition' of Book VII, and thus the early structural stages of the Manuel-tradition. See Appendix II, below.

See the treatment of the 'similarities' between the redaction and the rest of the Manuel, above, in which we cited this fourteen-line passage as an example of the redaction's reference to the act of confession.

The counterpart-lines from the early redaction are 469-82.

See the explanation of the structural evolution of this Book in the introduction to this chapter.

The variant reading of MS. B, of course, still presents a cross-reference which includes a verb in the first-person-singular. Laird ('Source,' p. 525) considers the reading of B to be unique. Earlier in his thesis, however
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(p. 244, note), he claims that Arundel mirrors B's reading for Il. 9307-8 and that St. John's 'corresponds in part to B' in this passage. He fails to elaborate on the latter point. All other MS. versions of Book VII share the reading of the printed text (Harley 273). On the basis of the minor variations in B, Arundel, and St. John's, which in no way affect the sense of the passage, Laird ('Source,' p. 244) tentatively rejects the cross-reference as a spurious scribal addition, because, he says, 'spurious cross-references are very common in the manuscripts of the _Manuel_...a cross-reference apparently is more likely to have been written in by an interpolator than to have been composed by the original author, and...we shall do well to view with suspicion any cross-reference not supported by impeccable manuscript authority.' He adds (pp. 244-5) that 'the authority for this passage is better than average, but is certainly not impeccable; we can scarcely accept it as more than rather doubtful corroborative evidence.' There is, on the contrary, no reason at all to suspect the authenticity of this passage: the MS. readings, if not unanimous in wording, are unanimous in sense. Laird's theory concerning the evolution of Book VII (viz., that only the Points and General Conclusion to the Points are authentic) obliges him to reject the passage despite resounding evidence of its authenticity. Later ('Source,' p. 251), Laird largely contradicts his earlier remarks by arguing that the cross-reference 'suggests that the [Things to Avoid] (and thus presumably the [Virtues]...) were written by the author of earlier books of the _Manuel_; this evidence would suggest that the book was written as a whole and inserted into the _Manuel_ by the original author; the lines may be spurious, however, and must not be considered more than corroborative.'

See the treatment of Book VII in the introduction. See notes 13 and 14, above, on Laird's and Arnould's (nearly identical) theories concerning the development of VII. For a detailed account of the structure of each extant version of the poem, see Appendix II, below.

On the omission of this line by Be.1.20, see Laird, 'Source,' p. 530.

Cp. 1. 117 (Arnould) of the Prologue ('Si aukun del oyr ( o.) evere, Be.1.20) seft amendé'). Cp also Il. 75-6 of the Prologue ('Deu [Dis], 9 MSS.1 fez le dei! rehercer/ Ky s'alme vodra amender').

On the omission of these two I1. by Greaves, see Laird's 'Source,' p. 419.

The omission by St. John's and Be.1.20 is recorded in Laird's 'Source,' p. 542. Also see next note.

The omission of the last three lines by HM is recorded on p. 405 of Laird's 'Source.' For those cross-referring from Appendix V, read 'last' for 'last three.'

Royal lacks the entire prologue to the Virtues (Il. 8649-90). The style of the prologue (with which we shall discuss shortly), and its appearance in all extant non-fragmentary MS. versions of VII (regardless of 'edition') save that of Royal, seem to assure us of its authenticity. Royal's organization of VII (third 'edition') may have been influenced by a drastic version of the second 'edition' in which not only the General Conclusion and the intervening scribal material, but also the prologue to the Virtues, were excised from the Book.

An awareness of the difference in purpose between the theoretical and practical sections prevents one from challenging convincingly the authenticity of the prologue to the Virtues section on the grounds of tone. Laird appears to make such a challenge ('Source,' pp. 228-31), though in the midst of his remarks he allows that the 'difference in tone in the prologue to the Virtues can perhaps be accounted for in the nature of the material' (p. 228).
Notes for Chapter I

11b Lines 10331-62 of the E.E.T.S. edition are printed from MS. B (see the edition, p. 369, note 'r').

11c On the relationship between this passage and the reference in the Epilogue to the poet's probable patron, see the discussion of the Prologue, above, and of the Epilogue, below.

11d The expansion in Royal was noted, but not recorded, by Laird ('Source,' p. 439). All readings from Royal recorded in this passage have been drawn from the MS. by the present writer.

11e Namely, that the penitent should confess willingly, hastily, openly, humbly, courageously, sorrowfully, wisely, unspitefully, truthfully, simply, obediently, and thoroughly.

11f The passage below is drawn from MS. B.M. as printed in Arnould, p. 92.

The General Conclusion is also printed from Harley 273 in the Roxburghe Club edition, pp. 395-6, note. On the analogues to the Latin questions, see Arnould, pp. 229-31. For those cross-referencing from the treatment of the Epilogue or from Chapter III, read 'passage' for 'passage below.'

11g Laird ('Source,' pp. 532 and 562) notes that the eleven MSS. which contain this passage (see Appendix II, below) present two lines before this one, which conclude exemplum 61 (Woman whose Sins Flew from her Mouth):

\[ \text{Vocore vist le prodhoum} \]
\[ \text{Qu'oi la confessioun,} \]

(E.E.T.S. edition, p. 370, note 'u' [after 1. 10362]).

Royal's version of 11. 10357-62 (plus the lines above) differs from that of the other MSS. (see the E.E.T.S. edition, loc. cit.).

11h On the omission of the remainder of the passage by Leeds, see Laird, 'Source,' p. 411. As is stated in Appendix II, the fragment of the General Conclusion in Leeds appears (uniquely) after the Things to Avoid section (i.e., after Roxburghe 1. 11356).

11i On the omission of this and the preceding line by Ee.1.20, see Laird, 'Source,' p. 530.

11j Laird ('Source,' p. 384) notes that the Latin text of this passage is 'altered' in Mm., Rawlinson, Fal.Lat., Es., HH, Greaves, Hatton, and York 7, but does not record the alterations. The present writer has checked the readings of Hatton and Greaves, and has found but the one minor variant in Greaves here recorded.

11k We have already alluded to the Manuel-poet's indebtedness to Peraldus. Arnould (pp. 185-244) examines the sources of the text in detail (on Book VII see esp. pp. 221-35). MS. B presents the following rubric after its Epilogue (see Roxburghe, p. 414): 'Icy finist la soume del Manuel de Peche.'

11l As we noted earlier, these are some of the final lines of the first and second 'editions' of Book VII.

11m On the form of all MS. versions, see Appendix II. Arnould prints the unique lines in Royal's Prologue (which refer to Books VII and VIII) on p. 404 (they would appear after 1. 30 of the printed text):

\[ \text{Pus i troverez uns sermun} \]
\[ \text{De les vertues de confessioun.} \]
\[ \text{Pus de orisun suit un escrit,} \]
\[ \text{Ki vertue fet home profit.} \]


11o As we pointed out in note 15, Laird tentatively denies the Manuel-poet's authorship of VIII because of the Book's 'suspicious surroundings.' He also argues that the Book's stable MS. readings (compared with those of the Points of Book VII) suggest its spuriousness (i.e., its comparative textual youth; see 'Source,' pp. 267-8). One cannot, of course, judge authorship by surroundings, and stable readings cannot be interpreted as signals of textual youth when all
extant non-fragmentary versions of the Manual contain the supposedly youthful Book VIII is textually stable, rather than young. Laird's examination of the textual qualities of VIII is inconclusive and vague. He never cites the text directly in his argument (see 'Source,' pp. 259-69). Both Laird and Arnould had to reject VIII as spurious in order to give credence to their theory concerning the development of VII (see note 15). Neither of them was able to construct an argument based on evidence which could support their rejection of VIII.

Arnould, p. 236 notes this obvious point, but does not dwell on its relevance to an assessment of the authorship of VIII.

Books VIII and IX of the printed text are drawn from MS. B (see Roxburgh, p. 396, note 2).

On the transposition, see Laird, 'Source,' p. 368.

Laird, 'Source,' loc. cit.

See Laird, 'Source,' p. 441 on Royal's omission.

Laird, 'Source,' p. 421.

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

On the variants to this passage, see Laird, 'Source,' p. 368. The variant readings in the side-notes are from MS. A.

Laird, 'Source,' p. 441 on Royal's omission.

The omission in Greaves, see Laird, 'Source,' p. 421.

Laird, 'Source,' p. 385) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird ('Source,' p. 365) notes the transposition. He claims that Royal, 'alters' ll. 11387-8, but does not record the reading (see 'Source,' p. 441).

Laird (p. 434, note) identified seven lines from the prologue to VIII which appear in the long transition to IX.

We have already cited all of the lines from Book VIII which will be presented below, except l. 11392, for which no substantial variants exist. The lines from Book II were cited in our treatment of the tone of Books I-V.

Laird and Arnould were forced to consider VIII spurious, failed to recognize the significance of Royal's conclusion to that Book (see notes 128 and 140), and did not spot the alteration of this conclusion in the long and short transitions to IX.

The variants are derived from Arnould's printing of the long transition from B.N. (pp. 434-5); the long transition, as we have noted, appears only in Taylor, E.N., York 7, and Harley 4971 (see Laird, 'Source,' p. 549).
Notes for Chapter 7

1 Arnold, p. 243, discounts IX as spurious on stylistic grounds. Also see note 17, above.

The text and variants of the Epilogue are drawn from Arnold’s edition of that section (pp. 430-6). Arnold’s base text for 11. 12700-49 is the first Epilogue of MS. B.N. We shall note the sources of subsequent 11. when we come to them. Arnold’s and Laird’s theories on the development of VII compelled them to reject tacitly the commonest form of the Epilogue as a spurious addition to the text. Neither of them analyzes the Epilogue closely (see notes 13 and 18, above).

The first two of these four lines are from Mm., while the last two are from MS. A. The passage was cited in our treatment of the Prologue, above.

On the structure of the MS. versions discussed in the following analysis, see Appendix II.

The text of the following three couplets is from MS. Mm., as printed in Arnold, p. 436.

All readings from Taylor’s Epilogue that are presented in this section are drawn from p. 124 of Laird’s ‘Source.’

The reading of Harley 4971 is recorded in Arnold, p. 434.

See Arnold, p. 434, on Harley, and Laird, ‘Source,’ p. 124 on Taylor and Harley. Greaves places the following lines between couplets (a) and (b):

Priez ausi devotement
Al duz rei omnipotent
Pur Adam de Furches que l’escrit,
Ke entre les bons seilt eslit,
E a Deu plut venir,
Sanz aucune returner.

This passage is printed in Arnold, p. 436. The present writer agrees with Arnold’s assessment (p. 376) that Furches probably was the man who copied this MS.

HM and Pal.Lat. add a tag couplet after couplet (c). St. John’s adds a rubricated and tautological couplet after couplet (c). These variations are printed in Arnold, p. 436.

The text of couplet (b) from B.N. (i) and of the long transition from B.N. are printed in Arnold, pp. 434-5.

Arnold (p. 433) transcribes the last four lines of Be’s Epilogue:

Qui pur autre prie et heure,
Pur sey mesmes, dit hom, labure.
En Deu finist cest escrit,
En Pere, en Fiz, en Seynt Espirit.
Chapter II
William of Waddington and his Readers

(a) The Author

William of Waddington, who was probably named after the village of Waddington, Lancs. (three miles S.W. of the Cistercian Abbey at Salley), and who was probably born during the last quarter of the twelfth century, was a secular canon who became a prominent member of Archbishop of York Walter Gray's legal team, and who seems rapidly to have become one of the Archbishop's favorite servants. His legal career is well-documented in the Archbishop's register. In ca. 1221 'Willelmo de Wydington' witnessed a confirmation of a grant of a church to York Minster (Reg. Gray, pp. 142-3, note). In 1226 'Willelmo de Widindon' and 'Galfrido de Bocland' witnessed a grant to the Archbishop of a parcel of land (Reg. Gray, p. 221, note). 'W. de Wydendone and G. de Bocland' are described as the Archbishop's justices at Hexham in a document of 1229, in which they witnessed an archiepiscopal grant of land to Richard, the sometime bailiff of Hexham (Reg. Gray, p. 235, 227 note), and as 'our justices' in a document of 1236, in which they again witnessed a grant to Richard (Reg. Gray, p. 248). A year later, in another grant to Richard, they are described as itinerant archiepiscopal justices (Reg. Gray, p. 249). In 1228 'W. de Widindon and G. de Bocland,' described as archiepiscopal justices based at Hexham, witnessed the Archbishop's grant of Hexham-area lands to Richard (Reg. Gray, p. 228); in an undated but probably contemporary exchange of lands between these two parties also witnessed by 'Willelmo de Videndon' and 'G. de Bocland,' Widendon and Bocland seem to be described as canons of Beverley (Reg. Gray, pp. 227-8, note"). In another undated but probably contemporary document,
these two men witnessed an exchange of Yorkshire land between the Archbishop and another party; in this document 'Willelmo de Widindon' is described as the seneschal 'domini Ebor.,' and 'G. de Bocland' as a canon of Beverley (Reg. Gray, p. 232, note).

Waddington may have been the Archbishop's seneschal for twenty or more years. In 1242 the Archbishop granted trusteeship of private land in the Beverley area to 'domino W. de Wydindon, senescallo nostro' (Reg. Gray, p. 253).

In 1247 an archiepiscopal grant of land to the Prior of the Augustinian house at Worksop, Notts., (18 miles N.W. of Southwell) was witnessed by 'domino W. de Wydindon tunc senescallo domini Ebor.,' by the Archbishop's Chancellor, and by 'Waltero de Ludham' and 'Ric. de Boyvill' (Reg. Gray, pp. 256-7), the last two elsewhere being frequently associated with Waddington (see below). In 1252 the Archbishop granted a 'general aquittance' to 'Wm. de Wyd., our seneschal' (Reg. Gray, p. 268).

Waddington was a feoffee of the Archbishop in the archiepiscopal Manor of Southwell (a 'peculiar' district in the Diocese of York) for many years, and when Gray's register refers to him in this capacity it often describes him as a 'knight.' In 1226 the Archbishop granted a piece of land in Southwell to 'Wm. de Widindon and his heirs, for their homage and service,'”doing knight service for the 15th part of a knight's fee therefore' (Reg. Gray, p. 223). In September of the following year the Archbishop granted fifty acres of surplus land in his Manor of Southwell (including some land in Easthorpe, near Southwell) to 'Wm. de Widindon and his heirs, for his homage and service' (Reg. Gray, p. 226). William thereafter seems to have had a small chapel at Easthorpe, which, like his chantry at Southwell (see below), was dedicated to St. Nicholas (Reg. Gray, p. 223, note). In 1235 the Archbishop granted land in Southwell and (nearby) Morton to 'dilecto et fidei nostro Willelmo de Wydendon, pro homagio et servitio suo' (Reg. Gray, pp. 244-5).
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The register also often refers to Waddington as a knight when recording his legal services. In 1239 'Sir Wm. de Widindon, knight' witnessed an archiepiscopal grant of land in the Hexham area (Reg. Gray, p. 252, including note), and in 1241 the Archbishop's plan for support of a chantry in York Minster was witnessed by 'dominis Villelmo de Widindon et Waltero de Ludham, militibus' (Reg. Gray, p. 191). Waddington and Ludham ('militibus') also witnessed the Archbishop's grant of a manor to the Dean and Chapter of York in 1241 (Reg. Gray, p. 195). In 1246 they and other 'knights' witnessed the Archbishop's grant of a church advowson to a private citizen (Reg. Gray, p. 202). In 1248 'Sir Wm. de Widingdon and Richard de Boiville, knights' witnessed an archiepiscopal grant of land to a private party (Reg. Gray, p. 259, including note). In the same year two canons of Southwell and 'Willielmo de Widindlona et Ricardo de Boyvill militibus' witnessed the Archbishop's grant of land to the Keyper Hospital (Reg. Gray, pp. 288-90).

Probably ca. 1250 'Sir William Wydyngton, Knight, Seneschal of the Archbishop, Bailiff of Southwell Manor' founded a chantry at the altar of St. Nicholas in Southwell Minster. Geoffrey de Bocland, Waddington's fellow justice, witnessed the foundation. In a 1369 inventory of the goods kept at the altar of St. Vincent in Southwell Minster, a copy of Waddington's poem is mentioned ('et unus liber qui vocatur 'manuele peche,' lingua gallica conscriptus, pretii iii s. iii d.').

In 1241/2 Robert de Lexington (canon of Southwell and King's Justice) founded a chantry in Southwell Minster. A good deal of this chantry's annual revenue was thereafter provided by the Gilbertine house at Sixhills, Lincs. (35 miles N.E. of Southwell), a house in which Robert Mannyng of Brunne, the first translator of Waddington's poem, lived, and to which Mannyng addressed his Chronicle. In a humorous letter of 1332, the Chapter of Southwell, after advising the Convent of Sixhills that debtors to the Chapter are routinely...
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excommunicated, urged Sixhills to send the chantry's endowment money within six
days.'

Certain historical incidents may expand on this connection. In 1232-5
William 'de Wadingeton,' Richard 'de Brunna,' and William of Lincoln (archdeacon
of Leicester) witnessed a rental contract for land in Eastgate (less than one
mile from Bourne, Lincs., the birthplace of Robert Mannyng). William of
Lincoln's predecessor as archdeacon of Leicester was Robert Grosseteste, to
whom the Manuel des Péchés is attributed in two manuscripts of Mannyng's
Handlyng Synne.' In 1269 three canons of Southwell were ordered by
Archbishop Giffard to induct a Robert 'le Brun' as proctor to a newly-appointed
prebend of Southwell.' The date of this event makes it most unlikely that the
person involved was the translator of the Manuel, for Mannyng's writing career
did not end until the late 1330s.' In 1294, however, a Thomas of Waddington
resigned from the rectory of Toynton St. Peter, Lincs. (22 miles S.E. of
Sixhills) to take a post at the church of Leconfield, Humberside (3 miles N. of
Beverley); the new rector of Toynton St. Peter was named Roger Brun.'
Connections between the Tempest family, who owned three copies of Waddington's
poem, and the house at Sixhills are explored in Appendix IV.'

(b) Readers of the Manuel

Even though there are reasons to suspect that Mannyng's exposure to the
Manuel was not entirely a product of chance, the surviving manuscripts (and the
lost MSS. about which we have information) indicate that there would have been
a good deal of scope for such a co-incidence. Waddington wrote for a general
clerical audience and his poem was widely received by such an audience. During
the Middle Ages manuscripts of his poem were owned by religious houses
throughout the country. The text achieved this national clerical readership
within a very short period of time; almost all extant MSS. containing the poem
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were copied between 1275 and 1325. Waddington's prominence in the diocesan hierarchy helps to explain this phenomenon, and promotes suspicion that the circulation of his work was considerably aided, if not managed, by the intercommunicating powers of the English church.

**MS. Harley 337**, dismissed by previous critics as insignificant, in fact may have been consulted by Robert Mannyng during his translation of the *Manuel*. The volume contains five fragments of separate manuscripts, beginning with a fragmentary twelfth-century Latin chartulary of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, followed by a heavily damaged fragment of the *Manuel* in a hand of the early fourteenth century (ff. 12r-31v; ll. 1068-4821, with lacunae), a fragmentary twelfth-century text of Origen's commentary on Leviticus, a thirteenth-century copy of Pope Innocent III's *De Contemptu Mundi*, and a text on the Mass, and a single leaf containing part of the *Analogium Vpocrates* in a thirteenth-century hand. These fragments were bound together at least by the mid-seventeenth century, when Sir Simonds d'Ewes (1602-50) owned the complete volume.

Along the top of the damaged leaves of the *Manuel*-fragment there appears a series of 191 colored armorial shields; beneath each shield an early-fourteenth-century hand has written the name of the person to whom the shield refers. It is likely that this series was originally much longer, and that the damage to the *Manuel*-fragment, which is known to have occurred before ca. 1590, was in part the result of reckless excision of particular shields. The names which appear in what remains of the series are of particular interest. On f. 15v (old foliation 16v) the shield of a 'Sir Symon Kokfeld' appears; in the mid-fifteenth century MS. Hatton (q.v.) was owned by a Margaret Cokfeld. On f. 16v (old foln. 18v) there is the shield of 'Sir William de Beuchamp,' on 19r (old foln. 21r) that of 'Sir Miles de Beuchamp,' the Beauchamps may have been connected with the production of the Simeon MS., which contains part of *Handlyng Synne*. On f. 21r (old foln. 14r) there appears...
beneath a shield the name 'Sir Robert de Moltone'; a contemporary man of the same name asked Robert Mannyng of Brunne to write the Chronicle.

Certain names under the shields in Harley also appear in the contemporary Boroughbridge Roll of 1332 (MS. Egerton 2850); these shared names are of little interest in this argument, but the connection between the rolls is important, for in Boroughbridge we find again some names of particular interest. The names of Sir Wauter and Sir Gyles de Beuchamp appear in Boroughbridge, as does the name of Sir Henri de Cocfeld. In addition we find Sir Richard and Sir Johan de Houland (or Holand), a Norfolk family of the same name owned MS. Taylor (q.v.). There is also the name of Sir Roger de Cursoun; MS. Folger of Mannyng's Handlyng Synne may have been owned during the early fifteenth century by a Thomas Cursoun of Croxall, Staffordshire (near Lichfield). We also find the name of Sir Roger de Clifford, Baronet, second Lord Clifford, of Cumbria; MS. Eng. Poet d.45 of Peter Idley's re-working of Handlyng Synne was originally owned by the Clifford family of Cumbria, a family closely connected to the Tempests (who owned three copies of the Manuel). There also appear the names of Sir Robert and Sir William de Morle, who may have been ancestors of the Durham Marleys who gave a great number of books to the Tempests. We find Sir Nichol Percy on the roll; the Percies and the Tempests had contacts with the Gilbertine house at Sixhills during this period. There is also the name of Sir Robert de Norton; a Yorkshire Norton family was interrelated with the Tempests, and MS. Harley 4971 of the Manuel (q.v.) was owned during the fifteenth century by a John Norton. Finally, we find in Boroughbridge the names of Sir William and Sir Johan de Clynton; in Handlyng Synne (ll. 71-2) Robert Mannyng claims to have lived five years at Sempringham (probably 1312-17) under the supervision of a person named 'Ione of Clyntone.'
Returning to MS. Harley, on f. 71v (the last leaf of the text on the Mass), in a list of names and numerals (perhaps referring to debts or wages owed) written in a hand of the first half of the fourteenth century, the following name is visible under ultra-violet light: 'R. <b>rune.'

MS. Harley 4971 consists of four manuscripts (copied during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries) which were bound together during the fifteenth century, when the volume was owned by the Benedictine abbey at Bury St. Edmunds. The entire volume offers a collection of practical texts probably used at the abbey for the training of young members in grammar, composition, arithmetic, law, and religious observance. The first manuscript (ff. 4r-41r), which was probably copied during the early fifteenth century, presents first texts on French pronunciation and orthography, on the duties of clerks who serve the nobility, on the composition of letters in French, on the composition of letters to persons of differing social backgrounds, and on the conjugation of Latin and French verbs. There then follows a copy of a roll of expenditures at the house of the Earl of Stafford, probably included as an example of proper record-keeping. There are thereafter examples of petitions and memoranda (one from Thomas Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick), and, after a few Latin verses, a list of days, feasts, and months, further examples of legal documents, another text on the rules of composition, a currency conversion table, a discussion of courtroom techniques, a copy of a court roll, and another example of a legal memorandum. The second manuscript (ff. 42r-65v), which is contemporary with the first, consists of further examples of legal documents, and the third one (66r-92v), also contemporary, contains some royal statutes of 1387-90. The final MS., which was copied during the early fourteenth century, contains the Manuel (93r-127r), followed by (127r-128v [ult.]) a text on sin, virtue, and hell, an excerpt from Erec et Enide by Chrétien de Troyes, a notice of a grant of
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Northamptonshire land dated 1308, and a brief discussion of the purification of the Virgin.

A table of contents on f. 3r-v (a flyleaf) indicates that the entire volume as it is arranged today was owned during the fifteenth century by Bury, and the medieval foliation of the volume carries through to the beginning of the Manuel. The simple and tidy presentation of the Manuel (rubrics and initials only, with almost no annotation) suggests that the MS, in which it appears was produced by and for clerics, and, though it would seem likely that it was copied at Bury, it could of course have been acquired by the Abbey from another clerical institution. On f. 128v the name 'William Cartere' appears in a fourteenth-century hand. On f. 41v a fifteenth-century hand wrote the name 'Willelmus Smyth.' On f. 79r a sixteenth-century hand wrote 'John Lanceter' and 'James Grundy,' and on f. 80r 'James Jakson.'

The text of the Manuel in this MS. is closely related to the lost exemplar used by the composer of Of Shrifte and Penance, the M.E. prose translation of the Manuel, which survives in only one MS. (St. John's College, Cambridge 197), a volume owned during the late fifteenth century by a man from East Dereham, Norfolk. During the late fifteenth century Harley 4971 belonged to a man named John Norton. During the fifteenth century the Norton family of Yorkshire was maritally allied with the Tempests; the Tempests had close business contacts with the Premonstratensian abbey of West Dereham, Norfolk.

MS. Stonyhurst (s. xiv, first quarter) consists of two booklets apparently bound together during the fourteenth century, the first presenting a Summa de Officis Ecclesiasticis, the second opening with a similar summa by John Beleth, followed somewhat incongruously by selected exempla from the Manuel (in a different hand, ff. 103v-107r). There are elsewhere two legal documents (dated 1299 and 1300) regarding the supervision of Royal forests, a Latin summary description of the nine daughters of the devil, and an A.N. passage on folly.
The bulk of the volume is taken up by the two summae, and contemporary annotations suggest that these texts were studied closely. Like the Bury MS., Harley 4971 (to which Stonyhurst's reading of the *Manuel* bears some resemblance), this MS. seems to have been used as a textbook for clerics. By the end of the fifteenth century it was owned by a John Pye, who may have been a collector of MSS., for he also owned MS. York 13.

MS. Harley 4657, which was copied during the early fourteenth century, is a single-text MS. (containing the *Manuel* only, ff. 5r-86v) prefaced and appended by short pamphlets in contemporary hands. The initial pamphlet (1v-4v) contains the Latin verse *Apocalypsis Golias*, a Latin text on manners, and a macaronic poem on the Virgin, and the latter pamphlet (87r-103v) Cato's *Disticha* (macaronic), prayers to the Virgin, a text on thirty-six errors, and a brief 'summa' on the deadly sins (the last three texts in A.N. verse). One scribe wrote both pamphlets, while another, in a more formal hand, copied the *Manuel*, and two others added corrections to that text (ff. 85r-86v). The text of the *Manuel* is well-organized, with rubrics and paragraph-markers; the pamphlets are far more casual productions. While the neatness of the *Manuel* MS. might suggest that it was a clerical production, the contents and presentation of the pamphlets seem slightly more common than those of the MS. which it surrounds. On f. 104r an early-fifteenth-century owner listed certain receipts; several of the identifiable places listed are within a few miles of Tempest family seats in Yorkshire and Co. Durham. This family is known to have owned the book by at least the seventeenth century. There is no evidence to suggest that the book was owned by Durham Priory. In Appendix III we discuss the history of the Tempests' library (which also included MSS. Harley 3860 and Rawlinson), the connections which the family had with the birthplace of Waddington, and the family's links with owners of MSS. of *Handlyng Synne* and *Idley's Instructions*. 
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MS. Harley 3860, which was copied during the first quarter of the fourteenth century, contains an anthology of historical and practical texts written in three booklets by four co-operating scribes and probably originally bound as one volume. The first booklet consists solely of historical matter—a Latin prose chronicle of English history (up to 1272), an Anglo-Norman genealogy of English and Scottish royalty (up to 1315), and a Latin prose history of the Scottish campaigns of Edward I. The second contains only the A.N. prose Seven Sages of Rome (also in Gg.1.1). The third presents Grosseteste's Chasteau d'Amour (also in Hatton, Royal, Taylor, and York 7), an excerpt from the Manuel (Books VII and VIII only), and Walter Henley's Husbandry (also in Harley 273). All of the texts are well-organized and pen-and-ink illustrations of a single style appear throughout the volume. The tidiness of and lack of annotation in the book and its professional execution suggest that it was a monastic production. There appears to be a reference to the Bishop of Durham in an early fourteenth-century hand on f. 2r (a flyleaf). At the foot of f. 9v a similarly-dated hand scribbled 'Dunelm' beneath a passage (in the first text) which refers to that city. On f. 78r Henley's text provides an example, perhaps, of the scribe's (quite northern) dialect: 'kar hom dist en Anglais. Aiper opir tua wrang wil on bande ga and suir at pe ende wrange wil wende.' On f. 1v (a flyleaf) the name 'John Dent' appears in a fifteenth-century hand. The book was in the possession of the Tempest family at least by the seventeenth century. The Tempest family received a windfall of manuscripts from the library of the Benedictine Cathedral Priory at Durham after the Priory's dissolution in 1539. While it would seem that this volume was copied in the Durham area, there is no evidence which definitely connects it with the Priory itself.

MS. Rawlinson (s. xiv inc.), which contains selected exempla from the Manual, as well as the General Conclusion to the Points of Book VII, Book VIII,
and the earlier redaction of the sermons (which was later reshaped into the spurious Book VI of the *Manuel*), is, unlike most *Manuel* MSS., somewhat downmarket in general appearance and contents. Several scribes were involved in the project, and organizational features were employed inconsistently. Aside from the aforementioned texts, there appear Bozon's *Proverbes de bon enseignement* and *Plainte d'Amour* (the latter also in Gg.1.1 and Harley 273), the *Petite Philosophie* and *Lumaire de Salomon*, a dialogue between St. Julian and his disciple, St. Edmund's *Speculum* (also in MS. Arundel), the marriage of the nine daughters of the devil (attributed to Bishop Grosseteste), a short text on the seasons, notes on military fees and the dimensions of St. Paul's, and, perhaps unexpectedly amidst these vernacular texts, the Latin *Liber Metodii Episcopi*.

The presence of a collection of miracles of the Virgin by Everard Gateley, a member of the Benedictine house at Bury St. Edmunds, may be suggestive of the book's origin. MS. Harley 4971 (q.v.) was certainly a Bury MS. Like Harley 3860 and 4657, MS. Rawlinson was owned by the Tempests at least by the seventeenth century.64

**MS. Gg.1.1**, which was copied during the first quarter of the fourteenth century by an Irishman, is a scribal achievement as colossal as, yet more practical than, MS. Vernon.65 Its appearance (633 mid-sized folios, written by one person) verges on the absurd, and though it is not nearly so ostentatiously decorated as Vernon or Simeon, it seems to have been spectacular enough to discourage people from handling it, for its pages bear few traces of use. Like Vernon, this MS. must have taken years to produce, at great cost to its patron.

Although the contents may be considered generally to be religiously didactic, there is quite a bit of (fascinating) scientific material sprinkled about. The book begins, curiously, with the table of contents only of Peter of Peckham's *Lumiere as Lais*, followed by a table of contents for the entire MS.66 The first text proper is *Urbane curteis*, a set of instructions to a son, and
this is followed by further practical wisdom in the form of proverbs. Then there appears Ralph of Lynham's A.N. *Art de kalender*, followed by brief Latin texts on baptism, visions of the body of Christ, and the value of the Mass. The immense *Lumiere* (also in MS. St. John's 167) is then presented, followed by a short A.N. text on the Day of Judgement, a brief excerpt from Aristotle, *La Plainte d'Amour* (also in Rawlinson and Horley 273), the prophecies of Merlin (A.N. prose), a Latin notice on perjury, some proverbs, and then, rather unexpectedly, the M.E. verse *Northern Passion* (also in MSS. II.4.9 and Ashmole 61 of *Handlyng Synne*), followed by the expansive A.N. homily cycle (*Miroir*) by Robert of Gretham (also in MSS. HM and Nottingham), the seven penitential psalms (A.N.), the *Ave*, and treatments of the five joys, the assumption, and the laments of the Virgin. There is then a woman's guide to Anglo-Norman, rather resembling a modern Berlitz (stressing key words on common subjects). The *Manuel* then appears. The text inexplicably skips some 3,000 lines at f. 317r, and breaks off awkwardly near the end of Book VI via a scribal conclusion. The MS. has suffered no physical loss here, and one can thus only assume that the otherwise careful scribe was copying from a damaged exemplar.

After the *Manuel* the scribe presents Langtoft's description of the reign of Edward I, a brief Latin text on the joys of heaven, and then an illustrated version of the *Image du Monde*. After this (yet another encyclopedia) it would appear that the scribe sought diversion, for a long series of short texts follows, on the goodness of women, the omens of birth, the ages of man, the letting of blood, the administration of drugs, the occasion of thunder, the dream of Daniel, the Sacraments, the Commandments, the Sins, the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Articles, the Cross, the Day of Judgement, the structure of the Bible, followed by a miracle of the Virgin.

A translation of the Book of Revelation (well illustrated) is then offered, but thereafter the scribe returns to short texts—the *Seven Sages of Rome* (A.N.)
prose, also in Harley 3860), an A.N. rendering of Aristotle's views on natural phenomena, and more on birth-omens. There are then two texts on confession, the first (in A.N.) on the seventeen points of conduct which a penitent should observe in the confessional,70 and the second (in Latin) on the general questions which confessors should ask penitents. This juxtaposition is of course identical to that found in Book VII of the Manuel (Points, General Conclusion). After this there are texts on the Pater Noster (Latin), on Pilate (Latin), on rules of love for clerks and knights (A.N.), followed, startingly, by the M.E. proverbs of Hengist, and thereafter by an A.N. text on the infancy of Christ, an abridged A.N. history of England (which may allude to the reign of Edward II), a list of knights' fees in England and Ireland (Latin), a physical description of the human head and a selection of familiar quotations from authorities (Latin). The book is, indeed, dazzlingly informative in a somewhat haphazard way. The final encyclopedia is the Livre de Sidrac, which answers perhaps many more questions than the reader might be inclined to ask. The book fades out with a series of short texts—a description of the qualities of women, a form of confession,71 a (Latin) prayer to the Virgin, an A.N. text on errors, and a series of (Latin) miracles of the Virgin.72

The only place in which a book of this scope could be produced during the early fourteenth century was at one of the very greatest English clerical institutions, for only at such a place would there be financial, bibliographical, and human resources great enough to assemble such a collection. The book clearly must have been commissioned for a great occasion or for or by a great person, and the contents, while occasionally appropriate for secular reception, are collectively so vast, varied, and so demanding of an exceedingly patient and educated mind that one must doubt that the book's patron was a layman. On the outside edges of the leaves the word 'Theolog' was painted, amidst a floral design. Like MS. Be.1.30 (q.v.), this MS. was during the late seventeenth
century in the vast collections of Bishop of Norwich and Ely John Moore (d. 1714). On f. iv, a flyleaf, there appears in a seventeenth-century hand a note that the MS. was 'bought of Mr. Washington.' If this person was a member of the Washington family of Durham, then his possession of the MS. is of some interest, for during the early fifteenth century a member of that family was Prior of Durham. In Appendix III we note a bibliographical transaction in which the Washingtons, Tempests, and Boweses (who owned a copy of Handlyng Synne) were involved.

MS. HJC (s. xiv inc.), which contains the Manuel and a disordered version of Robert of Gretham's Miroir (also in Gg.1.1 and Nottingham), was acquired during the Middle Ages by Brother Clement Warthwyk, a member of the Benedictine monastery of St. Mary at York. The book may have been copied in France. It was kept at Everingham Park, Humberside (15 miles S.E. of York) during the early part of this century (and perhaps long before), and was sold (as part of the collection of the Duchess of Norfolk) in 1925 to the Huntington Library.

MS. Be.1.20 (s. xiv, first quarter) contains the Manuel and an A.N. prose Brut (which concludes with the death of Edward I in 1307). The texts, which were copied by one scribe, are neatly set out (with running titles, boxed side-notes, and capitals) and a fifteenth-century list of contents appears at the end of the volume. The contents and the almost complete lack of annotation suggest that the volume was clerically-produced. It was owned during the early seventeenth century by Sir Thomas Knyvett, of Ashwellthorpe, Norfolk (10 miles S.W. of Norwich), a lawyer and antiquary (High Sheriff of Norfolk 1579-80) whose daughter Mary married into the Holland family of Norfolk (the owners of MS. Taylor [q.v.] by at least the seventeenth century). Knyvett’s library probably contained about 70 MSS. and 1,400 printed books, and most of it was after his death absorbed into Bishop Moore’s collections, which George I gave to the University Library in 1715. The volume’s connections with Norfolk may
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help to explain why its reading of the Manual seems so close to that of Mannyng's hypothetical exemplar. One of Knyvett's theological MSS. (now Gg.4.10) was owned during the early sixteenth century by a vicar of East Dereham; during the late fifteenth century a man from the same town owned the unique copy of the M.E. prose translation of the Manual.

MS. Taylor (s. xiii ex.) contains in its opening flyleaves catechetical diagrams (e.g., on the Virtues, Gifts of the Holy Ghost, Sins) explained in Latin, and a short poem on Our Lady; the MS. begins in earnest with the Manual, and proceeds with the Roman des Romans (also in Royal), a brief prose contemplation on the Passion, a short treatment of the Pater Noster, and Bishop Grosseteste's Chasteau d'Amour (also in Royal, Hatton, Harley 3860, and York 7). The first of twenty-seven illustrations which accompany the text of the Manual appears to portray a man of religion (possibly Waddington) writing under (it seems) the Virgin's supervision. At the beginning of Grosseteste's text the Bishop is depicted standing alongside a noblewoman, possibly the person for whom the MS. was compiled. Taylor is the only surviving example of an illustrated text of the Manual; all of the pictures (save the first) illustrate actions which occur in the exempla. This book and perhaps Harley 273 are the only extant Manual MSS. which appear to have been originally designed for secular reception; the elevated social position of the prospective receiver of Taylor seems unsurprising in light of our observations concerning the currency of the Anglo-Norman language in the thirteenth century. The book was owned at least by the seventeenth century by the Holland family of Norfolk, who were during that century maritally allied with the family of Sir Thomas Knyvett, the owner of MS. Es.1.20 (q.v.). Several antiquaries (Peter Le Neve, Thomas Martin, Thomas Tyrwhitt) seem to have owned the book during the eighteenth century, before Phillipps acquired it from the booksellers Longman during the first half of the nineteenth century.
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MS. Harley 273 consists of four separate manuscripts (or booklets) copied during the first quarter of the fourteenth century and bound together by the mid-fourteenth century.\(^6\) The first booklet begins with a calendar written by the Ludlow-area scribe of the famous MS. Harley 2253, which mentions at one point the dedication of the parish church of St. Lawrence, Ludlow;\(^7\) it continues with a short list of indulgences (in Latin), the Oxford Psalter (A.N. prose), the matins of Our Lady (A.N. verse), and the Placebo (macaronic A.N.).

The second booklet, which contains a collection of practical and contemplative Anglo-Norman texts, begins with Richard Fournival's Bestiaire d'Amour and Walter Henley's Husbandry (both in prose, the latter here attributed to Bishop Grosseteste\(^8\)), and proceeds with a short list of rules of friendship, two medicinal charms, Archbishop Turpin's prose history of Charlemagne,\(^9\) prose instructions on the practice of confession,\(^10\) prefaced by a bibliography of penitential texts, and followed by three short prayers, a diagrammatic guide to meditation on the fear and love of God (featuring a drawing of two hands, in which the digits signify separate devotions), a list of the seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, three further medicinal charms, the Manuel (concluding in a slightly later hand than that with which it began), a brief summary of the credo and the sins (in Latin), and the A.N. verse St. Patrick's Purgatory.\(^11\) The presence of the charms and the pragmatic content and presentation\(^12\) of the other texts suggest that this booklet was designed for and originally owned by a (probably wealthy and well-educated) layman.

The third booklet (ff. 199r-203r) contains only the Plainte d'Amour (also in Gg.1.1 and Rawlinson) and the fourth (204r-215v [ult.]) only a few Latin prayers, a Latin and A.N. guide to the concoction of colored dyes, and a few Latin and A.N. charms.\(^13\)

A note on f. 1r, a flyleaf\(^14\), indicates that by the second half of the fifteenth century the book was owned by John Clerk, who in 1462 was appointed
for life as apothecary to Edward IV, and who in 1467 and 1475 served as Warden of the Grocers' Company. On f. 5v the name 'Thome Herford' appears in a fifteenth-century hand.  

**MS. Arundel 288**, which was probably copied during the last quarter of the thirteenth century, contains an anthology of practical and contemplative Anglo-Norman texts, beginning with the *Manuel*, then proceeding with a prose translation of the *De Poenis Purgatorii* (attributed to Bishop Grosseteste), a prose sermon on the Passion, the earlier redaction of the verse sermons which were later revised and inserted into the *Manuel*, and a prose version of St. Edmund's *Speculum* (also in Rawlinson). The texts are copied in a textura hand, and presented in an organized fashion, with paragraph markers, rubrics, and side-notes aiding reference. Arundel is precisely the sort of orderly copy conducive to study which Waddington envisaged for his work. The texts suit a clerical audience, and there would seem to be little reason to doubt that the book was a clerical production.  

The only significant annotation in the book appears at the top of the folio on which the *Manuel* begins (5r), where the name 'John Parker' is written in red pencil in a sixteenth-century hand. This man (1548-1618/9) was the eldest son of Matthew Parker (1504-75), Archbishop of Canterbury (1559-75). During the period of the dissolution of the monasteries, the Archbishop had, with the help of several prominent antiquaries, collected and preserved a great number of medieval manuscripts, many of which he subsequently donated to his Cambridge college, Corpus Christi. During the last quarter of the sixteenth century his son compiled a list of manuscripts kept at the Parker family residence at Bekesbourne, Kent (near Canterbury); the list survives (in MS. Lambeth Palace 737) and MS. Arundel is recorded in it. During the seventeenth century the book was owned by Thomas Howard, second Earl of
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Arundel, and then by Henry Howard, sixth Duke of Norfolk; Henry donated it to the Royal Society, and in the 1830s the Society gave it to the British Museum.\textsuperscript{96}

MS. Royal (s. xiii, late last quarter) opens with the Manuel, and thereafter presents a series of contemplative A.T. texts, for example a sermon against the attractions of the world, Bishop Grosseteste's Chasteau d'Amour (also in Hatton, Harley 3860, Taylor, and York 7), the Roman des Romains (also in Taylor), a remarkably lengthy collection of miracles of the Virgin, and the precursor of Book VI of the Manuel (the earlier redaction of the sermons). Like almost all other Manuel MSS., in this one Waddington's text is neatly arranged (using capitals, section markers, rubrics, side-notes) by a competent scribe (whose text was exhaustively corrected by a contemporary). These learned corrections are particularly suggestive of a clerical origin. By the middle of the fourteenth century the volume was owned by a person named John Colyford, from Galmington, Somerset (in Taunton), and by the middle of the following century by Walter Hungerford, probably the first Lord Hungerford (1378-1449), sometime MP for Somerset and Wiltshire, speaker of Parliament, constable of Windsor Castle, steward to Henry V and VI, and Lord High Treasurer.\textsuperscript{97}

MS. Mm.6.4 (s. xiii ex.) contains the earliest example of the fully-developed nine-Book Manuel.\textsuperscript{98} The text is copied in long lines. The rest of the texts are in Latin. After Alan de Insulis's Cherubim, there appears a sinner's lament edited by John Goddard, the first Abbot of the Cistercian house at Newenham, Devonshire (25 miles E. of Exeter),\textsuperscript{99} and a miracle of the conversion of Kent woman which at one point refers to Richard de Wich, Bishop of Chichester (d. 1253). A Welsh miracle of the Virgin is followed by testaments of the twelve Patriarchs related by Bishop Grosseteste, a vision which was recorded in Essex, a life of St. Marina, a description of the passion of the saints and holy people, a collection of authoritative exempla by Peter Alphonse, and a history of the Cross. Then there is another text by Abbot John
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Goddard, this time a letter to his sister Margaret, Abbess of the Cistercian nunnery at Tarrant, Dorset (12 miles N.W. of Bournemouth).100 This is followed by an account of the temptations to which a French Cistercian novice was subjected in 1282, and a brief Flores Augustini.

The MS. is, like most other copies of the Manuel, tidily presented and almost unannotated. The markedly regional and Cistercian character of the contents make it unsurprising that the book was originally owned by and probably copied at the Cistercian house at Quarr, on the Isle of Wight.101 Like MS. Royal (q.v.), this MS. demonstrates that the Manuel circulated almost instantly to the furthest extremities of the country.

Four copies of the Manuel which no longer survive are known to have been owned during the Middle Ages by the clergy. A copy was held at St. Augustine's, Canterbury, another at the Benedictine priory at Dover,102 another, as we have noted earlier, at Southwell Minster,103 and another by a curate living in Barking, Essex.104

Conclusion

During his lengthy career in the service of the Archdiocese of York William of Waddington occupied positions of considerable influence and enjoyed consistently the favor of the Archbishop. There is good reason to suspect, but no evidence to demonstrate, that one of Waddington's colleagues (perhaps at Beverley or Southwell) was the 'sweet brother' who, Waddington says, asked him to write the dry, reformative tract on the law of confession which he compiled during the final years of his career. His wide legal experience of the shortcomings of men qualified him for the task and may have motivated it. Although he was in regular contact with the general public, his poem is clearly intended for study by a general clerical readership, and it is this point which could lead one to suspect that someone more influential than his friend Geoffrey Bocland, for example, asked him to write it. In the Epilogue Waddington (or his
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proxy) asks potentially displeased readers to forgive him since he was asked to write the poem, which seems another way of saying that he had no option but to write it, and that any complaints must be referred to higher level. If the bureaucrat was simply following orders, then one need not wonder too long about whose orders they were.

We established much earlier that, during the reformative campaign of the thirteenth century, there was a need for a text like Waddington's, which, unlike the diocesan constitutions and their appendages, was sufficiently pedestrian in language and content to prove readily comprehensible to an intellectually-broad spectrum of clerics. The medicine had to be made generally accessible and palatable. The vernacular language of the Manuel served the first end and its exempla the second. Co-operative distribution of medicine is the most effective way to combat an epidemic (even one of ignorance), and it is clear from the speed with which the Manuel was distributed throughout the country that such co-operation was achieved. It would seem probable that the Diocese of York to some degree enforced or managed this co-operation.

We shall see in the remainder of this study that the purpose of the Manuel, like that of other medicines, was subject to shrouding, alteration, and even perversion when it fell into the hands of independent agents.
In Appendix III some events in the medieval history of this village are examined. The Tempest family, who owned three copies of the *Manuel*, held the lordship of the village from 1268. Previous attempts to identify the author have been inconclusive or vaguely suggestive (see Chapter I, note 18). What follows is a positive identification. A detailed study of the evidence in Archbishop Gray's register (see next note) has until now never been attempted. The evidence presented here which does not derive from the register has never been noticed before.

2. The commonest version of the author's name in the surviving MSS. begins with the element 'Wid-,' (see the variants to line 12751, cited in the discussion of the Epilogue in the previous chapter). Only two copies offer 'Wad-.'. In the *Domesday Book* the village is called 'Widitum;' by the Middle English period it had become 'Waddington.' See F.W. Moorman, *The Place-Names of the West Riding of Yorkshire, Publications of the Thoresby Society* 18 (1910), p. 197. The MS. variants thus reflect an historical metamorphosis.
4. Bocland was also Dean of St. Martin's-le-Grand and canon and preacher of the collegiate house at Ripon. See A.F. Leach, *Visitations and Memorials of Southwell Minster, Camden Society* n.s. 48 (1891), p. 180, note.
9. See Leach's *Southwell Minster*, p. 198. This MS. has not been mentioned in any previous study of the *Manuel*. It may be St. John's 167 (which is described in note 103, below). The collection at the altar in the Minster included copies of the *Summa Summarum and Pars Oculi Sacerdotis* (see Leach, p. 198, including notes).
10. See Leach, p. 192 (including notes); on Lexington see Leach, p. 178.
Mannyng's life and writings are considered in Chapter III and Appendix IV.

13 See Leach, p. 182 (including notes).


16 See Chapter III and Appendix IV.


18 The account in Appendix III of the connection between Tempests and the Clifford family (who owned a copy of Idley's Instructions) may be expanded by noting that a W. de Clifford was a canon at Southwell during the 1280s (see W. Brown, ed., The Register of William Vickwane, SS 114 (1907), p. 11, and Brown, ed., The Register of John le Romeyn, part I, SS 123 (1913), p. 364).

19 See Arnould, pp. 384-5; Laird ('Source'), pp. 65-6.

20 Bibliographical information on editions and other MSS. of the texts mentioned in this review of MSS. of the Manuel is available in Arnould, Laird ('Source'), and J. Vising's Anglo-Norman Language and Literature (London, 1923), and will not be repeated here.


24 See C.E. Wright, ed., Fontes Harleiani (London, 1972), pp. 95, 131, and 378. Internal evidence suggests that the fragments were bound together by the mid-fourteenth century (see note 50, below).


27 The MS. is described in note 82, below.

28 On f. 18v (old foln. 20v) a now illegible name may be that of John Beuchamp (see Greenstreet, op. cit., p. 41).

29 This MS. is described in Chapter IV.

30 Greenstreet's reading of the Christian name ('Thomas', op. cit., p. 38) is incorrect. A 'b' struck through with the abbreviation for 'ier' is clearly visible.

31 See Chapter III and Appendix IV. On f. 18v (old foln. 20v) one finds beneath a shield the name 'Sir Morice le Brun.'
Notes for Chapter II

[3e Genealogist 1, p. 54.]


[S° See Chapter V.]

[4 See Appendix III.]

[4° Genealogist 1, pp. 54 and 121.]

[4° See Appendix III.]

[4° Genealogist 2, p. 30.]

[4° See Appendix IV.]

[4° Genealogist 2, p. 100.]

[4° See Appendix III.]

[4° Genealogist 2, pp. 100-1.]

[4° On Mannyng’s career, see Chapter III and Appendix IV.]

[5° This has not been noticed before. The first character in the surname is either ‘b’ or ‘t’; the latter yields a very unlikely name. The orthographical distinction between M.E. ‘Browne’ and ‘Bourne’ was not always observed in M.E. ‘Brown’ was usually rendered ‘Brune,’ and Bourne usually ‘Brunne’ but occasionally, as in the Domesday Book, ‘Brune.’ See E. Ekwall, The Concise Dictionary of English Place-Names, 4th ed. (Oxford, 1960), s.v. ‘Bourne’ and ‘Brendon Hills’ (or ‘Brown’), pp. 55, 63. Since the hand of the list in which the ‘b’rune’ entry appears compiled other notes on ff. 42v-43r (in the margins of the Origen text) and on f. 56v (the final leaf of Innocent’s text), it would seem likely that the fragments which form Harley 337 were bound together by the middle of the fourteenth century.]

[5° The table of contents begins with a statement of ownership (‘Liber monachorum sancti Edmundi’) and ends with a description of the Manuel (‘Tractatus...in gallicis in quo continentur...duodecim articuli fidel...’).]


[5° Liber Johannes Norton,’ fol. 3r.]

[5° See Appendix III. A late-fourteenth-century hand wrote an incomplete Middle English ‘poem’ on f. 128v which has not been noticed in The Index of Middle English Verse (ed. C. Brown and R. Robbins, New York, 1943) or in the supplement to the INEX (ed. Robbins and J.L. Cutler, Lexington, 1965). It begins ‘My swete bryd my love ys hud al at syn hert rote/ To 3e hyCra[y] byd. 3at yt be and 3ow mayt be my bote.’ Harley 4971 is described in Arnould, pp. 367-9 and Laird, ‘Source,’ p. 103; a fuller description appears in Herbert, Cat. Rom. III, pp. 288-9.]

[5° The MS. has been described in Arnould, pp. 394-8, in Arnould’s ‘Un Manuscrit Partiel du Manuel des Pachées,’ Romania 63 (1937), pp. 226-40, and in Laird, ‘Source,’ p. 131.]

[5° See Arnould, Romania 63, p. 229.]

[5° This MS., which begins with a fragmentary text of the Manuel followed by three saints’ lives (Bustace, Margaret, and Mary Magdalen), appears to have been owned during the seventeenth century by the Oxford antiquary Thomas Smith (d. 1710). See the descriptions in Arnould (Le Manuel), p. 392, and Laird, ‘Source,’ p. 79.]

[5° Ista sunt dona mihi data: de priore, xl²; de mascam [Nasham, Yorks., 7 miles N.W. of the Tempests’ seat at Studley], xl²; de gisbourn [in Cleveland], xl²; de graystaying [Grayston Plain, Yorks., 7 miles S. of Studley], xl²; de poklyngton [in Humberside, xx²; de fowne, xx; de berry xl²; de esche [Co. Durham, 2 miles from Lancaster, a Tempest seat], xii²; de helaw [Healaugh Park, site of an Augustinian priory from which Durham Priory held land from the thirteenth century (see R.A. Lomas and A.J. Piper, eds. Durham Cathedral Priory Rentals, SS 198 [1989 for 1986], p. 212); on Waddington’s possible connections]
with Healaugh see note 91, xxv; de Wessyngton [Co. Durham, 10 miles from Stanley, a Tempest seat (the Washington family owned MS. Gg.1.1 [q.v.]), xliv; de
mors [?Moorlesy, Co. Durham, where Durham Priory held land from the twelfth century (see Tomlin and Piper, p. 206)], xxv; de bursar., xliv.] The bursar and
prior mentioned cannot definitely be said to be those of Durham.

The name of Sir Thomas Tempest, fourth Baronet, of Stella, Co. Durham (1642-92), is inscribed on f. 1r.

Watson (Medieval Libraries, 2nd ed. supp., op. cit., p. 30) and Wright (Fontes Harleiani, op. cit., p. 325) suggest that it was a Durham MS. The MS. is
described in Arnould, pp. 365-7, and Laird (Source'), p. 90.

'The words 'epm. duemensis' are visible in an unclear note.

The name of Sir Thomas Tempest, fourth Baronet, is inscribed on f. 3r.

The Tempests' library is considered further in Appendix III. This MS. was briefly described by Arnould (pp. 385-6) and Laird (Source'), p. 109.

Wright believed it to be a Durham Priory MS. (Fontes, p. 325). The word 'Wygmor' appears in a scribbled s. xv note on f. 11v; places by this name exist
in Kent and in Hereford and Worcester.

The name of Sir Thomas Tempest, fourth Baronet, is inscribed on p. iii. In this description the contents of the MS. are not listed in the order in which
they appear; for further descriptions see Arnould, pp. 387-9, Laird ('Source'), pp. 48-9, and P. Meyer, 'Notice du MS. Rawlinson Poetry 241 (Oxford), Romania 29
(1900), pp. 1-84.

67. MS. Vernon is described in Chapter IV.

The original medieval foliation is in evidence occasionally; few leaves have been lost.

Lynham claims to have written for an unsophisticated patron: 'E pur mun
seignur aver/ Ki tant me deingna apreer,/ Kar cest art sauer voleit/ E pas le
latin ne entendeit./ Kar il n'esteit fors poi lettre,/ E pur ceo en romanz ai

In his prologue (which is directed to a woman named Aline) Gretham
suggests that the text (of over 20,000 lines) could be either read or heard; he
also explains his choice of language: 'Ma dame bien lai oi dire/ Que mult ame3
oir e lire/...Point de latine mettre ne wille/ Qe ceo resemblereit a orgoille/...E
si est ceo grant folie/ A lai parler latinerie/...Chescun deit estre a resoun
mis/ Par la langage dunt il est apris.' (f. 135r-v).

See Arnould, p. 391.

The text concludes (f. 470r) with a helpful recapitulation: 'Ces sunt les
xvii pointz qe partenent a confession: purement, hastiuement, voluntriment,
leament, entierement, soueneleement, humblement, vergonouement, pourouement,
discretelement, proprement, fermente, lermousement, simplement, dreiteulement,
vigorousement, et durableraent.'

This begins (f. 628r), typically, 'Ieo me rend couvable a nostre seignur
ibesu crist e al seint espirit treis persons e vn dieu en trinite, e a nostre
dame seinte marie...e a tuz seinz...'

Standard descriptions of the MS. appear in Arnould, pp. 389-91, and
Laird ('Source', p. 33); a lengthier study appears in P. Meyer's 'Les Manuscrits

See Meyer, Romania 15, p. 283, and E. Bernard, ed., Catalogi Librorum
Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae (Oxford, 1697), part II, p. 365, no. 272. On
Moore, see E.B. Fryde, et al., Handbook of British Chronology, 3rd ed. (London,
1986), pp. 245 and 263.

Viz., John Wessyngton, Prior from 1416 to 1446 (see Appendix III).

The MS. is described in Arnould, pp. 382-3, and Laird ('Source'), pp. 35-
40. MS. Pal.Lat. (s. xiii ex.) was on the continent by the mid-sixteenth
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century, when it was owned by Ulrich Fugger of Augsburg; it was thereafter at Heidelberg, and entered the Vatican’s collections during the first quarter of the seventeenth century. This MS. is described in Arnould, p. 383, in Laird (‘Source’), pp. 72-8, and in K. Christ, Die altrivarisischen Handschriften der Palatina, Beilste zum Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen 46 (1916), pp. 75-7. Nothing is known of the medieval ownership history of MS. Leeds (s. xiv’), which contains only the Manuel, and which like MS. HM was sold as part of the Duchess of Norfolk’s collections in 1925 (for descriptions see Arnould, p. 384, Laird (‘Source’), p. 41, and N.R. Ker’s Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries, vol. III (Oxford, 1983), p. 18). Nor is anything known of the ownership history of MS. Nottingham (formerly [s. xx] in the possession of Lord Middleton of Wollaton, Notts.), whose contents are precisely the same as those of HM (described in Arnould, p. 393, and Laird’s ‘Source,’ pp. 113-14).

The Brut is divided into 281 chapters.

On f. 142v, after a Latin prayer in a s. xiv hand.


On Mannyng’s exemplar, see Appendix V.

McKitterick, op. cit., p. 160; see note 52 for the signature in the MS. of the ME. prose translation.

On this currency, see Appendix I.

For a standard description, see Laird (‘Source’), pp. 119-21. The MS. is mentioned in Arnould, pp. 249-50, and unwittingly alluded to by H.E. Allen in her discussion of a MS. described by Samuel Pegge (see ‘The Manuel des Fechies and the Scholastic Prologue,’ Romanic Review 8 (1917), pp. 444-5). The Curator of Manuscripts at Princeton University Library, Dr. J. Preston, has kindly sent me her description of the MS. (published in ‘More Taylor Medieval Manuscripts,’ Princeton University Library Chronicle 47 (1985-6), p. 262), and Dr. M.R. Farrell, the curator of the Taylor Collection, has been extremely helpful with my further queries, and provided me with a very full description (unpublished, ca. 1978) compiled by the booksellers H.F. Kraus. Dr. Farrell believes that Taylor purchased the book from Kraus in 1978/9. On Phillipps’s purchase from Longman, see A.N.L. Munby, The Formation of the Phillipps Library up to the Year 1840, Phillipps Studies no. 3 (Cambridge, 1954), p. 149. On the recto of a flyleaf at the beginning of the MS. a late-sixteenth-century hand wrote ‘secreta mea mini The Hollands.’ An inserted s.xix' note by Shirley Woomler, an Exeter bookseller (see Laird, ‘Source,’ p. 120) indicates that the Hollands of Norfolk had owned the MS. perhaps until ca. 1700. Thomas Martin’s signature appears on f. 198r.

There is another Manuel MS. which was owned by a medieval woman. MS. Hatton (s. xiv, first quarter) is a single-text MS. to which an unrelated booklet containing Bishop Grosseteste’s Chasteau d’Amour (also in Harley 3860, Royal, Taylor, and York 7) was appended (for descriptions, see Arnould, pp. 373-4, Laird (‘Source’), pp. 134-5). Like most other Manuel MSS., it is neatly organized (rubrics, capitals, section markers, narration notations) and relatively free from significant annotation, and would thus appear to have been produced in a clerical, and probably monastic, milieu. By the middle of the fifteenth century the MS. seems to have fallen into secular hands, for on f. 138v (beneath text from Book VIII) the following note appears: ‘Thys boke gyffys dame Margaret Cockfeld to Marget [sic] Eyngham. In the Sere of oure lorde i.m’.ccciii.lili. To Margaret Eyngham pe fyne wyth crystes blessyng and myne.’ We have noted that Cockfelds appear in the Boroughbridge Roll and in the roll in Harley 337 (q.v.). Unlike Hatton, MS. Taylor seems to have been originally designed for a woman.

A comprehensive s. xiv med. table of contents on f. 217v indicates this.
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Fol. 81r; this text is also in Harley 3860.

To be 'chier tenue e volunters oie des tuz bons homes' (f. 86r).

With final remarks to 'celis qui cest escrit orrun ou lirrun' (f. 110r).

Vr la bone gent conforter/ E pur lalme amender' (f. 191v).

The text of the *Manuel* is organized with rubrics, paragraph markers, and initials up to the change of hand at f. 181v. The bestiary is illustrated with pen-and-ink drawings.


'Iste liber constat Johanni Clerk grocero a<e apothec>ario regis Edwardi quarti.'


The *De Poenitie* is addressed to 'treschiers freres & soers en deu' (f. 84r), the *Speculum* to 'noou gens de religion' (f. 103v). The *Manuel* is preceded by a poem on the Passion and prayers of St. Anselm in a slightly later hand (ff. 1r–4r), and the *Speculum* is followed (ff. 122v–126v) by three texts in a slightly later hand (precepts for religious people, a dialogue between the body and soul, and a poem on divine mercy).


See Arnould, pp. 372–3.


Described in Arnould, pp. 376–8 (where it is very seriously misdated s. xiv med.), Laird's 'Source,' p. 30; on its structure, see Appendix II. The scribe provides a unique prologue (printed in Arnould, p. 62) which describes nine divisions of the text, and which ends with the observation that 'Le queus ix liueres, entendaumeut parlus, funt souent les lisaunz, e les oyaunz maus lesser, e uertus enbracer' (Arnould's minor misreadings have been corrected here).


This house was founded by 1228 (*Medieval Religious Houses*, p. 272).

'Iste liber est de armario Monasterii beate Marie de Quareria quem qui subtraceret uel maliciouso elongauerit anathema sit, et interminabilem dei maledictionem incurrat' (f. 178r).


This MS. may be the second part of the present St. John's 167 (s. xiv first quarter, described Arnould, pp. 379–80, Laird ['Source'], p. 99), which contains two unrelated manuscripts, the first presenting the *Lumiere en Lais* only (also in Gg.1.1), the second the *Manuel* only. Unlike the *Lumiere* MS., the
Manuel MS. lacks consistent organization, and the carelessness of the first scribe of the latter MS. prompted a contemporary to intervene frequently with corrections. By the middle of the fifteenth century the second MS. (at least) was owned by a John Strelley, of Linby, Notts., 10 miles W. of Southwell Minster ('Iste liber constat Johanni Strelley de lyndeby' [fol. 157r]), a church in which, as we have noted, a copy of the Manuel is known to have rested during the mid-fourteenth century (see the discussion of the life of Waddington, above). The MS. passed through the hands of the Protestant preacher William Crashaw (d. 1626) and Henry Wriothesley, the third Earl of Southampton (one of Shakespeare's patrons) before Henry's son Thomas donated the book to St. John's in 1635 (this is clear from the book-plate on the front paste-down; for more on Southampton's donations, see H.R. James's *Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts of St. John's College, Cambridge* [Cambridge, 1913], pp. vi-viii and xiii).

See Arnould, p. 290. Brief mention of three further Manuel MSS. will conclude this review. MS. Greaves 51, most of which was probably copied by a man named Adam de Furches during the early fourteenth century, contains the Manuel (prefaced by a slightly later table of contents) and an Anglo-Norman text on the Passion of Our Lady (ending imperfectly in a later hand). The text of the Manuel is presented in a neat hand and orderly fashion (with paragraph markers, rubrics, side-notes), and was corrected frequently by a contemporary annotator. It is the sort of uncluttered book one might expect to have been clerically-produced. The original, costly, white leather binding survives. On the back paste-down the names 'John Burgens' and 'John de Prohin' appear in late s. xiv hands, along with an apparent reference to a place called 'Cronham,' which may be modern Cranham, Gloucs. For descriptions of this MS., see Arnould, pp. 374-5, Laird ('Source'), pp. 45-7. All that is known of the history of MS. B.N. fonds fr. 14959 (ca. 1300), which contains the Manuel followed by a few verse lines in a fifteenth-century hand, is that it was in the possession of the Abbey of Saint-Evroult before it entered the B.N. collection in 1839. For descriptions see Arnould, p. 380, Laird ('Source'), pp. 115-18, and H. Omont, ed., *Bibliothèque Nationale Cataloque Générale des Manuscrits Français*, vol. III (Paris, 1896), p. 289. Nothing is known of the ownership history of MS. York 7 (s. xiv inc.), which contains the Manuel and, in another hand, Bishop Grosseteste's *Chasteau d'Amour* (also in Taylor, Royal, Hatton, and Harley 3860), and whose reading of the Manuel is closely related to that of MS. B.N. For descriptions, see Arnould, pp. 380-1 and Laird's 'Source,' pp. 138-9.
Chapter III
The Text of Handlyng Synne

Introduction

Robert Mannyng transformed a manual on the law of confession designed for study by a general clerical readership into an entertaining, informative, and advisory poem on sin designed for selective reception by a local, socially-diverse group of intellectually-limited listeners and readers. His structural alterations were sweeping: he did not translate much of Waddington's Prologue, and completely omitted Book I (Articles of the Faith), the spurious Book VI (the later redaction of the sermons), Book VIII (theory and practice of prayer), the spurious Book IX (the shrill prayers), and Waddington's Epilogue, all of which were probably in his exemplar.¹ Waddington's Prologue and Epilogue were of course largely irrelevant in the new circumstances; Books I and VIII are somewhat removed from the theme of sin; Books VI and IX are generically incompatible with the rest of the text.² Mannyng also did not translate about 350 lines of Book VII,³ two exempla, and many repetitions, outdated observations, and other passages which seem not to have suited his tastes.⁴

He considerably expanded the Books which he did translate (II-V and VII). He added twelve new, entertaining tales (rather than exempla), many of which he seems to have composed himself; he transformed many of Waddington's exempla into tales, and found new sources for some of them;⁵ he doubled in length the treatment of the Sacrament of the Altar and turned that section into a separable booklet appropriate for oral presentation;⁶ he consistently clarified the extremely concise argument of his source; he continually introduced unsolicited advice, opinions, and digressions.⁷
The Text of *Handlyng Synne*

*Handlyng Synne* differs radically from its source not only in structure, but also in purpose, method of reception, intended audience, tone, style, and content.

(a) Purpose

Whereas Waddington at once (11. 3-5) claims that he will inform his readers of what to confess and then instruct them on how to confess, Mannyng's introductory remarks concerning the purpose of *HS* are idiosyncratic and circumlocutory:

Fadyr and Sone & holy goste,  
pat art o god of my3t es most,  
of...myJ and my3t hap, Dulwich.  
At py wurschyp shul we bygynne  
To shame pe fende & shew our synne—  
synne to shewe, vs to frame,  
sh...tol eschewe vs per, Dulw.  
God to wurschyp, pe fende to shame.  
Shameful synne ys gode to letë—  
Al pat men do, bope smale & grete.  
pe grete—withoutyn pruyyte—  
That ben commune to me & the,  
Of hem wyl y telle 3ow neede,  
As y haue herde & red yn dede.  
herd...d.I red herd and seyde, Dulw.  
(11. 1-12).

The first six lines state rhetorically that we shall begin to confess at the pleasure of the Almighty. Mannyng then says that confession is a good thing (7-8), and that he plans to tell his audience about the great common sins (9-12). After foreshadowing the contents of the poem in 11. 13-42 (lines largely derived from the *Manuel*), he explains for whom and why he wrote the poem:

For lewde men y vndyrtoke  
On englyssh tunge to make pys boke.  
For many ben of swyche manere  
pat talys and rymys wyl bleply here.  
Yn gamys & festys & at pe ale,  
Louve men to lestene trøteuale.  
le J telle, Dulw.  
pat may falles ofte to vylanye,  
To dedly synne or oper folye.  
For swyche men haue y made pis ryme,  
pat pey may weyl dyspende here tyme,  
And pereyn sumwhat for to here,  
To leue al swyche foul manere,  
And for to kynne knowe perynne,
It appears that Mannyng wrote for people who did not understand Latin (and perhaps also French—see the next passage), and who usually listened to trifles when playing, feasting, or drinking. He offered them the poem as a means of honest recreation, with the hope that it might help them stay out of trouble during their spare time.

Mannyng also wrote his more sizable (25,000-line) historical Chronicle in order to provide good fellows with respectable diversion. The Prologue to that text is admirably cogent:10

Als Robert Mannyng wryten it fand
& on Inglysch has it schewed
Not for pe lerid bot for pe lewed--
For po pat in pis land won
pat pe Latyn no Frankys cone--
For to haf solace & gamen
In felawschip when pai sitt samen.
And it is wisdom for to wytten
pe state of pe land, & haf it wryten.

Als pai [i.e., Wace and Langtoft] haf wryten & sayd,
Haf I alle in myn Inglis layd
In symple speche as I couthe,
pat is lightest in mannes mouthe.
I mad noght for no discours,
Ne for no seggers no harpours,
But for pe luf of symple men
pat strange Inglis can not ken.

I made it not for to be praysed,
Bot [plat pe lewed men were aysed. [plat] MS. reads 'at.'

And men besoght me many a tyme
To turne it bot in light ryme.
pai said if I in strange it turne,
To here it manyon suld skurne.

And perfore for pe comonalte
pat blythely wild listen to me," On light lange I it began,
For luf of pe lewed man.'"

I trausayled for 3our solace.

Danz Robert of Malton--pat 3e know--
Did it wryte12 for felawes sake,
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When pai wild solace make.
(4-12, 71-8, 83-4, 117-20, 123-6, 134, 142-4).
*Cp. 11. 7-8 of HS, cited above. *Cp. 1. 46 of HS, cited above.

In both of his Prologues, Mannyng seems to regard himself as a wholesome entertainer of ordinary folk.

The second half of the Prologue of Handlyng Synne provides receivers with a rambling, tripartite exegesis of the title (which is in fact a mistranslation of the A.H. title). Mannyng states first that we inevitably 'handle sin' by sinning:

Men clepyn pe boke handlyng synne h...s.l h. of s., Dulw.

... We handel synne every day--
In wurde and dede, al we may, wu...m.J wu. or d. with oper foly, Dulw.
Lytyl or mochel synne we do: a...t.J pe flesch techith, Dulw.
pe fend and oure flesh tysyn vs perto. For pys skyle hyt may be seyde
Handlyng synne for oure mysbreyde,
For every day & every oure
We synne, pat shal we bye ful soure.
(80, 89-96).

He thereafter outlines and recommends the commonest form of 'handling' the sins which one has committed, viz., through contrition, confession, and satisfaction:

Anoper handlyng per shuld be--
Wyp shryfte of moupe to clense pe. A...h.J And ofte handlyng it, Dulw.
Handyl py synne yn py pou3t,
Lytyl & mochel, what pou hast wroght.
Handyl py synne to haue drede:
Noyng but peyn ym parfoire mede.
Handyl py synnes & weyl hem gesse
How pey fordo al py godenesse.
Handyl py synnes & weyl hem euene,
Eilles forbarre pey pe blys of heuene. E...pey1 How pei f., Dulw.
Handyl hem at onys everychone,
Noght one by hymself alone.
Handyl so to ryse from alle--
pat none make pe eft falle--
With shryfte of moupe & wyl of berte,
And a party with penaunce smerte.
pys ym a skyl--pat hyt may be tolde--
Handlyng synne many a folde.
(97-114).

Then he explains that the text itself offers yet another way of 'handling sin'--by learning gradually about the species of sin. He says that one can 'handle'
sins in this way simply by opening the book anywhere, and browsing. There is a lot in the book, he notes, so a lot of browsing will be needed if one is to learn about all of the species of sin. He warns that there is no way to read the book once and understand everything in it. So one needs to 'handle' the book often:

Handlyng yn speche ys as weyl  
As handlyng yn dede every deyl.  
On pys manere handyl py dedys,  
And lestene and lerne whan any hem redys:  
For eveywhere ys bygynnyng of synne;  
Whedyr pou wylt opon pe boke,  
Pou shalt fynde begynnyng oueral to loke. 

It would appear that Mannyng considered the poem to be a source of honest (esp. public) recreation, and also perhaps a (private) directory of sin, from which readers could sample at their leisure, and by which they could thus gradually learn a bit about the species of sin.14 Dipping into the poem from time to time thus might prove profitable:

pey [i.e., God, the Virgin, and the saints] 3eue vs grace ry3t so to deme,Vs to profyt, and god to queue.  
Waddington's poem, in contrast, was a practical tract on the law of confession designed to inform its readers of what to confess, to teach them how to confess, and thus to prepare them for engaging in the act of confession. Waddington recommended that his poem be studied carefully, and intimated
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consistently his desire to amend his readers' behavior and to promote the sacramental means of such amendment. Waddington's Prologue is laden with unmistakable signals of his poem's reformatory purpose:16

(i) E ses pechés mut amender,  
Ky cest écrit veut regarder.  
(11-12 [Arnould]).

(ii) Le Manuel serra apellé  
Kar en meyn deit estre porté.  
L'alme aprent rectifier:  
A chescun deit estre le plus chier.  
(63-6).

(iii) Cuntes nus mettrum vus aucuns  
Sicum les seins nus unt cunte,  
Pur plus fere hayr peché.  
(80-2).

(iv) Pur ce nul trop hastivement  
Cet escrit lise nomsment.  
Deu fez le deit rehercer  
Ky s'alme vodra amender.  
(73-8).

(v) Si aukun del oyr seiyt amende,  
Deu de cyel en seiyt gracé.  
(117-8).

Mannyng does not translate passages i-ii and v. He mentions that he will include 'tales, adventures, and marvels,' but does not claim, as Waddington does in passage iii, that these have a practical purpose (see HS. 11. 131-6, cited above). Although Mannyng does recommend that private readers wishing to learn from the poem should browse about the poem frequently, he does not suggest, as Waddington does in passage iv, that the text should be studied repeatedly from cover to cover, or that the text will 'amend the souls' of its receivers. The Manuel is designed to reform methodically studious readers; Handlyng Synne is designed to divert and to inform intermittently casual listeners and readers.
Mannyng dilutes or eliminates the reformative content and tone of several crucial passages in the body of his source. Where Waddington stresses that ecclesiastical law demands annual confession and communion, Mannyng suggests that the 'old law' demanded annual confession, while the 'new law' is better because it demands annual communion:

Qe a la pasche ne receiuent le cors Dee c.J fi3, B.
E issi vnt l'an vtrepassé,
Teus as Deu mult manassé.
E cec est resun & equité:
Par la viel lai & le nouvel
Mustre pect estre lur peché mortel
Ki al meins vnt trespassé,
Qe seint eglise ad comandé
Qe home de age chescun ané
Seit confes de tut sun peché
E en signe de creisteneté
Seit vne feihe acoumié.
(7499-510 [Sacrament of the Altar (E.E.T.S.)]).

If Mannyng's principal aim were to promote observance of the law of confession, one would not expect him to remove the only blatant description of that law present in his source. This excision occurs in Mannyng's Sacrament of the Altar booklet. If he intended to promote anything in the booklet, it would seem to have been communion, not confession.

Whereas Waddington begins Book VII with a wish that he may amend his receivers, Mannyng begins with a wish that his writing should keep us all from sin, a statement which recalls his earlier claim (in the Prologue) that he would provide sinless recreation for his audience:
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Ma alme, du3 sire, enlumine3,
E chose dire me grante3
Dunt vus, Ihesu, a paié3
Sei3 à tun people amendé3.
(8659-62 [prologue to the Virtues section of Book VII]).

pou, Ihesu, ly3t my soule withynne
And graunte me swyche to bygynne
t.7 thyng, Osb.
pat hyt move be pe to queme
And vs alle fro synne Jeme.
(11311-14).

Whereas at one stage in Book VII Waddington practically orders his readers to confess, Mannyng at the same point offers only praise of the efficacy of frequent confession:

Pur ceo, si le maufe haie3,
Voluntes vus confesse3.
(8821-2 [4th Virtue]).

3yf pou wylt make pe deuy1 shent,
And withstonde hys tycement,
With no pyng mayst pou do hym so wo
As loue ofte to shryfte go.
(12015-18).

Where Waddington emphasizes through a rare direct address to his audience that excuses must not be made during confession, Mannyng simply describes the 'unthrift' of making excuses:

Garde3 bien, tresdu3 frere,
De vus escuser en nule manere
Al hure quant vus confesse3.
(9313-15 [2nd Thing to Avoid]).

3yt per ys an vnpryfte    a.1 anoper, Osb.; v.J vpprlft, Folg.
pat dop moche skape yn shryfte:
pat pou defendest pe fro ply3t
And puttest py synne on God almy3t.
(12339-42).

Where Waddington assumes that his readers will be confessing in the future, Mannyng speaks hypothetically about his receivers’ confession:

Quant vus peche3 lesse3 cunt3r  1.7 couent, R.
Ou circumstances neis vblier.  a.J ne deuez, R.
(9381-2 [3rd thing to Avoid]).

When pou tellest but pe grete,
pe smale synnes pan wylt pou lete.
pese clerkys kalle hem cyrcumstancys,
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To the grete synnes are pay puruyances. 17
(12421-4).

Where Waddington draws attention to the benefits of confession in this world and in the next, Mannyng presents instead an aside on the perquisites which priests offer to penitents:

Car cil qe ta confessiun orruit
Pur vus prier tenu serrunt.
...
Qe confes estes pleinement,
Dunc passere3 [i.e., the day of judgement] plus seurement.
(9843-4, 9855-6 [3rd Point]).

For pou shalt be yn alle preyers
Of alle pe prestes pat pe haue shryue
As longe tym as ever pey lyue.
For pey are holde parvnto:
pe order of prest wyl hyt be so.
(11430-4).

Whereas Waddington assumes at the end of Book VII that he has said enough about confession (presumably to allow his readers to confess competently), and that learned men would be available to explain to his readers the significance of the Latin 'circumstances,' Mannyng claims that his readers have learned 'a bit' (see l. 11885, below) about how to confess, but adds that it is a priest's job to know the Points of confession and to teach them to simple folk. 18 Waddington seems to have thought that his responsibility was to instruct his readers on the broad points of confession, and the priest's to cover the details. Mannyng does not appear to regard his HS as anything more than mildly informative, and seems to think that priests, rather than poets, are obliged actually to instruct people on the practice of confession:

Plus de confessiun ne dirai.
Kar suffist, sicum jeo crai.
Nepurkant, matere les voil doner,
Ki plus vodrupt rimer,
Vers en latin ici metrai,
Sicum des mestres apris ad.
Le clerk ke les vus lira
A vus de buche les espundera.
Plus plainement vus purra dire
Ke jeo par rime ne pus escrire.
(Verse lines of the General Conclusion to the Points19).
Mannyng planned to offer his audience wholesome recreation with informative potential, rather than staid information and instruction with reformative intention. His purpose differs from Waddington's, and demands that he dilute and/or excise much of the reformative content and tone present in his source.

While Mannyng seems to have thought himself an entertainer and informer, rather than an instructor and reformer, he frequently assumes the role of an advisor. Yet the oblique 11. 97-114 of the Prologue (cited earlier) and some vague statements near the end of the poem (cited below) are the only passages in the poem in which he seems to attempt to encourage the practice of confession. Immediately after failing to reproduce Waddington's claim that Book VII should amend God's people (see MP 8659-62 and HS 11311-14, cited above), Mannyng adds to Waddington's explanation of the theme of VII a wish that God help us on our way against the fiend:

De confessionum nomement,  
Dunt mester vnt tant souent  vntl auom, B.  
(8663-4 [Prologue to the Virtues of Book VIII]).

Namly of shryfte so to seye  soj now, Rodley, for, Osborn.  
pat we mow make vs redy wey  A3ens pe fende pat ysoure fo.  
parto God graunte vs alle to go.  
(11315-18).

In his transition to Book VII, a passage which probably draws from the one cited immediately above, Mannyng expresses the hope that all of us will confess before we die:

Of pys sacrament wyl y blynne,  
Of shryfte to telle y wyl bygynne  for of s. wyll I nowe b., Osb.  
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God 3yue me grace so to seye  
Of shryfte to shewe pe ry3t weye  
pat we receyue, are we be went,  
Withoute synne pys sacrament.  
(11397-302).

At the end of Tale 66 (Devil Blinded by Penitent's Confession) Mannyng adds a suggestive and slightly incongruous afterthought:

pe holy man come pan to pe deuyl,  
And bad he shulde do no man euyl,  
But go to helle, pere he come fro,  
Buer to dwelle yn pyne and wo.  
parfore y rede pat we bygynne  
To shryue vs of alle our synne.20  
(12247-52 (seventh Virtuel).

Mannyng ends his poem by reminding his audience that confession is useless without contrition and satisfaction, and that satisfaction includes avoiding sin after confession. He appears to imply that the poem, as a directory of sin, might prove particularly helpful after confession, as a guide to the sins to avoid (see 11. 12623-4, cited below). In his final prayer he asks that when we do confess, we confess well. He does not say that the poem will help us to confess well:

parfore, gode men, wyte 3e weyl:  
Shryfte sauep nat alone eche dyl  
But 3e haue gode repentaunce  
And of fory3uene gode affyaunce,  
And yn gode wy3 3ow to withholde  
Fro pe synnes pat before are tolde.  
God graunte vs grace swyche shryfte to make,  
And foroure synne swyche penaunce take  
pat we be never more ateynt  
For fals shryuyng, ne for feynt.  
But graunte vs alle vs self to 3ame,  
And yn oure shryfte Ihesu, to queme. Amen.  
(12619-30).

Mannyng transformed an informative and instructive tract on the law of confession designed to reform methodically studious readers into an entertaining and mildly informative and advisory poem on sin designed to provide listeners with respectable amusement and readers with an opportunity to learn a bit about sin by browsing through the text, browsing which might, it
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seems, prove especially beneficial after confession. This change of purpose creates another 'species' in the 'catechetical genre'—the story-book/directory of sin.²¹

(b) Reception, Intended Audience, Authorship

We have already noted that Mannyng wrote *Handlyng Synne* for those who could not understand Latin (and possibly also French) as an alternative form of public recreation and also as a somewhat informative book on sin for private perusal. He thus appears to have expected to attract groups of listeners and some individual readers. His expectations seem reasonable when one considers that, during the early fourteenth century, literacy in the vernacular among 'ordinary folk' was beginning to expand, but was certainly not widespread.²²

Waddington wrote for an intellectually-diverse group of clerical readers. Mannyng wrote for a socially-diverse group of intellectually-limited listeners and readers. Mannyng broadly directs his poem 'To alle crystyn men vndir sunne' (1. 57), then gets a bit more specific:

And to gode men of Brunne—
And speciali alle be name
pe felaushepe of Symprynghame—
Roberd of Brunne gretep Sow,
In al godenesse pat may to pow. to be, Dulwich. (58-62 [Prologue]).

Mannyng appears to have been born in the village of Bourne, Lincolnshire (the site of an Arroasian abbey of Augustinian canons²³), and to have lived for at least fifteen years at the Gilbertine double-house at Sempringham:²⁴

Of Brunnewake yn Kesteuene— É.1 supplied from Dulw.; Harl. and Bodl.
Syxe myle besyde Sympryngham evene— read 'Brymwaeg,' Foig. reads 'Bringwake.'
Y dwelled yn pe pryorye b.1 fra, Dulw.
Fyftene Sere yn cumpanye— pe1 pat, Dulw.
In pe tyme of gode dane Ione c.1 good c., Dulw.
Of Camelton, pat now ys gone.
In hys tyme was y pere ten Jeres, m.1 gode m., Dulw.
And knewe and herd of hys maneres. I...CJ John John Clatton, Dulw.
Sypyn with dane Ione of Clyntone

- 137 -
The Text of *Handlyng Synne*

Fyue wyntyr wyp hym gan y wone.  
Dane Felyp was mayster pat tyme  
pat y began pys englyssh ryme.  
pe Seres of grace fyl pan to be  
& poussand & pre hundred & pre.  
In pat tyme turnede y pys  
On englyssh tunge--out of frankys  
Of a boke as y fonde ynne.  
Men clepyyn pe boke handlyng synne.  
(63-80 [Prologue]).

In the first two lines of the above passage Robert of Bourne specifies that he is from the village of Bourne in Kesteven, Lincolnshire, which rests, he says, precisely six miles from Sempringham. Bourne is located seven modern miles south of Sempringham. Mannyng's geographical description of his home town is not repeated in the *Chronicle*, but is ratified by a rubric on f. 72r of MS. Lambeth Palace 131 which states that the *Chronicle* was 'transposita in lingua materna per Robertum de Brunne iuxta Depyng,' Deeping St. James, Lincs., the site of a Benedictine priory, is seven miles south-east of Bourne.27

Mannyng then informs us (11. 65-6) that he lived in 'that priory' (i.e., at Sempringham) for fifteen years. He says (11. 67-70) that his first ten years in the priory fell within the 'time' of John of Camelton. Camelton is known to have been prior of Sempringham at least from 1298-1312. Mannyng adds (11. 71-2) that during his final five years at the priory he 'lived with' John of Clinton. Clinton is known to have been prior of Sempringham at least from 1325-31. Between 1313 and 1324 documents simply refer to the prior as 'John,' the Christian name shared by both Camelton and Clinton. Mannyng seems to imply that he spent a fifteen-year stretch at the priory, rather than a series of visits amounting to fifteen years.28

The poet continues by saying (11. 73-6) that when he began writing the poem—in 1303—a man named Philip was master of the Gilbertine Order. Philip of Burton was master of the Order from 1298 to 1332. John of Clinton succeeded Burton as master.29 It seems probable that Mannyng's remark (1. 77)
that he wrote the poem during 'that time' refers to the period during which Burton was master, rather than to the single year 1303; it is possible, however, that it refers to the fifteen years which the author spent at Sempringham. 30

Although Mannyng began Handlyng Synne in 1303, it seems clear that he did not compose the Prologue until 1332 or later (i.e., until Burton's reign had ended), and thus may have worked on the poem intermittently for thirty or more years. It is possible that he released certain segments of his work before completing the final version: the two earliest surviving manuscripts witnessing HS--Simeon and Vernon--contain only the Sacrament of the Altar booklet, while a later HS--II.4.9--contains only the Commandments section. 31 Mannyng seems to imply in the passage under review that he began HS while in residence at Sempringham. One can only hypothesize that the fifteen years he spent at Sempringham were 1302-17. 32

It would seem extremely unlikely that a person unaffiliated with the Gilbertine Order would have been allowed to spend fifteen years of his life in a Gilbertine priory. It would seem equally unlikely that a Gilbertine lay-brother would have been able to devote thirty or so years to considered tinkering with an Anglo-Norman tract on the law of confession. It would seem likely, then, that Mannyng was a Gilbertine canon. 33 Hypothesizing that he became a canon a few years before he began Handlyng Synne, perhaps ca. 1300, when aged 20 or more, we may suggest that he was over fifty years old when he finally wrote the Prologue. 34

A passage in the Chronicle suggests that Mannyng was in Cambridge about a year or so after he began writing Handlyng Synne, and that he witnessed there a graduation feast held by Robert Bruce (King of Scotland 1306-29) in honor of Bruce's younger brother Alexander, a student at the University: 35

Of arte he [i.e., Alexander] had pe maistrie; he mad a coruen kyng
In Cantebrige, to pe clerige, or his broper were kyng.
Sipen was never non of arte so pat sped--
Ne before bot on pat in Cantebrigge red.
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Robert mad his fest, for he was pore pat tyme,
& he sauh alle pe gest pat wrote & mad pis ryme.26

In 1290 the Gilbertine Order founded a college at Cambridge (St. Edmund's) for
the education of its canons.27 Although there is no evidence of Mannyng's
matriculation at the Gilbertine college, it would be surprising if a canon
simply passing through town were able to attend a feast at the University for
so prominent a student.28 The scenario of a young canon of literary promise up
at his Order's college at Cambridge for study does not, of course, seem at all
improbable. His presence at the feast would seem to indicate that he was
socially-active to some extent while at Cambridge, and that he had mingled with
royalty at least once in his life. His introduction to tale 34 (Cambridgeshire
Miser-Parson) seems to confirm that he did spend some time in Cambridgeshire:

Yn Chambrygshyre, yn a toune,
Y herd telle of a persoune.
(6173-4).29

The Prologue to the Chronicle provides us with further information about
the poet's life:

Of Brunne I am—if any me blame— 135
Robert Mannyng is my name.
Blissed be he of God of heuene
pat me—Robert—with gude wille neuene.
In pe third Edwardes tyme was I
When I wrote alle pis story— 140
In pe hous of Sixille I was a throwe.
Danz Robert of Malton—pat 3e know—
Did it wryte for felawes sake,
When pai wild solace make.
(135-44).

After an apparent apology for his rusticity (1. 135), similar to that in the
Manuel's Epilogue (11. 12736-41), Mannyng reveals here his surname (1. 136 [also
see 1. 4]). He would seem to have written the Chronicle between 1327 (the
beginning of Edward III's reign—cf. 1. 139) and 1338:

What tyme I left pis lote, pe day is for to witen:
Idus pat is of May* left I to write pis ryme,
E letter & Friday bi ix pat 3ere 3ede prime.
(Chronicle, final lines, ed. Hearne, vol. II, p. 341; *MS. reads maif).
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The scribal colophon on f. 195r of the Inner Temple MS. of the Chronicle expands on this statement: 'Expliciunt gesta Britonum & Anglorum in lingua materna per Robertum Mannyaing transumpta. Anno Christi millesimo, ccc'='tricesimo viii Idus Maii, littera dominicali d. prima .ix. tempore Regis Edwardi tercii a conquestu .xi°.' Mannyng was thus probably at least in his late fifties when he finished the Chronicle.\(^40\)

The poet then adds in an apparent aside that he was in the Gilbertine double-house at Sixhills 'for a while' (l. 141).\(^41\) He may be implying here that he was at Sixhills for the 'while' it took him to write the Chronicle, which was probably a very long 'while' indeed. There may be some humor in the aside, just as there appears to be in HS when Mannyng claims that that poem is for everyone under the sun, and especially for the good folks at Brunne and the fellows at Sempringham.\(^42\) Both passages seem to attempt to engage the local intended receivers with a reference to them and with a self-effacing allusion to the poet’s relationship to them.

Mannyng thereafter claims that he wrote the Chronicle for 'fellows' at the request of Robert of Malton (ll. 142-3).\(^43\) It would seem probable that the 'fellows' concerned were those at Sixhills. The identity of Robert of Malton has never been established. The respectful prefix 'danz,' which also precedes Mannyng's reference to Camelton, Clinton, and Burton in HS (cf. ll. 67-8, 71, and 73), would suggest that Malton was a man of some prominence, and Mannyng himself assumes that all of the fellows at Sixhills know of this Malton.

In Chapter II we noted that the house at Sixhills provided a good deal of the annual revenue supporting a chantry (founded 1241/2) in Southwell Minster, and that Sixhills and Southwell enjoyed a close and friendly relationship during the writing careers of both Waddington and Mannyng. Waddington, it will be recalled, received grants of land in Southwell from the Archbishop of York, may have been at one point Bailiff of the Archbishop's Manor of Southwell, and
In 1327, when Mannyng may have been just beginning his work on the *Chronicle*, he appears to have benefited from and executed the will of a Lincoln woman of means named Avece de Crossyeby:

> To Sir Robert de Brunne in Lincoln, chaplain, ten shillings...To Sir Robert de Brunne, chaplain, aforesaid, one goblet without a foot, which is called 'Nutte'...I ordain as my executors of this my testament, Sir Robert de Brunne of Lincoln, chaplain, and Hugh le Bower in Lincoln...

The present testament was proved before me, the dean of the Christianity of Lincoln, in the church of All Saints, Lincoln, III Ides September, mccc.xxvii, and administration of the goods of the defunct was granted to Sir Robert de Brunne (sic*), chaplain, and Richard Gunne of Lincoln, the executors, Hugh le Bower the co-executor refusing for certain and lawful reasons to undertake the burden of administration...

The present testament was lawfully proved in respect of the lay fee before William de Bliton, mayor of the city of Lincoln...and the executors were directed to execute it according to the last will of the testatrix...*

Gilbertine canons were permitted to serve in parish churches,* and this document would seem to imply that Mannyng did so in Lincoln ca. 1327. There was a Gilbertine house in Lincoln,* and Sempringham and Sixhills are both within twenty miles of the city. Mrs. Crosseby's beneficiaries included the Augustinian canons at Torksey (10 miles N.W. of Lincoln), the Premonstratensian canons at Barlings (5 miles N.E. of Lincoln), the Augustinians, Franciscans, Dominicans, and Carmelites of Lincoln, and, more substantially, her own parish church in the city (St. Cuthbert's).

We know less about Mannyng's life than about Waddington's. Born in rural Lincolnshire probably before 1280, becoming a canon most likely before 1300, beginning *Handlyng Synne* in 1303, possibly going up to Cambridge for a spell shortly thereafter, spending fifteen years at Sempringham, apparently not completing *HS* until the 1330s, perhaps engaging in some pastoral work in Lincoln in the late 1320s, then spending an indeterminate period of time—conceivably over a decade—at Sixhills while writing the *Chronicle*, Mannyng
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seems to have enjoyed a somewhat relaxing lifestyle, often remaining with the fellows of his Order, but also having contact with the laity and probably also with the folks in his home town. He wrote HS for people he knew, and transformed his source into an enjoyable story-book/directory of sin that could be performed in public at social events and could be taken away and read randomly and at leisure by individuals who wanted gradually to learn a bit about the sins.

Waddington, born in rural Lancashire probably near the end of the twelfth century, became an archiepiscopal justice with wide responsibilities and a hectic schedule, and paced the top corridor of ecclesiastical power, as it were, for over thirty years. He wrote a dry reformatory text on the law of confession designed for wide circulation among clerics, and his poem seems almost instantly to have circulated across the country, quite possibly with the help of the ecclesiastical hierarchy which he served.

Unlike Waddington, Mannyng does not seem to have risen far above the circumstances of his birth; nor does he seem to have been, as Waddington was, a bearer of great responsibilities and a considerable medieval traveller. Mannyng liked ordinary people and good fellowship, and appears to have remained where such could be found. He was a local poet who wrote for local people. The villagers of Bourne were perhaps more likely to hear Handlyng Synne recited when 'playing, feasting, or at the ale,' while the varied fellowship at Sempringham might be better equipped to avail themselves of both of the recommended methods of reception (i.e., public listening and private reading).

Mannyng likewise wrote the Chronicle for his fellows. Neither of his poems circulated widely. Only two manuscripts of the Chronicle survive, and only four MSS. attest to the complete text of Handlyng Synne.
The implications of tone on reception and audience

Waddington altered his tone when he altered his purpose. He wanted Books I-V to be informative, and adopted a detached, bland approach to suit that purpose. He aimed in Books VII-VIII to instruct his readers on the theory and practice of certain rituals, and quite appropriately assumed in those Books a tone which varied from the dryly informative to the intimately instructive. He wrote for a wide and general clerical audience and employed direct addresses only a few times in his poem. There was no reason for him to approach his audience in a spirit of familiar conviviality.

Mannyng, on the other hand, aimed to provide ordinary, undecuated folk (with whom he was very familiar) with entertainment for their leisure hours, and also to offer some of these people the opportunity gradually to become somewhat informed on the subject of sin by reading the poem privately during their spare time. He adopted a frank and familiar tone which suited perfectly his purpose and his audience. He directly addressed both groups and the individual receiver on many occasions, but the majority of his direct addresses are to groups, and almost all of these appear immediately before and/or after the 'tales, adventures, and marvels.' These facts suggest that he designed the text primarily for public performance, that he assumed that the tales would prove for his listeners the most attractive features of the poem, and that he regarded the tales as a platform on which he could speak to his listeners directly.

Mannyng was not a reformer, but rather an opinionated entertainer, informer, and advisor. He addresses many social groups during the course of the poem, and assigns many tales for the particular consideration of certain groups. It is questionable, however, whether all of the groups which he addresses were represented in his original intended audience. The rich and covetous of the world, for example, form the group which attracts the greatest
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number of direct addresses, and which is the butt of some of Mannyng's most peevish criticisms. One suspects that Mannyng included these addresses to rally and rouse the rabble for whom, as it were, he wrote, rather than actually to gain the attention of pompous 'lords' unwise enough to seat themselves among the rabble for the public performance of the poem. Mannyng wrote for low folk, and one can, of course, occasionally gain the sympathy of the low folk by condemning the high folk. As we shall see, the poet's direct addresses to women also seem rhetorical.

Mannyng directly addressed his 'lewde' audience as a whole several times concerning subjects of particular interest to them. Superstition is an offspring of ignorance; Mannyng warns his receivers not to put their faith in dreams:

per beyn so many dremys yn veyne
yn v.l & weyn, II.4.9.
pat no man wote no certeyn
w. nol tellyn, II.4.9.
But pey pay beyn with god pryue--
To whom ys graunted swych pryng to see. ρ.l sy3th, II.4.9.
(Swych men desaruep nat pe devyl--
des.J dysteynyth, II.4.9, Dulw.
pey haue no grace to knowe hys euyl.)
For they ban grace to wythstande al e.,
II.4.9.
Ellys may no man fynde hem stable,
fl knowyn, Dulw.
So ben dremys deseyuable:
For dremys so deceynabyl, II.4.9; For dremys ben so dysteynable, Dulw. des.J destainable, Folg.
3yf pou telle hem, pan mayst pou erre,
And 3yf pou brow hem--pat is wel werre. pat...well 3it is it pe, Dulw.
For pou mayst dreme of sum euyl pryng
of s.l ry3t, Dulw.
pat may turne to better for py preyng.
for ρ.l yowre, II.4.9.
pou leudman 3yf gode tent:
Trow noght a3en pe commaundement.
(465-78, [1st Commandment, after allusions to Cato's dismissal of dreams and to Nebuchadnezzar's dream]).

The public airing of private practices is an effective comic technique when employed with the degree of delicacy demanded by the context and audience; Mannyng assures his receivers that, when it comes to sexual practices, they are quite as knowledgeable as any expert on the subject:

pou lewed man knowest also
k...a.J pou knowes well, Osb.
What ys to lete, what ys to do.
d.l d. yl, Osb.
pou knowyst as weyl every poynyt [i.e., of Lechery]
As pe prest pat ys anoynt,
And wost what peryl ys perynne.
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pou mayst no3t say to fende py synne.
(7413-18 [Lechery, after the introductory outline of the seven varieties of the sin]).

Mannyng designed the Sacrament of the Altar booklet so that it could be performed orally on its own, and, as we have noted earlier, he included a separate set of indications of reception and audience at the end of the booklet:7

3e men pat are now yn present.
pat haue herd me rede pys sacrament--
How ouer alle pyng hyt hap powere,
pe sacrament of pe autere--
As y have here to 3ow shewed--
Nat to lered onely but eke to lewed--
3e lewed men, y telle hyt 3ow,--
pe se clerkys kun hyt weyl ynow:
Pray we alle oure creatoure--
pe sacrament oure sauyoure--
pat body and soule he wyl vs saue,
And we hym loue, and he vs haue.
(10799-810).

The poet wisely sidesteps certain sleeping dogs of superstition:

Lewed man, pou shalt cursyng [i.e., of priests] doute,
And to py prest pou shalt nat stoute.
Be he wykked or be he gode
pou shalt to hym be polemode.
...
Yn sacrilege y tolde a tale,
How cursyng brewep moche bale,
pat alle pe 3ere [i.e., parishioners] hopped aboute
pat wulde nat pe prestys byddyng doute.
(10921-4, 10933-6 [Sacrament of Penance, cross-reference to Tale 50 (Sacrilegious Carollers)]).

Finally, he appears to warn his receivers that their next confession should not be like their last court appearance, as it were:

pou lewed man, y forbede pe weyl,
pogh pe prest aske, bewreys pou no deyl.
Bewreys weyl pyn owne dede,
But none ouper, y pe forbede.
Y tolde langer yn myn auys:
Loke algate py prest be wys.
(11639-44 [8th Point, introduction to Tale 63 (The Pharisee)]).

The image of women as nagging, vain, and vulnerable temptresses is, few would dispute, an ancient one, and Mannyng's failure to stray from it when he
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addresses women directly might imply that he anticipated an audience composed primarily of men. Mannyng asks women please not to pester:

And 3e wyuys penketh on pys cas:
Werryg nat for lytyl trespas.
pey pat wyl gladly warye  pey For 3e, Dulw.
Hem worryg god & seyt maryl.
(1287-90 [4th Commandment, at end of Tale 6 (Cursing Mother)]).

He warns them against vanity:

Or 3e wymmen also comunly
Wulde be kallede madame or lady--
Al pys comp of grete pryde.
(3411-13 [Pride, at end of Tale 20 (Monk and Knight who Loved New Fashions)]).

He advises them of the consequences of tempting those who (presumably) desire innocence:

Lokep, 3e wymmen, what 3e do!
3yf 3e dyd oght, dope no more so--
Or harder penaunce with bytter teres
Shul 3e do here or elles wheres.
And shame byt ys ever aywhare e...a.l for to fare, Osb.
To be kalled a prestes mare.
...
3e wommen penkep on pys tale,
And takep byt for no troteuale.
(7975-80, 8079-80 [Lechery, introduction and conclusion to Tale 43 (Priest's Concubine)]).

He reminds them that there are no free lunches, so to speak:

For whan a lechour hap 3yue hys mede,
pan hopep he weyl pat he shal spede.
Y rede 3e wommen 3yuep gode entent:
For mede 3e wyl sone consent.
Many one for mede dop ful euyl.
Men sey ofte mede ys pe deuyl.
(8325-30 [Lechery]).

He offers only one unconventional piece of advice:

Mydwyues, y tolde thys tale for Sow,
pat, 3yf 3e kunnat, lernep how  Yf 3e couthe noghte leres nowe, Osb.
To saue pat God bo3t ful dere:
pe poynes of bapteme y rede 3ow lere.
(9649-52 [Baptism, at end of Tale 53 (Ignorant Midwife)]).

Mannyng did not hesitate to ridicule women:

But of wymmen hyt ys grete wundyr.
Hyt farep with hem as fyre and tundyr.
Comunly forsake pey none
pat euer ys made of flessh and bone,
3yf she wulde to foly here take,
pe prest algate she my3t forsake!
For peys none pat she ne may
Haue a sengle man to here pay.
And 3yf she wulde algate mysdo,
A knawe my3t best beneve here to,
p3n hyt were to take a prest--
Osb.
For synne and sclaunder were pere lest.
But how as euer men preche or spelle,
Of prestes wyues men here euer telle.
Of ouper wyues y wyt naghht say.
Of ouper wyues y wyt naghht say.
pey do nat wrong--but at d3y.
But y dare sey as y haue herde
On Englys toung to alle pe werlde.
(792-40 [Lechery, in transition from Tale 42 (Nun Tempted by Devil) to Tale 43
(Priest's Concubine)].) 62
For wommens sake pys tale y tolde,
pat pey oute of chaunsel holde,
Wyp here kercheues--pe deuylys sayle--
Elles shal pey go to helle bope top and tayle.
For at hym pey lerne alle
To tempete men yn synne to falle.
To synne pey calle men, alle pat pey may.
why shuld pey elles make hem so gay?
For nopyng elles are pey so dy3t
But for to blynde mennes sy3t.
Ceretes hyt semep at alle endes
pat many of hem are but fendes.
(8881-92 [Sacrilege, at end of Tale 48 (Temptation of St. John Crysostom's
Deacon)].) 63

pys womman pleyned here husbonde sore.
Wulde God pat many swyche wommen wore!
... 
But, for alle pys tale, yn 3oure lyues
Truste 3e nat moche on 3oure wyues--
Ne on 3oure chyldryn--for nopyng,
But makep 3e self 3oure offryng,
For so kynde a womman as y tolde
Lyuep nat now--be pou bolde!
Ne no clerk pat pys ryme redys ryme om. Sim. and Vern.
Shal fynye a womman of so kynde dedes. 64
(10743-4, 10791-8 [Sacrament of the Altar booklet, beginning and end of Tale 60
(Miner Saved by Wife's Devotion)].) 65

Mannyng probably did not expect the womenfolk of Bourne or the nuns and lay-
sisters of Sempringham to receive the poem.

Mannyng directly addresses men on the subject of marital fidelity only
twice:
Ensample baue we perby
Of Iosep pat wedyd our lady—
pere was verry matrymony
Withoute flesly dede of any.  
By pys ensample mayst pou se
pat pe fyrst woman py wyfe shulde be.
(1657-62 [6th Commandment]).

And 3e men pat brekyn cunmaunte,
3e selfe falsen pat 3e fyrst graunte.
pan ys weddelak purgh 3ow shent.
(11215-17 [Marriage]).

Whereas Mannyng's rhetorical addresses to women were often degrading and
consistently conventional, his actual direct addresses to men are gentle and
advisory. He asks men, for example, to consider the case of Ely:

pys yche tale ys no tryfyl--
For hyt ys wryte yn pe bybyl--
And to 3ow y telle hyt here,
3oure sonys to chastyse and to lere,
pat 3e ne pey be nat shent--
For defaute of chastysment
Bodyly--yn pys worlde here
And aftyr pat, pe soule so dere.
penkep on Ely and on bys sonys,
And to gode 3oure chyldryn wones.
(5031-40 [Sloth, after Tale 28 (Ely and His Sons)]).

He reminds men that the birth of a child brings immediate responsibilities for
which they must be prepared:

Also, 3e pat heue chyldryn al day
Loke 3e be stedfast yn oure lay,
pat none haue yn herte doule,
Ne to no wychecrafte lest ne loute.
... 
Loke also 3yf pou euer ware
Yn place pere wymmen chyldryn bare,
3yf pou saw hyt yn perel of dede,
And pou ne coudest do bot e ne rede,
Ne seye wurde, ne helpe at nede,
So pat hyt to pe depe 3ede,
pou shalt perfors perel haue.
Vunkunyn shal pe nat saue,
For every man--bope bygh and logh--
pe poyntes of bapteme owp to knowe.
(9571-4, 9583-91 [Baptism]).

The only address directed to married couples seems to be a rhetorical
attempt to connect with ordinary life a tale on attempted lechery by witchcraft:
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Therefore, you man and you wyfe,
3yf you be of clene lyfe,
par you noght drede no wychecrefte

Noper temptyng of pe deuylys sharte,
And 3yf you be yn dedly synne,
To bys temptyng he may pe wyne.
(8279-94 [Lechery, end of tale 44 (St. Justyne and the Necromancer)]).

Since children could learn much more than they need to know by listening to HS, one suspects that the following direct address is also merely a rhetorical device:

perfore, 3e chyldryn, before al pyng
3el om. II.4.9. b.l in, II.4.9; for, Dulw.
Dredyp 3oure modrys warryng.
(1285-6 [4th Commandment, at end of Tale 6 (Cursing Mother)]).

As we remarked earlier, Mannyng's addresses to the many varieties of rich and covetous of the world seem often to be rabble-rousing cries, rather than actual direct addresses to members of the intended audience. The poet snipes at 'these gentlemen and getters' whose behavior is a poor example for those 'not worth a pear':

For hem pat ben of opys bolde,
For hem haue y pys tale tolde.
pey gentylmen, pys gettours,
pey turment hym alle pat pey may
with fals opys ny3t and day.
But 3e leue 3oure fals sweryng--
3oure vnykynde vpbreydyng--
3e shul go a deueyl weye
But 3e amende Sou ar 3e deye,
Takyp ensample at 3ow to swere.
(759-70 [2nd Commandment, at the end of Tale 3 (The Bloody Child)]).

Mannyng portrays judges as exploiters of the poor:

Many man ys broght ful bare
For cunseylours pat coueytous are,
And many a land yn grete errours
Are ouerturned purgh cunseylours.
Among hem, stywardes now be tolde--
at lordynges courtys holde--
For nyi hand every a styward,
pe dome pat pey 3eue ys ouer hard,
And namely to pe pore man--
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pey greue hym alle pat pey kan.

... parfor 3e stywardes on benche
peron shulde 3e alle penche:
3yf pou of pe pore haue pyte,
pan wylle God haue mercy on pe.

... 3e domes men pat pys chaunce here,
Yn pys tale mowe 3e lere
What hyt ys to do ever wrecche,
And to mercy no pyng reche.

Gaupp yn 3oure poght mercy, and se
pe pore now nat so wyl as 3e.
Bep mercable for 3oure prow,
pat God ne take veniance on 3ow.
3yf pou haue be so coueytous
To merces men ouer outraious--
And pore men specyally
pat ferde pe were for pat mercy--
Sykyr mote pou be, syre styward,
py mercyraent shal be ful hard.
(5417–26, 5437–40, 5481–94 [Covetousness, introduction and conclusion to Tale 30 (Hard Judge)].) 69

He advises usurers to take up almsgiving:

Take ensample here of Pers
And pat tep with pe pore, 3e okerers.
For 3ow shal never come joye withynne
But 3e leue fyrest pat synne,
And 3yue to almes pat yche pyng
pat 3e haue wune wyp okeryng.
(5937–42 [Covetousness, at the end of Tale 31 (Pers Tollere)].) 69

He condemns conspicuous consumers and asks his audience what they think about such people:

3e ryche men, 3e ryche purchasours, r.27 in Harley only.
3e wene pat al pe worlde be 3ours.
And yn alle 3oure moste purchase
Comp 3oure dep sunnest yn place,
God shewep hyt ofte to 3ow.
penkep peron for 3oure prow.
What seye 3e by pese streyte negons
pat se al day Goddes persones
Before hem deye for mysesee,
And pey are ryche and wel at ese,
And 3yt now pey no pyng spare
To helpe pe pore pat mys fare?
(6049–60 [Covetousness, at the end of Tale 32 (Lucrétius’s Theft)].) 70

The rich man is often miserable:

Be he never so wys ne slye--
pese pre sorwes shal be haue,
The Text of Handlyng Synne

Hys tresour for to gete and saue:
pe fyrst ys trauayle yn pe wynnyng;
pe touper ys drede to kepe pat pyng;
pe pryd ys pe most wo--
pat tyme pat he shall parte parfro.
pou ryche man, pou lestene weyl:
pou gettyst but sorow of every deyl.
Sykyr lyfe shalt pou noun lade.
pyn herte ys perfor euer yn drede.
And here y shall telle a lyte
A wurde of a gode Ermyte.
(6098-6110 [Covetousness, introduction to Tale 33 (The Hermit's Treasure)])

The rich practically murder the poor:

3e ryche men, weyl wers 3e do [i.e., than Dives]:
3e wyl nou boundes to hym leta,
But 3e self hem [i.e., the poor] sle and bete.
He ne dyd but werned hym of hys mete,
And 3e robbe al pat 3e mow gete.
3e are as Dyues, pat wyl naghit 3yus--
And wers, for 3e robbe pat pey shuld by lyue. r...byl 3e r. pat pere be, Osb.
(6812-18 [Gluttony, transition between Tales 38 (Dives and Lazarus) and 39 (St. John the Almoner)])

On only two occasions does Mannyng offer advice in a gentle and reasoned manner to those who lead comfortable lives. First he reminds them that their good intentions may accompany their bodies to the grave:

3e ryche men before 3ow se,
pe whyles 3e are yn 3oure pouste.
On 3oure soules y rede 3ow penke.
Y warne 3ow of 3oure eyres blenke.
Ne hauep no trust of 3oure sokoure
Nat of 3oure owne exectoure.
3yuep 3eself with 3oure hondys,
For pe dede hap few frendys.
(6293-300 [Covetousness, introduction to Tale 35 (Three Dishonest Executors)])

Next he tells them that they should carry out their good deeds with good will:

3e lordynges pat haue hnow,
pys tale haue y tolde for 3ow,
pat 3e ne repente 3ow of larges [i.e., in alms]
pat 3e 3yue to 3oure almes.
(7067-70 [after tale 40 (Bishop Troilus)])

These principles of behavior need not apply only to the rich, of course.

Along with the explicit clerical component in Mannyng's intended audience (the fellows of Sempringham), there probably was an implicit one (ordinary
secular priests among the 'good men of Bourne'. It is thus unsurprising that Mannyng directly addresses clerics on several occasions. All of these addresses appear in the second half of the poem. Comfy clerics have no reason to be covetous, Mannyng says:

Y speke to men of ryche lyfe
pat han no charge of chylde ne wyfe—
Persons, prestes, pat han here rente,
And ouper pat han grete extente,
pat mow weyl at alle 3ers
Lyue as lordes and be here pers.
pese nede nat to have tresourye,
But aftyr manhede and curteysye.
(6071-8 [Covetousness, at end of Tale 32 (Lucretius's Theft)]).

Mannyng advises ordered clerics to avoid any sort of lust:

pys tale to 3ow haue y tolde
How pe fende halle hym bolde
When he hap tyced an holy man
With any temptacyun pat he kan
Hym penkep he hap do a grete chaffare--
And namely po pat ordred are,
Whedyr hyt be yn a womman handlyng
Or yn any oper lusty pyng.
parefor lordynes, pat kun wel se,
Amende 3ow pur charyte,
And makep nat amys pe toye,
pat pe fende of 3ou haue loye.
(7881-92 [Lechery, after Tale 42 (Devil's Corruption of a Bishop through a Prioress)]).

He also (apparently) addresses secular priests and lettered clerics on the same subject:

parefor 3e prestes pat dwel at horn
penkep on pe drede of eynt Ierom,
And wommans felawshepe for to fle
For doute of synne, for so ded he.
(7919-22 [Lechery, at the end of an allusion to the life of St. Jeron]).

And 3e clerkes neded to be wyse.
3ow neded cune 3ow self chastysye.
3e mowe se yn holy wryt
How 3e shul kepe 3oure owne wyt.
(8893-6 [Sacrilege, after Tale 48 (Temptation of St. John Crysostom's Deacon)]).
He assigns the description of the properties of the Host in the Sacrament of the Altar booklet for the particular consideration of priests, and advises them to disregard the vulgar tongue in which the description appears:

Be pou neuer so gode a preste,
Ye so grete wytte ya gy brede,
Y rede pe here how pe propertes are shewed, 

po3 pe langage be but lewed.
Yf all be pi lang. lew., Osb., Alpauh pei ben of 

With small bautynges—and nat with wreche.

He twice offers tips to priests responsible for the cure of souls:

pe lorde bo3t pe shepe ful dere:
Lese hem nat pan so lyStly here.
po3 pey outrage and do foly,
He shal nat sle hem with felony.
He shal hem chastise with smert speche—  
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3yue gode tent to pys poynt,
pou prest pat art ancnyt:
And anoper be menged perynne,

...  
Aske aftyr none ouper name,
But lestene wyl hys owne blame.

For 3yf pou any ouper man namest,
Y dar weyl seye pou hym dyffamest.
Hyt ys grete synne to hym and pe
To aske or telle pat shulde nat be.
Hyt ys bakbytyng, and no shryfte.

Finally, he advises 'lords' who are able to present candidates for clerical posts to do so honestly:

3e lordes do 3e Goddes ordynaunce
And gode men 3e shul aunaunce.
To gode men 3yuep 3oure benefyces,
pat kun hem kepe fro wykked vyces.
pen make 3e gode presentement
To ordei of pys sacrament.

...  
Loke, lordes, how 3e mysdo,
pat eleccon dystroublep so
For a 3yfte or a present:
3e suffre holy cherche to be shente.
3oure synne shal be greuous,
Whan pys dekene Pascasyus
Mannyng's frank and familiar tone suits his stated purpose and audience, as we have said. The location, content, and tone of his direct addresses to groups imply much about the manner in which the poet expected the poem to be received, the poet's purpose, and the composition of the original audience.

The majority of the poet's direct addresses to groups appear immediately before or after tales. This suggests that Mannyng assumed that his listeners would be more interested in the tales than in the argument, and that (quite logically) he regarded the transitions to and from the tales as the most appropriate places in which to address his listeners directly.

Although Mannyng implied in his Prologue that he intended to entertain and inform, the direct addresses indicate that he also wished freely to encourage groups toward responsible behavior and to discourage them from the opposite. Not once in these addresses does he suggest that the addressees should confess. The main theme of HS is sin, not confession. Whereas Waddington consistently promotes a sacrament, Mannyng, while entertaining and informing, advises his receivers to behave themselves. Nothing in Mannyng's poem would lead one to believe that it was designed for practical application in either an official or unofficial program of religious instruction and reform of the laity.

The tones of the direct addresses vary, according to their targets, from reasoned to rabble-rousing, and these variations imply which addresses are genuine and which are rhetorical. In this regard the addresses seem to confirm that Mannyng wrote for an audience which primarily consisted of unsophisticated laymen and clerics, and which probably did not include women, children, or people of great wealth and power.
Mannyng's two stated purposes (to provide public recreation and a private directory of sin) imply that there were two intended audiences (groups of listeners and individual readers), and thus, of course, two methods of reception. The location, frequency, content, and tone of the direct addresses to groups imply that the author had envisaged an entertaining and advisory public sub-text (consisting primarily of the tales) which would be received by the public (listening) audience. The targets of the direct addresses within the argument of the text suggest that the poet also envisaged a private sub-text which would be received by individual readers.

In the public sub-text, as we have seen, Mannyng directly addresses groups, and almost always places these addresses immediately before and/or after tales. He implied in the Prologue that he was very familiar with the people for whom he wrote, and he seems to make it clear early on in the public sub-text that he wishes his listeners to consider him their fellow, rather than their judge:

3yf pou were euer so fole hardy
To swere grete opys grysly,
As we folys do alle day,
Dysmembre Ihesu alle pat we may.

(665-8 [2nd Commandment, introduction to Tale 3 (Christ-child Maimed by Oaths)])

By pys ensample pat vs awys
Y rede pat we leue alle oure foule sawys
pat we sle nat vs self gostly--
Ne noun ouper so--ne bodyly,
pat we be nat with here brent

Yn helle fere, no with here shent.

God almyghty shelde vs par fro,
And late vs neuer no man sic.

(1593-1600 [5th Commandment, after Tale 8 (Foul-Mouthed Nun)])
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In the argument of HS Mannyng primarily addresses the individual receiver, rather than groups. As the following examples demonstrate, the tone of these addresses is often far more intimate than that of the addresses directed to groups:

The first commandment ys of echone,  
You shalt have no god but one,  
Ne but o god shalt pou leve,  
Ne on nopyng pat wyl hym greue.  

Now bepenke pe weyl on pys  
Syf pou a3en pys haue do ou3t mys.  

(147-52 [1st Commandment, opening lines])

Syf pou euer bare pe hyghly  
Yn ouerdo pryde for py bayly,  
Bere pe lowe: men se al day  
py bayly shal nat laste alway.  
Now pou, and sythen y--  
So shal go oure bayly.  

(3069-4 [Pride]).

Loke now how many godenesse per are  
Withoute charyte noght but bare.  
Wylt pou know py self and se  
Syf pou wone yn charyte?  

(7143-6 [Gluttony]).

As y haue tolde of rere sopers,  
pe same fallep of erly dyners.  
Dyners are oute of skyl and resun  
On pe Sunday or hye messe be doun.  
Pogh pou haue hast, here 3yt a messe,  
Al holy and no lesse,  
And nat symple a sakare,  
For hyt ys nat ynow for pe,  
But hyt be for lordys powere  
Or pylgrymage pat hap no pere.  

(7291-300 [Gluttony]).

As the tales are the principal platform on which Mannyng speaks directly to his public listeners, the argument appears to be that on which Mannyng speaks directly to his private readers.

Mannyng seems to have envisaged a public and a private sub-text, but the internal borders of these texts are indistinct. The poet seems to have
anticipated a selective public presentation of the text;\(^6\) the content of the selection would be, of course, something for the reciter and listeners to decide.\(^7\) The public sub-text was thus a variable for which Mannyng could only prepare. The locations of Mannyng's direct addresses to groups suggest that he prepared for a public sub-text consisting mostly of the tales.

The poet also expected individual readers to browse selectively through the poem, and thus gradually to learn about the species of sins.\(^8\) The private sub-text was thus also a variable for which the poet could only prepare. The location of certain remarkably intimate direct addresses (apparently) to the individual receiver might lead one to believe that Mannyng prepared for a private sub-text consisting mainly of the argument (i.e., the information on the species of sins). His apparent recommendation of the tales to readers,\(^9\) however, indicates that he did encourage readers to browse without restriction. Since the publicly-performed text probably consisted mostly of the tales, the argument would prove the most effective place for Mannyng to address his readers directly.

Mannyng wrote one poem for two purposes, two audiences, and two manners of reception. The task required considerable technical skill and insight, and we shall demonstrate that the poet had both.

If one imagines oneself attempting to write a 'personalized form letter,' one may begin to spot the snares into which Mannyng could fall. Since the precise contents of both the public and private sub-texts were to be determined by their respective audiences, Mannyng had to assume that, in theory, the entire poem was at the disposal of each audience, and thus had to avoid alienating either audience at any point during the poem. His patterned placement of direct addresses (the ones to the individual reader are in the argument, the ones to listeners near the tales) form an impression of textual duality; the poet softened this impression by occasionally posting conflicting signals concerning
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the method by which the text should be received. For example, we have already pointed out (in note 6) that Mannyng appears to have designed the Sacrament of the Altar booklet for potential separate oral presentation:

3e men pat are now yn present
pat haue herd me rede pys sacrament.
(10799-800 [Conclusion to the Sacrament of the Altar booklet]).

In the same booklet, however, Mannyng alludes twice to his readership, the second time immediately before the passage above:

Whan he and pey were alle certeyn,
Yn forme of brede hyt turned a3eyn.
He ded hym housel as ouper wore,
And was a gode man for euermore.
And alle pe toper bep pe better
pat heren pys tale or redyn pys lettyr.
(10069-74 [Sacrament of the Altar booklet, end of Tale 55 (Host Changed to Christ-child)]).

Mannyng places within the argument (which, in theory, might be received principally by readers) two requests for the audience to listen:

A vyle synne men haunte alle now.
Of pryde hyt comp—lestnep how:
pat none can preyse hymself by name,
But he wyp euyl anouper blame.
(3123-6 [Pride]).

Many godenesse my3t men telle
How shryfte confoundep pe deuyl of helle.
Lestenep, gode men: to lere
pe grace of shryfte 3e mow here.
(11895-8 [Introduction to the Virtues of confession]).

In transitions to tales (which so often seem to be directed to the listening audience), Mannyng provides two retrospective cross-references (which are of more use to readers than to listeners):

Of pys before 3e herde me rede
How seynt Fursyn founde hyt yn dede.
And here y shal telle a lytyl tale
Of swyche a man pat brewed hys bale.
(5997-6000 [Covetousness, introduction to Tale 32 (Lucretius’s Theft); the reference is to Tale 13 (St. Fursey [7th Commandment])].
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Yn pe seuenpe comaundement
Touchep to pys sacrament--
Yn a tale of a kny3t,
How pe prest pat lyuep nat ry3t
Of hys preyer ys lytyl prowe--
And pere tellep hyt weyl how.
And y shal telle anouper here,
Of a messe of a frere.

(10389-96 [Sacrament of the Altar booklet, introduction to Tale 58 (Suffolk Man Saved by Wife); the reference is to Tale 12 (Knight Who Robbed a Poor Man)].)

Finally, the latter of the two cross-references which appear in the argument refers to a tale (thus perhaps confirming Mannyng's recommendation [in the Prologue] of the tales to individual readers):

Yn sacrylage y tolde a tale,
How cursyng brewep moche bale,
pat alle pe Sere hopped aboute
pat wulde nat pe prestys byddyng doute.

(10933-6 [Conclusion to the Sacrament of Penance; the reference is to tale 50 (Sacrilegious Carollers)].)

By thus sprinkling about mixed reception-signals, Mannyng softens the impression of duality created by his patterned direct addresses to groups and individuals, and encourages listeners and readers to browse throughout the poem. The dual purposes, audiences, methods of reception, and, in theory, sub-texts of Handlyng Synne fail to disintegrate the text because the poet takes advantage of perhaps the most important feature linking the two audiences—the selective manner in which both were to receive the poem. By pursuing the theory that the entire text would be at the disposal of each audience, Mannyng unifies the poem.

(e) Narrative style and internal continuity

Waddington's purpose was practical and so was his style. He included exempla in order to prove points made in the argument, and in order to inspire his audience to hate sin. His exempla were generally devoid of dialogue and characterization, dominated by unexplained action, and extremely brief. They
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were not designed to entertain, but rather to instruct. His argument was
concise and unadorned, occasionally to the point of incoherence. Sometimes he
jumped from argument to exempla without warning; a section in Book I and
several exempla appear to have been hastily grafted on to the text without much
effort being expended on revision or transitions; the text seems to end at
several points; the poet never foreshadows the existence of Book VIII. The
Manuel is a tract from which, quite appropriately, the trappings of literary art
are absent.96

Mannyng's purposes (intermittently to entertain, inform, and advise) were
recreational and his style was leisurely and expansive. Even though he did not
translate Books I, VI, VIII, and IX, and much other incidental material in his
source (i.e., about one third of what probably appeared in his exemplar), his
poem is roughly as long as the nine-Book version of the Manuel.97 Besides
adding a dozen new tales to his source, he reshaped many of the Manuel's
exempla into tales, expanded and clarified his source's argument when it seemed
to him too concise (which was often), and added throughout the text unsolicited
digressions, social observations, opinions, reminiscences, criticisms, direct
addresses, jokes, etc., of which we have already seen some examples.

Mannyng transformed many of Waddington's exempla into tales principally
by allowing the characters to express themselves. This is a considerable
advance from the Manuel, which often fails to provide convincing motives for
the actions of characters. The situations in which the characters find
themselves remain very improbable, but Mannyng allows the players to react in a
plausible manner to these conditions. In Mannyng's first tale (and Waddington's
third--The Tempted Monk), a monk is having second-thoughts about his decision
to renounce his faith in order to marry his Saracen sweetheart. Waddington
offers a clipped summary of the monk's pensiveness; Mannyng presents a monk
talking to himself:98
A tant en sei est returne,
Le moygne si est purpensé
Qe mult out fet grand outrage
E outre mesure sun damage,
Quant deu, qe plein est de pité,
Si folement out renié.
(1003-8).

pe munke rependyd hym pan and poght.
'Alas!', he seyd, 'what haue y wroght,
pat y shulde euer hym forsake
pat ys so redy me efte to take?
py mercy, god, ys mochyl to telle:
When y see a maumet of helle
pat neuer 3yt loued pe,
He spekyp of py mochyl pyte.
Sepyn pou art so mylde and meke,
py mochyl mercy wyl y seke.
Here y forsake pat y toke.
To hym y me betake pat y forseoke.'
(251-62 [1st Commandment]).

In Tale 22 (Waddington's no. 24—The Forgiving Knight), a knight who has spent
a year besieged in his castle sees the villagers going to church during Lent
and yearns to join them. Waddington distantly records the pining; Mannyng
brings us into the knight's dispirited chamber:

Le chiualer qe guëité estëit
En kernels sun chastel gisëit.
Nu pe uist la gent aler,
Espessement ai muster.
Meintenant se dechauc,
Ai muster aler, bien pensa.
En auenture se mettreit
A tel iur, dist, ein3 ne gireit.
(3799-806).

pe knyght pat yn pe castel lay
Loked oute and say men go
To pe cherche to and fro.
Barfote to pe cherche pey 3ede
To aske mercy for here mysdede.
'Ey,' poght pe kny3t, 'long ys gone
pat messe at pe cherche herd y none.
Whatsoever God wyl for me werche,
Y wyl ryse and go to pe cherche.'
He drogh of hys hosyn and hys shone,
And ded pe 3atys be on-done.**
Barfote his 3ede—as ys pe acyse--
To cherche for to here Goddys seruyse.
(3820-32 [Anger]).
In tale 23 (Waddington's no. 25—Murder of Florentius's Bear), Florentius has found an unlikely shepherd and dispatches him to the field with improbable instructions. Unlike Waddington, Mannyng records precisely what Florentius said to his bear:

**Berbi3 aueit cinc ou sis,**
**Mes de pastur fu mult enquis,**
**Al urs les comanda garder.**
**Semblant fist le urs otier.**
**Asse3 fut pastur meruillus,**
**Car berbi3 manger soleit l'urs.**
**Le iur qe Florence dou3 fe manga,**
**Al hostel venir le comanda**
**Le urs & les berbi3 qe il mena**
**A tierce; mes quant il iuna,**
**Qe al hostel a none venist.**
**E l'urs chesunc iur ensi fist.**
**Vn seul iur n'ad trespasse**
**Vtre cec qe li fu comandé.**

(3957-71).

For a final example, we find in Tale 33 (also Waddington's no. 33—Repentance of the Covetous Hermit) a hermit who, after saving money for a long time, finds that he was much happier when he was poor. Waddington alludes briefly to the hermit's troubled mind; Mannyng describes the man's mania and records what he says when he confronts his difficulty:

Cest home quilli si longement
Qe il enburca un poi de argent,
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Mes cil qe sout dormir a ese, s.J solait, B.
Apres dormi a grant mal ese.
Tant de ces deners penseit
Qe desu3 sa teste mis ausait.
Chescun home qe il vist de iur
Quida qe il fut vn robeur.
(5223-30).

He gadred vnto store fast,
pat hys purs he fylled at pe last.
po was he yn grete stodye
Where he my3t do hyt pryuylye,
For to lese hyt he was adred,
And 3ede and leyd hyt at hys bed.
Whan he shuld slepe, he my3t noght,
So moche on hyt was hys poght,
Whan he sagh men come or go,
He poghte and seyde, 'peues are po.'
Every man he wened had be a robbour,
For drede pat he had tresoure.
And whan he seyd hys oures of pe day,
He poght on hys tresour per hyt lay.
And more was he pan morenande
Sepen pan beforehand.
pan seyd hymself, 'wetyl y ferde
Ar y yn purs penys sperde.
Now slepe y neuer but with kare,
Syn y wyste where pens ware.
Y trowe,' he seyd, 'pat Goddys ours
ys spred with pens yn pe pursere.'
(6117-38 [Covetousness]).

The poet's narrative talents are displayed most clearly in his own compositions, of course. His capacity for sustained eloquence is particularly apparent in his curious 'Executor's Complaint,' which follows Tale 36 (Wicked Kesteven Executors):

"Why were pou nat pyn owne spensere?
How shuld y pan do now for pe,
Syn pyself were nat so fre?
How shulde y loue py soule nowe,
Whan pou louedyst nat py soule prove?
How shulde y penke py soule to saue,
Whan pou poghtyst noun to haue?
How shulde y brynge pe to blys,
Whan pou pyself ne wildest pe wysse? [pel not, Folg., om. Osb.
How shulde y bringe pe of pyne,
When pou ne wildest whyl alle was pyne? [WhenJ from Bodl.; Harl. has 'Why.'
How shulde y, frend-man, be py frende,
When pyself fo-man wald py hende?
How shulde y late py gode me fro,
When pou lete noun fro pyself go?
Who shulde pe oute of sorowe vnbynde,
When to pyself pou were vnkynde,
And wyystyst wel pou shuldest deye,
And nedely pe behoued passe pat weye?
pogh y for pe 3af aywhore,
Who shulde kunne me pank perfore?
What shuld God do pe mede?
pou dedyst hyt nat; hyt ys oure dede?
(m.J nede, Osb.)

One wonders whether Mannyng wrote this after he himself had executed the will
of Mrs. Crosseby of Lincoln.

An admirable example of Mannyng's ability to sustain natural dialogue
(despite a supernatural scene) appears in his tale of a late man of Suffolk,
whose wife's devotion finally brings him to bliss:

"3yf a messe were for me doun
With gode mannes deuocyoun,
Y hope,' he seyd, 'to blys go,
And be delyuerd of alle my wo.
Y prey pe pur charyte
To trauayle so moche for me.'
...
pe ny3t afyr pan come he.
'Slepest pou?,' he said. 'Nay,' seyd she,
'Be 3e 3yt,' she seyd, 'yn blys?
pe messe for 3ow sungen ys.'
....
Ofte he seyd to hys wyfe,
'A prest—a prest of clene lyfe!'
...
pe ny3t afyr, lestenep now,
He come and seyd 'slepest pou?'
'Nay,' she sayd, 'how fare 3e?'
'Weyl,' he seyd, 'and so wurp pe.'
'Were 3e pay of pat messe,
pat for 3ow sungyn ys?'
'3e,' he seyd, 'graunte mercy.'
(10403-8, 10421-4, 10435-6, 10461-7 [Sacrament of the Altar booklet, Tale 58]).

Waddington's concise argument demanded a certain degree of intellectual
dexterity from his clerical readers. Mannyng aimed to provide an
unsophisticated audience with entertaining and informative recreation. The
nature of his audience and purpose demanded that he make his poem easier to
understand than Waddington's. He did this principally by adding explanatory
passages when Waddington became too concise. Many of Mannyng's most effective
clarifications of his source appear in the transitions from argument to tale, the points at which the seams of the Manuel so often become visible. For example, in the introduction to exemplum 6 of the Manuel (Fond Father), Waddington states that a father should look after himself, and then moves directly to the story. Before beginning his tale (no. 5), Mannyng explains that he himself has seen fathers' generosity repaid with their children's contempt, and then announces the tale as an instance of such a regrettable outcome:

Chescun home fet grant folie
Qe se desmet en sa uie
Qe, pur enricher sun enfant,
Sel memes fet mendiant.
Neus vaut qe eu3 uren t mester
Qe vos enfans mendiuer.
(1585-90).

Y se men pat purchasours are,
pat coueyte catel with sorwe & kare
Here chyldryn gode for to wyne,
And here soules synke for synne.
And oper men also y see
pat 3yue here chyldryn bope lond & fee
For to fynde hem sustynaunce
In here age, for alle chaunce.
po men, me pynkep, most mysdo,
pat 3yue here gode fro hem so.
Hyt were bettyr holde here land
pan begge hyt at anouers hand.
Men we xen some sadde of hem pat craue,
When pey weyl wete pat pey naght haue.
By a tale y shal Sou mane
pat fyl betwx pe fadyr and pe sone.
(1105-20 [4th Commandment]).

In his introduction to exemplum 11 (Torment of the Dead Adulteress), Waddington says that a man who commits adultery sins terribly, and that he has found a story against such people. Mannyng correctly regards the story as one concerning adulteresses, and takes the opportunity to offer his opinions on the comparative rehabilitative capacities of male and female adulterers. While a man can rebound from the sin if his wife is of good character, he says, once a woman commits adultery her lust grows unquenchable. He directs the tale
against such women. Despite his unbalanced opinion (which once again suggests that he wrote for a male audience), his foreshadowing of the content of the story is far more accurate than Waddington's:

Ki ad femme espusé,
Si autre--pur gust, pur legereté--
Ou si de autre fay receit,
Malement peche, si deu me eyt.
Ceus sunt a pertement
Encuntre oceo siez comandement.
Encuntre la gent maluré
Qe espusailles unt debrusé,
Vne enseemple auy troué
Qe mereueil est & grant pité.
(2241-50).

3yf a man be of icoly lyfe
And mysdo onys vndyr hys wyfe,
3yf she be gode and certeyn,
To gode state she turnep hym ateyn.
But pere pe wyfe hauntep foly--
Vndyr here husbunde a ludby--
Comunly she wyl neuer blynne,
But euere be breynnyn yn here synne.
Vnto pe deuyl confounde her here
And brynghe her to helle fere!
A3ens swyche maner wyuys
pat wyl nat amende here lyuys,
Shal y telle Sow a tale
To swyche wyuys byttyr bale.
(1727-40 [6th Commandment, introduction to Tale 9]).

In the prelude to exemplum 41 (The Priest's Concubine), Waddington notes that 'priestresses' will be damned, but fails to mention the subject matter of the story he announces, or to justify the story's inclusion (he merely says that the exemplum 'is not one to hide'). Mannya offers a direct warning to priests' 'mares,' describes the forthcoming tale as an account of the damnation of such a woman, and narrows the date of the story's events to the reign of Edward I (1272-1307):

En sa demeine conscience
Encuntre li durra sentence
Od le deable dampné serra
Quant Thesu li roy iugera.
Vne cunte ai oy cunter
Qe ne est mie a celer.
En nos iurs auint en Anglette--
Mannyng's aim to provide his audience with entertainment demanded that he improve the narratives which he inherited from his source, and probably prompted him to compose the several tales which appear to be his own. The intellectual limitations of his audience and the recreational purpose of his text required him to simplify and clarify his source. Mannyng employed certain literary techniques when executing these narrative and structural improvements: he developed characters in order to provide motives for their actions, and he foreshadowed narratives in order to justify their inclusion. His aim to entertain, inform and advise intermittently, his technical literary abilities, and the A.N. tract on which his work is based, yield a generically indistinct poem, which at times seems to be literary, at times informative, and at times advisory, but which is neither of these three consistently.
Waddington was a member of the ecclesiastical 'establishment' and wrote for a broad (indeed perhaps national) clerical readership. He approached his audience (appropriately) with sustained detachment. His poem enjoyed almost instant nation-wide circulation. Mannyng, as we have said before, was a local poet who wrote for a particular group of local people. He approached his audience (appropriately) with frankness and familiarity. His poem enjoyed only limited and localized circulation.

One of the more difficult tasks for a writer is to compose for a general audience, for in such a situation he can neither attend to the needs and interests of each group within his audience, nor understand completely the nature of those particular expectations. Since an allusion to a particular group could alienate the unmentioned, a writer must approach the masses from a distance, and ignore the particular in the interest of the general. The writer loses his ability to identify, and the receivers lose their identities. The more general the intended audience, of course, the more acute this detachment will be. Nevertheless, a receiver's predisposed interest in a theme, regardless of the merit of thematic presentation, can be neither assumed nor discounted, and is regulated by circumstances ordinarily known only to the receiver. Texts for general audiences must have a theme of general interest, and when general interests are received by an individual they become particular. Self-improvement, a theme of almost universal interest, is the theme of the Manuel des Pêchés.

One of the simpler tasks for a writer is to compose for a particular group of people with whom he is familiar, for, with an ability to identify his receivers and with a knowledge of their particular needs, he can tailor his work to fit his audience perfectly. Mannyng faced and successfully completed such a task. He took a text designed for a national, general, clerical audience
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and reshaped it for a local, particular, and socially-diverse one. He knew his receivers and identified them in his Prologue and in his direct addresses; he approached them with an engaging tone; he knew what they wanted and needed (entertainment, information, advice) and gave it to them. He localized the *Manuel*.

We have seen how Mannyng's unambitious aims suit his audience of ordinary folks, how he speaks directly to groups and to the individual reader, how he anticipated selective public and private sub-texts, but mixed his reception-signals in order to give a clear impression that both listeners and readers had the entire text at their disposal; we have seen how Mannyng improved his source's stories and provided some of his own in order to achieve one of his main aims (to entertain), and how he simplified his source for the benefit of his audience of simple men. In all of these alterations Mannyng was tailoring his source to the precise requirements of his local audience.

In addition to these alterations in purpose, tone, and style, Mannyng added distinctively local content to his source. He did this indirectly, for example, in the several passages in which he claims to speak from his own experience.

He says, for instance, that he himself has heard the oaths of the gutter:

And po men fallyn more yn ply3t  
pat sweryn oper fals or ry3t  
By any membre of hyis manhede  
Benepyn pe gyrdyl--y pe forbede!  
For y have herd men swere swyche opys;  
To penke on hem forsorce me lopys;  
A lytyl tale y shal 3ow telle,  
pat y herde onys a frere spelle.  

(681-8 2nd Commandement, introduction to Tale 3 (Christ-child Maimed by Oaths)).

He also purports to have seen many men of ease and pomp come to an abrupt end:

3yf pou delyte pe yn grete hallys,  
Yn a foule pryde pan pou fallys.  
For y se many pat nowe pey bygge,  
And now scne dede pey lygge.  
Y sey for po pat haue grete pryde  
Yn hygh hallys and yn wyde:  
3yf pou delyte pe yn ryche beddyng,
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Yn hors, yn harnes, or yn feyre rydyng,
Alle ys pryde and vanyte.
Of al shalt pou acouped be. ac. I acombryde, Osb.
(3423-32 [Pride, after Tale 20 (Monk and Knight who loved New Fashions)]).109

He accepts the proposition that Englishmen are by nature predisposed to the sin
of envy, claims never to have seen a man guilty of that sin successfully
confess it, and recommends that 'we Englishmen' think about these matters:

And Englys men, namely,
Are purgh kynde of herte hy.
A forbyseyn ys tolde pys,
Seyd on Frenshe men and on Englys,
at Frenshe men synne yn lecherye,
And Englys men yn enuye.
Lecherye ys fleshely synne;
Enuye cump of pe soule wypynne.
Lechery ys pe lesse, we fynde,
And enuye ys pe more vnkynde.
For y se noun yn hys lyue
pat of enuye kan hym shryue.
...
He seyp a3en, 'hyt ys a lye!'
How mow pey pan shryue pat synne,
at seyn pey have no gylt perynne?
We Englys men peron shulde pynke,
at enuye vs nat blynk. vs...b.1 n. in vs synke, Osb.
(4147-58, 4162-6 [Envy, after Tale 23 (Murder of Florentius's Bear)]).

He states that he has heard of remarkable instances of death-bed greed:

And y haue ofte herde seye
Of sum men, whan pey shulde deye,
at pey wulde haue her pens ete
Raper pan any ouper had hem gete.
And here ar y ferper go
Y shal telle of one pat ded so.
Yn Chambrygshyre, yn a toune,
Y herd telle of a persoune.
(6167-74 [Covetousness, introduction to Tale 34 (Cambridgeshire Miser-
Parson)]).110

He knows, perhaps from his own interchange with penitents, that people who have
confessed their sins sleep better than those who have not:

And y haue ofte herd men seye,
And y wote myself pe certeyn wey,
at when men haue synned dedly,
Here soule ys moryng and heuy,
And cumbred ful of po3t and drede;
Ne he hap no wyl to do gode dede.
But whan pey have be clene shryue,
And do pe penaunce pat was hem 3yue,
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Hem po3t hemself wundyr ly3t,
And lesse dremed on pe ny3t.       d.J drecchede, Osb.
(11959-68 [2nd Virtue of Confession]).

Mannyng also alludes to local customs and gossip. He mentions, for example, the English tradition of beginning the weekend at noon on Saturday:

Sum tyme byt was wnt to be down
To halewe pe saturday at pe noun—
Namelche yn Inglonde,
And nawer so moche, y vndyrstand.
(645-8 [3rd Commandment]).

He refers to a big-city horror:

Yn London pe wurde gan go
pat eyres ded here fadrys slo.
(6283-4 [Covetousness]).

He describes a prevailing public uncertainty concerning Jews:

Ofte we here pe lewed men seye
pat erre ful moche oute of pe weye,
pat of pe Iewes seye sum ou:
pey ne wote wheper pey be sauved or noun.
But of sum prestes ys gretter tene
pat so of pe Iewes also wene.      pat of pe I. so pai mene, Osb.
Certes pey are alle yn were,
And yn pe feyp pey are nat clere,
For shal neuer Iewe pat deyp Iewe
Of heuene blys haue part ne prewe,
But he be crystened yn pe holy gaste,
And yn pe sacrament be ful stedfast.
(9515-26 [Baptism]).

He informs his audience that mining is primarily a West Country occupation (the West Midlands MSS. Simeon and Vernon omit this aside):

pyr was a man be3unde pe see,
A mynour woned yn a cyte.
Mynurs, pey make yn blylys holes—
As yn pe west cuntre men seke coles.    yn...men1 men don pat, Sim. and Vern.
(10729-32 [Sacrament of the Altar, introduction to Tale 60 (Miner Saved by Wife’s Devotion)]).

Mannyng's references to sources far outnumber Waddington's. Yet, unlike Waddington, who regularly cites literary precedents, Mannyng consistently refers to local (and esp. oral) sources, even when he is drawing directly from the Manual. The only written text to which Mannyng refers without prompting from
The Manuel is the Manuel itself. Mannyng wrote for ordinary people, to whom pedantic literary references would probably mean little. He depicts the Manuel as a text which he came across in a (presumably local) book:

In pat tyme turnede y pys
On englyssh tunge out of frankys
Of a boke as y fonde ynne.
Men clepyn pe boke handlyng synne. h.J h. of, Dulw.
In frenshe per a clerk hyt sees,
He clepyd hyt manuel de pecches.
(77-82 [Prologue]).

In the middle of the poem he reminds his audience of the title of the source:

Y shal 3ow telle pe same wyse
Ryt as manuel pecches seyse.
(6523-4 [Gluttony]).

Whereas at the beginning of the Sacrilege section Waddington reassures his readers of that he draws from the 'masters,' Mannyng reiterates that he is following the Manuel; he continues thereafter with a complaint against picky critics:

Ces autres racines vus cunterai
Sicum de nos mestres apris ay.
Rien vus dirrai san3 bon garant—
Ceo vus premis ieo bien auant.
(6679-82).

Many vyces perto longe.
Alle are pey synne, but sum are stronge.
Y shal 3ow telle of sum maners,
As manuel pecches me lers.
...

Nopeles, so weyl y nat seyd,
But pat to my sawe blame may be leyd
For foule englyssh and feble ryme
Seyde cute of resun many tyme.
(8615-18, 8623-6 [Sacrilege]).

The remainder of Mannyng's references are to local, oral sources. He explains, for example, that he once heard a friar tell Tale 3 (Christ-child Maimed by Oaths), which appears to be one of Mannyng's own compositions (of unknown origin):
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A lytyl tale y shal 3ow telle
pat y herde onys a frere spelle.
(687-8 [2nd Commandment, introduction to Tale 3]).

He claims that he once heard Tale 6 (The Cursing Mother), which in fact he drew directly from the Manuel:

For to leue Soure cursyng bolde,
Y shal Sow telle what me was tolde
Of a prest pat sagh and fonde
 pys chaunce yn pe holy londe.'117  ym befyl ym, Dulw.
(1251-4 [4th Commandment, introduction to Tale 6]).

He also says that he heard Tale 26, which describes Bishop of Lincoln Robert Grosseteste's love of music. As we shall see, this is one of several tales set in Lincolnshire and surrounding counties, i.e., in the local audience's region.

This story seems to be one of Mannyng's own compositions; its source is unknown:

Y shall 3ow telle as y haue herd
Of pe bysshope Seynt Roberd.
 Hys toname ys Grostest,
 Of Lynkolne, so seyp pe gest.
(4739-42 [Sloth, introduction to tale 26]).

MSS. Harley and Bodley, two of the four copies which attest to the complete text of HS, contain a rubric which attributes the Manuel to Grosseteste:

Here bygynnep pe boke pat men cleypyn yn frenshe Manuele pecche, pe whych boke made yn frenshe Roberd Grostest Eyshop of Lyncolne.118

As we have noted earlier, Mannyng says (11. 6173-4) that he heard Tale 34 (Cambridgeshire Miser-Parson [Covetousness]) in a Cambridgeshire town. This is another of Mannyng's additions (see note 5 concerning its analogue). He claims that a good man told him' Tale 35 (Three Dishonest Executors), though in fact the story appears in the Manuel:

A tale y herde a gode man sey,
How a man dyd whan he shuld deye.
(6305-6 [Covetousness, introduction to Tale 35]).

Tale 36 (Wicked Kesteven Executors) is another of Mannyng's additions to the Manuel set in Lincolnshire. It has no known source. Mannyng says that the
events related in the story recently occurred in Kesteven, and he implies that
he knows the people who were involved in the incident:

And here at pys yche pas
Y shal 3ow telle of a kas
pat fyl now late yn Kesteuene--
But pe name y wyl nat neuene.
(6375-8 [Covetousness, introduction to Tale 36]).

Mannyng even offers a source for the simple, common baptismal formula, which,
he says, he heard a Franciscan speak about:

Y shal Sow telle of a kas
pat fyl now late yn Kesteuene--
But pe name y wyl nat neuene.
(6375-8 [Covetousness, introduction to Tale 36]).

He says that a friar used to tell Tale 53 (Ignorant Midwife) in his sermons.
This is another of Mannyng's additions to the Manuel, and has no known source:

He implies that tale 58 (Suffolk Man Saved by Wife's Devotion) was a local
legend. This is another of Mannyng's additions to the ME, and has no known
source.

Similarly, he says that the events recounted in Tale 62 (Disgraced Dead Bishop),
occcurred recently in St. David's, Wales. The story is another addition to the
Manuel, and has no known source:

3yt shal y telle among pese talys
A tale pat now late fyl yn Wales;
Yn pe tyne of seynt Daueyn pe frere, Osb.
Fyl pys pyng--a grete ferly.
(11075-8 [Holy Orders, introduction to Tale 62]).
Mannyng thus regularly provides a local origin for the entertainment or information on offer, and especially for the material which he himself seems to have composed. He also sets locally some tales for which he fails to give a local source. For example, Waddington provides no setting for his exemplum 15 (St. Fursey); Mannyng stresses at the end of his version\textsuperscript{122} that Fursey is a local saint:

\begin{quote}
Sepen leuyd he so holyly
pat men callyn hym nowe seynt Fursey.
He was fyrst founder and syre
\textit{fo\textsubscript{J} master, Osb. fo\textsubscript{s\textsubscript{J} formyd a frerer,}
\textit{Ii.4.9.}}
Of pe cherche of Knresmyre.
\textit{K.J Carysmere, Ii.4.9; Canyesmyre, Dulw.,}
\textit{Knarysbyre, Osb.\textsuperscript{123}}
And of Norwyche pe modyr cherche
\textit{of N.J at Norwey, Ii.4.9.}
He ded hyt fyrist make and werche;\textsuperscript{124}
And pere he lyp be3unde pe see,
He ordeyned a mynster for to be.
Foure Sere or pe cherche were ful set,
\textit{F...3.J And. w...s.J was brout3 [sic] to
ende, Ii.4.9; was endyd, Dulw. and Osb.}
Was hys soule to god fet.
\textit{His s. gan to heuen wende, Ii.4.9; Or his s. was to
heuene sendyd. f.J sende, Osb.}
\textit{(2581–90 [7th Commandment, conclusion to tale 13]).}
\end{quote}

Waddington provides no setting for his exemplum 26 (King Conrad's Sergeant), which he (and Mannyng) drew from Bede; Bede sets the story in Mercia;\textsuperscript{125} Mannyng, perhaps with deliberate inaccuracy, advises his receivers that Mercia is 'now' Lindsey, the northern district of Lincolnshire in which the Gilbertine priory at Sixhills was located:\textsuperscript{126}

\begin{quote}
pyr was a kyng—Conred he hyght—\textit{\rho...k.J It was a knyght, Osb.}
pe Merce was hys kyngdom ry3t.
pe Merce hyght \textit{pan}, as y herd seye,
at men kalle now Lyndeseye. \textit{pe lande of mercedon perfay, Osb.}
\textit{(4365–8 [Sloth, introduction to Tale 24]).}
\end{quote}

Mannyng sets Tale 46 (apparently another of his own compositions, with no known source) in the nearby county of Norfolk:\textsuperscript{127}

\begin{quote}
Yn Northfolk yn a tounne
Wonede a kny3t besyde a persone.
\textit{(8669–70 [Sacrilege, introduction to Tale 46 (Norfolk Bondman)].)}
\end{quote}
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Waddington does not provide a setting for his exemplum 47; Mannyng initially insists that the action took place in England, though it turns out that almost all of it occurs in Germany:

And fyl pys chaunce yn pys londe—
Yn Ingland—as y vndyrstonde; I.J Elmette, Osb.
Yn a kynges tyme pat byght Edward
Fyl pys chaunce pat was so hard.
(G011-14 [Sacrilege, introduction to Tale 50 (Sacrilegious Carollers)])

As in Tale 24, in Tale 59 (Jumna and Tumna), which Mannyng drew from Bede, Mannyng refers to a king of Mercia as 'of Lindsey.' The main action of the story takes place alongside the River Trent:

And pat was weyl shewed yn dede
Yn Ingland—so seyp seynt Bede.
Yn hyss bokys wrytyn pyr ys
A feyre myracle of pe messe.
What tyme seynt Bede was man lyuand,
Were many kynges yn pys land.
Betwyxe tweyn was grete batayle,
For whych pyng y telle pys merueyle.
pe toon hyght Edryde of pe norpe cuntre,
pe toper of Lyndeseye was he.
...
pys batayle was, upurh here bope asent,
Besyde a watyr men calle Trent.
(10515-24, 10527-8 [Sacrament of the Altar, Tale 59])

Conclusion

Whereas Waddington wrote for a wide audience of intellectually-diverse clerical readers, Mannyng wrote for a local, socially-diverse audience of unsophisticated listeners and readers. Whereas Waddington intended to inform his readers of what to confess and instruct them on how to confess, and consistently indicated his desire to reform his readers, Mannyng aimed to provide his listeners with wholesome entertainment for their spare hours, and his readers with the opportunity to learn a bit about the sins by browsing through the poem. Waddington expected his readers to study the Manuel repeatedly. Mannyng expected that his listeners and readers would receive
random selections from the poem. Waddington's poem is a reformative tract which promotes observance of the law of confession. Mannyng's poem is an intermittently entertaining, informative, and advisory story-book/directory of sin which was designed to offer its receivers beneficial recreation. Nothing in HS would suggest that its author designed it for practical application in an official or unofficial program of religious instruction and reform of the laity, and there is no external evidence which might indicate that the text was used in such a manner. Mannyng eliminates much of the reformative content and tone present in his source, and rarely (and then obliquely) encourages the practice of confession (hinting but once at the very end of the poem that his readers might find the text useful after confession). Waddington's theme was confession. Mannyng's was sin.

Waddington was born in rural Lancashire and rose through the hierarchical ranks of the Diocese of York. His travels and responsibilities were wide. Mannyng was born into unremarkable rural circumstances in Lincolnshire, and seems not to have wished to distance himself from his background. His travels and responsibilities seem to have been limited. Waddington's readership was broad, and his tone was usually distant and impersonal. Mannyng wrote for people he knew (mentioning in particular the villagers of Bourne and the fellows of Sempringham), and approached them with frankness and familiarity.

Mannyng wrote Handlyng Synne for two purposes (to entertain/advise publicly and to inform/advice privately) and two audiences (listeners and readers). While he anticipated that both audiences would receive selections from the text, and while he seems to have foreseen what would be of most interest to each audience, he signalled that both audiences should be free to browse through the poem as they pleased.

Waddington's dry, instructive exempla were suitable for that poet's purpose, but not for Mannyng's. Mannyng transformed many of those exempla into
entertaining tales, principally by allowing the characters to speak, and thus by giving motives to actions. He also added a dozen new tales, which show clearly his ability to entertain with natural dialogue and at times with eloquence. Waddington’s concision, which may be indicative of the haste with which he compiled the Manuel, placed intellectual demands on his readership which would have proved too great for Mannyng’s unsophisticated receivers. Mannyng, who may have spent over thirty years composing Handlyng Synne, provided clear transitions when such were lacking in the Manuel, and in particular greatly improved the links between the argument and the stories.

The unambitious purposes, the convivial tone, and the leisurely and expansive style of Handlyng Synne suit perfectly its intended audience of local, ordinary folks. Mannyng further tailored his poem to the requirements of his audience by providing plenty of distinctively local content, a feature entirely absent from Waddington’s poem (which circulated nationally). Mannyng spoke from his own experience on many occasions. He did not trouble his receivers with references to literary sources; he preferred to say that the story or information on offer was something that he had heard locally, even when he was drawing his material from books. He set several stories in Lincolnshire and surrounding counties. Some of these were his own compositions; into those composed by others he himself introduced local settings.
Notes for Chapter III

1 See Appendix V ('Mannyng's Anglo-Norman Exemplar'), below. See Appendix VI ('Previous Estimations of the Purpose and Audience of Handlyng Synne') for a review of past criticism. All citations from Handlyng Synne will be drawn from Furnivall's E.E.T.S. edition (from MS. Harley 1701), op. cit., while the variant readings will be drawn primarily from I. Sullens's edition (Binghamton, New York, 1983), op. cit.

2 The origins of these two spurious Books are investigated in Chapter I.

3 This figure does not include the lines which comprise the fifth Thing to Avoid, which probably were not in Mannyng's exemplar (see Appendix V).

Mannyng did not translate Waddington's exemplum no. 4 (The Man Who Would Live Long [1st Commandment]) and only alluded briefly (ll. 11365-72) to the story of Achan which forms Waddington's exemplum no. 58 (Manuel 11. 9619-88 [1st Point of confession]). Exemplum 22b (On Women's Long Trains [Pride; ed. Furnivall, p. 119, note]), a scribal addition to the Manual found only in the closely related MSS. Harley 4657 and St. John's 167 (see Arnould, pp. 139-41), does not appear in HS. On the textual closeness of Harley 4657 to HS, see Appendix V. Exemplum 49b (Bishop William de Bencia's Confirmation of a Cotswalds Shepherd [Confirmation]), found only in MS. Royal (see Arnould, pp. 169-70), does not appear in HS. Exemplum 7 (Three Dishonest Executors [4th Commandment]; ed. Furnivall, pp. 206-9), a scribal addition found only in Harley 273 (see Arnould, p. 121, note 1), and exemplum 56 (Slave's Confession [7th Virtue of confession]), a scribal addition found only in Harley 273 and Rawlinson (see Arnould, p. 179), also do not appear in HS. Exemplum 11 (The Adulterous Wife [6th Commandment]), which is absent from MS. Taylor (which contains the first 'edition' of Book VII), MSS. Harley 4971 and Arundel (second 'edition'), Pal. Lat. (third 'edition'), and York 13 and Harley 337 (fragmentary copies), does not appear in HS. On the absence of this exemplum from these Manuel MSS., see Laird, 'Source,' p. 448.

Untranslated passages from the source which have a bearing on the audience or reception of HS will be discussed in the body of this chapter. Some of Mannyng's more minor omissions include the following: Manuel 11. 1299-1308 (a reference to an apparently oral legend that on the Day of Judgement a man on a white horse will arrive and forgive all fleshly sins); 1509-12 (a recommendation that one drink at home, rather than at the tavern, on holy days); 2409-10 and 2495-6 (two references to the custom of giving a side of bacon to the most faithful married couple; on the custom, see Arnould, pp. 267-8); 2985-8 (a comment on the prevalence of false testimony 'nowadays'); 3497-500 (a comment on the prevalence of clerks who 'nowadays' study fashion like the illiterate people); 3602 (an apostrophe concerning the prevalence of backbiters); 4295-6 (on clerks who disguise themselves with masks when acting in miracle plays); 4307-9 (on how play-actors assemble on city streets and in churchyards); 7859-62 (on how people always gossip in church 'nowadays'); 10273-84 (on how women will follow a doctor's orders more readily than a priest's).

The numbering of Mannyng's tales employed in this study is in accordance with that set out in Sullens's chart (after p. 382) up to tale 36. The tale which follows no. 36 (The Drunken Priest) is given no number in the chart. The present writer will refer to this story as no. 37; thus after no. 36 of Sullens's chart all numbers have been increased by one. The titles of tales will always accompany their numbers.
Mannyng added the following tales: no. 2 (Witch and Cow-sucking Bag [no known source; 1st Commandment]); 3 (Christ-child Maimed by Oaths [no known source; 2nd Commandment]); 26 (Bishop Grosseteste's Love of Music [no known source; Sloth]); 28 (Eli and Sons [1 Sam. 2: 12-36, and 4: 1-18; Sloth]); 34 (Cambridgeshire Miser-Parson [possibly related to a story in B.L. MS. Royal 7.D.1, a volume apparently compiled by a Cambridgeshire Dominican; Covetousness]); 36 (Wicked Kesteven Executors [no known source; Covetousness]); 46 (Norfolk Bondman [no known source; Sacrilege]); 51 (Devil Who Copied Down the Words of Gossips [de Vitry; Sacrilege]); 53 (Ignorant Midwife [no known source; Baptism]); 56 (Priest Who Could See Sins in Faces [Vitae Patrum; Sacrament of the Altar]); 58 (Suffolk Man Saved by Wife's Devotion [no known source; Sacrament of the Altar]); 62 (Corrupt Bishop [no known source; Holy Orders]). On the sources of the tales see the chart after p. 382 of Sullens's edition. On the analogue of no. 34 see S.A. Sullivan, 'Handlyng Synne in its Tradition A Study of Robert Mannyng of Brunne's Handlyng Synne and its Relation to other Instructional Works, in order to Establish the Place of the Poem in its Genre,' (University of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1978), pp. 176-7.

The improvements which Mannyng makes to Waddington's exempla are discussed in a separate section on Mannyng's narrative style, below. As we pointed out in note 56 of Chapter I, Mannyng sought new sources for Waddington's exempla 15 (St. Fursey [7th Commandment]), 47 (Sacrilegious Carollers [Sacrilege]), and 52 (Chained Captive [Sacrament of the Altar]).


Mannyng expands Waddington's brief invocation at the beginning of the sacrament of the altar section into a prologue:

Du3 Deu pere omnipotent
Qe le mund criastes de nient,
Done3 qe parler dignement
Pussum de cest haut sacrement.

The last couplet of the M.E. passage is quite similar to the final couplet of the general Prologue and to the final couplet of the text as a whole:

pey [i.e., God, the Virgin, and the saints] 3eue vs grace ry3t so to deme,
Vs to profyt, and god to queme.

But graunte vs alle vs self to 3eme

(9891-9902 [introduction to the booklet]).
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And yn cure shryfte Ihesu to queme. Amen.
(12629-30).

Mannyng also appended an epilogue to the section (which has no parallel in
the A.N.), in which he indicates for whom the section was written and in which
he implies in what manner it should be received:
3e men pat are now yn present
pat haue herd me rede pys sacrament—mel om. Sim. and Vern.
How ouer alle pyng hyt hap powere
pe sacrament of pe autere—
As y haue here to 3ow shewed—
phow the sacrament of pe autere—
Nac to lered onely but eke to lewed—
ler...tol pe lerde bot to pe, Osb; lered
bote to, Sim. and Vern.

3e lewed men, y telle byt 3ow,
y.I know, Sim.
Pray we alle our creature—
pe sacrament our sauyoure—
pat body and soule he wyl vs saue,
And we hym love, and he vs haue.

(10799-810 Conclusion to the booklet).

The prologue and epilogue, and the special set of indications of audience
and manner of reception in the latter, suggest that the poet designed the
Sacrament of the Altar section so that it could be performed orally on its own.
As we shall see later, he also provided within the body of the section
conflicting indications of the manner in which the section should be received,
apparently in order to soften the impression of its separability from the rest
of the text (which as a whole was meant to be received both by groups of
listeners and by individual readers).

Mannyng expanded the section by over 500 l. principally by adding two
tales (nos. 56 [Priest Who Could See Sins in Faces] and 58 [Suffolk Man Saved
by Wife's Devotion]) and by expanding greatly a third (no. 59 [Jumna and
Tumna]), which, as we pointed out in note 5, Mannyng drew from a source
different from that used by Waddington (for his exemplum 52).

The presentation of the Sacrament of the Altar booklet only in MSS. Vernon
and Simeon provides some bibliographical evidence of the separate circulation
of the booklet. The MS. circulation of HS is examined in Chapter IV.

These last few points will be discussed further below.

Unless otherwise noted, this chapter concerns itself with what Mannyng
himself contributed to Handlyng Synne, rather than with that which he merely
translated from his source.

The surviving copies of the poem, in the order in which they will be
discussed in Chapter IV, are listed below. Dates for which no reference is
given were compiled by Dr. M.B. Parkes for Dr. R.G. Biggar, and were kindly
supplied to me by Dr. Biggar:

WASHINGTON, D.C., Folger Shakespeare Library, MS. Folger V.b.236. Ca. 1400. A
volume now in the Tayloryian Collection at Princeton University and
University of London MS. Sterling Library v.17 were originally part of the
Folger MS., and were written by the scribe of the Folger MS.


LONDON, B.L., MS. Add. 22283 (the Simeon MS). Ca. 1400 (see Doyle, Vernon, p.
11).


CAMBRIDGE, University Library, MS. f.f.4.9. S. xv, last quarter. MS. Harley
3954, which was copied s. xv, first quarter (according to the present
writer), is related to the Cambridge volume (as we shall see), but does not
contain any part of Handlyng Synne.
EX LIBRO QUI VOCATUR MANUELE PECCHI

And specialy vnto a prest
Counsel of schrift sperid in his brest.
He ne oght hit for to telle
For lyf ne deth, whatsoever befelle.
Schrift ys goddis pryuyte,
at euer for counsel oght for to be.
3if a synne never so grym
To a prest in shriff wer shewyd hym,
pogh men afrorsed hym for drede
To say pat pat man dede pat dede,
Seppen hy hadde his penance take
And in shrift his synne forsake,
He scholde raper swer on pe haly dam
Nay ar he tolde hit any man.
3if he ne my3t wip non answere
On oper maner hymself saue* were.
The prest pat tellip goddis counsel,
He shal se hit wroperhele:
In erpe his tungeA oght be oute drawe
And in helle be al to gnawe!
("Inserted above the line").

The passage is drawn from the first volume of F. Furnivall's edition of the Chronicle (The Story ol England by Robert Manning of Brunne [London, 1887], Rolls Series, vol. 87a). Two MS. copies of this text survive: LONDON, Inner Temple Library, MS. Petyt 511, vol. 7. S. xiv med. according to J.C. Davies, ed., Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of the Inner Temple, vol. I (Oxford, 1972), p. 219, but in fact probably s. xiv[2], last quarter. The book, which contains Manning's text only (on parchment), was owned by Edmund Pymond, vicar of Laughton, Lincs. (22 miles W.-N.W. of Sixhills) during the early sixteenth century ('Iste liber pertinet Edmundo Pymond vic. de laighton,' f. viii'). Robert Manning himself may once have been vicar of Laughton (see Appendix IV). The MS. was written by a Lincolnshire scribe (see A. McIntosh, N.L. Samuels, M. Benskin, edd., A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English [hereafter LALME], vol. I [Aberdeen, 1986], p. 118). The book was put up for sale in 1522: (f. 198v) 'This buke be deliuered at the synge [sic] of ye bell in doncaster for to be saud to [sic?, sold for?] John <Ky>yr dwellyng at the
parsonage of laghton. anno 1522. x° die maii.' On f. 200v a s. xvi hand added: 'Sell this book for x° yf you can.' Elsewhere there are inscribed a few names in various sixteenth-century hands (Robert Howe [viii°], Sir John Thinne [197r], and John Turnar [199v]). Howe may be the Rector of Thetford (1473-81) by the same name who is known to have owned MS. ii.4.9 of HS (see Chapter IV). Sir John Thinne built Longleat House and had a considerable collection of MSS. by 1577 (see S.J. Ogilvie-Thomson, ed., Richard Rolle: Prose and Verse [E.E-T.S.Q.S. 293 (1968), p. xx].

LONDON, Lambeth Palace MS. 131. S. xv according to M.R. James and C. Jenkins, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace, part II (Cambridge, 1931), p. 210, and probably s. xv med. This paper MS. contains only the Chronicle; the text begins and ends imperfectly and some leaves are missing. During the sixteenth century the book belonged to an Antone Vakeman (see ff. 76r, 85r, e.g.). The language of the MS. is that of southern Lincolnshire, with some southern Wiltshire influence (see LALSE I, p. 35'). A single leaf containing lines from the Chronicle appears in Bodleian Library MS. Rawlinson D.913 (see Sullens, p. xxxv).

As we pointed out in note 23 of Chapter I, the term 'lewde' denotes an intellectual, rather than a spiritual status. On the fourteenth-century 'rise' of English as the literary language of the 'unlearned' and the simultaneous 'fall' of Anglo-Norman as such a language, see Appendix I ('Vernacular Literacy in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries'). The themes touched upon in the prologue of the Chronicle are not unlike those present in the prologue of the Speculum Vitae:

I warne 3ow ferst at pe begynnyng:
I wil make no veyn spekyng
Of dedes of armes ne of amours,
Os don mynstreles and oper gestours
pat make spekyng in many a place
Of Octouian and Isanbrace,
And of many oper gestes--
And namely whan pei come to festes.
...
In English tonge I schal 3ow telle,
3if 3e wyth me so longe wil dwelle.
No Latyn wil I speke no waste,
But English pat men vse mast,
...
For pat langage is most chewyd
Os wel among lered os lewyd.
Latyn al I trowe can cane,
But po pat haueth it in scole tane.
And somme can Frensche and no Latyn,
pat veed han cowrt and dwellen perein.
And somme can of Latyn a party,
pat can of Frensche but febly.
And somme vnderstonde wel Englysch
pat can noper Latyn nor Frankys.
Bope lered and lewed, olde and Songe,
Alle vnderstonden english tonge.

One could also cite for comparative purposes the following lines from the Middle English Castel of Love:
For lewede mennes byhous.
...we ne beg alle of one peode,
He iboren in one londe,
Ne one speche vnderstonde,
Ne mowe we alle Latin wite,
Ne Ebreu ne Gru pat beg iwrite,
Ne French, ne pis oper spechen.
...
On Englisch I chul mi resun schowen,
For him pat con not iknowen
Nooper French ne Latyn.

12While apparently perceiving that Mannyng was asked to write the Chronicle, T. Hearne, the editor of the second part of the Chronicle, inexplicably suggested that Mannyng was himself born in Malton (see Peter Langtoft’s Chronicle as Illustrated and Improv’d by Robert of Brunnel, vol. I (Oxford, 1725), pp. xxxi-ii). F. Madden correctly construes the line to mean that Robert of Malton was the man who asked Mannyng to write the poem (see Madden’s edition of The Ancient English Romance of Havelok the Dane (London, 1828 (Roxburghe Club)), pp. xiii-xv, note). For another example of Mannyng’s causative use of ‘do,’ see note 99, below. Mannyng’s career is examined later in this chapter and also in Appendix IV.

13Mannyng offers ‘handling’ as a translation of ‘manuel’:
Yn frenshe per a clerk hyt sees,
He cleppy byt manuel de pecches.
Manuel ys handlyng with honde.
Pecches ys synne, y vndyrstonde.
(yl to, Bodl., Dulw. ys s.J arn synnys, Dulw. (81-4).

14It will become clearer as we progress that Mannyng’s theme was sin, rather than the sacrament of penance, and that his aims were far less ambitious than Waddington’s. Casual phrases such as ‘And pereyn sumwhat for to here1 (1. 53), and ‘Many pyngys mayst pou peryn here’ (1. 125) are early indications that the poem will not urgently progress to a precise goal.

15The passages from the Manuel cited immediately below were examined (with a fuller complement of variants) in a different light in Chapter I.

16See note 6, above, for further details on the booklet.

17Waddington also explains what the circumstances are (Manuel 11. 9395-8).

18Mannyng does not present or translate the Latin verses of the General Conclusion to the Points. As is pointed out in Appendix V, below, the HS passage which is cited immediately below seems to translate some of the A.N. lines of the General Conclusion, and thus suggests that Mannyng drew from a first ‘edition’ version of Book VII.

19The passage (which was cited in Chapter I with a full complement of variants) is printed from the B.N. MS. in Arnould, p. 92. See note 119 of Chapter I for further information on the General Conclusion.

20This passage has no analogue in the Manuel’s version of the story.

21Discernment of the varied purposes and audiences of ‘catechetical texts’ eventually leads one to regard the ‘catechetical genre’ as an unbound series of ‘species of one.’

22See Appendix I, below.
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23 The abbey at Bourne was founded in 1138 (see Knowles and Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses, op. cit., p. 138).

24 The priory at Sempringham was founded in 1131 (see Knowles and Hadcock, p. 194).

25 J.W. Hales ('Robert of Brunne,' Academy 31 (1887), p. 27) suggested that the 'wake' in 'Brunnewake' might refer to the Wake family, who were lords of Bourne from the middle of the twelfth century (see G.E. Cokayne, ed., The Complete Peerage, 2nd ed., op. cit., vol. 12 [London, 1959], p. 296, including note 'd').

26 See M.R. James and C. Jenkins, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts...of Lambeth Palace, op. cit., p. 211.

27 The priory at Deeping was founded in 1139 (see Knowles and Hadcock, p. 53). Holles recorded that the arms of the Bohun family (a member of which, as we shall see in Chapter IV, may have been connected with the Simeon MS.), of the Clifford family (members of which, as we demonstrate in Appendix III and Chapter V, owned NS. Eng. Poet. d.45 of Idley's Instructions), and of the Wake family (see note 25) appear in the parish church at East Deeping (see R.E.G. Cole, ed., Lincolnshire Church Notes Made by Gervase Holles A.D. 1634 to A.D. 1642, LBS 1 [1911], p. 198).

28 R. Crosby presents the dates of Camelton and Clinton on pp. 20-21 of her essay, 'Robert Mannyng of Brunne: A New Biography,' MLA 57 (1942). She believed that the likeliest approximate dates for Mannyng's stay at Sempringham were 1302-17 (p. 21); S. Sullivan, op. cit., pp. 13-14, leaves open the possibility that Mannyng's stay with Clinton did not begin until 1325, and thus that the Prologue may have been written 'as late as 1330' (p. 14). A.I. Doyle, without specifically mentioning Crosby's evidence, suggests that the Prologue may have been written during the 1330s ('Survey I', op. cit., p. 60), but was surely composed after 1317 and 'perhaps after 1332' (p. 60, note 5). Doyle appears to have recognized the significance of Mannyng's statement that Burton was master when he began HS, which of course implies that Burton was no longer master when the Prologue was composed, and thus that the Prologue was composed after 1332.

The career of Burton is investigated briefly in Appendix IV. Little has emerged on the backgrounds of Camelton and Clinton.

29 The dates of the masters of the Gilbertine Order ca. 1250-1350 are presented by Crosby, op. cit., p. 20.

30 Burton would have been master throughout those fifteen years, of course. Evidence presented in note 119, below, indicates that Mannyng was still writing HS after 1307.

31 See Chapter IV for an examination of these MSS.

32 These approximate dates were suggested by Crosby, p. 21, as we have said.

33 On this point Crosby (p. 25), Doyle ('Survey' I, p. 60), Sullens (p. xiii), S. Sullivan (p. 79) and the present writer agree.

34 One had to be at least twenty years of age before becoming a Gilbertine canon (see Crosby, p. 25). The information presented in Appendix IV on Roger, or Robert, of Sixhills should be considered in an appraisal of the career of Mannyng.

35 S. Sullivan provides an analysis of the 'Cambridge evidence' on pp. 80-86 of his thesis; on p. 85 he narrows the date of the feast to 1304/5.


Notes for Chapter III

Crosby (p. 24) expresses a similar opinion, and notes that Philip of Burton was prior of St. Edmund's before becoming master of the Order in 1298 (see also Appendix IV). A.B. Emden (A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500 [Cambridge, 1963], p. 388) suggests, without citing any additional evidence, that Mannyng was at Cambridge for study from 1298-1302. He provides no evidence to support his claim that Mannyng became Prior of Sixhills.

S. Sullivan also points out these lines (op. cit., chapter III, note 46). He justifiably warns that the 'Cambridge evidence' indicates only that Mannyng was 'in Cambridge for an unknown period at some time in his career' (p. 66).

The colophon was transcribed from the MS. by the present writer. Also see Hearne, vol. I, p. xxxiii. J.C. Davies, ed., Catalogue of Manuscripts...of the...Inner Temple, vol. I, op. cit., p. 219, provides a faulty reading of it, and carelessly regards the date presented in it as that of Mannyng's death and of the production of this MS. J.A. Herbert (Cat. Rom. III, p. 306) noted that the dominical letter for 1338 was 'd', not 'b', and that 1338 was the 12th, not the 11th, year of Edward III's reign. These facts are confirmed with reference to C.R. Cheney's Handbook of Dates (London, 1978), pp. 126-7 and p. 20. An assessment of Mannyng's career should include a consideration of the known activities of Roger, or Robert, of Sixhills, which are set forth in Appendix IV.

Sixhills was founded ca. 1148-54 (see Knowles and Hadcock, p. 194).

Professor D. Gray brought the comic potential of the HS Prologue passage to my attention.

See note 12 on Mannyng's causative use of 'do' in these lines. A discussion of the possible identity of Robert of Malton appears in Appendix IV.

On the points raised in this paragraph, see Chapter II. On the possible relationship between Mannyng and the Tempest family, see Appendix IV. On the relationship between owners of MSS. of the Manuel HS, and Idley's Instructions, see Appendix III.

The significance of the will was first recognized by E. Seaton ('Robert Mannyng of Brunne in Lincoln,' Medium Aevum 12 [1943], p. 77). Doyle curiously considered the will 'incompatible' with the other evidence about Mannyng's life ('Survey' I, p. 60, note). The Crosseby family was probably originally from the village of Crosby, Humberside (18 miles S.W. of Hull).

The place-name is also misspelled in three MS. versions of l. 63 of the Prologue to HS, as we have seen.

The citation from the will is drawn from C.W. Foster, trans. and ed., Lincoln Willa, vol. I, LRS 5 (1914), pp. 6-7.

S. Sullivan examines the evidence for this on pp. 77-8. Cf. also Doyle, 'Survey' I, p. 61. In 1301, for example, a Walter de Codington, Gilbertine canon at St. Catherine's, Lincoln, was presented to the vicarage of Newark (see W. Brown, ed. The Register of Thomas Corbridge, SS 138 [1925], p. 223). By 1308/9 St. Catherine's had appropriated the church at Newark (see W. Brown and A.H. Thompson, edd., The Register of William Greenfield, part IV, SS 152 [1938 for 1937], pp. 51-2). Roger, or Robert, of Sixhills was presented to several churches during his known career (see Appendix IV).

See previous note; St. Catherine's was founded ca. 1148 (see Knowles and Hadcock, p. 197).

See the will, p. 5. The house at Torksey was founded during the reign of Henry II (see Knowles and Hadcock, p. 144). Roger, or Robert, of Sixhills was vicar of Torksey from 1283-5 (see Appendix IV).

One should, however, take into account the activities of Roger, or Robert, of Sixhills presented in Appendix IV. The lifestyle of the Gilbertines failed to inspire at least one prominent contemporary of Mannyng: in 1287-9
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Ranulf of Richmond, sometime Prior of the Gilbertine house at Malton, Yorks., was attempting to persuade the Archbishop of York to allow him to leave the Gilbertine Order for a stricter life with another Order. It seems to have been agreed that Ranulf would enter the Cistercian Order, and reside at the house at Fountains (see W. Brown, ed., The Registrars of John le Romeyn, part II, SS 128 (1917), pp. 58-9, 62-3).

Gilbertine canons and nuns were permitted access to books, of course (see R. Graham, G. Gilbert of Sempringham and the Gilbertines (London, 1901), pp. 68-9). There were some lay-brothers who kept agricultural accounts (see Graham, p. 66), and thus who must have been at least 'pragmatically' literate. While lay-brothers and lay-sisters were prohibited from having books in their possession (see S. Sullivan, p. 73), there is evidence of organized oral instruction of (at least) lay-sisters during holidays (see Graham, p. 69). The speculations of Furnivall (that Mannyng served as a master of novices [see his ed. of the Chronicle, p. viii]) and Crosby (that Mannyng's intended audience [in total consisted of Gilbertine lay-brothers and novices [op. cit., p. 27]) are groundless. See also S. Sullivan, p. 72, who asks whether Mannyng could have been a special roving confessor under the master of the Order. While it is useful to know that such a position existed, one has no reason to apply that knowledge to the problem of Mannyng's biography. Even with the new evidence presented in Appendix IV, we are not in a position to define precisely Mannyng's role in the Gilbertine Order.

The MS. circulation of HS will be discussed in Chapter IV.

Waddington's single direct address to a 'very sweet friar' (Cf. 1. 9313-16 (Book VII, Things to Avoid)) is a notable deviation from this pattern.

Cp. 11. 1207-14 of the Manuel. It should be recalled that we are considering in this chapter features (in this case direct addresses) of HS for which Mannyng himself is responsible; line references to MP are provided for illustrative purposes. Parallel A.N. passages of particular interest only are presented in the notes that follow and such presentation illustrates fully whatever similarities exist between the A.N. and M.E. versions.

See note 6, above, where the passage is cited with a full complement of variants.

Cp. 11. 7755-6 of the Manuel.

Cp. 11. 1877-8 of the Manuel.

Cp. 11. 3501-4 of the Manuel, a general address:

Si en vostre qeors desire3
Seignorie auer, ou estre aple3
Sire, mestre, dame, sache3
Orgoil est, bien le ve3.

Cp. 11. 6483-8 of the Manuel, a general address:

Recceyure ne deue3, ne duner,
Par entente de pecher.
Tut quide le lechur espleiter
Quant receue3 que vus veut doner.
A peine ne ad si prodor ne mulier
Qe dun ne peot changer sun qeor.

Cp. 11. 6235-8 of the Manuel:

Merueille est de la deblesce
Qe consent de estre prersesce.
De prersesce ai oy mult cunter,
Mes tu3 iurs a drein les oy damper.

Cp. 11. 6853-6 of the Manuel:

Pur ceo femme en chancel
Entre clerq ne dust ester,
De mal qe en pout auenir--
Car de fol regard vent fol desir.

The last couplet of this passage will be the subject of further commentary in the next section of this chapter.

While there is no passage in MP comparable to this one from HS, Waddington does include an 'anti-feminist' couplet in the same general area (MP 7633-4), and that couplet is translated by Mannyng (HS 10753-4). See HS 11227-30 for yet another example of Mannyng's ridicule of women.

While the initial direct address in this passage does not derive from MP, the latter parts of the HS passage follow the source (cp. MP 7113-24). For another of Mannyng's addresses to men, see HS 9861-8, 9871-84.

While the initial direct address in this passage does not derive from MP, the latter parts of the HS passage follow the source (cp. MP 7113-24). For another of Mannyng's addresses to men, see HS 9861-8, 9871-84.

While there is no passage in HE comparable to this one from HS, Waddington does include an 'anti-feminist' couplet in the same general area (HE 7633-4), and that couplet is translated by Mannyng (HS 10753-4). See HS 11227-30 for yet another example of Mannyng's ridicule of women.

While the initial direct address in this passage does not derive from MP, the latter parts of the HS passage follow the source (cp. MP 7113-24). For another of Mannyng's addresses to men, see HS 9861-8, 9871-84.

While there is no passage in HE comparable to this one from HS, Waddington does include an 'anti-feminist' couplet in the same general area (HE 7633-4), and that couplet is translated by Mannyng (HS 10753-4). See HS 11227-30 for yet another example of Mannyng's ridicule of women.

While there is no passage in HE comparable to this one from HS, Waddington does include an 'anti-feminist' couplet in the same general area (HE 7633-4), and that couplet is translated by Mannyng (HS 10753-4). See HS 11227-30 for yet another example of Mannyng's ridicule of women.

While there is no passage in HE comparable to this one from HS, Waddington does include an 'anti-feminist' couplet in the same general area (HE 7633-4), and that couplet is translated by Mannyng (HS 10753-4). See HS 11227-30 for yet another example of Mannyng's ridicule of women.
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"In MS. Osborn marginal Latin captions highlight the properties. As we shall see in the next section of this chapter, Mannyng softens the impression of the booklet's separability by providing conflicting indications of the manner in which the booklet should be received.

"The only part of the passage which derives from the Manuel is the metaphor (see MP 7749-50).

"Cp. the second half of this passage with ll. 7837-46 of the Manuel.

"It should be recalled that Mannyng anticipated that his audience would either listen to or read selections from the text chosen at random. See the discussion of the purpose of the poem, above.

"Previous critics have thought differently (see Appendix VI).

"Cp. ll. 1339-42 of the Manuel, which approach the audience impersonally.

"Cp. ll. 2137-46 of the Manuel, which, again, approach the audience impersonally.

"Cp. ll. 923-6 of the Manuel, in which the same request is made impersonally, and in which Waddington, unlike Mannyng, clearly recommends amendment:

Chescun ueie a comencement
Si encuentre ceo comandement
Rien ad fet follement--
Si le amende bastiument.

"Cp. ll. 3207-8 of the Manuel, which simply describe the sin.

"These examples of addresses to individuals have been selected for their striking intimacy of tone. Conditional constructions beginning with the phrase '3yf pou' abound throughout the argument of the text in rhetorical introductions to topics; while they cannot be considered direct addresses, they do have an effect on the overall tone of the poem. Although Waddington's tone is far more distant than Mannyng's, one can see from the following comparative series of lines that some of Mannyng's '3yf pou' phrases derive from his source:

3yf pou haue synned pus gretily. Si tant aus3 trespasce3.
(161).
3yf pou euere purgh folye.
(339).
3yf you yn swerd, oper yn bacyn.
(351).
3yf pou beleue yn wycchecraft.
(479).
3yf pou trowest or vndyrstondys.
(571).
3yf pou trowyst synne shall be for3eue.
(587).
3yf pou make a grete sweryng.
(635).
3yf pou trowyst pat bys manhede.
(655).
3yf pou trowest pat he may naght.
(659).
3yf pou were euere so fol hardy.
(665).
3yf pou hauntyst to make py play.
(1017).
3yf pou do any man yn prisun.
(1313).

"And 3yf pou make a grete sweryng.
Cels qe creient qe deu fet eyt.
(1327).
3yf pou trowyst pat bys manhede.
Cels qe creient qe le fi3 est meindre.
(1323).
3yf pou trowest pat he may naght.
Ki creit qe il ne peot parfere.
(1331).
3yf pou were euere so fol hardy.
Ne bante3 pas par iur feirable.
(1511).
3yf pou hauntyst to make py play.
E ceoly ausi qe en prisun
Home met cum felun.
(1893-4).
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3yf pou euer yn any tyme. Si vnques a home feites tolir.

D.W. Robertson, in his attempt to link Mannyng’s use of the '3yf pou' introduction with traditional lists of questions for confessors ('The Cultural Tradition of Handlyng Synne,' Speculum 22 [1947], pp. 175-83), seems to overlook the fact that Mannyng was simply generalizing a rhetorical technique present in his source.

See the discussion of the purpose of the poem which begins this chapter, and the examination of the poet’s use of direct addresses to groups, which follows that discussion. While it does seem clear that 11. 115-36 (which were cited in the first section of this chapter) recommend that readers read the text selectively, the following lines from that passage may also apply to listeners:

And lestene and lerne whan any hem redys; w...b.J qwat I pe, Dulw.

pou darst neuer recche where pou bygynne. he par not rekke whe he gynne, Dulw.

Many pyngys mayst pou peryn here. mayst poul may be, Dulw.

With oft redyng mayst pou lere. mayst poul men may it, Dulw.

The following lines from the Prologue may be addressed to reciters as well as to individual readers:

pou darst neuer recche where pou bygynne, be par not rekke whe he gynne, Dulw.

For everywhere ys bygynnyng of synne; F...b.J per pe b. is, Dulw.

Whedyr pou wylt opon pe boke, Qwhere he begynnith to o. bys b., Dulw.

pou shalt fynde bygynnyng oueral to loke. Hap a b. on to l., Dulw.

Oueral ys bygynnyng, oueral ys ende, Hou pat pou wylt turne or wende, H...t.J How so euere it t., Dulw.

We shall see in the Chapter V that the scribe of one MS. of Idley’s Instructions copied only the argument of that text.

We have already seen in the first section of this chapter how Mannyng mixed such signals in the Prologue.

Cp. 11. 7381-4 of the Manuel, which simply conclude the story without any allusion to the readership (note, however, the reference to priests and communicants in the added lines of MS. B):

Quant le simple home out grante, En semblance de pain est turné.

Sí est dunc acomunié, Deu ad mult regracié.

It should be recalled that we are considering only the requests to listen for which Mannyng himself is responsible.

Cp. 11. 3255-6 of the Manuel, which do not include a request that the receivers listen.

Again, it should be recalled that we are considering only those cross-references for which Mannyng himself is responsible. While cross-references to earlier points in the text would be of little use to listeners, they might, of course, prove useful to reciters.
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For the earlier of the two cross-references in the argument see 11. 2981-4 (10th Comm.).

For further discussion of the points made in this paragraph, see Chapter I.

While Mannyng did not translate roughly 3,800 lines from his source, he added nearly 3,800 of his own (3,756 to be precise—see C.W. Usis, 'The Narrative and Homiletical Technique of Robert Mannyng,' [University of California Ph.D. thesis, 1950], p. 80).

Unless otherwise noted, the passages from the Manual presented in this comparative section illustrate whatever similarities the Manual may have with the MS passages under review.

In this line we find an example of Mannyng's causative use of the verb 'do' (see note 12).

There will be a fuller discussion of the tales which Mannyng added to his source in the next section of this chapter. See note 5, above, for a list of the tales which he added.

See the examination of Waddington's style in Chapter I.

Mannyng's references to his own experiences will be discussed in greater detail in the next section of this chapter.

See note 96, above.

See the discussion of Waddington's tone in Chapter I and of the MS. circulation of the Manual in Chapter II. Waddington's adoption of a mixed tone (distant/intimate) in Books VII-VIII is, as we have already noted, a product of the purpose of those Books.

We have seen in the examination of Mannyng's direct addresses that he brings tales directly to the attention of certain groups, sometimes rhetorically, sometimes sincerely. He also indirectly brings tales to the attention of groups in rhetorical introductions and conclusions. For example, he says that thieves should take note of Tale 11 (Abbot Zenon [7th Commandment]):

A gode ensample pes clerkys wote
Of a tale pat an abbot wrote,
pat peyys shulde before hem loke
Ar pey ouper mennys pyng toke.
(2087-90; cp. 11. 2561-4 of the Manual).

He closes tale 25 (Unruly Minstrel [Sloth]) with a claim that he told the story for the sake of minstrels and their audiences:

 pys tolde y for pe glemmes sake,
To loke whan pey here gle shuld make,
And also for po pat shuld hyt [i.e., minstrelsy] here,
pat pey loue hyt nat so dere.
(4733-6).

He says that he told tale 49 (Couple Stuck Together [Sacrilege]) for clerks:

 pys yche chauscne to 3ow y tolde,
For hyt ys gode yn herte to holde--
Namly men of holy cherche,
pat pey perynne [i.e., in church] no swyche dede werche.
(8983-6).

Finally, he claims that he told tale 51 (Chattering Women [Sacrilege]) for those who gossip in church:

For ianglers pys tale y tolde,
pat pey yn cherche here tunges holde.
(9307-8).
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The only significant instance in which Waddington refers to his experiences occurs in the passage in which he implies that he had experience in the confessional:

Signe de cal enmortissement
En confession vneum souent.
(8719-20 [2nd Virtue of confession]).

See the treatment of Book VII of the Manuel, in Chapter I.

107 Cp. 11. 1354-60 of the Manuel, in which there appears to be expressed an assumption that the readers had heard foul oaths:
Dunt souuent avez bien ol. supplied from B, om. A.
Pur ceo est nostre hunte greignur n.J vostre, B.
Si desmembrer nostre seignur.
Mes cels vnt peché plus greveument
Encuntre deu omnipotent
Ki par les membres desuz la seinture from B. Ki par deu de tute creature, A.
Del duz ihesu fet serment ov iure. from B. Iure desu3 sa seruiture, A.

109 Cp. 11. 3509-14 of the Manuel, which lack the citation from experience.

110 Tale 34 is one of Mannyng's own additions to his source. Its inclusion may have been prompted by 11. 5259-64 of the Manuel:
Deu le pere omnipotent
Se pleint mult de tiele gent
Qe ne cessent de robber,
D'eschorchier ne de manger,
ne del vif ou, B.
Pur quels il duna sun du3 geor
Quant il se lessa en croiS pener

111 Cp. 11. 8771-8 of the Manuel, which do not contain a citation from Waddington's experience. The subject upon which Mannyng's reminiscences touch is not, of course, dissimilar to that which draws Waddington to his lone reference to his experience (see note 107, above).

On a similar point, see 11. 1105-20 (introduction to Tale 5 [Pond Father]), which were cited in the previous section as illustrative of Mannyng's improvement of the textual continuity of his source.

112 Cp. 11. 7613-16 of the Manuel:
En la tere par dela
Vn home pur sun viure travailla
En les muntaines miners quist,
Dunt il apress argent fist.

113 This section examines only those references to sources which Mannyng himself added to the Manuel.

114 See the treatment of Waddington's references to sources in Chapter I. Several of Mannyng's references to written sources are prompted by the Manuel. For example, Waddington introduces his exemplum 15 (St. Fursey) with a reference to his source (2831-4); Mannyng draws his version of the story from a different source, but likewise begins with a reference (2473-6). Similarly, Waddington provides a reference (6931-4) for his exemplum 47 (Sacrilegious Carollers); Mannyng drew his version of the story from a different source, but provided a reference (9233-40). Likewise, Waddington introduces his exemplum 52 (Chained Captive) with a reference to its source (7585-6); Mannyng draws a similar story from a different source, but also provides a reference (10703-4). One could also note that whereas in the Prologue to the Manuel (49-62) Waddington strongly asserts that everything he writes comes directly from written authorities, in the Prologue to HS (11-12, 131-6) Mannyng says only that his stories are from sound (written and oral) sources.

115 Unless otherwise noted, references to the sources of Mannyng's stories are drawn from Sullens's chart on that subject, op. cit., after p. 382. Also, unless otherwise noted, the references in HS to local, oral sources which are
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presented in this section have no parallels in the Manuel and are not prompted by anything in the Manuel.

117 This line derives from 1. 1853 of the Manuel ('En la seint tere, vne femme esteit').

118 See Furnivall's edition, p. 1. As we shall see, the texts of MSS. Harley and Bodley appear to be far removed from Mannyng's hypothetical original.

119 We have already cited 11. 7983-6, which introduce Tale 43 (Priest's Concubine). Whereas Waddington claimed that that story was dated 'En nos iurs...en Engletere' (6267), Mannyng says it happened 'In pe tyme of gode Edward/...syre Henryes sone' (7984-5), i.e. 1272-1307. As S. Sullivan has noted (op. cit., pp. 14-15), the passage implies that Mannyng wrote it after the latter of these dates.

120 Neither the formula nor any other element of this passage has a parallel in the Manuel.

121 None of Waddington's exempla is set 'locally.' He sets three in England:

A Lundres auint, pur verité,
Ceo que vus ai ore cunte.
(2989-90 [Conclusion to exemplum 17 (The Perjurer [8th Comm.])].)
Bien deuez ceste cunte crere,
Car il auint en Engletere,
En vn leu mult renomé,
Qe leo lesse nomer de grée.
(3661-4 [Conclusion to exemplum 23 (Backbiting Monk [Pride])].)
En nos iurs auint en Engletere--
Pur cee le deuex vus meus crere.
(6267-8 [Introduction to exemplum 41 (Priest's Concubine [Lechery])].)

Waddington draws his version of the story from Peraldus, while Mannyng
draws his from Bede. See Chapter I, note 56.


According to Bede's account, the other church founded by Fursey was
neither at Norwich nor in Norway, but in France, at Lagny (see Sherley-Price, op. cit., pp. 171 and 337). Bede claims that Fursey was buried at Peronne, and
that four years after his burial a special chapel was built there to house the
body of the saint (Sherley-Price, pp. 171-2). Mannyng probably drew his
confused account from a corrupt text of the History.

See Sherley-Price, pp. 290-2 (Book V, chapter 13).

In his attempt to portray the mind-set of medieval residents of
Kesteven, G. Platts mentions a few of the tales in HS which feature local
settings. In one of his suspect statements (Land and People in Medieval
Lincolnshire [Lincoln, 1985], p. 290) he claims that 'Lindsey...feels remote [? to
Platts, Mannyng, or to the residents of Kesteven?]: there are only two passing
references to it in Handlyng Synne.' He believes that Mannyng's failure to
refer frequently to the northern regions of England (and of Lincolnshire)
indicates that Mannyng and his audience had greater understanding of the south of England (and of Lincolnshire) than they had of the north (op. cit., p. 290).

Before he pronounces this theory of a north-south divide, Platts fails to
remind his readers that the Gilbertine house at Sixhills was in Lindsey, that
Mannyng had lived at Sixhills, that Mannyng wrote his Chronicle for the
Sixhills fellowship, and that both 'passing references' to Lindsey (the second
of which we shall see shortly) appear to be deliberate attempts by Mannyng to
link with Lincolnshire the stories in which the references appear (both stories
are drawn from Bede and in both Mannyng substitutes 'Lindsey' for Bede's
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The unexpressed false premise underlying much of D.V. Robertson's work on HS (namely that the foreground must be the background [see Appendix VII]), is expressed by Platts: 'A conscious perception of oneself and one's regional culture or mentality is like the centre of an onion, its very existence defined by its surroundings' (*Land and People*, p. 293). This simplifying strategy promotes a cursory examination of evidence supporting a set solution. It leads to cynical and groundless statements about Mannyng's poem: 'Mannyng's overriding concern in *Handlyng Synne* is that money should be kept circulating within society and not hoarded...Behind his encouragement of spending might have been the assumption that eventually the money would fall into the priory's [i.e., Sempringham's] hands. The assumption is reasonable enough since Sempringham held most of the land in east Kesteven, and as the landlord of a large number of tenants it was entitled to a wide range of secular exactions from them. The priory, therefore, could exert a legal claim to much of its tenants' property and might endeavour still more to lay its hands on individuals' wealth by persuading them to spend rather than save.' (Platts, 'Robert Mannyng of Bourne's *Handlyng Synne* and South Lincolnshire Society,' *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 14 [1979], p. 26). It encourages gross (indeed ridiculous) exaggeration of the significance of minor textual points: 'These stories [i.e., Tales 2 (Witch and Cow-Sucking Bag) and 3 (Christ-child Maimed by Oaths)] suggest that an alternative religion existed in medieval Lincolnshire, based on ancient traditions of pagan worship and folk ritual, quite independent of the Christian Church and fundamentally at odds with it...Mannyng becomes almost hysterical in his denunciation of witchcraft and it is his indiscriminate use of the term which is so unconvincing...during the first decade of the fourteenth century western Europe was riddled with allegations of heresy and accusations of witchcraft. Mannyng's uncompromising attitude and fervent tone seem to reveal a concern to preserve himself and the Gilbertine order from this witch-hunt: they cannot be taken as evidence of the existence of an alternative religion in Lincolnshire [*sic*].' (*Land and People*, pp. 288-9). Its final product is ordinarily a vague impression offered without reference to evidence: 'It is a reasonable probability...that the *Manuel*...did actually originate in Lincolnshire, and also from the pen of a Lincolnshire writer, if not from...Grosseteste's.' (*Handlyng Synne* and South Lincolnshire Society,' p. 25).

The story of St. Fursey, of course, is also set in Norfolk. On the circulation of *Handlyng Synne* in Norfolk, see Chapter IV.

At the end of the story Waddington may imply a setting by mentioning that intervention by St. Herbert broke the spell:

Car pur eu3 ad pri6
L'euesqe de Coloine--la cité--
Qe seint Herbert est nomé.

(6983-5).

Only the last scene is set in England, at the tomb of St. Edith at Wilton (see 11. 9226-32). Mannyng's source for this story differs from Waddington's (see Chapter I, note 56).
Dr. V. Gillespie kindly drew my attention to the fact that this variant sets the story in Yorkshire. The Osborn MS. was copied for a landed Durham family with literary connections with the Tempests (see Chapter IV and Appendix III).

Cp. ll. 6931-4 of the Manual.

According to Bede (IV. 21), the battle (A.D. 679), between King Egfrid of Northumbria (670-85) and King Ethelred of Mercia (674-704), did indeed occur alongside the Trent, but he does not define the precise locality in which it took place. See Sherley-Price, op. cit., pp. 238-40.

Mannyng's source for this story differs from Waddington's (see Chapter I, note 56).

For a discussion of the MSS., see Chapter IV.
Chapter IV

The Localized Circulation of *Handlyng Synne*

Two-thirds of the surviving manuscripts containing *Handlyng Synne* derive from the central regions of the country (three from Worcestershire, two from Norfolk, and one from Leicestershire). There are two closely-related copies from the south-east (Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire), and only one from the north (Durham).

**MS. Folger** (ca. 1400) contains the earliest surviving copy of the complete poem. Its scribe failed to copy four columns from his exemplar, but the missing lines survive in later complete copies.1 Linguistic analysis suggests that the volume derives from Worcestershire;2 the book may have been owned during the early fifteenth century by a Thomas Cur3oun of Croxall, Staffordshire (7 miles N.E. of Lichfield),3 and a coat of arms inscribed on f. 1r perhaps ca. 1500 may indicate that it was at that time owned by a descendant of Sir William Clopton (d. 1419), who owned land in Worcestershire and Staffordshire and had connections with the Beauchamps (who may have played a role in the history of the Simeon MS.).4

In 1937 this well-designed and undoubtedly costly book5 of 284 ff. was divided into three parts for commercial purposes.6 The Folger MS. represents the first part, in which appear the text of HS, followed by the **Meditations on the Supper of Our Lord** (*IMFV* 2487), a M.E. verse translation of (apparently) a late-fourteenth-century pseudo-Bonaventuran text. The **Meditations** is a somber poem of just over a thousand lines on the Last Supper and the Passion. It also follows HS in the other non-fragmentary complete copies of Mannyng's poem.
The Localized Circulation of *Handlyng Synne* (Harley 1701 and Bodley), and seems to provide a pensive coda of sorts after all of Mannyng's entertainment. Mannyng, of course, did not write it. The second part of the book, now in the Talyorian Collection at Princeton University, contains Mandeville's extremely popular *Travels*, an international survey of customs and curiosities, as it were, which seems well-placed after Mannyng's local poem. The final part is now MS. University of London, Sterling Library v. 17, which contains a 'C-text' of Langland's *Piers Plowman*, followed by *La Estoria del Evangelio* and a fragmentary text on the Assumption. Langland was born near Great Malvern (7 miles S.W. of Worcester), and this Worcestershire copy of the 'C-text' may have been copied within fifteen years of that text's composition. Both Mannyng and Langland use traditional material for untraditional purposes, though the aims of *Piers* are far more ambiguous than those of HS. Two other MSS. testify to a bibliographical link between these two Midlands poets. MS. Vernon, a northern Worcestershire volume also dated ca. 1400, contains the Sacrament of the Altar booklet of HS, an 'A-text' of *Piers*, and also *La Estoria del Evangelio*. Harley 3954, a Norfolk MS. copied ca. 1400-25, contains an abbreviated version of a scribal 'continuation' to HS which appears in MS. II.4.9, plus a combination of the 'B-text' and 'A-text' of *Piers*, and Mandeville's *Travels*.

The sumptuousness of MS. Folger and the possible prominence of one of its medieval owners seems somewhat unexpected when we recall that Mannyng's intended audience probably did not include people of great wealth or power. Indeed, all three of the Worcestershire copies (Folger, Vernon, and Simeon) are grandiose in varying degrees, while the rest of the HS MSS. are quite the ordinary (and often sloppy) productions we might expect with an understanding of the poet's intended audience. The Worcestershire texts, which were all copied within a few years (and perhaps a few miles) of each other, represent a short-lived departure from the general MS. tradition. The Gilbertine house
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closest to Worcester was at Clattercote, Oxfordshire, some 40 miles E.-S.E. of Worcester. There was also a house of Cistercian nuns at Catesby, Northants. (45 miles E. of Worcester) which appears to have been originally a Gilbertine establishment.¹⁷

*MSS. Vernon and Simeon* (both ca. 1400) are two of the more striking bibliographical oddities in Middle English literature. The (probably lay professional) scribe of Vernon's table of contents (which is somewhat later in date than the MS. itself), seems also to have copied two Staffordshire MSS. of the *Prick of Conscience*, part of the chartulary of the Cistercian abbey at Stoneleigh, Warwickshire, and several documents relating to Stoneleigh Abbey's manorial holding at Radway, Warwickshire,¹⁸ which is but five miles W. of the Gilbertine house at Clattercote, Oxfordshire. A Lichfield-area scribe named John Scryveyn used MSS. Vernon and Simeon while producing a copy of the *Speculum Vitae* for Thomas Heneley, who was variously Prebendary of Lichfield Cathedral, Chancellor of Hereford Cathedral, and Dean of the Royal Free Chapel at Tettenhall, Staffs.¹⁹ MS. Add. 37887, written 'by or for' John Northwood, a monk at the Cistercian abbey at Bordesley (15 miles N.E. of Worcester), shares fourteen texts with Vernon; both MSS. may have derived from a common ancestor. Vernon's inclusion of the life of Bernard of Clairvaux in the *South English Legendary*, and its (apparent) illustration of a Cistercian monk at the beginning of the *Prick of Conscience* add further suggestions that members of the Cistercian Order were involved in its production.²⁰ Simeon appears to be a fragmentary copy of Vernon, and contains several texts not found in its predecessor. The persons or institutions responsible for the production of Vernon and Simeon remain unknown.²¹

In textual scope, physical size, and artistic execution, these MSS. are two of the most extravagant collections of M.E. literature ever produced. Each book took several years to complete, at extraordinary cost.²² The logistics required
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for the assembly of collections of such breadth and the labor required for
their inscription seem insufferably daunting. The beauty of the books is
intensified by the mystery of their origins. Although the books have been the
center of much critical attention, we should present a brief and general
overview of their contents.

MS. Vernon originally consisted of between 422 and 426 enormous leaves
(544x393mm), in which there probably appeared 403 separate texts. 350 ff.
remain today, ruled in triple-columns for verse and double-columns for prose
(80 li. to a column). The contents appear to be divided into five parts:

I. The South English Legendary and supplementary saints' lives.
II. La Ristorie del Evangelie, brief prayers, a fragmentary collection of
miracles of the Virgin, and further (lost) prayers.
III. The expanded Northern Homily Cycle, Hou a man schal lyue parfitly
(from St. Edmund's Speculum), pe visions of saynt poul wan he was rapt into
paradys, Pope Gregory's Trental (which appears again later), the Speculum Vitae,
the Prick of Conscience, and many short texts of varied genre (e.g., Cato's
Distichs, Robert of Sicily, the Stacions of Roma, the Charter of Christ, etc.).
IV. Popular contemplative texts, including Rolle's Form of Living and Ego
Dormio, Hilton's Scale of Perfection, St. Edmund's Speculum, The Abbey of the
Holy Ghost, the Ancrene Riwle, Piers Plowman, and Joseph of Arimathea.
V. Religious lyrics.

MS. Simeon probably originally contained 382 ff., in which there may have
appeared up to 394 separate texts. Only 172 ff. survive (leaf dimensions
585x393mm), which are ruled in triple and double columns as in Vernon (but 90
li. to a column). The first 177 ff. of the original volume are wanting; they
probably contained the equivalent of the first two parts of Vernon. What
remains is a re-ordered and altered version of parts III-V of Vernon:

III. The part begins imperfectly in the midst of the Northern Homily
Cycle. After the Speculum Vitae there appears A meditacion of the fvyue woundees
of iesus crist, which otherwise appears only in MS. University College, Oxford
97. Aside from this departure, the part follows Vernon's closely until a
lacuna occurs, after which there appear six prose texts which are absent from
Vernon:
   a) The Book of Vices and Virtues, ending imperfectly at f. 115v.
   b) Fragmentary conclusion to Sir John Clanvowe's tract, The Two Ways,
a text which otherwise appears only in MS. Univ. Coll. 97.
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The nine items which it shares with Univ. Coll. 97 from an exemplar common to both volumes. The part of the Univ. Coll. MS. which contains the shared texts may be a fair copy of a commonplace book compiled for Sir William Beauchamp (d. 1411) by William Counter (d. 1409), a parish priest of Pirton, Worcs. (5 miles S. of Worcester), whom Beauchamp presented to that parish in 1392. After these six added texts, part III concludes on the lines of Vernon.

V. The lyrics, the last two of which are not found in Vernon.

IV. The last six texts of Vernon’s part IV (including Piers) are wanting, and probably were not copied.

Mannyng’s Sacrament of the Altar booklet appears in both MSS. in the midst of the expanded Northern Homily Cycle, specifically after the sermon De festo corporis Christi. The HS booklet is in Vernon given the title Septem miracula de corporis Christi, which may inaccurately refer to the number of tales in the booklet (six). The readings of both MSS. during the booklet are almost always identical. Like all other MS. versions of the booklet, both of these versions contain two cross-references to earlier sections of Handlyng Synne:

Also pe clerk pat hauntep synne: For no clerk pat is in s., Sim. and Vern. pe c.J clergy, Osb.

But he leue and perof blynne, He shall not serve at pe auter, Noper balewed pyng to come ner. Y touched langer of pys outrage Whan y spake of sacrlylage— pat pe holy gosht shewed hym no3t For pe dekene synned yn po3t. Yn pe tale of Ion Crysostomus, pys tale ys tolde for Sow and vs. (10269-78; the reference is to tale 48 [St. John Crysostom’s Deacon]).

Yn pe seuenpe commaundement Touchepe to pys sacrament— Yn a tale of a kny3t, How pe prest pat lyuep nat ry3t Of hys preyer ys lytyl prove— And pere tellep hyt weyl bow. And y shal telle anouper here,
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Of a messe of a frere.
(10389–96, introduction to Tale 58 [Suffolk Man]; the reference is to Tale 12 [Knight who Robbed a Poor Man]).

Thus it would seem that either the compilers of Vernon or those of the exemplar(s) from which Vernon drew its version of the NHC culled the HS booklet from a complete version of HS, and did not bother to revise the booklet for its new context. When one recalls that the producers of Vernon would have had some four hundred texts with which to occupy themselves, one doubts that they would have felt an urge to add a minor interlude from HS in the midst of the immense NHC. It would seem more likely that the booklet was in the NHC exemplar(s) from which Vernon drew. The Vernon and Simeon scribes' failure to remove the cross-references in the booklet is surely forgivable. The HS exemplar from which the (pre-Vernon) NHC exemplar(s) drew the booklet would seem to have been one related to the early Norfolk-Lincolnshire tradition: the readings of Vernon and Simeon regularly match those of the Osborn MS. (against those of Folger, Harley, and Bodley); among the surviving copies of HS, Osborn appears to be structurally and philologically the closest to Mannyng's original.40

Despite the facts that Folger, Vernon, and Simeon were copied in the same area and at roughly the same time, and that Folger highlights with running titles only the Sacraments section, Folger cannot have been the source of the booklet version present in Vernon and Simeon. Folger reflects a version thoroughly 'translated' into the language of Worcestershire, and this translated tradition appears to have been taken a step further in the more southerly translations presented in MSS. Harley and Bodley.41 A survey of the MS. readings for the booklet (a sample of roughly one thousand lines) reveals that of the three translated versions, Folger agrees most frequently (five times) with Osborn (against Harley and Bodley). In the same sample Folger and Harley together agree with Osborn (against Bodley) once, and together agree with Vernon and Simeon (against Bodley) once; Harley agrees with Osborn (against
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Folger and Bodley on three occasions; Bodley never agrees with Osborn against Folger and Harley. Logic suggests that Folger reflects a translated tradition closer to Mannyng's original than that of Harley, and that Harley reflects a translated tradition closer to Mannyng's original than that of Bodley.

The unwieldy physical format and extreme length of Vernon and Simeon would seem to encourage casual perusal rather than systematic reading. Vernon contains an index, and small reference tabs remain stitched to some leaves of Simeon today. Since the medieval ownership histories of the volumes are unknown, one can only hypothesize concerning the context in which the books were received. Needless to say, only wealthy religious institutions or members of the nobility could afford to commission such tomes. Both were undoubtedly showpiece copies, and reading from them, even in the best modern library conditions, demands a good deal tip-toeing, crouching, and squinting. The books seem far more symbolic than useful. They seem emblematic not only of extreme prosperity, but also of concentrated artistic skill and arduous physical effort whose aim appears to have been to create an encyclopedia of 'contemporary English literature.' They are, above all other considerations, English. They contain texts from many regions of the country. Though the appearance of a section of Mannyng's local poem in these MSS. seems to have been a bibliographical accident, it was an apt accident.

MS. Dulwich, which was copied during the middle of the fifteenth century, is the earliest surviving Norfolk MS. of HS. The scribe copied up to the middle of the 8th Commandment (11. 1-2894) before apparently aborting the project. Unlike the Worcestershire MSS., this volume displays remarkable carelessness and sloppiness. The scribe, whose name was Rose, is known to have copied MS. St. John's College, Cambridge 28, which contains a version of the South English Legendary (also in Vernon), and to have executed that MS.
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quite well, writing the couplets in long lines, and appending his or her signature after major sections of the text.\(^4^9\) In MS. Dulwich, however, Rose seemed unable to decide whether to copy HS in long lines or in single lines. The first two couplets are in long lines, the next four in single lines, then there is a return to long lines, and, because the paper was too narrow to accommodate the irregular hand and format,\(^4^9\) frequent returns to the single-line format occur thereafter. In the confusion, lines 417-79 are overlooked at f. 4v, and are restored on f. 5r-v. The final leaf of the single quire on which the text appears was cancelled, a catchphrase was inserted at the foot of the odd final extant leaf (21v),\(^6^0\) and a scribal signature was scribbled at the bottom of f. 16r--i.e., in an irregular place, contrary to the scribe's regular practice of signing at the end of major sections. Rose bungled the copy from the outset, and seems to have quickly abandoned it.

The scribe had adequate knowledge of organizational techniques,\(^5^1\) but failed to apply such knowledge successfully in this false-start of sorts. The sloppiness of the copy suggests that it was a leisure pursuit inattentively pursued. The scribe, like many before and after him (or her), seems to have enjoyed re-wording the text at whim.\(^5^2\) Aside from such frequent unique departures, the text regularly agrees with II.4.9 and Osborn against the translations, as might be expected.\(^5^3\) Mannyng's aims were unambitious, and so too was the manner in which this volume was copied. Dulwich would appear to be the work of a layman or laywoman.

**MS. II.4.9,** copied in Norfolk during the last quarter of the fifteenth century, was owned by Robert Hawe, who was rector of Thetford (55 miles S.E. of Bourne) from 1473 to 1481, and also by William Trew, who was mayor of King's Lynn (30 miles E. of Bourne) in 1504/5.\(^5^4\) Hawe also may have owned the Inner Temple MS. of Mannyng's *Chronicle*, which was copied in Lincolnshire.\(^5^5\) II.4.9
The Localized Circulation of *Handlyng Synne* is a very simple, homely compilation of brief texts which variously display devotional, didactic, contemplative, and entertaining themes.

The first part of the volume begins with the *Northern Passion* (also in MS. Ashmole), and carries on with the *Charter of Christ* (also in Ashmole and Vernon), two short prose pieces (Lydgate's *Lamentacio Sancta Marie* and *The Maundy of Oure Lorde*), *The Lay Folks' Mass Book* (also in Vernon), brief prose catalogues of the Commandments, Sins, Remedia, Senses, Works of Mercy, Gifts of the Holy Ghost, Sacraments, and Conditions of Charity, prose renditions of the *Pater Noster*, *Ave*, and *Credo*, a brief poem on the nine virtues, the popular prose disputation *De Tribulacione Secundum vi Doctores*, the extremely popular mortality-poem *Erthe upon Erthe* (to which is appended a macabre illustration and an annotator's verses on the picture), *The Abbey of the Holy Ghost* (also in Vernon and Simeon), *Robert of Sicily* (also in Vernon, Simeon, and Harley 1701), and some more brief prose pieces (on St. Edward, the Sacrament of the Altar, and the articles of Christ's Godhood and Manhood).

The scribe left a page (f. 96v) blank before the beginning of his excerpt from HS. After presenting the Commandments section only, he offers what seems to be a 'continuation' of the poem, consisting of eight minute and mediocre treatments of catechetical topics (Confession, Sins, Senses, Remedia, Works of Mercy, Sacraments, Principal Virtues, and Gifts of the Holy Ghost). A later hand added a version of Rolle's *Form of Living* (also in Vernon and Simeon) at the end of the volume.

The contents of MS. Harley 3954, a Norfolk volume copied perhaps a half-century earlier than II.4.9, indicate that the 'continuation' was a long-standing feature in the Norfolk tradition. This well-executed and visually-striking volume contains three booklets written by a single scribe. The first booklet presents a lavishly illustrated version of Mandeville's *Travels* (also in Folger). The second features short poems on the infancy of Christ, on the benefits of
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the Mass, and on the seven virtues of the Mass, after which, beginning on a fresh page, appear four of the 'continuation' texts (viz., the Remedia, Works of Mercy, Sacraments, and Principal Virtues); the booklet concludes with two filler-texts. The third booklet offers a version of *Piers Plowman* (also in Folger and Vernon).

Both II.4.9 and Harley 3954 (the latter of which does not present any part of HS itself) contain the following cross-reference to Tale 10 of HS (St. Macaire and the Two Good Married Women) in the Sacraments section of the 'continuation':

3e men yat in wedlac be,
Kepe 3ou clene for charyte,
For 3yf 3e doun withoutyn drede,
Yerfore 3e xun han mekyl mede.  x.J xal, II.4.9

A tale yerof 3e xul fynde—
3yf we wylyyn yerof han mynde—
In on of ye commandmentes x
Shewyd tyl alle crystyn men.  we...m.l 3e yerof wel have m., II.4.9.

Loke in ye boke before—
In ye vi comaundment it is 3ore.
Yer xal you wytyyn yi mede, I wene,
3yf you kepe yis sacrament clene
Cryst 3yf 3ou grace to kepynt wel,
And yat 3e forfetyn neuer a del.  3ouJ vs, II.4.9.

The connection between the 'continuation' texts and HS is thus both bibliographical and textual (external and internal), and began before Harley 3954 was copied. The Sins text probably began the original 'continuation,' which may have consisted only of four of the eight 'continuation' texts which appear in II.4.9. The 'continuation' seems almost certainly to have been a scribal composition designed to conclude an exemplar of HS which contained only the Commandments section. The separate circulation of the Commandments section of HS certainly began before Harley 3954 was produced, and endured throughout the fifteenth century. The following lines, which conclude only MS. Osborn's Commandments section, may indicate that Mannyng encouraged excision of
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dthis section (as he clearly also seems to have done in the Sacrament of the Altar booklet); the lines restate the topic of the section and the nature of the intended audience:

Here ere pe commenentes tene
On ynglyshe tonge for lewyde men. Amen. Expliciunt mandata.66

As we pointed out earlier, it is possible that Mannyng released the Commandments section (and the Sacrament of the Altar booklet) before he completed the entire poem.

MS. II.4.9 is precisely the sort of unremarkable local compilation in which we might expect to find HS. The variously devotional, didactic, contemplative, and entertaining texts are brief enough to be recited,67 and varied enough to offer enjoyable browsing to readers. HS was designed for such dual utilities, and a short selection from Mannyng's poem preserves the symmetry of this collection of short texts. The book, like HS, seems to have no single sustained purpose, and cannot be categorized generically. It presents from time to time information, matters for contemplation, and entertainment. Mannyng wrote for clerics and laymen. The book was owned by a clergyman and a layman.

The scribe edited the HS selection freely, removing over 250 lines, and adding a few of his own.68 As might be expected, the text which he offers frequently agrees with Dulwich, the other Norfolk MS., against all other copies, and often agrees with Dulwich and Osborn, against all other copies.69

MS. Ashmole (s. xv ex.-xvi in.) is the product of a decade or so of intermittent copying by a Leicestershire scribe named Rate.70 It contains forty-one brief texts of widely varying genre, many of which concern domestic life, and all of which may have been intended for recitation or private perusal within a familial context.71 The eighteenth entry is Tale 22 of Handlyng Synne (The Forgiving Knight [Sin of Anger section]).

-207-
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The volume begins with the story of St. Eustace, who perishes with his family after many tribulations. After Lydgate's *Ryght as a Rammes Horn*, which considers the ideal society, there appear two short didactic poems, *How a wyse man taught his sone* and *How pe goode wyf taught her douster*. Thereafter there is the story of Ysumbras, whose plot is broadly similar to that of St. Eustace, before another didactic piece, the Ten Commandments from the *Speculum Christiani*, and two texts on manners, *Stans Puer ad Mensam* by Lydgate, and *Dame Curtasy's Moral Instructions*.

A Latin couplet on untrustworthy friends, some rules for land-purchasers, and a Latin quatrain on unhappiness then precede a bed-time prayer, a morning prayer, a repetition of the first eight lines of the *Speculum Christiani* entry, and a prayer to the Virgin.

A series of stories then appears, beginning with *The Debate of the Carpenter's Tools*, in which the tools and the carpenter's wife deride the carpenter's drunkenness. After a levation prayer, there appears the tale from *Handlyng Synne*, which describes a rapprochement between two feuding men and how, after their differences were settled, the Cross kissed the one who forgave the other. This is followed by two romances, *The Earl of Tolouse* (featuring much violence leading up to a marriage), and *Libeaus Desconus* (in which a kiss breaks a spell and leads to marriage). Marriage is the subject of considerable humor in the next offering, *Sir Corneus*, which relates the activities of a brotherhood of cuckolds. A somber miracle follows, in which the Virgin grants children to a barren couple, and later forgives the wife for killing herself and her children in a rage of jealousy. The macabre note is sustained in a tale of an incestuous daughter who murders her mother and children after her sin is discovered.

The Christmas-romance *Sir Cleges* and a poem on the feast of All Saints lead into a series of contemplative poems—the *Chasteau d'Amour* by Grosseteste,
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Ypotis (catechetical precepts delivered by the Christ-child [also in Vernon and Simeon]), The Northern Passion (also in I.4.9), the Charter of Christ (also in Vernon and I.4.9), and a Lamentatio Beata Maria (in which an image of the Virgin warns mothers to remember Christ). After Lydgate's Dietary, the contemplative texts continue with Septem Psalmi Penitentiales by Richard Maydenstone, the Stimulus Consciencia Minoris, and the Stations of Jerusalem.

The volume closes with several unrelated articles, beginning with a story of a late adulterous squire who warns his son of the risks of the sin, followed by a romance on the Resurrection, a miracle of St. Margaret, an examination of the wounds of Christ, the story of Sir Orfin (which is not unlike those of St. Eustace and Ysumbras), a lyric on vanity, and finally a fragmentary story of a friendship between a king (perhaps Edward II) and a hermit which began in Sherwood Forest.

Like the Norfolk MSS., Ashmole is precisely the sort of book in which we might expect HS to appear. It is a homely production, copied casually by a scribe who had technical ability, but little inclination to demonstrate such consistently. It was evidently a leisure pursuit, probably undertaken by a layman, which continued for several years, and which was never pursued with zealous attention to accuracy. Rate, like the Norfolk scribes, edited his texts as he pleased. His reading of the tale from HS is occasionally nonsensical. The tale itself is derived from the Manuel and is of little merit; its use of certain romance-themes may explain its inclusion in Ashmole. Mannyng surely did not anticipate a reading of his poem as selective as this one, and there is no evidence elsewhere of circulation of individual tales from HS. The variety of texts which appear in the volume suggests that the scribe browsed widely and copied whatever appealed to him and was brief. He necessarily drew selectively from HS.
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MSS. Harley 1701 and Bodley 415, which contain the two south-eastern 'translations' of the complete text of HS, were both copied within the medieval boundaries of the Diocese of Lincoln. Harley was produced by a Buckinghamshire scribe during the first half of the fifteenth century. Although its text of HS lacks 41 lines which appear in Bodley's, evidence which we have already presented suggests that, of the two, Harley is the closer to Mannyng's original poem. After HS the Harley scribe offers the Meditations on the Supper of Our Lord (also in Folger and Bodley). A different but contemporary hand then adds Robert of Sicily (also in Vernon, Simeon, and II.4.9), and on the final leaf a third hand (also contemporary) begins a version of the Mass of the Holy Name. The main hand of the volume seems clearly to have been that of a professional scribe, and the neat simplicity of the format and execution, as well as the negligible amount of annotation, suggest that this was a library copy produced by a religious institution. Unfortunately, the MS. provides no evidence of ownership.

MS. Bodley was copied during the third quarter of the fifteenth century by a Hertfordshire scribe. It contains the longest extant text of HS (12,638 ll.) but, of the complete copies, it appears to be the furthest removed from Mannyng's original (see note 78). It seems to have been owned originally by the house of the Bonshommes canons at Ashridge, Buckinghamshire (40 miles S.W. of Cambridge), and was probably copied by a professional scribe at the house itself. The volume contains HS and the Meditations only. It was written by one professional hand, and, like Harley, displays the uncluttered, relatively unannotated neatness characteristic of the simpler products of monastic scriptoria.

Bodley is the only extant copy of HS which provides evidence of ownership by and (probably) production at a religious house. Mannyng wrote for ordinary people (religious or otherwise), and Bodley and Harley are plain,
unexceptional books. The Bonshommes followed the Augustinian rule, and
established only three houses in England (at Ashridge [in 1283], at Ruthin,
Clwyd [in 1310], and at Edington, Wiltshire [in 1345]). Mannyng's home town,
Bourne, was the site of an Augustinian abbey. His dedication of the text to
'gode men' of Bourne could be more particular than it seems.95

MS. Osborn was copied near Durham ca. 1500.96 Despite its late date,
among the surviving copies its text may be structurally and philologically the
closest to Mannyng's original. Only this MS. preserves the 126-line Tale of the
Drunken Priest (no. 37, in the Gluttony section), which Mannyng certainly wrote
drawing it directly from the Manuel, and which was apparently censored from
the main textual tradition.97 Only this MS. provides the names of the
sacrilegious carollers who figure in Tale 50.98 A further fourteen unique lines
appear in this version, four of which are derived from the Manuel.99 Despite
its being a northern 'translation' of HS, Osborn probably preserves uniquely
some of the original vocabulary of the poem.100

The MS. is unfortunately badly damaged. The first 2,500 lines of the poem
are lost, as well as the last 266, and in between there are several lacunae.101
The volume appears to have been thrown together quickly by a team of five
professional (and probably commercial) scribes. The cheap construction of the
book undoubtedly hastened its disintegration.102

The book seems to have been owned originally by the Bowes family, of
Streatlam Castle, Co. Durham (20 miles S.W. of Durham), and it seems to have
remained in the possession of that family until the late nineteenth century.103
The appearance of HS in an apparently commercially-produced edition for a
landed Durham family seems rather unexpected. The relationship between the
Boweses and the Tempests (who owned three copies of the Manuel) is examined in
Appendix III.
Conclusion

Vaddington's poem quickly circulated throughout the country, principally among the clergy. Mannyng transformed a national poem into a local one. The circulation of Handlyng Synne was limited. Only four copies attest to the complete text, while at least three others suggest that Mannyng released sections of the poem before he finished the entire work. Most of the copies were produced in the central regions of the country. While the poem (in whole and in part) circulated briefly among people of means in Worcestershire, and while a late copy was owned by a landed Durham family connected with the Tempests, the majority of the surviving (complete and partial) copies of the poem appear in plain, and often sloppy, manuscripts owned by ordinary laypeople and clerics. Mannyng wrote for ordinary people, and his poem was, for the most part, received by such people.
The missing columns were 40 ll. long, and correspond to ll. 4275-4314, 4675-4714, and 12225-12304. The Folger scribe ruled for 37 ll. to the page. The fact that the missing columns correspond precisely to columns in the Bodley MS. (see Sullens, p. xxvii), which was copied some 75 years after Folger, indicates that MS had been copied in the common 40 ll. format perhaps for over a century. Sullens (p. xxvii) regards the unusual coincidence as evidence that the scribe of Folger copied directly from MS. Bodley. She (p. xiii-iii, note 20) rejects the opinions of experts on the dates of the earliest complete texts (Folger and Harley), and (p. xcv) does not provide evidence to support her grossly misleading claim that Bodley was copied ca. 1400. In an attempt to conceal the obvious fact that she selected her base text (Bodley) on the grounds of convenience (Bodley is neater and longer than the other complete texts) rather than on grounds of textual merit, Sullens concealed some and distorted other evidence in order to claim that 'both F[olger] and H[arley] are copies of B[odley], and that therefore, Bodley must pre-date Folger and Harley (see Sullens, p. xiii-iii, note 20). Since one justifiably doubts that a modern editor would be unable to conceive that copies of a Middle English text might not survive, and therefore that surviving copies (e.g., Folger and Harley) might derive from lost ones, one must consider seriously the possibility that Sullens's thesis is an act of wilful distortion designed to save herself labor.

In order to disprove her thesis, one needs only to find a single instance in which Folger agrees with an extant MS. against the reading of Bodley, and another instance in which Harley likewise reads against Bodley. Fortunately, in a sample of only roughly a thousand lines (the Sacrament of the Altar booklet) there are several such instances (line numbers cited in this note refer to Sullens's edition). Folger agrees with Osborn, Simeon, and Vernon (against Harley and Bodley) at ll. 9924, 10054, and 10802. It agrees with Osborn (against Harley, Bodley, Simeon and Vernon) at ll. 10148 and 10352. Folger and Harley together agree with Osborn, Simeon, and Vernon (against Bodley) at ll. 10752, and together agree with Simeon and Vernon (against Bodley) at ll. 10168. Harley agrees with Osborn (against Folger and Bodley) at ll. 9900, 10390, and 10502.

Sullens places variant notes not only in the section devoted to them at the end of the text, but also unexpectedly at the foot of the text-page; the latter notes often further disprove her thesis. Folger and Harley agree with Dulwich (against Bodley) at ll. 199, 802, and 2343, with Dulwich and Cambridge (against Bodley) at l. 727, with Osborn (against Bodley) at ll. 3212, 3379, 9577, 10898, and 11578, with Osborn, Simeon, and Vernon (against Bodley) at ll. 10509, and together (against Bodley) at ll. 8542 and 9426. Folger agrees with Dulwich and Cambridge (against Bodley) at l. 1560, with Osborn (against Bodley) at ll. 3681, 3798, 7596, and 9247, and with Osborn, Simeon, and Vernon (against Bodley) at ll. 10619. Harley agrees with Dulwich and Cambridge (against Bodley) at l. 2526, and with Simeon and Vernon (against Bodley) at l. 9945.

Unlike MSS. Harley and Bodley, Folger does not translate rhyme-words (Sullens notes this, p. xxvii), and does not contain the rubric attributing the Manual to Grosseteste. As we shall see, it would seem that, of the three most complete MSS., Folger most resembles the hypothetical original, Harley resembles it less than Folger, and Bodley least resembles it.

^See LALME I, p. 137. The editors of LALME examined the third part of this MS., now held at the University of London (see below).

See LALME I, p. 137. The editors of LALME examined the third part of this MS., now held at the University of London (see below).

His name appears on f. 36v. On f. 4r of the part in the University of London (see below) the name 'Richardd hodysons' is inscribed in a mid-
sixteenth-century hand, and on f. 107r a hand of similar date records that the book then belonged to 'george langgam,'

*Doyle ("Survey II, pp. 42-3) provisionally accepted the judgement of an anonymous 'heraldic expert' who claimed that the arms were those of Sir William Clpton, whose name appears elsewhere in a will alongside that of one of the Beauchamps, a family which is connected with MS. University College, Oxford 97, a volume closely related to part of MS. Simeon (see below). C.U. Faye and W.H. Bond believed the attribution of the arms to be based on 'extremely doubtful grounds' (Supplement to the Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada, vol. I, (Oxford, 1969), pp. 376-7), and J.W. Bennett, who thought that the arms were added during the fifteenth or sixteenth century (The Rediscovery of Sir John Mandeville (New York, 1954), p. 290).

Floral borders appear on the first pages of texts; blue one-line capitals and formal marginal notations begin tales in HS; running titles appear in the Sacraments section of HS only. In the Mandeville text (see below), the first word of each paragraph is rubricated, as are all Latin passages, and, in Piers (see below) proper names, marginal notations, and Latin passages are rubricated. The pages are ruled (margins and lines) in ink, and the parchment is of high quality.

See Ker, Medieval Manuscripts I, op. cit., p. 376. One scribe wrote all three parts.

I.e., C. Brown and R.H. Robbins, edd., The Index of Middle English Verse (New York, 1943), which will be referred to hereafter as IMEV. The text has been edited by J.M. Cowper, E.E.T.S.O.S. 60 (1875).

The prologue to the text includes an authorial promise to 'chaunge py chere' (1. 11). See Sullens, p. xiii (note 21), where she reviews the findings of G.H. Naish ("A New Edition of Handlyng Synne," (University of London, Ph.D. thesis, 1936)) regarding the source of the poem, viz., apparently, the Mysteria passionis domini nostri Iesu Christi, which may not have been composed before 1376.

Cowper (pp. xiii, xvi-xvii) and Furnivall (Chronicle, p. xiv) were unable to support with evidence their speculations concerning Mannyng's authorship of the poem, and were unaware of the lateness of the text's Latin source.

This portion of the volume was formerly in the possession of Mr. Boies Penrose of Devon, Pennsylvania. Dr. R.G. Biggar kindly informed me of its latest location.


See the discussion of the contents of Vernon, below. On the language of Vernon, see LALME I, p. 148.

See the treatment of MSS. I.4.9 and Harley 3954, below.

See Knowles and Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses, op. cit., pp. 197, 272-3. The house at Catesby was founded ca. 1175 (op. cit., p. 272). The Folger volume as a whole (i.e., before it was divided) was owned during the seventeenth century by the antiquary Sir Roger Twysden (d. 1672), thereafter by the Sebright family of Beechwood, Herts., and ca. 1937 booksellers purchased it from the Giffard family, of Chillington Parks, Staffs., 20 miles W. of Croxall, where the book's first owner seems to have lived (see the typescript description bound with the Sterling MS., and Ker's Medieval Manuscripts I, p. 376).
Notes for Chapter IV

12See Doyle, Vernon, pp. 12-14.

An obscured scribble on f. 91v of Simeon may or may not represent the name 'Joan Boun,' i.e., Joan Bohun (d. 1419), sister of Archbishop Thomas Arundel (see Doyle, Vernon, pp. 15-16). Doyle appears to agree with H.E. Allen's statement that the origins of the MSS. probably will remain a mystery (Vernon, p. 16, note 87).

22See Doyle, Vernon, p. 6.


25The divisions were originally devised by Doyle in his essay 'The Shaping of the Vernon and Simeon Manuscripts,' op. cit., passim.

26A full list of the contents of Vernon appears on the overleaf at the back of Doyle's facsimile.

27On the format of the MS., see Doyle's Vernon, pp. 1-2, and Sajavaara, op. cit., pp. 433-4. The analysis of the contents of Simeon presented here is an overview of that set out by Sajavaara.

28Doyle has suggested (Vernon, p. 5) that Simeon once may have been divided into two parts, the first of which is no longer extant.

29A full list of the contents of Simeon appears on the overleaf at the back of Doyle's facsimile. On the appearance of this text in MS. Univ. Coll. 97, cf. Doyle's article, 'University College, Oxford, MS. 97,' op. cit., p. 266.

30On the peculiarities of Simeon's version of the text, see pp. 317-36 of W.N. Francis's edition (E.E.T.S.O.S. 217 [1942]). On the particles of the text which Simeon and Univ. Coll. 97 share, see Doyle's 'University College... 97,' op. cit., pp. 265-6.

31On this text's presence in Univ. Coll. 97, see Doyle's article on that MS., op. cit., p. 266.

32See Doyle's article on Univ. Coll. 97, loc. cit.

33Ibid.

34Ibid.

35Ibid.


37The booklet appears on ff. 197v-199v of Vernon, and ff. 2v-4r of Simeon; Vernon's version was edited by Horstmann, E.E.T.S.O.S. 98, pp. 198-221.

38The De festo appears in E.E.T.S.O.S. 98, pp. 168-97, and in S. Nevanlinna's edition of the NHC, part II (Helsinki, 1973), pp. 253-72. The sermon survives in only a few copies of the NHC, and is clearly a late insertion (see Nevanlinna, part I [Helsinki, 1972], pp. 21-2). MS. C.U.L. Dd.1.1 (which contains the unexpanded NHC [see Nevanlinna I, p. 2]) provides a 38 ll. introduction to
the De festo (see Horstmann, p. 168) which has all the markings of the beginning of an independent text.

This cross-reference is derived from the Manuel (see 11. 7481-8).

Simeon and Vernon agree with Osborn (against Folger, Harley, and Bodley) at (Sullens ed.) 11. 9904, 9906, 9918, 9960, 9970, 9984, 10001, 10025, 10035-6, 10043, 10058, 10091-2, 10094, 10098, 10115, 10129, 10141, 10151, 10158-9, 10182, 10189, 10192, 10212, 10224, 10241, 10260, 10263, 10265-6, 10295, 10304, 10310, 10319, 10337, 10340, 10347, 10355, 10375, 10382, 10391, 10413, 10434, 10446, 10453, 10455, 10466, 10488, 10493, 10496, 10498, 10624, 10639, 10645, 10675, 10702, 10723, 10737, 10744-5, 10748, 10755, 10758, 10773, 10783, 10788-9, 10799, 10803, 10809, 10812, and 10815. Sullens claims in her introduction (p. xxxii) that 'Simeon, Vernon and Osborn are not significantly different in line readings from Bodley, Folger, and Harley in this portion of the work [i.e., the Sacrament of the Altar section].' The Osborn MS. will be discussed below.

Sullens's argument that Folger and Harley are copies of Bodley has been disproved in note 1, above. Folger pre-dates the other two, lacks the translations of rhyme-words, lacks the attribution of the Manuel to Grosseteste, agrees with Osborn (against Bodley) more frequently than does Harley, and, most significantly, is in a different dialect from that used in Harley and Bodley. Sullens depends upon Naish's examination of the similar philological characteristics of Harley and Bodley, and admits (p. xl, note 13) that Naish had no knowledge of the Folger MS. when he wrote his thesis. Sullens's contention (p. xx) that 'The dialect of Bodley, Folger and Harley is South East Midland with occasional reflections of an older North East Midland manuscript source,' suggests that she had never attempted to identify the dialect of Folger. She believes (pp. xx-xxi) that all three manuscripts are the product of a 'revision' of Mannyng's text into the south-east Midland dialect executed either by the scribe of Bodley or by that of an ancestor of the Bodley MS. In her variant notes (which are laden with useless linguistic variants), Sullens betrays an uncertain grasp of Middle English. Her reference to Simeon and Vernon as 'Southern manuscripts' (p. xxx) with 'markedly Southern dialect forms,' (p. xx) alongside her recognition (p. xlv, note 30) that W.N. Francis (E.E.T.S.O.S. 217, op. cit.) believed that Simeon was copied in the south-west Midlands, suggests that she had little regard for topographical niceties. Sullens's concept of Folger's dialect is one of many distortions which allowed her to construct a false theory of textual descendancy (see note 1).

In his review of Sullens's edition (op. cit., Speculum 62 [1987], p. 972), Dr. Biggar provides a provisional stemma which appears to depict the Bodley MS. as the source of Folger and Harley, but rather as dependent upon exemplars which owe something to the sources of Folger and Harley. The present writer's suggestions concerning the relative merits of the complete texts are based upon a logical assessment of the sample of evidence presented in note 1.

See Serjeantson's edition of the index to Vernon, op. cit.; on the tabs in Simeon see Doyle, Vernon, p. 15.

E.g., pieces by Langland, Hilton, Mannyng, Rolle, and Nassyngton appear, as well as the HHC and the South English Legendary, plus a superabundance of prayers and lyrics of uncertain but unquestionably varied provenance.

On the language of this MS., see LALME I, p. 117.

At the foot of f. 16r the scribe writes 'Amen quod .<!>. Rose: Da gloriam deo.'

Doyle connected these two MSS. ('Survey' I, p. 64, note). For a description of the St. John's MS., see W.R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts of St. John's College, Cambridge (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 37-8, in
which it is noted that the scribe's signature appears after major sections, on ff. 73, 79, and 84.

The leaves are of ordinary dimensions (295x205mm), but the heavily-stroked and sprawling hand, and the scribe's failure to rule the pages, conspire against a successful execution of the long-line format. Sullens provides a facsimile of f. 9r (in long-lines) on p. 316 of her edition.

The presence of the catchphrase indicates that the scribe's exemplar continued after this point, and suggests a scribal intention to copy further. Nothing in the MS. would lead one to believe that the scribe carried on after the first quire. H. Gburek (Der Vortrachtzett des Robert Mannyng von Brunne in Handlyng Synne [Erlangen, 1977], p. 28) and Dr. Biggar (Speculum 62, pp. 969-70) consider the text a fragment; Sullens (pp. xxvi, xlv (note 42)) speculates that it would have offered only the Commandments section.

The scribe begins Commandments and tales with capitals, begins each Commandment with a Latin caption in bastard script, provides marginal notation of tales, and adds couplet-bars when working in the single-line format.

The variant notes to the several passages from the Prologue and Commandments section cited in Chapter III amply illustrate this point.

The (Sullens ed.) lines in which Dulwich agrees with Cambridge (against the common reading exemplified by Bodley) include the following: 147, 159, 182, 191-2, 216, 230, 255, 256, 265 (DCF), 271, 290, 305, 338, 340, 350, 366, 368, 373, 404, 412, 440, 468, 476, 491, 518 (DCF), 537, 539, 585-6, 699, 739, 812, 827-8, 846 (DCF), 850, 866, 902, 913, 941-2, 953, 999, 1026, 1066 (DCF), 1120, 1127, 1136, 1151, 1248, 1251, 1261, 1281, 1310, 1314, 1376, 1418, 1468, 1471, 1519, 1577, 1595, 1607, 1645, 1667, 1733, 1774, 1796, 1811-12, 1844, 1855, 1865, 1892, 1927, 1962, 1969, 1973, 1975-7, 2029-32, 2075, 2082, 2095, 2111, 2147, 2153, 2164, 2206, 2219, 2222, 2232, 2263-4, 2282, 2310, 2317, 2339, 2349, 2357, 2394-5, 2413, 2423, 2436, 2453, 2522, 2540 (DCO), 2556 (DCO), 2559 (DCO), 2561 (DCO), 2562, 2564 (DCO), 2569 (DCO), 2582, 2594, 2597, 2609 (DCO), 2615 (DCO), 2616 (DCO), 2629 (DCO), 2634 (DCOF), 2635-6, 2639 (DCO), 2642, 2644 (DCOH), 2647, 2659 (DCO), 2663, 2668, 2670 (DCO), 2673 (DCO), 2681-2, 2699, 2733, 2745 (DCOH), 2747 (DCOH), 2751 (DCO), 2756 (DCO), 2784-5 (DCO), 2815, 2818, 2821, 2831, 2839, 2865, 2876 (DCO), 2879 (DCO), and 2880 (DCO).

Osborn begins imperfectly at (Sullens ed.) I. 2501, but the closeness of its text to those of Dulwich and II.4.9 is clear in the four hundred lines which the three MSS. share. Dulwich's departures from the common reading (exemplified by Bodley) which are not shared by II.4.9 include those in the following (Sullens) lines: 1283 (DF), 1294 (DFH), 1985 (DFH), 2291 (DH), 2529 (DO), 2570 (DO), 2619 (DO), 2662 (DO), 2671-2 (DO) 2763-4 (DO), 2767 (DO), 2785 (DO), 2789 (DO), 2792 (DO), 2884 (DO), and 2888 (DO). Similarly, the departures of II.4.9 not shared by Dulwich are regularly shared by Osborn, e.g., at (Sullens) I. 2511 (CO), 2537-8 (CO), 2568 (CO), 2739-40 (CO), 2759 (CO), 2862 (CO), 2875 (CO), 2892 (CO), 2904 (CO), 2932 (CO).

On the language of the volume, see LALME I, p. 68. The following inscriptions appear on f. 195v, a blank leaf in the midst of the final text of the MS: 'This is the boke of Sir William Trew (i.e.) witnesse wherfor I Thomas Bareyle haveyng knowlage thereoff have putt to myn signe;' 'John Cuttyng de Worsted;' 'This is the boke ser Robert Hawe.' On f. 197v fult.1 a s.xv hand wrote 'Thomas Hardycham'. The surnames Bareyle and Cuttyng are connected with the area surrounding Norwich. Binders found underneath the bookplate a fragmenaty parchment document (C.U.L. Doc. no. 799; s. xiv inc.) which refers to Sedgeford (12 miles N.E. of King's Lynn). F.A. Foster identified Hawe and Trew, and discussed other historical points, in his edition of The Northern Passion, E.E.T.S.O.S. 147 (1916), p. 13, notes 4-7. Trew was a clothier by trade (see [anon.], A Calendar of the Freemen of Lynn 1292-1836. Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society Papers 10 (1913), p. 68).
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Notes for Chapter IV

It is a roughly executed paper MS. which regularly includes plain red-ink capitals at the beginning of texts and sections, occasionally provides couplet bars for the poetry, and captions for sections of texts, and from time to time adds marginal scribal commentary on the texts (notations of tales frequently appear alongside the excerpt from HS, for example). A reproduction of f. 97r of the MS. appears in Sullens's edition, p. 2.


It is a tall and narrow volume (leaf dimensions 290x145mm) of good quality parchment with regular pricking and ruling, separate sets of quire signatures for the booklets, and pre-planned decoration and rubrication which, for the most part, was executed. One neat, formal, bastardized anglicana-secretary band copied the entire volume. On the language of the scribe, see LALME I, p. 112.

On f. 89v, a blank leaf after the first filler text, a sixteenth-century annotator scribbled the following comment: 'This booke as I judge is full of many and provitid stories and which do seme most excelent and pleasant unto the reader.'

Vernon contains an 'A-text,' Folger a 'C-text,' and Harley (as Schmidt, ed., points out, op. cit., p. xi) a 'B-text' combined with an 'A-text.'

The passage is drawn from Braekman's edition of this text, op. cit., NM 82.

In his analysis of the 'continuation,' S. Sullivan draws attention to several verbal similarities between the 'continuation' and the Commandments section of HS, and notices that in the Sins section of the 'continuation' there is another cross-reference to Mannyng's treatment of the sixth Commandment (see S. Sullivan, pp. 220-1). S. Sullivan believes that the text on Confession may have appeared (logically) in final position in the original 'continuation,' that the Sins, Remedia, and Sacraments sections preceded Confession, and that the remaining sections, which are noticeably inferior to the aforementioned four, were later additions (op. cit., p. 240).

S. Sullivan also believes this to be the case, although he does think that the 'continuator' was at least broadly familiar with the general contents of the rest of HS (op. cit., pp. 240-1).


In note 57 we pointed out that the version of the Northern Passion in II.4.9 contains a unique epilogue directed to listeners. The 'continuator' frequently requests that his audience listen: Lystyn to me and you xalt here
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Of a tale good and fyt.
(Virtues [ed. Braekman, ll. 270-1].

Man 3yf you wylt here
Ryth good thyng you myth lere.

As 3e sullyn afterward here,
Syf 3e wyl lystyn and lere.

Lystyn man and you xalt here
Of thyng yat is boye dygne and dere.

Be a tale here myth you here.

Lystyn here and you myth here.
(Sacraments [ed. Braekman, ll. 1-2, 51, 147].

Lystyn I xal Sou telle.
(Gifts [ed. Bowers], i. 3).

See Sullens, p. xxv.
See note 53, above.

On the language of the volume, see LALME I, p. 145. A.J. Bliss believed, on the basis of watermark evidence, that the volume was copied over a number of years (see Sir Orfeo, 2nd ed. [Oxford, 1966], pp. xi-xiii). An examination of radiographs of the watermarks by Dr. B.C. Barker-Benfield (Bodleian Library MS. Refs. LXXIV. 27 [1986]) suggests that the book was copied during the 1480s.


J.C. Hirsh drew attention to some of the scribe's technical skills (e.g., the use of catchphrases and the quality of script) in 'Additional Note on MSS. Ashmole 61 Douce 228 and Lincoln's Inn 150,' MX 78 (1977), pp. 347-9. The scribe separates texts clearly, occasionally providing titles, and frequently concluding texts with his (or her) signature and with sketches of fish and flowers. G. Holmstedt (ed., Speculum Christiani, E.E.T.S.O.S 182 [1933], p. cxviii) identified the now largely illegible scribbles at the foot of f. iv as a table of contents. The margins, and sometimes the lines, are ruled in drypoint, and there are rhyme bars, tracings for capitals, marginal corrections, and even some highlighting in crayon of the first letter of lines. Dr. Barker-Benfield thinks that the unusually tall and narrow shape of the volume (leaf dimensions 425x135mm) is simply the result of the scribe's failure to cut the quires in half before writing. The horizontal fold to guide such a cut appears in the center of the leaves, and the scribe's pen occasionally dripped as he skipped over the folds (see Bodleian MS. Refs. LXXIV.27, op. cit.).

Notes for Chapter IV

At 1. 3829, for example, the scribe writes that the knight put on his shoes before walking barefoot to Mass, and at 1. 3880 he claims that the child kissed the crucifix, when it should, of course, have been the other way around.

This tale was examined briefly in Chapter III, in the discussion of the improvements which Mannyng made to Waddington's exempla. The motivation for the tale is a point of honor (a child's father is murdered by a knight) which draws the child to challenge the knight, thus leading to an extensive siege, which is resolved in a plea of mercy by the knight on Good Friday, which, being granted, leads to unification and the symbolic embrace of the child by the crucifix in the parish church.

During the fifteenth century texts frequently circulated in brief booklets, and this, P.R. Robinson has suggested, may help to explain how the scribe was exposed to such a variety of texts (op. cit., pp. 38-40 and 83-4). On the circulation of Icelandic translations of exempla from the Manuel tradition, see the examination of MS. Rawl. Poet. 241 in Appendix II.

On the language of the volume, see LALMR I, p. 110. On the boundaries of the medieval Diocese, see W. Smith, ed., Monastic Britain (Southampton, 1978 [Ordnance Survey]).

On the 41 lines which Harley lacks, see Sullens, p. xxviii. On the relative merits of MSS. Folger, Harley, and Bodley, see notes 1 and 43, above.

This last text was identified by Doyle ('Survey1 II, p. 42).

Gilt capitals with violet flourishes begin major sections of HS; blue capitals with red flourishes begin minor sections. The scribe notes in the margin the presence of tales, and there are couplet bars, rubricated running titles at the top of pages, and rubricated captions at the beginning of sections.

On the language of the volume, see LALMR I, p. 146.

On f. iiiv there appears the following note, in a hand contemporary with that which copied the texts: 'liber do<mu> s de Asshrugg.' The house at Ashridge was founded in 1283 (see Knowles and Hadcock, p. 203). At the end of the book the same annotator seems to refer to the content of the Meditations, and perhaps also to Mannyng's tales:

The passyon pat our lorde yn his manhede suffred he<re>,
And all his oper werkys pat he wroghte sere,
Examples yt wer for vs pat were <hy>dere.
(f. 92r [a flyleaf]).

Eleven extant manuscripts are known to have been owned by the house at Ashridge (see Ker, Medieval Libraries, 2nd ed., op. cit., pp. 4-5, and Ker and Watson, Medieval Libraries...Supplement to the Second Edition, op. cit., p. 2), and in one of these (B.L. Royal 3.D.6) an inscription of ownership appears which mirrors precisely the wording of Bodley's inscription (see H.C. Schulz, 'The Monastic Library and Scriptorium at Ashridge,' Huntington Library Quarterly 1 [1937-8], p. 305). In 1358 a canon at Ashridge copied Huntington Library MS. EL 7 H8 for the use of members of the house (see Schulz, op. cit., pp. 307-10).

The layout of Bodley is similar to that of Harley, but is executed with greater care. As in Harley, there are running titles, captions at the beginning of sections, couplet bars, and marginal notation of tales. The text is ruled for 40 lines to a page, while Harley is ruled for 38. A contemporary annotator drew particular attention to two tales which Mannyng added to his source (scribbling 'grosteste' on f. 30v, beside Tale 26 [Grosseteste's Love of Music], and 'a note fo<r> mydwy<f>' on f. 61r beside Tale 53 [Ignorant Midwife]), to one which Mannyng greatly improved (jotting down 'colbek' [57r] and 'Brunyng1 [58v] beside Tale 50 [Sacrilegious Carollers]), and to one drawn from the Manuel (writing 'of one in desperacion' [f. 28r] next to Tale 24 [King Conrad's Sergeant]).
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On the Westminster Diocesan Archives MS., which preserves only 20 ll. of the text, see Chapter III, note 9.

On the houses at Ruthin and Edington, see Knowles and Hadcock, pp. 203-4. In 1624 MS. Bodley 565, which was copied at and owned by the house at Edington, was donated to the Bodleian by a 'Mr. Tempest,' undoubtedly a member of the family which owned three copies of the Manuel (see F. Madan and H.E. Crafter, A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, vol. 2, part 1 [Oxford, 1922], p. 324). After the dissolution of Ashridge (1539), Thomas Waterhouse, the last rector of the house, may have preserved the library (see N.R. Ker's 'The Migration of Manuscripts from the English Medieval Libraries,' The Library, 4th series, vol. 23 [1943], p. 11, and, on the dissolution and later history of the house, Schulz, op. cit., pp. 308-9). In 1604 the house was in the possession of Sir Thomas Egerton, who later became Chancellor of the University of Oxford (1610-16?). Henry Wriothesley, the third Earl of Southampton and a patron of Shakespeare, donated the Ashridge copy of Handlyng Synne to the Bodleian in 1605 (see R.W. Hunt, ed. Summary Catalogue, vol. 1 [Oxford, 1953], p. 92). On the lives of Egerton and Wriothesley, see DNB VI, pp. 579-81 and DNB XXI, pp. 1056-61, respectively.

The language of the volume is described as 'northern' in LALME I, p. 166.

This tale is printed by Sullens, pp. 163-6. Waddington's version appears on pp. 210-11 of Furnivall's edition.

After l. 9026 of Furnivall's edition, Folger and Bodley present the introductory couplet to the list of names:

pe ouper twelue here names alle.

Neither MS. includes the list. The scribe of MS. Harley avoids this difficulty by not presenting the couplet. Osborn has the couplet, and the list:

Teodoryke, Meynolde, ande Bouelyne,
Gerarde, Edberte, ande Wenselyne,
Acelyne, Folkewarde, Hyldebrandus,
Aelwarde, Beune, & Odryous.

(Sullens, p. 226, note).

S.A. Schulz, who edited part of the Osborn MS., determined that the list was present in the source from which Mannyng drew the tale ('An Edition of Robert Mannyng of Brunne's Handlyng Synne [Osborn Manuscript]' [New York University, Ph.D. thesis, 1973], p. iii).

S.A. Schulz (op. cit., pp. vii-viii) provides a list of lines which she believed to be unique to the Osborn MS. Two couplets based on lines in the Manuel (viz., on ll. 4013-18 and 7796-7) appear in Osborn only (and would appear after Sullens ll. 4136 and 11022 [see Sullens, pp. 352 and 371]).

See Appendix VII ('Notes on Mannyng's Dialect').

Although some 4,000 lines of Mannyng's poem are missing from this copy (see Dr. Biggar's comments in J.A.W. Bennett's Middle English Literature, ed. and completed by D. Gray [Oxford, 1986], p. 478), it is clear from some torn leaves at the beginning of the volume (on which bits of text remain) that Osborn's text was once complete. The first such leaf carries a fragment of ll. 304-5.

Three scribes copied most of the text, while two others took over for just part of one page each (one for p. 134, another for p. 138). See LALME I, p. 166. 'Rogere Williams,' who signs his name on p. 111, may have been the man who copied p. 138 only. Only the bare boards of the binding remain, and the first pages of each quire are heavily soiled. One quire is lost after p. 94. The scribal plan was rough. Only the first scribe uses couplet bars, and throughout the book organizational features like rubrics, capitals, and running titles appear rarely and inconsistently. The scribes' consistent use of Latin captions in bastardized script to introduce sections and tales contrasts with...
the practices of the scribes of the other complete copies, who consistently provide captions in English.

93The bookplate of William Blakiston Bowes of Streatlam Castle is pasted on to the inside of the front board, and an eighteenth- or nineteenth-century note pasted to the front of that board indicates that the book remained in the possession of the family until modern times. Although twentieth-century booksellers believed that the copy could have been owned first by Sir William Bowes of Streatlam, Governor of Berwick-upon-Tweed (d. 1460), and although the watermarks resemble those employed in Durham during the middle of the fifteenth century (see Doyle, 'Survey' I, p. 64, note 14, S.A. Schulz, op. cit., pp. iv-v, and the Beinecke Library's typescript description), the handwriting present in the copy suggests that it was written some time after the death of the Governor. J.O. Halliwell-Phillips drew from the MS. for his Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words (London, 1847), but the Boweses were unable to find the book when Furnivall came up to see it (see his edition of the Chronicle, p. ii). Mr. J.M. Osborn purchased it from Mr. L. Witten in 1957, and bequeathed it to the Beinecke Library in 1976 (see the library's typescript description).
Chapter V

The Text and Manuscripts of Peter Idley's Redaction of Handlyng Synne

(a) The Author

Throughout his life Peter Idley appears to have enjoyed financial and political prosperity. His first marriage, to Elizabeth Drayton, landed him with nearly seventy acres in Drayton St. Leonard and Dorchester, Oxfordshire, and during his working life he leased royal mills at Wallingford and purchased property in Abingdon and in the vicinity of Lincoln. By 1439 he had been appointed Bailiff of Wallingford, St. Valery, and Chiltern; in 1453 he became master falconer to Henry VI, and three years later Comptroller of the King's Works, based at Westminster. His public career appears to have ended with the accession of Edward IV in 1461, and he died in 1473/4.¹

Some members of his social set had literary connections. The Duke of Suffolk William de la Pole, a poet, patron of Lydgate, recipient of confraternity with Bury St. Edmunds, and owner of the best extant exemplar of Lydgate's Siege of Thebes, was constable of Wallingford during Idley's years as Bailiff;² Suffolk's wife Alice, the apparent dedicatee of Lydgate's Virtues of the Mass, was Geoffrey Chaucer's grand-daughter, and a fixture among the well-placed figures who frequented her father's home at Ewelme (4 miles S.E. of Drayton St. Leonard).³ Geoffrey Chaucer, like Idley, was employed at the King's Works.⁴ Idley and Thomas Stonor witnessed three transfers of property belonging to their Oxfordshire neighbor Edmund Rede, Jr., whose will of 1487 indicates that the Rede library included, among much other material, works by Gower, St. Bonaventure, and Albertanus of Brescia.⁵ Idley himself translated excerpts from two of Albertanus's works.⁶ The Redes were maritally allied with the Stonors.⁷ John Warefield, sometime Mayor of Wallingford, who succeeded Idley as lessee of
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the royal mills at Wallingford, was friendly with the Chaucers and Stonors, and
Elizabeth Idley's family was related to the Stonors. As Idley's death
approached, Thomas and William Stonor became trustees of his possessions.
Thomas was one of Idley's provisional heirs. After Idley's death acrimonious
wrangling for the estate began between Idley's eldest surviving son, William,
and Idley's second wife, Anne. In an autograph letter of 1479/80 regarding this
case, Richard, Duke of Gloucester (later Richard III) asked William Stonor (JP
for Oxfordshire) to come to the assistance of Anne Idley, who was at that time
mistress of the nursery in Richard's household.

Idley was a man of the secular world of means and position, a
photographic negative, as it were, of Waddington the influential archiepiscopal
servant, and a figure thoroughly dissimilar to that of Mannyng, the country
canon. It should come as no surprise that in his redaction of *Handlyng Synne*
Idley transformed his source so completely that it is almost unrecognizable.
Unlike Waddington, who wrote a legal tract for a national clerical readership,
and unlike Mannyng, who wrote a story-book/directory of sin for rural,
unsophisticated listeners and readers, Idley wrote a guide to prosperity for the
prosperous.

Two poems are known to have come from his pen, one a selective
compilation and translation of Albertanus of Brescia's *Liber Consolacionis et
Consilii* (and segments of the *Liber de Amore et Dilectione Dei et Proximi*)
written ostensibly for his first son Thomas (who predeceased him), the other
the redaction of *Handlyng Synne* (incorporating from time to time excerpts from
Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*) written for a well-heeled readership. These poems
seem initially to have circulated separately; later a spurious transition was
effected by a scribe in order to fuse the two works and thus to form an
anthology of Idley's poems. The poorest texts derive from this later
tradition, as might be expected. The redaction of *HS* must have been composed
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between 1438/9, when Lydgate completed the Fall of Princes, and 1459, when the only dated MS. of the redaction was copied. It cannot be determined when Idley wrote the translation of Albertanus.

(b) Idley's Translation of the Liber Consolacionis et Consilii

There are no allusions in this poem to Idley's redaction of HS; likewise in the redaction there are none to this poem. The translation appears on its own in MSS. Digby 181 and Harley 172. Idley states in his Latin preface based on that in Albertanus's Liber de Amore that he (like Albertanus) was writing in order to instruct his son on the way to live honestly, and he suggests at the beginning and end of the work that his motives are paternal:

But that nature dryueth me to this dede,
As y can to teche the, my childe,
That art yet yonge and somdele wylde.
(I. 5-7).

Sauffe oonly nature, whiche doith me leede
For the, my childe, to this symple deede.
(I. 1469-70).

He addresses his son occasionally, and at one point threatens to disinherit him if he refuses to become a lawyer:

Also, sone, this lesson y the leere.
(I. 78).

Good soone, haue this weele in mynde,
And to thy grete profite pou shalt it fynde.
(I. 265-6).

Therefore lerne, sone, to lieue in peas.
(I. 1267).

I conceyve thy witte bothe goode and able
To the lawe; thersore, now haue I ment
To set the, if pou wilt be stable,
And spende thy witt pat God hath sent
In vertu with goode entent.
Than shall I helpe pe, as Y can,
With my goode till pou be a man.

And if pou do the contrarie--trust me well--
I woll put fro the, without nay,
Londe and goodis eueri deell,
And all pat euer I goodly may.
Therfore pat pou laboure nyght and day
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God and man hooily to please,
Thy fadre and moore to bertis ease.

... Therefore lerne besily while youthe last,
And murielie in age to leefe be not agast.
(I. 127-40; 146-7).

Since the last passage, unlike those which precede it, implicitly addresses his son, it would appear likely that the poem was conceived initially for the exclusive reception of the son.

The disparate provenances of the surviving manuscripts of the poem indicate of course that this theoretical conception was not practically manifested. Indeed, Idley includes at least one general address and a few modesty topos hardly appropriate for a father speaking alone to his son:

I reporte me to you that be maried:
Wher is ther ony so glorius a lyffe?
(I. 526-7).

In the begynnyng of this litell werke
I pray to God my penne he leede: II Late vs, Harley.
For in makyng I am as a yonge clerke
That lerneth first--Cristis Crosse me spede!
(I. 1-4).

This is thende of my litell frame,
Roughly hewe and without ony square.
That shold be sharppe is dulle and lame--

Idley could not have been ignorant of the appeal of the instructions-to-son genre, and it is clear from his additions to Albertanus (which are far fewer than those which he made to HS) that he wished to present comfortable commonplaces for comfortable people. He tells his receivers to impoverish the poor only when necessary:

Yet taketh no mater on hande of vntrouthe,
Ne pouere mannes good--but ye it desvere.
(I. 568-9).
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He reminds them that the lords whom they serve have the power to make or break them:

Beith true to youre cliaunt or whom ye serve;
Telleth hem the text and leevith the gloose,
For who woll all coveite all shall loose.
(I. 572-4).

The most important personal asset, Idley suggests, is a good reputation, and in order to give the impression of having one one must always, he indicates, keep up appearances:

Of thy tonge be free in gentill speche,
Meke in countenaunce, deboneire and mure,
And to honoure pou shalt areche.
Therfore do this, as I the teche, this t. son, Pepys.
And gladde of thy companye will be ecbe a man,
And sey of the worshippe al pat they can.
(I. 121-6).

Looke also for ony disporte or othir thyng
With good felawshippe pou be accomanyed,
That shall to honoure specially the bryng, sp.l effectuely, TCD.
If pou with hem woll be allied.
(I. 155-8).

He that wilfully his body abuseth,
And past is al drede and shame,
Lesith a precious lewell, which is his name.
(I. 117-19).

He warns, however, that one should not deceive oneself by believing that the public image is true to one's spirit:

And if to worshippe pou happe to rise
By fortune of connyng for tattayne,
Forgete not pysilf in noo maner wyse;
Fro proudnesse of herte pou the refreyne.
(I. 148-51).

In public life one must always make sure that one appears to be loyal to the forces of order:

Also for thy kyng and for the reawmes right
To put thy body with due diligence, duel soverayne, Harley.
With alle thy power and thy hooll myght,
Looke in the be founde noo necligence.
(I. 855-8).

Trust not to moche to thyn owne reason,
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Dispute not thy feith ne the power of thy kyng. D.J Dispise Be.4.37; thy f.  
Thow myght happe to stumble and falle into treason. 
Therfore medle not with suche maner thyng. 
(II. 806-9).

All of this advice, in theory dispensed to a son who was pressured to become a man of position like his father, is also practically designed to appear relevant to persons already enjoying position and wishing they could keep it. If Idley's ideas seem cynical in this poem, that impression will be firmly buttressed with reference to his material additions in his redaction of HS. In the redaction Idley never refers to his son. The public intended audiences of the translation and redaction seem, nevertheless, to be identical.

(c) The Redaction

(i) Manner of Reception and Intended Audience

Although no non-fragmentary text of this poem survives, the most complete version, in MS. Add. 57335, which breaks off during the treatment of the second Thing to Avoid in Book VII, indicates that Idley re-worked all of HS. It is quite clear that Idley wrote the poem for readers:

If ye list to wete and will enquire,  
Lokketh in the bible and ye shall fynde hem there. 
(II.A 417-8 [1st Comm.]).

Right so no man can serue God and please Sathan—  
In hooly write ye may pis lesson fynde. 
(II.A 545-6 [1st Comm.]).

In Vitas patrum a litell tale is tolde,  
As ye may see yf ye lust to beholde.  s.j here, Pepys. 
(II.A 2265-6 [2nd Comm.]).

But what availleth examples that we rede,  
If we doo the contrarie in all oure deede? 
(II.A 2650-1 [3rd Comm.]).

As ye may rede in the holy bookis of kyngis. 
(II.B 1341 [Sloth]).

In pe processe of Toby per 3e may ssee. 
(II.B 2610 [Lechery]).
Idley's Redaction of Handlyng Synne

Lookes in the Bible & ther ye shall fynde.
(I.I.B 3005 [Lechery], MS. Add., f. 73r).

All this ye may fynde playne in the Bible.
(I.I.C 746 [Sacr. of Altar], MS. Add., f. 80v).

Idley's direct addresses suggest that he was writing for people who shared his background. He warns that the whip should be cracked, as it were, at the servants:

I counceill you, be ware, pat kepe ony houshalde,
For ye shall for your servantes hoolly answere,
And all her dedis on your bakk ye shall heuely beere. d. onl othys off, Arundel.
(I.I.A 757-9 [2nd Comm.]).

Wherfore ye that haue the lordshippe and prosperite,
Rewleth youre people that be you vndre.
For wher obedience lacketh in a comynte, c.J commynalte, Pepys.
Prosperite and welthe woll sone asondre.
(I.I.B 120-3 [Pride]).

He adds, however, that blood should not be drawn:

Therfore, whanne thou art grettest in honour
And most may doo vndre maistershypp and dominacion,
Then bere the evenest with thy neighboure.
Thow wotest not how sone ther wil be a translacion.
(I.I.B 148-51 [Pride]).

He tells lords that sin threatens position:

Alas, 3e my lordes pat reyn most gloryous!
3e wyll not remembyr of estates pat hathe ben before
For sufferance of syn myschevyd and forlore! m...f.J have myschefely be born,
(I.I.B 2777-9 [Lechery]).

And he indicates in a general address that his intended audience consists of money-worshippers:

Now of gaderyng of goodis, I haue you tolde,
And what sorow and care and moche tribulacioun And w.J For, Pepys.
Ye haue in the getyng therof bothe in wete and colde,
And grete feere in the kepyng and grevous vexacion.
Ye make it youre godde, which is a grete abhominacioun. Y.y.J Sum make it here,
(I.I.B 1933-7 [Gluttony]).

The main theme of Idley's material additions to the content of HS is that the Golden Rule really is golden:

That every man may love that oon that othir,
As kyndely and frendely as brothir and brothir, and f.1 as frendys, Pepys; b.1 syster, Arundel.

Then shall we haue plente, prosperite, and welthe.
(II.A 1353–5 [4th Comm.]).

Cherisse vertu, all vices haue in hate, Ever dreadyng God, and then ye may be sure In prosperite and welthe long to endure.
(II.A 2656–8 [7th Comm.]).

God graunt vs grace oure defautis to amende, And welthe and prosperite ageyn to vs sende.
(II.A 3007–8 [10th Comm.]).

Lete call ayen that dwe obedience in haste, Or ellis all welthe and worship is paste.
(II.B 76–7 [Pride]).

Idley seems to know, though, that rich people are less concerned with making money than with keeping it. Virtue is the name of the road to financial and social security, he tells his readers time and time again, and Sin that of the road to cash crises and cold shoulders. Adam, he reminds them, was in clover before he stepped out of line:

Ther was no man erthly hadde soo moche ioye Ne so moche welthe as Adam hadde. But envie wolde not that he shold enioye That blissed place...

Thus was he put fro ioye and highe prosperite And becom subiecte to dethe and wooffull pouerte.(II.B 589–92, 601–2 [Envy]).

Perjury, envy, sloth, and lechery can all take the edge off one’s public image; the last three are particularly threatening to one’s cash flow:

Whanne they [i.e., perjurers] be vndirstonde, it doith hir name treble. No man woll trust hem, when they be knowe. bel pem, Arundel. Who that of his promyse is variaunt and doble, His honour and worshippe is sone ouerthrowe.
(II.A 2722–5 [8th Comm.]).

What is to felicite more sorowfull and odious Than whan man is sette most welthfull in his stalle, And by fals envie is made sodenlie to falle?
(II.B 614–6 [Envy]).

How he [Envy] bryngeth man owt of his good name, Whiche is to euery creature most paynfull shame.
(II.B 804–5 [Envy]).
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And delight never in slothful idleness,
For where they abide is cler dissolacion:
No comfort, no joy, no consolation,
But sorrow and pain and great grievance,
And of worldly goods no great abundance.
(II.B 1158-62 [Sloth]).

The vi* spi...*
...Yea to oppress and raueshe a manny's wyffe.
...God gyffes person a dreadfull sentence--
Loss of goods, hunger, and defamation,
Or--wars off all--perpetual damnation.
(II.B 2675, 2677, 2679-81 [Lechery]).

Myscheve and pouerte and grete angres ffele
pel xall haue pat lechery so haunte.
(II.B 2749-50 [Lechery]).

Theie [i.e., princes] haue come to greate mischief, this is certeyn:
Loeste lande and goodes, & thonour of theire name.
Thus lechery causeth worshippe halte & lame.
(II.B 2930-2 [Lechery], MS. Add., f. 72r).

The common grass-roots opinion of the rich that money (now that they have it) is earned through righteousness certainly would not be likely to be seconded by the poor,30 and Idley's persistent promotion of that opinion largely indicates for whom he wrote. Idley was not unaware that the people who most despise social mobility are those at the top of the social order, who can only fall; thus another one of his themes is that everyone must be put in his place and be kept there. Social posers may have the money, but, Idley asks, how did they get it? They have the clothes, but have they the manners? It would be heaven on earth, Idley says, if people were fixed in their places like the letters of the alphabet:31.

A man shall not now kenne a knave from a knyght,
For al be like in clothyng and array,
In freshe doublettes of silk strechychng vp right,
And few pens in her purs, y trowe, to pay.
No force of the getyng, so the garment be gay.
This maketh them to ken the craft of a theif,
And to blot the paupers of London in every leif.

How an ordre wold be hadde with vertu and grace
In every creature aboue all thyng,
In every contree and in every place,
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And specially to beginne aboute the kyng,
Not onely to speke of arraie as in clothyng--
Called inordynat--wiche is a grete offence,
But also of norture and curtessie and due reverence.

Eche man to kenne hymself and his better,
A page a grome, a grome a woman by right,
As the A. B. C. is made in ordre by lettyr,
A woman a squyer, and a squyer a knyght,
And so to the highesett and grattest of might,
And as they be in ordre set of degree,
Right so shall her clothyng and arraie bee.

In heuene and erthe an ordre must be accepte.
In heuene ther is non, ne never shall be.
In heuene, I wote, an ordre is keppe.
How it is in erthe now y reporte me:
I trowe it be not hadde in noo degree.

Idley, in a passage seen in part earlier, calls on the temporal powers to keep
the rabble down, for money's sake:

Wherfore ye that haue the lordshippe and prosperite,
Rewleth youre people that be you vnдрre:
For wher obedience lacketh in a comynyte,
Prosperite and welthe woll sone asondre.
If that londe stonde in peas me thynketh wondir,
Therfore rule youre people by reason and right--
And lete men kenne a knave fro a knyght.

A late-sixteenth-century annotator wrote on f. 1r of MS. Pepys 2030, which
contains the scribal fusion of Idley's two poems, that 'This Book was Henery y*
6 Kinge of England;' while it cannot be determined whether the annotator was
referring to the physical book or to the text within it, Idley's long career in
the service of that King makes either option not unlikely. Idley in fact
castigates H.R.H. for using his royal position to extort from traders:

It is said that it is the kyngis prerogatyff
To bye better chepe than another man.
Aynst his highnesse it is harde to stryff,
But the lawe is the contrarie, y report me than,
And but the parteis togedre accorde can,
It is noo sale but playn extorcion--
No trouthe but falshode, as in conclusioun.

Therfore let a kyng pay for his vetailles--
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And specially to a poore man for small acate. *sm.J fresche, Pepys.*  
(II.A 2939-45; 2953-4 [9th Comm.]).  

Although it is possible that a copy of Idley's works fell into the hands of the King, it is quite evident that in this poem Idley was writing for persons of his own station, and carefully expressed the sentiments of such persons on two topics of considerable importance to them, money and status. In the face of this fact, the following broad addresses fall flat:

Therfore of what degree ye be, condicion, or astate,  
Lete love be thy cheif mediatour and meane.  
(II.A 1739-40 [6th Comm.]).

But be thowe wedded man, seculer, or prest,  
If thowe in this synne eny wise have offended,  
Remembre the conscience within thie breste.  
(II.B 2940-2 [Lechery], MS. Add., f. 72r).

Idley addresses women on standard topics only:

Beith ware, ye women, I counceill you soo:  
For trouth oweth not to be geven by right  
But openly in holy churches sight.  
(II.A 1669-71 [6th Comm.]).

Therfore, ye women, kepe you cloos euer more,  
And suffre not men to haue freely her lust,  
For it causeth ofte housbandes wyffes to mystrust.  
(II.A 1690-2 [6th Comm.]).

Women au3t to have a grete remorse  
pat dysvyguryth pus peir soulys by wylfulnes,  
And with stynkyng lechery defoull peir corse.  
Alas, for shame that 3e lake shamfulnes!  
shamel ruth, MS. Add., f. 69r.  
3e be not remembyrd pis world hath no sykernes.  
Leyf 3our foule lust of lechery and pride!  
(II.B 2752-7 [Lechery]).

There are quite a few typical anti-feminist utterances, principally drawn from Lydgate, throughout the text, and there is also plenty of anti-clerical material: Idley's single piece of advice to priests is certainly rhetorical:

The preste also that of mannes soule hath cure,  
And of his parishyns hereth the confession,  
Behoveth to be gentle, meke, & mure,  
And in his demeanyng have a goode direccion,  
Comforable in heryng, not straite of correccion.  
If a man be ferefull handle hym faire:  
Fede hym with softe language, gentle & debonair.
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Serche his conscience craftilie, & tenderly hym grope.
Howe god is all mercifull & sone will foryeve,
Putt hym in no doubtes, for fere of wanhope.
For if a man be sorye, and of his synnes shryve,
And neuer in will after whiles that he lyve
More to offende, and ask mercy and grace,
God is anone redie to foryeve thie trespaece.
(II.C 869-82 [Penance], MS. Add., fol. 82v). 

Idley's main theme (that wealth and position are products of virtue and lack of such is the product of sin) makes the following passage seem humorous:

Beith not sorie for losse of worldlie goodis.
They com by fortune, whiche is transitorie—
Now heere, now ther, as ebbis and flodes.
This wolde be called to youre memorie:
Remembre thy maker, the Lorde of glorie.
Set at nought all your worldlie rages,
The pompe also of youre cofres and stuffed baggis.
(II.B 1611-17 [Covetousness]).

Similarly, there is a faint ring of insincerity about the following apostrophe, particularly since later in the text Idley dilutes the statement:

O, what shall falle thanne of the lordis grete [thel peis, Arundel, Laud.]
That take pore mennys lande to her possessioun,
And all othir goodis that they may gete? [And...g.] And lyvelode also, Pepys.

This is no theifte but tirannye and oppressioun!
Lucifer shall take her confessioun!
(II.A 2617-21 [7th Comm.]).

God of his rightwysnes may not saue
Hem that lyffe by raveyn and fals extorcioun
Without shrifte and penauns and due satisfaccioun.
(II.B 1062-4 [Sloth]).

Writing, perhaps, from the comfort of his first wife's expansive estates, Idley warns his readers not to marry money:

Yit be remembred, I rede every creature
That of his own soule hath the cure,

*If you marry*

For eny carnall affeccion or desire of goode,
For honour or worshipp to be sett vp in pride,
For lande, for rentes, or eny greate bloode—
All this pompe caste cleane frome you aside—
For butt if that love be the speciall gyde.
Els merthe will passe & loye waxe bare,
And all theire daies after lyve in sorrowe & care.
(II.C 1077-85 [Matrimony], MS. Add., f. 85r-v).
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Unlike the *Manuel*, which instructed clerical readers on the law of confession, and unlike *Handlyng Synne*, which entertained, informed, and advised simple country folk on the subject of sin, Idley, in his redaction of HS, advised people like himself on how they could stay just as they were, rich, and therefore (he would say), good. The redaction is a complacent reassurance for the snug and smug, a charter for stagnation, and as such a photographic negative of the reformative document on which it ultimately depends, the *Manuel*.

(ii) Editorial style

(a) Cutting and pasting

The editorial cunning of Peter Idley needs to be appreciated. Writing in fashionable rhyme-royal for fashionable people, he passed over much in his source which might have upset the minds he wished to soothe. Since he believed wealth to be a product, if not a symbol, of virtue, it comes as little surprise that most of Mannyng's statements which contradict this opinion do not find their way into his poem. Himself a member of the legal community (as a bailiff), Idley overlooked Mannyng's criticisms of the greed and dishonesty of the judicial system (HS 1335-62; cf. II.A 1412-3 [5th Comm.]). Thieving would appear to be an unmentionable, for Idley removes not only Mannyng's suggestion that the story of Abbot Zenon was for the particular attention of thieves (HS 2083-90; cf. II.A 2238-9 [7th Comm.]), but also Mannyng's description of servants' thefts from their masters and his analysis of the species of theft, including the story of St. Fursey (HS 2359-2634; cf. II.A 2658-9 [7th Comm.]). Mannyng's denunciation of the quest for wealth and public esteem (HS 3402-38; cf. II.B 245-6 [Pride]) does not, of course, appear in Idley's redaction; neither does Mannyng's reflection on the ease with which rich men lie with impunity during court appearances (HS 2702-16; cf. II.A 2749-50 [8th Comm.]). The connection between wealth and sloth described in HS does not appear in the
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redaction (HS 4239-40; II.B 875-6 [Sloth]), and, most significantly, nearly all of Mannyng's examination of the deadly sin of covetousness is missing from Idley's poem (HS 5326-6088; cf. II.B 1617-18 [Covetousness]).

Idley occasionally adds a detail which might make a point more easily understood by people of his sort. He suggests that dreams should be disregarded,

For ofte tymes in dremes we see
Goolde and good and grete array,
And whenne we awake, al is awaye.

Likewise the royal servant says that there is one God because

No man can ne may doo his service aright
Vnto twoo lordis--not with his ease:
That oon shall hym hate, if he pat othir please.
Right so no man can serue God and please Sathan--
In hooly write ye may pis lesson fynde.

Therefore kepe pis right well in thy mynde,
And serue pat Lorde that euer to the hath be kynde,
That for the suffred payne and deth on the rode.

Idley appears to have found Mannyng's frank discussion of sexual crudities distasteful, for he does not include his predecessor's allusions to the common man's opinion that sexual sins are trifling, (HS 582-97; cf. II.A 551-2 [1st Comm.]), to the practice of incest among children (HS 1666-8; cf. II.A 1734-5 [6th Comm.]), of conjugal relations during holy days or in holy places, of bearing bastards, of private misdeeds (HS 1999-2046; cf. II.A 2217-18 [6th Comm.]), and of keeping mistresses (HS 2925-38; cf. II.A 2980-1 [10th Comm.]). Mannyng's statement that fornication is the least dangerous of the sexual sins is also passed over (HS 7353-6; cf. II.B 2618-19 [Lechery]), as is his description of arousing fantasies (HS 7558-628; cf. II.B 2765.14-2766 [Lechery, MS. Add., f. 69r]). The advice to clerics in HS was clearly irrelevant to Idley's readers, so it is to be expected that Idley should not present Mannyng's suggestions that clerics should not drink and gamble before Mass (HS 1045-54;
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cf. II.A 1069-70 [3rd Comm.], and that they should praise their faith (HS 1543-6; cf. II.A 1559-60 [5th Comm.]); he omits the description of the properties of the Host, which Mannyng provided for the edification of priests (HS 10079-10142; cf. II.C 763-4 [Sacraments, MS. Add., ff. 80v-81r]).

(b) Narrative developments

(1) Continuity and description

Mannyng wished to entertain, and transformed Waddington's dry *exempla* into diverting tales by providing motives for actions through improved characterization. The flow of action, however, was still rather quick, and logical gaps were occasionally left unfilled. What would satisfy Mannyng's unsophisticated receivers clearly might not always do for the more discerning readers of Idley's work, and Idley's development of the logic and detail of the stories is frequent and perceptive. His alterations to Mannyng's Tale 9 (Adulteress Split in Two), which derives from the *Manuel*, are exemplary. In the story villagers are suddenly besieged by a murderous dragon, and approach a hermit for advice. Unlike Mannyng, Idley describes the ferocious beast:

The dragon was large and of suche a stature,  
Replete of venem bothe hedde and taille,  
That men durst not put hem in aventure,  
This lothly beest for to assaile.  
For ther was noon armure of steill ne maille  
That might avoide his venemous stroke,  
Though he hadde be mighti as an oke.  
(II.A 1840-6).

Mannyng (HS 1757-61) keeps Waddington's rather improbable statement that the people could not find the dragon, and then simply outlines their next actions, going to the hermit and telling him first 'alle here dere' (1769). Idley omits HS 1757-61, and adds drama and probability to the interchange between the seekers and helper by describing the villagers' decision to go to the hermit, their journey to his dwelling, what was said at the meeting, and how it was received:

Every man said his best advise,
As they thought after theire entent.
And amonge all ther was oon more sad and wyse,
And also suche a grace God had hym sent
To fynde a meane for this serpent
To haue hym distroyed thorow Goddis grace,
And right thus he said in the same place,

'Her dwelleth an eremite not ferre hens.'

And forth they went vnto the eremyte,
In all goodly haste a grete paace,
Every creature bothe moche and lite,
Till they com to his dwellyng place.
They fell on knees and prayed hym of grace
And of his counceill he wold hem yeve,
For vnto myscheif they were vttirly dreve.

And tolde hym all the caas vnto thende--
How hir kontrey was grevuoslie aclioid
With a dragon venemous, an orrible feende.
They were never so sore anoyed,
For man and beeste he hadde distroyed.
'Therefore we pray you of counceill and socoure
To brynge vs out of this wooffull doloure.'

And with this wordes the eremite still stode.
Full sobirly he gave hym audience,
And amonge hem demurely aboode,
And hadde in her wordis feith and credence.

The hermit suggested that the villagers confess and then pray in penance for
three days. Mannyng says that the villagers agreed to the plan and went home
(1777-83); Idley makes it clear that they kept their end of the bargain:

To doo in all thyng as the eremyte said,
To fullfylle alle t. that to hem
was s., Pepys.

And deuoutly shrove hem vnto the priest,
Every man, wyf, wedewe, and maide.
And still three dayes they bertyly praised
Vnto that Lorde that is maker of all,
To haue his people in memoriall.
(II.A 1897-1902).

After the vigil, Mannyng says that God heard the hermit's own prayers and sent
an angel to resolve the problem (1795-6); Idley puts the message into the
angel's mouth:

'God hath herde the, and therfore arise
And send for the people in all hast possible.
For God hath herde hir prayers all.
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And thow shalt be maister of that worm odible, 
And oppresse hym in his owne stall, 
And make the people free that were thrall.'
(I.I.A 1923-8).

In Mannyng's version, the angel asks the hermit to get the people together and then the people arrive; Idley makes it clear that the hermit gathered the folk:

And this was doo as the aungell hem badde. 
He sent for the people the countree aboute. 
(I.I.A 1931-2).

Unlike Mannyng, Idley properly introduces the people to their deliverer:

The eremyte badde hem to haue noo dowte: 
'For God hath sent his aungell vs to saue, 
And the dragon to oppresse in his owne cave.'
(I.I.A 1935-7).

The angel leads them to a tomb in which a dragon rests between two halves of an adulteress. In Mannyng's story, the angel explains that the sinner's body is divided because it had, when alive, divided its affections; Idley adds to the speech the reason why the sinner obviously was not forgiven:

'It availled hir not therof to be shreve, 
For eche a day she wold hir synne renewe. 
If they oones assaye, it is harde to be true.'

He also has the angel suggest that the adulteress was a part-time professional, receptive "'To every man that list to assay/ Som for love, and som also to pay'" (I.I.A 1978-9), and has him warn the womenfolk of the village to take heed of the grisly precedent in the tomb (I.I.A 1991-2028, [2022-8 are from PP II. 36-42]).

(ii) Characterization

Mannyng gave speech to Waddington's characters. Idley made the dialogue and action more human. In Mannyng's Tale 1 (Tempted monk), a monk pursuing the hand of an infidel's daughter is refused by the father on the grounds of Mohammed's knowledge of Christ's mercy (HS 239-50); Idley's saracen attempts to persuade the monk to resume the Christian faith:
Aske hym grace and good werkis begynne.
He shall be as welcom as ever he was,
And as he before that never did synne,
Be it never so grete or orrible trespaas.
And therfore I praye the voyd this place.'

(II.A 216-20).

Unlike Mannyng (HS 2817-40), Idley reminds his readers in his version of the
story of St. John the Baptist that Herod regretted his oath (see Matt. 14: 9,
Mark 6: 26):

And thus in haste she wolde haue it don.
Wherfore themperoure made grete moone.
And for he wolde not breke his symple beheeste,
He had hir doo as she liked beste.
(II.A 2830-3).

Idley's description of the parting of Jephthah and his daughter adds poignancy
to the version in HS (cf. esp. 2877-8; cp. Judges 11: 38):

And she knelid downe with an humble chiere.
Full maidenly in array was she attired.
She toke hir levee of hir fader dier,
Whom she loued hertely and most entiere,
Praieng hym of his blessyng that he wold hir geve,
Shapped hir only no lengger to lieve.
(II.A 2891-6).

In Mannyng's Tale 19, Florens's bear, who has been shepherding in the fields,
fails to return for lunch. After a search, Florens finds the bear's lifeless
body and immediately regrets the punishment that the unknown murderers will
receive (HS 4099-100). He is unaware that four envious monks had planned the
execution. In Idley's version Florens is less ingenuous:

'Allas, for petie, who wold the smyte
That was to me so true and kynde?
For to do true service was thy delite.
Envie hath a full grete appetite!'
Thus he saide to hemselfe allone.
(II.B 730-4).

A boy who habitually cursed God is punished with a visitation of the devil in
Mannyng's Tale 21, and Mannyng says that the boy's father attempted to hide the
child in his bosom (HS 4889); Idley's introduction of further paternal impulses
makes the scene far more dramatic:
This man laide this childe in his lappes,
For feere hymsel was nye atteynte,
And with his gowne couerty gan hym wrappe.
For drede and woo he wexe all feynte.
He prayd to God and many a seynt
The childis scoow cowde no peynte, Be.
H...an.] And promysed pylgrymage to, Pepys.
To saue his soone, that he not spille.
And ever the childe cried and shriked shille.
(II.B 1310-16).

The child dies, and Mannyng concludes his story by stating that the father's unwillingness to punish the boy led to the death (HS 4899-902); in Idley's version the father, quite naturally, blames himself:

The fadir cried piteusly and score gan to wepe,
And said, 'Allas, that euer I was born!
For slouthe of chastisyng my childe is lorn!'
(II.B 1321-3).

Human touches such as these are evident throughout Idley's re-working of Mannyng's stories.43

(d) Manuscripts of the Redaction

MS. Arundel 20 was copied during the second half of the fifteenth century apparently by a Norfolk man44 living in Newnham Murren, Oxfordshire (near Wallingford), who was a tenant of Idley's bibliophile neighbor Edmund Rede.45 As might be expected, the scribe's reading of the redaction is the best of the extant MSS.,46 though the text is structurally awkward, the scribe having a fondness for abridgement and relocation of substantial blocks of text. Two stories are moved from their usual place, and five others are omitted. Like all versions, this one is defective, breaking off at II.B 2813, and placing the first 434 lines only of the sacrilege section between the Commandments and the Sins.47 The redaction is preceded in the MS. by the Norfolk poet John Capgrave's lengthy and graphic Life of St. Katharine of Alexandria, which has only its verse form in common with the redaction.48 This is the only surviving MS. which clearly indicates that the redaction circulated independently from
Idley's Redaction of Handlyng Synne

Idley's other poem. The scribe had professional skills, but his casual use of such suggests that he was writing for himself. I

MS. Laud Misc. 416, which was copied ca. 1459 at Rode Heath, Cheshire (near Congleton), opens imperfectly with the redaction (beginning at II.A. 430, breaking off in mid-leaf [f. 64v] at II.B 2233), and proceeds with the monumental Cursor Mundi, a prose translation of Vegetius's De re Militari, Lydgate's Siege of Thebes (a copy of which was owned by Idley's associate and Lydgate's patron, William de la Pole), Lydgate and Burgh's Secreæ of Old Philisoffres, and Chaucer's Parlament of Poulæ (imperfect, also in Digby 181). In this odd mix of texts the acquisition and use of public influence may be seen to be an inconsistently present linking theme.

Although the loss of at least thirty-six leaves at the beginning of the book allows plenty of scope for the original presence of Idley's translation of Albertanus, the text of the redaction of MS was clearly originally imperfect. Despite some omissions, misplacements, and scribal misinterpretations, what remains of the text of the redaction is, as one might expect from its date, nearly as good as that in Arundel.

The book, which was originally bound in red leather, must have been commissioned by a layman of considerable wealth. It originally contained over 350 folios, written primarily by one professional scribe, John Newton of Rode Heath. By the early sixteenth century the MS. was in the possession of the Brigetidine nunnery of Syon; it was probably given to the house by the scribe's apparent relative, Humphrey Newton (1466-1536), of Pownall Hall, Cheshire (near Rode Heath), who, in his commonplace-book, Bodleian MS. Lat. Misc. c. 66, mentions a gift to Syon. An episode in the Laud-scribe's life may be recounted in Humphrey's book.

MS. TCD 160, which was probably copied near London at the end of the fifteenth century, contains the best extant reading of the scribal fusion of
Idley's Redaction of Handlyng Synne

Idley's poems,60 but is physically badly damaged, lacking over 200 lines of the translation of Albertanus, and over 500 lines of the redaction before it breaks off at II.A 1848.61 Most of the damage seems to have occurred before the second half of the sixteenth century.62 By the middle of the sixteenth century the book appears to have been owned by a wealthy Londoner, who may have been a merchant.63

MS. Add. 57335, the latest copy of the fusion (s. xvi?), provides, as we have noted before, clear evidence that Idley re-worked all of HS. Its reading of the poems appears to be related to the poor texts of MSS. Pepys and Be.4.37 (q.v.),64 and is riddled with scribal excisions, particularly of the stories in the redaction, of which the scribe copied only one (probably accidentally).65 The poem's stanzaic form and the scribe's unwillingness to compose lines of transition to cover his tracks results in the repeated appearance of authentic transitions to stories followed by no story and a radical shift into a new line of argument. The scribe organized the text roughly, with occasional captions and side-notes. The only annotation in the book suggests that one of its earliest readers was searching for entertainment.66 Nothing is known of the medieval ownership history of this MS.67

MS. Pepys 2030 (s. xv, third quarter) presents a poor reading of the scribal fusion, closely related to that found in MS. Be.4.37 (q.v.).68 Like the latter MS., Pepys breaks off at II.B 2555; elsewhere it has lost over 400 lines through physical damage.69 The fusion is preceded by Thomas Brampton's penitential psalms and the prose Fifteen Qes.70 The scribe himself composed a continuation to the imperfect text of the fusion, which itself ends imperfectly, but which indicates that he was more than likely a cleric.71 The book is well-organized, with initials (some of which are pictorial), border decorations, and frequently in the fusion the running title 'Piers Idley,' giving it the flavor of an author-anthology. An unidentified armorial shield within an initial at f.
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101v suggests that the book was designed for a person of position. The stories in the redaction were of particular interest to an early owner, and the scribe did not copy the Latin passages which appear here and there in both of Idley's poems. As we have said earlier, a seventeenth-century annotator's claim that the book belonged to Henry VI refers specifically to Idley's work and may in fact refer to the text rather than to the physical book. The MS. was owned by a series of laymen during the early modern period.

MS. Eng.Poet. d.45 (s. xv, fourth quarter) is a severely damaged copy in which just over 2,100 lines from the redaction remain; a note on the inside of the original parchment cover indicates that Idley's translation of Albertanus also appeared in the book. Its reading of the fusion is related to the poor texts in Pepys and Be.4.37, and at least three scribes were involved in its production. It appears to have been owned at least by the middle of the sixteenth century by the Clifford family of Cumbria, a family allied with the Tempests (who, it will be recalled, owned three copies of the Manuel) until at least the seventeenth century. The Cliffords owned the book until 1940.

MS. Be.4.37 contains a poor and incomplete, but undamaged, fusion text of the third quarter of the fifteenth century related, as we have said, to that in MS. Pepys, and copied probably at London by a professional book shop. This is by far the most extravagant surviving Idley MS., with rubricated captions and side-notes, and beautiful border illustrations by an illuminator who also worked on MSS. Bodley 283 (the unique copy of the Mirrour of the Worlde) and Bodley 596 (Lydgate's Life of Our Lady), the hand of the latter being extremely similar to that of Be.4.37. By the end of the fifteenth century MS. Be was owned by a Master Hill, and the mid-sixteenth-century signatures of Thomas Swinborne and Henry Cooper also appear. A number of annotators (including Cooper) were responsible for the variety of entries which appear on surplus leaves at the beginning and end of the book. The earliest of these
notes are merely lists of the commandments and sins. A mid-sixteenth-century annotator compiled a list of officials of the royal exchequer which at one point refers to a Richard Hill as deputy-marshall of the exchequer, and a contemporary list of the gentlemen and nobles who participated in the battle of 1542 at the River Esk near Carlisle may have been compiled by Walter Strickland (1516-69), of Sizergh Castle, Cumbria, and Thornton Briggs, Yorks. (near Boroughbridge), MP for Westmorland from 1563 to 1567, who in 1561 married Alice Tempest of Stella, Co. Durham. Alice was the daughter of Nicholas Tempest and Anne Marley, and a niece of the Marley brothers who gave a large number of Durham Priory books to the Tempests after the dissolution.

Conclusion

Idley, a man of means and position, skilfully designed his redaction of Handlyng Synne to suit the tastes of his set, making sure to say what they would want to hear and to avoid any potential unpleasantness. He reassured his readers that virtue brings wealth (and that, therefore, they must be virtuous), and passed over almost everything Mannyng said to the contrary. The poem is an historical testament of class perspective and an exemplar of considerable editorial acuity. It also illustrates the extent to which the original purposes of a text can be perverted in order to serve the ends of a new interpreter. Waddington wanted to reform. Mannyng wanted to entertain, inform, and advise. Idley wanted to ingratiate by uttering a placebo, and he seems to have achieved that goal. His poem was read from London to Cumbria by just his sort of people.
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3 D'Evelyn (p. 7) mentions that Alice was a Chaucer but does not point out her acquaintance with Lydgate; on this, see Cavanaugh I, p. 237. On Thomas Chaucer and the Ewelme set, see Pearsall, pp. 161-2, and MacCracken, pp. 146-7.

4 In her attempt to reconstruct the daily life of Idley at the King's Works, D'Evelyn recalls in passing (p. 15) that Chaucer was once Clerk of the Works, but attaches no significance to this co-incidence. Geoffrey's son Thomas was the subject of one of Lydgate's ballads (see Cavanaugh I, p. 179).

5 In March, 1459, July, 1461, and November, 1462 Idley and Stonor witnessed transfers involving Rede (see H.E. Salter and A.H. Cooke, eds., The Boarstall Cartulary, Oxford Historical Society 88 [1930], pp. 40 and 229, and D'Evelyn, p. 20). The will of Edmund Rede, Jr. (proved June, 1489) mentions, among other books, a volume containing a work or works by Gower, a collection of chronicles of England, another book containing works by Gower, a copy of Albertanus's De Loquendo et Tacendo, and a book containing a work or works of St. Bonaventure (see Boarstall Cart., pp. 286-90; a selective description of the will appears in D'Evelyn, pp. 20-21).

6 D'Evelyn (p. 21) drew attention to the co-incidence.

7 See D'Evelyn, p. 20.

8 On Warefield, see D'Evelyn, pp. 10-11, and on Elizabeth's family, p. 23.

9 On the Stonor trusteeship, see D'Evelyn, p. 24, on Thomas Stonor's place in Idley's will, p. 25, and on Gloucester's request, p. 31 and C.L. Kingsford, ed., The Stonor Letters and Papers, vol. II, Camden Society 3rd ser. 30 (1919), pp. 81-2. In 1475 William Idley purchased the portion of the estate which belonged to Anne Idley, his mother or step-mother (see D'Evelyn, p. 31); in 1481 he and William de la Pole's son launched an armed attack on the estate and evicted its inhabitants (see D'Evelyn, p. 34).

A John Mannyng, sometime Rector of St. Peter's, Wallingford, figures prominently in the fourteenth-century documents in the Boarstall Cartulary. In 1364 his receipt of land in Newnham Purden was witnessed by a Richard English (Boarstall, p. 238); a member of the English family from Newnham appears to have copied MS. Arundel 20, which contains the best extant text of Idley's redaction of Robert Mannyng's Handlyng Synne (see the description of the MS., below). John Mannyng was a party to many transactions involving John James (apparently the great-grandfather of Edmund Rede, Jr.) during the 1360s and 1370s (Boarstall, pp. 240-42, 264-5, 247-53, and 259), and involving Rede's grandfather Robert James in 1378 and 1391 (Boarstall, pp. 259 and 222; the last transaction also involved Edmund de la Pole). The principal residence of
Idley’s associate Edmund Rede, Jr. adjoined the church of St. Peter’s, Wallingford (Boarstall, p. 294).

The account (in Appendix III) of the execution of Nicholas Tempest, the recusant who opposed the dissolution of Whalley Abbey, in Lancashire, may be enlarged by noting that the penultimate Abbot of Whalley was named William Rede, and that a William Rede of Oxford, baker, delivered urgent messages from the last Abbot, John Paslew, to the Abbey’s scholar at the University of Oxford, when the rebellion against the dissolution of the Abbey was at its height (see J.E.W. Wallis, ed., The Narrative of the Indictment of the Traitors of Whalley and Cartmel 1536-7, Chetham Society n.s. 90 (1931), part IV, pp. 1-5, 16). A few months after a Mr. Tempest escorted the Jesuit martyr Edmund Campion into Yorkshire (in 1581), Campion was at Henley, a seat of the Stonor family (see J.S. Leatherbarrow, The Lancashire Elizabethan Recusants, Chetham Society n.s. 110 (1947), pp. 50-55).

On Thomas Idley, see D’Evelyn, p. 24. Both of Albertanus’s tracts appear in B. de Roezi, ed., Tre Trattati d’Albertano Giudice da Brescia (Firenze, 1610). The Liber Consolacionis has been edited more recently by T. Sundby (Chaucer Society, 2nd ser., vol. 8, [1873]). Lydgate’s Fall of Princes has been edited by H. Bergen (E.E.T.S.E.S 121-4 (1924-7)); Idley’s use of this text is examined in Appendix IX.

On this important point, which has not been previously recognized, see Appendix VIII.

The particulars in support of this conclusion will be brought to light in the examination of the MSS. at the end of the chapter; the conclusion can be drawn from D’Evelyn’s examination of the textual tradition (pp. 66-75). She chose one of the poorest texts (C.U.L. Be.4.37) for her edition probably because it was more complete than the others.

See D’Evelyn (p. 56) who, it must be stressed, regarded the scribal fusion of the two poems as a single authentic work. The dated MS., Bodleian Laud Misc. 416, which contains lines from the redaction only, will be described later.

The text of the translation in these MSS. closes definitively with the rubric ‘Explicit liber consolacionis et consili’ (Digby, f. 30v; Harley, f. 51v). Only in the three manuscripts which can definitely be said to contain the scribal fusion of Idley’s poems are there rubrics which refer to the translation as the ‘first book’ and to the redaction as the ‘second book’ (‘Here endith the first booke and soo foloweth the seconde as ye may after see’ [Be.4.37, D’Evelyn ed., after 1. I. 1470]; ‘Explicit liber primus consolationis consili’ [B.L. Add. 57335, f. 25v]; ‘Explicit primus liber consolationis et consili. Compositus per Petrum Idle’ [TCD 160, f. 36v]).

D’Evelyn’s edition presents the 1,470 ll. of the translation, the 40 ll. of the scribal attempt to fuse the two poems, the 2,926 ll. of the commandments section and 2,813 ll. of the sins section of the redaction known to exist in 1935, and the 434 ll. of the sacrilege section known then. Since then two further copies of Idley’s works have been discovered, Bodleian Eng.Poet. d.45 and B.L. Add. 57335, the latter of which is of extreme importance, for it contains some 2,000 previously unknown lines of the redaction which indicate that Idley re-worked all of Handlyng Synne. The text of MS. Add. (whose deficiencies will be described in greater detail later) breaks off in the midst of the discussion of the second Thing to Avoid of Book VII, i.e., very close to the end of Idley’s source. The present writer has transcribed the unique portion of this MS., and will cite from it during this Chapter.

D’Evelyn lineated separately ‘Book I’ (the translation [1. 1-1470]), the commandments section of the redaction, or of ‘Book II’ ([II.A 1-2966 (including the 40 spurious scribal lines of transition at the beginning)], the sins section of the redaction ([II.B 1-2813], and the sacrilege section of the redaction ([II.S
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1-434). All citations from the poems, except those witnessed only in MS. Add., will be drawn from D'Evelyn's edition according to her lineation scheme, with the single alteration that the section known as II.S in her scheme will be known as JJ.C here. This change is made in order to accommodate the unique lines from MS. Add., which the present writer has lineated continuously with D'Evelyn's final section as JJ.C 435-1938. MS. Add. uniquely offers a complete sins section of the redaction, and its unique lines at the end of that section have been lineated continuously with D'Evelyn's I.I.B section, and bear the numbers I.I.B 2814-3023. All line-citations from MS. Add. will include folio numbers. On f. 73v of MS. Add., at the end of the sins section of the redaction, the scribe has written 'This is the ende of the seconde booke, per Idle.' The creation of the fusion of Idley's poems and the division of that fusion into books is, as we have said, a scribal concoction, and the present writer will not complicate the text further by entertaining this nonsensical rubric.

'I say therefore, Petrus Idle, armiger, te filium meum Thomam bonis moribus conformare ac de amore et dileccione Dei et proximi ac aliarum rerum neconon de forma honeste vite instruere' (D'Evelyn, p. 81). Albertanus wrote the Liber Consolacionis for his son John and the Liber de Amore for his son Vincent. D'Evelyn describes Albertanus's works and charts Idley's use of them on pp. 36-44. We shall, as usual, cite only from Idley's substantive additions to his source.

Idley never alludes to or addresses his son in the redaction of HS. Legal terms appear regularly in the redaction (see, e.g., II.A 569-72, 584-6, 738-40, 777-9, 1024-7, 1529-31).

Cp. I, 21 and I, 189.

'The line indicates that Thomas Idley was a youth when the poem was written."

The MSS. of the redaction of HS and of the fusion of the two poems will be described later. Idley's works were read from London to Cumbria. The two MSS. of the translation will be described here. MS. Digby 181, which was copied during the second half of the fifteenth century, possibly in Leicestershire or Lincolnshire (see LALME I, p. 147), contains one of the best extant texts of the translation (see D'Evelyn, pp. 66-70), placed in the midst of an anthology of stanzaic love-poems by two greats with whom Idley can be connected (Lydgate and Chaucer), and another poet of note (Hoccleve). The book opens with an imperfect version of Hoccleve's 'Letter to Cupid' (ed. F.J. Furnivall and I. Gollancz, Hoccleve's Works. The Minor Poems, E.E.T.S.E.S. 61 and 73, revised by J. Mitchell and A.J. Doyle (reprinted in one vol., 1970, pp. 72-91), humorously followed by Lydgate's 'Pain and Sorrow of Evil Marriage' and 'Examples against Women' (ed. MacCracken, E.E.T.S.O.S. 192, op. cit., pp. 456-60, 442-5). After Idley's translation there appear Lydgate's Complaint of the Black Knight (E.E.T.S.O.S. 192, pp. 382-410), Chaucer's 'Anelide and Arcite' and Parliament of Fowls (ed. F.N. Robinson, The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1974), pp. 304-8, 310-18), and a selection from Lydgate's Fall of Princes (I. 4558-662, 4817-44; see A.S.O. Edwards, 'Selections from Lydgate's Fall of Princes: A Checklist,' The Library 5th ser. 26 (1971), p. 338). A separate booklet in a different hand then appears, offering a fragmentary text of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde (ed. Robinson, pp. 389-479). The book was professionally copied, is physically unremarkable, and was probably designed for a layman of modest means; the Troilus booklet (at least) belonged during the sixteenth century to a person named John Prout (f. 77v).

MS. Harley 172 (ca. 1500), whose text of the translation, while affected by scribal extemporizing, is one of the best (see D'Evelyn, pp. 66-70), was copied by a person associated with the Benedictine Cathedral Priory at Winchester, whose other extant scribal work is found in B.L. MS. Add. 60577 (see E. Wilson
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and I. Fenlon, The Winchester Anthology A Facsimile of British Library Additional Manuscript 60577 (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 4, 9, 39, and, on the Winchester owners of Add., pp. 10-13). The contents of Add. suggest that the scribe was a schoolteacher (Wilson and Fenlon, p. 13), and both MSS. seem to have been copied for his private pleasure (on Add., cf. Wilson and Fenlon, p. 14). It is possible that the scribe became a monk late in life (Wilson and Fenlon, p. 14). Harley opens with essentially the same excerpt from Lydgate's Fall of Princes with which Digby closed (I. 4556-613, 4614-62, 4817-32, 4834-44 (see Edwards, op. cit., p. 339)). There are then three contemplative prose texts, St. Bridget's Fifteen Cea (also in Pepys 2030 [q.v.]), a form of confession, and a discussion of the fourteen articles of the faith, the last two of which have not been edited. The book moves from the contemplative to the practical with Idley's translation and Burgh's paraphrase of Cato's Disticha (ed. M. Förster, Archiv 115 (1905), pp. 298-323 and Archiv 116 (1906), pp. 25-40), and, after Lydgate's 'Ryght as a Ramnes Horne' (ed. MacCracken, E.E.T.S.O.S. 192, pp. 461-4; also in MS. Ashmole 61 of HS) back to the contemplative with Hoccleve's Ars Sciendi Mori (ed. Furnivall and Gollancz, E.E.T.S.O.S. 61 and 73, op. cit., pp. 178-212), with which the MS. closes. Several anonymous entries in a variety of hands at the end of the MS. suggest that the book, like MS. Add. (see Wilson and Fenlon, pp. 10-13), changed hands frequently during the sixteenth century.

20 The 'ye' in I. 70 ('Thus childre lerne while ye be yonge') should have been emended to 'pe' on the basis of the reading in Digby, Harley, and TCD (on the source of the line, see D'Evelyn, p. 213); the line cannot be taken as an authentic address to children.

21 The Book of Proverbs is an early example of the genre and it is probable that Chaucer's translation of a French derivative of Albertanus's Liber Consolacionis within the Canterbury Tales did not escape the notice of Idley (D'Evelyn thinks otherwise [p. 38, note]). On the source of Chaucer's 'Tale of Melibee,' see D. Palomo, 'What Chaucer Really Did to Le Livre de Melibee,' Po 53 (1974), pp. 304-20. In Appendix IX we note that Idley's use of Lydgate's Fall of Princes is probably only fully explicable with reference to the poet's wider aims to ingratiate himself with his set, and Idley's neighbor Edmund Rede's possession of an Albertanus MS. might indicate that the poet's decision to translate Albertanus was made with similar motives.

22 On MS. Add. 57335, see note 14, above. All passages cited from the redaction are material additions to HS.

23 Cp. HS 409-10 ('pe touper foure pys clerkys wyten,/ For yn the byble pey ben wryten').

24 Cp. HS 2091-2 ('Yn vyta patrum hyt ys wryte--/Hyt ys a boke pat clerkys wete').

25 Cp. Fall of Princes II. 118-19 ('For what auaileth the auailep that thei [i.e., princes] reede,/ To ther reedyng yiff contraire be the deede?').

26 Cp. HS 4923-4 ('Yn pe byble hyt tellyp, pat touchep swych pynges,/ Yn pe holy boke of kynges').

27 The two calls bo listen which Idley adds to his source are clearly formulaic:

And to telle you forth of this commaunderaent
After my symplenessse, if you list to hire.
(II.A 631-2 [2nd Comm.]).

It is in the lyffe of seynt Makaire,
Yf it lust you tabide and hire.
(II.A 2087-8 [6th Comm.]).

28 At one point Idley seems to suggest that it is really cunning, rather than virtue, which brings the coveted rewards:

No welthe can be hadde longe tyme durable,
But connyng be hadde be vertu of experience.

(II.B 1496-7 [Sloth]).

2*The last line of the passage is drawn from the Fall of Princes (I. 658).

30The poor would be more likely to attribute misfortune to chance, of course. The classes' varied interpretations of their lot are examined in K. Thomas's discussion of the theory of Providence, in his Religion and the Decline of Magic (London, 1973), pp. 90-132; see esp. pp. 130-2.

31Examples of less remarkable laments about the state of the world may be found at II.A 2239-40, 3005-6, II.B 395-6 and 404-6. Idley also remarks that the position of his class could be attacked from above as well as from below: It is nou wyssdom in servise to trast,

For when men wene to haue them best,

For a litell thyng they faile at stryffe;

Then lesist thow thy seruice of all thy lyffe. of a.J and perauenture, Laud.

(II.B 144-7 [Pride]).

The passage bears some resemblance to I. 572-4, cited earlier, as the following passage does to I. 855-8, where it is stressed that one must keep one's head down in public:

If it [a parent's request] be ayenst God or the kyng, thow shalt not obeye,

But be true to God and also to thy kyng.

(II.A 1084-5).

32Cp. II.B 267-70 (Pride):

It is now harde to discerne and knowe

A tapester, a cookesse, or an hostellers wyffe c.J coquene, Pepys.

Pro a gentilwoman, if they stonde in a rowe,

For whoo shall be fresshest they ymagyne and stryve.

33D'Evelyn (p. 62), accepting M.R. James's view that the MS. was s. xvi (see his Descriptive Catalogue of the Library of Samuel Pepys, part III [London, 1923], p. 67), dismisses the annotation. A likelier date is s. xv, third quarter (see the description of the MS., below). The annotator continues with the observation that 'The Author was Bourn in Kent as he saith himselfe in thes foloing w<o>rck,' a clear allusion to Idley's modesty topos at II.A 1426 ('Haue me excused--I was born in Kent') which, for the reasons expressed by D'Evelyn (esp. p. 3), should not be regarded as an autobiographical fact.

Idley's criticism of the pomposity of 'gallants' and courtiers and of the greed of the 'establishment' is perhaps to be expected from a man of his experience:

As these galantis doith that beith lusty and iolye,

That in hir pride woll manace and threte.

They swere he shall dye—if they may hym gete--

Or they wall haue his lyffelode or his goode.

They swere by armes, sides, and blode.

(II.A 2801-5 [8th Comm.]).

Also in pride to swere orrible grete othis,

As it is now the vse among galauntis.

(II.B 169-70 [Pride]).

And proude sires--a galaunt is as moche for to sey--

As fro his maister at neede faste renne away.

(II.B 174-5 [Pride]).

As it is nowadaies the open guyse,

Courtyours woll medle of evey thyng

Till at last they woll clierly bryng

Hemsilf even out at the gate.
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At som season—hardely erly or late.

II.B 136-40 [Pride].

Couetise is maister and ruleth many realmes,
Bothe spirituall and temporall...

His [Covetousness's] wai is full redy to the paleys of the pope.
His sauff. conduyte is full sure—no man hath a better!
Rede it whoeso woll—therin laketh no letter!

Buery kyng in Christendome hath hym in drede,
For bothe theire lyff and lyvelode lieth in his hande.
He hath a feire suster called Maide Mede—
The feirest wenche named in ony lande!
She is woved with many, as I vndistonde.

Ther is no lorde, no lady, ne no maner of degree,
Spirituall ne temporall—if it be as I suppose—
But Couetise is of counceill, of clothyng, and of fee.

II.B 1814-5; 1818-25; 1828-30 [Covetousness].

In judging the merits of the inscription in MS. Pepys, Idley's second wife's services to the future Richard III (described earlier) should not be overlooked. This woman's maiden name has not been discovered (see D'Evelyn, p. 23).

The following passages implicitly address men and thus suggest that Idley's audience was exclusively male:
Ye shall fynde som be maidones yonge of age,
And theryrlyf and lyvelode lyeth in his hande.
And cheryssh oolde maidones, for they be deynte.

II.A 2061-3 [6th Comm.].

It is harde nowadaiies true love to fynde.
He is so pullid that he may not growe—
Countirfeted in a figure, peynted in a scrowe.

And if thow be ensured and purpose the to wedde,
And fleisshlie thow knowest the woman to fore,
Deadly thow synnest...

II.A 1683-8 [6th Comm.]; counterweighed by a rhetorical direct address to women, II.A 1690-2 [to be cited later].

And yet if she [as partner] can be a felow and will be soo,
And kenne hir housband when tyme is and season,
Reseyue hir thanne, and make noo more ado.

II.A 1637-9 [6th Comm.].

Cp. He 7457-8 ('parefore 3e men takep none/ Ne 3e wymmen takep but one').

See. e.g., II. II.A 1791-1800, 1805-10, 1812-16, 2393-9, which are all based on lines from the Fall of Princes. On Idley's use of FP, see Appendix IX. In his translation of Albertanus Idley admits that his criticisms of women are hackneyed:
Thus saith the philosofree--blame not me!
I wold in no wyse women displease,
For I am bounde and may not flee.
Women bethe goode, whoso can hem please;
Well y woote sufferaunce doth ease.
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I sche nothyng but as myn auctor techeth.
Euer the yonge cok croweth as the olde precheth.
(I. 1282-3).

Examples of Idley's formulaic use of the 'anti-feminist' tradition may be found at II.A 1033-62, 1303, 1632-6, 1787-9, 1801-3, 2069-70, 2192-217, 2988-3001, II.B 260-73 and 2632. The issue is discussed by D'Evelyn (pp. 55-6) and by S. Sullivan, 'Handlyng Synne in its Tradition,' op. cit., pp. 199-204. Idley includes occasional retractions in favor of women (e.g., II.A 1819-20, 1826-32, 2057-60, II.C 428-34).

Ex. of Idley's formulaic use of the 'anti-feminist' tradition may be found at II.A 1546-59, II.B. 2786.6-7 (MS. Add., f. 69v ['To kyssyng of women they [i.e., priests] can fetely them dresse;/ It is as well in experience as matyns & messe']), and II.C 1006-8 (MS. Add., f. 84r), where Idley asks lords not to appoint priests who are...iolysettes that will pricke & prunce, Plucke hiCr] by the buttocke & make hir stomble: This causeth in a lande myschefe and romble.

In 1441 and 1445 Bishop of Lincoln William Alnwick visited the Augustinian abbey at Dorchester and found that various canons were guilty of offences such as maintaining hound-packs and hawks for the hunt, frequenting taverns, pawning goods of the abbey, and setting aside a chamber in the abbey in which drinking, gaming, and sexual encounters could take place (see A.H. Thompson, ed., Visitations of Religious Houses in the Diocese of Lincoln, vol. II, LRS 14 (1918), pp. 68-83).

Idley was buried in this abbey (see D'Evelyn, p. 27).

At one point Idley affects a disinterested stance on the subject of clerical sin:

Butt what nedeth you laymen therof to speake,
Or eny suche wordes against them to proffre?
In the moste vengeable wise they wil be awrecke;
For goddes curse is closed within theire coffre.

(I.B 2919-22 [MS. Add., f. 71v (Lechery)].)

While the source of this passage has not been identified, the themes within it are quite commonplace (cp. e.g., Bishop Poore's statutes for Salisbury of 1217-19 [ed. F.M. Powicke and C.R. Cheney, Councils and Synods II, part I, p. 73]; the 'Constitutiones cuiusdam Episcopi' of ca. 1225-30 [ibid., p. 188]; Bishop Bricere's statutes for Exeter of 1225-37 [ibid., p. 237]; Bishop Basset's statutes for London of 1245-59 [ibid., p. 637]; the Ancrunse Wisse [ed. J.R.R. Tolkien, E.E.T.S.O.S. 249 (1962)], p. 174, 11. 6-12; Myrc's Instructions for Parish Priests [ed. E. Peacock, E.E.T.S.O.S. 31 (1868)], 11. 1507-16).

Idley's further omissions include HS 6273-304 (a discussion of heirs who kill benefactors, see II.B 1701-2 [Covetousness]), and HS 6783-96 (a critique of the greed of judges, sheriffs, and bailiffs, see II.B 2303-4 [Gluttony]).

Apparent appeals to the sensibilities of his audience also appear in the narratives, for example when he describes a priest in Mannyng's Tale 4 (Man who Worked on Saturday) as one who Worshipfully lieved ther all his dayes--

W.J Honestly, Pepys.

He says that the father who would not chastise his son (Mannyng's Tale 5) was a riche marchaunt, as many men saide,

Crete habundauns of goodis and of possession
He was to his con tree a full noble ayde.

The mairalte was ofte vppon hym laide.

He hadde a sone whome he loued aboue all thyng--

A lykkely persone to serue a prince or a kyng.

(I.A 1141-6 [4th Comm.]).
Notes for Chapter V

Minute details such as those presented in HS. 1689-90, 1697-704 (which consider why one should not marry one's godfather's sister or an insane person, and why one shouldn't remarry without making sure that one's spouse is dead), or in HS. 3447-702 (on species of pride, including, e.g., avoiding the tonsure and attending wrestling matches and juggling displays), are routinely omitted by Idley. When Idley omits one of Mannyng's stories, it is almost always as a part of an excision of a larger block of text. The HS tales which do not appear in the printed text of the redaction include 'St. Fursey's Visit to Hell' (HS no. 13), 'The Hypocritical Monk' (HS no. 18), 'The Backbiting Monk' (HS no. 21), 'The Minstrel who Bothered a Bishop' (HS no. 25), 'Bishop Grossseteste's Love of Music' (HS no. 26), 'Carpus the Priest's Vision,' 'The Hard Judge,' 'Pers Tollere,' 'Lucretius's Theft,' 'The Hermit Who Gave His Money Away' (HS nos. 29-33), 'The Kesteven Executors' (HS no. 36), and 'The Temptation of St. Benedict' (HS no. 41). The only Tale which Idley omits cleanly, without cutting further material, is 'Bishop Troilus' (HS no. 40).

MS. Add., as we shall point out again in our description of the MS., below, is riddled with lacunae, and most of these were caused by the scribe, who removed all but one story from his version of the redaction. His failure to conceal these omissions by removing the introductions to tales as well as the tales themselves allows us to perceive in the lines unique to this MS. that Idley did re-work at least Mannyng's nos. 42 (Converted Jew, cf. Add. f. 70r), 54 (Sinful Godfather, cf. Add. f. 78r), 56 (The Priest Who Could Read Faces, cf. Add. f. 81r), 57 (Felix the Priest, cf. Add. f. 81r), and 66 (How Shrift Blinds the Devil, cf. Add. f. 96v). There are many instances in the unique lines, however, when the absence of a tale cannot be attributed definitely to the scribe, but the scribe's known distaste for stories makes it equally impossible to attribute such absences (HS nos. 43-47, 49, 51-3, 55, 58-63, 65) to Idley (though the fact that HS nos. 47 and 49 are also absent from the brief sacrilege section in MS. Arundel [printed by D'Evelyn] suggests that those two stories were omitted by the author).

A few of Mannyng's allusions to witchcraft (e.g., HS 1711-12 [cf. II.A 1769-70], 2641-50 [cf. II.A 2672-31, 9572-4 [cf. MS. Add, f. 77v]) are removed by Idley, as are Mannyng's discussions of what a son can and cannot do without his father's permission (HS 1187-1219 [cf. II.A 1237-8]) and of why a child should not back-talk to his parents (HS 1077-92 [cf. II.A 1104-5]), the latter omissions appearing particularly indicative of the fact that Idley did not write the redaction for his son.

Further examples of Idley's improvement of the narrative movement of Mannyng's stories may be found at, e.g., II.A 76-9, 91-3, 241-3, 451-3, 507-9, 534-7, 904-6, 2104-5, 2309-12, 2474-6, 2486-90, 2508-11, 2587-8, 2747-9, 2887-9. Further examples of Idley's addition of details to narratives appear at, e.g., II.B 201-3, 296-8, 312-4, 345-7, 353-7, 650-1, 766-70, 778-84, 793-5, 1327-30, 1366-72, 1727-9, 1779-83, 2213-19.

Further examples of Idley's improvement of the characterization in the stories can be seen at, e.g., II.A 251-5, 482-5, 2593-5, II.B 750-4, 1039-40, 1048-9, 1878-80, 1884-90, 2405-8. For caricatures of types of sinners in the argument of the redaction see, e.g., II.A 2689-93 (flatterers), 2711-14 (false witnesses), II.B 926-32, 947-51, 961-4 (the slothful), 1627-31, 1639-49, 1683-7 (covetous executors), 2084-6 (the glutinous), 2225-6 (the rich man).

On the language of the MS., see LAKE I, p. 105. The scribe's name was R. English. On f. 34v, in the explicit to the fourth book of Capgrave's St. Katharine, he writes 'per manus R. English;' on f. 56v, in the explicit to the commandments section of the redaction, he writes 'Scriptus per manus M.R. Englyssh,' with the 'M.' probably an abbreviation for 'Master;' on f. 23v he writes 'Englysh' and on the opposite page 'Niualma,' i.e., probably Newmham Murren (which is spelled 'Niwewham/Nueuueham' in the Domesday
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Book [see H.C. Darby and G.R. Versey, edd., Domesday Gazetteer (Cambridge, 1975), p. 327]. D'Evelyn noted (p. 65, note) that a Richard English of Newnham Murren appears as a witness in a document of 1459 in the Boarstall Cartulary, and that the English family was well settled in Oxfordshire from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries. Then she rather curiously added that 'Kualma' is unidentifiable, possibly because she herself was distracted by the fact that the scribe's language was not that of Oxfordshire, a point which is irrelevant, since he could have acquired the Norfolk features of his language without having been born in that eastern county. The scribe was almost certainly from the Oxfordshire village, and a man named Richard Englysshe was ca. 1456 a tenant of Idley's neighbor Edmund Rede, Jr. (see Boarstall Cartulary, op. cit., p. 40).

Mr. English includes rubricated running titles and capitals, section markers, formal explicits, rhyme bars, and a full complement of rubrics in the redaction, drawing attention to narrations and changes of topic. His uninhibited alteration of the text, and minor details like the widely varied length of columns (42-56 lines) and his early attempt to write stanzas in long lines (up to f. 8), are experiments which might not be tolerated by a patron.

The name 'John Copleye' appears on f. 40r in a hand contemporary with the MS.; a s. xvi hand wrote the name 'Thomas Johnson' on f. 23r. The book was, like other Arundel MSS., donated by Henry Howard, 6th Duke of Norfolk, to the Royal Society in the seventeenth century, and then donated by the Society to the British Museum in the nineteenth century (see discussion of Arundel 288 in Chapter IV).

'Scriptus Rhodo per Johannem Neuton die 25 Octobris 1459' (f. 226v).

On the structure of the text of the MS., see D'Evelyn, pp. 63-5.


Mr. English includes rubricated running titles and capitals, section markers, formal explicits, rhyme bars, and a full complement of rubrics in the redaction, drawing attention to narrations and changes of topic. His uninhibited alteration of the text, and minor details like the widely varied length of columns (42-56 lines) and his early attempt to write stanzas in long lines (up to f. 8), are experiments which might not be tolerated by a patron.

The name 'John Copleye' appears on f. 40r in a hand contemporary with the MS.; a s. xvi hand wrote the name 'Thomas Johnson' on f. 23r. The book was, like other Arundel MSS., donated by Henry Howard, 6th Duke of Norfolk, to the Royal Society in the seventeenth century, and then donated by the Society to the British Museum in the nineteenth century (see discussion of Arundel 288 in Chapter IV).


This theme is present in the Idley, Vegetius, and Lydgate texts.

One can calculate the number of leaves lost from the extant medieval foliation; Idley's text is ruled for 42 lines to the page. There was thus room for more than 3,000 lines of verse in the lost portion preceding the Idley fragment (which has lost at the beginning only roughly 2,000 lines). Fifteen leaves are missing after f. 64v, where the redaction breaks off in mid-leaf.

On the structure of the text, see D'Evelyn, p. 61, and on its qualities, esp. pp. 71-2.

See note 50 on the scribe's identity. The scribe notes tales, provides marginal annotations and captions, and begins the Cursor with a full table of contents.


'My lytull box bedis haue alle pis bot Syon & pe anker' (f. 2v). On Newton, see the typescript description of the Lat. MS. at the Bodleian Library. The connection between these two MSS. has never been suggested before.

'Cf. 'A vision in a trunce of John Neuton,' f. 21r, in which John, a draper and sherman from Congleton, hallucinates while suffering from the plague.

'Do maister Robenson in Marke lane be thys delivered with sped at London' (s. xvi med., f. 23r).
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Cf. D'Evelyn, pp. 66-72. The fact that its text of the translation is better than its text of the redaction (cp. D'Evelyn, pp. 68 and 72) would seem to indicate (not unexpectedly) that the two poems had separate textual traditions before the scribal fusion was concocted.

On the structure of the text of this MS., see D'Evelyn, pp. 65-6.

Directions in a s. xvi med. hand included to help readers cope with the damage appear at, e.g., ff. 38v, 46v, and 53v. An early-sixteenth-century hand attempted to finish a damaged stanza at f. 16v.

See note 59. Other notes in the same hand relate to the Robinson family: 'Servante wyth Mr. William Robyns Mr. Graunte of the staple at eccllys' (f. 49v; Eccles, Kent, near Rochester); 'Anne Robyns prayet yow to sende her the xii d. that yow doth <owe> her' (f. 35r). Various other names appear in contemporary hands: 'Harry Parsons' and 'Rycharde Parsons' (f. 21v), 'Henry Parsons' (46r), William Wys<tone>yn (22r), 'Willame Legge' (42r), 'John <S>acke' (44v), 'William' Bafford (50v). In TCD 160 the Idley MS. (ff. 14r-58v) is the second of three completely unrelated MSS. once bound separately, but (Dr. S. ó Séanóir, the Assistant Librarian, has kindly advised me) since 1987 bound in two volumes.

This is a preliminary conclusion based on selective comparison with the printed text. In the passages cited in Appendix VIII all variants from Add. are presented.

On the text of the Add. MS., see note 14, above. On its omission of tales, see note 41. The only story copied by the scribe is Mannyng's no. 64 (Ananias and Sapphira, f. 91v).

On f. 60r a s. xvi hand wrote 'The executoure lenvoy' next to Idley's version of Mannyng's quasi-narrative 'The Executors Complaint.'

V.H. Kelliber, the Curator of Manuscripts at the British Library, has advised me that the book was owned by Phillipps, but that its earlier history is unclear. It was purchased from Sotheby's in 1971.

Cf. D'Evelyn, esp. pp. 66 and 70.

On the structure of the text, see D'Evelyn, p. 62. A page missing from the MS. appears in a miscellany at the University of Missouri (see H.G. Jones, 'Peter Idley's Instructions to His Son A New Fragment,' NK 74 [1973], pp. 686-9).

Brampton's text has been edited by J.R. Kreuzer in Traditio 7 (1949-51), pp. 359-403, and a version of the Fifteen Oas has been edited by C. Meier-Ewert in Modern Philology 68 (1970-71), pp. 355-61; the latter text also appears in Harley 172 (q.v., note 19, above).

There are nearly a dozen biblical allusions in the 98 lines of the continuation which survive. D'Evelyn inexplicably suggests (p. 62) that the hand of the continuation is different from that of the rest of the MS.

A late-fifteenth-century annotator comments upon the stories at ff. 60v, 63r, 65v, 68r, 73r, 77v, 81r, 89r, and 91v.

These passages do not appear in the printed text. In his translation of Albertanus, Idley frequently includes recapitulatory excerpts from the Latin (see D'Evelyn, pp. 37-8). His frequent quotations from biblical, apochryphal, and philosophical sources (but never from Albertanus) during the redaction receive only extremely brief acknowledgement from D'Evelyn (p. 46, note); the extracts do not add a great deal to the argument of the text.

See note 33, above.

'Master spragene' (f. 45v, s. xvi inc.); 'Robarte <C>larke' (126v, s. xvi'); 'Ma. Booth anno aetat. 82, 1674' (99v); 'John Bagford, 1682' (1r and 62r). Pepys died in 1703.
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77 "In the bygynyg [sic] of this lityll werke." This is line I.1.
79 On the text's position in the tradition, see the typescript description in the Bodleian. The book is simply organized, with plain ink paraph markers and captions.
79 John Clifford his booke so,' Mary Clifford,' Hanna Clifford,' Giles Kendall' (f. 10v, all in s. xvi med. hand). The surname Kendall would seem to indicate that the ancient Cumbria branch of the family originally owned the book. On the relationship between the Cliffords and the Tempests, see Appendix III. A John Kendale replaced Idley as Comptroller of the King's Works in 1461 (see D'Evelyn, p. 19). A person named J. Kendale witnessed the Duke of Gloucester's autograph letter to William Stonor regarding Anne Idley (see C.L. Kingsford, ed., The Stonor Letters, vol. II, op. cit., Camden Society 3rd ser. 30 [1919], p. 82).
80 In that year the Bodleian Library purchased the book from the Clifford family of Frampton Court, Gloucestershire (see the typescript description); the Frampton line of the Cliffords has only been in existence since the early nineteenth century (see LG, p. 466).
82 This MS. and MS. Eng. Poet. are the only surviving parchment copies of Idley's poetry. Like the text in Pepys, that in Ee is not fragmentary. Both texts stop on a recto of a leaf at line II.B 2555. The scribe of Pepys, as we have noted, attempted a continuation. The scribe of Ee simply left the remaining five leaves of the book (109-14) blank. Both scribes clearly were working with faulty exemplars.
82 On the text's place in the tradition, see D'Evelyn, esp. pp. 67 and 71. On the milieu in which the MS. was copied, see K.L. Scott, 'A Mid-Fifteenth-Century English Illuminating Shop and its Customers,' Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 31 (1968), pp. 187-9 and 194-6.
84 See Scott, pp. 192-3. Scott's speculation (pp. 188-9) that Idley himself may have owned Ee.4.37 is a quite absurd impression made possible by her failure to explore thoroughly the ownership history of the MS. and to recognize the inferiority of the manuscript's text.
85 'Est liber <Magester> Hyll' (f. 114r, visible under ultra-violet light, and never before noticed).
86 Fol. 108v. Scott notes (pp. 188-9) that a person of the same name was a chaplain at Oxford University during the mid-fifteenth century (d. 1465).
87 Fol. 111v.
88 Fol. 113v.
89 Fol. 110v. This may not be the 'Master Hill' who owned the book. Several persons named Hill were prominent in London commerce during the early sixteenth century, including Richard Hill, an international grocer who compiled a common-place book (MS. Balliol 354; on this man, see W.P. Hills, 'Richard Hill of Hillend and Balliol MS. 354,' NAQ 177 (1939), pp. 452-6). A London haberdasher named John Hill gave in his will of 1516 a considerable sum to the house of the Bonshommes canons at Ashridge (where MS. Bodley 415 of Mannyng's Handlyng Synne was copied), and a Thomas Hill was a member of that house at the time of its dissolution (see Hills, p. 455).
90 Thise be the namys of the gentylmen of England that wer at this journey and takyng of thise Skottes prisoners afore wrytten...Walter Strykland Esquier stuerd of Kendall vnder my lorde Parre...These wer the names of the Englysh capteyns pat had these sex stondertes: Syr Thomas Wharton, my lorde Parres stondert which was borne before Sir Walter Strykland his deputy with ii c archers of Kendall...' (f. 111v). While the syntax is troublesome, it is clear that either Strickland or an anonymous servant of Parr wrote these lists. On Strickland's marriage to Alice Tempest, see LG, pp. 2439-40. Sir Richard
Tempest (1437-88/9) had married Mabel, daughter of an earlier Walter Strickland of Sizergh (see LG, p. 2480), and his will was executed by Sir Thomas Strickland of Sizergh (see J. Raine, ed., Testamenta Eboracensia, part IV, SS 53 [1869 for 1868], pp. 249-50, note).


"On the relationship between the Tempests and the Marleys, see Appendix III.
Appendix I
Vernacular Literacy in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries

(a) The Thirteenth Century


Legge's suggestion that 'French was indeed a lingua franca, spoken not only by the nobility, but by clerks, merchants, and the literate of every class' ('The Rise and Fall of Anglo-Norman Literature' Mosaic 8, no. 4 (1975), p. 6) seems potentially deceptive. It must be qualified with a reminder that only a tiny proportion of the laity was literate during the thirteenth century, that the vast majority of literate laypeople during that century were members of the 'ruling classes,' and thus that one cannot imply broadly (as Legge appears to have done, perhaps unintentionally) that 'every class' was literate. The 'ordinary' layman at this time, it goes almost without saying, spoke English and could not read it. The 'pragmatic' literacy of lay tradespeople of which Dr. Parkes has written ('Literacy of the Laity,' p. 555) would hardly allow such people to study the Manuel ten times, as Waddington recommended. Vising (op. cit., pp. 15-18) makes much of various A.N. texts which appear to be directed to 'laie' people, and apparently takes this as evidence of broad circulation of such texts among the laity. Legge is somewhat more suspicious of the term 'laie,' and notes that while many A.N. texts appear to have been designed for the 'laie,' they were in fact circulated among the clergy ('Rise and Fall,' op. cit., p. 5). We have shown in Chapter I (note 23) that the word 'laie' denotes an inability to read Latin, rather than a spiritual status.

Legge (Cloisters, p. 125) discusses the general geographical area in which A.N. texts circulated. Vising's belief (op. cit., p. 18) that A.N. enjoyed 'complete dominance' in the linguistic arena in thirteenth-century England seems to be another potentially deceptive statement. One can say with some confidence that it probably was the most influential vernacular literary language in thirteenth-century England; but the remarkably swift decline of A.N. literary usage during the mid-fourteenth century suggests that it was never the preferred language of a substantial proportion of the English populace. Concerning the demise of A.N., see Legge's 'Rise and Fall,' op. cit., pp. 1-6, N. Davis's 'The Influence of Anglo-Norman on Early English Literature,' Problemi Attuali di Scienza e di Cultura 199 (1974), p. 43, and D. Knowles's The Religious Orders in England, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1948), p. 283.

The manuscripts of the Manuel provide a particularly eloquent illustration of that demise: none appears to have been copied after the first half of the fourteenth century. Further confirmation of the limitations of A.N. may be gleaned from the fact that Mannyng began his Middle English redaction of the Manuel only forty or so years after his source was composed, and at the precise
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period during which most of the surviving exemplars of the Manuel were copied. This, of course, would seem to indicate that it was quickly perceived that if the Manuel were ever to attract a socially, intellectually, and spiritually diverse readership, it would need to appear in a language which such a readership could read. Mannyng himself states in his Chronicle his belief that French, as well as Latin, was a language understood only by the learned:

Not for pe lerid bot for pe lewed,
For po pat in pis land won,
pat pe Latyn no Frankys cone.


Thus, with reference to the spurious 1. 113 of the Manuel ('Pur la laye gent iert fet') and the above passage from the Chronicle, it would seem clear that not long after 1260 A.N. appears to have been considered one of the 'unlearned' languages, while by 1338 it was deemed a 'learned' tongue. The explanation for this altered definition of 'unlearnedness' may be simple: ca. 1260 the vast majority of the 'unlearned' but literate society were members of the 'ruling classes' and clergy who predominantly read A.N., while by the mid-fourteenth century literacy (and literature) had trickled down to a broader 'unlearned' group whose spoken language had always been English and who now enjoyed the ability to read their mother tongue. A.N., ca. 1260 the literary language of the 'unlearned' but literate people who were at the time a social elite, was less than a century later an anachronistic tongue of an élite segment of an expanding 'unlearned' but literate group in society, and a tongue which that élite quickly abandoned once the spread of literature in English reached a state of obvious irreversibility.

Since A.N. was clearly the predominant 'unlearned' language during the thirteenth century, it would seem inevitable that it would have great stylistic influence on the Middle English literature which began to supplant it during the fourteenth century (see Davis's 'The Influence of Anglo-Norman' and Legge's 'Rise and Fall', passim).

(b) The Fourteenth Century

There is little evidence to suggest that, among 'ordinary' laypeople, the ability to read a vernacular language was much more common in Mannyng's time than it was in Waddington's. The extant evidence bearing upon the literacy of the 'ordinary' laity during the thirteenth century illustrates a growth in 'pragmatic' literacy (in Latin). Ordinary laypeople were gradually becoming more familiar with the everyday use of documents; they were increasingly able to recognize certain phrases in documents and to sign their names or affix their seals to documents, for example. More and more of them were being absorbed into a society increasingly fuelled by 'paper-work.' This integration of the ordinary laity into the 'document-culture' undoubtedly represented a first step in the creation of a society in which no 'class' utterly lacked literacy.

The growth in 'pragmatic' literacy during the thirteenth century does not alter the fact that only the élite of the laity could read vernacular literature when Waddington wrote, and it would not seem to suggest that such conditions had changed radically by the time Mannyng wrote Handlyng Synne. The growth does suggest, however, that the foundations for the expansion of vernacular 'literary literacy' were strengthening during the second half of the thirteenth century.

The next major step in the creation of a literate society seems to have been the gradual redevelopment of literature in the English language. Mannyng's poems are prominent signals of the onset of this process (i.e., of the decline of Anglo-Norman and the rise of English as the literary language of England), as are the several late-thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century Middle English renderings of French and Anglo-Norman romances, Dan Michel's 1340 translation
of the Somme le Roi, and, aside from such re-workings of tradition, the
distinctively individual works of Rolle.

The translations would not have been supplied without a demand, and that
demand must have come from those outside the group of elite lay Anglo-Norman
readers, i.e., among a growing group of new lay literates in English. The
production of the translations are the only evidence, however, that such new
literates in English existed and were demanding English literature from the
late thirteenth century onwards. Only in the latter part of the fourteenth
century do we find documented a shift from French to English as the basis for
rudimentary grammatical instruction in schools. One can only suspect that this
documentation post-dates by several decades the beginnings of general
instruction of children in the English language.

The lack of direct evidence of the growth of lay literacy in English
during the fourteenth century suggests that the growth was slow, rather than
explosive, and one should consider the advent of the great English-language
poets of the late fourteenth century a predictable result of a lengthy literary
redevelopment, rather than an impulsive gift to a suddenly literate mass
audience. Mannynng should appear on any ballot for 'father of English poetry.'

It is not until the fifteenth century that clear and sustained evidence of
considerable lay literacy in English can be seen in wills of lay book-owners, in
surviving MSS. providing evidence of lay ownership, and in surviving MSS.
compiled by laymen, including commonplace-books.

One of the most important recent works on the creation of the literate
society is M.T. Clanchy's From Memory to Written Record, op. cit. (cf. esp. pp.
182-96 on the growth of 'pragmatic' literacy during the thirteenth century).
M.B. Parkes highlights the distinction between 'pragmatic' and 'cultivated'
literacy in his 'The Literacy of the Laity,' op. cit., passim. Examples of
'pragmatically' literate laypeople are described in R.W. Kaeuper's 'Two Early
alteration of the medieval mind which occurred with the emergence of the
document-culture is discussed by H.J. Chaytor in From Script to Print
(Cambridge, 1945), passim, and by F.H. Bauml, 'Varieties and Consequences of
Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy,' Speculum 55 (1980), pp. 237-65. John of
Cornwall's alleged initial introduction of English as the basis of grammatical
instruction in the schools, which is recorded by Trevisa, is discussed by V.H.
Stevenson ('The Introduction of English as the Vehicle of Instruction in English
Presented to Dr. Furnivall (Oxford, 1901), pp. 421-9). The growth of literacy in
English during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (including the increase in
book bequests and in the compilation of common-place books by laymen) is
described in N. Orme's English Schools in the Middle Ages, op. cit., esp. pp.
42-9, 97-101. The book bequests of laymen during the fifteenth and sixteenth
century receive particular attention in J.A.H. Moran's The Growth of English
Schooling 1340-1548 (Princeton, 1985), esp. pp. 150-220, and a further dimension
of this evidence is explored in J.T. Rosenthal's 'Aristocratic Cultural Patronage
and Book Bequests, 1350-1500,' Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library
64 (1982), pp. 522-48. The common-place books receive further attention in A.G.
24-6. F.C. Robinson explains why one should not exaggerate the extent of
literacy during the 'age of Chaucer' in 'Reading and Writing in Chaucer's
assessment of the available evidence is stressed by J.W. Thompson, in The
Literacy of the Laity in the Middle Ages (Berkeley, 1939), esp. pp. 181-2 and
197.
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The Structural Variants of the Manuel des Péchés

In order to ease comprehension of the detailed structural history of Books VI-IX presented in Chapter I, there appears below an outline of the structure of each MS. version of the Manuel. The MSS. are grouped according to the 'edition' of Book VII which they contain. A fourth section is devoted to the fragmentary versions of the text. Descriptions of the MSS. appear in Chapter II.

I. Manuscripts containing the first 'edition' of Book VII.
   (a) Taylor: Prologue.
      I-V.
      VI.
      VII:  (i) Points.
            (ii) General Conclusion to the Points.
                 (a) Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).
                 (b) Long transition to Book IX.
                 (c) IX (initial fusion)
                 (d) Corrections and additions to Books I-V.
            (iii) Virtues.
            (iv) Things to Avoid.
      VIII.
   (b) B.N.: Prologue.
      I-V.
      VI.
      VII:  (i) Points.
            (ii) General Conclusion to the Points.
                 (a) Epilogue (an adulterated version lacking the Waddington ascription).
                 (b) Long transition to IX.
            (iii) Virtues.
            (iv) Things to Avoid.
      VIII.
   (c) York 7: Prologue.
      I-V.
      VI.
      VII:  (i) Points.
            (ii) General Conclusion to the Points.
                 (a) Epilogue (an adulterated version lacking the Waddington ascription).
                 (b) Long transition to IX.
            (iii) Virtues.
            (iv) Things to Avoid.
      VIII.
   IX (expanded).
      Epilogue (reduced through scribal error; contains the Waddington ascription).
   The MS. is described in Laird's 'Source,' pp. 115-18.
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The MS. is described in Laird's 'Source,' pp. 138-41. B.N. and York 7 are extremely similar to each other even in minor details (see Arnould, pp. 103 and 380).

I. (A): Hatton 99, a MS. containing a scribal critical edition of the first 'edition' of VII, which eliminates the confusion after the General Conclusion to the Points by eliminating (in VII) everything after the General Conclusion. Its contents are as follows:

- Prologue.
- I-V.
- VI.
- VII: (i) Points.
  (ii) General Conclusion to the Points.
- VIII.
- IX (expanded).
- Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).

Since it is quite clear that the Virtues and Things to Avoid sections were written by the Manuel-poet (see the treatment of Book VII in Chapter I), and since no other first 'edition' version of VII is unconfused after the General Conclusion to the Points, it would appear that this version of the Book was the product of a scribal critical compromise undertaken for the sake of textual clarity.

Arnould (p. 96) inaccurately claims that this MS. contains the prologue to the Virtues section of Book VII. The MS. is described in Laird's 'Source,' pp. 134-7.

I. (B): Copies reflecting the first 'edition' of VII which also display features of other 'editions':

(a) Be.1.20: Prologue.
- I-V.
- VI.
- VII: (i) Points.
  (ii) General Conclusion to the Points.
  (a) IX: fragment of the first prayer, including lines from the later redaction of the sermons.
  (iii) Virtues.
  (iv) Things to Avoid.
  (v) Points (to 1. 9630 [i.e., the first few ll.]).
- VIII.
- IX: further passages from the first prayer, plus part of the second prayer.
- Epilogue (possibly a scribally-edited version, it lacks the Waddington ascription).

The repetition of the beginning of the Points section at the end of VII suggests that the scribe responsible for the structure of this version was exposed to a third 'edition' text of VII, in which the Points followed the Things to Avoid. See Laird, 'Source,' pp. 94-8 for a description of the volume.

(b) St. John's: Prologue.
- I-V.
- VI.
- VII: (i) Points.
  (a) IX: the first prayer, including lines from the later redaction of the sermons.
  (ii) Virtues.
  (iii) Things to Avoid.
- VIII.
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IX (expanded).
Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).
The intervening foreign material in this manuscript's version of VII is of course characteristic of the first 'edition.' The absence of the General Conclusion to the Points suggests that the scribe responsible for the structure of this version was influenced by a second 'edition' text. Laird describes the MS. on pp. 99-102 of his 'Source.'

II. Manuscripts containing the second 'edition' of Book VII.
(a) Harley 4657: Prologue.
I-V.
VI.
VII: (i) Points.
(ii) Virtues.
(iii) Things to Avoid.
VIII.
IX (expanded).
Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).
The MS. is described in Laird's 'Source,' pp. 90-3.
(b) Arundel 288: Prologue.
I-V.
VI.
VII: (i) Points.
(ii) Virtues.
(iii) Things to Avoid.
VIII.
Since Arundel is one of the earliest surviving copies of the Manuel, it would appear that the second 'edition' of VII was executed very soon after the first 'edition' appeared. The penultimate entry in the volume is the earlier redaction of the sermons. For a description of the MS., see Arnould, pp. 371-3, and Laird's 'Source,' pp. 63-4.
(c) Harley 3860: VII: (i) Points.
(ii) Virtues.
(iii) Things to Avoid.
VIII.
The scribe maintains (at f. 70r) 11. 9303-8 in the Things to Avoid section of VII, which cross-refer to the treatment of Sloth in the Sins section. At the end of VIII (f. 77v) there appears the four-line 'short transition' to IX. The MS. is described by Laird in his 'Source,' pp. 109-12.
(d) Nottingham: Begins imperfectly at 1. 2208 (Book II).
II-V.
VI.
VII: (i) Points.
(ii) Virtues.
(iii) Things to Avoid.
VIII.
IX (expanded).
Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).
Laird did not see this MS., but provides a brief description of it in his 'Source,' pp. 113-14; see also Arnould, p. 393.
(e) Harley 4971: Prologue.
I-V.
Poem on the Passion (ends imperfectly at f. 120v).
(Lacuna)
VII: Only 11. 9258 ff. of the Things to Avoid section remain.
VIII.
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Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).

(a) Long transition to IX.
(b) IX (initial fusion).

Although the lacuna in this version obscures the first two-thirds of Book VII, it would seem clear from the order of the material after VIII that this text reflects the second 'edition' of VII, in which the gap in VII was closed and the spurious material which had previously filled the gap was shifted behind the authentic end of the text (i.e., Book VIII). Cf. this text with that of the Taylor MS., a first 'edition' version (see above), which places (i) the Epilogue, (ii) the long transition to IX and (iii) the initial fusion of IX immediately after the General Conclusion to the Points of VII. These three particles (in precisely the same order) appear behind the genuine conclusion of the Manuel (Book VIII) in Harley. Laird describes Harley on pp. 103-8 of his 'Source.'

III. Manuscripts containing the third 'edition' of Book VII.

(a) Royal: Prologue.
I-V.
VII: (i) Virtues.
(ii) Things to Avoid.
(iii) Points.
(iv) General Conclusion to the Points.
VIII.

Since Royal is one of the earliest surviving copies of the Manuel, it would appear that very little time elapsed between the appearances of the first and third 'editions.' The final entry in Royal is the earlier redaction of the sermons. For a description of the volume, see Arnould, pp. 369-71, and Laird, 'Source,' pp. 52-4.

(b) Greaves: Prologue.
I-V.
VI.
VII: (i) Virtues.
(ii) Things to Avoid.
(iii) Points.
(iv) General Conclusion to the Points.
VIII.
IX (expanded).
Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).
The MS. is described in Laird's 'Source,' pp. 45-7.

(c) Pal.Lat.: Prologue.
I-V.
VI.
VII: (i) Virtues.
(ii) Things to Avoid.
(iii) Points.
(iv) General Conclusion to the Points.
VIII.
IX (expanded).
Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).
See Laird, 'Source,' pp. 72-8, for a description of the volume.

(d) Ms.6.A: Prologue.
I-V.
VI.
VII: (i) Virtues.
(ii) Things to Avoid.
(iii) Points.
(iv) General Conclusion to the Points.
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VIII.
IX (expanded).
Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).

Laird describes the MS. in his 'Source,' pp. 30-2.

(a) Harley 273: Prologue.
I-V.
VI.
VII:  (i) Virtues.
(ii) Things to Avoid.
(iii) Points.
(iv) General Conclusion to the Points.
VIII.
IX (expanded).
Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).

The MS. is described in Laird's 'Source,' pp. 25-9.

(f) HM: Prologue.
I-V.
VI.
VII:  (i) Virtues.
(ii) Things to Avoid.
(iii) Points.
(iv) General Conclusion to the Points.
VIII.
IX (expanded).
Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).

The MS. is described in Laird's 'Source,' pp. 35-40.

I-V.
VII:  (i) Virtues.
(ii) Things to Avoid.
(a) The first two lines of the General Conclusion to the Points.
(iii) Points.
VIII.
IX (expanded).
Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).

The appearance of a fragment of the General Conclusion after the Things to Avoid section of VII might suggest that this version was influenced by a second 'edition' text which placed the General Conclusion after the Things to Avoid, although no examples of such a second 'edition' structure survive. The MS. is described in Laird's 'Source,' pp. 41-4 (see also p. 411).

IV. Manuscripts containing fragments of or selections from the Manuel.
(a) York 13: Contains ll. 1–6700 (i.e., Books I–III and the first few ll. of Book IV). See Laird, 'Source' (pp. 79–82) for a description of the volume.
(b) Harley 337: Contains ll. 1068–4821 (i.e., part of Books II and III), with various lacunae. Laird describes the MS. in 'Source,' pp. 65–6.
(c) Gg.1.1: Contains ll. 1–3750, 6669–8421 (i.e., Books I–II, part of III, part of IV, Book V, and part of VI [see Laird, 'Source,' pp. 33–41]).
(d) Arundel 372: Contains only two leaves of text from the Manual, comprising ll. 5721–566 from Book III and ll. 7480–641 from Book V (see Laird, 'Source,' p. 89).
(e) Stonyhurst: Contains selected exempla from the Manual, viz., numbers 5–6, 15, 3, 17, 45, 50–1, 53, 32, 2, 26, 40–42, and 57. See Laird,
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(f) Rawlinson: Contains selected exempla from the Manuel, viz., numbers 40-42, 50, 52-3, 55-64, 3, 5, 9, 14, 11, 13, 15-19, 31-2, 36-9, 23, 25, 45, 47-8, and 35. It also contains Book VIII in its entirety and the earlier redaction of the sermons. For a description of the MS., see Laird, 'Source,' pp. 48-51, and Meyer's 'Notice du MS. Rawlinson Poetry 241 (Oxford),' Romania 29 (1900), pp. 1-84.

I am grateful to Dr. R.G. Biggar for recently alerting me to the existence of late-fifteenth-century MS. versions of Icelandic translations of ten exempla present in the Manuel (nos. 8 [Mother Who Cursed Child], 10 [Foul-Mouthed Nun], 11 [Adulteress Split in Two], 14 [Knight Who Robbed a Poor Man], 17 [London Perjurer], 23 [Backbiting Monk], 24 [Merciful Knight], 30 [Hard Judge], 35 [Drunken Priest], 41 [Priest's Concubine]). These have been most recently edited by E.G. Pétursson (Midaldaevintyri [Reykjavik, 1976], nos. 5, 10, 13, 16, 18-21, 24, 28); six of them were printed by H. Gering (Islendzk Aventyri, 2 vols. [Halle, 1882, 1884], nos. XXXII-III, XXXVI, XL-XLI, XCII [German translations of the stories appear in vol. 2]). Gering (cf., e.g., vol. 2, p. 95) seems to assume that the stories are from Handlyng Synne, and makes scant reference to the Manuel. Pétursson (pp. lxxxvii-xc, cviii) is somewhat more cautious in his attribution. HS does share with the Manuel the stories in question, but a recent critic has suggested that the Icelandic versions derive neither from the Manuel nor from HS, but rather from a (lost) Middle English prose redaction of HS (see P.A. Jorgensen, 'Ten Icelandic Translations from Middle English,' in E.S. Firchow, K. Grimstad, N. Hasselmo, W.A. O'Neill, edd., Studies for Einer Haugen [The Hague, 1972], esp. p. 307; also see J. McKinnell's review of Pétursson's book, in Mediaeval Scandinavia 11 [1978-9], esp. p. 310). Jorgensen (op. cit., pp. 319-20) believes that the translations may have been composed ca. 1429-34 by Jón Egilsson, the notary public of Jón Vilhjálmsson Craxton, the only Bishop of Iceland of English extraction who actually lived for a time (1429-34) in Iceland. Waddington himself was a member of the ecclesiastical 'establishment' who wrote for and was read by a general clerical audience; there was also a clerical component in Mannyng's intended and achieved audiences. The corpus of Icelandic translations of exempla from English sources is exceedingly small and, Jorgensen thinks (op. cit., p. 320), probably the product of a short-lived 'ecclesiastical initiative.'
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Historical Notes on Readers of the Manuel and its Descendants

(a) The Tempest Family

The significance of the Tempests' ownership of three extant copies of the Manuel (Harley 4657 [containing the full text], Harley 3860 [Books VII and VIII], and Rawl. Poet. 241 [selected exempla and Book VIII]) might appear to be diminished by the fact that over one hundred and twenty extant medieval manuscripts, incunabula, and later printed books bear, like the three MSS. in question, an inscription of the name of Sir Thomas Tempest (1642-92), of Stella, Co. Durham (15 miles N.W. of Durham), fourth Baronet (from 1662) of the Stella line of this family. Dr. Doyle, in 'The Library of Sir Thomas Tempest: its Origins and Dispersal' (in G.A.M. Janssens and F.G.A.M. Aarts, edd., Studies in Seventeenth-Century English Literature, History and Bibliography, Costerus, n.s. 46 [Amsterdam, 1984], pp. 83-93), has begun to reconstruct some of the history of the Tempest collection. His findings need to be summarized.*

The majority of the books which bear the Tempest inscription (the three Manuel MSS. significantly excepted) are known to have belonged during the Middle Ages to the Benedictine Cathedral Priory at Durham. Many of these Durham books had belonged to two persons who had been monks at that house before its dissolution in 1539, and who had become canons of the Cathedral Chapter in 1541, viz., Stephen and Nicholas Marley (they inherited some of their books from Thomas Swallwell, sometime Chancellor of Durham [d. ca. 1534; see E. Bonney, 'Some Durham Abbey Books in the College Library,' The Ushaw Magazine no. 45 (December, 1905), pp. 252-5]). These Marleys appear to have been brothers, and their sister Anne was married to Nicholas Tempest (d. 1536/9), of Lancaster. The only son from this marriage was named Thomas Tempest (1530-78, of Lancaster and Stanley—see R. Surtees, The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, vol. II [London, 1820], pedigree p. 271). Nicholas Marley, stripped of his offices in 1560 after opposing Queen Elizabeth's new articles of religion, received a book from Thomas Tempest, his nephew, in the same year, and in 1562 was ordered by royal officials not to come within eight miles of Durham. Lancaster, Stanley, and Holmside, some Durham-area seats of the Tempest family, are all between six and seven modern miles from Durham. From 1563 Nicholas Marley was abroad, studying at the University of Louvain. Stephen Marley appears to have remained in his canonry until his death, ca. 1572. The 1569 inventory of the goods of Thomas Tempest, gent., of Stanley, refers to a room in Thomas's house at Stanley as 'Mr. Marleys chamber.' Doyle considers it 'likely' that the books belonging to the Marley brothers and perhaps other books belonging to Durham now known to have been in the Tempest collection were left by the brothers, perhaps gradually, at one of the Tempest seats during the 1560s.

While Thomas Tempest himself seems not to have been reported as a recusant,** his daughter-in-law (wife of the first Baronet, Nicholas Tempest)

*Dr. Doyle has kindly advised me of his latest views on this subject, and has provided me with valuable references. **Early recusant Tempests include Nicholas Tempest, probably a member of the ancient Bracewell or Broughton lines of the family, who in 1536-7 was a prominent lay figure in the rebel group assembled to oppose the dissolution of the Cistercian Abbey at Whalley (5 miles...
was imprisoned for recusancy. Thomas's grandson does not appear to have been a recusant, but his great-grandson was one, and his great-great-grandson, Sir Thomas Tempest, the fourth Baronet, whose name is inscribed in the books of the Tempest collection, was certainly one, having studied at the English College at Douai. Some of the volumes of the Tempest collection do not derive from Durham, and others were clearly acquired after the Marley period.

By the time of the fourth Baronet's death (1692) the books apparently had been moved to Stella, another Tempest seat, for in an inventory of that year Sir Thomas's library is valued at £60, or 15% of the total worth of Stella Hall. The Tempest baronetcy became extinct after Sir Thomas's son Francis died unmarried in 1698, and the estate fell to Sir Thomas's daughter Jane, wife of William, Lord Widdrington. Although Stella remained a Catholic household after 1698, with the extinction of the baronetcy began the dispersal of the library. Widdrington bequeathed some of the MSS. to the Harleian Library, while the Rev. Thomas Eyre, an associate of the heir of Widdrington's son, appears to have incorporated some of the books into a library of his foundation at Hassop, Derbyshire. By this time, however, several books in the Tempest collection had already been sold or given away to various people. Eyre founded Ushaw College, Durham, and at present roughly two-thirds of the extant volumes of the Tempest collection rest there. See Doyle, 'Tempest,' passim.

Before returning to the question of our three MSS., some details may be added to Dr. Doyle's account. The relationship between the Marley brothers and the Tempests appears to have been professional as well as familial. In 1536-7 Durham priory granted a pension to a Thomas Tempest, describing him as clerk of the Prior's exchequer and free court and as the Prior's attorney. In separate pensions issued at the same time to Thomas, he is described as a legal expert and as the forester of Bearpark (2 miles W. of Durham). See J.T. Fowler, ed., The Account Rolls of the Abbey of Durham, vol. III, SS 103 (1901 for 1900), p. 703. In the record of his payment of sheaf-tithes to Durham (Account Rolls III, p. 689) for land in Brafferton (15 miles S. of Durham) Thomas is referred to as a knight. This Thomas was a member of the Holmeside line of the family, and served from 1510 to 1544 as seneschal to Bishops of Durham Ruthall, Wolsey, and Tunstall. He was the brother of Nicholas Tempest of Lancaster (d. 1539) and thus the brother-in-law of Anne Marley (see R. Surtees, Durham, op. cit., vol. II, pedigree p. 327). Thomas's position as an influential retainer of the Durham hierarchy and as a colleague of the Marley brothers no doubt provides a motive for the Marleys' later bequest of books to Thomas's nephew Thomas.

The Tempests' business relationships with Durham were longstanding. Members of the Tempest family held land from the Prior of Durham in 1430 and 1464, and Thomas Tempest, knight, apparently the attorney, did so in 1539 (see W. Greenwell, ed., Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis, SS 58 (1872 for 1871), pp. 76, 92, 203, and 327, and p. 330 on Thomas's holding). In 1548/9 John Tempest was one of several persons appointed to a commission required to survey and assess church property and goods in Northumberland and Co. Durham (see J. Raine, ed., The Injunctions and other Ecclesiastical Proceedings of Richard Barnes, Bishop of Durham, from 1575 to 1587, SS 22 (1850), Appendix, p. lix), and in 1670 a Sir Thomas Tempest, apparently the fourth Baronet, appears to

S. of Waddington). Several monks, including the Abbot (who seems to have helped Tempest), were convicted of treason, as Tempest himself seems to have been. See J.B.W. Wallis, The Narrative of the Indictment of the Traitors of Whalley and Cartmell 1536-7, Chetham Soc. n.s. 90, part IV (1931), pp. 1-5, 16-17. In January, 1581, during his missionary journey to Lancashire, the Jesuit martyr Edmund Campion was escorted into Yorkshire by a 'Mr. Tempest.' See J.S. Leatherbarrow, The Lancashire Elizabethan Recusants, Chetham Society n.s. 110 (1947), p. 52.
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have been leasing a home in Durham from the Dean and Chapter of Durham (see J.C. Hodgson, ed., Northumbrian Documents of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, SS 131 (1918), p. 216, note).

While the majority of the extant volumes once in the Tempest collection belonged originally to Durham, there are some Tempest books, in particular their three Manuel MSS., whose provenance is uncertain. The Tempests are an ancient Norman family, and during the Middle Ages their members were scattered about the northern regions of the country. It is certainly not impossible that some of the books without certain provenances belonged to one line or another of the family before the Marley period, and that these books gradually made their way via inter familial exchanges to the consolidated seventeenth-century Tempest library at Stella.

Evidence of the Tempests' bookishness is not entirely lacking. In 1414 Richard Norton (sometime King's Sergeant and Chief Justice of the Common Pleas), the husband of Isabel Tempest (of Studley and Hertford, Yorks., and Trefford, Co. Durham) executed the will of John Newton, treasurer of the Archdiocese of York, which planned the distribution of the treasurer's considerable library, which included, among many other books, a volume containing works by Rolle, Hilton, and Remington (of Salley), and a copy of the Somme le Roi ('librum Parisiensis de virtutibus et vicinis'). The executor surely could have acquired a few books for himself in the course of his duties; during the late fifteenth century a John Norton owned MS. Harley 4971 of the Manuel (see Chapter IV). On the Norton-Tempest marriage, see L.G. Pine, ed., Burke's Landed Gentry (hereafter LG), 17th ed. (London, 1952), p. 2480; J. Raine, who prints the will on pp. 364-71 of his Testamenta Eboracensia (hereafter TE), part I SS 4 (1836), inaccurately suggests that Norton married Elizabeth Tempest (see p. 364, note). For more on the books mentioned in the will see S.H. Cavanaugh's 'A Study of Books Privately Owned in England: 1300-1450' (University of Pennsylvania Ph.D. thesis, 1980), vol II, pp. 607-14, esp. p. 608.

In the 1555 will of Roger Tempest of Norton, probably a descendant of the Tempest-Norton alliance, Roger gave all of his books to a curate (see J. Raine, ed., Wills and Inventories, part I, SS 2 (1835), p. 146). In 1649 the recusant Sir Richard Tempest, the third Baronet (see Doyle, 'Tempest,' op. cit., pp. 87-8, including notes), wrote An Entertainment of Solitariness, a series of prayerful meditations and youthful opinions on existence, religion, and politics apparently composed at Amsterdam for his brothers Nicholas and Thomas, and in ca. 1658 (for his mother and her friends) A Discourse Touching Choice of Religion, which learnedly defends the Roman Catholic Church (Sir Richard's defence of the Sacrament of Penance appears on pp. 74-83 [a copy formerly owned by Thomas Eyre, Esq. is held at the British Library]). In the 1680s Pierce Tempest (d. 1717), a member of the Tong line of the family (7 miles W. of Leeds) was a bookseller on the Strand (see DNB 19, pp. 494-5), and in 1764 Stephen Tempest, Esq. (d. 1771), of the ancient Broughton line of the family, published his Religio Laici (a copy of which is held in the British Library), a guide to manners for the gentry. All three of Stephen's daughters, incidentally, were Benedictine nuns at Ghent. On Stephen and his children see T.D. Whitaker's The History and Antiquities of the Deanery of Craven (reprint, Manchester and Skipton, 1973), p. 105 and the pedigree of the Tempests of Broughton after p. 106; also see LG p. 2481.

It would seem perfectly possible that the Tempests' possession of the three volumes of uncertain provenance containing versions of William of Waddington's poem was merely the product of chance. Nevertheless a family's possession of three different versions of a single medieval vernacular work is an extremely unusual occurrence, and one which encourages one to investigate whether or not some connection existed between the author and the book-owners.
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Although the case must not be overstated, it is possible that the Tempests had a particular interest in the work of Waddington.

Bracewell and Broughton, Lancs., the original seats of the Tempest family (Bracewell apparently coming into their possession during the reign of Stephen (1135-54)--see Surtees's Durham, vol. II, op. cit., p. 329), are respectively ten and fifteen miles north-east of the village of Waddington. In ca. 1268, i.e., perhaps within a decade or so of the composition of the Manuel, Sir Roger Tempest, knight, of Bracewell (d. 1289), married Alice (d. 1301-2), the daughter and heir of Walter de Waddington, and through this marriage inherited the title Lord of Waddington (see the pedigree of the Tempests of Bracewell after p. 96 of Whitaker's Craven; also see LG, p. 2479). The Tempests were thereafter active lords of that village at least until the dissolution.


In 1512 Sir Richard Tempest and his wife Rosamund arranged for the instalment of a window at Waddington chapel which would depict themselves (see J.W. Clay, ed., Yorkshire Church Notes 1619-31, by Roger Dodsworth, YAS 34 (1904), pp. 35-6). In his will (1514) Sir Richard granted to his son, Sir Thomas, the lease which he held on the parish church at Kirkby Malham (15 miles N.E. of Waddington), a church appropriated by the Premonstratensian abbey at West Dereham, Norfolk (12 miles S. of King's Lynn). See TR VI, SS 106 (1902), p. 61. The arms of the Tempest family appear in this church (see Whitaker's Craven, p. 249), and the Premonstratensian canons from West Dereham regularly served there (see A.H. Thompson, ed., Visitations of Religious Houses in the Diocese of Lincoln, vol. I, LRS 7 (1914), p. 150). Co-incidentally, the unique extant manuscript (St. John's College, Cambridge 197, copied s. xv) of Of Shrifte and Penance, the Middle English prose translation of Waddington's Manuel, was owned during the sixteenth century by a Sir John Birde, of East Dereham, Norfolk (22 miles from the Premonstratensian abbey).

*The Tempests were of course considerable landowners, and their connection with Lincolnshire can be traced back to the late thirteenth century, when (in 1284-5) Sir Roger Tempest (the man who married into the Waddington family ca. 1268) was recorded as holding land in Waddington, Lancs., from the Earl of Lincoln (see R.H. Skaife, ed., Kirkby's Inquest, SS 49 (1867 for 1866), p. 17). In 1294-6 and 1304-5 Walter de Waddington, Sir Roger's father-in-law, was renting land in Clitheroe and Downham from Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, who was Lord of the Honour of Clitheroe (see P.A. Lyons, ed., Two "Comptoi" of the Lancashire and Cheshire Manors of Henry de Lacy, Chetham Soc. 112 (1884), p. 11, 15, 107, 113 and, on Lacy, p. v).
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A royal survey of church property undertaken in 1546 records that the Tempest family and the Premonstratensian Abbot and Convent of Cokersand shared the administration of the church at Waddington, that the Tempests alone controlled the chantry of Our Lady in the chapel at Waddington, and that they and the Premonstratensian Abbey of West Dereham controlled the chantry of St. John the Baptist in the parish church at Kirkby Malham (see W. Page, ed., The Certificates of the Commissioners Appointed to Survey the Chantries, Guilds, Hospitals, etc., in the County of York, part II, SS 92 [1895 for 1893], pp. 248-9).

Occasional connections between the Tempests and the Waddingtons occur until the eighteenth century. In 1645 Dodsworth recorded the appearance in the church at Bracewell of the Tempest arms quartered by those of Waddington (see Clay’s Yorkshire Church Notes, op. cit., p. 243). In 1660 William Tempest, of Wigan (25 miles S. of Waddington), an innkeeper, granted in his will cash gifts to his ‘sister’ Elizabeth Waddington and her children, and to his ‘niece’ Margery Waddington (see J.P. Rylands, ed., Lancashire and Cheshire Wills and Inventories 1563 to 1602, Chetham Society n.s. 37 [1897], pp. 25-27, including note on pp. 25-6), and from 1712-20 a person by the name of Tempest Waddington is referred to in the Waddington parish register (see J. Parker’s The Parish Registers of Waddington, op. cit., e.g., pp. 154-5 and 170-71).

If the Tempests’ possession of three versions of William of Waddington’s poem is a product of chance, it is a most extraordinary example of such, for, in addition to the their having been long-standing and active lords of Waddington’s birthplace, the Tempests were friendly with owners of extant copies of Handlyng Synne and Idley’s Instructions (see below), and may have been related to Robert Mannyng (see Appendix IV).

(b) The Bowes Family

This Durham family seems to have owned the Osborn MS. of Mannyng’s Handlyng Synne from the time it was copied (ca. 1500) until the late nineteenth century (see Chapter IV). The Boweses are known to have had at least one ‘literary’ contact with the Tempest family during the fifteenth century. In ca. 1403 Sir William Tempest, of Studley, Yorks. (30 miles N.E. of Bracewell), the son of Sir Richard, of Bracewell and Studley (whose contacts with Gilbertine houses and whose possible relation to Mannyng are explored in Appendix IV), married Elinor Washington (d. 1451/2), daughter and heir of Sir William Washington, of Washington, Co. Durham (10 miles E. of Stella), and thus inherited the manor of Washington and land in Helton, Cumbria (20 miles N. of Kendal). The marriage was sanctioned by the Archbishop of York despite the parties’ consanguinity. One of Elinor’s daughters was Isabel, who married Richard Norton (the executor of John Newton’s will). On the Tempest-Washington marriage, see LG, p. 2480, and the (inaccurate) pedigree after p. 96 of Whitaker’s Craven. On the date and consequences of the marriage, see E.B. Tempest’s ‘Tempest of Holmeside,’ op. cit., pp. 6 and 9. In January, 1421, Matilda Bowes, the widow of Sir William del Bowes, of Streatlam Castle, Co. Durham (20 miles S.W. of Durham), granted in her will ‘the boke with the knotts’ to ‘Dame Elinore de Wessyngton,’ the wife of Sir William Tempest. To three other women (one of whom being her own daughter) Matilda gave a French Bible,

*In 1408 a ‘Gilemota Carreeke,’ of York, had given in her will ‘unum librum Anglicanum de Spiritu Guidon., & unum librum Gallicanum de Barlaham et Josephath’ to Alice, daughter of William Bowes (see TE I, op. cit., p. 352). In 1479 Thomas Bowes, sometime Keeper of the Royal Mint, left a substantial library in his will (see J.A.H. Moran, The Growth of English Schooling 1350-1540 (Princeton, 1985), pp. 154 and 191).
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a copy of Tristram, and a primer. At the time of her death she appears to have been letting a Durham cottage ("unam relaxacionem") to William 'Morle', perhaps an ancestor of the Durham Marley brothers whose books later entered the Tempests' library. See R.L. Storey, ed., The Register of Thomas Langley, vol. II, SS 166 (1957 for 1951), pp. 195-7. Dr. Doyle has kindly advised me that the Boweses inherited the Marleys' estate at Gibside through the Blakiston family during the seventeenth century (see J. Kynaston and M. Johnson, 'Bowes House,' in C.W. Gibby, J. Kynaston, and M. Johnson, Durham Buildings, 2nd ed. [Washington, Co. Durham, 1969], p. 21).

Like the Tempests, the Boweses had long-standing connections with the Durham hierarchy. In 1331 Adam Bowes served as seneschal to the Prior of Durham, and in 1338 he was one of Bishop of Durham Richard Bury's justices (see W. Greenwell, ed., Feodarium Prioratus Dunelmensis, SS 58 (1872 for 1871), pp. 69 (note), and 110 (note)). Waddington, of course, was also an episcopal justice, and the legal prominence of Waddington, Sir Thomas Tempest (the lawyer), and Adam Bowes in their respective ecclesiastical spheres and times is a connection between the author and the Tempest and Bowes families which cannot be overlooked. In 1430 William Bowes was serving as the Sheriff and Escheator of Durham (see Feodarium, p. 71). In 1468 Isabella Bowes, wife of William Bowes, received a letter of fraternity from Durham; she was the niece of Bishop of Durham Lawrence Booth (see J. Raine, ed., The Obituary Roll of William Rochester and John Burnby, SS 31 (1856), p. 112). Like the Tempests, the Boweses held land from the Prior of Durham in 1430, 1464, and 1539 (see Feodarium, pp. 52, 53, 57, 78, 89, 197, and 319).

When Matilda Bowes gave 'the boke with the knotts' to Elinor (Washington) Tempest, an apparent relative of Elinor, John Wessyngton (d. 1451), was Prior of Durham. John was Prior from 1416 to 1446. During the first decade of the fifteenth century he compiled a chartulary, and during his time as Prior he supervised the construction of a sacristy and library in the Cathedral (see K.E. Bayley, W. Brown, and A.H. Thompson, eds., Miscellanea, vol. II, SS 127 (1916), p. 223 (note), and A.F. Eden, A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500 (Oxford, 1957-9), p. 2018). During the first decade of the fifteenth century Wessyngton, then Chancellor of Durham, supervised the delivery of several books from the library at Durham to that at Durham College, Oxford (see B. Botfield, ed., Catalogues of the Library of Durham Cathedral, SS 7 (1838), pp. 39-40). A comprehensive account of Wessyngton's career may be found in R.B. Dobson, 'The Priory of Durham in the Time of John Wessington' (Oxford University D.Phil. thesis, 1962). Wessyngton was Librarian at Durham during his period as Chancellor (see S.L. Greenslade, 'John Washington, Prior of Durham,' Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church 16 (1947), p. 234; on the Boweses' 'constant' presence at Durham Priory, see p. 243). It is possible that the Washington family of Durham owned MS. Gg.1.1 of the Manuel during the Middle Ages (see Chapter I). Durham had from ca. 1083 a dependent cell at Stamford, Lincs., where there was also a Gilbertine house of studies from 1292 to ca. 1334 (see D. Knowles and R.N. Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses England and Wales [London, 1971], pp. 57, 77, 197, and 199). Stephen Marley, one of the Marleys who gave books to the Tempests, was Prior of this cell from 1530-33 (see S.L. Greenslade, 'The Last Monks of Durham Cathedral Priory,' Durham University Journal 41 (1948-9), p. 109). The Christopher Bourne who was a monk at Durham in 1529 (ibid., p. 111) cannot be connected with the author of Handlyng Synne. On the connections between the Tempests and the Bournes, see Appendix IV.

(c) The Clifford Family

The Cliffords of Cumbria seem to have been the original owners of MS. Eng. Poet. d.45 (copied s. xv², last quarter) of Peter Idley's Instructions, and the

The Cliffords and Tempeasts were officially and/or maritally allied from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. In 1417 Sir Piers Tempest of Bracewell served in France under Lord Clifford (see LG, p. 2480; the Clifford in question was probably John (d. 1421/2)—see Cokayne's Complete Peerage, op. cit., vol. III, p. 293). In 1499 Roger Tempest of Broughton (d. bef. 1537), while in the service of Henry, Lord Clifford, married the Lord's granddaughter, Anne. Roger's son Stephen Tempest (d. 1549) served in 1527 as esquire to Henry Clifford, first Earl of Cumberland, and Stephen's grandson, Sir Stephen (d. 1625) was a counsellor of the third Earl of Cumberland (see LG, pp. 2480-81).

Members of families which owned copies of the Manual, Handlyng Synne, and Idley's Instructions may have met in 1542, when Sir Thomas Tempest (perhaps the one from Holmside, the Prior's attorney, episcopal seneschal, and brother-in-law of Anne Marley) and Lord Henry Clifford, first Earl of Cumberland, supervised the settlement of a dispute between a Christopher Metcalf and John, eighth Lord Scrope of Bolton. Sir Robert Bowes (Councillor of the North, 1525-55, probably of the Bowes family of Durham) seems to have been one of Metcalf's supporters during the proceedings (see A.G. Dickens, ed., Clifford Letters of the Sixteenth Century, SS 172 (1962 for 1957), pp. 118-20).

During the decade in which Matilda Bowes gave a book to Elinor (Washington) Tempest, a book-owning member of the Clifford family was friendly with John Wessyngton, the Prior of Durham. In 1427 the Prior approved the request of Robert Clifford, vicar (by the Prior and Convent's appointment) of Bossall (about 8 miles N.E. of York) to have Henry Heley, monk and sometime bursar of Durham, execute his will (see J. Raine, ed., Historiae Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, SS 9 (1839), Appendix, pp. ccxxv-vi). In his will of 1428/9, Clifford gave a missal, a manual, and a psalter to his parish church at Bossall, and the remainder of his goods to his friends John Wessyngton and Henry Heley (see TE II, op. cit., SS 30, p. 5, including notes). Clifford was himself a monk of Durham, having been inducted into the Priory in ca. 1408 (see Dobson's 'Priory of Durham,' op. cit., p. 549).

Conclusion

The families examined here do not form the fabric of the (very different) readerships of the Manuel, Handlyng Synne, and Idley's Instructions, but rather represent a fringe which links the audiences of all three poems. While it has been demonstrated that these northern, landed families were well-connected not only with each other but also often with the ecclesiastical hierarchy (the similarity of the careers of Waddington, Thomas Tempest, and Adam Bowes is particularly remarkable in this regard), in weighing historical evidence of common literary interest there is not only an obligation not to underestimate the odds of chance in the calculations, but also one to regard the actual 'literary interest' component as unquantifiable. Minor common traits (such as
the ownership of certain types of books) can go unrecognized by the bearers of them, and books can go unread by their owners. Although it is true that a network of connected families owned certain copies of these poems, the circumstances of their acquisition of the books (e.g., by commission, purchase, bequest, theft, etc.) largely remain to be discovered, the possibility that the families were aware of their owning similar books is slim, and the degree of their interest in the poems is unknown.
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Historical Notes on Mannyng and his Associates

(a) Roger, or Robert, of Sixhills

This member of the Gilbertine Order was active in several Lincolnshire parishes and was a member of Bishop of Lincoln Oliver Sutton's household at least from 1290 to 1295. The portion of this man's career about which we have evidence (from 1283 to 1296) seems not entirely incompatible with the life of Robert Mannyng (though it would bring his birth-date back to ca. 1260, and thus would mean that he would have been in his seventies when he completed his poems). In 1283 Roger of Sixhills, as a subdeacon, was presented to the vicarage of Torksey (6 miles N.W. of Lincoln) by the Augustinian priory at Torksey (see R.M.T. Hill, ed., The Rolls and Register of Bishop Oliver Sutton, vol. VIII, LKS 76 [1986] p. 4). By 1285 he had resigned this post (Reg. Sutton VIII, p. 6). In 1287 'Robert' of Sixhills, referred to as a chaplain (as 'Roger' is before 1293 in Reg. Sutton VIII, p. 16), was presented to the rectory of Wing, Leics. (18 miles S.W. of Bourne) by the Benedictine Priory at St. Neots (see Reg. Sutton II, LKS 43 [1950], p. 58). In 1295 St. Neots would present a Geoffrey Brunne to the church at Edworth, Beds. (see below). 'Roger' of Sixhills is described as the former rector of Wing in 1295 (Reg. Sutton II, p. 130). In 1291 he (here again called 'Robert') is described as a religious deacon from Sempringham Priory (Reg. Sutton II, p. 130). In 1293 and 1294 Sixhills and Robert of Malton (probably the man who asked Mannyng to write the Chronicle) together witnessed official documents of Bishop Sutton (see section (b), below). In 1296 Sixhills was presented to the rectory of Laughton (18 miles N. of Lincoln) by the Augustinian priory at Thornholm (20 miles N.W. of Sixhills). See Reg. Sutton VIII, pp. 27-8. During the fifteenth century the Petyt MS. of Mannyng's Chronicle belonged to Edmund Pymond, vicar of Laughton (see Chapter III, note 10).

The dates of these activities do not conflict with the biography of Mannyng presented in Chapter III, where it is suggested that Mannyng's writing career began ca. 1303 and ended ca. 1338, that he spent fifteen years (perhaps 1302-17) at Sempringham, was in Cambridge ca. 1304, may have engaged in some pastoral work in Lincoln ca. 1327, and lived at Sixhills for 'a while,' probably after 1327. The activities of Roger, or Robert, of Sixhills would, if they could be said to be those of Mannyng, help to explain further the origins of the poet's worldly wisdom, interest in ordinary people, and preference for local stories.

Three contemporaries of Mannyng who bore the surname Brunne were active in the Diocese of Lincoln. In 1295 'Master Geoffrey de Brunne, clerk in minor orders,' was (a subdeacon) presented to the church of Edworth, Beds. (18 miles S.W. of Cambridge) by the the Benedictine house at St. Neots (18 miles W. of Cambridge) after a legal challenge to his presentation had been heard (see Reg. Sutton VIII, p. 114). During the same year Geoffrey advanced to the status of beneficed priest (see Reg. Sutton VII, p. 74). Eight years earlier St. Neots had presented Robert of Sixhills to the rectory at Wing, Leics. (see above). In 1298 another Geoffrey of Brunne, a knight, was Chief Constable of Kesteven. In
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an assize roll in which this Geoffrey is named occasionally, a Geoffrey Mannyng, possibly the same man, is once recorded as having arrested an offender (see W.S. Thomson, ed., A Lincolnshire Assize Roll for 1298, LSS 36 (1944), pp. 30, 36 (on Geoffrey Mannyng), 86, 114, 119-20, and 205). In 1281 a Henry de Bourne, subdeacon, was presented to the rectory of Clayworth, Notts. (20 miles N.W. of Lincoln) by Master Nicholas de Heyghara, Dean of Lincoln (see W. Brown, ed., The Register of William Wickwane, SS 114 (1907), p. 75). In 1301/2 Henry was found innocent of a murder which occurred on the grounds of Clayworth Church (see W. Brown, ed., The Register of Thomas of Corbridge, part I, SS 138 (1925), p. 226 (including notes), and pp. 233-4).

(b) Robert of Walton

In 1283 Robert, Prior of the Gilbertine house at Walton, Yorks., participated in the election of Roger of Bolingbroke to the Mastership of the Gilbertine Order (see Reg. Sutton I, LRS 39 (1948), pp. 40-43). This Robert is probably the person who asked Mannyng to write the Chronicle. In 1293 a Robert of Walton, clerk, and Roger of Sixhills (see above) witnessed an appeal to the papal curia by Bishop Sutton (see Reg. Sutton IV, LRS 52 (1958), pp. 88-91). In 1294 Walton and Sixhills witnessed the Bishop's addition of a codicil to his will (Reg. Sutton V, LRS 60 (1965), p. 3).

(c) Philip of Burton, or Barton

In 1298 Philip of Barton, Prior of St. Edmund's, the Gilbertine college at Cambridge, was elected Master of the Gilbertine order (the former Master, Roger of Bolingbroke, having died) and was confirmed in the position by Bishop Sutton at Banbury Castle (see Reg. Sutton I, pp. 230-4). During the same year Barton pledged obedience (at Burton, Humberside, 10 miles S.E. of Beverley) to Archbishop of York Henry of Newark for churches in the Diocese of York held by the Gilbertine Order (see W. Brown, ed., The Registers of John le Romeyn...and of Henry of Newark..., SS 128 (1917), p. 208). This Barton is the man to whom Mannyng refers in ll. 73-4 of the prologue of Handlyng Synne.

(d) The Tempests in Lincolnshire

A significant episode in the Lincolnshire history of the Tempests occurred because of their relationship with the famous Percy family, and must be introduced by a consideration of that family's connection with the Waddington area and with the Tempests. In 1148 William Percy founded the Cistercian Abbey at Salley (5 miles S. of Waddington; see Whitaker's Craven, p. 72). In 1334/5 Sir John Tempest witnessed three deeds in the Percy Chartulary (see M.T. Martin, ed., The Percy Chartulary, SS 117 (1911 for 1909), pp. 176, 202-3). In 1351 Lord Henry Percy granted the manor of Hetton, Co. Durham (5 miles N.E. of Durham) to Sir Richard Tempest of Bracewell (see LG, p. 2479 and Martin's Percy Chartulary, p. 218, including note 1). Sir Richard appeared repeatedly in the Percy Chartulary from 1347 to 1373 (see the Percy Chartulary, p. 211, 216-18, 231, 351, 365, and 371-2). In 1356 Sir Richard alienated to Salley Abbey the advowson of the church at Kirkby Overblow (10 miles N. of Leeds) in return for the Abbey's prayers for the soul of the late Henry Percy (see J. McNulty, ed., Chartulary of...Salley, vol. II, YAC 90 (1934), p. 58). In 1404 a Nicholas

*In 1297/8 Archbishop Newark, who appears to have been educated during his youth by the Gilbertines at their appropriated church at Newark, had recommended to the priors of the Gilbertine Order that the current prior of St. Katherine's, Lincoln, be appointed Master of the Order (see Reg. Newark, pp. 295-6, and p. xxxvii on Newark's relationship with the Gilbertines).
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Tempest was serving Henry Percy, 1st Earl of Northumberland, as a retainer (see J.M.W. Bean, *The Estates of the Percy Family 1416-1537* (Oxford, 1958), p. 95, note). Sir John Tempest, Lord of Waddington (d. 1463—cf. Appendix III) received an annuity from the Earls of Northumberland (see Bean, p. 92, including note). In 1485 a Sir Thomas Tempest was in the service of Henry Percy, 4th Earl of Northumberland (see *TE*, vol III, *SS* 45 (1865 for 1864), p. 308). In 1544 a Henry Tempest of Broughton married Isabel, the daughter of Sir Ingram Percy, Earl of Northumberland (see the pedigree after p. 106 of Whitaker's *Craven*). Dodsworth recorded in 1645 that the Percy arms were present in the Tempest's parish church at Bracewell (see *J.W. Clay's Yorkshire Church Notes*, op. cit. *YAS* 34 (1904), p. 242), and the two families' arms also appear in the remains of Salley Abbey (see J. Harland, *Historical Account of the Cistercian Abbey of Salley* (London, 1863), pp. 52-3 and 59).

The Percy family was receiving rents from the Prior of Sixhills for lands in Kevermound (unid.) and Ludford (1 mile from Sixhills) before 1303 (see Martin's *Percy Cartulary*, op. cit., p. 467). In his will of 1349 Lord Henry Percy (d. 1352) granted cash gifts to Sixhills Priory and Salley Abbey. He appointed Sir Richard Tempest of Bracewell (d. bef. 1379) as the administrator of his will, and provided £40 to Sir Richard to cover administrative costs (see *TE I*, op. cit., *SS* 4 (1836), pp. 57-61, including note p. 57). Sir Richard thus may have been in direct contact with Sixhills during Mannyng's lifetime.

In ca. 1355 Sir Richard married (secondly) Isabel de Bourne, daughter of Sir Thomas de Bourne,* Lord of Studley, Yorks. (7 miles W. of Boroughbridge). See *LG*, p. 2479. Sir Thomas de Bourne (who was almost certainly from Bourne, Lincolnshire, the birthplace of Robert of Brunne, the author of *Handlyng Synne*), was a cousin of Henry Burghersh, Bishop of Lincoln from 1320-40 (see N.K.M. Gurney and C. Clay, edd., *Fasti Parochiales*, vol. IV, *YAS* 133 (1971 for 1970), p. 86).

One perquisite of the Lordship of Studley was an advowson for the second moiety of the parish of Linton, W. Yorks. (12 miles N.E. of Bracewell, seat of the Tempests, and 22 miles N.E. of Waddington). It is in the history of this parish that we find an apparent link between all three of the authors with whom this thesis is concerned. Parts of the parish were owned at various times by a close relative of Archbishop of York Walter Gray (William of Waddington's superior and benefactor), by Sir Thomas de Bourne (a neighbor, if not a relative, of Robert of Brunne), and by Sir Richard Tempest, a member of the family which owned three manuscripts of the *Manuel* and which is linked with owners of manuscripts of HS and Idley's redaction; in addition, the de la Pole family, which in the fifteenth century can be associated with Peter Idley, staked a claim to part of this parish during the fourteenth century.

The advowson for the parish's first moiety was from 1252 in the possession of Walter Gray, the nephew of Archbishop Gray, and remained in the Gray family thereafter. The advowson for the second moiety belonged (apparently) originally to Fountains Abbey, which in 1225 quitclaimed it to John le Aleman, Lord of Studley. Aleman died in 1232, leaving a young daughter, Isabel, and shortly thereafter Archbishop Gray placed the advowson in the ward of his own brother Robert Gray until Isabel should come of age. Isabel later (ca. 1250) married John le Gras. Their son, Sir John, died ca. 1327, leaving a young daughter, Isabel le Gras, who was (ca. 1327-40) placed in the wardship of

*In 1343 'Thomas de Bourn, knight,' swore homage to Archbishop la Zouche for Yorkshire lands he held from the Archbishop (see R.H. Skaife, ed., *Kirkby's Inquest*, *SS* 49 (1867 for 1866), p. 419).*
Henry de Percy.* Percy transferred the wardship of Isabel to Bishop of Lincoln Henry Burghersh* for the express purpose of marrying the girl to the Bishop's cousin, Thomas de Bourne. Thomas married her, and through the marriage assumed the Lordship of Studley and possession of the advowson for the second moiety of Linton Parish. Isabel de Bourne's sister (apparently), Katherine de la Pole, and brother-in-law, William de la Pole, disputed Isabel's right to the advowson, and were eventually compensated. Isabel de Bourne's daughter, also named Isabel, became in 1355 the the second wife of Sir Richard Tempest, and Sir Richard later assumed the Lordship of Studley and the possession of the advowson for the second moiety of Linton.**

During the sixteenth century the Tempesteis appear to have had some connection with Sempringham, and to have had members living in that area. In 1506 Sir Thomas Tempest of Bracewell (son of Sir John, sometime Sheriff of Lincs.) gave in his will equal cash gifts to the nuns of Sempringham and the Abbey at Salley in return for memorial services, and gave his brother a salt mill which 'the parson leyt at Sempringham.' See TE IV, SS 53 (1869 for 1868), pp. 250-2. In 1522 a John Tempest, Esq., of Gosberton, Lincs. (5 miles W. of Sempringham) submitted his will (see C.W. Foster, ed. and trans., Lincoln Wills, LRS 5 [1914], pp. 113-14). In the seventeenth century Holles recorded the existence of an ancient tomb in the parish church at Horbling (2 miles N. of Sempringham) bearing the name 'Johannis Tempest' (see R.E.G. Cole, ed., Lincolnshire Church Notes made by Gervase Holles, LRS 1 [1911], p. 192), and in 1525 a woman bearing the surname Tempest was subprioress of the Benedictine nunnery at Staintfield (10 miles S. of Sixhills). See A.H. Thompson, ed., Visitations in the Diocese of Lincoln 1517-1531, vol. III, LRS 37 (1947), pp. 100-1.

*The Percies acquired the Manor of Linton during the time of Henry Percy, 1st Earl of Northumberland (1368-1408—see Bean, Estates of the Percy Family, op. cit., p. 10, including note). In 1458 the 3rd Earl (1455-61) mortgaged the Manor to a private party (Bean, pp. 100-1).

**In 1546 the Tempests of Hebden (2 miles E. of Linton) were still maintaining a lamp in the parish church at Linton (see W. Page, ed., The Certificates of the Commissioners Appointed to Survey the Chantries, Guilds, Hospitals, etc., in the County of York, part II, SS 92 [1895 for 1893, p. 411]). On the history of the advowson for the second moiety of Linton Parish, see Gurney and Clay, Fasti IV, op. cit., pp. 85-8. Their principal error (p. 86) is their assumption that Isabel le Gras was the daughter of Isabel le Aleman, when in fact she must have been the granddaughter. This error is not found in the history of the Lordship of Studley by J.R. Walbran (in Walbran's Memorials of the Abbey of St. Mary of Fountains, vol. II, part I, SS 67 [1878 for 1876], pp. 311-15) but his account is elsewhere seriously flawed. On the transfer of the advowson to Robert Gray see J. Raine, ed., The Register, or Rolls, of Walter Gray, SS 56 (1872 for 1870), p. 241. On Henry de Percy's transfer of his wardship of Isabel le Gras to Bishop Burghersh, see Martin's Percy Charterlary, op. cit., p. 460.
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Mannyng’s Anglo-Norman Exemplar

The critical edition of Handlyng Synne currently being prepared for the E.E.T.S. by Dr. R.G. Biggar and Dr. S.A. Schulz will undoubtedly improve our understanding of the probable content of the A.N. exemplar(s) from which Mannyng drew. Dr. Biggar has stated that, of the extant versions of the Manual, the text of MS. Harley 4657 appears to resemble most closely the hypothetical exemplar which Mannyng used, though he adds that Mannyng may have consulted more than one exemplar (see his comments in his review of I. Sullens’s edition of HS [Speculum 62 (1987), p. 969] and in J.A.W. Bennett’s Middle English Literature, ed. and completed by D. Gray [Oxford, 1986], p. 479).

While Harley 4657 may prove textually the extant copy of the Manual closest to HS, it seems possible that Mannyng’s A.N. exemplar was structurally somewhat different from Harley. As is pointed out in Appendix II, Harley contains the Prologue, Books I-VI, the second 'edition' of VII (Points, Virtues, Things to Avoid), Book VIII, the expanded version of Book IX, and the Epilogue (with the Waddington ascription).

The Prologue, Books II-V, and Book VII were obviously in Mannyng’s exemplar. Books I and VIII, which Mannyng did not translate, were almost certainly also in his exemplar, since they appear in all extant non-fragmentary versions of the Manual. Similarly, Mannyng probably decided not to translate Book IX and the Epilogue, for these two articles appear in all but two extant non-fragmentary MSS. of the Manual (Royal and Arundel). Since thirteen of the fifteen surviving versions of the Epilogue contain the Waddington ascription, and the two versions which do not are most likely corrupt, one can be confident that the Epilogue in Mannyng’s exemplar included the ascription. On the structural history of the Manual, see Chapter I and Appendix II.

It is impossible to say whether Mannyng’s exemplar contained the spurious Book VI (which is wanting in three MS. versions of the Manual). Mannyng seems originally to have concluded his poem at the end of Book V:

Ihesu, y pank pe of py grace
pat hast lent me wyt and space
pys yn Englys for to drawe,
As holy men haue seyd yn sawe.
For lewed men hyt may auayle.
For hem y toke pys trauayle.
(11291-6).

The statement of intended audience signals an apparently definitive closure. The lines which conclude Book V in all Manual MSS. (except Royal) may have confused Mannyng:

Ihesu Crist sejt gracié,
Qe nus ad si auant mené
Qe les sacremens auum terminé.
E plus ne dirm de peché.
(7953-6).

In Chapter I we noted that any reader aware of the title of the A.N. poem might logically regard this passage as the conclusion of the Manuel des Pêches. It is possible, however, that Mannyng examined Book VI and rejected it, or (in the absence of VI) balked at the prospect of translating Book VII. His topic, as we state in Chapter III, was sin, not confession, and his aims were not reformative.
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Mannyng proceeded thereafter with Book VII, however, and his structural disposition of that Book is unique (Prologue to the Virtues, Points, Virtues, Things to Avoid). In no extant A.N. version of VII is the prologue to the Virtues separated from the Virtues section itself. Aside from this departure, the general structure of Mannyng’s VII is the same as that of the first and second ‘editions’ of VII in the Manuel tradition. Mannyng’s apparent translation of part of the introduction to the General Conclusion to the Points suggests that his was a first ‘edition’ exemplar (Points, General Conclusion to the Points, Virtues, Things to Avoid), since the second ‘edition’ of VII does not contain the General Conclusion:

Now haue 3e here pe poyntes twelue— 3e h.1 we rede, Osborn.
How euery man shal shryue hymselfe—
And of pese poyntes lerned sum deyl
How 3e mow shryue 3ow weyl.

Prestes oghte hem alle to kunne
Lewed men to teche and monne:
And but pey teche hem pys lore,
Here perel ys weyl pe more.

(11883-90).

Plus de confessiun ne dirai.
Kar suffist, sicum jeo crai.
Nepurkant, matere les voil doner,
Ki plus vodrunct rimer,
Vers en latin ici metrai,
Sicum des mestres apris ai.

Le clerk ke les vus lira
A vus de buche les espundera.
Plus plaineunt vus purra dire
Ke jeo par rime ne pus escreire.
(from MS. B.N., as printed in Arnould, p. 92).

The Things to Avoid section of MS. Be.1.20 (a MS. which features the first ‘edition’ of VII influenced by the third ‘edition’) ends imperfectly at the precise point at which Mannyng’s Things section breaks off (see Laird, ‘Source,’ p. 530; Arnould, p. 93, note). Laird believed that Mannyng’s exemplar was related to Be.1.20 (see Laird’s ‘Source,’ pp. 360-3), and Arnould (p. 106) and Laird (‘MSS.,’ p. 122) both agree that Ee is closely related to MS. St. John’s 167 (which features the ‘first’ edition of VII influenced by the second ‘edition’) and MS. Harley 4657. Be.1.20 and St. John’s contain extremely confused versions of Book VII (see Appendix IV). Harley’s orderly version would prove more practical in a parallel-text edition of the A.N. and M.E.
Appendix VI

Previous Estimations of the Purpose and Audience of Handlyng Synne

While it is essential to recognize and understand the historical or 'cultural' milieu in which Mannyng's poem was written, it is a supremely illogical act to assume that HS must crisply reflect the spirit and aims of the tradition from which it derives. One must not allow the background (the post-Lateran impetus toward education and reform) to bias an estimation of the foreground (what Mannyng actually wrote). Theory must be the product of evidence, not the judge of it. The misleading descriptions of the purpose and audience of HS offered by some previous critics suggest that these commentators either had not read the poem with sufficient attention to detail or had chosen to envisage the poem in a way which would satisfy their expectations.

D.W. Robertson, for example, claimed that the purpose of Handlyng Synne was exactly the same as that of the Manuel: 'the class [i.e., genre] to which the Manuel belongs has long been apparent...a manual for the use of penitents..."intended to be of practical use to persons preparing for confession"...Handlyng Synne was written for the same "practical purposes"...Mannyng's account of the nature and purpose of his book...corresponds exactly with the intention expressed at the beginning of the Manuel.' See 'The Cultural Tradition of Handlyng Synne,' Speculum 22 [1947], pp. 164 and 167. The inaccuracy of Robertson's contentions is established in the first section of Chapter III, which compares and contrasts the purposes of the Manuel and HS.

R. Crosby, not surprisingly, could find no evidence to support her highly imaginative description of the audience and purpose of HS: Mannyng, himself a canon, is writing with two groups of hearers in mind: the "lewed men" or lay brothers, for whom he adopts a simple, friendly manner that he may not awe them with his learning; and the novices who will one day be canons and in whom he wishes to instil the duties of the priesthood.' See 'Robert Mannyng of Brunne: A New Biography,' PMLA 57 (1942), p. 27. She, like Robertson, formed a vague impression of the background and considered it a lucid explanation of the foreground.

S. Sullivan ('Handlyng Synne in its Tradition' [Cambridge University Ph.D. thesis, 1978] believed (p. 21) that Mannyng could not have intended to write what he wrote: 'Mannyng's propensity to enter into political and social controversy, allied with his evident concern for the souls of simple folk living outside the cloisters, means that his work may have less of a monastic stamp—certainly less of a confessional stamp—than its author intended [sic].' His argument continues (pp. 56-7): 'it is...necessary to qualify any discussion of the confessional content of Handlyng Synne with the consideration that none of the surviving manuscripts would have been used by a parish priest to bring a simple congregation to confession. The words of the poem do...suggest that this [practical purpose] may have been the intention [presumably of the poet]; but the Prologue [sic], and the manuscript survivals, suggest that this intention may have been ignored or abandoned.' Whereas Mannyng himself recommended random, selective, casual recreational reading of and listening to his poem, S. Sullivan says (pp. 50-2) that 'if the text is to be given [i.e., read aloud] in its complete form at all, it would have to be given in instalments...It follows, if the poem must be read from beginning to end to be effective [as S. Sullivan believes], that the audience, as a whole, would be present for each instalment. Handlyng Synne would thus need, in the same way as Thoresby's revision of the Lambeth Catechism, to be read weekly, on consecutive Sundays...It would thus be eminently practical to read Handlyng Synne to a congregation during the weeks
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The congregation could then make their confession and begin their penance, and partake of the Eucharist at Easter...It may therefore be possible to assign [presumably the public reading of] Handlyng Synne to a particular part of the Year."

The title of S. Sullivan's thesis is, of course, the first of many indications that its author was not prepared to consider the possibility that the poem might not fit neatly into the 'Tradition,' and that he was ready to force it to fit, if necessary. He contends (p. 53) without evidence that Mannyng wrote 'for an urban, rather than a rural, congregation...the poem might represent an attempt to bring an urban congregation to its annual confession,' and (p. 56) that HS 'served [as part of a program of reform of the laity] in one of the appropriated churches in Lincoln belonging to the Gilbertines.' He echoes Robertson by saying (p. 95) that 'the Manuel and its English interpretation are...congruent with Grosseteste's [reformative] intentions [as expressed in his Constitutions]. He concludes (pp. 246-7) with a conditional cliché: 'the Gilbertines could have commissioned Handlyng Synne for use by their chaplains in...[the Order's] appropriated churches, so that they were able to comply with the requirements of post-Lateran legislation, and did not fall foul of the bishops to whom they were responsible for the souls of their parishioners.'

R. Raymo (in A.E. Hartung, gen. ed., A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500, vol. 7 [Hamden, Connecticut, 1986]), who seems to think (p. 2255) that there are ten, rather than nine, Books in the Manuel, adds to S. Sullivan's account by misreading (p. 2256) two passages from HS: 'Handlyng Synne is addressed to the common people and is meant to assist them in the examination of their consciences prior to confession. It appears from [Sullens ed.] lines 10,807-10,818 and 11,306-11,310 that Mannyng himself read it to a lay congregation probably in connection with a course of Lenten instruction.' The first passage to which he refers is the conclusion to the Sacrament of the Altar booklet, which begins with the lines '3e men pat are now yn present/ pat haue herd me rede pys sacrament,' which do imply that Mannyng anticipated that the booklet would be recited (see Chapter III, note 6), but which certainly do not reveal that the poet himself recited it. The second passage to which Raymo alludes, which begins with the lines 'Of shryfte to telle y wyl bygynne./ God 3yue me grace so to seye,' is a rhetorical introit.

Dr. Doyle devotes only a few pages of his thesis to the text of HS ('Survey' I, pp. 60-63). He qualifies Crosby's estimation of the audience of HS by noting that the poem was addressed not only to the fellows at Sempringham, but also to the folks at Bourne and 'generally to the hearing of the unlearned, in explicit competition with popular entertainment and recreation' (pp. 60-61). He believed (logically) that clerics would have been the principal reciters of the poem, and perhaps also the principal private readers of it (p. 62).

Although Furnivall's ideas often seem impressionistic, his impression of the public purpose of HS (offered in the preface to his edition of the Chronicle, Rolls Series vol. 87a, p. xiii) seems one of the most accurate on record. Mannyng, he says, 'wrote his Handlyng Synne for unlearned men, to keep them out of mischief at their games and ale.'
Appendix VII

Notes on Mannyng’s Dialect

As Dr. Biggar has pointed out (in his comments in J.A.W. Bennett’s Middle English Literature, ed. and completed by D. Gray [Oxford, 1986, pp. 478-9]), one knows from the existence of certain northern rhyme-words in the ‘translated’ texts (Folger, Harley, and Bodley) that Mannyng’s own dialect included some northern features. When we recall that Mannyng lived for some time at Sixhills, in northern Lincolnshire, this point seems unsurprising. The scribe of MS. Folger did not provide translations above unusual rhyme words, while that of Harley provided some, and that of Bodley provided many. In a survey of the first 3,000 lines of the poem, one finds that Bodley and Harley share twenty-three translations of rhyme-words, that Harley has one which does not appear in Bodley, and that Bodley has thirty-four which do not appear in Harley.


‘Kirk’ appears in the ‘translated’ text (i.e., in Furnivall’s edition) only twice, both times as a rhyme-word (ll. 2163 [kyrke/myrke], and 4540 [yrk/kyrke]). See H. Gburek, Der Vortsschatz des Robert Mannyng of Brunne’s Handlyng Synne (Erlangen, 1977), p. 362. In both of these lines the scribe of Bodley translates not ‘kirk,’ whose meaning he seems to have grasped, but rather the word with which it is rhymed (Harley translates ‘yrk’ only). ‘Myrke’ is ultimately an Old Norse word, and appears but once in the text (see Gburek, pp. 416-17). ‘Yrk,’ which Mannyng uses to mean ‘remiss,’ is a northern word, perhaps of Celtic origin, which appears but twice in the text (the second time at l. 4340, rhymed with ‘wyrk’). See Gburek, p. 351 (‘yrk’ is used verbally [meaning ‘to tire’] within the line in the Norfolk MSS. ii.4.9 and Dulwich at [Sullens ed.] l. 1117). Mannyng seems to have used ‘kirk’ only to produce a rhyme for these odd words. In every other instance (and there are many) in which the equivalent of mod. ‘church’ is employed in rhyme-position, it is rendered as ‘cherche’ and rhymed with ‘werche’ (for the relevant line numbers, see Gburek, pp. 167-8). While it is possible that the scribe responsible for the ‘translation’ altered all of these examples from ‘kirk/werk’ to ‘cherche/werche,’ such scribal perspicacity and consistency would be unusual, and seems unlikely when we recall that no scribe felt the need to translate ‘kirk’ on the two occasions in which it appears in rhyme-position in the translated texts.

Gburek (pp. 190-1) notes that the word ‘ded,’ meaning ‘death,’ is of East Anglian and northern origin. ‘Ferly,’ a noun meaning ‘wonder,’ appears a few times in rhyme-position, and the scribes of Bodley and Harley offer a translation for it in the first instance (3863-4 [ferly/cumanye; f. translated in BH], 7483-4 [ferly/ny; f. translated in H only], 8209-10 [ferly/why; f. translated in H only], 9375-6 [candelstyleyke/ferlyke], 10765-6 [ferly/why], 11077-8 [Day/yferly]). One should note, however, that when the word is used adverbially (meaning ‘wondrously’) within the line it is never translated (5618 [ferly blype], 5711 [ferly wrope], 9132 [ferly sore], 9289 [ferly sore]). See Gburek, p. 239.

Dr. Biggar (op. cit., p. 479) also mentioned the presence in the translated versions (in rhyme-position) of ‘es’ (as the third-person singular of ‘to be’) and of present participles ending in ‘-and.’ ‘Es’ appears within the line at ll. 8085, 10868, and 10911, and also crops up several times in rhyme-position.
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(1231-2 [les/es], 2085-6 [falsnes/es], 2665-6 [lesse/es], 4653-4 [wyttnes/es], 6977-8 [sykenes/es], 7157-8 [wykkenes/es], 8993-4 [es/mess/es], 9969-70 [lekenes/es]). See Gburek, p. 222. The pres. p. ending in '-and' appears at least eighteen times in rhyme-position (see O. Boerner, Die Sprache Robert Mannyngs of Brune (Halle, 1904), p. 220).

Mannyng's vocabulary would seem to have incorporated some 'northern' words and perhaps some features of 'northern' morphology. These facts are not at all inconsistent with his having been born in Lincolnshire and having lived for some time in the northern regions of that county. 'A dialect has really no precise boundaries,' K. Sisam has advised (Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose, (Oxford, 1985), p. 271); 'the terms ['southern' and 'northern'] may...be applied to precise areas, so long as the boundaries of single dialect features are not violently made to conform. It is quite accurate to say that -and(e) is the normal ending of the pres. p. north of the Humber...provided it is not implied that [that ending]...should not be found south of the Humber.' Sixhills is but fifteen miles south of the Humber. G.V. Smithers has recently drawn attention to the similarities between Mannyng's dialect and that of the Lincoln-area text, Havelok (ed. Smithers (Oxford, 1987); see p. lxxxix).

In MS. Osborn, as one might expect from its Durham provenance, the language is consistently northern, within the line and in rhymes (see S.A. Schulz, op. cit., pp. ix-xii, and Biggar, in Bennett and Gray, op. cit., p. 478). Certain extremely northern words appear in this MS. only (e.g., 'aghtande' ['eighth'], 'gart' ['made'], 'golsoght' ['jaundice']). See Schulz, p. xi. While there is evidence to suggest that Mannyng's dialect included northern features, there is no evidence to suggest that it was consistently northern, and certainly no precedent by which one could argue that Mannyng's vocabulary included the northern oddities which we have just mentioned. Mannyng's dialect probably did incorporate more northern features than those which are apparent in MSS. Harley and Bodley. Those MSS. probably did translate some of the northern features present within the body of Mannyng's lines, while leaving untouched the rhymes. MS. Osborn probably does preserve some of the northern features removed by the translated versions. It seems equally probable, however, that MS. Osborn adds further northern features which were never present in Mannyng's original, i.e., that MS. Osborn is, to some extent, a northern translation of HS. B.M. Van der Schaaf's claim that the linguistic consistency evident in MS. Osborn is 'not authorial but rather scribal' ('The Manuscript Tradition of Handlyng Synne,' Manuscripta 24 (1980), p. 125, note) seems defensible, since Mannyng's dialect was surely not that of Durham.

Dr. Biggar's statement (op. cit., pp. 478-9) that the dialect of the Petyt MS. of Mannyng's Chronicle mirrors that of the Osborn MS. requires revision in light of the findings of A. McIntosh, M.L. Samuels, and M. Benekin, who have determined that Petyt, like the Lambeth Palace MS. of the Chronicle, was written by a Lincolnshire scribe (see above, Chapter III, note 10). The two Chronicle MSS. undoubtedly provide the key to Mannyng's dialect. The Petyt MS. was in fact owned by a vicar of a parish church in which Mannyng himself may have served (see Chapter III, loc. cit., and Appendix IV).
Appendix VIII

A Scribal Attempt to Fuse the Works of Idley

Idley's translation of Albertanus never alludes to his redaction of Handlyng Synne, and the redaction never refers to the translation; neither does the redaction mention or address Idley's son, for whose private perusal the translation was originally written. The two works initially circulated separately, and are internally unrelated.1 Their intended public audiences appear to have been identical, however, and this probably explains the existence in three MSS. of a scribal attempt to fuse the works.2 The five MSS. which present the fusion contain texts of Idley's two works which are inferior to those reflecting the earlier tradition of separate circulation of the poems.3

The scribal transition from the translation to the redaction is written in couplets largely derived verbatim from the prologue to Handlyng Synne. Idley's two poems are not written in couplets and in the redaction he never adheres slavishly to the text of HS.4 In his first six lines the scribe attempts to link the poems by deceptively suggesting that the forthcoming redaction is, like the translation, theoretically designed for the reception of Idley's son:

I haue told the certen thyngis in esspeciall,
Now woll I declare the more in generall;
That like as poy gowest firther in age,
So shold poy growe to be more wyse and sage,
And folow not ay youthes kynde—
I meane the worlde, the flesshe, the fende.

There then follows the stencil of Mannyng's prologue:

And first of alle vnto the I woll declare
The x commaundementes and whiche they are.
For they were first vnto man yoven,
First, therefore, of hem man must be shreven:
In what poynyte we haue ynne fall,
In open synnes ayenst hem all.
And then after the seuen dedly synnes,
Which fro God mannes soule twynnes.
And thence of the synne of Sacrelege—
That belongeth to holy churche praulege;
And of all the sacramentis seuene—
To teche man to the blisse of heuene;
And of the xii gracis of Goddis gyfte,
All that toucheth to dedly synne,
Such as mankynde daily falleth ynne—
Whiche that is open and in"nde wrought.

1On these matters, see Chapter V. 2MSS. TCD 160, Be.4.37, and Add. 57335 contain the scribal transition; Pepys 2030 and Eng.Poet.d.45 contained the fusion, but lack the transition because of physical damage. 3See the examination of the MSS. in Chapter V. 4See Chapter V, in particular the analysis of Idley's editorial practice.
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Of preve synnes I woll speke nought.
Preve synnes I woll in noo wyse touche.
(II.A 7-25).

Unto mannes consciens I theym vouche.
(II.A 26).

But open synnes that daily falle
(II.A 27).

Here in erthe among vs all--
(II.A 28).

To me and to the and to every man--
(II.A 29).

Vndre suche forme as I can,
(II.A 30).

Som by experience and som by writyng.
(II.A 31).

Avtnto thel om. Add [f. 26r]. "man! he, Add. "we hauel he hethe, Add. "after"

a. of, Add. "To t. J that techeth, TCD. "C.1 sic. "ofl om. Be.4.37, supplied from
TCD. "and inl om. Be.4.37, supplied from TCD.

The scribe concludes his transition to the redaction with a series of modesty
topoi probably based on similar phrases located at convenient points in Idley's
poems:

As I woll shewe in my symple endytyng.
I can no retorik ne floresshed eloquence," But blunder forth to* kepe in" sentence.
My connyng is litellc, my will isd grete.
And sith of makynge I haue not thee feete,
I praye you haue my litell wittef excused,
And lete my grete g will be not refused.

Now to the purpos of this litell matere.c
Thus I begynne, loo, h as ye shall hire.
(II.A 32-40)

"tol and, TCD. "inl my, TCD. Add. "litellj dull, TCD. "will is! witte is not, TCD. "not thel no, TCD. "wittel supplied from TCD; Be.4.37 reads 'wille.'

gretele good, TCD. "loul om. Add.

Cp. II.C 1146, at the end of the Sacraments section, MS. Add, f. 86r: 'Howe be it of rethorike I haue not the cure.' "Cp. this and previous four lines with I.1467, at the end of the translation: 'My wytt, I manee, I prayo you to spare.' Also cp. II.C 0.5-0.7, at the beginning of the Sacrilege section, MS. Add., f. 74r: 'Beseching every man my witt not dispise;/ Butt accepts my will, & the residue ye spare;/ For of scripture I am full naked & bare.' "Cp. the opening line of the translation (I.1): 'In the begynnyng of this litell werke.' Also cp. I. 1464, at the end of the translation: 'This is thende of my litell frame.'

The content and style of this transition indicate that it was not the work of Peter Idley, and the textual inferiority of the copies which present the fusion of Idley's poems testifies to the concoction's debasement of the tradition. Idley wrote two independent poems, whose best versions circulated independently. In printing the fusion, in failing to question the authenticity of the transition, in referring to the fusion as Idley's Instructions to his Son, and in regarding the fusion as a single work, the modern editor of Idley's poetry has perpetuated a scribal deception. The author of the transition

1See D'Evelyn, ed., p. 45.
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clearly must have had access to Idley's or to another exemplar of *Handlyng Synne*. Evidence presented by H. Gburek suggests that Idley's exemplar was related to the Norfolk textual tradition of HS as exemplified by MS. Dulwich, and that the transition likewise drew from that tradition (see *Der Wortschatz des Robert Malling of Brune in Handlyng Synne* [Erlangen, 1977], p. 21, note 3). One candidate for authorship of the transition might be the scribe Richard English, a tenant of Idley's bibliophile neighbor Edmund Rede. English copied in his Norfolk dialect MS. Arundel 20, which contains the best extant text of Idley's redaction of HS (here standing as an independent work, without Idley's other poem or the transition). English clearly was in a position to gain access to Idley's exemplar of HS, and Rede (among other prominent associates of Idley who had literary interests) was in a position to commission the creation of an anthology of Idley's works.1

1On Idley's social contacts, see the biography of Idley at the beginning of Chapter V; a full examination of the Arundel MS. appears in the final section of that Chapter.
Appendix IX

Idley's Use of Lydgate's Fall of Princes

In his redaction of Handlyng Synne Peter Idley draws from Lydgate's Fall of Princes often in order to conceal his own abridgements of, or to expand his own additions to, Mannyng's text. Occasionally, however, as in the first sequence of such insertions (6th Commandment: II.A 1791-5 [EE I. 6574-9]; II.A 1798-1800 [EE I. 6581-3]; II.A 1805-10 [EE I. 6630-61]; II.A 1812-16 [EE I. 6637-43]), Idley uses Lydgate's text in order to expand rhetorically upon topics brought up in HS. In this particular instance the passages from Lydgate's section on the 'malice of women' add some further punch to Mannyng's satirical observations on the lechery of women, and Idley's introduction in these stanzas of the refrain 'With hir croked instrument to encrees and multeplye' (see, e.g., II.A 1797) does not diminish this effect. The first added stanza of the next sequence, also in Idley's discussion of the 6th Commandment (II.A 2022-8 [EE II. 36-42]) comes at the end of Idley's substantial additions to Mannyng's Tale 9 (Adulteress Split in Two), during the speech of the angel who resolves the story. The changes which Idley makes to the stanza are in line with his implicit view that ordinary poverty is indicative of vice:

'Who foloweth vertue long shall perseuere
Who folweth v, lengest doth p.,
Be it in riches or in wilfull pouerte.
Be it in richesse, be it in p.

Vertue is cause is cause of welthe and long prosperite.
(J.A 2022-3, -26).
(EE II. 36-7, 40).

At the end of this story, Idley adds two stanzas from the 'malice of women' section of EE (II.A 2043-9 [EE I. 6679-85]; II.A 2050-6 [EE I. 6714-20]) which rhetorically qualify the negative views previously expressed about women.

The first six stanzas of the next sequence (II.A 2344-50 [EE I. 2150-6]; II.A 2351-7 [EE I. 6280-6]; II.A 2356-64 [EE I. 6287-93]; II.A 2365-71 [EE II. 15-21]; II.A 2372-8 [EE I. 3445-51]; II.A 2379-85 [EE I. 3452-8]) offer a somewhat irrelevant appendage on Fortune after an addition by Idley (II.A 2326-9, -32-43) to the examination of theft (7th Comm.), and include some lines which seem funny when viewed with an appreciation of Idley's fixation upon the necessity for financial and social comfort:

'Blessed be pouerte that may longe endure,
Mavgre the might and power of fortune.
(J.A 2351-2; cp. EE I. 6280-1).

Idley also adds an awkward illustration of theft of children from EE (II.A 2393-9 [EE I. 2703-91) and ten lines on fortune to the analysis of theft by lords (II.A 2421-7 [EE I 3837-43]; II.A 2428-31 (EE I. 3522-5)).

Idley's next insertion from EE (II.A 2624-51 [EE II. 99-105; 57-63, 70; 64-70; 113-91), following his addition on the history of tyranny, also in the treatment of theft (II.A 2610-22), presents a long and incongruous reminder that

1Some general comments on Idley's use of EE appear in A.S.G. Edwards's 'The Influence of Lydgate's Fall of Princes,' Mediaeval Studies 39 (1977); p. 435; also see D'Evelyn, pp. 49-50. D'Evelyn makes note of the borrowings in her apparatus to Idley's text. All EE line references in this Appendix are to H. Bergen's edition (E.B.I.S.E.S. 121-4 (1924-7)).

2An analysis of Idley's version of this story appears in Chapter V. Idley's social perspective is examined throughout Chapter V.
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past examples should be heeded, some lines of which were altered to fit more comfortably with Idley's belief in the direct link between virtue and wealth:

Vertu kepith men in welthe and prosperite    V. conserueth pryncis in ther glorie
And conserueth hym syerly to dwelle in glorie    And v. put ther price out of memorie.

After Idley's own lengthy comments on the need for social order (II.B 3-77 [Pride]) he adds stanzas from FP on obedience, humility, and Adam and Eve's disobedience, none of which meshes strongly with the theme of order (see II.B 78-98 [FP II. 533-53]; II.B 99-103 [FP I. 939-43]; II.B 106, 111-19 [FP I. 974-5, 980-7]). Before Idley's omission of Mannyng's examination of women's pride (HS 3310-702, cf. II.B 378-9) a stanza of commonplaces from the Adam and Eve section of FP appears (II.B 365-71 [FP I. 806-12]); further unsubstantive borrowings from this section of FP appear between two of Idley's expansions (II.B 570-80 and 603-30) of Mannyng's discussion of Envy (see II.B 582-6 [FP I. 631-5]; II.B 594-5, 596 [FP I. 650-1, 640]; II.B 602 [FP I. 658]), and between Idley's expansion of HS at the beginning of the covetousness section (see II.B 1542-62) and his omission of most of the remainder of that section (viz., HS 5326-6232 [see II.B 1617-81]) there are seven stanzas from the same section of FP (see II.B 1563-1610 [FP I. 793-819, 827-47—FP 806-12 appear for the second time in the text), the last three of which being the only ones having any close bearing upon the theme under discussion in the text.

Idley's expansion at the beginning of the lechery section (see II.B 2522-7) is followed closely by ten stanzas from the 'immorality of princes' section of FP, from which most of Idley's remaining insertions draw (see II.B 2535-2604 [FP III. 1163-95, 1205-11, 1296-1302]); the stanzas, which provide historical examples of sexual sinners who repented, unfortunately precede Idley's formal definition of lechery (see II.B 2605 ff.). Seven stanzas, six from the same section of FP, are inserted into the examination of the fifth and sixth type of lechery (see II.B 2661-74, 2681-716 [FP III. 1401-14, 1107-13 (the Complaint of Lucrece section), 1373-1400]), though only the first three make a substantive contribution, the others being merely repetitive.

The final sequence of insertions is witnessed only by the most complete surviving copy, MS. Add. 57335, whose text is badly affected by scribal abridgements and thus does not reflect thoroughly the original content of the redaction. The sins section in this MS. ceases to follow HS at II.B 2918 (f. 71v), during an allusion to clerical lechery (thus the remainder of Mannyng's treatment of the lechery, HS 8099-582, is not represented); after a stanza in which Idley draws attention to the irrelevance of clerical sin to his audience, ten stanzas derived from the 'immorality of princes' section of FP appear (II.B 2926-9; 2933-9, 2947-3002, MS. Add. ff. 72r-73r [FP III. 1324-7, 1331-7, 1345-65, 1485-91, 1366-72, 1401-14, 1471-71]), on subjects as diverse as the sex lives of princes and travellers, Lady Reason, the ruin of wealthy sexual sinners, violating virgins (FP 1401-14 appear after II.B 2981 in Add., but after II.B 2660 in the printed text), and Sodom and Gomorrah. The text of Add. is clearly very disturbed at this point. The sins section ends three stanzas after these FP insertions.

Idley's redaction of Handlyng Synne would be a more coherent text without these ordinarily gratuitous stanzas from the Fall of Princes. Their inclusion may have been motivated by the poet's apparent association with a patron of Lydgate and with others who had fashionable literary interests.¹

¹A biography of Idley appears at the beginning of Chapter V; the poet's desire to please his audience is frequently noted in that Chapter.
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