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The *Speculum huius vite* is a pastoral manual composed in English around the end of the fourteenth century. It is, on one level, an abbreviated version of the *Prick of Conscience*, arguably one of the most popular English texts of the late middle ages; but the *Speculum* is more than simply an abbreviation of a popular text, since it refashions its source to accommodate a new emphasis and new material, including a commentary on the ten commandments and some shorter exhortations to the clergy and laity regarding humility and modesty. Evidence from the two manuscripts of the *Speculum* (Bodleian MS Additional A. 268, fols. 117r-139r, and Dublin Trinity Coll. MS 155, pp. 149-238) and from two related manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience* (Cambridge University Library MS Dd.12.69, fols. 37r-97v and Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Library MS 155, fols. 1-77) indicates that two revisions were involved in the production of the *Speculum* from the *Prick of Conscience*. The dialect of the poem has been extensively studied to determine whether it is possible to make any conjectures concerning the geographical source of the first and second revisions of the text. The text was probably used for catechetical instruction, private reading, and preaching within the tradition of English catechetical manuals produced after the Fourth Lateran Council. The thesis provides a description of the manuscripts of the text (Chapter One), discussions of the historical context of the poem (Chapter Two), the sources and immediate context of the poem (Chapter Three), the relationship of the manuscripts (Chapter Four), and the language and dialect of the text (Chapter Five). These are followed by notes on editorial procedure, an edition of the text, a glossary, notes to the text, and a bibliography.
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<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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Incipits

Jolliffe

Jordan

Kaiser

LALME
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Linguistic Profile (used in LALME)

IWS
late West-Saxon

Meditationes piissimae
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MED

ModE
Modern English

Mustanoja
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<th>Author/Title</th>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>Old Norse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC, or Prick</td>
<td><em>The Prick of Conscience</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Chapter One: Manuscript Descriptions

There are four manuscripts described below which are significant to the text of the *Speculum huius vite*. The first two, Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Additional A. 268 (B) and Dublin Trinity College MS 155 (D), contain texts of the *Speculum*; the last two, Cambridge University Library MS Dd. 12. 69 (C) and Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University, Houghton Library MS English 515 (H), contain closely related texts of the *Prick of Conscience*. Reasons for the inclusion of just these two *Prick of Conscience* texts, and not any others, will be given in the discussion of manuscript relations. Richard Morris’ 1874 edition of the *Prick of Conscience*, the only edition of the poem to date, compiled from manuscript sources acknowledged up to the present time as close to the “original” of the poem, will stand as a common point of reference to the larger *Prick of Conscience* tradition, and will be acknowledged with the siglum “Z.”1 The manuscript descriptions below are given in the following format:

*siglum* for the manuscript: *shelfmark*  
*estimated date for the manuscript*

I. Materials
II. Collation
III. Number of Leaves
IV. Layout
   A. Size of leaves and written space
   B. Pricking and Ruling
   C. Rubrication
V. Content of the manuscript

---

1 *The Pricke of Conscience*, ed. Richard Morris (Berlin: A. Asher & Co., 1863). Further exposition upon the manuscript relations within the *Prick of Conscience* tradition, and arguments establishing why Morris’ edition has been used as a principal point of reference to this larger tradition, can be found in Chapter Four on manuscript relations.
Each item is numbered and described consecutively as it appears in the present binding.

VI. Handwriting
   A. Of the texts themselves
   B. Of the marginalia

VII. Punctuation

VIII. Binding (including dicta probatoria)

IX. History of the Manuscript

B: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Additional A. 268. (SC 29387) s. xv

I. Material

Almost the entire manuscript is composed of paper folios, except for the two exterior bifolia (fols. 97, 98, 115, 116), the centre bifolia (fols. 105, 106) of quire viii, an original endleaf (fol. 153), and the remains of the previous binding (fols. 154-162). The distinguishing features of the various stocks are described below:

Stock A (fols. 1r-10v)

The wire lines run vertically down the page and the chain lines are horizontal; the chain lines are 36mm apart. Watermarks can be seen near the spine, most likely of a fleur-de-lis supported by the letters "i" and "b", on the following folios: 2, 6 ("i" and "b"), 3, 7, 9 (top leaf of the fleur-de-lis). The watermark and chain lines most closely resemble Briquet, no. 7064, a watermark datable to 1471. The location of the watermarks supports the theory that the original quiring was eight plus two leaves. All 10 leaves have been mounted on nineteenth-century paper.

Stock B (fols. 11r-26v)

The chain lines run vertically down the page, and wire lines horizontally. There are watermarks on fols. 15 - 18, near the top of the leaves. The shape of the watermark appears to be the head of an ox, from the top and middle of which a line connects what looks like a capital "T" in outline. The watermark bears a resemblance to 15154 in Briquet, and measures 55x30 mm, standing in the middle of chain lines that measure

---

2 vol. i, pp. 390-391 (description), and vol. iii, no. 7064 (image).

3 Briquet, vol. iv, and vol. ii, p. 759, column a, dated 1478; however, the chain-line measurements are not exactly the same, and the paper does not fit the measurements described in Briquet. It resembles, but does not match watermark 428, Abteilung X, in Gerhard Piccard, Die Ochsenkopf-Wasserzeichen
45mm apart.

Stock C (fols. 26v-36v)

The chain lines run vertically down the page, the wire lines horizontally. An unidentifiable watermark appears on folios 30 and 31, measuring 80x30mm, between chain lines 45mm apart.

Stock D (fols. 37r-84v)

The wire lines run vertically down the page, and chain lines run horizontally across the page. The paper has a watermark in the shape of a hand, which can be seen close to the gutter in the centre of some leaves. The hand runs parallel to the chain lines, and a line surmounted by a crown sprouts out of the middle finger of the hand. There is a cuff at the base of the hand, but no letters on the cuff. These watermarks can be seen on fols. 39, 42, 43, 51, 61, 64, 65, 67, 77, 80, 81, 84 (bottom of hand) 38, 46, 47, 50, 54, 56, 57, 60, 69, 72, 73, 76 (top of hand and crown). The watermark is very similar to, if not identical with, 11323 in vol. iv. of Briquet. This watermark is very rare (see vol. ii, p. 564 of Briquet), and is datable to 1479-84.

Stock E (fols. 85r-116v)

The wire lines run vertically down the page, and the chain lines are horizontal. The chain lines are 40 mm apart. There are two kinds of watermarks, both in the shape of the head of an ox with curved horns, and both in the centre of the bifolia, bisected by the gutter, and set in the middle of two chain lines. The first of the two oxheads measures approximately 48 x 24 mm, and the second measures approximately 44 x 25 mm. The watermarks can be seen on fols. 85, 91, 93, 100, 108, 110 (horns); 88, 90, 96, 101, 103, 111 (head). The first type of oxhead mark can be seen on fols. 88, 101, 103, 111; the rest are of the second type. Both are of the general type found in Briquet, nos. 14294-14317, but neither one can be identified more precisely with a particular watermark.

Stock F (fols. 117r-152v)

The wire lines run vertically down the page, and the chain lines run horizontally across the page. The chain lines are barely discernible, but are approximately 40 mm apart. Some watermarks, approximately 40 x 30 mm, can be discerned in the middle of the folios near the spine, roughly in the shape of a ram's head with curved horns, on fols. 124, 125, 132, 137, 147 (bottom of head), 133, 136, 139, 141, 148, 150 (top of head). Not


4See Briquet, vol ii, p. 572, column b, for a description of the watermark. The watermark measures 83x23mm. The paper bearing this watermark usually measures 30x43cm., which accords with the size of the pages in this ms. and the placement of the watermarks, if the quire were made up of four sheets folded in quarto and each quarto was inserted into the preceding quarto in order to make a quire of sixteen folios.
enough detail in the watermark can be discerned to make a positive identification. Some folios have been mounted on nineteenth-century paper.

II. Number of Leaves

ii + 152 + ii, foliated i, ii (ult.), 1-164; the leaves foliated 153-162 are actually remains of the previous binding.

III. Collation

The varying stocks of paper, the differing hands, the divisibility of the contents into distinct quires and groups of quires, certain leaves which bear greater marks of wear (fols. 1 and 10, 11 and 36, 37 and 84, 85 and 116, 117 and 152), and the compressed nature of item 3 (as though to fit it in at the end of quire iii; see below under “Layout”) all provide evidence for the presence of at least three, and possibly five booklets.

i (10 leaves, remounted, possibly 8 with 2 leaves added) (fols. 1-10) | ii16 (fols. 11-26), iii10 (fols. 27-36) (fols. 11-36) | (possibly one quire of sixteen folios missing before quire iv) iv16-vi16 (fols. 37-84) | vii12 (fols. 85-96), viii18+two (fols. 113 and 114) (fols. 97-116) (fols. 85-116) | ix12-x12 (fols. 117-147), xi14 wants 13, 14 after fol. 152 (fols. 148-152) (fols. 117-152)

(Stitching appears between fols. 4, 5; 18, 19; 44, 45; 60, 61; 76, 77; 90, 91; 105, 106; 122, 123; 134, 135; 147, 148. Catchwords appear on fols. 26v, 52v, 68v, 128v, 140v.)

IV. Layout

1. Booklets 1, 2, and 3 (fols. 1r-84v, hand A; items 1-4)

   A. Size of leaves and written space

   The leaves are 197x144mm. The written space for item 1 is 148x88mm; for items 2 and 3 it is 138x90mm; for item 4 it is 134x93mm.

   B. Pricking and ruling

   There is no evidence of pricking. The written space alone is ruled in a single column with a stylus; there are no other indications of ruling. Item 3 usually has 29-33 lines per page, compared to the 20-22 lines per page of Item 2.

   C. Rubrication

   Items 1-3 each begin with littera notabilior in red, and all titles and marginal citations of sources are underscored in red in items 1-4. Paraph signs have also been rubricated. The rubrication in item 1
ends at fol. 6r, although space is left for litterae notabiliores up to the end of item 1 at fol. 10v.

2. **Booklet 4** (fols. 85r-116v; hands B, C, D; items 5-8)

   A. **Size of leaves and written space**
   The leaves are 200x145mm and the written space is 172x105mm. The text is in two columns throughout.

   B. **Pricking and ruling**
   There is evidence of pricking on most folios at the base of the columns, marking the outlines of the two columns of text; only the outlines of the written space appear to be ruled in plummet.

   C. **Rubrication**
   Subtitles, litterae notabiliorae, and citations of sources are all in red. Capital letters at the beginning of sentences are rubricated.

3. **Booklet 5** (fols. 117r-152v; hand E; items 9-11)

   A. **Size of leaves and written space**
   The leaves measure 204x150mm, and the written space is ca. 180x125 mm.

   B. **Pricking and ruling**
   There does not appear to be any pricking or ruling, which the casual slant and variation in size of the text bears out. The text is in two columns of varying widths.

   C. **Rubrication**
   The texts are unrubricated.

**V. Content**

A. **Booklet 1** (fols. 1r-10v)

1. (fols. 1r - 10r) *Ars moriendi.*

   **Incipit:** Quamuis secundum philosophum. Tercio ethicorum | omnium terribilium mors corporis sit terribi | lissima morti tamen anime nullatenus est comparenda.

   **Explicit:** Sed heu pauci sunt qui | in morte proximis suis fideliter assistunt
inter rogando monendo et pro ipsis orando. Presertim cum ipsi morientes non dum mori velint et anime moriencium sepe miserabiliter periclitantur. Explicit Ars moriendi

(Latin text. According to F.M. Comper, the explicit above is found only in block-book editions of the Latin Ars moriendi. It would appear that this is a copy of the block-book text. A complete bibliography of the surviving Latin and vernacular manuscripts and editions of this text can be found in Sr. Mary Catherine O’Connor, The Art of Dying Well: the Development of the Ars Moriendi (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), pp. 61-112.)

B. Booklet 2 (fols. 11r-36v)

2. (fols. 11r - 30r) De gaudiis celi.

Incipit: Notandum circa gaudia celi tria sunt dicenda scilicet | Valor imperciabilis Decor inestimabilis, Ho nor insuperabilis.

Explicit: Ad quam gloriam nos percutat et parti | cipes efficiat ductor illius coree Jhesus Christus | virginis filius cui cum patre et Spiritu Sancto vni | soli deo sit honor laus imperium et maiestas | per infinita secula seculum. Amen.

(An English summary of the twelve joys of heaven can be found on the bottom half of fol. 15r: “Youth withouten eldyng/ lyf withouten deyng”, noted in IMEV 4287. There are no other occurrences of this English text listed.)

3. (fols. 30r - 36r) Speculum peccatoris.

Incipit: Quoniam karissime in huius via vite sumus fugientis | dies nostri sicut vmbra pretereunt necesse est igitur cor | de solicto sepius memorari quod nostra fragilitas nostra | mortalis infirmitas tociens cogit oblivisci . . .

Explicit: Sapias | quomodo recte intelligas quomodo nouissima tua prudenter | prouideas | illud bonum invisibilem adquiras ad quod to | tum desiderium humanum tendit et aspirat ad quod nos | perducat Ihesus christus | qui sine fine viuit et regnat.

(A Latin text, beginning with a red paraph sign and centered title, “Incipit Speculum

---


peccatoris secundum Augustinum vel secundum Bernardum.” This text has been spuriously attributed to Augustine, but is recognized as a work by an author of the late tenth century or perhaps the thirteenth century. The text can be found in PL, vol. 40, 984-992, and has been spuriously attributed to Richard Rolle (with whose work it is often found) in five manuscripts. A red littera notabilior “Q” of two lines in height begins the treatise, which is subdivided by means of paraphs. Citations of auctoritates are underscored in red. Two notae can be read at the top of fol. 36v, neither of which has anything to do with the text. An inscription in a late fifteenth-century cursive under these two notae on 36v reads: “constat domino Gylbarto barton | viginti dinariorum vel viginti dinariis | a bibliopolis cui erit nomen thomas.” The catchwords “fuit pondus” at bottom of fol. 26v appear to indicate the end of a quire and there is an initial “h” in red ink above and to the right of these catchwords. See Johannis Machielsen, Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi, vol. ii (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1994), 3076, for additional information regarding authorship, and Incipits 4918 for a listing of further manuscripts.)

C. Booklet 3 (fol. 37r-84v)

4. (fol. 37r - 84v) The latter part of the Speculum Christiani, imperfect.

Incipit: The text begins with the words “-tibus superbit non gladio,” in the “Quarta Tabula.”

Explicit: (the following is the explicit for the text in the manuscript, which appears at the end of fol. 83r; it is followed by a number of theological notae on fol. 83v-84v):

Beatus uir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum pro consiliario ante omnes | eligendus est deus | Tob 3° | Omnia consilia tua | in ipso permaneant. Amen.

(This imperfect Latin text, interspersed with English, includes the material from p. 61, l. 4 to the end of the text in Gustaf Holmstedt’s edition of the Speculum Christiani, EETS, vol. 182 (London, 1933). Although the manuscript contains the explicit of Holmstedt’s text — “Nullum sacrificium ita placet deo sicut zelus animarum” — on the top of fol. 82v, the colophon does not come until just after the explicit given above; Holmstedt describes the extra material on fols. 82v and 83r as bearing some similarity to additional material found in the text of the Speculum Christiani in British Library MS Lansdowne 344. Each division of the text is signalled by a centered and underscored title following a paraph sign, and begins with a littera notabilior in red of about two lines in height. Paraph signs further subdivide the text, with accompanying notes and running titles in the margin. Auctoritates are acknowledged in the text and in the theological notae appended


8Allen, 354.

9Speculum Christiani, ed. Gustaf Holmstedt EETS 182 (1933), pp. xx, xxi.
to the text on fols. 83v to 84v. The name “Bradshawe” occurs in red display script at the bottom of fols. 63r and 65r, followed by some red decorations. A complete listing of other manuscripts and editions can be found in Gustaf Holmstedt, *Speculum Christiani*, pp. xix - cxxxiii. The catchwords “te sermones,” and “ignis,” and the quire numbering “iij” on the bottom right hand sides of 52v, 68v, and 84v respectively indicate the last leaf of each of three quires of 16 leaves each, i.e. eight bifolia to the quire. By calculating the average number of lines per page and comparing it with the amount of text in Gustaf Holmstedt’s printed edition, the missing text would fill one quire of sixteen folios. This manuscript of the text may thus be missing one quire at its beginning.

D. Booklet 4 (fols. 85r-116v)

5. (fols. 85ra - 108va) Thomas of Hales’ *Vita Sancte Marie* (Title in ms.: *Genealogia beate virginitis et infancia Christi auctentia a diversis ortodoxis excerpta de pereritibus beate Marie capitulum unum Johannes damascenus capitulo octagesimo octavo.*

Incipit: Sancta et semper laudabilis et semper virgo dei genetrix| maria de eterno premismo con|silio dei predestinata et
diuer|sis ymaginibus et sermonibus| prophetarum per
Spiritum Sanctum sanctificata| et predicata et
predeterminato| tempore ex dauitica radice| germinata est
propter eas que| ad ipsum facte sunt promisiones.

Explicit: Sic| ergo integriter uiuens. que omnium| uitam integram et
perfectam| genuit. Si hoc dixi ut debui? approba
benignissime| christe ihesu tu et tui. Si autem| ut debui
ignosce dulcis|sime ihesu. tu et tui. Amen.

(This Latin text, attributed to Thomas of Hales, O.F.M., is divided into capitulae by means of subtitles in red, and a red, decorated littera notabilior of two lines in height. Auctoritates are cited in the text in red bastard display script similar to the script used for the subtitles. The text is in two columns separated by a median of about 8mm. For a complete listing of other manuscripts and editions, see Thomas de Hales, *The Lyf of Oure Lady: the Middle English Translation of Thomas of Hales’ Vita Sancte Marie*, ed. Sarah Horrall, Middle English Text Series, vol. 17 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1985), pp. 12-14. Horrall writes in the introduction to her edition that this copy of the text “contains many additions and omissions not shared by any other manuscript. The most significant of these are the long passages from the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew* inserted into chapters viii, xxiv, and xxvii.” (p. 15))

6. (fols. 108vb-111vb) *Meditacio breuis et ualida*

---

10This attribution is listed in Lucas Wadding, *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum quibus accessit syllabus illorum qui ex eodem ordine pro fide Christi fortiter occubuerunt* (Rome: S. Michaelis ad Ripam, 1806), p. 220, and is confirmed by Sarah Horrall in her edition of the *Vita Sanctae Mariae* (bibliographical particulars follow), pp. 7-9.
Incipit: (Title in text: In nomine domini nostri ihesu christi inci pit meditacio breuis et ua | lida ad excitantum hominem | ad timorem dei que perfecte monet | et inducit hominem ad timendum | domini.)

Et sunt quinque raciones | speciales quare timendus est deus. | Et quelibet racio continet tres | causas precipuas propter quas timen | dus est deus

Explicit: Stude cog | noscere te. quia multo melior et | lauda bi lior es si te cognoscis. | quam si te neglecto. cognosceres | cursum siderum. uires herbarum | complexiones hominum. naturas | animalium. et haberes omnium ce | Iestium et terrestrial scientias. | Redde ergo te tibi. et si non semper aut sepe saltem interdum.

(The Latin text is divided into six parts comprising five meditations and a treatise on meditation, prayer, and contemplation.)

7. (fols. 111vb-116ra) De sex alis Cherubim (title in ms.: Exposicio alarum cherubyn)

Incipit: Prima ala est confessio. | non laudis. unde. | Confitemino (sic) domino quoniam bonus quoniam in secula | misericordia eius sed criminis unde. Confite- | mini alterutrum peccata nostra.

Explicit: Quintam pennam habet qui in hiis | perseverat vnde in euangelio Qui | perseverauerit vsque in finem hie salus | erit Videlicet in amore dei | hee sunt ale de quibus psalmista ait Sub umbra alarum tuarum pro | tege a facie impiorum qui me affixerunt. Explicit

(This Latin text is subdivided into six parts, one for each of the six wings of the cherubim, and has been variously attributed to Clemens Lantoniensis (de Lanthony), Alanus de Insulis, and to pseudo-Bonaventura. For a complete listing of manuscripts, see Incipits 4055. The text is printed “in Patrologia Latina vol. 210, pp. 273-280 as part of a longer work ‘ad explanationem huius figurai, necessaria videtur esse discussio . . .’, of which this part is probably by Alanus de Insulis.”

8. (fol. 116v) Acrostic on the words lesus, homo, clericus, cor and Deus

Text:

lesus I id est iocunditas merencium
E id est eternitas credencium
S id est salus credencium
V id est vita morencium
S id est securitas timencium

homo H id est huius
O id est omnia

11 Incipits, no. 4055, p. 345.
M id est manus
O id est omnipotens

Clericus
C id est clarus intencie
L id est lux in conversacione
E id est elevator in omni conversacione
R id est regulatus in omni opere bono
I id est intendens in studio in amore
C id est canis mortificationis
V id est valens ad pugnandum in omni bono opere
S id est sapiens in omnibus et maximus in lucucione (sic)

Cor Cor C id est camera
Cor C id est custas (sic)
O id est omnipotens O id est omnium
R id est regis R id est rerum

Deus
D id est dator
E id est eterne
U id est uite
S id est salute

(The text is in a different hand from the other items in Booklet 4.)

E. Booklet 5 (fols. 117r-139v)

9. (fols. 117ra -139rb) Speculum huius vite

Incipit: [B]efore any cre<at>ure was wr03t or er any begymyng was of o3t And before all tymes we sal trowe | he same god was | now he made heuon and erth and all thyng amen

Explicit: Iche day onus here 'quyk' be fle3en or he £>at joy and blis wold flee | hat witout end in heuon sall be | To he quych ioy he vs bryng

(This Middle English text in rhyming couplets is divided into parts by means of centered headings — “Dethe” (fol. 123v); “Day of dome” (fol. 128r); “Sexta pars de penis inferus: Hell” (fol. 133v); “Heuon” (fol. 136r). The English is interspersed with Latin quotations from auctoritates, written in a bastard display script slightly larger than the cursive Anglicana in which most of the text is written. The auctoritates, any additional notae, and corrections, are recorded in the margins. Space has been left at the beginning of the text for a littera notabilior. See IMEV 484. Other manuscripts 12: Dublin, Trinity College 155, pp. 149-238)

10. (fols. 139rb-145vb) The Virtues of the Mass

Incipit: [T]hat blesset barn in bedlem borne | hat let his brayne be thrille wit thorne | For monus mysedee | let neuer þer saules thur3 syn be

---

12All information regarding other manuscripts containing the Middle English texts described in this chapter comes from the IMEV.
 Explicit: The pape hat gaf and graunt pis he he3t Clement he fift I wis his saule god 3elde That barne best bryng vs to blis | Wit hym to belde

(This is a Middle English poem in 5-line stanzas. A space has been left for a littera notabilior at the beginning of the text. The whole is in English except for one quotation from Psalm 70:22, “Psallam tibi in cythara sanctus Israel.” See IMEV, 3268. Other manuscripts: London, British Library Royal 17. C. xvii, f. 155v)

11. (fols. 146ra-152vb) An Invocation to the Creator

Incipit: All my3ty god hat all has wro3t heue/? and hell erth of no3t | water and lond day and ny3t | Sone and mone to shyne bry3t | Gres corne tree and best | Foles and fysshes both most and lest... Explicit: <.......> Pase <. . > the les 7 <. . . > are | <. . . > mon say A<. . . > syne | <. . . > kyne 30 <. . . . . . > lyne | (fol. 152vb) In <. . . . > For here 3e ge <. . . > of me Amen | Explicit historia de passione domini

(The explicit names this Middle English poem as the Historia de passione domini ihesu, but the Index of Middle English Verse identifies the text as An Invocation to the Creator; see IMEV 256. The poem is in rhyming couplets, and is laid out in two columns. Auctoritates are cited in abbreviated form on the outer margins of the folios. Other manuscripts: London, British Library Cotton Calig. A. ii, f. 89, London, British Library Egerton 2810, f. 181v. A transcription of the text from British Library Cotton Calig. A. ii, can be found in H. Varnhagen, “Zu Mittelenglischen Gedichten,” Anglia 3 (1880) 543-4).
Inter vos non est lex
Inter vos non est laus
Sed inter vos est omne latrocinium
Inter vos non est virtus
Inter vos non est veritas
Sed inter vos est omnis vanitas

This poem is not listed in Carmina or Proverbia. The rest of the recto contains a number of illegible notae in light brown ink and pen trials in dark brown ink.

15. (fol. 153v) Three medical recipes for the pestilence

(Text in MS: For the pestilence)

Text: Take sauge Rewe Federfew 7 marygoldes 7 bray them | and streyn them 7 dryne ke Iuse <wit old ale.> Ap | May lun Iul Aug Sep And in october November | decem La Fe Marc take wormot and thees iij herbes | abof writen 7 do as is aboue writen 7 vse this | fastynge
Item take good triacle of leyne as <moch as a> litill | plome 7 iii sponefull of vinegar 7 vi sponefull | of water 7 medill all togeder 7 sett hit <neigh to> | <the> fire till hyt be blud warme 7 then gif | hit ke seke to dryne 7 then let him go 7 lave | himself the space of half an hour 7 then kepe him warme wit hoot meete 7 holsum 7 gif him | dryne ynoh 7 kepe him wakyng as meche as ye may. probatum est.
Item take ke iuse of marygoldes 7 medill hit wit vinegre 7 dryne ke peryf first 7 last 7 ye shall | not be enfect therewit et cet.

16. (fol. 153v) Note

Text: notandum that william roward has | resauyt xv lampis at the cherche halle and iij cante | Item <at> soth halle he has rd xiii lampis

This note is in a different ink and hand than the preceding item.

17. (fol. 154) Stub part of original binding, re-used from another manuscript, backed with paper and cut down.

18. (fols. 155-157) Fragment leaves of La Queste del Saint Graal

Incipit (fol. 158ra): cest diable. Qar li sires uous a este si larges | plus que a .i. autre que su uous per droit | mont nous endeuert leu blasmer. si ne resembles une les manues sergens | don il ple mont durement en leuuan | gile . . .

Explicit (fol. 157vb): estoient il com il estoit et poror ce ne sen | dr<. . . > il mie a ses disciples ne mestre | Lendemain quant nel apelleroiemt | <. . > pueples <. . > montag en .i. anter | 1<. >s tables <. . . . . . > es <. . >ace

(Prose grail quest in two columns, written in a thirteenth-century textura, used as part of
the previous binding. Leaves 156 and 158 appear to be damaged by damp and cut down, leaving only one column of the text; the bottom portions of fols. 155-158 are also cut off. The text contains *litterae notabiliores* of two lines in height, alternating in colour between blue and red. A comparison with the edition *La Queste del Saint Graal*, ed. Albert Pauphilet (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1967) reveals that fols. 159 and 160 are the bottom portions of leaves 155 and 156. Fol. 158 is a conjoint leaf with fol. 157, but contains text which precedes that found on fol. 155ra. Fols. 158 and 157 are, therefore, fragments of the front and back folia (respectively) of a quire in four folios. Fols. 155 and 156 are the inner folia, with their bottom portions being fols. 155 and 156. A combined measurement of leaves 155 and 159 reveals that the undamaged folios were 341×220mm. The text corresponds, with many substantial variations, to the following passages in the edition:

**Fol. 158ra**
- beg. “cest diable” = p. 63, l. 20 “ce est le deable”
- end. “et li ypocrates en” = p. 64, l. 6 “et li ypocrates de”

**Fol. 158vb**
- beg. “le diroit ulontiers” = p. 66, l. 1 “le diroit ulontiers”
- end. “il conte comet il a” = p. 66, l. 19 “il conte comet il avoir”

**Fol. 155ra**
- beg. “-roit aus serians” p. 66, l. 27 “rapeleroit o ses serjanz”
- end. “pierre et <. . . . >” = p. 67, l. 13 “pierre et fustes”

**Fol. 159ra**
- beg. “moi la senefiance” = p. 67, l. 13 “moi la senefiance”
- end. “uos ont es<. . . . >” = p. 67, l. 19 “vos ont esté dites.”

**Fol. 155vb**
- beg. “<ar> vous avez” = p. 67, l. 20 “Car vos avez”
- end. “<n>es et” = p. 68, l. 7 “nez et”

**Fol. 159rb**
- beg. “espurgiez de tous” = p. 68, l. 7 “espurgiez de toz”
- end. “plus pechieres” = p. 68, l. 14 “plus pecheors”

**Fol. 155va**
- beg. “dautres pechiores” = p. 68, l. 14 “d’autres pecheors”
- end. “fet a nostre s<. . . . >” = p. 69, l. 2 “fet a Nostre Seignor”

**Fol. 159va**
- beg. “tu le lessas” = p. 69, l. 3 “tu le lessas”
- end. “genz et itrone” = p. 69, l. 9 “gen issir”

**Fol. 155vb**
- beg. “-ent doucor” = p. 69, l. 9 “aucune doucor”
- end. “amartume est” = p. 69, l. 26 “et amartume est”

**Fol. 159vb**
- beg. “que pierre et plus” = p. 69, l. 29 “que pierre et plus”
- end. “<. . . . >esse le ior” = p. 70, l. 2 “l’asnesse, le jor”

**Fol. 156ra**
- beg. “que li enfant” = p. 70, l. 2 “que li enfant”
- end. “<. . >en t<ui> s<i> de<s> ga<. . . >” = p. 70, l. 21 “te trova si desgarni”

**Fol. 160ra**
- beg. “de totes bones oures” = p. 70, l. 22 “de toutes bones oevres”
- end. “mes por ce” = p. 70, l. 29 “Mes por ce”

**Fol. 156vb**
- beg. “un lit tel com boin” = p. 72, l. 19 “et un lit que”
- end. “vos queres greig” = p. 73, l. 7 “vos querez mout greignor”

**Fol. 160rb**
- beg. “vos soffrez de combatre” = p. 73, l. 9 “vos tenez de combatre”
- end. “mout seroit granz” = p. 73, l. 16 “mout seroit granz”

**Fol. 157ra**
- beg. “domages si vous” = p. 73, l. 16 “domages se vos”
- end. “loer. car” = p. 74, l. 5 “loer, car”

**Fol. 157rb**
- beg. “a ce repereron” = p. 74, l. 14 “a ce repairerons”
- end. “fu une autre <. . . . >” = p. 74, l. 32 “fu une autre table”

**Fol. 157va**
- beg. “porent bien estre” = p. 75, l. 6 “porent bien estre”
- end. “<s<. . . . > graal per cu<. . . . >” = p. 75, l. 24 “Saint Graal, par qui”

**Fol. 157vb**
- beg. “sacres et beneois” = p. 75, l. 32 “sacrez et beneiz”
end. “les tables” = p. 76, l. 17 “les tables”)

19. (fols. 161-162) Original parchment wrapper, with following items:

(fol. 161r) Rich(ard) Wills (or Wall?)
(fol. 161v) Pater noster qui es in celis | Pater

(The wrapper has a number of illegible notes in brown ink on fols. 161v-162r.)

VI. Handwriting

1. Handwriting of the texts themselves

Hand A: Anglicana in brown ink (Items 1-4, fols. 1r-84v; Item 14, fol. 153r, Item 15, fol. 153v) with some features of secretary (single compartment “a”, small “s”, occasional Secretary “g”. The rubrication for the same items appears to be in the hand of the scribe.

Hand B: Anglicana in brown ink (Items 5-7, fols. 85ra-116ra).

Hand C: Provides rubrication and subtitles (Items 5-7, fols. 85ra-116ra) in textura.

Hand D: Anglicana in brown ink (Item 8, fol. 116v).

Hand E: Anglicana in brown ink (Items 9-11, fols. 117ra-152vb); latin quotations in textura. Corrections in same hand as text.


2. Handwriting of the marginalia

Hand α: Anglicana in brown ink; contributes note of ownership (fol. 36v).

Hand β: Secretary in brown ink; contributes “Sancta maria ora pro me” (fol. 105v) and possibly “De falsitem dicam” (fol. 116r)

Hand γ: Anglicana in black ink; contributes Item 12 (fol. 152v)

Hand δ: Anglicana in black ink; contributes Item 13 (fol. 152v)

Hand ε: Secretary in light brown ink; contributes item16 on fol. 153v, which was a flyleaf in the former binding.

VII. Punctuation

A. Booklets 1-3 (fols. 1r-84v)
All four items make use of *litterae notabiliores*, underscored and centered subtitles, and paraph signs to mark different distinctions in the respective texts. All four likewise use a full stop for terminal punctuation and a *virgula suspensiva* for a medial pause.

**B. Booklet 4 (fols. 85r-116v)**

The single item in booklet 2 is subdivided into *capitulae* by means of red subtitles. Each *capitula* begins with a red *littera notabilior* of about two lines in height. Punctuation includes a *punctus* for a full stop, the use of a *punctus elevatus* for medial pause, and an occasional *interrogatīvus*.

**C. Booklet 5 (fols. 117r-152v)**

A simple *punctus* is the only mark of punctuation, and it appears irregularly. Rhyming couplets are joined with lines.

**VIII. Binding**

The present binding is a nineteenth-century chamfer that measures 220x160mm. The spine is 30mm wide. The remains of the original binding are all parchment pieces. The portions foliated (in pencil) 154-160 are portions of a French manuscript, written in a very neat textura. Folios 153 (a whole parchment leaf) and 154 (a parchment stub) appear to be one bifolium used as an end leaf and as the initial backing of the spine, through which the quires were stitched (there are six lines of eleven holes each at points along the “spine” portion, fol. 154. The original outer wrapper (leaves 161 and 162), composed of thick, folded parchment, could not have possibly covered the whole of the quires. There appear, from the markings on the outer cover, to have been six thongs in the binding. The marks from the original stitching indicate that the old binding covered 11 gatherings. 2° fol.: Christi committat

**IX. History of the Manuscript**

The manuscript description in the Bodleian Summary Catalogue states that the manuscript was bought in the Percy Sale of 1884. The manuscript thus belonged at one time to Bp. Thomas Percy, a well-known eighteenth-century antiquarian. The “Gilbert Barton” mentioned in the lines written on 36v could be a certain land-holder in Lancashire. The name “Rich. Wills” (or “Wall”) appears on the old binding in a sixteenth-century hand (fol. 161r).

---

D: Dublin, Trinity College MS 155

I. Material

The manuscript is composed completely of parchment folios.

II. Number of leaves

iii + 119 + iii leaves in the present binding, paginated in June 1916 to read ( ), 1-238, ( ).

III. Collation

On the basis of the handwriting, the contents, and the following collation, it would appear that there are six booklets. The indications of ownership and handwriting of John Mascy on pp. 28, 29, 46-48, 50-55, 66-68, 84, 88, 104-106, 129-140, 142, 143, 151-154, 160, 168, 172, 174-176, 198-202 indicates that the latter five booklets were bound together early (see discussion of handwriting and ownership below) possibly by John Mascy.

Catchwords appear at the bottom of pages 36, 52, 68, 88, 106, 172, 212, 236. The number of folios in quire xiii is reconstructed based upon the average number of lines per page (i.e. 28) and the number of lines missing from the last item (481 English lines of poetry and approximately 37 lines of Latin prose, making 518 lines in total). This renders the figure of 9.25 missing folia, which, when combined with the single extant folio, puts the estimate at just over 10 folia. Considering the prevalence of six bifolia to the quire in the final item, and the estimated number of missing folia, it seems reasonable to conclude that the final quire would have contained six bifolia.

IV. Layout

A. Size of leaves and written space

The leaves measure approximately 156 x 120 mm, with a written space of 122 x 90 mm.

B. Pricking and ruling

The leaves in quires i-v show evidence of pricking (pp. 1-12, 61-66) with a stylus, and the pages are ruled, on average, at 25 lines per page. Evidence of pricking for quire vi appears to have been cut off, and there are no obvious signs of ruling; the pages in the quire contain anywhere from 24 to 28 lines. Quire vii does not retain any signs of pricking, but shows some
signs of ruling (pp. 125, 126); the ruling was not followed very consistently by the scribe, who places anywhere between 24 and 26 lines on a page. Quire viii shows evidence of being pricked twice: once with a stylus (outer pricking) and once with a knife (inner pricking). The first hand in the quire (pp. 127-135) writes between 25-27 lines per page, whereas the second hand in the quire (pp. 136-148) varies greatly between 27-32 lines per page, despite the visible ruling on pp. 140-145. The last five quires show evidence of pricking (pp. 223-238) with a stylus. These pages are ruled, and contain anywhere from 24-32 lines per page. The ruling throughout the manuscript appears to have been done in plummet.

C. Rubrication

Headings for items 3, 4, 6, 9, 11 and litterae notabiliores in items 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11 are in red. Latin quotations in items 1, 3, 7, 9, 11 are underlined in red. Occasional rubrication of capitals occurs in items 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11. The rubrications for items 3, 4, and 6 appear to be in a different hand than the hand of the text.

V. Content

1. (pp. 1-18) Richard Rolle’s *Ego Dormio*

   Incipit: Ego dormio et cor meum uigilat. In pe boke of loue I fynde wrytyn þes wordes I slepe and my herte wakes Muchel he schewes þat neuer is wery to luf | but euer standyng sittynge goynge or any oþer þing | doing is ay of his loue þenkyng . . .

   Explicit: us by houes to refreyne us perfyȝtely fro þe lustes 7 þe lygyȝges 7 þe de lycke here in þis world 7 regne 7 wit god in joy in þe tober world 7 haue we oure trust 7 oure delyte on jhesu crist strongly standyng aȝeyne alle temp | tacions

(See Horstman, vol. I, pp. 49-61. But this text has many variations; see Allen, p. 248. For the lyrics, which are again unusual, see IMEV, 1717 [‘Ihesu grete loue meued þe/ To suffyr þe peyne etc.’ pp. 11, 12], 1700 [‘Ihesu for þe mourne I may/ As turtel þat longeþ etc.’ pp. 16, 17], 1743 [‘Ihesu receyue my hert/ for my desire þu art’ pp. 14, 15], and “Hymns of Richard Rolle,” British Magazine, 9 (1836) 501-502. See also Ogilvie-Thomson, pp. 26-33 and pp. 220-222 for the lyrics.)\(^{14}\)

2. (pp. 18-20) Thomas de Wilton’s *De Oratione Dominica* (in Latin)

---

\(^{14}\)I am indebted for the notes to Prof. J.V. Scattergood’s *Trinity College Library Dublin Middle English Manuscripts Catalogue (in progress)* (Unpublished; January 1996 version); all comments regarding modern editions or notices concerning the text come from Prof. Scattergood’s description of MS 155, and much of the rest of the present description has been checked against his description. Any errors or omissions, however, are my own.
Incipit: Post debes scire que sunt septem preces oracionis dominice | que auferunt omnia mala et procurant omnia bona et iste viatem | orationes continentur Pater noster qui es in celis Prima Sanctificetur nomen tuum secunda adveniat regnum tuum Tercia Fiat voluntas tua sicut in celo et in terra quarta Panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis |

Explicit: Nam si corpus tuum sit in <choro> et labia in psalterio et cor tuum in foro misero es diiusus pro certo | quia deus dicit Primum querite regnum dei et omnia adicientur vobis | quotquot indigetis de bonis temporalibus dabuntur vobis Ideo scire debetis | quod habebatis in gaudio celi et cet.

nouȝt louȝyng ne worʃupynge no ṣing ȝat may | be: so muche as hym / 7 to kepe hys comaundemen | tes: nowþer to golde ne to siluer ne of honourne ne of

Explicit: 7 reste is ynne / þes byn þe werkes of mercy ȝat | maken loue by twene god 7 man 7 by twene | man 7 man to come to ioye 7 rest: euer more to | wone wiþ hym ȝat ys kyng of ioye and pees | world wiþouten ende amen

(See Jolliffe, G. 27. For other manuscripts see Manchester, John Rylands Library, English MS 412 fol 72r, San Marino, California, Huntington MS 148 fol 206v. See Allen, pp. 366-368 for a description.)

5. (p. 90) A Fragment on Charity

Text: Charite sufers alle thyng mekely for gods sake | bope wronges reproues 
diseeses sekenes 7 al ȝat | god wil ȝat ho suffir

(Text written in black ink, in an Anglicana hand very different from the textura of the preceding item. See Jolliffe, G 4 (c). Two notes in faint grey ink follow the text: a) A note in secretary: ‘<...> sola ut in furore’ followed by ‘wyll i se it is not | so’. b) A note in the same hand at the bottom of the leaf reads: ‘Thys indenture made the viii° dye of | May in eyre (sic) of the rene of kuyng | henry the viii by the grace of God | Englon france and Irelan kyng | defendur of the fà’)

6. (pp. 91-108) Thomas Wimbledon’s Redde racionem villicacionis tue

Incipit: My dere frendes ȝe schulleþ understonde ȝat crist | ihesus auctor 7 doctor of treuþe in his boke of bo | gospel likenynge bo kyngdom of heuene | to an housholder seip on his maner suche is | bo kyngdom of heuene to an housholdynge mar ...

Explicit: -self ioy in oþre ȝat beþ saude And also ioye for | her trauel is bouȝt to so gracious an ende ioy | for beþ beþ scapid þe peyne of helle. ioy for þe | endeles blisse þat þei haue in siȝte of god Cui sit | honor et gloria in secula seculorum Amen

7. (pp. 109-119) Richard Rolle’s ‘Ihesu swete now wole iche syn’ . . . ‘ (in verse)

**Incipit:**
Ihesu swete now wole iche syn
to þe a song of luf longyng
Doo in my hert a welle to spryng
þe to loue ouer alle þing

**Explicit:**
þere ioy is euer wiþ outen endyng
and neuer sorow3 ne wepyng
but pees 7 myrþ wiþ gret lykyng
swete ihesu þer to us bryng Amen Amen

(This poem comprises 69 four-line stanzas rhyming aaaa, and each beginning with the name ‘Ihesu’. There are no introductory verses, and no ‘Mary’ verses. See *IMEV* 3238. See Horstman, II, pp. 9-24, Ogilvie-Thomson, pp. 50-63 for other versions.)

8. (pp. 120-126) Richard Rolle’s ‘Olium efusum . . .’

**Incipit:**
Olium efusum nomen tuum Þat is to sey oyle owte 3ette is þi name
þe name | of ihesu anone as it was comen in to þis | world it smelled
sweetenes of grace þe | kynde of oyle is to saufe a þing fro
co | rupcyon

**Explicit:**
on þe cros fast neyld hand 7 fote 7 in | ay þe more I delyted me to
luf ihesu þe swetter I fouwde it: 7 unto þis day it wente neuer oute
of my mynde þerfore blessed be þe name of | ihesu into þe world of
worldes Amen

(See Allen, pp. 66-68. This is the fourth section of the *Comment on the Canticles* in what Ogilvie-Thomson describes as ‘an aberrant version’ (p. xli).)

9. (pp. 127-135) *The Sixteen Conditions of Charity*

**Incipit:**
Of alle uertues þat byn charyte is þe beste | for in hym byn contened
alle ðer uertues: 7 | wiþoute þis uertu of charyte may noo man | be
saued 7 þerfore schuld euery man lerne bysyle | to knowe þe
propurtees of þis uertue For seynt . . .

**Explicit:**
. . . hys conyng 7 hys power is 7 þif he be | unkûnymyng hym oweþ
forto lerne to kepe | hys soule fro symne under peyne of
damp | nacion world wít outen ende charyte be | wiþ us amen

(See Jolliffe, G. 4. (d) but the title is that of G.4 (e).)

10. (pp. 136-148) *A Devotional Treatise*

**Incipit:**
[L]orde ihesu cristte schelde us fro helle 7 | fro ferdenes of þe fende
7 bringe us | to þe ioy þat þu woneste yn fro wych | ioy þou come
doune in to erthe 7 take oure kynde 7 by come oure brother: meche worschepe . . .

Explicit: gode spekere helpe hem nowe 7 alle deren 7 schelde hem fro myssantes body 7 soule 7 yelde hem lorde in pi ringe (sic) be kyng 7 be quene 7 alle deren folke menteyne in pes 7 charite 7 in riȝtwysenesses wit gode conseyle amen

11. (pp. 149-238) Speculum huius vite

Incipit: Byfore hat any creature was wrought or er any bygynning was of ouȝt and byfore alle tymes as we shul trewe he same god ay was hat is nowe studefast god in trinitye

Explicit: < . . > he man pi bedde schal be < . . > mes hat sore schul frete he < . . > schul wicked men be peyned for synne < . . > wiȝ fure 7 vermynne < . . > ignem et vermes < . . > eor < . > ut

(See IMEV 484. This copy of the Speculum is imperfect at the end, finishing at l. 2240b of the text as it stands in the Bodleian MS. It also contains four lines and a latin quotation found in Z, C, and H, (found at ll. 2176a-f in the present edition) which are not found in the Bodleian MS.)

VI Handwriting

A. Handwriting of the texts themselves

The text is in several hands, identified here in the order of the items in which they appear:

Hand A: Textura hand in brown ink (Items 1, 3, 4; pp. 1-18, 21-88). Although the hand changes into an Anglicana (pp. 71-88), it is still the same scribe and the same ink.

Hand B: Secretary hand in dark brown ink (Item 2; pp. 18-20)

Hand C: Late Anglicana hand in black ink (Item 5; p. 90); this hand also provides corrections to the text of item 4 (pp. 85, 88) and some latin quotations at the bottom of p. 84.

Hand D: Early Anglicana (no influence of secretary) in tan brown ink (Item 6; pp. 91-108)

Hand E: Textura hand in brown ink, different from hand A in its split ascenders (b, l, h, k) and in the “r” which follows “o” and “b” (biting on both letters, with the foot of the “r” descending noticeably below the line); hand is
generally larger than A (supply leaf, pp. 89, 90; Items 7, 8, 9, 11, pp. 109-135, 149-238)

**Hand F:** Anglicana in brown ink (Item 10; pp. 136-148)

**Hand G:** Textura quadrata (supply leaf, Item 11, pp. 173, 174).

### B. Handwriting of the marginalia and corrections

Once again, there are several hands in the marginal comments, listed below from most frequently occurring to the least:

**Hand a:** Textura in brown crayon, mostly declaring ownership of John Mascy

**Hand β** Secretary hand in ink ranging from grey to black, found in note “Robert heffelde heys boke” (p. 53), and in pp. 27, 36, 39, 43, 67, 90.

**Hand γ** Anglicana in dark brown ink, which provides the corrections to item 6 and the second explicit at the end of the text (p. 108).

**Hand δ** Anglicana in black ink, which provides corrections to latin quotations in item 11 (pp. 182, 183, 197, 202) as well as the name “John Thomas” on p. 203.

**Hand ε** Secretary in dark brown ink; “Rafe putt” written at bottom of pp. 54, 67)

**Hand ζ** Secretary in light brown ink; “Thomas Premitt” written at bottom of p. 77.

### VII. Punctuation

Item 2 does not contain any discernible punctuation other than the *virgula suspensiva* (used to distinguish quotations and as terminal punctuation) and underlining. Items 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11 all begin with a *littera notabilior* of between 2 and 6 lines in height. Items 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, and 11 are all subdivided by means of *litterae notabiliores*; item 10 has spaces reserved for such litterae. Items 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 11 all make use of paraphs. The *punctus* appears in items 8 and 10 for the full stop; a *punctus elevatus* appears in items 1, 3, and 4 for a medial pause, but in items 6 and 10 as a full stop. A *virgula suspensiva* appears in items 1, 3, 4, and 8 for a medial pause.

### VIII. Binding

It is impossible to tell if the binding has been resewn. The binding is a brown leather nineteenth-century binding, with five thongs in the binding; it has a blind-stamped design around the edges of the front and back covers, and the words SPECULUM | VITAE | C. 5. | 7. | on the spine in gold. The binding is lined with marbled paper in green, white, black, and red. Vamped in September 1950. Rubricated edges. 2° fol.: be strenghes.
IX. History

There are a number of names which appear in the marginalia: John Heghfeld (in a promissory note, p. 36), Robert Heffelde (p. 53), Rafe Putt (pp. 54, 67), Thomas Premitt (p. 77), John Mascy (pp. 46-48, 50-55, 66-68, [handwriting only pp. 84, 88], 104-106, 129-140, 142, 143, 151-154, [handwriting only 160, 168, 172], 174-176 [handwriting only 198-202]), William Burg (183), and John Thomas (p. 206). Of these four names, claims to ownership are made only by Robert Heffelde ('Robert heffelde heys boke,' p. 53) and John Mascy ('Iste liber constat Johanni Mascy,' pp. 28-29). There has been some attempt to identify John Mascy with the Massey family in Cheshire, and specifically with John Massey of Puddington, the "seneschal to Elizabeth, Countess of Salisbury for her lordship of Hawarden," but this remains a point of speculation rather than an established fact. The manuscript came to Trinity College, Dublin through the collection of James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh and antiquarian, in 1661.

C: Cambridge University Library MS Dd.12.69

I. Material

The entire manuscript is composed of parchment folios.

II. Number of Leaves

ii + 95ff. + iv, now foliated in order to make allowance for missing leaves (fol. 23, 35, 98-100): (i, ii) 1-22, 24-34, 36-97 (i-iv).

III. Collation

i-ii\(^8\) (fol. 1-16), iii\(^8\) (wants 7) (fol. 17-22, 24), iv\(^8\) (fol. 25-32), v\(^4\) (1,2 fragments, wants 3) (fol. 33, 34, 36) | vi-xii\(^8\) (fol. 37-92), xiii\(^8\) (wants 6-8) (fol. 93-97).

IV. Layout

---

15 J.V. Scattergood, "Iste Liber Constat Johanni Mascy": Dublin, Trinity College Library MS 155'' (Unpublished paper), p. 11. Prof. Scattergood mentions in p. 5 of his manuscript description that "It has been suggested that John Massey of Cotton (Cheshire) may be the author of the poems, especially Pearl", in BL MS Cotton Nero A.x. (see C.J. Peterson, RES, 25, 1974, 256-266). But this is disputed (see T. Turville-Petre and Edward Wilson, 'Hoccleve, "Maister Massy" and the Pearl-Poet: Two Notes', Review of English Studies, 26, 1975, 129-143).

16 J.V. Scattergood, Trinity College Library Dublin Middle English Manuscripts Catalogue (in progress), (Unpublished; January 1996 version), description for MS 155, p. 5.

17 The collation formula which appears here is given on the end pastedown of the present binding, and is in the handwriting of the former keeper of manuscripts at CUL, H.L. Pink, who has dated his work on the front pastedown as Aug. 1963. The formula is consonant with the evidence given by the existing stitching and catchwords.
A. Size of leaves and written space

The size of the leaves is approximately 185 x 120mm.

The written space varies between booklet one and booklet two:

1. Booklet one: 134 x 80mm
2. Booklet two: 145 x 90mm

B. Pricking and ruling

Signs of pricking and ruling occur on most every page of the manuscript. Both booklets appear to have been pricked with a stylus, and ruled in plummet. Booklet one has been ruled for a single column with 34 lines per page, whereas booklet two has been ruled for a single column with about 30 lines per page. The flyleaves are pricked and ruled, but have been bound horizontally, with the ruled lines running vertically on the page. Flyleaves i, v, and vi are all discoloured, with remains of glue, indicating that they were pastedowns in a former binding.

C. Rubrication

Titles, headings, paraphs, and litterae notabiliores in the first booklet are all in red, with the exception of item 2, which is all in a single color of ink. In item 4, all headings, latin quotations, and marginal citations are in red, while all litterae notabiliores are of two lines in height and in blue ink; all other items in the second booklet are in a single colour of ink.

V. Content

A. Booklet 1

1. (ff. 1-22r) Willelmus de Lanicia, O.F.M., Dieta Salutis

Incipit: Prohemium libri qui dicitur dieta salutis | Hec est uia ambulate in ea. neque ad dex | teram neque ad sinistram. Ysa.30. mag | nam misericordiam facit qui erranti uiam osten | dit maxime de nocte in terra hostium et in | tempore gwerrarum

Explicit: Narra siquid homines ut iustificeris. Et | dauid consulit omnibus peccatoribus penitentibus qui uo | lunt curiam regis introire quia tangant eo modo | quo dictum est mellam confessionis. Dicit enim psalmus Introite portas eius in confessione.

18 I am deeply indebted, in my description of contents and in the other information within this description, to the unpublished notes and description of this manuscript composed by H.L. Pink, the former head of the Manuscripts Department of Cambridge University Library. I have checked the information provided therein, and so any mistakes in the present text are my own.
(Printed as suppositious in A.C. Peltier’s edition of the *Works of Bonaventura*, viii (Paris, 1866), 248-67.) Ending unfinished in Tit. II. cap. 4 (De confessione). Fol. 23 is missing, and fol. 24r is blank.

2. (f. 24v) Verses on the Articles of Faith, taken from Richard of Wetheringsett’s *Qui bene praesunt*

**Text:**

Hec sunt percipue (sic) sermonibus insinuanda
Bis sex articuli fidei. Septemque petenda
Virtutes. vicia presentim crimina septem
Septem sacramenta duo domini mandataque decemque
legis. iustorum merces peneque malorum
In quibus orratur quid vitandum quid ve sit agendum

(For further manuscript copies of this text, see *Carmina*, entry 7598.)

3. (ff. 25r-34v) *Manuale Sacerdotum Parochialium*

(The text begins with the following Latin text taken from some local diocesan constitutions — or perhaps from an altered version of Archbishop Pecham’s *Ignorancia Sacerdotum*.

Sacerdos perachialis (sic) tentur per canones docere et predicare in lingua materna quater in anno septem peticiones in oracione dominica. Salutacionem beate marie. Quatuordecim articulos fidei conten[ten]tos in cymbalo; Decem precepta ueteris testamenti. Septem peccata mortalia. Septem uirtutes principales. Duo precepta euangelium; Septem sacramenta ecclesie; Excogitaciones a canone latas sub forma que sequitur addendo uel minuendo in singulis per ut deus inspirauerit; Sequentur (sic) eciam preces dominicales; Septem peticiones in oracione dominica continentur sic;)

**Incipit:**

In þe pater noster bé þi byd dynges þat god himself ordey | nede [myldeliche] ‘nedful to euer man’ for lyf and soule. þat euerych cristeneman þis | holde to knowe and ofte bydde to god in þis wyse; Prima | peticio; Pater noster qui es in celis sanctificetur nomen tuum; | Fader oure þat art in heuene y halwed be þy name;

**Explicit:**

(The text is imperfect, with only two scanty fragments of what were two leaves, 33 and 34, left. Leaf 35 is missing, and may have contained the ending of the text; leaf 36 is blank; the following text appears at the bottom of fol. 32v) my31 þu louye here and non òper þe whyles 3ow þe 3ey3e lyues lestþ R. ; 3e syre; þan tak þe wher he þe hond and say after me : ych .n. | take þe .a. in forme of holy cherche to my | wedde wyf for sakyng alle òpere and holyche |

---


20 cf. *CS II*, i, p. 901.
holdyng to þe. in syknesse and in helþe. in ry- (catchword at bottom of leaf: chesse)

(Folio 35 is missing, and 36 is blank. Additional manuscript copies of this text can be found in: London, British Library MSS Harley 4172 (fol. 1), Add. 10036 (fol. 91v), Add. 10053 (fol. 99), Burney 356 (fol. 43v), Royal 1 A.x (fol. 238); Oxford, Bodleian MSS Bodley 736 (fol. 191v), Bodley 110 (fol. 155), Rawl. A 381 (fol. 112); Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 285 (fol. 49); Durham, University Library MS Cosin v.iv.2 (fol. 136); similar texts are in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Rawl. D 913 (fol. 10) and Bodley 554 (fol. 88v). The text given as an explicit above appears at fol. 161v, l. 7. The date assigned for the work in Gillespie, p.124, is ca. 1380-1400).

B. Booklet 2

4. (ff. 37r-97v) Prick of Conscience

Incipit: Hic incipit stimulus consciencie
þe myth of þe fader almyghti
þe wit of þe sone alwytti
And þe goodnesse of þe holigost
And god and lord of alle my3thes most

Explicit: uche day ones qwik be fleyne
Er he þat ioye and myrþe wolde fie
þat wþpoute ende in heuene shal be
To þe whiche ioye he us brynge
þat of no3th hþ made alle þynge

(The text is fairly reduced in size and contains some additional material. Although the text finishes at the bottom of f. 97v, and ff. 98-100 are missing, the text is complete, ending at ll. 9623, 9624 in text Z).

5. (Endpaper iii°) Some musical notation on a four-line stave

6. (Endpaper iii'°) Drawing of two fish

7. (Endpaper iv°) Note relating to the accession of Edward IV

Text: Anno Mlmo CCC sexagesimo in vigilia sancti Johannis Baptiste
venerunt apud Sandwyche isti domini scilicet dominus de Marche.
Dominus de Warwyke. Dominus de Salusbury. et Dominus de ffawkynbruggeus. Et Dominus de Audeleeus et successessive (sic) lverunt
apud Londonyas. Et in diem septem fratrum postea apud Northampton
interfecti fuerunt isti domini videlicet dominus de Bokyngham et dominus
de la Persy. Dominus de Bemunde. Et [dominus] 'rex' Edwardus quartus

in dominica ramis palmarum postea in parte borialy Cepit bellum contra boriales dominos et habuit victoriam. Item eodem anno erat Coronatus rex Edwardus apud Westmonasterium in die sancti leonis pape. et. D. Dominicale litera Nota

8. (Endpaper iv’, v’) Pen trials and Sequences for Advent 1 and 2

Incipit 1: Salus eterna in | deficiens mundi | uita <L>ux sem | pitera et redemp | cio uere nostra. Condolens hu | mana perire secla pertemptantis | minima <N>on linquens excelsa | ad isti yma propria ueniencia.

(Endpaper v is a pastedown, and has therefore not been included in the foliation formula given above. For other manuscripts containing this sequence, see item 17777, p. 497 in U. Chevalier. *Repertorium Hymnologicum: catalogue des chants, hymnes, proses, séquences, tropes en usage dans l’église latine depuis les origines jusqu’à nos jours. Tome II.* (Louvain: Polleunis & Ceuterick, 1897).)

Incipit 2: <R>egnantem sem | pitera per secula susceptu | ra concio deuote concrepa. | <A>nimo sono factori reddendo | debita cui iubilant agmina | celica eius uultu exhilarata.

(For other manuscripts containing this sequence, see item 17240, p. 459 in the volume by Chevalier listed immediately above.)

VI. Handwriting

1. Handwriting of the texts themselves

*Hand A:* Textura in dark brown ink (Items 1 and 3; fols. 1-22r, 25r-34v).

*Hand B:* Anglicana in light tan ink (Item 2; fol. 24v)

*Hand C:* Anglicana formata in brown ink (Item 4; fols. 37r-97v)

*Hand D:* Secretary in dark brown ink (Item 7; endpaper iv’)

*Hand E:* Textura quadrata in dark brown ink (Item 8; endpapers iv’, v’)

2. Handwriting of the marginalia

*Hand a:* Textura in dark brown ink; provides some corrections in items 1 and 2 on fols. 13r, 14r, 16r, 17r, 19r, 25r, 26r, and corresponds to Hand A above.

*Hand β:* Anglicana in plummet; provides corrections to item 1 on fols. 7r, 9r, 10v, 11v, 13r-v, 14r-v, 15r-v, 16v, 18v, 20v.
Hand γ: Anglicana formata in dark brown ink; provides some corrections in item 4 on fols 51v, 55r, 54r, 55r, 71v.

Hand δ: Textura in dark brown ink; provides a line over an erasure in item 4 at the top of f. 72v: “pe whuche he schal not from hem huyde”.

VII. Punctuation

Items 1 and 3 subdivide the matter through the use of headings and litterae notabiliores for major subdivisions, and paraphs for minor subdivisions. Both these items make use of the simple punctus and the punctus elevatus for both a medial pause and a full stop. Item 2 uses a simple punctus for a medial pause. Item 4 is divided into parts by headings in red, and further subdivided by the use of litterae notabiliores in blue. There are a few paraph signs used to mark out some minor subdivisions and some items in lists; otherwise, there are no obvious signs of punctuation in the text. Item 7 makes use of the virgula suspensiva for a medial pause, and the punctus for a full stop. Item 8 is subdivided into verses by means of spaces left for litterae notabiliores, and is further punctuated with a punctus elevatus for a full stop.

VIII. Binding

Douglas Cockerell & Son of Letchworth rebound the volume in August of 1963 in a chamfer binding of quarter niger, with black, white, brown, and tan marbled paper sides, and vellum tips. There appear to be four thongs in the binding. The following appears on the spine in gold lettering: DIETA | SALUTIS | &c. | | Dd.12.69 | | 2° fol. : dissipatur Primo.

IX. History

An erased fifteenth-century inscription on f. ii reads: “This present boke ys gevyn to the paryshe chyrche of Shermanbury by the handes of John Haynes In nomine dei. Amen.” This is in turn followed by “Sussex | Thomas”. No other names appear in the manuscript. A Moore bookplate fixed to the front inner cover, taken from the former binding, implies that the book was a gift from King George I in 1715, who purchased the library of John Moore (1646-1714), Bishop of Ely, and donated the collection to the University for its library.

H: Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University, Houghton Library MS Eng. 515

I. Material

The entire manuscript is composed of parchment folios.

II. Number of Leaves

77 leaves with no endleaves, foliated 1-77.

III. Collation

i^8 (wants 1, 2, and 3) (fols. 1-5), ii-x^8 (fols. 6-77). Catchwords on the bottom verso of fols. 5, 13, 21, 29, 37, 45, 53, 61, 69. The missing amount of material at the beginning of the text would fill the three missing folios in the average ruling of the text (i.e. approximately 138 ll.). Stitching can be seen between fols. 1, 2; 9,10; 17,18; 25, 26; 33, 34; 49, 50; 57, 58; 65, 66; 73, 74.

IV. Layout

A. Size of leaves and written space

The size of the leaves is 182 x 114mm.

The written space is 136 x 80mm.

B. Pricking and ruling

The text is found in a single column at an unvarying 23 lines per page, but there are no obvious signs of ruling beyond two vertical lines in plummet marking the left and right margins of the page.

C. Rubrication

Quotations and subtitles are in red, in the same hand as the main text.

V. Content

(fols. 1-77) The Prick of Conscience

Incipit: (the text is imperfect at the beginning, and starts at l. 156 in Z, or l. 129 in the Speculum huius vite)
But grete perel ys þat man ymne
þat hæþ wyt 7 mynde 7 wol not lerne.
Ryȝtwys werkes and godes lawe
By þe wuche men schul be saue.
For man ȝif þu wole saued be
Kepe hys hestys god byddeþ þe.

Explicit: Er he þat ioye 7 murthe wolde fle
þat wip oute ende in heuene shal be.
| (fol. 77r) To þe whuche ioye he us bryngþe
þat of nouȝt hæþ made alle þinge.
Amen amen so mote hyt be
Seye we alle per charyte. Amen.

VI. Handwriting

The text is written in Anglicana formata; some interlinear corrections appear in a secretary hand (fol. 2r), in the same hand as the main text (fol. 17r, 22r, 25r, 67v, 69r, 69v, 73v) and once in a later hand (possibly seventeenth-century or later — fol. 7r). There is no noticeable difference between the hand of the rubricator and the hand found in the text.

VII. Punctuation

The text is subdivided by means of subtitles in red, as well as blue or gilded litterae notabiliiores of two lines in height. The punctus is the only sign of punctuation, and is generally used to signal the end of a rhyming couplet rather than to signal a medial or final pause.

VIII. Binding

The binding is a late fourteenth- or possibly early fifteenth-century chamfer of wood covered in leather with a simple blind-stamped design on the outside, and the remains of a clasp in the middle of the fore-edge side on both the front and back covers. The front and back covers measure 188 x 120mm; the spine measures 22mm across. There are 5 thongs in the binding, visible on the spine and on the inside front cover. 2° fol.: What schal

IX. History

The inscription “Iste liber constat t (tibi?) John Kyng” appears at fol. 77v in a calligraphic attempt to emulate the hand of the text, except for the name, which is in a fifteenth-century secretary hand. The whole of this inscription is in the same colour ink, and under ultraviolet light none of it shows any sign of erasure. The manuscript belonged to a Thomas Scott in 1715 (signature on inside of front cover, dated, with inscription “ex dono Domini [sic] Brown”), Francis Blomefield later in the eighteenth century (bookplate, inside back cover: “Francis Blomefield, Rector of Fersfield in Norfolk, 1736”). The name “Thomas Martin”, in what appears to be an eighteenth-century hand, appears on the inside of the front cover. The Harvard University bookplate on the inside front cover declares that the book was a gift to the University of Henry Tuke Parker of London, and is dated 24 Aug. 1863.

Date of Composition for the Text

Since the temporal limits for dating the text rest to a large degree upon the dating of the manuscripts, and since references to the date for the text appear throughout the chapters which follow, it seems appropriate to mention pertinent aspects of the date of composition at this stage before moving on. No internal evidence in the Prick of
Conscience or the Speculum gives either a definite or a general indication of the period of composition for these two texts. The conjectural date for the composition of the Prick of Conscience given in the Descriptive Guide to the Manuscripts of the Prick of Conscience, is based upon the evidence of the earliest manuscripts: "Manuscripts do not begin to appear until after 1350, but when they do appear, they do so in large numbers, which is usually a sign that the work in question was composed not many years before." This provides a rough estimate for the terminus a quo for the Speculum; the terminus ad quem depends upon the date of the earliest extant manuscript of the Speculum. The Bodleian manuscript probably comes from the second half of the fifteenth century, judging from its Secretary-influenced Anglicana hand. The evidence rendered by the watermarks in the booklets bound with the one which contains the Speculum in B would indicate that they were written sometime in the middle of the last half of the fifteenth century; since the booklets in question were bound together at a fairly early stage (the former binding, described briefly above, attests to this), it would be fair, in conjunction with an assessment of the hand of the text, to place it somewhere in the last half of the fifteenth century. The text of the Dublin manuscript, on the other hand, appears on vellum in a textura which probably comes from the late fourteenth century. The hypothetical terminus ad quem for the text, using manuscript D as the earliest of the two extant manuscripts, must be sometime before the end of the fourteenth century. The manuscript evidence thus leaves us with temporal limits sometime between 1350 and the last decade

---

23 Robert E. Lewis and Angus McIntosh, A Descriptive Guide to the Manuscripts of the Prick of Conscience, Medium ævum Monographs, new series xii (Oxford: Society for the Study of Mediæval Languages and Literature, 1982), p. 4. Hereafter referred to with the abbreviation Descriptive Guide. The "large numbers" of manuscripts referred to in the quotation include "forty of the ninety-seven Main Version manuscripts [which] are probably from the second half of the fourteenth century" (p. 4, n. 12).

24 I have discussed this conjecture with Prof. Malcolm Parkes, who has confirmed it, after seeing a microfilm facsimile of the manuscript.
of the fourteenth century for the composition of the *Speculum*. The only remaining
evidence which allows for further conjecture about the date of composition arises from
the content of the text; this evidence will be discussed, and further conjecture will be
given on the dating of the text in the third chapter, on the sources and coherence of the
*Speculum*.
Chapter Two: The Genre of the Text

I. Introduction to the Text

A glance through the text of the *Speculum huius vite* will reveal most of the relevant information for a general assessment of its genre according to the broadest categories: the *Speculum* is a poem of 2,722 four-stress lines in rhyming couplets which deals with human nature, the world, death, purgatory, the day of doom, hell, and heaven in seven well-defined parts. Such a bare statement, beyond raising concerns regarding how the text could ever begin to fill in such a broad canvas of topics, conceals the historical and literary contexts of the poem which may cast some light upon its readership and use. The sober subjects of the various parts of the poem comprise a syllabus of topics necessary for teaching what are customarily referred to in catechetical literature up to the present day as “the four last things”: death, judgement, heaven, and hell.¹ The text itself proclaims the pastoral purpose of such dire meditations within its first two hundred lines:

> For [man] may naujer know God ne feele,  
> Bot he first con hymself knowe wele:  
> How bare he fro his moder come,  
> And synful er he had cristyndome,  
> And how bare he shal pas away,  
> Quen deth sal com at his last day.  
> And þus on his endyng thenk shuld he,  
> And on þe dreadful dome þat last shal be,  
> And knowe wisly quat þis word is,  
> þat is full of falshed and wrecchednes,  
> And [lerne] to knowe and thenk wit all  
> Quat shal after þis lif fall.  
> For knowyng of al þos shuld hym lede  
> To know his God thurȝe luf and drede,  
> And so to come witout delay  
> To joy and blis þat lastis ay. (Speculum, ll. 161-176)

The *Speculum* therefore has the specific purpose of leading the reader to a conversion of

¹The current *Catechism of the Catholic Church* still includes this teaching in its explication of the phrase “I believe in life everlasting” taken from the Apostles’ Creed. See *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994), §§ 1020-1050.
life through a consideration of the punishments or rewards that await souls at the end of time. Its purpose is inherently pastoral (the teaching of doctrine in order to spur conversion of life), and its poetic form admits of some literary pretensions. The Speculum is, therefore, a text shaped within a particular ecclesiastical context, with a particular purpose, and has a particular form presumably because the author or compiler deemed such a form suited to just such a context and purpose.

The Speculum huius vite is a text with a more particular past as well; beyond the larger historical context, it is a highly derivative text, since most of its lines originate in the much longer fourteenth-century poem, the Prick of Conscience. In 1982, Professors Robert E. Lewis and Angus McIntosh produced their study of the manuscripts of this apparently popular poem (judging, at least, from its appearance in a multitude of manuscripts) and entitled it A Descriptive Guide to the Manuscripts of the Prick of Conscience, acknowledging that their work did not include the detail or depth required for a catalogue. The Guide was intended to encourage interest in and study of this catechetical treatise on the four last things, and it thus laid out a general categorization of its 115 manuscripts, leaving space for further research. The Guide describes the Speculum as an early fifteenth-century version of the Prick of Conscience which “follows the organization and controlling ideas of the original,” but abbreviates the Prick of Conscience by more than two-thirds.²

As a version of the prolix, occasionally tedious, and seemingly ubiquitous Prick of Conscience (hereafter also referred to as the PC), one might find it unsurprising that the Speculum has remained unedited for so long. The Speculum, as a consciously “tailored”

²Descriptive Guide, p. 11.
version of the *Prick of Conscience*, however, raises some interesting questions regarding the redaction of texts in the Middle Ages. Lewis and McIntosh point out that the *Speculum* does not merely abbreviate the *PC*; it also adds material, and, even more significantly, its excisions and additions “follow certain clear patterns.” These observations suggest complexities in the relationship between the *Prick of Conscience* and the *Speculum* which spark some interest, if not in the texts themselves, at least in the questions surrounding the redaction of the one for the purposes of producing the other. Since Lewis and McIntosh’s observations, not much more has appeared in print regarding the *Speculum* or how it relates to the *Prick of Conscience*, yet the relationship between the two texts elicits important questions: could the *Speculum*’s abbreviations of, and additions to, the *PC* point to any general rationale as to why this redaction exists? What sorts of “clear patterns” of redaction, mentioned in the *Guide*, emerge from a more detailed study of the relationship between these two texts? As one who knows the purpose of the *Guide* might expect, Lewis and McIntosh tempt the prospective investigator by stating that “the exact relationship [between the *PC* and the *Speculum*] could only be determined after a thorough study of the two versions.”

The following two chapters propose, then, to outline the development of the *Speculum huius vite*, first with reference to the larger historical context of universal and local ecclesiastical legislation and its interpretation (Chapter Two), and then with reference to its sources and coherence (Chapter Three). Chapters Four and Five, on the manuscript relations of the text and its dialect respectively, will supplement this delineation of the relationship between the *Prick of Conscience* and the *Speculum*. The

---

3 *Descriptive Guide*, p. 11.

4 *Descriptive Guide*, p. 11.
study of the historical context of the *Speculum*, the philological evidence found in the text, and the relationship of its manuscripts should provide sufficient information to answer Lewis and McIntosh’s challenge regarding the relationship between the *PC* and the *Speculum*, and to introduce a prospective reader to the pertinent merits of the *Speculum* as an example of a late medieval pastoral manual in English.

II. The Origin of Pastoral Manuals in English: Ecclesiastical Legislation

The late fourteenth- and early fifteenth-century English church, to judge from the proliferation of vernacular pastoral manuals during the period, saw the last great production of vernacular catechetical materials before the mid- and late-fifteenth century, when production of new works slackens considerably.\(^5\) Works such as *Handlyng Synne*, the *Ayenbite of Inwyt*, the *Speculum vitae*, the *Lay Folks’ Catechism*, and the *Book of Vices and Virtues* testify to a tradition of vernacular pastoral manuals stretching from the end of the thirteenth century to the beginning of the fifteenth, and many of these manuals survived as standard catechetical treatises until the Reformation. The *Prick of Conscience* and its abridged version, the *Speculum huius vite*, like many of the other works just mentioned, fit within a catechetical tradition which arose primarily, although not exclusively, from reforms promoted by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. These reforms made provision for the local education of parish clergy in pastoral care, which the Conciliar decrees called the *ars artium*, and encouraged the production of pastoral manuals for the use of clergy, which had already begun in such mnemonic works as those

One decree of the same council, *Omnis utriusque sexus*, stated that all believers of both sexes had to make their confession once yearly before Easter, and thus provided the impetus for the English bishops present at the Council to promulgate a body of local legislation which encouraged the vernacular catechesis necessary for each baptized Christian to render his Easter duties in an informed manner.

A general catechetical syllabus gradually emerged out of the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council and out of English legislation, a syllabus which demanded the development of catechetical aids, both for the clergy involved in delivering such instruction, and for the growing number of laity who, by the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth, had an interest in reading such texts themselves. At the risk of running over yet again the already well-trodden terrain of the development of the English pastoral manual, the following exposition attempts to delineate the influence of local ecclesiastical legislation upon the evolution of manuals like the *Prick of Conscience* and the *Speculum huius vite*.

While the Council may have captured the attention of the English episcopacy, it by no means represents the sole source of the later catechetical interests of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In what has been called “the earliest surviving set [of statutes] for

---


any English diocese”, Stephen Langton anticipates the provisions of *Omnis utriusque sexus* in canon 34 of his Statutes of Canterbury, promulgated in 1213 or 1214:

> Quia quilibet christianus adultus dominus dominicam orationem, scilicet Pater noster, et simulum apostolorum, scilicet Credo in deum, scire debet, precipimus quod quilibet sacerdos parochianos suos ut hec addiscant studeat ammonere. The simple minimum of religious knowledge stated here forms the foundation for the later post-Conciliar legislation. The main difference between the Conciliar decrees and Langton’s statute is that *Omnis utriusque sexus* never stipulates the precise content of the instruction which one must receive, but only specifies that parish priests must instruct the faithful in the way to make a good confession. Langton’s legislation sets a minimum for religious knowledge, not for the sake of the sacrament of penance alone, but out of general pastoral concern for the ignorance of the common believer. This impulse appears in some of Langton’s other statutes, which are likewise directed to pastoral concerns and involve some form of instruction, as in statute 39: “Instruat quoque quilibet sacerdos parochianos suos formam verborum baptizandi, quando ea dicere debent scilicet in immersione pueri, et quid agere debeant in confirmatione et post confirmationem.” Instruction in the faith involved not only the study of the Creed and traditional prayers, but also the practical elements necessary to confer emergency baptism and the responsibilities pursuant upon the reception of confirmation. The general catechetical concern expressed by the statutes of Canterbury met and merged with the more practical need identified at the Fourth Lateran Council for once-

---

8 *CS II*, i, p. 23.

9 *CS II*, i, p. 31.

10 *CS II*, i, p. 32.
yearly confession, and so catechesis was linked with preparation for the sacrament of penance in the Conciliar canon, albeit without any specification of a syllabus or minimum level of instruction beyond a knowledge which would facilitate a good confession. The onus in the Conciliar decrees for making a good confession is much more on the effectiveness of the confessor’s pastoral queries, than on the education of the laity:

Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter, saltem semel in anno proprio sacerdoti . . . . Sacerdos autem sit discretus et cautos, ut more periti medici superinfundat vinum et oleum vulneribus sauciati, diligenter inquirens et peccatoris circumstantias et peccati, per quas prudenter intelligat, quale illi consilium debeat exhibere et cuiusmodi remedium adhibere, diversis experimentis utendo ad sanandum aegrotum. 11

The canon of the Council does not reveal an interest in the education of the laity, so much as it demands a certain level of intelligence and sagacity from the priest-confessor.

Langton attended the Council along with some of his fellow English bishops, notably Walter Gray (Abp. of York), Hugh of Wells (Bp. of Lincoln), and Richard Poore (Bp. of Chichester). 12 Both Langton and Poore would produce significant diocesan statutes later, each with an emphasis on catechesis which involved the instruction of priests by the Archdeacons, and the subsequent instruction of the laity by their priests. From the development of the ecclesiastical legislation, it would appear that the English bishops, or at the very least Langton and Poore, interpreted the relevant canon of the Fourth Lateran Council as requiring, not only some remedy for priestly ignorance, but also lay instruction in the basics of the faith. Langton’s preconciliar interest in a basic lay catechesis, which he expressed in his statutes for Canterbury of 1213 or 1214, just before the Fourth Lateran Council, indicates that such concerns were current among members of the English


12 CS II, i p. 48.
episcopacy. The impetus which the Council provided spurred the English bishops to provide local statutes throughout the thirteenth century and beyond, most of which copied or built upon the catechetical legislation of the earliest of these local statutes.

The question of lay instruction raises the important question of language, and specifically the role of the vernacular, in relation to the development of pastoral manuals. Langton’s statutes may have set minimums for religious instruction, and the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council may have placed that instruction within the more specific context of the sacrament of penance, but neither of these two sets of decrees reveal anything about the question of language. If typical parishioners were expected to learn their prayers and their creed in Latin, then the whole educational project changes from an attempt to improve understanding among the laity in the rudiments of the faith, to an attempt to inculcate rote knowledge in a foreign tongue, without any particular emphasis on understanding. The tradition of English legislation immediately following the Council addressed this question fairly early, with a number of significant diocesan statutes (those of Richard Poore in 1219, Peter de Roches in 1224, William de Blois 1229, Robert Bingham in 1238, and Richard Wych in 1245 — all discussed at greater length below) stipulating popular instruction in the vernacular, even though the diocesan statutes themselves remained in Latin. The statutes of Richard Poore state that the explication of the creed must be simple, and in the “native idiom” (domestico ydiomate), suggesting the use of the vernacular, if not for the recitation of the creed, then at least for its explication.13 Most of the rest of the decrees composed after those of Richard Poore state that parishioners should know the necessary elements of the catechetical syllabus “at least

13 CS II, i p. 61.
in the mother tongue” (*saltem lingua materna* or *sub lingua ei nota*)¹⁴, and so they set a standard which allows, fairly early on, for vernacular religious instruction as a minimum without discouraging knowledge of the Latin texts. Even after Archbishop Arundel’s legislation severely limited instruction in the vernacular, and subsequent interpretation made knowledge of the Creed and the Lord’s Prayer in English evidence of heresy, “theological miscellanies still included English translations” of the relevant catechetical texts.¹⁵ Lay people thus received their instruction in English, whether that instruction pertained to the texts themselves or to the explications of the text; we cannot be sure that vernacular instruction was not also the medium in use for the customary review of catechesis which the archdeacon in most dioceses had to give his clergy. Whilst one might be tempted to make the easy correlation that the instruction of parish priests would have been in Latin, and the laity in English, the evidence does not clearly show a strict disjunction between the language of instruction for laity and clergy. Mention of clerical ignorance, especially ignorance of Latin, appears in several sources from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Archbishop John Pecham headed his statute on catechesis *Ignorantia sacerdotum*, and thus laid the blame for lay ignorance squarely on the shoulders of ignorant clergy.¹⁶ John de Grandisson, Bishop of Exeter in the fourteenth century, complained of improper instruction in the fundamentals of grammar, which resulted in an imperfect comprehension of Latin prayers among adult scholars.¹⁷

¹⁴ *CS II, i*, pp. 134, 172.

¹⁵ Spencer, p. 207. Spencer supports this statement with reference to the contents of two such miscellanies, Lincoln Cathedral MS 66 (fols 136r-137v) and Bodl. MS Rawlinson D. 913 (fols. 11r-12r).

¹⁶ see *CS II, i*, p. 901.

frequent references in diocesan statutes of the period to sacerdotal ignorance ought to caution against any hasty assumptions that English instruction, and subsequent English pastoral manuals, were necessarily just instruments for the clergy to use in their struggle to edify the laity, rather than instruments for the enlightenment of clergy and laity alike. While much of the legislation requires the instruction of parochial clergy by their archdeacons, the language of such priestly instruction is never made clear.

Among the statutes published by English bishops, those of Richard Poore set the standard, possibly because they were among the first to be promulgated after the Council. Written in 1219 for the diocese of Salisbury, where Poore was bishop, added to and promulgated again for the diocese of Durham (where Poore was translated as bishop after 1228), Poore’s synodal statutes set out principal concerns which are repeated in the statutes of Peter de Roches (Winchester, 1224), Robert Bingham (Salisbury, 1238 × 1244), and Richard Wych (Chichester, 1245 × 1252). The approach to education looks first to the instruction of the local clergy, and then to that of the local parishioners, instructed by their parish priests:

\[\ldots\text{districte iniuungimus quod in capitulis suis expositionem fidei catholice in}\]
\[\text{generalii concilio promulgatam sane et simplicibus verbis exponant. Et}\]
\[\text{sacerdotes, prout eis deus inspiraverit, parochianos suos instruant et eis}\]
\[\text{illum expositionem frequenter domesticio ydiomate sane inculcent.}\]

The explicit reference to an explanation “in the native idiom” is the first intimation within local legislation that parish priests should accommodate their instruction to the language of their parishioners. Poore’s legislation lacks the specificity of later statutes, leaving most aspects of the interpretation and presentation of instruction to individual priests.


19 CS II, i, p. 61.
The initial focus on the ignorance of the clergy remains in local legislation throughout the thirteenth century, and evidence of the follow-up on this first front of attack can be seen in the appearance and proliferation of large numbers of pastoral manuals intended for the instruction of clergy, mainly in the administration of penance. Poore’s legislation makes provision for private catechesis by the priest or someone else commissioned by him, and extends this instruction not only to the young, but to parents as well:


These early statutes make general provisions for catechetical education, stipulating a fairly vague syllabus (the exposition from Lateran IV on the Trinity and the Creed, along with instruction in the Pater Noster and Ave Maria) and a general context for teaching which emphasized personal instruction. Poore not only repeated Langton’s statute about administering emergency baptism, but he added another encouraging instruction about a rather different sacrament: “... precipimus quod ad sacramentum extreme unctionis moneant frequenter populum sacerdotes, in necessitate videlicet, et non tantum divites set pauperes, senes et minores, omnes maxime a quatuordecim annis et supra.”  

This encouragement to look not only to the sacrament of initiation, but also to the last of the sacraments, thus provides some context within ecclesiastical legislation for the eventual development of a catechetical literature which looked to a contemplation of death and the last things.

---

20CS II, i, p. 61.

21CS II, i, pp. 69, 93, Statute 93. Statute 23 provides instruction concerning baptism: “Semper sacerdos interroget diligenter laicum cum in necessitate baptizaverit puerum, quid dixerit et quid fecerit.”
The pastoral syllabus and the contexts for teaching it became more specific in later legislation, but it seemed to take some time before other bishops took notice of the work of Langton and Poore. The Council for the Province of Canterbury at Oxford in 1222 left behind a vague statute regarding preaching and teaching which states that parish priests ought to take care to inform the people committed to them by means of the food which is the word of God. The Oxford Council also repeated the statute regarding teaching parishioners the form of baptism in case of emergency, but it lacks any statute regarding extreme unction. Synodal statutes for an unknown English diocese, promulgated sometime between 1222 and 1225, likewise contain no specific instruction regarding catechesis, beyond a statute about teaching parishioners the formula for baptism and two statutes asking priests to exhort their flock to avail themselves of extreme unction. The statutes of Bishop Peter des Roches of Winchester (1224) present a similar syllabus to the one found in Langton’s statutes of 1213 or 1214, but he recommends only the Creed and the Pater “saltem in lingua materna,” as the foundation for his syllabus. His are among the first statutes to link explicitly catechesis of the laity and the giving of penance: “Sacerdotes in penitentiis dandis diligenter parochianos suos de fide trinitatis, passionis, et incarnationis, secundum quod convenit laicis, instruant, . . .” Nothing further regarding extreme unction appears in des Roches’ statutes. It was not until after Stephen Langton issued a second set of statutes for Canterbury (1222 × 1228), which in the main

---

22 CS II, i, p. 110.
23 CS II, i, p. 115.
24 CS II, i, pp. 140, 146.
25 CS II, i, p. 134.
26 CS II, i, p. 134.
shamelessly copied Poore’s legislation, that the standard form of the catechetical syllabus began to be specified further.

William de Blois’ statutes for the diocese of Worcester (1229) reveal a concern for the integrity of confession which underlies the attempts to educate parishioners about the faith. He sets out a fairly demanding scheme, in which matters like the seven vices and virtues are mentioned, along with a rigorous formula for daily prayers:

Statuimus ut sacerdos ante confessionem laici penitentis instruat eum de fide secundum formam et ordinem contentam in simbolo apostolorum sub lingua ei nota. Ut sacerdos ante confessionem penitentis moneat confortatione et exhortatione, confortatione ne desperet de magnitudine vel enormitate peccati vel de multitudine peccatorum, exhortatione ut etiam circumstantias peccati confiteatur, effundens cor suum sicut aquam coram domino. Ut sacerdos post confessionem penitentis plenius instruat eum de septem vitiis et speciebus eorum, ut facilius revocet ad memoriam in quae specie peccaverit. Ut in penitentia laico inungenda specialiter inungatur ei ut septies in die dicat orationem dominicam cum simbolo apostolorum, et semel in nocte. Ut sacerdos laico inungens penitentiam instruat eum inter cetera ut quotiens transitum facit per cimiterium dicat orationem dominicam pro animabus omnium fidelium defunctorum quorum corpora ibi requiescunt, et transitum faciens per crucem inclinet se et dicat orationem dominicam in honore crucifixi. 28

The whole of the educational scheme is thus placed within a pastoral programme for confession, but the recommendation of specific prayers at the end illustrates how the programme included other areas of life beyond confession, such as daily prayer. This carries on the tradition of Langton’s first statutes for Canterbury, which do not explicitly link sacramental confession and catechesis, but look more to general obligations consequent upon baptism. 29 The sacrament of confession provides the context for teaching in William de Blois’ statutes, which occurs before, after, and perhaps during the

27 CS II, i, p. 165ff.
28 CS II, i, p. 172.
29 CS II, i, p. 31.
sacrament, unlike Langton’s first statutes or Poore’s statutes for Salisbury, where the place for such learning is left vague enough to include preaching or private instruction outside the sacrament.

Up until this point, most of the synodal statutes mentioned included some rehearsal of the first canon of the Fourth Lateran Council, which was a summary of Trinitarian doctrine. This rehearsal could presumably constitute the foundation for some catechetical teaching on the Creed, although it is usually fairly technical and would require much expansion and simplification before it could be presented to those untrained in the subtleties of Trinitarian doctrine. The statutes of Bishop Richard Stavensby of Coventry and Lichfield (1224–1237) went one step further, and provided relatively long and detailed tracts on the seven capital sins and on confession. The two tracts are found in manuscript form independent of the statutes, and independent of one another, which indicates that they “were not necessarily composed for issue together or for issue with the statutes, and Stavensby does not explicitly claim authorship of them.”30 This association of tract and statutes continues in the Statutes of Water de Cantilupe for Worcester (1240), where the statutes mention a “tractatum etiam de confessione” included with the Statutes which all parish priests were to use in hearing confessions, and in teaching parishioners how to examine their consciences and confess their sins.31 The statutes of Richard de Wich for the diocese of Chichester (1245–1252) mention that the priests of the diocese should have “has constitutiones omnes . . . in libellis suis scriptas,” which implies that each priest had a copy-book (libellus) containing some pastoral manual, or collection of

---

30 Introductory notes, “Statutes of Bishop Alexander of Stavensby for the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield,” CS II, i, p. 208. See also Gillespie, 18.

31 CS II, i, p. 305; Gillespie, p. 19.
pastoral documentation, into which new material could be entered.\textsuperscript{32} The conjunction of tract and statute occurs yet again in the statutes of Archbishop John Thoresby of York in the mid-fourteenth century, which will receive more prolonged discussion a little further on.

At approximately the same time as de Cantilupe’s statutes and tract were issued, the catechetical syllabus received greater definition in the influential statutes (ca. 1239) of the sometime Chancellor of Oxford and Bishop of Lincoln, Robert Grosseteste. Grosseteste makes three additions to the syllabus, namely a knowledge of the ten commandments, the seven sacraments, and the possible inclusion of the Athanasian creed. Once again, the statutes are directed mainly to the amelioration of sacerdotal ignorance as the key to redressing lay ignorance:

\begin{quote}
Quia igitur sine decalogi observatione salus animarum non consistit, exhortamur in domino, firmiter inungentes ut unusquisque pastor animarum et quilibet sacerdos parochialis sciat decalogum, id est, decem mandata legis mosaice, eademque populo sibi subiecto frequenter predicet et exponat. Sciat quoque que sunt septem criminalia, eademque similiter populo predicet fugienda. Sciat insuper saltem simpliciter septem ecclesiastica sacramenta, et hii qui sunt sacerdotes maxime sciant que exiguntur ad vere confessionis et penitentie sacramentum, formamque baptizandi doceant frequenter laicos in ydiomate communi. Habeat quoque quisque eorum saltem simplicem intellectum fidei, sicut continenter in simbolo, tam maiori quam minori, et in tractatu qui dicitur: Quicunque vult, qui cotidie ad Primam in ecclesia psallitur.\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}

Throughout the passage above, the emphasis is laid upon what the pastor of souls should know, teach, preach, and expound. The use of these verbs \textit{scire}, \textit{docere}, \textit{predicare}, and \textit{exponere}, as well as the reference to sacramental confession suggest that such teaching and preaching would occur not only in the confessional, but also in the pulpit as well as in

\textsuperscript{32}For more discussion of this particular point in the legislation, see Gillespie, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{CS II}, i, p. 268.
private instruction.\textsuperscript{34} Walter de Cantilupe's statutes, perhaps as influential as Grosseteste's, contain a chapter cast in almost exactly the same wording as the above chapter from the Lincoln statutes,\textsuperscript{35} as do the synodal statutes of Bishop William Raleigh for the diocese of Norwich (1240\texttimes1243) and later, for the diocese of Winchester (1247).\textsuperscript{36} Bishop Nicholas of Farnham, in his statutes for the diocese of Durham, edits this formula slightly, suggesting that the formula for baptism (and possibly the other elements of the syllabus) should be taught "in communi idiome et vulgari" on Sundays and feastdays.\textsuperscript{37} Grosseteste's statutes also include a second chapter on lay education which is less directed to moral teaching than to basic Christian doctrine:

\begin{quote}
Provideant etiam attentius ecclesiarum rectores et sacerdotes parochiales ut pueri parochiarum suarum diligenter doceantur et sciant orationem dominicam, et symbolum, et salutationem beate virginis, et crucis signaculo se recte consignare. Et quia, ut audivimus, etiam quidam adulti hec ignorant, precipimus ut cum laici ad confessionem accedunt, diligenter examinentur utrum scierint predicta, et secundum quod expedit in eis a sacerdotibus instruantur.\textsuperscript{38}
\end{quote}

The boundaries of catechesis in Grosseteste's legislation, as in some of the other legislative texts mentioned previously, extend beyond what was immediately useful for penance to the basics of common belief and practice. This same chapter appears again in William Raleigh's statutes for Norwich, with an addendum to the effect that this teaching should be reinforced by the clear and distinct recitation of the Lord's prayer and the Creed.

\textsuperscript{34} On the subject of the diversity of pastoral situations for teaching to which these verbs may refer, see Spencer, p. 210; Gillespie, \textit{Doctrina}, 36-50; and Gillespie, p. 16ff.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{CS II}, i, p. 304.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{CSII}, i, p. 403.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{CS II}, i, p. 423.

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{CS II}, i, p. 269.
during the hours of Prime and Compline on Sundays.\textsuperscript{39} It may be that some form of preaching on the Creed was envisaged for these offices, since this added injunction was intended “ut articuli fidei plenius exponantur.”\textsuperscript{40}

The relationship between ecclesiastical legislation and pastoral manuals at this point becomes a symbiotic one: the need for manuals covering the necessary catechesis and confessional practice had begun in local legislation, yet now the bishops themselves were issuing their own elaborations on the catechetical syllabus using tracts composed separately from their legislation. We have already seen one example of this in the tracts on the seven deadly sins and confession in the statutes of Richard Stavensby for Coventry and Lichfield, which circulated independently of Stavensby’s legislation. Another significant example can be found in the \textit{summula} issued with the synodal statutes of Bishop Peter Quivel for the diocese of Exeter (1287), which, according to the statutes, was “\textit{a diversis tractatibus extractam sub compendio}.”\textsuperscript{41} Vincent Gillespie summarizes the development in pastoral manuals which this statement implies:

Although these episcopal manuals may have been influenced initially in their form by existing penitential literature (as with Stavensby’s tracts), by the time Quivel’s \textit{summula} was published not only were manuals for the clergy becoming increasingly available, but also the scope of these manuals was widening to include wider pastoral issues. Thus Quivel’s text is drawn ‘\textit{a diversis tractatibus}’ and is not tied to the narrow format of the penitential. Furthermore the publication of these manuals with episcopal authority makes it likely that they exercised an important influence on the structure and form of other manuals being produced, so that they may be seen both as a product of and a formative influence on the manual tradition.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{39}CS II, i, p. 346.

\textsuperscript{40}CS II, i, p. 346.

\textsuperscript{41}CS II, ii, p. 1018.

\textsuperscript{42}Gillespie, p. 21.
Despite the fact that it is drawn from “diverse tracts”, most of the material in Quivel’s text has a direct bearing on the sacrament of penance and is penitential in nature. Whilst one can acknowledge with Gillespie that the presence of several diverse tracts suggests a diversity in approaches to the catechetical syllabus, very little material in Quivel’s *summula* indicates a wide diversity in the penitential content of its sources; the *summula* begins with an exposition on the ten commandments, continues by describing the seven deadly sins and their progeny, touches on the circumstances of sin and the sinner, and finishes with a brief exposition on the Creed.\(^{43}\) Only the last of these items might not appear in a penitential, and so it is difficult to find much in this *summula* which would indicate that pastoral tracts existed which covered wider ground than a penitential tract. It is hard to know, then, how the *summula* indicates that current pastoral manuals were engaging “wider pastoral issues”, unless one looks at the obviously didactic nature of the text: clearly, the *summula* is intended to cover the didactic programme laid out in the statutes, and is not entirely intended as a document to guide the confessor through the pitfalls of confession. The articles on the ten commandments (1-11) and the deadly sins (12-19) do not principally address the priest, unlike the articles on the circumstances of sins and sinners (20-36) which often enjoin the priest to say or do something in response to what he hears from the penitent. Although the document states that the priest ought to teach the articles of the faith to a penitent (*penitens*) rather than to a parishioner in an unqualified sense (*laicus*), and so implies that such teaching occurs in the confessional, it by no means disallows teaching within another context: “the *summula*, although geared to penitential practice, would serve as a valuable aid to preaching and small group

---

\(^{43}\)See “Summula of Peter Quinel or Quivel, bishop of Exeter,” *CS II, ii*, pp. 1059-1077.
teaching. 44 In any event, an attention to wider pastoral issues in the legislation can be traced through the concern for a knowledge of the Creed, as in Langton’s first statutes, and for a knowledge of the practice of prayer and the sacraments, which can be traced through the concern for infant baptism, the rehearsal of the names and number of the sacraments, and exhortations concerning the sacrament of extreme unction. This wider pastoral vision could not help but appear in those pastoral manuals designed to cover the breadth of the catechetical syllabus as it appears in the legislation.

That these kinds of broader concerns — as evinced by the exposition listing the seven petitions of the Lord’s Prayer, the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, the eight Beatitudes, and explaining the articles of the Creed — appeared in pastoral literature can be seen in the rather brief summary by Roger de Weseham, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, entitled Instituta (ca. 1245-1256). 45 This summary, found in Oxford Bodleian Library MS Bodley 57, fols. 96r-97v together with several pieces of ecclesiastical legislation, deals evenly with matters of faith as well as morals, making it much more than another penitential handbook. Vernacular texts such as the Cursor Mundi and the Lay Folks’ Mass Book from the beginning of the fourteenth century 46 illustrate a growing interest in a literature which went beyond the concerns of the penitential literature, both in content and in style. Some credit for the broadening of these interests must lie in the even-handed emphasis of much of the preceding legislation on matters which were not strictly necessary for instructing parishioners in making a good examination of

44 Gillespie, p. 22.

45 C.R. Cheney, English Synodalia of the Thirteenth Century, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1941), Appendix II, pp. 149-152. See discussion of this work in Gillespie, p. 19.

46 The Lay Folks’ Mass Book is, properly speaking, an early fourteenth-century English translation of a mid-twelfth-century French text. See Raymo, item 195, pp. 2350, 2351.
conscience.

The canon on catechesis from the Council of Lambeth in 1281, which became dislodged from the rest of the legislation of that Council and is referred to in later legislation by its two opening words Ignorantia sacerdotum, provides the definitive catechetical syllabus as it was later taught. The Archbishop of Canterbury at the time and the one who promulgated the Council’s decrees, John Pecham, not only further specified the content of catechetical teaching, but he also stipulated some guidelines regarding how often it should be taught:

In quorum remedium discriminum statuendo precipimus ut quilibet sacerdos plebi presidens, quater in anno, hoc est, semel in qualibet quarta anni, die una sollemni vel pluribus, per se vel per alium exponat populo vulgariter, absque cuiuslibet subtilitatis textura fantastica, quatuordecim fidei articulos, decem mandata decalogi, duo precepta evangelii, scilicet, gemine caritatis, septem etiam opera misericordie, septem peccata capitalia, cum sua progenie, septem virtutes principales, ac septem gratie sacramenta. 47

The program is a rather ambitious one, since the whole syllabus was to be covered four times during the year, making it difficult to expound on a simple solemn day once in every quarter of the year. One might be able to read a short summary, like the Instituta, from the pulpit, but such a delivery would not be likely to bring about the desired effect of Pecham’s legislation. Like his fellow bishops, Archbishop Pecham did not merely list his catechetical syllabus, but he provided a brief summary “ne quis a predictis [sacerdotibus] per ignorantiam se excuset.” 48 This brief, rough-and-ready summary provides one- or two-sentence explanations for each item, without any “imaginative weaving of subtlety”; indeed, it is so sparse as to suggest that it was not intended as a ready set of lessons to be

47CS II, i, p. 901.
48CS II, i, p. 901.
delivered, but as the barest of foundations on which pastors were expected to build. Other than the additions of the two Gospel precepts and the seven works of mercy, Pecham’s syllabus seems less an innovation than a “restatement on a national level of the principles of a movement which was rapidly developing at the local level.”

_Ignorantia sacerdotum_ survives, however, as a most important point of reference in matters of catechetical import, especially where the discussion turned upon how much (or how little) average parishioners ought to know about their faith, as in Archbishop Arundel’s provincial legislation in 1409.

Archbishop John Thoresby of York adapted even further the established custom of including a summary of instruction along with the statutes on catechesis when he included a vernacular version of his summary with the Latin text of his statutes (1357). Both his statutes and his vernacular summary, issued under the authority of both a provincial council of the clergy and Thoresby’s own authority as metropolitan of the northern province, would have had wide circulation. These documents constitute the first occasion where a bishop’s summary appears in an approved translation, and it directly links the realm of pastoral legislation with the realm of the vernacular pastoral manual. Not only does the vernacular version prevent parish priests excusing themselves from their responsibility by a plea of ignorance, but it also provides a text which, if read aloud, could be readily understood by parishioners. A record in fragments from a letter-book containing correspondence relating to the archbishopric of York (British Library MS Cotton Galba E.x, fols. 73v-74r) requests that a certain Benedictine monk of St. Mary’s Abbey in York, John Gaytryge, who has long been thought to be the translator of the _Lay_  

---

49 Gillespie, p. 24.

50 Powell, pp. 68, 69.
Folks' Catechism, translate a document (cedula) which summarizes the necessary articles of faith, the precepts of the decalogue, “and other things.” In the letter, the Archbishop explains that the provincial council had undertaken to educate the laity in the fundamentals of the faith through the preaching of those with responsibility for pastoral care within the diocese, but because some of the clergy lacked care for their flock and did not know as much as they ought to know, a summary of the necessary items of the syllabus would be provided in the vernacular. The letter then asks Gaytryge to make the translation with all possible speed, seeking clarity and ease, rather than ornate language, seeing as the document is for informing the laity (ad laicorum informacionem). Thoresby’s summary could thus reach the average parishioner without the intervention of a faulty translation or the added complexity of a “fanciful weaving of subtleties”, and thus represents an attempt by the bishop to address his flock directly, avoiding possible corruptions due to sacerdotal ignorance. The pastoral summary issued with legislation has, in this case, ceased being merely an instrument interpreted and promulgated to the laity through the parish priest, and has become a mode of direct address to the laity.

Archbishop Thoresby’s letter states that the translation was intended “lest any matter for erring in some words touching on the foundation of the aforesaid faith (in aliquibus verbis dicte fidei fundamentum tangentibus) might be left to them,” intimating that the document would be directly quoted by parish clergy.

The text of the Lay Folks' Catechism fairly straightforwardly presents the fourteen articles of the faith, the ten commandments, the seven sacraments, the seven works of

---

51 Swanson, p. 98.

52 Swanson, pp. 98, 99.

53 Swanson, p. 98.
mercy, the seven virtues and the seven vices; the Pater Noster and the Ave Maria are conspicuously absent from the list of items covered, despite the fact that a "Wycliffite adaptation" of the text, printed in the EETS edition alongside the English text found in Thoresby's register, contains both prayers. There is considerable doubt, however, as to whether this really represents a distinct version of the catechism, as opposed to "an assemblage of diverse materials drawn together in an eclectic fashion." Although the presentation of the only edition of the Catechism proper arranges it in lines of verse, the line endings do not necessarily rhyme, nor does the text present any certain rhythm which would suggest poetry rather than prose, despite the fact that Canons Nolloth and Simmons, the editors of the text, assert that it is composed "in rude verse." The translation stays, for the most part, close to Thoresby's latin text, with a few minor expansions to fill out explanations of particular points. Thoresby's instruction required far more frequent teaching of his six catechetical topics, stating that parish priests and those with the cure of souls should instruct their parishioners in the vernacular "saltem diebus dominicis." In addition, priests were to examine both parents and children on their knowledge of the catechetical syllabus once during Lent; the English translation adds that this examination would normally occur "whan thai come to shrift," indicating that the manual and its contents were still linked with confessional practice.

Pastoral legislation concerning catechesis developed in three major stages over the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as the legislation specified the syllabus for such

---

54 On the question of this "version" of the Catechism, see Anne Hudson, "A New Look at the Lay Folks' Catechism," Viator 16 (1985), pp. 243-258. The quotation is taken from p. 257 of this same article.

55 Simmons, Thomas Frederick, and Henry Edward Nolloth, The Lay Folks' Catechism, EETS os 118 (1901), xvii. Powell (p. 72) mentions a "dispute as to whether Gaytryge wrote in unhymed verse or rhythmical prose. Without entering into the dispute, it can be said that it was variously interpreted as verse or prose in the manuscripts, though the earliest manuscripts (other than the Register) set it out as verse."
instruction, and included aids to that instruction. The Fourth Lateran Council spurred such bishops as Stephen Langton and Richard Poore to promulgate legislation regarding catechesis. Later legislation then included Latin tracts intended for the clergy, as with the tracts offered by bishops Richard Stavensby, Walter de Cantilupe, Peter Quivel, Roger de Weseham and John Pecham. In the last major development, represented by Archbishop Thoresby’s legislation, the bishop addressed both the laity and the clergy by means of a summary which could be read aloud in the vernacular. The rapid increase in numbers of literate laity may well have provided the Archbishop with readers of his text other than parish clergy; Malcolm Parkes has identified one Cambridge University Library manuscript (Ff.2.38) as an example of a fifteenth-century compilation containing, not only romances, but religious works intended “to satisfy most of the practical and intellectual requirements of a 15th-century middle-class family.” Bodleian manuscript Digby 86, from the end of the thirteenth century, is an earlier example of “a layman’s common-place book or miscellany... [which] includes prayers and devotional texts, romances, fabliaux, humorous lyrics, a game and party tricks, medical receipts for both humans and birds, prognostications and titbits of useful information.” Based on this evidence, the realm of pastoral manuals and devotional literature had already stopped being the private preserve of clergy, and had begun to form part of the leisure reading of the increasingly literate middle class. The threefold development within legislation thus involves the gradual definition of the catechetical syllabus, and the gradual definition of formulae to be used in

56 See Parkes, pp. 275-297, and also Spencer, pp. 36-41.

57 Parkes, p. 292.

teaching this syllabus, intended first for the edification of the clergy, and then, in Thoresby's statutes, for consumption by the laity (either read by the laity themselves or spoken aloud by their priests).

While the development of pastoral manuals may have specified a syllabus of instruction, it also broadened the variety of topics within the syllabus, extending it beyond those necessary for a good examination of conscience with the addition of pastoral instruction on baptism and extreme unction, along with doctrinal elements such as the gifts of the Holy Spirit and the Beatitudes. While discussion regarding how the specific contents of *The Prick of Conscience* and the *Speculum* fit within the catechetical syllabus awaits a more detailed examination of the contents of these texts a little further on, both texts fall within the larger bounds of pastoral manuals taking their origin from the pastoral legislation of the period. That they both concentrate on apocalyptic concerns as a means of bringing about conversion of life illustrates the growing interest in broader topics outside the syllabus, perhaps reflecting the interests of the newly literate classes in works which would both "edify and delight." The vernacular pastoral manual, as seen in the catechism accompanying Archbishop Thoresby's legislation, became a mode of direct address to the laity, rather than simply a sourcebook for the priest. The manual was moving beyond the realm of the clergy to address an increasingly literate laity in the vernacular; this transition from an address to the clergy to a more popular, vernacular address is what the Wycliffites used in order to disseminate their teachings rapidly among the laity they thought should most benefit from such teachings. It was at the beginning of the fifteenth century that the burgeoning movement to disseminate catechetical

---

59 Parkes, p. 292.

materials in the vernacular met the rather solid obstacle of Archbishop Thomas Arundel’s Constitutions for the Archdiocese of Canterbury.

III. Archbishop Arundel’s Constitutions of 1409 and the Distribution of Pastoral Manuals in English

Reference to Arundel’s legislation may seem irrelevant in the discussion of a text which, on the basis of the estimated date of the earliest manuscript (D), was probably compiled sometime before this legislation. There are no signs within the text itself that reveal whether the compiler knew Arundel’s legislation, such as the marks of approval given to Nicholas Love’s Myrrour of the Blessed Lyf of Jesu Christ or to The Mirror of Our Lady. The frequent quotation and translation of Scripture found in the Speculum, which was condemned by Arundel’s Constitutions, along with the date of of the earliest manuscript, indicate that the Speculum was composed sometime before the Constitutions of 1409 appeared. Arundel’s legislation is, indeed, not so much a factor in the composition of the Speculum, as in its dissemination. The suspicion of those owning vernacular religious texts which Arundel’s legislation aroused may explain the paucity of manuscript copies of the Speculum, despite the fact that it is a version of the very popular Prick of Conscience. It has been stated in recent scholarship that, as a consequence of Arundel’s legislation, fewer copies of fifteenth-century religious works circulated, whereas fourteenth-century works of the same type circulated more freely; Arundel’s legislation forced the creation of a “canon” of fourteenth-century religious works by discouraging the circulation of “dangerous” new works. A brief explanation of Arundel’s legislation, a discussion of its interpretation, and an evaluation of its

---

61 Watson, p. 831.

62 Watson, p. 834.
consequences for manuals like the *Speculum* accordingly follow.

The sixth article of Arundel's Constitutions placed heavy restrictions upon the publication of new academic works, stating that each new work not only required the approval of twelve appointed academics from Oxford or Cambridge, but that it also required the approbation of Arundel himself or his successors. The same article names, not just the works of Wyclif, but those "of anyone among his contemporaries" (*aut alium quemcunque tempore suo*), as works requiring the approval of the deputed censors. The seventh article in the same document had direct bearing upon most vernacular religious texts, since none of these usually avoided some direct reference to Scripture:

\[
\ldots \text{statuimus igitur et ordinamus, ut nemo deinceps aliquem textum sacrae scripturae auctoritate sua in linguam Anglicanam, vel aliam transferat, per viam libri, libelli, aut tractatus, nec legatur aliquis hujusmodi liber, libellus, aut tractatus jam noviter tempore dicti Johannis Wycliff, sive citra, compositus, aut in posterum componendus, in parte vel in toto, publice, vel occulte, sub majoris excommunicationis poena, quousque per loci diocesanum, seu, si res exegerit, per concilium provinciale ipsa translatio fuerit approbata: qui contra fecerit, ut fautor haeresis et erroris similiter puniatur.}^{63}
\]

The stringent procedure for the approval of a new work (described above) and of a scriptural translation (approval by the bishop, or — if the matter required it — the clergy of the province gathered in council\(^{64}\)) must have given pause to most authors. Arundel's legislation encouraged suspicion of recently composed works which contained Scriptural quotation, which might have made texts like the *Speculum*, which probably appeared sometime around the turn of the century, dangerous to read or own. Arundel's statute, however, remains vague regarding whether the words "textum sacrae scripturae" refer to a whole book of the sacred text, discrete parts of it, or to simple quotations like those which

\[63\text{Concilia, vol. 3 (London, 1737), p. 317.}\]
\[64\text{Concilia, p. 317, statutes 6 and 7.}\]
appear in the *Speculum*.

The test of any legislation is not so much in its creation, but in its interpretation and implementation, and it is the interpretation of this statute that clarifies how far-reaching was Arundel’s legislation. In this particular case, a body of interpretation exists in William Lyndwood’s *Provinciale* of 1430, composed by a principal canonist and aide to Archbishop Henry Chichele. Lyndwood interpreted Arundel’s prohibition against scriptural translation in “tracts” to extend to any words taken from the sayings of doctors or from original works for the purpose of explaining or translating the letter or the sense of Scripture into English or any other vernacular. Lyndwood’s interpretation of the seventh article of Arundel’s constitution extended the reach of this legislation to all translations of scripture regardless of length — whole books, or simple sentences. Since most, if not all vernacular catechetical treatises contained at least some references to scripture, such treatises would fall within the scope of Lyndwood’s interpretation. This rather broad interpretation of Arundel’s statute manifests the state of English religious writing after Arundel’s *Constitutions*: vernacular catechetical instruction, endorsed by Archbishop Thoresby in the fourteenth century, had now become possible evidence for heresy in the fifteenth. The common and frequent practice of quoting scripture in texts like *The Prick of Conscience* or *The Speculum* might have made ownership of such texts

---


67 Hudson, “English Heresy”, p. 149.
grounds for suspicion of heresy: “If the evidence of Lollard trials is to be trusted, it remained dangerous throughout the century for those beneath the ranks of the gentry and the urban elite to be known as a reader of texts as diverse as The Canterbury Tales, The Prick of Conscience, Dives et Pauper, and The Mirror of Sinners.” Anne Hudson lists a number of incidents where the knowledge of such things as the Pater, Ave, or the Creed in English provided evidence for convictions of heresy; she also cites long-standing suspicion of the Prick of Conscience in heresy trials in the fifteenth century. It is unclear, however, whether the authorities involved in such heresy trials considered possession of the Prick of Conscience as evidence which confirmed suspicions already held, or as initial evidence of heresy. Considering that one copy of the PC (London, British Library, Harley 1731, ff. 1-133v) which was surrendered to the authorities survived inspection, it is unlikely that ownership of the text itself was considered incriminating.

The air of suspicion attached to the Prick of Conscience, an extremely popular text, may have affected the Speculum by association, since the Speculum shares the same general structure, and many of the same lines. The suspicion of vernacular translations of Scripture, and the strict interpretation of the ecclesiastical legislation relating to translations, may provide another angle on the question of the scarcity of Speculum manuscripts, beyond labelling the poem as a mere second-rate version of another text. The Speculum’s survival in so few extant manuscripts could indeed be a testimony to poor

68 Watson, p. 831.


70 Premature Reformation, p. 485.

reader response for this radically abbreviated version of a much more popular text; it could also indicate that the Speculum was considered a somewhat risky text to own, considering the climate engendered by Arundel’s legislation and fostered by Lyndwood’s authoritative interpretations of this legislation. The quotations from and translations of Scripture, along with the anticlerical verses in the Speculum (ll. 525-566; 1867-1884), might have roused suspicion among the authorities. This particular line of argument runs up against the fact that many copies of the Prick of Conscience were made in the fifteenth century, after Arundel’s legislation, but it does point to possibilities, beyond arguments about the aesthetics of the text, as to why the Speculum, as a version of the Prick, did not enjoy as large a readership as its parent text. Conclusions regarding the popularity or unpopularity of the Speculum cannot, clearly, rest simply on a twentieth-century aesthetic adjudication of the text, but must take into account the tenor of the times in light of Archbishop Arundel’s 1409 Constitutions.

IV. Significant Features of Catechetical Method in the Late Middle Ages: The Speculum huius vite and the Pastoral Programme

The emergence of pastoral manuals within a pastoral programme outlined by episcopal legislation indicates that these manuals laid claim to some degree of usefulness within that programme. The modern temptation would be to categorize pastoral manuals and related catechetical materials as defined within the strict limits of their proper use for either preaching or teaching; medieval catechetical resources, however, fit rather uneasily into such strict disjunctions. Vincent Gillespie has pointed to the statute of Richard Poore which asks each parish priest to gather together the children of the parish and instruct

---

72 Watson, pp. 834, 835.
them in the rudiments of the faith\textsuperscript{73} as one indication (among many) that pastoral manuals were used in other catechetical contexts, not solely in preaching or in the confessional. Medieval pastoral manuals elude categorization in terms of utility mainly because episcopal legislation did not restrict catechetical training to the liturgy, the confessional, or the parish grammar school. Whilst early legislation points to an integral, intelligent confession of parishioners once a year as the intended end of teaching the catechetical syllabus, not any of the extant episcopal legislation (with the possible exception of William de Blois’ statutes for the diocese of Worcester in 1229) stipulates the confessional as the sole place where catechetical instruction was to take place. The Fourth Lateran Council not only provided an impetus for catechetical instruction by enjoining yearly confession upon all the members of the church, but it also repeated decrees from the Third Lateran Council (of 1179) for the institution of schools in major cathedrals.\textsuperscript{74} The Fourth Lateran Council also elaborated upon the Third Lateran Council’s educational decree by specifying that not only cathedrals, but all churches capable of making such provision were to employ a master to teach grammar “ac aliis instruat iuxta posse.”\textsuperscript{75} This concern for formal teaching alongside pastoral instruction appears in the Register of Bishop Grandisson of Exeter, who complains that the students in the grammar school are insufficiently instructed, and pushed on to pagan classics before they have mastered an understanding of the Lord’s Prayer, Ave, and the Creed.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{73}Richard Poore, Statutes of Salisbury I (1217 X 1219) CS II, i, p. 61 — quoted above in the section dealing with Poore’s statutes; Gillespie, Doctrina p. 36.

\textsuperscript{74}See constitution 18 of Lateran III in Conc. Oec. Dec. p. 196; see also constitution 11 of Lateran IV on p. 216 of the same.

\textsuperscript{75}Conc. Oec. Dec. p. 216.

This last comment is remarkable because it makes clear the expectations which at least one fourteenth-century bishop had of grammar-school instruction. The similarity between Grandisson’s proposed curriculum for grammar schools and the pastoral curriculum illustrates how blurred was the line between pastoral instruction and formal classroom teaching, and it serves as a warning against pigeonholing pastoral manuals into the categories of utility for either preaching or teaching. 77 Any discussion of the use made of manuals like the Prick of Conscience and the Speculum huius vite must therefore consider both of these important tasks within the cura animarum.

But before the particular contexts of the Speculum within the apostolic tasks of preaching and teaching pastoralia are examined, we need first to identify how the Speculum fits (and some of the ways it does not fit) generally within the pastoral curriculum and pastoral life described above. Catechesis in the episcopal legislation usually encompassed some treatment of the Pater Noster, the Ave, the Creed, the ten commandments, the two gospel precepts, the seven vices and virtues, and the seven sacraments of grace. Clearly, as a text concentrating on the Last Things which tends more to moral exhortation than to discourse on doctrine, the Speculum falls within that category of texts (discussed earlier) which contained some elements of the catechetical curriculum, but which moved beyond the strictly penitential aspects of that curriculum. Unlike the works which mostly dealt with vices and virtues (e.g. Fasciculus Morum) and those which dealt with several elements in the syllabus in a systematic order (e.g. Handlyng Synne, The Aȝenbite of Inwyt, The Lay Folks’ Catechism, The Book of Vices and Virtues) the Speculum, like the Prick of Conscience, “treats a variety of topics and barely touches on

77 “By grammar one not only learned one’s faith, by construing its formulations, but, in addition, one was enabled to expound it to others.” Spencer, p. 199, commenting on Grandisson’s Register entry referred to above.
the Sins,” and, in its style, is probably most like the *Speculum Vite* of William of Nassington. The *Speculum huius vite*, as laid out in lines 161-176 quoted at the beginning of this chapter, imparts information concerning the end and goal of life as a means of inspiring conversion of life. Unlike popular penitential manuals, the *Speculum* seems more concerned with moral exhortation than with communicating knowledge necessary for an integral confession. The poem contains only two references to “shriving” oneself (ll. 942 and 2308), and both of these mention the sacrament as an effective means of avoiding eternal punishments. Neither passage concerns the technical aspects of making a confession. The *Speculum* thus subordinates the enterprise of encouraging virtue and discouraging vice found in most other pastoral manuals to a more general exhortation to the reformation of one’s life in preparation for a good death. The *Speculum* concentrates on charitable and penitential action, supplemented by confession, as a means to escape eternal damnation and come to eternal joy. This is not to say that other pastoral manuals ignore the notion of conversion of life, since they often deal with the avoidance of vice, and with the cultivation of the virtues opposed to vice. Whereas most other manuals discuss such things within the context of particular vices and virtues, the *Prick of Conscience* and the *Speculum* direct one’s attentions to life’s eternal rewards and punishments as a goad (*stimulus* / “pricke”) to one’s conscience and the reform of one’s moral life. The traditional treatments of the vices and virtues, the *Prick of Conscience*, and the *Speculum* all seek the same goal — conversion of life — but their respective means to that goal differ, perhaps more in emphasis than in kind.

78 Descriptive Guide, p. 3. See also Allen, p. 372.

79 This emphasis upon action and activity (not to the exclusion of sacramental means of grace, but entailing a lack of emphasis on confession) marks out the *Speculum* as distinct from the *Prick of Conscience*; this distinction will be discussed at greater length in the next chapter.
This general difference between the Speculum and other pastoral manuals does not preclude the inclusion of some elements of the pastoral syllabus; in fact, the Speculum goes one step further than the Prick of Conscience in this respect by the addition of one more treatise in the catechetical syllabus (on the ten commandments; see II. 403-580). The seven deadly sins are listed (II. 1175-1184) as part of a discussion of the third pain of purgatory, but they do not receive the comprehensive explication or treatment found in texts such as Fasciculus Morum (which deals just with vices and virtues), Handlyng Synne (II.2989-858280), the Somme le roi tradition (Azenbite of Inwy,81 Book of Vices and Virtues82), or in the brief summaries accompanying pastoral legislation (e.g. Pecham’s Council of Lambeth in 128183, The Lay Folks’ Catechism II. 380-56084). The seven works of mercy appear as a criterion for judgement at the end of the portion of the text on the Day of Doom (II. 1859-2022), but, like the treatment of the seven deadly sins, they do not receive the ordered explication found in other manuals (e.g. Book of Vices and Virtues,85 Speculum Christiani,86 — although they receive a fairly cursory rehearsal in the Lay Folks’ Catechism, II. 348-363). Of these three elements in the pastoral programme, only the treatise on the commandments receives the attention it usually gets within other

80These line enumerations are taken from the following edition: Robert of Brunne’s “Handlyng Synne”, ed. Frederick J. Furnivall EETS os 119 (1901) and 123 (1903).
83CS II, ii, pp. 902, 903.
84See the version from Abp. Thoresby’s Register, named text “T” in The Lay Folks’ Catechism, ed. Thomas Frederick Simmons and Henry Edward Nolloth, EETS os 118 (1901).
85The Book of Vices and Virtues, pp. 204-220.
catechetical texts. The other elements of the legislative syllabus which appear in the *Speculum* thus play a secondary, supportive role to material more properly covering one of the *novissima*, or Last Things. This subordination of traditional catechetical treatises to topics of interest outside the traditional pastoral syllabus places the *Speculum* among those texts such as the *Cursor Mundi* and *Lay Folks' Mass Book*, discussed earlier, which manifest a growing interest in topics beyond the confines of traditional catechesis. The very presence of such catechetical items as the seven deadly sins and the seven works of mercy, however, provides a link to more conventional pastoral manuals.

The links between the *Speculum* and pastoral manuals (as opposed to narrative texts for general edification and delight such as the *Cursor Mundi*) may seem rather tenuous, considering how relatively few customary catechetical topics appear in the poem. Two other all-pervasive elements of the *Speculum*’s structure and content, however, clearly mark it out as a text within the pastoral manual tradition. The division of the text into seven parts and the subdivision of these parts by means of series of enumerated lists constitute the first of these two significant elements. The first part of the *Speculum* contains an invocation to the Trinity (ll. 1-210), a treatise on the human condition (ll. 211-420) which is further subdivided into parts dealing with the three ages of man (the “begynnyng” ll. 269-314; the “mydwart” ll. 315-374; the “endyng” ll. 375-398), and a treatise on the ten commandments (ll. 421-580). The second part, on worldly distractions, lacks firm subdivisions, although one could discern three general thematic divisions therein: love of worldly things is concupiscence (ll. 581-634); covetousness and the impermanence of the world’s goods (ll. 635-714); pride and vanity of certain kinds of fashionable apparel (ll. 716-822). The third part, on death, lists four reasons why one should dread death (ll. 869-882), and then proceeds to explicate each reason (ll. 883-
1072). Something similar occurs in the fourth part, where the seven pains of purgatory are listed and explained at length (ll. 1137-1264). The fifth part contains a list of the eight tokens of the doom (ll. 1351-1372) which receive a more detailed study (ll. 1561-2022) after an excursus on Antichrist in ll. 1374-1560. The Accusers at the day of doom form the sixth token of the day of doom, and are themselves listed and described in further detail within the discussion of the tokens of the doom (ll. 1759-1774). The sixth part of the poem lists and explains the twelve pains of hell (ll. 2050-2298), whilst the seventh part details the seven bodily (ll. 2355-2450) and seven spiritual joys (ll. 2451-2666) of heaven. This use of verse "tracts" placed together in a single work as a pastoral reference for both instructors and preachers hearkens back to the Versarius of William de Montibus, a late twelfth-century collection of verses organized by topic under alphabetical heads, presumably for the convenience of preachers, writers, and teachers.⁸⁷ The Liber Floretus and the Peniteas cito, two standard texts for schools in the fourteenth century discussed a little further on, likewise contain separable doctrinal "tracts" in mnemonic verse.⁸⁸ Separate tracts or "compartments" in pastoral texts appear in the separate treatments of each virtue and vice in the Fasciculus Morum, the separate tabulae of the Speculum Christiani, the separate elements laid out in the introduction and developed in the text of Handlyng Synne. This compartmentalization of topics within each major division of the Speculum makes the whole rather flexible: the parts, although part of a larger scheme, lend themselves to use either as parts within a sermon, or as digestible treatises for formal instruction.

---

⁸⁷ Goering, pp. 73, 389-397. See also the incomplete transcription of the text on pp. 399-471 of the same work.

⁸⁸ See Liber Floretus, ed. Árpád Orbán, Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch: Beih. 16 (Kastellaun/Hunsrück: Aloys Henn, 1979) and the edition of the Peniteas cito in Goering, pp. 107-138.
The second significant element which suggests that the *Speculum* would fit easily within the pastoral sphere involves the frequent quotation of Scripture and authorities within the text. In this respect, the *Speculum huius vite* resembles the *Speculum Christiani*, a text which is, in the main, a compilation of authoritative quotations marshalled under particular heads or *tabulae*. The *Speculum Christiani* identifies these authorities by means of an attribution in a different script and joins them together with short linking passages, so that the whole presents itself as a compendium of authorities on particular topics, ready to hand for quick consultation and apt for pastoral use. The authorities quoted in the *Speculum huius vite*, like those in the *Speculum Christiani*, are marked out by means of a different script in B, and by means of underlining in D. If the text does not identify the author of a quotation (a fairly rare occurrence, it must be said), then the marginalia generally provide the necessary information in both manuscripts. The use of Latin in the quotations of the *Speculum huius vite* alongside English translations follows the pattern set out in the *Prick of Conscience*, and presumably serves the purpose of providing reliable translations of authorities for the "lewed" whilst evincing original source material to quell the doubts or concerns of any critical "lered" readers. The inclusion of Latin quotations could also serve the custom at the time to use Latin quotations in sermons: "There can be no doubt that English preachers did customarily regale their audiences with incomprehensible bits of Latin, and not just with the translations which were then supplied. This is attested by the variations on the common

---

89 See *Speculum Christiani: a Middle English Religious Treatise of the 14th Century*, ed. Gustaf Holmstedt, *EETS* 182 (1933). Most of the manuscripts appear to have distinguished the names of *auctores* with red underlining; see the descriptions in the editorial introduction, pp. xix-cxxix. The plate of Brit. Mus. MS. Harleian 6580 fol. 8r. between pages 24 and 25 gives an example of the use of a different script and underlining to distinguish the names of authors from the rest of the text.

90 The same practice appears in sermons; see Spencer, p. 56.
formula which follows Latin quotations, ‘that is to say (in English) (to your understanding).’ The quotation of authorities is as old as the academic enterprise itself, so the quotations could indicate the use of the Speculum within the sphere of personal or formal instruction as well as preaching.

The treatment of the Four Last Things in the Prick of Conscience and the Speculum corresponds to another pastoral concern expressed in the legislation discussed earlier: training and preparation for a good death. The many injunctions to teach the baptismal formula to laypeople in order to provide this necessary sacrament in the event of imminent death, and the further encouragement to approach the sacrament of extreme unction contained in Poore’s Statutes for the diocese of Salisbury illustrate a concern for proximate and sacramental preparation for death. Although it must be said that neither the Speculum nor the Prick of Conscience contains references to extreme unction, the theme of prudence before death, particularly in conversion of life and the cultivation of the virtues, falls within the general pastoral concern of preparation for death. Other pastoral manuals of the period contain matter relating to preparation for death, an ars moriendi, similar to elements in the Speculum. The Book of Vices and Virtues, for example, contains a whole section teaching “his craft . . . to lyue wel and dye wel,” with elements analogous to those found in the Speculum: the theme of being born to die (Book

\[\text{91} \text{Spencer, p. 56.}\]

\[\text{92} \text{See CS II, i, Statutes of Winchester I by Peter des Roches (1224) p. 136, statute 66; Synodal Statutes for an English diocese (1222x1225), p. 140, statute 2; Constitutiones Cuiusdam Episcopi (1225x1230), p. 182; Statutes of Worcester II of William de Blois (1229) p. 180, statute 63 on baptism; Alexander Stavensby’s Statutes of Coventry and Lichfield (1224x1237), p. 214, statute 26; William Briwere’s Statutes of Exeter I (1225x1237), p. 233, statute 15.}\]

\[\text{93} \text{See CS II, i, Statutes of Salisbury I, p. 90, statute 93; see also Synodal Statutes for an English diocese (1222x1225), p. 146, statutes 36 and 37, for another example of statutes on extreme unction.}\]

\[\text{94} \text{The Book of Vices and Virtues, p. 69; the section on dying well occurs on pp. 68-73.}\]
p. 69; *Speculum* ll. 269-314); the distinction between different kinds of death (*Book* pp. 70; *Speculum* ll. 823-868); the fiery purgation in Purgatory (*Book* pp. 71-72; *Speculum* ll. 1197-1214); a list of the pains of hell (*Book* p. 71; *Speculum* ll. 2050-2298) and of the joys of heaven (*Book* p. 73; *Speculum* ll. 2355-2666); and, finally, an admonition to contemplate the last things (*Book* pp. 70, 71; *Speculum* ll. 161-176). The *Speculum Christiani* likewise contains a discussion of death (pp. 48-52), general judgement (pp. 52-57), a meditation on the damned (pp. 204, 205), the joys of heaven (pp. 118-120), and the pains of hell (p. 121). The *Speculum huius vite* also includes more traditional elements in the catechetical syllabus, stressing the keeping of the commandments (ll. 421-580), the practice of the works of mercy (ll. 1837-1866), and personal penance (ll. 1265-1286) as ways to avoid the horrors of an unprovided death. Takami Matsuda includes the *Prick of Conscience* among examples of the “literature of pragmatic prudence before death”, and, judging by the foregoing examples, the *Speculum* also fits within that category.\(^95\)

Another indication of the intended use of this text arises in the consideration of the ownership and the other contents of the manuscripts. Manuscript D contains references which suggest lay ownership (the name “John Mascy” appears frequently in the marginalia in D), which in turn suggests the text’s use as a manual for profitable private reading. Evidence in some *Prick of Conscience* manuscripts, however, indicates ownership by the clergy,\(^96\) and, considering the derivative nature of the *Speculum* and its

\(^{95}\) Takami Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory in Middle English Didactic Poetry* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1997), pp. 174-233; see p. 194 for the reference to the *Prick of Conscience*.

\(^{96}\) The *Descriptive Guide* lists the following manuscripts as carrying such evidence: Cambridge, University Library Dd.12.69 (C); London, British Library, Additional 32578; London, Lambeth Palace, 260; London, Lambeth Palace, 491; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson poetry 175; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Lyell empt. 6. Extracts appear in the following manuscripts, which likewise contain evidence of ownership by parish clergy: London, British Library, Royal 17 C.xvii; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C.285. One Latin version, Cambridge, University Library, Dd.4.50 also contains evidence of ownership by a parish priest.
many similarities to the *Prick of Conscience*, we cannot rule out the use of the *Speculum* within a pastoral context. The inscription of ownership in manuscript C, one of the *Prick of Conscience* manuscripts most closely related to the text of the *Speculum*, indicates that it was given to the parish church of Shermanbury in Sussex; the inclusion within C of the *Manuale Sacerdotum Parochialium* (fols. 25r-34v) and other Latin texts of pastoral interest (the *Dieta Salutis* of Willelmus de Lancia, O.F.M., and some mnemonic verses from Richard of Wetheringsett’s *Qui bene praesunt*) testify to the pastoral use of the text as well. The presence of Latin texts, and in particular the *Speculum Christiani*, in B may indicate clerical ownership at some stage — assuming that the “Dominus Gylbart Barton”, named in B as the owner of the manuscript, was a member of the clergy, and not an educated member of the aristocracy, and that the booklet in which he is named was bound, at an early stage, to the one containing the *Speculum*.97 The devotional nature, as opposed to directly catechetical content, of most of the other items in manuscripts B and D does not distinguish either manuscript as particularly “clerical”, since, as has been mentioned above, the new literate classes also read material akin to the English devotional texts found in both manuscripts. On the other hand, the inclusion of material, found only in the *Speculum*, on the need for clergy to be humble (ll. 525-562), and on the criterion of judgement at the doom for parish priests (ll. 1874-1884), hardly seems appropriate if the text was intended only for a lay readership. Archbishop Arundel’s *Constitutions* of 1409 legislated that preachers ought not preach about the sins of the clergy to laity, on pain of bitter punishment from the local ordinary *(aliaquin sic praedicans secundum qualitatem*  

97 For the use of the title *Dominus* for a member of the clergy, see the entry for *dominus* in the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, ed. R.E. Latham, D.R. Howlett, et. al. (London: British Academy, 1975 -).
delicti, per loci ordinarium canonice et acriter puniatur\textsuperscript{98}). The composition of the
 Speculum was probably not influenced by Arundel’s legislation, but subsequent owners of
 the Speculum would have been answerable for its contents.

One last warning remains as we move on to consider particular pastoral contexts
for the Speculum huius vite. The wide variety of uses made of the Prick of Conscience\textsuperscript{99}
ought to caution against too rigid an interpretation of the use of the Speculum. The
conclusion drawn by Robert E. Lewis and Angus McIntosh concerning the use of the
Prick of Conscience could just as easily be applied to the Speculum:

\textldots the fact that some lines [in other Middle English works and in a
stained-glass window] are taken from the Prick of Conscience indicates
that the poem was considered a storehouse of information to which a
medieval reader could go for various kinds of religious lore and from
which a medieval writer could borrow as he saw fit.\textsuperscript{100}

The “compartmentalized” nature of the Speculum and its frequent quotation of
authoritative sources make it just as much a storehouse as its “parent” text. If we consider
the text less as a tool circumscribed by a certain use, and more as a treasury which
someone could plunder at will for any number of uses, we will avoid one particular pitfall
in considerations of the utility of this text.

A. Possible Use of the Speculum huius vite in Preaching

Material in verse for the use of preaching is amply illustrated in a number of

\textsuperscript{98}Concilia, vol. 3, p. 316; statute 3 of the Constitutions.

\textsuperscript{99}The poem appears in four versions other than the Speculum, a number of extracts, as a source for
some of the material in the Stimulus Consciencie Minor, the Speculum Ecclesie, the Desert of Religion, and
some of its verses appear in a medieval stained-glass window. All of these uses are detailed in the
Descriptive Guide, p. 13. The stained-glass window is described in E.A. Gee, “The Painted Glass of All

\textsuperscript{100}Descriptive Guide, p. 14.
different studies of medieval preaching, and appears in sermon collections in Middle English with the arrival on the scene of the *Ormulum*, the *Northern Homily Cycle* and the *South English Legendary*. Siegfried Wenzel, in his study of English verses in the *Fasciculus Morum*, lists at least nineteen sermon manuscripts containing a “significant number of English verses,” and makes reference to thirty-one other manuscripts of *materia praedicabilis* containing English verse. English verse in sermons appears not only as a mnemonic device, but also for translations of liturgical hymns, for summarizing an exemplum, for quoting popular proverbs, and for drawing structural divisions within sermons. The existence of whole sermons in verse in such texts as the *South English Legendary* and the *Ormulum*, may suggest that some priests preached sermons completely in verse, but the prologue to the *South English Legendary* implies that it was envisioned as a pious response to the popularity of romances in English:

```plaintext
Men wilneþ muche to hure telle ð of bataille of kynge
And of kniþtes þat hardy were ðat muchedel is lesynge
Wo so wilneþ muche to hure ð tales of suche þinge
Hardi batailles he may hure ð here þat nis no lesinge
Of apostles & martirs ðat hardy kniþtes were
Þat studeuast were in bataille ð & ne fleide noþt for fere
Þat soffrede þat luþer men ð al quik hare lymes totere
```

This series of sermons, arranged in their sequence from the *Sanctorale*, may have suited any number of uses, both in the pulpit or privately as a pious alternative to romantic verse.

---


103 Wenzel, *Verses*, pp. 69-86.

It is difficult to tell for certain whether the verse sermons in any of these collections were preached \textit{in toto}, or whether they were intended as a resource in the memorization or construction of sermons.\footnote{See Spencer, pp. 1-19 (especially p. 9) concerning the uncertainties which caution against overhasty assumptions regarding the use made of sermon collections and sermon manuscripts.} The beginning of the \textit{Cursor Mundi}, a text not principally intended for preaching, likewise invites readers to turn from the morally dubious qualities of ancient heroes to the safer ground of biblical history.\footnote{\textit{Cursor Mundi}, vii parts, ed. Richard Morris \textit{EETS os 57} (1874), part i, II. 1-270.} The willingness of preachers to reach into the realm of popular song for a text to preach on (as in the thirteenth-century sermon in Trinity College Cambridge MS B. 1. 45, fols. 41v-42r, which takes as its text the song "Atte wrastlinge mi lemmen iches/ and atte ston kasting I him for les") attests to the ability of preachers to quote popular culture for their own purposes.

The \textit{Prick of Conscience} and the \textit{Speculum huius vite} clearly contain \textit{materia praedicabilis} taken in the broader sense of reference material that could serve as the foundation, or as structural elaboration, for a homily. G.R. Owst, in his study of medieval preaching, quotes from a number of medieval sermon collections, and intimates that the \textit{novissima} loom large among sermon topics.\footnote{Owst, pp. 334-344.} H. Leith Spencer, in her more recent study of late medieval English preaching, refers to the frequent preaching of the \textit{novissima} and the works of mercy as one example of how \textit{pastoralia} entered into \textit{de tempore} sermons:

"For example, the Second Sunday of Advent (‘Erunt signa in sole’, Luke 21:25) was by long custom an opportunity to remind the congregation of the rigours of the Day of Judgement. Since souls will be judged by their performance or neglect of the works of mercy, a rehearsal of their requirements was timely: it is, indeed, a commonplace of Advent preaching. The same subject was also appropriate on the Ninth Sunday after Trinity (‘Homo quidam erat dives’, the parable of the unjust steward, Luke 16:1), or on any of the many other occasions when Doomsday might
come under review."  

Sermon 19 from Woodburn O. Ross’ edition, *Middle English Sermons from MS Royal 18 B. xxiii*, is a sermon for the first Sunday in Advent with some matter concerning the last judgement. Sermon 40 in the same edition contains material which echoes passages from the *Prick of Conscience* and the *Speculum*: the terror of the sight of devils (*Speculum*, ll. 1143-1154; Ross p. 240, ll. 26-36), the drinking of fire and brimstone in hell (*Speculum*, ll. 2173-2176d; Ross, p. 241, ll. 1-4), the covering of worms (*Speculum* ll. 385-390; Ross, p. 241, ll. 6-11). A latin quotation on the terror associated with the contemplation of the judgement from the same manuscript appears in a slightly different form in the *Speculum* (found in ll. 1576a-1584 of the *Speculum*, attributed to St. Jerome, and in Ross, p. 317, ll. 22-24 attributed to St. Bernard). Owst cites several sermon manuscripts containing lists of the fifteen signs before doomsday (which get reduced to eight in the *Speculum*, ll. 1351-1372; ll. 1561-2022). The quotation “homo nihil aliud est quam sperma fetidum,/ saccus stercorum, et esca vermium,” from the *Meditationes piissimae de cognitione humanae conditionis* appears, not only in the *Prick of Conscience* and the *Speculum* (ll. 

---

108 Spencer, p. 209.
109 *EETS* 209 (1940).
110 The quotation in Ross’ edition is “Semper diem illum extremum considerans toto corpore contremesco,” whereas the text in the *Speculum* reads “Quociens diem illum considera toto corpore contremesco siue enim comedo siue bibo siue aliquis aliud facio semper videtur illa terribilis tuba sonare in auribus meis surgite mortui venite ad iudicium.”
112 Auctor incertus (Bernardus Claraevallensis?), “Meditationes piissimae de cognitione humanae conditionis”, *PL* vol. 184, col. 485-508. The quotation in *PL* reads “Nihil aliud est homo quam sperma fetidum, saccus stercorum, cibus vermium.” According to Rosemary Woolf, the text is “now known to be by William of Tournai”; see *The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 76.
322 a-b), but in two sermon manuscripts listed by Owst.\textsuperscript{113} Summaries of sermons given in Spencer’s study show parallels, at least in general topics, to some passages in the *Speculum*: a sermon in MS Bodley 806 retails the pains of hell\textsuperscript{114}; a sermon in Bodleian MS Rawlinson C. 751 lists reasons why bodily death should be kept in mind, and it also lists reasons why death is to be dreaded. An account of the doom and ten pains of hell occur in the same sermon.\textsuperscript{115} The “Sermon of Dead Men” found in Manchester, John Rylands Library MS Eng 412 and Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson C.751, makes reference to the last things as it proceeds to expand upon Ecclesiasticus 7:36: *Memorare novissima tua*.\textsuperscript{116} The sermon “In Die Sepulture Alicuius Mortui” in John Mirk’s *Festial* contains a reflection on the corruption of a dead body which is reminiscent of the *Speculum*, ll. 375-398,\textsuperscript{117} and the Advent Sunday sermon contains an account of the doom, replete with fifteen signs of the doom which in some respects resemble the eight found in the *Speculum* ll. 1351-1372.\textsuperscript{118} Thomas Wimbledon’s sermon *Redde rationem villicationis tue* likewise gives a systematic account of the signs before judgement (ll. 824-993 of the sermon\textsuperscript{119}), relating them to the “seven seals” mentioned in Rev. 6. The nature of the judgement itself receives some attention in Wimbledon’s sermon as well (ll.

\textsuperscript{113} London, British Library Harley 45, fols. 112v and 106v; Lincoln Cathedral Library A.6.2, fols. 31 and 121. Owst, p. 341, n.2.

\textsuperscript{114} Spencer, p. 350.

\textsuperscript{115} Spencer, pp. 354-358.


\textsuperscript{119} All line references to this text come from the following edition: *Wimbledon’s Sermon: Redde Rationem Villicationis Tue*, ed. Ione Kemp Knight (Pittsburgh, Pa.: Duquesne University Press, 1967).
994-1090), replete with a section on the body which Christ will have at the doom (ll. 1029-1035; Speculum II. 1685-1758), and a few brief sentences on the punishment given for the deadly sins (ll. 1075-1090; Speculum II. 1175-1184 — deadly sins; ll. 2050-2298 — pains of hell). The sermon for the Second Sunday of Advent in the Northern Homily Cycle also contains the fifteen signs before doomsday and an account of the kind of body Christ will have when he judges the damned (Northern Homily Cycle, ll. 785-878).\textsuperscript{120} The frequent quotation of scripture in the Speculum, with accompanying short translations and explications, and the common currency of some of its contents within manuals and materials for sermons as described above, indicate that the Speculum would be a profitable reference for medieval preaching.

B. Use of the Speculum huius vite in Pastoral Instruction

Medieval classroom instruction, particularly at the grammar and song school level, incorporated elements of form and substance which correspond to the verse structure and the contents of the Speculum. Material of catechetical import within grammar school study has been mentioned already in the example drawn from the Register of John Grandisson, bishop of Exeter. Education in primary schools concentrated, first upon the alphabet, but then upon learning prayers, usually from a primer: "The primer was a religious miscellany containing the basic prayers and elements of the faith, and the more simple liturgical devotions for the laity to follow, such as the hours of the Virgin Mary. These primers often began with the alphabet, thus serving in effect as a textbook of elementary education, for there are several indications that the learning of the basic

prayers followed the mastery of the alphabet.”\textsuperscript{121} The Floretus, a basic grammar-school text in use by the beginning of the fourteenth century,\textsuperscript{122} illustrates how formal instruction in grammar schools (the next stage after education in the primer) imparted catechetical knowledge. Its six constituent parts treat of all the topics listed in the usual catechetical syllabus, and a few more: chapters one through five cover, in consecutive order, the Creed (ll. 21-58), the Ten Commandments (ll. 59-80), the Seven Deadly Sins (ll. 81-352), the Seven Sacraments (ll. 353-532), and the Virtues (ll. 533-1046).\textsuperscript{123} The sixth chapter has much in common with the Speculum, since it describes the way to die well (ll. 1047-1094), the pains of hell (ll. 1095-1114), the pains of purgatory (ll. 1115-1123), and the joys of heaven (ll. 1124-1157). Cartula (otherwise known as \textit{De contemptu mundi}, or, in its Patrologia Latina edition, \textit{Carmen paraeneticum ad Rainaldum}), another of the series of texts included among the standard Octo Auctores used in grammar schools after about 1300\textsuperscript{124}, contains some thematic parallels to parts one to three of the Speculum on human nature, the world, and death. It contrasts the passing things of the temporal order with the eternal rewards (or punishments) of the next, advocating repentance now rather than at some time when it might be too late:

\begin{center}
Nunc locus est flendi, locus est peccata luendi
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{121} Nicholas Orme, \textit{English Schools in the Middle Ages} (London: Methuen, 1973), p. 62. Orme goes on to cite examples from school foundations which indicate the basic curriculum of such schools.

\textsuperscript{122} Orme, p. 104, n. 1.

\textsuperscript{123} see \textit{Liber Floretus}, ed. Árpád Orbán, \textit{Mittellateinischen Jahrbuch: Beih. 16} (Kastellaun/Hunsrück: Aloys Henn, 1979), pp. 56-58 for a table of contents. All line numbers to this poem are taken from this edition, which seems to be the only recent edition accessible. It has the distinct disadvantage of being transcribed from a single manuscript.

\textsuperscript{124} Besides the Floretus and Cartula, the other elements of the Octo Auctores were the Liber Parabolarum, the Tobias by Matthew of Vendôme, Aesop’s Fables, the Catonis Disticha, the Eclogue of Theodulos, and one which will be discussed further on, the Peniteas cito of William de Montibus. Orme, p. 104, n. 1.
Postea gaudebit qui nunc sua crimina flebit:
Jam jam laetetur quia gaudia summa meretur. ¹²⁵

The spirit of *contemptus mundi* which runs throughout the work resembles that which
runs through the *Speculum*, and a rather stern evaluation of high fashion in the *Cartula*
(*Resplendens vestis, quae moribus obstat honestis*) finds an (admittedly inexact) analogue
in lines 716-822 of the *Speculum* which criticize trendy fashions. The *Peniteas cito*, a
tract on confession (or, one should say, a collection of mnemonic verses on various
aspects of penance¹²⁶) which, like *Cartula* and the *Liber Floretus*, formed part of the
classroom reading for most students after the beginning of the fourteenth century, contains
an emphasis upon penance (*Peniteas cito* ll. 124-134) and on the works of mercy
(*Peniteas cito* ll. 136-147) which is echoed (albeit distantly) in the *Speculum* (ll. 1265-
1286; ll. 1837-1866). The standard school texts thus incorporated much material
analogous to matters discussed in the *Speculum* and the *Prick of Conscience*.

This is not to say that either the *Prick of Conscience* or the *Speculum* formed part
of any formal classroom reading; the predominance of English in the *Prick of Conscience*
and the *Speculum* makes it unlikely that either was used, as the *Floretus*, the *Peniteas
cito*, and the *Cartula* were, within the grammar school curriculum. Yet the similarity to
contemporary classroom texts, along with its verse format, suggest the use of the
*Speculum* in teaching contexts beyond the confessional or the pulpit. Verse as a common
mnemonic device in formal instruction appears not only in the preaching tags mentioned

¹²⁵ Auctor incertus (Bernardus Claraevallensis?) “Carmen paraeneticum ad Rainaldum,” *PL* 184
(1859) cols. 1307. This edition of the poem contains no line numbers, so references can only be made to
column numbers.

¹²⁶ See the edition of the *Peniteas cito* in Goering, pp. 107-138. See the introduction to the
*Peniteas cito*, p. 108 for a discussion of how the work came to be seen as a single poem rather than as a
series “of brief verse-units, only a few lines long, that served as the basis for a scholastic exposition.”
earlier and the classroom texts mentioned above, but also in formal grammar texts like the
*Doctrinale* of Alexander de Villa Dei, and the *Grecismus* of Évrard of Béthune.\(^\text{127}\) Major
texts of theology also appeared in verse versions, such as the *De sacramentis christianae fidei* of Hugh of St. Victor.\(^\text{128}\) The simple four-stress verse of the *Speculum* and its
separable treatises would make it easy to assign digestible portions for study and
memorization. The sing-song rhythm of the verse and its couplets would make it simple
for illiterate students to memorize by chanted repetition. Like many other pastoral
manuals, the *Speculum* shares much with formal classroom texts and methodology, which
in turn would make it an excellent resource for individual or group teaching.

**C. Use of the *Speculum* in Lay Private Reading**

In his study of the wide-ranging use of pastoral manuals in the parish context,
Gillespie mentions a developing taste “for handbooks among the laity, and the evidence of
free movement of pastoral manuals between clergy and laity in the fifteenth century.”\(^\text{129}\)
He cites as examples of this the *Tractatus de modo confitendi* of the schoolmaster John
Drury, *Peter Idley’s Instructions for his Son*, and the ambiguity of address in the
vernacular version of the *Templum Domini*.\(^\text{130}\) Another tradition of popular text, the *Ars
moriendi*, found in “three hundred manuscripts in Latin and Western vernaculars,”\(^\text{131}\)
provides a parallel for examining the possibility of a lay readership for the *Speculum*. The
*Ars moriendi* had a somewhat different purpose than the *Speculum* — specifically, to

\(^{127}\) Orme, pp. 89, 90.

\(^{128}\) Wenzel, *Verses*, p. 61.

\(^{129}\) Gillespie, *Doctrina* p. 37.

\(^{130}\) Gillespie, *Doctrina*, pp. 37, 38.

\(^{131}\) O’Connor, p. 1.
instruct one in the more practical elements of piety touching on one’s last hours: “it is a complete and intelligible guide to the business of dying, a method to be learned while one is in good health and kept at one’s fingers’ ends for use in that all-important and inescapable hour.” It contains descriptions intended to teach both what moriens, the dying individual, might do in order to secure a good death and safe passage to paradise and how his companions by the bedside might aid him. The Speculum concerns a stage of preparation more remote than that described in the Ars moriendi, yet the Speculum’s encouragement of virtue in order to avoid the punishments of hell and purgatory falls roughly within the topic of remote preparation for a good death. In blockbook illustrations from the Ars, the dying individual is usually portrayed as a layman, and the text’s topic, proximate preparation for death, seems best suited for the private reading of any individual interested in learning this particular morbid art — naturally, well before the final day drew near. Among the devotional items listed in the contents for Bodleian Library MS Digby 86 are two accounts of the fifteen signs of the doom (one in Latin at fol. 48r-v, and one in English at fols. 120v-122v) which parallel the eight signs given in the Speculum (11. 1351-1372; 1561-2022). The Speculum shares material similar to that contained in the Ars moriendi, a manual directed to a lay readership, and in Digby 86, a manuscript with clear signs of lay ownership. Another item of evidence pointing to lay readership has been mentioned above, in the discussion concerning the marks of

132 O’Connor, p. 5.


ownership in the *Speculum* manuscripts: this has already suggested that the owner of
manuscript D was a layman. This does not, of course, prove that the lay owner did not
give his possession over for some clerical or official use, perhaps to a private chaplain,
but the *prima facie* evidence introduces at the very least the possibility that the lay owner
of D made use of his possession for his own edification. The perennial and universal
interest in Apocalyptic literature is attested in its appearance in late medieval texts written
for lay reading, and in modern analogues mentioned in Bernard McGinn’s *Antichrist* and
*Visions of the End*, such as Hal Lindsey’s *Late Great Planet Earth*. If this
generalization concerning popular interest in apocalyptic themes holds true, then the
topics discussed in the *Speculum* would attract lay readers as well as clergy.

V. Conclusion

The *Speculum* finds its origin in pastoral legislation of the thirteenth and
fourteenth centuries, and although it holds in its verses just a few elements of the
traditional catechetical curriculum described by that legislation, it nevertheless shares
much, both in its form and in its contents, with the tradition of the vernacular pastoral
manual in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Just as the prominent manuals within
that tradition are only uneasily tied to a particular method of instruction, so the concerns
and the format of the *Speculum* find expression in manuals and sermon literature from the
same period. Far from being a rather rude and simplistic compilation in 2,722 lines of
verse, the *Speculum* stands within a whole pastoral project and series of pastoral concerns.
It stands closer to manuals which describe practical means of preparing for death,

---

135 See Bernard McGinn, *Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil*
(San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1994), pp. 258, 259 for the reference to Lindsey’s book; see also the
historical consideration of apocalyptic themes found in Richard Kenneth Emmerson, *Antichrist in the*
Middle Ages (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981) and Bernard McGinn, *Visions of the End:*
although it tends to concentrate less on death as something imminent, and more upon the last things as a prod to one's conscience. The poem's description of the signs before doomsday and the criteria for judgement appealed to an interest among the laity in books for private reading, the thirst for which has gone unabated from the middle ages to the popular apocalypticism of the present day. The Speculum stands, then, within a particular tradition of pastoral manuals; exactly how its particular contents took shape and developed remains to be seen in the following chapter.
Chapter Three: The Sources and Coherence of the *Speculum huius vite*

I. Introduction: The *Speculum* as a Version of the *Prick of Conscience*

The preceding chapter placed the *Speculum huius vite* within the tradition of pastoral manuals and works of religious instruction; the present chapter attempts to specify that conclusion further by describing the relationship between the *Speculum* and its sources. Much of what follows investigates how the *Speculum* shares in and differs from the *Prick of Conscience* tradition in order to determine how the redactor of the *Speculum* has altered his principal source. Only after such an examination can a hypothesis hope to express the possible reasons for the revisions which brought forth the *Speculum* as a work distinct from its parent text. One difficulty with the thesis that the *Speculum* does indeed represent a significant restructuring of the *Prick of Conscience* (significant enough, at the least, to merit a separate edition of the text) lies in the frequent identification of the two texts in previous scholarship\(^1\) without much explanation about what distinguishes them. Since the text of the *Prick of Conscience* awaits an updated edition, and its enormous number of manuscripts make close textual study of all its recensions a herculean task, it is hardly surprising that little detailed work has appeared regarding the relation of a rather isolated version of the text to its original within such a huge family of manuscripts.

While most studies which include a review of manuscripts B and D mention that the *Speculum* abbreviates the *Prick of Conscience*, only the *Descriptive Guide* includes a brief elaboration upon the thematic differences between the *Speculum* and the *Prick*, and mentions the inclusion of material foreign to the *PC* tradition within the *Speculum*. It was

---

in the *Descriptive Guide* that Lewis and McIntosh first mentioned that the
 alterations to the *Prick of Conscience* made in the *Speculum* follow
certain clear patterns: a number of organizational devices have been either
changed or left out; virtually all *exempla* and all fine distinctions are
omitted; not only are the Latin quotations of the original retained, however,
but they and the lines before and after are rendered more faithfully than any
other parts of the original; and the emphasis throughout is on the
audience’s *doing* something — forsaking sin, thinking on God, or thanking
God for his blessings — in place of the *understanding* of the great variety
of elements in God’s universe that leads to self-knowledge, which is the
main theme of the original poem.²

Since the *Speculum* does, for the most part, consist of an abbreviation of material found in
the *Prick of Conscience*, this chapter will first examine how the *Speculum* redactor has
manipulated his main source, and what other sources he has used in addition to the *PC*.
This first section will outline how the *Speculum* differs from the *Prick of Conscience* on
the basis of content, with some necessarily limited reference to the sources of the larger
interpolations of material unique to the two revisions³ which produced the *Speculum*
(where these can be identified). Since this study deals primarily with the *Speculum*, the
sources of the *Prick of Conscience*, studied elsewhere⁴, will not receive any significant
treatment here, except insofar as they contribute information about the sources of the
*Speculum*’s additions to the *Prick of Conscience* tradition. An assessment of the *Speculum*

²*Descriptive Guide*, p. 11.

³For the arguments concerning why there are at least two recensions of the *Prick of Conscience*
involved in the production of the *Speculum*, see the chapter on the manuscript relations of the text.

⁴The two principal studies are Reinhold Köhler, ‘Quellennachweise zu Richard Rolle’s von
Hampole Gedicht “The Pricke of Conscience”’, *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur*, 6 (1865),
196-212, and Arnold Hahn, *Quellenuntersuchungen zu Richard Rolles englischen Schriften* (Dissertation,
Halle a/S., 1900), pp. 16-40. The principal source for the fourth part of the *Pricke of Conscience*, on
Purgatory, is found in Robert J. Relihan, Jr., “A Critical Edition of the Anglo-Norman and Latin Versions
of Les Peines de Purgatorie” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1978), pp. 71-86, which
also includes a study of that text’s relation to the *PC*. Useful summaries of some of the foregoing works
as a recension of the *Prick of Conscience* follows in the second part of the chapter, which will examine the major omissions in the recensions leading to the *Speculum*, followed by a detailed investigation of the fifth part of the text in order to illustrate any “clear patterns” in the revision of the text, and to adjudicate whether, in the light of the revisions made, the *Speculum* makes sense as an independent work.

To facilitate discussion of the differences between the *Speculum* and the *Prick of Conscience*, the following conventions will appear throughout the chapter. In order to simplify the discussion of each stage of redaction, and to make this discussion consistent with the study of manuscript relations, the symbol “α” will refer to readings shared by manuscripts CHBD, which were presumably in the archetype from which all four manuscripts descended; the symbol “β” will refer to readings shared by manuscripts B and D, but not found in manuscripts C or H, which presumably formed part of the text of the *Speculum*’s archetype. In order to save space and time, the siglum Z will be used for readings from Richard Morris’s edition, which, for reasons given in the chapter on manuscript relations, serves as a basis for comparison with the larger *Prick of Conscience* tradition.

The references to the general, shared structure of the *Prick of Conscience* and the *Speculum* which follow likewise require a brief explication. As Lewis and McIntosh have pointed out, both texts are divided clearly into seven parts, but the *Prick of Conscience* (not only Z, but MSS C and H as well) contains a clear division between its prologue (Z, ll. 1-369) and seven parts, which deal respectively with man (Z, ll. 370-931), the world (Z, ll. 932-1663), death (Z, ll. 1664-2689), purgatory (Z, ll. 2690-3965), the day of doom and its tokens (Z, ll. 3966-6420), the pains of hell (Z, ll. 6421-7531), and the joys of heaven (Z, ll. 7532-9624). The *Speculum* picks up this same division in the text, with one
major modification: the prologue is merged with the first part of the text. Lines 1-216 of the Speculum correspond to the prologue in the Prick of Conscience, and will be occasionally referred to as “the prologue,” despite the fact that this does not constitute a separate structural feature of the Speculum. Whenever any reference is made to a “part” of the text, then, it is made with the more specific meaning of a demarcated portion of the text following the divisions of the Prick of Conscience (i.e. “Part I” on man; “Part VI” on hell, etc.). Just to make these divisions clear in terms of line numbers, the following are the points of demarcation in the Speculum: the first “part” (excluding the lines parallel to the prologue in the Prick of Conscience) on man is found in ll. 217-580; part II in ll. 581-822; part III in ll. 823-1072; part IV in ll. 1073-1350; part V in ll. 1351-2022; part VI in ll. 2023-2328; part VII in ll. 2329-2722.

II. The Sources of the Speculum

The first and most obvious source for the Speculum is the Prick of Conscience tradition. The chapter on manuscript relations (Chapter Four below) explains why there are at least two recensions involved in the production of the Speculum from the Prick, so the present investigation will not be concerned primarily with establishing the existence of the two redactions, nor will it exhaustively describe the characteristics of each separate redaction, beyond giving some general indications of omissions and additions made to the text of the PC. As McIntosh and Lewis indicated, the texts of manuscripts C and H resemble the Speculum in more than just the Latin quotations where they agree against the text of Morris’s edition of the Prick of Conscience (Z). All four of the manuscript texts C, H, B, and D, are highly abbreviated, and all four also contain material which Z does not have. They even share 221 lines of English which have no parallel in Z, which can be broken down according to the parts of the text in which they appear:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I Part of the text</th>
<th>II Total number of English lines in Z</th>
<th>III Total number of English lines in C</th>
<th>IV Total number of English lines in H</th>
<th>V English lines common to C and H alone</th>
<th>VI Total number of English lines in Speculum</th>
<th>VII English lines in C, H, and Speculum but not in Z</th>
<th>VIII English lines unique to Speculum</th>
<th>IX Latin quotations in C and Speculum but not in Z</th>
<th>X Latin quotations in H and Speculum but not in Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prologue</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>136*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2237</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9054</td>
<td>3312</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2722</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This low figure is affected by H's imperfect beginning at l. 129; H likewise misses one extra Latin quotation in the Prologue for the same reason.

As can be seen in the chart above, C and H abbreviate the PC by 67% or two-thirds; if one discounts the lines unique to the Speculum (col. VIII) and the lines which C, H, and the Speculum share against the testimony of Z (col. VII), only 1973 lines of the Speculum owe their origin to the 9054 lines in the PC, which in turn means that the Speculum abbreviates the PC by 78%. Despite the radical abridgement found in all four texts, they maintain the basic seven-part structure of the PC, although the Speculum, as has already been mentioned, does not demarcate the end of the Prologue. The main source for the material in both α and β is the Prick of Conscience, but the text has been altered principally through abbreviation (mainly in revision α) and through the addition of material (indicated in column seven for α and column eight for β). The type and extent of the material omitted from the text of the Prick in the compilation of the Speculum will receive greater attention later, as part of the discussion concerning the coherence of the poem as a whole.

The sources for those lines peculiar to the Speculum which stand outside the Prick
of Conscience tradition require some further investigation, not only to determine where the new material came from, but also to see if any trends in the redactor’s interests can be deduced from the kinds of additions made to the text. Although there are several smaller portions of additional text, generally of two to eight lines in length, added here and there throughout the poem\(^5\) (usually comprising new introductions to or translations of Latin quotations\(^6\), or seams closing a gap created by a series of omitted lines\(^7\)), the larger additions to the text, especially those with additional (non-biblical) Latin quotations, are easier to trace for sources. The larger additions can be broken down into two categories: two additions which include material shared by CHB and D (Speculum, ll. 831-852; 1473-1508), and four others which are only found in the Speculum (ll. 403-580; 723-780; 1423-1454, 1457-1461; 1874-1884).

The largest and most significant of these additions is the first one which arises in the text (ll. 403-580), comprising a rehearsal of the ten commandments and an exhortation to humility directed principally toward the clergy. The treatise is grafted onto matter which comes at the end of the first section of the Prick of Conscience, which deals with human nature. One element that makes the transition from lines directly from the Prick of Conscience to the ten commandments commentary so fluid is the added emphasis in the preceding lines upon keeping God’s commandments, as at ll. 127-132 of the Speculum:

\[ \text{C, H} \text{ Speculum} \]

---

\(^5\) For example: Speculum ll. 127-134; 163-166; 1005-1008; 1011, 1012; 1111-1114; 2075, 2076; 2161, 2162; 2195, 2196; 2247-2250; 2440-2442.

\(^6\) Some examples can be seen in Speculum ll. 183, 184; 185, 186; 246-254; 259, 260; 271, 272; 389, 390; 645, 646; 685-690; 798-800; 1005-1008; 1111-1114.

\(^7\) Examples: Speculum ll. 211-216; 315-320; 715-718; 677, 678; 1001-1003.
For witout þese no man may
Come to þe blisse þat lasteþ ay,
But in grete þerile is þat man here
Þat haþ wit and mynde and wil not lerne
Rithweise werkes in goddes lawe
Be þe whiche man shal be saue.

For witout þes, no mon may
Come to þe blis þat lastis ay,
Bot grete perell þat mon is inne
Þat has wytt and mynd and wil not lern
To know his God and do his wyll
And his commandmentis to fullfill.

Although one might make a case for the metrical necessity for the introduction of the word “commandments” here in order to accommodate the new (and more exact) rhyme, the word “lawes” might equally have provided the same necessary stress. This introduction of another reference to commandments picks up an earlier reference in the

*Prick of Conscience*, ll. 63, 64: “Mans kynd es to folow Goddes wille/ And alle hys
comandmentes to fulfille.” The additional series of lines on the decalogue also picks up an emphasis upon “læse” added in revision α and thus shared by CHB and D:

> God gef us a læse to kepe,
> To wurshep hym wit all oure myʒt (Speculum ll. 60, 61)

> How riʒtwis he is, and how trwe
> To al þoo þat his læse wil swe,
> And hold þe way þat he us laſt
> And wit his awne lifyng us taʒt (Speculum ll. 103-106)

These two references to God’s law are joined by two more references added in revision β:

> And þoo þat oʒt of Goddus læse here,
> Þai don þerafter neuer a dele
> (Speculum ll. 185, 186; no parallel in CHZ)

These additional references to God’s law, coupled with the references to God’s commandments and the section on the obedience of unintelligent beings to God’s natural law (Z, ll. 47-64; Speculum ll. 19-36) already in the *Prick of Conscience* text, provide an
apt preparation for the treatise on the ten commandments in the *Speculum*. The ten commandments treatise, insofar as it involves the regulation of actions, also picks up on additional references to “werk(is),” later in the text (CH add references in *Speculum* ll. 108, 111, 1495; BD contain additional references in *Speculum* ll. 1323 and 1504) and to the seven corporal works of mercy (C and H add a reference at l. 1866 in the *Speculum*; a further reference appears at l. 1979 in B and D).

The treatise in *Spec.* ll. 403-580 is best described as “grafted” onto the preceding *Prick of Conscience* material because it is not demarcated by any special headings, and it attaches to the preceding text in mid-sentence:

**Z,** ll. 892-899

Bot wha-so wald in hert cast  
What he was, and sal be at þe last,  
And what he es, whyles he lyves here  
He suld fynd ful litel mater  
To mak ioy whilles he here duelles,  
Als a versifiour in metre þus telles:

*Si quis sentiret, quo tendit, et unde veniret,*  
*Nunquam gauderet, sed in omne tempore fleret.*

**Speculum,** ll 399-404

And þus quo so will behold and see,  
Be he neuer so rich, faire, and myȝte,  
þen he sal fynd litill mater  
To joy mych on þes uanites here,  
Bot euer haf most mynd and thoȝt,  
To joy in Ihesu Crist þat hym boȝt.

Although these two quotations apparently share only one line of text, the preceding material in the *Speculum* does mirror, in its content, the matter found in the preceding lines of the *Prick of Conscience*. The matter which follows, however, is completely different, since the discourse on the ten commandments in the *Speculum* follows on from there and continues until the end of the first part of the text, leaving out the abrupt closing couplet found in manuscripts C and H in the same place, and the ending to part I given in **Z,** at ll. 897-931. The *Speculum’s* ten commandments treatise continues in the same style as the *Prick of Conscience* text, with four-stress lines in rhyming couplets.

The text of the treatise contains no extra-biblical Latin quotations, which makes it
difficult to identify possible sources for it; the multitude of ten commandments treatises, attested to in both vernacular⁸ and Latin⁹ works, makes it nigh impossible to discover any lines of dependency between the version in the *Speculum* and commentaries on the decalogue in other treatises. Vernacular ten commandment treatises found in such works as *Handlyng Synne*, *Speculum Christiani*, and Thoresby's catechetical treatise show no significant similarities to the treatise in the *Speculum*. Two of the Latin quotations, “Si uis ad uitam ingredi, ” (Matt. 19:17, quoted at *Speculum* l. 428a), and “Maledicti qui declinant a mandatis tuis” (Ps. 118:21, quoted at *Speculum* l. 434a) are quoted in at least four ten commandments treatises which bear no further resemblance to the *Speculum*.¹⁰

The various treatments of the ten commandments given in the verse treatises of William de Montibus, and in such manuals as the *Oculus Sacerdotis* by William of Pagula, and Hugo of Strassburg's *Compendium Theologicae Veritatis¹¹*, and the brief commentary in

---

⁸ See *IMEV*, 176, 214, 304, 744, 804, 1111, 1129, 1379, 1393, 1491, 1760, 2000, 2286, 2291, 2344, 2692, 2694, 3254, 3345, 3417, 3684, 3685, 3686, 3687, 3689, 3731; see also the abundance of miscellaneous manuals of religious instruction listed in Raymo, pp. 2492-2517. The following Oxford manuscripts listed in Raymo have been examined for this study: Laud misc. 463 (ff. 157r-v), Bodley 549 (f. 78r-v), Hatton 12 (ff. 211v-212r), Douce 141 (ff. 130r-139r).

⁹ See *Incipits*, Subject Index, s.v. “Decalogue” and “Decem mandata”. The following mss. from Oxford libraries, listed in *Incipits*, have been compared to the *Speculum* in this study: Laud misc. 12 (ff. 3r-66v); Rawl. C. 504 (ff. 50r-52r); Bodl. 857 (ff. 98r-109r); New College 51 (ff. 1-8); Laud misc. 409 (f. 63v); Bodl. 54 (ff. 50v-53v); Lat. th. e. 35 (f. 30r); Bodl. 848 (ff. 4r-5v); Bodl. 453 (ff. 57r-90r); Rawl. A. 384 (ff. 6r-11r); Univ. Coll. 36 (ff. 114r-116r); Rawl. C. 84 (lfv-16v).


¹¹ For the treatises of William de Montibus, see the works edited in Joseph Goering, *William de Montibus (c. 1140-1213): The Schools and the Literature of Pastoral Care*, Studies and Texts 108 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1992); for the text of the *Oculus Sacerdotis* used as a basis for comparison with the *Speculum*, see Oxford, Bodleian, MS Rawl. A. 370; see Hugo of Strassburg (sic), *Compendium theologicae veritatis, B. Alberti magni (sic) cum scholiis vitissimis per S. Caponi e Porrecta* (Venice, 1588).
Pecham's legislation for Canterbury\textsuperscript{12} share very little with the treatise found in the *Speculum*, beyond the quotation of the decalogue itself. The treatment of the decalogue found in Augustine of Hippo's *De fide et operibus* shares three scriptural quotations (Gal. 6:14, Matt. 19:17, and 1 Jn. 2:4, found at ll. 406a, 428a, and 452a-c respectively of the *Speculum*) with the additional matter in question, and has a brief "rehearsal" of the ten commandments, similar in brevity to the additional lines found in the *Speculum\textsuperscript{13}*, but offers very few other points of convergence with the somewhat "anticlerical" material which follows the commandments in *Speculum* ll. 525-580. This latter series of lines which criticize the pride of religious and the clergy, does not share any parallels, beyond general sentiment, with criticisms of the clergy in the vernacular "Ten Commandements", the "Seven Deadly Sins", "Vita Sacerdotum," nor the "Of Mynystris in the Chirche, an Exposition of Matthew xxiv," by followers of John Wyclif.\textsuperscript{14} The explications of the commandments themselves within the treatise (*Speculum* ll. 475-508) are nothing if not spare, consisting of bare translations of the commandments and little else. The commentary on the first commandment lacks the extensive criticism of the veneration of images usually found in Wycliffite treatises upon the decalogue\textsuperscript{15}, and while

\textsuperscript{12}CS II, ii, pp. 902, 903.

\textsuperscript{13}See Augustine of Hippo, "De fide et operibus," *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 41, pp. 35-97. The quotations mentioned above can be found at pp. 53, 60, and 84 respectively.

\textsuperscript{14}The "Ten Commandements," the "Vita Sacerdotum", and the "Seven Deadly Sins" can be found in vol. iii of the *Select Works of John Wyclif*, ed. Thomas Arnold (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1871), pp. 82-92, 119-167, and 233-241, respectively. The tract "Of Mynystris in the Chirche, an Exposition of Matthew xxiv" can be found in vol. ii of the same work, pp. 393-423. The *Tractatus de mandatis divinis*, ed. Johann Loserth and Frederic David Matthew, vol. xxxv of *Wyclif's Latin Works* (London: Wyclif Society, 1922) has not been consulted thoroughly in this study, beyond an examination of the introduction to the work.

\textsuperscript{15}See *The Premature Reformation*, pp. 4, 484. Hudson states that such a "tirade against the contemporary honour to shrines, statues, or paintings of the saints . . . is perhaps the simplest way in which a commentary of heterodox origin may be recognized" (p. 4).
it lacks any mention of obedience to a spiritual father and mother which usually appears in orthodox treatises, neither does it contain any Wycliffite criticism of spiritual direction which is found in similar contexts.\textsuperscript{16} There is little beyond the verses concerning the need for clerical humility at the end of the treatise which might indicate any Wycliffite connections with the text; this criticism of the clergy and its implications for the readership of the \textit{Speculum} will be discussed later with reference to other passages in the poem.

The second largest addition to material from the \textit{Prick of Conscience} found in the \textit{Speculum} consists of a series of lines on vanity in dress (\textit{Speculum}, ll. 723-780), which focuses on current fashions for men and for women. The passage contains a fair amount of technical vocabulary, mentioning “pykys” on men’s shoes (l. 725), “hornus” on women’s heads (l. 745), “crokettus and hor colert kell” (curled hair and coloured veils, l. 753), “wide colers, and reuerset tailus,/ And brode fyletus and 30136 vailus” (wide collars, reversed tails, broad hairbands and yellow [gold?] veils ll. 755, 756). Although the \textit{Middle English Dictionary} contains some examples of these terms from a variety of sources, no one source leaps out as bearing a particularly close relationship to the text in the \textit{Speculum}, at least in terms of containing all or most of the vocabulary items listed above in close proximity to one another. The terms “croket” and “horns” appear with reference to hairstyles in \textit{Handlyng Synne}, ll. 3204-3232, where “croket” appears to apply to a hairstyle peculiar to men rather than women.\textsuperscript{17} A Wycliffite treatise on the Seven Deadly Sins mentions various kinds of fashions which involve deforming the gifts God

\textsuperscript{16}For this feature of orthodox and Wycliffite commentaries, see \textit{Premature Reformation}, p. 167.

\textsuperscript{17}Robert Mannyng of Brunne, \textit{Handlyng Synne}, ed. Frederick J. Furnivall, \textit{EETS} os. vols. 119, 123.
gave the human form:

And in þis pride synnen wymmen in makynge of hor bosis, and generaly in atyre of hor body; þat comynly, fro þo hede to þo fot, men deformen hor body by hor foule atyre, as pikes of schoone, and garlondes of hedes, and tatering of clothes, beren opun witenesse.18

Although the passage above contains some similarities to the passage on men’s piked shoes (“For now weron men . . . pykys [on] hor schon as piggus tailus/ Þat nothyng to þe fote avaylis” Speculum, ll. 721, 725, 726), there is precious little else that reveals any relationship between the two texts. References to “calles of silk and thread” and to “wommens hornes” appear in Peter Idley’s Instructions to His Son (Book II, ll. 1040 and 1794 respectively), but the late date of composition generally given for this work (ca. 1445-1450) places it beyond the bounds of possible source material,19 and very little else reveals further similarities between the two texts.

The specific vocabulary of this passage offers no insight about possible sources, but it could offer some information about a terminus a quo for the period when these additional lines were composed. References in literature to “horns” on women’s heads appear in the Aæenbite of Inwyt and Handlyng Synne,20 and thus could be placed at almost any time within the fourteenth century, given the common composition dates given for these works (ca. 1303-1332 for Handlyng Synne and 1340 for the Aæenbite).

Commentators on the history of clothing tend to date “horned” headdresses to a much

---


19 See Peter Idley’s Instructions to his Son, ed. C. D’Evelyn, (London: Modern Languages Association, 1935). D’Evelyn’s conjectural date of composition is given on p. 58.

20 See Dan Michel of Northgate, Aæenbite of Inwyt, ed. Richard Morris and Pamela Gradon, EETS os 23 (1965), p. 176, l. 31 and Robert of Brunne’s “Handlyng Synne”, ed. Frederick J. Furnivall EETS os 119 (1901) and 123 (1903), l. 3224. The dates given for composition of these works are taken from Raymo, pp. 2256 and 2258.
later period, usually sometime around the end of the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{21} Piked shoes, sometimes called "crakou" shoes because of their Polish origins, first appear around the 1360s\textsuperscript{22}; the earliest reference to "crakou" shoes in the MED comes from 1362, whereas the first reference to "pyked shoes" is taken from the B-text of Piers Plowman, which is given the conjectural date of ca. 1378. The reference to "pyked shoes", then, narrows the conjectural date for the composition of the Speculum to sometime between 1362 and about 1390, if the first use cited in the MED can serve as a reliable terminus a quo. All of the other fashion-specific vocabulary items, "tailus," "colers," and "fyletus," are found in texts from the first quarter of the fourteenth century,\textsuperscript{23} and so do not provide any information for establishing a date for the additional material, given that the earliest date usually provided for the composition of the Prick of Conscience is sometime around the middle of the fourteenth century.

All but one of the additional quotations in this portion of text derive from scripture. The single quotation attributed to Augustine at Speculum ll. 760a-b (Non solum concupiscere, sed concupisci velle criminosum est), which cannot be found in any of Augustine's works, bears a strong resemblance to a statement in the Augustinian rule: "Oculi vestri, et si iacientur in aliquam feminarum, figantur in nemine. Neque enim, quando proceditis, feminas uidere prohibemini, sed adpetere, aut ab ipsis adpeti uelle,

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{23}MED, s.v. coler, tail(e, and filet.
\end{enumerate}
The slight differences in word-order (the "Non solum...sed" clause in the *Speculum*) and in the major verb ("concupiscere" rather than "adpetere") could indicate that the quotation comes either from a commentary upon the Rule, or from the memory of the redactor making the addition. The use of the quotation does, in any case, suggest some familiarity with the Rule, which may in turn identify the second redactor as a member of one of the religious communities who made use of the Augustinian Rule in the Middle Ages: the Augustinian Canons, the Augustinian friars, the Dominicans, and the Premonstratentions.

The additional material found in the *Speculum* at ll. 1423-1461 once again contains little but Scriptural quotations and translations. The passage from Adso of Montier-en-Der's *De ortu et tempore Antichristi* quoted in ll. 4057-4060 of the *Prick of Conscience* is altered in the *Speculum* to remove Adso's commentary and restore the scriptural quotation from St. Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians, 2:3b-4:

**ZCH**, ll. 4057-4072

*Quoniam nisi venerit dissensio primum etc.*, *id est*, nisi prius dissenserint omnia regna a Romae Imperio, que prius erant subdita, non antea veniet antichristus.

He says "bot if dissencion come, pat es, bot-if alle landes hald agayn Rome, Swa pat it be put til destrucion Thurg *bam* pat first was in subieccion, Anticrist ar *pat* tyme sal noght com *pat* sal com byfor *he* day of dom.

**Speculum**, ll. 1420a-1432

*Quoniam nisi venerit dissensio primum et revelatus fuerit homo peccati, filius perditionis qui adversatur et extollitur supra omne quod dicitur Deus aut quod colitur, ita ut in templo Dei sedet ostendens se tanquam ipse sit Deus.

And sais, bot *her* discension come, *pat* is to say, at *he* hed of Rome, And *he* son of perdition *her* be shewed, Both to lered men, and to lewed. For in prid of eul liffyng he shal be Euer to Ihesu Crist contrarye,

---


25 cf. Adso Deruensis, *De ortu et tempore Antichristi*, ed. D. Verhelst, *CCCM 45* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1976), ll. 100-102, 110-112. Although several different accounts of the life of Antichrist are given in this volume, the PC quotation shows most similarity to the corresponding passage in Adso's account.
Dat destruction, als says haly writt,
Sal be, bot þat tyme com noght yhitt.
Fra þat tyme sal na land ne contré
In subieccion of Rome langer be;
Ne fra þan sal na man be bughsome,
Ne obedient to þe kirk of Rome.

And tak on hym pouer in his doyng
As he were Lord and God of althyng,
And shal sitt and shew him þære
In þe templ as þose God he were,
And lause and bynd both fre and bond,
For few or non dar ȝayn him stond.

The fuller quotation from the Vulgate in the Speculum governs the substance of the translation and explication provided in Speculum ll. 1423-1432, which replaces the translation of Adso found in Z (ll. 4063-4072), and in the texts of C and H. It is interesting to note that, in the text of D, the corrector's hand adds Adso's text to the quotation, thus restoring the original Prick of Conscience reading, but the following Speculum translation remains untouched. The Speculum text following the translation of this quotation continues in the same vein, describing how the ministers of the Antichrist will deceive many lords by feigning holiness and how they shall be a burden upon the people because of their “costlew lifyng” (l. 1445). This is followed by two more Scriptural verses (Jer. 23:32 and Matt. 24:5, at ll. 1448a-d and 1458a-b respectively) accompanied by two more translations (ll. 1449-1454, 1457-1461). Wedged in between these two quotations, lines 1455 and 1456 (“And [made] þe folke ‘to’ do hym honour/
And say, ‘here is ȝoure sayueoure’”) are taken from Z, ll. 4223, 4224, almost as though the redactor, searching for something to join the two additions to the text, plucked out a choice couplet among the Prick of Conscience verses for the purpose. One further distinction between the passages quoted above in redactions α and β arises in the interpretation of the passage: redaction α identifies it as presaging the destruction of Rome, immediately before Antichrist appears, whereas the Speculum emphasizes that the Antichrist will first appear in Rome, sitting in “the temple,” acting in the capacity of God, binding and loosing both freemen and bondsmen. The references in the Speculum to a
figure sitting in "the temple" in Rome, and to the power of loosing and binding, suggest papal perogatives, and so the Speculum could refer to a papal Antichrist, a theme which does not belong exclusively to the Reformation.26 The Speculum lacks ll. 4063-4236 of the Prick (also represented in manuscripts C and H27) which immediately follow the translation quoted above, lines which contain, significantly, an account of the general disobedience toward "he kirk of Rome" (Z, l. 4072). If the Speculum comes from the late fourteenth century (as the manuscript evidence in chapter one attests), and if the passage in question refers to the Roman papacy, the absence of any reference to an anti-pope in such an interpretive schema could in turn indicate that the text was written prior to Clement VII's election in 1378 as a rival pope to Urban VI. As the evidence for this "papal Antichrist" interpretation is vague, such musings about the date of the text must remain mere speculations.

The scriptural quotations with their translations found in ll. 1423-1461 could be examples of marginal material brought into the body of the text. Derek Britton, in a review of the Descriptive Guide, points out that three sets of Latin quotations in Morris's edition (ll. 1145-1151; 6635-6636; and 6794-6795) "are certainly spurious, having perhaps been drawn into the body of the text from marginal annotations in an exemplar."28 The existence of marginal scriptural quotations in manuscripts B and D (opposite ll. 1347,

26 See Richard Kenneth Emmerson, Antichrist in the Middle Ages (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981), pp. 69-72 for a list of representative examples of the papal Antichrist tradition in the late middle ages. Hereafter referred to as Emmerson.

27 The following lines of Z appear in C and H: 4063-4072; 4101-4104; 4108, 4109; 4113, 4114; 4117-4122; 4125-4128; 4133-4142; 4149-4152; 4155-4164; 4166, 4167; 4169-4186; 4197-4200; 4202-4210; 4221, 4222.

1349, 1504, and 1946) allows for just such a possibility. Two Latin quotations from Z ("Mors depascet eos", Z, ll. 6711, 6712, Speculum, margin opposite l. 2162; and "Caput aspidum suggent" Z, ll. 6770, 6771, Speculum, margin opposite ll. 2179, 2180) become marginal quotations in B and D, illustrating the opposite kind of movement from the text to the margin, which in turn points to some free movement between text and margin within the redactions leading to the Speculum. Lines 1845-1848b in the Speculum may provide an example of marginal comments incorporated into the text:

Que wy chon shal 3eld acont certayn,
Of ich ydil word spokon in vayn,
De omni verbo ocioso reddent rationem in die iudicii
And of ich ydil tho3t, more and lesse,
*Deut* consentis to sym and wyckednes:
Usque ad minimam cogitationem. Quoniam cogitatio hominis confitebitur [tibi].

The second of the two Latin quotations is an interpolated continuation of the first quotation, which has no analogue in Z. Assuming that readers felt free to add their own apposite scriptural references in the margin, as the marginal scriptural quotations found in the Speculum suggest, then redactors might have incorporated these quotations into the text, and then have provided a translation for them. This would accord well with the practical use of the text: teachers and preachers usually do not hesitate to add marginal commentary or supporting quotations to an established text, if the additional commentary

29The quotations are, in order of occurrence (followed by scriptural citation): "Spes impiorum peribit" (opposite l. 1347; Prov. 10:28); "Fides sine operibus mortua est" (opposite l. 1349; James 2:20); "Operibus credite" (opposite l. 1504; John 10:38); "Qui non credunt iam iudicati sunt" (opposite l. 1946; John 3:18, although the number of the subject and verbs is singular in the Gospel). An additional marginal comment opposite line 135, "Paulus: ignorancia non excusat"). is not biblical (no such quotation can be found in any of St. Paul’s writings), but may refer to Rom. 1:19b-20: "Deus enim illis manifestavit invisibilia enim ipsius a creatura mundi per ea quae facta sunt intellecta conspicuiuntur sempiterna quoque eius virtus et divinitas ut sint inexcessibiles.” The biblical verse fits with the topic developed in the verses opposite — the status and judgement of non-Christians at the doom. The mistaken attribution might alternatively arise from a scribe’s misattribution of a commentator’s comments to the apostle; Peter Lombard’s Collectanea in epistolae Pauli (PL 192) contains just such a comment about ignorance (see 281B).
aids them in their teaching or preaching, as the tradition of glossed texts bears out. An alternative to this conjecture involves less intentionality on the part of the redactor: perhaps some marginal scriptural quotations appeared so close to the text that scribes mistook them for insertions. Lines like Speculum ll. 1423-1461 could arise from editorial attempts to provide such scribal mistakes with English translations and linking material. Latin quotations without corresponding translations occur, albeit rarely, in the Speculum and are, perhaps, quondam marginal comments inserted into the text, but untranslated by a redactor.

The one remaining passage of additional material unique to revision β is found at Speculum ll. 1874-1884, and can be easily identified on the basis of its Latin quotations. The lines derive from Isidore of Seville’s Sententiae, and refer to the account that will be rendered by priests and ministers for their care of the flock entrusted to them. Whilst the Prick of Conscience does have a short section on the reckoning priests will give of their subjects (Z, ll. 5882-5893), these lines are expanded with Isidore’s statement about the need for priests to teach properly those under their care. The clergy come in for criticism not only here, but elsewhere in the verses added to the Speculum:

3e, men of religion hat most shuld be me(ke),
To be wurschippet as goddus hai tak no hede,
For hai aske reuerens and knelyng,
As he3ly as emperour or kyng;
And bysshopps and clerkis of opher degre,
Coueten al wurshippus as men may se.
Bot be Cristus techyng and his liffyng here,
Clerkis shuld not lyf on his manere. (Speculum, ll. 525-532)

The lines which follow the above quotation (ll. 533-580) commend poverty and meekness

30Quotations unique to the Speculum without any English translation can be found at ll. 108a; 150a, 1324a-c. Quotations also found in Z without English translation (at least in the Speculum) can be found at Speculum ll. 184a; 1912a.
as virtues appropriate to clergy and religious. The last item in a list of things helpful to souls in purgatory, namely, the mass, appears in completely recast verses which contain an implicit criticism of the way priests celebrate mass (emphasis added): “And masse of gode prestis in holy liffyng/ Thur3e grace may be grete helpyng” (Speculum ll. 1291, 1292). This relation between the purity of the priest and the efficacy of the sacrament for those in purgatory contradicts the emphasis, found in yet another passage of the Pricke (ll. 3656-3761) which the Speculum does not contain, placed upon the efficacy of the eucharist ex opere operato, regardless of the priest’s moral state. The belief that priestly moral character influences the efficacy of the sacrament, apparent in the lines from the Speculum quoted above, comes close to one of the Wycliffite propositions condemned by the Blackfriars Council of 1382: “Si episcopus vel sacerdos exsistat in peccato mortali: non ordinat, non consecrat, non conficit, non baptizat.”31 The position as expressed in the Speculum, however, could express the orthodox belief that, while the moral state of the priest did not affect the validity of the sacrament, it did affect the accidental qualities of the mass, diminishing the magnitude of the grace bestowed through the sacrament, as a statement added in the first redaction implies: “Bot of [god] prestus masse syngyng,/ To saulus in pwrgatory is most helpyng/ If hñ lif here in holynes,/ As holy doctours bers witnes” (Speculum, ll. 1335-1338). The clerical emphasis of these additions to the text could indicate the intended audience, particularly if Archbishop Arundel’s 1409 legislation against preaching about the sins of the clergy to the laity32 reflects

31 Fasciculi zizaniorum, p. 278.

32 “Volumus et mandamus, ut praedicator verbi Dei veniens juxta formam superius annotatam, in praedicando clero sive populo, secundum materiam subjectam se honeste habeat, spargendo semen secundum convenientiam subjecti auditorii; clero praeertim praedicans de vitis pullulantibus inter eos, et laicis de peccatis inter eos communiter usitatis, et non e contra.” Concilia, iii. p. 316, statute III.
controversies that were "in the air" with regard to the topics of sermons at the time of the
*Speculum*'s composition (sometime before the writing of MS D at the end of the
fourteenth century). It has been said that "many of the principles" of Arundel's legislation
"were not new, but in the past had not been everywhere observed"; some of the
statements condemned by the Blackfriars Council twenty years earlier indicate a concern
over the Wycliffite criticism of the clergy, a concern which parallels (or perhaps prompts)
Arundel's legislation. The condemnation of statements supporting unlicensed preaching
and criticizing the mendicant orders illustrates, at the very least, a concern for controlling
preaching and an attempt to protect clergy from reproach. The representatives of the
mendicant orders, in a letter to John of Gaunt, express some alarm that Nicholas Hereford
and others "in the very ears of both clergy and laity proclaim and assert publicly that we
and our four Orders were the cause of the entire people's rebellion against the King in the
past year [i.e. the Peasants' Revolt]." Although such alarm proceeds from self-interest,
it does serve to show a certain concern about public and popular criticism of religious and
the clergy in the period prior to Arundel's legislation. The criticism of clerical sins
against humility, poverty, and pastoral responsibility which appear in the *Speculum*, along
with the possible reference to a "papal Antichrist" in *Speculum* II. 1421-1461, could thus
indicate that the poem (or at the very least, those portions of text containing such
sentiments) strayed onto rather suspect ground.

---

33 Spencer, p 175. See also the discussion of ad statum preaching, particularly preaching to the
clerical estate, on pp. 65-66 of the same work.

34 *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, determinations XIV, XV (on unlicensed preaching) and XX-XXIV (on
the mendicants), pp. 280-282.

35 "Epistola vel litera quatuor ordinum claustrialium Oxoniae ad Dominum Johannem ducem
Lancastriam . . .", *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 293. "... in ipsis auribus cleri simul et populi clament et
asserent publice nos et quatuor ordines nostros causam fuisse totius rebellionis populi, anno ultimo contra
dominum nostrum regem, . . ."
The question of the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of the poem deserves some attention here before moving on. The treatment of the ten commandments, as has already been mentioned, bears few marks which could distinguish it as a Wycliffite treatise. The criticism of the clergy found in ll. 553-580 and 1874-1884 does not necessarily indicate heterodox origins, since criticisms of clerical pride and negligence of pastoral duty can be found in orthodox writings as well. Other passages in the Speculum, specifically those which deal with auricular confession, the Virgin Mary, post-biblical saints, and prayers for the dead, would sit rather uncomfortably in a Wycliffite treatise. The Speculum contains, for example, some orthodox sentiments regarding the Virgin Mary and the cult of the saints taken largely from the Prick of Conscience with few alterations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{'e sext joi 'e faire sy3t shal be} \\
\text{Of aungels and sayntis in dyuers degre},
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{And oure Lady 'er shall 'ai see}, \\
\text{Next God hymself ho shal be}, \\
\text{For Ihesu Crist soke of hir brest}, \\
\text{Perfore skyll is ho sitt hym next.} \\
\text{Ho is so faire, and 'er so bri3t,} \\
\text{But hir fairenes passes ich monus si3t.} \\
\text{A ful grete joy 'en may hit be,} \\
\text{To won in blisse wit 'at lady.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{'ai shal se in heuon also} \\
Patriarkeis and prophetus, and ope r moo:} \\
\text{Apostels, martirs, and confessours,} \\
\text{And holy armetis, and doctours} \\
\text{But holy writt t3t, quere euer 'ai were,} \\
\text{To lered and lewed, hor wittus to clere.} \\
\text{'ai shal se holy virginus 'ore,} \\
\text{But here lufd God euer more,} \\
\text{But lyfd euer more in chastyte,} \\
\text{And after, for Goddus luf, ded wold be.} \\
\text{'ai shal se 'er in joy and blis,} \\
\text{Al 'at God has choson for his.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{(Speculum, ll. 2539, 2540, 2565-2572, 2587-2598; cf. Z ll. 8681-8734)}
\]

The focus upon the Virgin Mary, the use of a hierarchical scheme which highlights
traditional categories of saints (the Virgin Mary mentioned first, then patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, hermits, and doctors) presents a fairly standard orthodox view of the heavenly order among members of the Church Triumphant. The inclusion of such a hierarchy, which necessarily includes (at least among the confessors, hermits, doctors, and virgin-martyrs) post-biblical saints, runs counter to Wyclif’s own doubts regarding non-biblical saints.\(^{36}\)

Wyclif objected to auricular confession on the grounds that only God can forgive sin, and only God can know a penitent’s state of contrition. God, therefore, is the only one with both the proper power and knowledge necessary to grant absolution; the priest took no active part, but only declared an absolution properly given by God. In cases where the penitent was undeserving of absolution, the priest’s words were null and void.\(^{37}\) The inclusion in the \textit{Speculum} of two references to sacramental confession (added in redaction \(a\)) thus makes the poem an improbable Wycliffite text:

\begin{quote}
Wake and be redy ay,  
Quef per he come be ny3t or day,  
\textit{Pat} deth \textit{pe} fynde quen he comus in,  
Clene shryuen of al \textit{bi} syrne. (\textit{Speculum}, ll. 939-942)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Be}ro3t to joy from al oure care. (\textit{Speculum}, ll. 2307-2310)
\end{quote}

Whilst the verb “shrife” can refer to confession of sin in general, it most often refers, as it probably does in both these passages, to sacramental confession.\(^{38}\)

\(^{36}\) \textit{Premature Reformation}, p. 302, 311, 312.

\(^{37}\) \textit{Premature Reformation}, p. 294.

\(^{38}\) Cf. s.v. “shriven v.”, sense 1 in \textit{MED}; most of the examples cited relate, either directly or obliquely, to auricular (i.e. sacramental) confession.
The *Speculum* also attributes an efficacy to prayers for the dead which a Wycliffite would have difficulty accepting:

Bot set, þoȝe a mon in dedly symne be,
He may help þe saulus in purgatore
If [he] do truly almus dede
To pore febell men þat haf nede.
For almus dede praies specially
For þe saulus in purgatory,
If almus ded be truly doo
To blynd and lome þat haf ned þerto. (*Speculum*, ll. 1325-1332)

The above passage not only runs counter to Wycliffite denials of the efficacy of prayers for the dead 39, but it goes one step further in asserting that someone in a state of mortal sin could yet perform some meritorious work which could relieve the souls in purgatory. If sinfulness, for a Wycliffite, nullified temporal dominion 40, it surely would remove any form of spiritual merit as well. Since the passage just quoted appears only in B and D, redaction β thus adds at least one portion of text which is hard to reconcile with a Wycliffite soteriology and ecclesiology. The *Speculum* also carries over some verses from the *Prick of Conscience* supportive of prayers for the dead, in a quotation from the office of lauds for the dead (“Tuam, Deus, deposcimus pietatem,/ ut eis tribuere digneris lucidas et quietas mansiones.” 41 Z ll. 9131, 9132; *Speculum* 2620a,b), and in the lines

---

39 "The English [Wycliffite] sermon cycle accepts the existence of purgatory, though it rejects the usefulness of prayers for the dead . . . . The starting-point for the denial [of purgatory among the Wycliffites] was probably the denial of the usefulness of prayers for the dead, in conjunction with the rejection of indulgences that often purported to impinge upon the soul’s fate in purgatory” *Premature Reformation*, pp. 309, 310.

40 See the sixteenth “erroneous” statement in the Blackfriars Council in *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, p. 280: “Item asserere quod nullus est dominus civilis, nullus est episcopus, nullus est praebelatus, dum est in peccato mortali.” For an account of Wyclif’s views on civil dominion, see pp. 359-362 of *Premature Reformation*.

41 Although this quotation does not appear in the Sarum breviary or in the Sarum missal, it has been located in Lauds for the Dead in the Antiphonary for Cambrai Cathedral, found in Cambrai Médiathèque Municipal, MS C 38 (40), f. 359v; see the *Cantus* webpage of Gregorian Chant at http://www.publish.uwo.ca/~cantus01/search.html. The liturgical structure and contents of the prayer make it clear that the quotation is from a liturgical source and that it requires some belief in the efficacy of prayer
previously mentioned (Speculum ll. 1291, 1292; 1335-1338) which support the
celebration of masses on behalf of souls in purgatory. The omission, in the first redaction,
of several lines about the efficacy of mass and prayers for those who died young (Z, ll.
3784-3939), only serves to set in relief this retention of material concerning the efficacy
of prayers for the dead: the redactors do not appear to have scruples about the practice of
praying for the dead in itself, since they have not expunged all references regarding the
practice, despite feeling free to omit similar material elsewhere.

One further Speculum theme with possible Wycliffite connections is the “papal
Antichrist” passage examined earlier in Speculum ll. 1421-1461. The Wycliffites in the
later fourteenth century held views about the papal schism which painted the Roman
claimant as Antichrist:

By 1388 Wycliffites regarded Urban [VI] as as filius Antichristi, and the
following year the Opus Arduum declared that Urban VI was the one in
quo omnia mysteria antichristi fuerunt impleta. Many of the Wycliffite
texts, like De Papa, saw the Schism as the fulfilment of various biblical
prophecies concerning the last things.42

The Wycliffite view is uncharacteristic of the official English support which the Roman
papacy enjoyed throughout the schism, and may thus provide one criterion for discerning
whether a text contains Wycliffite views. The interpretation of ll. 1423-1461 in this light
presents some difficulties, however, because it never explicitly identifies a pope with
Antichrist, beyond the reference to “loosing and binding” in l. 1431, and the reference to
the “shewing” of the Antichrist in Rome after some “discension” there (ll. 1421-1424). If
the text were composed sometime in the last half of the fourteenth century, as the

---

42 Premature Reformation, p. 334, quoting Henry Knighton, Chronicon, ed. J.R. Lumby, RS,
(1889-95), vol. ii, 260 and the Opus Arduum in Brno University Library MS Mk 28, f. 176r.
manuscript evidence indicates, then the event most likely to fit the description of
disturbances in Rome in ll. 1421-1424 would be the beginning of the Great Western
Schism (1378-1417); the Roman pontiffs during that time were Urban VI (pope 1378-
1389) and Boniface IX (pope 1389-1404). The absence of any reference to a papal rival at
Avignon would suggest that the text was written shortly after the Schism had begun,
before the different papal obediences had become entrenched. If these references do
indeed point to the papacy, then the text would share the Wycliffite view of the papacy
during the Great Schism; the arguments in favour of such an interpretation, however, rest
uneasily upon a series of suppositions. It seems that, on this count at least, the
“Wycliffism” of the text must remain unproven. Other indications, such as the promotion
of post-Biblical saints and prayers for those in Purgatory, favour the view that the
Speculum is an orthodox text, although it shares some pastoral concerns with the
Wycliffite point of view (e.g. clerical poverty, clerical humility, and pastoral
responsibility).

The remaining two larger interpolations of text (Speculum, ll. 831-852; 1473-
1508) combine verses added in redaction a with verses from redaction β, and thus serve as
a good transition from a discussion of sources to the question of the coherence of the
Speculum, since the question of coherence rests upon the relative success with which the
poem has been fitted together. Lines 831 to 852 are, in the main, added in redaction a,
with lines 843 to 850 inserted in redaction β, as the following parallel comparison makes
evident:

C (and H)
For alle þat have lyf mote it þole and fele
And þat shulde euery man knowe wele

Speculum, ll. 829-852
For all þat here lyf has mot hit fele.
And þat [shuld] euery mon know wele.
And make hum euere redy and 3are
Out of his world for to fare
For þer is no man þat can sey
Whanne shal be his endyng day
For God hâp ordeyned as his wille was
þe terme þat no man may passe
And Job seij to al mankynde
As in holy writen [sic] we fynde

Constituisti terminos eius qui preteriri non poterat
God he seij terme hâp set
þe whiche may no man ben ouerflet
And whanne deþ shal to hym come
þanne is a day of dredfull dome
For þanne shal he haue knowyng clere
How he his lyf hâp spended here
And knowe þene how it is
Wheþer he shal to payne or blisse

And make hym euer rede and 3are
Out of þis word for to fare.
For þer is noo mon þat con say
Quen shal be his endyng day,
For God has ordand as his wil was,
þe terme þat no mon may passe:

Constituisti terminos eius qui preteriri non [poterunt].

And quen deth shall to hym come,
Þen is a day of dredfull dome,
For þen shal he haf knowyng clere,
How he his lyf has spendid here
And knaw þen how hyt (is)
Queþer he shal to payne or blysse,
And þerfore we shal euer redy be,
For quen deth comes we may not fle.
And if we endon in dedly synne,
We go to payne þat neuer shal blyme;
Þus synne is þe worst deth þat may fall,
For hit sles body and saule wit all,
As God sais be his holy prophet,
In holy writt as we rede:

Mors peccatorum pessima.
Þe worste deþ þat comët man witynne
Is þe deþ of dedly synne.

The conjunction "and" grafts the additional lines onto the preceding sentence from the

Prick of Conscience, illustrating a device often seen in the Speculum43 of adding lines to
the PC in mid-sentence by means of a conjunction. The device is not as obtrusive as one
might think, because of the frequent use of polysyndeton in the Prick of Conscience and

43See further examples at Speculum II. 50, 259, 389, 715, 1053, 1111,1423, 1469, 1681, 2003,
2319, 2415, 2565. Another frequent device is to join the additional lines to the preceding discourse with
the conjunction "for" (ostensibly providing a reason for the preceding statement): see Speculum II. 127.
271, 955, 1001, 1169, 1281, 1315, 1807.
in the *Speculum*. The spacing of the lines above emphasizes that the literal translation of the first Latin quotation drops out of the *Speculum*, and a series of new introductory lines is inserted before the second quotation. These new lines not only point to the “death of deadly sin,” mentioned in the corresponding introductory lines of the α-text, but they also provide a reason why the death of deadly sin is the worst form of death.

The last larger interpolation of lines exhibits the same tendency in redaction β toward expansion and elaboration of particular points made in the text of α. The second redaction interweaves its own additions with lines added in α:

**CH**

*Pat Cristes lawe shal moche fordo*

*Wit newe settes *pat* þey wole aferme þerto*

*And wit newe lawes *pat* hemself wole sette*

*Dispise þe lawes of holy writte*

**Speculum**, ll. 1473-1508

*And Crist/5 lagh pai shal mych undo,*

*Wit new settus *pat* pai wyl afferme þerto,*

*And wit sermonus *pat* pai wyl orden and sett,*

*Dyspyse þe laxe of holy wrytt.*

*And of þis, Sayn Petir warnet us as we rede*

*In his pistell, [if] we take hede:*

*Fuerunt vero et pseudo prophete in populo sicut et in uobis erunt magistri mendaces qui [introducent] sectas perditionis.*

*And sais, þer were ymong þe pepul in dyuers degre,*

*Fals prophetus, as ymong 3ow sal be,*

*And orden new custom in ich a lond,*

*Pat vmeth wyl any be Goddus laxe stond.*

*Pai wyl schew outwart grete pouerte,*

*And euer of þe pepul geduryng be,*

*And of men hor liflode seche,*

*Wit leysynges and wit peynted speche,*

*Þei wol en be conseilours of lordes of londes,*

*And drawe moche peple into here hondes*

*And queynte clopynge haue of memnes fyndynge*
And seie þei ben holiest in lyvynge
And of suche prophetes in þe gospell
Crist hymself techeþ us well
Attendite a falsis prophetis qui veniunt
ad vos in vestimentis ouium et cetera
sed a
fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos
Abideþ fro false prophetes and leueþ hem nonst
Þat in cloþynge of shep to yow shulle come
But witinne hemself þey wolde be
As a wolf ful of raueyne witoute pyte
But by here fruyt 3e mowe haue knowynge
Wheþer þey kepe goddes lawe in here lyvynge
For þey þat kepiþ it perfitly
Be non suche 3e mowe se þerby
For of what kynde so is a tre
Of þe same kynde behoueþ þe fruyt to be
For he þat is goddes trewe seruant
To lyue perfitly he wole ay fond

And hereof Crist warnet vs, as we sal here,
In his gospel on þis manere:
Attendite a falsis prophetis, qui veniunt
ad uos in vestimentis ouium, intrinsecus autem, sunt lupi rapaces. [A
fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos].
Bes warre of fals prophetus and lefus not hom,
Þat in cleþyng of shep to 3ov sal cum,

Bot witin homselfe þai shal be,
As wolfus `of´ raueyn witout pite.
And be hor werkes 3e may haþ knowynge
Queþer þai kepe Godus laþe in hor liffyng,
For þai þat kepe hit perfytyly,
Be non sich, 3e may se þerby:
For of quat kynd so is þe tree,
Of þat kynd behoue þe frutt to bee.
For he þat is Godus treu seruant,
To lif perfitly he wyll ay fond,
And þerfore men shuld trav and loke
To þe werkis of men as sais þe boke,
And nonst to ich spirit þat spekis here,
Bot profe first queþer he of God were:
Nolite credere omni [spiritui] sed
probate spiritus
si ex Deo sunt.
For mony mon shal desayuet be
Thurȝe Antecrist and his cumpane,

Once again, most of the verses added in the Speculum are from Scripture, and they involve little more than appropriate scriptural quotations and English translations strung, catena-like, between portions of text. The additional scriptural quotations could be marginal additions of the kind discussed earlier (with reference to Speculum ll. 1423-1461) or perhaps they are editorial insertions of quotations thought apt for a particular pastoral situation. The accuracy of the middle quotation (from Matt. 7:15-16a) in the Speculum, as opposed to the abbreviated version given in C and H, taken in conjunction
with the additional scriptural quotations found in most of the other major interpolations in the text indicates a redactor interested, not only in Scriptural support for his text, but also in getting Scriptural references right.

While much remains ambiguous about the sources for the major interpolations found in the *Speculum*, the manner in which these additions were made, and the kind of additions made, indicate an attempt to amplify the text with a certain respect for the continuity of the argument. The additions are made usually mid-sentence by means of conjunctions, and they generally amplify existing themes within the exposition of the preceding text. The addition of some biblical quotations without any corresponding English translation, along with the portions of added verses which pertain mainly to the clergy, may indicate that the text was intended as a catechetical tool for clerical hands, rather than for lay instruction. This particular hypothesis runs up against the obstacle presented by the most striking additional feature of the *Speculum*, the treatise on the ten commandments. If, however, the text were a teaching tool out of which a parish priest would draw support, not only for his lessons to his flock, but also for his own spiritual life, then the text might have been plundered for solitary treasures, rather than completely rehearsed. The texts contained in the *Speculum* could represent an individual reworking of the *Prick of Conscience* for a specific pastoral situation, along with the added "anticlerical" portions, intended for the cleric's self-correction and meditation. Rather than journeying much further into the fields of speculation, however, it might be best to examine just how the text does or does not "hang together" as a work, investigating both the nature and methods of abbreviation in the text, and then a representative part of the seven parts of the *Speculum*. Such an investigation may throw further light on the intended readership and use of the poem.
III. The Coherence of the *Speculum*

A. The Nature and Method of the Abbreviations Made to the Text of the *Prick of Conscience* in the *Speculum*

The *Descriptive Guide* mentions that both texts *C* and *H* are “highly condensed,” and that the *Speculum* “was probably made from the version contained in MV 11 [i.e. *C*] and 14 [i.e. *H*].”\(^{44}\) Since the version in *C* and *H* reduces the text of the Main Version of the *Prick of Conscience* by about two-thirds, whereas the texts of the *Speculum* reduce the readings of *C* and *H* only by another ten percent, one of the most prominent features of revision \(\alpha\) is its concision in comparison with the text of *Z*. Evaluating the quality of the material absent from the first revision involves somewhat delicate judgements: only a consistency in the kind of material absent from the text would indicate that its absence is the result of a carefully planned revision, rather than of a haphazard attempt to shorten the text, or (extremely unlikely, seeing as there is no consistent size to the omissions) of the destruction of particular folios from an exemplar. The evidence gleaned from a line-by-line comparison among all five texts involved in this study (*Z, C, H, B, D*) confirms that the first revision lacks two general categories of material from the *Prick of Conscience*: repetitious material which elaborates upon a point made earlier or later in the text; and material which introduces distinctions (usually more abstract or complex) into the text.

The greater part, not only of the abbreviation of the text in its transformation into the *Speculum*, but also of its simplification, occurs within the first revision of the text, but the general trends of abbreviation continue in the second revision.

The first revision lacks a number of the metaphors and exempla found in *Z*. A

\(^{44}\) *Descriptive Guide*, pp. 44 and 47 for *C* and *H* respectively.
quotation from Innocent III’s *De contemptu mundi* (*CHZ* ll. 636-643; *Speculum* ll. 362a-i) which compares plant life and human life, and finds the latter lacking, introduces a lengthy series of similar metaphors (*Z* ll. 660-851) which disappear in the first revision. Graphic descriptions in *Z* (ll. 860-869, 888-931) of the worms and vermin which consume dead bodies are reduced to the barest mention in the first revision (*CHZ*, ll. 852-859, 876-887; *Speculum*, ll. 375-390). A metaphor for the pain of death, likening it to having the roots of a tree, which had grown throughout one’s body, pulled out (*Z*, ll. 1896-1925) disappears from a discourse on how death shall be common to all (*Speculum* ll. 913-918). The second reason for fearing death (the sight of devils) is described in detail in *Z* (ll. 2216-2351), with exempla describing how Saints Martin and Bernard saw devils on their deathbeds, and reasons given for the horrible appearance of devils. This is reduced, in *α*, to six lines (*CHZ* ll. 2352-2355, 2368, 2369; *Speculum* ll. 1013-1016) which assert that the sight of one’s sins is more horrible than the sight of fiends. A series of metaphors in *Z* for the state of a soul during the dispute between the angels and the devils over its fate (the soul is like a man in the middle of the sea during a storm; the soul is in fear of its life as a felon fears the justice of a king; *Z*, ll. 2930-2961) is pared down in *α* to the barest mention of the disputation (*Z*, ll. 2924-2929; *Speculum*, ll. 1159-1164). A series of similes (*Z*, ll. 3178-3201) which develop the point that purgatory’s fires burn more fiercely depending on the severity of the venial sin committed (*Z*, ll. 3164-3177; *Speculum* ll. 1224a-1234), does not appear in the first revision. It would appear that, in his attempt to abbreviate the text, the initial redactor found elements of literary colouring such as similes, metaphors, and *exempla* expendable and extraneous to his purpose.

A number of repetitions or elaborations likewise find no place in the first revision.
A discussion of the seasons as an example of the instability of the world (Z ll. 1414-1449) disappears in α, and a list which retails examples of mutability and transience taken from human life ("Now er men wele, now er men wa,/Now es a man frende, now es he faa . . .") Z, ll. 1451-1473) is reduced to a much shorter list in α (Speculum, ll. 707-714). Notes on the change in manners (Z, ll. 1517-1531) and the vanity of dress (Z, ll. 1536-1543; 1560-1567) drop out in revision α, leaving behind only four lines which make reference simply to the pursuit of vanity in the rapid change in fashion (Z, ll. 1532-1535; Speculum 719-722). An elaboration upon how the virtuous have no reason to fear death (Z, ll. 2162-2215) which follows the quotation "Non potest male mori qui bene vixit, et vix bene moritur qui male vixit" (Z ll. 2160, 2161; Speculum ll. 1008a,b) does not appear in α. Jesus' review of all the land of his birth and earthly life when he descends to the vale of Josephat, along with the bulk of the description of his appearance to the righteous at that time (Z, ll. 5181-5252), are also passed over. A series of "dies irae" statements (Z, ll. 6089-6143; "he grete day of delyveraunce,/ he day of wreke and of vengeaunce"), which draw out the implications of God's wrath on the day of judgement, along with the account of the separation of the righteous and the damned, cannot be found in α. A discourse on the fate of the earth and the other heavenly bodies after judgement (Z, ll. 6340-6420) also drops out. The first recension lacks the vivid descriptions of what devils shall do to the wicked, and what the wicked shall do to one another in hell (Z, ll. 7358-7431), found in the sixth book. A litany of the joys to be found in heaven (Z, ll. 7805-7888), a discourse on the New Jerusalem (Z, ll. 8793-9006; 9017-9124; 9154-9231), the miseries of the damned (Z, ll. 9353-9474), and the concluding recapitulation of the whole work (Z, ll. 9475-9490; 9521-9622), are the largest portions of the seventh book which the first recension leaves out. Every part of the work, then, was radically abridged in the first
revision, often leaving the “bare bones” of argumentation, simple statements or quotations to stand in place of what was a far more capacious treatment in the text of Z. Portions of text which added literary ornamentation to the text, such as *exempla* and poetic repetitions, tend to be left behind.

The abridgement found in the first revision of the text not only omits material extraneous to the bare arguments of Z, but also removes a number of more complex distinctions in arguments, and some speculative matter, thus simplifying the poem as a whole. Part two, on the world, lacks distinctions between the spiritual and earthly world (Z, ll. 956-1057), some metaphors for the world, and a brief discourse on Fortune’s wheel (Z, ll. 1158-1288) taken from Bartholomaeus Anglicus’s *De Proprietatibus Rerum*.45 Another portion taken from Bartholomaeus’s work, an elaborate description of the heavenly bodies, and a description of where heaven fits in (Z, ll. 7631-7768), likewise disappears from α. The first revision omits the distinction between the three kinds of death (bodily, spiritual, and eternal) found in Z, ll. 1680-1693, and a discourse describing endless death and two reasons why death is dreadful (Z, ll. 1740-1817). An explanation of how the disembodied soul can feel diseases, attached to the fourth pain in Purgatory (that the soul will be afflicted with diseases) in Z, ll. 3006-3087, along with a further explanation regarding how purgatorial fire harms the soul more than earthly fire harms the body (Z, ll. 3102-3123), likewise have no analogues in the first revision. The first revision does not include a further discourse on whether purgatory fire is bodily or spiritual, on how purgatory fire destroys all sin, and on how the length of stay in purgatory is determined by the amount and severity of sin remaining (Z, ll. 3128-3151). Four ways

45 *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, Liber viii, c. 1. (Cologne: 1470), fol. 73ff. (Bodleian shelfmark: Auct. 6 Q inf. 2.13).
Antichrist will turn people to his law (Z ll. 4247-4352) do not get repeated in α. The fifth book of Z (ll. 4861-4898) elaborates upon the four ways in which the consuming fire at the day of doom will burn, and the three periods of this fire (ll. 4907-4920; 4923-4924; 4929-4956) — all of which drop out of the first revision. The general account of gifts of nature, grace, and fortune (Z ll. 5894-5921) at the day of doom is left out of the description of the doom in α as well.

With such large swathes of material omitted from the first revision, and the inherent ambiguity in assessing a compiler’s motivation in editing out lines from a text, it is sometimes difficult to judge whether particular matter has been omitted for doctrinal reasons. An elaboration regarding how the prayers of the sinful, and mass, even when celebrated by a sinful priest, may be efficacious in aiding the souls in purgatory (Z, ll. 3656-3761), is replaced by four rather different lines particular to the first revision: “Bot of [god]prestus masse syngyng,/ To saulos in purgatory is most helpyng/ If hai lif here in holynes,/ As holy doctowrs bere witnes” (Speculum, ll. 1335-1338). The whole final portion of the fourth book in Z, which explains why a requiem mass is sung for a young child, and which also explains the reasons for and purpose of papal indulgences (Z, ll. 3784-3939), does not appear in α. Less biblically-based (more fanciful?) portions of the discourse on Antichrist, on how he shall turn the people from Christ’s law (Z ll. 4247-4262; 4265-4330; 4333-4352), on his tyranny, the release of devils, and the mark of Antichrist (ll. 4357-4414), on the mission of Enoch and Elijah (ll. 4431-4502), and on the death of Antichrist (ll. 4587-4620), are passed over in revision α. An anti-Pelagian argument, setting out reasons why individuals cannot place confidence in their good deeds as a guarantee of salvation (Z ll. 2458-2577) does not get repeated in α, perhaps in order to avoid the perception that works lack merit. A major section of the part of the poem on
purgatory in \textit{Z} (ll. 3354-3511) which distinguishes between and identifies mortal and venial sins, drops out from the treatment of purgatory in \textit{\alpha}, thus removing some of the subtlety of the original; one could well ask whether this was done in order to avoid encouraging a kind of indifference to venial sin. Some of the first revision’s omissions of distinctions and speculative argument might also be motivated by a concern not to confuse or mislead the reader (or listener) in doctrinal matters — yet any speculations regarding editorial motivations for omission must be approached rather gingerly and tentatively.

Similar kinds of excisions are made in the second revision, although they tend to be shorter omissions, and fewer in number. Most of the omissions involve matter which introduces distinctions into the text: a brief distinction between the microcosm and macrocosm (\textit{ZCH} ll. 1480, 1481, 1504-1516), a list of the four places within hell (\textit{ZCH} ll. 2806-2828), lines describing why purgatory and hell are in the middle of the earth and a distinction between special and common purgatory (\textit{ZCH} ll. 2854-2887), a list of actions which aid souls in Purgatory (\textit{ZCH} ll. 3572-3629), a list of the fifteen signs before the doom (\textit{ZCH} ll. 4717-4823), and lines describing the location of heaven (\textit{ZCH} ll. 7567-7630) are all omitted in revision \textit{\beta}. Most assessments of the reasons why material does not appear in \textit{\alpha} or in \textit{\beta} must remain suppositious and vague, mainly because no positive evidence exists to form the basis for a judgement. It is often difficult to attribute intentions to omissions in the text, but these omissions do make an objective impact on its discourse: with fewer distinctions, fewer speculations (if one will forgive the pun on the title), the poem becomes simpler and more general. The bones of the argumentation, already bared extensively in the first redaction, become even barer in the second.
B. Characteristics of Abbreviation and Addition in Redaction β: Part V on the Doom

None of the available information about these omissions of material in the Speculum answers the more important questions regarding the Speculum as a work: is the Speculum merely a digest of a compilation, a medieval precursor to modern-day “best of” compilations in literature and music? Or does the Speculum stand as an independent work (albeit heavily indebted to the Prick of Conscience), which manifests concerns similar to, but slightly different from those of its major source? Since an exhaustive catalogue of additions and alterations to the text in redactions α and β might hide the major redactive features in a vast forest of tedious detail, a deeper examination of the representative developments within one part of the text will help to assess the coherence and “success” (if that is the correct term to use) of the Speculum as a work in its own right. The fifth part of the Speculum, on the day of doom, presents a particularly good field for such a study, since it is the longest part of the poem and contains within it examples of both structural rearrangement of the text, and the addition of new material. It also happens to be one of the most abbreviated portions of the text, which will help to illustrate how the remaining elements from the Prick of Conscience are brought together relatively seamlessly, allowing the text to enjoy a degree of coherence independent of its major source.

One caveat to this proposal deserves mention before proceeding further. The Prick of Conscience is, in the main, a compilation of excerpts and quotations from Latin and French texts, translated into verse and pieced together within seven topical parts. 46

---

As a compilation, it already contains discrete units of material placed within a larger structural template: the coherence of the whole depends on whether the discrete units have been harmoniously fit within the sevenfold “template”, and whether the parts of that template together contribute to the fulfillment of the common purpose of the text expressed in the prologue (Z, ll. 205-234; Spec. ll. 161-176). The existence of a fairly exhaustive table of contents given in one manuscript and reproduced at the beginning of Morris’s edition only serves to illustrate that the text has a highly ordered structure with discrete divisions within the seven major parts of the text. As with quiltwork or mosaic, a judgement about the coherence of the whole design in any such work of compilation depends largely on general impressions of the whole work. Since the source text for the Speculum is itself something of a patchwork, it will make any adjudication of the coherence of the Speculum in contradistinction to that of the Prick somewhat difficult.

The outset of Part V illustrates at least three major kinds of redactive activity going on in the Speculum: omission of material, structural rearrangement of organizational elements, and additions to the text. Many of the parts of the Speculum follow the Prick and develop the body of each treatise according to an introductory organizational list, as in the third part on death, where four reasons for dreading death are first listed (Speculum ll. 869-882), then individually explicated (Speculum ll. 883-1072), or in the fourth part, on purgatory, where the pains of purgatory are listed (Spec. ll. 1073-1136), then described in detail (ll. 1137-1264); a similar schema occurs in parts six and seven, which describe the pains of hell and the joys of heaven respectively. The fifth part and Stacy Waters, “The Prick of Conscience: the Southern Recension, Book V” (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1976), p. i. Robert J. Relihan’s doctoral thesis, “A Critical Edition of the Anglo-Norman and Latin Versions of Les Peines de Purgatorie”, (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1978), pp. 71-86, argues convincingly that the Prick of Conscience makes use of the Anglo-Norman version of the Les Peines de Purgatorie, attributed to Robert Grosseteste.
is no exception: a list of the tokens of the doom at the beginning of the section (Spec. ll. 1351-1372) provides the outline for the elaborations given later on in the body of the text (Spec. ll. 1561-2022). One major structural divergence between the Prick of Conscience and the Speculum occurs at this early stage, and is followed through later in the treatment of the day of doom. The list heading this portion of the text in Z gives ten signs of the doom, a list which is reduced to nine signs in revision α, and to eight in revision β.

Despite the absence of the first sign ("Pe first es of the wonderful takens sere,/ Þat byfor Þat day sal be shewed here." Z, ll. 3972, 3973), some of the explanatory matter corresponding to this sign, which covers the life of Antichrist and the traditional fifteen signs before doomsday (Z, ll. 3992-4817)\(^\text{47}\), appears in the Speculum (ll. 1374-1560), albeit highly abbreviated — many of the extra-biblical details of Antichrist’s life and the fifteen signs of the doom do not appear in the Speculum. The resulting account introduces something completely unexpected, and therefore somewhat jarring, into this part of the text, since the reader has come to expect a correspondence between initial lists and content in preceding sections of the poem. Although redaction α leaves out the ninth sign in the Prick of Conscience ("Pe neghend, of al men aftir Þai haf wroght,/ Of wilk som sal be demed, and som noght" Z, ll. 3988, 3989), it does contain, once again, some of the explanatory content attached to that sign (Speculum, ll. 1917-1954). In this case the omission of the item from the initial list does not create as much havoc in the text of the Speculum as the unexpected introduction of the life of Antichrist, since the material remaining from the detailed discourse on the ninth token can be easily added to the last sign, which concerns the final judgement itself.

This apparent unconcern for co-ordinating an initial organizational list with contents occurs again in Part V of the text, and once more in Part VI, on the pains of Hell.

The detailed explication of the sixth token of the doom, “pe Accusers mony/ ṭat the symnful mon shal accuse nomly” (Speculum, ll. 1367, 1368), includes a list stating that there will be fifteen groups of people who will stand as accusers on the day of doom.

While the corresponding list in the Prick of Conscience (Z, ll. 5424-5439) does indeed contain fifteen items, the list becomes somewhat reduced in redaction α:

Z, ll. 5424-5439
For I fynd written, als yhe sal here,
Fiften maneres of accusours sere,
Ṭat sal accuse in ṭat dredeful day
Pe symnful men, ṭat es to say,
Conscience ṭat es called Ynwitt,
And ṭaip awen syns, and hali writt,
Gods creatures ṭat we ken,
Devils and aungils and haythen men,
And martirs ṭat has feled tourments sere,
And othir ṭat wranges has tholed here.
Mens sons and doghters unchastyede,
Pover men ṭat ṭaip nede myght noght hyde,
Suggettes, and benefices receyved here.
Pe tourmentes of Cristes passioun sere;
And God hym-self and alle ṭe trinite,
Alle ṭere ogayne ṭe symnful sal be.

Speculum, ll. 1761-1774
For we fynd writon, as ȝe shal here,
[Fiftene] maners of accusers ṭere
Ṭat shal accuse, at ṭat dreful day,
.FindElement men, ṭat is to say:
Consciens, ṭat is clepet ṭe inwytt,
And hor awne symnus, and holy writt;
All Goddus creatures ṭat we con tell,
Holy men, and aungils, and fentus of hell;
Marturs ṭat hard turmentus did fele,
And mennus awne childer vnchastist here;
Pore men ṭat grete nede hade;
Sugettus and meyne, ṭat ṭai [mysladd];
Be passion of Crist, hard to see,
All ṭes aȝayne symnful mon shal be.

The list found in C and H is substantially the same as that found in the Speculum above.

No account of the disparity between the numerical title of the list and its paucity of elements appears in the texts of B, D, C, or H. The elaboration of this list in the Speculum only reduces the number of accusers even more, mentioning only the following ones (all line numbers are from the Speculum): conscience (ll. 1775-1786); Scripture (ll. 1787-1790); the whole world (ll. 1791-1796); fiends (ll. 1797-1802); angels (ll. 1803, 1804); unchastized children (ll. 1805-1816); poor men (ll. 1817-1822); subjects and
domestics (ll. 1823-1836). Although the disparity between organizational list and contents in this instance occurs within the first redaction, as the agreement of C, H, B, and D testifies, it seems odd that it was not corrected in the second redaction.

The treatment of the pains of hell in Part VI provides an additional example of a disparity between organizational list and contents carried over from the first into the second redaction. The pains are somewhat altered in the two redactions of the sixth part, and once again the alterations are due mainly to lacunae in the text of the first redaction. The fourteen general pains of hell listed in the Prick of Conscience become twelve in the Speculum with the removal of the ninth pain (beating by devils, Z, ll. 5571, 5572) and the fourteenth pain (despair, Z, ll. 6581, 6582). The enumeration of the list in the Speculum is altered in order to accommodate the new arrangement (unlike the list of the “fifteen” accusers in Part V); but, once again, the discourse which follows fails to match the initial list in all its particulars: the eleventh pain in the Speculum’s list (shame and compunction for sin, ll. 2105, 2106) simply drops out of the discourse, which skips from the tenth pain to the twelfth (see Speculum, ll. 2277-2291). The discourse on the twelfth pain of hell bears no resemblance to the twelfth pain mentioned in the list; rather than describing the “bandus of fire brennyng/ ḫat shal euer haf in hell wonyng,” (Speculum, ll. 2707, 2708) it describes a pain which stands over and above the fourteen others within the Prick of Conscience as the pain “mast principalle,” (Z, l. 7299) the loss of the sight of God:

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{be twelft payne is fa\textsuperscript{i}lyng of sy3t,} \\
&\text{Of God almy3ty, ḫat is so bɾɪ3t.} \\
&\text{ cazzo al be paynus ḫat in hell may be} \\
&\text{Shuld lityll grefe, if men \textsuperscript{'}my3t\textsuperscript{'} hym se,} \\
&\text{For as be sy3t of God in heuo\textsuperscript{o}n is} \\
&\text{Most joy of al, both more and lesse,} \\
&\text{So be faiyng of ḫat sy3t} \\
&\text{Is most payne ḫat in hell is dy3t. (Speculum, ll. 2291-2298)}
\end{align*}\]
This inconsistency between the list of the pains and the subsequent discourse originates in the first redaction, since manuscripts C and H do not possess any analogues to Z, ll. 7127-7190, 7195-7305, which contain the explications of the twelfth to the fourteenth pain in the Prick of Conscience. The list of pains in C and H matches the list given in Z, ll. 6557-6582, but the detailed descriptions of individual pains which come afterward in C and H stop inexplicably after the eleventh pain, “hot tears” (roughly equivalent to Z, ll. 7115-7126), and then resume with lines similar to Z ll. 7298-7311, which deal with the loss of the sight of God. The loss of the ninth and fourteenth pains in the Speculum could reflect a redactor’s recognition of the inconsistency in α between the list at the head of Part VI and the discourse afterward; in an attempt to correct this inconsistency, the ninth pain (beating by devils) was then incorporated into the eighth pain (gnawing of beasts), and the fourteenth pain dropped in order to accommodate the twelve pains which remained if the “mast principalle” pain (loss of the sight of God) was incorporated in the list as a general pain of hell.

From the examples studied above, it would appear that the second redactor entertained no strict regard for consistency in his adjustments to the organizational structure of his source text, yet the revisions detailed above for the treatise on hell illustrate that he was willing, at least on one occasion, to make adjustments in order to introduce greater consistency into the α-text he had received, despite the fact that the initial list and the contents of the part on Hell still do not quite match. The disregard for consistency between prefatory lists and content in the Speculum could point to any of a number of redactional concerns: perhaps the redactor was less concerned with organizational detail than he was with providing some content, no matter what; perhaps he recognized the chaotic state of the α-text with respect to organizational elements, and
only intervened in cases where he thought he could marshal the remaining material to advantage. In any event, inconsistencies like the ones present in Parts V and VI mar the text in terms of mnemonics: if the lists examined above were presented as a kind of “set text” for memorization, with their respective discourses as an explanation of the set text, then the inconsistencies would become obvious both to teacher and pupil. The “fifteen accusers at the day of doom” list in Part V could not serve as a useful mnemonic list unless it were memorized separately from the subsequent “explanations” or under a completely different heading. These inconsistencies in the text tend to limit its effectiveness as a teaching aid, and could thus narrow the field for understanding its possible uses.

Despite these structural examples of inconsistency, where the text of the Speculum does not cohere as well as it might (mainly due, in the examples given above, to an inadequate inheritance from the first redaction), the major omissions of lines, already mentioned briefly in the preceding section of this chapter, are executed with some regard for continuity and flow in the general argument of the text. In revising the text, the second redactor takes advantage of a structural feature in the Prick of Conscience tradition, namely the “compartmentalized” nature of the text as a compilation. Each part of the text is divided into subsections according to organizational lists at the head of each part mentioned earlier. In many cases, the individual explications for each item on the initial list are usually comprised of “separable” authoritative quotations, exempla, or elaborations. The second redactor takes advantage of the distinctive topical breaks in the text handed down to him, so that when he omits larger sequences of lines, he tends to omit one or more of these “separable” series of lines. The missing treatise on the fifteen signs of doomsday (Z, ll. 4681-4823, reduced to seventy-six lines in C and H) is the most
notable omission of this kind in Part V of the *Speculum*:

**CH**

*Arise*  [that]  *ben*  *dede*  and *come*
To  *hē*  grete  *dreadful*  dome.
But  *3ut*  mo  *tokenes*  men  *mo*  *we*  *telle*
As  Crist  *hymself*  seīp  in  a  *gospelle*:

**Et erunt signa in sole et luna et stellas**

[CH then carry 72 lines roughly equivalent to Z, ll. 4717-4729; 4738-4741; 4745-4746; 4748-4755; 4758-4767; 4770-4773; 4776, 4777; 4780-4785; 4788-4791; 4794, 4795; 4798-4813; 4816-4823]

And  *hus*  tellep  lorum  *pe*  *tokenes*  fiftene
As  he  *in*  *pe*  *bok*  of  hebrewes  *haþ*  *sene*
But  for  alle  *pe*  *tokenes*  *pat*  *man*  *may*  *telle*
or  *se*
3ut  shal  *phere*  non  certayn  be
What  tyme  Crist  shal  come  to  *pe*  dome
So  sodeynly  he  shal  to  hit  come
As  hit  bifelle  on  Noe  and  Lotes  dayes
So  shal  he  come  as  *pe*  *gospel*  seyes:

**Et sicut factum est in diebus Noe . . .**

The whole treatment of the fifteen signs simply drops out of the second redaction, and the redactor then seizes on a few apposite phrases (“Crist . . . shal cum so sodanly”) from the lines at the end of the treatise, sewing them onto the preceding lines with a conjunction in order to rework the introduction to the following quotation. Another treatise, concerning the purgation of the world by fire, drops out of the second redaction in a similar fashion:

**CH**

*Whanne*  [that]  *Loth*  *jede*  out  of  Sodome
And  sodeynly  goddes  vengeaunce  come
Hit  rayned  fuyr  from  *heuene*  and  brymstone
And  slow  and  brenned  man  and  womman
*Hus*  sodeynly  shal  falle  *pe*  day  of  dome
*Whanne*  Goddes  sone  *frō*  *heuene*  to  erpe  *come*
In  *pe*  ende  of  *pe*  world  bifie  *pe*  dome
An  hidous  fuyr  shal  sodeynly  come
*Pat*  al  *pe*  world  holly  shal  forbrenne
And  no  *þyng*  spare  *pat*  is  *þereynne*

**Speculum**, ll. 1583-1585a

*Arise, 3e*  *pat*  *ben*  *dede*,  *and*  *come*
To  *pe*  last  *dreadfull*  dome.

**Speculum**, ll. 1599-1606

And  *þat*  *day*  *þat*  *Loth*  *went*  out  of  Sodome,
*Sodanly*  *Goddus*  *venjaunce*  *come*:
Hit  rayned  [*fire*  *frō*  *heuow*]  and  bronston,
And  slo3e  and  brend  *mon*  and  womow.
*þat*  *sodanle*  *sal*  *fal*  *pe*  *dome*,
*Quen*  *Goddus*  *son*  [*of*  *heuen*]  to  erth  shal  shal  *come*.
For as God bifore his furste comynge
Wolde here fordo witoute lettynge
Al þe world þorw water onyle
Aþen þe fuyr of lecherye
Riþ aþen his laaste comynge
he shal of þe world make endynge
þorw fuyr þat shal brennynge be
Aþen þe coldnesse of charite
And of þis we haue auctorite
In holy writ as clerkes konne se

Ignis ante ipsum precedet et inflammabit
in circuitu omnes inimicos eius
The fuyr bifore hym shal go and brenne
þe world and al þat is þerinne
Whanne alle men ben brent as I haue told
þemente shulle þey uprise alle boþe 3ong
and old
Out of here graues in soule and body
And come to þe dom alle holly
Oure lord 3ut þemente or he come doun
To deme men in his propre persoun
Bot 3et þen, or Crist come don
To deme men in his propur persoun,

Once again, a whole swathe of lines which belong to a specific “distinction” within the
text of the Prick of Conscience drops out, whilst the first line after the omission is
modified slightly (once again, with a conjunction) in order to link the remaining text. The
remaining reference to purging fire before the doom, seen at the beginning of the
quotation above, serves the redactor as sufficiently explicating the item listed in the
opening organizational list (“þe first [token] is of fire þat shall bre«ne/ þe world, and al
þat is þerin.” Speculum, II. 1357, 1358). The lines quoted above thus also illustrate a
parallel to developments in the first redaction: the second redaction, like the first, omits
passages containing finer distinctions or elaborations upon points made earlier in the text,
with the net effect being the simplification of the text as a whole. Another example of a
textual simplification through omission appears in lines describing just how Christ shall
appear in the vale of Josefhat for the final judgement:
Contrary to the usual addition of scriptural passages to the text, two scriptural quotations (the first from Joel 3:12, the second an inexact quotation from Rev. 14:14) disappear in revision β, along with their accompanying translations. Once again, lines which elaborate upon an event (this time, the descent of Christ in judgement) are left out of the text, resulting in a loss of descriptive detail. Many similar omissions occur within part V: twenty-two lines in C and H (corresponding to Z ll. 5614-5619; 5622-5641) on the universal call to judgement disappear between ll. 1838 and 1839 of the Speculum; ten lines (corresponding to Z, ll. 5858, 5859; 5862, 5863; 5870, 5871; 5876-5879) on the
testimony required of souls not only concerning themselves, but concerning the conduct of others, likewise disappear in the second redaction. In each case, lines which belong together as an elaboration of a specific point within Part V drop out of the second redaction without any noticeable disruption in the flow of the text.

Although the larger additions to the text found only in the second redaction (ll.1423-1461; 1874-1884) have already received some scrutiny above, it is worthwhile noting here how they have been inserted in a manner which augments, rather than detracts from, the continuity and coherence of the poem. The first set of lines, *Speculum* ll. 1423-1461, replaces a lengthy description (based upon Adso of Montier-en-Der's *De ortu et tempore Antichristo*) of the destruction of Rome, and the conception, birth, and upbringing of the Antichrist, with biblical signs for recognizing the Antichrist — one treatise on Antichrist replaces another. The second set of lines, *Speculum* ll. 1874-1884, builds upon lines from the *Prick of Conscience* (*Z*, ll. 5882-5893) which state that priests shall give an account of their flock at the doom. In both cases, the interpolated lines appear within a discourse suited to their matter, and the redactor has made some attempt to link the new passages to the preceding lines. This parallels the behaviour of the redactor in the addition of other passages outside Part V, discussed at the beginning of this chapter. The attempt to incorporate such additional material within the larger text testifies to a redactor who is aware of the flow of discourse within the text, who respects that flow, and wishes to add lines in a manner which harmonizes with the rest of the text. In this sense, the text is not merely a series of unconnected quotations on distinct topics from the original poem, but a conscious redaction which seeks to alter the poem whilst maintaining its unity as a poem, and not as a mere collocation of *bon mots*.

A number of smaller redactional features in Part V which reveal something of the
attitude of the second redactor bear some mention here, despite the fact that they fall outside a discussion of the coherence of the poem. The introduction to the section on the Antichrist contains some minor editing which might betray something of the thought of the redactor:

\[\text{Z(CH), II. 4047-4050} \quad \text{Speculum, II. 1411-1414}\]

First of Antecrist tel we may,
bat has regned ymong us mony aday,
Aftir þe destrucion sal be
Ay, syn þe emperoure began to be
Of þe empyre of Rome, þat es yhit fre.
Soget þat sum tyme had maistree.

And first of ancrist wille I say
þat sal com befor domesday,
Aftir þe destrucion sal be
Pat has regned ymong us mony aday,
Of þe empyre of Rome, þat es yhit fre.
Soget þat sum tyme had maistree.

The shift from future to past tense and the mention of a defeated Roman emperor in the \textit{Speculum} raise questions regarding the interpretive schema of the redactor: which emperor does he have in mind? Who is the interpreted “Antichrist” who “has regned ymong us mony aday”? While the answers to these questions must remain mysteries, the redactor apparently holds that the arrival of Antichrist, rather than being an imminent event, has already occurred, after the fall of the last world emperor. The legend of the last world emperor, who establishes peace over the earth before the arrival of Antichrist, is a theme introduced in the \textit{Tiburtine Oracle}, mentioned in Matthew Paris’s \textit{Chronica majora}, and used by Peter Comestor in his \textit{Historia scholastica}. The legend is mentioned in Adso’s \textit{De ortu et tempore Antichristi} as an interpretation of the “dissencio” mentioned in 2 Thess. 2:3b-4, which is quoted in the \textit{Prick of Conscience} and the \textit{Speculum} immediately after the passage given above. The redactor of the \textit{Speculum} could be interpreting the Antichrist tradition in terms of contemporary events, something not unknown among polemicists of the later middle ages.\textsuperscript{49} The difficulty is the lack of any

\textsuperscript{48}Emmerson, pp. 48, 49.
\textsuperscript{49}Emmerson, pp. 62-73.
clear interpretive key: the "Roman Emperor" must refer to the office of the Holy Roman Emperor, which had been revived by Charles IV of Bohemia, who reigned under that title from 1355 to 1378. The claim to the title passed on to Charles's eldest son, Wenceslaus IV, who only succeeded in being acknowledged as King of the Romans from 1378 to 1410, resigning his claim to his brother Sigismund, who as Holy Roman Emperor convened the Council of Constance. Although the regnal dates for Charles IV would fit in well with the presumed date of the second redaction, the historical details surrounding Sigismund's arrest and subjection of Wenceslaus in 1410 accord better with the vague details about the career, fall, and subjection of the Last World Emperor as they are presented in the Speculum. This hypothesis presents a further difficulty, however: the date of Wenceslaus's arrest and subjection come later than the presumed date for the second redaction as given by the dating of the manuscripts. In any case, the references made to the Roman Emperor are too vague to support any definite historical interpretation.

One further odd redactional feature manifests itself in the way that references to the Jews are adapted within Part V of the Speculum. The medieval Antichrist tradition often included reference to the eventual conversion of the Jews, usually through the preaching of Enoch and Elias, the two prophets who will return to preach against Antichrist. The Prick of Conscience carries this tradition in material taken from Adso of Montier-en-Der's De ortu et tempore Antichristi:

Z (CH), ll. 4505-4510, 4515-4518:  
Speculum, ll. 1532a-1538:  
Convertent corda patrum in filios.  
Conuertent corda patrum in filios


51 See Emmerson, pp. 41, 100.
He says "þai sal turne thurgh Goddes myght
þe fadirs hertis intil þe sons right."
Þat es, þai sal turne þe lewery
Until right cristendom halely.

Percipient fidel quam ipsi habuerunt
"þe lewes sal tak þan with hert glade And men shal tak, wit hert glad,
þe trouth þat cristen men byfor hadde."

The disappearance of references to the eventual salvation of the Jews occurs once again in
another passage a little further on:

Z (CH), ll. 4635-4638

Speculum, ll. 1556a-1560

Et fiet unum ovile et unus pastor
He sais "alle folkes to fald sal falle,
And a hirde sal be to kepe þam alle."
Þat folk lewes and cristen men sal be talde
Under a trouthe in haly kirkes falde;

Et fiet unum ovile
He sais, þen shal folke to oon fold fall,
And oon hurde shal kepe hom all.
þe floke bes al cristen men þat Godus lase sal hold,
Under oon truth in holy chirch, þe fold.

The disappearance of references to salvation for the Jews could indicate an anti-Semitic
bias in the second redaction, or at the least a nervousness about that strand of apocalyptic
tradition which proclaimed the salvation of the Jews before the Last Judgement. No other
references offer further insight into the reasons behind these specific adjustments to the
text.

IV. Conclusions

The coherence of the Speculum cannot be seen merely as the discursive continuity
of the text, but must also be seen as a function of how the text coheres thematically as
well as textually. To say that the Speculum coheres textually might mean nothing more
than that it offers us a shortened version of the Prick of Conscience which lacks any
awkward or jarring evidence of excisions made from its parent text. Yet the evidence
given above tells a somewhat different story: the Speculum, rather than being just an abbreviated version of the Prick of Conscience, contains additions and excisions which, whilst they do not change the general focus of the text, place a different emphasis upon the exposition of the Last Things. Professors Lewis and McIntosh were correct in their assessment of the thematic emphases which distinguish the Speculum from the Prick, since the simplification found in the Speculum, and its added focus on law and on action, point to an emphasis upon exhortation, as opposed to contemplation. The Speculum presents us with a version of the Prick of Conscience which focuses on the Four Last Things, not so much as a meditation which eventually leads to conversion of life, but as an immediate spur to action: the attempt is not so much to change one’s thought, but to provide a plain answer to the old question, “What must I do to gain eternal life?”

This focus on action as opposed to contemplation can be seen both in the simplification of the text through the excision of speculative or illustrative matter, mentioned earlier with reference to both revisions α and β, and in the addition of references to God’s law, the commandments, and the works of mercy. Since most of the major omissions arise in the first redaction of the text, the process of simplification begins with the first redaction, and is continued, to a lesser degree, in the second redaction. The absence of some speculative distinctions manifests a desire to simplify the text, to remove musings whose attractions are more contemplative or intellectual than practical. The addition of a ten commandments treatise to the Speculum, along with additional references to “Goddus la3e” and the works of mercy, provide important positive evidence of this same shift of emphasis. The further additions to the Speculum in ll. 723-780 (critique of vanity in dress) and 1874-1884 (a reminder that priests will be judged for the faith of their flock) likewise focus on morality and deeds, rather than upon distinctions or
elaborations. The addition of the ten commandments treatise would appear to indicate some kind of pastoral use, since it broadens the scope of the text for the teaching or preaching of pastoralia.

The additional verses in the second redaction which are critical of the clergy may, as has already been stated, indicate something regarding the immediate use of the text. The Wycliffite controversies during the last quarter of the fourteenth century and the first quarter of the fifteenth made criticism of the clergy, when aired among the laity, rather suspect; it could be, then, that the Speculum was intended for a primarily clerical readership, despite its focus on action and its added pastoral emphasis. As a pastoral resource for the clergy, intended to be mined for personal as well as pastoral use, it could thus contain matter proper for the priest himself, and for his dealings with the laity. The possibility that the second redactor was a member of a religious community (or quasi-religious community, as the Augustinian Canons were) adds further possibilities to this speculation: Dominican or Augustinian friars, or indeed Augustinian Canons, could well be expected to address congregations of clergy (their fellow friars or Canons) or lay congregations, and so such a resource, with matter pertaining to both kinds of congregations, could prove most useful to a friar or Canon. The inconsistencies identified between initial lists and actual contents in Parts V and VI of the Speculum appear to indicate that this particular resource was intended for piecemeal use, rather than wholesale memorization, preaching, or teaching.

The structure of the text and its discursive continuity contribute more questions than answers to an overall picture of the use which someone might make of the Speculum. The use of rhyming couplets and a four-stress line makes the poem easy to memorize, and this, combined with the catechetical elements present in the text, suggests that the
Speculum was intended for some form of teaching. Unlike resources such as the Manipulus florum, or the Liber de abundancia exemplorum, where patristic references are strung together under topical heads which can then be indexed, the Speculum contains lengthier discourse and omits most of the subheadings given in some manuscripts of the Prick of Conscience. The presence of longer vernacular discourse and translations within both the Prick of Conscience and the Speculum makes them less suited to use as the kind of "pastoral dictionaries of quotations" represented by works like the Manipulus florum or the Liber de abundancia exemplorum, and, to a certain extent, the Speculum Christiani. The text is thus meant to be more than a series of quotations from the fathers strung together, and ready for quotation. The quotations themselves, generally set off from the rest of the text by means of underlining, rubrication, littera notabilior, or a different script, form landmarks for finding one's way through the text of the seven "parts" of the poem. The discursive cohesion of the Speculum in its additions and omissions presents another difficulty: how would someone make use of a series of lines within the text for pastoral instruction or a homily which must stand necessarily outside of such a smooth and contained whole? If the Speculum were meant for use as a whole, then how might the inconsistencies between organizational lists and explications mentioned earlier (i.e. the list of fifteen accusers at the doom, ll. 1761-1836; the list of the pains of hell in part VI) be reconciled with such an approach?

The limitations of the evidence found in the text do not provide for very specific conclusions concerning the identity of the redactor or redactors involved in the production of the Speculum, or the use of the text. The text is, however, more than just a compilation

52 See pp. XXXIV-XLI in Morris’s edition for a listing of subheadings given in one manuscript, some of which are retained in manuscripts C, H, and D.
of a compilation; it does not offer a mere digest of the *Prick of Conscience*, but it simplifies the contents of its source, and provides a new emphasis upon immediate action in the face of the Last Things, rather than upon contemplation of them as a spur to conversion. This new emphasis, along with the extensive revision of the text and the consistency of the poem within the bounds of its new focus, may provide the justification, at least in medieval eyes, for the new title of the poem in manuscripts B and D. In any event, we are left with a poem which still proclaims its purpose, shared with the *Prick of Conscience*, although it takes that purpose and develops it in new pastoral directions:

For knowyng of al þos shuld hym lede
To know his God thurȝe luf and drede,
And so to come witout delay
To joy and blis þat lastis ay. (*Speculum*, ll. 173-176)
Chapter Four: The Manuscript Relations of the *Speculum huius vite*

I. Introduction

A number of conclusions have been drawn in the preceding chapters based upon the seeming assumption that manuscripts C and H represent a manuscript tradition closer to the *Speculum* than any other manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience*. It may seem rather odd that such an "assumption" receives its proper scrutiny here, after it has already formed the basis for redactional analysis in the two preceding chapters, yet the manuscript study which lies at the heart of the present chapter necessarily preceded the establishment of the text, and finds its proper context as a justification for the editorial decisions present in our edition. What follows here constitutes a study of manuscript links between the *Speculum* and the *Prick of Conscience*, it is also the burden of this chapter to examine the manuscript evidence which underlies Professors Lewis and McIntosh’s hypothesis that the texts of C and H provide a link between the larger *Prick of Conscience* tradition (represented by Morris’ text, Z) and the *Speculum*. The objection could be made that the present chapter begs the question, since the conclusions offered herein form the basis for conclusions made in preceding chapters. Whilst the conclusions set forth in this chapter ground those made in previous chapters, it by no means constitutes a case of begging the question, since this study of the manuscript relations temporally preceded the establishment of the text, and therefore also preceded the conclusions based upon the examination of the established text.

A. Research to Date

1. Richard Morris’ Edition of the *Prick of Conscience*

   Richard Morris produced the only scholarly edition of the *Prick of Conscience* in

---

1 *Descriptive Guide*, p. 11.
1863, using two manuscripts as the base for his text. At the time, Morris knew of only 12 manuscripts of the PC, all but one of which were in the British Library. Since eight of the twelve manuscripts (London, British Library Arundel 140 ff. 41v-146v [MV26 in the Descriptive Guide], Cotton Galba E. IX ff. 76a-113a [MV27], Harley 2377 ff. 1-106 [MV32], Harley 2394 ff. 1-129 [MV33], Harley 4196 ff. 215-258va [MV34], Harley 6923 ff. 2-117v [MV35], Landsdowne 348 ff. 2-127 [MV36], Additional 22283 ff. 243a-259va [MV40]) available to Morris were dialectally northern, and the rest (Harley 1731 ff. 1-133v [SR8 in the Descriptive Guide], Harley 2281 ff. 1-64v [SR9], Additional 11305 ff. 3-126v [SR11]; Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Library Garrett 138 ff. 1-130 [SR15]) showed evidence of adaptation from northern exemplars, Morris concluded that the PC was northern in origin. He illustrated the northern origins of the PC through a study of certain elements of the vocabulary in the manuscripts of the PC available to him. He discovered that northern words such as loper, dasedness, domland, saghtel, merryng, bigg, romyng, rym, and worow were all changed in the Southern-dialect texts to the less appropriate and Southern leper, coldness, droubelond, pees, lowryng, riche, roryng, slouh, and strangely. On the basis of his judgement about the northern origins of the text, Morris chose British Library MS Cotton Galba E. ix as the best representative of the

---

2 Morris lists only ten of these manuscripts, but makes reference to the others (British Library Harley 2281 and British Library Arundel 140). Morris also makes mention of a text shown him by a Mr. Yates, which he called simply “Yates,” a manuscript which corresponds to Princeton University Library Garrett 138.

3 Richard Morris, ed., The Pricke of Conscience (Berlin: A. Asher & Co., 1863), p. II. Morris made it clear that he had many other examples of this kind, but not enough space to list them all. Morris gave no line numbers for the occurrence of these words, making it difficult to locate them and check his work. A quick survey of these words in the Middle English Dictionary shows that some of these examples, such as dasedness, are indeed northern. The examples in the MED for loper and domland are only found in the PC. Some of these words likewise have Southern occurrences: bigg (in the sense of “rich”) occurs in Malory, and saghtel has a South East Midlands equivalent of sahtlen.
northern manuscripts to hand, and used it as his base text. Only later did he realize that this manuscript was incomplete, and so he supplied the missing lines (lines 1538-1729, and 6923-9210 in the edition) from British Library MS Harley 4196, having concluded that this Harleian manuscript was “the best of [the] northern copies and differs but slightly from the copy which has supplied the present text.” Morris’ choice of a base text was later proven felicitous, since later research would confirm that the two manuscripts he chose, of the eleven manuscripts he had an opportunity to examine, were likely close to the original form of the poem.

2. Derek Britton’s Research and Morris’ Edition

The question of the interrelationship among the various manuscripts of the Prick of Conscience, and the determination as to which family of manuscripts came closer to the original, was developed gradually over the hundred years from Morris’ edition to the appearance of the Descriptive Guide. Percy Andreae, in his dissertation Die Handschriften des Prick of Conscience von Richard Rolle de Hampole im Britischen Museum (Berlin: G. Bernstein, 1888), analyzed eighteen manuscripts, collating three passages, corresponding to Morris’ ll. 1836-1927, 5126-5204, and 9335-9402. On the basis of this collation, he concluded that the manuscripts could be divided into four groups, A, B, C, and Z, the last of which contained those manuscripts closest to the original source. Derek Britton, building on Andreae’s work, collated completely eighteen manuscripts.

---


manuscripts of the Northern version of the PC for an edition of the poem. In an article for the journal Neuphilologische Mitteilungen dealing with some fragments of the PC in Dublin Trinity College MS O.2.40, he produced a stemma for the work, “without justification at this stage, and without discussion of its relationship to other stemmata of the P of C.” Britton placed Morris’ two base texts, BL Cotton Galba E.ix and BL Harley 4196 among those closest to the original, although, according to his comments, BL Add. 33995 was the better choice for a base text. Lewis and McIntosh largely accepted Britton’s estimation, and concur with Britton’s judgement that these three manuscripts, along with Bodleian Rawl. Poet. 175, and Wellesley Coll. 8, are the manuscripts closest to the presumed original.

3. Morris’ Edition in Lewis and McIntosh’s Descriptive Guide

Since Morris’ time, the tally of extant manuscripts has risen to 115, all of which Lewis and McIntosh have described in their Descriptive Guide. Drawing upon their own collations of certain discrete portions of the text, and correlating these collations with information from scholarship published since Morris’ edition, Lewis and McIntosh drew

---

7The manuscripts are: British Library (hereafter BL) Add. 33995, 24203, 25013, 32578; BL Cotton Galba E.ix, BL Harley 4196, 2394, 6923; Wellesley, Mass., Wellesley College 8; Bodleian MSS Rawl. Poet. 175, Rawl. C. 891, Bodley 99; Fitzwilliam Museum McLean 131; Cambridge, St. John’s College 80; Dublin, Trinity College MSS 158, 157; Lambeth Palace 260; Sion College Arc. L. 40. 2/E.25. Britton gives no rationale for choosing this set of manuscripts, beyond saying that he is interested in editing the northern version of the text.

8Derek Britton, ‘Unnoticed Fragments of the Prick of Conscience’, Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, 80 (1979), 327-34.


11Comprised of articles listed in the bibliography to the Guide under the following names: Andreæ, Percy; Britton, Derek; Bülbring, Karl D.; D’Evelyn, Charlotte; Humphreys, K.W. and J. Lightbown. The test passages for all of these studies correspond to ll. 1836-927, 5126-204, and 9335-402 in Morris’ edition. See Descriptive Guide, p. 6, notes 16, 17.
some self-confessedly tentative conclusions as to the manuscript relations of the poem. Their philological research led them to agree with Morris' estimation that the PC was originally northern, since "many of the early manuscripts,\textsuperscript{12} as well as those that are closest to the presumed original,\textsuperscript{13} are in northern dialects, and scholars have been in agreement that the poem was written in the north of England, probably in Yorkshire."\textsuperscript{14} Lewis and McIntosh then distinguished the manuscripts of the northern version (ninety-seven in total) from a "more radically and thoroughly revised Southern Recension,"\textsuperscript{15} found in eighteen manuscripts. They subdivided the Main Version into four Groups, "on the basis of varying length of copies, rearrangement or addition of material, and line-by-line textual revision."\textsuperscript{16} The first of these four groups holds "among others, the manuscripts that are closest to the presumed original (M[ain]V[ersion] 27, 34, 44, 83, and 96)."\textsuperscript{17} The second group's "most striking characteristic is a new sixteen-line preface to Book IV, though it has many other readings that differentiate it from the other three groups."\textsuperscript{18} The Guide is remarkably silent about what characteristics distinguish the third group, and although it mentions that the fourth group includes three subgroupings, each of which has some distinguishing characteristic, the Guide neglects to describe what

\textsuperscript{12}Listed as MV 5, 27, 34, 35, 41, 44, 62, 83, 93 in Descriptive Guide, note 13, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{13}Listed as MV 27, 34, 44, 83, 96 in the Descriptive Guide, note 14, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{14}Descriptive Guide, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{15}Descriptive Guide, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{16}Descriptive Guide, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{17}Descriptive Guide, p. 6. The Guide identifies these manuscripts respectively as: London, British Library Cotton Galba E. IX, ff. 76a-113a, Harley 4196, ff. 215va-258va, Additional 33995, ff. 102a-155a; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson poetry 175, ff. 1a-55b; Wellesley, Massachusetts, Wellesley College Library, 8, pp. 12-247.

\textsuperscript{18}Descriptive Guide, p. 6.
characteristics unify this group. The Guide lists Morris' two base manuscripts, British Library Cotton Galba E. IX, ff. 76a-113a, and Harley 4196, ff. 215va-258va, as part of the group deemed closest to the presumed original, which helps to justify the use of Morris' text as the most accessible reference to this "original version." McIntosh and Lewis concede as much when they grant in the Descriptive Guide that they have drawn upon Morris' text in their references to the "original" of the poem, as well as in their line references. Although Morris' edition cannot be said to be an ideal reference, it provides the most accessible approximation of an "original" version of the Prick of Conscience at the present time, and hence this study has made use of it as a basis for comparison with the Speculum huius vite.

4. The Speculum huius vite in Lewis and McIntosh's Descriptive Guide

The Speculum appears in the two manuscripts described in the beginning of the first chapter of the present study, D (Dublin, Trinity College MS 155, pp. 149-238), and B (Oxford, Bodleian MS Additional A. 268, ff. 117ra-139rb), which are numbered S1 and S2 in the Descriptive Guide. The descriptions of these manuscripts in the Guide do not say exactly how they compare in terms of content, beyond acknowledging that the Dublin manuscript has only "c. 2542 ll. in the extant text." The comparison between the


20See Derek Britton's review of the Descriptive Guide in Medium Aevum 53 (1984), p. 316, where he points out that Morris' edition "has substantial editorial errors of omission and line-numbering" and that three sets of Latin quotations (ll. 1145-51; 6635-6; 6794-5) included in the text "are certainly spurious, having perhaps been drawn into the body of the text from marginal annotations in an exemplar." Britton could be referring to the fact that none of the three quotations in question has a subsequent English translation, and the first quotation is, as acknowledged by Morris, "absent from most of the MSS" (Morris, note 1, p. 32).

21Descriptive Guide, p. 159.
Prick of Conscience and the Speculum given within the Guide provides a few preliminary, general comments regarding the content of the poems and the extent to which the Speculum abbreviates the text of the PC, expressed only as a calculation of the number of lines in each work, with the added statement that the Speculum also includes substantial passages without any parallel in the PC. The basis of the comparison between these two texts never gets clearly stated in the Guide: did Lewis and McIntosh perform a complete collation of the PC with the Speculum, or did they collate just the test passages used earlier to distinguish among the subgroups of the Main Version? The authors of the Guide also mention the curiously close relationship between the text of the Speculum and two particular manuscripts of the Prick:

The Speculum may have been made from a manuscript of the version that appears in MV 11 and 14 (a subgroup of Main Version Group I, the one closest to and presumably including the original), for some of the added Latin quotations appear in both, the nine tokens of the day of judgement in MV 11 and MV 14 (reduced from the ten of the original) have been further reduced to eight in the Speculum, and there are other similarities (at least in Books II and III). 22

The Guide makes no reference to the extent of the collation made between these two Prick manuscripts with the Speculum, beyond pointing out that it was incomplete. The descriptions of MV 11 (otherwise known as C, Cambridge, University Library MS Dd.12.69, ff. 37-97v) and MV 14 (otherwise known as H, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Library, English 515, ff. 1-77), found on pages 43 and 46 respectively of the Guide, state that both are highly condensed, periphrastic texts sharing some Latin quotations with B and D which are not found in Z. The descriptions of MV 11 and MV 14 do not further specify the relationship of these manuscripts, one to the other, or their

22Descriptive Guide, p. 11.
relationship to the *Speculum*.

**B. Methodology—General Overview**

Two principal problems, then, arise in the attempt to delineate the relationship between the manuscript traditions of the *Speculum* and the *Prick of Conscience*: how much do the two manuscript texts of the *Speculum* resemble one another, and therefore constitute a separate tradition; how do these manuscripts then relate to the manuscripts of the *PCI*? Parts of the first question have already been resolved in the foregoing textual studies: the distinct qualities and coherence of the *Speculum* have already received scrutiny in Chapter Three, and the use of one quotation to represent readings from B and D in previous chapters implies that the text of the *Speculum* is stable from one manuscript to the other. The resolution of the first question requires a collation of the two manuscripts, and a general statement of the conclusions arising from such a collation. The response to the second question follows on naturally from the resolution of the first question, but requires some testing of the conclusions put forward by Lewis and McIntosh regarding manuscripts C and H.

**II. General Conclusions Regarding the Collation of B with D**

The first stage of inquiry produces no surprises, considering Lewis and McIntosh’s statements regarding the two manuscripts of the *Speculum huius vite* and their agreement: there are relatively few substantial variations in the readings of B and D. The very paucity of textual variants in our edition supports this statement. Such a conclusion, however, must be accompanied by the proviso that the text of D is imperfect at the end, containing only 2,230 English lines to B’s 2,722. Although one might conjecture that greater variation in the two texts could have occurred in the remaining 490 lines which D lacks, the extensive evidence of agreement in the preceding lines renders such a conclusion
unlikely. The rhyme-words used in all of the couplets of the two texts are substantially the same, disregarding differences in spelling, and all of them are in the same order in both manuscripts. Most divergences between the two texts consist in the inclusion or omission of one or two words. The one portion of text where D greatly disagrees with the reading of B involves a relatively short passage, and can be easily explained as a scribal error. D has four lines and a Latin quotation which do not appear in B, although two of the four lines, along with a preceding Latin quotation, correspond to a passage in Z (ll. 6745-6748):

B, fol. 135ra, ll. 16-19
And wit oþer mykil sorow shal þai mete
As David sais þe holy prophete

D, p. 235, l. 22-p. 236, l. 3.
And wiþ mychel oþer sorowe schul þei mete
As Dauid seij þe holy prophete
Ignis et sulfur et spiritus procellarum
pars calicis eorum
Fure and brinstone and stormes seij he
To peyne hem sore her dryng schal be
And muchel oþer bytternes þei schul haue
As God hymselfe wittenes wel thys lawe

Quia fel draconum vinum eorum et venenum aspidum et cetera

Both B and D, like most Prick of Conscience manuscripts, distinguish Latin quotations from the rest of the text, although each does so in a different way: B makes use of a textura script (as opposed to the Anglicana of the English text), whilst D uses red underlining. One might assume from the agreement of B and D in this particular detail that the exemplar(s) of these manuscripts likewise distinguished Latin quotations from the English text by some means. As can be seen above, the close proximity of the two Latin quotations, and their equally distinctive quality, could have drawn the B-scribe’s eye further down the page, causing him to take up his copy at the quotation “Quia fel draconum . . .” This discrepancy between B and D might then not be as drastic as it
seems at first glance. It does, however, indicate that D could not have descended directly from B.

The evidence to prove that B could not have descended directly from D is not as dramatically clear as the testimony given above for the opposite conclusion. In a few lines, the D-text introduces a significant word (i.e., not simply an article) which disagrees with readings in BCHZ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B (l. 156)</th>
<th>D (p. 155, l. 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What he sumtyme was and now is and shal be</td>
<td>What he sumtyme was and now is and shal be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What hymself was, is, and shal be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z (l. 212)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What him-self was, and es, and sal be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B (l. 1465)</th>
<th>D (p. 204, l. 26)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat myȝt lyȝtly men þerwip bygyle</td>
<td>Pat myȝt lyȝtly men þerwip bygyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat inȝȝt liȝtly men begyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z (l. 4241)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat he mught lightlyer men bygile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B (l. 1545)</th>
<th>D (p. 208, l. 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For but his daies were shorten, sais he</td>
<td>For but hys dayes were schorten þenne seip he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But his daies were shorted seip he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z (l. 4575)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bot his days war abreged says he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B (l. 1670)</th>
<th>D (p. 214, l. 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For I haue synned mych aȝayne þe</td>
<td>For I haue synned ful mychel aȝeynes þe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For lord I haue synned to moche to þe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z (l. 5092)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-why I haf synd ogaynes þe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The agreement of B with the rest of the manuscript tradition against the readings of D seems to indicate that B is copied from another source than D. Evidence of misreadings in D against the witness of B and one or more of C, H, or Z supports this conclusion. The most striking of the misreadings in D occurs at ll. 2033-2038 of the Speculum (Z, ll. 6445-
The rhyme colke:3olke in BZ has been altered to the Southern\textsuperscript{23} corke:3olke in CHD, which produces an inexact rhyme. The Northern and Scandinavian egg in BZ, which should read ei\textsuperscript{24} in the South, is run together with its indefinite article in CH to readaney(es), and is even further confused to read an neye(s) in D. The MED does not record any forms for ei which include an an- or n- prefix. Somewhere in the transmission of the text, the Northern form egg has been altered to the Southern form ei, and then idiosyncratically written as neye, a form which would cause consternation for the B-scribe if he were copying directly from D. A mistranslation of Speculum ll. 178a,b ("Forma, fauor populi, feruor juuenilis, opesque/ Surripuere tibi noscere quid sit homo") appears in D: the translation for "feruor juuenilis" is "brenyng of 3outhe" in B (l. 180), C, and H, but D reads "brennyng of thou3t." D's error is not an isolated one, since Morris records thoght at l. 250 of his text, but includes the variant yhouthe in a note at the foot of the

\textsuperscript{23}See "colk" MED and OED.

\textsuperscript{24}See entries for "ei" and "egg(ge" MED
page. This misreading suggests that the B-scribe either had the verse in the form attested by C and H before him, or that the respective scribes of B, C, and H independently spotted the error and corrected it themselves. The absence in B of subheadings which originate in the PC tradition and appear in D (see editorial insertions at Speculum li. 1758a, 1836a, 1866a, 1916a, 1990a) would be rather odd if the B-scribe were copying from D. On the strength of the evidence rendered by additions and misreadings in D, it appears that the B-scribe used a manuscript other than D as his exemplar. The otherwise close correlation of B and D supports the conclusion that they originate, at the very least, from a common source which included the abbreviations and additions which distinguish the Speculum from the Prick of Conscience. With this high degree of agreement in mind, quoted passages from the Speculum's B-text will continue to serve in the place of quoting from both B and D.

III. Testing Lewis and McIntosh's Conclusions

A. Means of Testing

The complexity of the second stage of this inquiry requires an equally complex method of investigation. Lewis and McIntosh identified two PC manuscripts, C (Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Library MS Dd.12.69; “MV 11” in the Guide) and H (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Library MS 155; “MV 14” in the Guide), as those most closely related to the text of the Speculum, but they did not clearly identify the bases for their conclusion. The Guide states that the abbreviated nature of C and H, along with the appearance of some additional Latin auctoritates in them which the Speculum contains, but which are not found in Z, support the conclusion that these two manuscripts, of all the Prick of Conscience manuscripts, are most closely related to the
Speculum. This self-acknowledged tentative conclusion, then, warrants some testing. The sheer number of Prick manuscripts makes a complete collation of them with the Speculum not impossible, but impractical for the immediate purpose; a reliable, yet less labour-intensive method of checking Lewis and McIntosh’s conclusions must be found. Such a test would have to involve searching a representative number of PC manuscripts for some feature distinctive to the Speculum.

1. Test Passages

The use of Latin quotations in both texts provides convenient data for a quick comparison of the various manuscript versions of the texts. Both the Speculum and the Prick of Conscience contain a liberal sprinkling of Latin auctoritates, which, for the most part, are distinguished in the manuscripts from the English text through distinctive script (as in Bodleian Add. A. 268) or underlining (as in Trinity 155, along with initial litterae notabiliorae), or by rubrication. The English text immediately before or after these quotations usually provides a translation and some remarks related to the quotation. The larger portions of text where the Speculum differs from Morris’ edition of the PC often contain additional Latin auctoritates which either do not appear in the text of the PC, or which repeat a quotation found in a completely different location within the PC. Of the 179 Latin quotations in the Speculum, 49 do not have a parallel in Morris’ edition. Since the Latin quotations are frequent and are easily distinguished from the English text in manuscripts of the Prick, they provide a good basis for a “spot-check” of Lewis and McIntosh’s conclusions, assuming that the presence or absence of certain quotations may reliably reflect the presence or absence of the corresponding English translation and text.

2. Test Sample of Manuscripts

Such an examination must utilize a random test sample of a representative number
of manuscript texts. The *Prick of Conscience* appears in 32 manuscripts in Oxford University and College libraries: Ashmole mss. 41, 52, 60; Bodley 99; Digby mss. 14, 87, 99; Douce mss. 126, 141, 156, 157; English poetry a. 1; Junius 56; Laud misc. 486; e Musaeo 76, 88; Rawlinson A.366, C.35, C.319, C.891, D.913 (two fragments); Rawlinson poetry 138, 139, 175; Selden Supra 102*; St. John’s 57, 138; Trinity 15, 16A, 16B, 142; University 142. In addition to these manuscripts categorized by McIntosh and Lewis as manuscripts of the main version, three manuscripts containing what appears in the *Guide* as a Southern recension of the *Prick of Conscience* are also in the Bodleian: Bodley 423, Laud misc. 601, and Lyell empt. 6. A survey of these manuscript names reveals that they have arrived at their present repositories from diverse sources over a lengthy period of time. The collection in Oxford libraries thus represents a random set of *PC* manuscripts, brought together without any underlying organizational scheme or interest.

In addition, all the manuscript groups of the Main Version identified in the *Descriptive Guide* are represented, except Group III (which includes only three manuscripts):

Rawlinson poetry 175 belongs to Group I; Ashmole 60 and e Musaeo 76 represent Group II; English poetry a.1, Ashmole 41, and Rawlinson C.319 represent the first subgroup of Group IV; Douce 156, Trinity Coll. 16A, and Trinity Coll. 16B represent the second subgroup of Group IV; Digby 14 and Laud Misc. 486 represent the third subgroup of Group IV manuscripts. Excluding Rawlinson D. 913 as a small fragment, this random sample of 31 manuscripts, representing 26% of all known *Prick* manuscripts, provides a convenient basis for testing Lewis and McIntosh’s conclusions regarding the relationship

---

25 The descriptions of these manuscripts can be found in the *Descriptive Guide*, listed as MV 59-90.

26 These manuscripts are listed as SR 12, 13, and 14 in the *Descriptive Guide*. 
between the *Prick of Conscience* manuscripts and the *Speculum huius vite*. Armed with such passages and a random sample of manuscripts, a reasonably reliable test can be conducted.

**B. Results of the Test**

The results of this examination of the random sample of manuscripts in Oxford and of C and H allow for a general acceptance of Lewis and McIntosh's conclusions. Out of the 33 manuscripts surveyed, only three had any of the *Speculum*’s additional Latin quotations: C, H, and Rawlinson Poetry 139 (identified as MV 82 in the *Descriptive Guide*). The text of C contains 14 of the 49 additional Latin quotations found in the *Speculum*, in the sequence in which they are found in the *Speculum*; H contains 12, again in the same sequence. H possibly included two more of these additional quotations in the first few leaves of the manuscript, which are now missing; the text in H begins at l. 129 of the *Speculum*, and at about l. 169 in the text of Z. Rawl. Poet. 139 contains only two additional quotations, neither of which occur in the same sequence as they do in the *Speculum*.

A number of other details argue against grouping the Rawlinson manuscript with C and H as the *PC* manuscripts closely related to the *Speculum*. The first of the two additional Latin quotations found in the Rawlinson text, "maledicti qui declinant a mandatis tuis," (Ps. 118:21) appears twice in the *Speculum*: once in a place which corresponds to the prologue in the *Prick of Conscience*, and again in a commentary on the ten commandments added to the end of what corresponds to the first part of the *PC*. The quotation appears only once in the Rawlinson manuscript, in the section on purgatory (part IV of the *Prick of Conscience*). Of the two *Speculum* quotations, the second one most resembles the text from the Rawlinson manuscript:
The above texts do not share much vocabulary, beyond words which could have easily come to the minds of two independent translators: “prophet” is a common medieval term for any Old Testament author; “cursed,” and “biddings/commandments” are likewise frequently found equivalents for *maledicti* and *mandata.* The second quotation, “*si vis ad vitam ingredi, serva mandata,*” (Matt. 19:17) appears in the first part of the *Speculum,* immediately preceding the second of the two *Speculum* quotations above. The Rawlinson manuscript carries the same quotation in a portion of text corresponding to the seventh part of Morris’ edition of the *Prick of Conscience.* The translations for this text found in both manuscripts show some similarities in vocabulary:

---

27 See the entry for “prophet(e” in the MED, sense 2(d); see also the entry for “biddinge,” MED, sense 3(a); see also the entry for “cursed” in the same work — in three of the examples from the Wycliffite Bible, a form of *maledictus* has been translated as “cursed.”
As recorded the gospel
Si vis vitam ingredi serua mandata
3if thou in to lyf wilt entre seip he
he commaundementus to kepe bisye peee

mandata]
If bu will haf he lif pat euer shal be,
Kepe his commaundments he biddis he;
And bot mon hom kepe witout delay,
He ys curst of God witouton nay,

This second text shows a much greater similarity in vocabulary, but again, the similarities spring, for the most part, from the constraints of translating the text. Two independent writers, bolstering their argument with this scriptural quotation, could not help but mention that the highest authority, Christ himself, makes this statement. Most of the rest of the shared vocabulary, with the possible exclusion of “bid” and “biddus” could come from the common word-store used to translate such a passage. The translations of both these quotations, as they are found in the Rawlinson manuscript and in the Speculum, show some similarities in their vocabulary, yet it is hard to know whether the constraints of translation necessitate such common vocabulary, or if these similarities reveal a genuine dependence. The fact that both quotations are scriptural and therefore part of a commonly used source, and that each text uses these quotations in widely different contexts, argues in favour of coincidence rather than dependence.

Compared to the two additional quotations in the Rawlinson manuscript, the much larger number of additional quotations which C and H (14 for C, 12 for H) share with the Speculum confirm the greater proximity of these latter manuscripts to the Speculum. Considering the comparatively large number of similarities between the texts of C and H with the Speculum, the coincidental similarities seen in the Rawlinson manuscript, and the lack of any such similarities in the other Oxford PC manuscripts, it seems reasonable to conclude that C and H provide a more proximate link between the Speculum and its immediate precursor among all other PC manuscripts. The best way for determining the
exact nature of the interrelationships among these three texts, as Lewis and McIntosh suggest in the *Guide*, would be a thorough study of the two versions, in the form of a collation of all four of the texts B, D, C, and H.

IV. A Collation of the Text of C and H with the *Speculum*

A. Agreement between C and H

We must first discover to what degree C and H are related, if we are to speak meaningfully of any interrelationships among these texts and the *Speculum*. The collation of C and H reveals that they are very closely related beyond their similarity with regard to the aforementioned Latin quotations. Taking into account the fact that H begins imperfectly and thus lacks about 116 lines found at the beginning of C, there are only 28 lines out of just over 3,000 in total, which have precedents in Morris’ edition, but are peculiar to either the individual manuscript C or the individual manuscript H. Most of the remaining lines in C and H correspond in their rhyme-words and in their order. In the rare instances where rhymes differ between the two manuscripts, the rest of the lines usually remain recognizably the same:

C, fol. 48v., ll. 1,2
Be more in malice and febilnesse
Eiør of hem troubled isse

H, fol. 12v., ll. 18,19
More in malyce and in rebelnes
Eyber of hem troubeld ys

fol. 50v., ll. 28, 29
On is as seiþ holy writ
For God hem first togeder set

fol. 16r., ll. 1,2
On ys as seiþ holy wryt
For God hem furst to gader knyt

fol. 51r., ll. 22, 23
Boþe goode and yvel hit shal þorug sprede
But yvel men auȝte hit most drede

fol. 16v., ll. 3,4
Boþe yuel and gode alle it shal þorw flete
But yuel men auȝte it most drede

fol. 54r., ll. 7,8
Wrecchede soule he seiþ what may þu seie
Whanne þu deperte test fro þy body aweye

fol. 19v., l. 23 - 20r., l. 1
Wrecchede soule he seyde what may þu be
Whenne þu departest fro þi body aweye
Most of the remaining divergences in the two texts involve the inclusion, omission, or rearrangement of a few words within the lines. C and H also share 109 lines which have no parallels in either Morris’ edition, or the Speculum. One of the longest sustained passages of these lines unique to C and H serves to illustrate the degree of agreement present in these two manuscripts:

C, f. 61r, ll. 4-13
As seip David þe holy prophete
As hit is wretyn in holy writte

\textit{Oracio eius fiet in peccatum et iterum sine caritate nichil placet deo}
That is what we don or praye
And haue nost wit us charite aye
Hit is nost plesyng to God almy3ty
As clerkes fynde wretyn witturly
And þerfore if ony help of god shal be
Us behoueÞ to haue loue and charite

H, f. 28v, ll. 13-21
As seip David þe holy prophete
As hit ys in holy wyrt wyprete

\textit{Oracio eius fiet in peccatum. Iterum sine caritate nichil placet deo}
Þat ys what we don or praye
And haue not wiþ us charite aye
Hyt ys not plesyng to God almy3ty
As clerkes fynden wyten wyterly
þerfore 3if eny help of god shal be
Us byhoueþ to haue loue and charite

There are, then, relatively few differences between the two texts which would indicate that they derive from radically different families of manuscripts.

The 28 lines peculiar to either C or H mentioned above are spread fairly evenly throughout either text, with no one passage of consecutive lines of this kind exceeding a length of four lines, as in the following example:

C, fol. 45r, ll. 2-5
Ne riche ne pore ne bonde ne fre
Lered ne leweded what so he be
Þame shal he fynde litel mater
To make joye while he is here

Z, ll. 884-887; 890, 891; 895, 896
Ne riche, ne pure, bond ne fre,
Lered or lawed, what-swa he be,
Þat he ne sal turne aftur his deþ
To poudre and erþe and stynkyng breþ
And þus ho so wol byholde and se
What he was, and what he sal be

H, fol. 7v, ll. 4-9.
Ne ryche ne pore ne bonde ne fre
Lerede ne lewedede what so he be
Þat ne shal turne aftur his deþ
To poudre and erþe and stynkyng breþ
And þus ho so wol byholde and se
What he was, and what he shal be
Þenne shal he fynde lytel matere
To make ioye whyle he ys here
The above lines from H which are not in C clearly have precedents from the PC, as testified by Z. The evidence above, and in other instances where H and Z agree against C, establish that C could not have served as the exemplar for H. A similar divergence of H from the shared witness of C and Morris' text occurs later, in Part IV, on Purgatory:

C, f. 57r., ll. 6-9
For in þe comyn stede somme ben no3t ay
But þe punesched here boþe ny3t and day
In fele stude specially in here gost
Where þey haue synned in body most

H, f. 23v., ll. 12-14
For in þe comyn stude somme ben not ay
In fele studes specially in her gost
Where þey haue synned in body most

Z, ll. 2879-2881
For in þe comon stede som er noght ay,
Bot er here punyst, outher nyght or day,
In sere stedes specialy in gast,
Whar þai haf synned in body most.

The second half of the couplet “ay/day” might have gone missing in H through scribal error. The absence of one line in H, a small absence in and of itself, does argue against the use of H as the exemplar for C. Another instance where C disagrees with H occurs within a series of those lines with no precedent in Morris' edition, once again in the part on Purgatory:

C, f. 60v., ll. 21-25
And masse of prestes in good lyvynge
þat ha forsake þis worldes lykyngne
And ben besi in good praiere
Most helpen to þe soules þere
Be wey of rithwisnes helpe may be
In almes to pore men as þe may se

H, f. 28v., ll. 3-5
And masse of prestes in good lyuynge
þat haue forsaken þis worldes lykyngne
By wey of ryþtwysnesse helpe may be
In almes to pore men as þe may se

The absence of the couplet in H is of dubious significance in the example above, since
Morris' edition provides no other point of reference from which to judge whether this might be an omission in H, or an expansion in C. The evidence in all the examples quoted above from the 28 lines peculiar to either C or H indicates, then, that whilst C and H are related, they do not stand in a relationship of direct descent, one from the other.

B. General Areas of Agreement in C, H, and the Speculum

The statistics detailing the similarities between C, H, and the Speculum in terms of numbers of lines have already received some attention in the table presented in the preceding chapter. These foregoing statistics must be qualified, however, by the observation that in some (albeit relatively few) cases it can be rather difficult to tell the degree to which the texts of C, H, B, and D owe something to the text of the PC. This usually occurs in two types of instances: either the wording (and in some cases, the rhyme) has changed, or the manuscript texts summarise the reading found in Z. The four manuscripts in question contain readings which may closely approximate passages found in Z, but which do not share the rhymes found therein:

**Z**, ll. 1326-1331
He says, "continuel hele here
And plente of worldly gudes sere,
Er taknes, als in boke writen es,
Of þe damacion þat es endles."
And to þis wordes, þat sum men myspays,
Accordes Saynt Gregor, þat þus says:
**Continuus successus temporalium, future damnacionis est indicium.**

**H**, fol. 11r, ll. 11-17
He seij continual hele here
And plente of worldyl gode y fere
Is tokene as we fynde y wryten
Of euerlastyng peyne and dampnacioun
And Seynt Gregory seij also
And cordeþ wel þerto
**Continuus successus temporalium**

**C**, fol. 47r, ll. 15-22
He seijþ continual hele here
And plente of worldles good ifere
Is tokne os we fynde wryten
Of euerlastyng peyne and dampnacioun
And Seynt Gregory seij also
And acorþeþ well þerto
**Continuus successus temporalium, future damnacionis est indicium**

**Speculum**, ll. 667-672b
And sais, continual hele here,
And plenty of worldus gode ifere,
Is a token, as sais þis holy mon,
Of euerlastyng payne and damnacion.
And Sayn Gregory sais also
And profurs be gode reson þerto:
**Continuus successus temporalium**
future damnacionis est indicium

The third and fourth lines in the above quotations share several items of vocabulary — “token,” “everlasting pain,” and “damnation” — but the texts of C, H, B, and D do not share the rhymes of the equivalent two lines in Z. The rhyme *ex:endles* becomes *writen:dampnacioun* in C and H, and *mon:damnacion* in B and D. The rhyme-word *sere* in the second line of Morris’ text becomes *ifere* in all four of the manuscript texts. The amount of agreement in the texts thus far clearly indicates an indebtedness in the manuscripts to the text of the *PC*. The last two English lines leading up to the Latin quotation exemplifies another, more difficult kind of parallelism: a case where only one or two words are the same in Z and in C, H, B, and D. In this particular case, only the words *acordes* and *Seynt Gregor* from Morris’ text appear in some form in C and H, whilst C, H, B, and D agree in most of the reading in the same two lines. Despite the paucity of agreement between the manuscript readings and the text in Z, these last two lines in C, H, B, and D have been taken by this study as parallels to the lines in Z because they occur in the same context as they do in Z (i.e. they introduce the same Latin quotation) and they share some, although not much, vocabulary.

The amount of abridgement in all four manuscript texts likewise reveals another similarity: the patterns of omission in C, H, and the *Speculum* are often similar. The reordering and recasting of a number of lines in the Prologue of the *PC* can be seen in the following lines from Morris, B, and C²⁸:

Z, ll. 87-100

And, if he fraward be, to wende
Til pyne of helle, pat has nan ende.

B, ll. 69-74

And if we be fraward, we mon wend
Wit fendus of hell witouten end.

²⁸The text of H is imperfect at the beginning, and so does not include these lines.
Ilk man that here lyves, mare and lesse,  
God made til his awen lyknesse;
Til wham he has gyven witte and skille
For to knowe bothe gude and ille,  
And fre wille to chese, als he vouches save
Gude or ille whether he wil have;  
Bot he that his wille til God wil sette,
Grete mede þarfor mon he gette;
And he that til ille settes his wille
Grete Payne sal have for þat ille;
Whar-for þat man may be halden wode,
þat cheses þe ille and leues þe gude.

Bot þu, mon, may be holden wod,
þat choses þe eul, and leues þe gude,
Syn ich mon has a fre will,
To chose þe gode and lef þe ill.

C, fol. 38r, ll. 20-25
And if we be froward we mo we wende
To þe peyne of helte þat hae no ende
But þat man may be holde wood
þat cheseþ þe euyl and leueþ þe good
Seþe eche man hafþ a fre wille
To take wheter he wolde good or ille

The six lines in C and B both come from the *Prick* as illustrated in the passage from Z, but they are plucked out rather selectively, and they are rearranged in both. The first rhyme-word for the couplet skille:ille in Z (ll. 91, 92) becomes wille, and the whole couplet, radically revised, appears in a position in C and B after those verses which correspond to Z, ll. 99-100. All four manuscripts show a great deal of agreement in the patterns of abridgement in the third part of the poem: at one point, C, H, B, and D contain text parallel to ll. 1818-1831 in Z, picking up the text again at ll. 1836-1843; then again at ll. 1852-1863, ll. 1876-1883, and ll. 1890-1895. Such consistency among the four manuscripts in their patterns of abridgement must either be a result of some relationship of the manuscripts, or of an amazing coincidence.

Not all of the patterns of abridgement, however, illustrate the same degree of agreement. At times the text of C and H includes more material from the *Prick of Conscience* than the text of B and D:

**Z**, ll. 468-487:  
Pan has a man les myght þan a beste  
When he es born, and es sene lest:  
For a best when it es born, may ga  
Als tite aftir, and ryn to and fra;

**C**  
Panme haeþ a man lasse mitt þan a best  
Whanne he is boren and his synne is lest  
For he haþ no miþth to storne ne crepe  
But ligge and sprawle crie and wepe
Bot a man has na myght þar-to,
When he es born, swa to do;
For þan may he noght stande ne crepe
Bot ligge and sprawel, and cry and wepe.
For unnethes es a child born fully
Þat it ne bygynnes to goule and cry;
And by þat cry men knaw þan
Whether it be man or weman,
For when it is born it cryes swa:
If it be man it says “a. a”,
Þat þe first letter es of þe nam
Of our forme-fader Adam.
And if þe child a woman be,
When it es born it says “e. e.”
E. es þe first letter and þe hede
Of þe name of Eve þat bygan our dede.

But unnepes is a child bore fully
But þat he begyme to 3olle and cri
And criþ þ.A. 3if he be man
And .E. 3if he be a womman
As A is þe furste lettre of Adam
And E of Eve þe furste womman

H
Þenne hæþ a man lasse myȝt þan hæþ a
beste
Whanne he is bore and his synne ys lest.
For he hæþ no myȝt to stonde ne crepe
But ligge and sprawle crye and wepe.
For unneþe ys a chyl bore falsely
Þat he ne lyuuþe to 3olle and crye.
And criþ þ.A. 3if hit be a man
And .E. 3if hyt be a womman.
A. ys þe furst lettur of Adam
And .E.of eue þe furst womman.

Speculum, II. 281-286
þen has a mon las myȝt þen a best,
Quen he is born, and his synne is lest,
For he has no myȝt to stond ne crepe,
Bot lye and sprawle, crye and wepe,
And cres .A. first if he be mon,
And .E. if he be a womon.

Although C, H, B, and D together lack text equivalent to Z ll. 470-473, the way in which C and H deal with the material equivalent to Z ll. 476-487 differs markedly from the way in which B and D abbreviate it. C and H both include lines corresponding to Z ll. 476-477, and a fuller treatment of ll. 480-487, although all four of C, H, B, and D subsequently lack much further material on the same subject in Z ll. 488-494. All four manuscripts likewise take up their text again after the above passages at text equivalent to Z l. 508. The patterns of abridgement in all four manuscripts, then, contain many similarities, but they also indicate some complexities in the relationship of the manuscripts; C and H, except for one instance dealt with below, contain more text from...
the *Prick of Conscience* than B and D, although they often depart from and pick up the text of the *PC* in the same places.

The areas of agreement between B, D, C, and H against Morris’ edition likewise indicate a certain complexity in their relationship: although the four manuscripts share some sustained passages, as in ll. 1481-1502 of the *Speculum*, some significant variations occur within such passages. One such variation occurs in the passage just mentioned, at ll. 1489, 1490 of the *Speculum*:

*Speculum*, ll. 1485-1490c
And of men hor liflode sech,  
Wit leysyangus and wit payntyd speche.  
Pai sal be counsellors of lordus of londus,  
And draȝe mych pepul in to hor hondus,  
and hereof Crist warnet us, as we sal here,  
In his gospel on þis manere:  
**Attendite a falsis prophetis qui veniunt ad uos in vestimentis ouium intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapaces**

*C*, fol. 65r l. 25-v l. 4  
And of men þei wol here lyflode seche  
Wit leysynges and wit peynted speche  
þei wolten be conseilours of lordes of londes  
And draȝe moche peple in to here hondes  
And queynte cloȝyng haue of mennes fyndyng  
And seie þei ben holiere in lyuyng  
And of suche prophetes in þe gospell  
Crist hymself techeþ us well  
**Attendite a falsis prophetis qui veniunt ad vos in vestimentis ouium et cetera**

*H*, f. 34r, l. 19-v, l. 5  
And of men þey wol here lyuelode seche  
Wiþ lesynges and peyntede speche  
þei shul be consellours of lordes of londes  
And draue muche peple in her hondes  
And queynte cloȝinge han of mennus fyndyng  
And seyen þei ben holyest of lyuyng  
And of suche prophetes in þe gospel  
Crist hymself techeþ us wel  
**Attendide a falsis prophetis qui veniunt ad vos in vestimentis ovium et cetera**

In this passage, which generally illustrates fairly close agreement among all the texts, the readings part company at l. 1491 of the *Speculum*. C and H share four lines of introduction to the Latin quotation which do not occur in the *Speculum*. The agreement
between C, H, B, and D against Z, combined with the large amounts of abbreviation in both versions represented by these manuscripts, indicates that they all share some common source outside the PC.

C. Areas of Disagreement

The amount of agreement between C, H, and the Speculum might lead one to suspect a direct relationship of descent between these two PC texts and the Speculum, but evidence of particular disagreements between them illustrate that their relationship is more difficult to assess. Alongside the similarities of these three texts lie some features which distinguish the text of the Speculum from the other two. The Speculum contains three sizable portions of text (Speculum, ll. 403-580 — a treatise on the ten commandments; ll. 723-780 — a digression on the vanity and sensuality of current fashions; ll. 1423-1454 and 1456-1461 — a description of the Antichrist and his activities) with no parallel in Z, C, or H. In total, there are 528 distinctive lines in the Speculum which, other than in the three instances just mentioned, are spread throughout the text. There is one instance (corresponding to Z ll. 1334-1337, 1354,1355; Speculum, ll. 673-678) where the text of the Speculum agrees with text found in Morris’ edition against the witness of both C and H:

Z, ll. 1332-1337, 1354, 1355:  
Continus successus temporalium, futurum damnacionis est indicium.  
He says, “continuel happy commyng Of worldly gudes, es a takenyng Of þe damnacion þat sal be,”  
At þe last day, with-outen pité.  
.........................  
Þe quilk, als says wyse men and witty,  
Onence God es bot foly.

Speculum (B), ll. 672a-678:  
C, fol. 47r:  
Continus successus temporalium  
futurum damnacionis est indicium  
He seip hit is a shewynge to be  
Of damunacion and payne witoute pyte  
Þerfore to heuene may no man come  
Þat folowe þe world and his wysdome  
For wisdom of þe world witturly  
Is no3th to God but gret foly

H, fol. 11r:
The agreement between the *Speculum* and Z in the first couplet after the quotation (comyng:tokonyng), and the absence of this same couplet in both C and H tells us much about the relationships between the four texts. The couplet in question contains a literal translation of the Latin quotation, which one would expect in the text of the PC, given that fairly literal translations follow most of the other Latin quotations in Z, and in all of the PC texts discussed thus far. The appearance of this same couplet in Morris’ base text, which was among those recognized as being “closest to the presumed original” by Lewis and McIntosh, confirms that the *Speculum*, in these two lines, likely preserves a reading closer to the original reading of the PC than the readings found in C or H. The other points of agreement between Z and the *Speculum* in the four lines which follow serve to support this argument. The discrepancy in the four texts above points out, then, that the *Speculum* does not descend directly from the text of C or H, since the *Speculum* contains, in lines 673-678 quoted above, some text which is closer to the presumed original PC than C or H. There are three other brief passages where the *Speculum* agrees with H and Z against C (*Speculum* ll. 365-366; 397-398; 1935-1938), but other agreements between the *Speculum* and C against H argue against any speculations that either C or H may be closer in relationship to the text of the *Speculum*.

The agreement between the *Speculum* and Z against C and H becomes even more important when one considers that in most places where parallel readings exist in the
Speculum, Z, C, and H, but where there are significant variations in the text, such as different word order, or differences in vocabulary, or differences in rhyme, the text of C and H more closely approximates the text of Z. The use of variant word order in the passages below is more marked in the Speculum:

Z, ll. 528-536
Þus es a man, als we may se,
In wrecchednes borne and caytefte,
And for to life here a fon dayse,
Përfor Job þus openly sayse;
Homo, natus de muliere, brevi vivens
tempore, repletur multis miseriis.
He says, “Man þat born es of woman
Lyfand short time to [sic] ful-fild es þan
Of many maners of wrecchednes.”
Þus says Job, and swa it es

C, fol. 43r, ll. 13-22
Þus is a man as 3e may se
In wrecchednesse borne and caytife
And forto lyue here a fewe dayes
Përfore Job þus be men saies
Homo natus de muliere breui uiuens
tempore repletur multis miseriis
He seip man þat boren is of a womman
Lyuyng in tyme fulfuld is þan
Of many maner of wrecchednesse
So seip Job and soþ it is

H, fol. 5v, l. 23-6r, l. 8
Þus ys a man as 3e may se
In wrecchetnesse borne and caytife.
And forto lyue here a fewe dayes
Përfor Job þus by man says
Homo natus de muliere brevi uiuens
tempore repletur multis miseriis
He seip man boren ys of womman
Lyuyng in tyme fulfuld ys þan
Of mony maner of wrecchetnesse
So seip Job and soþ hyt ys

Speculum, ll. 299-304
Þus is a mon as 3e may see,
In wrecchetnes born, and caytife
And for to lif here a fewe days,
As Goddas laȝe to us sais:
Homo natus de muliere breui uiuens
tempore [repletur multis miseriis]
A mon þat of womon born is
Liflyng here, shorte his tyme is,
And ’ȝet’, ouer al fulfuld is he,
Of wrecchetnes þat he con not see.

The vocabulary is extremely close in all four passages, until the second line after the Latin quotation; then the expression “many maners” in Z, C, and H, cannot be found in the Speculum. In the Speculum, the shortness of time for the man born of woman is emphasized by the recasting of the second line after the Latin quotation, and the rest of the passage is likewise recast, providing new rhyme-words, is:is and he:see. Other subtle differences surface on close inspection: Z, C, and H all attribute the quotation to Job, whereas the Speculum attributes it to “Goddus laȝe.” Wider divergences in vocabulary
can be seen in the following passage:

Z, ll. 6053-6068
Som sal noght deme, bot be demed
Til helle, and fra God be flemed,
Als þas þat er fals cristen men,
Þat keped noght þe comandmentes ten,
And wald noght here forsake þair syn,
Bot whils þai lyfyed ay dwelle þar-in.
Som sal noght be demed þat day
Þat sal wende to helle and dwelle þar ay,
Als paens and sarazyns þat had na law,
And lewes þat never wald Crist knaw,
Þarfor þai sal ga til payne endeles,
With-outen dome, for þus writen es:

H, f. 51v, ll. 2-11
Somme shul not deme but be demed
To helle and fro god be flemed
Þat kepeþ not þe comauandmentys ten
And wol not here forsake her synne
Somme shul not be demyd þat day
Þat shul wende to helle and dwelle þer ay
As paynymes and sareasouns þat had no lawe
Þe lewes þat neuer wolde Crist knowe
þerfore þey shul goo to peyne endeles
Wipoute dome þus wryten it ys

Speculum, ll. 1939-1948
Som shal no3t deme bot demet be
Fro God and all his holy company,
For þai wold no3t dedly syn flee,
Ne kep þe comauandmentis wilfullu.
Bot sum shal no3t be demet þen, as Crist sais,
As hethon men þat ben witouton faith.
For þai ben demet now to hell worthele,
Þat wil not beleue in Crist true,
And þen shal go to payn endles,
As in þe gospell writen it is:

The above quotations differ greatly in the vocabulary used, despite the fact that all four share a fair degree of content. The first two lines in C and H are the same as the equivalent lines in Z. B and D have rearranged the lines in order to accommodate a new rhyme; the statement also gets completely recast in the second of the two lines, where B and D say that the damned will be sent “Fro God and all his holy company,” emphasizing the terminus a quo, rather than the emphasis on the terminus ad quem found in C, H, and Z, when they state that the damned will be sent “to helle and fro God be flemed.” All four of C, H, B, and D lack any equivalent to ll. 6055 and 6057 in Z, leaving C and H without any rhyming partners to the lines “Þat kepte no3t þe comauandmentes ten” and “And
wolde no3t here forsake her synne.” The *Speculum* recasts this whole section with a new rhyme and a rearrangement of the vocabulary, “For þai wold no3t dedly syn flee/ ne kep þe comaundmentis wilfulle.” Whilst C and H contain the couplet ending in *day:ay* found in Z ll. 6059, 6060, B and D lack the second line of the couplet, and in its stead, they have a paraphrase which criticizes “hethon men” (as opposed to the named “sarazynes”, “paens,” and “iewes”) not for their lack of law (as in Z, C and H) but for their refusal to believe in Christ. In the last two lines, C, H, B, and D all return to something approaching Z. Of the four texts, C and H maintain more of the rhymes and vocabulary found in Z than the equivalent text in B and D.

There are approximately 109 lines of English where the text of C and H does not agree with either Z or the *Speculum*, and these lines are dispersed fairly evenly throughout both manuscripts. The largest sustained passages of these lines in C and H appear in three places: there are 11 lines which occur between what are ll. 1291 and 1292 in the *Speculum*; there is one passage of 8 lines (between ll. 1554, 1555) and one passage of six lines (occurring between ll. 1502, 1503). There are, then, no particularly large, sustained passages in C or H where the text appears to be an interpolation of new material of the same magnitude as the commentaries on the ten commandments, on worldly vanity, and on the life of the Antichrist found in the *Speculum*.

V. Conclusion: The Relationship of the Manuscripts and the Base Text for the Present Edition of the *Speculum huius vite*

On the basis of what has already been stated about the larger similarities and dissimilarities present in C, H, and the *Speculum*, we can now draw some conclusions about their relationship. The material which these three texts share over against the witness of Z, along with their brevity, argues for at least one stage of redaction somewhere
between Morris’ base texts and the appearance of the *Speculum*, C, and H. The witness of ll. 673-678 in the *Speculum*, shared with Morris’ edition, against the corresponding texts in C and H indicates that, while the *Speculum* descends from the first stage of redaction, it does not derive from the same exemplar as C and H. The large amount of material unique to the *Speculum*, and its greater degree of abbreviation, indicate that the *Speculum* derives from yet another redaction of the text occurring somewhere between the first stage and the extant manuscripts B and D. At the very least, the evidence thus far indicates the following series of relationships:

\[ \text{PC} \]

\[ \alpha \]

\[ \beta \quad \gamma \]

\[ \text{B} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{H} \]

The text of \( \alpha \) would, then, represent the first stage of redaction described above, and would thus not only be an abbreviated version of the original *Prick of Conscience*, but it would also contain those 221 lines shared by B, D, C, and H which have no parallels in the PC. "\( \beta \)" would then represent the second stage of redaction, and would include the presumed archetype of the *Speculum*, containing the 528 lines and the Latin quotations unique to the *Speculum* which are shared by B and D. \( \beta \) would also preserve the reading found in Z, ll. 1332-1337, 1354, 1355 (*Speculum* ll. 673-678), whereas \( \gamma \), the hypothetical
archetype of C and H, would alter these same lines in the manner reflected in the shared reading found in C and H. The evidence thus far supports the conclusion, made by Lewis and McIntosh, that the Speculum "is closely related to, and probably made from, the version contained in [C and H]" with the qualification that the text in C and H descends from α without going through the second stage of redaction found in β, and could thus be said to represent most closely, of all the PC manuscripts, the version from which β, B, and D all take their origin.

The choice of the base text for the edition of the Speculum which follows is rendered simpler by the relative stability of the text manifested in the close readings of B and D, and by the missing folios at the end of manuscript D. In terms of their descent from β, neither B nor D manifest any obvious sign of priority, at least as far as the extant text in both manuscripts is concerned. Despite the earlier conjectural date of writing given for manuscript D (s.xiv. ex.), and the relative clarity of the hand in that text, its incompleteness provides the principal argument for the use of B as the base manuscript for the text. The dialects of the manuscripts, which will receive their proper analysis in the next chapter, shed further light upon the question of the descent of the text, and provide some support for the choice of B as an appropriate base text for the poem.

---

Chapter Five: The Language of the *Speculum huius vite*

I. Introduction

A. A Brief Survey of Investigations into the Language of the *Speculum*

Conclusions regarding the language of the *Speculum huius vite* are naturally bound up with investigations of the language of the *Prick of Conscience*: indeed, no independent study of the language of the *Speculum* exists, beyond the brief localizations given in the *Descriptive Guide* for its manuscript texts, and Linguistic Profiles (hereafter referred to as “LPs”) for these same manuscripts (LP 167 for the text of B, and LP 184 for the text of D) in the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*. Although much of the early research in Morris’ introductory notes and in the *Descriptive Guide* do not have a direct bearing on the language of the *Speculum*, the localization of the language of the *Prick*, or at least of those manuscripts closest to the *Speculum*, could aid in the search for further information regarding the origin and development of the *Speculum*, particularly if linguistic features in B and D reveal anything about the language of their respective exemplar(s). In view of this aim, a brief review of scholarship concerning the language of the *Prick* will be followed by a statement of the difficulties regarding the dialect of the *Speculum*, which in turn will be followed by a more detailed investigation of the language of the text in both B and D.

1. Conclusions Regarding the Language of the *Prick of Conscience* in Morris’ Edition and in Lewis and McIntosh’s *Descriptive Guide*

John Bale’s *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, published in the mid-sixteenth century, identified the *Prick of Conscience* with the fourteenth-century writer Richard Rolle of Hampole, an attribution which stood until the beginning of the present century. The attribution clouded the issue of the language of the text, since the attribution, rather than an independent study of the dialects represented in the manuscripts, tended to determine
early opinions as to the geographical origin of the text.\(^1\) Morris' edition of the *Prick of Conscience* in 1863 identified Richard Rolle as the author of the text, but Morris did not merely pass on a tradition of attribution without critical investigation: his conviction that the text was northern in origin, drawn from his own studies of the vocabulary in the twelve manuscripts he knew\(^2\), was what led him to concur with the traditional attribution. Finding that many of the twelve manuscripts contained northern forms, or evidence that northern forms had been changed to less adequate southern forms, Morris concluded that the poem came from the north; and since the traditional attribution fitted very well with this localization, Morris likewise credited the work to Richard Rolle. Lewis and McIntosh, having examined all the manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience*, concluded that many of the early manuscripts\(^3\) of the poem are dialectally northern, "and scholars have been in agreement that the poem was written in the north of England, probably in Yorkshire."\(^4\) Since the early identification of the *Prick of Conscience* with Richard Rolle skewed the estimation of its place of origin in early scholarship, Morris' earlier research, and Lewis and McIntosh's own investigation of the language, furnishes much more firm evidence than the scholarly tradition does for the provenance of the poem.

---


\(^2\)This has already been discussed in the previous chapter on manuscript relations; see p. 3 of that chapter.

\(^3\)Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, McClean 131, ff. 1-113v; British Library (hereafter BL) Cotton Galba E. IX, ff. 76a-113a; BL Harley 4196, ff. 215va-258va; BL Harley 6923, ff. 2-117v; BL Add. 24203, ff. 1-150v; BL Add. 33995, ff. 102a-155a; Oxford, Bodleian Library (hereafter "Bodleian") Bodley 99, ff. 1-120v; Bodleian, Rawl. poetry 175, ff. 1a-55b; Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Library, Taylor MS of the *Prick of Conscience*, ff. 1-126v.

\(^4\)Descriptive Guide*, p. 4.
Yet the more general question of the origin of the *Prick of Conscience* forms only a rather large backdrop to more proximate questions regarding the origin of the *Speculum huius vite*. The discussion of the manuscripts of the *Speculum* in the present study concurs with the conclusion, found in the *Descriptive Guide*, that the two *Prick of Conscience* manuscripts related most closely to the *Speculum* are C and H, identified in the *Guide* as MV 11 and 14 respectively. The dialects of these two manuscripts, however, serve only to cloud the question of the origin of the *Speculum*: the *Guide* states that C is “a probably Sussex transcription of an exemplar in a rather standard form of language.”5 H, on the other hand, is probably from Worcestershire, but contains “suggestions of a Gloucestershire dialectal element.”6 According to the *Guide*, then, both C and H come from areas notably south of the Yorkshire origins of the PC. A bewildering variety of dialects, namely those of Yorkshire, Sussex, and the South-West Midlands, thus present themselves as those of which one might find traces in the original *Speculum*. Lewis and McIntosh’s analysis of the dialects of B and D serves to stabilize this picture within the Midlands, since both texts are, according to them, in Midlands dialects — B coming from South Lancashire, and D from South-west Derbyshire.7 There are no guarantees, however, that the scribes of C, H, and the two *Speculum* manuscripts left behind any dialectal traces of the exemplars leading back to the common root of the version found in all four manuscripts; the scribes may have been entirely consistent in transcribing their texts using their own, more familiar spellings. The main difficulty in assessing the reliability of these localizations is that the authors of the *Guide* do not

---

5 *Descriptive Guide*, p. 44.
6 *Descriptive Guide*, p. 47.
7 *Descriptive Guide*, pp. 159-160.
indicate precisely how much of the various texts they examined in making their judgements, beyond saying that “not all texts of the Prick of Conscience have been analysed in their entirety.” 8 A resource published four years after the appearance of the Guide, and dependent upon the research which went into the Guide, not only went into more detail, but also presented the relevant evidence for evaluation.

2. Analysis and Conclusions Printed in the Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English

In 1956, Prof. Angus McIntosh argued the case for a science of graphemic analysis parallel to the science of phonetic analysis. There he stated that written Middle English should be treated, not principally as a means for understanding different varieties of the spoken language, but rather as a system of language “operating in its own right — a system specifically of written language such as we might envisage flourishing even if all its users were deaf and dumb.” 9 The study of orthography as a system, like the systematic study of pronunciation, could reveal distinctions which, although they might have no correlation to distinctions in pronunciation, are, nevertheless, reflections of a regional variety of the written language:

We have observed that written texts lack anything which reflects certain phonetic variants present in their spoken equivalents. But they also manifest other new distinctions of their own, distinctions which are in no sense a reflection of, or correlated with, anything in the spoken language. The spoken manifestations of Middle English have thus no monopoly in this matter; nor do they control, by the total extent of their own deviation one from the other, the extent to which corresponding written manifestations may deviate. 10


10 Ibid, p. 33.
McIntosh then sets out a way forward for a graphemic analysis of Middle English texts, analogous to the analysis of the spoken language: a comprehensive examination of visible graphic data would then be followed by an attempt to distinguish which features are relevant for establishing linguistic distinctions from those which are irrelevant. Only then can one provide a set of “graphemes” (on the analogy of “phonemes” for the spoken language): “The process of ‘graphemicising’ can only come later; there is no trustworthy way of short-circuiting the procedure of having to make a general ‘impressionistic’ examination of variants without a knowledge of their precise status or significance.”

The procedures utilized in producing the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English* followed this basic outline by first finding a body of data and then sifting it for significant graphemic variations.

The *Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*, published in 1986 but supported by twenty years of previous work, began with the examination of texts which could be associated with a particular place through non-linguistic evidence, such as local wills and legal texts. A study of the orthographical features of these texts provided a list of significant variations in particular words and features affiliated with the places where the texts were written. These then provided the basis for a questionnaire which was applied to another set of texts which could not be linked to a place by non-linguistic means. The responses to the questionnaire from each of this second series of texts enabled the compilers of the *Atlas* to determine a “place”, or at the very least, a working environment, for some of the scribes of the various texts. It was the next stage of investigation which introduced an element of controversy into the proceedings: the compilers of the *Atlas*

---

11Ibid., p. 43.
12Ibid., p. 43.
deemed some forms taken from this second set of texts graphemically relevant, and added them to the questionnaire. This step involves the assumption that additional, particular graphemes in graphemically-located texts were in turn graphemically homogeneous with the identified locale, and thus could be applied to further texts. This assumption of homogeneity, however, bends the whole procedure into a rather neat circular shape, since graphemically-localized texts provide in turn further graphemes for localization of other texts. The questionnaire, enlarged with graphemes extrapolated from the second set of texts, was applied to yet another series of texts, which were in turn localized. The reliability of this last procedure would depend on how thoroughly the compilers and editors of the Atlas sifted their data and saw a correlation between the elements they added to the questionnaire and a particular locale. The answers to the questionnaire for each manuscript in the study were developed into a linguistic profile for each manuscript text, and the various responses to the questionnaire enabled the authors of the Atlas to compose a series of “dot-maps” graphically representing which spelling forms appeared in which locatable and localized documents (without, however, distinguishing between these two varieties of documents). Each manuscript containing a particular form is identified in its place with a black dot for each item of the questionnaire. Geographical “clustering” and patterns of dots indicate those locales particularly associated with an item. The maps allow researchers to collate responses to the questionnaire from a manuscript text and compare these responses with those of the texts localized in the Atlas. By overlaying the various responses to the questionnaire on a map, one can find a narrower localization for a particular manuscript.\footnote{See Michael Benskin, “The ‘Fit’-technique Explained.” \textit{Regionalism in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts: Essays Celebrating the Publication of A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English}, ed. Felicity Riddy. (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1991), pp. 9-26.}
The Atlas contains a number of linguistic profiles for manuscript texts of the Prick of Conscience, and each profile lists a summary of the responses to the questionnaire which surfaced from the study of the manuscripts. The Atlas provides linguistic profiles for both manuscripts of the Speculum huius vite, which agree with the localizations found in the Guide. This should come as no surprise, since the efforts which went into the production of the Guide formed part of McIntosh’s research for the purposes of producing the Atlas. The responses to the questionnaire for B appear in Linguistic Profile (LP) 167 in the County Directory, among the entries for Lancashire in volume two of the Linguistic Atlas, and the responses for the text of D appear in LP 184 among the entries for Derbyshire in the same volume.14 The responses for both texts, as the localizations suggest, present no surprises, considering their fairly consistent agreement with the conclusions of the Guide. Like the study in the Guide, the linguistic profiles arise from evidence drawn from differing lengths of text: in the case of B, folios 117 r - 136 r (ll. 1-2338), practically the whole text of the Speculum, received a thorough examination, compared to thirty pages (149-179; ll. 1-840) in D. A survey of the responses with reference to a word-index of B reveals that the linguistic profile accurately reports the responses of B in almost all the essential details; the more particular examination of the language of B which follows will investigate one lapse in the account given in LP 167. A less systematic and sporadic survey of D likewise supports the responses listed in LP 184. If the associations drawn between particular graphemes and places indicated by the vast research underlying the Linguistic Atlas are correct, then the record in the Linguistic

Profiles for forms in B and D should provide accurate localizations for each manuscript text of the *Speculum*.

**B. Aspects of Language in the *Speculum* which Require Further Resolution**

The *Linguistic Atlas* answers many of the questions regarding the language of the two extant texts of the *Speculum huius vite*, but it cannot answer a question which concerns deviations from, rather than consistencies with, certain regional forms. The next stage of inquiry attempts to reach behind the regional forms of these two texts to see whether they surrender any clues about the geographical origin of the *Speculum*, and since this involves an examination of forms (if any exist) which deviate from those expected in the locales indicated by the *Linguistic Atlas*, the questionnaire results found in the two immediate linguistic profiles cannot supply much help. Poetic texts offer an advantage over prose texts in considerations of this kind, since scribes who would ordinarily change all spellings into their own regional spellings in a prose text are reluctant to do so when it would sacrifice a rhyme in a couplet. When they do change the word-form or the rhyme, it usually leaves some evidence of tampering, such as a new rhyme-word, an imperfect rhyme, or other re-writing in place of a rhyming word or rhyming pair which would not rhyme in the redactor's dialect. In some cases, new rhymes found only in B and D contain dialectal features which would not rhyme in the different dialects attested in Z, C, and H. If the manuscripts of the *Speculum* share any of these peculiarities in contradistinction to the texts of Z, C, and H, then the logical assumption is that their common source contained the same dialectally significant peculiarity. Word-forms and imperfections in the rhymes of the *Speculum* may well indicate one way past the regional dialectal variants of B and D, into the original dialect of the *Speculum*. That way is fraught with a number
of difficulties.

The examination of peculiarities in word-forms found in B and D presumes that both manuscripts show a certain consistency in spelling which would highlight the peculiarities of spellings passed down from the sources of the text in these two manuscripts. A survey of a computer-generated word index of B reveals that although certain words are spelt in slightly different ways, they rarely vary in the spelling of the stressed syllable:

apostel (ll. 626, 630, 684, 1640), apostil (l. 1613), appostel (l. 405); bysshoppus (l. 529), bisshopus (l. 557); bitterly (l. 1738), bittirly (l. 2254), bitturly (l. 133); blessed (1956, 1957, 2607), blesset (ll. 2600, 2669), blessyt (2549); blis (ll. 68, 82, 86, 110, 128, etc.; 22 occurrences), bisso (ll. 80, 842, 1072, 2022, 2329, etc.; 8 occurrences); brichil (l. 256), brichel (l. 1550); buxome (l. 240), buxom (l. 67); clensed (ll. 1077, 1235), clensed (l. 1116), clenset (l. 1179); comandment (ll. 493, 497), commandment (ll. 475, 483, 489, 491); damned (l. 1950), damnet (l. 1876); departis (ll. 853, 1044), departus (l. 930); derknys (ll. 2095, 2190, 2193, 2196), derknes (l. 2187); ensaumpel (l. 758), ensaumpul (ll. 565, 1883); envy (l. 1540), envie (l. 1181); febell (ll. 1328, 1967), feble (l. 2383), febul (l. 1888); fedd (l. 1863), fedde (l. 1961); folk (ll. 179, 1975, 2166), folke (ll. 602, 1455, 1557, 1920); gifes (l. 360), giffus (l. 1231), gisus (ll. 570, 1896, 2130); grucchon (ll. 190, 193), gruchon (l. 187); heuen (ll. 39, 64, 479, 482, etc.; 14 occurrences), heuon (ll. 9, 80, 223, 234, etc.; 51 occurrences); honger (ll. 1257, 2093, 2160), hongur (ll. 57, 1399, 2166, 2170, 2186); keppet (ll. 54, 514), keppt (l. 948), kept (l. 776); knowen (pa.pl. ll. 1034), knowen (pa.pl. ll. 1387, 2063); lond (ll. 19, 687, 1472, 1481), londe (ll. 479, 502, 2630); lucifer (l. 222), lucyfere (l. 574); meke (ll. 39, 401); meke (ll. 138, 240, 244, etc.; 8 occurrences), mek (ll. 560, 563); mykel (ll. 1997, 2139), mykell (l. 2142), mykil (ll. 233, 516, 1320, etc.; 7 occurrences), mykyl (ll. 1246, 1916); oponly (ll. 322, 765, 1779, 2462), opunly (ll. 1126, 1720, 1777), hopunly (1707); perel (l. 1168), perell (l. 129), perill (l. 56); pistell (l. 1478), pistil (l. 765), pistill (l. 548), pistul (ll. 452, 1830); plente (ll. 1178, 2016, 2658); plenty (l. 668); sodanle (ll. 1603, 2237), sodanly (ll. 580, 752, 1585, 1600), sodenle (l. 738), sodenly (ll. 1386, 1593); pan (ll. 1643, 1724, 1824, 2466, 2661), pane (l. 2555), pen (ll. 13, 215, 281(l), 291, etc.; 88 occurrences); trule (l. 1946), truly (ll. 93, 510, 936, etc.; 11 occurrences).

Although the list above is not exhaustive, it does point out the generic spelling variations found in the text of B. The value of the vowel in unstressed syllables above is expressed
as <i>, <y>, or <e>, and occasionally (see oonly/opunly and pistill/pistul above) <o> or <u>, all of which likely represent attempts to render the value [ə], the common value which vowels in unstressed syllables shared after about A.D. 1000. The variations in final -is, -es, and -us in plural nouns also indicates some confusion on the part of the scribe regarding how to record the value of the vowel in unstressed syllables: doyngis (l. 1674), doyngus (ll. 1450, 1454); fendis (ll. 1144, 2248), fendus (ll. 70, 724, 1020, 1148, etc.; 14 occurrences); joys (l. 1286), joyus (ll. 2452, 2692); daies (ll. 1545, 1547, 1551), days (ll. 301, 948, 1543, 1587, 2071), dayus (ll. 1555, 2679). In some cases, such as “joys” and “days” above, the scribe leaves the vowel out completely. Occasional doubling of consonants likewise occurs (e.g. febul/febull, giffus/gifus, grucchon/gruchon, keppt/kept, mykel/mykell, perel/perell, pistil/pistill, than/thanne). Final -e sometimes appears where one might expect a final -y (e.g. sodanle, plente, true), but it becomes a seemingly optional appendage in most other instances (e.g. blis/blisse, febll/feble, folk/folke, lond/londe, meke/mek, than/thanne). This confusion about final -e causes some doubts about whether final -e would have been voiced or silent in the dialect of B.

General impressions of the text of D indicate similar spelling variations to those found in B as the following pairs testify:

apostel (ll. 626, 630, 684, 1640), apostul (l. 1613); byshopes (l. 529), bysshopis (l. 557); blisse (l. 68), blis (l. 110); comandmentis (l. 34), comandmentes (l. 63); heuen (l. 223), heuene (l. 234); conceuet (l. 274), conceuet (l. 275); body (l. 360), bode (l. 356); among (l. 1479), emong (l. 1480); grutchen (ll. 187, 190), grutchyn (l. 193); 3ifeJ) (l. 2130), 3eueth (l. 360); honger (ll. 57, 1257, 1399), hongur (l. 2160); londe (ll. 19, 502), lond (ll. 479, 687); mater (ll. 214, 218, 221, 227, 232, 249), matere (l. 401); opunle (l. 322), opunly (l. 765), opunlyche (l. 1126); perel (ll. 129, 1168), perylle (l. 56); pistyl (l. 452), pystel (l. 548); sodenly (l. 580), sodeynlyche (l. 752); þanne (1643), þan (1724); trewly (ll. 93, 510, 936), trewle (l.

15Bennett and Smithers, p. xxiv.
Despite the abundance of examples quoted above, both B and D have generally stable spelling systems; any dialectally significant spellings will be noted duly in the particular examination which follows.

Another difficulty in attempting to reach beyond the texts of B and D to the original dialect of the Speculum stems from the disagreement between the late medieval notion of what is acceptable rhyme, and the most common modern notion of the same. The rhymes in the Speculum do not always strike the modern ear as particularly euphonious; in a number of instances, rhymes involve a match of two unstressed syllables: *nothyng:*lyfyng (ll. 191, 192), *endyng:*lifyn (ll. 267, 268), *partyng:*lifyn (ll. 797, 798), *truly:*purgatory (ll. 1079, 1080), *holynes:*witnes (ll. 1337, 1338), *bodely:*almystry (ll. 971, 972), *redy:*namly (ll. 1791, 1792), *gloryng:*brennyng (ll. 2145, 2146). Other rhymes match a fully-stressed syllable with an unstressed syllable or a secondary-stressed syllable: *is:*wrecchednes (ll. 169, 170), *see:*perte (ll. 311, 312), *is:*besynes (ll. 313, 314), *be:*povert (ll. 537, 538), *free:*honesty (ll. 639, 640). Still other rhymes are inexact: *redy:*be (ll. 417, 418), *rystfully:*deze (ll. 1005, 1006), *here:*pryvere (ll. 1179, 1180), *se:*bode (ll. 1307, 1308), *perfytly:*perby (ll. 1497, 1498), *straitly:*be (ll. 1683, 1684), *flee:*wilfylle (ll. 1941, 1942), *soothy:*me (ll. 1971, 1972), *derknys:*rese (ll. 2187, 2188), *swiftynes:*riztwis (ll. 2369, 2370), *blis:*witnes (ll. 2421, 2422). The lines in Z which correspond to those from the Speculum cited immediately above do not bear the same rhymes, although similar sorts of rhymes occur fairly often in Z as well:

*bygynnyn:*endyng (ll. 7, 8), *godhede:*anhede (ll. 13, 14); *service:*wise (ll. 125, 126); *foly:*worthy (ll. 267, 268); *com:*crystendom (ll. 548, 549); *bere:*shortere (ll. 742, 743); *complexion:*condicion (ll. 768, 769); *corrupcion:*carion (ll. 846, 847); *shynand:*wonand (ll. 996, 997); *fleshshely:*lychery (ll. 1140, 1141); *here:*messangere (ll. 2020, 2021);
aparty: mercy (ll. 3580, 3581); come: marteredome (ll. 4379, 4380);
les: unkyndenes (ll. 5586, 5587); grysely: myghty (ll. 6999, 7000).

The rhymes in the Speculum also indicate a tolerance for assonance on the pairs of final
consonants d/p, p/t, t/d, m/n, and ng/nd as illustrated in the following examples:

rede: kepe (ll. 59, 60), kepe: mede (ll. 63, 64), David: wit (ll. 203, 204),
proude: aboute (ll. 249, 250), non: caytifdom (ll. 287, 288), slepe: shet (ll.
389, 390), prophet: rede (ll. 433, 434; 799, 800; 849, 850; 1447, 1448;
1879, 1880), hede: kepe (ll. 423, 424), dred: kepe (ll. 453, 454),
wrong: londe (ll. 501, 502), lond: emong (ll. 687, 688), mete: rede (ll. 915,
916), ichon: hom (ll. 1039, 1040), hede: prophet (ll. 1461, 1462), sone: some
(ll. 1527, 1528), mon: dome (ll. 1575, 1576), monhed: wepe (ll. 1737,
1738), don: overcome (ll. 2013, 2014), hade: debate (2119, 2120),
cum: tribulacion (ll. 2337, 2338), rede: mete (ll. 2627, 2628).

The obvious absence of rhyme in some pairs of line-endings suggests the surrender of
form for the sake of the content, or the inability of a scribe to alter pairs of lines so that
they rhymed satisfactorily in his own dialect, as in the following: fele: here (ll. 1089, 1090;
1099, 1100; 2303, 2304; 2423, 2424), laze: safe (ll. 1435, 1436), had: perte (ll. 2301,
2302), zere: wele (ll. 2435, 2436), be: perre (ll. 2685, 2686). A proviso should be added to
this list: the final “e” on “perre” could be a closed French e (i.e. equivalent to modern
French é), thus rendering a rhyme of sorts on the word “be.” The apparent unconcern for
perfection in rhyme illustrated in all the cases listed above creates problems in assessing
whether or not an unrhymed, or imperfectly rhymed pair of lines originates in a marred
attempt to render once-perfectly rhymed lines into a dialect where they do not rhyme. The
pair faith: sais found in B at ll. 1943-1944, for instance, could be a reflection of an earlier
perfect rhyme faith: saith, or it might also be another example of a lack of rhyme.

Since the text of the Speculum is rather more like a patchwork quilt than a piece of
whole cloth, one must treat any dialectal evidence with extreme caution. An anomalous
northern rhyme in a part of the Speculum derived from the Prick of Conscience might do
no more than indicate the northern origins of the latter — which would be important if
evidence from the study of the manuscripts had not already indicated that the *Speculum*
comes from the main, and not the southern, version of the *PC.* Rhymes found in those
portions of text common to *B, D, C,* and *H,* but which do not appear in *Z,* may help to
localize the origins of the first of the two redactions (represented by the symbol “α” on the
stemma) which produced the *Speculum.* The variegated nature of the *Speculum* also has
its advantages insofar as the four related manuscripts just mentioned each represent
different dialects. Thus any agreement of these four in certain rhymes or word-forms
anomalous to at least three of them (since the anomalous dialect may be shared by the
scribe of one of the four manuscripts in question) may reveal the dialect of α. The
evidence found in those portions of text unique to the *Speculum* will be of most interest,
since it will furnish any clues about the localization for the second redaction of the text
(symbolized by the graph “β” on the stemma), which makes the *Speculum,* unlike the text
in *C* and *H,* more than simply a version of the *Prick of Conscience.*

The following study of the language proposes to investigate the language of *B,* the
only complete manuscript text of the *Speculum,* pointing out its characteristic dialectal
features. Any anomalies discovered will provide some specific items for investigation in
the other text of the *Speculum.* The text of *D* may corroborate the evidence found in *B,*
and it might also supply a way of checking any anomalous forms of words which occur
within the line, as opposed to limiting the following study to rhyme-words alone. If both
*B* and *D* agree in the use of a form which is anomalous to both, and this form agrees with
forms attested in anomalous rhymes, then one can be reasonably certain that the source of
the anomaly arises from the *Speculum,* and not from the caprices of scribal error. A
general summation of the evidence, along with some final conclusions, appears after the
following examination of the two texts.

II. The Language of Oxford, Bodleian MS Additional A. 268, ff. 117ra-139rb and Dublin, Trinity College MS 155, pp. 149-238.

A. General Features

As one would expect, the general features in the language of B support the information given in the Linguistic Profile for the text. The mixture of some features from the North (the development of OE hw, the retraction of OE -æld to <-ald>) and from the Midlands (the treatment of OE ā, the endings of third person present indicative singular and present indicative plural verbs, present participle forms, the forms for third-person plural pronouns, and the spelling of retracted OE -æld as <-old>) and the absence of any Scottish forms (confusion of -is, -isc in the suffix; ai, ei, oi used for OE ā, ē, ō) suggests the North Midlands as the most likely provenance for B. Some West Midland features (the development of OE eo, y, a + lengthening groups, and a + nasal) narrow this broad localization to the North-west Midlands. In the interests of thoroughness and clarity, the following sections will present several specific examples of the features outlined above along with the anomalous variants in each category, if any exist.

1. Northern/Southern Features

a. Third-person Singular Present Indicative Verbs

The endings of verbs and their present participles in B indicate that the text belongs somewhere in the midlands. The third-person singular present indicative ends invariably in a final “s”, and most usually with -us, -es, or -is, as the following instances illustrate:

acordis, accordis (ll. 204, 2700), availus (l. 2269), beddus (l. 498), begilus (l. 612), behofes (l. 112), behose (ll. 820, 1273, 1500), chalangis (l. 964), choses (l. 72), clanses (l. 1105), comes (l. 844), comus (ll. 354, 371, 372,
412, 749, 851, 903, 941, 1386, 2061), consentis (l. 1848), cres (l. 285),
delytus (l. 863), departis (l. 853), departus (l. 930), dos (ll. 99, 1099, 1103,
1109), endis (l. 1191), excuses (l. 135), falles (l. 320), fallus (ll. 1569,
1633), faris (l. 1305), faris (l. 2531), flîzes (l. 2273), folîzes (l. 1524),
foloes (l. 24), forbedus (ll. 499, 764), forgetis (l. 970), getis (l. 1172),
grefus (l. 99), groes (l. 374), helpus (ll. 144, 1091, 1314), knawes (ll. 155,
159), knowus (l. 2470), lazes (l. 611), lastis (ll. 128, 176, 246, 425, 992,
1072), lastus (ll. 644), ledus (l. 679), lernus (l. 563), leues (l. 72),
liifes (l. 359), makis (l. 656), mas (l. 1009), puttus (ll. 864, 973), sles
(l. 848), smylus (l. 611), stondis (l. 2116), sonnus (l. 1582), spekis (l. 1032,
1042, 1505, 2023, 2112), takus (881), techys (200), teches (936, 1126,
1271, 1334), tellus (ll. 308, 322, 323, etc.; 17 occurrences), thenckis (l.
962), venges (l. 740), warnus (ll. 388, 1457), wynnus (l. 1107).

A number of these instances occur at the end of lines as rhymes, but they are mostly
rhymes on another third-person present indicative singular verb:

lerus:berus (ll. 405, 406); gefus:lifus (ll. 77, 78; 359, 360; 1895, 1896);
worschipus:kepus (ll. 25, 26); brennus:rennus (ll. 2115, 2116); sais:plais
(ll. 653, 654); has:tas (ll. 907, 908).

All of these instances would rhyme in any dialect, since the inflectional endings in both
words would change in the same manner according to the dialect — hence the following
pairs in D: jevep:-lyfep (ll. 77, 78; 359, 360; 1895, 1896); worsyppip:kepyp (ll. 25, 26);
brenyp:rennyp (ll. 2115, 2116); seipe:pleipe (ll. 653, 654); hap:tape (ll. 907, 908)16.

There are, however, a few instances where a third-person indicative singular verb rhymes
on a noun or adverb ending in -us or -es: tellus:gospelus (ll. 427, 428); thrallus:callus (ll.
601, 602); ellus:dwellus (ll. 1073, 1074); days:sais (ll. 1543, 1544; 1555, 1556);
thewus:shewus (ll. 909, 910); tellus:ellus (ll. 307, 308; 322, 324 343, 344; 361, 362; 961,
962; 1197, 1198; 1733, 1734; 1783, 1784; 1909, 1910; 1929, 1930; 2039, 2040);

16The contracted form “tape” of the verb “take,” although rare, does occur in Gower (Confessio
Amanitis in The English Works of John Gower, ed. G.C. Macaulay EETS es 81 (1900), v. 48; vii. 1074 — in
both instances tath rhymes with hath), and in Chaucer (variant for taketh, l. 728 in the Man of Law’s Tale,
attested to by mss. Oxford Christ Church 152; Cambridge University Library Gg.iv.27; Aberystwyth,
National Library of Wales, Hengwrt 154; see Riverside Chaucer, ed. Larry D. Benson, 3rd ed. (Boston:
boyes:groes (ll. 373, 374). Almost all of these last examples can be traced back to the
Prick of Conscience, but there are a number of important exceptions: the pairs
tellus:gossipellus (ll. 427, 428) and tellus:ellus (961, 962) occur only in B and D. The verb
“tellus” in both these pairs rhymes on a plural noun and an adverb, both of which
ordinarily end in -s, which suggests that third-person present indicative singular verbs
ended in the Midland or Northerly -s in β, the archetype of the Speculum. One anomalous
rhyme mentioned earlier, which occurs at ll. 1943, 1944, clouds the issue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B:</th>
<th>D (p. 226)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bot sum shal nost be demet þen as Crist sais</td>
<td>But summe schul nost be demed þanne as Crist seip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As hethon men þat ben witouton faith</td>
<td>As heþen men þat byn wyþ outen feþ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rhyme, which has no parallel in C, H, or in Z and which remains awkward in B,
rhymes perfectly in D because of the ending of the third-person present indicative singular
in -p as opposed to the usual Midlands and Northern form in -s. A single piece of
evidence does not make a case for the whole, however; this instance could simply reveal
the tolerance of the poet’s ear for imperfect rhyme, or his knowledge of the alternative
third person singular indicative ending.

The inconsistency of the endings of third-person singular present indicative verbs
in D do not help to clarify whether these same verbs originally ended in -p or -s in the
Speculum. Some of these verbs appear in D at different points with one or the other
ending:

- behoues (l. 820), behoueþ (l. 112), behoue (l. 1500); beres (ll. 406, 540, 547, 564, 759, 2151), bereþ (l. 394); brynges (l. 298), bryngþ (l. 1011); comes (ll. 372, 412, 1386), comþ (ll. 354, 371, 844, 851, 903, 2061), comþþ (l. 941); departes (l. 930), departþ (l. 853); has (ll. 283, 465, 543, 809, 840), haþ (ll. 29, 73, 130, 160, 268, 278, 281, 346, 348, 349, 829, 835, 903, 907, 954, 959); helpful (ll. 144, 1314), helpþ (l. 1091); lastes (ll. 128, 176, 246, 644, 1072), lastþ (l. 425), lastþþ (l. 992, 1072); seys (l. 302).
seyes (l. 1556), seiþ (ll. 152, 188, 189, 653, 1943); schewes (l. 910, 2017), scheweb (ll. 1678, 2191); witnessþ (l. 666), wittenes (ll. 799, 1653, 1829, 1879), wytenes (l. 1224).

The rest of the third-person indicative singular verbs in D are fairly equally divided on the basis of the two endings:

**ending in -s:** acordis (l. 204), byddes (ll. 430, 475, 483, 489, 493, 495, 501, 505), bygyles (l. 612), cheses (l. 72), consentes (l. 1848), cryes (l. 285), drawþes (l. 643), dwellus (l. 1074), endis (l. 1191), excuses (l. 135), groues (l. 374), knowes (ll. 155, 159), lawþes (l. 611), lerns (l. 563), leses (l. 405), leues (l. 72), mase (l. 1009), pleynes (l. 731), proues (l. 626), semes (l. 2015), schakes (l. 1578), smyles (l. 611), telles (ll. 308, 322, 323), penkes (l. 961), warnes (ll. 388, 1457), wynnes (l. 1107).

**ending in -p:** byteþ (l. 2102), brennyþ (ll. 2115, 2130), clanseþ (l. 1105), deliteþ (l. 863), doþ (ll. 99, 1099, 1103, 1109), fallyþ (l. 320), fellþ (ll. 1569, 1633), fareþ (l. 1305), foloweþ (ll. 24, 1524), forþetþ (l. 970), þeueth (ll. 77, 360, 1231, 1896, 2130), goþ (ll. 1010, 1170, 1677), greueþ (l. 99), keþ (l. 26), ledþ (l. 679), letþ (l. 864), lyþ (ll. 359, 1005, 1007, 1895), lyfþ (l. 78), lþ (l. 698), luþ (l. 25), makeþ (l. 656), passeþ (ll. 24, 202, 713, 2131), preþ (l. 1329), putþ (ll. 864, 973), renþ (l. 2116), serueþ (ll. 1101, 1104), sleþ (l. 848), souneþ (l. 1582), speþ (ll. 1032, 1042, 1850, 2023, 2112), speþ (ll. 260, 272, 1505, 1531), standþ (l. 2116), takeþ (l. 881), techiþ (ll. 200, 936, 1126, 1271, 1334), vengþ (l. 740).

Both endings occur in those portions of the text associated with Z (e.g. acordis, bygyles, byteþ, departþ, fareþ, forþetþ, groues), those portions associated with the text of the first redaction, a, (behouþ l. 112, comeþ ll. 851, 903, seiþ, proues, mase, endis), and those associated with the text of b (behouþ l. 1273, brynþ l. 1011, clanseþ, comeþ l. 844, fallyþ l. 320, leses, byddes [all instances], lerns, pleynes). The use of one ending or the other in D is therefore not associated with the dialect of any of the redactions.

There are a number of possible explanations for the variation in forms found in D. The variation of forms in D for third-person singular present indicatives could indicate a scribe who came from a border area, or a scribe who inconsistently translates an exemplar from a -s area into his own -p. Another possible explanation for the variation in endings
could be varying "stints" of two scribes, one who comes from a more northerly region, and the other from a more southerly area. The scribe or scribes involved in the production of D could be copying slavishly the dialectally mixed features of his exemplar. The difficulty with this hypothesis is the occasional variation from one verb-ending to the next within a matter of a few lines, as in the following excerpt:

But he þat riȝt lyffynge wole loke,
Shalt first bygynne, as seip þo boke,
To knowe hymselfe what he is,
And put hym to verye mekenes.
For he þat knowes wel and con see
What he sumtyme was, and now is, and shal be,
A wyser mon he may be tolde
Where he þat knowes alle oþer þing
And of hymselfe hap noo knowyng. (D, ll. 151-160, p. 154)

The passage contains two examples of a third-person present indicative singular verb in -p (seip l. 152, and hap, l. 160), and two examples of the same variety of verb ending in -s (knowes, ll. 155, 159), all within the space of nine lines. A similar example from a little further on in the text illustrates that this phenomenon is not an isolated occurrence:

When men bryn strengest þei passe away,
Riȝt as a blossum of a tree,
Þat fallþþ when it is fayrest to see,
And how foule it is afturward
Tellus us opule seynt Bernard
Homo nichil aliud est quam sperma fetidum,
saccum stercorum, et esca vermium
þis holy man seip as þo boke tellus . . . (D, ll. 318-323, p. 160)

The ending for third person indicative singular verbs changes no less than four times, and once within the same line (fallyþ l. 320; tellus l. 322; seip l. 333; tellus l. 333). It must be said, however, that there are three large areas of D which use one ending to the exclusion of the other: all the third-person indicative singular verbs (with the exception of seip), which appears throughout the text with a final -þp except when it appears at the end of a
line) in ll. 374-643 end in -s, whilst the same species of verbs in ll. 1231-1569, and ll. 2023-2131 end exclusively in -p. The "scribal stint" theory is not substantiated by the appearance of any similar distinguishing Northern and Southern features in the text of D, so one must fall back on one of the other explanations for the variation found in D in this particular feature of the text: the scribe of D either comes from a border area, or he has inconsistently translated the third-person singular present indicative verb-forms of his exemplar.

b. Plural Present Indicative Verbs

Most plural indicative verbs in B have either no ending or an -e ending (which may be meaningless), or they end in -n (a feature usually associated with the Midlands):

**no ending/-e ending**: bere l. 2492; be ll. 120, 517, 1498, 2642; bring ll. 366, 367, come ll. 2388, 2477; crye l. 2222; cum l. 2646; ðeðe l. 66; do l. 1972; draege l. 754; dwell l. 2710; ende l. 1003; fall l. 2452; fare ll. 2309, 2525(2); fynde ll. 42, 177, 490, 1761, 2350; frynde ll. 690, 773; go ll. 66, 846; grete ll. 2222; haf ll. 27, 119, 121, 123; here ll. 187, 1617, 1626; kepe l. 1497; knaw l. 810; lif ll. 184, 1794; luf ll. 448, 2639, 2640, 2645; show l. 445; suffir l. 1250, suffur ll. 1112, 1189; swere l. 446; tak l. 526; take l. 342; tell ll. 1607, 1612, 2032, 2085, 2150; trow l. 191; use l. 1949; wend ll. 976, 2416; worschip l. 517, write l. 1799

**ending in -n**: beren l. 824; ben ll. 193, 195, 197, etc.; boðen ll. 134, 436; breken l. 438; comon l. 899; coueten l. 530; coueton l. 2329; ðeðen l. 738; dispisyn l. 729; don ll. 519, 1202, 2234; dredon 642; dwellen l. 2602; endyn l. 918; endon l. 977; fallen l. 149; fleen l. 827; folyen l. 1924; forrēten l. 1247; forskyn l. 2396; gifen l. 2348; gifon l. 599; gon ll. 2042, 2330; grefon l. 662; gruchon ll. 190, 193; gruchon l. 187; han ll. 663, 709, 2528; knawen l. 124; laston l. 1286; ledon l. 641; letton l. 178; lifon l. 2526; louen l. 2354; lufen l. 28; maken l. 805; makon ll. 598, 601, 638, 745; passen, passon ll. 1844, 2446; reuon l. 181; sayn l. 677, 1013; synnon l. 1672; speken, spekon l. 194, 1542; stiron l. 791; swen l. 1928; tellon l. 2573; touchon l. 1354; waxon l. 190; weron l. 721; weton l. 1245; wurschippen l. 21.

A very few indicative plural verbs end in -s: auaylis l. 726; bers l. 1338; bes l. 1736; callus 602; demys l. 330; dwellus ll. 1102, 1733; has ll. 141, 541, 1736; helpus 1095; lise l. 1306; semes 329; takis l. 440; tellus ll. 1410, 1636, 2039, 2713; wendus l. 1287. All of
these last examples derive from the *Prick of Conscience*, which comes as little surprise since one would normally expect either -s or no ending at all (if a pronoun immediately precedes the verb) on plural indicatives in the North.\(^{17}\) None of the plural indicatives in -n comes at the end of a line in B, except for the single self-rhyming pair *ledon:dredon* (ll. 641, 642), which appears as *leden:dreden* in D, and *ledep:dredep* in both C and H. The rhymes on verbs without any ending, or ending in -s, are few but significant, since most of them are paired with words that would not produce a rhyme if the verb ended in -n or -p:

semes:demys (ll. 329, 330); ellus:dwellus (ll. 1101, 1102); dwellus:tellus (ll. 1733, 1734); hell:dwell (ll. 2709, 2710); here:bere (ll. 2491, 2492); fare:care (ll. 2309, 2310); monkynd:fynd (ll. 41, 42; 689, 690); mynd:fynd (ll. 177, 178; 489, 490); poo:goo (ll. 803, 804); here:manere (ll. 187, 188); fell:tell (ll. 1611, 1612); hell:tell (ll. 2031, 2032; 2085, 2086; 2149, 2150)

The absence of any ending on verbs of this kind fits in well with the northern origins of the *Prick of Conscience*, and most of these rhyming pairs come directly from that work. The pair *semes:demys* is a self-rhyme, and thus indicates little of dialectal significance. The rhyme *dwellus:tellus* matches a third-person plural indicative with a third-person singular verb, which would rhyme in all areas except the East Midlands, where the endings (-en for the plural, -ep for the singular) would not match.\(^{18}\) All of the pairs rhyming on “fynd” and “fare,” however, occur in material shared by B, D, C, and H, and so they give some small testimony to the dialect of the first redaction. Only five plural present indicative verbs occur at the end of lines in material found uniquely in the *Speculum*, and in four of the five cases, they rhyme with words which indicate either a lack of any inflectional endings on verbs of this number and mood, or an ending in -s:

---

\(^{17}\) “In Northern texts the verb ending is generally lost when the plural pronoun immediately precedes the verb.” Burrow and Turville-Petre, p. 32.

\(^{18}\) See Bennett and Smithers, p. xxxv.
tailus:avaylis (ll. 725, 726); dwellus:tellus (ll. 1733, 1734); mynd:fynd (ll. 489, 490); end (sb.):wend (ll. 2415, 2416); here (adv.):bere (ll. 2491, 2492). The first pair of the five, tailus:avaylis, rhymes a plural noun with a third-person plural present indicative verb. The usual ending for plural nouns in all dialectal regions was the same -s ending which one sees in use today (the plural ending -(e)n is a possibility, although an unlikely one, in southern texts\textsuperscript{19}). If the indicative plural verb-form ended in -p, which is usual in most southern texts,\textsuperscript{20} it would produce the imperfect rhyme tailus:avaylip; but the rhyme would be rendered perfect if the verb ended in the more northerly -s, which is the form which appears in both B and D. The second of the five rhymes involving present indicative plurals in material unique to the Speculum, dwellus:tellus, has been explained above, and it eliminates the East Midlands as a possible place of origin for the rhyme. The last two of the five pairs only appear in B, since the text of D ends imperfectly at l. 2240. A plural pronoun or subject appears just before each of the verbs without any final -s (wend l. 2416 and bere l. 2496), something which was a common practice in the North.\textsuperscript{21} The appearance of rhyme only on plural present indicative verbs without a final -n or -p within material only found in the Speculum, as well as in material derived from the Prick of Conscience and the first redaction, could indicate a more northerly origin for the Speculum, despite the frequency of the -n ending in the rest of the text of B. The absence of any inflectional endings on plural present indicatives could also indicate the gradual disappearance of inflections towards the end of the fifteenth century in the Midlands and the South, but the additional evidence of present indicative plural verb

\textsuperscript{19}See Burrow and Turville-Petre, pp. 21-23.

\textsuperscript{20}Burrow and Turville-Petre, p. 32.

\textsuperscript{21}Burrow and Turville-Petre, p. 32.
endings in -s, an ending which survived into the seventeenth century in northern texts, strengthens the argument that the Speculum originated in an area with present indicative verb endings in -s, except where a personal pronoun immediately preceded the verb. The text of D agrees with the evidence given in B for the endings of all its present indicative plural verbs, with the following exceptions: deen (l. 66); done (l. 1972); drawzen (l. 754); suffren (l. 1112); tellen (l. 1607). Some plural indicative verbs in D end in the southern ending -p, such as bip (ll. 146, 195, 869, 1384; also appears as bup ll. 268, 341, and bep l. 1498), dop (l. 1202), helpip (l. 1095), and gop (l. 66), which appear with a southern ending. The -p endings on the plural indicative forms of “be” and “go” are clearly minority forms for the more frequent byn and go. Plural indicative verbs with endings in -p do not appear at the end of any lines, and appear so infrequently in D that they probably indicate nothing more than D’s more southerly origins.

c. Present Participle

The present participles in B most frequently end in -ing, but occasionally end in -and in those parts of the text derived from the Prick of Conscience. The endings of the present participles are exactly the same in both B and D:

ending in -yn: bozyng (l. 2499), brennyng (ll. 1153, 1198, 1199, 1755, 2094, 2107, 2114, 2125, 2137, 2146), vpbrynyng (l. 730), clansyng (ll. 1074, 1114), comyng (l. 1382), demyng (l. 1932), dreadyng (ll. 826, 1674), endyng (ll. 420, 834, 1055, 1386), geduryng (l. 1484), glouyng (l. 2145), zeldyng (l. 1392), knawyng (l. 115), lifyng (ll. 304, 825, 1090, 1150), lifyng (ll. 1307, 1931, 2204, 2405, 2421), menyng (l. 1615), rennyng (l. 2119), schewyng (l. 772), shynyng (ll. 2365, 2629), syngyng (l. 2652), stynkyng (l. 398), stondyng (ll. 1756, 2500), wallyng (l. 2284), wonnyng (l. 2197)

The present participles ending in -and almost all occur at the end of a line, and almost all appear in the Prick of Conscience:

undirstond:comand (ll. 785, 786; Z ll. 1548, 1549); undirstond:lyfand (ll.
The single exceptional pair, *undirstond:lyfand*, appears quite differently in Z and in C (it does not appear in H because the manuscript is imperfect at the beginning):

**Z**, ll. 151-154:

Bot som men has wytte to understand,
And yhit þai er ful unkunand,
And of som thyng has na knawing
þat myght styre þam to gude lyfynge

**C**, f. 39r:

But somme men haue þat understondyng
3ut be þey unkynde and yuell liuand
And of grace haue no knowynge
þat shulde stire hem to good leuynge

**D**, p. 153:

For summe men haue witte to undyrstonde
But 3itte þei be unkynd and yuel lyfnand
þerfore of grace haue þei no knowyng
þat shuld styrre hom to gode liffyng

**B**, ll. 119-122:

For som men haf witt to undirstond
Bot 3et þai be unkynd and eul lyfand
þerfore of grace þai haf no knawyng
þat shuld stirre hom to gude lifyng

The text of D and B has preserved a reading from the *Prick of Conscience* in the first line, which could not have happened if the text of α, the common archetype of C, H, D, and B did not contain the same reading. The text of α must have likewise contained a rhyme on the infinitive “understand,” as testified in Z, D, and B. D, B, and C all testify to a changed rhyme word in the second line, a present participle on the stem *lyf-*, but the only participial form that would rhyme with the infinitive “understand” would be one ending in *-and*. Therefore, the text of α probably read *understand:lyfand*, and the confusion of endings in C came into the text of C at a later stage of redaction (represented by γ on the stemma), with the change of the infinitive in the first line for the verbal substantive “understandyng.” This theory may indicate more northerly origins for α, since the alteration to the second line involves the insertion of a more northerly form “lifand” rather
than the more geographically dispersed "lifyng" into the text. One challenge to such a theory appears in another part of the text:

Z, ll. 5414, 5415:
Be world about hame sal be brennande,
Be devils onilk syde hame sal stonde

H 45v, 46r:
Be world aboute heme shal be brennyng
Be develys on uche side heme shal be stondynge

Speculum ll. 1755, 1756
Be word about hom shal be brennyng,
And the fendus of hell on ich side stondynge

The pair brennyng:stondynge would appear to take its origin in α, since it appears in C, H, B, and D as an alteration of the reading in Z; however, as it stands in all four manuscripts, it is a self-rhyme, and could thus have originated just as well in the more northerly pair brennand:standand. There are a number of examples where self-rhyming pairs of present participles in Z appear in C, H, B, and D with southern endings (lifyng:dredyng ll. 825, 826 in B, D, C 49v, H 14r, but lyfand:dredand in Z, 1668, 1669; lifyng:demyng ll. 1931, 1932, B, D, C 78r, H 51r but lifand:demand in Z ll. 6045, 6046; glouyng:brennyng ll. 2145, 2146, B, D, C 84r, H 59r, but glowand:brynand in Z, ll. 6669, 6670). There are no rhymes on the -yng form of the present participle in any of the material which the Speculum shares with C and H, which supports the thesis that the present participle of α ended in -and.

Rhymes on the -yng form of the present participle occur only in self-rhymes in the Speculum (hence such pairs as lifyng:dredyng ll. 825, 826, lifyng:demyng ll. 1931, 1932, and glouyng:brennyng ll. 2145, 2146) or in rhymes in material unique to the Speculum.

22See LALME, vol. i (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1986), map 346 (Pres. part.: -and(-) type, excl. -aund(-) and -annd(-)), p. 391; most of the texts carrying this form of the present participle are from areas North of a rough line from the Mersey to the mouth of the River Blackwater. Cf. map 345 (Pres. part.: ‘-ing(-)’ and ‘-yng(e)’ types) p. 391.
Two rhymes in the *Prick of Conscience* have been altered in B and D to accommodate a rhyme on a present participle ending in -yng: *understondyng:comyng*, ll. 1381, 1382 (*understande:comande* in Z, ll. 4002, 4003; C 62v, H 30v) and *brennyng:wonyn*, ll. 2107, 2108 (*brinnand:hand* in Z, ll. 6579, 6580 and in C 83r, H 58r). In both pairs, a verbal substantive stands in the place of another element which rhymes only on the northern -and ending for the present participle found in Z, C, and H. The alterations indicate the use of the -yng ending for the present participle in β, the archetype of the *Speculum*, a hypothesis supported by the further evidence of two rhyming pairs which involve a present participle rhymed with a verbal substantive: *schapyng* (vbl. sb.):*bryngyng* (pres. part.), ll. 729, 730; *lifyng* (vbl. sb.):*dredyng* (pres. part.), ll. 1673, 1674. In addition to this evidence, no present participles ending in -and appear in those lines which only occur in the *Speculum*. The use of the -yng ending for present participles was not geographically limited, and so this form in the *Speculum* does not provide significant evidence for localization.

d. Third-person Plural Pronouns

The third-person plural pronouns in B invariably follow the pattern for most midland texts of the period: *pai* is used no less than 262 times for the nominative, whereas *hom* and *hor* appear in the oblique cases. This usage also appears in D as *pei*, *hem*, and *her*, with the oblique cases appearing as *hom* and *hor* before l. 872.23 The preservation, in the oblique cases, of a form with initial *h* rules out the North-ast Midlands or the North as

---

23 This strict demarcation of the spelling in the oblique cases of the third person plural pronoun in D may indicate another hand in the D-scribe's exemplar, since there is no discernible change in the hand of D at that point. This hypothesis is supported by the sudden appearance, after l. 872, of the spelling "sch-" for "sh-" in such words as "shall" and "shuld", as well as the sudden shift from medial "o" to a medial "a" in the word "mon" after l. 836; a fuller discussion of this phenomena and others appears later in this study.
a possible localization for either B or D.\textsuperscript{24} The single occurrence of \textit{paimself} in B at l. 1727 appears as \textit{hemself} in D p. 216, C 73r, H 45r, and as \textit{pam-self} in Z (l. 5374), and it does not occur in B or D in rhyme (although this would not resolve much, since the rhyme would certainly occur on the second syllable \textit{-self} rather than on the syllable in question), nor, indeed, anywhere else in the text. The more usual form for this word in B is \textit{homself} (ll. 342, 573, 601, and 757). This single appearance of a northern form among an abundance of midlands forms lacks any other evidence to support a hypothesis for its appearance, and so remains a mystery.

The value of the medial vowel in the oblique form \textit{hom}, however, offers significant evidence concerning the localization of \( \beta \). Medial \( o \) in the oblique cases of third-person plural pronouns, according to the evidence given in the \textit{Linguistic Atlas}, occurs for the most part in the Northwest Midlands, whereas medial \( e \) is geographically widely distributed.\textsuperscript{25} The oblique form \textit{hom} occurs as a rhyme word in the following rhymes: 
\begin{itemize}
  \item ichon:hom (ll. 1039, 1040; uchon:hem in D);
  \item hom:cum (ll. 1457, 1458; hem:come in D);
  \item hom:cum (ll. 1491, 1492; hom:come in D).
\end{itemize}
The first of these rhymes, \textit{ichon:hom}, appears as a completely different rhyme in the corresponding lines of C, H, and Z (\textit{halely:worthy} Z ll. 2416, 2417; \textit{holly:worpy} C 54r, H 19v), and the other two rhymes occur in lines unique to the \textit{Speculum}. The rhyme \textit{hom:come} in D (ll. 1491, 1492) exhibits a rare exception to the \textit{hem} form usually found in D after l. 872. The medial vowel of \textit{come} shows evidence of being a medial \( \ddot{o} \), since it is rhymed on reflexes of OE \( \ddot{o} \) in other rhymes: 
\begin{itemize}
  \item come:dome (\textit{Speculum}, ll. 837, 838; 897, 898; 1351, 1352; 1603, 1604;
\end{itemize}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{24}see vol. i, map 52, p. 317, \textit{LALME}.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{25}For medial \( o \), see dot maps 48 (p. 316) and 61 (p. 320) in \textit{LALME}, vol. i.}
1667, 1668; 1675, 1676; all but the rhyme at 1675, 1676 are found in CH — cf. Z 1858, 1859; 5089, 5090); come:don (ll. 1029, 1030; 1587, 1588; 2013, 2014 — all of which are found in CH). All the instances of come in the foregoing rhymes involve infinitive forms of this verb, which descend from the OE *cuman*, rendering the *u* of the verb subject to vowel lengthening, especially in the North. Jordan notes that in the North in the thirteenth century, and in the Northwest Midlands a little later, reflexes of OE *ū* are frequently rhymed on reflexes of OE *ō* by the lengthening of *ū* in open syllables (itself a characteristically Northern change), as seen in rhymes such as loved:behōved, or (as witnessed above) come:dōme. This suggests that the value of the medial vowel in come would have been [o:] in Z, C, H, and in material peculiar to B and D. The value of the medial vowel in ichon, as a reflex of OE *ā* (aeghwilc an), would have been a long slack *o* ([ɔː:]; — see discussion in next section), which is borne out in other rhymes within the Speculum: ichon:ston (OE stān ll. 469, 470); ichon:non (OE nān ll. 475, 476). The rhymes come:hom therefore pair a medial *ō* (close or slack) with the medial vowel of the third-person plural pronoun, which indicates that the graph for the medial vowel of oblique forms of the third-person plural pronoun in β would have been <o> (as testified in B and the first 871 lines of D) rather than <e>, given that <e> never appears as a graph for [o:] or [ɔː:]. On the basis of the evidence given in the Linguistic Atlas about the localization of texts with hom forms, the rhymes involving hom in B and D appear to place the text of β in the Northwest Midlands.

e. Development of Old English *ā*

The reflex of Old English *ā* appears as <o> in B in nearly all cases, as the

following examples illustrate:

bon (OE bān 1150, 2209), brode (brād, ll. 581, 756), cloth (clāðian ll. 1822), clothes (clāðes ll. 1966), clothlyng (clāðian 1. 771), gost (gāst, ll. 2418, 2553), hole (hāl ll. 707), holeness (hālig+ness l. 1464), holy (hālig ll. 42, 203, 259, etc. — 78 occurrences), holyes (ll. 1337, 1440), holly (hāllice ll. 1627, 2700), homelich (hām+lic, l. 1832), hote (hāt ll. 1199, 1203, 2087, 2103, 2109, 2115, 2153, 2277), liflode (līflāde l. 1485), lo, loo (lā ll. 273, 749, 1711, 1713, 1872), lodly (lafrlic 1. 1144), lord, lorde, lordus (hlāfard ll. 27, 44, 255, etc.; 31 occurrences), lore (lūr ll. 518, 906, 2055), mo, moo (mā ll. 901, 1177, 1925, 2281, 2588), moon (mān l. 254), mor, more (māra ll. 35, 52, 77, 124, 225, 226 etc.; 62 occurrences; end of line: ll. 517, 661, 1301, 1799, 2243, 2410, 2467, 2479, 2490, 2536, 2594), most (māst ll. 36, 76, 316, 403, etc.; 17 occurrences), no3t (nāwih, nāwuh, nauht ll. 217, 343, 361, 508, 632, 678, 962, 986, 989, 1073, 1101, 1783), non, none (nān ll. 12, 27, 135, 287, etc.; 39 occurrences), nothyng (nān+pyng ll. 16, 191, 298, 324, etc. — 25 occurrences), ogh, o3t (āhte ll. 185, 457), o3t (āwiht, āwuh, āht, āht ll. 2, 1061, 1580), on, one, oon (ān ll. 862, 871, 893, etc.; 26 occurrences; only “oon” and “one” at end of line: ll. 1087, 2210, 2581), only (ānliē ll. 12, 571, 2065, 2082, 2084, 2701), ros (rās, 3sg.pret.ind. of risan l. 1621), so (swā ll. 8, 111, 175, etc.; 135 occurrences), soo (swā ll. 220, 414, 637, 1915), sore (sāre ll. 569, 662, 1302, etc.; 7 occurrences), sore, sory (sārīg ll. 277, 1266), ston, stonus (stān ll. 470, 1213, 1660, 2687, 2692), ˜s, ˜so (pā ll. 104, 133, 435, 803, 1393, 1643, 1823, 2533, 2666), ˜s (pās ll. 173, 1053, 1635, 1788, 1955), todes, todus (tādige ll. 385, 390), token, tokon, tokon(u)s (tācen, tācne ll. 375, 445, 784, etc.; 11 occurrences), two (twā ll. 219, 470, 576, 620, 890), wo, woo (wā. ll. 312, 413, 516, 575, 1916, etc.; 16 occurrences), wo3e (wāg, wāh l. 2127)

Most of the rhymes involving words within this list are cases of self-rhyme:

bon:non (ll. 1149, 1150); bon:one (ll. 2209, 2210); go:woo (ll. 699, 700); go:so (ll. 1271, 1272); more:lore (ll. 517, 518); more:sore (ll. 661, 662; 1301, 1302; 2243, 2244); moo:woo (ll. 1925, 1926); gost:most (ll. 2553, 2554); ichon:non (ll. 475, 476); oon:non (ll. 1087, 1088); fontston:non (ll. 1213, 1214); non:gon (ll. 2063, 2064); soo:woo (ll. 413, 414; 1915, 1916); also:go (ll. 2505, 2506);

The text of D has the very same reflex <o> for Old English ǝ as the text of B, a reflex which generally occurs in texts south of the rivers Ribble and Humber.27 The seeming anomalous cases of halje (hālgian, l. 490), hater, hatter (hāre ll. 1206, 1208, 2124, 27Bennett and Smithers, p. 44.
2126, 2283), found in both B and D, can be explained by the shortening of long vowels before clusters of consonants which do not constitute lengthening groups, a change which occurred sometime before the year 1000. 28 The only cases of rhymes of Old English /a:/ on /ɔ:/ in B and D occur in material which cannot be found in any of the other sources: hote: bote (OE hāt:bōt ll. 2109, 2110); before: more (ll. 2535, 2536). The first of these two pairs involve an adaptation of a rhyme from the Prick of Conscience:

Z, ll. 6595, 6596:
be first als I tald es þe fire hate,
þat na thyng may sleken ne abate;

C, f. 83r:
be first peyne is as i told is fuyr hate
þat no þyng may it sleke ne bate

H, f. 58r:
be furst as y tolde ys fuyr so hote
þat no þing may sleke ne bate

B, ll. 2109, 2110, D, p. 232
be first þat I told, fire so hot
þat [þoling] may hit slek, ne be his bote

The original rhyming pair involved the verb “abate” as the second element, and this has been preserved in C and H as “bate”. This verb, however, has been exchanged in B and D (and thus presumably in β) for the Old English noun bōt, which would have produced the sound /bo:t/ in Middle English. The rhyme, as it stands in both B and D, is, strictly speaking, inexact, since the <o> writing for OE ā in Middle English dialects generally represented the sound [ɔ:], 29 and thus the pair hot: bote would have yielded a rhyme of [ɔ:] on [ɔ:]. The second pair of anomalous rhymes, before: more, which only occurs in B (because D is imperfect at the end) presents the problem of vowel length, since beforan, the OE antecedent to the first word of the pair, had a short, as opposed to a long o.

Assuming, however, that the short o in beforan underwent lengthening as a vowel in an


29 Jordan, §44, pp. 72, 73.
open stressed syllable,\textsuperscript{30} it would have rendered the sound /o:/\textsuperscript{31} The rhyme before: more thus makes better sense,\textsuperscript{32} and is thus another example of the change of OE /a:/ > /o:/ in the text of β. One further anomalous rhyme which appears only in B and D gives cause for some comment:

\textbf{B, ll. 565, 566}
\begin{enumerate}
\item And sais, ensaumpul I haf gifon to 3ow
\item 3at r3t as I do, do 3e r3t so
\end{enumerate}

\textbf{D, p. 169}
\begin{enumerate}
\item And seip, ensaumpl3e I haue 3euen to 3owe
\item 3at ry3t as I doo, do 3e ry3th so
\end{enumerate}

The reflex of OE ā in both texts (ME so < OE swā) is paired with an initial OE ēo + w, (ME 3owe < OE eow). Such a rhyme would only be perfect assuming that: 1) 3ow would have been pronounced, not as Modern [yu:], but more like [jo:] or [jo:]; and 2) the OE ā of swā became [o:]\textsuperscript{33} in the dialect of β. The word 3ow only occurs at the end of one other line in the Speculum, rhyming with poo at ll. 1393, 1394:

\textbf{Z, ll. 4027, 4028}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Crist als tite answerd 3an 3an,
\item And sayd lukes 3at yhow desayve na man
\end{enumerate}

\textbf{C, f. 62v}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Crist anon answerede hem 3anne
\item Loke 3at 3ow disseyue no manne
\end{enumerate}

\textbf{H, f. 31r}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Cryst anon answerede hem 3o
\item Loke 3at no man disseyue 3ow so
\end{enumerate}

\textbf{B, ll. 1393, 1394, D p. 201}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Crist anon onswaret hom 3oo:
\item Lokes 3at non dissayfe 3owe
\end{enumerate}

Since poo most likely descends from OE pā (judging from the context), this last rhyme supports the assumptions regarding the phonetic value of 3ow, stated above. The two rhymes mentioned earlier, before: more and hote: bote, along with the rhyme of 3ow


\textsuperscript{31}Jordan, §35, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{32}Although, according to Jordan, it would not have been a perfect match: ‘Even in Chaucer this /o:/ can rhyme with the continuation of the OE ā, however it did not fall together completely with it, because the continuation of OE o was not so open . . . ’, §35, 3., p. 61.

\textsuperscript{33}One would ordinarily expect /o:/ in a reflex of OE ā after w; but “s(w)o ‘so’ as a result of being atonic lost w so early that it remained at the /o:/ level,” Jordan §45., 1., p.75.
([ɔː])ːxː deliver some solid evidence for the development of OE [aː] > [ɔː] in the archetype of the Speculum, which would place β somewhere south of the Ribble-Humber line.

f. a + Lengthening Groups (nd, ng, ld, rd)

The data rendered below for this particular category require a cautionary preface, since the ME reflex for OE a before lengthening groups is a somewhat slippery indicator for the purposes of localization. Richard Jordan, in his Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology, states that the -ond reflex for OE -and had a Northern limit because the Northern ā was not rounded, so that such nouns as lond and hond in the South appeared as land and hand in the North.34 Yet Jordan also admits that throughout the fifteenth century the Northern short a form gradually "pushed back more and more the — now mostly shortened — o forms like hond, lond . . . in [the East Midlands] progressively to the south, in London and the literary language."35 OE a before ng generally produced [ɔː] in the Midlands and the South, which was later shortened to [ɔ], and usually written <o> as in long and song.36 The dot-maps for the amang and among forms of the item "among" in the Linguistic Atlas support Jordan’s conclusions, since they clearly show the presence of -ong forms south of a rough line joining the mouths of the rivers Ribble and Humber, in both the East and West Midlands, and the absence of such forms north of that rough line.37 The reflex for OE -and could, therefore, identify

34 Jordan, §31, p. 52; see also the accompanying map, p. 55.


36 Jordan, §§31 and 269, pp. 52 and 233 respectively.

texts from the East Midlands and the North in the later fifteenth century, whereas the
<-ong> reflex for OE -ang occurs more generally across the Midlands and South.

The reflex for OE a followed by lengthening groups is fairly consistently <o> in
B, as the following examples illustrate:

among, emong, ymong (on+jemang ll. 688, 1412, 1479, 1480, 1757, 2094, 2357, 2652); fond (fandian I. 1502); hond, honde, hondus (hand 280, 480, 1488, 1701, 1873, 2288); honged (hangede I. 1692); lond, londe, londus
(lanl II. 19, 479, 502, 687, 1472, 1481, 1487, 2630); long (lang II. 708, 1223, 2072); song (sang II. 2651, 2683); stond (standan II. 279, 283, 1052, etc.; 7 occurrences); stondyng (standende II. 1756, 2500); stondis (standelp ll. 2116); strong (strong 392, 1065, 1241, 1658, 1899, 2093, 2135, 2160);
understand (understandan, understandap 20, 119, 183, 785, 1525); understandon ((ge-)understanden 1523); understandyng, undirstondyng
(understand- 346, 348, 1381, 2311), wrong (Late OE wrang 501)

There is only one exception in the text of B to the phenomenon observed in the examples
above, seen in the single occurrence of the plural landus at I. 1655 (londes in H 42r and C
71r; not found in Z) an anomaly which the text of D shares. Such anomalies are,
however, more frequent in D, which usually has an <o> in most of the instances listed for
B above, but contains a few <a> spellings, as in the following examples: hande (I. 1701, 1873); hanged (I. 1692); stande (II. 1052, 1432, 1482, 1751, 1874); standyng (I. 1756);
standip (I. 2116); understanden (II. 1523, 1525); understandyng (II. 346, 348). The
occurrence in D of an <e> spelling in the substantive plural hendes (OE handum I. 1488)
as the first rhyme-word of the pair hendes:landes, could be a retention of an “umlaut-
plural hend from Norse,”38 but since D contains no other examples of this plural form, and
it has no parallel in B, C, or H (which all read hondus:londus at the same point), it is
difficult to attach much weight to the singular occurrence of this Norse form. The
imperfect match of an e with an o in the stressed vowels of the rhyme-words in D may

38“hand sb.,” Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed.
suggest that the original pair, found only in α as the self-rhyming londus:hondus or landus:handus, was altered somewhere along the line of descent to D; the paucity of evidence and the agreement of B, C, and H, however, makes scribal error an equally plausible explanation for the unique spelling of hendedes in D.

The frequent occurrence in the Speculum of self-rhymes on the reflex of OE ā + lengthening groups presents one major difficulty in attempting to resolve what value OE ā had when followed by lengthening groups in the texts of any of the precursors to B and D; almost all of the rhymes on words containing this reflex are self-rhymes (or self-assonance), as seen in the following list from B and D:

lond:among (ll. 687, 688); song:among (ll. 2651, 2652); strong:among (ll. 2093, 2094); stonde (inf., sj.sg.):honde (ll. 279, 280; 1873, 1874 — hande:stande in D p. 223); lond:understood (ll. 19, 20); lond:hond (ll. 479, 480 — londe:ihounde in D, p. 166); wrong:londe (ll. 501, 502); lond:stond (ll. 1481, 1482 — lond:stande in D, p. 205)

Some rhymes involve a present participle ending in -and rhymed on a reflex of OE -and, but most of these derive from rhymes found in Z, and thus do no more than establish the Northern origins of that text: hond:semand (ll. 1701, 1702 and in H 44r; hande:semande in Z ll. 5289, 5290, C 72v, D p. 215); stonde:raumpande (ll. 1143, 1144; stonde:rampend in D; stande:raumpande in Z ll. 2906, 2907); understood:comand (ll. 785, 786, C 48v; understand:command in Z ll. 1548, 1549, H 13r); understood:lyfand (ll. 119, 120; understand:lyfand in Z ll. 151, 152; understand:lyfand in C 39r). All of these pairs, except for the last, reflect the Northern origins of Z. The explanation regarding the derivation of the pair understood:lyfand given above (p. 189), stated that α probably read understood:lyfand, since B and D preserve the infinitive "understand" in the first line of Z, and contain a rhyme word in the second line which has been changed to a present
participle on the stem lyf-; this conclusion necessarily implies that the reflex for OE -and present in the word "understand" would have been <a> rather than <o>, and thus it would have come from the Northeast Midlands or the North. 39

The rhyme bond:stond (ll. 1431, 1432; bonde:stande in D) provides the only rhyme on the reflex of OE a + nd in the text of the Speculum which is not a case of self-rhyme, and which is not derived from Z or from a. The first rhyme-word descends from late OE bōnda (husbandmen, serf), yielding /boːnd/. The second element of the rhyme, an infinitive derived from OE standan, would yield /stand/ in the North and in the East Midlands, and /stɔːnd/ in the West Midlands and the South. 40 In either area, then, the rhyme involves a mismatch of tonic vowels, [oː] on [a] in the North and East Midlands, and [oː] on [ɔː] in the West Midlands and the South. The values [oː] and [ɔː] stand in closer proximity than the values [oː] and [a], making the West Midlands and Southern rhyme a closer match phonetically speaking — but the degree of tolerance for such mismatched pairs in the mediaeval ear remains a mystery.

A few necessarily tentative conclusions can be drawn from the data given above. The consistent <o> reflex for OE a + ng in both B and D in such words as among, long, song and strong identifies both manuscripts as coming from an area south of the rivers Ribble and Humber; since no instances of rhyme other than self-rhyme exist for this reflex, not much can be said about its appearance in β, beyond the speculation that β shared the same consistency of form in this particular feature as the two manuscripts which descended from it. The alternation between <-and> and <-ond> forms in D

---

39 See LALME map 346 (Pres. part.: '-and(-)' type, excl. -aund(-) and -annd(-)), p. 391; most of the texts carrying this form of the present participle are from areas North of a rough line from the Mersey to the mouth of the River Blackwater. Cf. map 345 (Pres. part.: '-ing(-)' and '-yng(e)' types) p. 391.

40 Jordan, §31, p. 52.
suggests that D may come from an area further east in the Midlands (seeing that the North has been ruled out by the reflex of OE -ong, and the South has been ruled out by the appearance of some <-and> forms for OE -and) than B, perhaps bordering the regional divide between the two forms. The rhyme undirstonandlyfand (B, D ll. 119, 120) indicates that the reflex of OE -and in a was most likely the Northern or East Midlands <-and>.

The frequent occurrence of self-rhymes for words containing the reflex of OE a followed by lengthening groups makes it that much harder to determine what α or β might have read for this feature.

\[g.\] Breaking of Old English a before -ld / retraction to <ald>

Old English a before -ld always appears in the Midlands form <-old> in both B and D. An exhaustive list of the instances where this form of breaking occurs in B could equally stand for the same list in D (the West Saxon forms are given for the antecedents):

behold (behealdan, ll. 354, 364, 399, 1577), bold (beald 1058, 2203), cold (ceald, ll. 57, 1257, 1404, 2089, 2133, 2135, 2137, 2147), mony-a-fold, monyfold (manigfeald, ll. 58, 793, 1258, 1403), hold (healdan ll. 105, 337, 1559, 1681), holde (ll. 49, 2134), holden (healden, ppl., l. 71), holdon (healden ll. 1900, 1907, 1969), old, olde (ald; WS eald ll. 158, 780, 1623, 1057, 1682, 2204), sold (fr. sealde, 3ppretsg of sellan, 1597), told ((ge-)teald e ll. 157, 794, 1405, 2075, 2109)

Once again, most of the rhymes involving these words are cases of self-rhyme:

cold:monyfold (ll. 57,58; 1257, 1258; 1403, 1404); cold:hold (ll. 2133, 2134); hold:old (ll. 1681, 1682); monyfold:told (ll. 793, 794); told:old (ll. 157, 158); olde:bolde (1057, 1058; 2203, 2204). The only two rhyming pairs in this category which are not self-rhymes are hold:fold (ll. 1559, 1560), and hold:wold (ll. 49, 50). The first pair is found only in B and D, but is based on a couplet found in the Prick of Conscience:
The type of rhyme is essentially the same in all four examples, since both *talde* and *hold* are examples of OE *æ* breaking before *-ld*. The word *falde* or *fold* descends from OE *falod*, which, by means of the loss of the unstressed “o” and lengthening before *-ld*, becomes *falde* in the North, and *fold* in the Midlands, which, in turn, is what appears in the quotations above. Although this rhyme might not offer much information, it does illustrate that B and D (and thus probably β) shared the North and Midlands reflex of OE *-æld* with the *Prick of Conscience*. The second of the two rhyming pairs which did not constitute self-rhyme, *hold:wold*, is found in Z as *halde:walde* (ll. 79, 80) with evidence of northern unrounding of *ā* after *w*, and so it does not offer much information beyond indicating the northern origins of the PC.

h. Development of Old English *hw-*

The two manuscripts of the *Speculum* differ most markedly in this category, which places the text of B further north than the text in D. The reflex of OE *hw-* in B is frequently <qu->, and occasionally <qw->:

quat (*hwæt* ll. 100, 153, 156, etc.; 49 occurrences); quch (*hwilc* l. 1355); quen (*hwenne, hwænne, hwanne, hwanne* ll. 38, 43, 66, etc.; 90 occurrences); quere (*hwær* ll. 390, 606, 704, etc.; 19 occurrences); quereuere (*hwær+æfre* l. 1019); querefore, querfore (*hwær+for* ll. 19, 89, 337, etc.; 8 occurrences); quero (*hwær+to* l. 637); queper (*hweþer* ll. 50, 158, 842, etc.; 12 occurrences); quy (*hwï, hwý* ll. 1986, 2011, 2044, 2389, 2537); quyech (*hwilc* ll. 114, 677, 698, etc.; 19 occurrences); quyder (*hwider* ll. 2372, 2379); quyl, quyle, quyles, quyll (*hwire* ll. 184, 959, 971,
1093, 1312, etc.; 11 occurrences); quo (hwæl l. 399, 627, 881, etc.; 11 occurrences); quon, quom (hwæm l. 1376, 2274); quose (hwæs l. 2216); qwen (hwenne, hwænne, hwenne, hwonne l. 320); qwo (hwæl l. 2693); qwos (hwæs l. 2280)

The other four texts, comprising Z, C, H, and D, all have forms with an initial <wh->.

This qu- spelling, which usually occurs in texts from the North and Northeast Midlands (north of a rough line traced from the Mersey south to the mouth of the River Stour),\(^{41}\) marks out B as a text originating somewhere in the North, the Northwest Midlands, or the Northeast Midlands (given that East Anglia has been ruled out on other grounds\(^{42}\)). The wh- forms for all of the words listed above are generally distributed,\(^{43}\) and so do not offer much information about the places of origin for the other four texts in question.

i. Conclusions regarding Northern/Southern features

The general findings thus far support the detailed profiles given for B and D in the Linguistic Atlas. B has features which usually occur in Midlands texts such as third person present indicative singular verbs ending in -s, present indicative plurals ending in -n, present participles ending in -yng, third person plural pronouns with an initial h- in oblique cases, and a reflex for OE -æld in <-old>. The one feature among those surveyed above which marks B out as a North Midlands text is that its reflex for OE hw is <qu->, something more frequently found in the North. Whilst the text of D agrees with B in its use of the present participle, plural indicative verbs, its third-person plural pronouns, and

\(^{41}\)See map 270 (wh-: qu + vowel and qw + vowel) in vol. i of the LALME for a general picture of the use of qu- for OE hw-; for individual items, see maps 326, p. 386 (where: initial qw + V and qu +V); 341, p. 390 (when: 'q-' type); 251, p. 367 (while conj.: forms with initial q-); 77, p. 324 (which: all spellings with initial q-); 564, p. 445 (whether: q- forms); 573, p. 448 (whither: q- forms).

\(^{42}\)See the following discussion on East/West features.

\(^{43}\)LALME, vol. i, map 275, p. 373; for individual items, see maps 76, p. 323 (which: all spellings with initial w-); 340, p. 389 (when: 'whV-' type); 562, p. 445 (whether: wh- forms); 572, p. 447 (whither: wh- forms).
its reflex for OE \(-\text{æld}\), it differs from B in its use of third-person present indicative
singular verbs ending in \(-\text{þ}\). This last feature, generally associated with southern texts,
distinguishes D as coming from a more southerly area than B.

The evidence concerning the first and second redactions, \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\), is slight,
involving a handful of rhymes and examples. These few pieces of evidence suggest that \(\alpha\)
originated in the North; hence the lack of inflectional endings on the rhymes involving the
verbs \(\text{fynd}\) and \(\text{fare}\), and the use of \(-\text{and}\) for the present participle in the rhyme
\textit{understand: lifand}. The appearance in B and D of rhymes which indicate a mixture of
some Northern and Midland features (absence of inflections in third person plural
indicatives; \(-s\) ending in verbs of the third-person indicative singular; retraction of OE
\(-\text{æld}\) to \(<\text{-old}\>\), with features which occur south of the rivers Ribble and Humber (reflex
of OE [a:] as <o>, the use of the \(-\text{yng}\) ending of present participles) place the text of \(\beta\)
somewhere in the Midlands. The evidence given by B and D indicates that the medial
vowel of third-person plural pronouns in \(\beta\) was <o>, which the \textit{Linguistic Atlas} identifies
as a feature from texts written in the Northwest Midlands. Assuming that the absence of
verbal inflections immediately after pronouns arises from a Northern practice (a
precarious assumption, it must be said), the text of \(\beta\) probably came from the Northwest
Midlands.

2. Eastern/Western Features

a. Development of Old English \(eo\)

Old English \(eo\) (short or long) appears almost universally as <e> throughout both
manuscripts of the \textit{Speculum}. A number of instances of OE \(eo > ME\ e\) show evidence of
expected Anglian smoothing in the late OE period (occurrences of OE \(eo\) before c, g, h.
alone or preceded by \(l\) or \(r\)): \textit{dërkenes} (\textit{dœorc+ness} ll. 2095, 2190, 2193, 2196); \textit{dreʒe} (WS
drēogan l. 2079); fleye (flēogan l. 2220); seke (sēoc l. 710, 1967, 2383); seknes, sekyns
(sēoc+nes(se) l. 961, 1175, 1177, 1277, 2397, 2399); werk(e), werkes, werkis, werkus
(weorc l. 108, 111, 116, etc.; 14 occurrences, none at end of line). The following list of
forms for other words containing the reflex of Old English eo in B could stand for the
same list in D:

be (bǣn, 6, 13, 16, etc.; 309 occurrences); bee (bǣn, ll. 326, 504, 994, etc.; 9 occurrences); ben (bǣn l. 143, 146, 193, etc.; 72 occurrences); bes
(ll. 1134, 1491, 1559, 1736); betwene (betwēonum ll. 890, 1162); brest
(brēost, l. 2567); crepe (crēopan ll. 280, 283, 1660); depe (dēop l. 1749),
dere (dēore ll. 241, 408, 520, 2513); deul, deule, deulus (dēofol ll. 876, 1059, 1977, 1982, 2047, 2200, 2206, 2211, 2219, 2257); erth, erthe (eorf lll. 39, 219, 256, etc.; 32 occurrences); ethly, etrly (l. 1990, 2156, 2484);
erthlich (l. 2367); feliship (fēolaga l. 2604); fend, fende, fendis, fendus
(fēond, ll. 10, 70, 465, 724, etc.; 24 occurrences); fer (feorfr ll. 1572, 1998); ferre (feorfr ll. 775, 1509, 2027, 2578, 2664); fle, flee (flēon, ll. 148, 212, 216, etc.; 23 occurrences); forbede (forbeodan l. 407); forbedus
(ll. 499, 764), fre (frēo ll. 48, 73, 395, 639, 1431, 1658, 2093), fredome
(frēodōm l. 2387); frele (frēo l. 2449), frely (frēolic ll. 1909, 1912), frend
(frēond 627, 712), frendis, frendus (frēondes ll. 1202, 1288, 2517);
frenship (l. 2367); heleny (heofones l. 514); hert (heord l. 1873); hertes
(ll. 138, 520, 589, etc. 15 occurrences); hertis (l. 1534), heuen
(heofon ll. 39, 64, 86, etc.; 14 occurrences), heuon (ll. 9, 80, 110, etc.; 51
occurrences); knee (cnēow, cnēo l. 558); lern (lēornian ll. 125, 130, 139,
144, 458); lere (l. 123); leumer (l. 563); leuer (lēōra ll. 1651, 2313);
prestis, prestus (prēost ll. 1291, 1335, 1876, 1881, 1905); se, see (sēon ll.
40, 147, 155, etc.; 111 occurrences); seuent, seuon, sevon (seofon, seofunda ll. 497, 1259, 1369, 2097, 2358 etc.; 9 occurrences); sterrus
(steorra ll. 1520, 1525); tre, tre(e)s (trēow ll. 39, 319, 365, 368, 371,
373, etc.; 13 occurrences); trew (trēowe ll. 1501); trewth (trēowp l. 1435);
trw, trwe (trēowe ll. 103, 588, 641, 1528, 1540);

The cases listed above exhibit none of the spellings <eo, o, oe, u, ue> prevalent in the
West Midlands and the South-West, which preserved a close [ɑ] or [ɔ:] for OE eo or ēo
respectively, as opposed to the unrounded e ([e] or [eː]) usual in the rest of the country.44
Data from the Linguistic Atlas show that the items “far” (OE feor) and “earth” (OE eorp)
with an <e> reflex for OE eo are fairly widely distributed, whereas items with eo or u are geographically restricted to the West Midlands. A legion of self-rhymes occur in B, D, and Z, mostly involving the final -e of the words be and se.

be: fle (ll. 843, 844; 943, 944; 819, 820; 1015, 1016; 1035, 1036; 1167, 1168; 1247, 1248; 2719, 2720); fee: be (fēoh: bēon ll. 503, 504); see: flee (ll. 147, 148 Z; 215, 216); fre: be (ll. 395, 396; 2393, 2394); heuon: seuon (heofon: seofon ll. 2357, 2358; Z); be: knee (bēon: cnēow ll. 557, 558); tre: see (trēow: sēon ll. 39, 40; 319, 320; 1691, 1692 Z; 2271, 2272); see: be (sēon: bēon ll. 155, 156 Z; 229, 230 Z; 325, 326; 333, 334 Z; 339, 340 Z; 48 occurrences); be: tree (bēon: trēow ll. 1315, 1316; 1499, 1500; 1699, 1700 Z; 2034, 2035 Z)

Rhymes which marry the reflex of OE eo (long or short) to the reflex of OE e (or, in two exceptional cases, initial OE ār+g, smoothed to ē — see dreje: eje and flee: eje below) can be found in rhymes in the Speculum which derive from Z.

brest: next (brēost: [Angl.] nhēsta ll. 2567, 2568); crepe: wepe (crēopan: wēpan ll. 283, 284); depe: kepe (dēop: cēpan ll. 1749, 1750); here: dere (hēr: dēore ll. 2513, 2514); dreje: eje (dreogan: eage ll. 2079, 2080); fend: end (fēond: ende ll. 1523, 1524); flee: eje (fēon: eage ll. 2219, 2220; 2379, 2380); wendus: freundus (wendan: friēond ll. 1287, 1288); hert: smert (heorte: smeart ll. 883, 884); heuon: steuen (heofon: stēne ll. 1641, 1642); euon: heuon (eafne: heofon ll. 1519, 1520); nefon: heuon (nefne: heofon ll. 1561, 1562); se: pe (sēon: pē ll. 353, 354); he: see (sēon: he ll. 631, 632); see: me (sēon: mē ll. 1965, 1966).

A similar rhyme occurs in material which derives from a, as the following pair attests:

he: se (hē: sēon ll. 305, 306; 1081, 1082 C 55r, H 21r). A few rhyming pairs which appear exclusively in the Speculum likewise rhyme a reflex of OE eo on a reflex of OE e:

---

45 LALME, maps 737 (earth: ‘erth’ type, incl. ‘herth’ and rare ‘zerth’) and 756 (far(-): ‘fe(e)r’ type), pp. 481, 484 respectively.

46 The line numbers given are from the Speculum; rhymes which originate with Z are labelled, but the line numbers of Z are not given; see Appendix for a table of corresponding lines.

47 Some rhymes of the reflex of OE eo (long or short) on Old French <e> occur in Z: contree: free (contré [OF]: fréo ll. 1657, 1658); see: captifte (sēon: captivité [OF] ll. 299, 300); se: plente (sēon: plenté [OF] ll. 2015, 2016). See the next paragraph for parallel types of rhymes in B and D, and their significance.
dere: dere (děore: gefera [OF] ll. 241, 242); here: dere (hěr: děore [OF] ll. 407, 408);
flee: wilfulle (flěon: wilfullic [OF] ll. 1941, 1942); heuon: neuon (heofon: nefne
[ON] ll. 2543, 2544); almyzty: se (almihtig: sěon [OF] ll. 467, 468); se: sodenle
(sěon: -lich [OF] ll. 737, 738); se: bode (sěon: bodig [OF] ll. 1307, 1308); se: myzte
(sěon: mihtig [OF] ll. 399, 400).

The rhymes flee: wilfulle, almyzty: se, se: sodenle, and se: bode involve a reflex of -ic or
-ig, both of which endings would have developed to a final [i:],\(^{48}\) paired in the rhyming
word with a long [e:] from OE ēo, which in the fifteenth century became [i:],\(^{49}\) thus
rendering perfect the resulting rhyme of a reflex of OE ēo on the reflexes of the unstressed
suffixes -ic and -ig.

In a somewhat similar development, a series of couplets rhyme the final French
<-e, -i, -ie> on the reflex of OE eo found at the end of such words as be, flee, see, and tree
in B and D (and in Z, C, and H for those rhymes so marked):

be: charite (běon: charite [OF] ll. 1293, 1294); chastyte: be (chasteté
[OF]: běon [OF] ll. 2595, 2596); be: company (běon: companie [AN] ll. 2599,
2600); be: contrarye (běon: contrarie [AN] ll. 1425, 1426); be: contrree
(běon: counté [AN] ll. 1399, 1400 C 62v, H 31r, Z; 1471, 1472 C 65r, H
34r, Z; 2601, 2602 C 95v, H 73v); be: degree (běon: degré [OF] ll. 541, 542;
1445, 1446; 1479, 1480; 1881, 1882; 2495, 2496; 2539, 2540); be: dignite
(běon: dignité [OF] ll. 75, 76 C 38r); remedye: flee (remedie [OF]: flěon
ll. 949, 950); pytee: tree (pîté: trěow ll. 2019, 2020 C 81r, H 55r); see: perte
(sěon: pertie [OF] ll. 311, 312 C 43r-v, H 6r); pauste: see (pauste [OF]: sěon
ll. 1375, 1376); mercy: flee (merci [OF]: flěon ll. 2325, 2326 C 89r, H 65v);
free: honeste (frěo: honeste [OF] ll. 639, 640); degree: se (degré: sěon [OF] ll. 529,
530)

The rhymes of French final -é on the final vowel in the English word be are legion in the
Speculum, and have not been listed exhaustively above. The exact value of the French
vowels can only be guessed at, but the relatively frequent rhymes above on French final é
written as <e> or <ee> at least suggests the monophthongization of OE eo, which would

\(^{48}\) Jordan, §136, Remark 2, p. 140.

\(^{49}\) Jordan, §277, p. 238.
thus accommodate itself to a rhyme on the simple sound in Old French suggested by the single-letter graph in the examples above. If we could be certain that the French vowels which occur in such rhymes had the value /i:/, then the examples above would present solid evidence for the value of the OE Æo in the dialect of the Speculum.

There are a number of seeming exceptions to the <e> reflex for eo manifested in B and D, many of which arise out of particular philological circumstances. The verb <chose> (inf., cēosan 49, 74) in B, which manifests an instance of accent shifting after palatals, emphasizing the second element of the OE diphthong (yielding [o:] rather than the unrounded [e:] found in most other cases)\(^{50}\) is limited to the Northwest Midlands, while the form found in D (<chese>) in both instances is fairly widely distributed throughout the North and the Midlands.\(^{51}\) The appearance in B of the form “faure” (fēower, ll. 869, 2071) which resulted from the development [OU] > [au] usual for this word in the Northwest Midlands\(^{52}\) appears in the less geographically restricted form “foure” in both instances in D. Accent-shifting arises again in B’s parallel spellings for OE trēow(i)an: <trow> (ll. 189, 201, 1383, 1503, 1699) and <trow(e, trowe) (ll. 3, 191, 205). D has a consistent spelling (<trow/e>) for the same word. Two rhymes on the reflex of OE trēow(i)an occur in the Speculum: traw:now (trowe:now in D; ll. 3, 4; 1383, 1384; trow:now in Z, ll. 11, 12; 4004, 4005); trowed:lowede (trowed:lowed in D; ll. 205, 206; not found in Z, C, or H). The first of these two rhymes, attested in two separate

\(^{50}\)Jordan, §84, Remark 4, p. 112. cf. Mod. E. choose

\(^{51}\)LALME, vol. i, maps 718 and 719, p. 478.

\(^{52}\)Jordan, §109, Remark 2, p. 128: “In addition with /ou/ > /au/ . . . OE (Northumb.) fower . . . yielded under influence of initial labial and atonic position fawer > fær, four /fær/, . . . yet here also is found the development /au/ > /au/ in fawr in NWML and transitional area to the North.”; see also map 774, p. 487 (four(th): ‘fawr(-)’ and ‘fawr(-)’ types) as compared to map 775, p. 488 (four(th): ‘four(-)’ and ‘fawr(-)’ types), in LALME, vol. i.
places in the text of the poem, rhymes the word in question on the reflex of OE final ā (nā). If OE final [u:] developed into the diphthong [ou] in the fifteenth century,\textsuperscript{53} then presumably the same [ou] diphthong occurred in \textit{trow},\textsuperscript{54} and the forms with a medial -a- in \textit{B thus likely testify to the further development of [ou] > [au].}\textsuperscript{55} The second of the two rhymes mentioned above, \textit{trowed:lowede}, rhymes the reflex of OE ēo in \textit{trēowian} on the reflex of OE o in a descendent of OE \textit{lofian}, "to praise." Since \textit{lofian} is here used as a third-person preterite indicative plural, it would have been rendered \textit{lofodon} in OE. The o would have lengthened in the initial open syllable, and the labiodental "f" may have become "w" before the "d" of the weak verb ending\textsuperscript{56} (although the spelling \textless w\textgreater{} for the voiceless labiodental was not unknown\textsuperscript{57}), thus yielding [oː] + w, which eventually results in [ou], spelt \textless ow\textgreater{}.\textsuperscript{58} This would indicate that the vowel of the stressed syllable in "trowed" likewise had the value [ou]. The two different spellings "traw" and "trow" in \textit{B}, the former of which may be an attempt to render the later change [ou] > [au], do not have any great dialectal significance, as the phonological changes involved are manifested over a fairly wide geographical area. \textit{B} manifests at least one spelling from the Northwest Midlands (\textless faure\textgreater{}), but there is no available evidence in \textit{B} and \textit{D} to show that \textit{B} contained the reflex of OE eo common in the West Midlands and the South-west of England.

\textsuperscript{53}Jordan, §280, p. 240.

\textsuperscript{54}Jordan, §109, Remark 2, p. 128.

\textsuperscript{55}Jordan, §105, Remark 1, p. 125.

\textsuperscript{56}Jordan, §216, p. 194.

\textsuperscript{57}Jordan, §214, p. 191.

\textsuperscript{58}Jordan, §106, p. 125
b. Development of Old English \( y \)

The reflex of 1WS \( y \) (short or long) varies between \( <i> \) and \( <u> \) in D, C, and H, but always appears as \( <i> \) in the examples from B below:

- bilted (byldan l. 1598);
- brydals (brydealu l. 1590);
- chirch (cryce ll. 1560, 2619);
- dide, didon, did (fr. stem dyd- ll. 84, 88, 574, 1078, 1222, 1242, 1282, 1575, 1591, 1769, 1853, 1885, 1937, 2423, 2457, 2514);
- fyth (fylb ll. 361, 378, 2091, 2150, 2155), fire, fyre (fyr ll. 1153, 1198, 1199, etc.; 36 occurrences), first (fyr(e)st ll. 7, 152, 162, etc.; 28 occurrences); flyst, flist (fllyt, ll. 310, 2373);
- fulfill, fulfild, fulfilled, fulfillyng (fulfyllan ll. 34, 132, 236, 305, 1555, 1866, 2411, 2496, 2705);
- gild (glylt l. 1816);
- hide
- (hydan ll. 512, 1669, 1659, 1662, 1669, 1678, 1778, 2044, 2458);
- kyde (cydđed ppl. of cyðan ll. 87, 2043);
- kynd, kynde (zecynde ll. 21, 26, 28, etc.; 18 occurrences);
- kyndis (l. 18);
- kyndness (zeczynde + ness ll. 91, 2696);
- kyndomus, kyngdom, kyngdome (cyningdom ll. 1933, 2361, 2472);
- kyng, kyngis, kyngus (cyning ll. 271, 393, 482, etc.; 12 occurrences);
- lysse (lys l. 370);
- list (lystep l. 965);
- liçet (lýpre l. 596);
- itch, litel, lityl, litill, lityll (lityel ll. 249, 1404, 2007, etc.; 9 occurrences);
- mych (mycel 77, 270, 402, etc.; 35 occurrences);
- mynd, mynde (gemynd\.
- 30, 46, 91, etc.; 16 occurrences);
- myrth, myrthes, myrthis (myr(i)gb ll. 2605, 2656, 2659, 2661, 2667); pytt (pyt ll. 2039, 2155, 2289); syn(ne (synn ll. 82, 118, 148, etc.; 94 occurrences);
- syn(n)ful(l (ll. 164, 447, 969, 1053, etc.; 29 occurrences);
- synnus (synn ll. 966, 1039, 1069, etc.; 10 occurrences);
- synne (synygan ll. 751, 1062);
- synned ((ge)syngod ll. 1075, 1670);
- synnon (synniad l. 1672);
- stern
- (styrne l. 1747);
- styntyng (stytende l. 2278);
- stirr (styrleg l. 791); stirre
- (styrin l. 33, 122, 125, 216, 870);
- thynn(e (pynne l. 198, 462);
- thristed, thristid (pyrstede 1864, 1962).

These consistent \( <i> \) spellings usually occur in texts from the North and Northeast, whereas \( <e> \) spellings appear in the Southeast and Southeast Midlands, and \( <u> \) spellings in the West Midlands and Southwest.\(^ {59} \) While the readings in D generally agree with those quoted above for B, they occasionally appear with \( <u> \) spellings for OE \( y \), as in the following cases taken from D:

- buldel (gebylded 1598);
- dude, duden (dyde, dydon ll. 84, 88, 574, 1078, 1575, 1591, 1769, 1853, 1937); fure (fyr ll. 1153, 1198, 1199, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1207, 1208, 1210, 1244, 1357, 1601, 1976); hudde (hyðan ll. 1778,

\(^{59}\)see §§39-42, pp. 66-70 in Jordan.
2044); kude (cyøed l. 87, 2043); lust (lyste l. 965); muche (mycél l. 77, 270, 642, etc.; 18 occurrences — *but also found as* miche [l. 402, 700, 709] *and* mycel [l. 1670, 1715, 1926]); putte (pyr l. 2039, 2155); purstede (pyrsted 1864, 1962).

Similar cases occur in both manuscripts C and H, along with an occasional <e> spelling in C:

dude (l. 1853, 1886, 2457; *dede* in C); fuyr (l. 1198, 1199, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1207, 1208, 1210); hud, hudde (l. 1778, 2044, 2458); kud, kudde (l. 2044); luste (l. 965; *leste* in C); muche (l. 709, 1670, 1715; *moche* in C); put (l. 2289); purstede (l. 1864; 1962; *prustede* in C).

The variants in D, C, and H, taken without any reference to rhymes, might suggest a more southerly or south-western origin for α, but the frequent rhymes of the reflex of OE *y* on the reflex of OE *i* make a more compelling counter-suggestion. Such rhymes of *i* on *y* occur in material which comes from Z, which bears out the evidence of frequent <i> or <y> spelling found in that text for OE *y* (examples of <i> or <y> spelling from Z: dide l. 114; dyd l. 6213, 8203; fire l. 3088, 3094, 3095, 3096, 3098, 3099; hyde l. 5255; mykel l. 237, 339, 654, 889, 925, 926; kydde l. 115, 2408, 4342, 6212; pytt l. 4946, 7195, 8185). A list of the pertinent rhymes, with the corresponding line numbers in Z, follow below:

will:fulfill (will:fulfillan BD: l. 33, 34; 1865, 1866; Z: l. 63, 64; 9499, 9500); spilt:gilt (spildan:gylt BD: l. 1815, 1816; Z: l. 5558, 5559); synne:begyn (synne:beginnan B: l. 1061, 1062; Z: l. 2660, 2661); synne:blyne (synne:blinnan B: l. 2105, 2106; Z: l. 6577, 6578); synne:in (synne:in B: 595, 596; 863, 864; 1013, 1014; 1217, 1218; 1949, 1950; Z: l. 1058, 1059; 1702, 1703; 2352, 2353; 3156, 3157; 6071, 6072); syn:wyn (synne:winnan B: l. 1243, 1244; 1995, 1996; 2449, 2450; Z: l. 3212, 3213; 6308, 6309; 8139, 8140); synne:witin (synne:wiþinnan B: l. 917, 918; 1311, 1312; Z ll. 1928, 1929; 3644, 3645)

Identical kinds of rhymes are found in material unique to B, D, C, and H, and thus they

---

60 See dot-maps 104, p. 330 (much: ‘much’ and ‘muchel’ types, all variants) and 400, p. 404 (did sg/pl: ‘dud(-)’ type, incl. rare *dwe* and *jude*) in LALME.
likely took their origin from α:

will:fill (BD: ll. 1865, 1866; C76v, H48r); kynde:fynde (jeczynde:findan BD: ll. 21, 22; kende:fende in C 37v; not in H because of imperfect beginning to ms.); synne:in (BD: ll. 149, 150; 941, 942; 1191, 1192; 2265, 2266; C: 39r, 51v, 58r, 87v H: 1v, 17r, 25r, 63v); syn:wynne (BD: ll. 1195, 1196; C 58r, H 25r); synne:witin (BD: ll. 851, 852; 1251, 1252; 1263, 1264; C 50r, 59r, 59v H 14v, 26v)

The same kinds of rhyme likewise appear in the following pairs taken from material found only in the texts of B and D:

did:stid (ll. 1853, 1854; 2677, 2678); will:fill (ll. 131, 132); mynd:fynd (jemynd-findan ll. 489, 490); pyt:hit (pytt:hit ll. 2155, 2156; putte:hyt in D); synne:blynne (ll. 845, 846; 1169, 1170); synne:in (ll. 715, 716; 761, 762; 1111, 1112; 1227, 1228); synne:betyme (synne:bi+itima ll. 415, 416); syn:wyn (ll. 117, 118; 2009, 2010); synne:witin (ll. 757, 758); synne inf.:begin (ll. 1061, 1062)

These pairings of OE y with OE i indicate that the two sounds related to the two graphs have fallen together in the dialects of Z, α, and β, a thesis which would in turn place all three of these texts outside of the South and Southwest Midlands, which tended to preserve the more rounded [y(:)], spelt <u> or <ui>.61 The <u> spellings found in D and H (and occasionally in C), fits in well with the more southerly localizations given for those manuscripts in the Descriptive Guide; the occasional <e> spellings in C ("dede" and "leste") may indicate different layers of textual history.

c.  
α + Nasal

Although few words in the Speculum contain examples of OE ǣ before a nasal, they are fairly significant words found frequently throughout the text, such as man, can, and many. Both B and D show different reflexes for this particular phonetic feature, but the reflex changes in the text of D at a specific point, somewhere between ll. 836 and 851.

---

61 Jordan, §42, pp. 69, 70.
after which all cases of *mon* (including *monkynd, monnus*, and *monus*), *mony*, and *con* are rendered *man, many*, and *can*. This partition in the case of this particular feature coincides with the appearance, mentioned earlier in the appropriate section, of the oblique cases of third-person plural pronouns as *her* and *hem* rather than the previous *hor* and *hom*. Spellings of initial *sh*- in such words as *should* and *shall* also change at the same point, after which *sch* - predominates. The hand of the text remains fairly stable throughout the manuscript, which would indicate that these specific changes in D at a fairly well-defined point arise from a change of hand in D’s source, and that the D-scribe recorded the differing forms of the first and second hands of his exemplar without adapting them to his own dialect. The change of hand does not seem to affect those features which distinguish texts as northern or southern, since the data given for D in the preceding sections dealing with such features are fairly consistent. The use of *hom* and *hor* places the first hand somewhere in the Northwest Midlands, but third-person plural pronouns with a medial “e” are fairly widely distributed,62 so that the second hand is slightly more difficult to localize. The use of medial o in *mon, mony*, and *con*, is geographically limited to the West Midlands according to the maps for these items in the *Linguistic Atlas*, but the use of medial a in the same items is generally distributed throughout the Midlands.63 The common appearance of <a> for OE a followed by a nasal in the second “hand” of D does not, therefore, offer significant clues for localization, yet judging from the homogeneity of the two hands in features which indicate northern or

62 See the preceding discussion of this feature above, p. 21. See also *LALME*, vol. i, dot maps 48 (p. 316) and 61 (p. 320).

63 Compare maps 91 (many: ‘mony’ type, p. 327), 95 (man: ‘mon’ type, p. 328), and 715 (can sg/pl.: ‘con(-)’ and ‘kon(-)’ types, p. 478) with maps 90 (many: ‘many’ type, p. 327), 94 (man: ‘man’ type, p. 328), and 714 (can: ‘can(-)’ and ‘kan(-)’ types, p. 477), vol. i, *LALME*. 
southern affinities, it would be reasonable to assume that the two hands in D’s exemplar
were from linguistically proximate areas.

The reflex for OE *a* followed by a nasal is usually <o> in B, as illustrated in the
following examples:

con, kon (can 20, 52, 147, 155, etc); mon (man ll. 10, 13, 14, etc.; 223
occurrences); monhed (man + hād 1737, 1745); mony, monye (manig,
monig 18, 88, 141, etc; 37 occurrences); monyfold (manigfeald 58, 793,
1403); monkynd, monkynde (ll. 37, 41, 87, 92, 214, 689, 1664); monnus
(mannes ll. 818, 854, 1074, 1317); monus (mannes ll. 83, 265, 269, etc; 24
occurrences); nome, nomely, nomly (nama, nama + līc ll. 137, 1368,
1458, 1788, 2157); onsware, onswaret (answerian ll. 1393, 1898); plonted
(plantian l. 1598).

A few exceptions appear in the text of B: *can* (can l. 2356 — end of line); *man* (ll. 1620,
1644, 1723, etc.; 9 occurrences, all at end of line); *manhed* (l. 1691); *manus* (l. 1698);
*name, namely, namle, namly* (355, 484, 1395, 1621, 1729, 1792). The one instance of
“can” and all but two of the instances of “man” appear in rhymes which can be traced to Z
(can:man ll. 2355, 2356 = Z ll. 7889, 7890; man:pan ll. 1619, 1620 = Z ll. 4983, 4984;
1643, 1644 = Z 5046, 5047; 1723, 1724 = Z 5370, 5371; 1823, 1824 = Z 5578, 5579;
1841, 1842 = Z 5652, 5653; 2661, 2662 = Z 9268, 9269). Although *manhed* and *manus*
are not rhyme-words, they follow the form found in Z (ll. 5259, 5278), and are found with
the same medial -a- spelling in C (72v) and H (44r). The alternation of medial *a* and *o* in
the spellings for OE *nama* found in B presents a problem, particularly in the appearance,
at l. 484, of *name* in mid-line; no rhyme taken from Z requires its presence, and it stands
in the middle of a fairly large portion of material which is unique to the two manuscripts
of the *Speculum*. While the spelling <nom(-)> occurs almost exclusively in the Northwest
Midlands, the spelling <name(-)> is fairly well distributed throughout the North and North Midlands.

The issue is clouded further by the evidence given by rhymes on the OE ā + nasal reflex which are not self-rhymes: man:crīstendam (ll. 1833, 1834); lesson:mon (ll. 645, 646); mon:Jon (ll. 1789, 1790); man:come (ll. 963, 964 C52r, H17v; 2547, 2548 C94r, H72r); mon:dome (ll. 1575, 1576 C67v, H37v); man:damnacioun (ll. 669, 670). The two rhymes on French cognates (lesson and damnacioun), along with the rhyme on the proper name “John” (mon:Jon) favour o rather than a as the reflex for OE ā + nasal, but the precise value of the vowels in the last syllable of each French word remains unclear, just as the value of the medial vowel in the proper name remains a mystery. The rhyme mon:dome presents the problem of a dissimilarity in vowel quality (above and beyond the problem of the use of assonance on m/n, which has already been established above). According to Jordan, the word “dom” would likely have contained an ə, yielding [o:] in the South and Midlands, becoming [u:] later in the fifteenth century; in the North, it yielded [e:] or [y:]. In the West Midlands the reflex for OE mann, <mon>, would probably have corresponded to /mən/ and the <a> spelling for the same word elsewhere would probably have corresponded to /man/. The rhyme mon:dome thus involves imperfect rhyme, no matter what combinations among the dialectal variants might be tried, although /mən/:/dəm/ in the West Midlands is considerably closer than

---

64 LALME, map 839 (name: nom(-)), p. 498; compare with map 837 (name: nam(-), all simple a spellings), p. 498.

65 Jordan, §53, pp. 84, 86

66 OE ā followed by a nasal yielded /ə/ in the West Midlands, which was then lengthened to /ɔ/: Jordan, §25, Remark 1, p. 47.

67 Jordan, §30, p. 50.
the other possibilities. The rhyme *come:mon* is imperfect for similar reasons, since it matches the reflex of OE *ū* of the antecedent infinitive *cuman*, which was *<o>*; with the reflex of OE *a* in *man*. The *<o>* spelling in “come” usually represented /u/ in most areas after the mid-thirteenth century, and so the tonic vowel in either *<mon>* or *<man>* would not provide a perfect rhyming match for *<come>*. The only remaining rhyme, *man:cristendam*, which arises only in B and D, involves a rhyme on the OE suffix *-dōm*, which, judging from the *Linguistic Atlas*, appears as *<-dam>* anywhere south of a rough line drawn from the mouth of the Humber to the northern tip of Morecambe Bay, and as *<-dom>* over the whole of the North and Midlands. 69 Jordan states that OE *-dōn* “yielded partly /u/ (written *<dum*, *dom>*), partly /o/ > /a/ *dam* which predominates in the North . . . however [it] is also widely spread southwards.” 70 Of these two options, only *<-dam/> (<-dam>) and /man/ (<*man*>) would provide a match, having taken into consideration the assonance on m/n. The spelling of this pair in B (*man:cristendam*) both breaks from the scribe’s regular habit of spelling, 71 and conforms to the conditions of the rhyme just laid out. This single rhyme provides the only evidence for the reflex of OE *a + nasal* in *β*, which indicates that it would likely have been the more widely distributed *<a>* spelling, rather than the more geographically restricted *<o>* spelling. It seems that, on the basis of this reflex alone, no solid case can be made for restricting the provenance of the *Speculum* to the West Midlands, other than making an appeal to the relative frequency of *<o>*

---

68 Jordan, §17, p. 34, and §37, p. 65.

69 See maps 942 (<-dom: ‘-dam’ type, p. 515) and 943 (<-dom: ‘-dom(e)’ type, p. 516), LALME, vol. i.

70 Jordan, §137, Remark, p. 140.

71 There are 223 occurrences of “mon,” and the following occurrences of *<-dom>*: caytifdom (l. 288); cristyndome (l. 164); fredome (l. 2387); kyndomus, kyngdom, kyngdome (ll. 1933, 2361, 2472); wysdom, wisdome (ll. 113, 682, 910, 983, 2453, 2478).
spellings in B and in the first 836 lines of D.

d. Conclusions regarding Eastern/Western features

The data above from the two manuscripts B and D generally uphold the localizations given them in the *Descriptive Guide* and the *Linguistic Atlas*. Most of the reflexes in B for the features listed above are fairly geographically distributed throughout the East and West Midlands (the <i/y> for OE y, <e> for OE eo), but the consistent <o> spelling for OE a before a nasal marks out B as a West Midlands text; this, taken in conjunction with the frequent appearance of the geographically restricted third-person plural pronouns *horn* and *hor* to the Northwest Midlands, supports the conclusion that B comes from South Lancashire. The appearance of <u> spelling for i/y in D may, as has been suggested, indicate more southwesterly origins for that text, yet the sudden difference in the reflex for OE ů + nasal which appears after l. 836, accompanied by other sudden changes (the form of the third-person plural pronoun, spelling of ‘sh’ as <sch>) at the same point, indicates the presence of two hands in D’s exemplar (since the hand of D remains consistent throughout). The agreement between the two hands in so many other features makes it likely that the two scribes of D’s source come from geographically proximate areas. The first hand, with its frequent use of <o> for OE a + nasal, and its use of the third-person plural pronouns *horn* and *hor*, likely comes from the Northwest Midlands, but the second hand, with its geographically dispersed reflexes (<e> for OE eo, <a> for OE a + nasal) make it much more difficult to place. The occasional occurrence of <u> spellings for OE y throughout the second hand may suggest that the second scribe came from the South or Southwest. If the two scribes in D’s exemplar came from neighbouring areas, they must have come from the region bordering the Northwest and Southwest Midlands, which would explain the slight differences in reflexes for the
features mentioned above. Since the LP given for D is based on a close reading of the first 800 lines of the poem, before the change of hands in D's exemplar, we may assume that the first hand comes from Derbyshire, and the second may come from a nearby region which is just to the Southeast of Derbyshire. This line of speculation would place the text of D's exemplar in a slightly more westerly portion of the Midlands, and would thus place D's exemplar with B, within the West Midlands.

The paucity of much clear evidence about the forms in β makes it difficult to provide firm conclusions regarding its provenance in the East or West Midlands. The absence of any of the forms from the West Midlands (<eo, o, oe, u, ue> spellings for OE eo, <u> spellings for OE y, <o> spellings for OE a + nasal) may suggest the East Midlands, but the absence of forms does not provide incontrovertible evidence, especially considering the wide geographical dispersal of the forms which were likely in β (<e> for OE eo; <i,y> for OE y; <a> for OE a + nasal). Evidence from passages shared by B, D, C, and H show that α shared the reflexes of β for OE eo and y, although no significant evidence could be found for the value of the reflex on OE a + nasal for material from α. These forms would be consistent with the northern origin posited for α earlier, but, like the forms in β, they show a wide geographical dispersal.

3. Vocabulary

Although the vocabulary of the Speculum contains several Scandinavian borrowings, they are not particularly northern in character, and most of them derive from α or Z:

bondis (ON band l. 1241 [C 59r, H 26v, Z 3209]); cast (ON kasta ll. 681

---

72 None of them can be found in Rolf Kaiser, Zur Geographie des mittelenglischen Wortschatzes. Palaestra 205 (Leipzig: Mayer & Müller, 1937), and most of them occur in Chaucer.
Some Scandinavian borrowings do appear in B and D only, but once again, most of these are not geographically limited elements of vocabulary: cast (l. 2139), getis (ON geta l. 1172), lause (appropriation of ON equivalent lauss, rather than OE leas l. 1431), mek (ll. 560, 563), omys (l. 1282), sleze (ON slæg-r 1441), till (l. 437), trist (adaptation of ON treysta l. 579), waylyng (ON veila+ -ing 1011). The only Scandinavian word with Northern associations which appears with any regularity in passages unique to D and B is the adverb hethon (ON hedan ll. 290, 807, 970, 2021, 2309). While this might suggest the North or North Midlands as a possible place of origin for the Speculum, the absence of many other northern elements of vocabulary in those lines unique to the Speculum tends to cast serious doubt on such a contention.

73 All of the following examples are found, for instance, in Chaucer.

74 See Kaiser, p. 214.
B. The *Linguistic Atlas* and Closer Localization of Forms

The Linguistic Profiles for B and D in the *Linguistic Atlas* are supported by the data assessed for these two manuscripts thus far, and there is no need to doubt the information provided there. One particular minority form, however, is missing from the LPs for both manuscripts: the form *por(e*, a fairly rare form\(^{75}\), appears for the adverb "there" in B, D, C, and H. Every time *pore* appears in the Speculum, it appears in a rhyme: *pore:evermore* (ll. 607, 608 [D, C 45v, H 9r; *pare:evermare* Z 1070, 1071]; 2593, 2594 [C 95r; *pare:evermare* Z]); *pore:sore* (ll. 1757, 1758 [H 46r, Z 5416, 5417]); *more:pore* (ll. 1799, 1800 [C 74v, H 46v; *mar:par* Z 5490, 5491]; 2409, 2410 [C 91v, H 69r; *mar:par* Z 8031, 8032]; 2467, 2468 [C 92v, H 70r; *mar:par* Z 8213, 8214]; 2479, 2480 [C 92v, H 70v; *mare:pare* Z 8295, 8296]; 2489, 2490 [C 93r, H 71r; *pare:mare* Z 8395, 8396]); *lore:pore* (ll. 2055, 2056 [C 81v, H 56r; *lare:pare* Z 6469, 6470]). Each rhyme listed above is a self-rhyme on OE *a*, so one might argue that *por(e* arises from the typical Southern and Midland reflex of OE *a*. All the rhymes above would then be explained as attempts by southern or midland scribes to render northern rhymes into their own dialect by changing a medial <a> graph to a medial <o> graph in the rhyme-words.

Such an explanation does not, however, account for the absence of a *pore* form in most other texts of the *Prick of Conscience* examined in the *Linguistic Atlas* and localized in the *Descriptive Guide*. Out of all the Linguistic Profiles given for this form, it occurs as a majority form in the West Riding of Yorkshire (LP 30, 100, 175, 211, 240, 494, 497, 589, 601), Yorkshire generally (LP 199), Lancashire (LP 595), Lincolnshire (LP 46, 549).

---

\(^{75}\)See the entries *thor, thore, youor, yor, yor-, yore, yore-, por, pore* under "there" in vol. iv, pp. 91, 92 of *LALME*, and map 322 (there: all forms with medial *o*), p. 385, vol. i in the same work.
Cheshire (LP 43), and Cornwall (LP 5010). Given that the single occurrence in Cornwall is exceptional, the rest of the occurrences cluster in the West Riding of Yorkshire, or generally in the North. The form *pore* appears as a minority form in Nottingham (LPs 2, 514), West Riding of Yorkshire (LPs 217, 454, 488), Herefordshire (LP 7500), Sussex (LP 5850), and in the North generally (LP 22). Once again, the form predominates in the North or North Midlands, the two texts from Herefordshire and Sussex being the only exceptions to this generalization. Since the form *por(e* is relatively rare and belongs within a reasonably restricted geographical area, it is unlikely that it occurs in B, D, C, and H as a dialectal variant, and far more likely that it derives from α, the common antecedent of all four texts.

The presence of *por(e* in α would agree with the general conclusion outlined above that α probably came from the North, and it seems to indicate its provenance in Yorkshire generally or the West Riding in particular. The localization seems all the more likely when one takes into consideration the scholarly agreement “that the [Prick of Conscience] was written in the north of England, probably in Yorkshire.” In point of fact, two manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience*, British Library Add. 25013 (LP 494, West Riding of Yorkshire; Grid 399 428), and Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, McClean 131 (Hand B; LP 595, Lancashire; not entered on maps), contain the form *por(e* as a majority form — which is not to identify either manuscript with α, but merely to point out that the form is found in Northern manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience*.

---


77 *Descriptive Guide*, p. 4.

78 This is also one of the group identified by Lewis and McIntosh in the *Descriptive Guide* (p. 4) as being among the oldest of *Prick of Conscience* manuscripts.
III. Conclusion

The main purpose of the preceding study was to look at the linguistic forms of B and D in an attempt to find linguistically significant evidence for any of the earlier stages in the development of the Speculum. The evidence rendered by both these manuscripts supported the findings of Lewis and McIntosh in the Descriptive Guide, and the conclusions given in the Linguistic Atlas for the probable place of origin for both manuscripts of the Speculum. Not very much evidence came to light for the assessment of \( \beta \), but the evidence suggests that it originated in the Northwest Midlands. The evidence in B, D, C, and H indicates that \( \alpha \) came from somewhere in the North, and, judging from the appearance of a fairly rare word-form, it may have come from the West Riding of Yorkshire. The literal descent of the text is thus also a geographical descent from the North to the Midlands: the texts of Z and \( \alpha \), both from Yorkshire, give rise to the version in \( \beta \) somewhere in the North or Northwest Midlands, which then comes to Lancashire and Derbyshire in manuscripts B and D.

This localization of \( \beta \) confirms the choice of base text outlined in the conclusion to the previous chapter, since it places \( \beta \) with manuscript B within the North-West Midlands. The evidence discussed earlier concerning the medial vowel of the third-person plural personal pronouns points to the presence of the localized spelling \(<\text{hom}>\) in \( \beta \), which appears throughout B, but only within the first eight hundred lines of D. One could wish for incontrovertible evidence regarding the localization of \( \beta \), but given the likelihood that the text of \( \alpha \) disseminated from its point of origin in Yorkshire and then was altered to become \( \beta \) somewhere on its journey South, the slightly more Northern dialect of B probably resembles the dialect of the Speculum's exemplar more closely than that of D. The complete state of B, then, taken with its dialectal resemblance to \( \beta \).
provide good reasons for choosing it as the base text.
Appendix: A Table of Corresponding Lines in ZCHBD

The following table gives the lines from the *Prick of Conscience* which appear in mss. C and H, and in the *Speculum*. It is difficult in certain cases to determine the attribution of some lines to the *Prick of Conscience*, and so some of the correspondences below, particularly those which are marked as paraphrased, depend upon some subjective judgement. In most cases the criteria for attribution depends upon a similarity in more than two or three significant words of the text (i.e. nouns and verbs rather than articles, prepositions, and common conjunctions). Line numbers in plain text (e.g. 2102-2103) are taken from Morris' edition (Z). Line numbers in bold text (e.g. 2102-2103) are from the *Speculum*. If nothing appears in a cell under either column, it means that there is no corresponding passage in the other text for the lines so mentioned. Line numbers in angled brackets (“<” and “>”) denote lines which are paraphrased in C and H; lines paraphrased in C and H will be presumed to appear in their paraphrased form in B and D unless otherwise noted. Where CHZ are in agreement, but the *Speculum* contains a paraphrase, the corresponding *Speculum* line numbers will appear in angled brackets. If C and H contain any unique lines, the number of lines will be recorded in square brackets: e.g. [2 lines]. The following legend interprets the various possible entries in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C, H</th>
<th>Speculum</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>245, 246</td>
<td></td>
<td>C and H contain ll. 245, 246 of Z, but the same text does not appear in the <em>Speculum</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-66</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lines 64 to 66 in the <em>Speculum</em> do not appear in Z, C, or H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-44</td>
<td>39-44</td>
<td>C and H contain text which corresponds to ll. 39-44 in the <em>Speculum</em>; there is no corresponding text in Z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;480-485&gt;</td>
<td>285, 286</td>
<td>Z ll. 480-485 have been paraphrased in C and H; the <em>Speculum</em> contains the paraphrased lines much as they appear in C and H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281, 282</td>
<td>&lt;183, 184&gt;</td>
<td>C and H contain Z ll. 281, 282, but the same lines appear in a paraphrased form in the <em>Speculum</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2760&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;1091&gt;</td>
<td>l. 2760 from Z appears in a paraphrased form in C and H; a different paraphrase for the same line of Z appears at l. 1091 of the <em>Speculum</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
<td>At this point in the text, C and H contain two lines which do not appear in Z or in the <em>Speculum</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further information regarding Latin quotations and source material can be found in the Notes to the Text and in Chapter Three.

**Prologue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C, H</th>
<th>Speculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-38</td>
<td>5-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39, 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-44</td>
<td>13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-66</td>
<td>17-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67, 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69, 70</td>
<td>37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-44</td>
<td>39-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-80</td>
<td>45-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-63</td>
<td>51-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-88</td>
<td>67-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99, 100</td>
<td>71, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91, 92</td>
<td>73, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101, 102</td>
<td>75, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105-120</td>
<td>77-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-135</td>
<td>95-103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104-112</td>
<td>104-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143-148</td>
<td>113-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-158</td>
<td>119-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-130</td>
<td>127-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133-134a</td>
<td>133-134a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169-174</td>
<td>135-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183-190</td>
<td>141-148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149, 150</td>
<td>149, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205-208</td>
<td>151-154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211-218</td>
<td>155-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219-222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163-166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223-230</td>
<td>167-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175, 176</td>
<td>175, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241, 242</td>
<td>176, 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245, 246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247-252</td>
<td>178a-182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253, 254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281, 282</td>
<td>&lt;183, 184&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283, 284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285, 286</td>
<td>184a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287, 288; 293, 294</td>
<td>185, 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297-307</td>
<td>187-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196-198</td>
<td>196-198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309-325</td>
<td>199-210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328, 329; 348-365; [2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part I: Man’s Wretchedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C, H</th>
<th>Speculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>372-387</td>
<td>217-232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233, 234</td>
<td>233, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390-395</td>
<td>235-240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396, 397</td>
<td>241, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398-403</td>
<td>242a-246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-413</td>
<td>247-254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414-419</td>
<td>254a-258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420, 421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422-425</td>
<td>260a-262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428, 429</td>
<td>263, 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432, 433</td>
<td>265, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438, 439</td>
<td>269, 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440-449</td>
<td>271, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450-455</td>
<td>272a-276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458, 459; 462, 463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465-469</td>
<td>278-282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474, 475</td>
<td>283, 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476, 477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;480-485&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>287, 288</strong></td>
<td>285, 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508-519</td>
<td>287, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522, 523</td>
<td>289-298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528-536</td>
<td>299-306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538-543</td>
<td>307-310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544, 545</td>
<td>313, 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550, 551</td>
<td>311, 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552, 553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>315-320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558-573</td>
<td>321-334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586-591</td>
<td>335-340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596, 597</td>
<td>341, 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-609</td>
<td>343-350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618-631</td>
<td>351-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634-651</td>
<td>361-370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656-659</td>
<td>371-374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>375-380</strong></td>
<td>375-380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>854-859</td>
<td>380a-384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>385-388</strong></td>
<td>385-388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876-887</td>
<td>380a-398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890, 891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>399, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>895, 896</td>
<td>401, 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>403-580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Part II: The World

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C, H</th>
<th>Speculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>934</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582-590</td>
<td>582-590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954, 955</td>
<td>591, 592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593, 594</td>
<td>593, 594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1058-1071</td>
<td>595-608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1072, 1073; 1076, 1077; 1080-1085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1088, 1089</td>
<td>609, 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1092-1095</td>
<td>611-614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616a</td>
<td>616a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615, 616</td>
<td>615, 616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1098-1110</td>
<td>617-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1113-1117</td>
<td>626-628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120-1125</td>
<td>629-632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1127</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129-1133</td>
<td>634-634b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1134-1145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1152-1156</td>
<td>635-639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289-1292</td>
<td>641-644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293, 1294</td>
<td>645, 646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1295-1317</td>
<td>646a-662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320-1333</td>
<td>663-672b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1336, 1337</td>
<td>673, 674 [Z, ll. 1334, 1335]¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352, 1353</td>
<td>675, 676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1354-1357</td>
<td>677-678a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360, 1361</td>
<td>679, 680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681, 682</td>
<td>681, 682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1368-1371</td>
<td>683-684b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685-690</td>
<td>685-690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1382-1389</td>
<td>690a-696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1394-1396</td>
<td>697-699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1398-1405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406-1409</td>
<td>701-704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412, 1413</td>
<td>705, 706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707-710</td>
<td>707-710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452, 1453</td>
<td>711, 712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1474, 1475</td>
<td>713, 714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4 lines]; 1504-1516;</td>
<td>715-717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532-1535</td>
<td>719-722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>723-780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1544-1559</td>
<td>781-794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568, 1569</td>
<td>795, 796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572, 1573</td>
<td>797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹These lines are not found in C and H, despite their derivation from the Prick of Conscience, and so they illustrate that the Speculum does not derive directly from manuscripts C or H.
### Part III: Death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C, H</th>
<th>Speculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666-1669</td>
<td>823-826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1670, 1671&gt;</td>
<td>827, 828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678, 1679</td>
<td>829, 830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>831-836</strong></td>
<td><strong>831-836</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>836a</strong></td>
<td><strong>836a</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>837-842</strong></td>
<td><strong>837-842</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4 lines]</td>
<td>[4 lines]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>850a-854</strong></td>
<td><strong>850a-854</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694-1704</td>
<td>855-864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704, 1705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865, 866</td>
<td>865, 866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1722, 1723; 1734-1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867, 868</td>
<td>867, 868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818-1831</td>
<td>869-882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836-1843</td>
<td>882-890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852-1863</td>
<td>891-902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903-906</td>
<td>903-906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-1883</td>
<td>906a-910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-1895</td>
<td>915-918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932-1935</td>
<td>920a-922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940, 1941</td>
<td>923, 924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925, 926</td>
<td>925, 926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927-932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>933, 934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935-938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1971&gt;</td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>940-946</td>
<td>940-946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1993</td>
<td>946a-954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994, 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>955, 956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>956a-961</td>
<td>956a-961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2013</td>
<td>962a-966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>967, 968</td>
<td>967, 968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2038-2041</td>
<td>968a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042-2045</td>
<td>&lt;969, 970&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2046, 2047</td>
<td>971, 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048, 2049</td>
<td>&lt;973, 974&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050, 2051; 2054</td>
<td>975-977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2058-2061</td>
<td>978a-980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2064-2067</td>
<td>981-984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070-2075</td>
<td>984a-988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080-2083</td>
<td>988a-990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2118-2121</td>
<td>991-994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2122, 2123</td>
<td>&lt;995, 996&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2124-2129</td>
<td>996a-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1 line]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2140, 2141</td>
<td>&lt;1003, 1004&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2142, 2143; [2 lines]</td>
<td>1005-1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2160, 2161</td>
<td>1008a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009, 1010</td>
<td>1009, 1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1011, 1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1013-1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017, 1018</td>
<td>1017, 1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2368, 2369</td>
<td>&lt;1019, 1020&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1021, 1022</td>
<td>1021, 1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2380-2383</td>
<td>1023-1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2396-2398&gt;</td>
<td>1027, 1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1028a-1030</td>
<td>1028a-1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2404-2407</td>
<td>1031-1032b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2408, 2409</td>
<td>&lt;1033, 1034&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2412-2417</td>
<td>1035-1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2424-2429</td>
<td>1041-1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047, 1048</td>
<td>1047, 1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1046a,b</td>
<td>1046a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines, and 1 Latin quotation]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2454-2457</td>
<td>1049-1052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1053-1056</td>
<td>1053-1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2578-2579</td>
<td>&lt;1057, 1058&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1059</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2654-2657</td>
<td>1060-1060b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2659-2661&gt;</td>
<td>1061, 1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2672, 2673</td>
<td>1063, 1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2668, 2669</td>
<td>1065, 1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2674-2677</td>
<td>1067-1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2641, 2642</td>
<td>1071, 1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2680, 2681; 9623, 9624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2710-2713</td>
<td>1073-1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2714, 2715</td>
<td>1077, 1078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2726, 2727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2728, 2729</td>
<td>&lt;1079, 1080&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2730-2731</td>
<td>1080a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2732-2735&gt;</td>
<td>1081, 1082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2736, 2737</td>
<td>1083, 1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2740-2743</td>
<td>1085-1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1089, 1090</td>
<td>1089, 1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2756-2759</td>
<td>&lt;1091&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2760&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2761-2763</td>
<td>1092, 1092a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1093, 1094</td>
<td>1093, 1094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2766-2771&gt;</td>
<td>1095-1098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099, 1100</td>
<td>1099, 1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2772-2781</td>
<td>1101-1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2782-2797</td>
<td>1111-1114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2798, 2799</td>
<td>1115, 1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2806-2828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2829-2833</td>
<td>1117-1120a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2836-2846</td>
<td>1121-1129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2847&gt;</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1131, 1132</td>
<td>1131, 1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2852, 2853</td>
<td>1133, 1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2854-2887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2897, 2898</td>
<td>1137, 1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900, 2901</td>
<td>1139, 1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2904-2912</td>
<td>1141-1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1151</strong></td>
<td>1151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2918, 2919</td>
<td>1155, 1156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2920-2923</td>
<td>&lt;1157, 1158&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2924-2928</td>
<td>1159-1163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1164-1168</strong></td>
<td>1164-1168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2936, 2937; 2 lines; 2961, 2962]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1169-1172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2964, 2965</td>
<td>1173, 1174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2984-3001&gt;</td>
<td>1175-1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3004, 3005&gt;</td>
<td>1185, 1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1187-1196</strong></td>
<td>1187-1196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3088, 3089&gt;</td>
<td>1197-1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090, 3091</td>
<td>1201, 1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3094-3102</td>
<td>1203-1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3124-3126</td>
<td>1211-1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1214</strong></td>
<td>1214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3152-3155&gt;</td>
<td>1215, 1216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3156-3177</td>
<td>1217-1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3202-3205</td>
<td>1235-1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3207-3209</td>
<td>&lt;1239-1242&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3212, 3213</td>
<td>1243, 1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3230, 3231</td>
<td>1245, 1246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1247, 1248</strong></td>
<td>1247, 1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3232, 3233</td>
<td>1249, 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1251, 1252</strong></td>
<td>1251, 1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3246-3249</td>
<td>1253-1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1257, 1258</strong></td>
<td>1257, 1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3266-3269</td>
<td>1259-1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1263, 1264</strong></td>
<td>1263, 1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3274, 3275; 3288-3293; 3312-3321; 3326-3335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1265, 1266</strong></td>
<td>1265, 1266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3512, 3513&gt;</td>
<td>1267, 1268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3514, 3515</td>
<td>1269, 1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1271-1274</strong></td>
<td>1271-1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]; 3522, 3523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3524, 3525</td>
<td>1275-1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3526-3531; 3542-3547</td>
<td>1279, 1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3566-3571</td>
<td>1281-1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3572, 3573; 3590-3593; 3596, 3597</td>
<td>1287-1290b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1291</strong></td>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3606, 3607; 3614, 3615; 3624-3627; 3650, 3651; [11 lines in C; 7 lines in H]</td>
<td>1292-1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1296a</strong></td>
<td>1296a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3630-3647</td>
<td>1297-1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3648, 3649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1322</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1 line]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3652-3655</td>
<td>1323-1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3652-3655</td>
<td>&lt;1327-1330&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335-1337</td>
<td>1331-1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1 line]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3778-3783;</td>
<td>1347-1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C has 2 more lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part V: The Doom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C, H</th>
<th>Speculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3966-3971</td>
<td>1351-1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3972, 3973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3974-3987</td>
<td>1357-1370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3990, 3991</td>
<td>1371, 1372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3994-3996</td>
<td>1373-1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3997</td>
<td>&lt;1376&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3998-4005</td>
<td>1377-1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4008-4010</td>
<td>1385-1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4011-4013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4014, 4015</td>
<td>1388a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4015-4024</td>
<td>1392a-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4025, 4026</td>
<td>1389, 1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4027-4032</td>
<td>1391, 1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4035-4047</td>
<td>1393-1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4048</td>
<td>&lt;1412&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4049, 4050</td>
<td>1399-1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4051-4054</td>
<td>1415-1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4055, 4056</td>
<td>1419, 1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4057</td>
<td>1420a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4058-4060</td>
<td>1420b-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4061, 4062</td>
<td>1421, 1422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4063-4072; 4101-4104; 4108, 4109; 4113, 4114; 4117-4122; 4125-4128; 4133-4142; 4149-4152; 4155-4164; 4166, 4167; 4169-4186; 4197-4200; 4202-4210; 4221, 4222</td>
<td>1423-1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4223, 4224</td>
<td>1455, 1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4225, 4226; 4235</td>
<td>1457-1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4236-4244</td>
<td>1462-1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4245, 4246</td>
<td>1469, 1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4263, 4264</td>
<td>1471, 1472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473-1476</td>
<td>1473-1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1477-1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481-1488</td>
<td>1481-1488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490a-1502</td>
<td>1490a-1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6 lines]; 4283, 4284; 4321-4324; 4327-4330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4331, 4332</td>
<td>1503-1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1509, 1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4353-4356</td>
<td>1511, 1512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515, 1516</td>
<td>1513-1514b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;4415, 4416&gt;</td>
<td>1515, 1516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4417-4422</td>
<td>1517, 1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4425, 4426</td>
<td>1518a-1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525, 1526</td>
<td>1523, 1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4443-4450; 4471, 4472; 4499-4502</td>
<td>1525, 1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4503-4508</td>
<td>1526-1530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4509, 4510</td>
<td>1531-1534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1535, 1536&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4515-4518</td>
<td>1536a-1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4523-4526; 4529-4532; 4541-4544; 4563-4570</td>
<td>1539-1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1543-1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4621, 4622; [8 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4633-4638</td>
<td>1555-1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4639</td>
<td>&lt;1559&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4640</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4647, 4648</td>
<td>1561-1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4649-4655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1 line]</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4657-4660</td>
<td>1568a-1570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4663-4668</td>
<td>1571-1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4671-4674</td>
<td>1576c-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4675-4680</td>
<td>1577, 1578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4699, 4700; 4724-4729; 4738-4741; 4745, 4746; 4748-4755; 4758-4767; 4770-4773; 4776, 4777; 4780-4785; 4788-4791; 4794, 4795; 4798-4813; 4816-4823</td>
<td>1579-1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4824-4836</td>
<td>1585, 1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4839-4854</td>
<td>1586a-j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1603, 1604</strong></td>
<td>1603, 1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4857-4860; 4899-4906; [2 lines of English; 2 lines of Latin]; 4921, 4922; 4925-4928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4957-4960</td>
<td>1605-1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4963, 4964</td>
<td>1609, 1610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4967, 4968</td>
<td>1611, 1612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1613, 1614</strong></td>
<td>1613, 1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4973-4978</td>
<td>1614a-1618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4983-4990</td>
<td>1619-1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4999, 5000</td>
<td>1627, 1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5003, 5004</td>
<td>1629, 1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5005, 5006</td>
<td>1630a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5007, 5008</td>
<td>&lt;1631, 1632&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1633, 1634</strong></td>
<td><strong>1633, 1634</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5025-5028</td>
<td>1635-1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5029-5032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5033-5043</td>
<td>1639-1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5046-5049</td>
<td>1643-1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5050-5053</td>
<td>&lt;1647, 1648&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5054, 5055</td>
<td>1649, 1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5058, 5059&gt;</td>
<td>1651, 1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5063&gt;</td>
<td>1653, 1654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5064-5079</td>
<td>1654a-1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1663, 1664</strong></td>
<td><strong>1663, 1664</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5084, 5085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5086-5092</td>
<td>1665, 1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5096-5104; [2 lines]; 5112, 5113; 5120, 5121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5121-5129</td>
<td>1671-1676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]; 5138-5141</td>
<td>1676a-1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5149, 5150</td>
<td>&lt;1681, 1682&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5151, 5152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5153, 5154</td>
<td>1682a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5155, 5156; 5159-5162; 5171-5180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1683, 1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5253-5260</td>
<td>1685-1692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5261, 5262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5263, 5264</td>
<td>1693, 1694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5267, 5268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5271, 5272</td>
<td>1695, 1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5281, 5282</td>
<td>1696a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5283, 5284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5277, 5278</td>
<td>1697, 1698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5287-5290</td>
<td>1699-1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5291-5294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5301, 5302</td>
<td>1703, 1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1705, 1706</strong></td>
<td>1705, 1706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5313, 5314</td>
<td>1707, 1708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5331, 5332&gt;</td>
<td>1709, 1710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5333, 5334</td>
<td>1711, 1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5337, 5338</td>
<td>1713, 1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1715, 1716</strong></td>
<td>1715, 1716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5351, 5352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1717, 1718</strong></td>
<td>1717, 1718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5361-5365</td>
<td>1718a-1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5368-5375</td>
<td>1721-1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5378-5391</td>
<td>1729-1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5392-5393</td>
<td>1739, 1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5396-5400</td>
<td>1740a-1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5401</td>
<td>&lt;1744&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5404-5417</td>
<td>1745-1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5422</td>
<td>1759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5423&gt;</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5424-5430</td>
<td>1761-1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5431&gt;</td>
<td>1768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5432</td>
<td>1769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5434-5437&gt;</td>
<td>1770-1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5439-5443</td>
<td>1774-1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778a</td>
<td>1778a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5444-5446</td>
<td>1779-1780a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5447, 5448&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;1781, 1782&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5449-5453</td>
<td>1783-1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5468, 5469</td>
<td>1787, 1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5470, 5471</td>
<td>1789-1790b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5476, 5477</td>
<td>1791, 1792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1793-1794a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5478, 5479</td>
<td>1795, 1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5488-5491</td>
<td>1797-1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5492, 5493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5494, 5495</td>
<td>1802a-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5496, 5497</td>
<td>1801, 1802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5498, 5499</td>
<td>1803, 1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5516-5521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544, 5545</td>
<td>1805, 1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5546-5549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1807-1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5550-5555</td>
<td>1810a-1814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5558-5565</td>
<td>1815-1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5578, 5579</td>
<td>1823, 1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5580, 5581&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;1825, 1826&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1827-1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5612, 5613</td>
<td>1837, 1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5614-5619; 5622-5641</td>
<td>1839, 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5642, 5643</td>
<td>1841-1842c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5652-5657</td>
<td>1843, 1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5664, 5665</td>
<td>1845, 1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5666, 5667</td>
<td>1846a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5668, 5669</td>
<td>1847, 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5674, 5675</td>
<td>1848a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848a,b</td>
<td>1849-1850c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5680-5683</td>
<td>1851, 1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5684-5687&gt;</td>
<td>1853, 1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5728, 5729</td>
<td>1854a-1856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5731-5734</td>
<td>1857, 1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5735, 5736</td>
<td>1859, 1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5764, 5765&gt;</td>
<td>1860a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5766, 5767</td>
<td>1860a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5768</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5769</td>
<td>1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5770, 5771</td>
<td>1863, 1864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865, 1866</td>
<td>1865, 1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5858, 5859; 5862, 5863; 5870, 5871; [2 lines]; 5878, 5879; 5876, 5877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882-5885</td>
<td>1867-1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5886, 5887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5888-5892</td>
<td>1870a-1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5893</td>
<td>1874-1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1885-1888</strong></td>
<td>1885-1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5922, 5923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5924-5935</td>
<td>1888a-1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5936, 5937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5938-5941</td>
<td>&lt;1899-1902&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5942, 5943</td>
<td>1903, 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944, 5945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5948-5956</td>
<td>1905-1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5957</td>
<td>&lt;1912&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5958, 5959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5962, 5963</td>
<td>1912a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5964, 5965; 6000-6009</td>
<td>1913-1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6010, 6011</td>
<td>&lt;1917, 1918&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6012, 6013</td>
<td>1919, 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6014, 6015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6034-6039</td>
<td>1921-1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1927, 1928</strong></td>
<td>1927, 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6040-6047</td>
<td>1929-1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6048</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6049, 6050</td>
<td>1935, 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6051, 6052</td>
<td>&lt;1937, 1938&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6053</td>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6054</td>
<td>&lt;1940&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6056, 6057</td>
<td>&lt;1941, 1942&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6063</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6064-6066</td>
<td>1944-1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6067, 6068</td>
<td>1947, 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6069, 6070</td>
<td>1950a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6071, 6072</td>
<td>1949, 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6073, 6074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6075, 6076</td>
<td>&lt;1951, 1952&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6077-6088; 6093-6097; [1 line]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1953, 1954</strong></td>
<td><strong>1953, 1954</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1955, 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6144-6146</td>
<td>1960a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6147, 6148</td>
<td>&lt;1957, 1958&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6149, 6150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1959, 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6151-6160</td>
<td>1961-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6175-6178&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;1971, 1972&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6179, 6180</td>
<td>&lt;1973, 1974&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6183-6188</td>
<td>1974a-1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1 line]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines];6190-6193; 6196, 6197; [4 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6222-6227</td>
<td>1981-1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6230, 6231</td>
<td>1987, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6232-6235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6236</td>
<td>&lt;1989&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6237-6241; 6252-6267; 6270-6277; 6286-6291; 6306, 6307</td>
<td>1990-1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6308-6313</td>
<td>1995-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002a</td>
<td>2001-2002a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6314-6318</td>
<td>2005-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6319&gt;</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6320-6323</td>
<td>2009, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6324-6327</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6328-6331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6332, 6333</td>
<td>2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6336-6339</td>
<td>2017-2018a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6340, 6341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part VI: Hell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C, H</th>
<th>Speculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6423-6430</td>
<td>2023-2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6431-6434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6437, 6438</td>
<td>&lt;2031, 2032&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6441, 6442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6443-6450</td>
<td>2033-2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6453, 6454</td>
<td>2041, 2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6457-6470</td>
<td>2043-2056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6477-6480</td>
<td>2057-2060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6481, 6482&gt;; 6489, 6490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6491, 6492</td>
<td>2061, 2062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6493, 6494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6495, 6496</td>
<td>2064a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6497, 6498</td>
<td>2063, 2064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6499, 6500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6501, 6502</td>
<td>2065, 2066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6503-6506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6507-6514</td>
<td>2067-2074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6515-6518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6521-6528</td>
<td>2075, 2076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6529-6548 (H; C lacks ll. 6533, 6534); 6550; [1 line]</td>
<td>2077-2084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6551-6556&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;2085, 2086&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6557-6570</td>
<td>2087-2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6571, 6572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6573-6579</td>
<td>2101-2107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6580</td>
<td>2108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6581, 6582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6595, 6596</td>
<td>2109, 2110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6635, 6636</td>
<td>2110a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6597-6604</td>
<td>2111, 2114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6605, 6606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6607-6610</td>
<td>2115-2118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6611, 6612</td>
<td>&lt;2119, 2120&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6613, 6614&gt;</td>
<td>2121, 2122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6615-6622</td>
<td>2123-2130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6629, 6630</td>
<td>2131, 2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6625, 6626</td>
<td>2132a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6637-6640</td>
<td>2133-2136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6641, 6642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2137-2139</td>
<td>2137-2139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6654-6658</td>
<td>2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6659-6672</td>
<td>2140a-2148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6675, 6676</td>
<td>2149, 2150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6677, 6678</td>
<td>&lt;2151, 2152&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6679-6684</td>
<td>2152a-2156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6693, 6694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6695, 6696</td>
<td>&lt;2157, 2158&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6699, 6700</td>
<td>2159, 2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6707, 6708; 6721, 6722</td>
<td>2161, 2162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6723-6734</td>
<td>2162a-2172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6737, 6738</td>
<td>2173, 2174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6741, 6742&gt;</td>
<td>2175, 2176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6743, 6744</td>
<td>2176a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6746, 6747</td>
<td>&lt;2176c,d&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6747, 6748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6753-6756</td>
<td>2176e,f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6757, 6758; 6761, 6722</td>
<td>2176g-2178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6764, 6765</td>
<td>2179, 2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6768-6771; 6774, 6775</td>
<td>2181, 2182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6776, 6777</td>
<td>2183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6780</td>
<td>2184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6790, 6791</td>
<td>2186a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6792, 6793</td>
<td>2185, 2186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6796, 6797</td>
<td>2187, 2188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6801-6808</td>
<td>2189-2194b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6819, 6820; 6825, 6826</td>
<td>2195, 2196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6823, 6824</td>
<td>2198a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6831, 6832</td>
<td>2197, 2198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6841, 6842</td>
<td>2199, 2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6845, 6846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6853, 6854&gt;</td>
<td>2201, 2202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6855-6864</td>
<td>2203-2212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6867, 6868</td>
<td>2213, 2214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6871-6874</td>
<td>2214a-2216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6877-6886</td>
<td>2217-2222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2223</td>
<td>2223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6908-6914</td>
<td>2224-2228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6917-6918</td>
<td>2229, 2230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6923-6926</td>
<td>2230a-2232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6927; [1 line]</td>
<td>2233, 2234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6929, 6930</td>
<td>2234a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6931-6934; 6945-6950</td>
<td>2235, 2236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6951, 6952</td>
<td>2236a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6953, 6954&gt;</td>
<td>2237, 2238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6955, 6956</td>
<td>2239, 2240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6959, 6960</td>
<td>2239, 2240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6963, 6964</td>
<td>2240a-2246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6965-6974</td>
<td>2247-2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]; 6982; [1 line]; 6985-6990; [2 lines]; 7019, 7020</td>
<td>2247-2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7021-7026</td>
<td>2250a-2252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7028</td>
<td>2253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2254</td>
<td>2254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7045-7050</td>
<td>2255-2260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7055, 7056</td>
<td>2261, 2262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7057, 7058</td>
<td>2263-2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2263-2266</td>
<td>2263-2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7061-7072</td>
<td>2267-2272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7073, 7074</td>
<td>2273-2276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7075-7078</td>
<td>2277, 2278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7097, 7098</td>
<td>2279-2282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7115-7120</td>
<td>2283, 2284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7125, 7126</td>
<td>2285, 2286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;7123, 7124&gt;</td>
<td>2285, 2286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2287, 2288</td>
<td>2287, 2288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7191, 7192</td>
<td>2288a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2289, 2290</td>
<td>2289, 2290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7298, 7299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7300, 7301</td>
<td>&lt;2291, 2292&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7310, 7311</td>
<td>2293, 2294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7306-7309</td>
<td>2295-2298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7310, 7311 [repeated]; 7320, 7321; 7332-7337; 7340-7343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2299, 2300</td>
<td>2299, 2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;7432&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;2301&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7434, 7435</td>
<td>&lt;2302&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;7436, 7437&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7482, 7483</td>
<td>&lt;2303, 2304&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7484</td>
<td>&lt;2305&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7485; 7504-7507</td>
<td>2306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2307-2314</td>
<td>2307-2314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7508-7511</td>
<td>2315-2318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2319-2328</td>
<td>2319-2328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part VII: Heaven**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C, H</th>
<th>Speculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7533-7541</td>
<td>2329-2337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2338-2338b</td>
<td>2338-2338b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7543-7546</td>
<td>2339-2342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7547, 7548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7563-7566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7567-7572; 7578-7579; 7581-7600; 7603-7606; 7613; 7621-7630</td>
<td>2343-2346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7769, 7770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7787-7796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7797, 7798; &lt;7799-7802&gt;; 7803, 7804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7889-7896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7909, 7910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7913, 7914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7923, 7924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7933-7938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7941, 7942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7943-7948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7959-7964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7979, 7980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7983-7986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7995-7998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2393, 2394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8007, 8008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8009, 8010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;8011, 8012&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8013, 8014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8023-8028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8031, 8032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8039, 8040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8041, 8042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8063, 8064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2313, 2314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2347, 2348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2349-2354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2363, 2364&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2365, 2366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2367, 2368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2369-2374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2375-2380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2381-2386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2387, 2388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2389-2392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2395, 2396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2397, 2398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2399, 2400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2401, 2402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403-2408</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2409, 2410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2411, 2412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2415-2416b</td>
<td>2415-2416b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8067, 8068</td>
<td>2417, 2418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2419, 2420</td>
<td>2419, 2420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2421-2428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8071-8074</td>
<td>2429-2432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8075-8078</td>
<td>2433, 2434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8079, 8080</td>
<td>2438a,b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8081-8084</td>
<td>2435-2438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8093</td>
<td>2439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8094</td>
<td>2440-2442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8097, 8098</td>
<td>&lt;2443, 2444&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8099, 8100</td>
<td>2445, 2446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8137-8139</td>
<td>2447-2449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;8140&gt;</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8175, 8176</td>
<td>2451, 2452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8187, 8188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8189, 8190</td>
<td>2453, 2454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8201-8214</td>
<td>2455-2468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8277, 8278</td>
<td>2469, 2470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8283, 8284</td>
<td>2471, 2472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8287-8296</td>
<td>2473-2480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8377, 8378</td>
<td>&lt;2481, 2482&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;8379, 8380&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8385, 8386</td>
<td>&lt;2485, 2486&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8387-8390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8391, 8392</td>
<td>2487, 2488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8395, 8396</td>
<td>2489, 2490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8397, 8398</td>
<td>&lt;2491, 2492&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2493, 2494</strong></td>
<td>2493, 2494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2495, 2496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8493, 8494</td>
<td>&lt;2497, 2498&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8495, 8496</td>
<td>2499, 2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8499, 8500</td>
<td>2501, 2502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8503-8506</td>
<td>2502a-2504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8525, 8526</td>
<td>2505, 2506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2507</td>
<td>2507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8528</td>
<td>2508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8529-8532</td>
<td>2509-2512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8533, 8534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8535-8542</td>
<td>2513-2518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2519, 2520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8559, 8560</td>
<td>2521, 2522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8563-8576</td>
<td>2523-2536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8605, 8606</td>
<td>2537, 2538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8623, 8624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2539, 2540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8627, 8628</td>
<td>2541, 2542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8633-8636</td>
<td>2543-2546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8643-8646</td>
<td>2547-2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8649, 8650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8651-8658</td>
<td>2551-2558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8665, 8666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8667-8670</td>
<td>2559-2562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8679, 8680</td>
<td>2563, 2564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8681-8686</td>
<td>2565, 2566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8687-8690</td>
<td>2567-2570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;8691, 8692&gt;</td>
<td>2571, 2572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8693-8698</td>
<td>2573-2578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8700</td>
<td>2579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;8702&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;2580&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8703-8706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8709-8712</td>
<td>2581-2584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8715-8718</td>
<td>2585-2588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8723-8725</td>
<td>2589-2591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2592</td>
<td>2592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8729-8734</td>
<td>2593-2598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8737, 8738</td>
<td>&lt;2599, 2600&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8761-8764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8765, 8766</td>
<td>2601, 2602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2603, 2604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9007-9010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9011, 9012</td>
<td>2605, 2606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9013, 9014</td>
<td>&lt;2607, 2608&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9015, 9016</td>
<td>2609, 2610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611-2616</td>
<td>2611-2616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9125, 9126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9127-9144</td>
<td>2617-2632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2633, 2634</td>
<td>2633, 2634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9151-9153</td>
<td>2634a-2636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9232-9235</td>
<td>2637-2640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2641, 2642</td>
<td>2641, 2642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8783-8786</td>
<td>2642a-2644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9236-9239</td>
<td>2645-2648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9250, 9251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9252-9259</td>
<td>2649-2656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9262</td>
<td>2657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9263</td>
<td>2658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9266-9269</td>
<td>2659-2662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9272-9274</td>
<td>2663-2665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9275</td>
<td>&lt;2666&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9276, 9277; 9280-9283; 9290-9291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9292, 9293</td>
<td>2667, 2668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9300-9305</td>
<td>2669-2674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9306, 9307</td>
<td>2675-2678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9308-9312</td>
<td>2678a-2680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2 lines]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2681, 2682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9315, 9316</td>
<td>2683, 2684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9319-9324</td>
<td>2685-2688b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9327-9330</td>
<td>2689-2692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9351, 9352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2693, 2694</td>
<td>2693, 2694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2695-2698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9487-9490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, H</td>
<td>Speculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9491-9494</td>
<td>2699-2702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9495, 9496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9497-9500</td>
<td>2703-2706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9509-9520</td>
<td>2707-2718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2719, 2720</td>
<td>2719, 2720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9623, 9624</td>
<td>2721, 2722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>