

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Trinity College MS 93:
A Study and Partial Edition

Part I

Hannah Schühle-Lewis

St Edmund Hall, Oxford

DPhil Thesis

2019

(Word count: 150,440)

Abstract

This thesis examines the Middle English *Declaracion on the Bible* contained uniquely in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Trinity College MS 93. The text represents a fascinating and methodologically varied response to the Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible (LV), written very soon after its completion.

The thesis is in two parts. The opening chapter of Part I provides a brief overview of the manuscript and its contents, and considers evidence concerning how, where and when the manuscript might have been produced, proposing that the text was likely the product of a scholar or group of scholars working in Oxford in the 1390s. Chapter 2 develops the themes of the opening chapter by examining the evidence for authorship and intended audience, suggesting that the text was almost certainly produced by and for the scholarly community, but perhaps also to facilitate small group learning outside the university. Chapter 3 considers the context in which the *Declaracion* was compiled, suggesting that, while it would have been condemned by some, the text might have appealed to a relatively wide audience, possibly including some moderate opponents of scriptural translation. The chapter then considers the *Declaracion* from an ideological standpoint, suggesting that, though it is not polemical, its themes and concerns are consistent with Wycliffite ideas. Chapter 4 examines the *Declaracion* as a work which balances exegesis and paraphrase. Comparing the text to analogous Wycliffite works, it argues that the *Declaracion* is the most varied and experimental Wycliffite response to scripture. Chapter 5 provides an in-depth examination of the *Declaracion*'s use of sources. It argues that the main biblical source is LV, but that the level of engagement with other sources, notably the Vulgate, Lyra's *Postilla*, the *Magna*, and the *Glossa*, has long been underestimated. A brief conclusion suggests that the *Declaracion* is an exceptional and

intricate example of Wycliffite biblical scholarship deserving of further study.

Part II includes a selection of text edited from the manuscript, along with Explanatory and Textual Notes, brief introductory material for each biblical book edited, and an Editorial Note. The edited text consists of all the books of Ezra (including 3 and 4 Esdras), the Penitential Psalms, Isaiah, the Gospels and Acts.

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of St Edmund Hall, Oxford, without which this thesis could not have been completed.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Annie Sutherland. Her thoughts and suggestions, given with such warmth and enthusiasm, have improved the thesis immeasurably, and her support has been invaluable.

I would also like to thank Dr Jenni Nuttall, my college adviser, for her encouragement and guidance. Many thanks also to Professor Michael Kuczynski, Dr Elizabeth Solopova, and Cosima Gillhammer, all of whom have helped both by providing sage advice and also by allowing me to see pre-publication copies of their research. I am also indebted to Anne Hudson, Kantik Ghosh and Helen Barr, whose insight helped to shape the thesis throughout the writing process, and to Professor Daniel Wakelin for his palaeographical advice.

In addition, I gratefully acknowledge the members of the academic community who have contributed questions, thoughts and comments on my conference papers, all of which informed this thesis.

My interest in medieval literature was sparked at Cambridge by Dr Charles Moseley and Professor Barry Windeatt. I would also like to thank Dr Isobel Maddison for her support at Cambridge and in the years since.

Thanks are also due to my friends, all of whom have been enormously supportive. Matthew Roby has been a brilliant friend and study partner. Special thanks are also due to Raphaela Rohrhofer, for her unerring support and occasional Latin guidance. Heartfelt thanks also to Emma Leonard-Brook, Karen Rushton, Tamara Patrick and Jennifer Knox, and to

Camille Kerker, who also helped with French.

Finally, I would like to thank my family, and particularly my parents, Reini Schühle and Brian Lewis, for their unfailing support, love, and guidance. Words cannot express the depth of my gratitude.

Contents: Part I

List of Abbreviations	i
I.1: Chapter 1: Overview and Production	1
I.2: Chapter 2: Authorship, Audience, Use	33
I.3: Chapter 3: The <i>Declaracion</i> in Context	73
I.4: Chapter 4: The <i>Declaracion</i> as Summary and Commentary	100
I.5: Chapter 5: Sources	137
Conclusion	172

Contents: Part II

Introduction and Editorial Note	1
Ezra: Introduction	8
1 Esdre	14
Neemy	18
2 Esdre	25
3 Esdre	30
4 Esdre	32
5 Esdre	42
Penitential Psalms: Introduction	45
Penitential Psalms	50
Isaiah: Introduction	58
Isaiah	64
Gospels: Introduction	167
Matthew	178

Mark	201
Luke	214
John	237
Acts: Introduction	258
Acts	264
Bibliography	297

Abbreviations

<i>Advocates</i>	Mary Dove, ed., <i>The Earliest Advocates of the English Bible: the Texts of the Medieval Debate</i> (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2010)
<i>BHC</i>	<i>Bible Historiale Complétée</i>
<i>Commentaria</i>	Haymo of Auxerre, <i>Commentaria in Isaiam</i>
<i>Declaracion</i>	<i>The Declaracion on the Bible</i>
EETS	Early English Text Society
EV	Earlier Version of the Wycliffite Bible
<i>EWS</i>	Hudson, Anne, and Pamela Gradon, eds, <i>English Wycliffite Sermons</i> , 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983-96)
<i>FEB</i>	Dove, Mary, <i>The First English Bible: The Text and Context of the Wycliffite Versions</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
<i>Feeling</i>	Fiona Somerset, <i>Feeling Like Saints: Lollard Writings After Wyclif</i> (Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 2014)
FM	<i>The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, With the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions</i> , ed. by Josiah Forshall and Frederic Madden, 4 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850)
<i>GG</i>	<i>Glossed Gospels</i>
<i>Glossa</i>	<i>Glossa ordinaria</i>
<i>Historia</i>	<i>Historia scholastica</i>
IG	Interlinear Gloss of the <i>Glossa ordinaria</i>
<i>LM</i>	Nicholas of Lyra, <i>Postilla moralis</i>
<i>LPL</i>	Nicholas of Lyra, <i>Postilla literalis</i>
LV	Later Version of the Wycliffite Bible
<i>Magna</i>	<i>Magna Glosatura</i>
MG	Marginal Gloss of the <i>Glossa ordinaria</i>
<i>MED</i>	<i>Middle English Dictionary</i>

- ODNB* *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*
- OED* *Oxford English Dictionary*
- PL* *Patrologia Latina*
- PR* Hudson, Anne, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988)
- PWB* Prologue to the Wycliffite Bible
- Reilly Robert Reilly, 'A Middle English Summary of the Bible: An Edition of Trinity College (Oxon) MS 93' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Washington, 1966)
- Revisions* Anne Hudson, ed. *Two Revisions of Rolle's English Psalter Commentary and the Related Canticles*, 3 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)
- TWB* *The Wycliffite Bible: Origin, History and Interpretation*, ed. by Elizabeth Solopova (Leiden: Brill, 2016)
- WB* Wycliffite Bible

Manuscripts

- Bodley 277 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS 277
- Bodley 554 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS 554
- CUL Ee 1.10 Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, MS Ee 1.10
- John Rylands 89 Manchester, John Rylands Library, MS 89
- New College 67 Oxford, New College, MS 67
- SS 51 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Selden Supra 51
- T93 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Trinity College MS 93

The following short forms are used additionally to refer to the *Declaracion* and its sources, particularly in the Editorial Notes in Part II:

D *The Declaracion on the Bible*

HS *Historia scholastica*

L *Lyra, Postilla litteralis*

LM *Lyra, Postilla moralis*

Mag. *Peter Lombard, Magna Glosatura*

PART I

Chapter 1: Overview and Production

The Text

The text at the centre of this study, which is contained uniquely in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Trinity College MS 93 (hereafter T93), has generally been described in previous scholarship as a vernacular summary of the Wycliffite Bible (WB).¹ As this study and partial edition will demonstrate, however, this characterisation is insufficient to describe the text's ambition and complexity. Far from being a straightforward précis of WB, it skilfully interweaves biblical paraphrase, verbatim scriptural quotation, and copious exegesis from several sources. The incorporation of exegesis has led to the text being described alternatively as a commentary.² The term *compendium* has also been suggested as a means of capturing the interplay of summary and commentary, but tends to imply that the text is fundamentally an abridgement.³

¹ N.R. Ker, 'A Middle English Summary of the Bible', *Medium Aevum*, 29.2 (1960), 115-118 (p. 115); Robert Reilly, 'A Middle English Summary of the Bible: An Edition of Trinity College (Oxon) MS 93' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Washington, 1966), p. i; Fiona Somerset, *Feeling Like Saints: Lollard Writings After Wyclif* (Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 2014), pp. 179-202; James H. Morey, *Book and Verse: A Guide to Middle English Biblical Literature* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000), p. 110; Mary Dove, *The First English Bible: The Text and Context of the Wycliffite Versions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 52; A. B. Kraebel, 'Middle English Gospel Glosses and the Translation of Exegetical Authority', *Traditio* 69 (2014), 87-123 (p. 104); Anne Hudson and Elizabeth Solopova, 'The Latin Text', in *The Wycliffite Bible: Origin, History and Interpretation*, ed. by Elizabeth Solopova (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 105-32 (p. 111); Kantik Ghosh, 'The Prologues', in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 162-82 (p. 168); Ralph Hanna, 'The Palaeography of the Wycliffite Bibles in Oxford', in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 246-65 (p. 246); Elizabeth Solopova, *Manuscripts of the Wycliffite Bible in the Bodleian and Oxford College Libraries* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2016), p. 274; Laurence Muir, 'Translations and Paraphrases of the Bible, and Commentaries', in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1500*, ed. by J. Burke Severs and others, 11 vols (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1967-2005), II, ed. by J. Burke Severs (1970), pp. 401-02; N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969-2002), III (1983), p. 713; S. J. Ogilvie-Thomson, *The Index of Middle English Prose, Handlist VIII: Manuscripts Containing Middle English Prose in Oxford College Libraries* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1991).

² David C. Fowler, 'A Middle English Bible Commentary (Oxford, Trinity College MS 93)', *Manuscripta* 12.2 (1968), 67-78.

³ Jean-Pascal Pouzet, 'Entre *abbreviatio* et *auctoritas*: les modes de l'écriture vernaculaire dans un *compendium*

Thankfully, the text does provide one contemporary label which comes closer to encompassing its variety. At the end of the Psalter, in a rare note addressed directly to the reader, the preceding book is called a ‘declaracion of þe psauter’ (fol. 68^r).⁴ Although in this instance the word refers only to one particular book, which is decidedly exegetical, I argue that it aptly describes the whole text. *MED* includes evidence that *declaracion* was used to mean ‘an explanation, interpretation’ before 1387, but by the early fifteenth century it could also mean ‘an inventory’ (it is first attested in this sense in 1414), and by the middle of the century it is recorded in the sense of ‘a telling, narration’ (c. 1450).⁵ While only the first of these three definitions can therefore be certainly attested at the time of the text’s compilation, it is not difficult to imagine that the word might also have been used to describe a narrative summary by the 1390s. If so, it would deftly incorporate the two meanings of summary and commentary, perhaps with an emphasis on the latter, while reflecting something of the way in which the work was viewed. In light of this, and in view of the fact that no scholarly consensus has been reached with regard to what the text should be called, I refer to it as the *Declaracion on the Bible* (hereafter *Declaracion*).

The *Declaracion* proceeds chapter-by-chapter through scripture. As noted above, it incorporates scriptural summary, direct biblical quotation and commentary, almost exclusively in the vernacular. Latin is used only for Psalm incipits, the names of canticles, and in a couple

moyen-anglais de la Bible’, in *The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Rosalynn Voaden, René Tixier, Teresa Sanchez Roura and Jenny Rebecca Rytting (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), pp. 101-11. Both Fowler and Somerset also gesture towards this interplay. Fowler refers to the text as ‘a summary and commentary’ (‘Commentary’, p. 67), and Somerset writes: ‘So extensive are [the] glosses in some books that the work might be viewed as a bible commentary as much as a bible summary’ (Feeling, p. 185). However, neither makes this point with any consistency.

⁴Note that in quotations from the text (hereafter *Declaracion*), capitalisation and punctuation are editorial unless otherwise stated. Folio references will generally be given in brackets in the text. Line references will also be given in the case of books or sections of the *Declaracion* which have been edited in Part II of the current study, namely all books of Ezra; Isaiah; the Penitential Psalms; the Gospels, and Acts.

⁵‘Declaracioun’ (n.), in *Middle English Dictionary* [online], < https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary/MED10701/track?counter=1&search_id=1166926 > [accessed 30 June 2019]

of other phrases.⁶ Though some of the commentary passages are attributed to their sources, the vast majority are not distinguished from the biblical material in any way, either linguistically or palaeographically. The *Declaracion* survives in a single manuscript, T93, from which some folios are missing (see below), but the text originally seems to have included material for each book of WB (and 4 Ezra, here labelled III-V Esdre, which is not found in any surviving WB manuscript).⁷ However, as previous scholars have noted, the coverage of the different books is wildly uneven.⁸ This unevenness manifests not only in the number of pages devoted to each book, but in the type of attention they receive. Though most of the books consist of summary with short interpolations of undifferentiated commentary material, the treatment of a few is very different. Psalms, Job, the Prophets and the Epistles contain more commentary material than other books, and consequently they also include more attribution and are more careful to distinguish biblical from extra-biblical material, generally by underlining (see below). At the other end of the scale, Song of Songs contains no commentary at all, and no independent summary: rather, the writer simply copies phrases verbatim or near-verbatim from the biblical text.⁹

The Manuscript

T93 is a parchment manuscript measuring about 204 x 140mm, and consisting in its current form of 200 folios, with two parchment and three paper flyleaves front and back.¹⁰ There are

⁶ For example the verse fragment ‘*propter Dauid seruuum tuum*’, quoted in Psalm 23 (fol. 39^v), and phrases such as ‘*sanctum sanctorum*’ (Ezekiel 41, fol. 128^v) and ‘*Magister Historiarum*’ (Acts 16, fol. 198^r, l. 262).

⁷ For more on this, see Chapter 5, and Introduction to Ezra in Part II of the current study.

⁸ Somerset, *Feeling*, p. 183; Ker, ‘Summary’, p. 116. For more on this, see Chapter 4.

⁹ See Chapter 4.

¹⁰ Ker gives the dimensions as 208 x 140mm, and Robert Reilly, who never examined the manuscript in person, repeats Ker’s measurements (Ker, ‘Summary’ p. 115; Reilly, p. v). The discrepancy between Ker’s measurements and my own is small, and can be explained by my having chosen a different set of folios from which to take an average.

27 quires remaining. Each originally had eight leaves, though at least sixteen folios are now missing. In the description of missing folios that follows, references to biblical books are to the summarised and expounded version found uniquely in the *Declaracion*:

- 1² (after fol. 1): containing Genesis 13-32, and the beginning of Genesis 33. A tiny stub, which has never before attracted comment, indicates that it was bound in after fol. 5 at some point and then removed.
- 3⁷⁻⁸ (after fol. 21): containing 1 Chronicles from the latter part of Chapter 6, and 2 Chronicles up to the beginning of Chapter 11. Neat stubs show that these folios were bound in after fol. 17 and then excised.
- 20²⁻⁸ (after fol. 150): containing 1 Maccabees from the end of Chapter 6, and the whole of 2 Maccabees.¹¹
- 21⁴ (after fol. 153): containing Matthew from Chapter 16 to the beginning of Chapter 22. A stub shows that the folio was bound in the right place, but neatly excised.¹²
- 26¹ (after fol. 189): containing the beginning of 1 Timothy, up to and including the start of Chapter 5.
- 27⁵⁻⁸ (after fol. 200): containing the whole of James excluding the very beginning of Chapter 1, and presumably some or all of the following: 1-2 Peter, 1-3 John, Jude, and Apocalypse.
- Since seven complete books have been lost from the end of the manuscript, it seems almost certain that at least one whole quire has been lost; depending on the depth of coverage, it may well have been two.¹³

¹¹ Following Ker, Reilly mistakenly gives the position as after fol. 151 (Reilly, p. v; Ker, 'Summary', p. 115). Solopova corrects this error (*Manuscripts*, p. 275).

¹² For more information, see the annotations to Matthew in Part II. Ker and Reilly label this folio as 21³ (Reilly, p. v; Ker, 'Summary', p. 115).

¹³ It is possible, too, that the final folio(s) might have contained an epilogue: see Chapter 2.

As well as the loss of these full folios, the manuscript has been cut down. It seems that whoever undertook this task did so with a degree of care. As far as it is possible to tell, all the long corrections or *notae* written by the original scribe in the bottom margin are intact: the only one that is damaged seems not to have been a victim of cutting down (see below). The same care was not, however, extended to the large amount of later writing in the bottom margins, nor to the marginalia, scribal and otherwise, in the side margins. This evidence suggests that the manuscript was cut down after the sixteenth century, likely in 1808 when it was rebound.¹⁴ In addition, a few folios have been damaged, resulting in the loss of parts of the following:

- fol. 79: The very bottom of this folio has been ripped out. The damage is confined to the bottom margin, which originally contained a gloss. The legible material is as follows: ‘Lira Bla [...] witnessing’. The gloss in question must have related to the mention of blasphemy in Ecclesiasticus 23, likely copied from Nicholas of Lyra’s *Postilla literalis* (hereafter *LPL*).¹⁵ There is no clear reason why such a gloss would have been intentionally removed.
- fol. 142: The folio is either neatly torn or cut in an arc. The top two thirds of the folio remain intact, but very little remains from the bottom third (which originally contained the end of Micah 4 and beginning of Micah 5 on the recto, and the end of Micah 7 on the verso).
- fol. 143: This folio has sustained very similar damage, though slightly more material is missing. The missing sections comprise the end of Nahum 2 and beginning of Nahum

¹⁴ See Chapter 2.

¹⁵ Nicholas of Lyra, *Postilla literalis*, in *Bibliorum Sacrorum cum Glossa Ordinaria*, 6 vols (Venice, 1603), Vol. 3, Col. 2085, Gloss 14. Future references to the *Postilla literalis* will be given in the form L3/2085:14.

3 on the recto, and the majority of Habakkuk 2 and beginning of Habakkuk 3 on the verso.¹⁶

The rest of the damage is relatively minor. Discolouration of certain folios (particularly fol. 1^r) makes some sections difficult to read, but in general this difficulty can be overcome with patient study, and words that are damaged beyond recognition can often be supplied by reference to WB or other sources.

Production

When considering production, it is necessary first to determine the relationship between the surviving manuscript witness, T93, and the text, the *Declaracion*. Although it contains some evidence of textual revision, T93, in common with the vast majority of surviving medieval manuscripts, does not contain a working draft, but rather a fair copy of the text.¹⁷ Having been carefully assembled using material from multiple sources by a man (or group of men) whom I will term ‘the compiler(s)’, the text was carefully copied by an experienced scribe, before being decorated with coloured paraphs and initials.¹⁸ The first stage in the production process, however, was to compile the text itself. In quite what order this work was completed, and by whom, is difficult to ascertain. Evidence about the identity of the compiler(s) will be examined in more detail in the next chapter, and evidence about how different sources were used will be examined in Chapter 5, but here I offer three broad theories about how the work might have

¹⁶ Reilly suggests that only the bottom quarter of each page has been torn away (Reilly, p. vi).

¹⁷ See Richard Beadle, ‘English Autograph Writings of the Later Middle Ages: Some Preliminaries’, in *Gli Autografi Medievali: Problemi Paleografici e Filologici*, ed. by Paolo Chiesa and Lucia Pinelli (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo, 1994), pp. 249-268 (p. 260); Simon Horobin, ‘The Nature of Material Evidence’, in *Imagining Medieval English: Language Structures and Theories, 500-1500*, ed. by Tim William Machan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp. 147-65 (pp. 147-48).

¹⁸ For more on the term ‘compiler’ as it relates to the *Declaracion*, see Chapter 2.

been undertaken:

1. The text was conceived as a whole, and compiled by a single scholar. This is the only scenario to have been seriously considered in previous discussions of the text. Somerset writes that '[f]eatures consistently present across the whole of [the text] strongly suggest that it is the product of one writer's sustained effort...' Beyond a certain thematic and lexical unity, however, she provides little evidence in support of this hypothesis.¹⁹

On one level, it would not be unexpected for a biblical summary/commentary to be the work of a single creator.²⁰ On the other hand, Wycliffite texts were often produced collaboratively (see below). If the *Declaracion* is the product of one writer's 'sustained effort', it is an idiosyncratic one to say the least. Somerset notes the wide variation in coverage, which she suggests demonstrates 'his varying level of interest' and 'his sense of what the [biblical] book in question demands'. She also tentatively notes variation in the sources from which the writer draws: analysis undertaken as part of the current study bolsters this supposition.²¹ All three of Somerset's points have merit, though I would suggest that the second is by far the most important. Although the perfunctory treatment of some books (including, notably, 5 Esdre) does seem to indicate that they were included only in order to represent the integrity of scripture, in general even those books that take up the least space are clearly the result of careful study, suggesting that the compiler(s) were interested in their work.²² It is true, though, that biblical books of similar character, as for example narrative books or prophetic

¹⁹ *Feeling*, p. 180.

²⁰ See Greti Dinkova-Bruun, 'Rewriting Scripture: Latin Biblical Versification in the Later Middle Ages', *Viator*, 39.1 (2008), 263-284.

²¹ See Chapter 5.

²² Jonah, for example, takes up less than one folio, but it is a fluid narrative summary with some glossing material carefully interwoven. See fol. 141^r.

books, tend to be treated in broadly similar ways.²³ Variation in sources follows on from this: with a couple of exceptions, Lyra's *Postilla literalis* (hereafter *LPL*) and the *Glossa ordinaria* (*Glossa*) are used consistently throughout the whole text, but those books selected for a more exegetical treatment (as for example the Psalter and Isaiah) sometimes marshal additional commentary sources. The question of how and why books are treated differently is complex, and will be examined in detail in Chapter 4. Nevertheless, even if these larger types of variation can be explained, there remain smaller differences in the spelling used in different books: these will be discussed below.

If the *Declaracion* were the work of a single man, it is possible that he approached the task broadly chronologically. The narrative books of the Old Testament are treated briefly and consist largely of biblical summary. It is possible to imagine that these books were completed before the more complex and varied material of the Old Testament from Job onwards, and the New Testament. The very spare treatment of the poetic books of the Old Testament might suggest that the compiler was attempting to conserve time and space having completed a very long Psalter commentary immediately before. The fact that each gospel contains cross-references only to the gospels that precede it also tends to support the theory that the compiler worked chronologically, at least in some sections.

2. The work was conceived as a whole, but then, like WB, was divided into sections, each of which was completed by a different scholar at roughly the same time. Given the already-noted thematic and linguistic similarities between the different sections, it must be imagined that these scholars were working closely with one another, and intended to highlight the same aspects of the biblical text. The idea that the text was divided into portions would explain some

²³ For more on this, see Chapter 4.

of the small linguistic differences, including spelling changes between the Old and New Testaments.²⁴ In this scenario, the differences of approach that have been noted between different books can be ascribed not only to differences in the level of interest they engender, or in the type of treatment they are felt to require, but also to variance between the working practices and interests of multiple writers.

There are a number of problems with this theory, however. The *Declaracion* is far shorter than either WB or the *Glossed Gospels* (hereafter *GG*), so could more easily be imagined to be the work of a single compiler. Further, the idea of multiple scholars working at the same time does not explain the fundamental lack of balance in the text, where the Psalter threatens to overwhelm everything else, since in this scenario it must be assumed that the men involved would have undertaken some form of planning together and would have an idea of the broad outline of the text before commencing work.²⁵ If multiple scholars with similar training and ideas had set out to create a text of this type at the same time and with the same intention, we might expect the result to be rather more unified than it is, especially because in this case the puzzling aspects of the text cannot be put down to the personal eccentricity of a single man. This theory would also rely on a number of scholars all having access to WB, the *Glossa* and *LPL* simultaneously.

3. The text started life as a number of separate commentary/summaries on different biblical books, which were subsequently stitched together to form a single work. In this scenario, those books containing the most commentary were probably completed first, either independently of one another or by a single scholar or small group; these commentaries likely included the

²⁴ For a similar theory regarding the translation of LV, see Dove, *FEB*, p. 149.

²⁵ Hudson suggests such forward planning in the case of *EWS*, though whether the cycle was the work of multiple writers is unclear: see Hudson, *EWS*, I, p. 46.

Psalter, the Prophets, Job and the Epistles. The rest of the books were then compiled, with far less emphasis on exegesis, by the scholar(s) in question, in order to present a “complete” *declaracion*. In this scenario, the majority of the Old Testament and the Gospels were still likely compiled in order, but after work on the aforementioned sections.

There are a number of factors that make this theory plausible. First, there is the sheer unevenness of treatment between different sections of the bible, and different books within those sections. The most obviously aberrant of the books is the Psalter: it fills 32 of the 200 folios (the next longest book is Isaiah, at 14 folios, while most other books run to less than 2 folios). Aside from length, the Psalter is set out formally, with incipits in Latin and underlined biblical lemmata in English, and commentary sections that are divided into numbered parts and almost always attributed to earlier authorities (here Nicholas of Lyra and Peter Lombard’s *Magna Glosatura*, hereafter *Magna*).²⁶ Such formality is unusual in the text as a whole, and the prominence of the *Magna* alongside Lyra is also unusual; in general, *LPL* is the standard source for exegetical material in the *Declaracion*, though other sources are also used.²⁷ Perhaps the most unusual aspect of the *Declaracion* Psalter, though, is that it could conceivably have been produced without direct reference to WB. Although certain lemmata agree with the Earlier Version (EV) or Later Version (LV), and even more contain faint echoes of the latter, particularly in terms of vocabulary, it is likely that all were translated independently from the Vulgate. In any case, the bulk of the *Declaracion* Psalter text draws not on the bible but on *LPL*, Lyra’s *Postilla moralis* (*LM*), and the *Magna*.²⁸ Although it is important to remember that the Psalter is almost always afforded special treatment when compared to other biblical

²⁶ For more on how the Psalter uses its sources, see Chapter 5. The Penitential Psalms are edited in the present edition: see Part II.

²⁷ See Chapter 5.

²⁸ For more on this, see Chapter 5.

books, all this evidence could suggest that the *Declaracion* Psalter existed independent of WB. It is possible that it even predates the completion of WB, though the fact that some of the independent translations seem verbally to echo LV would tend to suggest otherwise. It might suggest, though, that the Psalter was compiled at a different time to the rest of the *Declaracion*. Given the general importance of the Psalter in late-medieval Christianity, and the particular interest the Wycliffites seem to have had in the book, it is plausible that the whole of the *Declaracion* might have grown out of an initial project to create a glossed Psalter bringing together exegesis from Peter Lombard and Nicholas of Lyra.²⁹

As well as the Psalter, several other books, notably the Prophets, Job, and the Epistles, contain a larger amount of exegetical material than is usual in the *Declaracion*. None of these books is set out in quite as formal a manner as the Psalter, though parts of Job and Isaiah come close, with underlined lemmata and long commentary sections, sometimes attributed. It is interesting to note that the writer of the WB Prologue (hereafter PWB) mentions writing glosses on both Job and the Prophets, and it is tempting to think that there might be some connection between these glosses and the *Declaracion*. Somerset suggests that: '[i]t seems possible that the [*Declaracion*] may be the "glos" [on Job that PWB's] writer refers to'.³⁰ This would suggest that *Declaracion* Job, and possibly the *Declaracion* Prophets, were once independent works, designed to stand alone. There is no direct evidence to suggest that the

²⁹ Of course, Wycliffites also seem to have demonstrated their interest in the Psalter by making revisions to Richard Rolle's *English Psalter Commentary*; but neither Rolle's original mid-fourteenth-century text nor the revisions include any exegesis from Lyra, and in any case the Revised Psalter Commentaries are far longer than the *Declaracion* Psalter. See *Two Revisions of Rolle's English Psalter Commentary and the Related Canticles* ed. by Anne Hudson, 3 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), and particularly vol. I, pp. clxxxiv-clxxxix for evidence related to sources.

³⁰ *Feeling*, p. 185. For the references to these glosses in PWB, see 'The Prologue to the Wycliffite Bible', in *The Earliest Advocates of the English Bible: the Texts of the Medieval Debate*, ed. by Mary Dove (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2010), pp. 3-85 (p. 57, ll. 1963-65 and p. 60, ll. 2079-82). Further references to PWB will be given in the body of the text.

PWB writer also undertook to make a commentary on the Psalter, or on the Epistles, but he does make it clear that he would value a gloss on the Psalter, in particular: ‘No book in þe elde testament is hardere to vndurstandyng [...] Wel wer hym þat coude wel vndurstonde þe Sauter and kepe it in his lyuyng [...] Perfor God ȝyue grace to vs to lyue wel in charite and seie it deuoutli and vndurstonde it treuli, and to teche it openli...’ (pp. 58-59, ll. 2014-22). If the PWB writer (or someone associated with him) had undertaken a gloss on the Psalter, using the *Magna* as a major source, he might also have turned his attention to the Epistles, since they are expounded in the same source.³¹ Finally, with so much of the bible already covered, he (or others in his circle) might have wished to finish the job, altering the methodology to favour summary over commentary both because the narrative books are less complex, and because doing so would save a large amount of time. In this scenario, the scant treatment of the poetic books of the Old Testament must be put down to a lack of appetite on the part of the compiler(s) to provide them with the extensive commentary we might expect, having already invested a large amount of time and effort in the exegesis of other books.³²

Although it is true that there is a certain thematic consistency to the work as a whole, and also a consistency of vocabulary, this does not necessarily preclude the idea that parts of the *Declaracion* were created at different times and even by different writers, particularly if the men involved shared an ideological framework, and particularly if they wrote the later sections with an awareness of the work already completed. This might also explain some of the small linguistic inconsistencies in the manuscript, which will be discussed in more detail below. This collaborative style of working would also be more in line with many of the other Wycliffite texts

³¹ The *Magna* is cited several times in the *Declaracion* Epistles. See 1 Corinthians 3, fol. 170^v; 1 Corinthians 4, fol. 171^r; 1 Corinthians 6, fol. 171^v; 1 Corinthians 16, fol. 176^r; 2 Corinthians 5, fol. 178^v; 2 Corinthians 8, fol. 179^r; 2 Thessalonians 2, fol. 189^v; 2 Timothy 2, fol. 190^v; Titus 1, fol. 191^r. It is called ‘þe glose’, except in 2 Thessalonians 2, where it is ‘þe comyn glose’. Given the *Declaracion*’s inconsistent attitude toward attribution, there are likely to be more points of influence. See Chapter 5.

³² See Chapter 4.

produced around the same time. So frequent is the evidence of such collaborative practice in lollard writing that Anne Hudson has posited a ‘well-organised and prosperous centre for the dissemination of Lollard texts’.³³

Of the three theories outlined above, the second can probably be discounted. Though it might help to explain some superficial variation in the text, it sheds limited light on more fundamental questions regarding unequal coverage of material. Crucially, this scenario also requires a prohibitive level of resources, since almost all the books of the *Declaracion* draw from a number of sources, which would have been required in multiple copies if the work on different sections of the text were ongoing simultaneously. Each of the other two theories has its merits. The most compelling evidence for the latter is the marked difference in length, style and methodology between the *Declaracion* Psalter and the rest of the text, though the idea that the commentaries mentioned in PWB might have formed the core of the *Declaracion* is also intriguing. The best way in which to test these theories further would be to undertake detailed linguistic and stylistic analysis of samples from the whole text, and perhaps to compare the relevant books to PWB in hopes of discovering similarities that might point towards shared authorship. Such a detailed analysis is beyond the scope of the current study. For the present, then, the question of multiple authorship must remain open.³⁴ For the purposes of this study, I will assume that each book of the *Declaracion* was compiled by a single man (‘the compiler’); when discussing the whole work or a group of books, I will use ‘the compiler(s)’.

Whichever of these production theories is correct, the general method of working on any given book would have been similar. First the compiler would need to gather the relevant sources. For some books, notably the Song of Songs, this would have meant merely consulting

³³ Anne Hudson, *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978; repr. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), p. 11.

³⁴ The question of authorship will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

WB; in most cases, it would have required sustained access to at least two different copies of the bible (LV and the Vulgate), and a number of extra-biblical sources.³⁵ These were likely accessed directly. Although the use of some kind of florilegium cannot be ruled out, it is unlikely, as the *Declaracion* approaches the biblical text chronologically rather than thematically.³⁶ These sources were then synthesised to form a single *declaracion* for each book of the bible. Whatever the number of compilers, and however the *Declaracion* was produced, what is clear is that those involved worked diligently for an extended period of time, and felt the work to be purposeful and important. If they had not, they could not have produced the lengthy, intricate text that now survives.

The T93 Scribe

As noted earlier, T93 is not a working draft, though it does contain some evidence of small revisions, particularly in the early folios.³⁷ Nevertheless, there must have been an exemplar, from which the text was copied into our manuscript. Changes in orthography between the Old and New Testaments might even suggest that there were two exemplars, though, as I will demonstrate below, these differences are more likely either to suggest that the two testaments were compiled by different people, out of different copies of LV, or to reflect unstable orthography in a single copy of LV.³⁸ Whatever the case, the copying work was undertaken by

³⁵ See Chapter 5.

³⁶ For more on the development of alphabetical florilegia, see Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus florum of Thomas of Ireland* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979), pp. 3-36, pp. 117-24. On the Wycliffite florilegium known as the *Floretum*, and the shorter *Rosarium*, see *The Middle English Translation of the Rosarium Theologie*, ed. by Christina Von Nolcken (Heidelberg: Heidelberg University Press, 1979); Anne Hudson, 'A Lollard Compilation and the Dissemination of Wycliffite Thought', in Anne Hudson, *Lollards and their Books* (London and Ronceverte: The Hambledon Press, 1985), pp. 13-29; Anne Hudson, 'A Lollard Compilation in England and Bohemia', in Hudson, *Lollards and their Books*, pp. 31-42; Rouse and Rouse, pp. 202-04.

³⁷ See for example Genesis 4, fol. 1^r; Genesis 9, fol. 2^r; Exodus 4, fol. 3^r; Exodus 30, fol. 4^r; Psalm 111, fol. 59^v.

³⁸ See Dove, *FEB*, p. 149.

a single experienced scribe who used an anglicana hand with some secretary features. He was clearly skilled: working in a single, unruled column of 170 x 125mm, he fits an average of 38 lines onto each page, working remarkably neatly.³⁹ Copy errors are infrequent, generally minor, and are almost always corrected in the same hand, either in the moment of copying or some time later.⁴⁰ The fact that the corrections are all (as far as it is possible to tell) undertaken by the main scribe makes the manuscript somewhat unusual among Wycliffite productions, which, as Daniel Wakelin has asserted, tend to be corrected by at least one hand other than that of the main scribe.⁴¹ Shorter corrections are generally written in the side margins, while larger corrections and revisions are placed in the bottom margin, with appropriate *signes de renvoie* to alert the reader; these cases are rare. The level of the scribe's dedication to correction suggests either a personal investment in the text, or at least a great respect for it; this is, of course, understandable given the biblical material.⁴² It is important to note, however, that such care does not necessarily suggest any particular sympathy with Wycliffite ideas.⁴³

It is clear that the scribe's practice developed as he was copying, in a way that suggests that the manuscript was copied in order, and that the scribe was thinking about practicality. Economic considerations may have motivated the decision to stop beginning each chapter on a new line at Ezekiel 3 (fol. 118^v), after which point there is no line break between chapters, and

³⁹ See Ker, 'Summary', p. 115; Reilly, p. v. On the discrepancy between Ker's measurements and my own, see above, n. 10.

⁴⁰ For an example of a later correction, where the ink is a markedly different colour from the surrounding text, see the numbering of Exodus 16 (fol. 3^v), mentioned below. On the incidence of copy errors in Middle English manuscripts, see Daniel Wakelin, *Scribal Correction and Literary Craft* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 130-35.

⁴¹ *Scribal Correction*, pp. 83-86. Wakelin notes however, that even in such cases the majority of corrections are undertaken by the main scribe (pp. 71-72). On the difficulty of identifying whether or not corrections are undertaken by the main scribe, particularly in Wycliffite manuscripts, see *Scribal Correction*, pp. 83-84.

⁴² Wakelin, *Scribal Correction*, p. 25. Wakelin notes that Wycliffite texts are particularly assiduously corrected (p. 85).

⁴³ Maureen Jurkowski, 'Lollard Book Producers in London in 1414', in *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson*, ed. by Helen Barr and Ann M. Hutchinson (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), pp. 201-228 (p. 201).

only a coloured initial to indicate the division. Reilly also suggests that the scribe's attitude to underlining changes markedly as he goes on, though in reality the picture is more complex, and will be dealt with separately below.⁴⁴ Occasionally, the scribe's choices defy explanation: there is no clear reason for his decision to switch to roman numerals for the chapter numbers in Exodus and Leviticus, though thankfully he abandons this policy and reverts to arabic numerals for all subsequent books.

The numbering seems to have been written in by the scribe at the same time as he was copying the text: he makes a mistake in the numbering of Exodus 16 (fol. 3^v), and corrects it within the body of the text itself in a different ink, suggesting that the original numbering was done at the same time as the main copying, and that the correction came a little later. As Reilly notes, the coloured initials and paraphs must have been added after the initial copying, as guide letters are often visible underneath the coloured ink, and some were clearly missed (for example, the opening letter of Deuteronomy 22, fol. 10^r).⁴⁵ There is evidence that some correction occurred after the rubrication: at least one rubricated initial is corrected in black ink (Psalm 111, fol. 59^v). A double slash seems to have been used by the scribe to indicate that a paraph mark should be inserted: many of these are still visible, and there are several instances where they have been missed (for example Isaiah 65, fol. 100^r). This work also seems to have been undertaken in order, since on the first folio chapter initials do not alternate in colour, as they do in the rest of the manuscript.⁴⁶ Similarly, paraphs are all red on fol. 1^r, after which they alternate consistently.⁴⁷ It is impossible to say if the main scribe added the coloured ink, but if

⁴⁴ Reilly, p. v.

⁴⁵ Reilly, p. v.

⁴⁶ On fol. 1^r all initials are blue, and on fol. 1^v they are all red. Reilly mistakenly suggests that the capitals are always in blue ink (p. v). The error can probably be attributed to his never having seen the manuscript in person; he was presumably working from monochrome images.

⁴⁷ fol. 150^r is slightly anomalous: there is one blue paraph at the top of the page, and then chapter initials have all been filled in with black ink.

he did not, then the person who did shared his ability to think on his feet, and his determination to make choices that would enhance the reader's experience.

The materials used are of reasonable quality, but not the best (the parchment, for example, varies, but it is often thicker than is ideal, making the pages unyielding). In general, the design prioritises the needs of the reader over any aesthetic concerns. Although it is important to remember that it would originally have been rather larger than it is now (having lost folios and been cut down), this is a practical, portable volume to be used, not admired.⁴⁸ The running headers, given in brown ink at the top of each page and indicating the biblical book, are written in a slightly larger and marginally more ornate script than the main text, but are not decorated or rubricated in any way. A coloured initial marks the start of each new chapter, but these are generally only slightly larger than the main text and use only one colour at a time. The initials at the start of books are a little larger, up to three lines high. Brown-ink chapter numbers are given down the left-hand margin of each page, almost always in arabic numerals, though roman numerals are favoured for numbers within the body of the text itself. Like the running headers, the chapter numbers are often missing, or at least hard to see, having been either cut off or bound into the gutter. Empty space marks the division between each book. Only one such space, before Acts, has been filled in by a later reader with the appropriate title; if the original scribe intended to write in rubrics, he never did so.

The manuscript shares several physical characteristics with Wycliffite manuscripts of the same date. According to Ralph Hanna, the bulk of WB manuscripts in Oxford libraries have similar dimensions to T93, though it must be remembered that T93 would originally have been rather larger.⁴⁹ A sizeable minority of those MSS studied by Hanna also follow what he calls the

⁴⁸ See Chapter 2.

⁴⁹ All the WB manuscripts in this size category contain only part of WB, typically the gospels or New Testament. See Hanna, 'Palaeography', pp. 251-52.

‘customary English practice’ of writing in a single column, and some use plain headers of the type found in T93.⁵⁰ Of the thirty-one *English Wycliffite Sermons (EWS)* manuscripts discussed by Anne Hudson, nineteen are apparently written in a single hand, and many have been carefully corrected by the original scribe, either at the time of writing or some time later.⁵¹ The anglicana-secretary hybrid script is also typical of Wycliffite manuscripts of a similar date.⁵² Finally, while it does not include the rubrics typical in WB manuscripts, T93 does consistently include clear chapter numbers and initials for ease of navigation, albeit less decorative examples than are often found in WB manuscripts.⁵³ Whether all these similarities are enough to suggest that work on T93 was undertaken at Hudson’s posited ‘centre’ for lollard book production is uncertain, but the hypothesis must be a reasonable one.⁵⁴

Fiona Somerset has suggested that the T93 scribe was also the compiler of the *Declaracion*, or at least that the two were ‘working in collusion and sympathy’. Somerset cites the fact that the manuscript is copied and corrected carefully in a single hand, the marginal *nota*-marks occurring on several folios, which she attributes to the main hand, and ‘the way that the text is crammed onto the page in some places’.⁵⁵ The only evidence Somerset offers with regard to this second remark is the phrase ‘of þe gift of first frutes, and of þe maner of offering of þem’, which is, in her words ‘shoehorned’ onto fol. 5^r.⁵⁶ It might also refer, however, to the presence of several sections of text in the bottom margins of the manuscript. These are written in the main hand, though sometimes with a different pen and ink. For

⁵⁰ Hanna, ‘Palaeography’, pp. 255–58.

⁵¹ *English Wycliffite Sermons*, ed. by Anne Hudson and Pamela Gradon, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983–96), I, ed. by Anne Hudson (1983), for example p. 80 and p. 126.

⁵² See for example three copies of *EWS*: London, British Library MS Royal 18 B.ix; London, British Library MS Add. 40671, and Cambridge, Trinity College MS B. 4. 20. All three are described by Hudson, *EWS*, I, pp. 60, 67 and 69. I have examined Trinity B. 4. 20; the hand is similar, but not identical to, the main hand of T93.

⁵³ Dove, *FEB*, pp. 87–88.

⁵⁴ Hudson, *EWS*, I, pp. 195–202.

⁵⁵ *Feeling*, p. 184. For more on the *nota* marks, see Chapter 3.

⁵⁶ *Feeling*, p. 184, n. 50.

example, on fol. 1^r, three lines are written in the bottom margin for insertion in Genesis 3. No *signes de renvoie* are now visible marking where the text is to be inserted, but this may just be because of the poor state of the page: in a similar example on fol. 4^r the *signes* are clear. Such instances cluster in the first few folios (another occurs on fol. 1^v). On fol. 3^r, the text for insertion in the top line of the page is given in the top margin, with an extended paragraph to mark where the insertion is to be made. In these first few folios, such augmentations are largely comprised of biblical material. After this, revisions and corrections are sometimes found in the side margins, as on fol. 66^r, fol. 68^v, fol. 78^v and fol. 79^r. It is of course possible that other examples of this type have been cut off or bound into the gutter. The practice of including additional material in the bottom margin reasserts itself later in the manuscript, but in these cases the text tends to be commentary, often directly translated from, and attributed to, Lyra (see for example fol. 198^r, where the gloss is not only attributed, but prefaced with the word ‘Nota’).⁵⁷

Though these might be simple copy errors, there is no repetition in the text at the relevant points that would explain an eye-skip.⁵⁸ It seems likely, then, that they are revisions. The fact that they appear very intermittently and pool at the beginning of the manuscript suggests, however, that they were never completed. That they were attempted at all, though, does seem to indicate that the T93 scribe was involved in the compilation of the *Declaracion* itself, or at least that he was associated with the compiler(s).

⁵⁷ Similar examples, both with and without an accompanying ‘nota’, are found on fol. 59^v, fol. 166^r, fol. 169^r, fol. 171^v and fol. 194^v. The gloss on fol. 174^r cites both Lyra and Augustine.

⁵⁸ See Daniel Wakelin, ‘Writing the Words’, in *The Production of Books in England 1350-1500*, ed. by Alexandra Gillespie and Daniel Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 34-58 (p. 52).

Underlining

One important feature of the manuscript that has attracted very little attention is its use of underlining. Throughout the text, words and phrases are underlined in brown ink. It is impossible to know with certainty when this underlining was undertaken, but the fact that it is done in the same ink as the rest of the text suggests that it was completed as part of the initial copying process: this would have been by far the most efficient approach. Underlining had long been used as a method of separating biblical from extra-biblical text, and particularly for distinguishing glosses from scripture. WB manuscripts almost always include at least some underlining, though Dove notes that while the translators seem to have envisaged that all glosses would be underlined, in reality the task was undertaken only sporadically. She also notes that, in WB manuscripts, underlining is often done in red ink, but sometimes in brown.⁵⁹ Of course, for the scribes of *EWS* it made much more sense to underline the *biblical* material. Hudson asserts that the biblical lection was scrupulously underlined for each sermon: ‘the scribes regularly managed to exclude even the odd adverb, repeated pronoun or verb necessary to English syntax, as well as the introductory *pat* or *how* supplied as the direct speech of the bible is turned into the indirect speech of the sermon’.⁶⁰ Hudson also notes that only the particular lection for each sermon was underlined in this way: other incidental biblical quotation is not distinguished.⁶¹

What is interesting about T93 is that, while it uses underlining, it adopts no clear stance on how and when it is used, and what it denotes. Though the policy is often consistent within each book, even here there is some variation. The following list gives an idea of how underlining is used in T93. Those books which are not included in the list make no use of

⁵⁹ Dove, *FEB*, p. 158.

⁶⁰ Hudson, *EWS*, I, p. 134.

⁶¹ Hudson, *EWS*, I, p. 134.

underlining at all:

Underlining denotes glossing: Numbers, Judges, 1 Kings-3 Ezra, Tobit, Esther, Proverbs, Matthew, Romans, 2 Corinthians

Underlining denotes scripture: Prayer of Manasses (after 2 Chronicles), Job, Psalter, Lamentations, Baruch, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Zechariah, Malachi, Luke, Galatians, Ephesians, 2 Thessalonians, Hebrews

Underlining can denote either scripture or gloss: Ecclesiasticus, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, 1 Corinthians, Acts

Of course, such differences might add weight to the theory that the original text was not produced all at once by the same compiler: if it had been produced by a group of scholars or by a single scholar working over a long period of time, it would help to explain the variation. On the other hand, as we have seen, underlining practice in WB manuscripts was not entirely fixed, and other texts related to WB show an even more varied approach to underlining than the *Declaracion*. As Cosima Gillhammer has pointed out, the Middle English Old Testament Lectionaries use underlining to pick out liturgical framing phrases, syntactical additions to the Latin, and parts of the biblical text not included in the lection: all three categories of text might be underlined on a single page, without any means of distinguishing between them.⁶²

Underlined Glosses

Underlined glosses vary in length from a single word to several lines. The longest underlined

⁶² See for example Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley MS 665, fol. 235^v, which was discussed by Gillhammer in the paper 'Editing the Old Testament Lectionary', Medieval English Research Seminar, University of Oxford, 31st October 2018. See also her upcoming edition, *The Old Testament Lectionary*.

glosses are concentrated in Tobit, and particularly in Romans, though there are also reasonably long underlined glosses in other books.⁶³ The lengthiest is found in Romans 9:

Paul sweris how þat he was heuy & sory, for þe Iewes, þat were his cosyns, bileued not on Crist, and how he desired to be departed fro Crist for þem. Þis mey be vnderstanden on two maneres: on one wise, to referr þis to þe tyme in which he pursued Crist in his membres, Actus 9, ffor þen he desired to be departed fro Crist for zele of þe Iewes lawe. An oþer manere it mey be remeued, or referred to þe tyme after his conuersion, and so he desired to be departed fro Crist by deleying of his blis for a tyme to lif here & to labour to conuert þe Iewes.

(fol. 167^r)

The gloss in this case is a very faithful translation from *LPL* on Romans.⁶⁴ Given the lack of attribution, it might seem sensible to underline the gloss. However, the manuscript contains a huge number of unattributed glosses that are *not* underlined, or distinguished in any way, many of which are also translated very faithfully from the same source.⁶⁵ In fact, the idea that Paul is sorry because the Jews do not believe in Christ (which immediately precedes the underlined gloss in the above example) is taken from *LPL*, albeit in a less faithful translation.⁶⁶ A more direct translation is included immediately after the underlined section, where the *Declaracion* says that the Jews ‘þe sons of God, as *Exodus* 4’: this gloss, which is not underlined in T93, is translated from Lyra, who says they were ‘filius Dei, Exo. iiij’.⁶⁷ These examples demonstrate that the underlining policy is not consistent even across a single chapter of one book. Nor is it true that the length of the gloss is necessarily a determining factor. The majority of underlined

⁶³ See for example Numbers 6, fol. 6^v; Esther 10, fol. 31^r-31^v; 1 Corinthians 10, fol. 173^v.

⁶⁴ L6/119:1.

⁶⁵ See Chapter 5.

⁶⁶ L6/118:4; the gloss is also included in at least one LV MS, London, British Library, MS Harley 5017. See *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, With the Apocryphal Books, in the Earliest English Versions*, ed. by Forshall and Madden, 4 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1850), IV, p. 321. For more on the overlap of glosses in the *Declaracion* and WB manuscripts, see Chapter 5.

⁶⁷ L6/119:3.

glosses are short phrases, under ten words long.⁶⁸ Some are as short as a single word, as in the repeated underlined gloss ‘yronice’, or the clarification that ‘þi fader’ refers to ‘God’ in Proverbs 1 (fol. 68^v).⁶⁹ Acts 6 contains a gloss very similar in structure and length to the long Romans 9 gloss, much of which is quoted faithfully from *LPL*, but which is not distinguished from the surrounding text in any way (in the following example, the gloss is signified by bold italics):

When þe noumbre of Cristen peple encrested, þe Grekes gruched ageyn þe Hebrewes, for her wydoes were despised in ich deyes mynistring; *which mey be vnderstanden on iij maneris: eþer þat þe Greke wydoes as rude wymmen were not suffred to mynistrer; or elles þat þey were to mych greued in her mynistring, as seruyng in vile offices; or elles þat necessaries were not als wele mynistred to þe Greke wydoes as to þe Hebrewes.*
(fol. 196^v)⁷⁰

It is clear, then, that there is no infallible rule, either regarding placement, faithfulness of translation, or length, that determines which glosses are underlined in the manuscript and which are not.

There is also no clear-cut rule regarding which types of gloss are underlined. At their simplest, underlined glosses might supply a biblical cross-reference. These tend to be lifted from *LPL*. However, such cross-references are by no means consistently underlined: in fact, the vast majority are not visually distinguished from the surrounding text at all.⁷¹ Underlining might also be used for glosses that supply an alternative translation, as for example in 3 Ezra 4 (‘Shew þou to my peple, þat is, to folkes’, fol. 26^v) and Proverbs 6 (‘þou slowe man go to þe

⁶⁸ For exceptions, see for example Numbers 6, fol. 6^v; Tobit 5, fol. 29^r; Tobit 6, fol. 29^r; Esther 10, fol. 31^r-31^v.

⁶⁹ For more on ‘yronice’, see Chapter 5.

⁷⁰ For the sources of this gloss, see L6/1040:3, and Peter Comestor, *Historia scholastica*, in *Patrologiae cursus completus Latina*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne CXCVIII (Paris: Garnier, 1844-65) <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2378/all/fulltext?ACTION=byid&ID=Z100091290&WARN=N&TOCHITS=N&ALL=Y&FILE=../session/1570007442_19655> [last accessed 01 October 2019], Col. 1662C. Future references to the *Historia* will be in the form *HS, PL* 198/1662C.

⁷¹ The only underlined examples are found in 4 Kings 10, fol. 20^r; 1 Chronicles 2, fol. 21^v; 2 Chronicles 30, fol. 23^r.

pismyre or to þe amt', fol. 69^r). Again, though, glosses of this type are by no means always underlined.⁷² Linked to these glosses are those that supply the definition of a potentially unfamiliar word. These are more common in the Old Testament, as for example in Numbers 6 ('Of þe lawe & of þe rite of Nazarese, &c. Nazarese were certeyn men which by vowe bounde hem self to holynes for a certeyn tyme, or elles continually, & departed hem self fro þe comyn lyuynge of men', fol. 6^v). At times, such glosses seem designed not so much to further the reader's understanding as to provide some colour, as in 3 Kings 15 ('& he brake þe mawmet of priapus, &c., which was an ydol like a man with þe priue membre of outrage gretnes', fol. 18^v). This type of gloss might also be used to clarify the meaning of an ambiguous word, rather than an unfamiliar one, as in this example from 1 Corinthians 14: 'a psalme is loouynge of God by synngynge' (fol. 175^r), where the gloss is presumably included in order to make it clear that the word 'psalm' in this context does not necessarily refer to one of the Psalter texts. Once again, these sorts of clarification and definition are not consistently underlined in T93.

Despite the relative abundance of 'yronice' glosses, which are always underlined, other glosses specifying the tone or mode of speech, which are common, tend not to be (the only exception is the gloss that 'þe speche of þe auengel was figuratiue', Tobit 5, fol. 29^r).⁷³ Glosses explaining the difference between the Hebrew and Latin texts are relatively rare.⁷⁴ Most of the time, they are attributed to Lyra, but occasionally underlining is used in place of attribution, as for example in Esther 10: þe wordes þat cum after are not of þe text of Hebrew, nor of þe

⁷² See for example Judges 17: 'And of his ydol or mawmet' (fol. 13^v); Ezekiel 4: 'Ezechiel is comazded to take a tyle stone & descriue or peynthe þerin þe cite of Iersalem' (fol. 119^r); Acts 26: 'þat Paul myzt haue ben dismissed or delyuerd if he had not appeled to þe emperoure' (fols 200^r-200^v, ll. 444-45).

⁷³ For examples of this type which are not underlined, see for example Isaiah 9, fol. 84^v, l. 157 ('Bot Ysaie, vsing figuratiue speche'); Zechariah 9, fol. 147^r ('and so forþe to þe ende of þe chapitre vnder figuratiue speking is of þis mater'); 2 Corinthians 3, fol. 177^v ('as who sey "ney"').

⁷⁴ In this sense the *Declaracion* differs from many glossed WBs: see Hudson and Solopova, 'The Latin Text', p. 127.

canon of þe scripture; nereþe lese þey be writen in þe comyn translacion' (fols 31^r-31^v).⁷⁵

By far the most common underlined glosses in T93 are those that attempt to clarify the literal sense. These can be very long, as in this example from Tobit 6:

þe second night þou shall be receyued in þe coupeling of holy patriarkes, þat is to sey: it shal be graunted to þe coupeling wíth þi wife as it was to holy patriarkes; nereþeles þou shal abstene fro þi wife til after, for it is a special cause þat by iij nightes ze prey to be delyuerd of þe deuels power

(fol. 29^r)

They can also be shorter glosses, as in Proverbs 3: 'Nedynes of gostly godes is in þe house of a wicked man, &c.' (fol. 68^v). Again, however, underlining is not consistent. In fact, for every gloss of this type that is underlined there are several that are not.⁷⁶

Underlined Scripture

The way in which underlining is used to denote scripture in T93 is less complex than the way in which it is used to denote gloss. For one thing, in those books where scripture is underlined, examples are much more abundant. In the Psalter, it is not uncommon to have five or six underlined biblical lemmata in a single chapter, and Psalm 118 has twenty-four.⁷⁷ Job and Isaiah also often have multiple underlined lemmata per chapter.⁷⁸ It is also true that, in those books where underlining is used to denote both scripture and gloss, the scriptural examples are more frequent, often by a significant margin.⁷⁹ In those books where it is employed, underlining is not used for every scriptural quotation, but rather for the names of canticles, and

⁷⁵ The other example of this type is in Job 10, fols 31^r-31^v.

⁷⁶ See for example Hosea 4, fol. 134^v: 'Prestis shal ete þe synnes of þe peple, þat is to sey, þingges offerd for synne of þe peple'; 1 Corinthians 7, fol. 172^r: 'þat it is gode, þat is to sey perfection, to touche no woman.'

⁷⁷ See fols 61^r-61^v.

⁷⁸ See for example Job 10, fol. 32^v. See also Isaiah in the present edition, Part II.

⁷⁹ Isaiah has the most glaring imbalance, with a single underlined gloss and over one hundred underlined biblical lemmata.

for biblical lemmata that are then subject to some level of discussion or commentary. In this regard, T93 is in line with biblical commentaries of the period, and with Wycliffite texts like *EWS* and *CG*.⁸⁰ Underlined lemmata are also often marked lexically: they are commonly preceded by ‘þer’ or ‘after þer’, or followed by ‘here’, or the sign ‘&c’.⁸¹

Although Reilly’s edition suggests otherwise, scripture quoted in Latin is underlined only rarely. Reilly consistently underlines the Latin incipits in the T93 Psalter, when in fact only three incipits (to Psalm 1, Psalm 69, and Psalm 111) are underlined in the manuscript. The general practice of the T93 Psalter is as follows: Latin incipit; English incipit; English commentary. This is similar to the practice followed in a number of English bible commentaries, including Rolle’s *English Psalter Commentary* (though in those examples the Latin text also tends to be distinguished from the English by size or script).⁸² Underlining of Latin scripture is very rare in the rest of T93: all the remaining instances are canticle incipits (Ego dixi; Magnificat; Benedictus; Nunc dimittis).⁸³ However, such incipits are not *always* underlined. The opening of 1 Kings 2, for example, reads: ‘Of þe canticle of Anna, Exultat cor meum, &c.’ (fol. 14^r); the opening of Deuteronomy 32, meanwhile, has ‘Of the canticle of testimoni, audite celi *quae* loquor, þat is, Here 3e heuens what I sey, &c.’ (fol. 11^r). It may be that the practice of underlining such material was not set until later in the copying process.

Date

The manuscript contains no definitive evidence regarding its date. However, its reliance on LV

⁸⁰Hudson, *EWS*, I, p. 135; Anne Hudson, *Doctors in English: A Study of the Wycliffite Gospel Commentaries* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2015), p. xlv. For underlining in non-Wycliffite commentaries, see Kraebel, ‘Glosses’, p. 91.

⁸¹ See Chapter 2.

⁸² Kraebel, ‘Glosses’, pp. 91-92.

⁸³ Isaiah 38 (fol. 91^r, l. 628); Luke 1 (fol. 157^v, l. 8 and l. 10); Luke 3 (fol. 157^v, ll. 15-16).

provides strong guidance, and the hand in which it is written is also suggestive. Somerset posits a date for the manuscript ‘around the turn of the fifteenth century’, while Jean-Pascal Pouzet suggests the 1390s.⁸⁴ Reilly dates the manuscript to c. 1390, in part because of his belief that T93 might have been made ‘after EV but before LV’, rather than after LV.⁸⁵ This assertion is not supported in Reilly’s own writing, and, as I will demonstrate in Chapter 5, his suggestion that the *Declaracion* might have influenced LV is not a convincing explanation for the overwhelming similarities between the two texts: the *Declaracion* clearly selects from and alters the LV text, not vice versa.

It is almost certain, then, that work on the *Declaracion* could not have begun before work on LV was completed, or at least well-advanced (unless the *Declaracion* Psalter was begun earlier – see above). Precisely when this might have been is open to debate, but Hudson cites the use of LV in the preparation of PWB to suggest that the former must have been complete before the latter was written. While noting that some critics have suggested a date of 1395-96 for PWB, Hudson cites Dove’s analysis to the effect that the date of composition was actually 1388,⁸⁶ suggesting that work on LV was completed that year or a little before. The date *post quem* for the *Declaracion* is therefore relatively solid. The date *ante quem* is less certain, but there is reason to believe that our text was composed in the 1390s or the very early years of the fifteenth century. As will be discussed in Chapter 3, the *Declaracion* contains none of the polemical material associated with later lollard writing; this perhaps indicates that it was written before the drafting of Archbishop Arundel’s *Constitutions* in 1407.⁸⁷ Further, its

⁸⁴ *Feeling*, p. 179; Pouzet, p. 102.

⁸⁵ Reilly, p. xvi.

⁸⁶ Anne Hudson, ‘The Origin and Textual Tradition of the Wycliffite Bible’ in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 133-61 (pp. 148-49). For the original analysis, see Dove, ‘Wyclif and the English Bible’, in *A Companion to John Wyclif: Late Medieval Theologian*, ed. by Ian Christopher Levy (Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 365-406 (p. 392).

⁸⁷ Christina Van Nolcken posits that although both were used in the production of ‘extremer’ texts by ‘more radical Lollard groups’, the *Floretum* and *Rosarium* were both productions of what she terms the ‘moderate part of the movement’: *Rosarium*, ed. by Von Nolcken, p. 42.

methods and aims are in keeping with those of several academic Wycliffite texts produced around the turn of the fifteenth century. Also, as Hudson notes, after the enforcement of the *Constitutions* in 1409 it became dangerous to engage in the production of vernacular scripture, or publicly to support it.⁸⁸ It has been posited that manuscripts containing only selected books, chapters or verses from WB may have been designed to ‘evade the legislation by concealing the fact that the extracts derived from a complete (and therefore Wycliffite) Bible’.⁸⁹ But even though it does not contain the full text of scripture, producing the *Declaracion* after 1409 would have left its compiler(s) exposed to charges under the *Constitutions*: the law forbids the dissemination of biblical translations produced after Wyclif’s time ‘in parte vel in toto’ (‘in part or in whole’).⁹⁰ This is not to say, of course, that the text could not have been produced under such conditions, especially since the *Constitutions* do not seem to have been particularly effectual in practice.⁹¹ But it would have been less likely to be produced, copied and sought out once it became illegal.

Broadly, then, it is possible to date production of the *Declaracion* between c. 1390 and c. 1407. Although I have not located any other manuscripts written by the T93 scribe, the hybrid anglicana-secretary script he used is common in Wycliffite texts produced at this time, as noted above. Scholarly opinion on the hand supports a dating of c. 1400.⁹² This would place the copying of T93 at the height of academic Wycliffism: most copies of *EWS* were created

⁸⁸ Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 22.

⁸⁹ Dove, *FEB*, p. 52; Sven L. Fristedt, *The Wycliffe Bible, Part II: The Origin of the First Revision as Presented in De Salutaribus Documentis, SSE 221* (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1969), p. liii.

⁹⁰ For more on this, see Dove, *FEB*, p. 36; Watson, ‘Censorship’, pp. 828-29.

⁹¹ See Jurkowski, ‘The Selective Censorship of the Wycliffite Bible’, in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 371-88 (pp. 375-76).

⁹² Hanna dates the hand to the very beginning of the fifteenth century: see Hanna, ‘Palaeography’, p. 262; *Feeling*, p. 171, n. 21. Solopova suggests a date in the early fifteenth century (*Manuscripts*, p. 274). Ker asserts that ‘The script is of chancery type and dates probably from a little before or a little after 1400’ (‘Summary’, p. 115). Fowler dates it to ‘about 1400’ (‘Commentary’, p. 67); Morey agrees (*Book and Verse*, p. 110).

around the same date, and at least one of the surviving copies of *GG*.⁹³ Several copies of *WB* also survive from around the same time, while the *Floretum* and *Rosarium* have been dated a little earlier (1384-1386 and 1384-1396, respectively).⁹⁴ The compilation and copying of the *Declaracion* can, then, be comfortably dated to a period in which the Wycliffites were undertaking similarly ambitious projects of biblical scholarship.

Location

The manuscript itself provides no concrete evidence as to where it was produced. As I will argue more fully in the next chapter, the most likely location is Oxford: the compiler(s) clearly had sustained access to at least one copy of *LV*, and possibly to a copy of the Earlier Version (though I will argue in Chapter 5 that use of *EV* is less likely than has previously been supposed). The work would also have required sustained access to the Vulgate, the *Glossa*, the *Magna*, and *LPL*, with occasional recourse to *LM*, to Haymo of Auxerre's *Commentaria in Isaiam* (hereafter *Commentaria*), and to the *Historia scholastica* (hereafter *HS*).⁹⁵ Although this list is in some ways not as impressive as it might first appear (the Vulgate, the *Glossa* and the *Magna* were all almost certainly contained in a single manuscript set, which might also have included *LPL* and *LM*), it still indicates that the compiler(s) were working within very easy reach of an institutional library.⁹⁶ Given the clear evidence that *WB* was produced in Oxford, and its similarities to other

⁹³Hudson, *EWS*, I, p. 201; Hudson, *Doctors*, p. xxx (the manuscript is London, British Library, MS Additional 28026).

⁹⁴Anne Hudson, 'Wyclif and the English Language', in *Wyclif in his Times*, ed. by Anthony Kenny (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 85-103 (p. 97).

⁹⁵It is to be noted that the section of *HS* which most clearly informs the *Declaracion*, namely Acts, was in fact the work of Peter of Poitiers (see Guy Lobrichon, 'The Story of a Success: The *Bible Historiale* in French (1295-ca. 1500)', in *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible*, ed. by Eyal Poleg and Laura Light (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 307-31 (p. 309). However, the *Declaracion* compiler(s) refer in Acts to the *Magister historiarum*, i.e. Comestor, indicating that they did not recognise this distinction.

⁹⁶See Chapter 5. On the idea that book supply is evidence of an Oxford location for Wycliffite works more generally, see Hudson, *PR*, p. 109.

works of Wycliffite scholarship presumed to have been produced there around the same time, there is no good reason to suppose that the *Declaracion* was compiled anywhere else, or that T93 was copied away from Oxford.⁹⁷

Dialect, Vocabulary and Orthography

Reilly undertook a fairly extensive linguistic analysis of the manuscript, including spelling, inflection, and vocabulary, concluding that '[t]he area which best fits the evidence seems to be southwest Yorkshire, but northern Lincolnshire or parts of Nottingham and Derby are strong possibilities'. Fowler, writing two years after the completion of Reilly's thesis, which he supervised, says simply that 'the dialect and vocabulary [...] is decidedly northern', and Solopova notes 'some northern linguistic forms'.⁹⁸ A full linguistic analysis is beyond the scope of the present study, but it is important to note that many of the characteristics highlighted by Reilly are less common in the manuscript than his analysis might suggest. Very few of the word forms he characterises as 'distinctly northern' occur more than half-a-dozen times across the manuscript, and many are not the dominant form (most obviously, *kirk* occurs six times in the manuscript, while *chirch(e)* occurs nearly three hundred times). Nevertheless, the lexical evidence, as compiled by Reilly, does seem to confirm strong northern involvement in the production of the text and/or the manuscript. This need not suggest, however, that the text was not both compiled and copied in Oxford: the nature of the university system in the late fourteenth-century meant that scholars were drawn there from all over the country (like Wyclif himself, from Yorkshire, or John Trevisa, from Cornwall); further, professional scribes were often highly mobile.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ On Oxford as a likely location for the Wycliffite 'centre', see Hudson, *EWS*, I, p. 201.

⁹⁸ Fowler, 'Commentary', p. 67; Solopova, *Manuscripts*, p. 276.

⁹⁹ Simon Horobin, 'Mapping the Words' in *The Production of Books in England*, ed. by Gillespie and Wakelin,

Although Hudson has noted that Wycliffites tended to use Midland forms, certain northern features have been noted in other texts presumed to have been composed in Oxford, most notably EV.¹⁰⁰ Some such features are presumed to have been introduced by scribes, though others, such as *thof* for ‘though’ (similar to T93 *þof*) may stem from the archetype.¹⁰¹ Whether they were introduced by the scribe, or were a feature of the original text, then, the northern features discernible in the *Declaracion* as it is preserved in T93 are consistent with certain other Wycliffite texts.

When compared to LV, the *Declaracion* demonstrates a few idiosyncrasies regarding word forms: it almost always replaces LV *clepe* with *call*, and *schulen* with *shat*; in fact, it consistently removes *-en* endings from verbs where such endings are found in LV, and replaces *-th* endings with *-s*. LV *ben* also regularly becomes *are*, and, as in EV *wher* is preferred over *whether*. In addition, present participles are regularly employed in the *Declaracion* where they are not found in WB.

As interesting as the dialect are the orthographical idiosyncrasies of the manuscript. In particular, there seems to have been a change of practice between the Old Testament and the New. Certain forms that routinely contain the letter *u* in the Old Testament – for example *ansuer(e)*, *tru(e)* – are often replaced in the New Testament by forms containing *w* (for example *answer(e)*, *trew(e)* or *trwe*), while forms ending in *er* are often replaced with those ending *re*, as in the pairs *better/bettre*, *childer/childre*, *fader/fadre*, *moder/modre*, *suffer/suffre*, *to gider/to gidre*. The distinction between Old and New Testament in these cases is generally not absolute: in the case of the word *father*, for example, the ratios are Old

pp. 59-78 (p. 61).

¹⁰⁰ Solopova, ‘Dialect’, in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 202-219 (pp. 208-12; pp. 215-19). According to Solopova, the hyparchetype of the Wycliffite revisions to Rolle’s *English Psalter Commentary* was also northern.

¹⁰¹ Solopova, ‘Dialect’, p. 215. Solopova is somewhat sceptical.

Testament 52:1 *fader:fadre*, New Testament 188:10 *fadre:fader*. Nevertheless, there is a clear change in policy between the two testaments. Certain other forms are found regularly in the Old Testament but almost never in the New, as *awne* (NT always *owne*); *bifore* (NT always *before*); *deghed* (NT always *died*); *-li* (NT always *-ly*) and *peir(e)* (NT almost always *her*). It is important to note that in most of these cases both forms of each word can be found in the Old Testament; however, it is striking that the New Testament takes a consistent policy of favouring one form over the other. On their own, each of these changes is relatively minor: taken together, however, they suggest some sort of break between the Old and New Testaments. If attributed to the scribe, this would suggest a break in copying, likely of some duration. It is also possible, however, that the scribe copied the forms as he found them in his exemplar(s). In this case, it may be that a separate exemplar existed for each Testament, or even that the original task of compilation was divided into two parts. A thorough investigation of this question is beyond the scope of this thesis, but would likely yield illuminating results.

Chapter 2: Authorship, Audience, Use

As is clear from the previous chapter, the *Declaracion* is long, varied and complex. Whichever of the outlined production scenarios is closest to the truth, it is undeniable that the original composition would have been a major undertaking, requiring close engagement over an extended period of time. In common with many texts of a similar date (and perhaps especially like most lollard texts of the late fourteenth century), the *Declaracion* provides no contemporary evidence that would allow us to attribute it to a named writer or writers.¹ A nineteenth-century attribution to the Cornish translator John Trevisa, a contemporary of Wyclif's, is noted in previous scholarship on the *Declaracion*, but in all cases dismissed, generally on the basis of dialect.² Beyond this, the question of the *Declaracion*'s authorship has never been discussed in any depth. Reilly's half-page consideration of the evidence is the most exhaustive so far attempted, and is hampered by an apparent desire to attribute the text to a named Wycliffite of renown: rejecting Trevisa on dialect grounds, he also suggests and immediately discounts John Purvey and Nicholas Hereford on the same basis. Noting the preponderance of Northern forms, he says '[I] would like to fasten upon John Wycliffe himself, saying that he i[s] the obvious man: learned, interested in Bible study and translati[on,] speaking a Northern dialect.' Given the date, however, he concludes that 'this would be a very rash assumption' unless supported by a careful comparison with English texts attributed more surely to Wyclif. The evidence put forward in the present study regarding the *Declaracion*'s

¹ On the impossibility of attributing most lollard texts to named authors, see Somerset, *Feeling*, p. 14.

² See Reilly, p. xix; Fowler, 'Commentary', p. 67. Ker and Solopova note the attribution to Trevisa glancingly and without comment (Ker, 'Summary', p. 115; Solopova, *Manuscripts*, p. 277), while Somerset does not mention him at all (*Feeling*, pp. 179-202).

reliance on LV (which was likely completed several years after Wyclif's death) makes such a comparison unnecessary: Wyclif could not have written the *Declaracion*.³ Reilly also asserts that 'the possibility of multiple authorship should not be overlooked', concluding that 'the whole question of authorship requires much further study'.⁴ This chapter is the result of such study.

The chapter will begin by discussing medieval conceptions of authorship and how they might inform discussion of the *Declaracion*. It will then examine the evidence related to Trevisa, attempting to understand how the attribution came to be made, and whether it could be accurate. Beyond this, the opening section considers more broadly what type of writer (or writers) might have been involved in the enterprise. The second part of the chapter moves on from authorship to discuss the related question of audience, suggesting that, although this evidence is somewhat mixed, the *Declaracion* is primarily aimed at an academic audience. Though this does not preclude the idea that some less educated people might have accessed the text through an intermediary, the way in which the text presents material suggests that the main intended audience must have been readers with at least a basic level of academic training. The final section of this chapter discusses how the *Declaracion* was intended to be used. It examines theories advanced by earlier scholars, and then considers statements of purpose in a number of earlier Latin bible summaries and Middle English commentaries. Following on from this will be an examination of the physical evidence related to the use of T93, first relating to the size and layout of the manuscript itself, and then to its early modern marginalia.

³ See Chapter 5.

⁴ Reilly, pp. xix-xx.

1. Authorship

As noted above, the question of authorship has scarcely been considered in previous studies of the *Declaracion*, and scholars have tended to assume single authorship. Reilly refers to the originator of the text alternately as the *author* or *writer*, while Somerset generally favours the latter term (but occasionally uses *summarizer*). All three of these terms seem to me inadequate. The term *writer* is too broad, *summarizer* too narrow, and the word *author* potentially misleading as it seems to suggest a far greater proportion of original material than the *Declaracion* in fact contains.⁵

In fact, though the summarising of both the biblical text and the exegetical sources is in general deftly handled and clearly considered, almost all the material contained in the *Declaracion* can be traced back to an earlier work.⁶ In these circumstances, the *Declaracion* would not have been viewed by a medieval audience as the work of an *author*. In the mid-thirteenth century, St Bonaventure set out four categories of writing that are useful to a consideration of the *Declaracion*. In this model, the scribe (*scriptor*) simply copies out the work of others. The compiler (*compiler*) ‘writes the materials of others, adding, but nothing of his own’. The commentator (*commentator*), meanwhile ‘writes both the materials of other men, and of his own, but the materials of others as the principal materials, and his own annexed for the purpose of clarifying them’. Finally, the author (*auctor*) ‘writes both his own materials and those of others, but his own as the principal materials, and the materials of others annexed for the purpose of confirming his own’.⁷ Nuancing this somewhat, Bonaventure decides it is

⁵ For the argument that the *Declaracion* should not be regarded simply as a summary, see Chapter 1 and particularly Chapters 4 and 5.

⁶ See Chapter 5.

⁷ Translations from Bonaventure’s prologue are supplied from A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, 2nd edn (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1988), p. 94.

right to call Peter Lombard an *auctor* rather than a *commentator*, since he draws from materials of sufficient *auctoritas*.⁸ It is deeply unlikely, however, that a scholarly medieval audience would have thought of the writer(s) of the *Declaracion* in the same way as they thought of a master like Peter Lombard.

It is clear, then, that the *Declaracion* was not the work of an *author* in the medieval sense. As I will demonstrate in Chapter 5, the incidence of original material in the *Declaracion* is vanishingly low, suggesting, on the strength of the above definitions, that it also should not be viewed as the work of a *commentator*. Instead, the text can most accurately be termed a compilation – a gathering together of material from others without adding anything original – and thus the work of a *compiler*. The English word *compiler* will therefore be used throughout this study to refer to the person (or persons) who composed the *Declaracion*, while the word *scribe* is used only to refer to the person who physically copied the text into the surviving manuscript, T93.⁹

Is it possible, then, to identify the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion*? As noted above, the manuscript has only once attracted a positive attribution: the nineteenth-century binding, and contemporary pencil notes in the fly-leaves, name John Trevisa. I will, therefore, now examine the evidence related to Trevisa, before going on to consider the social, educational and ideological profile of the compiler(s) in broader terms.

1.1 John Trevisa

The manuscript was rebound circa 1808, probably at the request of the Oxford antiquary and

⁸ Minnis, *Authorship*, p. 94.

⁹ On the question of multiple authorship, and the theory that the scribe and compiler might in fact be one and the same, see Chapter 1.

clergyman James Dallaway.¹⁰ Dallaway clearly believed the text to be the work of Trevisa, since the spine of the binding declares it to be ‘Trevisa’s Comm / on the Bible’. Dallaway presented the manuscript to James Ingram, outgoing Rawlinsonian Professor of Anglo-Saxon at the University of Oxford.¹¹ Handwritten notes in the flyleaves both front and back give details of Trevisa’s life and career, though no evidence directly linking him to the *Declaracion* itself. Furthermore, a short biography of Trevisa has been cut out of Anthony Wood’s 1694 work *Historia et Antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis* and pasted in on one of the front fly-leaves.¹² All of this evidence is undated and unsigned, but examination of Ingram’s *Memorials of Oxford* suggests that both the pencil annotations and the excerpt from Wood are his additions. Ingram lists the English translation of Wood’s *Historia* first among his sources in the preface to the *Memorials*,¹³ and he must also have been familiar with the earlier Latin text. Wood is also cited in the pencil annotations, which note that Trevisa was ‘Expelled from Queen’s College in 1379 – being deprived of his fellowship there by alex Nevile abp of York the visitor – see Wood, annals [illegible] vol. 1 p. 496’.¹⁴ However, it is by examining the rest of the pencil annotations that we can ascribe them with some degree of certainty to Ingram, and begin to understand the source of the Trevisan attribution. The notes in the fly-leaves assert that ‘[Trevisa] was Vicar of Berkely and canon of the colegiate ch. of westbury, wilts’, and call the *Declaracion* an ‘English Commentary or abridgment of the Old and New Testaments’. Both of these statements agree very closely with Ingram’s writing on Trevisa in his *Memorials*, where he asserts that:

¹⁰ See *ODNB*, ‘James Dallaway’ (1763-1834).

¹¹ fol. v^r. For more detail on the life and career of James Ingram, see *ODNB*, ‘James Ingram’ (1774-1850).

¹² fol. v^r. See Anthony à Wood, *Historia et Antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis*, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1674), II, p. 95.

¹³ James Ingram, *Memorials of Oxford*, 3 vols (Oxford: John Henry Parker; H. Slatter, and W. Graham; London: Charles Tilt, 1837), I, p. ix. Ingram refers to ‘The Annals of the University’, but the work in question is in fact Anthony à Wood, *The History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford in Two Books*, 2 vols (Oxford: Printed for John Gutch, 1792).

¹⁴ fol. iii^v. See Wood, *History*, I, p. 496.

One of the earliest inmates of [Exeter College] was John de Trevisa, *canon of the collegiate church of Westbury in Wiltshire, and vicar of Berkeley*; who assisted Wicliffe in the translation of the scriptures, *and left behind him an English abridgment or commentary of the Bible*.¹⁵

In a footnote, Ingram further notes that ‘[a] copy of this work, which is scarcely known, was presented to the Editor [Ingram] in 1808 by the late ingenious Mr Dallaway. It is mentioned by sir Wm. Dugdale, in his *Baronage*, I. 360’.¹⁶ This helps to demystify a couple of smudged citations in the fly-leaf notes. The annotator cites ‘D[ug]d: Bar: I, 360’ in relation to Trevisa’s positions at Berkeley and Westbury (fol. iii^v). More importantly, the pencil annotations assert that the text ‘is frequently though [illegible] called a translation [illegible] dugdale’s [sic] Bar [illegible] I, 360’ (fol. iv^r). Reference to the work in question, William Dugdale’s *Baronage of England*, shows just how closely Ingram’s work, both in the pencil annotations and the *Memorials*, is indebted to Dugdale’s writing on Lord Thomas Berkeley, Trevisa’s patron:

[...] he was a great lover of Learning, an especial favorer of that worthy person Iohn Trevisa, Vicar of Berkley, in his time; of whom Bale gives this Character, that he was Vir multa[m] eruditione atque eloquentia[m] clarus. Which Iohn, moreover, was a Cannon of the Collegiate Church of Westbury in Com. Wilts, and translated into English, the Old and New Testament...¹⁷

It is clear from the footnote in Ingram’s *Memorials* quoted above, and from the rubbed pencil annotation, that Ingram believed that this “translation” of the bible was in fact the *Declaracion*.

¹⁵ Ingram, *Memorials*, I, ‘Exeter College’, p. 15 (my emphasis).

¹⁶ Ingram, *Memorials*, I, ‘Exeter College’, pp. 15-16. Although Ingram uses the indefinite article when referring to his copy of the commentary, it is almost certain that he knew of no other copy: had he done so, he would surely have referenced it either here or in his pencil annotations on T93.

¹⁷ Sir William Dugdale, *The Baronage of England, Or an Historical Account of the Lives and Most Memorable Actions of four English Nobility in the Saxons Time to the Norman Conquest, and from thence, of those who had their Rise Before the End of King Henry the Third’s Reign Deduced from Publick Records, Antient Historians, and Other Authorities*, 2 vols (London: Abel Roper, John Martin, Henry Herringman, 1675), I, p. 360.

What is less certain is why Ingram came to believe this. Dugdale makes no mention of commentary or paraphrase, and Ingram never explains the discrepancy. Certain circumstantial factors, outlined below, do provide at least some basis for Ingram's belief that Trevisa could have written the *Declaracion*, but his certainty is misplaced.

Trevisa was a known associate of several leading Wycliffite figures in the later fourteenth century. He was admitted as a fellow of Queen's College, Oxford in 1369, the same year as Nicholas Hereford, who was to become a key figure in the WB translation project; John Wyclif also roomed at Queen's during this period.¹⁸ Though Trevisa's writings do not chime entirely with Wyclif's theology, it is clear that they agreed on some important issues. Hudson cites asides written by Trevisa in his *Polychronicon* which she says 'reveal sympathy with Wycliffite radicalism', in particular around the issues of miracles and religious orders.¹⁹ Fowler, meanwhile, suggests that, while they did not agree on all issues, Trevisa may have been one of a number of 'intellectually independent friends' to Wyclif, and that he was certainly influenced by Wyclif's thought.²⁰ It may have been through an association with Wyclif, or with Hereford, that Trevisa began work on the WB translation: he is widely believed to have been involved in the project, particularly in its early stages, and certainly wrote in favour of the vernacularisation of scripture.²¹ Aside from his possible association with WB, we know that Trevisa was familiar with another of the *Declaracion*'s major sources, *LPL*. A man of Trevisa's

¹⁸ David C. Fowler, 'John Trevisa and the English Bible', *Modern Philology*, 58 (1960), 81-98 (pp. 96-97).

¹⁹ Hudson, 'Origin', p. 156.

²⁰ David C. Fowler, *The Bible in Early English Literature* (Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1976), p. 157.

²¹ Hudson, *PR*, pp. 395-97; Hudson, 'Origin', pp. 154-56; Fowler, 'Trevisa and the English Bible', pp. 81-88; Sven L. Fristedt, *The Wycliffe Bible: Part III – Relationships of Trevisa and the Spanish Medieval Bibles* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1973), pp. 7-58. See also Trevisa's *Dialogus inter Dominum et Clericum*, in Ronald Waldron, 'Trevisa's Original Prefaces on Translation: A Critical Edition', in *Medieval English Studies Presented to George Kane*, ed. by Edward Donald Kennedy, Ronald Waldron and Joseph S. Wittig (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1988), pp. 285-99 (pp. 289-94); also A. S. G. Edwards, *A Companion to Middle English Prose* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2004), pp. 117-26 (p. 120). For more detail on the arguments advanced by Trevisa, see Chapter 3.

education and interests in the late fourteenth century might be expected to know Lyra's work, and Trevisa's writing demonstrates this familiarity; he was also among a group of scholars who removed books, including a partial copy of Lyra's *Postilla* on the Proverbs, and a full copy of his *Postilla* on the Psalter, from Queen's College, following a controversy there in the late 1370s.²²

Furthermore, Trevisa was a talented translator from Latin, and demonstrated a clear interest in translation theory, expressing the opinion that translations ought to prioritise intelligibility, even at the expense of strict literal accuracy. In the *Epistola* addressed to his patron Lord Berkeley on his translation of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, he writes of the need for the translator to sometimes change voice and word order so as to make the meaning 'cleer and pleyn to be knowe and understonde':

in som place Y schal sette word vor worde and actyue vor actyue and passiuue vor passyue arewe ry3t as a stondeþ withoute chaungyng of þe ordre of wordes. But yn som place Y mot change þe rewe and þe ordre of wordes and sette þe actyue vor þe passiuue and a3enward. And yn som place Y mot sette a reson vor a word to telle what hyt menep. Bote vor al such chaungyng, þe menyng schal stonde and no3t be ychanged.²³

Both the methods discussed in this passage are integral to the methodology of the *Declaracion* compiler(s), though they are most often reworking an English text (LV), rather than translating from Latin, as Trevisa did. As the quotation suggests, Trevisa also regularly employs synonymous variants or multiple English words to translate or explain a single Latin word ('Y mot sette a reson vor a word to telle what hyt menep').²⁴ Fristedt calls this 'the most notable

²² Fowler, 'Trevisa and the English Bible', pp. 94-95.

²³ Waldron, 'Prefaces', p. 294, ll. 218-227. See also Traugott Lawler, 'On the Properties of John Trevisa's Major Translations', *Viator* 14 (January 1983), 267-88 (pp. 268-70).

²⁴ On this point, and for examples, see Fristedt, *The Wycliffe Bible: Part III*, pp. 28-29; John Trevisa, *Dialogus inter Militem et Clericum, Richard Fitzralph's Sermon: 'Defensio Curatorum' and Methodius: 'Pe Bygynyng of þe World and þe Ende of Worldes'*, ed. by Aaron Jenkins Perry (London: EETS, 1925), p. civ-cix; Edwards,

characteristic of Trevisa's style'.²⁵ This is a notable aspect of the *Declaracion*, but also of the WB translations.²⁶

Trevisa was no stranger to paraphrase. Lawler notes that, in the opening books of his *Polychronicon* translation, Trevisa often introduces paraphrase in order to maintain the clarity of his text, even at the expense of strict accuracy to his sources.²⁷ Hudson, meanwhile, notes that Trevisa clearly had no ideological objection to biblical paraphrase: he sometimes summarises biblical quotations in his work.²⁸ In terms of diction, too, there are some surface similarities to the *Declaracion*. Trevisa's translations employ a mixture of Latinate and native words, and he occasionally leaves Latin words or phrases untranslated, either because there is no suitable English equivalent, or because they are so familiar that he deems translation unnecessary.²⁹ At other times he employs cognates.³⁰ His rendering of scriptural material is often close, but not identical to, the LV translation.³¹

It seems likely, however, that Ingram's attribution of the *Declaracion* to Trevisa was not based on any deep analysis of the text itself. Instead, Ingram may simply have been attempting to solve a thorny academic problem. As mentioned above, William Dugdale had attributed to Trevisa a bible translation comprising both Testaments. The question of whether Trevisa had produced such a translation had been debated by scholars since Caxton, and continued to be discussed in the early nineteenth century: Thomas Dibdin's enlarged 1810 edition of Joseph Ames's *Typographical Antiquities* includes a long footnote laying out

'Trevisa', pp. 122-24.

²⁵ Fristedt, *The Wycliffe Bible: Part III*, p. 29. See also Lawler, 'Properties', pp. 272-73 and pp. 279-80.

²⁶ See Chapter 5.

²⁷ Lawler, 'Properties', pp. 271-72.

²⁸ See Hudson, 'Origin', pp. 154-55. Trevisa's *Dialogus inter Dominum et Clericum* also contains a paraphrase of Genesis 1. The wording is similar to WB, but not enough to suggest a definite connection. See Waldron, 'Prefaces', pp. 293-94, ll. 173-89.

²⁹ Lawler, 'Properties', p. 280. On untranslated Latin words in the *Declaracion*, see Chapter 1.

³⁰ Lawler, 'Properties', p. 279. On cognates in the *Declaracion*, see Chapter 5.

³¹ Hudson, 'Origin', p. 156. On this aspect of the *Declaracion*, see Chapter 5.

evidence both for and against a Trevisan bible translation, without coming to a firm conclusion.³² The footnote indicates that Dibdin had been engaged with the question since at least 1805. By reconceptualising the translation mentioned by Dugdale as an abridgement, Ingram is able implicitly to assert that Trevisa did produce an independent version of the bible in English (neither the spine nor the fly-leaves contain any reference to Wyclif, so it must be assumed that the *Declaracion*'s debt to LV went unnoticed at this time). Simultaneously, he downgrades Trevisa's purported achievement, thus, perhaps, attempting to explain the confusion. Trevisa's 'bible' becomes not a lavish, full translation, but rather an unassuming 'abridgment or commentary'.

In fact, despite the stylistic and circumstantial factors mentioned above, it is very unlikely that the *Declaracion* was the work of Trevisa. He is not known to have produced any extended summaries of a similar type, and where he does paraphrase the bible, both in short quotations and longer summaries of particular biblical narratives, his treatments bear no striking resemblance to the *Declaracion*. Trevisa was also generally careful regarding attribution: when quoting the bible he includes references, and when quoting earlier authorities he cites them by name.³³ He also habitually prefaces his own interpolations in his texts (which are relatively frequent) with his own name.³⁴ It might be argued that the *Declaracion* is of such a different character to the other works of Trevisa that differences in its

³² Joseph Ames, William Herbert and Thomas Frognall Dibdin, *Typographical Antiquities; or The History of Printing in England, Scotland and Ireland: containing Memoirs of our Ancient Printers, and a Register of the Books Printed by Them*, 4 vols (London: William Miller, 1810-19), I, pp. 141-143. For more on the debates around Trevisa's authorship from Caxton onwards, see David C. Fowler, 'Trevisa and the English Bible', pp. 81-87.

³³ See Trevisa, *Dialogus*, ed. by Perry; *John Trevisa's Translation of the Polychronicon of Ranulph Higden, Book VI: An Edition Based on British Library MS Cotton Tiberius D. VII*, ed. by Ronald Waldron (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2004). In the latter work, the attributions to earlier authors follow Trevisa's Latin source.

³⁴ Edwards, 'Trevisa', p. 121; Fiona Somerset, *Clerical Discourse and Lay Audience in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 66 and pp. 76-77.

style of attribution are inevitable. The close association between the *Declaracion* and WB may have meant that a careful scholar would not wish to advertise his involvement, even before the enforcement of Archbishop Arundel's *Constitutions* in 1409.³⁵ Aside from this, Trevisa's attributions to earlier sources are frequently simply copied from the Latin texts he is translating, but even were this not the case, the way in which the *Declaracion* interweaves material from different sources, and the relatively high number of direct biblical quotations, would make consistent attribution nearly impossible.³⁶ However, the difference is still striking.

Finally, and most importantly, the *Declaracion* uses English markedly differently to Trevisa's known works. It is true that Trevisa mixes Latinate and native vocabulary, but Lawler suggests that 'whenever he can he eschews Latin entirely', choosing instead Germanic or French-derived vocabulary.³⁷ In this his practice differs from that of the *Declaracion* compiler(s), who frequently translate Latin sources using cognates, going so far as occasionally to replace a non-Latinate word from LV with a Latinate alternative. Most important, of course, is the objection that has been raised most frequently in previous discussions of the *Declaracion*'s authorship. Trevisa tended to write in the South-western dialect of his Cornish home, as Lawler and others attest, and though it has been suggested that in writing the *De proprietatibus rerum* he consciously adopted Midlands grammar and spelling in an attempt to appeal to a wider audience, nowhere is there a suggestion that he would have consistently adopted as northerly a dialect as is in evidence in the *Declaracion*.³⁸

³⁵ See Chapter 3.

³⁶ See Chapter 5.

³⁷ Lawler, 'Properties', p. 281.

³⁸ Waldron notes that a piece of doggerel verse in Trevisa's *Polychronicon* includes occasional northern forms, but only in order to aid the rhyme-scheme. See Ronald Waldron, 'Dialect Aspects of Manuscripts of Trevisa's *Polychronicon*', in *Regionalism in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts: Essays Celebrating the Publication of A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*, ed. by Felicity Riddy (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1991), pp. 67-87 (p. 69). On the use of the South-Western dialect, see Lawler, 'Properties', p. 282; Waldron, 'Dialect', pp. 67-87. On the suggestion that Trevisa may have deliberately used Central Midland dialect, see Irma Taavitsainen

In conclusion, the *Declaracion* does share certain stylistic features with works by John Trevisa, and as a work based on WB and involving the translation of a large amount of exegetical material from Latin into English, it is likely he would have found the project both interesting and worthwhile. Taken together with the confusion over whether Trevisa had written his own translation of the bible, it is easy to see why the *Declaracion* might have been previously attributed to him. However, other elements of the style, diction and methodology of the *Declaracion* argue against Trevisan authorship, as does the dialect evidence.

1.2 Characteristics of the compiler(s)

Although there is not enough evidence to suggest a solid attribution in the case of the *Declaracion*, there are several assumptions that can be made about the compiler(s). As will be demonstrated more fully in Chapter 5, the person(s) who produced the text were highly educated, familiar with a wide range of exegetical and theological material in Latin, and intellectually curious. That the compiler(s) were deeply familiar with LV, and that they approved of the translation, is also certain, though the presence of independent translations from the Vulgate might also suggest that they did not view LV as infallible or immune to improvement. Such translations also prove that they had a great deal of confidence in their own facility with Latin, and their knowledge of the biblical text (again, these points will be discussed more in Chapter 5). As Fowler notes, they even occasionally demonstrate an interest in problems relating to the text itself. He draws the reader's attention to *Declaracion* Hebrews 8:

'Scientific language and spelling standardisation 1375-1550', in *The Development of Standard English 1300-1800: Theories, Descriptions, Conflicts*, ed. by Laura Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 131-54 (p. 145). Waldron suggests that the replacement of South-Western forms with Midlands forms in the *Polychronicon* may have instead been the work of scribes: see 'Dialect', pp. 67-69.

Þat for *imperfection* of þe Old Testament it was nedeful to gif þe new, he shewes by auctorite written Jer. 31, þof þe wordes be *sum* what chaunged, ffor þe apostle allegges it after þe *translacion* of 70 *interpretours*.

(fol. 193^v)³⁹

While this, and other references to the Septuagint, are taken originally from *LPL* (in this case L6/881:3), they still suggest that the compiler(s) were interested in textual problems, and believed their readers might also be. References of this kind are however confined to the Epistles and Acts.⁴⁰

If it is clear that Trevisa is not the compiler of the *Declaracion*, then, it is also clear that the true compiler(s) would have been similar to him in terms of education, status, resources and interests. Taken together with the location evidence presented in the previous chapter, it is reasonable to assume that the man or men who worked on the *Declaracion* in the first instance were Oxford academics with theological training. Given that the text relies not only upon LV, but also upon the WB translators' favoured exegete, Nicholas of Lyra, and was almost certainly produced within a few years of LV and in the same location, it seems reasonable to assume that the scholar(s) responsible may have known those involved in the WB translation. It is possible that the compiler(s) even worked on the WB translation themselves. As the last chapter suggested, the PWB writer claims to have written glosses on Job and the major and minor Prophets, and it is conceivable that these formed the basis for the *Declaracion* itself.⁴¹ Additionally, the PWB writer envisages the production of a work strikingly similar to the *Declaracion*, which will 'expowne myche openliere and shortliere þe Bible in English þan þe elde grete doctours han expowned it in Latyn...' (p. 82, ll. 2869-70). This adds weight to the

³⁹ Fowler, 'Commentary', p. 76.

⁴⁰ See Romans 9-10, fol. 167^v; 1 Corinthians 14-15, fols 175^r-176^r; Acts 13, fol. 197^v (l. 200).

⁴¹ See the present study, Chapter 1; Somerset, *Feeling*, p. 185.

idea that the *Declaracion* was one of a group of ‘related editorial projects’ which are posited to have been undertaken by Wycliffite scholars at around the same time as the WB translation.⁴² Of course, it is impossible to prove any concrete connection between the *Declaracion* and the WB translators (particularly since it has recently been suggested that the PWB writer in fact overstated his role in the translational endeavour).⁴³ Taken together with the respect for the LV translation evident in the *Declaracion*, and the dialect evidence mentioned in the previous chapter, however, these pieces of evidence from PWB at least suggest that, beyond the obvious source relationship, there might have been a deeper connection between the *Declaracion* and WB.⁴⁴

2. Audience

Previous scholars have not engaged very much with the question of audience as regards the *Declaracion*. However, Somerset’s remarks bear quotation:

[The compiler] comments often on the interpretation of narrative voice, pausing to explain, for example, that in a given psalm David speaks in the person of a meek man [...] In these ways he strives to teach his readers that the truth of statements depends on who or what their speakers represent and on what they mean by them. Irony, too, is a special concern, prominently glossed and fully explained. His concern with giving his readers tools of analysis goes further: he commonly identifies and explains tropes and forms of discourse including the literal, figurative, allegorical, prophetic, moral, and disputational. This book is not merely a work intended for personal reference nor a coterie production designed for an educated group. It is designed to convey information to others, and the level at which the writer’s glosses are pitched suggests that the anticipated audience included members with little formal schooling.⁴⁵

⁴² Ghosh, ‘The Prologues’, p. 166; see also Elizabeth Solopova, ‘Introduction’, in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 1-8 (p. 2).

⁴³ Henry Ansgar Kelly, *The Middle English Bible: A Reassessment* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), pp. 17-30.

⁴⁴ Somerset asserts that the evidence suggests some level of collaboration with the WB translators (*Feeling*, p. 180).

⁴⁵ *Feeling*, p. 187.

I agree wholeheartedly with much of Somerset's analysis, and she draws out a number of aspects of the *Declaracion* that are key to the question of audience. The compiler(s) do indeed dwell often on the nature of truth, and in particular on what it means to speak truthfully: true speakers are held up as examples, while the text also highlights the dangers of false, guileful or hypocritical speech. The question of voice, of 'speaking in the person of' someone else, is also regularly invoked. That Somerset frames the text as something designed to 'teach' these ideas, however, seems to imply that the audience is not expected to understand or be familiar with them already: there is no concrete evidence in support of this. It may be that, rather than 'striv[ing] to teach his readers' about these issues, the compiler(s) were instead gently, if insistently, *reminding* the audience of truths they were assumed to know already. In fact, Somerset acknowledges something similar when she notes that '... words and phrases are repeated and varied across long stretches of the summary, as if we should already know what they mean. Many of them crystallize into full lucidity in the context of a key quotation and its exposition: several of these fuller explanations occur in the Pauline epistles, fewer in the prophets'.⁴⁶ If the main audience of the *Declaracion* were really imagined to be ignorant of the meanings of these crucial words and phrases, then the way in which the text is set out, with explanations coming so late, seems calculated to do little more than test the patience of an unfamiliar reader. Given the focus on patience and learning across the text, this motivation cannot entirely be discounted, but it is undeniable that the *Declaracion* takes a rather inefficient approach to teaching basic concepts, if this is indeed its aim. As Somerset herself notes elsewhere in her analysis, 'this is not a work with any interest in conveying the pastoral

⁴⁶ *Feeling*, p. 183.

essentials'.⁴⁷

Nor does the text as it survives provide any real elucidation of exegetical terms and methods.⁴⁸ This lack of definition extends much further than Somerset suggests. Although literal, moral and allegorical readings are sometimes labelled as such, the exact meaning of exegetical terms is never clearly explained. See for example Tobit 5:

Raphael, þæt shold be gide to 3ong Tobi, seyð to old Tobi, "I am Azari, þe son of greet Anany." Þis was soth after þe interpretacions of þe names; for þe speche of þe auʒgel was figuratyue.

(fol. 29^r)

In one sense, this gloss is useful, as it explains that Raphael essentially has two names, clearing up a source of possible confusion. However, although it identifies the angel's speech as figurative, no attempt is made to define what is meant by this.

When allegorical readings are mentioned, the meaning of the term is sometimes made clearer, albeit implicitly, as the literal and allegorical readings are occasionally included together, as in Isaiah 4:

Seuen wymmēn shal take one man, &c. Lira, as vn to *litteral* sense, seyse here þæt when þe men of Iuda were sleyne, as þe next chapitre bifore telles, þen many wymmēn were *wit*h oute husbandes; & so vij wymmēn soght to haue one man to þeire husband, þæt þey were not bareyne, for þæt hade bene to þe shenship.

As to þe allegori, Seynt Ierome vnderstandes by 7 wymmēn vij giftes of þe holy goste þæt were in Criste fro his concepcon.

(fol. 83^v, ll. 61-66)

⁴⁷ *Feeling*, p. 180. Hudson notes a similar tendency in *GG (Doctors)*, p. cxxxix.

⁴⁸ On the possibility that the text originally had an epilogue, see section 3.1 below.

However, though the text goes on to include another allegorical interpretation from Haymo, it still gives the reader no real idea of how any of these readings fit into the broader exegetical context. Nor does it explicitly explain the difference between the literal and allegorical senses. In fact, it is very rare for the *Declaracion* to mention different types of interpretation in conjunction with one another. Even in the Psalter, which is the most exegetically self-conscious of all the books, and where references to literal and moral readings are relatively common, it is unusual to find the two different senses labelled in the same psalm.⁴⁹ Only Psalm 3 labels three different senses:

As to þe letter, Lira seys þat Dauid made þis psalme for afflictions þat he sufferd when he fled fro Absolon, &c., 2^o Regum 15, &c. [...] After þe glose, as to þe allegori, þe intent of þe prophete here is to confounde þem þat þinken þat God myght not meke hym self to be cum man [...] Moraly, it may be þe voice of ilk feythful persone þat is pursued of vices, whome God delyuers, & smytes down his gostly emmys.

(fol. 36^r)⁵⁰

Once again, no attempt is made here to explain how the three listed senses differ from one another. It might be argued that such definitions would interrupt the flow of the commentary if interpolated at this point, but even in the note at the end of the Psalter, the compiler does not attempt to educate his readers in the basics of exegetical theory:

It is to wit þat in þis declaracion of þe psauter Lira shewes þe littoral sense, & þe glose, þat is þe comyn glose, oþer senses [...] Fforþer more, where þu findest þis worde, Morali, with a shorte shewing of Moral vnderstanding in þe endes of declaracion of psalmes, þat is comynly taken of Lira.

(fol. 68^r)

⁴⁹ Senses are labelled 35 times across the Psalter, but on only four occasions (in Psalm 3, Psalm 58, Psalm 80, and Psalm 85) are two or more different senses named in the same Psalm. See fol. 36^r; fol. 46^v; fol. 52^v; fol. 54^r.

⁵⁰ For more on why three senses are labelled in this psalm and not elsewhere, see Introduction to the Psalter in Part II.

Even here, in a direct address to the reader, the compiler is concerned only with clarifying source relationships, not with defining (or even listing) the senses. Clearly, this note is intended for a reader with at least a reasonable prior knowledge of exegetical methods, and of exegetes.⁵¹ Even its position – at the end of the Psalter rather than at the beginning – is testament to the idea that the compiler was not thinking in terms of immediate accessibility. The note offers clarification for an audience already in the know, not instruction for those with little prior knowledge. In contrast, PWB provides a clear delineation of the senses of scripture that would have been of use to a less educated audience:

But it is to wite þat hooli scripture haþ foure vndurstondyngis: literal, allegorik, moral and anagogik. Þe literal vndurstonðing techiþ þe þing doon in deede, and literal vndurstonðing is ground and foundement of þre gostli vndurstonðingis, in so myche as Austin in his pistle to Vyncent, and oþere doctours, seyn oneli bi þe literal vndurstonðing a man mai argue aȝenus an aduersarie. Allegorik is a gostli vndurstonðing þat techiþ what þing men owen for to bileue of Crist or of hooli chirche. Moral is a goostli vndurstonðing þat techiþ men what vertues þei owen to sue and what vices þei owen to fle. Anagogik is a gostli vndurstonðing þat techiþ men what blisse þei shulen haue in heuene.

(p. 63, ll. 2166-75)

This explanation provides a concise definition for each sense, in plain terms. It also provides the reader with an idea of how the senses relate to one another, and even how they have traditionally been viewed (with the literal sense providing a foundation for the other three ‘gostly’ senses). Directly after the section quoted here, the writer provides an example of how this model can be applied to scripture, by considering the word *Jerusalem* through the lens of each of the four senses (p. 63, ll. 2175-80). In PWB, then, the reader is not only provided with

⁵¹ That Lyra is mentioned without comment suggests that his name was imagined to be already familiar to readers. In fact, as I will demonstrate in the next section, the *Declaracion* compiler(s) seem to have envisaged an audience with knowledge of, and even access to, Lyra’s work.

a clear theoretical explanation of the fourfold division, but also with a practical example. In the same chapter of PWB, the writer also explains in detail the concept of figurative speech in scripture (pp. 63-65, ll. 2191-2255). In comparison, the *Declaracion* provides no useful explanation of exegetical theory or methodology. Rather, it seems to assume a certain level of basic exegetical knowledge.

This is not to say, however, that Somerset is wrong to suggest that some of the text is simple and easily understood. Those books that mainly comprise brief narrative summary seem at first glance to be aimed at a wholly different audience than the more heavily exegetical books, both in terms of content and style. The narrative books tend to comprise a large number of brief sentences or phrases, paratactically arranged and visually distinguished by the frequent use of vergules and paraphs.⁵² This method is particularly rife in the early books of the Old Testament, as for example in Deuteronomy 10 (note that line breaks are used to indicate the position of paraphs):

Of þe second tabuls of stone *in* which þe præcepts were writen, *Exodus* 34, & how þey were leyde *in* þe arke of þe Lord.

Of remoyng of *tentes*.

Of þe deth of Aaron, &c., *Numeri* 20.

Of þe Leuites ministring to þe Lord, not hafeand *parte with* oþer kynredes, *Numeri* 18.

What askes þe Lord of þe bot drede & luf, &c.

Of *circumcision* of þe hert, &c.

Of þe iust dome of God.

Luf ʒe *straunge men*, &c.

Suere þu *in* þe name of þe Lord

Of þe multiplicacion of þe childre of Israel like þe sterres of heuen.

(fol. 9^v)

On the surface, this example might seem to support the assertion that the *Declaracion* was

⁵² This paratactical style is noted by Pouzet (p. 104).

intended to appeal to Somerset's 'wider range of readers',⁵³ and even to those with 'little formal schooling'.⁵⁴ The language is simple, and the list-like structure is very easy to follow.⁵⁵ However, the phrase 'circumcision of the hert' (Deut 10. 16) complicates the picture. That this opaque phrase is included here, alongside more straightforward narrative summary, and with no explanation or gloss, seems to suggest that the reader is assumed to understand it already. For a reader familiar with the biblical text, this would present no difficulty, as the concept is discussed a number of times in scripture, most fully in Romans 2. 25-28. It seems unreasonable, however, to assume that an audience with 'little formal schooling' could have understood the phrase immediately.

In fact, the situation for readers with 'little formal schooling' would have been further complicated by the way in which the text is copied: it employs a range of abbreviation marks familiar from medieval Latin manuscripts, indicating letters and letter combinations such as *e*, *er*, *es*, *is*, *m*, *n*, *or*, *our*, *ous*, *par*, *per*, *pre*, *re*, *ter*, *tre* and *us*, and words such as *Dauid*, *Ierusalem*, *Israel* and *Iesus*. These abbreviation marks, together with the sprinkling of Latin which is included in the text,⁵⁶ suggest an initial readership comfortable with Latin and its scribal conventions. Altogether, then, it seems that the initial intended audience for the *Declaracion* would have had a relatively high level of education.⁵⁷ It is conceivable that the text could have been used by such men in the preparation of so-called 'cursory lectures' (that is, lectures on the bible that consisted of 'a literal exposition or outline of the main points of a text', delivered by a bachelor as part of his Master's degree). However, the unevenness and

⁵³ *Feeling*, p. 184.

⁵⁴ *Feeling*, p. 187.

⁵⁵ See Chapter 4.

⁵⁶ See Chapter 1.

⁵⁷ Ghosh suggests that the audience for the EV translations of Jerome's Old Testament prefaces must have been similarly learned: see 'The Prologues', pp. 180-81.

lack of attribution in the *Declaracion* make such a use unlikely, and it is to be noted that bachelors were required only to lecture on a single book of the Old and New Testament, not the whole of scripture.⁵⁸ The fact that the text proceeds chronologically through scripture, and that it does not habitually include biblical quotations and regularly provides only a smattering of glosses makes it even more unlikely that the work was intended to aid priests in sermon-writing. Here, alphabetical *distinctiones* would have been far more useful.⁵⁹ It is more likely, then, that for a learned audience the *Declaracion* had no specific purpose, but was rather designed, in a general way, to provide a digest of scripture and exegesis.

Of course, the sort of people mentioned by Somerset may have accessed the *Declaracion* in a mediated form, perhaps not as readers but as listeners. The text could have been worked through, possibly in order, by a small group, with a more educated leader to elucidate difficult phrases or passages. Such study has been posited as a key feature of Wycliffite teaching, and may help to explain tonal variation in *EWS*.⁶⁰ It could also at least partly account for the variation in complexity and methodology across the *Declaracion*, allowing for audience members with different educational backgrounds. If the text were read chronologically, it would even allow less experienced audience members to gain confidence by introducing them first to a simple narrative account with a smattering of interpolated exegesis, before moving on to the more heavily exegetical books from Job onwards. If the teacher in

⁵⁸ J. I. Catto, 'Wyclif and Wycliffism at Oxford, 1356-1430', in *The History of the University of Oxford*, ed. by T. H. Aston and others, 8 vols (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984-), II: *Late Medieval Oxford*, ed. by J. I. Catto and Ralph Evans (1992), pp. 175-261 (p. 196).

⁵⁹ H. L. Spencer, 'Sermon Literature', in *Middle English Prose*, ed. by Edwards, pp. 151-74 (pp. 163-64).

⁶⁰ See Hudson, *PR*, pp. 180-200; *EWS*, IV (1996), ed. by Pamela Gradon, pp. 35-36; Kantik Ghosh, *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and the Interpretation of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 112-13; Michael Kuczynski, 'The Psalms and Social Action in Late Medieval England', in *The Place of the Psalms in the Intellectual Culture of the Middle Ages*, ed. by Nancy Van Deusen (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999), pp. 191-214 (pp. 205-06); Rita Copeland, *Pedagogy, Intellectuals and Dissent in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 127.

such a scenario were skilled and knowledgeable enough, the text could have formed the basis of an extensive scriptural and exegetical education for a lay audience. It is easy to imagine that the original compiler(s) may have had this sort of group study in mind when working on the text.

Michael Kuczynski imagines such a scenario with regard to the glossed WB Psalter MS Bodley 554.⁶¹

It is possible, then, to imagine for the *Declaracion* a dual audience, and a dual purpose. The text might have been intended both to aid more experienced scholars by providing them with a portable digest of scripture and exegesis, aimed primarily at reminding them of what they already knew, and also to facilitate the teaching of less educated people, who would encounter the text primarily mediated through their teacher. However, it seems very unlikely that uneducated lay people were ever intended to be the primary audience for the *Declaracion*, particularly as it is copied in T93. Although some books would have been at least largely intelligible to a less educated audience, these books may have been included in the *Declaracion* largely out of a desire for completeness. The majority of the text is taken up with much more complex, heavily exegetical material, clearly written for a scholarly audience. It is to such material that I turn now.

While the text may sometimes be written simply, and may occasionally include glosses that seem superfluous for a scholarly audience, in general the compiler(s) explore the complexity of the biblical text, and do not shy away from presenting scriptural polyvalence and even exegetical uncertainties.⁶² Perhaps the most complex example of this kind occurs in

⁶¹ Kuczynski, 'Social Action', pp. 205-06.

⁶² Such inconsistency is not unusual in lollard texts. Kantik Ghosh notes that, in *EWS*, 'the tonal variation is great: occasionally, the sermons seem to assume a fairly learned audience and therefore include logical references and recondite academic jokes; at other times, the audience visualised seems to have been secular and lay, one which would sympathise with the denigration of academics and the mockery directed against clerical pretensions.' (*Wycliffite Heresy*, p. 112). For more on the presentation of polyvalence and uncertainty in the *Declaracion*, see Chapter 5.

Obadiah 1:

Sauyours shold sty, &c. Þat is, Esdras & Neemy, or Machabeis as *sum* sey, &c.
 Or elles þis last parte fro þat place, and saluacion shal be, after Lira mey better be
 vnderstanden of þe tyme of Criste to þe letter, þat oft prechid *in* þe hil of Syon, &c.
 Which *prophecie* as Seynt Ierom seys is after þe gostly vnderstanding moste certainly
 fulfilled in Cristes chirch þat is þe rewme of þe Lord.

(fol. 141^r)

Here, the compiler sets out three different interpretations of the literal sense: first that the ‘sauyours’ might be Ezra and Nehemiah; then that they may instead be the Maccabees; and finally, that the lemma refers instead to the time of Christ, and his preaching on the hill of Syon.⁶³ Finally, the compiler includes a single spiritual interpretation, attributed to St Jerome.⁶⁴ The compiler provides no guidance to suggest which is the best of the three literal interpretations. Rather, the reader is trusted to weigh all of them independently.⁶⁵ This trust is perhaps most in evidence in 1 Corinthians 11, where, as David Fowler notes, the compiler leaves the reader to ‘decide for himself whether Paul is being ironical or not’: ‘Paul preyses þem for þey kepted his comandements, or elles he spekes yronice, blamyng þem þat kept hem not’ (fol. 174^r).⁶⁶ In this instance, the reader is trusted to be able to choose between two directly opposing views of the sacred text. This is clear evidence that the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion*

⁶³ In fact, all three interpretations are from L4/1915:6-7. On Lira’s habit of presenting multiple interpretations, see Leslie Smith, ‘Uncertainty in the Study of the Bible’, in *Uncertain Knowledge: Scepticism, Relativism, and Doubt in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Dallas G. Denery, Kantik Ghosh and Nicolette Zeeman (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), pp. 135-59 (pp. 141-45). On hermeneutic uncertainty in Wycliffite writing, see Kantik Ghosh, ‘“And so it is licy to men”: Probabilism and Hermeneutics in Wycliffite Discourse’, *The Review of English Studies*, 70.295 (2019), 418-36.

⁶⁴ A similar interpretation is given in L4/1915:7, though it is not attributed to Jerome in either the Venice 1603 or the Strassbourg 1492 edition. The *Glossa* contains no gloss of this kind attributed to Jerome at this point. For the likely ultimate source of the gloss see Jerome, *Commentarium in Abdiam*, PL25/1114-1116D.

⁶⁵ On the possibility of multiple literal senses in a given scriptural passage, see Ian Christopher Levy, ‘The Literal Sense of Scripture and the Search for Truth in the Late Middle Ages’, *Revue d’Histoire Ecclésiastique* (2009), 104.3-4, 783-827 (p. 785).

⁶⁶ Fowler, ‘Commentary’, p. 76.

were well aware of the complexity of biblical exegesis, and intellectually honest enough not to attempt to provide a definite answer to every exegetical problem. It also suggests that they had faith in the ability of their audience to think deeply and do some of the intellectual and spiritual work for themselves.⁶⁷

There is also clear evidence that the initial audience of the *Declaracion* was expected to be able to access the full biblical text with relative ease. The clearest evidence of this is in those books which contain a large proportion of exegetical material. Presumably for the sake of brevity, and unlike *CG*, for example, the *Declaracion* does not quote full biblical passages. Rather, it includes only the opening lemma of a given passage, almost always ending ‘&c.’, and sometimes preceded by the phrase ‘after þere’ to suggest that the commentary that follows refers not only to the lemma itself, but to a longer section of scripture of which the lemma is the opening.⁶⁸ In order fully to understand the commentary, therefore, the reader would need to have access to the full text of scripture, either in the Vulgate or, more helpfully, WB. In fact, in the vast majority of cases underlined lemmata are not long enough to be intelligible without such access, and in many cases they are only a word or two long.⁶⁹ The lemmata represent either prompts to memory (see below) or finding aids for use alongside the biblical text.

It also seems that the compiler(s) expected their initial audience to be able to access more detailed exegetical works to supplement their study. The *Declaracion* contains just three apparently original notes addressed directly to the reader: it has already been suggested in this chapter that the note appended to the *Declaracion* Psalter seems to address an audience with a good deal of basic exegetical knowledge.⁷⁰ The note immediately before Job Chapter 3, which

⁶⁷ See Chapter 5.

⁶⁸ The phrase ‘after þere’ is used habitually in Job, occasionally in the Psalter, and once in Ephesians 1 (fol. 184^r).

⁶⁹ See for example Job 21: ‘How oft’ (fol. 33^v); Psalm 46: ‘God steghed’ (fol. 44^r); Amos 5: ‘perauenture’ (fol. 139^v); Hebrews 8: ‘lawes’ (fol. 193^v).

⁷⁰ The Psalter note is also discussed in Chapter 5, and in the Introduction to the Psalter in Part II.

will be discussed in Chapter 4, displays the same recognition of biblical polysemy as the examples discussed above, while also focusing on the thorny question of voice in the scriptural text: again, this is not a note addressed to an uneducated readership. Most revealing on the question of readership, however, is the note at the very end of *Declaracion* Ezekiel:

To vnderstand fro þe xl chapitʀe of Ezechiel to þe ende of his boke as to litteral sense of þe ymaginari vision, it is gode to se or to haue þe figure þat Doctor de Lira hace descryued [drawn] in his writing vp on Ezechiel, ffor it is a ful hard processe to vnderstand.

(fol. 130^r)

This piece of evidence has not garnered previous scholarly attention, but it is of crucial importance to any attempt to understand who the compiler(s) envisaged their readership to be, and how they understood and reconciled themselves to the limitations of their own work.⁷¹ The ‘figure’ to which the note refers is the detailed diagram of the temple interior included by Lyra as part of his commentary on Ezekiel 40, possibly alongside another in the commentary on the same chapter.⁷² An examination of manuscripts containing the relevant section of *LPL*, produced at around the same time as the *Declaracion* and now held in Oxford, suggests that these diagrams were viewed as integral, even if occasionally, as in the case of the copy produced for Merton College library c. 1400 (now Oxford, Merton College MSS 163-165), the diagrams were never actually completed: this set contains empty spaces where the diagrams ought to be.⁷³ Of twenty-four manuscripts containing works by Lyra in the Bodleian’s online

⁷¹ Beyond noting where the figure would be found in Lyra, Reilly makes no comment on the note (see Reilly, p. 537).

⁷² L4/1401-04. Lyra includes several other diagrams towards the end of Ezekiel 40 that might have been useful: see in particular the very detailed diagram in Chapter 41 (L4/1409-10).

⁷³ For example, a whole folio, fol. 234^r, is left blank at the end of Ezekiel 40 in Merton 164. This folio was presumably intended to contain a large diagram. Similar gaps are left at other points in the same manuscript, particularly in the last several chapters of Ezekiel, but also in the opening volume of the set, Merton 163, for example after Numbers 3 (fol. 103^r). At least one diagram has been filled in: see Merton 163, 3 Kings 6 (fol. 208^r). Another contemporary Lyra manuscript now held at the Bodleian, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawl G.

catalogue, only two include his commentary on Ezekiel. Of these, both include the diagrams on Ezekiel 40.⁷⁴ The diagrams are also found in a fascinating English manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 156, which contains the diagrams from *LPL* without the text.⁷⁵ This early fifteenth-century example demonstrates that the reader wanting to consult Lyra's diagrams need not necessarily have had access to his whole commentary, although the wording of the above note ('descryued in his writing vp on Ezechiel') suggests that the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion* envisaged that they would.

The note, then, demonstrates that the compiler of *Declaracion* Ezekiel hoped his readers would have access to a full copy of Lyra's commentary on the same book. The casual way in which he suggests that readers should look at the diagram implies that he sees no great difficulty in their finding and accessing it. The suggestion is that the compiler's imagined audience is one of learning. T93 (and the *Declaracion* more broadly) is either intended to be owned by someone with a reasonably impressive library of their own, or by someone with easy access to an institutional library, either in a university setting or potentially in a monastic context. Given that the manuscript was likely the product of an academic community in Oxford, access to a college or university library is more probable. All of this evidence suggests that the compiler(s) and the intended initial readership were part of a relatively homogenous group: the academic community in Oxford around the turn of the fifteenth century, even if the text might also have been used to facilitate group study with a wider audience. The next section will

164, also includes spaces, presumably for diagrams (see for example Numbers 3, fol. 127^v).

⁷⁴ These are Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 152 (fols 223^r-225^v) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Canon. Bibl. Lat. 70 (fols 153^r-158^v). The diagrams are also contained in Oxford, New College, MS 11, part of a five volume set of *LPL* (fols 197^v-201^r). Diagrams are found at other points in manuscripts that do not contain Ezekiel, as in the late-fourteenth century copy of the *Postilla* on Genesis-Ecclesiasticus, now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 251, which includes diagrams for example in 3 Kings 6 (fol. 150^r) and Exodus 25 (fol. 49^r).

⁷⁵ See fols 5^r-15^r. The diagrams from Ezekiel 40 and 41 are found on fols 10^r-12^v. Alongside the diagrams, the manuscript contains a table of quaestiones in Lyra (fols 2^r-3^r), together with William Norton's *Tabula super doctorem de Lyra* (an alphabetical index to topics in the *Postilla*, fols 16^r-60^r), and assorted other diagrams on religious material.

examine other evidence related to the intended purpose of the *Declaracion*, before considering physical evidence of use.

3. Purpose and Use

Previous scholars have advanced a number of theories related to the purpose of the *Declaracion*, though these may be said to obscure rather than to elucidate the matter. Having (rightly) rejected the ‘very attractive’ hypothesis that the *Declaracion* may have been ‘used as a ready-reference tool by the initial translators’ of WB because of the text’s similarities to LV, Reilly offers no further discussion of what its purpose might actually have been.⁷⁶ James Morey, meanwhile, asserts that ‘it is hard to imagine a suitable purpose for such an extensive summary’.⁷⁷ In the analysis that follows, he expands on Reilly’s rejection of his own theory, but helpfully offers some new suggestions:

Such a summary, obviously enough, is useful only to someone who knows the particulars already, and it could conceivably serve to refresh memories or to facilitate an answer to questions such as “what does the rainbow mean?” or “who saw Noah drunk and naked?” It may also be another attempt to produce a more easily accessible digest of main points, like the one in PCE⁷⁸ or like the fifteen-chapter prologue to the later Wycliffite version of the Old Testament.⁷⁹

Each of these suggestions has merit. However, some of Morey’s assumptions need to be examined in more detail. Morey’s suggestion that the *Declaracion* might be of use in providing answers to biblical questions is at odds with his earlier statement that the text would only be

⁷⁶ Reilly, p. xviii.

⁷⁷ *Book and Verse*, p. 111.

⁷⁸ This is Morey’s abbreviation for what he calls the ‘Pauline and Catholic Epistles’, more commonly known as *A Fourteenth Century English Biblical Version*, ed. by Anna C. Paues (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904). It is to be noted that the version edited by Paues is not a summary of the type found in PWB, but rather a collection of excerpts translated from the Vulgate into English.

⁷⁹ *Book and Verse*, p. 111.

useful to someone who knows scripture already, particularly since the questions he chooses are rather basic. His suggestion that the text is meant to ‘refresh memories’ is interesting, and will be dealt with in more detail below. The idea that the text represented an attempt to facilitate access to the main points of scripture is in one sense inarguable, although it fails to recognise the lack of basic information in the text (neither the ten commandments nor the Beatitudes are listed, for example).⁸⁰ Like the rest of Morey’s analysis, the ‘digest’ theory also does not take into account the vast amount of exegetical material that is a key feature of most *Declaracion* books past Esther. This focus on the summary aspects of the *Declaracion* is unsurprising given the subject of Morey’s study, but is nevertheless misleading: any attempt to understand how the text was expected to be used must take into account the whole work, and the vastly different elements it contains. These elements will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 4 and 5, but for now it is important to note that the inclusion of commentary, some of which is quite complex, and nearly all of which is not visually distinguished from the summary elements of the text, strengthens the hypothesis that the *Declaracion* was designed initially for experienced scholars.

3.1 Statements of Purpose in Bible Summaries and Commentaries

How might such an audience have used the *Declaracion*? Frustratingly, the text never explicitly states its aims. The manuscript as it survives today contains no prologue, and given that the main text begins on the first folio of the opening quire, it seems unlikely that one was included at all, unless it was appended to the text and lost with the final quire(s). The placement of the notes addressed to the reader at the end of Ezekiel and especially at the end of the Psalter

⁸⁰ See Somerset, *Feeling*, p. 180.

suggest that this theory cannot be discounted, and such material is found in other manuscripts at the end of a text rather than the beginning.⁸¹ It is also possible, of course, that the original text included a preface that was not copied into T93 for whatever reason, though given the general care of the scribe and the meticulous provision of finding aids to help the reader, this is on balance improbable. Faced with such a lack of written evidence, it seems reasonable to turn to the writings of some other bible paraphrasers and commentators, to see whether they might provide any hypotheses that could be tested against our text. Of course, this approach must be treated cautiously: the summaries examined here were written in Latin verse, while the commentaries, though written in the vernacular, are not exactly analogous to the *Declaracion*. All the texts discussed here were written in different contexts and by different men, each of whom had his own agenda. The examples used will be merely a starting point for an examination of the possible purpose of the *Declaracion*.

In an article examining five Latin verse paraphrases written in England and on the European continent between the early twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, Greti Dinkova-Bruun notes that all the works begin with a prologue, in verse or prose, setting out the author's intentions, and promoting the usefulness of the text.⁸² Of the five texts examined in the article, I will focus only on the three that are likely to have been circulating in England at the time the *Declaracion* was written: Lawrence of Durham's *Hypognosticon* (c. 1130); Alexander of Ashby's *Brevisissima comprehensio historiarum* (c. 1200); and Peter Riga's *Aurora* (c. 1180-1200).⁸³ In addition, I have examined several prologues and epilogues attached to vernacular

⁸¹ See for example 'Epilogue to Intermediate/Long Matthew' in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. lxiv-lxv and pp. 180-83.

⁸² Dinkova-Bruun, 'Rewriting', p. 265.

⁸³ 'Rewriting', p. 265, n. 10, n. 12 and n. 13. See also Mary Liguori Mistretta, 'The Hypognosticon of Lawrence of Durham: A Preliminary Text with an Introduction' (unpublished PhD thesis, Fordham University, 1941), p. 61; Greti Dinkova-Bruun, 'Verse Epigrams Added to Peter Riga's *Aurora* from Olomouc', *Sacris Erudiri*, 55 (2016), 391-418 (p. 391).

bible commentaries produced at around the same time as the *Declaracion*.⁸⁴ In summarising and/or expounding the biblical text, the writers of these prologues express the following aims: to assist students in their learning (partly by ensuring that readers do not become bored); to help with memorisation of the biblical text; to improve their readers and ultimately save souls; and to guide readers in scriptural meaning by providing accessible exegesis.

As noted above, the *Declaracion* does not seem to have been written in the first instance for those wishing to learn the basics of scripture, although it is easy to see that in a group setting such as the one imagined above, the text's brevity would have been helpful to some students. However, the text has a tendency to be repetitive, not only in its content, but also in its style: virtually no effort seems to have been made to include any stylistic flourishes or to make the writing interesting in and of itself. This suggests that the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion* assumed that their readers would be compelled to read (or listen) despite the lack of emotional or literary interest. Of course, it is also probable that literary tastes have changed markedly since the text was written; it might have been more consistently compelling to its original audience than it is to a modern reader.

In terms of aiding memorisation, the *Declaracion* is an interesting case. The writers studied by Dinkova-Bruun suggest two ways in which their works might aid memorisation of the biblical text. Alexander of Ashby suggests that understanding scripture is key to remembering it.⁸⁵ By this logic, the *Declaracion* might certainly be said to have a mnemonic function, as it provides so much exegetical material. Unlike the verse paraphrases, however, the text does not seem to have been written in such a way as to aid memorisation by rote. Its length,

⁸⁴ The prologues examined for this section are the texts edited as 'Glossed Gospel Prologues and Epilogue' in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 172-86. I also include the Prologues to non-Wycliffite commentaries on the Gospels edited by Andrew Kraebel: see 'Glosses', pp. 109-23.

⁸⁵ Dinkova-Bruun, 'The Verse Bible as Aide-Mémoire', in *The Making of Memory in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Lucie Doležalová (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2010), pp. 115-31 (p. 117).

its methodological variety, and the fact that it is written in prose immediately suggest that it was not meant to be learnt by heart.⁸⁶ It also does not consistently contain the sort of vivid mental images favoured for example in *Hypognosticon*, which were thought to be crucial in aiding memorisation in the Middle Ages.⁸⁷ Compare for example LV Isaiah 1. 21-23 with the relevant section of the *Declaracion*:

LV: Hou is the feithful citee ful of dom maad an hoore? Riztfulnesse dwellide ther ynne; but now menquelleris dwellen ther ynne. Thi siluer is turned in to dros, ether filthe; thi wyn is medlid with watir. Thi princes ben vnfeithful, the felowis of theuys...

D: How Iewes, þat sum tyme were feythful, were turned to syn, & þeire princes in to felowes of þeues...⁸⁸

The metaphors in the LV text are visceral: just the sort of images that were thought to adhere most readily to the memory.⁸⁹ By comparison the *Declaracion* is efficient, but unmemorable. Though it is easy to see why the *Declaracion* compiler(s) decided to omit the metaphors – especially because at least one LV copy, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius E.2, suggests they were felt to require extensive glossing – the omission still makes for a blander and more forgettable text. This is not to say, of course, that such imagery is never present in the *Declaracion*. Striking images are included, particularly in the narrative books of the Old Testament, which provide a litany of gory incidents from which the *Declaracion* compiler(s) select a few.⁹⁰ Nevertheless, it is safe to assume that the compiler(s) did not choose material in

⁸⁶ On the relative mnemonic properties of poetry and prose, see Dinkova-Bruun, ‘The Verse Bible’, p. 116.

⁸⁷ See Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 19; Frances A. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966), pp. 1-19.

⁸⁸ Isaiah 1, fol. 82^v, ll. 21-22.

⁸⁹ Yates, pp. 9-10 and p. 104.

⁹⁰ See for example *Declaracion* 1 Kings 5, which records both that ‘þe men of Azotus were peyned in þe priue parte of þeir buttocks’, and also that, as the ark was moved by the Philistines ‘þe folk of ich cite were smyten: þe lawer entreiles of þem were smyten roten & cam oute, &c.’ (fol. 14^r).

order to make their text memorable, at least on a surface level.

It does seem, however, that the *Declaracion* was at times intended to fulfil a mnemonic function. Rather than aiding memorisation, though, the text seems designed to aid recall. Thus, the many partial verses ending ‘&c.’ that are scattered through the text may be designed as a prompt to readers who know the full verse.⁹¹ A similar function might have been performed on the many occasions where the text draws attention to a list in the scriptural text, but without listing the items themselves, as for example in Exodus 20: ‘Here is gyuen þe lawe of ten comandements’ (fol. 4^r) or 3 Kings 8: ‘þe preyer of Salomon þat contenes vij petitions’ (fol. 17^v).⁹² The *Declaracion* also habitually provides only one side of an exchange (typically giving the question but not the answer), as for example in 4 Kings 20: ‘þe King of Babilon send messengeres *wit*h letters & giftes to Ezechi, and he shewed to þem his tresours, &c., wherefore Isay blamed hym & prophecied of þe translacion in to Babilon. Of þe meke ansuere of Ezechi, &c.’ (fol. 21^r).⁹³ Again, this seems designed not only to save space but also to provide a prompt to an already knowledgeable audience.

It is highly likely that the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion* hoped it would have an improving effect and help to save souls. While it is not as overtly moralistic as the bible summary contained in PWB, for example, it does often seem intended to provide the audience with models of how to live. The Psalter, in particular, engages a very practical mode of exegesis, often complete with a moral interpretation, wherein the audience is encouraged to be penitent for past sins, to obey Christ, and ‘nought to lif beestly’ in the future (Psalm 31, fol. 41^v, l. 22).⁹⁴

⁹¹ For a concentrated example of this phenomenon, see Luke 6, ll. 67–69. Of course, this practice of including partial verses reaches its zenith in Song of Songs, though it is possible that in that book it had a devotional purpose. For more on this theory, see Chapter 4.

⁹² For more on this, see the Introduction to the Gospels in Part II.

⁹³ This phenomenon is particularly common in the Gospels: see Introduction to the Gospels in Part II.

⁹⁴ See also Psalm 2, fol. 36^r.

More subtly, the text models appropriate behaviours by drawing out certain themes: patience in the face of persecution; the importance of ‘true penance’ and of ‘true belief’ more generally; the relative inefficacy of ritual; how to speak effectively, and when to keep silent; the importance of studying the gospel. These thematic concerns will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, but it is easy to see how the compiler(s) of such a text might have intended it to help save souls.

Of course, the provision of exegesis would also have been key to guiding the audience on the path to salvation. The *Declaracion* was clearly intended to make exegesis more accessible, both through careful selection and condensation of material from longer commentaries (the method used in the Latin verse paraphrases as well as the vernacular commentaries), and, crucially, by translating commentary material out of Latin and into English. However, as the discussion above demonstrates, even here the picture is not straightforward, since, instead of consistently guiding the audience to the ‘correct’ reading, the compiler(s) regularly refuse to take a firm stance on the interpretation of thorny passages. In addition, the ways in which the compiler(s) go about selecting and including exegetical material are varied across the manuscript and by no means transparent; the lack of attribution means that it is not always possible to distinguish scriptural material from exegesis.⁹⁵

While it is impossible, then, to know what purpose the *Declaracion* compiler(s) envisaged for the text, it is easy to imagine that it was meant to perform some of the same functions listed in prologues to other bible summaries and commentaries. While it was probably not intended to aid rote memorisation of biblical incidents, it is easy to see how it would have served as a prompt to recall, both for a very knowledgeable scholarly audience and

⁹⁵ See Chapters 4 and 5.

also, sometimes, for an audience less familiar with scripture. As a digest of scripture and exegesis, it would have been a practical study aid for both its immediate audience of scholars (who would presumably have valued the exegetical elements, and would have had access to its main sources to facilitate further study) and for less educated lay people (or clergy) in a group study scenario.⁹⁶ As well as teaching the bare narrative of scripture, and giving the audience (limited) access to the words of the bible in the vernacular, the text seems designed also to convey scriptural meaning, to demonstrate the complexities of exegesis, and to model Christian behaviour.

3.2 Physical evidence and Use

I have so far considered primarily the characteristics of the *Declaracion* as a text. What can the physical makeup of the manuscript, T93, tell us about the way in which it was intended to be used, and how it actually was (or was not) used?

The most striking aspect of T93 in this regard is its size. Measuring 204 x 140mm, and with 200 folios, the manuscript as it survives is portable and easy to handle. Ralph Hanna lists T93 as one of a large group of WB manuscripts that measure ‘about 200mm high’, though in doing so he obscures the fact that the manuscript has been cut down on all four margins, and would originally have been somewhat larger.⁹⁷ Nevertheless, given the production values of the manuscript it is difficult to imagine that it would have had very large margins to begin with. It seems reasonable to assume, therefore, that though it was originally bigger than it is now, in all dimensions (since it has also lost a number of folios), it would still have been ‘portable [and]

⁹⁶ For more on the idea that the *Declaracion* might have been intended to improve clerical knowledge of scripture, see Chapter 3.

⁹⁷ ‘Palaeography’, p. 252. Hanna lists the manuscript as ‘TCO 93’.

capable of being consulted in one hand'.⁹⁸ This was not a large display copy, but a compact, practical volume for personal study, or study in a small group setting. The size might also suggest that it was intended to be carried around and shared with different communities of believers, in order to spread lollard scholarship (and perhaps lollard thought) outside of Oxford.⁹⁹ Its relatively humble production values would have kept the cost down, placing it more easily within the reach of individual scholars and parish priests (few of whom would have had personal possession of a complete bible).¹⁰⁰ Those decorative features it has (coloured chapter initials and paraphs) seem primarily designed to fulfil a practical function. The evidence suggests that the manuscript was primarily functional, and had been produced as efficiently as possible.

3.4 Marginalia

The marginalia of T93 have never before been studied in any depth.¹⁰¹ Medieval marginalia will be discussed in the next chapter. This section focuses instead on the copious early modern marginalia. In his brief survey of T93, N.R. Ker states that '[a] miserable sixteenth-century scribbler has dirtied at least one margin on almost every page, but all he tells us, again and again, is that the book was his and that his name was Thomas Shawe'. Shawe's marks are indeed the most frequent in the manuscript, and often concerned with the question of ownership, but he is far from the only person to have written in the margins. I will return to Shawe, but first it

⁹⁸ Hanna, 'Palaeography', p. 252.

⁹⁹ On the peripatetic nature of many early lollards and the spread of Wycliffite ideas, see Hudson, *Selections*, pp. 7-10; Hudson, 'Wycliffism in Oxford, 1381-1411', in *Wyclif in his Times*, ed. Kenny, pp. 67-84 (pp. 74-75); 'Introduction', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, ed. and trans by J. Patrick Hornbeck, Stephen E. Lahey and Fiona Somerset (New York and Mahwah: Paulist Press, 2013), p. 33.

¹⁰⁰ Margaret Aston, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London: Hambledon Press, 1984), pp. 200-01 and p. 109.

¹⁰¹ See Ker, 'Summary', p. 116; Solopova, *Manuscripts*, p. 276.

will be instructive to provide a quick survey of the variety of marginalia preserved in the manuscript as a whole.

The vast majority of reader marks in T93 are of a type that might be termed ‘graffiti’: they are generally short and completely unrelated to the text itself.¹⁰² Many are now incomplete, having been mutilated when the book was cut down.¹⁰³ Most are written in English, and in secretary hands, but some incorporate brief Latin phrases (see for example fol. 112^r; fol. 154^r), and there are occasionally more formal, set hands. The marginalia include practice alphabets and unconnected words, but also more substantial notes. While these notes are never directly connected to the text, they do sometimes suggest a certain religious engagement, however formulaic.¹⁰⁴ On fol. 29^v, a sixteenth-century reader has noted down a snippet from Thomas Tallis’s 1565 work ‘O Lord in the is all my truste’, while on fol. 112^r a damaged prayer is written upside-down in the bottom margin. On other occasions, the graffiti are more secular: fol. 65^v contains an aphorism on the importance of money, which is repeated on the following page. Two of the marginalia also contain thankful references to parents (fol. 34^v, fol. 158^r): of these, it is possible that the latter is the draft of the opening to a letter, where

¹⁰² This point has been made more fully with regard to Early Modern books: see William H. Sherman, *Used Books* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); Juliet Fleming, *Graffiti and the Writing Arts of Early Modern England* (London: Reaktion Books, 2001); Heidi Brayman Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender, and Literacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Jason Scott-Warren, ‘Reading Graffiti in the Early Modern Book’, *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 73.3 (September 2010), 363–81. For similar marginalia in medieval manuscripts, see Carl James Grindley, ‘Reading *Piers Plowman* C-Text Annotations: Notes toward the Classification of Printed and Written Marginalia in Texts from the British Isles, 1300–1641’, in *The Medieval Professional Reader at Work: Evidence from Manuscripts of Chaucer, Langland, Kempe, and Gower*, ed. by Kathryn Kerby-Fulton and Maidie Hilmo (Victoria, B.C.: ELS University of Victoria, 2001), pp. 73–141.

¹⁰³ Monique Hulvey notes that early printed books were often cut down deliberately in the nineteenth century to get rid of ‘all the “mutilating” marks’ of readers. See ‘Not so Marginal: Manuscript Annotations in the Folger Incunabula’, *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 92.2 (June 1998), 159–76 (pp. 160–61). A similar impulse might have been behind the cropping of marginalia in T93, suggesting that the damage may have been done when the book was rebound in 1808.

¹⁰⁴ It is not unusual for early modern readers to make marginal notes that bear ‘no discernible relationship whatsoever to the texts they accompany’: see Sherman, *Used Books*, pp. 15–16. Elaine Whitaker thinks of such marginalia as ‘avoidance’: see ‘A Collaboration of Readers: Categorization of the Annotations in Copies of Caxton’s *Royal Book*’, *Text*, 7 (1994), 233–42 (p. 235).

the writer sends his mother and father ‘my hartey Commante dacions’. All of these graffiti are of the type discussed by Heidi Brayman Hackel, who notes that early modern marginalia consist of ‘fragments of verse, lists of clothing, enigmatic phrases...’ She also notes that ‘sassy records of ownership’ are common, and it is to such records that I will turn now.¹⁰⁵

At least fourteen different names are discernible in the margins of T93, though not all of these are in different hands: fols 183^v-184^r contain a list of six names (of which two are repeated), which seems to be the work of a single scribe. Fol. 184^r also contains a record of ownership giving the names of two further men. Ownership is the question with which most of these graffiti are concerned: though some of the names recorded in the margins are undoubtedly those of owners, many seem to be witnesses to that ownership. In the example cited above, the list of names might well be witnesses to the ownership of a man called George Miles (the writing is very worn, and illegible in places, but it is possible to see that it deals with the ownership question, and that at least one of the other names recorded on the page is acting as a witness).¹⁰⁶

Of all the names recorded in the manuscript, two stand out. The first, as Ker suggests, is Thomas Shawe. Though Ker is wrong to suggest that Shawe was the only owner to have written in the book, his is certainly the name most frequently recorded, and the bottom margins are plastered with his statements of ownership. Though his spelling varies, these often take the exact same form: the phrase ‘Iest liber pertine – bere it will in mynde – ad me, Thoms Shawe so curtes and so kinde...’ occurs on at least five folios, mainly concentrated at the end of the

¹⁰⁵ She is quoted in Scott-Warren, ‘Reading Graffiti’, pp. 364–65.

¹⁰⁶ It is possible that this was the same George Miles who gained an MA from St Edmund Hall in 1623 and went on to serve as a rector in Hertfordshire and Sussex. If so, it might suggest that the manuscript was still in Oxford in the early seventeenth century. However, the name is not unusual enough to allow anything other than conjecture on this point, and the other names listed near Miles’s cannot be located in *Alumni Oxonienses* around a similar date. For Miles, see *Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714*, ed. by Joseph Foster, 4 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1891), III, p. 1012.

manuscript.¹⁰⁷ On other occasions, the phrase is present but incomplete, either because of damage or sometimes apparently because Shawe lost interest halfway through writing.¹⁰⁸ Many other folios bear a similar phrase in English.¹⁰⁹ On other occasions Shawe simply records his name (or part of it).¹¹⁰ Putting all of these occasions together, it seems that he felt compelled to claim ownership of the manuscript around twenty times (more may of course have been cut off when the manuscript was rebound). On one occasion, he invites his ‘preves’ (intimate friends) to witness his ownership.¹¹¹ Such enthusiasm is unusual, but not unheard of in early modern readers.¹¹² Unfortunately, his common name has made it impossible to trace any concrete information about Thomas Shawe.¹¹³

The other owner to have made a significant impression on the manuscript seems to have been a friend of Shawe’s. Fol. 60^v contains a note in the bottom margin, stating that:

This is William Daunce booke Recyrd / of Thomas Shawe and of many more /
of his felowes I beare wytness to the / same william Daunce is my nam

This indicates that, at some point, the book passed from Shawe to Daunce (or vice-versa).¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁷ fol. 41^v, fol. 136^r, fol. 164^r, fol. 189^v, fol. 197^v.

¹⁰⁸ For an example of the latter type, see fol. 198^v.

¹⁰⁹ See for example fol. 68^r, fol. 193^r.

¹¹⁰ The word ‘Thomas’ is written, for example, once on fol. 76^r and twice on fol. 77^r.

¹¹¹ fol. 193^v. The names of the friends are unfortunately cut off.

¹¹² Scott-Warren cites many examples where the same name is recorded two or three times, and one example where the same name or set of initials is written nearly fifty times in the same volume (‘Reading Graffiti’, pp. 366–67). Multiple signatures are sometimes found in medieval manuscripts: Scott-Warren cites a copy of *The Canterbury Tales*, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 739, fols 218–19 (‘Reading Graffiti’, p. 367). See in particular fol. 218^v.

¹¹³ One possible candidate is the Thomas Shawe, member of Middle Temple, who made his will in 1605 aged around 64 years. This Shawe had been admitted to Middle Temple in June 1578. The record of his admission to Middle Temple states that he is ‘late of New Inn’, probably New Inn Hall Oxford; if this is the correct Shawe, it might suggest that the manuscript was still in Oxford in the late sixteenth century. See ‘Will of Thomas Shawe, Gentleman of Middle Temple, Middlesex, 5 November 1605’ <<https://discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/r/D941379>> [accessed 28 October 2017]; *Middle Temple Records*, ed. by Charles Henry Hopwood, Charles Trice Martin and John Hutchinson (London: Butterworth [bookseller], 1904), p. 222.

¹¹⁴ Scott-Warren notes that ‘inviting one’s “friends” into the copy of a book, making the owning of it a communal ritual like the drawing up of a will, or any other legal document’ was common. We should perhaps view the lists of

Daunce had access to the book in 1576, when he recorded for posterity that ‘James Mott is a knaue, by mee William Daunce’.¹¹⁵ This William writes his full name three times across the MS, and several other pages record just ‘William’. Once again, it has proved impossible to trace William Daunce, or indeed any of the men listed in the margins of T93, with any certainty.

In one sense, then, the marginalia, copious as they are, can tell us little about the life of the manuscript between its creation and its presentation to James Ingram in 1808. That the manuscript has attracted so little evidence of use should not however lead us to believe that it was not used. Although the early modern marginalia demonstrate virtually no interest in the text itself, there can be no concrete evidence to suggest that even these apparently disengaged readers did not study it closely at other times. It is important to remember, too, that the book was originally rather larger than it is today. It is impossible to know what marginal material might have been lost in the process of cutting down, especially if that was in fact the point of the exercise.¹¹⁶ It is impossible, too, to make any certain pronouncements on how popular the *Declaracion* might have been in the first instance. The fact that a single manuscript survives has been used to suggest that the text must not have been very popular,¹¹⁷ but given the profusion of single-witness texts in medieval studies, this seems a slight basis for such an assumption. What is clear is that the *Declaracion* was compiled and then scrupulously copied into T93.¹¹⁸ So at some point after its initial production, it was thought useful enough that a professional

names on fols 183^v-184^r as part of this phenomenon. Sherman notes that the phrase ‘et amicorum’ (and friends) is often found next to ownership signatures (p. 18). See T93 fol. 193^r: ‘This is thomas shawes booke rekerd of all is preves [recorded of all his friends]’.

¹¹⁵ fol. 87^v. Scott-Warren notes that such defamation is a common form of early modern graffiti (‘Reading Graffiti’, pp. 378-9). See also Natalie Zemon Davis, ‘Printing and the People’, in *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1975), p. 192.

¹¹⁶ See above, n. 103.

¹¹⁷ Somerset, *Feeling*, p. 180; Hudson, *PR*, p. 235.

¹¹⁸ See Chapter 1.

scribe was commissioned to copy it at least once, or a scholar (who may or may not have been involved in the compilation) took the time to do so very carefully. Given the length of the text, the investment, either monetary or temporal, would have been considerable. On this evidence, it would be unwise to suggest, at a remove of 600 years, that the text could not have been useful, or even popular, at least within a certain (admittedly small) social group. If nothing else, the early modern marginalia demonstrate that, many years after it was originally copied, a number of men were proud to own the manuscript and to have their names associated with it.

Chapter 3: The *Declaracion* in Context

As already stated, the *Declaracion* was likely conceived for an academic audience in Oxford in the late fourteenth century, and copied into T93 around 1400. The scope of the present study precludes an in-depth examination of the period, but this chapter will examine some of the circumstances, debates and beliefs that might have informed the compilation process. The chapter begins by considering the *Declaracion*'s use of LV (and Latin exegetical sources) in the light of contemporary debates on vernacular scriptural translation. It then examines the *Declaracion* in the context of works produced by followers of John Wyclif, considering whether it is possible to discern in the text any thematic concerns or linguistic features that might indicate Wycliffite associations, beliefs or sympathies.

1.1 The Translation Debates and the *Declaracion*

The question of whether or not the bible ought to be translated into English was the subject of much debate in the last quarter of the fourteenth century.¹ There seems to have been a flurry of activity on the issue around 1400, but by then the question was no longer purely theoretical.

By the early 1390s, a group of scholars working in Oxford, and probably inspired by the

¹ See Dove, *FEB*, pp. 6-36; Hudson, 'The Debate on Bible Translation, Oxford 1401', in *Lollards and their Books*, pp. 67-84; Dove, *Advocates*; Dove, 'Wyclif', pp. 367-68 and pp. 376-85; Margaret Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible and Other Medieval Biblical Versions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920), pp. 268-97; Anne Hudson, 'Lollardy: The English Heresy?', in *Lollards and their Books*, pp. 141-63; Copeland, Rita, 'Rhetoric and the Politics of the Literal Sense in Medieval Literary Theory: Aquinas, Wyclif, and the Lollards', in *Interpretation: Medieval and Modern*, ed. by Piero Boitani and Anna Torti (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1993), pp. 1-23 (pp. 14-21); Simon Hunt, 'An Edition of Tracts in Favour of Scriptural Translation and of Some Texts Connected with Lollard Vernacular Biblical Scholarship' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1994), especially pp. 208-40. On the idea that the debates predate Wyclif and his followers, see Lynn Staley, *Margery Kempe's Dissenting Fictions* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994), pp. 131-37; Nicholas Watson, 'Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel's Constitutions of 1409', *Speculum*, 70.4 (October 1995), 822-864 (p. 840).

recently deceased John Wyclif (on whom more below), had completed two separate but related translations of the whole bible into Middle English, the latter of which formed the basis for the *Declaracion*.² As we shall see, however, support for the idea of vernacular scripture was not limited to those who approved of this particular translation. Those who opposed vernacularisation, too, often did so on theoretical grounds apparently unconnected to the specifics of any particular translation. Fundamental to arguments against vernacular scripture was the hierarchical belief that the clergy were inherently better able to understand the bible and its interpretative tradition, passed down from the doctors, than could the laity. To make scripture available in the vernacular, therefore, was to threaten the natural order.³ It might also lead to misinterpretation, since lay people would have access primarily to the literal sense of scripture, and not to the allegorical, moral and anagogical senses assumed to be available to the clergy. Ultimately, opponents of vernacular translation were concerned that the practice could lead to heresy.⁴

Proponents of scriptural translation, on the other hand, suggested that laity and clergy had the same capacity for scriptural understanding.⁵ On this point, some of their opponents would have agreed. Henry Knighton, writing in opposition to scriptural translation c. 1390, suggests that, after the bible was translated into English:

² *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, is a particularly thorough and informative recent study. For general information on WB, see also Hudson, *PR*, and Dove, *FEB*. Henry Ansgar Kelly is the latest of a small group of scholars to argue that the translation was probably not the work of Wycliffites: see *The Middle English Bible*. For a recent (re)consideration of the relationship between EV and LV, see Anne Hudson, 'Earlier Version/Later Version – in the Wycliffite Bible is that the Only Choice?', in *Medieval and Early Modern Religious Cultures: Essays Honouring Vincent Gillespie on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. by Laura Ashe and Ralph Hanna (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2019), pp. 63-82.

³ Dove, *FEB*, p. 8; Watson, 'Censorship', pp. 841-43.

⁴ Dove, *FEB*, pp. 10-12; Hunt, 'An Edition', pp. 209-12.

⁵ Dove, *FEB*, p. 19; Watson, 'Censorship', pp. 845-46. The first Cambridge Tract in favour of translation argues that at least some lay people are capable of understanding: see 'Cambridge Tract I', in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 89-102 (pp. 94-95, ll. 200-05 and ll. 214-228). This is not to say that all scripture was necessarily assumed to be comprehensible to ordinary people: see *EWS*, I, p. 451, ll. 76-79.

Unde per ipsum fit vulgare et magis apertum laicis et mulieribus legere scientibus quam solet esse clericis admodum litteratis et bene intelligentibus...’

(As a consequence, the gospel has become more common and more open to laymen and even to women who know how to read than it customarily is to moderately well-educated clergy of good intelligence...)⁶

Of course, for Knighton the problem was not so much that clerical education was inadequate, as that some lay people would presume to acquire unnecessary knowledge and thereby to place themselves above the clergy, who, in the view of many opponents of translation, did not need to be able to provide in-depth scriptural teaching to their parishioners. For proponents of widespread scriptural education, however, vernacular scripture could be used to temper clerical inadequacy, by making the biblical text available both to barely-Latinate clergy and to the laity themselves.⁷

Making scripture available in the vernacular would, in the eyes of proponents, therefore in fact mitigate the risk of heresy, allowing both laity and clergy to develop a more thorough understanding of scripture.⁸ Although the literal sense was viewed as foundational by proponents of vernacular translation (as by many others),⁹ texts in favour of vernacular scripture do not generally advocate the dissemination of an English bible completely devoid of exposition. In fact, several texts advocate translation of exegesis into the vernacular. In PWB, the writer rehearses a common nationalistic argument in favour of translation, but it is not limited to the biblical text:

Also Frensche men, Beemers and Bretouns han þe Bible and opere bookis of

⁶ Knighton is quoted by Dove, who also provides the translation (Dove, *FEB*, p. 6).

⁷ Dove, *FEB*, p. 19.

⁸ This point is found for example in Ullerston’s *determinacio*: see Hudson, ‘English Heresy?’, pp. 157-58; Hunt, pp. 225-40.

⁹ Aquinas and Lyra both held this view, as did Hugh of St. Victor: see Levy, ‘Literal Sense’, p. 784 and p. 788; Light, Laura, ‘Non-Biblical Texts in Thirteenth-Century Bibles’, in *Medieval Manuscripts, their Makers and Users: A Special Issue of Viator in Honor of Richard and Mary Rouse* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 169-83 (p. 180).

deuocioun and of expositioun translated into her modir-langage. Whi shulde not
 Englisch men haue þe same in her modir langage I can not wite...
 (p. 84, ll. 2939-46)¹⁰

That the PWB writer was not only committed to providing a straightforward English translation of scripture is clear at several points. As mentioned in Chapter 1, he asserts that he himself has undertaken to gloss several books, presumably in English, and goes on to trust that:

[...] A symple man wiþ Goddis grace and greet trauele my3te expowne myche openiere
 and shortliere þe Bible in English þan þe elde grete doctours han expowned it in Latyn,
 and myche sharplier and groundliere þan many late postilatours or expositours han do.
 (p. 82, ll. 2868-71)

This quotation is particularly interesting in relation to the *Declaracion*, and will be considered in more detail in the conclusion to this study. For now, it is important to remember that the debate around translation was not focused solely on scripture itself, but also on exegetical works. The proliferation of vernacular biblical scholarship around the time of the translation debates is perhaps what encouraged Richard Ullerston, an ‘orthodox colleague’ of Wyclif’s who nevertheless wrote in favour of translation, to see the issue in a broad sense, ‘as including secondarily both biblical paraphrase and any other kind of vernacular instruction’.¹¹

The translation debates, then, touched on a whole range of scholarly texts, and were heavily influenced by broad ideas around the authority of the clergy; the proper place and

¹⁰ A similar argument is rehearsed in an English translation of *De Officio Pastoralis* in Manchester, John Rylands Library, MS 86, fol. 10^r, and Wyclif himself noted that Anne of Bohemia owned a copy of the bible in both Czech and German: see Dove, *Advocates*, p. 200, n. 2940. For similar arguments, see ‘First seiþ Bois’, in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 143-49 (p. 145, ll. 66-74), and Trevisa’s *Dialogus* (Waldron, ‘Prefaces’, pp. 289-94, particularly pp. 291-92, ll. 100-109, and p. 292, ll. 135-44).

¹¹ Watson, ‘Censorship’, p. 841. Several such works will be discussed in the next chapter. On Ullerston’s attitude toward Wyclif and Wycliffism, see Hudson, ‘Debate’, pp. 79-80; Christina Von Nolcken, ‘Lay Literacy, the Democratization of God’s Law, and the Lollards’, in *The Bible as Book: The Manuscript Tradition*, ed. by John L. Sharpe III and Kimberly Van Kampen (London: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press, in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 1998), p. 182; Hunt, p. 211.

capabilities of the laity; the status of the literal sense; the standard of clerical education; and the threat of heresy. The *Declaracion* is fascinating in this context. On one hand, it is not a complete translation of scripture into English. Its main mode is scriptural paraphrase, which, as Morey asserts, was more widely acceptable than biblical translation: ‘the critical difference lay precisely between translating Scripture verbatim, with no glosses, and selectively paraphrasing and rearranging Scripture, usually, but not always, with traditional exegesis and apocryphal additions’.¹² The proliferation of vernacular glossed biblical paraphrases in the period, several of which will be examined in the next chapter, tends to support this argument. As the next chapter will demonstrate, the *Declaracion* habitually uses methods of selective paraphrase and exegesis, and so might plausibly be thought to fit neatly into this category. It also regularly encourages the reader to seek out the full text of scripture.¹³ However, as chapter 5 will make clear, the text is deeply reliant upon the LV translation. When it paraphrases, it tends as far as possible to retain the lexis of LV, and beyond this it habitually includes quotations from LV.

It is very difficult to know how such a text might have been received in the context of the translation debates. It is irrefutable that the *Declaracion* compiler(s) were themselves in favour of vernacular scriptural translation in certain circumstances. Their overwhelming reliance on LV is testament to this, as is their willingness to undertake independent translations from the Vulgate. Nevertheless, it is possible to believe that the work was compiled with an awareness of some of the objections to vernacular scripture, and to imagine that it would have found an audience among moderates on that side of the debate. Although the text does include a large number of verbatim scriptural quotations, they tend to be relatively brief

¹² *Book and Verse*, pp. 25-26.

¹³ See Chapter 4.

(no longer than a single verse, and frequently much shorter). The *Declaracion* does not purport to be the bible, nor a replacement for it. The aim seems to have been to provide a complete overview of biblical content, but the text frequently gestures beyond itself, inviting its audience to consult the full scriptural text.

As asserted in the previous chapter, several factors, including the use of Latin, also suggest that the *Declaracion* was written primarily for a highly educated and biblically literate audience, as a digest of scriptural and exegetical material, and an aide-mémoire. It does not seem to have been designed as a means of dissolving the barriers between clergy and laity, and might in fact have been used as a tool for improving clerical knowledge, of the sort imagined in the first Cambridge tract in favour of biblical translation:

And for as moche as þe curatis ben often so lewid þat þei vnderstonden not bookis of Latyn for to teche þe peple, it is speedful not oonly to þe lewed peple but also to þe lewed curatis to haue bookis in Englisch of needful loore to þe lewed peple...¹⁴

The material contained in the *Declaracion* is not perhaps as basic as that imagined here (the tract goes on to mention the Ave Maria, the decalogue, and the Pater Noster – passages actually omitted by the *Declaracion* – and the Seven Deadly Sins as texts a curate ought to be able to expound); nevertheless, it is easy to see how it might have been a useful tool for improving clerical knowledge of both scriptural and exegetical material. Clerical deficiency in these areas was noted on both sides of the translation debate.¹⁵ By improving clerical knowledge and understanding of scripture, the *Declaracion* might be regarded therefore as a means of strengthening, not weakening, clerical authority.

¹⁴‘Cambridge Tract I’ in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 89-102 (p. 90, ll. 54-57).

¹⁵See for example the Prologue to *John Mirk’s Festial*, ed. by Susan Powell, 2 vols (Oxford: EETS, 2009), p. 3, ll. 8-14. On Mirk’s probable opposition to vernacular scripture, see Judy Ann Ford, *John Mirk’s Festial: Orthodoxy, Lollardy and the Common People in Fourteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006), pp. 113-16.

This picture is complicated slightly by the possibility, examined in the previous chapter, that the *Declaracion* was designed in part to facilitate small group study. Even here, however, the text seems to have been conceived in such a way as to require a certain amount of clerical exposition.¹⁶ This would have been important: it is to be noted that vernacular preaching was not nearly as controversial in the period as was vernacular scripture, precisely because preaching was undertaken by priests.¹⁷ Even if the *Declaracion* were to fall into lay hands, away from clerical supervision, it is designed in such a way as to mitigate the risk of its being used to support heretical beliefs. As Chapter 5 will demonstrate, it draws its exegesis accurately from a range of impeccably orthodox sources.¹⁸ The fact that these glosses are only intermittently distinguished from the biblically-derived material might even be interpreted as a means of elevating the interpretative tradition, ensuring that traditional readings of scripture cannot easily be discarded by the reader. It has been posited that, had the Church approved an English bible, it may well have been one with copious glossing either arranged around the text or else interwoven with it, ‘intended to protect the biblical text from solipsistic readings uncontrolled by the accumulated authority of the church’.¹⁹ This is not to say that the *Declaracion* would have provided lay readers with a consistently clear guide to scriptural meaning: it seems it was not primarily intended for that purpose. As noted in Chapter 2, at times it presents multiple interpretations of the same passage, some of which may be directly contradictory. However, it is possible that the volume of exegesis contained in the text would have been comforting to some translation opponents concerned about heresy, even if many

¹⁶ Note that a priest read Margery Kempe ‘þe Bybyl wyth doctowrys þer-up-on’ in the early fifteenth century. See Von Noleken, ‘Lay Literacy’, p. 181; Staley, *Dissenting Fictions*, p. 136.

¹⁷ Hudson, ‘English Heresy’, pp. 154-55.

¹⁸ The preface to Nicholas Love’s *Meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ*, intended as an alternative to WB, notes its own use of commentary, presumably to demonstrate its orthodoxy. See Hudson, ‘English Heresy?’, p. 155; Nicholas Love, *The Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ: A Reading Text*, ed. by Michael G. Sargent (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2004), p. 10, ll. 17-22.

¹⁹ Von Noleken, ‘Lay Literacy’, p. 181.

would likely have disapproved of its overwhelmingly literal flavour, and some would have found even the translation of exegesis problematic.²⁰

On one level, then, it is easy to see how the *Declaracion* might have appealed to a broad cross-section of moderate academic readers on all sides of the translation debate. However, its inclusion of independent bible translations, alongside verbatim quotations from LV, and its obvious debt to the latter work suggest that it would have found particular approval among proponents of vernacular translation in general, and those associated with WB in particular. In fact, the *Declaracion* provides compelling evidence to reinforce the idea that, for the academic Wycliffites of the late fourteenth century, the WB translation was not an ending, but a beginning: their new English bible was a tool to be used, reworked, and experimented with, for the benefit of an educated audience who should feel duty-bound to share their learning with the laity.²¹ The text brings together a number of methodologies common in other Wycliffite texts produced around the same time: paraphrase, exegesis, and direct quotation from WB (see Chapter 4).

While some, notably Michael Wilks and Henry Ansgar Kelly, have questioned whether WB was entirely produced by followers of Wyclif, most scholars agree that it was produced by Wycliffites.²² Either way, it is clear that not everyone who owned or used WB necessarily ascribed to a heterodox system of belief.²³ On its own, then, use of WB need not be evidence of

²⁰ Copeland, 'Rhetoric', pp. 21-22. This belief that the literal sense is inadequate and even potentially dangerous is also evident in Palmer's writing: see Dove, *FEB*, pp. 10-11. This view is rejected in a number of Wycliffite texts. See for example 'Holi Prophete Daud', in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 150-59 (pp. 156-57 ll. 212-62) 'Cambridge Tract IX', in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 122-23 (pp. 22-23, ll. 27-39). On opposition to the translation of exegesis, see Hudson, 'English Heresy?', pp. 141-43 and p. 149.

²¹ On the pedagogical impulse in Lollardy, see Copeland, *Pedagogy*; Hudson, *PR*, pp. 174-227; Rita Copeland, 'Childhood, Pedagogy and the Literal Sense: From Late Antiquity to the Lollard Heretical Classroom', in *New Medieval Literatures I*, ed. by Wendy Scase, Rita Copeland and David Lawton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 125-56; Von Nolcken, 'Lay Literacy', pp. 184-85.

²² Michael Wilks, 'Misleading manuscripts: Wyclif and the non-Wycliffite Bible', *Studies in Church History*, 11 (1975), 147-61; Kelly, *The Middle English Bible*.

²³ The translation seems to have been disseminated fairly widely, to an audience including orthodox clergy and nobility. See Elizabeth Solopova, 'The Manuscript Tradition', in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 223-45 (pp. 226-

Wycliffism. As we have seen, however, there are other circumstantial factors that suggest Wycliffite involvement in the compilation of the *Declaracion*. The probable date and location of composition both argue in favour of this hypothesis. As I will demonstrate more fully in Chapters 4 and 5, as well as relying on LV, the *Declaracion* shares characteristics with other works of Wycliffite biblical scholarship produced in the late fourteenth century, and draws upon sources favoured in Wycliffite circles (principally WB and *LPL*). In the following sections, I will consider the *Declaracion* from an ideological perspective, suggesting that, although the text is not in any way polemical, there is compelling evidence that it was compiled by Oxford-educated Wycliffites who subscribed to a number of the beliefs associated with John Wyclif and his followers.

2.1 John Wyclif

John Wyclif began his career in Oxford in the early 1350s, and the bulk of his surviving writing was composed in the 1370s and early 1380s. Written in Latin and mainly for a scholarly audience, his works included a full commentary on the bible, as well as a separate commentary on the decalogue, and several on the Pater Noster, along with a number of philosophical and theological tracts, examining for example the nature of scriptural truth, the power of the Pope and the status of the Eucharist.²⁴ His hermeneutics stressed the crucial importance of authorial

29); Jurkowski, 'Censorship', p. 378 and pp. 384-85; Dove, *FEB*, p. 44; Annie Sutherland, *English Psalms in the Middle Ages, 1300-1450* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 156-58.

²⁴ For more detail on Wyclif and his known works, see *A Companion to John Wyclif: Late Medieval Theologian*, ed. by Ian C. Levy; *Wyclif in his Times*, ed. by Anthony Kenny; John Wyclif, *On the Truth of Holy Scripture*, trans. by Ian Christopher Levy (Kalamazoo: TEAMS, 2001); John Wyclif, *Trialogus*, translated by Stephen E. Lahey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); 'Introduction', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 30-39; 'Part I: Wyclif', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 63-155; Levy, 'The Place of Holy Scripture in John Wyclif's Theology', in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 27-48; K. B. McFarlane, *John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Non-Conformity* (London: English Universities Press, 1952); Aston, *Lollards and Reformers*, pp. 10-12 and pp. 140-43. On the question of Wyclif's audience, see *Wycliffite Spirituality*, p. 88; Hudson, *Selections*, pp. 2-4.

intention, and entailed an expansion of the traditional literal sense to encompass many readings traditionally classed as allegorical (in this he followed Lyra).²⁵ His support for vernacular scripture, implicit in his approval of preaching to the laity, was only rarely made explicit, at least until the last two years of his life.²⁶ In his more controversial works, Wyclif wrote forcefully against what he saw as abuses of power within the institutional Church, especially those committed by the friars, whom he characterised as servants of the antichrist.²⁷ He particularly objected to the Church's vast wealth, asserting that Christ's poverty was an essential part of his message.²⁸ He also argued that, while the pope and clergy held authority in the institutional Church, the 'true church' was made up only of those who will be saved. This group, Wyclif argued, might not even include the pope, whose decretals must be seen as less authoritative than scripture.²⁹ Fiercely critical of sinful priests, he asserted not only that parishioners had a right to withhold tithes from those clergy deemed to have committed wrongdoing, but also that believers had a duty humbly to rebel against prelates who commanded them to act in any way that contravened Christ's teaching.³⁰

Wyclif further eroded the authority of the Church by asserting that only God could absolve sin, and that the sole basis for absolution was faith and true contrition, not auricular confession to a priest.³¹ He also rejected the idea that lay access to scripture must be mediated through the clergy, arguing instead that, while scholars and clerics had a duty to aid lay

²⁵ See Levy, 'Holy Scripture', pp. 31-36; also Dove, *FEB*, pp. 115-16; Ghosh, *Wycliffite Heresy*, pp. 35-45; Levy, 'Literal Sense', pp. 797-802; Copeland, *Pedagogy*, p. 52.

²⁶ Hudson, 'English Heresy?', pp. 144-45; Levy, 'Holy Scripture', pp. 44-45; Wilks, 'Misleading manuscripts', pp. 154-55. For Wyclif's views on vernacular preaching, see Hunt, 'An Edition', pp. 9-13.

²⁷ Levy, 'Holy Scripture', p. 48.

²⁸ Levy, 'Holy Scripture', p. 47.

²⁹ Maurice Keen, 'Wyclif, the Bible, and Transubstantiation', in *Wyclif in his Times*, ed. by Kenny (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 1-16 (p. 3); Levy, 'Holy Scripture', pp. 40-41; Aston, *Lollards and Reformers*, p. 104.

³⁰ Aston, *Lollards and Reformers*, p. 12; Wyclif, 'The Six Yokes', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 74-75.

³¹ Stephen Penn, 'Wyclif and the Sacraments' in *A Companion to John Wyclif*, ed. by Ian C. Levy, pp. 241-291 (pp. 283-89); Hudson, *Selections*, pp. 4-5.

understanding through exegesis and translation, scriptural truths were knowable to everyone, and imperative to salvation.³² Unlike some of his later followers, Wyclif was not wholly opposed to religious imagery, but did recognise the danger of idolatry.³³ Most controversially, he wrote extensively on the Eucharist. Wyclif's views on this subject were for a long time unfixed.³⁴ By the beginning of the 1380s, however, he was teaching a form of consubstantiation that was felt by those opposing him to threaten the doctrine of Christ's real presence in the Eucharist.³⁵

Wyclif's views were condemned by the Pope in 1377, and were subject to several inquiries and formal censures in Oxford and London in the late 1370s and early 1380s, but he remained an influential figure, particularly in Oxford, where, despite pressure from church authorities, and even (reluctantly) from the University itself, a group of followers developed and spread his ideas through written projects and preaching.³⁶ Although Wyclif's theology contained 'little that was completely original',³⁷ his ideas, as outlined above, proved influential, as did his support for teaching and preaching in the vernacular. His work in this area seems at least to have *inspired* the WB translators, even if, as Hudson asserts, he probably did not undertake any of the actual translation work himself.³⁸

³² John Wyclif, 'On the Divine Commandments (Selections)', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 87-146 (p. 93); Levy, 'Holy Scripture', p. 29; Keen, 'Transubstantiation', p. 4.

³³ Wyclif, 'On the Divine Commandments (Selections)', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 107-110; see also Aston, *Lollards and Reformers*, pp. 141-43.

³⁴ Hudson, *Selections*, p. 5; Keen, 'Transubstantiation', pp. 9-10.

³⁵ The *Declaracion* mentions the Eucharist, but gives no indication that it ascribes to these views; in-depth discussion of Wyclif's Eucharistic theology include Ian Christopher Levy, *John Wyclif: Scriptural Logic, Real Presence and the Parameters of Orthodoxy* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2003); Stephen Penn, 'Sacraments', in *A Companion to John Wyclif: Late Medieval Theologian*, ed. by Ian C. Levy (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), pp. 241-91.

³⁶ Hudson, *Selections*, pp. 7-10; Hudson, 'Wycliffism in Oxford', pp. 73-78; Maurice Keen, 'The Influence of Wyclif', in *Wyclif in his Times*, ed. by Kenny, pp. 127-45 (pp. 135-36). On the reluctance of the University to condemn Wyclif, see Hudson, 'Wycliffism in Oxford', p. 78; Penn, 'Sacraments', pp. 249-50. On the confidence this may have given even his most radical early supporters within the university, see Hudson, *PR*, pp. 72-73.

³⁷ Hudson, *Selections*, p. 4.

³⁸ Hudson, *PR*, pp. 240-41.

Before proceeding, it is necessary to say a little about the broader religious make-up of England in the late fourteenth century, and particularly about the extent to which Wyclif and his followers might be considered to espouse a distinct, heterodox theology, when compared to the established English Church. Recent scholarship suggests that the boundaries between orthodoxy and heterodoxy in the period were rather more permeable than has previously been supposed. As Hudson asserts, ‘Lollardy and orthodoxy were not in every regard mutually exclusive creeds’.³⁹ Many orthodox contemporaries clearly agreed with Wyclif and his followers on a number of issues, particularly regarding the necessity of church reform.⁴⁰ In the words of R.W. Southern, ‘for several years, until it became too dangerous to agree with him, probably a majority of that not notably revolutionary body, the University of Oxford, would have gone most of the way in most of what [Wyclif] said’.⁴¹ Anne Hudson supports this view, suggesting that, had Wyclif refrained from discussing the Eucharist and the issue of dominion, or simply kept his writing in Latin, he might have avoided condemnation by church authorities, and that polarisation on other issues occurred only gradually.⁴² Even the issue of biblical translation, which has come to be seen as a key interest of Wyclif and of his followers, cannot be used to distinguish them. As we have seen, not everyone who argued in favour of translation was a follower of Wyclif; and while, as Anne Hudson has demonstrated, ownership of English books was taken as a possible indication of heresy at least as early as 1382,⁴³ in practice ownership of WB did not necessarily imply sympathy with Wyclif’s theology, and there is

³⁹ Hudson, *PR*, p. 429; see also Somerset, *Feeling*, pp. 4-5; Ian Forrest, ‘Lollardy and Late Medieval History’, in *Wycliffite Controversies*, ed. by Mishtooni Bose and J. Patrick Hornbeck II (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 121-34 (pp. 125-26); Hudson, “‘Who is My Neighbour?’: Some Problems of Definition on the Borders of Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy”, in *Wycliffite Controversies*, ed. by Bose and Hornbeck, pp. 79-96; Watson, ‘Censorship’, p. 826.

⁴⁰ See Thomson, ‘Orthodox Religion and the Origins of Lollardy’, *History*, 74 (1989), 39-55).

⁴¹ *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962), p. 77.

⁴² ‘Preface’, in *Lollards and their Influence in Late Medieval England*, ed. by Fiona Somerset, Jill C. Havens and Derrick G. Pitard (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003; repr. 2009), pp. 1-8 (p. 5); Hudson, ‘Debate’, p. 83.

⁴³ Jurkowski, ‘Censorship’, p. 388.

evidence of Wycliffite Bibles in orthodox ownership.⁴⁴

2.2 Evidence of Wycliffite Thought in the *Declaracion*: Some Difficulties

So, it can be difficult to distinguish between Wycliffite and orthodox texts in this period.⁴⁵

There are two interconnected factors that make it even more difficult to determine how far the *Declaracion* is influenced by Wycliffite thought. The text is undated but, based on the evidence presented in Chapter 1, assumed to have been composed relatively soon after the death of Wyclif, probably in the early 1390s, long before the institution of Arundel's *Constitutions*.

These statutes, designed to clamp down on perceived Wycliffite heresies and to restrict access to vernacular scripture, appear to have been only partially successful, but they do seem to have had an effect on the ways in which both Wycliffites and their opponents viewed themselves: positions on both sides became more extreme and more entrenched over time.⁴⁶ Of course, this makes it easier to identify Wycliffite texts written after c. 1407.

The task of determining its ideological underpinning is further complicated by the way in which the *Declaracion* uses its sources. This aspect of the text's methodology will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5, but for now it is important to understand that, while it is obviously selective, the material presented in the *Declaracion* can almost always be traced back to one of a handful of earlier sources. A salient example of the ways in which this methodology can make it difficult to identify the beliefs of the compiler(s) occurs in Galatians 4: *'ffals*

⁴⁴ Hudson, *PR*, p. 423.

⁴⁵ See Aston, *Lollards and Reformers*, p. 211; 'Introduction', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 41-43; Dove, *FEB*, p. 51; Somerset, 'Wycliffite Prose', in *A Companion to Middle English Prose*, ed. by Edwards, pp. 195-214 (pp. 196-97). Wycliffite and orthodox texts are also found side-by-side in a number of manuscripts: see James H. Morey, 'The Wycliffites: Hosts or Guests, First Finders or Followers?', in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 85-104 (pp. 103-04).

⁴⁶ Hudson, 'Debate', pp. 82-83. Hudson further notes that because the 'bounds of orthodoxy or of heterodoxy' changed over time, it can be particularly difficult to place undated texts on the spectrum: of course, the *Declaracion* fits into this category (see Hudson, *PR*, p. 429).

apostles louen 3ou not wele þat wolde[n] exclude 3ou ***fro þe trube of þe gospel*** to sue þem ***in obseruances***, &c.’ (fol. 183^r). In this example, glossing (here indicated by bold italics, though it is not differentiated in any way in T93) is interwoven with a slightly reworded rendering of Galatians 4. 17. On the face of it, the glosses that have been added to the biblical text here have a distinctly Wycliffite flavour, setting up a contrast between truth and falsehood, mentioning the truth of the gospel in such a way as potentially to imply access to scripture, and contrasting those who would spread the gospel with those who would prioritise observance, in a way that seems freighted with contemporary significance.⁴⁷ The slight difficulty is, however, that, whatever might have been supposed by previous scholarship, these glosses, and many others like them, are not original to the *Declaracion*. Instead, they are translated from *LPL*.⁴⁸ In fact, of the three sections of glossing highlighted above, two are found, in very similar wording, in the margins of at least two copies of LV, attributed to Lyra.⁴⁹ *LPL*, as we shall see, was valued particularly highly by Wycliffites, but also enjoyed wider popularity.⁵⁰ This makes it difficult to judge the ideological motives of the compiler who included them. On one hand, the use of Lyra is in itself potentially suggestive of Wycliffite sympathies, and the glosses, as noted above, do relate to common Wycliffite themes. On the other hand, these are not original polemical asides of the type noted for example in *GG*,⁵¹ and it must be remembered that an orthodox compiler might use Lyra, and might be interested in certain themes that also interested Wycliffites.

The text must therefore be judged as a whole: no individual gloss in the *Declaracion* is in itself inherently heterodox. In fact, the glosses on Galatians 4. 17 are representative of

⁴⁷ For evidence related to these themes in the *Declaracion* and other Wycliffite texts, see below.

⁴⁸ L6/503:3-7. For more on this, see Chapter 5.

⁴⁹ These are Oxford, New College, MS 67 and London, British Library, Harley 5017. The coincidence of glosses in the *Declaracion* and LV manuscripts is examined in more detail in Chapter 5.

⁵⁰ See Chapter 5.

⁵¹ Anne Hudson, ‘Lollard Book Production’, in Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall, *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375-1475* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 125-42 (pp. 132-34).

several concerns that recur throughout the *Declaracion*, some of which will be discussed in more detail below. False apostles, including false preachers, feature heavily throughout, as does the concept of truth, and of course the question of access to the gospel. The theme of religious observance is also prevalent. In this case, then, the glosses do seem to be characteristic of Wycliffite thought. While it is right, given all the factors outlined above, to exercise some caution when attempting to understand the relationship between the *Declaracion* and Wycliffite ideas, I would assert that, taken as a whole, there is more than enough evidence confidently to identify the text as Wycliffite. However, as suggested above, the evidence is accretive. Anyone reading the whole text would be left in little doubt of the ideology that underpins it, but this is difficult to demonstrate in a piecemeal way. The following sections will examine the evidence related to this question in more detail.

2.3 Wycliffite Themes in the *Declaracion*: The Evidence of the *Nota* Marks

Given that the thematic evidence is both subtle and accretive, it is difficult to judge how far any one particular example is evidence of an overall interest in a given theme or idea. However, as noted in Chapter 1, the manuscript does contain a number of contemporary *nota* marks, demonstrating that someone close to the text (either the original compiler(s), the main scribe, an annotator involved in the manuscript's production or a very early reader) felt certain passages worthy of special attention. Before considering these passages in more detail, it is necessary to say a little about the marks themselves.

Nota marks, intended to draw the reader's attention to a particular passage of text, are relatively common in medieval manuscripts, but have so far attracted only limited scholarly attention. They take a number of forms, including manicules, bracing, and various stock

phrases, whether abbreviated or written out in full.⁵² The *nota* marks in T93, however, are of a very simple type: the abbreviated word ‘nota’ in the right-hand margin.⁵³ The abbreviation consists of the letters *no*, with a secretary *a* above.⁵⁴ While they seem to have been written in a contemporary hand, it is very difficult to say with certainty whether these marks are the work of the main scribe, particularly because *n* and *o* are among the most unvariable of anglicana letter forms.⁵⁵ When compared to the main text, however, there are discrepancies of ink colour, pen thickness, and orientation that at least suggest that the *nota* marks were added after the main stint of copying was complete.⁵⁶ This is not unusual in the case of *nota* marks, and does not necessarily suggest that they were simply added by a later reader: many such marks are assumed to have been added after the main work of copying but during the production process.⁵⁷ While some seem to have been added independent of the author, others are assumed to be authorial.⁵⁸ In the case of T93, the fact that the marks appear to have been added after the main stint of copying seems to suggest that they were not copied from an exemplar: had they been, we might expect them to have been written in as part of the main copying process. However, given the existence of revisions in the manuscript (discussed in Chapter 1), this need not suggest that the *nota* marks were not added by one of the *Declaracion* compiler(s). Even if we

⁵² Marleen Cré, *The Medieval Translator: Traduire au Moyen Age 9: Vernacular Mysticism in the Charterhouse: A Study of London, British Library, MS Additional 37790* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006), p. 281.

⁵³ This was a common annotation in medieval manuscripts: see Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, ‘Professional Readers at Work: Annotators, Editors and Correctors in Middle English Literary Texts’, in *Opening Up Middle English Manuscripts: Literary and Visual Approaches*, ed. by Kathryn Kerby-Fulton, Maidie Hilmo and Linda Olson, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2012), pp. 207-244 (pp. 239-40); C. David Benson and Lynne S. Blanchfield, *The Manuscripts of Piers Plowman: The B-Version* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997), p. 20; Cré, *Medieval Translator*, p. 281. It is possible that a symbol consisting of three dots is also intended as a *nota* mark, but the evidence of this is inconclusive, and these instances have therefore been disregarded in the following discussion: see 1 Kings 20, fol. 15^r; 2 Kings 5 and 2 Kings 10, fol. 16^r; 4 Esdre 32, fol. 28^r; Luke 17, fol. 160^r; Hebrews 9, fol. 194^r.

⁵⁴ This is a common abbreviation: see Cré, *Medieval Translator*, pp. 281-82.

⁵⁵ Somerset suggests that the marks were the work of the main scribe (*Feeling*, p. 184).

⁵⁶ Private communication with Prof. Daniel Wakelin.

⁵⁷ Kerby-Fulton, ‘Readers’, pp. 239-40.

⁵⁸ Kerby-Fulton, ‘Readers’, pp. 239-40; *Love’s Mirror*, ed. by Sargent, p. 50.

do assume that they are not authorial, these marks were clearly added either during the production process or very soon afterwards. They are therefore valuable in suggesting which parts of the text were thought to be most interesting or useful by those involved in the production of the manuscript (who, as we have seen, seem to have had a very close relationship to the compiler(s) of the text itself), or by its very first reader(s). Of course, given all the uncertainty suggested above, these marks cannot be given too much weight; however, it seems reasonable to use them as a guide when examining the text from an ideological standpoint, particularly as they tend to draw attention to themes that pervade the whole text.

Since the margins have all been cut down, it is impossible to know for certain whether or not any evidence of these marks has been lost. A large number of them are now very difficult to make out, having either been bound into the gutter or partially cut off from the side margin. However, from the evidence that remains it seems that there were around fifty contemporary *nota* marks concentrated in the prophets and the epistles, particularly in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The first example of a visible marginal *nota* mark occurs in Isaiah 1, on fol. 82^v. The marks are particularly concentrated on fols 87^r-89^r (Isaiah 22-30: eight *notae* in total); and fols 113^r-116^r (Jeremiah 35-51, seven *notae* total). That the marks are found specifically in these books is not surprising: the narratives of Isaiah and Jeremiah in particular provide scope for detailed discussion of several of the *Declaracion*'s major themes (see below).

The *nota* marks provide concrete evidence of an interest in several themes, including contrition,⁵⁹ hypocrisy,⁶⁰ and tribulation.⁶¹ Mostly, they highlight material related to proper teaching: incidents where true prophets are ignored, threatened and betrayed,⁶² while false

⁵⁹ Isaiah 1, fol. 82^v (l. 15); Jeremiah 18, fol. 107^v

⁶⁰ Isaiah 29, fol. 89^r (l. 467); Jeremiah 48, fol. 115^v; Ezekiel 14, fol. 121^r; Titus 1, fol. 191^r.

⁶¹ Isaiah 27, fol. 88^r (l. 402); Zechariah 12, fol. 147^v.

⁶² Jeremiah 51, fol. 116^r; Jeremiah 11, fol. 105^v; Jeremiah 37, fol. 113^v.

prophets and sinful priests spread error through their own teaching, oppressing the poor and needy.⁶³ The *nota* marks are clearly written from a perspective of dissatisfaction with the established church, which is presented as an oppressive force. That they also draw attention to idolatry on several occasions might also be indicative of Wycliffite patterns of thought around the use and veneration of images, particularly in Hosea 12 (in this example and those that follow, the asterisk marks the position of the *nota* mark on the page) :

How Effraym þe folk of Israel þat here are called Chanaan for her wickednessis were wrongful oppressours & gileful. & þey seyð þey were riche & hade fonden an ydol þat was gold þat þey wirchipped in her hertis. & synned þey neuer so mych, men þat neded her * help wold not accuse hem whiles þey hade richesses, þat þey hade laboured aboute wickedly.

(fol. 137^r)

In this example, the *nota* mark is placed in such a way that it might either be drawing attention to the assertion that the rich do not generally face justice, or to the line about idolatry. Either one of these would be consistent with lollard concerns (see below).

2.4 True Piety and Outward Observance

One of the most pervasive themes of the *Declaracion* regards the difference between interior and exterior religious observance, and the first surviving *nota* mark in the manuscript, in Isaiah 1, reflects this: ‘Sacrifices of * þe Iewes þat synned *wit*h oute shame, as þe men of Sodom, plesed not God’ (fol. 82^v, l. 15). The very first passage apparently marked for special attention, then, concerns the disjunct between the observance of outward rites on the one hand, and true religious feeling expressed inwardly on the other. This was a key area of interest for Wyclif and

⁶³ On bad teaching: Isaiah 28, fol. 88^v (l. 430); Isaiah 30, fol. 89^r (l. 487); Jeremiah 5, fol. 103^v; Jeremiah 7, fol. 104^f; Ezekiel 13, fol. 121^r. On oppressive churchmen: Isaiah 22, fol. 87^r (l. 327); Ezekiel 34, fol. 126^v.

his followers, and is the focus of a number of other *nota* marks in T93, and of the *Declaracion* text more generally.⁶⁴ Throughout, the *Declaracion* presents a view of Christianity that is focused on interiority: a personal connection with God, the truth of which cannot be observed from without. This inner connection, often posited in Wycliffite texts as more important than any earthly hierarchy or observance,⁶⁵ is in line with the Wycliffite preoccupation with the priesthood of all believers: the principle that the established Church hierarchy could be circumvented, and that any true Christian had a direct connection with God, and so the ability to preach and even to administer the sacraments.⁶⁶ It also chimes with Wycliffite beliefs around confession and absolution, which prioritised inner contrition over outward observance.⁶⁷ The Wycliffite view of penance is outlined in the tract ‘Sixteen Points on which the Bishops Accuse Lollards’:

we graunteyn þat schrifte of mouþe is nedeful to al suche þat ben counselid of God for to make it mekeliche. But ȝut very contricioun is more nedeful [...] very contricioun is þe essencial parte of penance, and confecioun of mouþe is þe accidental parte.⁶⁸

⁶⁴ See for example the *nota* marks in the following locations: Jeremiah 48, fol. 115^v (‘he is cursed * þat dose þe werk of God gilefully’); Ezekiel 14, fol. 121^r (‘þey cam * to ask þe worde of God of hym feynnyngly, & not to amend her life...’); Galatians 5, fol. 183^v (‘Neþer circum- * cision nor preþuci wirkes oȝt to þe helpe þat is gyuen by crist’).

⁶⁵ See for example ‘Wyclif’s Confessions on the Eucharist’ in *Selections*, ed. by Hudson, pp. 17-18 (p. 17, ll. 9-13).

⁶⁶ Leicester lollards believed in 1389 that ‘any layman can preach and teach the gospel anywhere’. Leading Wycliffite John Purvey also taught before 1401 that any ‘holy and predestined’ man can administer ‘all the sacraments necessary for the salvation of man’ (see Margaret Aston, *Lollards and Reformers*, p. 15-16, p. 60, p. 144); see also Andrew E. Larsen, ‘Are All Lollards Lollards?’, in *Lollards and their Influence*, ed. by Somerset, Havens, and Pitard, pp. 59-72 (p. 64); The tract ‘Sixteen Points on Which the Bishops Accuse Lollards’ nuances this, recognising church hierarchy but suggesting that all men are ‘prestes spirituali’, able to preach to their family: ‘Sixteen Points’, in Hudson, *Selections*, pp. 19-24 (p. 22, ll. 119-29). See also ‘Confession of Hawisia Moone of Loddon’, in Hudson, *Selections*, pp. 34-37 (p. 35, ll. 59-61); ‘The Trial of John Godesell, March 18-21, 1428’, in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 322-27 (p. 324); ‘The Trial of Margery Baxter, October 7, 1428’, in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 327-36 (p. 328).

⁶⁷ This interior focus is not unique to Wycliffites, but obviously appealed to them: Gustafson notes a focus on ‘the interior drama of penance’ in Rolle’s English Psalter, a text revised by lollards: ‘Richard Rolle’s English Psalter and the Making of a Lollard Text’, *Viator*, 33 (2002), 294-309 (p. 303).

⁶⁸ Hudson, *Selections*, p. 20-21 (ll. 69-78). On this point, see also ‘John Godesell’, in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, p. 323; ‘Margery Baxter’, in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, p. 334; ‘The Trial of John Kynget, August 20, 1429’, in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 336-40 (p. 338) ‘Hawisia Moone’, in *Selections*, pp. 34-37 (p. 34, ll. 25-31); ‘A Form of Confession’, in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 244-47.

The theme of penance is particularly pervasive in the *Declaracion*, which often specifies that ‘true’ or ‘verrey’ penance is meant, particularly in the Psalter and Prophets.⁶⁹ Though the text never explicitly defines what is meant by ‘true’ or ‘verrey’ penance, it is clear that penance is only ‘true’ if it comes from the heart; penance for show, or as an empty observance, is insufficient for salvation.⁷⁰

A key theme of lollard writing is, of course, that such empty observance often replaces adherence to the true law of God. Here, too, the T93 *nota* marks draw attention to a theme prevalent in the rest of the text and in keeping with Wycliffite concerns, highlighting this passage in Isaiah 29:

Pis peple glorifies me *wit* her lippes; bot þe hert þerof is ferr fro me.
 How * scribes & phariseis lefing Goddes comandementis preferred þeire
 tradicions to þe biddinges of God, wherfore wisdam perished fro þem, &c.
 (fol. 89^r)

In this context, it is to be remembered that Pharisees were often used symbolically as a means of discussing more pressing contemporary concerns, as in this example from Cambridge Tract VII:

loke wheþer oure clerkis don now as yuel, or worse, and namely oure religio[u]s, þat ben fayners of holines, þe whiche pursuen Crist in his membris as þe farisees diden his owne person [...] We knowen þat farisees braken þe lawe þat God 3af to hem and to þe pepel for here fayned reule þat þei himself maden a3ens þe ordeinaunce of God.⁷¹

⁶⁹ See Psalm 6, fol. 37^r (l. 8); Psalm 37, fol. 42^v (l. 47); Psalm 41, fol. 43^r; Psalm 59, fol. 47^r; Psalm 64, fol. 48^v; Ecclesiasticus 17, fol. 78^r; Isaiah 21, fol. 86^v (l. 309); Isaiah 64, fol. 99^v (l. 1260); Isaiah 65, fol. 100^r (l. 1278); Jeremiah 3, fol. 102^v; Jeremiah 23, fol. 109^v; Amos 4, fol. 139^r; Zechariah 12, fol. 147^v; Hebrews 12, fol. 195^r.

⁷⁰ On the incidence of the words *true* and *verrey* in Wycliffite texts, see Hudson, ‘A Lollard Sect Vocabulary?’ in *Lollards and their Books*, pp. 165-80 (pp. 170-71). On these words in the *Declaracion*, see Introduction to Isaiah in Part II.

⁷¹ Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 118-20 (p. 120, ll. 70-78). This type of analogy is common in Wycliffite writing: see for example the tract ‘Biblical Translation’ in Hudson, *Selections*, pp. 107-09 (p. 109, ll. 81-84). See also Hudson, ‘Vocabulary’, pp. 170-71. For this trope in medieval English literature more broadly, see Penn R. Szittyta, *The*

This text draws a clear parallel between the Pharisees and the modern religious, demonstrating that, for many readers, material apparently detached from the present could have powerful contemporary significance. As Dove notes, the complaint that human laws and customs are upheld while those who advocate a return to Christ's law are persecuted was common in Wycliffite writing.⁷² PWB asserts that it is 'open eresie' to suggest that the ceremonies of the old law need to be kept, but even more egregious to assert that the gospel 'wiþ his treuþe and fredom' is not sufficient to guarantee salvation 'wiþout kepyng of ceremonyes and statutis of synful men and vnkunynge, þat ben maad in þe tyme of Sathanas and of antecrist' (pp. 6-7, ll. 125-30). It is easy to see how the *Declaracion*'s many references to Jewish ceremonies and empty observances, including the one above, might have been intended as a criticism of the contemporary Church.

Linked to this, of course, was the question of idolatry, a key concern among Wycliffites.⁷³ PWB mentions idolatry persistently.⁷⁴ Once again, the theme is pervasive in the *Declaracion*, and is sometimes highlighted by the use of *nota* marks. In this example from Isaiah 28, the *nota* mark is placed in such a way as to draw attention both to the erroneous and sinful idolatry of the priests and false prophets, and to the true 'conyng' of more deserving men:

Napeles þey were dronken *wiþ* wyne of erreure: þe preste & þe prophete erred in ydolatry & wanted dome of discrecion, wherfore þe prophete asks, * 'Whome shal þe Lord teche conyng', &c. And he ansueres, 'Men wened fro mylk', &c., þat is to sey,

Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 201-07.

⁷² Dove, *Advocates*, p. xxxiv, p. xlvi, p. 189 (n. 125-30).

⁷³ Aston, *Lollards and Reformers*, p. 136; Larsen, 'Lollards', pp. 70-71; 'John Godesell', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, p. 324; 'Margery Baxter', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, p. 328.

⁷⁴ Dove also cites ll. 1620-27 of the same text as proof of the same phenomenon, along with 'Epilogue to Intermediate/Long Matthew', in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 180-83 (p. 182, ll. 89-96).

men departed fro fleschly delices.

(fol. 88^v, ll. 428-31)⁷⁵

This *nota* mark, then, highlights bad priests, false prophets and idolatry, and simultaneously suggests that God will choose good men directly to receive knowledge and understanding.

Each of these themes is in keeping with Wycliffite belief, and each is recurrent in the *Declaracion*.

2.5 True Prophets and Persecution

I have noted that the *Declaracion* often focuses on the ways in which religious observance can become perverted and distract from God's truth, and suggested that the text often implicitly connects such failings with the established church. At the same time, the *Declaracion* demonstrates a persistent interest in true prophets.⁷⁶ The idea of men specially chosen and inspired by God, but ignored, or even persecuted, by the authorities and the people, seems to have held a particular fascination for the *Declaracion* compiler(s). A series of *nota* marks, concentrated in Isaiah-Ezekiel, explores this idea. They highlight passages in which people refuse to hear the truth, asking instead to hear 'þinges þat plesen vs' (Isaiah 30, fol. 89^r, ll. 486-88). This, another highlighted passage suggests, is because of 'her wickednes, wherby þey forsoke God' (Ezekiel 39, fol. 128^r). False prophets are shown to be willing to meet the people's demands for comforting lies, though the *Declaracion* makes plain that such behaviour will ultimately be punished, as in Jeremiah 5:

prophetes prophecied lesing & prestes ioyeden of her lesinges, & þe peple louyd such

⁷⁵ See also Ezekiel 16, fol. 121^v; Ezekiel 21, fol. 123^v; Hosea 4, fol. 134^v; 1 Mac 3, fol. 150^r.

⁷⁶ PWB demonstrates a similar interest: see Dove, *FEB*, pp. 127-28.

þinges. ‘What þerfore shal þey do at þe last dome, * or at þe last when þe Caldeis shal take þe peple prisoneris?’, as who sey, ‘3e prestes & 3e pꝛophetis 3e shal be taken captiue with hem’.

(fol. 103^v)

Crucially, this example implicates the priesthood in encouraging the people to believe lies.

Another example, in Jeremiah 7, implicates the priesthood even more strongly, and suggests a reason for their involvement in spreading falsehood:

Þe Lord comandes Jeremy þat he preche to þe Iewes þat þey trist not in wordes of lesing, þat as Lira seys were seyde of prestes for *temporal wyn-* * nyng, seyand, ‘Þe temple of þe Lord, þe temple of þe Lord’

(fol. 104^r)

Priests are here presented as unscrupulous, willing to lie to gain earthly advantage, but damning themselves and those believing them in the process. This idea of priestly neglect is taken even further in Ezekiel 34:

Here he *prophecies* ageyne þe shepꝛdis of Israel * þo were *kinges*, princes, prestis & fals *prophetis* þat gaf *tent* to her owne lusty *feding* & *cloþing* & toke no hede to her flockes.

(fol. 126^v)

Here, the secular and church authorities and false prophets are all presented as greedy for worldly gain, and actively indifferent to the needs of the people. The *Declaracion* contrasts such behaviour with that of a procession of ‘verrey’ prophets, chosen by God to spread his truth. The focus of the *nota* marks (and the text more generally) is not, however, the particular teachings of such prophets, but rather the persecution they face. The *nota* marks, for example highlight two passages in Jeremiah that deal with threats to the prophet’s life:

And þey seyð to hym: ‘Cees to *propheci*, &c., and þu shal * not dy in oure handes’, þæt is, we shal not slee þe.

(Jeremiah 11, fol. 105^v)

And when he cam to a ȝate, a keper þerof bare hym fals on * hand þæt he wold haue fled to þe caldeis, & he led hym to þe princes, which beten hym and send hym in to prison, & þere he was many deyes.

(Jeremiah 37, fol. 113^v)

Although Wycliffites were not as fiercely persecuted in the 1390s as they would be in the early years of the fifteenth century, those who remained publicly loyal to Wyclif and his ideas in the years following his death did suffer for it to varying degrees.⁷⁷ While, as we have seen, it was possible at this time to express support for the English bible without attracting suspicion of heresy, expression of support for some other common Wycliffite ideas (especially perhaps around the status of the Eucharist) could be dangerous. It is easy to imagine that those who followed Wyclif at this time would have felt themselves to be unfairly targeted: even if they were not in immediate danger, they clearly recognised the precariousness of their position.

Although burning was not formally instituted as a punishment for heresy until 1401, evidence suggests that Wycliffites feared the death penalty from 1388 or even earlier.⁷⁸

Unsurprisingly, Wycliffite texts often reflect this, demonstrating a particular interest in ‘models of response to persecution [...] visible in the frequent quotation of Christ’s comforts to his apostles in the face of tribulation and in a preoccupation with martyrdom’.⁷⁹ For example, in ‘*Epistola Sathanae ad Cleros*’, a Wycliffite text dated c. 1400, Satan suggests that those who teach the gospel and live by it should be treated harshly: ‘put hem into prison, and thret to bren

⁷⁷ See P. R. Cavill, ‘Heresy, Law and the State: Forfeiture in Late Medieval and Early Modern England’, *The English Historical Review*, 129.537 (April 2014), 270-95 (p. 275, pp. 280-81).

⁷⁸ Hudson, ‘A Neglected Wycliffite Text’, in *Lollards and their Books*, p. 65; Maureen Jurkowski, ‘Lollardy and Social Status in East Anglia’, *Speculum*, 82.1 (2007), 120-52 (p. 127).

⁷⁹ ‘Introduction’, in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, p. 14.

all suche men'.⁸⁰ He also warns his followers to 'be not borne down by þes lewid Lollers, but bere þem down your myzt and lette þem not aryse'.⁸¹ In *EWS*, lollards are warned: 'studye wel Godus lawe, and the trewthe that suweth of it, and defende it booldely, bothe to prestus and to the world, and thou schalt haue enemyse to pursuwe the to the deth'.⁸² The *Declaracion* fits this model. True prophets and true believers, particularly those who speak out, are often presented as outcasts from the wider community, who are at best ignored, and at worst scorned, pursued and even killed. In light of this, the *Declaracion* takes a nuanced stance on the issue of speaking in defence of one's beliefs. On one hand, it often draws attention to examples of valiant truth-speaking, and in the New Testament books sometimes even seems to provide a model for how to defend God's truth in the face of examination by authorities. This model is based not only on pure bravery, but also on preparation: the marshalling of scriptural authority and the need to refine one's arguments once again seem to suggest a well-educated initial audience.⁸³ On the other hand, the *Declaracion* provides support for the idea that men need not *always* declare the truth; the Wisdom books, in particular, often seem to suggest that speech may be withheld.⁸⁴ It is possible to imagine that this message would have been particularly important in the face of persecution.

3. 6 Study

The *nota* marks do, however, highlight occasions when speech is desirable. In 1 Timothy,

⁸⁰ 'Epistola Sathanæ ad Cleros', in Hudson, *Selections*, pp. 89-93 (p. 92, ll. 139-40). For dating, see Hudson, *Selections*, p. 182.

⁸¹ 'Epistola', in Hudson, *Selections*, p. 92, ll. 145-46.

⁸² This is quoted in Copeland, *Pedagogy*, p. 129. See Gradon, *EWS*, II, p. 235, ll. 51-53.

⁸³ See Introduction to Acts in Part II.

⁸⁴ See for example Proverbs 23, 'Speke not *in* þe eeris of vnwise men' (fol. 71^r); Ecclesiastes 10, 'ffeyned foly *sum* tyme is more profitable þen wisdam' (fol. 73^v); Ecclesiasticus 19, 'tell not þi þræetese' (fol. 78^v); Ecclesiasticus 20, 'Of frute of discrete speche & harme of vndiscrete speche (fol. 78^v); Ecclesiasticus 28, 'well to gider þe gold of þi wisdam & þe siluer of þine eloquence & weygh þi wordes what þu shal speke & what þow shall not (fol. 79^v). On this point see also Introduction to Isaiah in Part II.

attention is drawn to a passage that valorises preaching: ‘Tymothe shold ordeyn able men to help hym to teche þe peple * & his self shold trauel in preching as a knyzt of Crist’ (fol. 190^v).⁸⁵ The word ‘trauel’ here is polyvalent: its primary meaning is almost certainly ‘labour’, but it might also have brought to mind suffering, punishment, fighting and travel in the modern sense.⁸⁶ These last two interpretations would have been particularly apt given the image of the knight, and the final one may even suggest peripatetic teaching of the sort traditionally associated with Wycliffites (see above). Crucial to the quotation, however, is the idea of study: of teachers who will go out into the community and teach ordinary people. The *nota* marks do not only suggest a role for oral teaching, however: the importance of books is also clear. The balance between oral teaching and the written word is demonstrated in a *nota* mark in Jeremiah 36: ‘Baruch wrote in an oþer boke of Jeremyes mouþe all þe wordes of þe * boke þat Ioachim hade brent, & many mo wordes were added þen were bifore’ (fol. 113^v). Although the *Declaracion* almost certainly predates the burning of Wyclif’s work at Carfax in 1411,⁸⁷ it is likely that Wycliffites would have feared the destruction of their texts long before that. If this were the case, then the *nota* here might be read as a reminder that such destruction of physical objects cannot stop ideas: any attempt to destroy Wycliffism by destroying its texts would be met with reconstruction, and extension, of the texts in question.

The importance of books in preserving and teaching true belief is also evident in the *nota* mark given in 1 Maccabees 3:

þey spred bokis o brode to shewe þat þey were redy to put hem self to perel of deþe for þe lawe; of which bokis summe heþen * men þat were letterd wold haue argued þat þey myght wirchip simulacres, ffor Exo. 25 it was biden to put

⁸⁵ See also Isaiah 58, fol. 97^v, ll. 1090-91.

⁸⁶ *MED*, ‘travail’, (n.).

⁸⁷ David Daniell, *The Bible in English: Its History and Influence* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 75-76.

ymagis of cherubyn in þe tabernacle. Bot her skil was noght, for þey were not set þere to be wirchipped, bot *in* mystery or in figure...

(fol. 150^r)

As Somerset suggests ‘[t]his moment is almost too rich with present resonances’.⁸⁸ Firstly, it seems to suggest that the mere act of reading might place a person at risk of death. It then sets up a contrast between educated or trained men who are nevertheless unable (or possibly unwilling) properly to interpret scripture, and believers who have understood the true meaning of the text. That the disagreement pertains to images is interesting given the Wycliffite context. Crucially, too, the text does not merely mention the debate, but provides the erroneous evidence and also the means of refuting it. Such detail is rare in the narrative books of the *Declaracion*, but this moment seems to have particularly appealed to the compiler(s): their text, after all, attempts to arm its audience with just such biblical knowledge, founded in a true understanding of scripture.

⁸⁸ *Feeling*, p. 188.

Chapter 4: The *Declaracion* as Summary and Commentary

The *Declaracion* is difficult to categorise in any straightforward way. The nineteenth-century binding calls it a ‘Comm on the Bible’. Notes written in the fly-leaves presumably at around the time of rebinding in 1808 call it a ‘commentary’, an ‘abridgement’ or both, as well as suggesting that it is ‘in some measure a concordance or Harmony of the gospels’.¹ As noted in Chapter 1, with the exception of David Fowler, who sees it mainly as a commentary, modern scholars have tended to follow N. R. Ker in characterising it primarily as a summary of WB. Those who have engaged with it more thoroughly have noted, however, that it mixes paraphrase and commentary. Even here, as I will demonstrate in the next chapter, scholars have erred in supposing that the commentary sections are far more original than they actually are. But leaving aside for now the question of where the commentary material comes from, even the most cursory reading of the *Declaracion* alongside WB demonstrates that it contains a mixture of several elements, and that it does not slot easily into any generic category. While this sort of generic fluidity is not uncommon in medieval writing, I argue that the way in which the *Declaracion* deploys all of these elements, in complicated and varied ways, is unusual, and that the *Declaracion* is a bolder, more experimental text than any other associated with WB. This chapter begins by situating the *Declaracion* in the context of biblical commentary and summary produced in England before WB. It then examines Wycliffite attitudes to both practices, before considering the various methods of the *Declaracion* in comparison with analogous Wycliffite texts.

¹ fol. iv^r; fol. 201^v. This last categorisation is misleading: though each *Declaracion* gospel does include a number of cross-references to the other gospels, these do not qualify it as either a harmony or a concordance.

1. Biblical Commentary and Summary in England before the Wycliffite Bible

Works of Biblical paraphrase and summary abounded in the Later Middle Ages. Although the most influential bible commentary, the *Glossa*, was completed much earlier, the fourteenth century saw a profusion of new commentaries, while works of biblical summary continued to be produced throughout the century. A thorough study of biblical summary and commentary in the period is far beyond the scope of this thesis, but this section will focus on those aspects of each tradition that may have informed the production of the *Declaracion*. Before proceeding, it is important to register that there is no clear-cut boundary between biblical summary and exegesis. As Rita Copeland notes, paraphrase is a key component of medieval exegesis (in fact, she calls it ‘the most basic and characteristic practice’ of exegetical texts).² Meanwhile texts that primarily summarise the content of the bible do regularly include some exegetical material.³ For the purposes of the current discussion, texts that consist mainly of condensed biblical material will be termed summaries or paraphrases, whereas texts that seek mainly to interpret or explain scripture will be termed exegesis.

It is to such exegesis that we turn first. A large number of bible commentaries were produced in Europe in the fourteenth century and into the fifteenth.⁴ Of these, a sizeable proportion were written in England.⁵ While there was a tendency in the earlier fourteenth century for commentaries to focus on the Old Testament (especially Wisdom literature), by the

² *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 83. It is important to note, however, that Copeland is mainly focused on secular commentary. On this point as it relates to the *Declaracion*, see Pouzet, p. 107.

³ Dinkova-Bruun, Greti, ‘Why Versify the Bible in the Later Middle Ages and for Whom?: The Story of Creation in Verse’, in *Dichten als Stoff-Vermittlung: Formen, Ziele, Wirkungen – Beiträge zur Praxis der Versifikation lateinischer Texte in Mittelalter*, ed. by Peter Stotz and Philipp Roelli (Zürich: Chronos, 2008), pp. 41-56 (pp. 45-46).

⁴ William J. Courtenay, ‘The Bible in the Fourteenth Century: Some Observations’, *Church History*, 54.2 (June 1985), 176-87 (p. 176).

⁵ Courtenay, ‘Observations’, p. 182.

end of the century New Testament commentaries were much more popular, though Psalter commentaries continued to be produced regardless of broader trends.⁶ The fourteenth century also saw the production of commentaries on the whole bible, such as *LPL*. This text, of course, was to become a major source for the *Declaracion*.⁷ Heavily influenced by Lyra, and in addition to five commentaries on the Pater Noster produced between 1373 and 1384, John Wyclif also produced a *Postilla* on the whole bible, likely between 1371 and 1376.⁸ All Oxford theology students in the late fourteenth century were required to lecture on the bible for one term as part of their degree.⁹ It has been suggested that Wyclif's *Postilla* grew out of such a lecture series, though, as Pamela Gradon suggests, it is likely that, if so, the work was subject to extensive revision.¹⁰ Given that Wyclif was only required to lecture on a single book, it is also likely that his *Postilla* was the result of large-scale augmentation of the earlier work. If Wyclif's *Postilla* had grown out of his lectures, it would not be particularly unusual: bachelor commentaries were increasingly recorded in writing in the late fourteenth century.¹¹

Like the *Declaracion*, commentaries in this period were in general derivative, with little original material.¹² With regard to the *Declaracion* there are three other important features of late medieval commentaries that bear examination. The first is reliance on *LPL*. As Jeremy Catto notes, it formed the basis for commentaries by Robert Holcot, John Wyclif and William Woodford in fourteenth-century England and became 'the standard interpretation of scripture

⁶ Courtenay, 'Observations', p. 185.

⁷ See Chapter 5.

⁸ See Pamela Gradon, 'Wyclif's *Postilla* and his Sermons', in *Text and Controversy: from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson*, ed. by Helen Barr and Ann M. Hutchison (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005) pp. 67-77. On the Pater Noster commentaries, see 'Introduction', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, pp. 12-13.

⁹ W. J. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 42-43.

¹⁰ 'Postilla', p. 75.

¹¹ Courtenay, 'Observations', p. 186. Jeremy Catto, 'The Wycliffite Bible: The Historical Context', in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 11-26 (pp. 15-16).

¹² Catto, 'Bible', p. 18. See Chapter 5.

across Europe'.¹³ Thus, Lyra's insistence on the primacy of an expanded literal sense is reflected in most commentary of the period, as it is in the *Declaracion*.¹⁴ The second is length. As Courtenay notes, commentaries produced c. 1400 (at around the same time as the *Declaracion*) often had 'monumental scope', running to hundreds or even thousands of folios.¹⁵ While there was some recognition that such extensive commentaries would not be easily accessible to all those who might benefit from them (Lyra, for example, produced an abridged version of *LPL* for the use of students),¹⁶ the majority of commentaries remained accessible only to an educated elite. Tied to this is the question of language. While vernacular commentaries did exist (for example Rolle's *English Psalter Commentary*, or the late fourteenth-century commentaries on Matthew, Mark and Luke, the prologues to which have been edited by Andrew Kraebel, and, of course, *GG*), the majority of commentaries were written in Latin.¹⁷ Taken together with the enormous length of many productions, this meant that only highly educated readers with access to institutional libraries would be able to read them.¹⁸ As a work which condenses and vernacularises commentary from a range of longer Latin texts, the *Declaracion* may have been designed as a remedy to this problem, although, as noted in Chapter 2, its main audience was still likely an academic one.

Of course, biblical exegesis was not only disseminated via complete commentaries.

After 1200, many Latin bibles had 'considerable' interpolations derived from glosses.¹⁹ Many

¹³ Catto, 'Bible', p. 15 and pp. 18-19.

¹⁴ Levy, 'The Literal Sense', pp. 788-89.

¹⁵ Courtenay, 'The Bible', p. 187. Catto notes that William Woodford's commentary on Matthew 'failed to reach the end of the fifth chapter even after 175 folio leaves of the only manuscript' (Catto, 'Bible', p. 20).

¹⁶ See Chapter 5.

¹⁷ See Hudson, *Revisions; The Psalter or Psalms of David and Certain Canticles with a Translation and Exposition in English by Richard Rolle of Hampole*, ed. by H. R. Bramley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884); Kraebel, 'Glosses'; Hudson, *Doctors*. *GG* is discussed in more detail below.

¹⁸ See Chapter 5.

¹⁹ Dove, *FEB*, p. 24

bible paraphrases, summaries and harmonies also contained a large proportion of exegetical material.²⁰ Latin verse paraphrases of the bible (in whole or part) produced in England and on the European continent in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are regularly augmented with glossing, historical detail (often culled from Josephus), authorial interpretation, and/or legendary material.²¹ Prose works, too, intermixed narrative scriptural summary with interpretation. The most popular and influential such work was the *Historia scholastica* (*HS*). Completed in 1170, the text gained papal approval at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, and became a mainstay of religious education across Europe, which would be translated and summarised many times over.²² The popular French bible version known as the *Bible historiale complétée* (*BHC*) consisted of translations from the Vulgate with translations from *HS* and other commentaries.²³ As Morey notes, ‘the *Historia* [is] a book of *stories*’.²⁴ Although coverage of biblical books is relatively comprehensive, Comestor’s focus is markedly different from that of the *Declaracion*: he omits Proverbs, Psalms and the epistles, among other books such as Isaiah, presumably because they do nothing to further the narrative (the four gospel accounts are also harmonised into one).²⁵ At the same time, books with a high narrative content are given much more space. This is a looser and less comprehensive treatment than the

²⁰ One such harmony circulating in England in the fourteenth century is the Middle English *Estoire del Evangelié*, which survives in both a longer and an abbreviated version. See Gertrude Campbell, ‘The Middle English *Evangelié*’, *MLA*, 30.3 (1915), 529–613.

²¹ Evelyn Birge Vitz, ‘Medieval Verse Paraphrases of the Bible’, in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. by James Carleton Paget and others, 4 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012–16), II: *From 600 to 1450*, ed. by Richard Marsden and E. Ann Matter (2012), pp. 835–59 (pp. 835–36).

²² James Morey notes that ‘[a]bridging the *Historia* was a popular fifteenth-century pastime’: ‘Peter Comestor, Biblical Paraphrase and the Medieval Popular Bible’, *Speculum*, 68.1 (January 1993), 6–35 (p. 8, n. 6).

²³ Morey, ‘Comestor’, pp. 21–24; Rosemarie Potz McGerr, ‘Guyart Desmoulins, the Vernacular Master of Histories, and his *Bible Historiale*’, *Viator*, 14 (1983), 211–44; Delbert Russell, ‘The European Background: “pe Bible and opere bookis of deuociun and of expositioun” in French’, in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 49–65 (pp. 54–55). Russell notes that the WB translators would have been familiar with *BHC* (p. 55).

²⁴ Morey, ‘Comestor’, p. 7.

²⁵ See Lucie Doležalová, ‘The Dining Room of God: Petrus Comestor’s *Historia scholastica* and Retelling the Bible as Feasting’, in *Retelling the Bible: Literary, Historical and Social Contexts*, ed. by Lucie Doležalová and Tamás Visi (Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang, 2011), pp. 229–44 (pp. 239–40).

one found in the *Declaracion*.

The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, however, saw the creation of a number of biblical paraphrases that attempted to retain more of the wording of scripture, with no exegetical material. The principal works of this type are the *Summarium Biblicum* commonly attributed to Alexander de Villa Dei, but likely written c. 1300, after his death; the anonymous fourteenth-century *Capitula Euangeliorum uersifice scripta*; and the *Margarita* of Guido Vincentinus. Of these, only the *Summarium Biblicum* can be proven to have circulated in England.²⁶ These poetic treatments share a mnemonic and didactic purpose, and vary in length. All, however, are significantly shorter than the *Declaracion*.²⁷ When compared to earlier bible versifications, though, they do share one important characteristic with our text: they are largely faithful to the wording of scripture.²⁸ Sometimes, as in the *Capitula Euangeliorum*, such lexical fidelity seems to have been more important than intelligibility. In this text, words are lifted directly from the Vulgate and stuck together to produce one line for every chapter of the gospels, but because the words retain their Latin inflections and are presented in the exact order in which they appear in the Vulgate, the result often feels garbled.²⁹ Dinkova-Bruun suggests that in this case each word acts as ‘a mental bell that is supposed to bring forth for the reader a world of biblical meaning’.³⁰ Such an impetus can perhaps be discerned in those *Declaracion* books, like the Song of Songs, which provide only a list of brief biblical quotations. Although the dominant mode of the *Declaracion* as a whole is paraphrase, and it includes a large proportion of exegetical material, it also seems to have been

²⁶ Lucie Doležalová, ‘The *Summarium Biblicum*: A Biblical Tool Both Popular and Obscure’, in *Form and Function in the Late Medieval Bible*, ed. by Eyal Poleg and Laura Light (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 163-84 (pp. 164-65).

²⁷ Dinkova-Bruun, ‘Memory’, p. 55.

²⁸ Dinkova-Bruun, ‘Memory’, p. 55 and p. 57.

²⁹ Dinkova-Bruun, ‘Memory’, pp. 59-60.

³⁰ ‘Memory’, p. 62.

written in such a way as to preserve the lexis (if not the syntax) of scripture where possible. This fidelity to LV likely had an ideological impetus, as I suggested in the previous chapter, but it may well also have been intended to have a mnemonic function.

It is also worth noting that the bible is, at times, itself a summary, and the *Declaracion* is alert to this.³¹ In summarising Genesis 2. 4-5, for example, the *Declaracion* does little more than note the repetition:

LV: These ben the generaciouns of heuene and of erthe, in the day wherynne the Lord God made heuene and erthe, and ech litil tre of erthe bifore that it sprong out in erthe; and he made ech erbe of the feeld bifore that it buriownede. For the Lord God had not reyned on erthe, and no man was that wrouzte erthe.

D, fol.1^r: A short recapitulaciozn of makyng of creatures.

The *Declaracion* is in this moment far more indebted to *LPL* than to the biblical text.³²

However, what matters for the present discussion is that the *Declaracion* (somewhat misleadingly) suggests that these verses merely rehearse the creation narrative from Genesis 1 in a condensed form. The word ‘short’, not found in either *LPL* or LV, is even added to emphasise the point. Although Genesis 2. 4-5 does draw the reader’s mind back to the Creation as recorded in Genesis 1, it can hardly be called a recapitulation: there is a restatement that God created the earth and heavens, and an allusion to part of the Creation, but this is no straightforward summary of what went before. In fact, Genesis 2. 5 contains information not already given in Genesis 1 (that God had not yet caused it to rain), and Genesis

³¹ For more information on retelling within the biblical text, see Tamás Visi, ‘Introduction’, in *Retelling the Bible*: ed. by Doležalová and Visi, pp. 13-43 (pp. 17-24). On this aspect of the *Declaracion*, see Somerset, *Feeling*, p. 200.

³² L1/59:1. The prioritising of Lyran material over biblical text will be discussed in Chapter 5.

2. 6, which is missing from the *Declaracion* entirely, expands on this theme ('but a welle stiede out of the erthe, and moistide al he hizere part of erthe'). That the *Declaracion* omits this new detail in favour of a comment about the bible's use of paraphrase is telling, especially since this is not an isolated example: the text often speaks of 'rehersing' and 'recapitulation' in the biblical text.³³ In addition, it frequently provides cross-references to treatments of the same material in other biblical books, as for example in Jeremiah 52:

Pis chapitre is a shorte recapitulacion or rehersing of summe þinges seyð bifore: of þe taking of King Sedechie, & destruction of Ierusalem, & translating of þe Iewes, &c., as *Jeremiah* 39.

(fol. 116^v)³⁴

As Chapter 5 will demonstrate, these citations are mainly copied from *LPL*, but nevertheless they have the effect of drawing attention to repetition and paraphrase in the scriptural text, and thus providing a legitimising model for the *Declaracion* itself.

In fact, given their educational background, it is clear that the *Declaracion* compiler(s) would have encountered a large corpus of other texts that would have provided them with a model. They would have known of a large number of biblical commentaries recently produced in England, and the exclusivity of many of these texts may well have motivated them to produce something more accessible. In terms of biblical paraphrase, too, there would have been a number of available models. Although it is possible that they were unaware of the Latin verse paraphrases discussed here, they clearly knew *HS*, and likely also *BHC*. This broader context also influenced other texts produced in the wake of *WB*. The next section will consider

³³ For example Jeremiah 52, fol. 116^v; Baruch 2, fol. 118^r; Amos 2, fol. 138^v; Ephesians 1, fol. 184^r.

³⁴ For other examples see Leviticus 20, fol. 5^v; Deuteronomy 11, fol. 9^v; Nehemiah 1, fol. 24^v (l. 52); Esther 9, fol. 31^r; Psalms 8, fol. 37^r; Psalm 104, fol. 58^r; Isaiah 22, fol. 87^r (l. 315); Jeremiah 26, fol. 110^v; Galatians 1, fol. 181^v; Acts 7, fol. 196^v (l. 95).

Wycliffite attitudes to scriptural paraphrase and commentary, and examine the *Declaracion* in the context of Wycliffite texts incorporating one or both elements.

2. Wycliffite Scriptural Paraphrase and Glossing

Before examining Wycliffite attitudes to scriptural paraphrase in particular, it is instructive to consider their use of summary more broadly. While many of the projects associated with the Wycliffites are large-scale productions, they also recognised that abridgement and paraphrase could play an important role in helping to disseminate their biblical scholarship to a wider audience. Sometimes, as with the chapter-by-chapter summary of Wyclif's *De Mandatis* found in Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College MS 565/337, these summaries are *capitula*-lists obviously just meant to facilitate access to the longer texts, acting as finding aids, and prefaced to the full text.³⁵ The same manuscript, though, contains what Anne Hudson has described as 'analyses' or 'summaries' of several other of Wyclif's works, which are presented independent of the full texts. Hudson also notes that several of Wyclif's works survive only in summary form.³⁶ These works are not scriptural paraphrase, but they are suggestive of Wycliffite attitudes to the practice of summary more generally. While these works are much briefer than the *Declaracion*, they do demonstrate that abridgement was an important Wycliffite tool, and that these abridgements were sometimes intended to stand alone. The most high-profile of these productions were the 'short' versions of the *Glossed Gospels* (on which more below), and the *Rosarium*, the abridged version of the Wycliffite moral/ecclesiological anthology known as the *Floretum*.³⁷ That they were producing such works indicates that Wycliffites were

³⁵ See also Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 524, which contains an abridgement of *De Mandatis* (fols 67^v-81^v).

³⁶ Hudson, *PR*, p. 104.

³⁷ See Chapter 1.

comfortable with the idea of paraphrase more generally, and provides an interesting context for the excerpting and paraphrasing of exegetical material that is such a key feature of the *Declaracion*.

But while they clearly saw the value of excerption and paraphrase as a tool for the dissemination of exegetical material and theological treatises, there has been some scholarly disagreement on the question of how far Wycliffites were prepared to tolerate deviation from the biblical text, and therefore, how comfortable they would have been with the idea of biblical paraphrase. On the one hand, inspired by an injunction in Deuteronomy 4. 2 ('Ȝe schulen not adde to the word which Y speke to ȝou, nether Ȝe schulen take awei fro it...'), some Wycliffites wrote against adding to or abridging scripture.³⁸ For instance, the short tract 'How thu schuldest not adde ne abrigge ouȝt change not ne countre not þe biddingis of God', suggests an aversion to any form of paraphrase, abridgement or commentary:

How thu schuldest not adde ne abrigge ouȝt change not ne countre not þe biddingis of God [...] if any man do it awey fro the wordis of this book, God schal do away his *part* fro the book of lif [...] also it spekiþ nat of þe wordis of þis book but of all þe wordis of holi writ *in* the bible.³⁹

The exegetical implications of this will be dealt with below. In terms of summary and paraphrase, it might be argued that, taken to its logical conclusion, this passage precludes believers not only from paraphrasing scripture, but also from excerpting it, or discussing it in any meaningful way: this cannot, however, have been the intention. Another Wycliffite tract, 'A Dialogue Between Jon and Richard', expresses a similar sentiment, though this time directed

³⁸ It is to be noted that this verse is mentioned twice in quick succession in PWB: see Dove, *Advocates*, p. 10, ll. 240-42 and ll. 246-47.

³⁹ Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, MS Ff. 6. 31, fols 61^r-61^v. Dove notes that Reginald Pecock viewed this text as lollard in origin (*Advocates*, p. lvi).

narrowly at the friars: ‘... we may not put fau3te in þe gospel as þei putten fau3te in þer new reule and purchasen dispensacioun to haue new reules. But God biddiþ þat we schal not put to ne take fro his wordes.’⁴⁰ This time, the text is informed by Revelation 22. 18-19, another injunction against taking away from or adding to scripture. Similar anti-fraternal sentiment is common in Wycliffite writing: ‘The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy’ warns readers to ‘be war wiþ þes false profetis [...] and moost þese freris’, suggesting that in some cases abridging scripture can be as harmful as lying: ‘[s]umme prechen fablis and summe veyne stories; summe docken hooli writt and summe feynen lesyngis’.⁴¹ It is likely that ‘How thu schuldest not adde’ was intended to be a similarly focused injunction.

In her work on *Oon of Foure*, a gospel harmony based on the Wycliffite Bible, Mary Raschko suggests that some scholars believe that it is unlikely to be Wycliffite, since it rearranges and omits biblical material.⁴² Raschko goes on to assert that Hudson ‘considers the rearrangement and omission of text in Gospel harmonies inconsistent with a Wycliffite approach to scriptural translation’, though an inspection of the passage cited demonstrates that Hudson’s view is not so definite: she merely questions whether Wycliffites would have approved of this sort of paraphrase.⁴³ Raschko is perceptive, however, in her statement that any argument which presumes that Wycliffites had a problem with translating anything but ‘the precise words of Scripture’ is misguided, since ‘it generalizes characteristics of one translation

⁴⁰ ‘Dialogue Between Jon and Richard’, in *Four Wycliffite Dialogues*, ed. by Fiona Somerset (Oxford: EETS, 2009), pp. 3-31 (p. 12, ll. 333-35).

⁴¹ Hudson, *Selections*, p. 75 (ll. 1-3 and ll. 15-17). A similar sentiment is expressed in other Wycliffite texts: see for example ‘The Nature of the Church’, in *Selections*, ed. by Hudson, pp. 115-19 (pp. 118-19, ll. 120-26); and the Wycliffite libel ‘Heu! quanta desolatio’, on which see Wendy Scase, ‘“Heu! Quanta desolatio Angliae praestatur”: A Wycliffite Libel and the Naming of Heretics, Oxford 1382’, in *Lollards and their Influence*, ed. by Somerset, Havens and Pitard, pp. 19-36 (p. 32).

⁴² Mary Raschko, ‘*Oon of Foure*: Harmonizing Wycliffite and Pseudo-Bonaventuran Approaches to the Life of Christ’, in *Pseudo-Bonaventuran Lives of Christ: Exploring the Middle English Tradition*, ed. by Ian Johnson and Allan F. Westphall (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 341-370 (p. 342).

⁴³ Raschko, ‘*Oon*’, p. 344; see Hudson, *PR*, pp. 267-68.

project – the comprehensive Bible – to all forms of Wycliffite scriptural translation’.⁴⁴ Rather, she quotes a 2011 paper by Somerset to the effect that summary was an important ‘interpretative tool’ for Wycliffites.⁴⁵ Raschko further suggests that *Oon of Foure* proves that Wycliffites did not always prioritise the precise words of scripture, either as translators or readers.⁴⁶ Of course, *Oon of Foure* is not the only such example apparently produced by Wycliffites. Several others will be discussed in detail below.

It seems, then, that although certain Wycliffite texts discuss the practice in harsh terms, Wycliffites had no blanket objection to scriptural paraphrase or summary: rather, most seem to have objected only when abridgement was undertaken in a way that they deemed to be false, either because it was not sufficiently transparent, or because it presented a misleading picture of biblical meaning. As Michael Kuczynski and others have noted, Wycliffite attitudes to glossing were broadly similar: suspicion of ‘falce glosatours’ did not preclude them from glossing scripture themselves, nor from trusting certain existing glosses.⁴⁷ The WB translators had relied upon Latin exegetical texts to help them to understand the true meaning of scripture, and had subsequently translated portions of these texts for inclusion in certain WB manuscripts, particularly in LV.⁴⁸ Wycliffite scholars are also presumed to have been instrumental in preparing a number of commentaries (including *GG*, to be discussed in more detail below).⁴⁹ Of course they also added supplemental glossing to existing English

⁴⁴ Raschko, ‘*Oon*’, p. 345.

⁴⁵ Raschko, ‘*Oon*’, p. 345. Somerset returns to the question of lollard biblical summary in *Feeling*, pp. 166-201.

⁴⁶ Raschko, ‘*Oon*’, pp. 366-69.

⁴⁷ Michael Kuczynski, ‘Glossing and Glosses’, in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 346-67 (p. 355); Ghosh, *Wycliffite Heresy*, pp. 63-64 and pp. 115-20; Von Noleken, ‘Lay Literacy’, pp. 181-82.

⁴⁸ ‘PWB’, in Dove, *Advocates*, p. 80, ll. 2800-11; Dove, *FEB*, pp. 152-72; Kuczynski, ‘Glossing’, pp. 346-353.

⁴⁹ See Hudson, *Doctors*; Henry Hargreaves, ‘Popularising Biblical Scholarship: the Role of the Wycliffite *Glossed Gospels*’, in *The Bible and Medieval Culture*, ed. by W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1979), pp. 171-89; ‘The Ten Commandments (Selections)’, in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, p. 201.

commentaries, most notably Rolle's *English Psalter commentary*.⁵⁰ The view of Wycliffites seems to be 'not so much that the scriptural words themselves must stand alone, as that some conclusions may legitimately be extrapolated from them through commentary, while others may not'.⁵¹ As Kuczynski notes, the gloss found on Deuteronomy 4. 2 in two LV manuscripts demonstrates this point:

3e schulen not adde to the word etc. Here that adding is forbedun, that depraueth, ether peruersith the vnderstanding of the lawe; that adding that declarith, ether makith cleer, is not forbedun...⁵²

This self-reflexive gloss makes it clear that most Wycliffites would have approved of glossing under certain circumstances. The difficulty, of course, is how to distinguish a "good" gloss from a "bad" gloss. Like Wyclif himself, Wycliffites had great respect for earlier exegetes, and the prologues to Wycliffite commentaries often cite reliance on earlier authorities, presumably in part to reassure the reader of the reliability of the exegesis presented.⁵³ Much also depended upon the character of the exegete. Wyclif wrote that glossators must be humble, and be in communion with Christ.⁵⁴ Ghosh notes that this second criterion, which was taken up by Wyclif's followers and which he terms 'a tendency to valorise "revelation"' was 'by its very nature beyond the domain of intellectual engagement'.⁵⁵ Thus, the criteria by which

⁵⁰ See Hudson, *Revisions*.

⁵¹ 'Introduction', in *Wycliffite Spirituality*, p. 8.

⁵² The gloss occurs in London, Old Royal Library British Museum, MS 1 C. 9 and London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius E.2. See Forshall and Madden, vol. 1, p. 474; Kuczynski, 'Glossing', pp. 355-56.

⁵³ See for example 'Prologue to Short Matthew', in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 172-73 (p. 173, ll. 25-47); 'Prologue to Intermediate Matthew', in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 174-79 (pp. 177-78, ll. 107-115 and ll. 128-36); 'Epilogue to Intermediate/Long Matthew', in Dove, *Advocates* (p. 180, ll. 9-10 and l. 27); 'Prologue to Short Luke', in Dove, *Advocates*, pp. 184-85 (p. 184, ll. 18-56); 'Prologue to Short John', in Dove, *Advocates*, p. 186 (ll. 7-16). On respect for earlier exegetes among Wyclif and his followers, see Levy, 'Holy Scripture', pp. 37-39; Kuczynski, 'Glossing', p. 356.

⁵⁴ Levy, 'Holy Scripture', pp. 38-40. Wyclif was not alone in this: see Levy, 'Literal Sense', p. 825.

⁵⁵ Ghosh, *Wycliffite Heresy*, p. 64.

Wycliffites judge glosses as true or false can at times be utterly opaque.

Howsoever the glosses were judged, Wycliffite texts do tend to follow Wyclif in attempting to keep them separate (or at least separable) from the biblical text itself: I will return to this point below. For the present it is important to remember that Wycliffites do not seem to have had any general objection to either scriptural summary or exegesis in principle. The evidence presented below suggests, instead, that they were actively engaged in producing works that incorporated one or both elements.

3.1 Paraphrase and Exegesis in the *Declaracion* and Other Wycliffite Texts

The methods of the *Declaracion* are varied and often difficult to pin down without detailed analysis of its sources.⁵⁶ It deploys direct quotation from LV often, and to varying degrees in different books, so that it is at times simply a list of excerpts. More often, however, the biblical text is reworked to create a paraphrase of elegance and concision, which remains remarkably true to the lexical flavour of LV. The text also incorporates direct English translations of Latin exegetical material, and of the Vulgate: these translations are generally quite brief, but sometimes longer, and often use cognates. Again, though, the compiler(s) are adept at excerpting material from commentary sources, and paraphrasing it when appropriate.⁵⁷ What makes the text even more difficult to categorise is the fact that the boundaries between paraphrase and commentary (and paraphrased commentary) are not clearly defined, either in the text itself or in the mise-en-page. At times, most clearly in the Psalter, and the majority of Job and Isaiah, the text is set out like a traditional commentary: clearly defined biblical lemmata are followed by extensive commentary sections. At other times, though, commentary and

⁵⁶ See Chapter 5.

⁵⁷ See Pouzet, p. 108.

biblical material mingle together seamlessly, and the commentary elements are so short and unobtrusive as to be invisible to all but the most careful and knowledgeable reader. Even within biblical books, the methods deployed can change quickly, without notice and seemingly without reason. In this section, I will demonstrate how the *Declaracion* balances summary and commentary in different ways at different times, comparing its practice to various Wycliffite texts from the same period. Though the two are not generally visually distinguished from the rest of the text in the manuscript itself, in each of the following examples, direct quotations of two or more words from LV will be given in **bold**, while commentary material will be given in *bold italics*. Normal type signifies that the text is paraphrased from LV. With regard to the *Declaracion*, the discussion below should be taken as a guide to general characteristics: as I have mentioned, the methodology does vary even within books, and an exhaustive analysis of each book is outside the scope of the current study. Further detail on the characteristics of the books edited as part of the study can be found in the individual introductions in Part II, and in the accompanying annotations.

3.1 Biblical Abbreviation without Paraphrase

Perhaps the simplest method of abbreviation demonstrated in the *Declaracion* is the excerption of verses (or partial verses) verbatim (or near-verbatim) from LV. This technique is evident throughout the text, but is used in the most sustained way in the books from Proverbs-Ecclesiasticus, and particularly in the Song of Songs, the opening chapter of which is reproduced below, with original punctuation retained:

D: Kis he me with þe cus / Better are þi pappes / oyle shed oute is þi name / zong damyselles / drawe me / Celeres / Rightful men lufen þe / I am blak / tabernaculs of cedar / skynnes of Salomon / þe son hace discoloured / þe sons of my moder / a

**keper in vyneres / shewe to me where þou restes in myd dey / if þou knowes not þi
self feyre amongwymmen / þe chares of pharao / chekes as of a turtil / Nek as
broches / golden ournementes / þe king in his resting place / Narde / a boundel
of myrr / a cluster of cipre tre among þe vyneres of engaddy / lo þou art feyre my
frendesse⁵⁸ / þine eghne as of doufes / oure bed is feyre as floures / trees of cedar /
Coupels of cipresse / I am a floure of þe felde / as a lily among þornes / as an
appeltre**

(fol. 74^r)

While this may read like a list of vernacular lemmata, it is important to note that the phrases do not seem to correspond to the Latin lemmata used in either *LPL* or the *Glossa*; instead, they appear to have been independently selected by the compiler.

Noting that Song of Songs contains ‘no analysis whatsoever’, and that the other Wisdom books include ‘little expansion’, Somerset warns against concluding that the approach indicates a ‘lack of interest’: ‘we should bear in mind the benefits of such a list as a finding aid and how important key evocative phrases could be in remembering the bible’.⁵⁹ Although Somerset is right to suggest that the compiler might have intended these grammatically disjointed phrases to have acted as a mnemonic prompt, it is also possible to imagine that they could have a meditative or devotional purpose. By refusing even to gesture toward fluidity or intelligibility, much less to ‘explain’ the biblical text, these books seem to encourage the reader to set aside conscious thought, and instead to be swept up in the poetry of the text, and the feelings it stirs.⁶⁰ In the above example, the text proceeds as a number of striking images. Read continuously, the cumulative effect is powerfully evocative. Read more slowly and deliberately, each partial verse provides a meditative opportunity.

It is difficult to say with certainty why Song of Songs is treated in this way. Obviously,

⁵⁸ The word order in this quotation is different in LV: ‘my frendess, thou art fair’ (Song of Songs 1. 14).

⁵⁹ *Feeling*, p. 187.

⁶⁰ For discussion of extra-grammaticality in medieval devotion, see Vincent Gillespie, ‘Postcards from the Edge: Interpreting the Ineffable in the Middle English Mystics’, in Vincent Gillespie, *Looking in Holy Books: Essays on Late Medieval Religious Writing in England* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), pp. 307-337 (p. 312).

the book does not lend itself to the kind of narrative summary with historical commentary favoured by the compiler(s) in the Pentateuch and the historical Old Testament books (see below), but the stricter adherence to the wording of the biblical text and lack of commentary is still puzzling. In fact, in some ways the lack of commentary here is more unexpected than it would be in any other book, because Song of Songs had long been recognised as a book that needed exegesis, and had been covered extensively in both of the *Declaracion*'s main exegetical sources (the *Glossa* and *LPL*).⁶¹ The lack of analysis provided by the compiler seems even more strange in light of the extensive treatment afforded to the Psalter. However, it may have been the experience of glossing the Psalter that led the compiler(s) to treat Song of Songs and the other Wisdom books in such a different way. If the Psalter was complete before work began on the other sapiential books, it might have been realised that such an exhaustive approach would not be feasible. Given the exegetical complexity of these books, and their relative unimportance in terms of 'needful scripture',⁶² the compiler(s) may have sought to approach them in the simplest way possible. This need not imply a lack of interest, but might reflect an ability to prioritise, and a realistic view of the limitations of the project. For comparison, the PWB summary (discussed in more detail below) devotes only a short section to Song of Songs, noting how obscure it can be: 'þis book is so sutil to vndurstonde þat Iewis ordeyneden þat no man shulde studie it no but he were of xxx. 3eer and hadde able wit to vndurstonde þe gostli priuytees of þis book' (pp. 59-60, ll. 2052-55). In order to remain useful, the *Declaracion* would have had to remain relatively short, so as to fit into one easily portable volume. In response to such complexity, and in view of the spatial constraints, it might

⁶¹ See E. Ann Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990); Mary Dove, 'Love *ad litteram*: The Lollard Translations of the Song of Songs', *Reformation*, 9. 1 (2004), 1-23.

⁶² Unlike the Gospels, for example, which are mentioned in several Wycliffite tracts as being most necessary for salvation. See Introduction to the Gospels in Part II.

well have seemed better to present Song of Songs (and the surrounding books) without exegesis than to attempt to condense the whole tradition and end up with a job half done.

The technique used in Song of Songs and the other Wisdom books, of simply excerpting WB text without comment, is common in a number of other Wycliffite manuscripts. The manuscript with which T93 has been most frequently associated, Cambridge, Cambridge University Library, MS Ee 1.10 (hereafter CUL Ee 1.10), contains the most sustained example of this type.⁶³ It consists of a lengthy chapter-by-chapter abbreviation of WB from 2 Chronicles to 2 Maccabees, in a hand dated to the early fifteenth century. The manuscript is therefore roughly contemporary with T93 and is almost exactly the same size, though with noticeably higher production values.⁶⁴ Like the *Declaracion*, the CUL text has received relatively little critical attention, most of which has focused on its treatment of the Psalter, and in particular on its relationship to EV and LV.⁶⁵

In many ways, the CUL text shares the approach set out above: it contains a selection of biblical verses (or partial verses) from each chapter, presented in bible order, with no commentary. These fragments are quoted directly from EV, or at least from a manuscript much closer to the EV than LV. Previous scholarship has suggested that the text contains a wealth of revisions, though my own research on the manuscript has found much less evidence of revision in other books than in the Psalter.⁶⁶ For the purposes of the present discussion, I will refer to

⁶³ For mentions of T93 and CUL Ee 1.10 together, see Hudson, *PR*, p. 235; Hudson and Solopova, 'The Latin Text', p. 111; Ghosh, 'The Prologues', p. 168; Dove, *FEB*, p. 52; Dove mentions Manchester, John Rylands Library, MS 89 in the same context.

⁶⁴ See Henry Hargreaves, 'An Intermediate Version of the Wycliffite Old Testament', *Studia Neophilologica* 28 (1956), 130-47 (p. 130).

⁶⁵ Hargreaves, 'Intermediate'; Sutherland, *Psalms*, pp. 152-55. See also Dove, *FEB*, pp. 239-41; Fristedt, *Wycliffite Bible*, II, pp. li-liii; see also Margaret Connolly, *The Index of Middle English Prose, Handlist XIX: Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge (Dd-Oo)* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2009), pp. 85-86; FM, I, p. liv; *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge*, ed. by C. Hardwick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1857), II, p. 10-11.

⁶⁶ For previous examinations of this question, see FM, Vol. I, p. liv; Hargreaves, 'Intermediate', p. 133; Daniell, *The Bible*, p. 81.

the source as ‘EV’.

Admitting that all the material in CUL Ee 1.10 is excerpted from a single source should not blind us to the fact that it is an impressive production. Like the *Declaracion*, CUL Ee 1.10 demonstrates a surprisingly careful attitude to selection of material, and often stitches together fragments from different verses in order to create fluid syntactical units. The following example from 1 Ezra 7 will demonstrate this. The numbers in bold refer to the verse from which CUL Ee 1.10 is quoting, and follow Forshall and Madden’s numbering. A double-slash is used to indicate a paraph:

[1] Forsobe aftir þese wordis in þe regne of Artaxerses king of Persis, Esdras þe sone of Saraie, sone of Azarie &ce // [10] Forsobe made his hert redi þat he enserche þe lawe of þe Lord ; & do & tech *in Israel* mandement & doom.

(fol. 181^v)

Although the use of ‘&ce’ and the paraph here slightly ruins the effect, these two partial verses are excerpted in such a way that they flow on from one another. In his work on the manuscript, Hargreaves notes that, though the compiler always includes the first verse of the chapter (or at least the opening of the first verse), after that ‘odd verses or passages [are] picked seemingly at random’.⁶⁷ Certainly, if one lists the verses included by number, as Hargreaves does, the selection can feel rather arbitrary, and when the text is compared to a full bible, some of the omissions are striking. However, when reading the text independent of its source, the main impression is of surprising fluidity: the text does not feel as haphazard as Hargreaves’s analysis might suggest. Far from assembling a random collection of verse fragments from each chapter,

⁶⁷ Hargreaves, ‘Intermediate’, p. 131.

it is clear that the compiler worked hard to create a cohesive whole, prioritising and omitting material as necessary, so that each chapter feels coherent. However, even though the selection and amalgamation of verses has been handled just as carefully here as it sometimes is in the *Declaracion*, the CUL compiler lacks the same willingness either to pick out short quotations from WB, or to paraphrase scripture (see below). While this gives a fuller sense of those verses and sections of the bible that the CUL text does quote, the weaknesses of such a rigid approach are clear. Because the text includes longer verbatim quotations than are common in the *Declaracion*, it necessarily lacks the same scope. After the first and tenth verses quoted above, for example, CUL Ee 1.10 1 Ezra 7 quotes three sustained sections (verses 11-14, 21-23 and 25-27) in their entirety, while completely omitting the material in between. In the CUL text, then, preservation of the scriptural text is consistently prioritised over breadth of coverage, with brevity achieved primarily through the wholesale omission of large sections of each chapter. Conversely, the *Declaracion*'s less rigid and more fragmentary approach allows the shape of each chapter to be sketched out in a more rounded way.

3.2 Biblical Paraphrase

The majority of books in the *Declaracion* use biblical quotations only sparingly. More usual is biblical paraphrase. Paraphrase of this type in the *Declaracion* can readily be compared to two contemporary examples of Wycliffite bible summary. The first is perhaps the most famous such example: the PWB Old Testament summary. Unlike the *Declaracion*, this is not a standalone text, but rather a section of a larger whole: it takes up chapters 3-11 of PWB.⁶⁸ PWB was

⁶⁸ PWB is found (in whole or part) in 16 LV manuscripts, generally in full bibles (Solopova, 'The Manuscript Tradition', p. 233), though only five manuscripts contain the whole Prologue (Dove, *Advocates*, p. xxv).

probably composed a little before the *Declaracion*,⁶⁹ and, even taken as a whole, is significantly shorter. Its writer suggests that he was responsible for the WB translation, though many scholars have questioned the precise level of his involvement in the enterprise.⁷⁰ PWB has been surprisingly little-studied, and the summary portion has attracted even less attention.⁷¹ Noting that it would have required access only to WB, Dove suggests that the summary portion was written while the writer was waiting to access other material (she notes that the small amount of Lyran material included in the summary seems to have been recalled from memory).⁷²

Although there are real stylistic differences between the *Declaracion* and the PWB summary, which will be discussed below, the most striking difference between the two texts is not one of style but of focus and intent. The PWB summary is overtly moralistic.⁷³ The summary for each biblical book ends with a moral specifying the lesson(s) believers should take from the book in question, as for example, ‘Al þis proces of Exodi shulde make men to triste in Goddis help, and to be trewe in his loue and to eschewe his offence wiþ alle her myztis’ (p. 8, ll. 170-71). Even beyond these, the summary often presents narratives through a lens of vice and virtue, implicitly asking readers to search within themselves and to adjust their own behaviour in light of the biblical material, as in Genesis:

Also men moun knowe hou sore God punyschide Adam and Eue for brekyng of his comaundement, and hou Abel pleside God bi feiþ, mekenesse and charite, and hou Caym displeside hym bi synnes, and speciali bi enuye, hatrede and manquelling [...] And hou feiþful and obedient to God Abraham was [...] And hou God distriede Sodom and Gomore and opere þre citees for lecherie and opere synnes...

⁶⁹ See Chapter 1.

⁷⁰ Somerset suggests that, at least by the time he wrote PWB, the writer may have become ‘peripheral’ to the translation effort (*Feeling*, p. 173).

⁷¹ See Dove, *FEB*, pp. 103-36; Dove, *Advocates*, pp. xx-xxx and pp. 3-85; Hudson, *PR*, pp. 243-46; Hudson, ‘Origin’, pp. 147-49; Somerset, *Feeling*, pp. 173-79; Ghosh, ‘Prologues’, pp. 167-72; Kelly, *Middle English Bible*, pp. 14-30.

⁷² Dove, *FEB*, pp. 121.

⁷³ See Somerset, *Feeling*, p. 176.

(p. 7, ll. 135–45)

Although it becomes less obvious in the long treatments of certain books, when the sheer weight of narrative detail can become a distraction, this ‘relatively uncomplicated affective-didactic impulse’ is evident throughout the PWB summary.⁷⁴ The morals appended to each book anchor the text, providing a level of cohesion. This unity of intention and structure is mirrored in a certain thematic integrity. Most prominent are themes particularly associated with Wycliffite thought: idolatry; the status of the priesthood; the importance of God’s word (and his commandments); the fate of true prophets and those who oppose them. Of course, as made clear in Chapter 3, these themes are also central to the *Declaracion*, although the length and complexity of that text makes it more difficult for the reader consistently to perceive them. However, as I will now demonstrate, the way in which the PWB summary approaches the task of biblical paraphrase makes it much easier for these themes to come to the fore.

In a broad sense, the PWB summary and the *Declaracion* share a number of characteristics. Both employ a mixture of biblical paraphrase, scriptural quotation and exegesis, although in very different ways. In terms of paraphrase, the key differences are all reflective of the different levels of constraint within which the two texts were written. The *Declaracion* aims to provide material to cover each chapter of each book of the whole bible. As I will demonstrate in the next chapter, it also regularly seeks to preserve the lexis of scripture, even as it alters syntax, omits whole sections, or reorders material. As I suggested above, it is written with an eye to ensuring broad coverage of the material, at the expense of long quotation or fine detail. The PWB summary, meanwhile, proceeds book-by-book, allowing for much

⁷⁴ Ghosh, ‘Prologues’, p. 169.

greater latitude in terms of what material is included and what omitted. Even more so than in the *Declaracion*, its coverage of books is uneven.⁷⁵ The poetic books are afforded between six and seventeen lines each, while the majority of narrative books fall in the range of 10-50 lines. However, 4 Kings and 2 Chronicles are very much longer (355 and 450 lines respectively), to the point that, as Somerset suggests, the summary often seems ‘self-indulgent and somewhat rambling’.⁷⁶ As demonstrated in Chapter 1, the prophets are passed over completely, and the reader directed to forthcoming glosses on the material (p. 60, ll. 2079-82). By focusing primarily on the narrative books, disregarding chapter divisions, omitting a large amount of material altogether and allowing such varied coverage, the PWB summary is able to be considerably more expansive and fluid than the *Declaracion*. Certain incidents are treated in great detail, often through the use of a large amount of quotation, as for example in the description of Elijah’s prophesy on the fate of Ahab and Jezebel in 3 Kings:

... God bad Elie mete him and seie þus: ‘þou hast slayn and hast take possessioun. Þe Lord seip þese þingis: in þis place wherinne doggis lickiden þe blood of Nabath, þei shulen licke also þi blood’. And Achab seide to Elie, ‘wher þou hast founde me, þin enemye?’ And Elie seide: ‘I haue founde, for þou art seeld to do yuele in Goddis siȝt; þerfor God shal distroie and sle ech man of þe hows of Achab, and ȝyue his hows as þe hows of Ieroboam and as þe hows of Baasa, for Achab terride God to wrappe and made Israel to do synne. Also doggis shulen ete Iesabel in þe feeld of I[e]srael. If Achab die in þe citee, doggis shulen ete him, if he die in þe feeld, briddis of þe eir shulen ete him.’

(pp. 23-24, ll. 735-45)

This level of detail is by no means unusual in the PWB summary, particularly in the books of Kings and Chronicles. Incidents are often recounted at length, and routinely, as here, they have a thematic significance. In this case, the level of detail is testament to the writer’s interest

⁷⁵ See Somerset, *Feeling*, pp. 176-77; Ghosh, ‘Prologues’, p. 168.

⁷⁶ *Feeling*, p. 174.

in true prophecy, bad governance and (tangentially) idolatry. On a stylistic level, the summary employs complex sentences which give a flowing impression, allowing the reader to feel fully immersed in the story. In comparison, even the most expansive narrative book of the *Declaracion*, Acts, can feel rather stilted, as the opening of chapter 12 demonstrates:

Heroud slouȝ by swerd Iames þe broþer of Iohān, & prisond Petre, &c. Þe chirch preyed to God for P[et]re. Petre & þe auȝgel þat delyuerd hym, passing þe first & þe second warde of knyȝtes, camen to þe yren ȝate þat was þe vtter ȝate of þe prison, &c. Petre ȝede to þe house of Mari modre of Iohān þat is named Mark, &c. When a damysel told hem *in* þe house þat Petre stode at þe ȝate, þey seyð it was his auȝgel, &c. Heroud comaunded þe keepers of þe prison to be broȝt to hym to haue punyscht hem for Petre was not founden; bot Heroude was let, for he ȝede fro Iudee to Cesarie to noye men of Tyre & Sydon, to whome he was wroþe.

(fols 197^r-197^v, ll. 169-76)

Although the *Declaracion* does use some complex sentences, in general it prefers short and simple constructions. The paratactical impression is enhanced by the insistent use of the abbreviation ‘&c.’ which here, as in the rest of the *Declaracion*, is generally used to mark an omission of some kind. This means that the reader is, by design, constantly reminded of the full text of scripture, and constantly aware of the gaps in the *Declaracion*’s telling.

This list-like method is most noticeable in the Old Testament, particularly in the books from Genesis-Esther. The length varies (*Declaracion* Exodus 37-39 each consist of a single line, of no more than 15 words, for example, while some chapters run to 150 words or more),⁷⁷ but the following example, *Declaracion* Judges 11, is typical (note that line breaks indicate the position of paraphs):

Þe breþer of Iepte put hym fro þem for he was gotten *in* aduoutri, &c.
Iepte is made prince vp on þe folk of Galaad.

⁷⁷ See fol. 4^v. For an example of a longer summary of this type, see 3 Kings 6, fol. 17^v.

Of þe messages betuene Iepte & þe king of Amon.
 Of þe vow of Iepte, & of his victori.
 Þe doghter of Iepte weyled hir meydenhode ij monethes, &c.

(fol. 13^r)

The brief, paratactical style, lack of extraneous detail and simple language of this paraphrase is most obviously reminiscent not of the PWB summary, but of a *capitula*-list. These lists, typically written at the start or end of a bible manuscript (whether in Latin or English), provide an abbreviated account of the contents of each chapter for a given portion of the biblical text. In the case of WB they typically treat only the gospels or the whole New Testament.⁷⁸ Five full or partial WB manuscripts in Oxford contain such a list.⁷⁹ While these vernacular *capitula*-lists are always affixed to full or partial bible texts, and are significantly shorter than the *Declaracion* (typically providing just a couple of lines for each chapter), the style in which they are written is at times very similar. In this example, an extract from *Declaracion* Matthew 6 is followed by the listing for Matthew 6 as given in the *capitula*-list found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Selden Supra 51 (hereafter SS 51). Bold type signifies verbatim WB quotation of a couple of words or more; italics are used to highlight places where the *Declaracion* contains a lexical echo of LV, using the same basic vocabulary but with alterations in word order or tense. Bold italicised text, meanwhile, is exegetical, translated in this case from *LPL*, and can for the present be discounted:⁸⁰

⁷⁸ On *capitula*-lists in Latin bibles, see Laura Light, 'Non-Biblical Texts', p. 171; Laura Light, 'French Bibles c. 1200-30: a New Look at the Origin of the Paris Bible', in *The Early Medieval Bible: Its Production, Decoration and Use*, ed. by Richard Gameson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 155-176 (pp. 168-72). On *capitula*-lists in WB manuscripts, see Hudson and Solopova, 'The Latin Text', p. 111.

⁷⁹ Four of these manuscripts – Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS e Musaeo 110; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Fairfax 2; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Selden Supra 51; and Oxford, Christ Church MS 146 – contain a version of the same list. Meanwhile, the list found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 111, the only EV manuscript containing a *capitula*-list in Oxford, is independent of the others.

⁸⁰ See L5/138:8; L5/136:11; L5/137:2. The reference to penance is likely influenced by Lyra's condemnation of false penitence, L5/133:4.

D: How men shold *do* her *almes*. How men **shold prey**, & what, in þe Pater Noster. How men shold *forgif*. How men shold *fast & do penaunce*. Of *inordinate* making of **tresories in erþe**. Of a *simple ize* **þat is a right intencion**, & a wickid *ize* **a wickid intencion**, &c. (fol. 151^v, ll. 68-71)

SS 51: Hou þou schalt preye & what preier. Hou þou schalt faste / Þat þou tresoure in heuene & not here / That þou be not bysy but for soule heele. (fol. 4^r)

The similarities between the two extracts are immediately obvious. Both provide a concise inventory of biblical content, and there is even some linguistic agreement, most clearly in the persistent use of the word *how*.⁸¹ This chapter of the SS 51 list is in fact unusual, both in its consistent use of the second person pronoun *þou* and in its use of *þat* as a way of opening sentences. The opening of SS Matthew 8 is more representative: ‘Of a leperous mannes heling / Hou Centurio preied for his seruaunt / Hou he heelid Petris modir *in lawe*’ (fol. 4^r).⁸² This example demonstrates that the wording and detached style of the *Declaracion*’s Matthew 6 is very much in keeping with the mode and methods of the *capitula*-list. Like a *capitula*-list, the *Declaracion* sometimes prioritises brevity and clarity over precise adherence to the words of its biblical source, while simultaneously pointing toward that source. The habitual use of the words *how* and *of* underline the point that the *Declaracion* cannot provide readers with a full account of scripture; nor does it pretend to.

One other similarity bears comment: both the *capitula*-lists and the *Declaracion* frequently reference answers given by biblical figures, but without providing any

⁸¹ This style is also used occasionally in the PWB summary: see the example from Genesis quoted above.

⁸² The treatment of this material in the *Declaracion* is rather longer, but for comparison the relevant parts of the chapter read as follows: ‘He helid a mesel of his lepre, & bad hym go shewe hym to prestis & offer after þe lawe of Moyses, what þe offering of a mesel was when he was clensid, loke Leuitici 14. Þe seruaunt of Centurio, of whome *Iesus* seyde he founde not so grete feyth in Israel, is helid of þe palsy [...] Petre wifis modre is helid of þe fiueris’. See fol. 152^r (ll. 88-94).

detail.⁸³ This phenomenon is particularly noticeable in *Declaracion* Mark, most strikingly in these lines from Mark 12:

How *Iesus* answered to hem þat axid hym if it were leueful to gif tribute to Cesar, as *Mattias* 22. How he answerid to Saduceis axing hym of a woman wed to vij breþer, &c., as *Mattias* 22. How *Iesus* answerid to a scribe þat axid hym which was þe first comandement, as *Mattias* 22 (fol. 156^v, ll. 133-36)

Here, the text acts as a *capitula*-list not only for the full scriptural text of Mark 12, but also for *Declaracion* Matthew 22: all the answers alluded to here, and cross-referenced, are answered in the earlier chapter.⁸⁴

In its use of biblical paraphrase, then, the *Declaracion* has much more in common with the style of the WB *capitula*-lists than with the highly selective, occasionally very detailed narrative summary commonly found in the PWB synopsis. It must be noted, however, that *capitula*-lists include only biblical content. The *Declaracion*, on the other hand, includes a large volume of exegesis. The following sections will examine two different ways in which this exegesis is incorporated into the text.

3.4 Interpolated Glossing

It has been noted that Wycliffite texts in general at least attempt to keep exegesis separated from biblical text.⁸⁵ Glossed bibles are common, but exegesis tends in these manuscripts to be placed in the margins; interpolated glossing is sometimes found, but it is clear that such material was at least intended to be underlined.⁸⁶ Other methods of distinction in Wycliffite

⁸³ For this phenomenon in the *Declaracion*, see Introduction to the Gospels in Part II. See also Chapter 2. For similar examples in SS 51, see Matt 15, Mark 7, Luke 13, Luke 17, John 2, Acts 4.

⁸⁴ On the use of cross-referencing in the *Declaracion*, see Introduction to the Gospels in Part II.

⁸⁵ Kuczynski, 'Glossing', p. 348; Von Nolcken, 'Lay Literacy', pp. 181-82.

⁸⁶ See Chapter 1.

texts include direct attribution, a distinction in the style or size of script, and verbal signifiers like ‘þat is’ or ‘by which is vnderstanden’.⁸⁷ How does the *Declaracion* compare? Of course, as we have seen, although it does contain a wealth of scriptural quotation, the text does not pretend to have the same authority as scripture, or to offer a reasonable replacement for the full bible text. It is true, too, as Copeland’s work suggests, that the compiler(s) and readers might have viewed the whole work as exegetical. In this sense, it is unsurprising that the *Declaracion* does not routinely attempt to distinguish between material gathered from bible commentaries and material paraphrased (or even quoted) from scripture. However, the extent to which scripturally-derived material is interwoven with material translated from Latin exegetical sources is at times staggering. Interpolated glossing is a key feature of the majority of books in the *Declaracion*, but is particularly concentrated in the Prophets and Epistles. Although such glossing might be demarcated, either through the use of an introductory phrase (commonly ‘þat is’), or underlining, it is by no means always easy to tell what material is strictly exegetical.⁸⁸ In the following example from Matthew 3, bold, italicised text is traceable to a known commentary source (in this case *LPL*); bold text, as ever, indicates verbatim quotation from LV:

Iohān Baptiste prechid in deserte, seying, ‘**Do 3e penance**’, &c. *He was þe voice of a cryer*, &c., of whome it was *prophecied, Ysa. 40*. Of his *vile cloþing* & his *streyte fode*. Mich people went **to hym & were baptized of hym in Iurdan**. Iohān callid many of Phariseis & Saduceis þat camen *feynyngly* to his baptem ‘**Generacions of eddres**’, & monesid hem to do wurthy frutis of penance. *þat Phariseis shold not enioye þat Abraham was her fleschly fader, siben þey folwid hym not in bileue*, ffor God is **myghty to reyse vp of stones sones of Abraham**. Now þe ax is put to þe rote of þe tre, &c. Iohān seyð þat he washed *alonly bodies in water, in signe of penance* to be done. Bot Criste, **whose shone** he was

⁸⁷ On the use of these techniques in the *Glossed Gospels*, see Hudson, *Doctors*, p. xxix.

⁸⁸ Even where underlining is employed, the manuscript’s inconsistency regarding what underlining denotes adds a further complication. See Chapter 1.

not worpi to bere, shold baptise þem **in þe Holy Goste and fire**. *Ffor þe Holy Gost apperid after in tonges of fire*. How Criste *by his dome*, as *with* an instrument of wyndewyng, shold clense *his Chirch, departing þe gode fro þe badd*, as whete fro þe chaf, &c. Iohan sufferd *Iesus*, which seyð, ‘**Pus it falles to vs to fulfill all rightwisnes**’, to be baptizid of hym. **Heuens were opend**, þe Holy Goste apperid *in liknes of a doufe*, and *þe Fader’s* voice was herd, seyng, ‘**Pis is my loued son**’, &c.

(fol. 151^r, ll. 19-32)⁸⁹

Here we can see that Lyran material is seamlessly intermixed with biblical paraphrase (and even biblical quotation). Beyond the Lyran material there is more glossing, not here highlighted: phrases specifying who is speaking or being spoken about (as ‘Iohan seyð þæt he’; ‘How Criste’) are generally not biblical, and may be original to the *Declaracion*. There is no underlining in the manuscript here, and no lexical markers to indicate where glossing occurs. None but the most experienced reader could hope to untangle Lyra’s interpretation from the biblical narrative here. Clearly, the *Declaracion* compiler(s) did not expect that they should.

3.5 Lemmata with Commentary

This is not to say that the *Declaracion* never provides demarcation. Having written the first two chapters of Job in the same brief, straightforward summary style as all the preceding books, the compiler includes a long commentary section, separated (albeit in a rather subtle way, with merely a *capitulum* symbol in the margin) from the rest of the text, in between chapter 2 and chapter 3. The first of an array of longer glosses in the books from Job onwards, it offers three distinct explanations for the tone of Job’s speech in the rest of the book:

Here is to vnderstand þæt þe wordes of Iob *in þe thrid chapitre* & after, þæt semen to a fleschly man þæt hace not þe gostly vnderstading of scrīpture as þey sowned inpaciente

⁸⁹ L5/70:4-78:7.

or blasfemy: þem most outhere be vnderstanden gostly, as Seynt Gregori *in* his morals & oþer doctours expoune hem; or elles þey are spoken *after* þe disposicion of þe sensual parte, þat often suffers peynes *with* heuynes, þat reson þorw þe vertu of pacience receyues *with* greet gladnes. Or elles, as Lira seys, þem most be taken noht þat Iob spekes þem of his owne sentence, bot as wordes dryuen owte by disputacion of þe errand wordes of þem þat disputed *with* hym; for þof his frenedes seyð many tru þinges, 3it þey erred *in summe* þinges, and so Iob concluded of her erring sentence many wordes þat shold sue of her erroris. Þus to vnderstand Iob shal "h[e]" neþer be noted of inpacience nor of blasfemy, to take þen þis chapitre & all þe disputacion *after* betuene Iob & his frenedes *after* þe exposicion doctoris de Lira.

(fols 31^v-32^r)

This passage demonstrates a completely new approach: named exegetical sources are quoted (or paraphrased) at length. On a more fundamental level, the biblical text is treated here as though its meaning were not always completely accessible. This change is typical of Wycliffite texts, which, as Ghosh suggests ‘vacillate between two hermeneutic systems: one postulating an “open”, anti-hierarchical and accessible text, the other acknowledging that the often obscure scriptures require “myche special declaryng”’.⁹⁰ To quote one authority at length would make this point; to cite multiple authorities, two of them named and highly respected, and to note that they offer different interpretations, makes it all the more forcefully.⁹¹ Furthermore, although the final line seems to suggest that Lyra’s reading is the one to keep in mind, the others are not refuted. As noted in Chapter 2, this signals that the compiler will not spoon-feed the reader: each must weigh the evidence and come to his or her own conclusion, while remembering that scripture can be polyvalent.⁹² After this point, chapters of Job tend to be split into a number of parts, keyed to the text with underlined lemmata. These lemmata are generally quoted from LV, but some are also independently translated or augmented.⁹³ The

⁹⁰ Ghosh, *Wycliffite Heresy*, pp. 138-39.

⁹¹ For the source of the exegesis, see L3/43:1. Lyra quotes both the other explanations here rehearsed, and cites Gregory. Such multiple interpretations are particularly common in the *Declaracion* Epistles.

⁹² See also Chapter 5.

⁹³ See for example Job 5, fol. 32^r: ‘A verrey folc, &c.’ LV/EV: ‘a fool’ (Job 5. 3). On independent translation of

lemmata are followed by a summary of the content of the section, often quoted from *LPL*. At times, Lyra's commentary is itself paraphrased. Chapter 3, for example, reads as follows (in this example, em-dashes indicate the joining places where material from different parts of Lyra has been stitched together:

Pis chapitre is parted in to ij: first Job curses to þe begynning of his life — & to þe tyme of his begynning. —
In þe second parte, -- þere why is light gyuen to þe wrech, &c., he weyles þe contaminacion of þe life of wreched men in general, & telles of his owne sorw in special.
 (fol. 32^r)

For comparison, here are the relevant sections of *LPL*:

Hic igitur praemissis praesens capitulum in duas partes diuiditur, quia primo Iob vitae suae detestatur inchoationem, secundo eiusdem continuationem, ibi, *Quare misero*. Prima in duas, quia primo maledicit tempus inchoationis vitae suae...⁹⁴
 (L3/46:divisio)

Quare, &c. Hic consequenter Iob lamentatur vitae suae continuationem, & primo facit hoc generaliter respectu omnium miserorum, secundo specialiter applicat ad seipsum...⁹⁵
 (L3/57:3)

Several aspects of the paraphrase are to be noted here. Firstly, in the space of a few lines the

Declaracion draws from two parts of *LPL* which are separated by several pages.⁹⁶ Secondly, in

lemmata in the *Declaracion* more generally, see Chapter 5.

⁹⁴ 'Here, therefore, the present chapter is divided into two parts, because firstly Job detested the beginning of his life, and secondly, equally, its continuation, there, *Quare misero*, the first in two, because he first curses the time of his life's beginning.'

⁹⁵ 'Why, &c. Here Job laments the continuation of his life, and first he speaks generally, with regard to all wretched people. Secondly, he speaks specifically of himself...'

⁹⁶ This method is particularly common in the *Declaracion* Psalter, which frequently translates both from Peter Lombard's initial summary of the Psalm in question, and then from later on in his commentary. For examples, see

paraphrasing the first of the above-quoted glosses it selects material incisively from a longer section. Finally, in its treatment of the second above-quoted gloss it concisely and sensitively rephrases the original Latin. Comparison with the source suggests that the word ‘contaminacion’ in the *Declaracion* is either a scribal error, a misreading of Lyra, or a reproduction of an error from a particular copy of *LPL*.⁹⁷ Despite this small error, it is clear that Lyra was carefully studied and greatly respected by the compiler: in fact, *Declaracion* Job is based more on *LPL* than on *WB*. The *Delcaracion* Psalter takes this approach to its logical conclusion: it dispenses with *WB* altogether, instead providing a straightforward commentary, complete with biblical lemmata independently translated from the Vulgate and regular citations to exegetical authorities (in this case the *Magna*, *LPL* and *LM*).⁹⁸

This more formal, demarcated commentary style is of course reminiscent of *GG*. This group of Wycliffite texts consists of commentaries on each of the four gospels. For Matthew and Luke both a ‘long’ and a ‘short’ version survives; Mark and John remain only in their ‘short’ versions (these multiple versions are, of course, further proof of Wycliffite abbreviation).⁹⁹ Most follow the framework of the *Catena Aurea*, and draw from a number of commentary sources, though not, notably, from the Wycliffites’ (and the *Declaracion*’s) favoured commentator, Nicholas of Lyra. Hudson also notes that, despite lollard regard for Augustine, his work features in *GG* only rarely.¹⁰⁰ In the texts, each gospel chapter is divided into a

the Penitential Psalms in Part II, and the accompanying annotations.

⁹⁷ ‘Continuationem’ is also the reading found in the unpaginated 1488 Venice edition.

⁹⁸ For more detail on the Psalter, see the Introduction to Penitential Psalms in Part II, and the annotations accompanying the edited text. For information on how sources are used differently in the Psalter as compared to other books, see also Chapter 5.

⁹⁹ Hudson, *Doctors*, p. xx; Anne Hudson, ‘The Variable Text’, in *Crux and Controversy in Middle English Textual Criticism*, ed. by A.J. Minnis and Charlotte Brewer (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1992), pp. 49-60 (pp. 51-53); Anne Hudson, ‘Two Notes on the Wycliffite *Glossed Gospels*’, in *Philologia Anglica: Essays presented to Professor Yoshio Terasawa on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by Kinshiro Oshitari and others (Tokyo: Kenkyusha, 1988), pp. 379-84 (p. 380).

¹⁰⁰ Hudson, *Doctors*, p. xxiii-iv, p. lviii. For more on the sources of *GG*, see Hudson, *Doctors*, pp. liii-xcv.

number of sections of varying length. Each section is quoted in full, from EV, and followed by a commentary section.¹⁰¹ These commentary sections are also of varying length, but are often substantial. They draw material from a number of different sources, and provide plenty of cross-referencing, and scrupulous citations.¹⁰² Since, as we have already seen, the *Declaracion* gospels contain relatively little exegesis, in the following example a short passage from *GG* is placed alongside two passages taken from the *Declaracion* books which use the most analogous methodology. In the examples from the *Declaracion*, bold italics indicate indebtedness to a known exegetical source:

GG, Long Luke, 10. 5-7: Into whateuere hous 3ee shulen entre, firste seie 3ee “Pees to þis hous”. and if a sone of pees shal be þere, 3oure pees shal reste on hym, if noon, it shal turne a3en to 3ow. Forsoþe dwelle 3ee in þe same hous, eting and drynkyng þo þingis þat ben at hem. Forsoþe, a werkman is worþi his hire.

Pees is a modir of alle goodis, wiþoute which oþere þingis ben voide. Wherefore þe Lord comaundide his disciplis entryng into housis anoon to brynge forþ pees as shewyng of godis, sei yng into whateuere hous. **Cristostom. Pees:** Bere we þe message of pees þat þilke firste entre be halowid wiþ blessing of pees. **Ambrose here.** Also þe bischop 3yueþ pees to þe chirche sei yng ‘pees to 3ou’; holy men axen pees, not onely þilke pees whiche is among men togidere, but also þat pees whiche is to vssilf; for ful ofte we beren batel in þe herte, and while no man dissesiþ we ben troblid also, shrewide desires risen ofte a3enus vs. **Cristostom.**¹⁰³

D Psalm 37: *Domine ne in furore tuo arguas me* Lord repreue not me in þi strong vengauce. *Lira takes þis psalme as made of Daudid to bring to mynde his notable synnes in to mekenes of hym self. And first he bringes to mynde his synnes.*

And in þe last verses *he preyes God not to forsake hym, bot to preserwe hym,* þat he fall not ageyne.

After þe glose, *þe intencion is to stirr to penaunce, and it hace iij parties: ffirst a true doer of penaunce, rehersand his sorwes both of body & saule which bene fisched in hym as arwes, desires mercy.*

¹⁰¹ Dove suggests that some elements of *GG*, particularly in the lemmata, seem intermediate between EV and LV (Dove, *FEB*, p. 142), but Hudson asserts that the evidence for EV is ‘overwhelming’, though noting that it may have been ‘somewhat revised’ (*Doctors*, p. lii; ‘Two Notes’, p. 379). Hudson speculates that EV might have been favoured by the compilers of *GG* because it was more closely reflective of the Vulgate (*Doctors*, p. lii).

¹⁰² Hudson, *Doctors*, p. xxv.

¹⁰³ Hudson, *Doctors*, pp. 27-28, ll. 289-302. It is to be noted that this passage of Short Luke is only very slightly abbreviated in comparison: see Hudson, *Doctors*, pp. 32-33, ll. 99-111.

Pe second þer, Myne old woundes wex roten, he noumbers many wreched nesses.

Pe thrid þer, for in þe Lord I hooped, for he trusted in God among so many illes, he affermes þat God shal here hym, seyand þat he wil confes his syn & bisy hym in his boght for amending.

In ij þe last verses is a *ioyfull conclusion put of helth þat hoop be certen* to þem þat do true *penaunce*.

(fol. 42^v, ll. 34-47)¹⁰⁴

D Isaiah 47: Here is describ'd þe cesing of þe *rewme* of Babilone, þat is called a virgin, *for no vertue bot for it was baren of gode werkes. & of þe captiuite þerof*, and how it shold be made vile as a *seruaunte* grinding at a querne, & no more be called lady of rewmes.

I was wroþe, &c. *Here are ij causes why Babilone was so ponished. Pe first skil is for þey were to cruel with oute mercy ageyne þe peple of God*; which God toke in to her handes *bicause of her synnes. Pe second is þe greet pride of Babilone, þat wend it shold euer hafe regned* & neuer hafe bene wido *with* oute king; & þoght not what þerrel might cum þerto at þe last. *Pe þrid cause* was wiccraftes þat it used, &c.

Stand þu with þine enchauntors, &c. Here is shewed þat neþer wicches nor astronomyers *þat seyne þey knowe by her craft þinges þat are to cum*, shold delyuer þe Babilonies, ffor þem self shold be brent *with* þe cite *of Babilone*. Also þat her merchauntes shold not help hem *with* richessis, nor by aspiyng to warne þem of harmes þat might cum to hem by men of oþer landes.

(fol. 93^v, ll. 812-24)¹⁰⁵

Although it is impossible to see from the examples quoted above, the most striking difference between *GG* and the *Declaracion* is length. The *GG* exposition of Luke 10. 5-7, whether in Long or Short Luke, is in fact far too long to be quoted here in full: the section excerpted above deals only with the opening few words of the passage, and the opening lemma, which is 'Pees'. The whole exposition, however, runs to 73 lines in Long Luke, and 41 lines in Short Luke.¹⁰⁶ As mentioned above, the biblical passage is quoted in full, and lemmata used only to key back to that passage. In contrast, the *Declaracion* relies on the reader either having access to a full

¹⁰⁴ L3/691-698; *Magna*, PL191/380D-381A.

¹⁰⁵ L4/393-397.

¹⁰⁶ Hudson, *Doctors*, pp. 27-29, ll. 294-367; pp. 32-22, ll. 104-45.

copy of scripture, or having an exceptional memory of the passages in question. Exegetical sources, meanwhile, are scrupulously named at the end of each short commentary passage in *GG*, allowing the reader to understand more fully what he is reading. While the example from the *Declaracion* Psalter also includes attribution, it is slightly more vague (as I shall demonstrate in Chapter 5, the term ‘the glose’ would not necessarily have directed readers toward Lombard). In a number of Psalms, attribution to one or both of the exegetical sources is missing altogether. The Isaiah example, meanwhile, contains no attribution whatsoever, and continues the habit, noted above, of intermingling Lyran exegesis with scripturally-derived material.

Of course, these differences are easily explained. While the shorter versions of *GG* attest to a certain desire for brevity, the spatial constraints inherent in the conception of the *Declaracion* as a one-volume digest of scripture and commentary do not apply to *GG* in the same way. It would be impossible for the *Declaracion* to include full quotations of each passage and, as we have seen, the complex way in which exegesis is employed throughout the text would have made consistent attribution all but impossible. *GG* is also able to include a much greater volume of exegesis, though it does mirror the *Declaracion*’s habit of including multiple interpretations. Like the *Declaracion*, *GG* does not seem to have been intended for an uneducated audience.¹⁰⁷ Rather, it provides complex commentary and often presents several different interpretations of the same passage without providing any guidance to the reader. As Hudson notes, the reader is trusted to take responsibility and to use the text appropriately.¹⁰⁸ The same seems to have been true for readers of the *Declaracion*, as will be demonstrated more fully in Chapter 5. At the same time, *GG*’s scrupulous attribution and its clear layout would

¹⁰⁷ Hudson, *Doctors*, p. cxxxix.

¹⁰⁸ Hudson, *Doctors*, p. cxxxix.

have made it in some senses much more accessible than the *Declaracion*, as the reader is at all times aware of the source of what he is reading, and the distinction between scripture and commentary is strictly and visibly observed.¹⁰⁹ The inclusion of the whole biblical passage to be commented upon, rather than just the opening lemma, would also have allowed *GG* to stand alone.

It is clear, then, that the *Declaracion* and *GG* were intended for very different purposes. The *Declaracion* must have been intended to be used in conjunction with a full bible text (presumably a full LV), or by a scholar of immense scriptural and exegetical knowledge. While the commentary offered in *GG* is deeper and in some ways more complex than that found in the *Declaracion*, its sources and methods would have been far more transparent. This is not to say that the *Declaracion* should be seen in any way as attempting to compete with or replace *GG*, or that the two texts were produced by men of different beliefs or training. In fact, both provide clear evidence that Wycliffites had an interest in biblical commentary, and devoted time and effort to making traditional commentary available in the vernacular.¹¹⁰ They might even have been produced by groups working in close proximity and perhaps even collaboration, or at least with knowledge of each other's work. I would suggest, indeed, that their differences argue in favour of a certain level of knowledge, rather than against it. While part of the *Declaracion*'s intention is clearly to make commentary available, its completely different way of approaching both text and commentary, and its use of different sources (primarily Lyra) means that it does not repeat or render redundant any of the material in *GG*.

¹⁰⁹ Hudson, *Doctors*, p. xxix. Manuscripts of *GG* use techniques such as underlining and marginal attribution, as well as page layout and script size to distinguish text from commentary. While it is true that some manuscripts make the distinction more obvious than others, all of them prioritise this more than T93 does.

¹¹⁰ Hudson notes that the work on *GG* would have been particularly labour-intensive, requiring consultation of a number of exegetical sources, and a painstaking level of attribution, including noting agreement between sources ('Two Notes', p. 380).

Even where the *Declaracion* comments on the same biblical material, the commentary is so different (and generally, in the gospels, so brief), that the reader would still learn a great deal from consulting *GG*. In short, both texts perform vastly different functions, using different authorities, and they could be used in conjunction. Even if this were not the intention, it is easy to imagine that they were both conceived by similar people in response to WB, though the *Declaracion* is the more experimental production.

As this chapter has demonstrated, the *Declaracion* was not produced in a vacuum. As educated men in Oxford in the late fourteenth century, its compiler(s) would have been familiar with an array of biblical summaries and commentaries, many of which were produced in response to WB. Their text was clearly intended as a compendium of biblical knowledge, and must have been designed to fulfil a need: as we have seen, many of the analogous texts were far too long to be contained in a single volume, or owned by any but the wealthiest. None of the many techniques demonstrated in the *Declaracion* is original. What is unusual, though, is its sheer variety: this is a deeply experimental text which displays creativity in responding to the bible, and a great trust in its readership. The way in which it intermingles scriptural quotation, biblical paraphrase and translated Latin exegesis, often seamlessly, suggests, as argued in Chapter 2, that it was intended to be used by knowledgeable biblical scholars. As the next chapter will demonstrate, though, even the most experienced such scholar would, it seems, have required access to the *Declaracion*'s biblical and exegetical sources in order to understand it fully.

Chapter 5: Sources

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, although several texts share superficial similarities with the *Declaracion*, none of them is closely analogous. What most distinguishes the *Declaracion* is the way in which it uses its sources: while there exist a number of roughly contemporary biblical summaries, none interweaves summary and commentary in such a sustained way, and few have such a complex relationship to WB. However, the question of sources has largely been overlooked by previous studies. As already noted, those few scholars who have engaged with the text have tended to follow N.R. Ker in characterising it primarily as a summary of WB. As I have shown, this portrayal is simplistic at best, and in fact fundamentally misleading. To bracket the *Declaracion* together with the much simpler ‘summaries’ contained in CUL Ee 1.10 and Manchester, John Rylands Library MS 89 is vastly to underestimate the achievement of its compiler(s), and the thought and labour that went into its production. This categorisation has also meant that while various attempts have been made to understand which Version of WB was used in the preparation of our text, the importance of extra-biblical sources has been neglected.¹ This chapter will provide the first in-depth examination of the *Declaracion*’s relationship to the bible, before moving on to consider the importance of commentary sources, the full influence of which has been masked by a lack of consistent attribution. The balance between the different commentary and scriptural elements shifts throughout the text, as demonstrated in the previous chapter, but the complex interplay between biblical and non-biblical sources remains key to its methodology in almost every biblical book.

¹ Even work on the question of how the *Declaracion* relates to WB has been glancing. See for example Ker, ‘Summary’, pp. 115-16; Reilly, pp. xvii-xix; Somerset, *Feeling*, pp. 179-80.

The *Declaracion* and the Bible

When outlining the process by which WB was translated, the PWB writer asserts that he ‘hadde myche trauel wiþ dyuerse felowis and help[er]is to gedere many elde biblis, and opere doctours and comyn glosis, and to make o Latyn Bible sumdeel trewe, and þanne to studie it of þe newe...’ (p. 80, ll. 2802-05). This quotation demonstrates the ambiguous attitude that the WB translators (and many other medieval bible scholars) had towards the Vulgate. On one hand, it was recognised that the text, which had been translated by Jerome in the fourth century and become the standard Scriptural text of the Western Church, was riddled with errors. Many of these were simple copy errors that had been cemented and augmented over centuries of transmission, so that, as the above quotation suggests, it was impossible to have complete confidence in any one manuscript, even, apparently, one that had been compiled after careful consultation of a number of others (the WB translators can only hope to make a Latin bible ‘sumdeel trewe’).² On top of this variation, there were more fundamental errors that had been made when translating the text from Hebrew or Greek and into Latin. This sense that the Latin text could no longer be considered ‘trewe’ was one of the driving forces behind the project to translate the bible into English. At the same time, because the scholars involved lacked first-hand knowledge of Hebrew (and presumably the sources) to undertake a translation completely independent of the Vulgate, they were bound to rely heavily upon it, occasionally

² See Ralph Loewe, ‘The Medieval History of the Latin Vulgate’ in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. by Peter R. Ackroyd and others, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963-70), II: *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, ed. by G.W.H. Lampe (1969), pp. 102-52; Frans Van Liere, ‘The Latin Bible, c. 900 to the Council of Trent, 1546’ in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. by James Carleton Paget and others, 4 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012-16), II: *From 600 to 1450*, ed. by Richard Marsden and E. Ann Matter (2012), pp. 93-109. On errors in medieval copies of the Vulgate, and attempts at correction, see Laura Light, ‘The Thirteenth Century and the Paris Bible’, in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, II, pp. 380-91 (pp. 389-90); Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964), p. 220.

supplementing it by reference to commentators, particularly Lyra (see below).

By the time he completed PWB, the writer asserted that ‘þe comyne Latyn biblis han more nede to be correctid [...] þan haþ þe Englisch Bible late translatid’ (p. 82, ll. 2850-52). Nevertheless, he acknowledged that the English version was not necessarily perfect: ‘if ony wiys man fynd[e] ony defaute of þe treuþe of translacioun let him set in þe trewe sentence...’ (p. 81, ll. 2847-48). While warning that the Latin bible should be treated with caution (‘but loke þat he examyne treuli his Latyn Bible...’, p. 81, ll. 2848-49), he is also acknowledging here that it has not been completely superseded by the English translation: however faulty, it still has an important role to play.³

Even if the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion* were not necessarily influenced directly by the attitudes and practice of the WB translators in this regard, given their reservations it should not be surprising that, despite using WB as its main source, the *Declaracion* is also heavily reliant upon the Vulgate.

That there is a connection between the *Declaracion* and WB is beyond doubt: in fact, for a commentary/summary, it is surprising just how much of the vocabulary of the latter text is retained.⁴ Verbatim quotations are relatively infrequent, and of course a large amount of biblical material is omitted altogether. But aside from this, where the compiler(s) make alterations, it is generally to the syntax, not to the lexis, of the scriptural text. This section focuses on the ways in which the text balances a respect for the wording of its scriptural sources with a desire for breadth of coverage.

The interplay of these twin (but often competing) concerns is demonstrated in the

³ For another examination of the weakness of the Vulgate in PWB, see also p. 58, ll. 2014-15.

⁴ For an examination of the ways in which the *Declaracion* straddles these two generic categories, see the previous chapter.

Declaracion's rendering of Luke 23. Here, as in much of the rest of the text, biblical quotation and biblical paraphrase are used in concert with one another to create a paratactical but fluent account. In the following examples, verbatim biblical quotations of more than two words are highlighted in bold, while normal type signifies material paraphrased to a greater or lesser extent from LV:

Jesus is led to Pilat, &c. Of his accusing. Ppilat **send hym to Heroud, &c. Heroud & Pilat are made frendes.** Pilat seyde he founde no cause to do hym to þe deþe, &c. Baraban is delyuerd, &c. Ssymond of Sirenen beres þe crosse, &c. *Jesus* seyde to *wymmen* þat sued hym weyling, **Dou3ters of Ierusalem, Nil 3e wepe on me, &c., ffor if in a grene tre þey done þise þinges,** &c. *Jesus* is done on crosse. He preyed for his enemyse. Pey *parted* his clopes & **cast lottes.** How he was scorned. Of þe superscripsion writen **wiþ Greke letters, of Latyn & of Hebrewe. One of þe þeues blasfemed hym.** His felowe blamed hym & accused hymself, & seyde, **Lord haue mynde on me, &c. Pe suzne was mad derk. Pe veyl of þe temple was rent.** *Jesus* cried, **Ffadre, izto þi handes I bitake my spirit,** &c. Centurio, glorifyng God, seyde, **Verily þis man was iust.**

How þe peple **smyten her brestis,** &c. **All his knowen stoden o fer.** How þe body was biried. *Wymmen* **made redy swete smelling spices & oynementis. Bot in þe Sabbot þey restid.**

(fols 161^r-161^v, ll. 287-99)

Though the biblical quotations are not visually distinguished from the paraphrased material in the manuscript, highlighting them here demonstrates just how strongly the *Declaracion* relies upon the LV translation. Even when the *Declaracion* does not quote directly from LV, the lexical similarities are still striking. Take for example the following two lines from the above quotation, which are presented below with the relevant passages of LV (Luke 23. 35-39):

D: Pey *parted* his clopes & cast lottes. How he was scorned. Of þe superscripsion writen **wiþ Greke letters, of Latyn & of Hebrewe. One of þe þeues blasfemed hym.**⁵

LV: And thei departiden his clothis, and kesten lottis. And the puple stood abidyng; and the princis scorneden hym with hem [...] And the superscipcioun was writun ouer

⁵ Luke 23, fol. 161^r, ll. 292-93.

hym with Greke lettris, and of Latyn, and of Ebreu [...] And oon of these theues that hangiden, blasfemyde hym.

The depth of influence here is unmistakable.

The debt to LV is most clear, however, in those moments where the method of abbreviation simply relies upon the excerption of partial verses, which are then stitched together, omitting material in between. In *Declaracion* Luke 7, the line ‘**Dou3ters of Ierusalem, Nil 3e wepe on me, &c., ffor if in a grene tre þey done þise þinges, &c.**’ is an amalgamation of two truncated LV verses, Luke 7. 28 and Luke 7. 31. This precise, surgical approach, which seeks to preserve the wording of its scriptural source even as it abbreviates, is reminiscent of the two partial vernacular Old Testament summaries preserved uniquely in CUL Ee 1.10 and John Rylands 89, discussed in detail in the previous chapter. What sets the *Declaracion* apart from these texts, however, is its willingness not only to omit sections of LV, but also to rework them. Even setting aside the question of the exegetical material, which will be considered in detail below, the *Declaracion* takes a confident approach to LV, often making alterations to the syntax or tense. In Isaiah, for example, passages written in the present tense or with future meaning in LV are often summarised in the *Declaracion* using the past tense: this alteration is presumably made in deference to the fact that the *Declaracion* postdates the coming of Christ and the fulfilment of Isaiah’s prophecies. For example:

D: how þeire ournements, ribandes, broches, &c., were taken away⁶

LV: In that dai the Lord schal take awei the ournement of schoon [...] and ribans, and brochis⁷

⁶Isaiah 3, fol. 82^r (l. 56).

⁷Isaiah 3. 18-19

D: And þe Lord was a croune of glorie to þe residue of his peple⁸

LV: In that dai the Lord of oostis schal be a coroun of glorie [...] to the residue of his puple⁹

Alterations of tense in other books are less easy to explain, but are in general minor and relatively infrequent.¹⁰ Small lexical changes are more common, as the above passage from Luke 23 demonstrates.

As will be demonstrated below, the compiler(s) also exhibit an impressive ability to interweave elements from different sources in order to create a cohesive whole. It would have been far simpler to follow the biblical text precisely, and eschew commentary sources, as did the compilers of CUL Ee 1.10 and John Rylands 89. The fidelity to WB in the *Declaracion* is not, therefore, merely pragmatic. Instead, it must reflect confidence in the text. Work on the *Declaracion* did not merely involve selecting verses from WB and then copying them down verbatim: rather, it required a long and intense engagement with the biblical text, with the compiler(s) freed to make certain alterations as they saw fit. That the words of the WB translators are preserved so frequently under these circumstances suggests that their work was highly valued.

Of course, it is not enough to say that the *Declaracion* uses WB as a source. The translation work on WB proceeded in two broad stages, producing EV and LV.¹¹ Within each of these versions, there are myriad differences between manuscript copies. In addition, some scholars have posited the existence of an intermediate version (or versions).¹² Previous

⁸ Isaiah 28, fol. 88^v (l. 427).

⁹ Isaiah 28. 5.

¹⁰ See Introduction to the Gospels.

¹¹ In a recent article, Hudson reiterates that EV and LV can be readily distinguished from one another. See 'Earlier Version/Later Version', p. 63.

¹² Hargreaves, 'Intermediate'; Dove, *FEB*, p. 142 argues that the lemmata of the Wycliffite *Glossed Gospels* seem at times to be intermediate between EV and LV, though Anne Hudson suggests that the text used was in fact simply EV: see Hudson, *Doctors*, pp. xlvi-liv. Hudson suggests Oxford, New College, MS 67 as a copy which, while clearly based on EV, contains a number of elements more in keeping with LV, and which in her words

scholarship has attempted to determine which of these versions (or which combination of versions) was used as a source for the *Declaracion*, by examining the relatively infrequent underlined scriptural quotations.¹³ Ker notes that biblical quotations in the Psalter (which are almost always underlined) sometimes agree with EV, sometimes with LV, and sometimes with neither.¹⁴ Presumably in light of this analysis, Solopova suggests that the compiler ‘compared and made use of EV and LV’.¹⁵ As noted in Chapter 1, Reilly observes that the text most often agrees with LV, but cannot shake the idea that the compiler(s) also had access to EV, even suggesting that the *Declaracion* was produced before LV and not vice versa.¹⁶ Somerset notes that Reilly’s analysis is dependent for EV and LV upon Forshall and Madden’s edition, and suggests that ‘more comparison with other manuscripts might tell us still more and help to pinpoint the stages of the bible’s production during which [the *Declaracion*] itself was composed and revised’.¹⁷ No such deeper analysis, however, is necessary to conclude that Reilly’s theory is incorrect. The only theory that can reasonably be said to fit the evidence as it survives is that the *Declaracion* was produced after LV, and that it was deeply reliant upon it, or at least upon some intermediate version very much closer to LV than to EV.

Why, then, has there been such confusion as to this simple relationship? The answer is that researchers have tended to overlook the importance of the Vulgate in the production of the *Declaracion*. Because EV is a less idiomatic translation from the Vulgate than LV, it includes far more Latinate diction and often follows the Latin syntax. When Latinate readings occur in the *Declaracion*, therefore, there has been a tendency to suppose that they are taken from EV.

‘derives from the central translational endeavour’. See ‘Earlier Version/Later Version’, p. 70.

¹³ Pouzet notes, however, that such an approach should not mask the text’s originality (p. 106).

¹⁴ Ker, ‘Summary’, p. 116. For more on the probable reasons for this, see below.

¹⁵ Solopova, *Manuscripts*, p. 276.

¹⁶ Reilly, pp. xviii–xix.

¹⁷ *Feeling*, p. 179, n. 39.

However, I have found several Latinate readings that cannot be explained with reference to EV or any of the main commentary sources, but are in fact translated, often rather literally, from the Vulgate.¹⁸ Given that so many of the posited ‘EV’ readings in the text are also literal translations from the Vulgate,¹⁹ it seems likely that, rather than working from two distinct copies of WB (EV and LV) and the Vulgate, the compiler(s) instead worked from LV and the Vulgate, producing independent translations from the latter whenever they found LV to be lacking for some reason. There remain some apparent ‘EV’ readings that cannot be explained in this manner, and of course it is impossible completely to discount the idea that the compiler(s) referenced EV for occasional readings, but from a practical point of view it seems to me more likely that these unexplained readings stem from the particular copy/copies of LV being used, which may have contained readings slightly closer to EV than those LV manuscripts collated by Forshall and Madden.

The most conclusive indication that the *Declaracion* compiler(s) used the Vulgate is the inclusion of 4 Esdras. This book, along with 3 Esdras, had been dismissed as apocryphal in PWB (pp. 4-5, ll. 54-62). While 3 Esdras was nevertheless translated into English, appearing habitually in EV manuscripts and in one LV manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 277 (see below),²⁰ 4 Esdras is not included in any extant WB manuscript. The *Declaracion*, on the other hand, includes both books (3 Esdras is titled 2 Esdre, and 4 Esdras is labelled 3-5 Esdre). The treatment of 4 Esdras is perfunctory, but clearly reliant on the Vulgate text.²¹

¹⁸ The majority of these independent translations are found in the underlined biblical lemmata: for more on these, see below. Literal translations from the Vulgate do also occur in the main body of the text. See for example Matthew 10, l. 134): Vulgate ‘persecuerit’ and ‘persequitur’ become *D* ‘persecuerance’ and ‘persecucion’ (WB 10. 22-23 ‘dwelle stille’ or ‘contynue’ and ‘pursue(n)’). More examples are given in the explanatory notes to each book in Part II.

¹⁹ See for example Isaiah 41, l. 682 ‘euangelist’ from Vulgate ‘euangelistas’ (EV ‘euangelist’, LV ‘gospellere’, Isaiah 41. 27); Acts 3, l. 30: ‘Siluer & gold is not to me’, from Vulgate ‘Argentum & aurum non est mihi...’ (EV ‘Siluer and gold is not to me’, LV ‘Y haue nether siluer ne gold’, Acts 3. 6).

²⁰ Solopova, ‘Manuscript Tradition’, p. 230.

²¹ See Introduction to Ezra in Part II.

According to Ker, its inclusion in the *Declaracion* is probably an indication that the Vulgate in question was produced in England. The numbering (of both books and chapters) is even more unusual, and Ker locates only one Vulgate manuscript in Oxford that shares the chapter numbering of T93's 4 Esdre (the section known to modern scholarship as 4 Esdras 3-14).²² Quite why 4 Esdras was included in the *Declaracion* is mysterious. Suffice it to say that its inclusion is a further indication that, instead of merely parroting the contents of WB, the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion* were thoughtfully engaged with the biblical text in both its English and Latin forms.

That the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion* were Latinists of some facility, fully capable of undertaking independent translations from the Vulgate, is clear from the extensive use of Latin sources, including *LPL* and the *Glossa*, which are skilfully translated into English. That the *Glossa* always accompanies a full text of the Vulgate is proof that the compiler(s) had sustained access to Latin scripture. And, beside the readings mentioned above, there is clear evidence that they translated biblical text directly from Latin into English in the Psalter, as Ker attests.²³ In Psalm 6, for example, there are four quotations from the biblical text, ranging in length from two to six words. All the quotations are underlined, but only one, a two-word tag, follows LV exactly. The rest are closer to LV than to EV, but all are independent. The Psalm 6 incipit demonstrates the point (underlining is consistent with the manuscript):

*D: Domine ne in furore: Lord not in þi strong vengau[n]ce*²⁴

LV: Lord, rep[re]ue thou not me in thi stronge veniaunce

EV: Lord, in thi wodnesse vndernyme thou nott me

²²The manuscript in question is Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Lat 12. See Ker, 'Summary', pp. 115-116. Though it does indeed share the same chapter numbering in this particular section, it does not share the idiosyncratic numbering of the books themselves.

²³Ker, 'Summary', p. 116.

²⁴fol. 36^v, l. 1.

The relationship between the *Declaracion* and EV here is very loose. The lexical similarities between LV and the *Declaracion*, on the other hand, are undeniable, and suggest a level of familiarity with that translation. The use of the phrase ‘strong vengauⁿce’ to translate the Vulgate ‘furore’ is particularly suggestive of LV influence. Neither EV nor Rolle’s English Psalter include the word ‘strong’, and nor is it added in the Revisions to Rolle’s *Psalter Commentary*. Likewise, it is absent from the *Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter*: EV, Rolle and the Revised Psalter Commentary all translate ‘furore’ as ‘wodnesse’, while the *Prose Psalter* just uses ‘vengeance’.²⁵ However, the word order and the cut-off point of the *Declaracion* translation suggest that it was undertaken directly from the Latin lemma. Given the overwhelming influence of *LPL* and the *Magna* on the *Declaracion* Psalter, the Latin lemmata may have been copied directly from a commentary source, with no reference to the full Vulgate text.²⁶ Either way it seems likely that the compiler translated them directly into English himself, perhaps influenced by his own memory of the LV translation, rather than stopping regularly to consult WB.²⁷

Here, then, we have compiler(s) who set great store by the LV translation, but not so much as to preclude the interpolation of independent translations, especially of familiar texts like the Latin Psalter incipits. In the Psalter, these translations show a clear adherence to the

²⁵ See FM, II, p. 742; Bramley, *Psalter*, p. 21; Hudson, *Revisions*, I, p.45; *The Middle English Glossed Prose Psalter: Edited from Cambridge, Magdalene College, MS Pepys 2498*, ed. by Robert Ray Black and Raymond St-Jacques, 2 vols (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2012), I, p. 5. The phrase ‘strong veniaunce’ is also found at other points in LV and in PWB. See for example Isaiah 30. 27; PWB, in Dove, *Advocates*, p. 9 (l. 222), p. 33 (l. 1063), p. 42 (l. 1417).

²⁶ Manuscript copies of Lyra’s *Postilla* often just include lemmata, rather than a full biblical text: see for example Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Canon. Bibl. Lat. 70 and Oxford, Merton College MSS 163-165. Manuscripts of the *Magna*, on the other hand, would almost certainly have contained a full scriptural text of each book included in the commentary; even so, it is possible that the *Declaracion* compiler simply used the same lemmata as those used in the *Magna*, without reference to the full text that accompanied it.

²⁷ Kuczynski notes that biblical text included in glosses on WB is often translated independently of either EV or LV (‘Glossing’, p. 357).

Latin syntax. However, such adherence is much less common in other parts of the *Declaracion*, and it may be that the Psalter lemmata (and particularly the incipits) were felt to be deserving of special treatment. Perhaps, like Richard Rolle, the *Declaracion* compiler(s) hoped that some non-Latinate readers would be able ‘by the ynglis [to] com til mony latyn wordis’.²⁸

Hudson has noted several differences between the translation styles of EV and LV which are of interest with regard to the *Declaracion*. She notes that, when translating Latin phrases such as ‘defunctus est’, EV retains the present tense (‘is deed’), where LV employs the past tense (‘was deed’).²⁹ The *Declaracion* is interesting in this regard, as it frequently employs the present tense in this context, even where EV does not. See for example 1 Kings 25:

Vulgate: Mortuus est autem Samuel
D: Samuel is dede.
 EV: Samuel forsothe diede
 LV: Forsothe Samuel was deed³⁰

This suggests that, even though the *Declaracion* is not likely to have been directly influenced by EV, its compiler(s) shared some of the same translation philosophy and practice. Hudson notes that double glosses (synonymous variants) are another major element of the EV translation, though, as Dove reminds us, these also occur in LV.³¹ Hudson notes that these often pair a Latinate or technical term with a more idiomatic alternative, though some alternatives feel superfluous.³² Synonymous variants are common in the *Declaracion*. While there is some overlap with the variants provided in EV, there are also a lot of seemingly

²⁸ Bramley, *Psalter*, p. 5.

²⁹ Hudson, ‘Earlier Version/Later Version’, p. 68.

³⁰ 1 Kings 25. 1; *Declaracion* 1 Kings 25, fol. 15^r.

³¹ Dove, *FEB*, pp. 154-55. Dove asserts that the incidence of synonymous variants in LV is in fact much higher than FM would suggest.

³² Hudson, ‘Earlier Version/Later Version’, pp. 68-69.

independent alternative glosses. For example, *Declaracion* Genesis 11 has ‘of tonges or of langages’, where EV consistently has ‘lippe’ and LV ‘langage’.³³ Again, the influence of EV seems to be methodological rather than direct. Finally, Hudson notes that EV habitually translates Latin *autem* as *forsope*, where LV generally substitutes *and* or *but*. The evidence of the *Declaracion* is mixed: the word *forsope* only ever occurs in the underlined biblical lemmata, which have, presumably, been translated independently from the Vulgate. Once again, the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion* seem here to demonstrate an affinity with the techniques of the EV translators, though in this case the similarity is limited to a few specific instances.³⁴

It is clear, then, that while the *Declaracion* compiler(s) worked from LV, they also had some degree of sympathy with the techniques of the EV translation. This might suggest some familiarity with the earlier text and its methods, or might imply that the compiler(s) were working from a copy of LV that retained some EV features (possibly both). The most well-known example of this type is MS Bodley 277. This large, lavishly produced manuscript, dated c. 1415-30, contains an unusual LV text, which mixes LV and EV readings, and contains many readings that are rare or unique.³⁵ It is tempting to think that some of the apparent EV readings in Bodley 277 might be the result of independent translation from the Vulgate, but even if this supposition proves incorrect, there is still one concrete connection between the *Declaracion* and Bodley 277: both texts include 3 Esdras. However, unlike almost all other books of the *Declaracion*, *Declaracion* 2 Esdre (which contains 3 Esdras) does not show a

³³ See also 1 Ezra 8, ll. 41-42, ‘þe pistel or þe decre’, where EV consistently uses *maundemens* (LV *comaundementis* or *heestis*). At times, the synonymous variant is found in LV but not EV, as for example 3 Kings 4, fol. 17v ‘xij prefects or chefe ministers’ following LV ‘twelue prefectis *ether cheef minystrys*’ (EV ‘twelue ouerseers’).

³⁴ Outside of the *Declaracion* Psalter, where it is used relatively frequently in lemmata, *forsope* occurs just eight times across the text. See Isaiah 32, fol. 89v (2 uses, ll. 527-28); Isaiah 38, fol. 91r (l. 629); Jeremiah 11, fol. 105v; Baruch 6, fol. 118v; Ezekiel 16, fol. 121v; Daniel 11, fol. 133r; Habakkuk 3, fol. 144r.

³⁵ *King Henry’s Bible: MS Bodley 277: The Revised Version of the Wyclif Bible*, ed. by Conrad Lindberg, 4 vols (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1999-2004), IV, p. 33. See also Annie Sutherland, ‘The Wycliffite Psalms’, in *TWB*, ed. by Solopova, pp. 183-201 (pp. 192-201).

particularly strong affinity with the WB text, whether in Bodley 277 or in EV.³⁶ An in-depth analysis focused on this question is beyond the scope of the current project: suffice it to say that though they share certain characteristics, Bodley 277 and the *Declaracion* are not related to one another in any straightforward way. Lindberg's hypothesis about the production of Bodley 277 notes that there had been ample time for several revisions to the LV text before it was produced: it is possible that the similarities between the *Declaracion* and Bodley 277 can be traced back to one of those revised copies of LV that existed after the main work on the project had been completed, but before Bodley 277 itself was created. This would account for many of the discrepancies between the *Declaracion* and Bodley 277, and also for some of the few EV readings in the *Declaracion* that cannot be explained by reference to the Vulgate (which may have been included in an earlier revision to LV, but then altered in Bodley 277). It would also make sense of the dating of the two manuscripts, since Bodley 277 was produced far too late to have been a probable source for the *Declaracion*. However, such a hypothesis is necessarily speculative.

One other manuscript deserves special mention here. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 554 contains a heavily glossed LV Psalter. As Michael Kuczynski makes clear in his forthcoming edition, the glosses, taken mainly from Lyra's *Postilla* and from Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, are so extensive as to form a commentary, and often overlap with the glosses contained in the *Declaracion* Psalter.³⁷ However, as Kuczynski notes, the Psalter section of the *Declaracion* is 'too brief to have served as a standalone source' for Bodley 554. In addition, Kuczynski notes stylistic and methodological differences between the two that

³⁶ For more on this, see Introduction to Ezra in Part II.

³⁷ For details of these parallels, see the Explanatory Notes in Michael Kuczynski, *A Glossed Wycliffite Psalter: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodl. 554* (forthcoming EETS publication), and my own annotations on the Penitential Psalms in Part II.

make any kind of source-relationship unlikely.³⁸ Nothing in my own analysis has suggested otherwise; though they share their main sources and demonstrate similar interests, it seems these near-contemporary manuscripts are independent productions.

Bodley 554 is not the only manuscript to share glosses with the *Declaracion*: in Acts, many of the Lyran glosses included by our compiler are also found in Oxford, New College MS 67 and London, British Library, MS Harley 5017, but in different wording, or with a slightly altered focus. Similarly, the first eight chapters of *Declaracion* Isaiah contain a number of glosses that overlap with those in London, British Library, Cotton Claudius MS E.2.³⁹ Examination of other Lyran glosses in WB manuscripts would likely show similar results, and although the shared glosses have been posited as evidence of a connection between the *Declaracion* and LV,⁴⁰ it seems clear that the *Declaracion* compiler(s) worked directly and independently from a Latin copy of *LPL*. The overlaps might suggest that the *Declaracion* compiler(s) knew the WB translators, and shared some of their concerns; they might even bolster the theory that the *Declaracion* compiler(s) were involved in the WB translation.⁴¹ They are not, however, consistent enough to suggest any sort of source-relationship between the *Declaracion* and any of the LV copies I have mentioned.

Extra-biblical sources

That the *Declaracion* makes use of extra-biblical sources is clear even to the most casual reader: though relatively infrequent, attributed glosses are dotted throughout the manuscript,

³⁸ Kuczynski, *A Glossed Wycliffite Psalter*.

³⁹ For more on these glosses, see the Explanatory Notes to Isaiah and Acts.

⁴⁰ See for example Morey, *Book and Verse*, p. 111.

⁴¹ See Chapter 2.

and are particularly concentrated in the Psalter, the Prophets and the Pauline Epistles. The difficulty is that these overt citations are not representative of the influence of extra-biblical sources as a whole: in most books, short glosses are introduced into the text without any signposting, so that they are indistinguishable from the biblically-derived material. The reason for this must be at least partly practical. The frequency and general brevity of the Lyran interpolations in particular means that any attempt to differentiate them all, for example by underlining (let alone by adding an attribution for each one) would have been a daunting task. Additionally, it is possible that the manuscript as it survives today has lost prefatory or explanatory material that would have alerted the reader to the presence of Lyran glossing in the text, even if it could not pick out every instance.⁴² In fact, a similar method was employed in the Middle English Gospel Harmony *Oon of Foure*, where the prologue explains that the compiler has removed all the citations from the text itself, 'lest þis ofte rehersing and medeling of þe names of þe Gospeleris among þe sentence shulde make þe sentence derk, and cumbre symple mennis wittes'.⁴³ Of course, *Oon of Foure* differs slightly from the *Declaracion* in that it places citations at the beginning of individual chapters, while the *Declaracion* often omits them altogether. Additionally, the citations given in *Oon of Foure* are all biblical, whereas the citations primarily missing from the *Declaracion* are of commentary sources. However, it is easy to imagine that, like the compiler of the lollard gospel harmony, the *Declaracion* compiler(s) wanted to prioritise intelligibility over attribution.⁴⁴

This has, nonetheless, led to some scholarly confusion regarding the amount of exegesis contained in the *Declaracion*. Even those who have worked in detail on the text have

⁴² On this point, see Chapter 2.

⁴³ Paul Smith, 'An Edition of Parts I-V of the Wycliffite Translation of Clement of Llanthony's Latin Gospel Harmony *Unum ex Quattuor*, Known as *Oon of Foure*', 2 vols (PhD thesis, Southampton University, 1985: theuniversitiespress.com, 2015), I, p. ccvii, n. 8; Smith, '*Oon of Foure*', II, pp. 2-3 (ll. 13-22).

⁴⁴ Smith, '*Oon of Foure*', I, p. ccvii and II, pp. 2-3 (ll. 13-22); Raschko, '*Oon*', p. 354.

not attempted the kind of in-depth analysis that is required to understand the full extent of extra-biblical influence, and often seem to have assumed that non-attributed glossing material was original to the *Declaracion*. Reilly, for example, asserts that '[the compiler] has himself added glosses to the text in many places', suggesting that 'they seem to be at least as frequent as direct references to other commentators'. However, both examples he cites are actually copied from *LPL*.⁴⁵ Somerset makes a similar error in her examination of the manuscript, where, in claiming that the compiler 'invents his own commentary', she cites his habit of commenting on narrative voice: one of the two examples she gives is from *LPL*.⁴⁶ Further, a concern with narrative voice is evident in both Lyra and the *Glossa* more widely, and most of the examples of this nature that I have examined in detail are from one of these sources. In fact, there is little material in the *Declaracion* which cannot be traced back to an earlier writer. The work of earlier commentators is systematically abbreviated, and the compiler(s) demonstrate a ruthlessly economical approach to selecting relevant material. As noted above, this material is then incorporated – often seamlessly – into the *Declaracion*. I will begin by delineating the relationships between the *Declaracion* and its two major exegetical sources, *LPL* and the *Glossa* (including the *Magna*). I will then turn to the question of how the *Declaracion* uses other authorities, in particular Haymo of Auxerre's *Commentaria in Isaiam* (*Commentaria*) and the *Historia*.

The *Declaracion* and Lyra's *Postilla*

Nicholas of Lyra was a prominent Franciscan exegete whose crowning academic achievement was a comprehensive commentary on the literal-historical sense of the bible, known as the

⁴⁵ Reilly, p. vii; L1/1551:4; L2/1380:7. Pouzet also underestimates the amount of exegesis (pp. 105-06).

⁴⁶ *Feeling*, p. 186; LA/725:3. Somerset's analysis contains several examples of this type.

Postilla super totam bibliam or *Postilla literalis*, and written between 1322 and 1331. His shorter *Postilla moralis* followed between 1333 and 1339. Lyra was admired for his simple style, and for his learning in Hebrew: this interest saw him engage with the work of various Jewish scholars, most notably the eleventh-century rabbi Shlomo Yitzchaki, who was known to medieval Christendom as Rabbi Salomon or Rashi.⁴⁷

Lyra was one of the most respected exegetes of the later Middle Ages. The fact that his work now survives in over 800 manuscripts is testament to his popularity with orthodox readers throughout the Latin West.⁴⁸ As noted in Chapter 3, his facility with Hebrew and his insistence on the primacy of the literal sense of scripture meant that he was admired by John Wyclif.⁴⁹ He was also a major influence on the WB translators. As asserted above, many LV manuscripts contain extensive marginal glossing translated faithfully from *LPL* and almost always attributed to Lyra by name.⁵⁰ In addition, PWB mentions him approvingly on several occasions, and repeats his analysis.⁵¹ *LPL* was very long, and it is unclear precisely how either the WB translators or the *Declaracion* compiler(s) accessed his work.⁵² It likely existed in

⁴⁷ Deana Copeland-Klepper, 'Nicholas of Lyra and Franciscan Interest in Hebrew Scholarship', in *Nicholas of Lyra: the Senses of Scripture*, ed. by Lesley Smith and Philip Krey (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 289-312 (p. 289-91). PWB names Lyra, along with Jerome, as an authority on the differences between the Latin and Hebrew biblical texts (Dove, *Advocates*, p. 82, l. 2853). For more on Lyra, see Lyra, ed. by Smith and Krey; Deana Copeland-Klepper, *The Insight of Unbelievers: Nicholas of Lyra and Christian Reading of Jewish Text in the Later Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Herman Hailperin, *Rashi and the Christian Scholars* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963); Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982; repr. 1983), pp. 170-196; Levy, 'The Literal Sense', pp. 786-89.

⁴⁸ Philip Krey and Lesley Smith, 'Introduction', in *Lyra*, ed. by Smith and Krey, pp. 1-18 (pp. 8-12). Smith notes that the *Postilla* 'rivalled [the *Glossa*] in number and distribution of copies'. See *The Glossa ordinaria: the Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 225-26.

⁴⁹ Wyclif's own *Postilla* drew extensively on Lyra: see Catto, 'Bible', p. 15; Kuczynski, 'Glossing', p. 360.

⁵⁰ Kuczynski, 'Glossing', p. 356. Smith notes that Lyra is more prominent in WB glosses in the Old Testament, while the *Glossa ordinaria* is more prominent in the New (*Glossa*, p. 232).

⁵¹ 'PWB', in Dove, *Advocates*, p. 68 (ll. 2360-61), pp. 73-74 (ll. 2555-90), p. 80 (ll. 2805-07), p. 82, (ll. 2854-53). Lyra is also mentioned twice in the 'Prologue to Isaiah and the Prophets', in Dove, *Advocates*, p. 86 (ll. 17-19), p. 87 (ll. 44-45); and once each in 'First seip Bois', in Dove, *Advocates*, p. 145 (ll. 58-62); and 'The Holi Prophete Daud', in Dove, *Advocates*, p. 159, (ll. 329-33).

⁵² On this question as it relates to WB, see Kuczynski, 'Glossing', pp. 359-60. Dove suggests that the Wycliffites made their own 'abbreviated translation' of Lyra, from which the WB glosses and some revisions to LV derive, but

Oxford in large display copies like the six-volume set now known as Oxford, New College MSS 8-13. A slightly less elaborate three-volume set was made for Merton College in c.1400, at around the same time as T93. There is also evidence that some Wycliffites had access to editions of Lyra's work on individual books of the bible, which could be contained in a single volume.⁵³ As noted in Chapter 4, Lyra himself recognised that his work would be out of reach to the average student, which is why he produced a digest, focusing on those places where the Hebrew text differs from the Latin.⁵⁴ Perhaps following in this spirit, though not using Lyra's digest as a direct source, the *Declaracion* is humbly produced and easily portable.

Despite being considerably more compact than *LPL*, the *Declaracion* borrows heavily from Lyra in terms of both form and content. The aim seems to be not only to summarise the content of WB, but also to produce a vernacular compendium of Lyran biblical scholarship, using some of the same methods as Lyra himself. Like the *Declaracion*, Lyra's commentary contains very little that is truly original; his reliance on the *Glossa* and on the work of Rashi has already been noted, and according to Corrine Patton '[a]lmost every word of his commentary has precedent in the great theologians of the twelfth- and thirteenth-centuries'.⁵⁵ However, like our compiler(s), Lyra is adept at handling his sources, and remains keenly engaged with the biblical text, treating each book as distinct and adjusting his style of glossing and his main

she provides no evidence of the existence of such a work apart from the glosses themselves. It is clear that she did not believe the *Declaracion* to be the digest in question, and given the only partial overlapping of glosses in WB manuscripts and the *Declaracion*, noted above, such a theory is unlikely. See Dove, *FEB*, pp. 164-65.

⁵³ It is certain that partial copies of Lyra existed in Oxford and were in the possession of men associated with WB in the last quarter of the fourteenth century: a copy of Lyra's Psalter commentary was among the books taken from Queen's College by a group of Southern academics (including John Trevisa) when they were expelled in 1378. They also took a partial commentary by Lyra on Proverbs. See Fowler, *The Bible*, pp. 155-56. John Purvey also owned a copy of Lyra's commentary on the Pauline Epistles, while Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS e Musaco 5 contains just the Psalter commentary: see Kuczynski, 'Glossing', pp. 359-60.

⁵⁴ This is the *De differentia nostre translationis ab hebraica littera veteris testamentis*. See Smith and Krey, 'Introduction', pp. 7-8; Hailperin, p. 139.

⁵⁵ Corrine Patton, 'Creation, Fall and Salvation: Lyra's Commentary on Genesis 1-3' in *Lyra*, ed. by Smith and Krey, pp. 19-44 (p. 24).

sources depending on the nature of the text in front of him.⁵⁶ At the same time, he regards the bible as ‘a genuine whole’, and sees it as his mission to gloss the complete text, so that those who are unable to do so themselves can benefit from his learning.⁵⁷ The *Declaracion* compiler(s) show a similar impulse for completeness, even where it is not particularly helpful to the reader; this is demonstrated most starkly by the inclusion of a perfunctory summary of 4 Esdras.⁵⁸ At the same time, like Lyra, the *Declaracion* compiler(s) will often pass over an incident briefly if it has been dealt with elsewhere: this pattern is particularly noticeable in the Gospels, for obvious reasons.⁵⁹

Another key similarity between Lyra and the *Declaracion* compiler(s) is that both seem consciously to avoid controversy.⁶⁰ Despite his willingness to challenge the orthodox readings laid down by the Church Fathers, Lyra’s commentary on Matthew has been described as ‘highly traditional and conservative’, and Kevin Madigan notes that there are few clues to the exegete’s Franciscan background in either the language he uses or the values he espouses (though Madigan notes, too, that such a lack of polemic was common to many commentaries of the period).⁶¹ As Chapter 3 demonstrated, the *Declaracion* is similar in that, although there are clearly themes that interest the compiler(s), and a careful reader might be able to piece together a speculative idea about their beliefs, the clues are sparing and never straightforward.

Aside from these methodological similarities, the text of *LPL* is woven through the whole of the *Declaracion*. Lyra is by far the most cited authority in the text: his name is mentioned 230 times, though the vast majority of these citations (around 140) are in the

⁵⁶ Patton, ‘Creation’, p. 20.

⁵⁷ Lesley Smith, ‘The Gospel Truth: Nicholas of Lyra on John’, in *Lyra*, ed. by Smith and Krey, pp. 223–49 (p. 249).

⁵⁸ For more on this, see the Introduction to Ezra in Part II.

⁵⁹ Smith, ‘The Gospel Truth’, p. 248. See the Introduction to the Gospels in Part II.

⁶⁰ Kevin Madigan, ‘Lyra on the Gospel of Matthew’, in *Lyra*, ed. by Smith and Krey, pp. 195–222 (p. 220).

⁶¹ Madigan, ‘Matthew’, p. 196 and p. 220.

Psalter, where *LPL* is closely translated and quoted at length to delineate the literal sense of the majority of the Psalms, while *LM* is commonly used as a source for the moral sense. Most of the other attributed citations to Lyra are found in the Prophets, Pauline Epistles, and Acts.⁶²

This list fails, however, to capture the way in which Lyra's work pervades the whole text, and I will turn my attention now to those books where his influence is not immediately obvious. *Declaracion* Luke, for example, runs to only 5,100 words, and Lyra is never cited by name, yet I have detected over 100 instances where *LPL* provides the source of a particular word, phrase, or idea, or of a citation to another biblical book, commonly another gospel.⁶³ This rate of influence, with Lyra providing inspiration on average once every fifty words or so, is stable throughout the Gospels, despite the fact that he is only named three times across all four books, twice in John and once in Matthew. In the instances from John the reason for the attribution is, as so often, obscure; the attribution in Matthew makes slightly more sense as it relates to a gloss on the Hebrew meaning of a phrase, something with which Lyra was particularly associated.⁶⁴

It is difficult to discern any clear pattern governing the use of Lyra in the *Declaracion*. As in many LV manuscripts, the focus of the glosses is often on historical details: for example, in John 4, the summary says that '[a] litel king' comes to ask Jesus to heal his son; this reading follows LV. The compiler then includes the following: 'Lira seys þæt þis man was no king, bot an officere of þe emperoure deputed or ordeyned to kepe Galile'. Such glosses are the most likely to be distinguished in some way, either by direct reference to Lyra or by underlining.⁶⁵

⁶² See Isaiah and Acts in the current edition.

⁶³ For more detail, see the Explanatory Notes.

⁶⁴ See Matthew 2, fol. 151^r (ll. 16-18). On those occasions where Lyra is cited by name, the gloss attributed to him may not even be more faithfully translated than other unattributed glosses: see for example Isaiah 8, ll. 131-134 in the current edition. There are also occasions where Lyra is cited completely unnecessarily, as his gloss only repeats what is already obvious from the text: see Acts 23, l. 402.

⁶⁵ For an example of the latter type, see Judges 8, fol. 12^v: '[...] he made ephod, þæt is a prestes cloth'. In this case,

However, these historical glosses are not the only ones given in the *Declaracion*. Often, Lyra's work is used to clarify the supposed literal meaning of the text, for example in the frequent phrase 'dey *of dome*' (in this quotation and those that follow, material derived from Lyra is given in bold italics).⁶⁶ The word 'foly' is also added often from Lyra, as in the phrase '*foly* demyng'.⁶⁷ A similar one-word gloss that is often interpolated from Lyra is 'feynyngly' (see for example Matthew 3, fol. 151^r, l. 21-22: 'Ioh^{an} callid many of Phariseis and Saduceis þat camen *feynyngly* to his baptem "Generacions of eddres"'). This gloss is exemplary of the *Declaracion*'s habitual use of Lyra to elucidate the inner thoughts and motivations of biblical characters:

John 3: '*Iohan vnderstode by þis, as Lira seys, þat þe office of Crist was to baptise...*'⁶⁸

Acts 16: 'Paul, *to eschewe sclaudre of þe Iewes*, circumcided Tymothe.'⁶⁹

Acts 24: '*He gaf þis fredam to Paul not only for drede of Goddes dome, bot also for couetise*, wenyng þat Paul hade had money to haue gyuen hym.'⁷⁰

This focus on interiority lends weight to Somerset's argument that the *Declaracion* is concerned with feelings,⁷¹ suggesting that the emotions and motivations of characters were used to prompt readers to examine their own inner lives. Sometimes, however, the motivations given are misleading. In Acts 25, for example, Festus suggests that Paul go to Jerusalem to be judged. Following Lyra, the *Declaracion* says that '*[this] had ben perilouse to Paul*, and so Paul

the same gloss is included in the body of the LV text, but this is not always the case with underlined glosses.

⁶⁶ See for example Luke 21, fol. 161^r (l. 268).

⁶⁷ For example, Matthew 7, fol. 151^v (l. 75).

⁶⁸ fol. 162^r (l. 36).

⁶⁹ fol. 198^r (l. 256).

⁷⁰ fol. 200^r, (ll. 419-20).

⁷¹ *Feeling*, pp. 180-83 and pp. 190-92.

appealed to be emperor'. In fact, Paul's argument is not that going to Jerusalem would be dangerous, but that he refuses to die with no just cause.⁷² The inclusion of this gloss suggests that Lyra was not always merely an adjunct to the biblical text: faced here with a choice between text and gloss, the compiler chooses to include the gloss and leave out the biblical text, even though the former does not accurately represent the latter.⁷³

Lyra is also routinely used as a means of bringing order to the text. The example in Acts 6-7 is striking:

Of þe vertu and wisdom of Steuen, and of his fals *accusacion of iij þinges: þat he shold haue spoken ageyn God, ageyn Moyses, ageyn þe temple, & ageyn þe lawe* [...] *Here Steuen excuses hym self, and first of blasfemy ageyn God* [...] *þen he excuses hym of blasfemy ageyn Moyses* [...] *Here he excuses hym of blasfemy ageyn the temple* [...] *Here he excuses hym of blasfemy ageyn þe lawe...*

(fol. 196^v, ll. 88-100)

Although the four false accusations are all present in the LV text (Acts 6. 11-13), the use of each accusation to break up Stephen's long defence is copied directly from *LPL*.⁷⁴ These 'headings' fulfil a mnemonic function, and also suggest that the biblical text is at its heart orderly and easily comprehensible.⁷⁵ The idea of taking inherent patterns and structures within the biblical text and making them explicit is key to the practice of the *Declaracion* compiler(s), and is often copied from Lyra: this impulse can be seen most clearly in the cross-references that are peppered through the whole text, most obviously in the Gospels after Matthew. These

⁷² Cf. Acts 25. 10-11; L6/1231:6.

⁷³ In this sense it is similar to the English *Prose Psalter*, which was produced around half a century before the *Declaracion*, but which also sometimes prioritises gloss over text. According to Sutherland, 'throughout the Psalter, direct translation is replaced with gloss rather than supplemented by it'. See "'In eching for the beste": The Fourteenth-century English *Prose Psalter* and the Art of Psalm Translation', in *The Psalms and Medieval English Literature: From the Conversion to the Reformation*, ed. by Tamara Atkin and Francis Leneghan (Woodbridge, D.S. Brewer, 2017), pp. 108-127 (p. 114).

⁷⁴ L6/1045:1; L6/1054:8, L6/1059:4 (sic) and L6/1061:1.

⁷⁵ For more on the mnemonic properties of the *Declaracion*, see Chapter 2.

cross-references have, of course, been noticed by earlier scholars – Reilly says, somewhat hyperbolically, that ‘[they] are almost sufficient to serve as a concordance’ – but as ever, their basis in Lyra has been overlooked.⁷⁶

The *Declaracion* does not only engage with WB and reproduce its text in a digestible form. It performs a similar, though less obvious, function for the work of Nicholas of Lyra, the commentator who seems to have influenced the Wycliffite translators above all others. While the use of Lyra in the *Declaracion* is similar to that of the WB translators in some ways (for example, in the faithfulness of the translations and the careful selection of material), it is infinitely more intricate and sustained.⁷⁷ The compiler(s) engage with Lyra’s work in a way that celebrates its complexity, and asserts its authority, but, as ever, the *Declaracion* does not simply reproduce the earlier exegete’s work, or even just quote selectively from it. Instead, it is reworked: woven seamlessly through the biblically-derived text at times, while at others there is a more obvious separation of text and gloss. Some of the decisions may seem eccentric, but there can be no doubt that this work represents a complex and deliberate response to Lyra, and one unparalleled among manuscripts associated with the Wycliffites.

The *Declaracion* and the *Glossa ordinaria*

Though it has left a smaller mark on the *Declaracion* than *LPL*, the influence of the *Glossa* should not be underestimated. This seminal early-medieval commentary, which was compiled over many years, by several compilers, and out of an array of exegetical sources, provides the direct source for many of the glosses that cannot be attributed to Lyra.⁷⁸ Like Lyra, it might

⁷⁶ This is not to say that there are no independent cross-references in the *Declaracion*, but the bulk of those I have examined are given in *LPL*.

⁷⁷ For more on the ways in which the Wycliffite translators engaged with Lyra, see Kuczynski, ‘Glossing’, pp. 356–59.

⁷⁸ For more on the *Glossa*, see Smith, *Glossa*; Margaret T. Gibson, ‘The Glossed Bible’, in *Biblia Latina Cum*

also have provided a validating model for the *Declaracion*. I will begin by discussing the *Glossa* as a direct source for some of the material in the *Declaracion*, before proceeding to the thornier question of general influence.

First it is necessary to clarify that the version used in the preparation of the *Declaracion* seems not to have been the “pure” *Glossa* text, but rather one in which the original *Glossa* sections on the Psalter and Pauline Epistles had been replaced by the continuous prose commentaries of the twelfth-century Italian theologian Peter Lombard, which were known collectively as the *Magna Glosatura (Magna)*.⁷⁹ The *Magna* came to supersede the earlier sections on the Psalter and Epistles in most copies of the *Glossa*, and it is likely that our compiler(s) were working from such a copy.⁸⁰

The distinction between the original *Glossa* text and the *Magna* is crucial to understanding the *Declaracion*, but once again, it has been overlooked by previous scholars, none of whom mention Lombard. Reilly includes a large volume of annotations in his edition citing the original *Glossa* text in relation to the *Declaracion* Psalter,⁸¹ and later scholars also failed to recognise the *Magna*. The misunderstanding has even caused errors in analysis, as when Somerset asserts that the *Declaracion* Psalter ‘uses an unusual scheme of analytical division into parts’, noting that the method ‘contrasts with the usual conventions of

Glossa Ordinaria: Facsimile Reprint of the Editio Princeps, Adolph Rusch of Strasburg, 1480/81, introduced by Karlfried Froehlich and Margaret T. Gibson, 4 vols (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992), I, pp. vii-xi; Margaret T. Gibson, ‘The Place of the Glossa Ordinaria in Medieval Exegesis’, in *Ad Literam: Authoritative Texts and their Medieval Readers*, ed. by Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery Jr (Notre Dame, IN; London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), pp. 5-28; Lesley Smith, ‘The Glossed Bible’, in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, II, pp. 363-79.
⁷⁹For instances where the *Declaracion* uses the *Magna* on the Pauline Epistles, see for example 1 Corinthians 3, fol. 170^v, (*Magna*, PL191/1557A-B); 2 Thessalonians 2, fol. 189^v (*Magna*, PL191/318D).

⁸⁰For more on Peter Lombard and the *Magna*, see Philipp W. Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 34-53; Mark A. Zier, ‘Peter Lombard and the Glossa ordinaria on the Bible’, in *A Distinct Voice: Medieval Studies in Honour of Leonard E. Boyle, O.P.*, ed. by Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), pp. 629-41. On the relationship between the “original” *Glossa* text and the *Magna*, see Smith, *Glossa*, pp. 200-01.

⁸¹Reilly, pp. 513-525.

commentary on the Psalter and with what Lyra and the *Glossa ordinaria* provide'.⁸² In reality, both the division and the analytical substance of these parts of the *Declaracion* Psalter are copied directly from the *Magna*.⁸³ In fact, as will be demonstrated below, although the rest of the *Glossa* is a key source for the *Declaracion*, Lombard's commentaries are more influential, because they are used so extensively in the Pauline Epistles, and particularly the Psalter.

Lyra was heavily influenced by the *Glossa* (including the *Magna*). Often the two sources overlap, so that it is difficult to judge whether a word or phrase in the *Declaracion* has been lifted from the *Glossa* or the *Postillae*. This is particularly problematic because the *Declaracion* compiler(s) were not interested in distinguishing between the two. Lyra and the *Glossa* are often cited in close proximity to each other, particularly in the Epistles, and on one occasion the two are merged together: 'Lira & þe glose seyn...'.⁸⁴ A further indication that the two sources are not completely separable is given in a short note at the end of the Psalter, where it is explained that:

It is to wit þat in þis declaracion of þe psalter Lira shewes þe littoral sense, & þe glose, þat is þe comyn glose, oþer senses; wherfore where þe declaracion of Lira diuerses noght or litel fro þe comyn glose, þere is not rehersed distinctly what Lira seys & what þe glose seys...

(fol. 68^r)⁸⁵

Though Reilly is too sweeping in his assertion that this note is the writer's attempt to '[set] forth his principles of annotation' (not least because it clearly refers only to the Psalter), the note does indicate that any attempt by a modern scholar completely to separate the two sources is bound to fail.⁸⁶ For this reason, unless the influence of the *Glossa* seemed particularly strong

⁸² *Feeling*, pp. 197-98.

⁸³ For examples, see Explanatory Notes to the Penitential Psalms.

⁸⁴ 2 Timothy 2, fol. 190^v.

⁸⁵ For more on this note, see Chapter 2.

⁸⁶ Reilly, p. vi.

in a particular book (as it does, for example, in Isaiah), I have tended to search it only in those instances where no Lyran source is forthcoming, since the later work was undoubtedly the more important of the two sources across the text as a whole.

Direct citations of the *Glossa* are relatively frequent in the *Declaracion*, where ‘the glose’ is named 127 times. However, as with citations of Lyra, most appear in the Psalter: the phrase ‘after þe glose’ is found there on 112 occasions. In addition, there are nine mentions of ‘the glose’ in the Pauline Epistles, and another four in the endnote that accompanies the Psalter. In other words, the vast majority of citations to ‘the glose’ in the *Declaracion* actually reference the *Magna*. The endnote quoted above seems to suggest that the *Magna* was considered to be an intrinsic part of the *Glossa*, but even if so it is interesting to note that the Lombard’s continuous prose commentary is cited far more frequently in the *Declaracion* than other less cohesive parts of the *Glossa*: clearly, it was felt to provide a closer model for our text. However, the influence of the rest of the *Glossa* should not be underestimated. It is cited by name just twice in the rest of the text, but, like *LPL*, its words are frequently translated (often using cognates) and woven silently throughout the whole.⁸⁷ Translations from the *Magna* are similarly faithful, though not mechanical. Though it does often include very close translations, the *Declaracion* draws material from Peter Lombard’s whole commentary on each Psalm, rather than just translating a single part. As ever, the *Declaracion* compiler(s) are actively engaged and thoughtful.

Of the ‘glose’ citations in the Epistles, two are deserving of special attention here.

⁸⁷The two citations are in Daniel 8 and Hosea 4. In Daniel 8, the material that is attributed to ‘the glose’ is also found in Lyra, so the reason for the attribution is somewhat mysterious. In Hosea 4 the *Glossa* is used to clarify a potentially confusing moment in the biblical text, and there is no Lyran equivalent, so the citation makes more sense (for this gloss, see MG4/1729c). For examples where *Glossa* commentary is included silently in the text, see the Explanatory Notes.

Firstly, in 1 Corinthians 4 and 1 Corinthians 6 (fols 171^r-171^v), the *Magna* is cited in support of the idea that the text is meant to be understood ironically, a proposition with which the *Declaracion* compiler(s) seem to have been a little uncomfortable. The word ‘yronice’ is used several times throughout the text, always underlined and often glossed.⁸⁸ In 1 Corinthians 4, the word is even repeated three times in a single chapter (underlining follows the manuscript):

Yronice he seys to þem, Now 3e are filled & made riche of spirituel godes, & 3e regnen *in perfection*, as who se, Ney Lira: þe cause why trewe apostlis were despised was for wretchednesses þat þey sufferd *in* þis life, and þerfore after þe glose he seys yronice I wene þat God shewes vs apostlis abiecte, as if he charge not of vs, as no3t worthe, bot to dye. [...] In þise wordes he blames hem yronice, for al was contrary.

(fol. 171^r)⁸⁹

Even having given two brief definitions in the text (‘as who se, Ney’, ‘al was contrary’), the compiler feels compelled to add a longer explanation in the bottom margin:

Nota: A man spekes yronice when he menes contrary þat his wordes sownen, as if I seyed to a man, þu art a wise man, meenyng þat he were a fole.

Interestingly, this definition seems not to be taken from the *Magna*. It is, however, similar to one given in Isaiah 57 in *LPL* (LA/467:4): ‘quia ironice loquitur, sicut fatuo ironice dicitur, tu es multum sapiens’.⁹⁰ The compiler’s caution is understandable, since the word had apparently not yet entered common English parlance (it is not included in *MED*, and *OED* gives the first

⁸⁸ See Isaiah 57, fol. 97^r, ll. 1073); Jeremiah 4 (fol. 103^r); 1 Corinthians 4 (fol. 171^r); 1 Corinthians 6 (fol. 171^v); 1 Corinthians 11 (fol. 174^r) and 2 Corinthians 12 (fol. 181^r). In all but two of these cases, the compiler immediately provides an in-text gloss to explain what the word means.

⁸⁹ See *Mag*, PL191/1567D-1568A.

⁹⁰ ‘For he speaks ironically, as if he said to a fool, you are very wise.’ Strangely, when the compiler defines ‘yronice’ in *Declaracion* Isaiah 57, he does not use the same definition, but one that may be original: ‘A man spekes yronice when he meenes contrary to þat his wordes sowne: as if þou seyed to a childe, ‘þou art a gode childe,’ meenyng þat he were a shrew’ (fol. 97^r, ll. 1076-77).

recorded usage as 1614).⁹¹ What is most interesting here, though, is the way in which sources are marshalled in support of a potentially confusing reading of the biblical text. The explanation of irony draws not only from the *Magna*, but also from *LPL*, and even possibly from a Lyran gloss provided to a different biblical book.

In 2 Thessalonians 2 (fol. 189^v), commenting on the passage ‘þat he þat holdes now hold he, &c.’, the compiler writes that ‘þe compiler of þe comyn glose knowleches here þat he wist nere what Paul ment here: neþeles diuerse opinions how many men vnderstanden þem he rehersed here’. This is an accurate representation of the commentary contained in the *Magna*.⁹² It is interesting, though, that the *Declaracion* includes the admission (‘Ergo prorsus quid dixerit me fateor ignorare’),⁹³ and none of the interpretations. On one hand, this might suggest that the compiler(s) envisaged that most of the audience would have access to the *Magna*, and could be trusted to chase up the citation if interested.⁹⁴ On the other hand, particularly with the inclusion of an admission of ignorance from a respected commentator, the intention might simply be to signal that scripture can be ambiguous, and that exegesis can be correspondingly difficult. In this light, the fact that the *Declaracion* leaves some of the interpretative work still to do, rather than settling on a single interpretation, and necessitates a return to an earlier source for anyone wishing to read the arguments, indicates a certain intellectual scrupulousness. It clarifies the idea, also evidenced by the extensive use of doublets, that the *Declaracion* is not a text meant to simplify Scripture, and nor is it in the business of providing easy answers.⁹⁵

⁹¹ ‘ironic’ (adj.), in *OED* [online] <<https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/99525?redirectedFrom=ironic#eid>> [accessed 01 July 2019].

⁹² *Mag*, PL192/318D.

⁹³ ‘I confess therefore that I do not know at all what he meant.’

⁹⁴ See Chapter 2.

⁹⁵ See Chapter 1. For examples of synonymous variants in the *Declaracion*, see above.

In terms of more general influence, both the *Magna* and the *Glossa* have several features which might have provided a model for the *Declaracion* compiler(s). On the surface, the *Magna* seems to be a more convincing general model because, unlike the *Glossa*, it weaves its commentary into a cohesive prose text: it also follows its source (the earlier *Glossa* text) closely, so that, as Smith notes, ‘We need to look hard to find the Lombard’s own words’.⁹⁶ However, the *Declaracion* also shares a number of important characteristics with the *Glossa*. For example, Smith notes that, in the *Glossa*, while glosses are generally quoted almost verbatim from their sources, they are often abbreviated, with the sentences ‘shaped to fit the often peremptory syntax of the glosses’; paraphrase is also relatively common.⁹⁷ Both these techniques form the bedrock of the *Declaracion*’s engagement with its sources (both scripture and commentary).⁹⁸ Similarly, Smith notes that some books in the *Glossa* include a number of citations at the beginning, but these have a tendency to tail off, ‘almost as if, having signalled who might be the authors associated with its glosses, the author of the Gloss (or its subsequent copyists) is not interested in showing which *individual* glosses are attributable to which author’.⁹⁹ Likewise, the explicit citations to exegesis in the *Declaracion* tend to pool at the beginnings of books: in several longer books where explicit citations occur, they are all placed within the first four chapters (see for example Nehemiah, Job, Ecclesiastes, Micah, Matthew, John, 2 Corinthians). Most of the time the reader is left to discern what is and is not gloss, and to determine what the source might be.¹⁰⁰

Aside from this (and also as in the *Glossa*), there is no discernible rule that explains

⁹⁶ Smith, *Glossa*, p. 201.

⁹⁷ Smith, *Glossa*, p. 55.

⁹⁸ See Chapter 4.

⁹⁹ Smith, *Glossa*, p. 57.

¹⁰⁰ The following discussion assumes that the policies of underlining and attribution witnessed in T93 are not peculiar to that manuscript, but are part of the make-up of the text itself.

why some attributions are given and some not, and the text does not contain consistent attribution. Smith argues that this precludes the idea that the *Glossa* was intended to send its readers back to the source material.¹⁰¹ Here, however, the *Declaracion* is slightly different: because it works with far fewer sources, and because its main exegetical sources proceed chronologically in tandem with the biblical text, it is possible to believe that a very knowledgeable reader would have been able to recognise commentary material and chase up citations when necessary. It is important to recognise, though, that given the lack of consistency around attribution and underlining in T93, none but the most experienced biblical scholars could have hoped to distinguish biblical material from gloss with consistency.

This lack of division between biblical text and gloss seems on a surface level to make the *Declaracion* very different from either the *Magna* or the *Glossa*, since both those texts build the separation of scripture and gloss into their design. However, as Smith notes, in the *Glossa* the line does sometimes become blurred: extracts from other books of the bible are often quoted without notice in the marginal gloss, and this lack of clarity, and the lack of attributions, leads her to argue that the *Glossa* was not intended for student use or public teaching.¹⁰² Instead, she suggests that it was likely intended for private consultation; attributions were omitted because the original audience did not need them, or because they were thought unimportant (a similar argument has been made with regard to the *Magna*).¹⁰³ The same also seems true of our manuscript. While it may also have been used to facilitate learning in small groups, the small size of T93 would have made it easy to handle at home. The humble production-values would also have minimised costs, making it possible for scholars to

¹⁰¹ See Smith, *Glossa*, pp. 60-63.

¹⁰² Smith, *Glossa*, pp. 68-9; p. 109.

¹⁰³ Smith, *Glossa*, p. 70; Rosemann, p. 43.

own their own copy, rather than relying on a library.¹⁰⁴ In this, of course, it is very different from the *Glossa*.

Perhaps, like the readers of the *Glossa*, the audience of the *Declaracion* was never expected to be able to untangle the text's sources entirely: it was, after all, intended for a very different purpose than the WB manuscripts, where readers could expect more scrupulous distinctions between scriptural and interpolated material.¹⁰⁵ Linked to this is the idea of layout. Smith notes that in later copies, '[t]he Gloss no longer looks like a text with surrounding glosses', but is rather set out to make clear that text and gloss are both 'an integral part of a single work'.¹⁰⁶ It is tempting to see the *Declaracion* as the logical extension of this kind of thinking. That the manuscript (and probably the text itself) makes very little effort consistently to delineate text from gloss suggests that the compiler(s) did indeed think of the two as integral: they seem to have viewed both as authoritative (though not equally so), and to have been comfortable with the idea that the reader would not be able consistently to distinguish one from the other.

As the previous chapter made clear, Wycliffites were not generally opposed to the idea of biblical exegesis. It was only when this exegesis was seen to be false in some way, or when it threatened to overwhelm the biblical text, that it was viewed with suspicion.¹⁰⁷ It might be argued, of course, that this is precisely what the *Declaracion* represents. However, by its very nature, our text exists removed from the sort of strict rules that would govern, for example, a WB manuscript. The *Declaracion* never pretends to be a full and unaltered scriptural text. Although it does not contain any explicit statement of purpose in its opening folios, from the

¹⁰⁴ See Chapter 2.

¹⁰⁵ Even WB manuscripts are not always scrupulous when it comes to underlining. See Solopova, 'Dialect', pp. 202-19 (pp. 210-11); Solopova, 'The Manuscript Tradition', p. 244.

¹⁰⁶ Smith, *Glossa*, p. 109. For a similar argument related to the *Magna*, see Rosemann, p. 53.

¹⁰⁷ Kuczynski, 'Glossing', pp. 355-56.

very beginning, in the opening line of Genesis (fol. 1^r), it gestures to something outside itself: ‘In þis first chapiter is made mencion þat God made heven *and* erth of noght’. The opening phrase here is redundant, except to remind the reader that the *Declaracion* contains only a partial rendering of the full scriptural text. Throughout, words and phrases like ‘of’, ‘how’ and ‘here’ continue to remind the reader that more detail can be found in the bible itself.¹⁰⁸ Even if the *Declaracion* circulated then, as it does now, with only one short note to explain something of its methodology, it would have been obvious to any reasonably educated person that it was not scripture in the strictest sense. In those books where commentary is most habitually and extensively used, some effort is made to alert the reader, but for the most part the compiler(s) trust that their selections are sound, and will subtly elucidate readers, rather than leading them astray.¹⁰⁹

Other Sources

Several other exegetes are mentioned in the *Declaracion* by name. Jerome is cited nine times, mostly in Isaiah.¹¹⁰ The ninth-century bishop Haymo of Auxerre has the second most citations (eight, all in Isaiah);¹¹¹ he is often but not always mentioned in conjunction with Jerome or Lyra.¹¹² Additionally, material from Haymo’s *Commentaria* is often included in *Declaracion*

¹⁰⁸ See Chapter 4.

¹⁰⁹ In this sense it is again similar to the English *Prose Psalter*, where, as Sutherland notes, ‘the text’s legitimacy rests on our acceptance of the translator’s implicit claim to have accessed divine authorial “entent”’ (“In eching”, p. 115 and p. 126).

¹¹⁰ Isaiah 4, fol. 83^v (l. 65); Isaiah 7, fol. 84^f (l. 113); Isaiah 22, fol. 87^r (l. 328); Isaiah 23, fol. 87^r (l. 332); Isaiah 44, fol. 92^v (l. 737); Isaiah 45, fol. 93^r (l. 780); Isaiah 63, fol. 99^r (l. 1217); Isaiah 65, fol. 100^r (l. 1280); Jeremiah 7, fol. 104^f; Jeremiah 9, fol. 105^r; Jeremiah 11, fol. 105^v; Ezekiel 39, fol. 128^r; Joel 2, fol. 137^v; Obadiah 1, fol. 141^r.

¹¹¹ Isaiah 4, fol. 83^v (l. 66); Isaiah 22, fol. 87^r (l. 328); Isaiah 23, fol. 87^r (l. 332 and l. 345); Isaiah 45, fol. 93^r (l. 780 and l. 795); Isaiah 63, fol. 99^r (l. 1216); Isaiah 65, fol. 100^r (l. 1281).

¹¹² On only one occasion is Haymo cited on his own: see Isaiah 45, fol. 93^r (l. 795). On one additional occasion, he is cited separately from Jerome, but Jerome’s interpretation is also given (Isaiah 4, fol. 83^v, l. 66). All other citations note agreement between Haymo and either Lyra or Jerome. Isaiah 23 notes agreement between all three authorities (fol. 87^r, l. 332).

Isaiah without attribution.¹¹³ On those occasions where Jerome and Haymo are mentioned together, Jerome seems to be cited from Haymo, who used the earlier exegete's commentary on Isaiah as a basis for his own *Commentaria*.¹¹⁴ At other points Jerome is included probably via the *Glossa*. One such occasion has been the subject of a scholarly error. Somerset, asserting that a particular passage attributed to Jerome in *Declaracion* Jeremiah 7 is not found in *Patrologia Latina*, states that 'the writer [of the *Declaracion*] presents as Jerome's commentary on the passage an interpretation that lies much closer to his own concerns than Jerome's'. The passage she quotes, however, is in fact attributed to Jerome in the *Glossa*, and is found in *Patrologia Latina*.¹¹⁵

Gregory is mentioned only once, predictably in Job,¹¹⁶ while Augustine is also cited just once, in 1 Corinthians, in conjunction with Lyra.¹¹⁷ Rashi is also mentioned, in the Psalter, as 'Rabi Salomon', but only in conjunction with Lyra, and it is clear that the compiler(s) only had access to the Jewish scholar's work through the later source.¹¹⁸ Finally, Peter Comestor is cited twice, in Acts, as 'Magister historiarum' and 'meystre of stories'.¹¹⁹ My research has uncovered a further three instances where the *Declaracion* includes material from the *Historia*,

¹¹³ Of the books edited for this study, Isaiah is the only one to contain such unattributed material from Haymo. Copious examples of this kind are detailed in the Explanatory Notes on that book.

¹¹⁴ Despite having been misattributed to his contemporary Haymo of Halberstadt, it is now generally agreed that the *Commentaria*, and a number of other exegetical works previously similarly misattributed, were in fact the work of Haymo of Auxerre. It is unclear if the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion* believed Halberstadt or Auxerre to be the author of the *Commentaria*, since he uses only the single name 'Haymo' in his attributions. Reilly, presumably following *Patrologia Latina*, believes the attributions to refer to Haymo of Halberstadt. See Reilly, p. vi. On the misattribution of Haymo of Auxerre's work, see Ian Christopher Levy, 'Trinity and Christology in Haimo of Auxerre's Pauline Commentaries', in *The Multiple Meaning of Scripture: The Role of Exegesis in Early-Christian and Medieval Culture*, ed. by Ineke van 't Spijker (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 101-123 (p. 101).

¹¹⁵ See MGA/639a; Jerome, PL24/729D-730A. Somerset had looked for the passage a little later, at Col. 753A. See *Feeling*, p. 186 and the accompanying n. 56.

¹¹⁶ In the introductory note before Job 3, fol. 32^r (see Chapter 4). The reference to Gregory is likely copied from L3/43:1.

¹¹⁷ 1 Corinthians 11, fol. 174^r; see the *nota* at the bottom of the page. The citation to Augustine is likely from MG6/300d. That he is cited only once is somewhat surprising given Wycliffite regard for his work: he is cited numerous times in PWB, and in *GG* and the accompanying Prologues and Epilogue.

¹¹⁸ Psalm 23, fol. 39^v (L3/591:1); Psalm 87, fol. 54^r (L3/1109:*)

¹¹⁹ Acts 16, fol. 198^r (l. 262); Acts 17, fol. 198^v (l. 291)

all in Acts.¹²⁰ It seems clear, then, that the *Declaracion* compiler(s) had access to the *Historia scholastica* on Acts, and possibly on other books.¹²¹ As noted in Chapter 4, the *Historia* was a very popular text, and would have been well-known in contemporary university circles, so its inclusion here should not be surprising. Given that the *Declaracion* compiler(s) take a generally relaxed attitude toward attribution it seems likely that more unattributed glosses from the *Historia* will be found. I have been unable to pinpoint any instances outside Acts, but I suspect a more thorough search through those books not edited here could yield such results: there seems no reason to assume that the compiler(s) of the *Declaracion* only consulted the *Historia* for this single book. Those instances already uncovered, whether attributed or not, tend to follow the *Historia* very closely, suggesting that the Acts compiler had access to the original text. This supports the theory that the compiler(s) were working in Oxford, with easy access to a large institutional library.

The compiler(s) also clearly had sustained access to Haymo's *Commentaria*. Augustine, Gregory, and Rashi, on the other hand, were almost certainly accessed only through other texts (the *Glossa* and *LPL*). As noted above, references to Jerome commonly come from Haymo's *Commentaria* or from the *Glossa*. In other words, work on the *Declaracion* probably involved access to seven different texts: LV; the Vulgate; *LPL* and *LM*; the *Glossa* (including the *Magna*); Haymo's *Commentaria*; and the *Historia*. A more detailed investigation of those parts of the *Declaracion* not edited for the current study may well uncover further sources. It is, for now, most important to note that the *Declaracion* compiler(s) do not only summarise WB;

¹²⁰ Acts 6, fol. 196^v (l. 84); Acts 8, fol. 196^v (l. 114); Acts 24, fol. 200^r, l. 411)

¹²¹ Of the books edited for the current study, only Acts and the Gospels are included in the *Historia*. To compare the *Declaracion* gospels to the *Historia* is outside the scope of the present study, but in any case there is very little material in them that cannot be attributed to one of the other major sources. Whether the use of the *Historia* extended to other books in the Old Testament must for the moment remain an open question.

the *Declaracion* engages thoughtfully with a variety of different sources, weaving them together to produce a text of elegance and complexity. While the *Declaracion* compiler(s) and the WB translators share a reliance on Lyra, the former also draw from a number of other authorities; while the majority of these are also found in PWB, some (notably Haymo and Peter Comestor) are not: once again, the *Declaracion* compiler(s) show an affinity with the WB translators, but also an independence from them. More than anything, an examination of the sources of the *Declaracion* underlines the fact that the compiler(s) of this unusual text were knowledgeable, and wanted not only to reproduce the material of earlier sources, but to engage with them and bring them into harmony with one another. The resulting text deserves to be seen for what it is: a work woven with real skill and elegance.

Conclusion

Even after WB was completed, the scholars connected to it retained a high level of ambition, dedication and intellectual confidence. Towards the end of his own text, the PWB writer trusts that:

A symple man wiþ Goddis grace and greet trauele myȝte expowne myche openliere and shortliere þe Bible in English þan þe elde grete doctours han expownded it in Latyn, and myche sharplier and groundliere þan many late postilatours or expositours han do.
(p. 82, ll. 2868-71)

Much like the biblical text that the *Declaracion* seeks to interpret, this passage is polysemous. The verb *expownden* might mean ‘to describe’, ‘to explain’, ‘to interpret’, and even ‘to paraphrase’.¹ *Openli*, meanwhile, suggests clarity, intelligibility, honesty, certainty and boldness, and might also refer to a style of exegesis prioritising the literal sense.² Although *shortli* can carry a suggestion of haste or rashness, it is used here instead to imply brevity and concision, perhaps with a secondary sense of immediacy.³ *Sharpli* serves to intensify the senses of openness and brevity already mentioned, but also suggests keenness, wisdom, cleverness and accuracy.⁴ Finally, the word *groundli* suggests a text that is thorough, and interested primarily in fundamentals.⁵ So, the work envisaged by the PWB writer here is one that might combine elements of description, interpretation and paraphrase; a work which would elucidate biblical meaning clearly, likely with a focus on the literal sense, and in a such a way as to balance

¹ *MED*, ‘Expounen, expownden’ (v.).

² *MED*, ‘Openli’ (adv.).

³ *MED*, ‘Shortli’ (adv.).

⁴ *MED*, ‘Sharpli’ (adv.).

⁵ *MED*, ‘Groundli’ (adv.).

the demands of brevity and thoroughness, certainty and accuracy, intelligence and intelligibility.

Although it is impossible to prove that PWB refers here specifically to the *Declaracion*, it is impossible to deny that this hitherto neglected work is just such a text. As this study has shown, it was produced very soon after LV, and was heavily, but not slavishly, reliant on the work of the LV translators. The evidence suggests that it was compiled by scholars, and that it found its initial audience among university men, likely in Oxford. It is easy to see how a text synthesising biblical paraphrase and commentary in the vernacular would have appealed to such an audience, particularly in the context of the wide-ranging translation debates ongoing in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Its production clearly entailed a great deal of labour, and meticulous engagement with a wide range of sources, both scriptural and exegetical. Although its methods at times coincide with those used in other contemporary works of Wycliffite biblical scholarship, this work is exceptional both in its breadth of coverage and in its methodological variety. The true complexity of the text, recognised in this study for the first time, and the lack of contemporary evidence regarding its production and use, mean that many questions must remain open for now. It is to be hoped, however, that the present study provides a firm basis for further investigation.