

Contact between *Piers Plowman* and *The Prick of Conscience* in Rawlinson poetry 139

A manuscript of *The Prick of Conscience* seems to contain a strange error. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson poetry 139 organises the poem according to an unusual system of rubrics, which in the early parts do not correspond to the Prologue and Book divisions seen in other copies. The rubric for Book 3 is particularly surprising, given the heading ‘Passus tertius’ (f. 23^v), the same term used for the structural divisions in *Piers Plowman*. No other manuscript of *The Prick* and indeed very few other Middle English texts, none of them widely circulated, use the term *passus*. Andrew Galloway notes that although a number of other alliterative texts use the cognate Middle English term *pas*, only *The Wars of Alexander* (surviving in two manuscripts) and a single copy of *The Siege of Jerusalem* use *passus* to describe textual divisions.¹ Given their restricted dissemination, it seems unlikely that either is the source of Rawlinson’s use of the term, so the apparent slip indicates familiarity with Langland’s poem.

Rawlinson contains further evidence suggesting a relationship with *Piers*. Its text of *The Prick* also contains a group of unique interpolated passages, short insertions of fifteen to twenty lines clustered in Book 4. They challenge statements made in the poem about the process of salvation, produced by a reviser who wanted to reshape *The Prick of Conscience* from a more restrictive theological position. Several of these insertions contain embedded Latin quotations, in imitation of the style of the poem, and some of these quotations were taken from a copy of *Piers*. This note identifies these interpolated passages for the first time, exploring what they suggest about the reviser’s response to *Piers*, and drawing some broader conclusions about the relationship between *Piers* and *The Prick of Conscience* at the beginning of the fifteenth century.

¹ *The Penn Commentary on Piers Plowman, Volume 1*, pp. 19-21.

The Prick was written in Yorkshire around the second quarter of the fourteenth century. In part a translation of an Anglo-French text, *Les Peines de Purgatorie*, it brings together a wide range of mostly Latin material into a manual for salvation.² The poem is divided into a Prologue and seven Books, which deal with the wretchedness of man, the world, death, purgatory, judgment day, the pains of hell, and finally the joys of heaven. Modern readers of Middle English might be forgiven for not having picked up a copy, but whatever one thinks of the quality of this lengthy specimen of northern religious verse it was evidently extremely popular with medieval readers. Over 120 witnesses survive from all over England, more than any other work of Middle English verse and substantially more than *Piers*, and it was rewritten into several new versions and a Latin translation.³

The Prick had a significant relationship with *Piers*, of which the text in Rawlinson represents a small part. Six scribes are known to have copied both, three in single manuscripts and three in separate books, so the addition of Rawlinson brings the total number of medieval copyists with access to both poems up to seven.⁴ A larger but now mostly invisible community of readers or listeners presumably surrounded these books in their original contexts, broadening the reach of the two poems as a pair. Despite growing interest in *The Prick* in recent years, the

² This and other sources are discussed in *Richard Morris's Prick of Conscience*, ed. by Hanna and Wood, pp. lii-lxi.

³ The most up-to-date list of manuscripts is available in *Richard Morris's Prick of Conscience*, ed. by Hanna and Wood, pp. 378-83. On its relative popularity, see Sargent, 'What Do the Numbers Mean? A Textual Critic's Observations on Some Patterns of Middle English Manuscript Transmission'. The poem's dissemination, including adaptations and translations, is discussed in Lewis and McIntosh, *A Descriptive Guide to the Manuscripts of The Prick of Conscience*, pp. 1-15.

⁴ These manuscripts are London, Society of Antiquaries, MS 687; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. poet. a.1 (the Vernon); San Marino, Huntington Library, MS Hm 128; London, British Library, Additional MS 34779/Manchester, John Rylands Library, MS English 90; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson poetry 137/Oxford, University College, MS 142; and Durham, Ushaw College, MS 50/Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 201. The identification of a shared hand in Rawlinson poetry 137 and University College 142 was made by Horobin, 'The Scribe of Rawlinson Poetry 137 and the Copying and Circulation of *Piers Plowman*', and the identification of the same scribe in Corpus Christi College 201 and Ushaw College 50 was made by Doyle, 'Ushaw College, Durham, MS 50: Fragments of the *Prick of Conscience*, by the same Scribe as Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 201, of the B Text of *Piers Plowman*'.

lack of research into almost all areas of its dissemination has meant that Langlandians have largely overlooked this relationship.⁵

In some ways *The Prick* is very unlike *Piers*, yet the two have some significant subject matter in common. Both are concerned with self-knowledge as a step on the road to salvation. Both depict scenes of the apocalypse, and both discuss the nature of pardons – an aspect discussed in more detail below. It should not be entirely surprising, therefore, to see the two in contact among medieval readers, but still their conjunction produces interesting reflections on both. Rawlinson suggests how such readers may have engaged with the two poems principally as Latin texts, with only minimal interest in their English.⁶

Rawlinson is a single-text parchment manuscript, written by one scribe in textualis throughout. Its copy of *The Prick* belongs to the ‘Vernon-Simeon group’, a family of eight texts named after its two best-known members.⁷ This group was apparently disseminated from the Lichfield area, according to a recent argument placing the production of Vernon in that city.⁸ The Vernon-Simeon group is related to another group of seven copies also associated with Lichfield, known as the Lichfield group.⁹

Rawlinson is something of an outlier among this constellation of manuscripts, which is otherwise marked by evidence of close and overlapping production. Vernon’s Scribe A was

⁵ On manuscripts of the poem, see Sawyer, ‘Codicological Evidence of Reading in Late Medieval England, with Particular Reference to Practical Pastoral Verse’; Sawyer, *Reading English Verse in Manuscript, c.1350-c.1500*; Marshall, ‘Literary Codicologies: The Conditions of Middle English Literary Production, c. 1280-1415’; Johnston, *The Reading Nation in the Age of Chaucer: Copying and Reading Middle English Books, 1350-1500*; and Killian, ‘Menacing Books: *The Prick of Conscience* and the Rhetoric of Reproof’. For literary-critical studies, see Rentz, *Imagining the Parish in Late Medieval England*, pp. 122-48; Galloway, ‘Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*, the *Prick of Conscience*, and the History of the Latin Gloss in Early English Literature’; and Chickering, ‘Rhetorical Stimulus in the *Prick of Conscience*’.

⁶ On *Piers*’s reception as a Latin text, see Warner, *The Myth of Piers Plowman: Constructing a Medieval Literary Archive*, pp. 53-71.

⁷ The Vernon-Simeon group is described in Lewis and McIntosh, *A Descriptive Guide to the Manuscripts of The Prick of Conscience*, pp. 7-8.

⁸ Horobin, ‘The Scribes of the Vernon Manuscript’.

⁹ Lewis and McIntosh, *A Descriptive Guide to the Manuscripts of The Prick of Conscience*, p. 8. More detail on this group, including a stemmatic analysis, is given in Dareau and McIntosh, ‘A dialect word in some West Midland manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience*’.

responsible for part of two other manuscripts in this group,¹⁰ while the hand of the scribe known as the Lichfield Master, possibly identifiable as one John Scriveyn, is found in three.¹¹ One further hand appears in two copies,¹² while the artist of the initials in Vernon has been identified in another.¹³ Meanwhile, the *Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* places the dialect of Rawlinson poetry 139 in south-east Shropshire, close to the border with Staffordshire.¹⁴ This isolated position might reflect the transmission of a Vernon-Simeon group exemplar some distance away from Lichfield, though scribal dialect does not, of course, always reflect provenance: the dialect of Vernon's Scribe A, for example, is localised to Worcestershire, some way south of Lichfield.¹⁵ Nonetheless, the marked difference in layout between the tall and narrow format of Rawlinson and other Vernon-Simeon and Lichfield manuscripts might indicate separateness from these more consistent productions. The others share layout features including bracketing for rhyme, but all are produced in more standard shapes. Rawlinson's proportions are that of the 'holster book', a format historically associated with public reading, though this theory has since been disputed.¹⁶

This geographical isolation reflects the unique state of its text. As mentioned above, Rawlinson contains insertions of material not found in the Main Version of *The Prick* or in any other copy of the poem, added to the discussion of purgatory in Book 4. The reviser who

¹⁰ Oxford, Trinity College, MS 16A and Wells (Norfolk), Holkham Hall, Earl of Leicester's Library, MS 668: see *The Vernon Manuscript: A Facsimile of Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Eng. poet. a.1*, ed. by Doyle, p. 13; Lewis and McIntosh, *A Descriptive Guide to the Manuscripts of The Prick of Conscience*, pp. 54 and 121; and Horobin, 'The Scribes of the Vernon Manuscript', p. 45.

¹¹ London, British Library, MS Harley 1205, London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 57, and Manchester, John Rylands Library, MS English 50: see Horobin, 'The Scribes of the Vernon Manuscript', p. 28, repeating earlier partial identifications in McIntosh, 'A New Approach to Middle English Dialectology', 7, and separately *The Vernon Manuscript: A Facsimile of Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Eng. poet. a.1*, ed. by Doyle, pp. 13-14.

¹² Hand B of Oxford, Trinity College, MS 16A has been identified as the scribe of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 156: Horobin, 'The Scribes of the Vernon Manuscript', p. 46.

¹³ Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 41: see *The Vernon Manuscript: A Facsimile of Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Eng. poet. a.1*, ed. by Doyle, pp. 7-8. Horobin, 'The Scribes of the Vernon Manuscript', p. 39, further suggests that the scribe of Ashmole may be the same as the copyist of part of the episcopal register of Bishop Stretton of Lichfield.

¹⁴ McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, III, p. 426.

¹⁵ McIntosh, Samuels, and Benskin, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, III, p. 553.

¹⁶ Taylor, 'The Myth of the Minstrel Manuscript'.

composed them appears to have taken issue with some of the poem's theological views: although they mimic the style of the Main Version, in rhymed octosyllabic couplets, they challenge its statements about the help available to souls in purgatory and insist that only the individual Christian can save their own soul.

Three of the insertions contain Latin quotations which also appear in *Piers*. On f. 49^v, between lines 3833-4 in Book 4, a nineteen-line passage is inserted containing Verse 41 of the Athanasian Creed: '*Qui bona egerunt ibunt in uitam eternam qui uero mala in ignem eternam*'.¹⁷ This quotation is familiar, of course, from all three versions of *Piers*, in which it constitutes the pardon sent by Truth to Piers.¹⁸

Later in the text of Rawlinson, ll. 3924-5 are omitted and replaced with six lines of new material incorporating two pieces of Latin. The first is a quotation from Psalm 50:19: '*Cor contritum et humiliatum deus non despiciet*' (f. 50^r), found also in the B text at 13.58a and 15.194, and in cognate C-text passages at 15.62 and 16.336a. The second resembles closely a line found only in the B text: '*sola contricio delet peccatum*' (11.81a), apparently known to other writers but uniquely adapted in *Piers*.¹⁹ In Rawlinson, it appears as '*Sola contricio delepe omne peccatum*' (f. 50^r), giving the Latin '*delet*' an English ending.²⁰

A third interpolated passage follows on f. 50^v, where five new lines are inserted between lines 3929-30, incorporating a quotation from Matt 3:2 and 4:17 which appears in slightly different form in other biblical books: '*Penitenciam agite quia aporpinquabit regnum celorum*'.²¹ This finds a less exact parallel in *Piers*, but might also be derived from the poem. At B.13.49, part of this line is embedded in the English verse, in the form found in Job (21:2)

¹⁷ Line numbers are taken from *Richard Morris's Prick of Conscience*, ed. by Hanna and Wood. All references to the text of the poem are to this edition. Italics in manuscript transcriptions represent expanded abbreviations.

¹⁸ *Piers Plowman: The A Version*, ed. by Kane, 8.95-6; *Piers Plowman: The B Version*, ed. by Kane and Donaldson, 7.113-4; *Piers Plowman: The C Version*, ed. by Russell and Kane, 9.287-8. Further references to the text of *Piers* will be to these editions.

¹⁹ Gray, 'Langland's Quotations from the Penitential Tradition', 56.

²⁰ The Englishing of Latin verbs has been noted in other contexts, for example in a sixteenth-century ownership inscription discussed by Wakelin, "Thys ys my boke": Imagining the Owner in the Book', p. 26.

²¹ Alford, *Piers Plowman: A Guide to the Quotations*, p. 82.

and Ezekiel (18:30): ‘He sette a sour loof toforn vs and seide ‘*Agite penitenciam*’. The likelihood of a Langlandian source for this very common piece of Latin is strengthened both by its proximity in the manuscript to the preceding insertion and by its proximity in *Piers* to the quotation from Psalm 50, ‘*cor contritum...*’, a few lines later in passus 13.

These quotations were widely dispersed in late-medieval England, and the Rawlinson reviser could conceivably have accessed them independently of *Piers*. The creedal verse and the quotation from Psalm 50 were both used liturgically, as John Alford notes, while all have a clear relevance to discussions of penance and are found in several penitential manuals.²² ‘*Agite penitenciam*’ appears in the Latin manual *Fasciculus Morum*, as does ‘*Cor contritum*’.²³ Although ‘*Sola contricio delet peccatum*’ appears to be a unique Langlandian formulation, parallels appear in other texts: one of these is the *Summa* of Robert Courson, which also contains ‘*Penitenciam agite*’ (quoted from Matthew).²⁴ A later text, the Middle English manual *Jacob’s Well*, contains ‘*Sola contricio*’ in the same form found in *Piers*, suggesting that *Piers* may have been a source; this text, like Courson’s, also contains ‘*Penitenciam agite*’, and shows how these quotations were relevant to a range of writers concerned with pastoral care.²⁵

There are three further insertions in Book 4 (two on f. 47^r and one other on f. 50^v) which contain five quotations in total, all biblical, not found in *Piers*, indicating that the reviser had access to other sources. However, Rawlinson’s close reproduction of Langland’s ‘*Sola contricio*’ suggests *Piers* is its most likely source, and although the four quotations overlapping with *Piers* were available separately, their presence together in Rawlinson seems most easily explained as the result of the reviser’s reading passūs 7-13 of the B text. I have identified no

²² Alford, *Piers Plowman: A Guide to the Quotations*, pp. 56-57, 83, 82

²³ *Fasciculus Morum: A Fourteenth-Century Preacher’s Handbook*, ed. by Wenzel, p. 480, l. 229 (‘*Agite penitenciam*’, quoted from Ezekiel). Two similar quotations also appear on pp. 484, l. 57 (from Matthew) and 486, l. 96 (from 1 Peter). ‘*Cor contritum*’ appears at p. 438, l. 96; this phrase alone is also used earlier in the text without reference to its source, at p. 282, l. 135.

²⁴ Identified in Gray, ‘Langland’s Quotations from the Penitential Tradition’, 56; see Kennedy, ‘Robert Courson on Penance’, 294.

²⁵ *Jacob’s Well*, ed. by Brandeis, pp. 172, 174, 167. See Gray, ‘Langland’s Quotations from the Penitential Tradition’, 56, n. 21.

Latin or vernacular source which contains all four quotations, and they may have been less common in instructional writing than the above occurrences suggest: none appear, for example, in the Parson's Tale, Chaucer's imitation of penitential literature, or *The Lay Folks' Catechism*, the English form of the syllabus issued by Archbishop of York John Thoresby in 1357.²⁶

Other evidence supports the relationship between the insertions and *Piers*. In addition to the manuscript's *passus* rubric, the new context into which the Latin material is placed in Rawlinson also suggests that it was borrowed from *Piers*. The first of the three insertions outlined above, containing the creedal verse found in the pardon-tearing scene, is used to make a point about pardons. The second and third insertions contain quotations found also in the 'Feast of Conscience' scene, which stages a dramatisation of the sacrament of penance (B.13). These are used also to support the reviser's view on pardons, incorporated into insertions which insist that only penance, and not indulgences, can save the soul. The other quotation in the second insertion, taken from the first inner dream in B.11, occurs during the dreamer's rebuke of the friars for neglecting their duties of baptism and confession in the pursuit of wealth. Associated thereby with opposition to clerical corruption, it bolsters the reviser's stance against indulgences. These parallels make clear that the context of the Latin in *Piers* is related to its new setting in Rawlinson.

Looking at the first of the three insertions containing Langlandian Latin in closer detail shows how the reviser was guided by the context of the material in *Piers*, while at the same time redeploying it in a different style. The first insertion occurs during the discussion of pardons in Book 4. The *Prick* poet describes pardons as follows:

Pardon helpes þam, als clerkes says,

Pat it has purchased in þair lif-days,

²⁶ On the *Catechism*, see Swanson, 'The Origins of *The Lay Folks' Catechism*'.

For pardon of papes and bisschopes,
 Pat es granted here als men hopes,
 May availe þair saules in purgatory
 Pat has purchaced it here worthyly,
 If þai of þair syn had contricion
 And war shrifen byfor þat pardon. (ll. 3802-9)

This position was apparently too generous for the Rawlinson reviser, for the manuscript contains an added passage challenging this some lines later:

Of al þis þat I haue said bifore [l. 3832]
 Is gederid holy chirche tresore [l. 3833]

[Interpolated material begins here]

Pat is grauntid to hem þat haue uerrey contricion
 And after her power makeþ satisfaccioun
 Of alle wrongwise takyng in her lyue
 And of alle her synnes clene hem schryue
 In his bulle to oþer grauntid þe pope neuer pardon
 Ffor if he hade aȝeyn oure crede hade he don
 Pat in *quicunque* wlt [*sic*] saiþ þus
 And al holy writ þerto bereþ witnes
 Qui bona egerunt ibunt in uitam eternam qui uero
 mala in ignem eternam

Þat is to say þat goode werkes don in charite
 In euerlastyng lif her wonyng schal be
 And þei þat yuel wirche *and* so ende
 Into fuir for euer schul þei wende
 Þer is no pardon þat schal hem saue
 Þanne it is to drede leste fewe it haue
 In þis forme to peter þis tresour crist dide ȝiue
 Among his disciplis whil he dide lyue
 Goode to louse *and* yuel to bynde
 And þis power haden þe apostles alle we fynde (f. 49^r)

The inserted material makes explicit a more restrictive view than the Main Version. From the reviser's perspective, papal pardons are a misunderstanding of church doctrine, as they contradict the Athanasian Creed. The passage suggests instead that Christ is the source of salvation, a power deputised to the Apostles. Like the priest in the pardon-tearing scene, the reviser sees 'no pardon' in the Creed. This insertion suggests that the reviser found *The Prick* dangerously ambiguous in its treatment of the subject of pardons, and drew on the Latin in *Piers* to compose an insertion clarifying a more correct position.

Although the insertion borrows material from the poem, the views it expresses are not straightforwardly derived from *Piers*. In the B text, the words of the Creed borrowed by the reviser are destroyed in the pardon-tearing scene. Following the tearing, Piers declares that,

Of preiers and of penaunce my plouȝ shal ben hereafter,
 And wepen whan I sholde werche þouȝ whete breed me failleþ
 The prophete his payn eet in penaunce and in sorwe

By þat þe Sauter vs seith, and so dide othere manye. (7.124-7)

These lines are part of a speech in which Piers seems to lament the injustice of the Creed. He asks, ‘The foweles in þe firmament, who fynt hem at wynter? [...] Haue þei no gerner to go to but god fynt hem alle’ (7.133, 135). The position taken here is complicated: Piers laments the suffering of the poor and the weak, yet seems also to assert faith that God will protect them. The emphasis on penance and on a return to the sacraments as the source of redemption is tonally ambiguous, resigned yet also acknowledging the security offered by the ‘Sauter’. The position in the inserted passage is not entirely dissimilar. It emphasises the responsibility of individuals to atone for their own sins, but maintains that forgiveness is possible through penance.

Nonetheless, this insertion flattens the scene in *Piers*, discarding its ambiguity and emotional conflict and translating its underlying point into the discursive style of *The Prick*. This loss of ambiguity is reflected also in the treatment of Latin in the new insertions. The Rawlinson text emphasises the clarity of guidance offered by scripture and other authoritative Latin materials; unlike *Piers*, it admits no sense of confusion or difficulty of interpretation. This is unsurprising, given the reviser’s evident concern with possible errors in *The Prick* and his attempts to control its interpretation by the intended readers of the new version, but it also represents another kind of assimilation. In almost every case, *The Prick* offers only one interpretation of the Latin material it quotes, minimising any sense of disagreement or instability. This is the style adopted by the Rawlinson reviser.

Also significant is the reviser’s exclusive interest in Latin. While the creedal quotation inserted between ll. 3833-4 contains a gloss on the Latin like that of Langland’s priest, the revision makes no direct borrowing of English material from the poem. Instead, *Piers* was mined for the Latin it contains, and it was in the Latin that the reviser found authoritative

support for his views on pardons and other contentious subjects. The Rawlinson revision put *The Prick* in contact with *Piers* through this most visible of their shared formal features, and suggests that the reviser treated Langland's text as a repository of Latin scaffolded with English.

In addition to evidence for the reviser's response to *Piers*, Rawlinson also suggests some conclusions about the relative status of *Piers* and *The Prick*. The Rawlinson revisions indicate a desire to maintain the wholeness of the Main Version; even while directly challenging material in the poem, the reviser chose not to omit those statements he clearly found troubling. This fidelity might imply that *The Prick* had an authoritative status of its own. It was certainly important within the local textual culture which produced it, and among the nearby group of scribes around Lichfield who generated one of the largest surviving local clusters of a single text. This culture appears to have favoured works of northern Middle English verse: copies of *Speculum Vitae* and *Cursor Mundi* are copied in the hand of the Lichfield Master.²⁷

In contrast, while Rawlinson offers the first evidence that the B text was present in the north-west Midlands in this period, the poem still appears to have been very sparsely copied in the area. Rawlinson and Vernon's A text are a lonely pair of witnesses to Langland's poem compared to the abundance of *Prick* manuscripts surrounding them. The material evidence for the substantially greater popularity of *The Prick* compared to *Piers* among medieval readers is a challenging prospect for our field, accustomed as it is to viewing the two in almost oppositional terms. Where *Piers* is regularly lauded, not undeservedly, for its ambition, complexity, and interpretative openness, *The Prick* has mostly experienced neglect.²⁸ We must

²⁷ Doyle, 'Codicology, Palaeography, and Provenance', p. 15; Horobin, 'The Scribes of the Vernon Manuscript', p. 30; Dareau and McIntosh, 'A dialect word in some West Midland manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience*', p. 22.

²⁸ See, for example, Andrew Galloway's praise of the poem in 'Madame Meed: *Fauvel*, Isabella, and the French Circumstances of *Piers Plowman*' (particularly 229: 'the most ambitious and scandalous invitation to topicality

take seriously the interest of medieval readers in the latter text, to understand better the textual culture inhabited by early readers of Langland.

The Rawlinson revision presents another challenge. There has been a tendency in scholarship to look for creativity and originality in medieval reading practices, but these qualities are not apparent in the work of the reviser.²⁹ The insertions instead suggest concern over ambiguity and a conservative approach to form, seemingly disengaged from the attributes of the poem celebrated today. So, how can we address medieval reception when it is opposed to the ways we ourselves want to see medieval texts? Without returning to the George Kane school of thought, which unhelpfully chastised the supposed incompetence of scribes,³⁰ it may be productive to consider ways in which medieval reading could sometimes be simplifying, dogmatic, and reductive. A balanced view of the medieval past must embrace the ‘bad’ readers, as well as the good.

that any poet in English of his century carried out’), and in ‘Non-literary Commentary and its Literary Profits: The Road to Accounting-ville’ (especially 22-23).

²⁹ See the influential view of the value of scribal variation as a form of literary criticism in Windeatt, ‘The Scribes as Chaucer’s Early Critics’.

³⁰ Articulated, for example, in “‘Good’ and ‘Bad’ Manuscripts: Texts and Critics’ (particularly 208).

Works Cited

Manuscripts and Archival Resources

Durham, Ushaw College, MS 50

London, British Library, MS Additional 34779

London, British Library, MS Harley 1205

London, College of Arms, MS Arundel 57

London, Society of Antiquaries, MS 687

Manchester, John Rylands Library, MS English 50

Manchester, John Rylands Library, MS English 90

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 41

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 156

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. poet. a.1

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson poetry 137

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson poetry 139

Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 201

Oxford, Trinity College, MS 16A

Oxford, University College, MS 142

San Marino, Huntington Library, MS Hm 128

Wells (Norfolk), Holkham Hall, Earl of Leicester's Library, MS 668

Primary Sources

Fasciculus Morum: A Fourteenth-Century Preacher's Handbook, ed. by Siegfried Wenzel (University Park and London: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989)

Jacob's Well, An Englisht Treatise on the Cleansing of Man's Conscience, ed. by Arthur Brandeis, Early English Text Society, Original Series 115 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1900)

Langland, William, *Piers Plowman: The A Version*, ed. by George Kane (London: Athlone, 1960)

———, *Piers Plowman: The B Version*, ed. by George Kane and E. Talbot Donaldson (London: Athlone, 1988)

———, *Piers Plowman: The C Version*, ed. by George Russell and George Kane (London: Athlone, 1997)

Richard Morris's Prick of Conscience: A Corrected and Amplified Reading Text, ed. by Ralph Hanna and Sarah Wood (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Secondary Sources

Alford, John A., *Piers Plowman: A Guide to the Quotations* (Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1992)

Chickering, Howell, 'Rhetorical Stimulus in the *Prick of Conscience*', in *Medieval Paradigms: Essays in Honour of Jeremy Duquesnay Adams*, ed. by Stephanie Hayes-Healy, 2 vols (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005)

Dareau, Margaret Grace, and Angus McIntosh, 'A dialect word in some West Midland manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience*', in *Edinburgh Studies in English and Scots*,

- ed. by A. J. Aitken, Angus McIntosh and Hermann Pálsson (London: Longman, 1971), pp. 20-6
- Doyle, A. I., 'Codicology, Palaeography, and Provenance', in *The Making of the Vernon Manuscript: The Production and Contexts of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. poet. a.1*, ed. by Wendy Scase (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 3-25
- , 'Ushaw College, Durham, MS 50: Fragments of the *Prick of Conscience*, by the same Scribe as Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 201, of the B Text of *Piers Plowman*', in *The English Medieval Book: Studies in Memory of Jeremy Griffiths*, ed. by A. S. G. Edwards, Vincent Gillespie and Ralph Hanna (London: The British Library, 2000), pp. 43-9
- , ed., *The Vernon Manuscript: A Facsimile of Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Eng. poet. a.1* (Cambridge: Brewer, 1987)
- Galloway, Andrew, 'Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, the *Prick of Conscience*, and the History of the Latin Gloss in Early English Literature', in *John Gower: Manuscripts, Readers, Contexts*, ed. by Malte Urban, Disputatio, 13 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), pp. 39-70
- , 'Madame Meed: *Fauvel*, Isabella, and the French Circumstances of *Piers Plowman*', *Yearbook of Langland Studies*, 30 (2016), 227-52
- , 'Non-literary Commentary and its Literary Profits: The Road to Accounting-ville', *Yearbook of Langland Studies*, 25 (2011), 9-23
- , *The Penn Commentary on Piers Plowman, Volume 1* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006)
- Gray, Nick, 'Langland's Quotations from the Penitential Tradition', *Modern Philology*, 84 (1986), 53-60
- Horobin, Simon, 'The Scribe of Rawlinson Poetry 137 and the Copying and Circulation of *Piers Plowman*', *The Yearbook of Langland Studies*, 19 (2005), 3-26

- , ‘The Scribes of the Vernon Manuscript’, in *The Making of the Vernon Manuscript: The Production and Contexts of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. poet. a. 1*, ed. by Wendy Scase (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), pp. 27-48
- Johnston, Michael, *The Reading Nation in the Age of Chaucer: Copying and Reading Middle English Books, 1350-1500* (forthcoming)
- Kane, George, ‘“Good” and “Bad” Manuscripts: Texts and Critics’, in *Chaucer and Langland: Historical and Textual Approaches* (London: Athlone, 1989), pp. 206-13
- Killian, Ann, ‘Menacing Books: *The Prick of Conscience* and the Rhetoric of Reproof’, *The Yearbook of Langland Studies*, 31 (2017), 5-41
- Lewis, Robert E., and Angus McIntosh, *A Descriptive Guide to the Manuscripts of The Prick of Conscience* (Oxford: Society for the Study of Mediaeval Languages and Literature, 1982)
- Marshall, Helen, ‘Literary Codicologies: The Conditions of Middle English Literary Production, c. 1280-1415’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Toronto, 2014)
- McIntosh, Angus, ‘A New Approach to Middle English Dialectology’, *English Studies*, 44 (1963), 1-11
- , M. L. Samuels, and Michael Benskin, *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, 4 vols (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1986)
- Rentz, Ellen K., *Imagining the Parish in Late Medieval England* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2015)
- Sargent, Michael G., ‘What Do the Numbers Mean? A Textual Critic’s Observations on Some Patterns of Middle English Manuscript Transmission’, in *Design and Distribution of Late Medieval Manuscripts in England*, ed. by Margaret Connolly and Linne R. Mooney (York: York Medieval Press, 2008), pp. 205-44

- Sawyer, Daniel, 'Codicological Evidence of Reading in Late Medieval England, with Particular Reference to Practical Pastoral Verse' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 2016)
- , *Reading English Verse in Manuscript, c.1350-c.1500* (forthcoming)
- Swanson, R. N., 'The Origins of *The Lay Folks' Catechism*', *Medium Ævum*, 60 (1991), 92-100
- Taylor, Andrew, 'The Myth of the Minstrel Manuscript', *Speculum*, 66 (1991), 43-73
- Warner, Lawrence, *The Myth of Piers Plowman: Constructing a Medieval Literary Archive* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014)
- Wakelin, Daniel, "'Thys ys my boke": Imagining the Owner in the Book', in *Spaces for Reading in Later Medieval England*, ed. by Mary C. Flannery and Carrie Griffin (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 13-33
- Windeatt, B. A., 'The Scribes as Chaucer's Early Critics', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 1 (1979), 119-41