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VOL. I.
INTRODUCTION.

The life of Reginald Pecock has been made the subject of a special work by Lewis, who has con-

1 The Life of the learned and right reverend Reynold Pecock, S.T.P., lord bishop of St. Asaph and Chester, in the reign of king Henry VI., faithfully collected from records and MSS., being a sequel of the Life of Dr. John Wiclif, in order to an introduction to the History of the English Reformation. Collected and written by John Lewis, minister of Mergrate in 1725, and now reviewed. London, 1744, pp. 344, and Pref., pp. xvi. (250 copies printed for the subscribers). This book was reprinted at the Oxford University Press in 1820. The original edition is always referred to in this introduction. The literature and authorities for Pecock's life and opinions (apart from his own works), so far as they are known to me, are as follows:—

(1.) Gascoigne's Theological Dictionary, MS., Lincoln College, Oxford, sec. xv. This is by far the most important authority for the history of Pecock; and from it Wood drew up his account of him in the Hist. et Ant. Univ. Oxon., observing at the end: "Haestenus de Pecockio illo de quo certe bene referenda duxi . . . quod Oxoniensis fuerit, praesertim vero quod illa scriptorum neminem attigisse crediderim prater unicum Gascognum, cujus cum eorum quae refert pleraque oculis et auribus praeens haserit vestigia premenda mibi religioso videbantur." Many excerpts from this Dictionary relating to Pecock are given by Hearne at the end of his edition of Walter Hemingsford, 2 vols., Oxon, 1731 (vol. 2, pp. 509-550), and by Lewis in his Life of Pecock. To these volumes reference will be made in the following pages for the original, which will not ordinarily be quoted at length. An extract not before printed is given in the Appendix to the present work.

(2.) Johannis de Whethamstede narratio de R. Pecockii abjuratione. Printed by Hearne as above, pp. 490-502.

(3.) Official documents preserved in Bishop's Registers, &c., quoted by Lewis. Copies were sent to him by various friends, as Kennet and Baker; some of them are likewise contained in Baker's MSS. (partly at Cambridge in the University
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scientiously and laboriously (if not very skilfully) put together almost everything of importance which can now be learned respecting him. The actual facts, however, admit of being stated tolerably briefly.

His parentage is unknown, as well as the exact time and place of his birth. He must have been born, however, about the end of the fourteenth century, and is said by Gascoigne, Leland, and others to have been a Welshman; he is styled, moreover, in a papal instrument, *presbyter dioecesis Menevensis*. He appears, therefore, to have sprung from the

Library, partly at London in the British Museum, and in Wharton’s MSS, now in the archiepiscopal palace at Lambeth.


(6.) Foxe (Book of Martyrs, s. a. 1457, vol. 3, pp. 724-734. Lond. 1844) devotes several pages to “The history of Reynold Pecock, bishop of Chichester, afflicted and tormented by the false bishops for his godliness and profession of the Gospel.” On this are two adverse criticims; one by N. Dolman (*Three Conversions of England*, c. 6, vol. 2, p. 265, sqq.), and another, whose author is unknown. Both these are printed in extenso by Hearne. (Appendix to his preface to *Heningford*, pp. clxi.-clxii.)

(7) There are also besides these various incidental allusions to him in the chroniclers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Caxton, Hall, Fabian, Stowe, Holinshed, and others, which are mostly collected by Foxe (u. s.), Waterland (Works, vol. x.), and Lewis.

Of MSS. sources of information, I have availed myself of Bury’s answer to the *Repressor*, which is contained in the Bodleian Library (another copy of the same is in the Durham University Library, which has been kindly examined by the Rev. T. Chevallier for this work), and of some portions of Gascoigne’s *Theological Dictionary* (preserved in Lincoln College, Oxford, sec. xvi.) not printed by Hearne. For permission to inspect these and other MSS, and to have transcripts made of such parts as appeared desirable, my best thanks are due to the Rev. H. O. Coxe and the Rev. M. Pattison.

Of writers after the sixteenth century it is unnecessary to speak. They have added little or nothing to the accounts of their predecessors, except (in very many cases) errors of their own. Some of these are corrected by Henry Wharton, and more by Lewis, from whom later writers seem to have derived nearly all their information.

1 Pope Eugenius, in his bull of provision for the bishopric of St. Asaph styles him *presbyterum Menevensis dioecesis in artibus magistrum*
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northern district of the principality comprised within the diocese of St. David’s, and contiguous to the parts which he afterwards governed upon being promoted to the bishopric of St. Asaph. His boyhood was spent in his own country, and many of its years were doubtless (as Wood, perhaps following Gascoigne, asserts) well spent in the acquisition of grammatical learning. He thence went to Oriel College, Oxford, and was elected to a fellowship October 30, 1417, upon the vacancy occasioned by the elevation of Dr. Garsdale to the office of provost of the College. He was ordained acolyte and subdeacon by his diocesan, Dr. Flemmyng, Bishop of Lincoln, on the same day, December 21, 1420; admitted to deacon’s orders February 15, 1421, and to priest’s orders March 8 the same year, upon the title of his College fellowship. He soon afterwards proceeded to the degree of bachelor in divinity, and incepted under a Cistercian monk, whose name has not come down to us, about the year 1423, when Gascoigne was Chancellor of the University. His studies had been unwearied both in sacred and profane literature, and, his very enemies being judges, were crowned with complete success.

Felicia haec principia (says Leland) tales habuere

ac in theologia baccalaureum, &c. Reg. Staff. f. 15; Wharton MSS. 577, p. 31 (Lambeth MSS.). The bull of Eugenius the Fourth and the Juramentum fidelitatis episcopi Assuensis are still preserved at Lambeth.

1 "Wallius origine," Gascoigne in Hearne, s. a., 514, 516, and 548. "natione Wallius," Incert. Chron. in Leland Collect., tom. ii. p. 409; "relieta Cambria, patrio solo." Leland, De Scriptt. Brit., c. 566. Bale, indeed, calls him "Anglus," De Script. Brit., fol. 204, ed. Wes. 1548), but even this is not necessarily inconsistent with the foregoing testimonies, and his later edition adopts Leland’s language (p. 594, ed. Basil, 1550). Lewis is therefore mistaken in saying that the pope’s bull is the "chief authority" for the assertion that he was born in Wales; his interpretation of the pope’s bull (p. 8) seems very improbable.

2 Gascoigne’s MS. (tom. ii. p. 597) has 1445 (written in Arabic characters); but I have received Lewis’ correction, which is little less than certain.
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"successus, quales virtus suo promittit cultori, nempe
"optimos: jam studiorum orbem absolverat, et insignia
"theologi severi suprema acceperat; tanta igitur viri
"eximie docti latere quidem gloria non potuit." 1

Soon after this time he was summoned to court,
where, according to Leland, his services were so ac-
tetable to his prince, that they brought him into
great note and were rewarded with an ample fortune.
Humphrey Plantagenet, Duke of Gloucester, being at
that time protector of the kingdom, was very prob-
ably the person to whom Pecock was especially
indebted for his earlier promotions, the first of which
was the mastership of Whittington College, London,
to which the rectory of St. Michael in Riola was
attached. He obtained this piece of preferment in
1431, and alludes to his residence there in his
Repressor, this being one of the very few particulars
of his life which that book has preserved. It was
here that Pecock applied himself to study the con-
troversy between the Lollards and their opponents,
which must have been prominently brought before his
eyes both in his experience of London life and by
the Smithfield bonfires. Gascoigne tells us that he
wrote books in English for twenty years together,
and we know from himself that many of these were
principally designed to convince the Lollards of their
errors. During the thirteen years then of his London
residence, we cannot doubt that he composed several
of those works to which such frequent allusion is
made in the Donet and the Repressor. 2

1 Leland, De Scriptt. Brit., u. s.,
egiid. Collect., u. s.; Gascoigne, u. s.,
p. 548. Also Kennet MSS. and
Reg. Flemmyng, referred to by
Lewis, pp. 2-4.
2 Leland, u. s., Gascoigne, u. s.,
p. 516. Pecock’s Repressor, p. 112.
Lewis, pp. 7, 8, where some infor-
mation about Whittington College
will be found. It is marked
in a map of London in 1553
(copied in Pennant’s London), being
situated near the Three Cranes in
the Vintree, about half way be-
tween St. Paul’s and old London
Bridge.
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But Pecock was destined to rise to higher honours. The protector's influence procured him a bishopric. The see of St. Asaph became vacant by the translation of John Lowe to Rochester, who afterwards became one of the most bitter as well as the most formidable opponents of his successor. The bull of provision by which Pope Eugenius the Fourth promoted Pecock to his new dignity is dated April 22, 1444, and he was consecrated in the palatial chapel at Croydon on June 14 of the same year, as appears by the register of John Stafford, who was at that time Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of England. He was at the same time admitted to the degree of doctor of divinity (possibly by royal mandate) without keeping any exercise or act, a proceeding at which few in this age will feel much scandalized, though to the correct and punctilious Gascoigne it appeared a prodigious breach of discipline and propriety.

How it fared with Pecock during the first three years of his episcopate we do not distinctly know; but as he tells us himself in a work written only five years after his consecration, that his proceedings in his own diocese had been misconstrued by many, who, if they had known more, would have been the last

---

1 So Bale says expressly (De Script. Brit.), and there is no reason why Lewis should question the fact, p. 14. At the same time it may be true enough that Pecock himself had to pay the pope a round sum for his provision.

2 Le Neve's Fasti, vol. i. pp. 71, 72 (Hardy's edition). Lewis, pp. 13-17. Gascoigne, v. s., pp. 516, 517, whose solemn words are these:—"Doctor fuit in Oxonia per gratiam absentandi: nunquam enim respondit alicui doctori pro forma sua ut esset doctor, nec aliquem actum in scholis fecit in Oxonia, postquam incepit in theologiam, an postea faciet nescitur a nobis. Per omnes annos a die inceptio in Oxonia usque ad diem presentis scripturae nihil actum fecit scholasticum, nec legendo, nec pradicando, nec disputando, nec determinando." And again (p. 548):—"Receptit illum gradum per dispensationem, i.e. per dissipationem seu licentiam ad malum per regentes in Oxonia."
to blame him, we may surmise that all things did not proceed very smoothly. But a more serious trouble was near at hand. The episcopal order had been in little favour in England generally for some time. Many of the most rigid Anglicans, and the whole body of the Lollards, with all its parties and subdivisions, were vehement in their denunciations. Men of the opinions of Wiclif and men of the opinions of Gascoigne alike lifted up their voice on high. It was believed and proclaimed that the bishops of that age looked upon the duty of preaching,—"illud egregium et praeclarissimum praedicandi officium solis quondam pastoribus attributum, eisque maxime debitum,"—as something beneath their dignity, and an occupation fit only for the inferior clergy and such as had nothing better to do. Archbishop Arundel, whose orthodoxy had displayed itself in burning Lord Cobham to ashes, had done what he could to restrict preaching even among the lower orders of the clergy. His death, occasioned by a swelling of the tongue, was interpreted by many as a judgment. Men believed, according to Gascoigne, that God had tied his tongue for having tied the tongues of almost all preachers, merely because some few pulpits had vented heretical doctrine. The result of all this was that there was little preaching of any sort among the secular clergy, whether high or low.1 And for all this the bishops were principally blamed. Pocock came forward as their advocate. In truth he was their natural advocate, not only as a member of a body in whom the esprit de corps is supposed to be at all times strong, but as having a special predilection for defending any established practice which admitted of a specious rather than a solid vindication. Not that he was consciously dishonest,

1 The omission was supplied, but in no very satisfactory manner, by the friars.
on the contrary his integrity and sincerity are indubitable, but his natural disposition inclined him to take as conservative a view of affairs as possible; while his unbounded vanity continually led him to weave subtle and elegant arguments, weak and flimsy indeed as the threads of a spider, but which served admirably to bring out and to display his own acuteness and ingenuity. Accordingly Pecock took upon himself, in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross in 1447, to show that bishops are not bound by virtue of their office to preach, using that word in its most ordinary acceptation. He maintained that they were free from this burden, being obliged to works of a higher character, which require greater knowledge (as the solution of difficult questions), and having a more important work to discharge in relation to the souls of Christian men than the office of preaching, probably thereby intending the care and supervision of the whole diocese committed to their charge. In the same discourse he strove to vindicate the non-residence of bishops on their dioceses, then only too common (against which exception had been very generally and very justly taken by opposite parties), on the ground that there were divers causes which would justify such non-residence in the sight of God, and even render it meritorious, so long as such causes lasted. In these he referred, as it seems, to the assistance which they might be required to render to the king or to the Church by attendance in court, or in parliament, or otherwise. He appears to have expressed similar opinions on several following occasions. In the same discourse he also justified the papal bulls of provi-

1 As an illustration of this, see his amusing vindication of the singularly hypocritical practice of the Franciscan friars in counting money with a stick. Repressor, pp. 554-61. Erasmus, as may be imagined, viewed the matter with very different eyes. See his Moria encomium, or Lewis, p. 139. For the Franciscan rule, thus eluded, see Monumenta Franciscana, p. 576, in the present series.
sion (by which a man might be appointed to a piece of preferment before it was vacant, and which were usually obtained by a large fee), as well as the payment of the annates or first year's income of a bishopric to the pope, and endeavoured to clear the pecuniary negotiations of pope and bishops from the not altogether unnatural charge of simony. Pecock, whose ideas on the subject of papal supremacy were not at all in advance of his age, conceived that the pope, as lord paramount of the universal Church and of all things thereto pertaining, had a right, strictly speaking, to the entire proceeds of all benefices, and that those whom he placed therein to enjoy them did no sin in giving him of that which was his own, any more than a bailiff does when he pays anything to the landlord of the soil. By such arguments, some of which were wholly false, and some of which were true, but at the same time quite insufficient to cover the space which they were intended to cover (being applicable to exceptional and temporary cases only), did Pecock endeavour to vindicate some of the grossest abuses which prevailed in the English Church in the fifteenth century. It is indeed very probable that he did not fully approve of the conduct of the bishops of his own time, but perceiving that the imputations of Wyclif and his disciples were of too sweeping a character, only lent himself inadvertently to make the worse appear the better reason, and to prop up a system of things which was essentially rotten and corrupt.

Pecock's efforts on this occasion gave him, as usually happened, complete satisfaction; insomuch, that he cast the substance of his discourse into the

---
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form of seven conclusions, which he transmitted to divers persons after its delivery, and, among the rest, to Walter Hart, Bishop of Norwich, the queen’s confessor, residing at court (to whom he afterwards lay under obligations), and Adam Moleyns, or de Molineux, Bishop of Chichester, at that time Lord Privy Seal. He observed to another friend, that from henceforth no one would speak evil of bishops, for all men would know from his writings that bishops are not bound to preach or undertake the cure of souls, as the clergy and the common people imagined, but only to exercise a superintending power. The event, however, turned out very differently. Men exclaimed against the bishops more than ever, and against Pecock in particular. Nor were these denunciations confined merely to the populace, but a crowd of learned antagonists of Pecock on this occasion have been handed down to us, belonging to both Universities, the most distinguished, perhaps, being William Millington, pro-

---

1 He thus alludes to these “conclusions publish’d” in the Follower to the Donet (fol. 49): “Y wote wel tho conclusions wolen be holde for trewe of ech greet leernyd man in dyvnite or in lawe of canouns, while the world schal dure... No clerk shit bitherto into this present day bi more than vi sier passad after the bigynnyng of the strijfe durste take vpon him forto answere to the proofs of hem, thon; summe clerkes han be ful reyi forto argue and make motyues ayens hem and ayens side half maters, which is ful liyt and esi in reward of the answer-yng to the proofs of hem.” The “principal mater” in these conclusions is “of bishops boond to preche.”

2 Moleyns, like Pecock himself, had been raised to the episcopate by papal provision. He was, within four years afterwards, murdered at Portsmouth in the civil wars, as was also William Aske, Bishop of Salisbury, whom the mob thus upbraided: That fellow always lived with the king, and did not reside in his diocese with us, nor keep hospitality, therefore he shall die. Gascoigne observes, that since Pecock and the other prelates promoted by Henry VI. had maintained that bishops are not obliged to preach, Almighty God himself had preached in England by the punishments which had fallen upon them, pp. 524, 525; see also pp. 532, 533, and Le Neve’s Fasti.
vost of King’s College, Cambridge, who, in a sermon preached at St. Paul’s, declared that England would never suffer those who patronized Pecock to prosper. Damlet, master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, offered to prove Pecock guilty of heresy from his own writings. His successor at Whittington College, Thomas Eborall, also took a vigorous part against him. Nor were the friars of the mendicant orders, his sworn enemies, inactive. They belonged mostly to the University of Oxford. Their disputations and discourses were held, from time to time, partly at the Universities, and partly in London, in the presence of bishops. The Archbishop of Canterbury himself, John Stafford, was appealed to; and we have a copy yet remaining of the defence which Pecock transmitted to the primate. He there recites his seven conclusions, and the motives which he had in preaching them. These were a desire to clear the bishops from the calumnies with which they had been attacked both in the pulpit and out of it, and to restore their influence; also a design to satisfy the scruples of any bishops whose consciences might reproach them for a neglect of duty; and, in fine, a hope to bring the traducers to a better mind.  

The bishops, as was to be expected, took a lenient

---

1 “Doctor Millington de Cantabrigia . . . egregie determinans contra R. Pecock.” Gascoigne, u. s., 524. This was William Millington. Id., p. 542. Everything that can be known about Millington has been collected with extraordinary care by my learned friend, the Rev. G. Williams, whose paper (read May 3, 1858) is printed in the Communications made to the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, pp. 287–388 (No. 8, octavo series). Wood’s enumeration of Pecock’s opponents, which is partly taken from parts of Gascoigne’s Dictionary not printed by Hearne, mentions also the names of Gilbert Worthington, William Littlefield, Peter Beverley, John Burbach, and John Milverton, the last of whom is noticed more fully by Bale (Cent. viii. 44). It is contained in Hist. et Ant. Univ. Oxon., s. a. 1457, and his entire article on Pecock is reprinted by Hearne along with the excerpts from Gascoigne, u. s., pp. 480–489. See also Lewis, pp. 205, 206.

view of Pecock's case. Divers prelates were said and believed to favour him, among whom was the Bishop of Norwich, whose influence contributed, by and by to Pecock's further advancement. Some secular lords, who hated preaching, took the same side. The tumults, however, which were occasioned by this sermon of Pecock's by no means subsided, and were not likely to abate by a repetition of the same sentiments which he delivered in London about two years afterwards. About this time, also, it appears that he gave great offence by speaking in too disparaging a manner of the authority of the Fathers, more especially of those who were commonly called the Four Doctors of the Church, viz., SS. Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory. But for this time at least he seems to have escaped censure for any opinions which he might have expressed on this point.  

It is abundantly clear that Pecock did not intend to defend abuses as such, but only laboured to display his skill in vindicating his brethren from what he deemed untrue or exaggerated charges. And indeed we may easily imagine that he was not wholly unsuccessful in his efforts; for extremes of one kind had already (and very naturally) given birth to extremes of a directly opposite kind. Pecock himself, in addition to his very numerous theological works, in writing which he doubtless conceived himself to be pursuing a more excellent way of teaching than in preaching in the pulpit, nevertheless found time to deliver many discourses in his own diocese, and caused many more to be delivered there, insomuch that many wondered (or affected to wonder), and exclaimed that the bishop, who defended unpreaching prelates, had now turned preacher himself.

---

2 Id., pp. 520, 521. Lewis forms, I think, an equitable judgment of our bishop's design in his Sermon at Paul's Cross, pp. 46, 47. The following passage, in the Follower to
It is difficult to say with precision what works Pecock had up to this time written: a long list may be drawn up from those which are referred to in the Repressor, most of which were, in all likelihood, published when it appeared, while others were in preparation, or promised only. These were partly in Latin, partly in English, and treated on a great variety of religious and moral subjects. Most of them seem to have sprung out of the controversies in which he was engaged, and the greater part of them appear to have been addressed to the common people with a view to reclaim them from the Lollard errors (as he deemed them), which were then widely prevalent.

Of all these, however, little or nothing remains to us except his Donet, or introduction to the chief truths of the Christian religion,¹ the date of which is rather

---

¹ Among other things it contains the Apostles' Creed in an altered form, which is here subjoined. The importance of this document will appear in the sequel. It occurs at fol. 47, b, of the original MS., from which it is here printed, and also in James' transcript, pp. 63, 64:

"The first article of the commune crede, which article is this, "Y bileene into God ye Fadir maker of heene and of erthe" thon schalt fynde in ye xiii" and xv" chapitris of the first party aforesoing. For whi in the xiii" chap. it is tauz, that God is thre persoonya, Fadir, Sonc, and Holi Goost, and ʒiʒ that ther-with he is not but oon and the same substance in alle thre persoonya. Also in ye bigynnyng of the xv" chap., where benefite vindgracioso or longuer than gracioso ben tauz, it is seid, that God maad heene and erthe and alle her contentis, and how manye mo articlis of bileene touching ye Godhede and touching his benefite in making creatures ben tauz in the seid xiii" and xv" chap., which articlis ben as necessary to be bileenid as this seid first article of the commune crede is to be bileenid, it is liʒ to turne thidir and to se. Alle the other xi. articlis of the commune crede . . . ben these. And y bileene into Ihesu Crist his oon bi-geten Sone ocre Lorde which was conceyneyd of the Holy Goost and born of Mary the maide, which Ihesu
uncertain. The second part of this treatise is directed against those who impugn "the device" of his book. These persons being principally, as it appears, the Lollard party, this book is not without its interest, and might probably deserve to be printed.

Both the Donet and the Follower to the Donet, which appeared some time after (probably about 1454) as a supplement designed for readers of a higher class, are cast into the form of a dialogue between a father and a son. It appears from the Donet that his Rule of Christian Religion, and other works in connexion with it, had been already before the world; but that he had only intended to circulate them among private friends. He makes great and perhaps not unreasonable complaint that they "bin runne abroode and copied azen my will and myn entent, as ye haue openly prechid at Poulis." In the same book he affirms that if through "eny vndervisidnes, hastynes, or ignoraunces" he should write any conclusion against the faith or the law of God, he would be ready "to leue it, forsake, and retrete mekely and devoutly at the assignementis of myn ordinaries fadris of the chireche." From all this it is evident that Pecock had, in these his earlier and

suffrid vndir Ponce Pilate, was crucifed, was deed and biried, and rose in the iii" daie to lyf; stiished vp into heuene, stith at the riht side of the Fadir, fro whens he is to come for to deem quyk and deede. I bileeue into the Holy Goost. And y bileeue his holy vniersal or generall chiche to be. Y bileeue the commyng of salats or of holy men to be. Y bileeue fortementes of syne to be. I bileeue the azen rising of deed men, that is to se to be or to come. And I bileeue everlastinge lijs to be or to come."

1 An early MS. note in the Oxford copy says that "this book was compiled by Reynold Pecock, A.D. 1457."

But this is too late; it must have been written, and was probably published, when he was only a priest.

2 Before 1456, or the date of the Book of Faith (see Foll. to Donet, MS. fol. 32), which seems, from Pecock's remark ("holde thei her patience vnto tyme thei heere of the book of faith"), not to have been then published; and full six years after his sermon at Paul's Cross in 1447. See p. xvii., note.

3 For some account of this work, which exists, indeed, but cannot be found, see the enumeration below.

4 James' transcript, p. 53.
more unfinished treatises, given expression to some sentiments which were not favourably received by certain of the hierarchy.

But Pecock had been already engaged on a more important work, to which he alludes in the Donet, although it came out into the world later, viz, his Repressor, of which it is now time to speak. The design of it is to defend the clergy from what he conceived to be the unjust aspersions of many of the "lay party," or "Bible-men" (by which he means the Lollards), and to show that the practices for which they were blamed admitted of a satisfactory vindication. The outline of the work will be best perceived from the summary of the contents, so that nothing need be said here of its order and arrangement. It is evident that, as his book proceeded, Pecock perceived that he had undertaken too large a subject for a single treatise; and while at the outset he gives the reader notice that he shall justify eleven

---

1 Lewis (p. 62) gives 1449 as the date of the Repressor. Pecock, indeed, alludes to Henry's efforts to save Normandy (which was not wholly lost till the siege of Cherbourg, Aug. 12, 1450), and speaks of war having been carried on between England and France for 34 years. See Repressor, pp. 90, 516, 617. This war may reasonably be taken to commence with the siege of Harfleur, Aug. 17, 1415. Although from these data it is manifest that Pecock was composing the work in or about 1449, yet it is certain that it did not appear publicly till at least five or six years later. "Furthermore, for as myche as soone after that y hadde write the book cledip The Repressor, which is not 3itt into this present day utterly into vse deluwered, fillen to me manye occupations by saxe yeere next thanne folowing, that leiser was not to me neither sitt is forto write in special ayns the articlis whiche ben spokun in the eend of The Repressor and left there vntretid."—Pecock's Book of Faith, MS., fol. 6, 7. The Repressor was one of the nine books of Pecock exhibited before the archbishop, Nov. 11, 1457, and Pecock had said that he would only be answerable for books which he had published within three years from that day, some others having been circulated surreptitiously before receiving his final corrections. The Repressor contains such frequent allusions to the Donet, that we must suppose the latter work to have appeared first, even although in the Donet itself one or more allusions (I observed one only when inspecting it at Oxford) to the Repressor are to be found.
Practices or governances (as he calls them) of the clergy, he does in fact restrict himself to a vindication of six, viz., the use of images, the going on pilgrimage, the holding of landed possessions by the clergy, the retention of the various ranks of the hierarchy, the framing of ecclesiastical laws by papal and episcopal authority, and the institution of the religious orders. For the remaining five he refers his readers to his other works, of which some were already published, while others were in preparation. The arguments of the Lollards are usually first stated, and then answered; after which Pecock brings forward his own reasons for retaining the practice objected against. These various arguments may be quickly understood from the marginal summary, and it would needlessly swell the bulk of the present volume to state or discuss them here. It would, moreover, be necessary to enter upon the hottest part of the field of polemical theology, on which war has been waged for centuries between the reformed and the unreformed Churches. Any lengthened discussion of such points would be out of place in a work published at the public expense, and the editor must be excused for declining to enter upon it more than can well be avoided, interesting and important as it is in itself.  

1 A great deal of information (conscientiously and on the whole accurately put together, but with a somewhat clumsy laboriousness) on almost all the controversial points touched on by Pecock, and various other illustrations of a historical and antiquarian character will be found in Lewis' Life of Pecock, pp. 62–184. One or two errors, however, may be noticed here. His remarks on the pardon-mongers (p. 142) have nothing to do with the subject, Pecock's quest-mongers being persons wholly different. Neither is his disquisition on religious persecution (pp. 159–179) any more to the purpose. It was capital punishment generally, not religious persecution in particular, to which some of the Lollards objected, an opinion against which one of the thirty-nine articles is directed. But the worst blunder of all is the supposition that Auchen (it should have been Anchon) is a name for Avignon (p. 116). This piece of nonsense, like many more absurd
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consists in this, that it preserves to us the best argu-
ments of the Lollards against existing practices which
he was able to find, together with such answers as a
very acute opponent was able to give. Every one,
however, will perceive that there are some egregious
blunders on both sides, such as that of the Lollards,
in adducing a text of St. Peter (1 Pet. iv. 12) against
pilgrimages,¹ and that of Pecock in elaborately argu-
ning that the pope is the Head of the Church because Cephas
is the name given to St. Peter.² There is also another
matter, which every impartial reader will probably
perceive and admit, that both Pecock and his oppo-
nents contributed very materially to the Reformation
which took place in the following century, whatever
abatements he may make from the soundness of the
views advocated by either, or whatever opinion he
may entertain of the merits of the Reformation itself.
Pecock himself aimed at temperate improvements in
the Church, not at violent measures of reconstruction;³

¹ See Repressor, p. 176, sqq. There
 can be no doubt, I think, that Pe-
cock contends against an interprer-
tation which he had actually en-
countered.

² This error is as old as Optatus
(or at least it occurs in his present
text);—"Igitor negare non potes
scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo
cathedram episcopalem esse colla-
tam; in qua sederit omnium Apo-
stolorum caput Petrus, unde et
Cephas appellatus est." (Optat., lib.
ii. p. 31. Ed. Par. 1702.) If the
Donatists had had no greater diffi-
culties than this to contend with,
they might probably have van-
quished their opponents. Many later
writers make the same absurd mis-
take. See Fulke's Discovery, &c.,
p. 301. (Parker Society's edition.)
From some or other of them Pe-
cock, no doubt, derived it, but St.
Jerome, to whom he strangely re-
fers (p. 437), would have taught him
better. Valla ridicules this popular
error in his declamation against
Constantine's donation. Brown,

³ "By tranquil opposition to the
more zealous followers of Wiclif," ob-
erves Bishop Short, "and by
grounding his arguments on sound
reason in the interpretation of the
word of God, he contributed much
to the furtherance of religion."  
Hist. Church of England, c. iii.
§ 126. But his subsequent remarks
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and if his character as a reformer leaves something to be desired, it was *multo melior futurus, nisi tempora in quibus vivet obstisset*.

We gather from Pecock's work a fact which is exceedingly important to be borne in mind, that what may be called the discontented portion of the Church of the fifteenth century in England embraced persons of very various views. The more moderate portion of that party may fairly be considered as the precursors of the reformed Church of the age of Elizabeth, while the more extreme portion (to whom the name of Lollards is perhaps now more usually limited) were developed into the puritanical party of the same period. But in the fifteenth century everything was in a transition state. Distinct communions had not yet been formed, and the various parties within the bosom of the Church were connected amongst each other by various approximations, overlappings, and interchanges of sentiment. Pecock himself is a singular illustration of the eclecticism (so to say) which prevailed. He virtually admitted, on the one hand, the fallibility of general councils, and insisted strenuously on the necessity of proving doctrines by reason, and not simply by authority; while, on the other, he carried his notions on the papal supremacy almost as far as an ultramontane could desire, and was blamed even by men like Gascoigne for giving

---

(S 129), that "he does not appear to have possessed any very superior talents...yet God can work by weak instruments," might, I humbly think, have been spared. As the expositor of the province of reason in matters of religion, in opposition to the absolute dogmatism of the one party and the narrow scripturalism of the other, Pecock stands out prominently as the one great Englishman of his age, and as the precursor of a still greater Englishman in the age following, viz., Richard Hooker.

1 This will perhaps be disputed; but Pecock's common expression "many of the lay party," to designate the Lollards, appears to warrant the assertion. At the same time it is certain, from Foxe, that meetings for prayer, &c., were held by some of this party, which may be regarded as the beginnings of a future generation.
more than its due to the pope's temporal authority. In maintaining Scripture to be the sole rule of faith, and in rejecting the apocryphal books as uncanonical, he agrees with the reformers altogether: in his doctrine of the invocation of saints, and in various other particulars, he agrees altogether with their adversaries. If, in his discourse of images, he writes some things which few Anglicans would approve, so also he writes others, in the same discourse, which many Romanists would still less approve. Perhaps it would not be greatly wrong to assert that Pecock stands half-way between the Church of Rome and the Church of England as they now exist, the type of his mind, however, being rather Anglican than Roman. Of puritanism, in all its phases, he is the decided opponent. There were many others more or less like him.

Very interesting it is to inquire from what sources Pecock derived the arguments which he ascribed to his opponents. In part, undoubtedly, and probably for the most part, he learned them by personal intercourse. Allusions to such intercourse are sufficiently frequent in his Repressor. But, apart from this, we may be sure that so learned a disputant would not fail to make himself acquainted with the controversial writings of his adversaries. To these, however, he very rarely alludes. Once, and once only, he mentions the sect of the Wicliffites, who hold "against governances treated of in the "manner rehearsed in this present book, and in worse "and horribler manner, as it is open in the book of "Wiclif and of others being of his sect." What this book is, it is difficult to say, for many of Wiclif's works are unfortunately yet unpublished, and there are passages quoted from several of his works in Lewis' Life of Wiclif, which more or less resemble the statements which Pecock controverts.² But there is one book,

¹ See Repressor, p. 501.
² Compare in particular Wiclif's...
doubtfully ascribed to Wiclif, which Pecock appears, from time to time, to have in his eye, and that book is The Apology for the Lollards. Some of the arguments against images, against doing a less good work when a better work may be done, and against the religious orders, which that Apology employs, bear too strong a resemblance to those which occur in Pecock to be the effect of chance. This book is in all likelihood the fountain head of some of them; but when once used, they may, of course, have found their way to Pecock through other channels. Almost as much may be said of the work which has been called by its editor, Mr. Forshall, a Remonstrance against Romish Corruptions in the Church, addressed to the people and parliament of England in 1395. While, on the one hand, the author of this treatise agrees perfectly with Pecock in several material points relating to the Lollard controversy, so, on the other, some of his arguments relating to the various ranks of the hierarchy and the maintenance of the clergy appear to be directly answered by Pecock in his Repressor. In another place Pecock certainly alludes to Wiclif under the appellation "of one clerk, but verily to say one heretic," who has expressed the sentiment, which Pecock impugns, in more than one of his

dowed the church (which occur both in his Dialogus, lv. 18, and in his treatise Of Clerks’ Possessions,) with the Repressor, pp. 323, 324, and the note.

1 This is omitted, accidentally, I presume, from Mr. Shirley’s useful catalogue of the works attributed to Wiclif, printed at the end of his Fasciculi Zizaniorum.

2 A sensible article in the Christian Remembrancer (July 1859) takes notice of this, among other works of the Camden Society, and gives also much information relating to the period with great impartiality and knowledge of the subject.

2 See Remonstrance, pp. 1–8, and compare Repressor, pp. 303, sqq., 408, sqq., &c.; also Rem., pp. 147–152; and compare Repr., pp. 423, sqq., &c.
works extant in MS. It deserves to be added that, in the majority of Scripture citations, Pecock employs the version ascribed to Wiclif, in that form of it, however, which is the later of the two, whether the revision be due to Wiclif or to some other person.

It is the preliminary part, however, of Pecock's work which will be read by many with the greatest interest. The Lollards, against whom Pecock argues, carried their views of the sufficiency and completeness of Scripture so far, that they conceived them to be our only sure guide in matters in their own nature indifferent, and required that the ritual, as well as the theology of the Church, should rest upon Scriptural grounds. When the lawfulness of any ecclesiastical usage was in debate, the Lollard would ask, Where groundedest thou it in Scripture? Against this extreme view of the sufficiency of Scripture, Pecock argues in the first part of his Repressor with singular clearness and ability. He maintains at large that it is not the office of Scripture to ground any law or ordinance of God which man's reason may discover

1 See Repressor, p. 413, and the note. It may indeed be said that Wiclif does not use the important expression "customarily misuse," but "withdrawn of teching in word and deed in good example," virtually amounts to the same thing, i.e. to more than occasional delinquency.

2 See Repressor, part v. ch. 1 more especially. The exceptions to this remark are mostly confined to short texts quoted apparently memoriter, such as occur in the first sixty pages; at p. 63 is a manifest quotation from Wiclif's version.

3 In this case, as well in others which concern these controversies, it is most necessary to remember that many who protested against Romish opinions missed falling into the extremes against which Pecock disputes. Thus the Remonstrance against Romish Corruptions, written in 1595, published by Mr. Forshall, says (p. 131): "Cristen men shulden accepte the determination of the Church of Rome, eyther of any other, onely in as much as it is found in Holy Scripture openly eyther priuely, eyther in resoun that may not faile." Pecock himself might have written these words.

4 Scripture itself remonstrs us to reason for such matters. 1 Cor. xiv. 40; xi. 13.
by the light of nature. He shows likewise that Scripture presupposes a knowledge of the moral virtues, and that its special office is to make known these truths and articles of faith which human reason could not have discovered. In adopting this line of argument, he may be considered as the forerunner of Hooker, who had to contend against precisely similar opinions maintained by his puritan opponents. Nor, perhaps, is it too much to say, with the lamented Hallam, that this portion of Pecock’s work “contains passages well worthy of Hooker both for “weight of matter and dignity of style.”

At the same time the attentive reader will perceive that Pecock has occasionally brought forward opinions of a questionable character, to use the mildest term, which were noways essential to his argument, and which his enemies were not slow to fix upon to his disadvantage. Such, for example, as his position, that if there should be any apparent discrepancy between Scripture and reason on matters relating to the moral virtues, Scripture must be brought into accordance with the judgment of the reason, and not vice versa. Or such an opinion again as this, that the doctrine of the sacraments is more founded in reason than revelation.

Yet, after every deduction has been made, his Re-pressor will ever be regarded as a masterly performance. Fullness of language, pliancy of expression, argumentative sagacity, extensive learning, and critical skill distinguish almost every chapter. His disquisition on the fabulousness of Constantine’s donation, occasioned by an absurd argument of the Lollards in connexion with that donation, is, considering the age of the work.

1 See Repressor, part i. passim, especially pp. 10, 23; Hallam, Middle Ages, ch. ix. part 2, vol. 3, p. 388, note. (Ed. Lond. 1853.) Pecock, however, is much more successful in establishing his general principles than in applying them.

2 See pp. 25, 45, &c.
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in which it appeared, a surprising piece of criticism. And, in palliation of some of Pecock's grossest errors, it may be observed that they arise partly from ignorance of the Greek language, which at that time was almost wholly unknown in this country, and partly from his being imposed upon, in common with his age, by spurious productions, such as those which have been fathered on Dionysius the Areopagite. It is no exaggeration to affirm that Pecock's Repressor is the earliest piece of good philosophical disquisition of which our English prose literature can boast. As such it possesses no small interest for the philologist and for the lover of letters generally.

So far indeed as secular history is concerned, the allusions to passing events either in England or elsewhere are extremely few and unimportant. Pecock takes some notice of the disturbances in Prague occasioned by the Hussites, as well as of the wars which had now

1 See pp. 357-366. Just about the same time Lorenzo Valla had been turning his attention to the same subject, and had arrived, not without hazard to his fortunes, at the same result. There is, however, a perfect independence of each other in the two treatises. Although there is not much in common between the character and pursuits of these two remarkable men, it is singular that Valla was very near getting into trouble for denying that the Apostles wrote the creed which still bears their name. But Valla was in high favour at the court of Naples, and so came off more easily than Pecock, who held the self-same opinion, after his court favour had declined.

2 Witness his criticisms on Cephas and orthodoxy in his Repressor (p. 434) and Book of Faith (p. 31, Wharton's ed.), which make us wish that he had even known less Greek than he did. His knowledge must have been confined to a few stray words. He does, indeed, say in his Book of Faith: "Wolde God that lay peple hadden in her modir tunge the epistils of Seynt Ignace . . . . for certes red y never in no manny's writings so tenderly charchid the obeisance to bischopps." (MS. Bibl. Trin. Coll. Cant.) But this was doubtless a Latin version. Between Roger Bacon's death (circa 1295) and Grocyn's lectures at Oxford (1491) Greek learning had but few English cultivators, and those mostly travellers. Warton (Hist. Engl. Poetry, § 85) and Hallam (Lit. Eur. part i. capp. ii., iii.) mention Eston, Richard of Bury, Gunthorpe, Robert Flemming, Bishop Grey, Frey, Mil- ling, and Selling, to whom Maundevile (see his Travels, pp. 20, 76) may perhaps be added. But Pecock had never travelled (Repr. p. 370).
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for more than thirty years been going on between England and France.¹ We also learn from him a fact, which no candid person who possesses a competent knowledge of the subject will be disposed to deny,² that the state of English society at this time was widely and deeply corrupt. This corruption, which he represents as almost universal, he conceives (perhaps not without reason) would have been even more general but for the institution of the religious orders.⁵ A few references to London buildings and to London customs (for which see the Index) are almost the only passages of purely antiquarian value. Nor will the ecclesiastical historian obtain from this work much information on other subjects than the Lollard controversy. Sundry allusions to the ritual of the Church of England in the fifteenth century, and also to that of an earlier period, and a few notices of the wealth, habits, and practices of the monastic orders, are almost the only matters to which attention needs to be called.⁴

To return, however, to Pecock. A brief elevation now awaited him, but it was only that his fall headlong might be the heavier and the more conspicuous. Humphry Plantagenet, his old patron, had already fallen a victim to the hatred of Margaret of Anjou, for hav-

¹ Pecock’s strange remark (p. 306), that “the world evermore decreases in people,” England and France being specially mentioned, may have sprung out of the fact that these countries were reduced and well-nigh exhausted (some parts of France being even depopulated) by these long-continued wars.

² An able writer in the Dublin Review for 1858 (n. lxxxvii, art. ii.) scruples not to call the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, regarded morally, a period of “Egyptian darkness” (p. 49). He has a great deal more to the same effect.

³ Pecock’s account, pp. 516, 540, relates to “well nigh all worldly people,” by which he probably intends principally the laity. But with respect to the clergy, the higher clergy especially, let Gascoigne speak (u. s., p. 537): “Ab anno Christi in quo fui natus (1403) non novi promosos esse in ecclesia qui scient, possunt, et volunt debito modo animabus prodeasse.” (See also p. 513, etc., and Repressor, p. 381.) Some abatements are usually to be made from this querulous and not over large-minded, but most conscientious writer; in the present instance, however, it is to be feared that they need not to be very extensive.

⁴ See Index to Repr., s. v. Rituals, and Religious Orders.
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...ing patriotically opposed her impolitic marriage with Henry the Sixth. William Delapole, created by her favour Duke of Suffolk, was now prime minister. He had previously regarded Pecock with disfavour, probably because he had been patronized by the Duke of Gloucester. But whatever the cause may have been, it was by his influence and that of the Bishop of Norwich, who has been already mentioned, that Pecock was raised to the see of Chichester in the place of his friend Adam Moleyns, to whose brutal murder, which took place June 9, 1449, the leaders of the Yorkists appear to have been privy. Pecock, after some delays, was translated by papal provision to his new office on March 23, 1450. He made his profession of obedience at Leicester, where the parliament was sitting, a week afterwards, and had the temporalities restored to him on June 8 of the same year. The smiles of Delapole proved fatal to Pecock. The people generally were persuaded of the integrity of the "good Duke Humphry" (as he was called), and were convinced that the Duke of Suffolk was both concerned in his death and was the main cause of the English losses in France. He was accordingly arraigned and sentenced to banishment, but was assassinated before the sentence took effect. The Bishop of Norwich, the queen's confessor, was driven from his see. Their friends, more especially the bishops, were universally detested.\footnote{Le Neve'sFasti, vol. i. p. 247 (Hardy); Gascoigne, m.s., pp. 524, 537, 539, 548; Lewis, 185-199.}

The storm of indignation did not at once descend upon Pecock, who about this time was engaged in writing or correcting his *Treatise on Faith*, an English work still extant, intended to reduce the Lollards to obedience to the prelates of the Church. In the first part of this treatise, which appears to have been published about 1456,\footnote{Wharton and Lewis consider it to have been composed about 1450. This may be so, but it was one of the nine books presented to the archbishop, and so ought not to have} he gives up the idea of an
INTRODUCTION.

infallible authority in the Church (as a basis of argument at least), and maintains that many have fruitlessly endeavoured to convince the Lollards of error by the principle that "the clergy, or the church of the clergy, may not err in matters of faith." He accordingly proposes to convince them by another means, viz., "that we ought to believe and stand to some sayer or teacher, which may fail, so long as it is not known that that sayer or teacher therein fails." He even contends that faith is a matter of probability rather than of knowledge, and that the truth of the Christian religion itself is to be proved, not by demonstrative, but by probable argument. Such views were in fact absolutely incompatible with the popular doctrine of a living infallible authority in matters of faith. Very remarkable also is the approximation which Pecock here makes towards the doctrine of religious toleration, an approximation which shows him to be far in advance of his own age, and indeed of the age of the Reformers. He maintains that "the clergy shall be condemned at the last day, if by clear wit they draw not men into consent of true faith otherwise than by fire and sword and hangment; although I will not deny" (he adds) "these second means to be lawful, provided the former be first used." In the second part he treats of the rule of faith, and maintains the Scripture to be the only standard of supernatural

been published before 1454. It is mentioned once in the Repressor (p. 45), perhaps again (p. 564), each place being written on an erasure, although "the author himself in the entrance reckons six years from the time of his writing the Repressor, and afterwards speaking of the same war between England and France, he sets it at forty years, as he had in the former at thirty-four."—Waterland's Works, vol. x. p. 914. Pecock seems to have had several works half finished at the same time, which afterwards came out at different times; and thus one book may be referred to in another book, which itself came out earlier than the book to which it refers. See above, p. xxii., note.
and revealed verities. The opinions implied rather than advocated in the first part, on the infallibility of general councils, were no doubt at variance with those most generally received in his time, easy though it be to find sundry authors of that age who agree with him even here; but his view of the rule of faith may perhaps be said to have been the usual one in that period. It was maintained, among many more, by Pecock's bitter enemy, John Bury, who does not seem so much as to have imagined that any verities of the Christian religion were preserved merely by the medium of tradition.¹

At last the cloud burst upon his head. The Duke of York, secretly aiming at the crown, veiled his design by affecting to redress grievances, and to procure the removal of evil counsellors from the king's presence. Pecock was peculiarly unfortunate, as having lost his patrons, the Duke of Suffolk and the Bishop of Norwich, in whose disgrace he shared, and also in being out of favour with the king personally.² His remarks on the wars with France were certainly not calculated to gain him Henry's partiality, and his notions on various points of doctrine made him

¹ See Pecock's *Book of Faith*, pp. 1, 3, 4, 14, and Wharton's Preface (passim); Excerpts from Bury, p. 612 (of this work). Lewis, pp. 199–202; also pp. 285–302, where are some quotations from the *Book of Faith*, which are not contained in Wharton's edition. Yet Pecock himself does not seem to perceive that his arguments were really more than *argumenta ad hominem*, for he says expressly and (we must presume) sincerely: "Nevertheless of this . . . followeth not that the church on earth err eth or may err." (Lewis, p. 994.)

² This personal feeling may, perhaps, be thought to manifest itself in the statutes of King's College, Cambridge, in which Henry directs that no disciple of Wiclif or Pecock shall be suffered to remain there. But other considerations may likewise have come in. "Item statuimus . . . quod quilibet scholae. . . . juret quod non, favebit opinionibus, damnatis erroribus, aut heresibus Johannis Wycklyfe, Reginaldi Pecocke, neque alienus alterius heretici, quondiu vixerit in hoc mundo, sub pena perjurii et expulsionis ipsae facta." Statut. Coll. Regal. Cantabri. c. ult. in fine.
extremely unpopular with many of the hierarchy. His very defence of them, of which they at first approved, had caused, it was said, the death of some. His undisguised aversion, moreover, for the bombastic manner and legendary matter of the discourses of the friars, gained him the enmity of many of that order, whom he not very reverentially designated as pulpit-bawlere. There was no powerful person, there was no political or religious party, on whom he could count for aid. Those who took any part at all, seem to have taken part against him.

It is Pecock's misfortune that we are obliged to...
depress principally on his enemies' statements for the history of the remainder of his life. Even from such accounts, however, the malignity and gross ignorance of his persecutors are abundantly manifest. So far as can now be made out, the closing events of his career were as follows.

Towards the close of the year 1457, probably on the twenty-second of October,¹ King Henry VI. held a council at Westminster. There was a large muster both of the temporal and spiritual lords. Among the rest was Pecock. The hatred long entertained against his person and opinions here burst forth with unrestrained fury. Not one of the temporal lords would speak on the business of the council so long as Pecock was present. Many clamoured aloud for his expulsion. Complaints and murmurs proceeded from all sides. He had written, it was said, on profound subjects in the English language. What else but mischief to the ignorant vulgar could be expected from such productions? He had vilipended and rejected the authority

¹ There are some slight errors about the dates in the accounts which have come down to us, which I have endeavoured (in some degree at least) to rectify. These would hardly be worth mentioning, were it not that the order of the events is thereby confused. Gascoigne evidently did not exactly know on what day the council was held, using the vague expression "circa festum S. Martini Ep. et Christi Conf.," or "about November 11." He goes on to add that Pecock was cited to appear with his books "in Sabbato infra octavas S. Martini." This latter date is almost certainly false; for, instead of the examination being after November 11, or St. Martin's day, we have two accordan testimonies for its being on St. Martin's day itself, viz., the note in Cambridge MS. of the Repressor, and the mandate of the archbishop, dated Lambeth, October 22, 1457, quoted at length by Lewis. It seems probable enough that the archbishop issued his mandate on the same day that he required Pecock to withdraw from the council, or, in other words, that the council was held on October 22, 1457; if not, we must suppose that the council was held some short time previously. It seems very improbable that it can have been later than October 22.
of the old doctors, saying that neither their writings nor those of any others were to be received, except in so far as they were agreeable to reason.\textsuperscript{1} When passages from their works had been produced against him, he had been known to say \textit{Pooh! pooh!} He had even made a new creed of his own, and had denied that the Apostles' creed was composed by the Apostles! Much more was said. He had written last year a letter to Canning, lord mayor of London, who had forwarded it to the king. In that letter, which the king had shown to some of them, there were (they averred) no ambiguous signs of exciting England to a change of faith, and even to an insurrection. To crown all, he had therein asserted that many of the nobility agreed with him and his detestable writings. At length the divines who were in attendance demanded of Archbishop Bourchier that they might have copies of Pecock's books for examination. The primate assented. Upon this Pecock himself came forward. He was willing (he said) that copies of all the books which he had composed within the last three years should be delivered to his grace; but he would not be answerable for such works as he had written before that time, because they had only been circulated among private persons, and had not received his final corrections. The archbishop required him to appear at Lambeth on the eleventh of November, and to bring his books with him. After more confusion and disturbance, the king himself was appealed to, and

\textsuperscript{1} See p. xxxix., note. In the same way he refused to acknowledge the absolute authority of Aristotle in matters of philosophy. "Aristotel was not other than an encercher fortio fynde out trouthis, as other men weren in his dayes and now after his daies sit hidirto ben. And he failide in ful many poyntis bothe in natural philosophie and in moral philosophie, as schal be maad open in othere placis, and as ech large encercher of trouthis into this present day hath failid." — Follower to the Donef, MS. fol. 68.
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Bourchier commanded Pecock to withdraw. He quitted the council-chamber accordingly, and left London. 1

Immediately afterwards, as it seems, the archbishop issued his mandate for Pecock's opponents to appear. It is dated from Lambeth (or as it was anciently written Lambith), October 22, 1457. He there directs the clergy (to whom it is addressed) "to admonish all and singular who would oppose anything against the conclusions of the said bishop had or contained in his books or writings," to appear before the archbishop or his commissaries on the twentieth day (Nov. 11) after the date of the monition, and to bring their objections in writing, "withal commanding them by his authority to inhibit all and singular . . . that they do not presume in any manner out of court to assert, judge, or preach anything to the prejudice of the aforesaid lord bishop Reginald, whilst this affair of the examination and discussion of his books and conclusions before him or his commissaries was depending and unfinished." 2

How the interval was employed by Pecock and his adversaries we do not distinctly know. The former seems to have been engaged in correcting the copies of his works which he was to exhibit to the archbishop, and the latter, we may be sure, were preparing their exceptions and accusations.

The eleventh of November arrived, and Pecock presented himself at the archiepiscopal palace. He brought

---

1 Gascoigne, u. e., pp. 542-547; Whethamstede in Hearne, u. e., pp. 490-493.
2 Quoted by Lewis, p. 216. Foxe gives the document at length, a. a. 1457, rather differently. According to his copy, the objectors were to appear against Pecock "the twentieth day after such monition or warning had." This would, of course, in some instances be a little later than Nov. 11; but I believe Lewis' marginal note to be quite right, that this was the day intended for the examination, or at any rate for the first examination. His own account of the transactions is confused.
nine of his works with him, which were found to contain many erasures and passages written anew. The Repressor and The Book of Faith were among them. They were handed by the primate to twenty-four doctors for examination, who should report to him and his assessors (viz. Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester, Chedworth, Bishop of Lincoln, and Lowe, Bishop of Rochester) the results of their inspection. Pecock requested that he might not be judged by them, but by his peers, meaning thereby not the bishops, but those who were his equals in scholastic disputation. This objection was overruled by the archbishop. When their examination was concluded, these doctors reported to the archbishop and the bishops present that Pecock's writings contained many errors and heretical opinions, as they were prepared to prove in their full canonicals before the king in council. George Neville, Bishop elect of Exeter and brother of Lord Salisbury, is reported to have said to Pecock while the report of the examination was going on, "My lord of Chichester, the just judgment of God suffers you to incur these reproaches for having yourself reproached the holy doctors Augustine and Jerome, and for denying the truth of their sayings." To whom Pecock is said to have replied, that he regretted that he had so written, not being sufficiently informed on the matters in question. We know no more of Pecock's reply to

---

1 The MS. note at the end of the Repressor affirms so much of that work, and several of the condemned conclusions are manifestly taken from The Book of Faith.
2 "Suis pilcis utenter." (Gascolgne).
3 Gascolgne, c. c., pp. 543-545.
4 It may be presumed, however, that he who had been writing a treatise On the just apprising of Doctors, was at least as well instructed as Neville, who had been appointed bishop by provision from the pope the year before on condition that he should not, on account of his youth, being then 23 years old, be consecrated for four years. (Gascolgne, d 2
the charges of the doctors, but it may be imagined, from the sequel, that it was tame enough.\footnote{1}

It was very probably at this time that John Bury, an Augustinian friar, was preparing his reply to Pecock's \textit{Repressor}, which he entitled \textit{Gladius Salomonis}, and which is still preserved.\footnote{2} This work he

\footnote{1} Foxe, indeed, perhaps referring to this examination, says that "he declared many things worthy of a good divine, and armed himself with all kind of armour for the defence of his life and cause," while his enemies, "with like labour and pain, laboured and travailed for their dignity and gain . . . and thought good to use all kind of preparation and to show their power and strength, all that ever they might. Wherefore the most subtle and exquisite sophisters, philosophers, divines, and orators were called for, besides centurions of lawyers and decretries, whose use and help in these matters is greatly esteemed." This may be so, but Pecock's courage seems shortly to have forsaken him. Foxe's account, however, is so vague and wanting in circumstantiality, that no great use can be made of it.

\footnote{2} Lewis (p. 249) evidently thinks that Bourchier requested Bury to write his reply after Pecock's deprivation. The preface may very well be taken to allude to the adverse report of the commissioners of inquiry; but if Pecock had been already deprived, the words of Bury would probably have been more definite.
undertook at the primate's request; and he alludes in terms of high praise to Lowe, Bishop of Rochester, as being the archbishop's counsellor in dealing with the heresies of Pecock. In the preface to this treatise he announces his intention of going to the root of Pecock's errors, and of showing that Scripture and not reason is the true mother of the living morality; while the boasted offspring of the latter (who lay overpowered by the deep sleep of ignorance) is discovered to be a lifeless corpse. He also promises a second part, in which he will prove that the various arguments in the whole course of Pecock's *Repressor* in behalf of drowsey reason are nothing to the purpose. Whether this was ever published does not appear.\(^1\) The first part, however, has come down to us complete, and it contains an acute and ingenious reply to the thirteen conclusions propounded in the first part of the *Repressor*, in which Pecock had attempted to define the respective provinces of reason and revelation. The reader will discover the plan of the book from the original table of contents, and the principal arguments by which its more important conclusions are supported from their summary printed in the margin of the Excerpts.\(^2\) On

---

\(^1\) Bale, who quotes the first words of the treatise, says that it consists of two parts; it does not, however, follow that he had ever seen the second portion.

\(^2\) Having procured a transcript of the entire MS., I am able to say that the omitted parts are, like the rest, of a philosophical and not of an historical character. Quotations from the fathers and schoolmen, and from some of the classical writers, form a very large part of the treatise. These are often vaguely or inaccurately made; and there are some few occurring in the Excerpts, which I have been unable to verify. With regard to the Greek writers which Bury quotes (and he quotes Aristotle perpetually), it is strongly to be suspected that he only knew them from Latin versions. His citations from Plato's *Timaeus* (p. 590) do not appear to have been derived from Cicero's paraphrase (*De Universo*, § 3, and § 11), but Latin versions of Plato were, even in that age, not wholly
the points at issue between Bury and Pecock the reader must form his own conclusions. They relate to questions which concern the very foundations of morals, and which are likely to afford matter of disputation to ingenious men so long as the world shall last.

Pecock’s examinations (to which he had been no stranger before both when Stafford and when Kemp had been archbishop of Canterbury) and condemnations (which he had hitherto escaped) now become so frequent, that it is hard to say what took place at each.1 The primate having, with his assessors, drawn

unknown. Upon the whole, Bury’s erudition is highly creditable to him, considering the age in which he lived; and his work, if printed at length, might give some idea of the range of a learned Englishman’s reading in the middle of the fifteenth century in Suffolk.

The only historical part of the work is the preface (printed entire), which is, unfortunately, very obscure, and perhaps a little corrupt; *fraus* should possibly be written for *laus* (p. 571, l. 17), and *ledet* for *parect* (p. 573, l. 9). A glossary to the Excerpts has not been deemed necessary; the sense of *vistor*, strange principally as occurring in such an unpoetical place as a table of contents, is noticed at p. 568. (See also *Fusc. Zizan.* p. 105, in this series). The reader will observe the indicative sometimes used where the subjunctive is either absolutely required or greatly preferable, as well as an uncouth form or barbarous use of a word here and there, e.g., *scrupulum* for *scrupulus*; *evidet* in the sense of it is evident, &c. These blemishes, however, occur but rarely, and

Bury’s composition may in general be read with pleasure. Some account of his life, and of his work against Pecock, may be seen in Leland (*Comm. de Script. Brit.*, c. dxiv), Bale (*Cent.,* viii. n. xx. p. 595, ed. Bas. 1599), and Oudinus (*De Script. Eccl.*, tom. iii. p. 3594). The last-named author mentions the MS. from which the Excerpts in the Appendix are made. It is preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, being a small quarto, written on parchment in the fifteenth century, of 63 leaves, abounding in contractions, now numbered 108 (formerly 1960. See *Cat. Libr. MSS. Angl.* p. 98). It was formerly in the possession of Thomas Allen, of Gloucester Hall. Lewis made some use of it in his *Life of Pecock*.

1 “His injurious handling is long, and the circumstances thereof very long,” Foxe; who also says that, "besides many other articles, the presence of the bread in the sacrament was laid unto Pecock." He alone inserts in Pecock’s recantation the following article: “Item, that it is not necessary to salvation to affirm the body materially in the
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up a condemnation of a creed¹ which Pecock had composed, directed Dr. Pinchbeck to read it upon the Sunday following at Paul's Cross. He then convened a meeting of bishops and doctors (both secular and religious) on Nov. 21, probably at Lambeth, when Pecock retracted, according to Gascoigne, various conclusions which he had laid down in his writings. These doctors considered Pecock's works unfit to be read, because in his Book of Faith he had said that St. Gregory's saying that "faith has no merit, of whose truth human reason gives proof," is false, and that the pontiff had contradicted himself. His Repressor they objected against for maintaining that the property of churchmen is as strictly their own as is the property of laymen. His sermon at St. Paul's gave offence for teaching that the payments made to the pope for provisions were lawful; as did his letter to Friar Godhard about the "ranting preachers" of the day. They also censured him for maintaining that a man is not bound to stand by the determination of the Catholic Church, but only to believe that there is a Catholic Church.² He

¹ sacrament." This article comes in after the article relating to the communion of saints. We have so many other copies, however, without this article, that a mistake on Foxe's part is strongly to be suspected. Leland's Chronicler, indeed, tells us: "Male sensit de eucharistia," which probably means that Pecock disbelieved transubstantiation. Whether the doctors, however, his examiners, found fault with him on this score, we do not certainly know.

² I incline to think that this creed was contained at the end of the Book of Faith, which has not come down to us complete. The Donet contains the Apostles' creed in an altered form, omitting the descent into hell; but the condemned creed was "novum symbolum magnum et longum in Anglicis verbis." (Gascoigne, u. s., 546). Pecock (Donet MS., fol. 48) writes thus: "Whether the Apostles said the comune crede or not, schal not be seid here, but it schal be tredd in The Book of Faith." Now Gascoigne says, u. s., 511: "Scriptum in suo symbolo magno Anglicano...... quod Apostoli non fecerunt symbolum nostrum com-

³ mune." This looks very much as though his Creed and Book of Faith were united together or identical.

² Gascoigne, u. s., 528, 529.
was next examined by the archbishop on Nov. 28, at Lambeth, according to Gascoigne, in presence of various ecclesiastical and secular lords; or rather, as Wethamstede reports, at Westminster, before the king himself in full council. Indeed he may have been re-examined at both these places about the same time. At his final examination (wherever held) there was much and long disputing. Much the same charges were brought against him as had been brought a month before. He was interrogated on the descent of Christ into hell, on the authority of the Catholic Church, on the power of councils, on the sense of Scripture, and on other matters mentioned below.\(^1\) Replies and rejoinders produced no definite result. The Archbishop of Canterbury at length rose and addressed him to the following effect:—"Dear brother, Master Reginald, since all heretics are blinded by the light of their own understandings, and will not own the perverse obstinacy of their own conclusions, we shall not dispute with you in many words (for we see that you abound more in talk than in reasoning), but briefly show you that you have manifestly presumed to contravene the sayings of the more authentic doctors. For as regards the descent of Christ into hell, the Tarentine doctor, in an inquiry of his into the three creeds, says that it was left out of the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, because no heresy had then arisen against it, nor was any great question made about it. As to the authority of the Catholic Church, the doctor Augustine says, Unless the authority of the Church moved me, I should not believe the Gospel. As to the power of councils, the doctor Gregory says (and his

\(^1\) "In his answering for himself in such a company of the pope's friends albeit he could not prevail, notwithstanding he, stoutly defending himself, declared many things worthy great commendation of learning, if learning against power could have prevailed." Foxe, u.s.
"words are placed in the Canon, Distinct. xv.), that "the four sacred councils of Nice, Constantinople, "Ephesus, and Chalcedon are not less to be honoured "and reveredence than the four holy Gospels. For "in them (as he asserts), as on a square corner-stone, "the structure of sacred faith is raised; and in them "the rule of good life and manners consists. The "other doctors also say with one mouth that although "the sacred councils may err in matters of fact, yet "they may not err in matters of faith, because in "every general council, where two or three are "gathered together in Christ's name, His Holy Spirit "is there in the midst of them, who does not suffer "them to err in faith or to depart from the way of "truth. As regards the sense and understanding of "Scripture, the doctor Jerome says, that whoever "understands or expounds it otherwise than the "meaning of the Holy Spirit requires, is an un- "doubted heretic. With whom agrees the Lincoln "doctor (Grosteste), thus saying: Whoever excogitates "any opinion contrary to Scripture, if he publicly "teach it and obstinately adhere to it, is to be "counted for a heretic." The archbishop having then "enlarged on the necessity of removing a sickly sheep "from the fold, lest the whole flock should be in- "fected, offered him his choice between making a "public abjuration of his errors, and being delivered,"after degradation, to the secular arm "as the food of "fire and fuel for the burning." "Choose one of "these two" (he added), "for the alternative is imme- "diate in the coercion of heretics."1

1 Gascoigne, a. a. 546, 547; Whethamstede, a. a., 493–496. The "archbishop's speech, here some-"what compressed, is open to serious exception both as to facts and the interpretation of facts. His quota-"tion from St. Gregory is not quite accurate, and his citation from St. Augustine is in reality nothing to the purpose. On these points, how-
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Pecock stood for a few moments in motionless silence, not knowing what to answer. He then replied as follows: "I am in a strait betwixt two, and hesitate in despair as to what I shall choose. If I defend my opinions and positions, I must be burned to death: if I do not, I shall be a byeword and a reproach. Yet it is better to incur the taunts of the people, than to forsake the law of faith and to depart after death into hell-fire and the place of torment. I choose, therefore, to make an abjuration, and intend for the future so to live that no suspicion shall arise against me all the days of my life." He then and there made, as a preliminary to his abjuration, a confession in presence of the archbishop and the assembly, and retracted in general all the heretical positions which were contained in his various books. On the third of December he abjured at Lambeth the condemned conclusions in a written form, in presence of the archbishop and twenty-four doctors of divinity; they were inserted in the original Latin in his public recantation, which he made on the following day. That day was Sunday. Twenty thousand persons were assembled at Paul's Cross. Pecock, arrayed in his episcopal habit, was accompanied by the Archbishop of Canterbury, ever, the reader may consult Lewis, 221-229, as well as for the (uncertain) Tarentine doctor, and for the absence of the descent into hell from an ancient copy of the Athenasian creed.

1 Whethamsted, u. s.
2 It exists in MS. at Lambeth, n. 577, Wharton MSS., p. 25, and is headed "Reginaldi Pecock episcopi Cieestrensis abjuratio in foro judiciai." The only variation of importance between it and the copy printed below is, that concilium generale et universalis ecclesia is read instead of concilium generale universalis ecclesia. The seventh article is wanting. My best thanks are due to F. Knvett, Esq., Secretary to the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, for affording me every facility for the examination of the Lambeth MSS.
3 The feast of St. Barbara and the second Sunday in Advent happened to coincide.
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the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Rochester, and the Bishop of Durham. Many other ecclesiastics were also present. He then knelt down at their feet, and made a recantation in the following words:

"In the name of the Holy Trinity, Father and Son His recantation at Paul's Cross. and Holy Ghost, I, Reynold Pecock, Bishop of Chichester unworthy, of mine own pure and free will, without any man's coercion or dread, confess and acknowledge that I have beforetime, presuming of mine own natural wit, and preferring the judgment of natural reason before the New and the Old Testaments, and the authority and determination of our mother Holy Church, have holden, feel'd, and taught otherwise than the Holy Roman and Universal Church teacheth, preacheth, and observes; and over (besides) this, against the true catholic and apostolic faith, I have made, written, and taken out and published many and divers perilous and pernicious doctrines, books, works, and writings, containing in them heresies and errors contrary to the faith catholic and determination of Holy Church, and especially these errors and heresies following, that is to say:

(i) "Imprimis, quod non est de necessitate salutis credere, quod Dominus noster Jesus Christus post mortem descendit ad inferos.
(ii) "Item, quod non est de necessitate salutis credere in Spiritum Sanctum.
(iii) "Item, quod non est de necessitate salutis credere in sanctam ecclesiam catholicam.
(iv) "Item, quod non est de necessitate salutis credere in sanctorum communionem.
(v) "Item, quod ecclesia universalis potest errare in iis quae sunt fidei.
(vi) "Item, quod non est de necessitate salutis credere et tenere quod illum, quod concilium generale universalis ecclesiae statuit, approbat, seu determinat in favorem fidei et ad salutem animarum, est ab uni-
versis Christi fidelibus approbandum et tenendum;
et quod probat et determinat seu condemnat esse
fidei catholicae vel bonis moribus contrarium hoc ab
eisdem pro reprobato et condemnato esse credendum
et tenendum.
(vii.) "[Item, bene licebit unicuique Scripturam Sanc-
tam in sensu litterali intelligere, nec tenetur aliquis
de necessitate salutis alicui alteri sensui inhaerere.]
Wherefore I, miserable sinner; which here-before
long time have walked in darkness, and now, by
the mercy and infinite goodness of God, reduced
into the right way and the light of truth, and
considering myself grievously to have sinned, and
wickedly to have informed and infected the people
of God, return and come again to the unity of our
mother Holy Church, and all heresies and errors
above rehearsed and also all other heresies and
errors written and contained in my said books,
works, and writings here-before this time, before the
most reverend father in God, solemnly and openly
revoke and renounce; which heresies and errors
and all other spieces (kinds) of heresy, I have before
this time, before the most reverend father in God, my
lord of Canterbury, in due and lawful form, judicially
abjured, submitting myself, being then and also at
this time a very contrite and penitent sinner, to the
correction of the Church and of my lord of Can-
terbury. And over this exhorting and requiring
in the name and virtue of Almighty God, into the
salvation of your souls and of mine, that no man
give faith or credence to my said pernicious doctrines,
eresies, and errors; neither my said books keep, hold,
or read in any wise; but that they bring all such,
books, works, and writings as suspect of heresy (deal-
ing in all godly haste) unto my said lord of Canter-
bury or to his commissaries or deputies in eschewing
of many inconveniences and great perils of souls, the
which else might ensue of the contrary. And over
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"this declaration of my conversion and repentance, I here openly assent that my said books, works, and writings, for consideration and cause above rehearsed, be deputed unto the fire, and openly be burnt into the example and terror of all other." 1

This mean recantation ended, a fire was kindled at the Cross. Pecock, with his own hands, delivered three folios and eleven quartos of his own composition to the executioner, who took and threw them into the flames. It is said that if he had himself descended to the bonfire, the populace would have hurled him in along with his books. As these blazed up before his eyes, he exclaimed aloud, My pride and pre-

---

1 Gascoigne, u. s., pp. 548, 549; Whethamstede, pp. 496-500; Lewis, pp. 237-241. The confession, &c. of Pecock is preserved by Whethamstede (in Latin) and in Kennet's collection, from which last Lewis prints it. It is also preserved at Lambeth among Henry Wharton's MSS., n. 594, pp. 22, 23, from a MS. in Ashmole's collection, and again in n. 594, p. 33, from Neville's register. This last must be considered authentic. Foxe likewise has it, with an additional article about the eucharist, as has been already mentioned, but omitting the important article relating to the Holy Ghost, which is also omitted (as well as article iii.) by the chroniclers, and in a MS. in Trinity College, Dublin (class E. 5, 10, fol. eev.), of the fifteenth century, kindly examined by Dr. Todd. It is printed here entire "Ex Reg. Exon. Nevil." in Wilkins' Concilia (vol. iii. p. 576), except that one or two very obvious corrections are introduced from Whethamstede and from the other copies. The bracketed article occurs in Whethamstede only. The orthography in Wharton, Wilkins, and Lewis is not that of the fifteenth century, and is here completely modernised; it is preserved, however, in an ancient form, in a copy of the recantation given in a chronicle from 1377-1461, pp. 75-76 (Camden Society), and in the Dublin MS., but with many differences; these copies are, however, in other respects less complete. Stowe copies this chronicle almost verbatim (Annals, pp. 402, 403, ed. 1631). See also Holinshed's chronicle s. a. 1458, p. 646. Other chronicles, as Caxton's (sig. y. 2. ed. 1480), Fabyan's, p. 463 (ed. 1559), and another in MS. s. a. 1458, written in Henry the VIII.'s reign, in verse, briefly mention Pecock's recantation. The passages are quoted at length by Waterland (Works, vol. x. pp. 234, 235). To them may be added another of Henry VIII.'s time, in the British Museum (Cotton MSS. Vitell. A. xvi. fol. 114): "In this yere (Hen. VI., xxxvi) Bishop Pecock was abjured at Powis Crosse, beyng bishop of Chycestir, and his bookys brent."
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sumption have brought upon me these troubles and reproaches!

Thus ingloriously, (as his biographer well says,) "did this great man fall, being overcome by his own fears, and not having courage and resolution "enough to hazard the poor remainder of a life, "almost worn out already and come to an end; and "thereby has given to others this useful lesson, when "they think they stand, to take heed lest they fall." He retracted errors which he had never uttered, and he retracted utterances which he knew to be truths."

---

1 Lewis, p. 241. "It is notorious," (he adds very truly, p. 244), "that some of the conclusions, for holding which his lordship was convicted of heretical pravity, or, however, of error, were maintained by many of the doctors of even the Roman Church; and that in particular the third and fourth of them have been since established and authorized by their famous Council of Trent." Pecock was condemned by the perverse ignorance of his persecutors for affirming that it was the existence of the Catholic Church, not an implicit faith therein, which the Apostles' creed required us to acknowledge. Lewis does them too much honour by refuting them at length (pp. 261-264). These men might have reduced the Tridentine Fathers, and Bonner himself, to cinders. In reference to the Communion of Saints, he says in the creed set down in his Donet (which has been already quoted at length, p. xx., note), "I beleue the comming of seintis to be." What would any one desire more? He even agrees in the interpretation of the article with the present Roman view, and considers it "God's ordinance that we moye preie to him and to angellis and to seintis for vs siff and for our neighbouris and beherd." (Donet MS., w.s.) With regard to its not being necessary to salvation to believe in the Holy Ghost, Pecock never affirmed any such thing, as his enemies very well knew, or at least ought very well to have known. He says expressly, "God is three persons;" and again, "three persones ben oon God" (Repressor, pp. 39, 83; see also above, p. xx., note, and Poor Men's Mirror, MS. p. 82, where he says: "In ech of hem, i. e. these three persons, "ben alle the same seid noble dignitae afore rehercif ful and hooij lijk miche: and such an other beyng, substance, or godhede is ther noon, neither may be"), besides inserting the article in his above mentioned creed in the expressive form: "I beleue into the Holi Goost." Lewis is probably correct in thinking that those who ignorantly concluded that because in the common creed we profess to believe in the Holy Ghost, we are therefore obliged to believe in the Holy Catholic Church and in the...
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But, indeed, he seems to have been so confused and bewildered, as scarcely to know what he had said or what he had not said.

...
The archbishop without delay transmitted copies of
Pecock's recantation to the bishops of his province,
and required them to publish it in their respective
dioceses.\textsuperscript{1} The University of Oxford signalised itself
in behalf of the orthodox or winning side. On the
17th of December the Chancellor, Mr. Chandler, and
all the University proceeded in solemn procession to
a place where four roads met, thence called Quatre-
voix or Carfax, and there burnt to ashes every copy
of Pecock's works which could be found in Oxford.
About a month before this they had written a let-
ter to the primate, avowing their detestation of the

adding that it had no ground in
Scripture; — in thereupon assum-
ing that Scottus was correct so
far as the Scriptural argument
was concerned, and that the
article was consequently not apo-
solical: "And so the ground,
foundament, and cause whith the said
doctor held the said article to be a
faith is not trewe, that is to seie,
that the Apostles putthiden thilk
article into the comoun crede; and
that the Kirke may make noon such
article of faith is before schewid."
I see not, therefore, how Pecock
can be acquitted of denying the
descent into hell to be an article
of faith. Lewis, in attempting to
wash him clean, has somewhat dir-
tied his own fingers (p. 250). How-
ever, it is likely enough that Pecock
would without much scruple have
admitted it to be an article of faith in
general terms (taking hell as "the
state of the dead in general, without
any restriction of happiness or
misery"), though not in the par-
ticular sense in which it may have
been ordinarily explained in his own
age. (I doubt Gascoigne's accuracy
in making Pecock say, "quod anima

Christi non descendidit in infernum,"
u. s., 511). Lewis himself must in
common candour be so understood
and his own quotation (p. 340, Ad-
enda) from Thomas Burnet (\textit{De
Fid. Christ.}) may be taken to im-
ply so much: "Quod symbolo
apostolico intersecitur de descensu
Christi ad inferos, de ecclesia cath-
tholica, et communione sanctorum
sequioris est aevi, et \textit{explicationis}
\textit{magis dubia}.
With regard to the
seventh particular, it is absent from
most copies; and whether it be
genuine or not, hardly any one
will pretend that it is heretical.
It is even difficult to understand to
what opinion of Pecock it refers.
\textsuperscript{1} Wharton's MS. (Lambeth MSS.
394, p. 33) gives a copy of Pecock's
abjuration from the register of a
mandate of Neville, Bishop of Exe-
ter: — "Archidiaconis suis direc-
tum, 1457 (i.e., 1458, modern style)
12 Jan., ut publicari . . . faciant
per totam diocesis Exon. revocat-
tiones et renuntiationes Reginaldi
Pecock episcopi Cieestriteria, quas
archiepiscopos Cantuarienses trans-
miserat episcopo Exonensi, man-
dans ut easdem sic publicari faciat."
man, and begging him to pardon the lukewarmness of which they had hitherto been guilty. 1

Pecock’s enemies now everywhere set up a note of triumph. Doggerel verses were put in circulation, in which the laws of humanity and the laws of prosody were alike disregarded:

"Sic deplumatus" (says an unknown scribbler)
"pavo fuit et spoliatus,
"Sicque sibi siluit, vox quia rauca fuit.
"Sic dudum volucris, qua nomen habebat honoris,
"Bubo non pavo dicitur esse modo.
"Nomine privari vult atque gradu spoliari,
"Qui violat fidei dogmata sive Dei.
"Ne sic priveris, haec qui legis, aut spolieris,
"Nec basse tendas nec nimis alta petas.
"Dum medium tenuit currum patris bene rexit,
"Alta sed ut petiit, Phaëton ab arce ruit."

Even an abbot of St. Alban’s, John de Whethamstede, could express himself thus: "Sic intoxicator ille impiusimus, qui perfidiae venenum imbibert, ut ipsum imbibitum effunderet iterum ac populum simplicem in fide infective informaret, exspuit ipsum modo taliter et evomuit, quod,

"‘Dum sol dat radium, Mars gerit aut gladium,"
"ipsum rebiberse seu reglutire nullatenus ausus erit."

Pecock’s final sentence was deferred, and he was sent by Bourchier, in the first instance, to Canterbury.

---

1 Gascoigne (Appendix to this work). Wood, w. a. Lewis (p. 248), professing to follow Wood, carelessly makes the confabulation occur Nov. 17, and then puts the letter a month after it, which would in that case have been a modest production indeed. It is vexations to spoil a good story, but it must be said of Lewis here, as he observes of Collier’s use of Wood elsewhere (p. 272): “The good man, ‘tis plain, has quite mistaken his own author, and blunders in reading, or, however, in representing what he writes.”

2 Whethamstede, w. a., 501, who has also immortalised the foregoing poem.
and then to Maidstone;¹ yet, though a prisoner, he somehow or other contrived to send a statement of his case to the pope, of which it would be interesting to know the particulars.² Whether the Roman archives furnish them must be left to others to inquire. "But it seems," as his biographer observes, "such was the bishop’s interest at the court of Rome, that he had from thence bulls of restitution, by which the archbishop was required to put him again in possession of the bishopric of which he had now deprived him." Upon the receipt of the papal bulls, the archbishop applied to the king; and represented that Pecock had been convicted of heresy, and made his abjuration accordingly, and yet that he had surreptitiously purchased and obtained from our holy father the pope certain

¹ There is a story mentioned by Gascoigne (see Appendix), and also by the Camden Society’s chronicle (p. 77) named before, that Pecock used to repeat to those who visited him in his confinement these lines following:—

"Wit hath wonder that reason not tell can,
How a Maid is a Mother, and God is a Man;
Leave reason, believe the wonder;
Belief hath mastery, reason is under."

The story, of course, means that Pecock retracted what he had said about the province of reason in matters of religion; but in his *Repressor* he expressly says that the mystery of the Incarnation cannot be comprehended fully by any Christian man (p. 245). I have little hesitation therefore, in setting it aside as fabulous and should have none at all, were it not that Pecock sometimes confessed to crimes of which he was not guilty. The composition of the stanza is ascribed by the chronicle to Pecock, but this seems to be fabulous also. It is printed, according to Lewis (p. 283), under an old woodcut of Joseph and Mary, with these words following: Quoth antiquity. The Lincoln College MS. of Gascoigne places Gascoigne’s name against the last two lines, as though he were the author of them, and so leads Wood astray. "Quibus in hunc modum Gascoigne pie subject, Leave reason," &c. So also B. Twyne before him. (Ant. Acad. Oron., p. 303.)

² John Milverton, provincial of the Carmelites, Pecock’s old opponent, also sent a statement of the condemnation and recantation of Pecock to Rome. See Dale, *Cent.* viii. n. 44.
"bulls for his declaration and restitution contrary "to the laws and statutes provisors,¹ and to the "great contempt and derogation of his majesty's "prerogative and estate royal." The king hereupon issued a commission, dated from St. Alban's, Sept. 17, 1458, to the Bishop of St. Asaph (whose name seems to be unknown) and Dr. Stillington, to report to him in writing the legal course to be pursued in the matter, taking such advice of jurists and divines as they should deem necessary. The commissioners recommended that the king should send an ambassador to his holiness, in order to represent to him the dangerous character of the bishop's heresies, and to request him to revoke his bull and appoint a pious and learned bishop to be nominated by the king. They also considered that Pecock was heretical before he was appointed to the see of Chichester, and that the king might therefore lawfully detain the temporalities thereof until a catholic successor was appointed.²

¹The less the archbishop had said of these statutes the better; he dwelt in a crystal palace. Several of the other bishops (Kempe, Lowe, and Neville), who had been concerned in procuring Pecock's condemnation, owed their sees to papal provision. See Lewis, p. 252, and Le Neve's Fasti.
²Lewis, pp. 250–254, 270 (where the documents are quoted, from Kennet, at greater length); Gascoigne, w. s., p. 549. The documents are to be seen in full at Lambeth among Wharton's MSS. 577, pp. 26–28, and 594, pp. 23, 24. The articles of the commissioners are signed by T., Bishop of Asaph, Dr. Stillington, and other doctors, twenty in number, of whom Pinchbeck and Hugh Tamelet or Damelet were two. In the course of their letter to the king they thus describe Pecock's sentiments:—"Forasmuch as the damnable doctrine and pestiferous sect of Reynold Pecock exceeded in malice and horribility all other heresies and sects of hereticke to us herebefore known by hearing or writing, in the which the said Reynold destroyeth not only the pouvoir and jurisdiction of regalle (regality) and priesthood . . . but also despieth and annulleth the authority of all Holy Scripture, as well of the Old Testament as of the New, impugning the principles and ground of the religion and doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom, among other blasphemies and detestable heresies, he ascribeth ignorance and imperfection, and namely
The king tendered his thanks to the commissioners for their diligence in this business, and further requested them to certify him of the heresies of which the bishop was guilty: their report has not been discovered. He likewise informed Pecock, through John Derby and Gilbert Haydock, of the report of the commissioners, who were to notify to him in the king's name, that if he would resign, the king would grant him a competent livelihood; but that if he forced his majesty to send letters to the pope, he would "write for the uttermost rigour of the law to " be inflicted upon him." Pecock's subsequent history has been thought, perhaps erroneously, to indicate that he declined the king's offers and refused to resign; but be this as it may, John Arundel, the king's

in making the holy prayer of the Fater noster, and, over that, of his arrogance and presumption, reproved the doctrine of Moses and other prophets of God, and also of the apostles, evangelists, and disciples of Christ, contemning also the decrees and ordinances of general councils with [the] dicta and holy expositions of holy doctors and fathers of Christ's Church, as well upon the ten commandments comprised in the two tables of Moses, and the twelve articles of the faith, and seven sacraments of the Church; and, to speak summarily, he intendeth by his detestable and blasphemous doctrine utterly to destroy the honour and the name of Christ, and to confound finally the authority and state of Christian religion,—therefore it is considered," &c. &c. But the reader will already be more than satiated.

1 The king's letter is preserved in Wharton's MSS., Lambeth, n. 377, p. 29, directed to Mr. Stillington and Hugh Tamelet.

2 Wharton's MS., w.s., gives the king's letter entire, directed to Mr. J. Derby and Mr. Gilb. Haydock, &c. A Latin copy, which Lewis evidently follows, is contained in Wharton's MSS., Lambeth, n. 594, p. 20.

"His being put under a very strict confinement to do penance," and the smallness of his pension, (which he thinks to be eleven pounds), leads Lewis to that opinion. Turner, however, conceives that his treatment was "not pain-fully rigorous, but rather indulgent" (Hist. Middle Ages, book iii. o. vii.). If this opinion be just, we may conclude that he did accept the king's offers; and if forty pounds was the annual sum allowed for his maintenance, we can hardly doubt it.
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physician and archdeacon of Richmond, was soon afterwards appointed as his successor, and the temporalities were restored to him March 26, 1459.¹

Pecock being now left without a bishopric, was sent to the abbey of Thorney, in Cambridgeshire. The primate's instructions to the abbot of Thorney are still extant. They run in these words: "He shall have a secret closed chamber (having a chimney), and convenience within the abbey, where he may have sight to some altar to hear mass; and that he pass not the said chamber. To have but one person that is sad (grave) and well-disposed to make his bed, and to make him fire, as it shall need. That he have no books to look on, but only a portuous (breviary), a mass-book, a psalter, a legend, and a bible. That he have nothing to write with; no stuff to write upon. That he have competent fuel according to his age, and [as] his necessity shall require. That he be served daily of meat and drink as a brother of the abbey is served when he is excused from the freytour (i.e., from dining in hall) and somewhat better after [the first quarter], as his disposition and reasonable appetite shall desire, conveniently after the good discretion of the said abbot."² "Forty pounds" were assigned "to the abbey for his finding."

¹ Lewis, pp. 254–256. Le Neve's Fasti, vol. i. p. 247 (Hardy's ed.).
² The abbot at that time was William Lyal or Ryal; he was elected in 1457, and resigned in 1464. See Dugdale's Monast., vol. 2, p. 596 (ed. 1846). The "Red Book" of Thorney, in the possession of the Earl of Westmoreland at Apethorpe, has been kindly examined, at my request, by my friend the Rev. M. J. Berkeley, who informs me that, after Lyal, Thomas Wyslich appears as abbot in 1464, who seems to have been abbot for four years; after this time the diary ceases entirely. Reginald Pecock's name does not occur in it.
³ This important document is taken verbatim from Turner's Hist. Middle Ages, book iii. ch. vii., who copied it from the Harleian MS. n.
At this point the authentic history of Pecock ends; but there is every reason to presume that his last days were spent here, and that his dust reposes within the precincts of the abbey.¹ No portrait of
Pecock is known, but he is said to have been a man of stately figure and handsome features, notwithstanding a tendency to some cutaneous affection, which was hereditary in his family. Such are the chief events of the life of Reginald Pecock, who would have been remarkable in any age, and who was in his own age most remarkable. He was the enlightened advocate of toleration in times peculiarly intolerant; he was the acute propounder of a rational piety against unreasoning and most unreasonable opponents. To say that he had some errors and weaknesses is only to say that he was a man; but his good deeds live and have triumphed; his frailties, we may hope, are forgiven. His theological knowledge, scriptural, patristic, and scholastic, was for that age very considerable; he was, indeed, in the opinion of no mean judge, "by far the most eminent and learned

says that he had "a certayne pension assigned vn to hym for to lyue on in an abbey, and some after he dyed" (p. 77.) Similarly Stowe, p. 403. But Hall's chronicle, which Grafton (p. 632, Lond. 1569) transcribes, says that he died in his "owne house." A MS. chronicle, quoted by Waterland (Works x. p. 235), says:

"His bookees brent at Paulis Cross,
He in Newgate kept
All his liues after, for the here-
yses he had kept."

Bale and Foxe insinuate that he may have been "privily made away" with; but I see no ground at all for any such suspicion. The Rev. J. Cauley, Incumbent of Thorney, has, in answer to my inquiries, kindly informed me that there is no monument to Pecock's memory now existing there; and I cannot make out from books that there ever was any. It is most probable that none was erected.

There are, indeed, representations of a long line of bishops of Chichester now existing in Chichester Cathedral; but my friend, the Rev. C. A. Swainson, assures me that they are not real portraits, being modelled (like the portraits on the coins of our early Edwards) on one conventional type. They were placed there in the reign of Henry VIII.

Whethamstede, u. s., p. 491; Gascoigne, u. s., p. 518.

Henry Wharton, Preface to Pecock's Book of Faith, p. xi., who elsewhere, p. xxxiv., observes of him, "Many good and learned men endeavoured the reformation of these abuses (of Romanism) without departing from the commonion
INTRODUCTION.

"bishop of the Church of England in his time." Yet evil report pursued him through life, and even long after his death, and his character has been singularly mistaken both by friends and enemies for a series of many generations. Of his opinions, but slightly touched on here, his works are the living and only

of the Church. . . . Our learned bishop was of the number of those brave and generous persons, who while he earnestly invited the Lollards into the communion of the Church, [it is to be doubted if they had generally left it,] no less vehemently opposed the superstitions of his own party. Some footnotes and marks of this disposition may be found in this treatise, which prove his integrity to have been equal to his zeal, and neither inferior to his learning: It is to be regretted that Wharton should have been led into so many errors about Pecock as he has committed through following the almost incredible blunders of Bale's appendix. The illustrious Waterland estimates Pecock's character as follows: "Here (in his Book of Faith) and in other parts of his pieces may be seen the good bishop's excellencies, and at the same time his foibles. He had great parts, learning, and abilities; and was too confident in them, and trusted too much to them; while he hoped to be able at pure reason and argument to defend a very corrupt Church in all or its main doctrines and practices [this requires a little qualifying] against all assailants. Yet he is to be commended in preferring the rational way of dealing with adversaries before fire and faggot. The good man was forced to sweat and labour hard in so difficult an undertaking; and here and there to drop many a concession, such as the warm men of the Church could by no means brook or consent to. He hoped, since he was writing on the Church's side, and since his concessions were such only as plain force of reason or as plain fact extorted, that he might be safe enough from censure; judging too kindly of other men's moderation and candour by his own." (Works, vol. x. p. 218.) His letters to Lewis are full of information about Pecock, and a great part of what is good in Lewis's Life of Pecock is due to Waterland.

1 Edward IV. in 1476 denounced him, his books, and followers, which last were numerous in Oxford. Henry VI.'s edict against him in the statutes of King's College remains to this day: it may perhaps be cancelled during the present year. Strangely enough both by Archbishop Harpsfield in Mary's reign, and by Holinshed and other historians, as well as by Fuller (Worthies of Wales), Pecock is represented as favouring the opinions of Wiclif. The Index Expurgatorius of Madrid, 1667, with seal scarcely according to knowledge, calls him "a false bishop and a Lutheran professor at Oxford." Collier's account has many errors, and Bale's appendix (Basil. 1659) consists of little else. For some of these facts, see Lewis, passim.
true exponents; and by them he being dead yet speaketh.

Of these works, and of the far greater number which have perished, the following account is added: it might no doubt be altered for the better if the MS. works of Pecock were in print.

A. Extant Works.

1. The Donet.

A copy exists (without a title) in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Bodl. n. 916), in small quarto, on vellum, consisting of 106 leaves, each page containing about twenty-nine lines, neatly written in a small hand of the fifteenth century.

Begins:

"Prolog. For as moche as the book ycallid The "
"Reule of Cristen Religioun"

Ends:

"And here ynne I make an ende to this present "
"ij" party longing to the lawe of God."

An early note says that "this booke was compiled "
"by Reynolde Pecocks, Bisshope of Asaphensis and "
"after Byeshope of Cicestrensis, A.D. 1457." This
work is owned by Pecock as his own in The Book of Faith, The Follower to the Donet, and the Repressor, and it is assigned to him by Bury and by Bale.

From this MS., in all probability, Dr. James made a transcript or rather an epitome (James, MS. n. 14, in Bibl. Bodl. pp. 49-79, small quarto), entitled Regi-
nald Pecock's Donet.

Begins:

"Whereas the booke ycallid The Reule of Cristen "
"Religioun."

Ends:

"Thou; thou be in placis privyist." (Compare the foregoing MS. fol. 102, a.)
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In the commencement the author says that in his Rule of Christian Religion he had not taken into account everything necessary to be known on the seven matters therein treated, and "therefore is maad " this litil present boke and anothir book callid The " Folewer herto... in foorne of a dialog bitwix the " son and the fadir... Therfore this present dialog " myȝte wel and conuenientli be clepid The Donet (i.e. " grammar).... or key of Cristen religiouvn." He designed it both as an introduction to his Rule, and also " for to be a schort compendiose report aftirwards," of the "seid long book."

A brief description of the contents of the work may be seen in Lewis's Life of Pecock, pp. 315, 316; but he has fallen into the serious error of describing the first-named MS. as a copy of Pecock's Rule of Christian Religion, and the latter as a copy of The Donet. This work has never been printed, nor has much use been made of it in ascertaining Pecock's opinions. The titles of the works of Pecock occurring therein are mentioned below in their places. Respecting the dates of this and the three following treatises something has been said already.

2. The Repressor.

This is now first printed from the MS. in the Cambridge University Library, Kk. iv. 26., which is a folio on vellum of 190 leaves, in double columns, each of which contains about thirty-seven lines, well written in a hand of the fifteenth century. The title, in a later hand (of Stowe ?), runs thus: The Repressor of over myche blamynge the Clergie, compiled by Bysshope Pecock. At the end is this note in a later hand: Exhibit. coram Domino [i.e., Archbishop Bourchier] in Capella sua apud Lamkith [i.e., Lambeth], xii. Novembr. A.D. 1457 which, as Lewis (p. 319) observes, "is very probably "the entry of the notary after reading this book.
"before the archbishop, and in order to its examina-
tion." The work contains a variety of notes
(usually trivial, sometimes absurd), in later hands of
various ages, which are passed over in this edition.¹

¹ There are many corrections
made in the text by early hands
(three at least), besides a few which
seem to be much later; these are for
the most part self-evident, but in
some cases they seem to be uncalled
for. Whenever the first hand is
readily to be made out, the original
reading is noted below the text in
this edition; but when the corre-
tions are made on erasures, this is
not always or usually discoverable;
in such cases (except in one or two
instances, where the erasures are
very extensive) no notice is taken
of them in this edition. The prin-
cipal corrections upon the erasures
are almost certainly written in Pe-
cock’s own hand (see Appendix,
p. 573, and Gascoigne, u. s., pp. 518,
543); and had I been aware of this
at the outset, I might perhaps have
noticed them in every instance; but
the reader will probably think that,
even as it is, the notes which refer
to the corrections of the MS. are
scarcely worth recording. Neither,
indeed, would they have been so
often given, had the work been in
Latin, but philological accuracy de-
mands that early English texts should
be edited with more minute exact-
ness. In Pecock’s language, which is
a transition from the old to the new,
this is peculiarly necessary. The
verbs usually (but not always)
have distinct plurals, imperatives ex-
cepted, which (contrary to Wicliff’s
usage) are always the same in both
numbers. Again, his, hise; al, alle,
&c. &c., usually, and yet not con-
stantly, denote different numbers.
Under such circumstances, it may
be conceived what annoyance a
MS. full of erasures and corrections
made at different times and corrections
made at different times creates to any
editor who aims at strict accuracy.
With regard to the composition of
words, I have, as a general rule,
followed the MS., one or two ex-
ceptions being made (somewhat reluc-
tantly) for the convenience of the
reader. The indefinite article is
often, but not always, joined to its
noun in the MS., e. g., aman, &c.,
for a man; in the edited text, how-
ever, it is separated. It is quite
certain that the scribe observed no
law in this disjunction or conjunc-
tion. Thus, on the very same leaf
(fol. 65, b. col. 1), we have that it
is a miracle, and also that it is
amypacle. Whenever the word it-
self is unusual, the coalition might
have occasioned a difficulty, e. g.,
“to make a ring of arische” (i. e., a
rush), p. 156; and even when not
usual, some unpleasant hesitation.
But yet this form of composition is
interesting, not only as illustrating
the crisis of the definite article in
other languages, but as showing the
origin of our modern compounds
another, anew, &c.; for a like
reason, prepositions in composition
are printed conjunction with the
verbs, &c. to which they belong,
instructive enough as the occasional
disjunction in the MS. is, because
it shows how slight an union sub-
sists between the preposition and its
verb, just as in Greek the position
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The names of several persons are written in the MS. who must be presumed to have owned it, viz.: John Stephenson, Chrystopher Michell (fol. 145),

of the augment (and in the poets the tmesis) in the case of verbs so compounded evinces the same thing, or, in other words, shows how easy is the transition from a preposition to an adverb. Further, for the same reason a preposition combined with its noun, yet not in composition, is ordinarily separated from it in the edited text; those cases excepted, where the two coalesce into a kind of adverb, of which so many instances occur in the modern language, as indeed, because, &c. Again, where one portion of a word indicating the nature of its formation is separated from the other portion, as y clepid, y now, they are edited conjunctim, cyclepid, ynow, and, indeed, ought so to be edited on all accounts. The deviations from the composition observed in the MS. being thus mentioned here, and in the notes also where requisite, the philologist will not perhaps have much reason to complain. The general reader, however, may think that it would have been better to have discarded the word-composition of the MS. when it differs from modern use; and the inconstancy which prevails in the same MS. may seem to give some colour to this view of the matter, to say nothing of the difficulty which there often is in determining the composition which the scribe really intended. With regard to the inconstancy just named, there is the same inconstancy in the orthography; and if this last is worth retaining in spite of the manifold varieties of writing the same word, so also is the composition of words, though it be not always uniform. For in very many instances (such as bi causae, al cos, &c., now replaced by because, alone, &c.) the origin of the modern forms is agreeably presented to the eye, and in some cases a difficulty is at once explained. Thus unless is nothing but is lasse thannsae (so written in the MS.), corresponding to is as much as, only the than has fallen out in the later language, and so the modern form (welded together and altered) has led the etymologists astray. The illustrations, then, and explanations of the modern English language afforded by the ancient composition of English words amply justify the retention of that composition, let the occasional difficulties and ambiguities be what they may. But there is much more to be said. If the ancient composition be not observed in certain cases, the syntax is violated, and the sentence even becomes unintelligible. One example shall be cited instar omnium: "At this now reheredit foule and mys bering and venust challenging and blaming is reprooned and vnproned," p. 564.

Upon this subject the prudent caution to editors from the pen of the Master of Cain College may be quoted with advantage: "I would take this opportunity of again pressing on the reader the importance of copying our MSS. faithfully, I mean
not only to the letter, but so as to show their peculiarities as regards punctuation, composition, &c. It is astonishing how much light may thus be thrown upon the structure of our language” (Guest’s English Rhythms, p. 430). Several of the more carefully edited English works, especially of late years, retain the original word-composition of the MSS. There are still one or two other minute points which remain to be mentioned. The th, ordinarily expressed by a single Anglo-Saxon character (ȝ) in the MS. (see fac-simile), is here printed at length as two letters; occasionally, however (but very rarely), the same two letters are written at full in words where they are commonly expressed by one character; e.g., the is written in three letters at fol. 71, b. col. 1, also thi at fol. 176, a. col. 1, but perhaps everywhere else in two. If, however, the Ġ is hard (as in knythode, presthode, &c.), the MS. always keeps both letters distinct, as well as in cases where the th stands for t in the modern language; e.g., Thimothie, the first syllable of which never has the Ġ, the last sometimes having it, sometimes not. It may also deserve notice that the scribe never uses a capital Ń, but writes the only as a capital followed by a small Ġ; from which we collect that no stress was laid upon the strict value of this letter in the middle of the fifteenth century, when the distinction between the ȝ and ȝ of the Saxon alphabet had already vanished. Dr. Todd has some remarks on its use in a somewhat earlier MS., The Apology for the Lollards (Camden Soc., 1842), to which the reader is referred. The e and û are written so similarly, that it is sometimes impossible to say whether resurrection or resurrection, &c. be the orthography intended; m and Ῥ are in appearance identical, but very rarely create thereby any difficulties. The contractions occasionally produce ambiguity. The same sign is used for er and re, and perhaps it should also be rendered ir, although in fact it has never been so rendered in the following pages. But the scribe shows himself to be so very inconstant in the orthography where it is expressed in full, that the philologist will not be very uneasy about this matter on learning that the following forms occur at length in the MS.: — ouer, aifter, entre, sufferable, othir, othire, edir, poorer, Petre, Petir, Artir, Artur, chaumbre, chaumbir, wiker, wikir, writer, waiatir, fadir, techer, unproprie, propiri, properest, chapiter, chapire, chapites, chapitree, chapitris. In the same way par, por, and peri are expressed by the same character þ; the plural terminations also, es and is, as well as the letters m and Ń, are not distinguished from each other. Very frequently it seems to be quite indifferent how the words in which the contractions occur should be written in full; e.g., persoon or parson, peraunture or par-aventure, images or imagis, improve or improve, &c. &c.
ing the *Repressor* to Pecock, he adds: "So sayth "John Stowe," an observation probably made after his *Chronicle* was published, in which the *Repressor* is not enumerated among Pecock's writings. The remark, therefore, made by myself in the Catalogue of MSS. in the Cambridge University Library, vol. iii. p. 673, on the authority of a M.S. Catalogue preserved in the Library itself, that Archbishop Rotheram (who died in 1500) gave the M.S. to the University, is probably erroneous. It probably found its way thither during the last quarter of the sixteenth century.

Various extracts are given by Waterland in his letters to Lewis (*Works*, vol. x.), who has copied many of them into his *Life of Pecock*. Henry Wharton also, in his Appendix to Cave's *Historia Literaria* (pp. 158, 159, Bas. 1744), has translated one or two passages into Latin.¹ Pecock, in his *Donet*, *Follower to the Donet*, and *Book of Faith*, acknowledges this work as his own, and it is also assigned to him by Bury and by Bala.

3. The *Book of Faith*.

This is preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge (B. 14, 45); it is a small octavo (the catch words are in eights), about six inches by four, on vellum, now containing 128 leaves, twenty-two lines on a page, neatly written in a hand of the fifteenth century, very similar to that in which the *Repressor* is written.² Imperfect at the end.

Begins:

"*Facti sunt filii mei perditi, quia invaluit inimici*;
"that is to seie in English thus: *My sones ben* "maad lost for the enemye hath had the maistrie."

¹ Some excerpts in his handwriting are preserved at Lambeth, n. 593, pp. 61–68.
² But not the same; *per* is written *p* in this MS., not *p* as in the *Repressor*. 
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Ends (abruptly):
thei ouerleapen this artif[cle]."

Various notes, erasures, and corrections are made by later (?) hands.

At the beginning, inside the cover (on which Whitgift's arms are stamped), is written in a hand of the sixteenth century: "Reginald Peacock (corrected to Pecock), "Bppe of Chichester's Sermons in englisch," and on the top of the first leaf of the MS. is scrawled in a different hand (Stowe's?): "Reynold Pecok, Bisshop of "Chichester, compiled this bok." It is also assigned to him by Gascogne and by Bale, who had seen it. 1 Excerpts from the first part, and the whole of the second part were edited in black letter, with a learned preface by Henry Wharton, 2 4to. London, 1688. A copy of this rare book exists in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, but it was unknown to Waterland, who has made, however, (Works, vol. x.) many extracts from the MS., which Wharton has not published.

The second part begins fol. 81, b, so that Wharton's edition comprises about a third of the whole; it cannot be commended on the score of strict accuracy; thus verrt is wrongly printed urri more than once (pp. xxii., xxviii.), the imaginary word being also inserted in the Glossary; the philosophir of the MS.

---

1 This may be the same as the Book of Faith, to which Pecock alludes in his Follower to the Donet and Repressor, but there were several other works having nearly the same title, both in English and Latin.

2 Wharton had a controversial purpose in publishing these extracts, which occupy forty-one pages, the preface being about the same length, in which he labours to show that "the Church in the fifteenth age did generally believe the Scripture to be the rule of faith, and to contain all things necessary to salvation" (p. xi.), and also that various writers had held that general councils were not infallible, the authority of the Scripture being superior to the authority of the Church (pp. xx., xxi., &c.).
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(i.e., Aristotle) is changed into the philosophie (p. xxiv.); and there are many other errors besides. The orthography seems exactly like that of The Repressor. Wharton thinks that the Trinity MS. was written "with Bishop Pecock's own hand, as may be conjectured from the present emendations and additions inserted in the margin and bottom of the pages by the same hand" (Preface, p. xxxix.). This is certainly not impossible, but we may more confidently affirm that the Book of Faith and the Follower to the Donet were written by the same hand.

From these materials Lewis derived his knowledge of this work of Pecock; of which, in his fifth chapter "On the Bishop's opinions," he has made great use. The titles of Pecock's works which are alluded to in this treatise are mentioned below in their proper places.

My best thanks are due to the Rev. J. Glover, M.A., Librarian of Trinity College, for affording me every facility for examining this interesting MS.

4. The Follower to the Donet.

A copy of this work is mentioned in the Catalogus Librorum MSS. Angliae et Hiberniae (n. 6627, p. 202) as existing among the MSS. of C. Theyere in Gloucestershire. Waterland (Works, vol. x. p. 213) and Lewis (p. 317) have corrected the misprint devout into donet: they were unacquainted with the work, and no writer (so far as I know) has hitherto made any use of it.

This is doubtless the same as is now preserved in

1 The corrections in the Repressor are certainly written in a similar hand; but it is difficult to speak positively about their identity. The erased surface of the parchment rather disguises a hand; and the Repressor itself contains several hands extremely similar to each other.

2 The Royal Library contains many of Theyere's MSS. See Wanley's Cat., Pref.
INTRODUCTION.

the British Museum, *Bibl. Regy*. 17 D. ix. The MS. is in folio on vellum, and consists of 99 leaves of text (excluding blanks at both ends), in double columns, each column containing about forty lines. Many corrections on erasures occur in the course of it, and some remarks by later hands. At the top of the first leaf occurs this note: "Reginaldus Peacock Eps., " Cicestrensis clar. A.D. 1450. Educatus Oxon. in col- legio Orialensi."

Begins (fol. 2):

"Here bigynmeth the book ycallid The Folewer to " the Donet. Sitten it is so that in the first and " secund parties of The Donet into Cristen Religioun " bfore goyng this present book."

Ends (fol. 100):

"which thei myȝten not denye to be of hem entendid " and meenyd."

Pecock, having said that his *Donet* sufficiently teaches the moral virtues which are contained in the four tables, tells his reader that "it is ful fittynge to " him that may so fer knowe, that he knowe what " longith to a moral vertu, that is to seie, what " thingis ben causis to a moral vertu, and what thingis " ben requyrid to be had to a deede that he be a " moral vertuose deede, and how moral vertu is dy- " uerse and different from othere vertues (i.e., from the " natural and the sciential or 'knowyngal' vertues), " whiche ben not moral." This and other allied subjects are treated of in the two parts of *The Follower to the Donet*; which is to be learned "bi way of " honeste and of habundaunt kunnyng," all necessary truth being comprised in the *Donet*.

This English work is repeatedly referred to by Pecock in *The Repressor* (the title, however, being invariably written on erasures); also in *The Book of Faith* and in *The Donet* itself.
5. The Book or Rule of Christian Religion (in three parts).

Lewis asserts by mistake (see n. 1) that this exists in MS. in the Bodleian Library; but a MS. copy was offered for sale in a catalogue of Cochran's books, and was purchased by Sir Thomas Phillipps, Bart., of Middlehill, Broadway, in whose collection it remains.

This, the earliest of Pecock's extant works, but of uncertain date, is frequently referred to in his Donet, Repressor, Book of Faith, and Follower to the Donet.

6. The Poor Men's Mirror.

The MS. preserved in Archbishop Tenison's Library, Leicester Square, London, is in duodecimo, consisting of eighty-one leaves (excluding blanks); each page contains about nineteen lines, well written in a black-letter hand of the fifteenth century.

Begins (p. 1):

"Prolog. Not withstanding that I have maned the first part of the book clepid The Donet of Cristen Religioun to be of litil quantite, that welni ther poore persoon mai bi sum meene gete coost to have it as his owne; sit in to the moor esse of the persoonan poorist in hauer and in wit I haue velium of the middle of the fifteenth century, of 384 pages, ending abruptly. Begins: "Here begynenethe the prolog into the book yealid the reule of Crysten religioun." The work itself begins p. 28: "Here begynenet the firste tretice of this firste partie, in which tretice is tawn the firste pryncipal mater of this book, that is to seye, what God is in his worthis dignites."

1 In the hopes of seeing this MS., I went to Middlehill, but although Sir Thomas Phillipps very politely made every effort to find it, both before and after my arrival, he was unsuccessful. Sir F. Madden had examined it a few years ago, and kindly promised me the use of his notes, but these also could not be found, so that I am most reluctantly compelled to let this introduction go forth without being able to say more of the MS. than what is contained in Cochran's Catalogue of MSS., pp. 21, 22 (London, 1829). It is a folio on

2 My acknowledgments are due to the Rev. W. G. Humphry, B.D., and to the Rev. C. F. Milner, M.A., for permission to inspect it.
"drawen this now folowyng extract or outdrawʒt fro
the first parti of the seid Donet, that no persoon
Cristen grown in to discreetoun of resoun, or fewe
of hem, aſtir sufficient pupplishng of this book
to hem, schulde haue eny excusacion for this that
thei knowe not the lawe and seruice of her Lord
God, and that thei knowe not how worthi, gode,
and lovyng is the Lord, which thei ouȝten serve,
and what benefetis and rewardis thei receyuen and
schulen receyue, if thei wole, of the same Lord;
and so forth of other materis conteyned among the
vij. materis necessarie to be knownen sum what more
or lasse of ech Cristen persoon which hath vse of
his kindeli discreetoun and resoun. And this litil
book I wole be clepid Poore mennis myrrour."

Ends (p. 118):

"and wirche thou therafter, o my sone, that thou
haue Goddis blessing and heuen to thin ending, and
that thou with God euer blissfulli won. Amen." 1

1 After this follow in the MS., in a different but not much later hand,
various pieces in prose and verse of a devotional kind, mingled with a few
Latin verses and scraps. It is difficult to say whether Peacock may have
written any of them or not.

(a.) These ben the gadered counsels of Seint Yeidre (sic) to enforme man
how he schulde fle vicis and use vertuis:

"Consideracioun of a man hym self."

"O man, knowe thi sifl: knowe what thou art: knowe thi bigyn
nynge, fol. 118. From this place forwards the MS. is inconsistently
numbered by leaves, not pages.

These Counsels end with the words:

"Do no thing for preising, no thing for worldli opinion, but
oonl for lijfeuerlasting. Amen. These ben councellis good and holsum,
if thei haue wilful execucion," foll. 134, 135.

These Counsels of St. Isidore are printed, perhaps from this very MS.,
at the end of Tho. Luptet's Works, 12mo., Lond., 1560. (Printed by
John King.) They are certainly not Peacock's Book of Counsels, as any
one reading Lewis' account of the MS. (p. 333) might naturally suspect.
I doubt whether Luptet be the translator; Mr. Maskell has noted in the
copy in Tenison's library, that among Luptet's Works are some which are
by Sir T. Eliot and others.

f 2
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This work, like the Donet and the Follower to the Donet, is in the form of a dialogue between a father and a son.

At the beginning occurs this note in a hand of the sixteenth century:

"Hujus operis author est Reginaldus Pecock, Asaphensis primo, deinde Cicestrensis episcopus: circ. an. 1456."

The name of George Overton, some previous possessor in the seventeenth century, is written in various parts of the book. Erasures and corrections are made in Pecock's text in various places, and later hands have added observations.¹

(8.) Augustinus De Contemptu Mundi.
Begins (fol. 135):
"If thou seie to me this is an hard word."
Ends (fol. 135, b):
"and into the erthe thou schalt turne."

(γ.) A Poem without title.
Begins (fol. 135, b):
"Whi is the world biloued, that fals is and veyn,
Sithen that his weithis ben vncertein?"
Ends (fol. 137, b):
"Whanne liȝf is mooet loued and deeth is mooet hatid,
Thanne deeth drauȝt, and maketh man ful nakid."

(3.) De terra plasmasti me.
Begins (fol. 137, b):
"Erthe out of erthe is wondirli wrouȝt,
Erthe of erthe hath gete a dignite of nonȝt."
Ends (fol. 139, 140):
"Lord that erthe madist for erthe and suffivist paynes ille,
Lete neuer this erthe for this erthe myscheue ne spille;
But that this erthe in this erthe be worchynge thi wille,
So that erthe fro this erthe stiȝ to thin hiȝ hille. Amen."
"Memento homo quod cinis es, et in cinerem reverteris."
"Doc bene dum vivis, post mortem vivere si vis;
Tangere qui gaudet meretricum, qualiter andet
Palmis pollutis Regem tractare salutis?"

¹ Against the following passage is annotated, in a hand of cent. xvi., Transubstantiation not knowne. This can hardly, perhaps, be deduced; but as Pecock was accused (according to Leland’s Chronicler) of un-
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Henry Wharton (Lambeth MSS. n. 594, pp. 38, 39) gives excerpts from this treatise. Lewis, who says (p. 333) that he saw no ground for ascribing the work to Pecock, as Wharton had already done, could hardly have seen Wharton’s MSS. himself, much less the original MS. The above-cited passage is itself a decisive proof of the authorship, and there are also numerous allusions to Pecock’s other works in the course of the book.

Pecock once refers to it in the Repressor under the title of The outdraught of the Donet (p. 541), and as the words are not written on an erasure, it may be earlier in date of publication than the Repressor.

To these works of Pecock ought perhaps to be added certain Latin pieces, partly printed, partly in MS.

sound doctrine on the eucharist, the passage is subjoined (pp. 19, 20):

"[Son.] Fadin, to what purpose, endent, and seend ordeyned God the eucharist to be receyued and hauentid? [Father.] Sothili, sonne, for the that the receyuer in the eucharist receyuing schuld oft remembre him self therbi upon Cristi holi iijf and passioun, and upon his benefiteis, and his lawe, and solewyngly schulde take and make a sade purpose to God (thow without newe bond and coement) that he wole be oon to God, and to his neibore in charitee and in keping vertues and the iijf which Crist kepte and taut in erthe; rjit as thilk signe which he esth and druykith be made or seom to be made oon to hym, or joyneyd to him in his bodili substance. And for to make oft this remembrance and oft this purpose was ordeyned the eucharist oft to be eten and drunke, as to be ofte of this purpose a remem-brauing tokene or signe of wit-nessee therof."

1 The following works of Pecock are referred to therein:

Donet, pp. 1, 16, 22, 31, 73, 116.

The book clepde The Sufficiency of the iijf. Tablis, pp. 3, 21. (The same as The Filling of the iijf. Tablis?)

The Just Apprising of Holy Scripture, p. 7.

The Afore-crier, p. 7.


The Book Filling the Four Tables, pp. 7, 22, 31, 49.

The Provoker of Christian People, p. 17.

The Book of Sacraments, pp. 20, 29.

The Book of Priesthood, p. 29.
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(a) Collectanea quaedam ex Reginaldi Pecock Cistercensis episcopi opusculis exustis conservata, et ex antiquo pergmate conscripta.

Printed in John Foxe's Commentarii rerum in Ecclesia gestarum. (8vo. Argent. 1554, fol. 199, b–203, b.)

The excerpts seem to be taken from Pecock's Book of Faith, either wholly or in part; they relate at any rate of the same subjects; to the apocryphal account of the restoration of the books of the law by Ezra "per inspirationem sine copia," mentioned by the Master of the Histories (Petrus Comestor); to St. Gregory's saying, Fides non habet meritum, cui humana ratio praebet experimentum; to the difference between Credere ecclesiam and Credere ecclesia, &c.

A copy of this rare book, unknown to Wharton (see Appendix to Cave's Hist. Lit.), is preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

(b) Abbreviatio Reginaldi Pecock.

A vindication by himself of Pecock's famous sermon at Paul's Cross. Printed in the Appendix to this work from a paper MS. of the fifteenth century in small quarto, in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (n. 117, formerly n. 1979, Cat. Libr. MSS. Angl. p. 100), which contains a miscellaneous collection of pieces. It is followed by a few brief excerpts from Pecock's works, or perhaps from his sermon at Paul's Cross, of which the most important is the last, entitled Differentia inter prædicare et docere. Lewis used both the Abbreviatio and the excerpts in his Life of Pecock (see pp. 20–23, 38, 39, and 263), deriving them doubtless from this MS. It is most probable that the Abbreviatio, and possibly the extracts also, were drawn up by Pecock himself, and sent to Archbishop Stafford in their present form. See above, p. xviii. and the note.
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(c) His Abjuration.

This composition, which can hardly be called his own, is given above, and has been several times printed.

B. WORKS NOT KNOWN TO BE EXTANT.

The seal of Mr. Chancellor Chandler, of Archbishop Bourchier, and of King Edward IV.,¹ in burning

¹ Chandler has been already mentioned. In Baker's MSS. (vol. xxx. pp. 59-62, in the Cambridge University Library) is contained the archbishop's mandate, dated March 10, 1457, to the Bishop of London, to order inquiries to be made for Reginald Pecock's books in his province of Canterbury. There were some of both sexes who not only had Pecock's original English works, "verum etiam allos nonnullos per eundem confratrem nostrum et alios contra prohibitiones ecclesiasticas et SS. Patrum decreta e Latino in Anglicum ex S. Scriptura translatos." These works having been discovered to be heretical, "decrevimus comuere nos." The Bishop of London is to apprise "omnes et singulos coepiscopos et suffraganos nostros in nostra Cantuarensi provincia constitutos," to inquire for the names of all persons having Pecock's books, and to admonish all such (of whatever rank or sex) "quod infra xv dies post monitionem hujusmodi libros dictis confratribus nostris... sub pena excommunicationis majoris... tradant." The names of the persons and the books are to be transmitted to the archbishop. The Bishop of Ely (William Grey) writes, May 14, 1458, to the archbishop, that he has received his letter and followed his instructions, but "nullum tamen in nostris civitate et diocesi reperire potuitus quo hujusmodi libros vel aliquem librum hujusmodi habuit vel sic sapiebat." See also Baker's MSS. vol. xix. (Harl. 7046, p. 23), and Lewis, pp. 242-248, and the extract from the register of Nich. Bubbeworth, Bishop of Bath and Wells, printed by Hearne (App. to Hexerciseford, p. 549). Lewis (following Wood) gives an account of Edward IV.'s mandate to the University of Oxford in 1475, pp. 310, 311. See also Bryan Twynne, Ant. Acad. Oron., p. 329. This, I presume, is the letter printed at length from the MS. in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, among The writings and examinations of Brut, Pecock, &c., pp. 206-208, London, 1831. It is dated Feb. 16, from Westminster. Another letter of the king is dated Windsor, April 17, thanking the University for its zeal in destroying Pecock's works. No year is added to these letters, which by the kindness of the Rev. T.T. Perowne, M.A., Fellow of the College, I have been permitted to examine. A royal injunction is preserved in Wharton's MSS. at Lambeth, n. 577, pp. 30, 31. The University is required to with
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Pecock's works, has probably destroyed most of the following treatises; it would be rash, however, to affirm that some of them may not yet be lurking in old libraries.\(^1\) It might be possible to form some notion of the contents of these treatises by comparing all the passages where they are referred to in Pecock's other works; this, however, is not attempted here, and indeed could hardly be done well till various unpublished MSS. are printed in extenso. The reader at the same time may make out a good deal from the Index to The Repressor. Wharton (Pref. to Pecock's Book of Faith, p. xxxiii.); Waterland (Works, vol. x. pp. 213-221); and Lewis (pp. 315-333), have given material help to the formation of the following catalogue.

ENGLISH WORKS.

- Many of these are referred to en masse by Pecock, in a ludicrously vain-glorious manner, in his Repressor (p. 47), and in his Book of Faith (quoted by Waterland, u. s., p. 216), and are also elsewhere noticed in these books, and in his Donet; the initial letters of which (f being used to indicate that the work is named in The Follower to the Donet) are here attatched to the books mentioned therein. Various of them are also mentioned by Bury, Bale, and Stowe.

---

hold the doctor of divinity's degree from J. Haycock, said to hold and favour "the superstitious, erroneous, and damned opinions of Reynold Pecock," and from every other person "holding any of the errors or heresies or keeping of the books of the said Pecock."

The Catalogus Libr. MSS. Angl. et Hib. (Oxon. 1697) enumerates among Lord Clarendon's Irish MSS., n. 128, "opus quodam Reginaldi Peacock, Episcopi Armaghensis. 8vo." Many of these MSS. are now in the Bodleian, but Mr. Coxe informs me that this is not among them.
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(1.) The Before-crier, or The Crier. (D. R. F.)
Probably the Præco of Bale's enumeration.

(2.) The Book of Worshipping. (D. R. F.)
"The Book of signis in the chirche, which y clepe "the boke of worschiping." (F. in Waterland, u. s., p. 216.)

(3.) The Provoker of Christian People. (D. R. F. f.)

(4.) The Filling or Spreading of the Four Tables. (D. f. R. F.)
Waterland and Wharton (in Appendix to Cave's Hist. Lit.) make The Filling a different book from The Spreading. Lewis is probably right in identifying them.

(5.) The Just Apprising of Holy Scripture (in three parts). (D. R. F. f.)

There was also a Latin form of the same book, as appears by the Follower to the Donet, MS. (fol. 5), "The book clepid the just apprisyng of hooli scripture "in Latyn."

(6.) Enchiridion or Manual. (D. Bale.)
"Go into the book ycaled my Manual, or my En-
"chiridion, whereinne is devised the rialist foorme of "preying with Paternooster that euer, as I trowe, was

---

1 The meaning of these will appear from the following passage of The Donet (MS. fol. 12): "The first table of Goddis lawe schal con-
teyne these viij. pointis of meernal verta, that is to seie, forto gourne vs keenyngly, presiyngly, dis-
presiyngly, presiyngly, preiyngly, thankyngly, worschipingly, diaworschipingly, and sacramentingly (the other three contain 'cendal' virtnes)... The iij' table... these viij. poyn-
tis, that is to seie, forto lyue and gourne vs anentias God at the next goostly, obediently, riȝtwisely, mekely, treuly, benynghely, and largely... The iij' table... these viij. poyn-
tis, that is to seie, forto lyue and gourne vs anentias vs sif at the next goostly, fleischely, worldly, clerly, honestely, pacientely, douȝtily, and largely... the iij' table... these viij. poyn-
tis, that is to seie, forto lyue and governe us anentias ours neȝboris at the next, goostly, attendauntly, riȝtfullly, mekely, ac-
cordingly, treuly, benynghely, and largely."
devised." Donet MS., p. 78 (James' transcript). To this book Whetamstede (u. s., p. 491) probably refers, and if so, determines its language to be English: "In tantum "in suo sensu de sua scientia superbierat . . . quod "ultra orationem illam salvificam, quam . . . Jesus "Christus proprio suo ore compositit, ederet in suo "vulgari . . . alias tres et populo ad dicendum pro- "palaret." The following work is probably in English, but that is less certain.

(7.) The Book of Faith, Hope, and Charity. (D.)

The reference occurs at p. 53 of James' transcript. This work is entirely unnoticed by bibliographers. There is a little anonymous MS. treatise (sec. xv.) in the British Museum (Bibl. Reg. 17 A. xxvi. fol. 27, b–28, b), entitled: "Here bigynmeth the thre good ver- "tues that Poul clepith Feith, Hope, and Charity."

Begins:

"The first is feith," &c.

It is certainly not impossible that this and other short devotional treatises in the same volume are by Pecock; the style and sentiment are extremely similar; the omission of the descent into hell in the interrogatories to be put to a sick man is also very ominous: "Bileuest "thou that he was aftir his deth biried, and roes on "the thridd dai in fleisch, and steiz to heuenes?" The other chapters are on the ten commandments, the seven deadly sins, the seven deeds of mercy, &c.

(8.) The Book of Counsels. (D. fol. 96, R.)

The references in The Donet and The Repressor indicate that this book of "Counseilis" treated of the Evangelical counsels as opposed to commands, not of the councils of the Church.

(9.) The Book of Priesthood. (R. F.)

(10.) The Proving of Christian Faith. R. p. 99
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where it is distinguished from The Book of Christian Religion, and is mentioned among English works; it is also alluded to in the Poor Men's Mirror.

(11.) The Book of Learning. (F.)

(12.) The Book of Compendious Logic (promised only. R).

(13.) The Book of the Church. (F.)
See Latin treatises (n. 8).

LATIN WORKS.

(1.) The Book of Repentance or Penance. (D. R.)

(2.) The Less Book of Christian Religion. (D., u. s., pp. 53, 77.)

Only known, as it seems, from the above references in the Donet.

(3.) The Just Apprising of Doctors (probably unfinished). (D. R. F. f.)

There seems to be no ground for supposing, with Lewis, that there was also an English form of this book.

(4.) The Book of Faith and Sacraments (promised only). (R.)

Probably this is "The Boks of Faith in Latin" (F. pp. xiv. xli., ed. Wharton), and "The Book of Faith" (R. p. 564), and may be "The Book of Sacraments" (R. pp. 168, 564) and (D., u. s., p. 54) the language of which is not stated.

(5.) The Book of Baptism. (R.)
There seems no reason for thinking, with Waterland, that there was also an English work of Pecock so called.

(6.) The Proof of Christian Faith (promised only).
(F. See Waterland, u. s., p. 219).
Possibly the same as No. 2.
(7.) The Book of Lessons (promised only). (R.)

Probably in Latin, as it was to be read "in the " chair of schools."

(8.) Book on the Church. (F. f. Lewis, p. 324.)

In his Book of Faith (p. xiv., ed. Wharton) occurs this passage: "In the Book of Faith in Latin and " in the Book of the Church." From this we may perhaps infer, with Lewis, that there was also an English treatise so called. To the same two books allusion seems to be made again in The Follower to the Donet M.S. fol. 30, "as herof y write in oon of " the bookis of feith, and in the book of just apprizing " hooli chirch," where "the book of the chirch in " Latyn" is also named, fol. 35, b.

(9.) There was also a Latin edition of The just apprising of Holy Scripture. See English Works, n. 5.

(10.) Concio ad Clerum. (f.)

"Loke thou, my sone, into a sermoun which y made " in Latyn to the clergi: which sermoun bigynneth " thus: Montes Israel, ramos virides germinetis et " fructum viridem afferatis." (Follower to the Donet, fol. 37, b.)

LANGUAGE UNCERTAIN.

(1.) The Book of Sacraments. (R.)

Perhaps the same as the Latin work On Faith and Sacraments.

(2.) The Book of Eucharist (promised only). (R. F.)

"Into time leiser schal be to me forto write the " book of eucharist." (F. M.S. fol. 7.)

Probably in Latin, as it is mentioned in connexion with The Book of Baptism, which is Latin.

(3.) The Book of Legends (promised only). R
(4.) The Book of Preaching (promised in the Abbreviatio).

(5.) The Declaratory (Declaratorium). Bale.

This book may perhaps be alluded to in the prologue to the Donet (p. 50, James' MS.) thus: — "He made a litter booke declarative of himself against envie making . . . and concerning his boke of Cristen religioun." But he elsewhere says: "Whanne I purposid to make this present littil book, I purposid to make no more than that which is now the first party of this book for that it schulde be a schort profitable compendi of alle the vij. maters . . . and sone after the eende of this seid first partye, I was moved for to make further this which now is this present jere partye for a defensoriye and an excusatorye and sumwhat a declaratorye of the other first seid partye." (Donet MS. fol. 85.) Consequently the second part of the Donet may be the Declaratorium or the Defensor of Bale. The "litter booke" is probably intended by Stowe: "Of Christian Religion, and a book pertaining thereunto" (Chronicle, p. 408,) and by Peacock (Follower to the Donet, MS. fol. 5): "The Rule of Christian Religion, and the books pertaining thereto," who may also include the Donet.

There is little doubt that it was in English, as well as the two following: —

(6.) The Book of Sentence. (f.)

"Answer therto schal be maaed in the firste parti of Cristen Religioun, the thridd treti, and by the "Book of Sentence." (Follower to the Donet, MS. fol. 37. See also fol. 74.)

(7.) The Book of Divine Office. (D. f. Bale.)

"Y settide forth a schrift in the book of dyuyne office in Fridaies matyns." (Follower to the Donet, MS. fol. 53.) "In the book of dyuine office in the preisingis for matyns in Trynitese Sundaye." (Donet,
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fol. 39; see also foll. 41, 44, 100.) See also the references in the Poor Men’s Mirror, which probably refers to none but English books.

The above thirty are the lost works of Pecock to which I have been able to find allusions in his English treatises and in the Abbreviatio above mentioned.

Besides these, however, there are some others, mentioned by Bale, about most of which nothing certain can be said.

(1.) Epistle to W. Godharde the Franciscan, also mentioned by Gascoigne (u. s., p. 528), in which he ridiculed the noisy style in which many of the popular preachers (probably Franciscans) indulged. This existed in Dr. James’ time in MS. in a private library, and may possibly still exist. (See Cave’s Hist. Lit.)

(2.) “Defensor.” (Possibly a defence of his sermon at St. Paul’s, and contained in the Abbreviatio mentioned above. See also p. xx., note, where the Follower to the Donet (fol. 100) is quoted.)

(3.) “Sequax.”

This work may also be alluded to in the Follower to the Donet (u. s.): “No man wijte me, thou speke “ and write so oft for my defensia.” It may even be itself the Follower to the Donet; if so, Bale misplaces it.

(4.) “Symbolum.”

This is most probably the same as the English Book of Faith, or a portion of it, as has been already said; it is also often mentioned by Gascoigne. Bale goes on to say: “Ab aliis hos etiam addidisse “ fertur:”

(1.) De providentia Dei. (2.) De libertate Evangelii. (3.) De saecularium potestate. (4.) Contra dotationem Constantini. (5.) De sequalitate ministrorum. (6.) De legibus et doctrinis hominum. (7.) De communione sub utraque specie. (8.) Contra mendicitatem impiam. (9.) De sua palinodia. Nos. 4, 5, 6 are probably parts of the Repressor; No. 7
may very probably be a portion of his Book of
Eucharist; and No. 9 the letter to the pope men-
tioned above, which he wrote after his abjuration.
About the rest I cannot even hazard a conjecture.¹

The ancient English Chronicler from 1377-1461, to
which allusion has been made before, and Stowe, who
transcribes him, affirm that Pecock "had laboured
"many years to translate the Holy Scripture into
"English;" but there is every reason to suppose this
assertion to be an error;² not only because Pecock
makes no mention of having done so, which a man
of his extraordinary vanity would be nearly certain to
have done; but also because in almost all his larger
citations he uses the later form of the version called
Wiclif's, which contains archaisms foreign to his own
style. It is certain, however, that he was favourable
to the circulation of the Bible among the laity in the
English language.³

Such is the best account that I am able to furnish
of Pecock's life and writings, from which it is vain to
hope that all error has been excluded, and which
might no doubt be improved or enlarged from various
MSS. sources of information. With respect to the
Glossary at the end of the work, while nothing has
been omitted intentionally which the reader might
require for his immediate convenience, yet at the same
time this has not been the only or even the principal

¹ Oudinus (De Scriptt. Ecles.,
tom. iii. pp. 2593, 2594), without
the smallest reason, imagines that
several anonymous treaties, con-
tained in a MS. now preserved in
Corpus Christi College, Cambridge,
are the works of Pecock. They
appear to be the works of a French-
man. One of them is headed:
"Quod Rotomagensis ecclesia eoc-
clesiae Romanae non subjecta sit."
The MS. itself must, in my judg-
ment, have been written before
Pecock was born.
² The mandate of Bouchier to
inquire after Pecock’s books, quoted
in a preceding note, may easily have
given rise to this mistake.
³ See Repressor, pp. 114, 115,
119, &c.
INTRODUCTION.

object in drawing it up. It is hoped that it will be a tolerably complete Index Anglicitatis, for one of the earliest pieces of philosophical prose composition which exist in the language, and thus be available for the use of the philologist and the lexicographer. 1

It only remains that I should tender my best thanks to various friends who have kindly assisted me with their advice on various points connected with this work, viz., to Sir F. Madden, K.H., Keeper of the MSS. in the British Museum; to the Rev. G. E. Corrie, D.D., Master of Jesus College, Cambridge; to E. Guest, Esq., L.L.D., Master of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge; to the Rev. J. H. Todd, D.D., Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin; to Dr. R. Pauli, the learned author of The History of England; to the Rev. T. Chevallier, B.D., Professor of Mathematics in the University of Durham; to the Rev. M. J. Berkeley, M.A., Incumbent of Apethorpe, Northamptonshire; to the Rev. J. Cautley, M.A., Incumbent of Thorney, Cambridgeshire; to the Rev. H. O. Coxe, Sub-librarian of the Bodleian Library, Oxford; to the Rev. J. Stevenson, M.A., Vicar of Leighton Buzzard; to T. Duffus Hardy, Esq., Assistant Keeper of Records; to the Rev. C. A.

1 "The language of Bishop Pecock is more obsolete than that of Lydgate or any other of his contemporaries." Hallam's Lit. of Europe, part i. c. iv. (vol. i. p. 311. Lond. 1847). This being so, I have preferred to err on the side of excess rather than defect in the enumeration both of words and forms of inflection. Peckock in his Book of Faith (p. 13, Wharton's ed.) observes "hou that langagis whose reuils ben not writen, as ben English, Freensch, and manye othere, ben chaungid withynne yeeris and cun-

trees, that oon man of the oon cun
tree and of the oon tymes myghte not
and schulde not kunne undirstonde
a man of the othe kuntry and of
the othe tymes, and al for this, that
the seid langagis ben not stabi and
foundamentli written." Upon the
whole the only satisfactory course
seemed to be this, to set down all or
at least the principal inflections and
variations of all the words included
in the Glossary. This plan is mostly
adopted in the excellent Glossary to
Wyclif's Bible, edited by Mr. For-
shall and Sir F. Madden.
Swainson, M.A., Principal of the Theological College, Chichester; to H. Bradshaw, M.A., Esq., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; and more particularly to the Rev. G. Williams, B.D., Senior Fellow of the same College; and to the Rev. J. E. B. Mayor, M.A., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge, who have kindly looked at a large part of the sheets of this work as they were going through the press. It will, however, of course be distinctly understood that for all matters of opinion expressed in the introduction or elsewhere, I am alone responsible.

St. John's College, Cambridge,
March 30, 1860.
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PROLOG.

Vnulirnyme thou, biseche thou, and blame thou, in al pacience and doctrine. (ij". Thi. iiiij". ť.)

THOU; these wordis weren writen¹ bi Seint Poul to Thimothe being a bishop² and not a lay persoon of the comon peple, þit in tho wordis Seint Poul źeueth not to Thimothe instruccioun of eny hiȝer governoroace than whiche also he myȝte haue źeue to a lay persoon of the comoun peple, bi cause that in tho wordis Poul źeueth instruccioun not of correccioun (or of correcting bi thretenyng and punyschinge), which longith oonli to the ouerer anentis his netherer, and not to the netherer anentis his ouerer; but he źeueth instruccioun of correcpioun and of correpting, which not oonli longith to an ouerer anentis his netherer, but also to a netherer anentis his ouerer, as it is open, ij". ad Thessalonic. iij". ť. and Math. xvij". ť., and as resoun also it weel³ confermmeth; so that it be do with honeste and reverence, and with other thereto bi reson dewe circumstauncis. Of which correcpioun first openyng or doing to wite, thanne next blamyng,

¹ wref writ, MS. ; but the stroke above is in a later hand, and so elsewhere often, but not always.
² abishop, MS. ; and so elsewhere
³ weel it, MS. (first hand).
and afterward biseching ben parties: and therfore these same wordis speking oonli of correpiou, so bi Seint Poul dressid to Thimothe bischop, to whom longith\(^1\) bothe to correpte and correcte, mowe weel ynow\(^2\) be take and dressid ferthir to eech lay persoon, forto ther yn ʒeue to him instruccioun, how he schulde reule him, whanne euere he takith vpon him for to in neizbourli or brotherli maner correpte his Cristen neiz-bour or brother, namelich being in other wise to him his ouerer. In which wordis (as it is open ynow; for to se) eech man, which takith vpon him the deedis of brotherli correpiou, is enformed, that the parties of thilk correpiou (whiche ben vndirnymynge, biseching, and blamyng) he do “in pacience and in doctrine”; that is to seie, ouer this that for the while of his correpting he hath pacience, that he haue also ther with such doctrine, knowing, or kunnyng, wherbi he canne schewe and prowe it to be a defaute for which he vndirnymeth and blameth, and the persoon so vndirnome and blamed to be gilti in the same defaunt and synne.

And for as mieche as after it what is write, Rom. xe. ç., manie han zeel of good wille, but not aſtir kunnyng, and han ther with take upon hem forto vndirnyne and blame openli and scherpli bothe in speche and\(^3\) in writing the clergie of Goddis hool chirche in erthe and forto bere an hond upon the seid clergie that he is gilti in summe gouernauncis as in defauits,\(^4\) whiche gouernauncis tho blamers kunne not schewe, teche, and prowe to be defauits and synnes; and han therbi maad ful mieche indignacioun, distur-

---

\(^1\) it longith, MS.; but it is can-
celled by a later hand.

\(^2\) y now, MS.; but elsewhere con-
junctim; similarly y clepid, &c.

\(^3\) bothe in speche and added in the

\(^4\) indefaultis, MS.
balunce, cisme, and otheres yuelis, forto rise and be
continuned in manie persoones bi long tyme of manye
\[theirs\]: therfore to ech such vngroundid and vnredy
and ouer haasti vndirnymyner and blamer y seie the bi-
fore rehercid w\[ords\] of Seint Poul: Vndirnymye thou,
biseche thou, and blame thou, in al pacience and doc-
trine: as thouȝ y sculde seie thus: If thou cannest
teche, schewe, and proue that the deede of which thou
vndirnymest and blamest the person or persoones is
a defaute and a trespase, and thanne that he is
gilti ther of; vndirnymye thou and blame thou in thilk
kunnyng or doctrine and in pacience: and if thou
canst not so schewe, teche, and proue, thou ouȝtist be
stille, and not so vndirnymye and blame.

For ellis Seint Poul schulde not haue seid thus,
Vndirnymye thou, blame thou, in al pacience and
document: \[the\]e, and ellis thou ouȝtist vndirnymye and
blame first thi sylf of this defaute, that thou vndir-
nymest and blamest not hauynge the doctrine which
thou ouȝtist haue, eer than thou take vpon thee forto
vndirnymye and blame: and so to ech such ouer haasti
and vnwijs blamer myȝte be seid what is writun,
Luk iiiij. c., thys: O leche, heele thi sylf: \[the\]e, pera-
venture to summe suche blamers and for sumwhilis
myȝte be seid what is written, Luk the vj. c., thys:
Ypocrity, take first the beem out of thine owne izc, and
thanne thou schalt se forto take the mote out of thin
negbori izc. And furthermore sithen it is so, that
suche vnwise, vndiscrete, and ouerhaasti vndirnymers
letten the effect of her wijs and discrete and well
avisid vndirnymyngis, whiche thei in othere tymes
maken or mowe make to the clergie; and so \[euen\]
occaisoun that bothe thei hem sylf and her iust vndir-
nymyngis ben despisid and ben not sett bi, and so
maken therbi hem sylf to be letters of miche good
and causers of miche yuel, it is riȝt greet nede, that
alle tho, whiche taken upon hem to be vndirnymers
and blamers of the clergie, kepe weel what is seid to be the menyng of Seint Foul in the biforn rehercید wordis, Vndirnymye thou, biseche thou, blame thou, in al pacience\(^1\) and doctrine.

Now that God for his godenes and charite ceese the sooner in the comoun peple such vnwijs, vntrewe, and ouerhasti vndirnymyng and blamyng maad upon the clergie, and that for the harnes and yuelis therbi comyng now seid, y schal do therto sumwhat of mi part in this, that y schal iustifie xj. gouernauncis of the clergie, whiche summe of the comoun peple vnwijsly and vn treuli iugen and condempnen to be yuele; of whiche xj. gouernauncis oon is the having and vsing of ymagis in chircis; and an othir is piligrimage in going to the membrialis or the mynde placis of Seints, and that pilgrimagis and offringis mowe be doon weel, not oonli priuely, but also openli; and not oonli so of lay men, but rather of prestis and of bispocis. And this y schal\(^8\) do bi writing of this present book in the comoun peplis langage pleinli and openli and schortli, and to be clepid \textit{The repressing of ouer miche wijting the clergie}: and he schal haue v. principal parties. In the firste of whiche parties schal be mad in general maner the seid repressing, and in general maner proof to the xj. seid gouernauncis. And in the i\(^{e}\), ii\(^{e}\), iii\(^{e}\), and vi\(^{e}\) principal parties schal be maad in special maner the seid repressing; and in special maner the proof to the same xj. gouernauncis; thout alle othere gouernauncis of the clergie, for whiche the clergie is worthi to\(^3\) be blamed in brotherly and neiþbourly correpecioun, y schal not be aboute to excuse neither defende; but preie, speke, and write in al pacience and doctrine, that the clergie forsake hem, leue, and amende.

\(^1\) paciencien, MS.\hfill \(^3\) to is inserted by a later hand, 
\(^2\) schal y, MS. (first hand).\hfill \(^5\) perhaps wrongly.
THE FIRST PART.

THE FIRST CHAPITIR.

Thee trowingis or opinionus ben causis and groundis of manie and of weel nyʒ alle the erroris whiche manie of the lay partie holden, and bi which holding thei vniustly and ouermyche wijten and blamen the clergie and alle her othere neizbouris of the lay side, which not holden tho same erroris accordingly with hem, and therefor it is miche nede forto first þeue bisyne to vnroote and ouertorne tho thre trowingis, holdingis, or opinionus, before the improuynge of othere; sithen if tho thre be sufficiently improued, that is to seie, if it be sufficientli prooued that tho thre ben nouȝt and vntrewé and badde, alle the othere vntrewé opinious and holdingis bildid viþon hem or upon eny of hem muste needis therbi take her fal, and lacke it wherbi thei miȝten in eny colour or semyng be mentened, holde, and supportid.

The firste of these thre trowingis, holdingis, or opinious is this: That no gouernance is to be holden of Cristen men the servuice or the lawe of God, saue it which is groundid in Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament, as summe of the bifoire seid men holden; or namelich, saue it which is groundid in the Newe Testament or in the Oold, and is not bi the Newe Testament reuokid, as summe othere of hem holden. In this trowing and holding thei ben so kete and so smert and so wautéoun, that whanne euer eny
clerk affermeth to hem any gouvernance being contrarie to her witt or plesaunce, thouz it ligge ful open and ful sureli in doom of resoun, and therfore sureli in moral lawe of kinde, which is lawe of God, forto be doon; zit thei anoon asken “Where “groundist thou it in the Newe Testament?” or “Where groundist thou it in Holi Scripture in such “place which is not bi the Newe Testament re-“nokid?” And if thei heere not where so in Holi Scripture it is witnessid, thei it dispisen and not receyuen as a gouvernance of Goddis servise and of Goddis moral lawe. This opinion thei weenen to be groundid, Mat. xxijt. c., where Crist seide to the Saduceis thus: 3e erren, not knowing Scripturis, neither the vertu or strengthe of God. In the resurrectioun forsothe thei schulen not vedde neither be weddid, but thei schulen be as augetlis of God in heaven. Han not 3e rad of the resurrectioun of dode men, that it is seid to us of God, I am God of Abraham, God of Ysaac, God of Iacob, et cetera. Also thei weenen this opinion be groundid, Iohun vi. c., where Crist seide to the Iewis thus: Serche 3e Scripturis, for 3e trouwen zou forto haue everlasting lyf in hem, and thei ben whiche beren witnesses of me.

The secunde trowing or opinyoun is this: That what euer Cristen man or womman be meke in spirit and willi forto vndirstonde treuli and dewli Holi Scripture, schal without fail and defaut fynde the trewe vn-dirsoning of Holi Scripture in what euer place he or sche schal rede and studie, thouz it be in the Apocalips or ouz where ellis: and the more meke he or sche be, the sooner he or sche schal come into the verr trewe and dew vndirsoning of it, which in Holi Scripture he or sche redith and studieth. This ij. opinion thei weenen to be groundid in Holi Scripture, Ysaie lxvjt. c. in the bigynnyng, where God seith thus: To whom schal y biholdes but to a little pore man,
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broken in herte, and trembling at mi wordis? And also Iames the iii. c., and ii. Petre iv. c., where it is seid thus: God azenstondith proude men, and he zeueth grace to meke men. Also Ysaie lvij. c. where it is seid, that God dwelning in everlastinge dwellith with a meke and a contrite spirit, that he quyke the spirit of meke men and that he quyke the herte of contrite men. And in other dyuerse placis of Scripture mensioun is mad that God zeueth goode thingis to meke men more thanne if thei were not so meke.

The iij. trowinge or opinioun is this: Whanne euere a persoone hath founde the vndirstonding of Holi Scripture into whiche he schal come by the weye now bi fore seid of the ijer opinioun, he or sche ouste bowe away her heering, her reeding, and her vndirstonding fro al resonying and fro al arguyng or prouyng which eny clerk can or wole or mai make bi any maner eyudence of resoun or of Scripture, and namelich of resoun into the contrarie, thou; the mater be such that it passith not the boondis neither the capacite of resoun forto entermete therwith and forto iuge and zeeue kunnyng ther upon; which trowing and opinioun to holde and fulfille thei wenen hem be bede bi Poul, Colocens. ij. c., where he seith thus: Ye seis to zou these thingis, that no man bigile zou in heizte of spechis. And soone after there, Poul seith thus: Se ze that no man bigile zou bi philosphi and veyn falsenes afther the tradiciouns of men and afther the elementis of the world, and not afther Crist. Also ii. Cor, ii. c., weelnyʒ thoruz al the chapiter, Poul meeneth that Cristen bileueuers ousten not recehe of wisdom such as wise worldli men vsen and settene miche therbi.
FORTO meete ažens the firste bifoire spoken opioun, and forto vnroote and updrawe it, y schal sette forth first xiiiij. principal conclusiouns. But for as Miche as this vnrooting of the firste opioun and the proofs of tho xiiiij. conclusiouns mowen not be done and madewithoute strengthe of argumentis, thersore that y be the better and the cleerer vnairobi of the lay peple in summe wordis to be aifter spoken in this present book, y sette nowe bifoire to hem this doctrine taken shortli out of the faculte of logik. An argument if he be ful and foormal, which is clepid a sillogisme, is mad of twey proposiciouns dryuyng out of hem and bi strengthe of hem the thridde proposicioun. Of the whiche thre proposiciouns the iij. firste ben clepid premissis, and the iiij. folowing out of hem is clepid the conclusioun of hem. And the firste of tho iij. premissis is clepid the firste premisse, and the iiij. of hem is clepid the iiij. premisse. And ech such argument is of this kinde, that if the bothe premissis ben trewe, the conclusioun concludid out and bi hem is also trewe; and but if euereither of tho premissis be trewe, the conclusioun is not trewe. Ensaemple her of is this. "Ech man is at Rome, the Pope is a man, "eke the Pope is at Rome." Lo here ben sett forth iij. proposiciouns, which ben these, "Ech man is at Rome;" and "The Pope is a man;" and these ben the iij. premyssis in this argument, and thei dryuen out the iiij. proposicioun, which is this, "The Pope is at Rome," and it is the conclusioun of the iij. premissis. Wherfore certis if eny man can be sikir for eny tymte that these iij. premyssis be trewe, he mai be sikir that the conclusioun is trewe; thouz alle the angeliis in heuen wolden seie and holde that thilk conclusioun were not trewe. And this is a general reule, in euery good and formal and ful argument, that if his premissis be knowe for trewe, the conclusioun ouȝte be avowid for trewe, what euer creature wolte seie the contrarie.
What propirtees and condiciouns ben requireid to an argument, that he be ful and formal and good, is tauzè in logik bi ful faire and sure realis, and may not be tauzè of me here in this present book. But wolde God it were leerned of al the comon peple in her modiris langage, for thanne thei schulden therbi be putt fro myche ruydnes and boistosenes which thei han now in resonyng; and thanne thei schulden soone knowe and perceue whanne a skile\(^1\) and an argument bindith and whanne he not byndith, that is to seie, whanne he conclusidh and proueth his conclusioun and whanne he not so dooth; and thanne thei schulden kepe hem sylf the better fro falling into erroris, and thei myzten the sooner come out of erroris bi heering of argumentis maad to hem, if thei into eny erroris weren falle; and thanne thei schulden not be so blunct and so ruyde and vnformal and boistose in resonyng, and that bothe in her arguyng and in her answering, as thei now ben; and thanne schulden thei not be so obstinat azens clerkis and azens her prelatis, as summe of hem now ben, for defaut of perceuyng whanne an argument procedith into his conclusioun needis and whanne he not so dooth but semeth ooni so do. And miche good wolde come forth if a schort compendiose logik were deuyisd for al the comoun peple in her modiris langage; and certis to men of court, leernyng the Kingis lawe of Ynglond in these daies, thilk now seid schort compendiose logik were ful precioso. Into whos making, if God wolde graunte leue and leyser, y purpose sumtyme after myn othere bisynessis forto assaie.

But as for now thus miche in this wise ther of here talkid, that y be the better vndirstonde in al what y schal argue thoruz this present book, y wole come down into the xiiij. conclusiouns, of whiche the

---

\(^1\) *askile, MS.*; but the words are divided by a later hand. See p. 1, note.
firste is this: It longith not to Holi Scripture, neither it is his office into which God hath him ordeyned, neither it is his part forto grounde eny gouernaunce or deede or service of God, or eny lawe of God, or eny trouthe which mannis resoun bi nature may fynde, leerne, and knowe.

That this conclusion is trewe, y proue thus: Whateuer thing is ordeyned (and namelich bi God) for to be ground and fundament of eny vertu or of eny gouernaunce or deede or trouthe, thilk same thing muste so teche and declare and seie out and 3eue forth al the kunnyng vpon the same vertu or gouernaunce or trouthe, wher with and wherbi thilk same vertu, gouernaunce, or trouthe is sufficientli knownen, that without thilk same thing the same kunnyng of thilk same vertu, gouernaunce, or trouthe may not be sufficientli knownen, so that thilk same vertu, gouernaunce, or trouthe, in al the kunnyng withoute which he may not at fulle be learned and knownen, muste nedis growe forth and come forth out and fro onli thilk thing which is seid and holden to be ther of the ground and the fundament, as anoon aftir schal be proued: but so it is, that of no vertu, gouernaunce, or trouthe of Goddis moral lawe and service, into whos fynding, learning, and knowing mannis witte may by his natural strength and natural helpis come, Holi Scripture al oon 3eue the sufficient kunnyng; neither fro and out of Holi Scripture al oon, whether he be take for the Newe Testament al oon, or for the Newe Testament and the Oold to gider, as anoon after schal be proued, growth forth and cometh forth al the knowing which is nedeful to be had upon it: wherfore nedis folewith, that of no vertu or gouernaunce or trouthe into which the doom of mannis resoun may sufficientli ascende and come to, for to it fynde, leerne, and knowe withoute reuelacioun fro God mad ther vpon, is groundid in Holi Scripture.

The firste premisse of this argument muste needis be grauntid. Forwhi, if the sufficient leernyng and
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kunnyng of any gouernaunce or eny trouthe schulde as miche or more come fro an other thing, as or than fro this thing which is seid to be his ground, thanne thilk other thing schulde be lijk miche or more and rather the ground of thilk gouernaunce than this thing schulde so be; and also thilk gouernaunce or trouthe schulde haue iij. diuere groundia and schulde be bildid vpon iij. fundamentis, of which the oon is dyuers awyn fro the other, which forto seie and holde is not takeable of mannis witt. Wherefore the first premisse of the argument is trewe. Ensaumple her of is this: But if myn hous stode so in this place of erthe that he not stode so in an othir place of erthe ellis, this place of the erthe were not the ground of myn hous; and if eny other place of the erthe bare myn hous, certis myn hous were not groundid in this place of the erthe: and in lijk maner, if this trouthe or gouernaunce, that ech man schulde kepe mekene, were knowe bi sum other thing than bi Holi Scripture, and as weel and as sufficiently as bi Holi Scripture, thilk gouernaunce or trouthe were not groundid in Holi Scripture. Forwhi he stood not oconi ther on; and thersfore the first premisse is trewe. Also thus: Ther mai no thing be fundament and ground of a wal, or of a tree, or of an hous, saue it upon which the al hool substance of the wal, or of the tree, or of the hous stondith, and out of which oonly the wal, tree, or hous cometh. Wherefore bi lijk skile, no thing is ground and fundament of eny trouthe or conclusioun, gouernaunce or deede, saue it upon which aloon al the gouernaunce, trouthe, or vertu stondith, and out of which aloon al the same trouthe or gouernaunce cometh.

That also the ije. premisse is trewe, y proue thus: What euere deede or thing doom of resoun dooth as fulli and as perfittli as Holi Scripture it dooth, Holi Scripture it not dooth oonly or al oon; but so it is, that what euere leeryng and kunnyng Holi Scripture zeueth upon eny of the now seid gouernauncis, trouthes, and vertues, (that is to seeie, upon eny gouernaunce, trouthe,
and vertue of Goddis lawe to man, in to whos fynding, leernynge, and knowing mannis resoun may bi him sylf aloon, or with natural helpis, rise and come,) mannis resoun may and can zeue the same learning and knowing, as experience ther upon to be take anoon wole schewe; for thou canst not fynde oon such gouernaunce tauzt in Holi Scripture to be doon, but that resoun techith it lijk weel and lijk fulli to be doon; and if thou wolt not trewe this, assigne thou summe suche and assae. Wherfore folewith that of noon suche now seid gouernauncis the leernynge and knowing is had and tauzt bi Holi Scripture oonli or aloone; and therfore the ijer premisse of the firste principal argument muste needis be trewe.

And thanne further, thus: Sithen the bothe premissis of the firste principal argument ben trewe, and the argument is formal, nedis muste the conclusioun concludid bi hem in the same arguyng be trewe, which is the bifoire set firste principal conclusioun.

111. Chapter.

The ijer principal argument into the firste bifoire sett and spoken conclusioun or trouth is this: Thilik thing is the ground of a gouernaunce, or vertu, or trouth, out of which al the sufficient leernynge and knowing of the same gouernaunce, trouthe, and vertu cometh, procedith, and growth, and may be had, thouz al other thing pretendid to be ground ther of be aweyr or were not in being; but so it is, that al the leernynge and knowing, which Holi Scripture zeueth vpon any bifoire seid gouernaunce, deede, or trouthe of Goddis moral lawe, mai be had bi doom of natural resoun; zhe, thouz Holi Writt had not spoke ther of, or thouz he schulde neuere fro mens forthward speke ther of, as anoon aftir schal be proued; and ouer it al the forther kunnyng which Holi Writt zeueth not vpon any seid gouernaunce or deede or trouthe of Goddis lawe and
service, and is necessarie to be had vpon the same
gouernaunce, trouthe, or vertu, mai be had bi labour
in doom of natural resoun, as anoon aftir schal be
proued. Wherfore doom of natural resoun, (which is
clepid “moral lawe of kinde” in the book Of iust
apprising Holi Scripture,) and not Holi Scripture,
is the ground of alle the seid gouernauncis, deedis,
vertues, and trouthis.

The firste premisse of this ijte. principal argument is
proued before bi proof of the firste premisse in the firste
principal argument; and the secunde premisse in this
principal argument mai be proued thus: Ech of these
gouernauncis, trouthis, and vertues, now to be rehercied,
mowe be knowen bi doom of resoun as sufficienti
as Holi Scripture techith hem to be don, thou; Holi
Scripture had left al his teching which he makith
vpon eny of hem; that is to seie, that God is moost
to be loued of man; and that a man schulde loue
him siff and his neibore as him siff, thou; not so
miche as him siff; that a man schulde be trewe to
God in paiyng hise iust promissis, if he hath eny suche
maad to God; that he be meke to God in not amys
tempting God a’zens reson; that he reuerence God,
and that he take bisynes for to leerne what plesith
God, that he it do to God or for God; that a man
ouzte be temperat in eting and drinking, and not be
glotenose; and that he ouzte be contynent or holding
mesure in deedis of gendring; and that he ouzte be
meke to othere men and not proud; and that he ouzte
be trewes and iust to othere men; and that he ouzte be
mylde in speche and answere; and that he ouzte be
pacient and sobre in tribulaciouns; and that he ouzte
be douzty and strong into gode werkis; and so of ful
manye mo gouernauncis and vertues of Goddis lawe,
in to which mannis witt mai suffice to come forto
hem fynde, leerne, and kunne. Certis of alle these and
of alle to hem lyk mannis witt can teche and schewe
that ech of hem ouzte be doom of man, as ferforth
as Holi Scripture techith of any of hem that he ouȝte be don of man, as experience soone can ther of make proof. And also hetthen philosophiris bi her studie in natural witt founden and grauntiden alle hem to be doon; and that these philosophiris so founden and grauntiden bi her natural witt, it is to be holde. Forwhi thei hem sylf knewe of noon reuelacioun mad to hem bi God ther upon; and if eny such reuelacioun hadde be maad to hem, thei schulden bifoer othere men haue knowe it so to be maad to hem. Neither othere men euere knewen that to tho philosophiris was maad such reuelacioun. Forwhi, if eny men wolen so holde, thei kunnen not schewe therto eny proof forte saue her seiyng and holding fro feynyng; no more than if it had likid to hem forte hauo holde that an aungel speke to tho philosophiris fro heuene, as an aungel speke to Abraham and to Moises; and sithen to neuernether thei han sufficient euidence, it foloth with that forte eny of hem bothe holde is not but feyned waer; forwhi it is waer which lackith his ground, proof, and fundament. Furthermore, with this now seid and ouer this now seid of the bifoer spoken gouernauncis, trouthis, and vertues knowable and fyndeable sufficientli bi doom of reson, this is trewe, that of ech and vpon ech of hem, and of ech othir, and upon ech othir lijk to hem, mannis resoun can þeue miche more leernynge and kunnyng than is therof þouen in Holi Scripture, as experience ther upon openli schewith; þe, ther is noon such now seid gouernaunce or vertu or trouthe of Goddis moral lawe taȝt bi Scripture to be had and vsid: but that six sithis¹ more leernynge and knowing muste be had upon him, eer he schal be sufficientli learned and knownw, than is al the leernynge and knowing which is writun upon him in Holi Scripture, as it mai wel be seen to ech reeder in the book.

¹ sixeith, MS.; but the words are divided by a later hand.
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quire Cristen religioun and in the bookis pertynyng therto. Wherfore the iij. premisse of the iij. principal argument is trewe thorugh his bothe parties; the, upon sum trouthe or gouernaunce of Goddis lawe longer writing muste be had, eer it be sufficientli knowe, than is al the writing of Mathewis Gospel; and hit of thilk vertu or gouernaunce scantli is written in al Holi Writt ten lynes, as it is open to ech reeder and vnderstonder in the seid bokis. Wherfore folowith that the iij. premisse of the iij. principal argument for his iij. partie is trewe.

I preie thee, Sir, seie to me where in Holi Scrip-
ture is ȝouen the hundrid parti of the teching upon matrimonie which y teche in a book mad upon Matrimonie, and in the firste partie of Cristen religioun: and hit rede who so wolde thilk book Of matrimonie, and he schal fynde al the hool teching of thilk book litle ynoȝt or ouer litte forto teche al what is necessarie to be leerned and konnen vpon matrimonie. Hast thou eny more teching in Holi Scripture upon matrimonie than a fewe lynes writen, Mat. viii. c. and Mat. xix. c., Mark x. c., and Luk xvij. c. and Genesis i. and iij. c.? And hit alle thilk vj. places spoken not saue tweyne pointis of matrimonie, which ben vndepartabilnes and fleischli vse of bodies into childe bigeting. What therfore a grounde ouȝte eny man seie that Holi Scripture is to matrimonie, sitthen al Holi Scripture techith not but these iij. pointis of matrimonie? For thouȝt Poul bidde ofte that a man schulde loue his wijf, and that the wijf schulde obieie to hir husbonde, hit what is this to knunnyng of matrimonye in it silf, and into the propirtees of it, and into the circumstauceis of it, withoute which matrimonie is not vertuouse? And so forth of manie purtenaucins and longinges to matrimonye.

CHAP. III.

Teaching of Scripture concerning matrimony exactly.

Seie to me also where in Holie Scripture is ʒoounen the hundrid part of the teching which is ʒoounen upon vsure in the thridde part of the book yclepid The filling of the iiiij. tablis: and ʒit al thilk hool teching ʒoounen upon vsure in the now named book is litil ynoȝ; or ouer litle fort to leerne, knowe, and haue sufficientlī into mannis bihoue and into Goddis trewe seruice and lawe keping what is to be learned and kunne aboute vsure, as to readers and studiers ther yn it muste needes be open.

Is ther any more writen of vsure in al the Newe Testament saue this, Luk vj. ʒ., ʒeue ʒe loone, hoping no thing ther of? and al that is of vsure writen in the Oold Testament fautorith rather vsure than it reproueth. How euere, therafore, schulde any man seie that the sufficient leernynge and kunnyng of vsure or of the vertu contrarie to vsure is groundid in Holie Scripture? How euere schal thilk litil now heredich clausul, Luk vj. ʒ., be sufficient forto answere and esseidle alle the harde scrupulose douts and questionis which al dai han neede to be esseild in mennis beryngnis and cheffaringis to gidere? Ech man having to do with suche questionis mai soone se that Holie Writt ʒeueth litil or noon liȝt therto at al. For-whei al that Holie Writt seith ther to is that he forbedith vsure, and therfore al that mai be take therbi is this, that vsure is vnleeful; but thouȝ y bileene herbi that vsure is vnleeful, how schal y wite herbi what vsure is, that y be waer forto not do it, and whanne in a bargeyn is vsure thouȝ to summen seemeth noon, and how in a bargeyn is noon vsure thouȝ to summen ther semeth to be? And also thouȝ Holie Scripture bidde that we tempte not God amys and aȝens resoun, certis resoun techith the same. But ʒit where ells thian in doom of resoun schule1 we fynde what tempting is, and which tempting of God

1 schulde, MS. (first hand).
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is loeful and which is not? Certis not in al Holi Scripture. Also, thouz Holi Scripture bidde that a man be iust to his neizbour, and resoun techith as fulli the same, zit what riñtwisnes is and whiche ben hise spics, muste be founden in doom of resoun and not in Holi Scripture; and whanne eny plese is bi-twix man and man, and eueriehether party trowith to hane riñt, the ingement muste be had in the doom of resoun in the court bi the iuge, and not bi Holi Scripture. And so forth y myȝte make inducioun of ech gouernaunce longing to Goddes lawe weelnyȝ. Wherfore the secunde premisse of the ij" principal argument for his ij" party is trewe.

Confirmation to this ij" principal argument is this: Euerly thing groundid hangeth and is dependent of his ground, so that he mai not be withoute his ground; but so it is, that al the leernyng and kunnyng which Holi Scripture ȝeueth upon eny of the seid gouernauncis, vertues, deedis, or treuthis, and al the other deel of kunnyng upon hem which Scripture ȝeueth not, hangeth not of Holi Scripture, neither requirith and askith Holi Scripture forto so ȝeu. Forwhi al this kunnyng myȝte be had bi labour in doom of resoun, thouz no biholding thereto were maad into Holi Scripture, or thouz Scripture were distrioed and brent, as summen¹ trowen that it so was, with al the writing of the Oold Testament in the tym of transmigracioun into Babilony, as it is now before schewid;

¹"If this be trewe . . . . . . it
" folowith that forto seie this
" whiche summe doctouris com-
" oulli holden with the Maiistir of
" Stories (i.e. Petrus Comestor),
" that Edras by inspiracioun
" wrote without eny copil alle the
" fine bokis of Myyses and alle
" the other bokis of stories and of
" prophecies in to hise dailes, is not
" but a feynyng thing." Pecock's

Book of Faith, p. xxiii. (Wharton);
but the notion is as old as Tertul-
lian (de Cult. Færm., lib. I. c. 3):
" Perinde potuit abolefactam eam
" violencia cataclysmi in spiritu
" rurum reformare; quemadmodum
" et Hierosolymis Babylonia ex-
" pagnatione deletis, omne instru-
" mentum Judaicæ litterature per
" Edram constat restauratum."
wherfore needis foloweith that Scripture is not ground to eny oon such seid vertu, gouernaunce, deede, or trouthe, of which the firste conclusion spekith, but oonli doom of natural resoun, which is moral lawe of kinde and moral lawe of God, writun in the book of lawe of kinde in mennis soulis, prentid into the ymage of God, is ground to ech such vertu, gouernaunce, deede, and trouthe.

iiiij. CHAPITRE.

The iiij. principal argument into the same firste and principal conclusion is this: Bfore that eny positijf lawe of God, that is to seie, eny voluntarie or wilful assignement of God, was ʒouen to the Iewis fro the long tyme of Adamys comyng out of Paradijs into the tyme of circumsicioun in the daies of Abraham, and into the positijf lawe ʒouen bi Moyses, the peple lyueden and seruiden God and weren bounde weelnit bi alle tho moral vertues and moral gouernaunciis and treuthis whiche bi doom of her natural resoun thei founden and learneden and camen to, and so thei weren bounde1 weelnyʒ to alle moral gouernaunciis and moral trouthis into whiche Cristen men ben bounden now in tyme of the Newe Testament. Afterward, whanne tyme of Iewis came and the positijf lawe of the cerymonyasy, iudicialisy, and sacramentalsi weren ʒouen to the Iewis, the othere now bfore seid lawis of resoun weren not reukid, but thei contynuened into charge of the Iewis with the lawis of cerymonyas,

1 bōüðe, MS.; but the stroke over the s has been erased. Just above, the strokes over came and werē seem to be a later hand. Just below, bōudes is written by the first hand, and has not been altered. In many other places of the MS. it is difficult to be sure whether the stroke above is by the first hand or not; sometimes the original stroke has only been made darker by a later hand, and both inks are clearly traceable. See fol. 9 b, col.1, l. 2, werē (p. 21, l. 30 of this edition).
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Chap. IV.

Judicialis and sacramentis, so that the Iewis weren charged with alle the lawis of resoun with whiche the peple fro Adam thidir to weren charged and also ouer that with the positijf lawis of God thanne zowen. Forwhi it is not rad that the lawis of resoun weren thanne reuokid, and also needis alle men musten graunte that summe of hem abode charging the Iewis, and skile is ther noon whi summe of hem so abode and not alle; wherfore it is to be holde that alle tho lawis of resoun with whiche the peple were charged biforn the tyme of Iewis aboden, stille charging also the Iewis into the tyme of Cristis passioun.

And thanne ferverther, thus: Whanne Crist prechid and suffrid, alle the peple of Iewis were charged with the hool lawe of kinde and of resoun and with al the positijf lawe of cerimonies judicialis and oold sacramentis, but so it is that to Cristen men succeeeding next after the Iewis weren not reuokid eny lawe bi Crist and his newe lawe saue the positijf lawis of cerimonies judicialis and oold sacramentis: wherfore in to the charge of Cristen men abidith zit the hool birthen which was to the Iewis, excepte the birthen of cerimonies judicialis and oold sacramentis, so that in to the charge of Cristen men abidith the al hool birthen of lawe of kinde which is not ellis than moral philosopie, which was birthen and charge bothe to the Iewis and to alle peplis biforn the Iewis fro Adamys comyng out of Paradis. And sithen it is not founde in the Newe Testament that Crist made eny positijf lawe bi sidis the oold lawe of kinde and of resoun which enere was biforn, except oonli his positijf lawe of hise newe sacramentis with whiche he chargid the peple of Cristen, instide of 1 cerimonies judicialis and oold sacramentis with whiche the Iewis weren charged,

1 of the, MS.; but the is cancelled by a later (?) hand.
it folowith that Cristen peple abiden ȝit hidir to chargid with the seid ful al hool moral lawe of kinde, and with the positiȝ lawis of Cristis newe sacramentis, so that whelnyȝ or weel toward the al hool lawe with which Cristen men ben chargid is mad of lawe of kinde, which is doom of resoun and moral philosophe as of the oon partie, and of lawe of the newe sacramentis, which is lawe of newe feith, as of the other partie. And if this be trewe, as it is openli and cleerli ynoȝ; lad forth to be trewe, it muste nedis folowe that whelnyȝ or weel toward al the hool lawe of God in tyme of the Newe Testament, except a fewe positiȝ lawis of Cristis fewe newe sacramentis, is not ellis than the same lawe of kinde which was long bfore the tyme of Abraham and of Iewis.

And thanne fother ther of y argue thus: But so it is that al thilk now seid lawe of kinde which was bfore the tyme of Iewis, not withstandong it is the more partie of Cristen lawe now bi ful greet quantite, is not foundid in Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament, neither in Holi Scripture of the Oold Testament, neither in hem bothe to gidere. Forwhi this lawe was whanne neither of the Newe neither of the Oold Testament writing was, and that fro the tyme of Adam into Abraham, wherfore folowith that thilk lawe ȝit abiding to Cristen men is not groundid in Holi Scripture, but in the book of lawe of kinde writen in mennis soulis with the finger of God as it was so groundid and writen bfore the daies of Abraham and of Iewis. Whi in this iiȝ. principal argument y haue seid these wordis whelnyȝ or weel toward schal appere and be seen bi what schal be seid aftir in proosis of the viȝ. and xiȝ. conclusiouns, and more openli by the place there allegid in the book clepid The iust apprising of Holi Scripture.

The iiiȝ. principal argument is this, What euer
thing oonli remembrith, stirith, and exortith, or bid-
dith or counsellith men forto kepe certein gouer-
auncis, vertues, and trouthes groundith not as in
that the gouernauncis, vertues, and trouthis. Forwhi
as in that he presupposith tho gouernauncis, vertues,
and trouthis to be before knowne of tho same men;
and ellis in waast he schulde so speke to tho men of
hem not before knowen; and ther fore as in that he
not hem groundith. But so it is that Holie Scripture
doeth not ellis aboute the moral vertues and gouer-
auncis and trouthis of Goddis moral lawe and servise
before seid in the firste conclusioun, saue oonli this, that
he remembrith, or exortith, or biddith, or counsellith
men upon tho vertues and gouernauncis and forto use
hem, and forto fley the contrarie vicis of hem, as ech
man mai se bi reding where euere he wole where men-
sioun is mad of any moral vertu in the Oold Testa-
ment or of the Newe. For he biddith a man to be
meke, and he techith not before what mekenes is. He
biddith a man to be pacient, and zit he not before
techith what pacience is. And so forth of ech vertu
of Goddis lawe. Wherfore no such seid gouernaunce or
vertu or trouthe is to be seid groundid in Holie Scrip-
ture, no more than it ouȝte be seid if a bischop wolde
sende a pistle or a lettre to peple of his diocese, and
ther yn wolde remembre hem, exorte hem, and stire
hem, and bidde hem or counseile hem forto kepe cer-
teyn moral vertues of lawe of kinde, that theroe tho
moral vertues and pointis of lawe of kinde writen in
thilk epistle weren groundid in thilk epistle of the
bischope; for noon other wise upon such seid vertues
Poul wrote in hise epistlis, neither Petir, neither Iame,
nor Iohun, nor Iudas wrote in her epistlis and
writingis.

Confirmation to this argument mai be this: If
the King of Ynglond dwelleth in Gascony, and wolde
sende a noble longe letter or epistle into Englonde,
bothe to ingis and to othere men, that ech of hem schulde kepe the pointis of the lawe of Englund, and thowz he wolde reherce the pointis and gouernauncis, vertue, and trouthis of the lawe forte remembre the ingis and the peple ther upon, and thowz he schulde stire and prouoke, and exorte, bidde, or counseile hem therto, zit it ouzte not be seid that thilk epistle groundid eny of the lawis or gouernauncis of Englund, for her ground is had to hem biforn thilk epistle of the King, and that bi acte and decre of the hool Parliament of Englund which is verry ground to alle the lawis of Englund, thowz thilk epistle of the King or of the Duke had not be writun; and at the leest he in thilk bidding presupposith tho deedis to be knownen biforn of hem to whom he biddith tho deedis to be kept as lawis. Wherfore bi lijk skile, thowz Crist and thowz Poul and othere Apostlis wroten to peple epistlis or lettris or othere writingis, zit sithen tho truthor which thei so wroten weren groundid biforn tho writingis and hengen upon the doom of resoun which is lawe of kinde and moral philosophie and schulden bi dewte have be kept of men thowz tho writingis hadden not be maad, it fol etheth that tho spoken gouernauncis ouzten not be trowid groundid in the now seid writingis of Crist or of the Apostlis. Who euer mai seie that eny thing was biforn his ground, and ouzte be thowz his ground were not, and thowz his ground had not be? Wherfore needis fol etheth that the firste biforn sett and principal conclusioni is trewe.

1 and vertue, MS.; but and is cancelled.  
2 epistle, MS.; e added above in a different hand.
v. Chapter.

The v. principal argument into the same firste and principal conclusion is this: Who euer in his speche, bi which he spekith of a gouernaunce or truethe presupposith the same gouernaunce to be knowne bfore his same speche and to be knowne eer he so thether of spekith or spak, he as in thilk speche groundith not thilk gouernaunce or trouthe; for thanne the thing groundid schulde be bfore his ground. But so it is, that whanne euere Holie Scripture or Crist or Apostле spekith or spak of eny of the seid gouernaunccis or moral trouthis thei in the same speche presupposen the same gouernaunce to be bfore her speking therof. Forwhi in thilke spechis thei bidden or counsellen or exorten or remembren to men tho deedis to be doon of hem; and who euer so dooth presupposith the same deedis to be bfore knowen of hem to whom tho deedis ben so beden, councellid, exorted, or remembrid to be doon, as it is bfore seid in the iiiij. argument. And also in thilk speche thei speken of the gouernaunce not as of a thing which thei thanne first maken, but as of thinge bfore being eer eny lawe was zounen to the Iewes, as it is riȝt euydent that Crist and hise Apostlis it weel knownen and in to whos performynge thei remembren men and stiren and prouoken. Wherfore needis folewith that noon such seid gouernaunce is groundid in eny speche or Holie Scripture or of Crist or of Apostłe.

1 Acer, MS.; but the first letter is in paler ink, and euer is no doubt the reading intended by the corrector.

2 The indefinite article should probably be inserted.
The vj. principal argument into the same first and principal conclusion is this: No sufficient cause hast thou forto seie and holde that Holi Scripture groundith eny of the gouernauncis, trouthis, and vertues bifoire seid in the firste conclusion saue this, that in Holi Scripture menaion is maad that thei ben treuthis; but this is not sufficient cause forto ther bi thus seie and holde. Wherfore noon sufficient cause hast thou forto seie and holde that Holi Scripture groundith eny of the gouernauncis, trouthis, and vertues spoken of in the firste principal conclusion.

The ij. premisse of this vj. argument may be proved thus: If thilk now seid cause were sufficient forto so holde, thanne, sithen Holi Scripture makith menioion M. xvi. c. of treuthis longing to natural philosophi and approueth hem there weel to be treuthis, it wolde folewe that Holi Scripture groundith treuthis of natural philosophie; which no wijs man wolde graunte: wherfore the ij. premysse of this vj. argument is trewe. Schal y seie for this that Crist rehercith Math. xvii. c., how that whanne heuyn is rody in the eventid a cleer dai schal be the morewe, and whanne in the morntide heuene schineth heuyli in thilk dai schal be tempest, that in Holi Scripture this treuth of natural philosophie now rehercith bi Crist or the leernyng and kunnyng ther of is groundid in tho wordis of Crist and is groundid in the Gospel? Alle men witen nay. Forethi the kunnyng ther of was had eer Crist there and thanne tho wordis spake, and no thing is bifoire his owne ground, and the kunnyng of thilk mater is largir in his ground which is natural philosophi than is many hool chapitris to gidere ligging in Matheu. And hit bi blyk skile it schulde be holde and seid that the now rehercited pointis of natural philosophie were groundid there, if eny oon point of the seid moral philosophie were groundid in Holi Scripture; wherfore sithen thilk
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kunynge of cleernes and of derknes in the dai is not
groundid in the Gospel thouz the Gospel make a
schort reheceel ther of, it foleweth bi lijk skile that of
no moral vertuose gouernauncis the sufficient kunynge
is groundid in Holi Writt, sithen al Holi Writt techith
not forth the ful and sufficient and necessarie kun-
yng of ony oon moral vertu in Goddis lawe or
Goddis seruice, thouz of many of hem Holi Scrip-
ture makith schort remembrauncis to us that we
schulde hem kepe and not azenz hem do. And it is
welnyz al that Holi Writt dooth or namelich en-
tendith forto teche aboute ony moral vertu or point of
Goddis moral lawe: and Goddis forbode that this little
were sufficient ground of the ful hool leernynge neces-
sarie to be had upon ony oon such seid point of
Goddis lawe and seruice, for thanne not oon such seid
point of Goddis lawe and seruice schulde or myȝte
be sufficientli leerned and kunne. Schal y seie that an
hous hauynge an hundrid feet in brede is groundid upon
lond in which he takith not but oon foot? Goddis
forbode y schulde be so lowde forto so seie. Forwhi
miche rather y ouȝte seie that this hous takith his
grounding upon thil that land in which ben alle the feetis
mesuris of the same hous, and therfore nedis ech
witti man muste graunte that the first principal con-
clusiouin bifo re sett is trewe.

Of whiche first principal conclusiouin thus proued
foleweth ferther this corolarie, that whanne euere and
where euere in Holi Scripture or out of Holi Scrip-
ture be writen ony point or ony gouernaunc of
the seide lawe of kinde it is more verdilli writen in
the book of mannis soule than in the outward book
of parchemyn or of velym; and if ony semyng dis-
corde be bitwixe the wordis writen in the outward
book of Holi Scripture and the doom of resoun,
write in mannis soule and berte, the wordis so writen
withoutforth ouȝten be expowned and be interpretid

COROLLARY TO
THE FIRST CON-
CLUSIOIN: Whene-
ever any moral
truth as delivered
in Scripture
appears to con-
tradict the moral
law written in
man's soul, the
sense of Scrip-
ture must be ac-
commodated to
the judgment of
the reason; not
once erras.
and brouȝt forto accorde with the doom of resoun in thilk mater; and the doom of resoun ouȝte not forto be expowned, glosid, interpretid, and brouȝte for to accorde with the seid outward writing in Holi Scripture of the Bible or ouȝwhere ellis out of the Bible. Forwhi whanne euery eny mater is tretid bi it which is his ground and bi it which is not his ground, it is more to truste to the treting which is maad ther of bi the ground than bi the treting ther of bi it which is not ther of the ground; and if thilke ij. tretingis ouȝten not discorde, it foloweith that the treting doom bi it which is not the ground ouȝte be 1 mad for to accord with the treting which is maad bi the ground. And thersore this corelariie conclusioun muste nedis be trewe.

More, for proof of the firste principal conclusioun and of al what is seid fro the bigynnyng of the same firste principal conclusion hidir to, is sette and writen in the book clegid The just apprissing of Holi Scripture, which book if he be rad and be weel vnderstonde thorouȝout, his e ij. parties schal conferme vndoutablly al what is seid here fro the bigynnyng of the firste principal conclusioun hidir to.

Weel y woot that not withstanding no verri and trewe grounding (propirli forto speke of grounding) is saue such as is now spoken of in the firste and ij. argumentis to the firste conclusioun, hit whanne a mater or a trouthe is witnesseid or afferned or denouned or mad be remembried to persoones, and that bi a reuerend and worthi witnesse or denouner or remembar (as is God, an Apostil, or a Doctour), thanne thilk witnesse or denouncing or remembarance making is woned be clegid a grounding of the same mater or trouthe so witnesseid,

---

1 to be, MS.; to is cancelled by a later hand.
rehercid, or into remembrance callid, not withstandong thilk rehercer and witnesser dooth not ellis in that than takith it what is groundid ellis where, and spekith it or publischith it to othere men. But certis this rehercing and publisching is not a grounding saue bi vnpropre maner of speche and bi figure and like-nes; and to this maner of vnpropre speche y con-forme me in othere wheris of my wrintings, bi cause that (as the philosophir seith) it is profitable and speedful ofte tymes a man forto speke as many vsen forto speke, thouȝ he not feele as the manie but as the fewe feele; and ther fore where ever in mi wrintings y speke of grounding and calle grounding which is not verri grounding y wolde that y be vnderstande there forto speke of grounding in figuratijf maner, bi likenes as othere men ben woned so forto speke and forto kepe ther with in the same mater my trewe feeling. For thouȝ y wolde write thus, "Mi fadir lithe in this " chirche and my fadris fadir lithe in thilk chirche," bi figuratijf speche, for that her bodies or bones liggen in thilke chirchis, and that bicausë such speche is famose in vce, sit y wolde be vndestonde that my feeling in thilk mater is other wise than the speche wowneth, and is hool and propre and trewe. And in lijk maner y speke and feele in this present purpos of grounding and of the vnpropir speking vsid ther upon.

vj. CHAPITIR.

AFTER that y haue thus argued now bifoře bi resoun into proof of the firste principal conclusion y schal argue now in to the same by ensaumplis thus:

---

1 It is not clear whether bicausë is meant to be written conjunctim or disjunctim in the MS. It is written both ways elsewhere.
Seie to me, good Sire, and answere herto, whanne men of the cuntre vplond bringen into Londoun in Myd-somer eue braunchis of trees fro Bischopis wode and flouris fro the feeld, and bitaken tho to citeseins of Londoun forto therwith ariae her housis, schulen men of Londoun receuyung and taking tho braunchis, and flouris, seie and holde that tho braunchis grewen out of the cartis whiche brouȝten hem to Londoun, and that tho cartis or the hondis of the bringers weren groundis and fundamentis of tho braunchis and flouris? Goddis forbode so litil witt be in her hedis. Certis, thouȝ Crist and his Apostlis weren now lyuyng at Londoun, and wolden bringe so as is now seid braunchis fro Bischopis wode and flouris fro the feeld into Londoun, and wolden deluyeere to men that thei make there with her housis gay, into remembrance of Seint Iohun Baptist, and of this that it was prophecied of him that manye schulden ioie in his birthe, ȝit tho men of Londoun receuyng so tho braunchis and flouris ouȝten not seie and feele that tho braunchis and flouris grewen out of Cristis hondis, and out of the Apostlis hondis. Forwhi in this dede Crist and the Apostlis diden noon other wise than as othere men miȝten and couthen do. But the seid receuyers ouȝten seie and holde that tho braunchis grewen out of the bowis vpon whiche thei in Bischopis wode stoden, and tho bowis grewen out of stockis or tronchons, and the tronchons or schaftis grewen out of the roote, and the roote out of the neste erthe therto upon which and in which the roote is buried, so that neither the cart, neither the hondis of the bringers, neithor tho bringers ben the groundis or fundamentis of the braunchis; and in lĳk maner the feld is the fundament of tho flouris, and not the

\[1\] to Londoun, MS.; but to is interlineded in an ink of the same colour.
hondis of the gaderers, neither tho bringers. Certis, but if eche man wolde thus feele in this mater, he is duller than eyen man ouȝte to be. And sithen in liȝk maner it is that the maters and conclusiones and trouthis of lawe of kinde, (of which lawe myche is spoken in the first part of the book clepid The iust apprisying of Holi Scripture, and which lawe is welnyȝ al the lawe of God to Cristen men, for in sum maner forto speke of lawe of kinde it is al the lawe of God to Cristen men, except the making and the vsing of Cristis sacramentis,) and of it what folowith ther of and is necessaril longing therto leggith ful fair abrood sprad growing in his owne space, the feeld of mannys soule, and there oon treuth come out of an other treuth, and be of the iij\(^*\), and the iiij\(^*\) out of the iiiij\(^*\), and into tyme it become vnto openest treuthis of alle othere in thilk faculte of moral philosophie, and to the principis and groundis of alle othere trouthis in the same faculte, (euen as the sprai cometh out of the braunche, the braunche out of the bouȝ, the bouȝ out of the schaft, and the schaft out of the roote:) and thus it was welnyȝ with all this lawe of kinde eer eny Scripture of the Oold Testament or of the Newe were, and schulde haue so be, thouȝ alle tho Scripturis weren brend,—needis every wiȝs man muste graunte and consent that noon of the now seid trouthis and conclusiones of lawe of kinde is ground in Holi Scripture of the Bible, but thei ben groundid in thilk forest of lawe of kinde which God plauntith in mannis soule whanne he makith him to his ymage and likenes. And out of this forest of trouthis mowe be take trouthis and conclusiones, and be sett into open knowing of the fynder and of othere men, thouȝ not withowte labour and studie thorȝ manie ȝeeries. And herto seruen clerkis of moral philosophie whiche now ben clepid Dyuynes riȝt as forresters and othere men seruen for to hewe doun braunchis for hem sylf, and
for to deleyere hem to citeseins in Londeoun that her housis be maad the more honest ther with and therbi.

Go we ferther now thus: What if Crist and heise Apostlis wolden fische with bootis in the see, and wolden afterward carie tho fisches in paniers upon horsis to London, schulde men seie for reuerence or loue to Crist and hise Apostlis that tho fisches growen out of the panyeris or dosseris, or out of the hondis of Crist and of hise Apostlis, and that the ground and fundament of the fisches stubauncis and beingis were the houndis¹ of Crist and of hise Apostlis whils thei toke tho fisches, or whils thei carieden tho fisches? Goddis forbode that for eny loue or reuerence which men wolden do to Crist and to hise Apostlis that thei schulden make so greet a leesing aȝens treuth. And thanne ferther thus: Certis treuthis of lawe of kind which Crist and hise Apostlis schewiden forth to peple were bifoire in the grete see of lawe of kinde in mannis soule eer Crist or his hise Apostlis were born into this lijf; as it is ofte bifoire proued; and therfore it may noon other wise be seid and holde, but that out of the seid see thei toke as bi fysching tho treuthis of lawe of kind of thei tauȝten and prechiden to the peple, and therfore for no reuerence or loue to be ȝoun to God or to hise Apostlis, or to her writingis, it is to be seid and feelid that the now seid treuthis weren or ben foundid and groundid in the seiyngis or writingis of Crist and of hise Apostlis.

Also in caas a greet clerk wolde go into a librarie and ouer studie there a long proces of feith writun in the Bible, and wolde afterward repore and reheere the sentence of the same proces to the peple at Poulis Cros in a sermoun, or wolde write it in a pistle or lettre to hise freendi under entent of reporting the sentence of the seid proces, schulde the heerers² of thilk

¹ Probably we should read hondis. ² heeres, MS.
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reportyng and remembering seie that thilk sentence were foundid and groundid in the seid reporter or in his preching or in his pistle writen? Goddis forbode; for open it is that thei ouzten seie and feele rathir† that thilk sentence is groundid in the seid book ligging in the librarie. And in case that this clerk reporting the seid sentence or proces spake or wrote in othere wordis thilk sentence than ben the wordis vnder which thilk sentence is writen in the seid book, thei ouzten seie and feele that his he wordis and hise writingis ouzten be glosid and be expowned and be brouz in to accordaunce with the seid book in the librarie, and the seid book in thilk proces ouzte not be expowned and be brouz and wrestid into accordaunce with the seid clerkis wordis② and writingis: þe, thou Crist and hise Apostlis wolden entende and do the same as this clerk dooth, the peple ouzte in noon other wise than which is now seid bere hem anentis Crist and hise Apostlis in this case, as it is opene ynoȝt. And sithen it is so, that alle the trouthis of lawe of kinde whiche Crist and hise Apostlis tauzten and wroten weren bifoare her teching and writing, and weren writen bifoare in thilk solempnest inward book or inward writing of resounis doom passing alle outward bookis in profite to men for to serue God, of which inward book or inward writing miche thing is seid in the book clepid The iust apprising of Holi Scripture and of which Jeremye spekith in his xxxi. ɔ, and Poul in his epistle Hebr. viij. ɔ, it muste needis folowe that noon of the seid trouthis is groundid in the wordis or writingis of Crist or of the Apostlis, but in the seid inward preciose book and writing buried in mannis soule, out of which inward book and writing mowe be taken bi labour and studyng of clerkis mo con-

† rathir is added by a later hand. | ② wordris, MS.
clusiouns and treuthis and gouernauncis of lawe of
dynaste be writen in so manie bokis whiche schulden
fille the greet chirche of Seint Poul in Londoun.

CHAP. VI.

THE SECONd
PRINCIPAL
CONCLUSION
AGAINST THE
FIRST ERROR:
Though Scrip-
ture be not the
ground of any
moral truths
discoversable by
reason, yet it
hears witness
to them, and
relates to their
better fulfillment.

vii. Chapter.

The secunde principal conclusioun and truthe is
this: Thouz it pertyne not to Holi Scripture forto
grounde eny natural or moral gouernaunce or truthe
into whos fynding, leernynge, and knowing mannis
reason may bi him sylf and bi natural help come, as it
is open now before bi proofs of the firste principal
conclusioun, zit it mai pertyne weel ynoz to Holi
Scripture that he reherce suche now seid gouernauncis
and trutheis, and that he witnesse hem as groundid
sumwhere ellis in the lawe of kinde or doom of mannis
reason. And so he dooth (as to ech reder ther yn it
mai be opene) that bi thilk rehercing and witnesseyng
so doon bi Holi Scripture to men tho men schulden
be bothe remembrid, stirid, prouokid, and exortid forto
the rather perfore and fulfille tho same so rehercid
and witnessid gouernauncis and trutheis.

This conclusioun mai sone be proued. Forwhi we
seen that not withstanding bookis and writings of
grammer han noon riȝt neither power forto grounde
eny gouernaunce or truthe of dyuynyte, bi cause that
grammer and dyuynyte ben iȝ facultees atwin and
asondir\(^1\) departid, and therfore thei han her propre to
hem boundis and markis that noon of hem entre into
the other as bi office of grounding, and han her
propre to hem officis of grounding and to hem her
propre truthis, zit the bokis of grammer reherceen
with inne hem and witnessen summe treuthis of dy-

\(^1\) sondir, MS. (first hand).
uynyte as in *Catholicom*, which is a book of gramer, in the word of . . . .

Also thou, the faculte of Canon Lawe and the faculte of dyuynyte be ij. departid atwynne facultees, and ther fore thou; ech of hem hath his propre to him lymyted boundis and markis for grounding, riȝt as ij. maners and lordschipis ligging in a cuntree han, and ech of hem hath his propre to him conclusiouns and trouthis to be groundid bi him, (as that Canon Lawe groundeth constitucionis and ordinancis of general counsellis and of popis and prouynial and synodal constitucionis as hise propre to him trouthis and conclusiouns; and dyuynyte, in verri maner forto spoke of diuinite, groundith articles of feyth, that is to seie, trouthis and conclusions reuelid and affermed bi God to be trewe, as propre to him trouthis and conclusiouns, into whos fynding, leerning, and knowing mannis resoun mai not sufficienli with oute reuelacioun ascende and come to;) and, ther fore, Canon Lawe ouȝte not and mai not grounde eny trouthe or conclusioun which is propre to the grounding of divynyte, neither diuinite mai grounde eny trouthe or conclusioun which is propre to the grounding of Canoun Lawe: ȝit bokis of Canoun Lawe bisidis her treting of the chirch lawis and constitucionis rehercen manie trouthis and conclusiouns whiche ben propre to the grounding in diuynite, and aʒenward bokis of diuinite bisidis her treting of articles of feyth reuelid fro God rehercen manye trouthis and conclusiouns whiche ben propre to the grounding in Lawe of Canoun, ȝhe, and rehercen manye trouthis and conclusiouns of whiche summe ben propre to methaphisik, summe ben propre to natural philosophi, and summe ben propre to moral philosophi. And ȝit it may not be seid herfore

---

Six lines of the MS. are left blank, i.e. about forty words may probably be missing.
that Lawe of Canon groundith eny article of feith reuelid fro God, or that divynite groundith eny constiitucioun or lawe maad bi the chirche or bi the pope, or that he groundith eny trouthe or conclusioum of methaphisik or of natural philosopi or of moral philosiphie. Forwhi thanne these facultees were not separat and departid atwynne facultees havynge her propre boundis and markis, which is inconuenient to holde. And also the trouthis of diuynite were eer the faculte of Canoun Lawe biganne, and the trouthis of methaphisik and of natural philosiphie and of moral philosiphie myȝten be thowȝ no dyuynyte were (forto speke pureli and mereli of dyuynyte as it tretith articles of feith), and open it is that no thing groundid may be whanne his ground is not. Wherfore bi lîjk skile, thouȝ it may not longe and pertyne to Holi Scripture forto grounde eny trouthe or gouernaunce of moral philosiphie, into whos fynding and knowing natural resoun with natural helpis mai suffice, as it is proued bifoire in the proof of the firste conclusioum, zit herwith mai weel stonde that Holi Scripture reheere trouthis and gouernauncis whiche ben propre to moral lawe of kinde, that is to see, propre to moral doom of resoun, which is not eillis than moral philosiphie. And that Holi Scripture so doth it is open; forwhi he reheercith to us that we schulden be make and not proude, and that we schulden be temperat in eting and drinking and not glotenose, and that we schulden be continent or mesurable in deedis of gendring, and that we schulden be mylde in answering, and that we schulden be pacient in aduersitees; and so forth of manie uther gouernauncis, which alle ben tauȝt in the lawe of kinde bi doom of resoun more fulli than thei ben reheercid in Holi Scripture bi tenfold and more. And so al that Crist dide in teching eny of these was not eillis than that what he siȝt to be
THE FIRST PART.

Trewen biforme in doom of resoun and lawe of kinde he
toord out to hise herers. And whanne Poul and eny
Apostle in her epistlis wroten of eny of these now
seid vertues, thei diden not ellis as there for tho
vertues but this, that thei token what ther of thei
founden in doom of resoun and in lawe of kinde to
be trewe, and thei wroten it in her epistlis.

The iij. principal conclusion is this: The hool office
and werk into which God ordeyned Holy Scripture
is forto grounde articlis of faith and forto reherce
and witnesse moral trutthis of lawe of kinde groundid
in moral philoscophie, that is to seie in doom of resoun,
that the reders be remembrid, stirid, and exortid bi so
miche the better and the more and the sooner forto
gulle hem. Of whiche articlis of faith summe ben
not lawis as these: that God made heuen and erthe
in the bigynnyng of tyne, and that Adam was the
firste man and Eue was the firste womanan, and that
Moises ladde the peple of Israel out of Egipt, and
that Zacharie was fadir and Elizabeth was modir of
Iohn Baptyst, and that Crist fastid xl. daies; and so
forth of many like. And summe otheres ben lawis, as
that ech man oufte be baptisid in water, if he may
come thereto; and that ech man oufte be hostilid, if
he mai come ther to.

This conclusion may be proved thus. Sithen it is
so that Holie Scripture muste founde and grounde sum
to him propre trutthis and conclusiones, (for ellis he
were not vnlaceabli necessarie to Cristen men,) he
muste needis grounde trutthis and conclusiones suche
as mennis resoun bi it silf or with natural helpis
may fynde, leerne, and knowe, or ellis suche as
mannis resoun bi it silf and bi the seid helpis mai
not fynde, leerne, and knowe. But so it is that
Holie Scripture groundidh not the trutthis of the firste
maner now rehercid, that is to seie trutthis and con-
clusiones into which manys witt mai in the seid maner
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rise, as it is proved bi the firste principal conclusiou. Wherfore he muste needis grounde treuthis and conclusions of the ij* maner now seid, that is to seie, treuthis and conclusiouns into whiche mannis witt mai not bi it sif and bi natural help without reuelacioun mad therto fro God uprise and come to, forto hem kunne and knowe. And these ben articlis of feith as it is schowid in The folwer to the donet; and so the firste partie of this iiij* conclusioun is schëwid to be trewe.

Also that Holi Scripture makith rehercel of many treuthis and conclusions groundid in moral philsophi for the entent here in this iiij* conclusioun seid, it is schowid biforn in proof o the ij* conclusioun. Wherfore the ij* parti of this iiij* principal conclusioun is needis to be holde for trewe.

Also that the feithis whiche now here ben rehercid as for no lawis to Cristen men ben not lawis to hem, and that the feithis whiche now here ben rehercid as for lawis to Cristen men ben lawis to hem; it is schowid in the firste parti of the book clepid The iust apprising of Holi Scripture; and ther yn the reder mai it leerne, if he wolde. But y wolde se that oure Bible men whiche holden hem so wise bi the Bible aloone, the, bi the Newe Testament aloon, couthen bi her Bible aloon knowe which feith is a lawe to man and which feith is not a lawe to man, and thanne he dide a maistrie passing his power. Wherbi and bi many othere pointis of Goddis lawe and serv- ice to man, whiche mowe not be knowen bi onli the Bible but by doom of resoun and moral philsophi, (as it is weel open thorugh manye treticis in the book of Cristen religioun and in the Filling of the iij. tablis and other mo,) the Bible men mowe take good

* Perhaps meant to be written divisim in the MS.
marke that myche nede schulen alle tho haue to the help of weel leerned clerkis. And, forto seie sumwhat here and now of lawis, it is to feele and vndirstonde that oonli thilk trouthe is a lawe to man which is doable and not oonli knoweable and biholdeable of the same man. Wherfore the iiij. parti of this present iiij. principal conclusioun is trewe.

This what y haue now seid of and to Bible men y have not seid vndir this entent and meenyng, as that y schulde feele to be vnelleful laymen forto reede in the Bible and forto studie and leerne ther yn, with help and counsell of wise and weel leerned clerkis and with licence of her gouvernour the bishop; but forto rebuke and adaunte the presumptcioun of tho\(^1\) lay persoones, whiche weenen bi her inreding in the Bible forto come into more kunnyng than thei or alle the men in erthe—clerkis and outhere—mowe come to, bi the Bible oonli withoute moral philosophie and lawe of kinde in doom of weel disposid resoun, y haue seid of and to Bible men what is now seid.

---

\(^1\) The MS. altered from the into tho by a later (?) hand.
in doom of resoun sufficientli; neither into his finding, learning, and knowing mannis resoun bi it sylf and bi natural help may rise and suffice, without thereof maad reuelacioun or affirmynge fro God. Forwhi thanne feith were no feith, as it is tauyt in The folwer to the donet and in the book Of feith and of sacramentis in Latyn. Wherfore moral lawe of kinde, (which is not ellis than moral philosophe writen depe in mannis soule, there ligging with the prant and the ymage of God,) mai not grounde any artide or treuth or conclusion of feith: but into the grounding of feith serveth Holi Scripture, as it is bi the iiij. conclusion proued. And so this present iiij. conclusion muste needes be a trouth.

The v. principal conclusion is this: Thou; neither the seide moral lawe of kinde neither outward bokis therof writen mowe grounde any trouth or conclusion of verrey feith, zyt tho outward bokis (as Cristene men hem maken) mowe weel ynow rehearse and witnesse trouthis and conclusions of feith groundid bifoer in Holi Scripture; and so thei doon. Forwhi it is no more repugnant that bokis of moral philosophie rehearse trouthis and conclusions propre to the grounding of Holy Scripture, than that bokis of Holi Scripture rehearse trouthis and conclusions propre to the grounding of moral philosophie, and that bokis of grammar rehearse trouthis and conclusions propre to the grounding of Holi Scripture. But so it is that bokis of Holi Scripture reheeren trouthis longing to the grounding of moral philosophie, as it is bifoer schewid in proof of the secunde conclusion; wherfore it is not repugnant that bokis of moral philosophie, namelich tho whiche Cristen men maken, reheere trouthis of feith longing to the grounding of Holi Scripture. And that thei so doon it is open bi the book of Cristen religioun and hise parties mad in the comoun peplis langage.
The vij. principal conclusion is this: The hool office and werk into which ben ordeyned the bokis of moral philosophie (written and mad bi Cristen men in the maner now before spoken in the vij. conclusion) is forto expresse outwardli bi writing of penne and ynke the treuthis and conclusionis, whiche the inward book of lawe of kinde, biried in Mannis soule and herte, groundith; and forto rehease summe treuthis and conclusionis of feith longing to the grounding of Holi Scripture, that the reders be the more and the oftir remembried and stirid and exortid bi thilk rehearsing into the treuthis of feith so rehearsed. Of whiche summe ben positif lawis, as ben onli the treuthis aboute the newe sacramentis of Crist and aboute the vssis of hem: and summe ben not lawis, as that thre persoones ben oon God, and that the ij. of hem was mad man, and that he died and roos fro deeth, and so forth. This conclusionis is so open bi miche what is seid before, that weelny; he needith no newe proof to be sette to hym. Neuertheless into his prouyang mai be seid thus: The seid bokis of moral philosophie doon these ij. now seid officis and werkis, as it is open by the vij. conclusion; and thei doon noon othir or noon more notable officis or werk than oon of these ij.: wherfore these ij. officis maken the hool al werk into which tho bokis ben principali or notabl entendid to be maad.

The vij. principal conclusion is this: The more deel and party of Goddis hool lawe to man in erthe, and that bi an huge gret1 quantite ouer the remanent part of the same lawe, is groundid sufficiently out of Holi Scripture in the inward book of lawe of kinde and of moral philosophie,2 and not in the book of Holi Scrip-

1. *gret* is interlined in a later hand.
2. *philosopie*, so the MS. originally, but a later hand, contrary to the usage of the MS., has corrected it to *philosophie.*
Chap. VIII.

Scripture, but are grounded in man's soul; and they form the greater part of God's law to man; so that this is based principally on the judgment of the reason.

The first premisse of the argument proved.

The first premisse of this present argument is openli proved bi the first principal conclusion and bi the argumentis and euyedencis prouying him, and therefore the firste premisse of this present argument is to be holde for trewe.

That the ij\textsuperscript{e} premisse of this present argument\textsuperscript{1} is also trewe is schewid bi a ful solempne and rial processe in the firste parti of the book clepid The iust apprising of Holi Scripture, the \textsuperscript{2} e, which processe were ouer long to be azen rehercid here.

\textsuperscript{1} argumenet, MS.

\textsuperscript{2} Space left in the MS. for the number.
Neuertheles that the same iij. premisse of this present argument is trewe sure experience may schewe at the ful. Forwhi let a man renne thour; alle the xxxiiij. pointis of the iiiij. tablis of Goddis lawe to man in erthe whiche ben sett in the first parti of The donet into Cristen religion, and also in the firste parti of Cristen religioun, and lete him marke hem weel and alle her spicis with inne¹ hem and vnder hem, and let him also renne thour; al Holi Scripture fro the bigynyng into the eende forto marke al that he can marke there to be rehercied for gouernauncis, trouthis, and vertues of Goddis lawe to man in erthe, and he schal fynde bi opene experience and open assaie surely ynow, that in huge quantite many mo of hem ben fyndeable and knowable bi mannis resoun without help of Holi Scripture, than ben tho of hem whiche ben not fyndeable and knowable bi mannis resoun without Holi Scripture. Namelich if he haue leerned before this that mannis resoun without Holi Scripture may fynde and knowe that oon God is, and that he is maker of alle creaturis out of nouz, (whether therwith be holde that creaturis weren euer so mad and so brouz forth bi God bifore now, or that thei biganne to be brouz forth bi God in a certein bigynyng of tyne;) and that man is maad into an eende, which eend is forto be couplid and ooned to God bi knowing and louyng and seruynge: and so of many mo pointis and trouthis of which it is spoken in the firste parti of Cristen religioun. In to whos fynding and leernynge certein it is that mannis resoun bi him sylf and with natural helpis without Holi Scripture mai rise and come bi so probable and so likeli evidencis, that the leernyng

¹ It is not quite clear whether this is meant to be written conjunctum or division in the MS.
and kunnyng geten therbi mai and schal be suffi-
cient forto reule and dreese and move mannis wille
into choicis withinforth and into comaundis and
outward deedis answering to thilk same so getun
learnynge kunnyng, thouz thilk kunnyng be not
demonstratijf, that is to seie more sure than is pro-
bable and likeli kunnyng. Forwhi thilk kunnyng is
so probable and likeli that into the contrarie parti
is not had nouzwhere nyz so probable and so likeli
euydencis, and therofore thilk kunnyng so geten is
strong ynowz forto make the hauers of it lyue and
lede her conversacion ther aftir and forto serue God
therbi in keping lawe of kinde: for certis bi other
strengthe than bi probabilite and likelihode no feith
had bi Holi Scripture mai reule oure lyuyng and
conuersacion to God, as it is sumwhat tauz in the
firste parti of Cristen religioun and in The folwer to
the donet, and more schal be tauz in the book Of
feith and of sacramentis in Latyn.

But forto turne azen into the fynysching of the
proof before sett for the vij. conclusion y argue thus:
The argument maad into the proof of the vij. conclu-
sion is formal, as mai be iugid bi hem whiche in
logik knowen the reulis longing to a formal argument,
and the bothe premis of the same argument ben
trewe, as it is now before openli schewid. Wherfore
needis it mustebe
1 that the conclusion concludid and
dryuen out and forth fro hem bi strengthe of hem
is trewe: and thilk same conclusion of hem is the
vij. principal conclusion. Wherfore the vij. principal
conclusion is trewe.

1 So the MS.
ix. CHAPTER.

THE viijth. principal conclusion is this: No man mai leerne and kunne the hool lawe of God to which Cristen men ben bounde, but if he can of moral philosophi; and the more that he can in moral philosophie, bi so miche the more he can of Goddis lawe and seruice. This conclusion folowith out of the viijt. conclusion openly ynoy. Forwhi lawe of kinde and moral philosophie ben oon, and the more parti of Goddis lawe bi which man is bounde for to serue to 1 God is moral lawe of kinde, as it is proued before in the vijjt. conclusion.

The ixth. conclusion is this: No man schal perfitli, sureli, and sufficienti vndirstonde Holi Scripture in alle tho placis where yn he rehereth moral vertues not being positijf lawe of feith, but being such as manys resoun may fynde, leerne, and knowe, but if he be before weel and perfitli, sureli, and sufficiently leerned in moral philosophie; and the more perfitli, sureli, and sufficientli he is leerned in moral philosophie the more able as bi that he schal be forto perfitli, sureli, and sufficientli vndirstonde Holi Scripture in alle tho placis wheryn he spekith of eny moral lawe of God being not positijf lawe of feith. This conclusion folowith out of the vijth. and the viijth. conclusions: wherfore he is to be holde trewe.

The xth. principal conclusion is this: The leernynge and kunnyng of the seid lawe of kinde and of the seid moral philosophie is so necessarie to Cristen men, that it mai not he lackid of hem if the schulen thritfili serue to God and kepe his lawe bitake to hem in erthe. This conclusion mai be proued thus. Thilk leernynge and kunnyng is so necessarie that it

1 to is interliniated, apparently by the same hand.
maist not be lackid of Cristen men which leernyng and kunnyng is the leernyng and kunnyng of the more deel of Goddis lawe bitake to hem in erthe; but so it is that the leernyng and kunnyng of the seid lawe of kinde and of the seid moral philosophe is the leernyng and kunnyng of the more parti and deel of Goddis lawe, bi which man ouzte servse to God in erthe, as it is proued bi the viij. and viij. principal conclusiouns to giderse. Wherfore nedis foelwith that the leernyng and kunnyng of the biform seid lawe of kinde and of the seid moral philosophe is so necessarie to Cristen men, that thei mowe not lacke it forto servse God bi eny thrift. The firste premisse of this argument is open ynowt that ech man wolde him graunte. The ij. premisse is proued bi the viij. biform sett principal conclusioun: and this present argument is formal and gode. Wherfore his conclusioun in him now proued is trewe, which is not ellis than the x. principal conclusioun.

Also thus: Thilk leernyng and kunnyng is necessarie and vnackeable to Cristen men without which thei mowe not sufficientli and sureli vnderstonde Holi Scripture in alle placis where he spekith of Goddis lawis to man not being positijf lawis of feith. For whi tho placis ben manye, as open assay in reding Scripture wole suerly schewe; but so it is that, without the leernyng and kunnyng of the seid lawe of kinde and of doom of resoun, Holi Scripture mai not be sufficientli and dewli vndirstonde and expowned in no place where he spekith of lawe of God not being positijf lawe of feith, as it is biform schewid bi the ix. principal conclusioun. Wherfore this present x. conclusioun is trewe.

Also thus: The leernyng and kunnyng of it is necessarie and vnackeable to mankinde, in which alle the guernauncis, treuthis, and vertuus of Goddis lawe being the lasse deel and beyng the remanent to the
other more deel and parti before seid in the vijt. conclusion of Goddis lawe ben more foundid and groundid than in Holi Scripture, that is to sey positijt lawis of Crist whiche ben the makingis and the vsingis of Cristis sacramentis longing to the Newe Testament: but so it is, that in the seid lawe of kinde and doom of resoun or moral philosophie, alle the gouernauncis, treuthis, and vertues of Goddis lawe whiche ben the lasse deel and ben the remanent to the more deel before seid of Goddis lawe in the vijt. conclusion ben more groundid and foundid than in Holi Scripture; and that alle thei and ech of hem whiche biholden the making and the vsing of the seid newe sacramentis ben more groundid bi doom of resoun than bi Holi Scripture, for as miche as ech of hem into his grounding nedith euydencis of bothe to gidere, that is to seie of resoun and of Holi Scripture to gidere, and ellis he mai not be sufficientli groundid. And here with it is trewe that in this grounding doon to hem bi doom of resoun and by Holi Scripture to gidere, the evidencis which doom of reson 3eueth into the seid grounding of hem alle and of ech of hem ben more in strengthe and in substance and in noumbre into the seid grounding of hem, than ben the evidencis whiche Holi Scripture 3eueth into the grounding of eny of hem which ben the makingis and vsingis of the newe sacramentis and tho whiche folowen of hem bi formal argument, as n Ths fo le wer to the donet and in The book of feith ioyned therto, outhire of my writingis, it is sufficiently tauxt; whiche processe were ouer long and sumwhat ouer hard to be eftsone sett here.

The, and 3it with al this that is now seid treuth is also that the makingis and the vsingis of the seid

1 It is not quite clear whether to gidere is intended to be written conjunctim or disjunctim: it is usually written disjunctim in the MS.
newe sacramentis mowe not be groundid bi Holi Scripture to be oure goouernauncis now lyuyng in erthe withoute help of resonyss doom, and withoute that lawe of kinde and moral philosphi and Holi Scripture grounds hem to gidere; and that into the grounding of hem the euydencis or premyssis which Holi Scripture bringith ben not more substancial and strengre into the grounding, than ben the euydencis and premisssis which doom of resoun therto bringeth, as in the now alleggid bookis it is openli declarid. Wherfore folowith the treuth of this present x. conclusion, that the leernyng and kunnyng of lawe of kinde and moral philosphi in doom of resoun is so necessarie to Cristen men, that it is vnlaceable to hem forto be in eny worth seruants to God and kepers of his lawe in erthe.

Out of these bisefore sett viij. viij. ix. and x. conclusiouns and trouthis cometh forth ful openli and sureli this xij. conclusion and trouthe. Ful weel ouzten alle persoones of the lay parti not miche leerned in moral philosphi and lawe of kinde forto make miche of clerkis weel leerned in moral philosphi, that the clerkis schulden helpe tho lay persoones forto arixt vndirstonde Holi Scripture in alle tho placis in which Holi Scripture reherceth the bisefore spoken conclusiouns and trouthis of moral philosphi, that is to seie of lawes of kinde. Forwhi withoute tho clerkis so leerned in moral philosphi and with outhe her direccioun the now seid lay persoones schulen not esili, lixtli, and anoon hae the dew vndirstanding of Holi Scripture in the now seid placis, as is bisefore proued in the ix. conclusioun.

Also out of the same bisefore sett viij. viij. ix. and x. conclusiouns and trouthis and out of the assaay and experience which mai be had in the ouer reding and studyng the bokis anoon aftir to be rehercied folowith this xij. conclusion and trouthe. Ful weel ouzten
alle persoones of the lay parti not leerned ou\textsuperscript{\textregistered} where ellis bi the now seid clerks or bi othere bokis of moral philosophie forto make miche of bokis maad to hem in her modiris language whiche ben clepid thus: The donet into Cristen religiou\textsuperscript{n}: The folweur to the donet: The book of Cristen religiou\textsuperscript{n}, (namelich the first parti fro the bigynnyng of the iiij. treti forthward): The book filliug the iiiij. tablis: The book of worshiping: The book clepid The iust apprissing of Holi Scripture: The book clepid The prouoker of Cristen men: The book of Councelis, and othere mo pertenyng to the now seid Book of Cristen religiou\textsuperscript{n}. Forwhi in these now spoken bokis thei schulen leerne and kunne (in a ful notable quantite and mesure and in a fair fourme) the now bifoere seid moral philosophie being so necessarie forto be vndirstonde, and being in it siff the more parti of al her moral lawe and servyce to God, as it is open bi the viij. conclusion; and being so necessarie forto expowne or interprete or glose dewli and treuly Holi Scripture in alle placis where he spekith of Goddis lawe and servyce, except thilk fewe placis where yn he spekith of the making and vsing of the fewe newe sacramentis of Crist, as it is open bi the ix. bifoere sett conclusion. Wherfore miche ou\textsuperscript{\textregistered}ten lay persoones forto make and apprise and loue the now spoken bokis. And furthermore ou\textsuperscript{\textregistered}ver this now seid the now spoken bokis techen ful clereli and bihouesfulli the treuthis and gournauncis of Goddis lawe whiche ben groundid in Holi Scripture, and also othere treuthis of feith whiche ben not lawis and ben groundid in Holi Scripture; and also thei treten ful nobili the positijf lawis of Criste aboute the newe sacramentis, and theryfore ful miche good (as y hope) schal come bi the reeding, leernyng, and vsing of the now spoken bokis.

Of this same mater it is quikli and smertli spoken in a litil book therto and theryfore maad, which y
clepe The prouoker of Cristen peple, and ther fore no more ther of here now but this: that wolde God men wolden not be bi so miche the blinder that liȝt is to hem thus schewid, and that thei wolden not be bi so miche the frowarder and the more presumptuose that goodnes is to hem thus profrid: but wolde God that thei wolden assaie perfittly what tho now seid bokis ben and wolden weel kunne hem, and thanne if thei schulden haue euy cause forto blame or commende tho bokis that thanne first thei wolden blame or commende: for bi good resounys doom and bi the oolde wijs prouerbe, A man schulde blame or commende as he fyndeth, and so aftir that he hath founde cause to blame or commende he myȝte blame or commende; and not bifoire eer he eny suche causis fyndeth, and eer he aftir eny suche causys sechith. And certys the contrarie doing of this wijs prouerbe dooth miche sorow among simple lay peple, yuel lad forth bifoire and wors conserned bi a wickid secole of heretikis, which is not zìt al quenchid.

x. Chapter.

The xiiij. principal conclusion or trouthe is this: Thei that wolen aske and seie, thus, “Where fyndist thou it groundid in Holi Scripture?” as thouȝt elli is not worthi to be take for trewe, whanne euere eny gouernance or trouthe sufficientli grondid in lawe of kinde and in moral philosopli is assernd and mynys-trid to hem, (as ben man of the xij. gouernauncis and treuthis whiche schulen be tretid aftir in this present book: whiche ben setting vp of ymagis in hiȝe placis of the boduli chirche, pilgrimages doon priueli, and pilgrimages doon openli bi lay men and bi preestis and bischopis vnto the memorialis or
THE FIRST PART.

mynde placis of seintis, and the endewing of preestis bi rentis and bi vmmoueable possessiouens, and suche others) asken tho whilis in lijk maner vnresonabili and lijk vnskilfulli and lijk reprouabili, as if thei wolden aake and seie thus,—"Where findist thou it "grondid in Holi Scripture?" whanne a treuth and a conclusioun of gramer is affermed and seid to hem: or elliis thus, "Where findist thou it groundid in talour "craft?" whanne that a point or a treuth and a conclusioun of sadeler craft is affermed, seid, and mynistrid to hem: or elliis thus, "Where fyndist thou it groundid "in bocheri?" whanne a point or a treuth and conclusioun of masonry is affermed and seid and mynistrid to hem.

This present xiij*. conclusioun mai be proved thus:

Euen as gramer and dyuynyte ben ij. dyuere facul-
tees and kunnyngis, and therfore ben vnmedlid, and
ech of hem hath his propre to him boundis and markis, how fer and no ferther he schal strecche him-
silf vpon maters, treuthis, and conclusions, and not to
entirmete neither entermeene with any other facultees
boundis; and euen as sadelerie and talarie ben ij.
dyuere facultees and kunnyngis, and therfore ben
vnmedlid, and ech of hem hath his propre to him
boundis and markis, how fer and no ferther he schal
strecche him silf forth vpon maters, treuthis, and conclu-
siouns, and not entircomune with any other craft
or faculte in conclusiouns and treuthis: so it is that
the faculte of the seid moral philosopie and the faculte
of pure dyvynite or the Holi Scripture ben ij. dyuerse
facultees, ech of hem hauynge his propre to him
boundis and markis, and ech of hem having his propre
to him treuthis and conclusiouns to be groundid in
him, as the bifoyle sett sixe firste conclusiouns schewen.

1 to inserted, perhaps wrongly, by a later hand.
Wherfore foloweth that he vnresonabili and reprouabili askith, which askith where a treuthe of moral philosophi is groundid in pure divynyte or in Holi Scripture, and wole not ellis trowe it to be trewe; lijk as he schulde vnresonabili and reprouabili aske, if he askid of a treuthe in masonry, where it is groundid in carpentrie; and wolde not ellis trowe it be trewe, but if it were groundid in carpentrie.

No man objehte here aïens me to be aboute forto falsifie this present xiiij. conclusioun; and that, foresmiche as sporiers in Londoun gilden her sporis whiche thei maken, and cutelers in Londoun gilden her knyfis whiche thei maken, as thou; therfore sporiorie and cutellerie entermeeneden and enterededen with goldsmyth craft, and that these craftis kepten not to hem sylf her propre and seuerel to hem sylf boundis and markis. For certis thou; the sporier and the cuteler be learned in thilk point of goldsmyth craft which is gilding, and therefore thei vsen thilk point and deede and trouthe of goldsmyth craft, zit thilk point of gilding is not of her craft, but oonli of goldsmyth craft; and so the craftis ben vnmedlid, thou; oon werkman be learned in hem bothe and vse hem bothe, rïst as if oon man had lernid the al hool craft of goldsmythi and the al hool craft of cutleri, and wolde holde schoppis of bothe, and wirohe sumwhile the oon craft and sumwhile the other craft. Zit herfore tho craftis in thilk man ben not the lasse dyverse, ne neuer the lasse kepen her seueralte in boundis and markis as in hem sylf, thou; oon man be learned in hem bothe and can wiroche hem bothe and hath hem bothe. Zit it is impossible the oon of tho craftis forto entre and entermete with the trouthis of the othere, thou; oon man can wiroche in hem bothe: for

---

1 The MS. originally had to me, but the to is scraped out.  
2 lernid interlined in a later (?) hand.
than the other crafts were not the different crafts not subordinated. And thus without being this objection, right as thou a man were a knight and a priest; right as the man is for a twynne fro preesthood in the same man, (as by her both the natural and being, thou not in place or person,) as by the knyghts in one person and preesthood in another person.

In this wise be these xij. before going conclusions is vrrootid and upplucked, and sufficiently rebuked and proved for vntrewe, the first of the iij. opinions spoken and set forth in the bigynnyng of this present book in the first chapter. And also be these same xij. conclusions and her proofs ben weel adaunited the wanton and vnkunynng bering of hem which not allowe any gouernance to be the lawe and service of God, inlasse than it be grondid in Holys Scripture; as thou the schulden preise and worciuphe ther yn God the more and plese God the more, that thei apprisen so Michele Holys Scripture. For wite thei weel with oute any doute that God is neither preisid, neither worschipid, neither pleisid bi vntrothe or bi lesing. If eny man make of Holys Scripture and apprise it, euyn as treuth is and no more than truthe is, God is ther yn pleisid; and if eny man wole make of Holys Scripture or of eny creature in heuene or in erthe more than treuth is that he be maad of and be apprisid, God is ther yn displeised.

And farther thus: If eny man be feerd lest he treepase to God if he make our litle of Holys Scripture, which is the outward writing of the Oold Testament and of the Newe, y sake whi is he not afeerd lest he make our litle and apprise our litle the inward Scripture of the biforn spoken lawe of kinde written bi God.1 him aif in mannis soule, whanne he

---

1 bigod, MS.
made mannis soule to his ymage and liknes? Of which inward Scripture Poul spekith, Romans ij'. ĉ., and Jeremye in his xxxj'. chapiter; and Poul takith the same processe, Hebr. viij'. ĉ. For certis this inward book or Scripture of lawe of kinde is more necessarie to Cristen men, and is more worthi than is the outward Bible and the kunnyng ther of, as fer as thei bothe treten of the more parti of Goddis lawe to man, as mai be taken bi the vij'. conclusioun and his proof, and bi the x'. conclusion and his proof.

And more proof therto ech man may se at ful, if he wole rede and studie in the book plepid The iust apprising of Holī Scripture, which book if any man wole wijisi reede and perfitle vndistonde with this proces now afore going fro the bigynnyng of this book hidir to, y wole leie myn arme to be smyte of, but that he schal sente in his witt withinforth, wole he nyle he, amagrey his heed, that alle these now bifo fore going xij'. conclusiouns ben trewe, and that the firste of the iij'. opinions sett bifo re in the bigynnyng of this book is vntrew.".

The textis bifo re alleggid in the firste chapiter of this book, Mat. xxij'. ĉ. and Iohn v'. ĉ., which the holders of the now seid firste opinion weenen grounden thilk same opinion, goon not thertho. For whi, if the processis forth and afore the textis ligging be weel and diligentli considerid, it schal be open to ech such reeder and considerer, that tho ij. textis seruen and remytten or senden into other Scriptureis of prophecie whiche grounden feith: the oon of hem remittith or sendith into Scripture of prophecie, which schulde grounde feith of the laste resurreccioun; and the other sendith into Scripture of prophecie, which schulde grounde feith of Cristis incarnacioun. And sithen neuer neither of hem remyttith or sendith into other Scripture, whiche schulde speke of maters being in lawe of kinde and in moral philosophi
to be groundid ther yn, therfore neuer neither of tho ij. textis, the oon Mat. xxij. č. and the other Iohn v. č. alleggid biffore in the firste chapter, where the firste opioun is sett, serueth neither forto grounde neither forto verrifie the seid firste opioun. And thou3 the lay peple wolden holde that eche treuth and conclusion and article of catholik feith is groundid in Holi Scripture, so that ellis he is not to be take for catholik feith, y wolde not make me miche bis forto seie ther ažema.

xij. Chapiter.

Furthermore, for as miche as holders of the firste opioun gloriens miche in these textis now to be rehercid, it is ful good with this that is seid forto sette forth also dawe vndirstandingis of tho textis.

The firste of tho textis is writen i. Cor. xiiiij. č. in the eende thus: Sotheli if eny man vnknowith, he schal be vnknowun. Bi this text thei taken that if eny man knowith not or putte not in what he may his bysynes forto leerne the writing of the Bible, as it lijth in text, namelich the writing of the Newe Testament, he schal be vnknowen of God forto be eny of hise. And for this, that thei bisien hem sylf forto leerne and knowe the Bible, namelich the Newe Testament, in the forme as it is wurun word bi word in the Bible, thei ſeuen a name propre to hem sylf and clepen hem sylf "knowun men," as thou3 alle othere than hem ben vnknowun; and whanne oon of hem talkith with an other of hem of sum other ii3. man. the heerer wolde asken thus: "Is he a knowen man?" and if it answerid to him thus: "3be, he is a knowen "man," al is saaf, perel is not forto dele with him; and if it be answerid to him thus: "He is no knowen "man," thanne perel is castid forto miche homeli dele with him.
The ijth. text is writun ijth. Cor. iiiijth. e. in the bi-
gynnyng where Poul seith thus: That and if oure
Euangelie is covered, it is covered to hem whiche
spillen; in which God of this world hath blindid the
myndis or wittis of unfeithful men, that the liyting
or cleering of the Euangelie of the gloris of Crist,
which is the ymage of God, schine 1 not. Of which
now rehercid text thei taken that who euer is a
persoon of saluaicioun schal soone vndirstonde the trewe
meenynge of Holi Scripture, namelich of al the Newe
Testament, as weel of the Apocalips as of the othere
deel, if he attende therto. And the now seid trewe
dewe vndirstonde of Holi Scripture schal not
be hid to sechers aftir it, saue to hem whiche schulen
perishe and be not saued. And forthimore alle hem
whiche ben biforn clepid knowen men thei holden
forto be children of saluaicioun or nyse to saluaicioun,
and alle othere men and wommen thei holden as erring
sheep in perel of perisching; and al for that thei
taken of the ijth. text that to the biforn seid men callid
knowen men the Euangelie is not coverid, and to alle
othere men the Euangelie is covered; not withstanding
that in trouth to seie of the men clepid of him sylf
knowen men the verri lawe of kinde and of feith, (as
it is pureli in itsylf, and so the substancial lawe of
God to man in erthe,) is wors knowen than of manye
othere, whiche it not leemen in wordis of the Bible
but in wordis writun in othere bokis, as here upon
y durste leie a waious of lesing myn arme, and that
for the experience which y haue therin upon the
kunnyngis of men in euer either of the ij. now spoken
sortis.

The iiijth. text is writun Apocalips 2 laste chapter in
the ende where it is seid thus: I witnesse to ock

1 schineth, MS.; but the th is
2 Opoc., MS. scratched out.
heever the wordis of the prophecis of this book. If eny man schal putt to hem, putt God upon him the veniaunce writun in this book. And if eny man schal take awey fro the wordis of the book of this prophecis, God take awey his part fro the book of lij, and fro the holi cite, and fro the thyngeis which ben writun in this book. Bi this book of prophecie which is spoken of in this lij, text thei vnndirstonden the hool Bible or the Newe Testament, and of this lij text thei taken this, that to Holi Writt men schulde not sett eny exposicionis, declara-cions, or glosis, no more than that men ouxten take awei fro Holi Writt eny proces or parti writen in Holi Writt; and if eny man sette such now seid exposicionis, whiche ben not open bi sum text in Holi Writt, he is cursid.

That the now biforn seid vnndirstonding, whiche thei seven to the staircase of the lij textis, is vntrew and vnndew to him, y prone thus: Whanne Poul wroot thilk first texte i. Cor. xiiiij. chapiter: Sotheli if eny man knowith not, he schal be vnknovyn, he spake of a thing to be knowyn, which thing than was presentlie. Forwhi he seith not thus: Who euer schal vnknovyn he schal not be knovyn, but he seith thus: Who euer vnknovyn, he schal not be knovyn. But so it is that the al hool Bible was not thanne. Forwhi the al hool writyng of Newe Testament was not thanne. Wherfore Poul meened not and vnndirstode not in thylke wordis forto speke of the writing of the al hool Bible, or of the writing of the Newe Testament, of whiche neuer neither thanne was, that whoeuer knowith not thylk writing he schal be vnknovyn of God. That in thylke tyme, whanne Poul wrote tho wordis, the al hool writing of the Newe Testament.

The first text explained. The ignorance intended by St. Paul is not ignorance of the New Testament, some books of which, as the Second Epistlo to the Corin-thians, and the Revelation, were not then written.

\[1\] vnndirstode, MS.
was not, y prowe thus. In thilk tyme he wrote his Firste Epistle to the Corinthieis. Wherfore in thilk tyme this parti of Holie Writt and of the Newe Testament was not, which is now the ij*. Epistle to the Corinthieis. Also, whanne Poul wrote the firste text, the Apocalips was not written; forwhi Iohun wrote the Apocalips whanne he was in exile in Pathmos, as he seith him sylf the [first]1 chapter of the Apocalips; and in thilk exile he was not bfore the laste 3eer of Domician, Emperor of Rome. But Poul was slayn bfore the tyme of this exile bi almost xxxi*. 3eer: for Poul was slayn of the Emperor Nero, in the last 3eer of Nero. Wherfore foolewith needis that not al the hool writing of the Newe Testament neither of the al hool Bible was, whanne Poul wrote the first bfore sett text i. Cor. xiiiij*. c.

Also Poul wrote hise bothe Epistlis to Corinthieis eer he came to Rome, and eer he was prisoned there. Forwhi Poul wrote his Firste Epistle to the Corinthieis whanne he was at Ephesia, and whanne he was in purpos for to come aftirward into Corinthie, as it is open bi the last chapter of the same First Epistle to Corinthieis. Also he wrote his ij*. Epistle to the Corinthieis whanne he was at Troade, as it is open bi the ij*. chapter of the same ij*. Epistle to the Corinthieis, and whanne he was in hope fortio come aftirward to Corinthie, as it is open bi the firste and ij*. and last chapter of the same ij*. Epistle to Corinthieis. And herewith open it is that Poul came neuer to Effesi, neither to Troade, neither purposid fortio come to Corinthie after he was prisoned in Rome, and after he lay in bondis at Rome; for he was not delyuered fro the bondis into his death, as it is open bi the ij*. Epistle to Thimothie, the [fourth]1 chapter. Wher-

1 A space left in the MS. for the number.
fore nedis it is trewe that Poul wrote his bothe Epistlis to Corinthis e er he was bounden by prison- 
yng in Rome; but his Epistle to the Effesies and his Epistle to the Philipensis and his Epistle to Colocencis he wrote whanne he was in prissoun at Rome, as it mai be tak bi the same epistlis, and as Jerom thera-
fore wittnesith in the prologis of the same epistlis. And also his Secunde Epistle to Thimothie Poul wrote whanne he was in prissoun at Rome little biore his deeth, as it is open bi what Poul seith in the same epistle, that tym of his resoluciuon (that is to seie of the departing bitwixe his bodi and his soule) was than neiȝe. Wherfore needis folweith that not al the writing of the hool Bible (forwhi not al the writing of the hool Newe Testament) was, whanne Poul wrote the first biore sett text i. Cor. xiiij. e. And if this be trewe, he wolde not seeie whanne he wrote the seid first text, that who vnknowith the al hool writing which we now han of the Newe Testament, he schal not be saued; and so folweith that tho whiche in the seid first text vndirstonden thilk text forto meene of the hool writing, which we now han of the Newe Testament, vndirstonden thilk text amys.

Also thus: Thilk words of the first text which Poul writithe i. Cor. xiiij. e. were trewe biforn Poul was convertid to feith, and biforn eny writing of the Newe Testament was bigunne. Forwhi er Matheu, or Mark, or Luk, or Iohn wroten, and eer Poul or Petir or Iame or Iudas wrote, it was trewe that who euer bi his owne negligence and bi his owne fre wil vnknowith the lawe, which he is bounden to knowe, schal be vnkownen of God, but if he amende thilk

---

1 These prologues (whoever may be their author) are prefixed to the Epistles in the Vulgate: they do not, however, in every case bear out Pecock's assertion. The pro-
logue to the Epist. ad Col. says: Scribit Apostolus eis ab Epheso.
2 thî-neiȝe, MS.
default: and more than this can not be take bi the seid first text of Poul, whanne he seith thus: Whoeuer vnknowith, he schal be vnknownen. Wherfore folowith that the other vnirdisting, bi which summen streynen\(^1\) thilk text forto speke of the writing which we han now of the Newe Testament, is not dewe to him, namelich sithen in thilk text no mensioun is maad of eny writing. And therfore whi schulde it be seid that needis thilk text is to be vnderstonde of the writing which we now han of the Newe Testament? And thus it is now opened, bi this laste now mad argument, which is the trewe and dewe vnirdisting of the same text.

Wherfore sithen ech Cristen man and womman, thou; thei neuere rede oon word in the Bible, or thou; thei neuere lerne bi oon daies labour ther yn, mowe leerne and kepe as miche lawe of kinde as God chargith hem forto leerne and kepe, and as miche lawe of feith as God chargith hem forto leerne and kepe, and mowe leerne as miche feith not being lawe to hem how miche God chargith hem forto leerne and knowe; and therfore al that Cristen men and wommen ousten leerne, thei mowe leerne out of the Bible, and bi bokis treuli drawen out of lawe of kinde and out of the Bible: — the, and sithen al this thei mowe leerne and kunne more pleini and more fulli and sooner than thei mowe it leerne in the Bible, (as it folowith out and fro the vi\(^\ast\) and vij\(^\ast\) and x\(^\ast\) biffre sett conclusiouns, and as experience Wolfe nedis proue to ech asnier for to lerne The donct and his Folewer in to Cristen religioun, The book of Cristen religioun, The filliug of the iiiij. tablis, with othere bookis annexid and knyt to The book of Cristen religioun) it muste needis folewe that al the kunnyng, whos igno-

\(^{1}\) streynen, MS., the c being in a later hand.
raunce is so perilose as Poul spekith of in the firste biforn seid text, may be had better out of the Bible by reding and studying and leernyng in the othere seid writyngis, than bi reding and studiynge and leernyng in the Bible oonli. And if this be trewe (as it is proued at ful now to be trewe), y mai seis to ech of these men whiche so glorien for her kunnyng and leernyng in the Bible oonli or in the Newe Testament oonli, and enhaunsen hem sylf in her owne myndes therbi aboue othere men not so in the Bible reding studyng, and leernyng, what Seint Poul, Romans [third] 1 seith in sumwhat liik caes to the convyrsis of the Iewis, forthat thei enhaunciden hem sylf aboute the convyrsis of the hethen men, bi cause the convyrsis of the Iewis had red biforn and studied and learned the Oold Testament, and so hadden not learned the convyrsis of the hethen men. Where he seith thus: *Where is thi gloryynge? He is excludid. Bi what lawe is he excludid? Certis bi the lawes of kynge and of feith, which mowe be learned of the lay peple and also of clerkis, thou, thei not rede and studie in the Bible only for to it leerne: the, and mowe be learned\(^2\) of hem sooner, clerelie, and fuller, than bi reeding and studyng in the Bible oonli, and that bi reding and studyng in the othere seid bokis. And thercfor thi "gloryynge is excludid."

xij. Chapiter.

That the vnderstanding which thei assignen to the secunde biforn sett text, writen ij. Cor. iiiij. \(^2\), forto seie that ther yn thilk text bi the Euangely Poul

---

1 A space left for the number in the MS.
*lerered, MS.
chap. xii. of the new testament, much of which was not then written.

...vnderstode and meened the writing of the newe testament, is not dewe ther to vnderstonding, y proue thus: Whanne Poul wroth thilk ij. text to the corinthies, seying thus, If our euangell be covered or be hid, it is covered to hem that perischen, the euangellie of which he spekith in thilk text was had thanne presentli. Forwhi the text speking of thilk euangellie spekith of it presentli, and not as of a thing aftir thanne to come. But the hool writing of the newe testament was not thanne had, as it is schewid now biforn in arguyng azena the mis vnder- standing of the firste text. Wherfore by thilk euangellie, of which Poul spekith in the seid ij. text, he vnderstode not the hool writing which is now had of the newe testament.

Also thus: Biforn and eer than eny word was writen of the newe testament, the euangellie of God was, which to alle men ouȝte be denouncid, and whiche alle men ouȝten receyue, thanne it schulde be to hem denouncid. Wherfore the euangellie of God is not the writing of the newe testament, for thanne the same thing had be biforn him sylf, and eer tharf he was him sylf, which includith repugnaunce. That the euangeli of God was, biforn and eer than eny word was writen of the newe testament, y proue thus: The euangellie of God which was to be denouncid to alle peple was in the dai in which Crist stied up into heuen: forwhi he seide thanne to bise disciplis: Go 32, and preche 32 the euangellie to ech creature. And open it is that he thanne bade not to hem forto preche any euangellie which thanne was not and which thei thanne not knewen, but which thanne was and which thei thanne knewen; and as thanne no word was writen of the newe testament, as it is open ynoȝ. Wherfore folowith needis that the euangellie which alle men schulden aftirward receyue into her saluacioun was, eer eny word was writun of the newe testament.
THE FIRST PART.

Also thus: Whanne euere the Apostilis prechiden the Euangeli of God, thanne thilk Euangeli was. For whi no thing was prechid, eer than it was: but so it is that the Euangeli of God was prechid bi the Apostilis soone aftir the Pentecost day, whanne thei hadden receyved the Holi Goost and kunnyng of langage, and whanne thei continuede so in preching bi manye þeeris eer they wroten. Wherfore the Euangeli of God (which Poul and othere Apostilis prechiden) was, eer any word was written of the Newe Testament. And if this be trewe, thanne sithen the ij. seid text of Poul spekith of noon other Euangeli than of the Euangeli of God, for neither he neither eny creature ouzte seie him to hane a propre Euangeli bisidis the Euangeli of God, it folowith nedis that Poul in his ij. text bifoire alleggid, ij. Cor. xiiiij. &. meeneth and vnderstondith of this Euangeli of God, which was bifoire and eer than the Newe Testament was written, and eer than this writing which we now han of the Newe Testament was, and so not as forto signifie this writing of the Newe Testament the ij. text ouzte take his dëw vnderstonding. Certis stories maken mension that Matheu wrote what he wrote of the Gospel in the xlix. þeer of Crist, and Mark wrote what he wrote of the Gospel in the xliij. þeer of Crist, and Luk, (as it is open bi his owne prolog into what he wrote of the Gospel,) he wrote aftir othere writers, and (as summe stori seith) Iohun wrote what he wrote of the Gospel aboute the eende of his ijf aftir his comyng fro exile after the lxxxiij. þeer of Crist. Wherto sowmeth sumwhat the epistle which Dionysse wrote to Iohun being in exile, as thou; Dionise schulde in thilk epistle haue prophecied Iohun to be delyuered fro exile and forto write of the Gospel of

\[1\] vnderstondinging, MS.
Chap. XII.

God. And fit in al this while the Euangelie of God was, and the Gospel of God was; and it was not "covered, but to hem that perischiden." Wherefore the sentence and what is vnderstonde bi the seid ij. text of Poul was, eer Poul wroght thilk text, and eer any writing of the Newe Testament was in erthe. And therafore the verri dew sentence and propre vndirstonding of thilk ij. text is not needis to be of the writing of the Newe Testament. Forwhi the sentence of thilk text is of the Euangelie of God prechid bi Poul, which Euangelie was prechid eer Poul was convniertid and eer eny writing of the Newe Testament was.

Certis this Euangelie (which includith lawe of kinde and lawe of feith zouden bi Crist, and includith also other feith taupt bi Crist which is not lawe to man) is not covered, that is to sei, is not so derk that it be not bileseued and receyued and performed; saue in tho men whiche schulen not bileseue to it and receyue it, whanne it is denouncid to hem, and therafore whiche schulen perishe, for that thei not receyuen and bileseuen what is bi the Euangelie of God to be bileseued and receyued: and this was trewe eer the writing of the Newe Testament was. And this is the trewe and dew vnderstanding of the seid ij. text ij. Cor. iiij. c. where it is seid thus: If oure Euangelie be covered, it is covered to hem whiche spilleth: and that this is the verri trewe and dew vndirstonding of the same text the processe next without meene therto folowing schewith openli ynow, which processe is biforn with the same text in the bigynnyng of this present chapter rehercid.

Excludid therafore is thi gloriuyng, which thou tookist into thee bi this that thou learnedist and studiedist

---

Dionys. Areop. Ep. x. (Op., tom. ii., p. 179. Ed. Cord.) It is almost needless to say that this is a spurious production.
in the wordis and letter of the al hool Bible, or. of
the Newe Testament aloone, and bi the mys vn-
dirstanding of this ij*. biforn herercid text of Poul; and
therbi enhauncidist thi sifl aboue thi Cristen bri-
theren and sistren not so in wordis and letter of
the Bible learned. Excludid certis is thi gloriyng therbi
taken, and verrili it is excludid bi this that thin vn-
trewes vnnderstonding of thilk ij*. text, (3he, and thin
vntrewes vnnderstonding of also the first text) ben in-
proud here, and the trewe and dewe vnnderstondingis
ben to hem here sett and assigned. Be warre ther-
fore frohens forthward that noon of 3ou, so as 3e han
biforn this, glorie and enhaunoe 3ou sifl aboue alle
othere Cristen not so learned in the text of the Bible
as 3e ben, lest that y (which haue experience of 3oure
conuersacioun not according with the commundementis
of the Bible) see to ech of 3ou what Poul seide in
sumwhat lijk caso to the convurias of Iewis, Romans
ij*. 6. fro the bigynnyng of the same chapter into
weel toward the eende, where Poul in the bigynning
seieth thus: Wherfore thou art vnexcusuable, ech man
that deemest: for in what thing thou demest the other
man thou condempnest thi sifl, for thou doost the same
thingis whiche thou deemest, et cetera. And after there
thus: Accepioion of persoones is not anentis God:
for who euere han synned withoute the lawe schulen
periscohe withoute the lawe. And who euere han syn-
ned in the lawe thei schulen be deemed bi the lawe:
for the heerers of the lawe ben not iust anentis God,
but the doers of the lawe schulen be mad iust. For
whanne hethen men, whiche han not lawe, doon kindeli
tho thingis whiche ben of the lawe, tannie thei not
hauyng such lawes ben lawe to hem sifl, that scheven
the werk of the lawe writen in her hertis. For the
consciencie of hem zeldith to hem a witnessing bitwixe
hem sifl of thouztis, whiche ben accusing or defending,
in the dai whanne God schal deeme the privy thingis
of men after me Gospel be Iesu. But if thou art a named Iew, (or ellis for this present purpose for to see thus: but if thou art a named known man,) and restest in the lawe, and hast glorie in God, and hast known his wil, and thou leerid in the lawe proved the more profitable thinges, and trustest thi self to be a leder of blisly men, the list of hem that ben in derkenessis, and techest of unwise men, a maister of young children, that hast the forme of kunnyng and of truthe in the lawe: what thanne?* techest thou another, and techest not thi self? Thou that prechist me schal not stele, stelis? Thou that techest me schal do noon auctorite, doost auctorite? Thou that wlatist mawmetrie, doost sacrilege? Thou that hast glorie in the lawe, vnworshipist God bi breking of the lawe? Thus miche there and ful miche lijk to this present purpose.

That the vndirstonding which this before seid peple gueuth to the iij. before allegid text, Apocalips laste chapter, in the ende, is not dew vndirstonding, y proue thus: The curs of whiche the iij. text spekith is not souen but to hem that amys treten the Apocalips, as it is open bi the same iij. text. Wherfore bi thilk text it is not seid that any curs is souen to eny men amys treting any other parti of the Newe Testament. Also thus: Oonlhe he, that makith the text of a book lenger than he is, settith to the wordis of thilk book; and oonlhe he, which makith the text of a book be schorter than he is, takith fro the wordis of thilk book. But so it is, that if a man makith a exposicioun or a declaraçioun to the text of a book, he makith not the book neither eny text of the book to be therbi the lenger or the schorter. Wherfore he in that settith not or putthith not to the book or to the wordis of the book.

---

1 iij. MS.  
2 The note of interrogation seems necessary, but there is no stop in the MS.
neither takith therfor; and thersore thouz a man expowne the Apocalips or any other book or processe or text of the Newe Testament, he is not therfore in the curs of which it is spoken in the said iiij. text. And so open it is that the biforn seid persoons vndirstonden anys the same seid iiij. text. But the trewe and verry vndirstonding ther of is this: That no man vndir peyne\(^1\) of the seid curs schulde encrece or decrece the text or proces of the same book clepid the Apocalips, as peraunter, if this thretenyng hadde not be \(\sim\)ouen, summen wolden haue do in encreceing or decreceing; bicause that the Apocalips is morre wondurful than othere writings of the Newe Testament ben. Also treuthhe is that the biforn seid men wolen expowne the Apocalips and othere placis of the Newe Testament, whanne euere eny of tho processis ben alleggid a\(\text{s}\)ens hem and a\(\text{s}\)ens her opiniouns. Wherefore bi her vnderstanding which thei taken of the seid iiij. text, that alle expowners and glose \(\text{\^}\)eurers to Holi Scripture ben cursid,\(^2\) thei muste needis graunte hem silf to be cursid.

Now, Sires, whiche schulen rede this book, thouz thoruz out this present xij. chapiter y have taried upon thing which is as of in it silf little worthi or not worthi to be spoken or writun, bi cause this present chapiter is reprouyng a thing which berith openli y\(\text{n}\)ouz with him his owne reproof, \(\text{\^}\)it bi cause that the persoones biforn seid glorien ful veinli and ful childli and lewdel in tho iiij. textis biforn in this chapiter tretid, and that aboue her gloriyng bi whiche in manie othere thei glorien, ech redier of this present chapiter haue pacience in his reding and haue me excusid of therof so long writing.

---

\(^1\) vndirpeyne, MS.  
\(^2\) acursid, MS. (first hand).
xiiij. Chapter.

A great cause why thei of the lay parti which han vaid the hool Bible or onli the Newe Testament in her modris langage han holde the seid first opinion was this, that the reeding in the Bible, namelich in the historial parties of the Oold Testament and of the Newe, is miche delectable and sweete, and drawith the reders into a deuocioun and a loue to God and fro loue and deinte of the world; as y haue had her of experience upon\(^1\) suche reders and upon her now seid disposicioun. And thanne bi cause that the seid reeding was to hem so gracefull, and so delectable, and into the seid eende so profitable, it fil into her conceit forto trowe ful soone, enformyng and tising ther to vsufficienti leerned clerkis, that God had mad or purueied the Bible to mennis bihoue after as it were or bi the vttterist degre of his power and kunnyng for to so ordeyne, and therfore al the hoole Bible (or, as summen trowiden, the Newe Testament) schulde conteyne al that is to be doon in the lawe and servuce to God bi Cristen men, withoute nede to haue ther with eny doctrine. The, and if y schal see what hath be seid to myn owne heering, sotheli it hath be seid to me thus, "that neuere man errid bi " reeding or studiyng in the Bible, neither eny man " myste erre bi reeding in the Bible, and that for " such cause as is now seid:" notwithstanding that ther is no book written in the world bi which a man schal rather take an occasioun forto erre, and that for ful gode and open trewe causis, whiche ben spoken and expressid in the ijt. parti of the book clepid The iust apprising of Holi Scripture. But certis thei

\(^1\)upon, MS. The word is written upon and upon elsewhere.
tooken her mark amys: for thei puttiden al her motyue in her affeccioun or wil forto so trowe; and not in her intelleccioun or resoun; and in lijk maner doon wommen, for thei reulen hem silf as it were in alle her gouernauncis aftir her affeccioun\(^1\) and not aftir resoun, or more aftir affeccioun than after doom of resoun; bi cause that affeccioun in hem is ful strong and resoun in hem is litle, as for the more parti of wommen.

And therfore euyn riȝt as a man iugid amys and were foule bigild and took his mark amys, if he schulde trowe that in hony were al the cheer, al the coumfort, al the thrist which is in al other mete, bi cause that hony is swettist to him of alle othere metis; so he is begild and takith his mark amys, if he therfore trowe that in Holi Scripture is al the doctrine necessarie to man for to serve God and forto kepe his lawe; bi cause that Holi Scripture is so michi delectable, and for that bi thilk delectacioun he bringith yn myche cheer and coumfort and strenghthith the wil forto the more do and suffre for God. And so me thinkith to suche men good counsell were for-to seie to hem, that thei be waar of childrenys perel, which is that bi cause children louen sweete meetis and drinkis ful michi, therfore whanne thei comen to feestis thei feeden hem with sweete stonding potagis and with sweete bake metis, and leuen othere substancial and necessarie metis; trowing that bi so michi tho sweete meetis ben the more holsum, how michi more thei ben swetter than othere metis: and therfore at the laste thei geten to hem therbi bothe losse of dewe nurisching and also sumtyme vilonie. Certis in lijk maner y haue wiste suche men, that han so ouer michi þeuen hem to reeding in the Bible alone, haue gete to hem losse of sufficient and profitable leernyng

---

\(^1\) It is not very clear whether the MS. has *affeccioun* or *affeccioun*.
which in other wheris thei mizten haue gete, and also vilonie forto avowe and warante that thei couthen the trewe sentence and trewe vnderstonde of the Bible, whanne and where thei not couthen so vnderstonde, neither couthen mentene what thei ther ymne vnderstonden, and also forto avowe and warante that in the Bible were miche more and profitabler and of other soort kunnyng than¹ can ther yn be founde. And therfore to alle suche men mai be seid what is seid Prouerbs xxv. c. in sentence thus: Thou hast founde hony, eto thereof what is ynowz, and no more; lest thou ouer fillid caste it vp out azen, and thanne is it to thee vilonie: and what is witten aftir in the same chapter there in sentence thus: Foro eto miche of hony is not good to the eter. So that thanne euere thou takist upon thee forto vnderstonde fether in the Bible than thi wit may or can therefore suffice without help of a substancial clerk, thanne etist thou of hony more than ynowz, and doost azen the biding of Seint Poul, Romans xij. c. sooone after the bigunynge. And whanne thou attendist forto leerne Holi Scripture, and attendist not ther with forto haue any other leernyng of philisophie or of diuynite, bi thin owne studie in bookis ther of maad or bi teching and informacion of sum sad clerk zouun to thee, thanne thou etist hony aloon and feedist thee with hony oonli. And this feding schal turne into thin vnholsumnes, riȝt as if thou schuldist ete in bodili maner noon other mete than hony it schulde not be to thee hoolsum.

To ȝou therfore, whiche fauoren the firste seide opinion, I seie the wordis of Seint Iame writen in his [first]² c. thus: Take ȝe or receyue ȝe this graffid word, which may saue ȝoure soulis. Receyue ȝe the loore of this present firste parti of this book and the iij.

¹ that, MS.; altered by a later hand into than.
² A space left for the number in the MS.
parties of The iust apprizing of Holi Scripture, and receive 3e it as a graffid word, that is to seie receive 3e it as a doctrine groundid and foundid in such autorite, which muste needis menteyne the same doctrine, that no man schal mowe putte it doun. For if he wel considere out of what ground it groweth and to what fundament it leeneth, y doute not but that 3e schulen consente that it is a sureli graffid word, which mai saue 3oure soulis fro manye perilouse errouris and heresies, if into eny suche 3e ben cume; and mai preserue 3ou that 3e falle into noon, into which 3e ellis schulden come. And if 3e bithenke 3ou weel how it is in werk of this present first parti bitwixe me and 3ou, certis it is in lijk maner as it was bitwixe Poul and the Cristen whiche at Rome were conuertid fro Iewry into Cristenhode. Forwhi in the daies of Seint Poul Iewis. and tho that weren conuertid fro Iewis lawe into Cristenhode magnifieiden ouermiche the Oold Testament; for thou 3 the oold lawe was good to the kepers therof, 3it it was not so good as thei maden therof, namelich in thilk degre in which thei conceueden it to be good; and Poul witing this repressid her ouer miche dignifiyng of the oold lawe, and declareid the dignifiyng and the laude of the oold lawe, as he is in treuthie, withynne his propre and seueral boundis and markis. For of this mensioun is maad Romans [the second and third chapters].1 And euen lijk maner is bitwix 3ou and me in these daies. Forwhi many of the lay parti dignifiuen ouer miche the writing of the Newe Testament, and many other dignifiuen ouermiche the writing of al the hool Bible, weenyng that of the now seid writing is verifid the bifoire rehercid firste opinioun: and y, bi what y can, am aboute fro the bigynnyng of this present book hidir to, and thorouz out al the book clepid The iust ap-

---
1 A space left in the MS. for the reference.
prising of Holi Scripture, for to improse and reprouse the seid firste opinioun, and for to therbi represse the seid ouermiche dignifiyng of the Newe Testament and of the al hool Bible, and forto putte his trewe and dew dignifiyng withynne his propre to him seueral and dewe markis and boundis, in the maner bifoire spokun bi the iij\* principal conclusion. God therafore grante that as the Romayns obeieden to the open resoun and proof which Seint Poul made and wrote a\#nens hem, that so ze obie to the open proof which y make and write a\#nens 3ou, thou\$ y desire not that ze obie to me.

And whanne al is doon, what euuer wil a man hath forto do reuerence to Holi Scripture, 3it sithen treuth is to bê had in al a mannys gouernauncis, the best gouernaunce in this mater is this: forto suffre Holi Scripture abide withinne his owne termys and boundis, and not entre into the boundis and the rîst of lawe of kinde: that is to seie, that he not vsurpe eny grounding which longith to the faculte of lawe of kinde or of moral philosphi, and so that he not wrongee the\' lawe of kinde. And a\#nward, that the seid lawe of kinde kepe him withinne hise owne teermys and boundis, and not entre into boundis and rîst of Holi Scripture: that is to seie, that he not vsurpe eny grounding which longith to Holi Scripture, neither therbi wrongee Holi Scripture; but that euereither of hem neizbourly dwelle bisidis the other of hem, and not entermete as in grounding with the other of hem. And this beste gouernaunce schal be performed, if (aftir sentence of the vj. firste conclusiouns) it be holde\# that Holi Scripture schal grounde the conclusionus and treuthis of Cristen feith, and not eny oon conclusioun or treuth into whos fynding and

\* A stroke is drawn through the by a later hand, but the corrector seems to have tried to wash it out; the article seems to be right.  
\# biholde, MS.
THE FIRST PART.

grounding doom of mannys resoun may suffice, with
concours of the grace which God bi his comoune uni-
versal lawe is woned and is redi alwey zeue; and
azensward, that doom of manunys resoun or lawe of
kinde schal founde and grounde the conclusioume and
treuthis of Cristen lawe into whose fynding resoun in
the now seid maner may suffice, and that he not
grounde eny oon conclusioune or treuth of feith; and
but if this gournaunce be kept, pees, riʒt, and
trouthe is not bitwixe hem kept.

Pernenture here summan of the lay party, hold-
ing the seid first opiniooun and therefore hoolding azens
the first before sett conclusioune, wole renne azens me
with summe writings of oolde and holy Doctours
sownyng into the firste opiniooun and azens the firste
conclusiooun: not for that he admyttith, receueth, and
allowith the writingis of the Doctours, for thanne he
schulde smyte him sylf with his owne stroke; but for
that he knowith me admyytte and allowe the writingis
of Doctours, therfore he makith azens me this assaut,
in pretending as thou; he wole do to me as Davud
dide to Golie in smyng of of Golie's heed with his
owne sword. Neuertheles sufficient bokeler azens this
assailing schal be to me a book which y haue bigunne
to' write in Latyn, clepid The iust apprising of Do-
couris. For in hizjer maner than as thilke book schal
techte the writingis of Doctours to be take in to cre-
dence, (whether thei ben of oold or of newe, of holi
or of not holi Doctours), thei ouzten not be take, as
there schal in clerist maner be opend and proued:
but bi cause noon of hem, azens whom y write this
present book, wole so allegge azens me for eny zele
or credence which he him sylf hath to what he schal
so allegge, therfore it is no nedo me forto, as here in
this booke enecrse the writingis of Doctours sown-
yng azens mi present entent, and forto expowne and

\[1\text{ to in a later hand.}\]
cleree her wordis. Perauentur summe of tho writingis
vnderstonden of grounding takun vnpropirli and
largeli and not propirli, of which maner of taking
this word ground or grounding y haue spoken bifoere
in this book in the eende of the [fifth]1 chapiter.
And summe of tho writingis ben to be vnderstonde in
figure of yperbole or in summe other figuratiif speche,
for whanne vpon any thing spechis or writingis ben
maad bi wey of commendaciuon or bi wey of vitupe-
racioun, tho spechis ben2 woned be myche fauorid bi
figuris excusing what ellis in hem schulde be vntrewed
and defauti; and a greet licence han writers and spek-
ers in these now seid causis forto write and speke
more wijdeli, than thei schulden be suffrid forto
write and speke of the same thing out of these now
seid causis. And thercfoere, brother, be not ooverboold
vpon wordis and writingis in suche maters where yn
resoun hath to decee; but truste ther yn to cleer
doom of resoun, and thenke what an oolde Doctour
Hillary seith (and soothe it is) that the wordis of a
spiker ben to be referried into the extent wherto he
hem spekith.3 For therbi ful ofte and ellis not schal
be caușt4 of tho wordis the trewe and dew vndir-
stonding. But forto seie in oon word what mai be
seid in manie, who ever wole for eni Doctouris writ-
ing fauore the firste opinioun and countre ażens the
firste conclusiouon, assiole he ther with alle the euy-
dencias or argumentis bifoere sett into proof of the
firste conclusiouon. And no more bi me of this vnto
other place and tyme.

---

1 A space left in the MS. for the
number.
2 be, MS. (first hand.)
3 Intelligentia dictorum ex causis
est assumenda dicendi, quia non
sermoni res sed rei est sermo sub-
jectus. S. Hilari., de Triis, lib. iv.
(p. 835. Ed. Bened.) Dicti ratio
ex sensu crit intelligenda dicendi
(dicentis, some MSS.) Id., ib. ii.
(p. 803. Ed. Bened.) To one or
both of these passages Pecock here
alludes.
4 The MS. probably originally
had caușt, but an erasure has altered
it into caușt.
xiiij. CHAPTER

But certis more scharpeli here risen ij. obieciouns, whiche the holders of the firste opinoun miitzen make aizens me bi resoun thus: Mannys resoun is a thing whiche in hisе doomys and iugementis ofte failith, as experience ofte schewith. Wherfore it myзte seme that God wolde not him to be oure reule in deedis of oure servisice to God. Forwhi this, that God schulde make vs forto leene to a thing deceuyuyng and failling forto performe his servisice, biftith not his wisdom as it wolde seme. The ij. obiectioun is this: Holi Scripture is a reuerend thing and a wortli, sythen that bi it and fro it al the Cristen Chirche of God takith her feith. Wherfore it miitze seme that God wolde not subdewe or submitte and remytte and sende him to resoun, for to be interpretid and be expowned and dressed into trewe and dewe sense and vndirstonding; and that bothe for resoun is a reule failing in his doom, and al so for that Holi Scriptures affermyng vpon a mater is more worthi than is the doom of mannis resoun. And therafter sithen, as it semeth, God not so reulith him in bisе gouernauncis, that he zeneth a reule which is not sufficient forto reule, or that he putith the worthier thing vndir reule of the vnworthier thing, it miitze seme miche of al what ye hauе bfore tauэt in this present book be vntrewe.

This chapter is misnumbered xiii. in the MS. (the two preceding chapters having been originally numbered xii.), and the error extends throughout the remainder of the First Part. A later hand has corrected the running title in part; in this edition, it need hardly be added, the error is corrected throughout.

The MS. has been corrected from bissettith into bissettith; but bissettith is probably the true reading.
To the firste of these iij. obieicinow y aswvere thus: It is ful profitable to mankinde that he hauke of seable truehithe sure knowinge, and that bi siȝt of iȝen; and ȝit what ȝothere iȝen or seinge power hath God ȝouen to mankinde forto therwith se, than which at sumtyme wolen falfe and erre? It is also ful profitable to mankinde that he hauke sure knowinge of heereable truehithe, and that bi hearinge of eeris; and ȝit what ȝothere eeris or power of heering hath God ȝoue to man, than which at sumtyme schulen faile and erre in deemyng? Is it not profitable to mankinde forto move fro oon place into an other place redili and riȝtli and sureli with leggis and feet? And ȝit what ȝothere feet or leggis hath God ȝoue to man, than which schulen at sumtyme slide and at sumtyme stumble fro the riȝt going and moving? And if this be trewe, certis thouȝt it be ful profitable to mankinde forto knowe with and bi the power of resoun resonable truehithe, (that is to sesie suche as mowe not to be knowe bi seing or heering or byny outward sensitijf wit,) and also thoȝ same truehithe whiche outward sensityue wittis knowen, it is not mervel, thouȝ God ȝene noon other power of resoun to man forto bi it knowe these truehithe, than whiche power of resoun schal at sumtyme and ofte falfe in his resonyng and iuging. And, namelich, herfore it is the lasse mervel. For bi cause that God hath ȝouen to vs noon ȝothere ȝinen and power of seing than whiche wolen at sumtyme erre, and noon other power of heering than whiche wolen at sumtyme erre, and noon ȝothere feet than whiche wolen ofte slide and stumble; therfore if we do oure diligence and bisynes forto kepe as weel as we mowen and kunnen oure power of seing that he erre not, oure power of heering that

1 the, MS. (first hand).
2 schat, MS.
he erre not, our feet that thei slide not and stumble not, God wole holde us excusid, thouzh our power of seing erre, and thouzh our power of heering erre, and thouzh our feet stumble; and it schal be allowd to us as miche of God as if it be seen arižt, herd arižt, and walkeid arižt. And euyn so, bi cause that God hath ʒouen to vs noon other power of resonyn gyng than which may faile and erre, he wole holde us excusid, thowʒ we felewe an erroneose doom of reson, whilis we ben not neelgint but diligent bothe in oure owne avising and bi counseil taking of othere forto haue a riʒt doom in oure reson; and he wole allowe, rewarde, acceppe, and take oure deede which we doon bi such an erroneose doom, as ferforth as it were doon bi a riʒt doom; al the while that thilke errour in oure resonys doom is had ægens oure wil, and not bi oure consent and willing or neeligence. And so, if this be trewe, (as it is proued be trewe in other placis of my writingis,) noon incoonvenience is, if God ordeyne the power of reson for to be oure reule in his service doing, thouʒ thilke power of reson be such that he schal sumtime (ʒhe, and ofte tym) erre, but if the gretter laboure be mad tharažens bi avisingis and bi counseil taking and bi leernyng long tym in scolis.

Neuertheles it may be answerid to the firste objec-
cioun in other wise thus: That the power of reson
in him sylf is not ordeynef of God to be oure next and
best and surest reule or reule anentis alle resonable
truthis, but the doom of reson is ordeynef to so be;
and ſit not ech doom of reson, but thilke doom of
resoun which is a formal complete argument clepid
a sillogisme in reson, whos bothe premisse ben
sureli or likeli known for trewe, and that bi hem
sylf or bi syme othere before had lijk sillogisme or
sillogismes prouying the premisse hauyn gi ng to be
proued, into tym he bcome into premisse openest
in suerte or openest in probabilite or likelihode. And

Another answer
to the same ob-
jection. God has
not ordained the
power of reason,
simply taken in
itself, to be our
guide, but the
syllogistic judg-
ment of the
reason, which is
infallible.
certis this doom of resoun (in this wise had) faillith neuere, neither may in eny tyme erre. For if y be sikir aud suer in my resoun that no man is in the chirche of Seint Poul at Londoun, and that the bishop of London is a man, y mai be sekir and sure that the bishop of London is out of the chirche of Seint Poul at London, thou alle aungels in heuen wolde see the contrarie. And cause of this suerte is that the doom of resoun is had bi such a formal sillogisme as is now seid. And in lijk maner suerte of knowing is had bi ech other of the xix. maners or chaungis of sillogismes tauht in logik bi opene reulis. Lete therefor ech man abide in his resonyng in what euer mater of resonyng he hath to do, in to tyme he be sure that he hath suche seid sillogismes; and he schal neuere be deceyued. So that al the cause whi men ben deceyued in resonyng is her hastynes, that thei wole iuge bi schorte argumentis, eer tho argumentis ben reducied into formes of sillogismes; or ellis for that thei trusten and trownen the premisse be trewe, eer that thei seen the premisses sufficientli proued bi sillogizing, into tyme it be come up into premissis so open in sure trouthe or ellis so open in probabilitie, that noon rede is that eny other premisse be take forto proue hem; or ellis for that thei known not bi reulis zounen therto whanne an argument is a formal sillogisme, and whanne he so is not. Sotheli, if a man wole reule him thus, he schal neuere be bigiled aboute maters of reoning; for whi ther is noon conclusioum or trouthe in the world, (except tho which ben open bi experience of sensitiij Witt or at fulle pleyn in resoun, whiche ben clepid groundis and foun-damentis to alle the other treuthis and conclusioums in philisophie, and aboute which no man schal erre, bi cause thei ben so openli trewe), but that into proof of it mai be had a sillogisme weel reulid. And thanne if the bothe premisises be knowne at fulle for sure
trouthis, the conclusioum is to be take for sure trouth; and if the bothe premyssis be knowyn not for sure trouthis, but for suche that for the more parti thei ben trewe and seeldem fallith the contrarie that thei ben vntrewe, or if oon of the premisis be such as is now seid and the other is sure trouth, thanne the conclusioum is known as probabili or likeli trewe.

And this difference here now touchid is the difference bitwix a demonstratijf sillogisme and a probable sillogisme, that is to seie bitwixe a sillogisme which zeneuth sure and vndoutable kunnynge and a sillogisme which zeneuth probable kunnynge oonli, that is to seie kunnynge of likelihode and of opiouion but not of certeinte. And so no trewe is a this side the openest fundamental treuthis, but that into proof of him mai be he had a sillogisme weel reulid forto prowe him sureli trewe, or forto prowe him likeli to be trewe; unde, and so likeli to be trewe that he is rather to be holde for trewe than for vntrewe, and that he is to be holde trewe into tyme his contrarie parti be had strenger and eydenter premisis than ben the premesis whiche ben had into him now. And even as a premisse, whoes suer knowing is lokiid aftir and souzt aftir, is to be resolued bi arguyng of sillogismes in the maner now seid, into tyme it be come into premisis of openest suerte; so whanne eny premysse is such that his suer trouth is not lokiid aftir neither souzt aftir, but his probabilite or likelihode of trouth is lokiid aftir and souzt aftir, he is to be resolued upward bi sillogismes, into tyme it be come vp into premyssis of whiche enue either is openest in likelihode thouz not in suerte, or ellis into premyssis of which oon is openest in suerte of trouth and the other is openest in suerte of likelihode or of pro-

1 The word into seems required  2 Ooon, MS. before his.
bility a this side suerte. So that as ther ben principis openest in suerte to treuthis whos suer kunnyng is souzt aftir to be had, so ther ben principis openest in probabilite or likelihode to treuthis whos likeli kunnyng or probable kunnyng is souzt aftir to be had, and whos suer kunnyng is not souzt aftir to be had.

If ensaumplis weren sett to al this doctrine, weel y woot the doctrine wolde be vndirstonde the bettir. But certeinli it were ouerlong for this book for to sette out al the ful doctrine which is now here attained of sillogizing for sure kunnyng, and of sillogizing for probable or likeli kunnyng; and forto sett therto sufficient ensaumplis were ouer it miche lenger. And threfore y must here therof abstene and forber. But sit thou; y schal not be vnderstonde sufficientli of the lay reders in this bifoire going proces (namelich at the first), and not with oute studie and labour in her partie, me thinkith y muste needis seie so miche ther of as y haue now seid; for ellis thei wolden weeue that a good clerk couthe the not asoile the fiste obiecccioun, which y am sikir thei wolden make. And y haue leefir forto seie sumwhat of the trewe substantial answere longing therto, thou; y schulde not be sufficientli ther yn vnderstonde of hem, than forto seie not of such sufficient answere bi cause of her insufficiency of vndirstonding, and therbi forto suffre vntrewwe diffame falle to the clergie, and hem forto rise into presumpcioun of trowing that thei han kunnyng more than thei han, and that thei han noon or litle nede to groundli clerkis. Wherfore who mai not or cannot vnderstonde this ij' answere to the fiste obiecccioun, take he him to the fiste now bifoire seid answere to the same obiecccioun; for bothe ben gode ynozu, and bothe (thou; in her dyuerse maners) ben trewe, sithen the doom of resoun may not be oure next reule in doing Goddis service, but if resoun were the romber reule to vs into the same doing of Goddis service, bi
cause that the doom of resoun cometh out and fro the resoun, as the liȝt of the sunne comith fro the sunne.

Aftir that y haue schewid thus: That noon inconuenient is, thou; God assigne for oure reule into his seuerice the power of resoun in oon maner of reuling, as a power of deedis hath forto reule; and also aftir that y haue schewid thus: That the doom of resoun miȝte be a surer reule to us into Goddis moral seuerice than is the power of reson,—now y schal schewe that eneereither of hem is needis to be seid oure reule into the moral seuerice of God to be doon. And firste thus: Of al the moral seuerice of God, which is moral lawe of kinde, Holi Scripture is not the reule. Forwhi than therof Holi Scripture were the ground, which is proved bifoire to be vntrewye: Also of al the now seid moral seuerice of God, Holi Scripture is oonli a witnesser and a reheroe, and takith it out and fro moral lawe of kinde and out of moral philosophe, as it is bifoire proved. Wherfore Holi Scripture is not neither may be reuler of thilk moral lawe and seuerice to God. And thanne thus: Of thilk now seid moral lawe and seuerice to God Holi Scripture muste be reuler, or sumwhat ellis bisidis Holi Scripture muste be ther of the reuler; but now and bifoire it is proved that Holi Scripture may not be ther of the reuler, bi cause he is not therof the grounder, and he is ther of oonli the reheroe and witnesser, and taker of it fro an other which is grounder. And herewith it is also open that noon othir thing bisidis Scripture can be assigned forto be ther of the reule or reuler, but if it were the seid doom of resoun mad in forme of sillogisime as the next and best reule, and the power of resoun as for the romber and ferther reule; in as miche as fro the power of resoun cometh forth the now seid doom of resoun. Wherfore needis it muste be grantid, no man may it avoide, that bothe resoun which is the power of resonyng and of deemyng, and
the seid sillogistik doom of resoun ben in her bothe
dyuerse maners reulis of al our e moral servise to
God, which is moral lawe of kinde, and of al our e
lawe to God noon except, whether thei ben lawis of
feith or not of feith; for noon of hem can be knowen
of us withoute a sillogisme. And thus Miche is ynoy
for answere to the firste obieccioun.

XV. Chapiter.

For answere to the ij" obieccioun: Sithen it is so
that Holi Scripture hath not to do in him sif forto
reule any trouthe or gouernaunce of natural philosphi
or of moral philosphi and of moral lawe of kinde,
which he rehercith, witnessith, or tretith, and as of
hem he rehersith, witnessith, and tretith, (for this is
ofte before schewid and proued,) and for that he is
reule oonli of feithis whiche he tretith and tetchith, bi
cause that oonli of hem he is founder and grounder;
and therfore of the treuthis and conclusiouns of moral
lawe of kinde as thei ben witnessid in Holi Scripture
sum thing muste be reule, rjst as of hem sum thing
muste be ground, and noon such thing can be avisid
to be bisidis Holi Scripture forto be to hem reule and
ground, saue the seid sillogistik doom of resoun in oon
maner, and the power of resoun out of which thilk
doom cometh and that in an other maner: (wherfore
needis it muste be grauntid that bothe resoun which
is the powere of resonyng, and resoun which is the seid
doom and sillogistik deede of resonyng ben in her ij.
dyuerse maners reulis to Holi Scripture in alle the
pointis of mannis moral servise to God, noon except;
and that for cause now late before sett and seid which
is broddir declarid in The folwer to the donet, and
is proued openli in the first parti of The book of
And furthermore for answer to it that the 2nd objection allegith Holi Scripture to be worthier than is the doom of resoun, and that therefore the 1st doom of resoun ouȝte not reule Holi Witt, it is to be seid thus: That Holi Witt mai be take for the outward letris writun and schapun vnder dyuerse figuris in parchemyn or in velyn, and forto speke of Holi Witt in this maner is not according to this purpos. For Holi Witt in this wise takun, is not holier neither better than any other writing is 3nd which hath lîjk good ynke, and is lîjk craftili figurid. In an other maner, accordingli to this present purpos, Holi Witt is takun for the kunnyng wherbi the thing is kunne which is signifiied and bitokened bi the now seid outward Holi Witt writun in parchemyn or velyn, or ellis mai be take for the outward writing, as it signifieth his estruthis bitokened bi it, and as it is ioyed and couplid with the kunnyng of the estruthis signifiied bi the outward writing. Also it is to vndir-stonded that doom of resoun mai be take in ij. wisis pertinentli, and accordingli to this present purpos. In oon maner doom of resoun is the deede of resonyng in mannis resoun, bi which the power of resoun (or

1 that the, MS. (first hand).
2 A later hand has joined writing wrongly.

Further answer to the objection. Disproof of the position that Scripture is more worthy than the judgment of the reason. Explanation of certain terms premised. Further discussion of this subject shall be made in another treatise.
the man bi the power of resoun) resoneth, making proposicions of simple wordis and termys knyt to gideere, and making syllogismys of proposicions knyzt to gideres bi teching of certein reulis: and in this maner oonli it is to be vnderstonde, as ofte as we han spoke ther of fro the bigynnyng of the xij. chapiter biforn hidir to. In another maner doom of resoun is take for the kunnyng of the conclusioum which is concludid in a syllogisme mad bi doom of resoun takun in the firste maner, and in this ij. maner it is spokun biforn fro the bigynnyng of the ij. chapiter vnto the eende of the x. chapiter, weelniʒ alwey, whanne it is thare spokun of doom of resoun, or ellis namelich whanne euere thare doom of resoun is clepid lawe of kinde or moral philosophie, and comparisoun is mad thare bitwixe lawe of kinde or doom of resoun and Holi Scripture.

Now, Sir, if we now in the ij. obieccion biforn sett take Holi Scripture in the ij. maner, and doom of resoun in the ij. maner, sotheli Holi Writt in alle the now seid trouthis, conclusioums, and gouvernauncis, whiche he rehercith, denouncith, and techith of moral lawe of kinde, is vnworthier than is the moral lawe of kinde; and therfore is vnworthier than is sum doom of resoun takun in the ij. maner. Forwhi alle tho trouthis and conclusions1 Holi Writt takith and borewith out of moral lawe of kinde, and2 ben not hise as bi grounding, and founding, and prouyng, but oonli bi rehercing, witnessing, and denouncing; and open ynow it is that the grounder and prouver of truthis is in hem worthiher than the rehercer of hem; as the lord of money is worthier in the money than he that hath it3 bi mustring it and schewing it oonli; and therefore, though Holi Writt, as anentis alle the treuthis and conclusioums whiche ben of moral phil-

1 conclusions of, MS. (first hand). 2 it is interlinearized by a later (?) 3 We seem to require thei after and. hand.
THE FIRST PART.

Sophie or of natural philosophi or of methaphisik
reheroid bi him, be reulid bi resoun and his' doom
(takun in the i*j. maner) in alle the now seid
trouthis, conclusouns, and gouernauncis, ther of fol-
ewith not that the worthier in that that he is wor-
thier is subdewid vndir reule of the vnworthier as he
is the vnworthier. Certis, if Holi Scripture be wor-
thier in eny of hise trouthis and conclusouns than
is doom of resoun takun in the i*j. maner, and as he
comprehendith natural philosophie and metaphisik and
moral philosophie, he is so worthier in hise trouthis of
faith whiche ben not lawis to man, whiche Holi Scrip-
ture groundith, and the seid doom of resoun may not
hem grounde, as that God is iij. persones, and that
the secunde persoone of hem was mad man, and that
he suffrid and died, and that we schulen rise in fleisch
after ours deeth, and so forth of others suche feithis
being no lawis to man; and vit whether Holi Scrip-
ture be worthier or profitabler to man than is the
now seid doom of resoun taken in the i*j. maner, forto
serue God and deserue meede in hevne, schal not be
disputid and determyned here in this book, but per-
amenture it schal be determyned in my writingis to
heers of hijer vndirstonding.

Neuertheles with this y wolde it were not forsete it has been
what y haue taucht bifoire bi the [seventh] principal
conclusion, that al the positijf lawe of feith which
Scripture groundith or techith, that is to seie, al the
feith being positijf lawe to man, which Scripture
groundith or techith, is not so worthi in it sult, nei-
ther so necessarie and profitable to man, for to serue
God and deserue meede in heuen, as is the seid doom
of resoun being moral lawe of kinde; and therfore

1 in his, MS. (first hand).
2 A space left in the MS. for the
number. The seventh rather than
the tenth conclusion seems to be
intended; but neither of them is
exactly designed to prove what is
here affirmed to be proved. See
pp. 39, 43.

F 2
Holi Scripture as in the positijf lawis of feith to man is not so worthi in him sylf, neither so profitable and necessarie to man as is the seid doom of resoun, which is lawe of kinde.

And furthermore, sitheal what mai be clepid in eny maner largeli lawe of feith, being not positijf lawe of feith, is propirli lawe of kinde and not oonli lawe of feith, (as it is tauȝt bifoer in proof of the x\textsuperscript{e} conclusion bi remyssioin into the book Of iust apprising of Holi Scripture,) it folowith that if we speke of lawe of feith in this maner, al the lawe of feith which Holi Scripture techith is not so worthi and so profitable to man as is lawe of kinde tauȝt out of Holi Scripture bi doom of resoun, with oute godli reuelacioun. Forwhei thuȝ forto speke of lawe of feith ther is no lawe of feith, saue it which is positijf lawe of feith; and al positijf lawe of feith is oonli lawe aboute the newe sacramentis; and the vis of tho (as for and bi hem sylf) ben vnworlth and lasse profitable to man than is lawe of kinde, as it is bifoer proued. If Holi Writt be take in the iij\textsuperscript{e} maner and doom of resoun in the firste maner, certis y holde thanne that doom of resoun in sum maner is worthier and perfiter than is Holi Writt thoroȝ out al the Bible. Forwhei the seid doom of resoun in this firste wise taken is cause of the Holi Writt takun in the iij\textsuperscript{e} wise. Forwhei doom of resoun, takun in the firste wise is cause of al kunnyng in the vnnderstanding or intellect of man, and that whether thilk kunnyng be feith or no feith; and Holi Scripture in the iij\textsuperscript{e} maner takun is not ellis than a certein kunnyng causid bi doom of resoun takun in the firste maner, by occasioun of Holi Writt takun in the firste maner; and therfore Holi Writt in this iij\textsuperscript{e} maner takun is vnworthier than is doom of resoun takun in the firste maner, and that as weel where Holi

\textsuperscript{4} thes is by a later hand, the original reading having been erased; this word may have been propirli, which the sense seems to require.
THE FIRST PART.

Writt techith articlis of feith as ellis where. And here y make an eende of my answeris 3ouun to the ij. bfore reheciced obieciouns.

xvj. CHAPITER.

In whiche answeris thou y haue write or seid more than wole anoon accorde with the capacite of the Bible men, to whom and aqens whom this book is principaly maad, zit y haue leefir so do than forto seie and write lasse; leet therbi schulde seeme to hem, that sufficient answeres oouthe not be 3ouun to her seid ij. obieciouns; and leet that ellis thei mysten trowe, that bi her powring in the Bible aloon thei misten leerne for to asoile sufficientli alle obieciouns bhiholding the Bible, thou3 thei hadden no counsell of substancial clerkis weel leerned in logik and in moral philosophie. And ther fore of oon thing y warne al the world, which is this. If substanciali learned clerkis in logik and in moral philosophie and in dyvynyte, and ripeli exercisid ther yn, weren not and schulden not be forto wiseli and dewli 3ene trewe vndirstondingis and ex-posiciouns to textis of Holy Scripture: or ellis, thou3 suche clerkis ben, and the lay parti wolen not attende to the doctrine, whiche tho clerkis mowe and wolen (bi proof of sufficient and open euydence) mynstre to the lay parti; but the lay parti wolen attende and truste to her owne wittis, and wolen lene to textis of the Bible oonli, y dare weel seie so many dyuernse opinions schulden1 rise in lay mennys wittis bi occa-sioun of textis in Holy Scripture aboute mennys moral councersacioun, that al the world schulde be cumbrid therwith, and men schulden accorde to gi-dere in keping her seruice to God, as doggis doon

1 schulde, MS. (first hand).
Hence the origin of the Bohemian troubles in the time of the Hussites. These should be a warning to the Bible-men, who are split up into various parties among themselves. The names of some of these parties.

Certis in this wise and in this now seid maner and bi this now seid cause bifille the reful and wepeable destruccioun of the worthi citee and universite of Prage, and of the hool rewele of Beeme, as y haue had ther of enformacioun ynow. And now, afar the destruccioun of the rewele, the peple ben glad for to resorte and turne azen into the catholik and general feith and loore of the chirohe, and in her pouerte bildith up azen what was bren and throwun doun, and noon of her holdingis can thriue. But for that Crist in his prophecycynge muste needis be trewe, that ech kingdom deuidid in hom silf schal be destryued, threfore to hem bifille the now seid wrecchid mys chaunce. God for his merci and pite peke Ynglond, that he come not into lijk daunce. But forto turne here fro azen vntooure Bible men, y preie ze sele ze to me, thanne among you is rise a strijf in holdingis and opinious, (bi cause that ech of you trusstith to his owne studie in the Bible aloon, and wole haue alle treuthis of mennys moral conversacioun there groundid,) what iuge mai theerto be assigned in erthe, saue resoun and the biFORE seid doom of resoun? For thou3 men schulden be
The First Part.

and doom of resoun; and if this be trewe, who schulde thanne better or so weel vse, demene, and execute this resoun and the seid doom, as schulde tho men whiche han spende so miche labour aboute thilk craft? And these ben tho now bifoire seid clerkis. And therefore, ze Bible men, bi this here now seid which ze muste needis graunte, for experience which ze han of the disturblauce in Beeme, and also of the disturblauce and dyuerse feelingis had among 3ou sif now in Ynglond, so that summe of 3ou ben clepid Doctor-mongers, and summe ben clepid Opinioun-holders, and summe ben Neutralis, that of so presumptuose a cisme abhominacioun to othere men and scheme to 3ou it is to heere; rebuke now 3ou sif, for as miche as ze wolden not bifoire this tyme allows, that resoun and his doom schulde haue such and so greet interesse in the lawe of God and in expownyng of Holi Scripture, as y haue seid and proued hem to haue.

And also herbi take ze a sufficient mark, that ze haue nede forto haue 3oure recours and conseil with suche now biforessid clerkis, thouz ze wolden la-

bore, and powre, and dote alle the daies of 3oure lijf in the Bible aloon. And drede ze of the effect which biffile to Bohemers for lijk cause, and mys
gouernaunce in holding the first seid opinion; and bi so miche the more drede ze thilk effect, bi how miche bi Crist it is pronouncid forto falle, where euer cysme and dyvisyon is contynued; for he seith [Matth. xij.] 1 z, that every kingdom or comouncte dyvidid in him sif schal be destroyed. But thanne 

3enward ze must 2 be weare her of, that euen as oon sterre is different from an other sterre in cleernes, so

1 A space left in the MS. for the reference.
2 ze must interlinearied in a later (?) hand.
oon clerk is different from an other in kunnyng. And therfore, brother, take heed to doom of cleer resoun in this mater, which also is remembrid to vs bi the wise man, Ecclesiastici vii. c., thus: Manie be to thee possible, but of a thousand on be thi counsellor. And in special be waer that thou not accepte, cheese, and take a clerk forto be sufficient to thee into the now seid purpos bi this aloon, that he mai were a pilioun on his heed; neither bi this, that he is a famose and a pleaunt precher to peple in a pulpit; neither bi this, that he is a greet and thikke rateler out of textis of Holie Scripture or of Doctouris in feestis or in othere cumpanyingis: for certis experience hath ofte tauzt and mai here teche surely ynoy, that summe werers of piliouns in scole of dyuynyte han scantli be worthi for to be in the same scole a good scoler; and ful manye of the iij. and iij. soortis appeering: ful gloriose1 to the heering of the lay parti, and also summe of othere maner of clerkis, whanne thei schul-den come forto dispute and examyne and trie and iuge in harde2 doutis of Goddis lawe, were not worthi forto therto vnnethis opene her mouth. I detecte here no man in special; who euer can proue him sylf to be noon such as y haue here now spoken of, he therbi scheweth weel him to be noon of hem.

Weel y wote, that thou, the office of preching is ful profitable into the enede of exortacioun and of remembranccc, certis it is not so into the enede of best teching. Forwhi it is not so into the enede of formal and groundli disputing, arguing, and prouyng, withoute which no sure trial mai be mead upon any hard and douteul questioun of mannis conversacioun; and zit if such maner of arguyng and groundli prou-yng schulde be sett in sernomyng, the sermon schulde

---

1 *gph*one, MS.  
2 *her harde, MS. but her is can-celled by a later (?) hand.
be ful vnsaury; and if the maner of outrind which is saury in a sermonyng schulde be sett and vsid in the office of scole prouyng and determynyng, al the werk ther of schulde be the vnsaueryer and the vns- shedier. And therfore¹ the office and werk, (wherof y have spoke bifoire to be so necessari as is said to al the world,) into repressing of erroreis and into grounding of al Goddis lawe, the teching muste be take bi othir testimorie and witnesing than bi weryng of pilleoun, or bi greet kunnyng of preching and bi saury vtrting therof, or bi greet plenteusse out hilding of textis writen in the Bible or in Doctouris. For manye, whiche neuere learned ferther in scolis than her grammer, kunnen suche textis bi herte and bi mouth, and kunnen bi textis and by narraciouns and parabolis and likenessee preche ful glorioelely into plesaunce of the peple and into profite of the peple, and semen therfore and therbi ful wise. And if thei were weil apposid in any of the textis and parabolis and othere precheable processis, thei couthe not de- fende and moyntene any oon of hem, neither outhen putte out sufficientli the very and ful dewist vndir- standing of any oon of hem.

This is now seid of me, (God y take therto into witnes,) for harme which y haue knownen come bi de- faut and the vnhauying and the vnknowing of this now seid consideracioun, and for perel that suche harmes schulde the oftir in tyme here aftir come, if of this consideracioun no mensioun and waarnyng were bi me or bi sum other in writing bifoire mad. For, as aikir as the sunne schineth in somerys dai, the vnconsideracion of this, whereof y haue ʒounen now warnyng, hath be a greet cause of the wickidli enfectid scole of herezie among the lay peple in Ynglond, which is not ʒit conquerid. And therfore

¹ Possibly of should be inserted after therefore.
into plesaunce bi which y wolde plese God and servue to God, and do sumwhat into goostli profite of myne euene Cristen, and for drede of God, (lest so profita bli to be spoken a thing y schulde spare, speke, and write for fere of bachingis,) y write and outre what y now haue outrid. And if any man iuge me in any other wise, be waer he thanne of him which schal ther upon iuge vs bothe.

But wolde God that the king of Ynglond wolde sette so myche bisynesse forto conquer and reforme his lond of Ynglond fro seid wicke sbole, and fro othere defautis, as miche as he dooth aboute the conquest of his lond of Nornandi and of Fraunce, and perauntuere he schulde thanne haue more thanke and reward at his laste comyng hom to the King of blisse, and more noble fauour of dignie fame among alle the prinquis of the world and the worthi peiris of heuen, than he schal haue bi miche of his labour and cost doon aboute the worldli conquest of Fraunces.

Verilli to sele vndir perel of my soule, (and no man conceyue me in contrarie wise to feele,) y wolde grees of scolis to be take and not to be left, whanne euere the persone desiring the gree is able therto in scolis bi kunynng longe to the same gree, and ellis noth, thoughe he be able into othere deedis profitabil to be doon. I wolde also that the office of preching had his dew honour and fauour and his dew wiseli to be don exercise and execucion, and God forbes that y schulde in contrarie wise feele or meene. But certis her withal y wolde that profound and groundli scoling in logik, philosopi, and dyuynyte, and lawe were not left bhynde, but that he were to euereither of these ij. now seid thingis preferrid; for without him grees goon 1 on out of gree, and prechingis rennen arere, as herof experience is ouer ofte in my daies at

---

1 gres, MS.
Poulis Crosse takun. And without him the sad forth leding and reuling and the firme stabiling of al the chirche, both in the clerige and in the layfe, may not be had and doon, for al the preching which without him into the worldis eende mai be mad and doon.

Also y wolde that, bi cause he flotereth not so ofte aboute the eeris of the lay peple as dooth the feet of preching, that the lay peple schulden not theryfore trewe noon such so preciosse and vnlaceable occupa-

cioun to be had and laborid among hem that in soolis waken, studien, and disputen, thou thei not into preching attenden; neither that theryfore the lay peple schulden lacke wil and purpos forto bisette notable costis vpon hem, whiche so in soolis laboren; neither that the lay peple holden hem siff theryn deceyued, if therto thei han any expensis bfore leid out and mynynstrid. Certis ofte han men and wom-

men come to me, and seid: "Thus hath a doctour " seid in this mater: and thus hath a doctour seid " in thilk mater: and thus hath this famose precher " prechid: and thus hath thilk famose precher " prechid:" and y haue answerid azen thus: "Thou " he and he and he and he han so tellt and " prechid, zit [it] is not theryfore and therbi euer " the rather trewe, but it is vntrewe, and needis " muste be vntrewe, and mai be schewid and proved " undoutabili to be vntrewe." No man conceyue bi my wordis here that y meene and lete as thou the neuere failid, or that y am sikir that y schal neuere faile in myn answeris; but for the experience which y haue had vpon the failing of other doctouris and prechere, that y myzte the sueler therby warne peple vpon the failing of clerkis, ther fore y haue seid what is now seid: and y haue lefr forto mekeli

1 layfe, MS. (first hand): but a stroke is added in a darker ink, changing the word into layfe. The correction layfe is tempting; but see Glossary.
knouleche that y and thei han failid and mowe her aftir faile, and that y haue had ther of suer experience, than that the peple schulde trowe stidfastli that neither y neither thei han failid neithir schulen faile, and that for wering of oure pilleons or for prechung in pulpitis of oure sermons. And how schulde eny doctouris and prechers be wrooth for this what y haue of hem seid, whilis y seie and knouleche the same of mi sif which y haue seid and knoulechid of hem.

Neuertheles, whanne the comoun lay peple doon as weel and as diligentli as thei kunnien forto chese to hem a wijs and a sufficient clerk into her counseiler, thei ben excusid amenis God in trowing to his counseil and in folowing it, though his counselling be vntrewe, vnto tyme thei mowe aspie the default of the same counseil, as schal be proued in the firste parti of The book of feith and of sacramentis in Latyn. And if eny man wole obserue and kepe the gouernauncis which y teche and counseile in the ij° parti of Cristen religioun, the 1 treti the 1 chaper, to be kept, whanne euer oon man requirith and sechith and askith an other manmys counseil in eny mater, y wote weel that he schal therbi take greet waarnes that he be not bi vnsufficient and vnewis counseil bigilid.

xvij. Chapiter.

That the ij° opiinnoun sett and spoken bifoire in the firste chapiter 2 of this present book is vntrewe, y mai proue bothe bi experienciis and bi resoun. Bi ex-

---

1 Spaces left in the MS. for the numbers.  
2 See page 6.
The First Part.

Among hem that holden the seid ij\textsuperscript{o} opinionun many ben whiche han vndirstonde certain processis of Holi Scripture in oon certein maner of vnderstanding, whanne thei helden hem silf meeke and in good wil forto receyve and haue the trewe and dew vndirstonding therof; and as afterward, whanne thei were not more meke neither more willi to the same, thei han chaungid and varied fro the firste had vndirstonding into an other maner of vndirstonding the same processis, as y here of haue had sufficient knowing. Wherfore thei hem silf, whiche holden the seid ij\textsuperscript{o} opinionun, ouzten bi her owne experience takun vpon her owne deedis proue the same ij\textsuperscript{o} opinionun to be vntrewel.

Also thus: Of the same noumbre which holden the seid ij\textsuperscript{o} opinionun manye vndirstonden a processis of others. Holi Scripture in oon maner and wolen needis so vndirstondede it, and manye othere of the same noumbre wolen needis vndirstonde the same processis in an other maner not according therto: and in this tho ij. soortis of men stryuen, and as ech soort of hem holdeth him\textsuperscript{1} silf so meke and so disposed, that he ouzte haue the trewe vndirstonding of thilk same processe. And thilk same processe mai not haue bothe the ij. vndirstondingis to gidere, (as it is proved in othere places of my writing,) and namelich not tho ij. vndirstondingis, for thei mowe not stonde to gidere. Wherfore bi open experience had among the holders of the ij\textsuperscript{o} opinionun mai be openli knowe, that the same ij\textsuperscript{o} opinionun is vntrewel.

Also thus: Open experience scheweth that a viciouse man is as kunnyng a clerk for to finde, leerne, and vndirstonde which is the trewe and dew sentence of Holi Scripture, how soone a vertuose clerk is kunnyng therto: and into the same vnderstandingis thei to

\textsuperscript{1} holden hem MS. (first hand).
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The second error disproved by reason. The power of exposition varies with the intellectual, not with the moral virtues: consequently a vicious man may be a better expositor than a virtuous one.

A possible answer to this argument supposed. Peacock's argument may be true, so far as the mere difference of men's natures is concerned; but it is not true, when the grace of God is taken into the account, which is not given to good men and bad men equally.

Reply to the answer. The gifts of prophecy, revelations, and miracles have sometimes been conferred more plentifully on bad men than on good men.

gidere accordingli fallen. Wherfore experience confirmeth the iij. opinion to be vntrewe.

Now forto prowe the same iij. opinion to be vntreweu bi resoun, y procede thus: Forto fynde the verri and just vndristonding of processis in Holli Writt is a labour of the witt or of the intellect, or of resoun in biholding aboute the circumstauncis of the proces and in resonyng ther upon; and forto be good and holi is a labour of the wil or of the afecte or of the appleitie: but so it is, that a badde man and a ful yuel disposid man in wil and in affect mai haue so cleer and so weel disposid witt and reson into alle things to be founde bi witt, as hath a good man weel disposid in maners of his affect and wil: wherfore foleweth bi resoun, that as soone may a viciose man come to and fynde the dew vndristonding of Holli Scripture, how soone mai a vertuoys man finde, so that thei ben lijk witti in nature, or so that the viciose man haue a cleerer witt than the vertuoys man hath.

If any man wole seie here, that this now mad argument proueth weel that, as bi nature and kinde, so soone schulde a witti viciose man fynde and come to the verri trewe vndristonding of Holli Scripture, as schulde a vertuoys euyn witti or lasse witti man; neverthelesse so it is, that God ȝeusth not hise ȝisitis to a viciose man lijk plenteuoselie as he ȝeusth to a vertuoys man.

Azens this answeres y mai meete thus: We han noon other knowing in experience but that men fynden and comen (as for the miche more parti) to the kunnyng of Scripture and of alle others divyne and godli trouthis rathir or latir, as thei ben disposid kindeli in her resoun and witt. And what ever experience techith we ouȝte holde, but if resoun or Scripture or sure reuelacioun schewe other. Wherfore we ouȝten noon other holde, but if resoun or Scripture or other sure reuelacioun schulde enforme vs that we schulde other holde. For ellis the holding
were feyned, and lackid evyndence and ground. But so it is, that neithir sufficient resoun, neither Scripture, neither other sure revelacioun schewith to us forto holde other wise ther yn than experience schewith. Wherfore as experience schewith, so ther yn it is to be holde: and that is what is now before seid, that men comen into the dew vndirstonding of Scripture rathir or latir, as thei therto ben kindali disposid. And furthermore, thou; God schulde not and wolde not suffre eny man to haue the dew vndirstonding of Holi Scripture saue bi his ȝıfte, ȝıt we moue haue that hise ȝıfthes and gracie of wit he ȝeue as plenteuoseli to a bad man as to a good man, and sumtyme more plenteuoseli to the lasse good man than to\(^1\) better man. Forwhi ellis what euere men were prophetic, or what euere men hadden reuelaciouns, were holier than eny other men whiche hadden noon reuelaciouns and visiouns; and the holier that eny man or womman is, the more he or sche hath prophacie and reuelacioun than an othir lasse hol; which is knownun as vntreuwe bi open experience. Wherfore folith with that thou; God wolde not suffre eny man to haue the dew vnderstoniding of Holi Scripture bi his natural wit, but bi ȝıfte of God, ȝıt herewith stondith weel that a bad man haue as plenteuosely thilk ȝıfte as a good man, and that sum bad man haue thilk ȝıfte more plenteuoseli than sum good man, riȝt as sum bad man or sum lasse good man hath ȝıfthes of helth and of miraclis doing more plenteuoseli zounc to him than a good man or than a more good man, as it is open in the Gospel\(^2\) that a man not folowing the trewe and dew wye of Crist dide miraclis bi ȝıfte of God, as the very and

\(^1\) Probably the should be inserted after to.

\(^2\) A space left in the MS. for the reference. Pecock seems to have in his eye Mark ix. 38, seqq. (Cf. Luke ix. 49); although Matth. vii. 22, would be in fact more to his purpose.
trewe Apostlis diden. Wherefore folewith needis that
the seid ij. opinioune is vntrewye.

Tho textis of Holi Scripture, whiche ben alleggid
bifore in the firste chapiter for grounding of the ij.
opinioun, doon no thing therto. Forwhi, thou, it
mai be had bi tho textis that God schal ȝeue and do
singerli and notabili to meke men for her mekenes,
certis ȝit bi noon of thilk textis is had, that God schal
ȝeue or do into the wit or vndirstonding of ech meke
man eny ȝifte aboue the ȝiftes which he wole ȝeue into
the resoun or vndirstonding of vnmeke men. And
therefore thilke textis spoken in so general maner of the
visiting to be doon bi God to meke men, that thei
mowe be verrified in manye othere wisis and for
manye othere visitings, than ben the visitings and
the ȝiftis of kunnyng. And verili to seie in myn ex-
perience, ful manye passyyng meke men y haue knowe,
whiche han bi ful lewid in the knowing of moral
vertu and han be ful of doutis, ȝhe, and han be the
lewedir bi so miche that thei laborid euere in meke-
nes forto haue it in greet mesure, whilis thei myȝten
haue laborid forto haue hald kunnyng of moral ver-
tuosenes. And thus miche is ynow for improuyng
and reprouyng of the ij. opinioune.

The iij. opinioune put bifore in the firste chapiter of
this present book muste needis be vntrewye, for he is
ȝagens Holi Scripture and also ȝagens resoun.
He is ȝagens Holi Scripture; forwhi i. Petri iij. ȝe.
it is writun in sentence thus: That ech Cristen man
schulde be redi forto answere and ȝeue satisfac-
cioun to ech asker of him resoun (that is to seie,
argument) vpnon his feith and his hope; and so wole
not the iij. opinioune graunte or suffre. Also Iohnun
vij. ȝe it is had, that mennis goode werkis ben not
oonli the werkis of her affect and wil and the out-

1 myȝte, MS. (first hand).  

* See p. 7.
ward werkis commaundid bi the wil to be doon, but also mennis werkis ben inward werkis of his intellect or vndirstonding, and thersfore ben hise opinious and sciencis upon treuthis in lawe of kinde: and also thei ben hise feithis had upon treuthis being not fyndeable and knoweable bi lawe of kinde, whanne thei folwen choiciis and deedis of the wil, as it is tauxt in The folower to the done, and as it is open by Cristis wordis, Johon the vij. č. Forwhi whanne the Iewis aek- iden of him thus: What schulen we do that we worche the werkis of God? Iesus answeride and seide to hem thus: This is the werk of God that ze bileeue in to him which he sende. And sitthen herby it is open that mennis feithis ben her werkis, it folewith that the men whiche reulen hem bi the iij*. opinion and wolen not bringe forth and schewe her feithis at lixt (that is to seie, at argumentacioun) ben of thilk soort of peple which God reproueth, Iohon the iij*. č, where Crist seide thus: This is the iugement, for lixt came in to the world, and men loved more dorknes than lixt, sotheli her werkis weren yuel. Forsothe ech that doith yuel hatith lixt, and he comith not to lixt, that hise werkis ben not undernome. He that doith treuthes cometh to lixt, that hise werkis be a mad open, for that thei ben doon in God. Thus miche there. Se now therbi how openli men of the iij*. opinioni ben reproued of Crist, and thersfore the iij*. opinion is azens Holi Writt.

Certis withoute argument can no trouthe be knowe neither learaed in the intellect of man, and that whethar thilk trouthe be of lawe of kinde or of feith, except thilk treuthis in lawe of kinde which ben openest of alle othere treuthis, and han noon opener treuthis than thei ben bi whiche thei mowe be proued.

1 Jhē, MS.
2 for sothe, MS., apparently; but elsewhere conjunctivm.

The MS. had originally ben, but the last letter is scraped out.
CHAP. XVII. as y haue openli schewid in othere places of mi 
writingis. And therfore ful weel and ful treuli ouȝte 
arguyng and disputing be clepid liȝt.

The third error disproved also 
by reason; be 
cause every true 
opinion will bear 
the light.

That the iiȝ. opinioun is also aȝens reson, y mai 
schewe thus: Euen as thilk opinioun or conclusion 
of lawe of kinde is not worthi be holde trewe, but 
if he mai be susteyned bi hise propre to him groundis 
and evidencis, withynne the boundis of lawe of kinde, 
perteynyng to the grounding of suche conclusions; and 
but if sufficient aunswere can be mad to al arguyng, 
which may ther aȝens be maad, bi skillis in lawe of 
kinde: riȝt so thilk feith or conclusioun of bileuee is 
not worthi to be holde trewe, but if he may be 
susteyned bi hise propre to him groundis and evid 
cenis perteynyng to the grounding of feith; and but 
if sufficient answere can be ȝeue to al arguyng, which 
mai be mad ther aȝens. Goddis forbode that eny 
man schulde so trowe and feele that eny conclusioun of 
feith ouȝte be holde for trewe and for feith, and ȝit 
couthe be proued bi eny argument to be vntrewe and 
fals; and that eny argument couthe be mad aȝens eny 
conclusioun of trewe feith, to which argument it couthe 
not cleerli at fulle be answerid. For whi ther is no 
treuthe knownun for a treuthe (whether it be a treuthe 
of lawe of kinde or of lawe of feith), but that if he 
be knowe perfittli and fulli bi hise euydencis and 
groundis, as it mai bi good labour of arguyng be 
knowe, he schal be proued trewe aȝens alle aȝenseiers 
whiche euere thei ben, Cristen or hethen, and thei 
mowe bi strengthe of argument be constreyned in her 
reson for to consente therto, wole thei nile thei, if thei 
ȝeue sufficient attendaunce to the arguyng; and also 
sufficient cleer at fulle answere mai be ȝeuan\(^1\) to al 
arguyng mad aȝens the same conclusioun of feith.

\(^1\) There has been an erasure and correction here, and it may perhaps be doubted whether ȝeuan was the original form; it occurs however in Gen. xxx. 18. (Wicl. Vers.)
Al this is open bi what y haue write of feith in The folewer to the donet, and in the first parti of Cristen religioun, and in the firste parti of The book of feith and of sacramentis, and in the book clepid The prouyng of Cristen feith. And furthermore the more eny treutehe, whether he be of feith or of no feith, be brouȝt in to examinacioun of arguyng, the more trewe and the more cleerli trewe he schal be seen; and if he be not trewe, but seme trewe eer he come into triyng of argumentis, the lenger he abidith the examynacioun of arguyng, the more vntrewe and the more cleerli vntrewe he schal be seen; riȝt as good trewe gold, the more it suffrith the fier, the more cleerli he is seen to be trewe gold; and if he be not but countirfeet golde, certis the lenger he abidith the examynacioun of fier, the more cleerli it schal be seen that he is fals and not trewe gold. And therfore Goddis forbode that any Cristen man schulde thinke and trewe to be a trewe and a good gouernance forto kepe his feithis and his othere opinioins priuey, and let hem not come into what euer examynacioun of argumentis whiche mowe be mad ther upon; namelich whanne and where the holder of tho feithis and of his othere opinions mai be sikir forto come and go and speke and argue and answere withoute eny bodili harme, and with out eny losse of his riches or of his fame. Certis if eny man dare not in the now seid casis suﬀre his feith and his othere opinioins be brouȝt into riȝt and into fier of argumentis to be at uttrist examyned, he ouȝte be trowid that in that he hath vntrewe chaffar and vntrewe gold, which mai not abide riȝt and fier. Also that this iijr. opinioin is aȝens resoun it is euydent herbi: He is lijk to the lawe of Macomet and of Sarezenis in thilk point in which her lawe is moost vnresonable. Forwhi the lawe of Macomet biddith, vndir greet peyne of horrible deeth suﬃringer, that no
man after he hath receyued the feith of thilk lawe
dispute or argue with any other man upon any point,
article, or conclusion of thilk lawe: and bi this
wrecchid and cursed maunderment the peple of thilk
secte ben so miche lockid up vndir boond, that manie
mo of hem myȝten be convurtd into trewe feith than
ȝit ben, if thilk so vnresonable maunderment of the
same lawe ne were. And if any Cristen men wolen
locke hem sylf so up in her feithis and othere opinioouns
of Cristis lawe fro arguyng and disputing ther upon
with othere men, as y haue knowe bi reporting of ful
trewe persoones that thei so doon, certis ther in thei
doone foul vilonie to Cristis lawe of feith and of lawe
of kinde, making as thouȝ Cristis seid lawe were so
feble chaffare and so countirfeitid and so vntrewe,
that it durst not saue his worship if he were thriti
examyned. And thei doon also ful periloseli to hem
sylf for to make hem so sikir in a feith, eer it be
sufficienli tried and proued forto be holde worthi a
trewe feith or no. And therefore the thridde before
setti opinioun in the first capter of this book is
vnresonable.

Now forto answere to tho testis, whiche ben
there before alleggid for grounding or ellis witnesing
or prouyng of the iij°. opinioun, it is liȝt forto an-
swere. Forwbi to ech diligent considerer vpon the
processis forth and after, bfore and behinde, where
thilke textis ben writun, it schal be riȝt liȝtli and
soone seen, that the first test there alleggid, Coloc.
ij°. ć., wole that in mater of Cristis Incarnacion,
which is a mater of pure feith, no man schulde be
bigilid bi philisophi; that is to seie, no man schulde
be moved āgens the feith ther of bi evidencis and
bi argumentis mad oonli vpon evidencis of lawe of
kinde and of pure resoun without evidencis takun
vpon Goddis affermyng or Goddis reveling. Forwbi
tho ben argumentis of pure philisophie, and thei ben
CHAP. XVII.

veyn fallacis as to schewe treuthe of feith; for thei han no place in mater of feith; and argumentis takun vpon evidencis of Goddis assercioun, or Goddis affermyng or reveling that the thing is trewe, ben the oonli argumentis which han propre place forto proue and grounde articles, treuthis, and conclusiouns of feith; but certis thei (that is to seie, argumentis of philosophie) and noon othere argumentis han place forto groundli and fundamentali schewe and proue maters of lawe of kinde not being of feith; and suche maters ben maters of Goddis lawe and seruice, as weel as ben maters of feith. And tharefore the first text alleggdid gooth not into the proof of the iiij. opiionioun.

And in lijk maner it is to be seid that Poul meened in the iiij. place, alleggdid before to be i. Cor. i. 5., that in mater of feith Poul vsid not hiznes of wisdom and of pure resoun oonli, thouz not al maner of arguyng may be excludid fro the fynding, the leernyng, the knowyng, and the prouyng of feith, as it is proved weel in the book clepid The book of feith and of sacramentis, and as it is tauz in The folower to the donet and in the i. partie of Cristen religiouz; bicause that no treithe (except tho which ben at vtrist degre pleyyn and open treuthis) mai be leerned, kunne, and proued without argument, as it is in my writingis sumwhere ellis sufficientli schewid; and ech argument muste needis be maad bi werk and deede of the resoun. And thus it is answerid to the textis whiche in the first chapter of this book ben brouz into proving of the iiij. opiionioun.

1 or of, MS., but of is scraped out.
Another erro-

eous opinion,

which came more

recently to

Pecock's know-

de. If a man

keep God's law,

he shall have the

ture understand-

ing of Scripture

without the aid

of any human

teacher; but if he

do not, he shall

never have it by

all the teaching

in the world.

The Lollards

consider the

clergy to be of

the latter sort.

AFTIR y had herd and had writun thus as is now

passid of these iiij. opiounns, ther came into my know-
ing that among the peple before spokun is holde this

iiij', now to be reherced opiounn. And for as myche

as he is ful perilose and worthi it is forto him ažen-

stonde and him forto proue be vntrew, thercfor y

thouzte forto plaunte into this book the writing of

him here next to the othere thre opiounns, and forto

sette my bisynes forto bringe him into nouʒt. The

opiuon in him sif is this. If eny man be not oonli

meke, but if ther with al he kepe and fulfille al the

lawe of God so miche and in the maner as it is long-
ing to him forto it kepe and fulfille, he schal haue

the trewe vndirstonding of Holi Scripture, thonz no

man ellis teche him saue God. And tho men whiche

ben not trewe lyuers in the lawe of God schulen not

falle vpon the trewe and dewe vndirstonding of Holi

Scripture, thonz thei putte therto al her natural

power and diligence, with the help and counsell of

othere suche persoones like to hem. And thanne

here by for as miche as to her seming the bishopis

and archidenes,1 doctouris, and othere clerkis lyuen

alle out of Goddis lawe, thercfor thei wenen that noo

bishop or archidenken or doctour or eny other such

persoon of the clergie cometh into the trewe and
dew vndirstonding of Holi Scripture; and therfore

thei twenon that ech bishop and ech such other

clerk bileueth amys and techith amys, and thei

wolen not twroe to his teching, but thei twenon to

the doctrine which thei fynden among hem sif bi

studiyng in the Bible oonli. For hem sif oonli thei

1 Probably we should read archidekenes.
THE FIRST PART

This iiiij. opinionun, as y weene, thei trowen be certain textes alleged in behalf of this opinion.

Is writen Iohun viij. 

Thus: Iesus seid to hem of the Iewes, whiche bilyueden to him: If ze schulen dwelle in my word ze schulen be my very disciplis, and ze schulen knowe trouthe, and trouthe schal deleyuere ze. The iij. text is writen Iohun xiiiij. 

Thus: He that loueth me schal be loued of my Fadir, and y schal loue him, and y schal schewe my self to him. The iij. text is writen Iohun xv. 

Thus: I schal not now clepe zou seruauntis or bond men, for the seruaunt woot not what his lord schal do; but y haue clepid zou frendis, for alle thingis what ever y herd of my Fadir y mad known to zou.

This iiiij. opinionun may ful lietli be improued. For whi azens him is had the grettist certeinte which mai be had in oure knowing, and it is clepid experience: zhe, such experience is azens him had, that the holders of him kunnen not and mowe not azens thilk experience seie nay, and therfore needis fro this iiiij. opinionun thei musten falle. As for the seid experience had azens the seid iiiij. opinionun, sotheli y have mad inquisicion therto sufficient and diligent, and y am certified at fulle that among the holders of this same iiiij. opinionun summe ben founde and known openli among hem siff and of othere neibouris to be grett leechouris, summe to be avontreris in gret haunt and contynuance, summe to be theefis, even azens her owne leernyng and azens her owne holding and doctrine. Zhe, thei that han be and ben riȝt grete in auctorite of teching among hem han be, and ben suche, and in other wise miche vicioso per- sones, so that thei mowe not here azens seie nay, for y can make it vndoutabili be proved. And alle men witen that these ben grete synnes and miche
Chap. XVIII. ažens the keping of Goddis moral lawe; and thei hem silf knoulechen that these dedis ben gret synnes and ažens Goddis lawe. And þët thei weenen and holden hem silf for to haue the trewe and dewe vnþirdusting of Holis Scripture; þëhe, that no men han bettir the trewe vnþirdusting ther of than thei han. Wherfore needës folëwith that thei hem silf musë holde the seid iij*. opinioun to be vntrewe, and that for open knowing of experience which is had among hem silf of these now bëfore rehëred vicis, and of many other vicis. And therfore fro this daï forth ward y hope noon holder of the iij*. opinioun schal moue for schame holde the same iij*. opinioun, but rather he schal be schamed that he hath it bëfore so vngroundabili holde, and withoute sufficient evidence therto bëfore had he hath so faste thereto cleued and lened. Furthermore y dare weel seie, if alle the evidenciës whiche ben late bëfore writun in the next chapiter, ažens the iij*. opinioun be weel considerid thei schulen suffice forto vnprove this iij*. opinioun here, as thei vnprozen the iij*. opinioun there. And therfore more than this no nede is forto write now and here ažens the seid iij*. opinioun.

Tho iij. textis of Holis Scripture, whiche bëfore in this present chapiter ben alleggid into the grounding of this iij*. opinioun, availen not therto. Forwhi, iijk wise as bëfore (in the eende of the ix* chapiter in this present i* partie) to iij. textis of Holis Scripture brouȝt forth into helping of the firste opinioun y haue answerid there, that tho iij. textis speken of leernynge and kunnyng which is feith, and not which is had bi doom of resoun in lawe of kinde; so y answere now to these iij. textis brouȝt forth in this present chapiter for grounding of the iij*. opinioun, that ech of these iij. textis spekith of leernynge and knowing which is feith, namelich vpon Cristis Persoon and upon his Incarnacioun, and not of leernynge and
knowing which is lawe of kinde geten bi labour in

doom of mannis resoun oonli, as it is open if a man
weie weel the wordis of the textis. And thersore
these iij. textis ben not for the purpos for to grounde
the iij*. opinion.

As to this, that the holders of the iij*. opinion,
deemen prelatis of the chirche forto be mys lyuers
and trespacers aqens Goddis lawe, weel y wote that
in summe thingis prelatis synnen and amys1 doon.
For, thou thei ben prelatis in the chirche, thei ben
men and not pure sanguels, and thersore thei ben
suche, and muste needis be suche, that han the
natural temptatyue wrecchidnessis whiche other men
han. And weel y wote herwith, that in summe
thingis thei ben iugid to be more gilit than thei ben,
and also in summe thingis thei ben iugid to be gilit
whanne thei not gilit ben, as the same iugers schulden
weel wite, if thei were homeli with the same prelatis,
and weren priuy to the same gouernauncis and to
alle the causis and motyues and circumstauncis of the
same gouernauncis whiche thei blamen.

Wolde God that men, eer thei wolden2 blame eny
mannys gouernaunce, wolden weel leerne and wolden
be remembrid weel vpon the same learning wher of a
deede or a gouernaunce takith his moral godenes and
his moral badnes, and that a gouernaunce is not
moraly3 good for and bi his owne subsstaunce, but for
and bi his causis, hise motyues, and hise circumstauncis,
as it4 is tauqt in other placis of my writings, name-
lich in The folower to the donet : zhe, and that moral
gouernauncess of mennis conversacioun, namelich suche
that ben politik (that is to seie, suche wherbi prelatis
of the chirche or othere ouerers gouerne othere men
vndir hem bi spiritual policie or worldli policie)

1 mye, MS. (first hand).
2 wolde, MS. (first hand).
3 moral, MS. (first hand).
4 as is, MS. (first hand).
ständen neuere thorun long tymes vndir oon reule, neither vndir oon maner to be doon, neither stonden in alle placis like wise or vndir lijk reule to be doon. And also that in the causis\(^1\) of God and aboute the helthe of Cristen soulis the more good is rather to be doon than the lasse gode, and the lasse good is rather to be left vndoon than the more good; thou\(^2\) into the lasse good certyn pointing is maad bi reulis and is writun, and not into the more good. Sotheli thanne schulden not tho men iuge and deem so vnwijsly and so vntreuli of prelatis and of her gouernauncis, as y heere summen so do. Weel y woot as for my\(^3\) part, that how men han iugid me and my gouernaunce anentis my diocise, hath come to myn eeris; and zit y knowe the wittis and the disposicious of the same iugers, that if alle the causis and motyues and ententis, meenis, helpis, and lettis, and manie othere circumstauncis of the same gouernaunce whiche thei blamen were opened to hem, and if thei were made theerto priuei, thei wolden be of the firste whiche schulden counseile me to kepe and fulfille the same gouernaunce.

Of mi partiy speke in special more than of the parties of othere\(^4\) prelatis: for the vniustnes of iuging, which is zouun upon me y knowe better than the vniustnes of iugingis doon vpon other. And as it is of me in this caas, so it is lijk to be with manie othere prelatis to be wrongli deemed of men, whiche not knownen in special al that ouzte be considerid aboute a gouernaunce, eer than thilk gouernaunce ouzte of hem be iugid morali good or bad.

How suche now seid politik gouernauncis of prelatis anentis her peple was doon and vnder what reule in the eeldir daies, it is writun in lawis and in holi
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\(^1\) in causis, MS. (first hand).
\(^2\) formy, MS.
\(^3\) the others, MS. (first hand).
\(^4\) formy, MS.
mennys doctrines and in holi mennys exortaciouns, semyngli as that tho gouernauncis schulden alwey be contynued vndir lykke reule. Thanne comen forth men sumwhat letrid as in grammer oonli or little therfer, and not instructid in the kunnyng of moral philosophe and of lawe of kinde, neither considering or remem-
bring that the godenes of a gouernaunce hangith upon hise circumstauncis; and that, if transmutacioun and chaunge be of the circumstauncis, so that thei not abiden vndir oon and the same reule, the gouernaunce ouzete not abide and be contynued vndir oon and the same reule forto be good; and not considering that in length of tyme ful greet transmutacioun and chaunge is alwey maad in and aboute the circum-
stauncis of politik gouernauncis, 3he, and of monastik gouernauncis (that is to seie, of gouernauncis bi whiche oon man gouerneth him sifl aloon); and thei reden these writingis so written in eeldir daies, and anoone thei iugen that vndir lykke reule and maner thilke gouernauncis ouzete be contynued now and alwey with oute excepccioun and without dyuersite, namelich for-
that the eeldir writingis were writingis of holi men. But, lo, how foule thei ben bigilid; for thei not con-
sideren farther in the writingis than is expressid in the same writingis, neither thei consideren that no man euere wrote in suche gouernauncis alle the excepcciouns and alle the privey condiciouns whiche ben priucely
and implicitli includid in the same writingis; but who euere wrote or schal write in suche maters of moral gouernauncis, he muste needis comitte and bitake to the doom of resoun manie excepcciouns and condi-
ciouns, and myche more thing vnwritun of hem con-
cernynge the same maters than is al what he ther of
writith expresseli; and that bi cause of the seid trans-
mutacioun which is alwey in the world; and therwith
becaus that a gouernaunce is not good but bi hise circumstauncis, whiche ben thus changeable and trans-
mutable. For certis ellis it wolde needis folewe that tho writers, how euere holi thei were, wrotten and tauzet ażens trewe philosophie and ażens trewe diui-
nyte and ażens trewe doom of resoun, which as for thilk evidence is not to be grauntid.

And thercfore wolde God that men wolden bithenke weel, that no man may vndir oon reule and oon maner kepe his gouernaunce toward him sylf, toward his meynee, and toward his eother peple, in wynter and in somer, in a ľeer of derth and in a ľeer of greet cheep, in tyme of wete and in tyme of drouȝth; and if in oon ľeer such transmutacioun and chaunge of wether muste make a man chaunge his moral gouernaunce anentis him sylf and anentis his peple, whi not bi lijk skile if thorui hundridis of ľeiris ben falle manye transmutacions in the circumstauncis of the seid politik gouernaunce, and manie lettis and manye vnhelpis and manye lackis of helpis, whiche in the eeldir daies weren not in the circumstauncis of the same gouernaunce? The prelate muste make thilk gouernaunce to be doom in an other maner and in an other reule, as resoun for the tyme wole deeme, and not vndir the same forme and reule in which it was doom bifore in eeldir daies, and in which thouȝ it be writun that in thilk reule that it was doom in eeldir daies biore; ľhe, and if such transmutacioun and greet dywersyte be in oon dioisie, miche more and miche other wise than in an other dioisice, whi schal not the gouernaunce in thilk dioisie be doom bi doom of resoun myche other wise than the same kinde of gouernaunce oute be doom in an other dioisice?

If thercfore reders in lawis and writings of eeldir daies were ferther and better instructid than in her grammer in such doctrine as is now sumwhat here schortli seid and touchid, thei wolden not ľeue such

\[1 \text{ thik, MS.} \quad \text{2 a other, MS.}\]
THE FIRST PART.

vnwise and vntrew doomes upon prelatis of the chirche and vpon religiouse persoones for chaunging of gouernauncis bfore doon and led and writen to be so doon, as y heere that thei doon; but thei wolden\(^1\) thinke that manye thingis musten be considerrd mo than oon in iuging of a gouernaunce, and thei wolden\(^1\) thenke that thei knewen not al that ouste be considerrd aboute thilk gouernaunce or thilk gouernaunce, as causes, motyues, ententis, helpis, letcis, lackis of meenis, chaungis of the better good which may not be differred, neither mai be doon of othare men for the lasse good, and manye suche othare; and thanne thei wolden thenke and seie, that thei hadden not sufficent ground forto deeme and zeue iugement, whether thilk gouernaunce be good or bad.

And furthermore, to seie redilli as no man woot, how hard it is to clymbe vpon a tree or forto come doun of a tree, saue thilk that assaieth it; and no man loking vpon an other man so clymbing vp or comyng doun can iuge so wel that he gouerneth him wel or yuel in so ascending or descending as he him siff which so ascendith or descendith, neither he woot so wel as if he him siff were sett into lijk werke of clymbing or of doun comyng, and ful liþtli eeh such biholder schal deeme amys the clymber, if he make soone any iugement ther upon without priuey counselling with the clymber, to wite of him whi he is moved forto sette his foot rather there than here, and so of other\(^2\) dyueritees: euen so it is in oure now present purpors. And therfore not for nouzt God seid in the Gospel,\(^3\) Matheu vij. c.: \emph{Nile ze deeme and ze schulen not be deemed: in what euer doom ze schulen deeme ze schulen be deemed.} Vpon which sentence it were good that men hem bithouste, and of which sentence it

---

\(^1\) *wolde*, MS. (first hand).

\(^2\) *otherer*, MS.

\(^3\) *Golpe*, MS.
were good that men were afeerd. Forwhi tho wordis ben the wordis and the thretenyngis of God, namelich if men myften not be reulid fro mys deemyng bi wisdom sumwhat now schortli bifoire tauʒt of moral philosphie. And ʒit fæther, if suche hasti demers bi her vnwisse and vnentrewe deemyng diffame the prelatis which thei so demen, than is al the mater in her side the wors. Forwhi, thanne thei ben bounde forto make a sufficient amendis to the fame of the same prelate so hurtid bi hem, euen as thei ben bounden into a sufficient amendis to his worldli hounour, if thei take ther of eny thing vntreulid fro him; and ellis thei kunnen not hauie of thilk trespas forzœuenes of God. And sithen restitiuciuon of fame to be doon to a man aʒens diffame is ful hard, and myche hardir than is restitiuciuon of worldli good, it folewith that a perilose thing is it forto appeire vnentreuly a manmys name, and namelich a prelatis name, thoruʒ suche now seid vnwijs and hasti deemyng.

xix. Chapiter.

Thouʒ, fro the bigynnyng of the firste chapiter in this book hidir to, y haue thus laborid forto distroe it which schule and wolde ellis ful miche lette my purpos and entent forto turne many of the comoun peple fro mys holding aʒens xj. gouernauncis, which aftir in this present book schulen be proued for leeful and gode and profitable to Cristen men; ʒit, eer y schal come down into the special profis of tho xj. gouernauncis, y schal proue hem alle to gidere vnder general profis, and that bi setting2 forth of iij. suppo-

1 for inserted in MS. by a later (?) 2 bisetting, MS. hand.
siciouns or iiij. reulis, and with taking out of hem iiiij. conclusiones. And thanne, after it is so done, y schal.decezende into special profis of tho xj. gouernauncis, of whiche gouernauncis the oon is the hauyng and using of ymagis in chirchis; an othir is pilgrimage in going into memorialis or into mynde placis of Seintis.

The i\textsuperscript{st}. supposicion or reule is this: Who euere (whether he be God, man, angel, or Scripture) biddith bi word or bi ensampling of deede expresseli eny gouernaunce to be doun, he theryn\textsuperscript{1} and therbi biddith includingli or closingly al it to be doun, which folowith in formal argument of resoun out of thilk gouernaunce bedun. And also therin and therbi he biddith al it to be doun, withoute which the seid gouernaunce may not be sufficientli doun into the entent of the biddir; and also if into the same gouernaunce to be doun ben manye dynerse weies and meenis, of which ech bi him silf is a good and a speedful wey and meene into the seid gouernaunce to be doun, he in the bidding of the seid gouernaunce to be doun, alloweth ech of thilke weies vndir fre choice of the taker to be take and doun, and also he allowith thilk wey and meene rather and more to be chose, take, and doun, bi which the seid gouernaunce schal be the more or the better doun. And also in the same bidding of the seid gouernaunce he counselith and willith thilk gouernaunce to be doun in the better maner, rather than to be doun in the lasse good maner.

The ii\textsuperscript{nd}. supposicion or reule is this: Who euere (God, angel, man, or Scripture) counselith and willith with oute coomandement bi word or bi ensampling of deede expresseli eny gouernaunce to be doun, he theryn and therbi counselith and willith includingli or closingly al it to be doun, which folowith in formal argument of resoun out of thilk same gouernaunce.

\textsuperscript{1} ye, MS. (first hand).
counselilid and willid; and also ther yn and therbi he counselilith al it to be doon, withoute which the same said counselilid gouernaunce mai not be doon as it is so counselilid to be doon. And also, if into the same gouernaunce to be doon ben manye dyuerse weies and meenis of which ech is a good speedful wey and meene into the said gouernaunce to be doon, he in the counselling and willing of the seid gouernaunce to be doon allowith which euer of thilk weies and meenis be take and doon into the doing of the seid gouernaunce. And also he allowith thilk wey and meene to be chose, take, and doon, rather and more, bi which the seid gouernaunce schal be the better doon into the entent of the counseller or willer. And also in the same counselling of the seid gouernaunce he counselilith and willilith thilk same gouernaunce to be doon in the better maner, rather than to be doon in the lasse good maner.

The iij. supposicionoun or reule is this: Who euer (God, aungel, man, or Scripture) rehercith, witneseth, or denouneth bi such bidding as is biforn seid in the firste reule, or bi such counselling as is biforn seid in the iij. reule, or bi eny other maner eny gouernaunce to be doon, he ther yn and therbi rehercith, witneseth, or denouneth includingli or closingli al it which soleweth out of thilk gouernaunce and is includid formal in thilk gouernaunce, and al it with out which thilk gouernaunce mai not be doon; and so forth in alle the ethere pointis and degrees reherceth now biforn in the firste and iij. reulis.

These iij. supposiciousons or reulis ben so openli trewe, that no man hauying eny quantite of resoun mai deneie hem. Forwhi, if y, being at Londoun in the Collage of Whittington, bidde or counsele or witnesse to my servaunt there being with me, that he go to Poulis Cros forto heere there attentiffl a sermon to be prechid, it muste nedis be grauntid, that y in
so bidding, counselling, or witnessing, bidde, counseile, or witnesse, that he leerne or remembre sumwhat bi the same sermoun, and that sum maner of newe disposicioun (lasse or more) he take into his affeccion vpon sum thing of thilk sermoun. Forwhi al this folewith out of the attentif heering of the sermoun. Also it muste needis be grauntid, that y (in so bidding, counseiling, or witnessing) bidde, counseile, or witnesse, that he go forth out at the collegis gate. Forwhi, inlasse than he go forth fro me at the gate, he mai not come to Poulis Cros forto heere the sermoun. Also, sithen fro the seid college ben manye weies to Poulis Crosse, and of whiche ech is speedful and good ynow forto lede to Poulis Crosse, it muste needis be grauntid that in so bidding, counselling, or witnessing, y witnesse that, which euere of thilk weies he take, y it allowe; and if cause be founde in any of tho weies that bi doom of resoun thilk weie ouȝte be left (as if persauenture in oon of thilk weies a man liggith in wait for to sle my seid ¹ seruaunt) certis thilk wey is not, as for thanne, oon of the speedful weies for him into Poulis Crosse. And also it muste be grauntid that in so bidding, counselling, or witnessing, y woole and allowe rather that he go and chese the better of tho weies than the lasse good of tho weies, and that he in bettir maner heere the sermon than that he in lasse good maner heere the same sermoun. Wherfore, sithen in lijk maner it is to be holde and seid in alle lijk casis, it folowith that the iij. biforn sett supposiciouns or reulis ben trewe and ben to be grantid. 

Aftir these iij. so openli trewe reulis y putte forth iijj. conclusiouns, whiche muste needis be trewe, if these iij. reulis be trewe. 

The firste of tho ² iiiij. conclusiouns is this: For thus that Holi Scripture wole a man to loue God

---

¹ *sic* is added by a later hand.  
² *the*, MS. (first hand).
and drede God with al his herte, soul, and strengthe, it muste needis be grauntid that ther yn Holi Scripture wole a man to loue al what God wolde him loue, and hate al what God wolde him hate, and that Holi Scripture ther yn wole a man forto do Goddis serviciis whiche God biddith him to do, and forto do and suffre for God in his servici. Forwhi al this folewith in formal argument fro this, that a man loueth God with al his herte, soul, and strengthe. Also it muste needis be grauntid, that ther yn and therbi Holi Scripture wole that a man bithinke and remembre upon these vij. maters, that is to seie, what God is in his dignitees, nobilitiees, and perfecciouns; whiche ben hise benefetis ʒounen and bihiʒt to man in this lijf and in the lijf to come; whiche ben hise punysehingis ʒounen and to be ʒounen in this lijf and in the lijf to come; whiche ben pointis and articlis of his lawe and his servici; that man ther yn serue to him; whiche ben manys natural freemnessis and yuel disposiciouns and redinessis into synne and loothinessis into good; whiche ben manys synnes doon ʒens the lawe of God; and which ben remedies ʒens the new seid freemnessis and ʒens the new seid synnes. Forwhi the remembraunce and mynde taking upon these vij. maters is so necessarie a meene into the loue and drede of God, that withoute meditacioun and mynde vpon hem or upon summe of hem no man schal loue God and drede God in eny while with al his herte, soule, and strengthe. And furthermore, sithen this mynde, remembraunce, and meditacioun mai not be had upon these seid maters withoute summe of these weles or meenes, that is to seie, reding or heering of Holi Scripture and of othere wrightis, heering of sermons prechid, biholding upon picturis or purtraturis or graued werk or coroun werk, visiting and going into the placis in whiche holi men han lyned, or in whiche holi men dwellen, or in whiche the reliis or the relikis of hem abiden; as bi whiche meenis alle or
summe of the seid vij. maters mowen be representid, signified, and be brought into mynde, meditacioun, and rememberance, and ech of these weies and meenis is profitable and speedful into the seid rememberance making upon the seuen seid maters, as sure experience and assaye ther upon had it witnessith;—it muste needis be grauntid that in this that Holi Scripture wole a man forto love and drede God with al his herte, soul, and wil, Holi Scripture allowith weal that a man take in to vsee ech of these now bfore reherced meenis (now oon of hem, now an other of hem) at his libertse, as him likith forto so take. This fiste concluisioun folwith openli out of the iij. seid supposiciouns and reulis, and out of the ensaampling bfore upon hem. Wherfore, if thei be trewe, this fiste concluisioun muste nedis be trewe.

The iij. conclusionis is this: Thilk xj. gouernauncis whiche y schal susteyne, meytene, iustifie, and defende aftir in this present book, ben bede or counsellid or wittesaid bi Holi Scripture to be doon. This conclusionis y proowe thus. Ech gouernaunce which is expresseli bede, counsellid, or wittesaid bi Holi Scripture to be doon, or is includigli or closigli in eny of the now bforeseid maners bede, counsellid, or wittesaid bi Holi Scripture to be doon, is bede or counsellid or wittesaid [by] Holi Scripture to be doon; but so it is that ech of thilk now spokun xj. gouernauncis, which after in this present book y schal defende and susteyne, is a gouernaunce expresseli bede or counsellid or wittesaid bi Holi Scripture to be doon, or is includigli or closigli bede, counsellid, or wittesaid in summe of the maners now bfore seid in a gouernaunce bede, counsellid, or wittesaid expresseli bi Holi Scripture to be doon, as schal be openli at ful proued after in this book. Wherfore ech of thilk xj. gouernauncis is bede or counsellid or wittesaid of Holi Scripture to be doon.
The iij\textsuperscript{th}. conclusion is this: In thilk maner of vnpropre and large speche, in which it may thouž vnpropiri be seid that what is Bedford or counsellid or witnessid bi Holi Scripture in eny of the now biforn seid maners of bidding, counselling, or witnessing is theryfore and therby groundid in Holi Scripture, it is trewe that ech of the xj. gouernancis, which ý schal aftir in the iij\textsuperscript{th}, iij\textsuperscript{th}, iv\textsuperscript{th}, and v\textsuperscript{th}. parties of this book menteyne and defende is groundid in Holi Scripture largelid and vnpropiri farto speke of grounding, as it is ther of seid biforn in the [fifth]\textsuperscript{th} chapter of this present firste parti of this book. This iij\textsuperscript{th}. conclusion folieth pleini at the ful out of the iij\textsuperscript{th}. now biforn going conclusion. Wherfore, if the iij\textsuperscript{th}. conclusion is trewe, this iij\textsuperscript{th}. conclusion is needis trewe.

The iij\textsuperscript{th}. conclusion is this: If the bidding or counselling or witnessing of Holi Scripture in eny of the biforn seid maners upon a mater or a conclusion or a trouthe of moral lawe of kinde were a groundind in Scripture, farto speke propiri and verili and dewli of a ground and of grounding to a thing, in the maner which is biforn spokun in the iij\textsuperscript{th}. and iij\textsuperscript{th}. chapitris of this present first parti, certis thanne ech of the xj. gouernancis (whiche aftir in the iij\textsuperscript{th}., iij\textsuperscript{th}., iv\textsuperscript{th}., and v\textsuperscript{th}. parties of this present book ý schal defende and menteyne) were groundid in Holi Scripture bi grounding in propere maner vndirstondun and takun. This iij\textsuperscript{th}. conclusion folieth openli out of the iij\textsuperscript{th}. and iij\textsuperscript{th}. conclusionis. Wherfore, if thei be trewe, he is trewe.

---

\footnote{1 Some erasures and corrections have been made in the numbers; the same remark is to be made just below in two instances; also at p. 4, l. 23. The numbers are written in Roman character by the first hand, in Arabic by the second.}

\footnote{2 A space left in the MS. for the number.
CONFIRMACIOUN to the i. and ii. of these iiiij. now putt conclusions is this. Who ever for devecioun and louve which he hath to Holi Scripture wole holde that ech gouernaunce of Goddis moral lawe and seruice is groundid in the Newe Testament, (as summen holden,) or in the holde Bible, (as summe othere hol- dem,) and ellis it is not to be take for a point and deede or gouernaunce of Goddis lawe and of Goddis seruice, zit he mai not holde and seie that needis ech gouernaunce of Goddis seid lawe and seruise muste be groundid expresseli in Holi Scripture, as anoon aftir schal be proued. Wherfore he muste needis graunte and holde, that if eny deede or gouernaunce be groundid or witnessid includingli or closingly in eny of the before spokun maners bi the thre reulis, it is ynow; forto seie and holde that thilk deede or gouernaunce is groundid or witnessid in Holi Scripture. And if he muste so graunte, certis thanne if it be schewid to him that ech of the xj. gouernaunccis whiche y schal aftir in the iiij., iiij., iv., and v. parties of this book defende and justifie, (of which oon is setting up of ymagis in chirchis, and an othir is pilgrymage vnto the memorialis or mynde placis of Seintis,) is includingli or closingly groundid or witnessid in Holi Scripture bi eny of the maners before seid in the iiij. reulis, (as aftir in the ij*. parti of this book it schal be schewid,) he muste needis lijk weel graunte that ech of tho xj. gouernaunccis is groundid or witnessid in Holi Scripture.

That thou maist not seie and holde ech gouernaunce and deede of Goddis lawe and seruice to be expressid in Holi Scripture, and that ellis it is not Goddis ser-
uice and a deede of Goddis lawe, lo thou maist se herbi. In al Holi Scripture it is not expressi
d bi bidding, counseeling, or witnessing, or bi 
ensaum-pling of persoon, that a lay man not preeest schulde 
were a breche, or that he schulde were a cloke, or 
that he schulde were a gowne, or that he schulde die 
wollen clooth into other colour than is the colour of 
scheep, or that men schulden, bake eny fleisch or fisch 
in an ovyn, or that men schulde make and vse clockis 
forto knowe the houris of the dai and ny3t; for thou 
in eeldist daies, and thou3 in Scripture mension is 
maad of orologis, schewing the houris of the dai bi 
shadew maad bi the sunne in a cercle, certis neure 
saeue in late daies was eny clok telling the houris of 
dai and ny3t bi peise and bi stroke, and open 
it is that nou3where in Holis Scripture is express 
mensio3 mad of eny suche. Also nou3where in Holis 
Scripture is mensioad mad or eny ensampling doon, 
that a womman schulde were upon her heer and heed 
eny couerchief of lynnen thred or of 3 silk. Forwhi 
the coueryng with which a wommanys heed ou3te be 
couered, wherof Holis Scripture spekith in the pistlis 
of Pou,1 was only the heer of wommennys heed 
vnschorn, and of noon other coueryng to wommennys 
heedis spekith Holis Scripture. And here a3ens Holis 
Scripture wole that men schulden lacke the coueryng 
which wommen schulden haue, and thei schulden so 
lacke bi that that the heeris of her heedis schul- 
den be schorne, and schulde not growe in lengthe 
doun as wommanys heer schulde growe. Perauen-

---

1 eni is added by a later (?) hand. 
2 schulde, MS. (first hand). 
3 of is added by a later hand. 
4 See 1 Cor. xi. 3-10. It need hardly be added that Pecock has committed an error in this sentence, the ἡμερα of v. 10 being certainly a veil. Veils are also several times mentioned in the Old Testament. See Kitt, Cycil Bibli. Lit., s. v. Veil.
ture, as wijn as thou makist thee in the Bible forto
reprowe pilgrimage and setting up of ymagis and
worschiping doon before ymagis, thou couthist not
aspie this laste seid point of wommannis coueryng:
therfore how thou canst fynde it by Holyscripture,
lete se; and if thou canst not it fynde, it may be
founde and prowd so by Holyscripture that thou
schalt not kunne seie nay; and zit it is holde for
a dede allowbable and vertuose that wommen were
couercheefs, and that men and wommen were
gownys and clokis, not withstonding that more synne
cometh bi wering of wommennys couercheefs and bi wom-
mennys gownys than by vce of ymagis and bi pilgram-
agis, as al the world may wite, if the mater be weel
and thriftili examyned, bi what schal be seid and
proued of ymagis and of pilgramagis in the ij. parte
of this present book, and bi what is al redi therof
clereli seid and prowd in *The book of worschiping*.

Also thou schalt not fynde expresseli in Holyscrip-
ture that the Newe Testament schulde be write in
Englisch tunge to lay men, or in Latyn tunge to
clerkis; neither that the Oold Testament schulde be
write in Englisch tunge to lay men, or in Latyn tunge
to clerkis: and zit ech of these gouernauncis thou
wolte holde to be leefull, and to be a meritorie vertuose
moral deede forto therbi deserue grace and glorie,
and to be the service of God, and therfore to be the
lawe of God; sitben bi no deede a man hath merit,
sauz bi a deede which is the service and the lawe
of God; and ech moral vertu is the lawe of God, as
it is proued weel in othre place of my writings.

Also thus: Where it is groundid expresseli in Scrip-
ture, that men mowe lete schaue her berdis. And how

---

1 Probably we should read *placeis*.
2 Perhaps we should read, *Where*.

 stand from above, [*Thou shalt not
is it, &c.; if not, we must under-
dare thei so lete, sithen it cannot be founde expresseli in Scripture 1 that thei ouȝten so lete, and namelich sithen it is founde in Holî Scripture that men leten her berdis growe withoute schering or schauynge, and also sithen it was the oolde ysage thorum al the world in Christendom? Where is it in Holi Scripture groundid bi wey of comendyng or of allowaunce that men schulden or miȝten lauȝwe? For to the contrarie is euydence in Holî Scripture, Mat. v. 5., where it is seid thus: Blessid ben thei that moorñen or weilen, for thei schulden be cownfortid; and also, Gen. [xviiij.] 4. 5., Sara the wijd of Abrabam was punyschid, for that sche lauȝe biihinde the dore of the tabernacle. Where is it also grondid in Holî Scripture that men miȝten alloweabili or schulden pleie in word bi bording, or in deede by rennyng or leping or schuting, or bi sitting at the merels, or bi casting of coitis? And ȝit ech of these deedis mowe be doon and ben doon vertuoseli and merytorili.

Also where in Holî Scripture is it grondid that men miȝten or schulden singe, same oonli where yn thei preisiden God, as amugelis diden in erthe whanne Crist was born? And so for esement of a man him sel, and for esement of his neizbour, it is not expressid in Holî Scripture that a man schulde singe. And ȝit Goddis forbode, but that into esement of him sel and also of his neizbour, a man mai singe, pleie, and lauȝe vertuoseli, and therfore merytorili; and if he mai do it merytorili, certis thanne thilk deede is Goddis service; and if it be Goddis service, it is needis a deede of Goddis lawe.

Where is it expressid bi word or bi eny persoonys ensaumping in Holî Scripture that men schulden make

---

1 Holî is inserted in the MS. before Scripture, but cancelled by a later (?) hand.

2 A space left in the MS. for the number.
THE FIRST PART.

ale or beer, of which so myche horrible synne cometh, myche more than of setting up of ymagis, or of pilgrymagis; and the defautis doon aboute ymagis and pilgrimagis ben myche liytter and easier to be amendid, than the defautis comyng bi making of ale and of beer. And also here with it is trewe that without ale and bere, and without sidir and wijn and meeth, men and wommen mynte lyue ful long, and longer than thei doon now, and in lasse iolite and cherte of herte forto bringe hem into horrible grete synnes. And as thou wolte seie that forto make ale and beer and forto drinke hem is the seruice of God, and is merytorie, and therfore is the lawe of God: for bi no deede a man schal plese God and haue merit and meede, saue bi deede of his seruise; and ech deede which is his seruise is a deede of his lawe.

That in Holi Scripture is noon of these now rehercicd gouernauencis groundid or wittnesid or ensaumplid bi eny persoon expresseli, lo, y prowe thus: No thing is expresseli spoken of in Scripture, which is not there in special openli named; but so it is,¹ that neither breche of ley man, neither gown, neither cloke, neither wommanis lynnen or silken couercheef, neither clock, neither Englisch tunge or langage,² neither ale, neither bere is spokun of there in special and bi name. Werfore the vee of these thingis, as to be doon bi tho thingis, is not there expressid. Also thus: No gouernaunce or treuthe is expresseli groundid or wittnesid in Holi Scripture, which mai not be knowne³ bi the Scripture aloone, without more sett therto of propo-

¹ is is interlineated in a later hand, which has also made some erasures.
² After this follows, neither Latyn tongue or langage, but a later (?) hand has drawn a pen through it; rightly. See Luke xxiii. 38. But very possibly Pecock wrote it, since he was capable of making such a blunder as to say that a cloak is not mentioned in Scripture.
³ known, MS. (first hand).
**Chap. XX.**

Cisionins in the resoun of him which redith and vnder-
standith there the Scripture. Forwhi in this case thilch
gouernaunce schulde be grondid or witnesseid sumwhat
and in parcel bi tho proposicions caste to Scripture,
as it is groundid and witnessid sumwhat and in parcel
bi the Scripture; but so it is, that noon of these now
bifore spokun and rehercid gouernauncis may be knowe
to be trewe, iust, and riȝtful bi eny text or processe
in Scripture aloone, whilis no more at al in resoun is
sett to the same Scripture, for to conclude the seid
gouernaunce bi the Scripture and bi resoun to gidere.
Wherfore noon of alle these seid gouernauncis is
groundid or witnessid expresseli in Holi Scripture.

Confirmacioun herto is this: No thing is expressid
or expresseli witnessid or groundid in Holi Scripture,
which is not rehercid in Holi Scripture; but so it is,
that noon of these gouernauncis is rehercid in Holi
Scripture: wherfore noon of hem is expressid in Holi
Scripture. And if noon of hem is there expressid,
certis noon of hem is there expresseli groundid, wit-
nesseid, or denouncid, or tauȝt. Also thus: Oonli it
is expressid or expresseli tooled and tauȝt in Holi
Scripture, which is known for trewe or to be doon,
thouȝ no thing ellis in1 doom of resoun be sett ther
to; but so is not of eny of the bifore rehercid gou-
ernauncis: wherfore noon of hem is expressid or expres-
seli tooled, or tauȝt, witnessid, rehercid, or groundid
in Holi Scripture.

Now, Sir, to thee thus: In caes that y wolde holde
aȝens thee, and seie that it is not to be do, that ale
and beer be mad and drunke; or that wommen weere
couerchesis of lynnen or of silk, of whiche so miche
synne cometh; or if y wolde holde that it were not
Goddis servise forto at sum while laȝe or make

---

1 in is interlined by a later (?) hand, and done written on an erasure.
feeste or pleie; and namelich if y wolde seie to thee thus: "Where ben these biforn rehearsed gouernaunconis "groundid in Holi Scripture, namelich in the Newe "Testament?" loke how thou woldist in this case answere to me forto defende bi doom of resoun the making and vsing of ale, or the wering of womman-
yny couercheefis to be a moral, vertuose deede of Goddis lawe; and how thou woldist grounde or bi witnessing fynde eny of hem in Holy Scripture bi eny of the maners biforn spoken in the thre reulis, or in eny other maner; and in the same or euen lijk wise y schal defende bi resoun ech of the xj. gouernaunconis aftir to be justified in the ij*, iiij*, iiiij*, and v* parties of this book, as there aftir schal be seen. And in the same or euen lijk wise y schal grounde or fynde bi witnessing ech of hem in Holi Scripture, as also thou shalt openli aftir in the ij* parti of this book se. Wolde God thilk men and wommen, (and namelich thilk wommen whiche maken hem self so wise bi the Bible, that thei no deede wol-len allowe to be vertuose and to be doon in mannis vertuose convensacioun, saue what thei kunnen fynde expresseli in the Bible, and ben ful coppid of spece anentis clerkis, and avauten and profren hem self whanne thei ben in her iolite and in her owne housis forto argue and dispute ajens clerkis,) schulden not were couercheefis into tyme thei couthlen1 schewe bi her Bible where it is expresseli bede, conseilid, or witnessid in her Bible to be doon; neither schulde sette hem self for to sitte at priuey; neither schulden rise ther-
fro, whanne thei were so set or sitting, into tyme thei hadden groundid expresseli in Holi Scripture that thei ouzten alle tho deedis do, but if thei wolten leue her vnwijs and proud folie. And zit ech of tho deedis, whanne he is doon aftir doom of resoun and for God,
 Chap. XX.

is service of God, and lawe of God; for ech of hem is a moral vertuose deede; and also forto leue eny of hem were a vice and a synne to God. And therfore ech of tho deeds, whanne thei ben\(^1\) doon bi resoun and for God, is a service and a lawe to God, name-
llich siten ech deede, which eny Cristen man schulde wirche and do bi avisement and in which he schulde bi avisement be occupied, ouste be a lawe to God. Forwhi eche such dede ouste be a service to God, siten Poul seith ii. Cor. xii. 2. thus: *Whether ye eet or drinke or eny other thing doon, alle do ye into the glorie of God.*

Also y wolde that no suche wommen schulden anointe, waische, or bathe hem silf into tyme thei cou-
then alle tho deeds grounde expressly in the Bible to be doon. Certis wommen mowe not so grounde the wering of her silken or lynnen couerchevis bi it what is writen is. Thimothe, ii. Cor. ii. 2. that wommen schulden haue couenable habit, where Poul seith thus: *Also wommen in couenable habit with schamefastnes and sobirnes araiyng hem silf, not in writhen heris, or in gold, or in peeris, or precioso clooth; but that that bicometh wommen biheting pite, bi gods werkis.* Forwhi in tho daies of Poul summe wommen weriden couenable habit, and hit noone wommen we-
riden thanne eny lynnen or silken keuerchevis, but weriden her open heer, as sumwhat therto sowith this same now rehercid processe of Poul, and bettr it mai be proued bi processe of Poul if thilk processe be weel discussid. Wherfore bi this that Poul seith, "Wommen to haue couenable habit,"

\(^1\) be, MS. (first hand).
\(^2\) A space left in the MS. for the reference. Pecock may probably have misunderstood 1 Cor. xi. 15: that veils were in that age some-
times worn by women needs no proof, and is affirmed by St. Paul himself, 1 Cor. xi. 10. See Smith’s *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Ant.*, s. v. Vo-


mai not be so groundid that thei schulden haue lyn-
ningen or silken keuercheeis.

Also thus: Whanne Poul seith that wommen schul-
den haue couenable habit, he pointith not to hem
which habit is couenable to hem and which is not
couenable to hem; neither he pointith more speciali
that for to were lynnen or silken couercheeis is co-
uenable; or that it is not couenable. Wherfore forto
haue al this pointid he remittith and sendith us sum-
where ellis, and wolde that we seche and fynde sum
where ellis than in Holi Scripture which habit is
couenable, and which is not couenable; but so it is,
that into nowhere ellis he remittith us or sendith us
or ouȝte sende us for this purpose, saue in to doom
of resoun and into lawe of kinde and moral philos-
ophie. Forwhi nowhere in Holi Scripture this mater
is pointid and tauȝt expresseli. Wherfore it was the
entent of Poul in the scid proces, i* Thim. ij* c.*, that
foro fynde, know, and iuge expresseli which habit is
couenable, and whether forto were lynnen or silken
couercheeis is couenable, we schulden go to doom of
resoun and lawe of kinde. And, if this be trewe,
thanne doom of resoun and lawe of kinde and not
Holi Scripture muste expresseli grounde this, that
wommen mowe weel were lynnen and silken couer-
cheeis, if it be in any wise groundable and leeful.
Forwhi whanne Holi Scripture remittith from him or
leethyst to an other thing or sendith into an other
thing eny certeyn kunnyng or knowing to be had,
Holi Scripture not groundith, namelich not expresseli,
thilk kunnyng and knowing; but the thing, into

1 The twenty-three following
lines are added in the margin, being
partly written on an erasure. The
hand is very similar to that of the
general text, but a little smaller; | some additions and erasures how-
ever being made by a later, though
early, corrector. Some considerable
erasures occur also in the preceding
paragraph.
which Holi Scripture so remyttith, it so groundith. Wherfore needis if it be leeful wommen forto were lynnen and silken couercheevesis, doom of resoun muste expresseli grounde thilk wering; and Holi Scripture not so it groundith. Ensaunpyle for this purpos is this: If the king sende his epistle to alle peintouris, that thei peinte alle crucifixis with couenable colouris; certis it mai not be seid as here that thilk epistle groundith this, that whijt colour schal be leid in oon certein parti of the crucifix and reed in an other parti, and so forth of othres colouris; but the craft of peinting muste it grounde; and as for the grounding therof, the king in his epistle leueth hem to her owne craft. In lijk maner it were if the king bi his epistle wolde comande to goldsmithis, thys whanne euer thei schulden enamele eny cuppe or other iewe, thei schulden enamele it couenabili; certis herbi the king schulde not grounde to hem, that there in such a place of the iewe thei schulden leie rather blew enameling than reed or whijt, and that in this place thei schulden leie whijt or greene enameling rather than blew; but al this he leueth to be groundid bi her craft. Wherfore lijk wise it is to be seid in this present purpos.

Furthermore fortioiustifie her bathing, wasching, and anointing wommen moewe not allege the storie of Sussanne, Daniel xiiij. c.; for thilk procese and storie is not Holi Writt, but Apocrif; and the verri book of Daniel (as mich as is Holi Writt) is eendid with the xij. chapter of the same book, as Ierom.

1 schulde, MS. (first hand).
2 "Hec in idecreo, ut difficultatem vobis Daniels ostenderem: qui apud Hebræos nec Susannah habet historiam, nec hymnnum trium puero-
rum, nec Bella draconisque fabulas: quas nos, quia in toto orbe dis-
perse sunt, verum anteposito, casque jugulante, subjecimus, ne videremur apud imperios magnam partem voluminis detruncasse." S. Hieron.
the translatour witnesseth; and it in thilk story is
no mension maad of alle the wommennys deedis now
rehercoid, saue oonli of bathing and of waisching with
oyl and swope, and zit not of these bi wey of com-
ending or bi wey of ensaumling that othere per-
soones schulde do the same.

Though the thre reulis or supposiciouns, whiche y
haue sett biforn in the xix. chapiter, ben sufficien into
the purpos of the iiij. conclusionis there drawn out
of hem, and into the purpos of a general proof there
mad upon the xj. biforn spoken gouernauncis, (and
therefore y there settid no mo reulis than was nedeful
to myn there purposid entent,) zit lest that summe
reders wolden conceyue and trouwe ther bi that in the
iiij. reulis or supposiciouns y weene and vnderstonde
to be alle maner bi whiche eny trouthe, gouernaunce,
or conclusionis is bede, counsellid, or witnesid in-
cludingli or impiedli in Holi Scripture; therefore into
oon other maner bi which a gouernaunce or trouthe is
bede, counsellid, or witnesid bi Holi Scripture, y
remytte and send ech man desiring forto it leerne or
knowe into the firste parti of the book clepid Just
apprising of Holi Scripture. For theare in the chaper
in proyng of the trouthe schal be schewid this other maner of gronding, bidding, counseiling, or
witnesing bi Holi Scripture, which is left here vnseid
and vntaught.

After that (fro the bigynnyng of this present chap-
ter hidir to) y haue thus confirmed the firste and
conclusionis, put and proved in the next biforn going
chapiter, y putte now here the v. conclusion as for
an eende of this present first parti, which v. conclu-
sioun is this. For to conuiete and overcome the erring

---

1 upon is inserted by a later (?) 2 Spaces left in the MS. for the numbers. 3 and the, MS. (first hand).
personees of the lay peple whiche ben clepid Lollardis, and forto make hem leue her erruris is a ful notable, the, and an excellent remedie, the writing in her modiris langage of this present firste parti, and of the book clepid *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture*, and tho bookis of whiche mensioun is mad in these bokis, and the bitaking of these bookis and of the bokis into her voe of reeding and studiying.

That this conclusion is trewe y proue thus: For to conuicte and overcome tho seid erring personees of the lay peple, and for to make hem leue her erruris, an excellent remedie is the dryuynge of hem into sure knowing or into weenyng or opinion, that thei neden miche more to leerne and knowe into the profit and sure leernyng and knowing of Goddis lawe and service, than what thei mowe leerne and knowe bi her reeding and studiying in the Bible oonli; but so it is, that forto dryue hem into the now seid knowing, trowinge, or opinion seruen at ful in an excellent maner the writing of this present firste parti in her modiris langage, with liyk writing of the book clepid *Iust apprising of Holi Scripture*; and bi so miche the better, if therto be sett the othere bokis named in these ij. And without the writing of this present firste parti and of *The iust apprising*, or with out sum other writing liyk to hem, tho personees wolen in no wise be so conuictid and overcume, as assay thet therto mad before this present day thurou this sexti wyntris by his ther yn vneffectual speding makith open experimental witnesse. Wherfore for to conuicte the seid personees and forto make hem leue her erruris is an excellent remedie, (the, and as it were an vnackeable remedie,) the seid writing of the now spoken bokis and the bitaking of tho seid bokis into the reeding and studiying of the same personees.

The firste premisse of this proof and argument is trewe. Forwhi, if tho personees were dryue into sure
knowing or into trowing, that thei neden leerne and knowe miche more into the profit and ful learning and knowing of Goddis lawe than what is in the Bible, or what thei mowe leerne and knowe bi the Bible, certis thei schulden be maad seme to hem sylf verry foolis; and thei schulden se and knowe wel hem sylf to be fonyns and foolis, as anentis ful manye of the thingis whiche ben necessarili to be leerne and kunne of hem bisidis the Bible, 3he, and in the Bible; and thei schulden se that thei han miche neede to clerkis, and thei schulden be aschamed of her biforme had hiȝe bering and presumpcioun and of her wyncing in witt, and of her hopping bisidis witt, as her of ful sure experience is had, blessid be God, and sure expe-
rience may be had, how ofte euer eny of tho persoones
talken in long leiser eernelesti upon eny point of Goddis
lawe and seruice with a sad and weel leerneclerk
in moral philosoplie and dyuynyte. For sotheli ful
soone schulen tho persoones thanne stonde at her
wittis eende, and ful rude be where yn the clerk
schal sprede him sylf abrode in large cleernes: Verrili
the thing which we knowen we now spoken, and the
thing which we han seen we wittessen: where now
aȝentward, (bi cause it seemseth to hem that thei neden
nothing into the scale of Goddis lawe and seruice
saue Holi Scripture aloone, and that therto Holi
Scripture sufficith, and thei weenen hem sylf forto
kuene at ful and substanciali and piththali Holi
Scripture, for that thei kunnen bi herte the textis of
Holi Scripture and kunnen lussche hem out thikke at
feest, and at ale drinking, and vpon her hiȝe benchis
sitting,) thei ben obstinat aȝens her owne goostli
thrift and aȝens her soulis sauyng. And therfore the
seid first premisse is redili trewe.

---

1 schulde, MS. (first hand.) | 2 See John iii. 11.
And that the iij. premysse of the same proof and argument is trewe in his firste parti, it schal be openli knowne to ech diligent of tho bokis the ouerredor and attentijf studier. For whi this firste parti of this present book and The iust apprizing of Holis Scripture as in generalte schewen vndoutablly and vnsensesiably, that myche moral philosopie and miche lawe of kinde is algatis necessarie to be learned, as weel as the Bible; and that withoute the learning of the seid moral philosopie and lawe of kinde the Bible may not be ariȝt vndirstonde; and that the seid philosopie and lawe of kinde is the more parti of Goddis lawe and servise; and the ather bokis, whiche ben named in these now seid iij. bokis, schewen the same in specialte: and therfore the readres and studiers in these bookis muste nedis be dryue herto, that thei han nede to the help and counsel and direccioun of clerkes, and han nede to miche other thing than to the Bible aloon. And therfore the iij. premisse of the principal argument is trewe as for his firste parti, whos also secunde parti is confirmed bifoer bi experience and assay spoken bifoer, where the same secunde parti is sett forth in the principal argument.

And so, (sithen the bothe premissis of the prouyng argument ben trewe, and the argument is formali maad,) it muste needis be that the conclusion of the premisss is trewe, which is not ellis than this present v*. conclusion. And therfore this present v*. conclusion is nedis to be holde for trewe. For making and writing of whiche now bifoer spokun and rehercid bokis; to the hise aloon God, louyngist Lord a thousind sithis gramerci.

Here cendith the firste party of the book clepid
THE REPRESSER OF OVER MOCH WIJTYNG THE CLERGIE.
Here bigynneth the ij. pàrti of this book clepid
THE REPRESSER.

THE FIRST CHAPETER.

Eer than y schal come doun so speciali into the ij'. iiij'. iiiij'. and v'. parties of this present book forte rehearse, prowe, and iustifie the xi. gouernauncis, for whiche manye of the lay peple blamen ouermiche the clergie, y schal sende and putte bfore certeyn supposiciouns or reulis opene ynow; to be grauintid of ech man, and whiche schulen helpe and avelie into the prouyng and iustifying of ech of the xj. gouernauncis. Neuertheles, who euer schal thenke that thei ben ouer hard or not nedeful to be of him ouerrad and leerned, y wole vouche saaf that he ouerlepe hem and go at the firste into the ij'. chapiter of this same ij'. partie, vnto tyme his witt be growen hiþer.

Of whiche supposiciouns or reulis the firste is this:

Ech treuth which is knownen in manyns vnndirstonding is known bi doom of resoun rennyng vpon the mater of thilk trouthe, and upon hise causis and circunnstauncis and purtenauncis; or ellis it is knowyn by the assercioun or the* witnessing of a persoon, which is not likeli ther yn to make lesing and to bigile. This now seid reule is so open that no man may ther azens seie nay. Forwhi no man can fynde or assigne eny maner in which a man mai leerne and kumne eny thing, save oon of these ij. maners now seid.

*ellis in a later hand. | the* in a later hand.
The iij\textsuperscript{e} reule or supposicioun is this: Al the kunnyng or knowing gete and had in the firste of these iij. maners now seid is clepid \textit{Philosophie}, bi cause it is had bi labour of kindeli witt without telling or witnessing fro aboue kinde; and al the kunnyng or knowing gete and had in the iij\textsuperscript{e} now seid maner is credence\textsuperscript{1} or feith, and is dewli to be clepid \textit{Pure Divynite} or \textit{Pure Theologie}, forto speke propiri of divynite and theologie as it is dyuerse fro philosopie. This reule is open bi what y haue write in the book clepid \textit{The\textsuperscript{2} inst aprrising of Doctourie}, and mai be proved thus. Sum kunnyng gete bi mannys resonin, without certifiyng ther of fro aboue kinde, is to be clepid \textit{Philosophie}; and skile is noon whi eny oon such kunnyng or knowing schulde be seid \textit{Philosophie}, more than ech other such kunnyng or knowing schulde be clepid \textit{Philosophie}. Wherfore ech kunnyng or knowing, getun and had bi labour of mannys kindel reson without the seid affermyng and certifiyng mad ther upon fro God aboue, is to be clepid \textit{Philosophie}. And if this be trewe, thanne, (sithen ech kunnyng or knowing of mannys vnderstanding is gete and had in this now seid maner, or ellis in certifiyng and ascercioun mad fro God as the firste reule seid,) it muste nedis folewe that if eny kunnyng or knowing is to be clepid propiri divynyte (as he is dyuere fro philosopie), he muste be oonli the kunnyng or knowing gete and had in the iij\textsuperscript{e} now seid maner, that is to seie, bi ascercioun and certificacioun and reuelacioun mad fro God to man. And so it is open that the iij\textsuperscript{e} reule is trewe.

The iij\textsuperscript{e} reule or supposicioun is this: If a treuthe be knoen bi doom of reson, thanne it is knoen or sureli and sikiri; or it is knoen oonli probabili

\textsuperscript{1}credence, MS. \textsuperscript{2}The in a later hand.
and likely. This rule is open at the fulle. Forwhi
mo maners or any other maner, dyuers from oon of
these now seid ij. maners, no man can assigne and
zeue, in which a treuthe may be knowun.

The iiiij. rule is this: If a treuthe be knowe
sureli and sikirli, thanne thilk kunnyng or knowing
is woned be clepid intellect, science, craft, or prudence.
And if a treuthe be knowun oonli bi probabilnes
and likelihode and not sureli, thanne thilk kunnyng
or knowing is woned be clepid opinioyn upn the
mater of science, craft, or prudence; for vnderstonding
of which now spokun names recours is to be had into
The folewer to the donet, the 1 chapter, and
therbi this present rule schal be open ynoy.

The v. rule or supposicioun is this: If a treuthe
which we mowe not knowe in the now bifoire seid
maner bi doom of resoun, withoute asseriouyn of an
other trewe persoon, be knowen in mannys vnder-
stonding bi the seid asseriouyn or witnessing of a
trewe persoon, which asseriouyn is the ground of feith;
thanne it is knowe bi asseriouyn or witnessing of
God doon bi his Holi Scripture, or bi eeldist and
lengist vee of bileuyng in the Chirche, or bi godli
myracle doon into witnessing of it, or bi speche of
God doon bi him sylf, or bi his suer messanger with-
oute writing; and in ech of these caasis the knowing
is holi feith or goostli feith. Or ellis it is knowe
bi asseriouyn or witnessing of man or ungel not as
messanger of God; and that, or bi his writing in
storyng or cronycleing, or bi spech of him sylf, or of
his messanger without writing; and in ech of these
casis is credence or worldly ithfe and not goostli
feith, sих as is in the next maner now bifoire seid.
Al this is so open to be grauntid, that who euer

1 A space left in the MS. for the number.
denyeth any point of it, he is unable to be admitted and to be received into any enquireance or commun- naunce forto fynde, leerne, and knowe treuthis, so that the significacioun of these wordis be maad open to him, that he understonde what the wordis meenen.

The vj. supposicioun or reul is this: What euer thing is knowe in manys vnderstanding to be vntrewe is knowe to be vntrewe bi the same ij. kindis of groundis before reherced, bi which treuthis is knowun, as ben the doom of resoun and the assercioun of a trewe persoon; and so forth descending into membris\(^1\) of hem, as the bbefore ij. reule hem dividith and departith. This reule is openli trewe. Forwhi what other ground than any of these now reherced couthe be assigned, forto bi it knowe a thing to be vntrewe, no man can seie. Also, when euer a thing is known to be vntrewe, than al it which is ther in\(^*\) knowun is a treuth. Forwhi al what is so ther yn knowun is this: That thilk thing is vntrewe, and this is a trouthe; and ech trouthe is knowun bi the seid groundis oonli, as the firste and ij. reule schewen. Wherfore medis this, that this is vntrewe, is knowe bi the same kindis of groundis oonli. And therothere this vj. reule is nedis to be grauntid as for trewe.

This vj. reule is this: Ech treuth knowun in mannis vnderstanding is a treuthie considerabile or speculabile or biholdable oonli, that is to seie, such as where upon neither mannis doing in moral conversacioun, neither mannis making in craft fallith; as is this, that aungelis ben vnbdilli subsauncis; and this, that the planetis moven fro eest into west, and suche others; or it is a treuthie doable or makeable, that

\(^{1}\) into the membris, MS.; but the word to the foregoing, needlessly is cancelled by a later hand.

\(^{*}\) A later hand has joined this against the more usual division in this MS.
is to seie, upon which mannye doing in moral conversacioun leiding fallith; as is this, that God is to be loued aboue alle creaturis; and this, that man ouȝte be temperat in eting and drinking; and this, that he ouȝte be meke; and that this werk is to be mad by1 cumpaes, and thilk werk is to be mad bi auyner, and suche othere.

The viijth reule is this: Ech thing, which is doon of man in his moral conversacioun, is such that doom of resoun or the bifore seid ground of feith it approueth; as is, that God is to be loued, and oure neiȝbour is to be loued; and as is, that we loke to be baptisid; and so of othere: or is such that doom of resoun or the bifore seid ground of feith it reproueth; as is this, that a man take his neiȝboris wiȝf into fleschli comunyn; and this,2 that we waite not affer to be hossilid with the sacrament of the auter, and suche othere; or it is such that neither doom of resoun neither eny bifore seide ground of feith it approueth or reproueth, but is of neuer neither of hem approued or reproued; as is this, that a man lete his heer growe vnto bynethe bise eeries, or that he wole haue bise heer schorne of, and his heed to be dod; and this, that a man wole were a girdel, or that he wole go vngerd. And so forth of othere sucha.

The ixth reule or supposicioun is this: Ech doable thing longing to moral conversacioun, which thing doom of resoun or ground of feith approueth, is leeful; and it is leeful in propre maner forte clepe a thing leeful, for that it is approued bi doom of resoun or bi ground of feith: and ech doable thing don in moral conversacioun, which thing doom of resoun or ground of feith reproueth, is vnleeful; and it is vnleeful in contrarie maner to the now seid maner of

---

1 by added by a later hand. 2 thus, MS.
leefulnes, for that it is bi resoun or bi ground of feith reprovéd. And ech such doable thing, which neither doom of resoun neither ground of feith approueth neither reproveth, is in it sifl neither leeful neither vnleeful, in eny of the i. jow seid maners of propre taking leefulnes and vnleefulnes. And it is so neither leeful neither vnleeful, for that it is neither approued neither reprovéd bi resoun or bi ground of feith.

The x\textsuperscript{th} reule or supposicioun is this: Al doable thing which in propre maner now biforn sett is neiðer leeful neither vnleeful, and namelich if it be not vnleeful, mai and is woned convenientli ynoût as in a larger speche to be seid and clepid leeful; and that for as miche as ech doable thing, for whos doing the doer is not to be blamed and to be punyschid, mai be clepid leeful: and so al such thing is woned to be clepid leeful, thou; not so propirli as it is leeful which doom of resoun or ground of feith approueth.

I wote not that it is worth fòto talle in\textsuperscript{1} resonýng with eny persoon of the laife upon eny mater of Goddis lawe, but if he be able fórto vndestonde thes now biforn sett x. reulis, and but if he graunte hem and holde hem for trewe.

ij. CHAPETER.

AFTIR whiche x. reulis or supposiciouns y procede thus. The firste gouernance for which the lay peple ouermyche and vntreuly wijten the clergye is the hauynge and vsing of ymagis.

Vpon which gouernance y setthe forth this firste conclusioun. The hauing and the setting vp of ymagis in chrichis and the vsing of hem as rememoratiij

\textsuperscript{1}is is interlineated by a later (?) hand, which has also altered the preceding word by an erasure.
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or mynding signes is not reprooved by any ground of feith, that is to seie not bi Holie Scripture, neither by long vse of the Chirchis bileuuyng, neither bi any myraculose theerto of God wirching. That this conclusion, namelich as for Holie Scripture, is trewe, ye proue thus: If eny text or proesse of Holie Scripture schulde reprove the seid firste gouernaunce, that is to seie, the seid hauyng and vsing of ymagis, thilk text or proesse schulde be oon of these, of which the firste is writun Exodi xx. c. thus: Thou schalt not make to thee eny graued thing; and the same text word bi word in proesse bifoire and after is writun Deutron. v*. c. in the bigynnyng; but so it is, that neither this text neither eny of the others after to be rebereid textis of Holie Scripture reproueth or leittih ymagis to be had and to be vsid in the maner now spokun in this present firste conclusion. Wherfore this present it. conclusionis is trewe.

That this now spokun text writun Exodi xx*. c. and Deut. v*. c. reproueth not the bifoire sett firste gouernaunce aboute ymagis hauyng and vsing, y proue bi vj.1 argumentis, of whiche the firste is this. Not withstanding that God seide tho wordis to the Iewis, Thou schalt not make to thee eny graued thing, 3it he bade hem make two ymagis of cherubyn of gol, to be sett at the eendis of the cheest of witnes in the ynner partie of the tabernacle; as it is open Exodi xxv*. c.; but so it is, that God was not contrarie to him silf in his commaundis and biddingis: Wherfore bi tho wordis, Thou schalt not make to the eny graued thing, God vndirstode not forto weerne hem and for to forbede hem make eny graued ymagis, namelich into the entent and vse bifoire seid; for ellis God had ben contrarie to him silf in hise biddingis.

1 v. MS.; but the chapter contains six 'principal arguments.'
CHAP. II.

The second argument is this: Numeri xxj. c. it is writun, that God bade the peple of Israel forto make a brasen ymage of a serpente as for a signe, and forto sette him up an hîte in the end of a long pole for to biholde of alle the peple: Wherefore it mai not be that God, bi tho wordis seide to the same peple, Thou schalt not make to thee eny graued thing, that is to seie, not eny graued ymage, that bi tho wordis he vndirstode noon graued ymage to be mad. Forwhi thanne God had be contrarie to him sîf; but if thou woldist seie that God wole now weel allowe the clergie forto haue and vse ymagis yȝutte of gold and siluer and bras and of othere mettallis, and noone ymagis graued of tre or of stoon: which seiyng is not but a seyned trîsfe. Forwhi in kinde of ymagis no difference the grauyng makith fro the ȝutting, or the ȝutting fro the grauyng, neither the peinting fro the grauyng; and also this seiyng leytith not what the lay partie is aboute forto lette in the clergie, that noon ymagis of God or of Seintis be in chirchis: and therefor this seiyng is to be cast aside as a iaperi.

Also iij. Regum vij. c. it is writun, that Salomon made in the temple iij. ymagis of cherubyn of tree. Therefore open it is that thei were graued, and hem he couered and clothed al-aboute with plate of gold. And also he ordeyned the wallis of the temple to be graued with diuerse grauyngis, and he ordeyned to be graued ther yn ymagis of cherubyn and ymagis of palme trees and othere ymagis boocing and seemyng as thou; thei were going and passing out of the wal. Also in the doors of the temple he graued in a greet out-boocing ymagis of cherubyn and ymagis of palme trees. Also he made a brasen ymage of the see, and vndir this ymage he made xij. ymagis

\[1 \text{ alaboute}, \text{MS.} \]
\[2 \text{ out boocing}, \text{MS.} \]
of oxen, and in the sidis of the same ymage he made stories\(^1\) in ymagerie in a greet lengthe and heizte, as it is open iij\(^*\) Reg. vij\(^*\) c. Also in the veil which heng biforn the dore of the temple Salomon made weue ymagis of cherubin, as it is writun iij\(^*\) Paralip. iij\(^*\) c. And for alle these dedis he was weel allowid of God, as it is open ynuou iij\(^*\) Reg. ix\(^*\) c. and iij\(^*\) Paralip. vij\(^*\) c. And this myzte not stonde, if God hadde forbode alle graued ymagis to be had and vsid. Wherfore the dew vnndistonding of thilk text Exodi xx\(^*\) c. and Deut. v. c. Thou shalt not make to thee any graued thing, that is to seie, any graued ymage, is not to be vnndistonde so that he weerned any graued ymagis to be had; and sithen no thingis ben to be had with oute vce of hem, (for thanne thei were had in veyn,) it foloweth with that thilk same text weerneth not graued ymagis to be vsid.

And fethermore, if to the peole of Israel it was leeful forto make and rere up an hizte a brased ymage of a serpent, forto biholde it; wondir it were but that it were leeful to Cristen men forto make and rere up an yzze an ymage of Crist crucifid, forto biholde into it; and if it was leeful to the seid oold peole forto haue xij. ymagis of oxen bering vp the brased see, forto biholde hem, wonder it were whi it schulde be vnleeful to Cristen peile forto haue xij. ymagis of the xij. Apostiles, and forto biholde hem in remembering that the Apostilis were bede go and baptise a the world in water. And therfore the azensiers her of ben to be reiatid and rebukid as nyce, foned, wilful, wantoun, scisme sowers and disturbers of the peole, in mater which thei nowe neuer her entent bringe aboute.

The iij\(^*\) argument is this: It is writun in the Newe Testament, Matheu xxij\(^*\) c., whanne the Iewis askiden of Crist "whether it was leeful or no forto

\(^{1}\text{stories, MS. See 1 Kings vii. 24, where Wiclif's version has stories.}\)
The fourth argument. It cannot be denied that in some places of Scripture an image is used as equivalent to a false God; and it cannot be proved that it means anything else in the Second Commandment.

The iiiij. principal argument is this: If in some other place of Holy Scripture than in the before alleged text Exodi xx. c. and Deut. v. c. it is founde that bi this word "graued thing" is signified no thing ellis than a graued God or a mawmet, certis no man mai cleyme and avowe and stonde bi vttirli, that in the before reherced text Exodi xx. c. and Deut. v. c. this word "graued thing" schulde needis bitokene a graued ymage dyuers fro a mawmet and fro a graued syneyd God. Forwhi no skile he can fynde whi this word "graued thing" in eny othere placis of Scripture

1 aboute writing, MS. ; but abouteriting just below.
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schulde be take for a fals God, and not in the text of 1 Exodi xxv. c. and Deut. v. c.; but so it is that in manye other placis of Holi Scripture than Exodi xxv. c. and Deut. v. c. this word "graued thing" bitokeneth no thing ellis than a graued God and a mawmet graued, takun as a God and for a God, as now anoon aftir schal be proued. Wherfore this text biforn alleggid Exodi xxv. c. and Deut. v. c. lettith in no point graued ymagis to be had and to be vsid.

Lo y rede Abacuk ij. c. thus: Lo, what profitith the graued thing, for his maker graued it; a wellid thing to gider, and a fals ymage, for the make throf hopiad in making, that he made dourmbe symy-lacris? Wo to him that seith to a tre, Wake thou; Rise thou,[to3] a stoon, being stille. Whether he schal move teche? Lo, this is covered with gold and siluer, and no spirit is in the entrailis. Forsothe the Lord is in his holi temple; al erthe be stille fro his face. Thus miche there what man mai seie, which is not mad or wood, but that in this now rehercic proces of Abacuk, this word "graued thing" bitokeneth needis cost a fals and a feyned graued God? Forwhi this word "graued thing" bitokeneth the thing into which men hopiden, and to which men spaken and seiden, Rise thou, and which men weened to haube quyk; and therfore nedis "graued thing" in this place is take not for an ymage of God, but for an ymage pretendid to be God. And therfore, thoug in noon other place of Holi Scripture than in this oon place, dyuers fro the xxv. c. of Exodi and the v. c. of Deut. this word "graued thing" muste nedis bitokene onli a graued God, it were ynoyng fortto schewe that the text Exodi xxv. c. and Deut. v. c. biforn

1 of inserted in MS. by a later hand; the same expression occurs more than once below, where it is written at length by the first hand. 2 This word is read in both forms of Wiclif's version, from which this citation is made. See Wicl. Bibli. vol. iii. p. 783.
allegid, Thou shalt not make to thee a graven thing, constreyneth not that this word "graven thing" in thick text bitokeneth an ymage of God not pretendid to be a God. But it eter this, in mo than in a dosen placis of Holi Scripture, this word "graven thing" is take in ljk maner as it is take in the now reheercid processe of Abacuk ij'. ċ. for a graven God. For whi¹ Leuit. xvij'. ċ. in the bigynnyng, Deut. viij'. ċ. soone aftir the bigynnyng, ij'. Reg. v'. ċ. aboute the myddis, ij'. Paralip. xxxiiij'. ċ. soone aftir the bigynnyng, Isaae xxx'. ċ. in the middis, and in the xl'. ċ. aftir the myddis, and in the xlij'. ċ. soone after the bigynnyng and also in the myddis, and in the xlijij'. ċ. aftir the bigynnyng and eftsoone aboute the myddis, also notabili Ieremye the x'. ċ. aboute the myddis, and Daniel the xj'. ċ. aftir the bigynnyng, and notabili Michee in the v'. ċ. aftir the myddis, and in the Sauter in psalmis, as in the psalme which bigynneth thus: In exitu Israel de Egypto, et cetera, and in the psalme which bigynneth thus: Laudate nomen Domini, laudate servi Domini, et cetera. Wherfore if it like to eny man for to holde, that in ljk maner this word "graven thing" in the text allegid Exodi xx'. ċ. and Deut. v'. ċ. bitokeneth a graven fals pretendid God, certis no man mai dryue him ther fro; and therfore solewith that this text Exodi xx'. ċ. and Deut. v'. ċ. soone after the bigynnyng weerneth not neither reproueth alle graven ymagis to be had and vsid; neither eni en man may seie for vndoutable sooth, that in the seid text Exodi xx'. ċ. and Deut. v'. ċ. is groundid that noon graven ymagis ouȝte be had and be vsid. Who therfore may make him so boold for to reproue alle

¹ After this word we must sup- pose some such words as 'it must be so understood as' to have been oc- cidentally omitted, or else that the sentence is wholly ungrammatical.
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graued ymagis in the chirche to be had and vsid, and that bi the seid text Exodi xx. c. and bi līk text Deut. v. c., saue he which hath not therwith seen the othere now alleggid placis of Holyscriptur, (in which is conteyned also this word "graued thing," and is therfore ouerhast iuger and sentence ʒeuer, eer he haue seen al that ouȝte be seen biforn sentence bi the text Exodi xx. c. to be ʒouun? And alle such ouerhastī iugers and wijters God amende, for michie harme han thei doon. God letē hem do no more! Wolde God, that bi the schame which thei ben worthie in this partie for evidences now mad, thei wolden be waer of like defautis in othere maters forto iuge, eer thei ben ful learned thei yn. Furthermore, othere evidencis for myn entent in this mater and for confermynge of these here maad argumentis into the proof of the firste conclusion y haue sett in the ijth partie of The donet into Cristen religioun, the 1 chapiter; se hem there who so se wolē.

The vth. principal argument is this: If this word "graued thing" muste needis in the text of Exodi xx. c. and Deut. v. c. bitokene no thing ellis than a grauēd God, thilke text weerneth not grauēd ymagis to be had and to be vsid not as Goddis. This ech man wolē sone graunte; but so it is that thilke word "graued thing" in the seid text Exodi xx. c. and Deut. v. c. muste nedis signifie and bitokene no thing ellis than a grauēd fals God, as now anoone after schal be proved. Wherfore nedis it muste be holde, (it may be noon otherwise,) that the seid text of Exodi xx. c. and Deut. v. c. weerneth not and reproueth not vetterli ymagis of God and of Scintis to be had and to be vsid. That the ijth. premisse of this argument is trewe y proue thus: This word "graued thing" in

1 A space in the MS. for the number.
the text Exodi xx*. č. and Deut. v*. č. muste nedis bitokene al maner graued ymage indifferentli, so that therbi al graued \textsuperscript{1} ymagirie be forbode to be had; or ellis it muste nedis bitoken oomli a graued God, that ther bi be forbode oomli a graued God to be had. This ech man wote weel ynoy; but so it is, that it mai not be hold that in the seid text Exodi xx*. č. and Deut. v*. č. this word "graued thing" bitokeneth in the firste of these now spokun ij. maners. Forwhi ther aţens meeten the iij. principal argumentis biforn goyng prouing vnsoilabili that thanne God were contrarie to him self. Wherfore nedis soleth with that in the seid text of Exodi xx*. č. and Deut. v*. č. this word "graued thing" muste nedis bitokene in the ij. now spokun maner, that is to seie, that he bitokene and signifie oomli a graued God; and so the ij. premisse of this v*. principal argument is openly at the fulle proued: and therbi the v*. argument proueth vnsoilabili his entent. And thus myche fro the bigynnyng of the i*. principal argument in to the eende of this present v*. argument is ynoy for schewing, that the seid text Exodi xx*. č. and Deut. v*. č., Thou schalt not make to these eny graued thing, reproueth not and lettith not graued ymagis of very God and of Seintis to be had and to \textsuperscript{2} vaid vttely.

The vj*. principal argument for the firste conclu-
sioun is this: Alle othere \textsuperscript{3} processis of Scripture bi eny colour speking aţens graued thingis, that is to seie aţens graued ymagis, ben writun in the now late named psalmes of the Sauter and Sapience the xiiiij*. č., Ysaie xliij*. č., and Baruk the vj*. č., whiche ben ouer long to be rehercied word bi word here;

\textsuperscript{1} graue, MS.; the d is added above by a later (?) hand.

\textsuperscript{2} Others is interlined by a later (?) but early hand.

\textsuperscript{3} Either be must be inserted, or to must be cancelled.
but this y dare avowe and dare leie what waioir
eny man wole me forto leie, that in ech of these now
alleggid iij. placis the processe considerid weel bifiore
and after wole schewe openli ynonz, that al the rebuk
which is zoon there to men making and vsing
graued ymagis, is zoon to hem whiche token and
helden tho ymagis to be her Goddis; and theryore
noon of these iij. now alleggid placis in Holi Scrip-
ture lettith alle graued ymagis to be had and vsid
in the chirche, so that tho ymagis ben not bleeued
to be Goddis; and so follewiht that no man, saue he
which is vnable forto entermete with any partie of the
Bible, wole bi eny of thes\(^1\) iij. placis now alleggid
trowe alle graued ymagis in the chirche to be reproeued.
Be war\(^2\) therfore, who euer be war\(^2\) wole; for who
euer scheweth him lewedd, so as is new touchid, he
is worthi to be forbode fro entermeting with the
Bible in eny party ther of.

Also the place of Holi Writt iij. Reg. xj. ei., where
into rebuke of Salomon it is reherid that he, fonned
and bidotid with bise wijfis, made ydolis false Goddis
and worshipid hem, is not forto reproue alle maners
of ymagis had and vsid in the chirche. Forwhi he
was so miche fonned, masid, and dotid, that he wor-
schipid tho ydolis as Goddis, for so seith Holi Scrip-
ture there; but so no persoon dooth in these dales
aboute the ymagis had and vsid in the chirche.
Wherfore men now haung and vsing ymagis in the
chirche ben not in the caas in which Salomon was,
and therfore thilk proces so writun and speking of
Salomon iij. Reg. xj. ei. weerneth not graued\(^3\) ymagis
to be had and vsid in the chirche, as theli now ben
had and vsid, not for Goddis, but for rememoratijf
signes or mynding signes of God and of Seintis.

\(^1\) The, MS. (first hand).
\(^2\) It is not quite clear whether
these words are here (twice) written
conjunctiun or (as usually) dijunctiun.
\(^3\) graued, MS.
Furthermore thilk proces writun Acts xvij. c. toward the eende, which Poul seide thus: God that made the world and alle thingis that ben in it, this, for he is Lord of heuen and of erthe, dwelith not in templis mad with hond, neither is worshipped with manyys hondis, neither hath node of any thing; for he zeueth lijf to alle men and brethyn and alle thingis, and made of oon alle the kindes of men forto enhabite on al the face of the erthe, deter-mynynge tymes ordyned and termes of the dwelling of hem, to seke God, if peraunture thei feelen him or fynden; thouz he be not fer fro ech of you, for in him we lyuen, moveyn, and ben, weerneth not neither forbedith alle graued ymagis to be had and vsid in the chirche. Forwhi Poul dooth no more in thilk processe, than that he makith this skile: "God is such oon, that he nedith not to have housis ouer him for to couere him fro reyne and fro othir sturne wedris, neither he nedith housis to be lockid, leste men steel awey him or his godis; and these ydolis or symylacris, whiche ze worshipen here in this hous, neden these thingis; and therfore ze maken to hem these thingis. Wherfore noon of these ydolis whiche ze worshipen in these housis, (whether thilk ydol be Saturne or Iupiter or Mars or thilk ydol which ze clepen Vnknowne God,) is verri God." Certis the proces there had weel seen schewith weel, that more than this Poul dooth not there in thilk processe; and therfore thilk processe hath no strenthe forto weerne ymagis of God to be had and vsid in the chirche, so that thei be not worshipped as for very God him silf. Also the proces writun iiiij. Reg. xvij. c., in which it is writun into the commending

1 of is added by a later hand.  
2 him is interlined by a later hand, but the sign of omission is by the first hand, apparently.
of King Ezechie, that he brake the brassen serpent which Moyses lete make, Numeri xxij. c., weerneth not ymagis to be mad and had and vsid in the chirche. Forwhi how schulde or myȝte thilk ymage haue be broke, but if he had biforn be? And theryfore thilk proces rather contermeth ymagis to mowe lawfullie be, than that thei alle to be is vnleeful. Al that this proces wole or may dryue to is this: That ymagis mowe leefullie be broke, whanne thei ben vsid in ydolatrie irremediabilie, for so it was in the causes of the brassen serpent in the tyme of Ezechie, as the storie schewith; or at the leeste, that ymagis mowe leefullie be brokun, whanne more harme irremediabilie cometh bi the hauynge and vsing of hem, than is al the good which cometh bi the hauynge 1 and the vsing of hem; and more than this cometh not forth bi this 2 proces of Ezechie, iiiij. Reg. xviiij. c. And theryfore thilk proces is overfeble forto weerne ymagis to be had and vsid, whanne thei ben had and vsid withoute ydolatrie, or with ydolatrie remediable, or with other harme remediable, namelich lasse than is the good comying bi the vce of the ymagis.

Finali, theryfore, y mai conclude bi al what is seid fro the bigynnynge of the ij. chapiter in this present secunde partie hidir to, that Holi Scripture weerneth not neither reproueth ymagis to be had and be vsid. And sitheyn her with it is open, that neither long customed vce of bileueynge in the chirche weerneth and reproueth hem, neither eny myracle doon bi God into her reprouyng reproueth or weerneth hem, it folowith that noone sufficient ground of feith reproueth and weerneth hem. And so is the firste conclusion before sett sufficientlie proued.

1 hauynge of hem, MS. (first hand). 2 the, MS. (first hand).
THE SECOND
CONCLUSION IN
FAVOUR OF
REMAINING
IMAGES. Reason
does not forbid
images to be used
as reminding
signs. For it can
only forbid them
on one of the
three following
grounds: that
they give occa-
sion to idolatry;
or to absurd
opinions; or to
moral vices. But
reason does not
forbid them on
any of these
grounds, and
therefore not
at all.

THE ij. principal conclusion is this: Doom of
naturali weel disposid resoun weerneth not and
reproeueth not ymagis to be had and to be vaid as
rememoratijf and mynding signes. That this con-
clusion is trewe y proeu thus: If eny doom of re-
soun schulde weerne and reproeu ymagis to be thus
had and vaid, thilk doom of resoun schulde be on
of these iiij. doomys, of whiche the firste is this:
That peple doon ydolatrie bi and with thy ymagis.
The ij. is this: That the peple trowen or bileuen
summe wrong and vntrewe opiniouns bi occasioun of
ymagis, as that sum godli vertu is in thy ymagis, or
that thy ymagis doon myraclis, or that thei ben quyk
and seen, heeren, or speken at sum while, or that
thei sweten at sum while. The iiij. doom is:
That ymagis ben occasiouns of summe moral vics in
the peple, as of overmyche worshipping a doon to hem, or
of pride, or of couseitise, or of suche othere. But
so it is, that noon of these iiij. doomys sufficeth forto
reproeu and weerne the seid haung and vsing of
ymagis; wherfore no doom of weel disposid resoun
reproeueth and weerneth the seid haung and vsing
of ymagis in the chirche.

The ij. preuyesse of this now maad argument, as
anentis the firste doom, schal be openli proved thus:
Peple in haung and vsing ymagis sett vp in the
chirche doom noon ydolatrie by hem. Forwhi ydolatrie
is neuere doon, saue whanne a man takith a creature
for his God and worchipith thilk creature as for his
God; but so doith no man with eny ymage now in

1 and heere, MS. (first hand).
vorshiping, MS. (first hand).
doom or doom, MS.
Cristendoom, aifter that the man is come into zeeris of discrecioun and is passid childhode, and which is not a natural fool. Forwhi, if of eny of hem it be askid, wheather this ymage is God in heuen, which made al thing, and which was euere withoute bigynnyng, and was therfore eer this ymage was maad; he wolse scie anoone, that this ymage is not he, but that this ymage is the ymage of him. And thanne, if this man take not this ymage as for his God, certiis be wole not therwith worschipe him as his God; neither he wole zeue to him the worschipe which he knowith to be dew to God oonli; neither he wole be aknowe that the ymage is his God. Forwhi ther yn he dido repugnaunce in sum maner, or ellis certiis cause is not likeli to be founde whi he schulde so do tho thingis to gidere. And therfore as for drede of ydolatrie, that is to seie, lest peple be ydolatreris in haying and vsing ymagis, doom of resoun hath not forto weerne and reproue ymagis to be had and vsid.

The strengthe of this argument stondith vpon the very knowing what ydolatrie is. And sithen ydolatrie is no thing ellis than what is now seid to be, the argu-
ment now maad muste needis haue his entent. Ful ofte haue y herd men and wommen vnuweseli inue and dif-
fame ful scherpli weelny3 alle Cristene to be ydolaters, and al for the hauynge and vsing of ymagis. And jít whanne it hadde be askid of hem what ydolatrie is, forsothe thei couthe not seie neither feele what it is in his trouthe, thouz thei schulden haue wonne therbi al the worldis blis or the blis of heuen. And whether this was not an horrible abhomyachts and a vile stinking presumpecioun hem forto so sturdili bi manye zeeris inue and diffame bothe the clergi and weelny3 al the lay party of Goddis chirche in so greet a cryme, which thei couthen neither my3ten proue to be doon, (for whi thei wisten not what thing thilk cryme is, and therfore thei my3ten not knowe whether it was doon

Those who are most prone to accuse their neighbours of idolatry do not so much as know what idolatry is.
or not doon,) and whether such peple be able and
worthi to be admyttid into the homeli reeding of Holi
Writt, eer thei be weel adauntid and weel schamed
of her folie and of her vnwisdom and pride, seei who
euer schal this heere. And y trowe he may not
azens this seei and holde, if he haue eny quantite
of discrecioun. Manye lesings y haue herd hem lie, how
thei knowen that persoones reulen hem in amys bi-
lyuyng fonnedli aboute ymagis; but whanne profris
of greet meede (3he, of xl. pound and of more) hath
be mad to hem forto bringe forth ij. or iij. of suche
persoones, thei couthen' bringe forth noon of hem.

Perauenture thei wolen seei thus: Manye hundridis
of men clepiden this ymage the Trinyte, and thei
clepen this ymage Crist, and this ymage the Holi
Goost, and this ymage Marie, and this ymage Seint
Petir, and this ymage Seint Poul, and so forth of
other; and thei wolden not so clepe, but if thei feel-
iden and bileueuen withinnenforth as thei clepen with-
outeforth; for ellis thei woren double. Wherfore alle
tho hundridis bileueuen amys aboute tho ymagis. Her-
to it is ful lîst forto answere. Whanne y come to
thee in thi parish chirche thou wolt perauenture seei
to me thus: Lo here lieth my faidir and there lieth
my graunt faidir, and in the other side lieth my wijf;
and 3it thei liggen not there, but oonli her boonyt
liggen there. If y come to thee into thin halle or
chaumbir thou wolt perauenture seei to me in de-
scryuyng the storie peintid or wouun in thin halle or
chaumbre: "Here ridith King Arthir, and there fîztith
" Iulius Cesar, and here Hector of Troie throwith doun
" a knyt," and so forth. For thow thou thus seei
thou wolte not holde thee forto seei ther yn amys.
Schal y therfore bere thee hoond that thou trowist thi

1 couthe, MS. (first hand).
THE SECOND PART.

fadir and thi graunt fadir and thi wijd for to lyue and
dwelle in her sepulcris, or schal y bere thee an hond
that thou trouwest Artur and Iulius Cesar and Hector
to be quyk in thi clooth, or that thou were double
in thin so reuling of speche? Y trowe thou woldist
seie y were vncurteis, or ellis vniwys and folish, if y
schulde beere thee so an honde, if it likid thee forto
so speke. And, if this be trewe, it folowith that as
weel thou art vncurteis, or ellis thou art to be ex-
cuaid of vncurtesie bi thi greet folie and madnes, if
thou bere me an hond that al the world ful of clerkis
and of othere lay men weenen summe ymagis to be
God, and summe ymages to be quyke Seintis; or that
thei ben double and gileful, if thei clepen 1 an ymage
of God bi the name of God, and an ymage of a
Seint bi the name of a Seint. But (for more clerel
this same answere to be vndirstonde) it is to wite,
that if figuratiijf spechis weren not allowid to be had
in vce, that the ymage or the likenes of a thing
mai be clepid bi the name of the thing of which he
is ymage and likenes, and that the parti of a thing
mai be clepid vnder and bi the name of his hool, as
that men seien thei hane lyued xl. wynteris, meanyng
therbi that thei hane lyued fowrti þeeris, certis thi
chalenge myazte weel procede and hauve his entent;
but aþenward it is so that such figuratiijf and vn-
propre speche, forto clepe the ymage of a thing bi
and vndir the name of the thing 2 of which he is
ymage, hath be in famose vce and hath be allowid
bothe of Holi Scripture and of alle pepulis. And ther-
fore, theu; men in such woned figuratiijf speche seie,
"Here at this autir is the Trinyte, and there at thilk
"auter is Iesus, and þondir is the Holi Goost, and
"therbi is Marie with Seint Peter," and so forth; it

1 clepe, MS. (first hand).

2 of thing, MS. (first hand).
nedith not that thersfore be seid that\textsuperscript{1} thei meenen and feelen that this ymage is the Trinwyte, or that thilk ymage is verili Jesus, and so forth of othere; but that these ymagis ben the liknessis or the ymagis of hem.

That Holi Writt confermeth weel and allowith weel this answere, that the ymagis of thingis mowe weel be clepid bi the names of the thingis of whiche thei ben ymagis, lo, Sir, it is writun Exod. xxxv\textsuperscript{1}. c. that God bade to Moyses thus: Thou schalt make on ever-either side of Goddis answering place ij. cherubims of gold and beten out with hamer; oon cherub in the oon side, and an other cherub in the other side of Goddis answering place. Now y aske of thee, whether God bade Moyses make ij. quyke angelis of cherubym, or ellis ij. ymagis of cherubym?\textsuperscript{1} If thou seie, that ij. ymagis; certis thanne folewith that the ymagis of cherubim God clepid cherubym. And if this be trewe, thanne folewith that Holi Scripture allowith what y haue seid now biforn in answering; or ellis thou muste make thi chaleng a\textsuperscript{2}ens God, which thou biforn madist a\textsuperscript{2}ens man, that God schulde feele amys or that he schulde be doubl. Furthemore, not oonli in this now alleggid place Exodi xxxv\textsuperscript{1}. c., the ymagis of cherubim ben clepid cherubim, but also in lijk maner bi mo than half a dosen othere placis of Scripture the ymagis of cherubim ben clepid cherubim, as Exodi xxxvij\textsuperscript{1}. c., i. Reg. iiiij\textsuperscript{1}. c., ij. Reg. vij\textsuperscript{1}. c., iij\textsuperscript{1}. Reg. vij\textsuperscript{1}. c., iij\textsuperscript{1}. Reg. viij\textsuperscript{1}. c., i. Paralip. xxvij\textsuperscript{1}. c., ij. Paralip. iij\textsuperscript{1}. c., ij. Paralip. v\textsuperscript{1}. c., whos textis or processis weren ouerlong to be here writun and rehercijd. Also in the c. and xij\textsuperscript{1}. Psalm, where it is spokun of ydolis, that is to seie of graued

\textsuperscript{1} that is interlineated by a later (?) \textsuperscript{1} So the MS., possibly accidentally hand.
Goddis, it is seid of hem there thus: *Thei han mouth and thei schulen not speke, thei han izen and thei schulen not se, thei han eeris and thei schulen not heere, thei han feet and thei schulen not walke.* And ʒit ech man wote weel that these ydolis as thei in hem silf weren not but ymagis, so thei hadden not but the ymagis of mouth and the ymagis of izen and of eeris and of feet. Wherfore here in this Psalme Holy Writt clepid the ymagis of membris vndir the name of verri membris; and so herbi my bifo re sette answere is confirmed, whanne y seide that the comoun speche of the peple, calling the ymagis of God bi the name of God (or of the Trinyte), of Jesus, of the Holi Goost, makith not that the callirs ben ydolatreris; neither that thersfore doom of resoun schulde schewe ymagis to be not had and vsid, as that bicause that ydolatrie is doon bi hem.

Thou maist not seie that hauers and vsers of ymagis ben ydolatreris; and that for thei trowen sum godli vertu to be in thilk ymage. Forwhi y aske of thee what vertu clepist thou a godli vertu? If thou clepist oonli thilk vertu to be a godli vertu which mai not be but oonli in God, certis thanne is this trewe that no Cristen man holdith or trowith eny godli vertu to be in eny ymage. Forwhi no Cristen man trowith eny ymage to be God him silf; and herwith ech Cristen man knowith openli, that no thing may hauue such as now is seid a godli vertu, saue God him silf. Wherfore no Cristen man trowith eny ymage to hauue such now seid godli vertu; and thersfore thou canst not herbi proue, that eny Cristen man hauing and vsing ymagis is an ydolatrer. If thou clepist a godli vertu such a vertu which is causid of God into a creature aboue the worching of kinde, and in maner not woned miche to be doon coursli, forsothe thanne is this trewe, that thou Cristen men trowen that ymagis han such vertu, ʒit tho men
for thilk trowing ben not ydolatirs. Forwhi no man is bi eny thing an ydolatrer, saue by which he takith and makith a creature to be his God, and worshipith him as his God; but so dooth no man, thou; he trowe ymagis haue suche now seid vertu. Neither eny man so dooth, thou; he trowe that ymagis doon myraclis in such wise as creaturis,—the Apostilis, and othere Seintis,—diden myraclis; and thou; he trowe that ymagis ben quyke, or that thei seen or spoken or heeren or sweten at summe whilis, as it is open ynow; to ech man hauyug eny quantitie of resoun. Forwhi noman, in so trowing as now is seid, trowith therfore thilk ymage to be God; no more than men, whiche trowiden the Apostilis wirche myraclis, trowiden hem to be God. Wherfore nedis this is trewe, that no man for eny such opiniou or feith which he hath vpon ymagis, thou; thilk opiniou or feith be vntrewes, is an ydolatrer.

And furthermore, thou; a Cristen man worschiphe an ymage more than dewli, so that he worschip not it as God and with worschip of herte withyn forth dew to God oonli, 3he, and thou; he take occasioun bi ymagis to do synne of pride or of coueitise or othere moral synnes, zit fer is at this fro ydolatrie. Forwhi in noon of these casis the man takith and makith eny creature to be his God; and therfore the firste biffer spokun doom of resoun, which is bering an hond Cristen men vaing ymagis to be gilte of ydolatrie, is not sufficient forto reprode and weerne ymagis to be had and vaid of Cristen men as rememoratiif or mynding signes or tokens. Forwhi thilk doom of resoun and thilk bering an hond and putting upon men, that thei ben ther fore and ther yn ydolatres, is schewid now biffer to be vntrewes.

1 which is added in the MS. by a later (?) hand.
iiiij. Chapter.

The ijth befor sett and spoken doom of resoun, wijting hauers and vsers of ymagis to be gilte of vntrewe feith or vntrewe opinioun had upon tho ymagis, is not sufficient for to reprove weerne the hauynge and the vsing of hem as for mynding signes. Forwhi thilk doom and thilk wijting and bering an hond is vntrewe.

And that y schal proue, so that y sette befor a reule or supposicioun which is this. Sum vntrewe opinioun of men is such that for it her conversacioun is the worse morali, for it is leding into deedes whiche ben grete moral vicis; as this opinioun, that fleischli comunyng bitwixe a syngil man and a syngil womman doon bi her fre consent is no synne; and this opinioun, ech man forto take as myche as hym lustith and may holde withoute clayme and victorie of hise neizboris worldli good is no synne; and this opinioun, a man for to smyte and bete his neizbour a this side deeth for wraththe or trespassе is no synne; and suche othere opiniouns. Sum other vntrewe opinioun of men is such that for it her conversacioun schal not be maad the worse moralli, or ellis not azenz notable, good, vertuose moralte; as is this opinioun, that a man which stale sumtyme a birthan of thornis was sett in to the moone, there forto abide for euere; and this opinioun, that Seint Michaelis bonys resten in the Mount Michael; and this opinioun, that iiij. sistris (whiche ben spiritis) comen to the cradilis of infants, forto sette to the babe what schal bifalle to him; and suche othere manye. Forwhi more than the dotage or deceit or folyynes or the bigiling of the persoones so trowing,
at whiche men mowe lawzē and take bourse for her
sympelenes or her vnkunnyng as of folis, cometh not
of suche now laste spokun opinionus.

Thanne upon this reule or supposicioun y argue
thus: For noon such fonnyes opinionioun, of which it is
now last spokun in the ij°. partie of this reule or sup-
posicioun, is eny long bifiore stabillid guernanced to
be left and to be leid aside, which is in him silf
resonable, honest, and expedient, namelich if thilk
fonnych opinionioun may soone bi wise men be schewid
to the holder to be vntrewe. But so it is that
these opinioniouns, bi whiche symple men trowen at
sumtyme that an ymage hath withinne him vertu,
such as God mai putte into a creature; or that the
ymage dooth miraclis, or spekith at sumtyme, or
heerith alwey, or swetith at sum tyme, ben opin-
ioniouns of the ij°. now seid soort; that for hem
discrete men mowe oonli lauze at suche folies of
men, as thei doon at her othere folies, of whiche
no moral harme cometh. Wherfore for noon such
opinioun the hauynge, and the vysetting of ymagis,
whilis therbi myche moral good cometh, (as schal be
proued aftir and as is proued al redi in The book of
worshiping,) oûte be left and leid aside; namelich,
sithen these now seid folisch opinioniouns mowe lištli be
schewid to her holders fortô be vntrewe.

Confirmaxioun herto is this: Whanne Seint Bernard
lyued he dide manye myraclis bi his lijf, and whanne
Seint Nicholas lyued, and whanne Seint Martyn lyued,
thei diden manye myraclis bi her lijf; and therfore
manye men (as it is likeli) trowiden in tho daies, that
these now\(^1\) named persoones hadden goostli vertu
ʒouun to hem fro God, bi which thei in hem silf
diden tho miraclis; but þit not therfore and bi cause

\(^1\) now is interlineated in a later (?) hand.
that summe symple persones hadden thilk opinion, tho iij. seid persones ouȝtiden to be slayn and to be take\(^1\) fro iijā and fro siȝt of men and fro worching of myraclis, bi cause that foolis and symple persones hadden suche seid vntrewe opiniouns upon the seid worching of myraclis.

Also thouȝ men trowen that my precious stoonys, whiche y haue, han vertues whiche in trouth thei han not, schal y therfore breke hem or caste hem awaye, that suche lewid men haue no such wrong opinioyn vpon hem? Also if men trowe that sum aldirman in Londoun is miche riccher than in trouth he is, schal therfore thilk aldirman be slayn or be banyshyd out of the citee, that men haue no such folisch vntrewe opinioyn upon his ricches? God forbede. Wherfore liȝk wisse it is to be holde in this present purpos, that the having and vsing\(^2\) of ymagis, (sithen therbi miche moral good cometh,) ouȝt not be left for this, that foolis han suche seid folisch opinioyns of the iij\(^3\). bifoř spokun soort vpon tho ymagis and vpon the vais of hem.

And ȝit furthermore, that men mowe haue withoute blame and withoute folie this opinioyn that summe ymagis at sumwhile sweten, and that bi hem speche is mad, and that at sumwhile thei ben moued fro oon place to an other place withoute mannyys therto doing, and suche othere like opinioyns, schal be schewid after in the iij\(^3\). principal gouernaunce, whanne y schal trete of pilgrimage. And thus myche is ynoȝt, that the iij\(^3\). bifoř spokun doom of resoun is not sufficiant forto lette ymagis to be had and vsid.

That the iij\(^3\). bifoř spokun and sett doom of resoun, which is that ymagis ouȝt\(^3\) not be had and

\(^1\) take is interlined in a later (?) hand.
\(^2\) the vsing, MS. (first hand).
\(^3\) ouȝt, MS. (first hand).
vsvd, and that for therof cometh moral yuel (as ouer-
myche worshipping not being ydolatrye, or ellis co-
ueitise or pride or suche other moral vicis,) y schal
prowe, so that y sette and sende biforn a reule or
supposicioun, which is this. ¹ Summe moral vicis com-
yng bi occasioun of a vertuose gouernance ben litle,
asuch as wolen soone be amendid with labour,
thou; the same vertuose gouernance be lete stonde
stille and be lete contynued; and summe ben grete,
and so grete that thei ben in myche more quantite
grete, than is the godenes of the seide gouernace in
his contynuance. Vpon this reule y argue thus. For
such yuelis, of which it is now spokun in the firste
parti of this reule or supposicioun, a notable vertuose
gouernance, of which miche moral good cometh, is
not to be left and leid aside; and namelich, whilis it
is not impossible or ouer myche hard that the moral
vicis so comyng be amendid bi good informacioun and
other good labouris. Forwhi thanne ech good and
profitable craft, the, and weelny; ech notable vertuose
gouernace ou;te be lefte and leid aside; sithen ech
of hem is an occasioun of sum moral yuel, at the lest
of such moral yuel as of which it is spokun in the
firste partie of the next biforn going supposicioun or
reule. But so it is, that the yuelis whiche comen
out and bi the hauing and holding of ymagis in
chirchis, ben noon othere or not gretter than ben the
yuelis of whiche it is spokun in the firste partie of
the next seid supposicioun or reule; and zit furtwer to
seie, thei ben not gretter than the yuelis whiche occa-
sonianarili comen out fro the hauing and the vsing of
profitable craftis and marchaundising; neither gretter

¹ It is evident that this sentence cannot be construed: probably after 'vicis,' we should add 'is not suffi-
cient foro reproze the hauynge of
ymagis vteirly,' or something to that
effect.
than ben the yuelis comyng bi this, that lay men vsen
the Bible in her modir tunge; neither gretter than
the yuelis which comen bi this, that preestis ben and
that prechers ben. Wherfore this iij. bifoire seid
sett doom of resoun is not sufficient for to lette the
hauing and the vsing of ymagis, but if he schulde
lette the hauynge and the vsynge of alle maners of
craftis, and the hauing and vsynge of Holiscripture
among the lay persoones, the, and but if he schulde
lette the being of alle preestis and of alle prechouris,
namelych sithen the worschiping, bi which perauntuer
manye persoones worschipen ymagis more than resoun
wole, is not a greet vice; so that thilk worschiping
be such, that thei not worschipen tho ymagis as God:
and bifoire it is schewid, that no persoones taken eny
ymage for verri God.

Confirmacioun to this argument is this: Summen
wolen knele deppir and louzer to a knyzt, than
summe othere men wolen; the, and thei wolen sixe
sithis more preise and worschipe him in word and
dide, than summe othere men wolen; the, and pera-
untuer more than resoun wole that he be worschipid.
What harme or yuel is this forto be so myche chargid,
that the good knyzt be put out of mennys cumpa-
nying; sithen this worschiping is fer fro godli wor-
schiping; and fer fro this, that eny worschipers of
him takyn hym for her God? Wherfore foleweth bi
sufficient likenes, that thou men worschipen ymagis
more than resoun wole hem be worschipid, zit this
is not vice of so greet fors that for it ymagis be
put doune; namelych, sithen thilk worship is noon
such, wherbi the worschipers maken tho ymagis to be
her God or her Goddis. Goddis forbode that for ech
folis folie stable gouernaunccs weel takun of wise men

\[1\] wolen is interlined by a later hand.
ouȝten be chaungid; for thanne ouer many and ouer thicke chaungis of ful vertuose gouernauncis schulde be mad, and no good gouernaunce schulde be bi eny while contynued: but certis aţens such vicis comyng bi tho gouernauncis labour ouȝte be maad, and tho gouernauncis ouȝten be suffrid to stonde and contynue stille.

Another confirmacioun into this present purpos may be this: If y haue a fruyteful tre, which in oon or in summe of his braunchis hath a canker, schal y therfore hewe down al my tre? Goddis forbode y schulde be so lewid; but y ouȝt rather pare away the canker, and sette medicyn thereto, and let e the tre stonde forto bringe forth good fruyt. Also in caes that this tree in summe of his bowis bringith forth soure applis and in summe othere bowȝes sweete happlis and gode, as y haue knowe so to be trewe in a tre which hath some of dyuere graffis in oon stok, or if perauenture many of tho applis roten upon the tre, eer it be tymel to schake the tree, schal y therfore hewe down the tree? Nay, nai, y ouȝte cast awei what is badde, ȝhe, and helpe cure what is badde, and kepe what is good. Wherfore bi like skile in oure present purpos a badde husbondrie it were for to caste away the havieng and vsing of ymagis for ech moral vice which myȝte rise therbi, namelich sithe the havyng and vsing of ymagis is fruyteful into moral good, and the yuel therbi comyng is paresable and kutteable away bi good and thrifti bisynes thersto sett. And this is ynoȝt forto schewe, that the iij. bifices spokun and sett doom of resoun is not sufficien forto weerne and lette the havyng and vsing of ymagis into rememoratijf or mynding signes.

1 bi is interlineated by a later (?) hand.
2 husbondrie, MS. (first hand).
3 for is interlineated in a later hand.
And so fynaly it is lad thus fer forth fro the bigynnynge of the iiij. chapiter hidir to, that no doom of resoun werneth and lettith ymagis as now is seid to be had and to be vsid. And here yn eendith the proof of the iiij. principal conclusioun.

v. CHAPITIR.

The iiij. principal conclusion is this: It is not vn- leeful ymagis to be had and vsid as rememoratijff signes. This conclusioun y proue thus: What euer gouernaunce neither Holi Scripture, neither doom of resoun, neither mennys iust positijff lawe weerneth, is not vneeful; but so it is, that for to haue and vse ymagis as mynding signes is not weerned bi Holi Scripture, as is open bi the firste principal conclusioun; neither it is weerned bi doom of resoun, as it is open bi the iiij. principal conclusioun; neither it is weerned bi eny mennys iust positijff lawe, as it is open ynow to alle men. Wherfore this iiij. principal conclusioun is needis trewe, that it is not vneeful ymagis to be had and vsid as rememoratijff signes of God, and of his benefetis of Seintis, and of her conversacioun.

The iiiij. principal conclusion is this: It is leeful, in the maner of leefulnes spokun biforn in the firste chapiter of this ij. partie in the x. reule or supposicioun, that ymagis be had and vsid as rememoratijff signes in the maner now last biforn spokun. That this conclusioun is trewe, y proue thus: What euer gouernaunce is not vneeful, is leeful in this maner of leefulnes, as it is open bi the now seid x. reule or supposicioun: but so it is, that the now seid hauynge and vsing of ymagis is not vneeful, as it is open ynow bi the iiij. next biforn going principal conclusioun. Wherfore needis folwith that this present iiiij. conclusioun is trewe.
The v*. principal conclusioun is this: Holi Scripture bothe in the Oold Testament and in the Newe al-
allowith 1 to haue and vse ymagis as rememoratijf
signes in the maner now laste before seid. That this
conclusioun is trewe, it is open ynow3 bi it what is
bifore argued in the ij*. chapter in the iij. firste
principal argumentis to the first principal conclusioun.
Wherfore this v*. principal conclusioun is to be holde
for trewe.

Also, Matheu xxvj*. ċ, Crist allowid and approued
the deede of Marie Magdalen, in that that sche vaid
the oynament as a seable and a smelleable rememo-
ratijf signe, and in that that sche vaid the dede ⁵ of
anoynting ⁶ as a seable rememoratijf signe. Forwhi
he seide: What ben ze greuose to this womman?
Sche hath wrouz a good werk into me. Where euer
this gospel schal be prechid in al the world, it schal
be seid that sche dide it into mynde of him.⁴ And
so it is open that Crist allowid and approued the
voie of the seid oynament, in that that it was vaid
as a seable or smelleable rememoratijf signe. And
sithen this is approued of Crist, certis ⁵ bi lik akile
others seable signes as ymagis, and others smelleable
signes as encensis, ben ther yn and ther bi allowid
and approued of Crist. And so bi Holi Scripture of
the Newe Testament the voe of sensible rememoratijf
signes ben allowid.⁶

Also an⁷ other vnsoyable proof for this v*. principal
conclusioun is sett bifore in the firste parti of this

---

1 allowith and approveth, MS. (first hand).
2 the deede is interlineated by an early but later hand.
3 an oynaming, MS.
⁴ This blundering translation of "dicetur et quod hac fecit in memo-
rium ejus," (altrini). Vulg., occurs in both forms of Wycliff's version,
from which this citation is mostly taken.
⁵ certis is added by a later hand.
⁶ allowid and approved, MS. (first hand).
⁷ in other, MS. (first hand).
present book, the [xix*] chapter, where bi setting
bifore of iiij. reulias and bi iijj. conclusiouns drawun
out from hem this v* principal conclusioun is vn-
doutabilia proved bi this meene; that whanne euere
Holi Scripture biddith, counselith, or allowith eny
eende, he ther yn and ther bi biddith, counselith, or
allowith, or approueth ech meene profitable into the
same eende. Se there who so wolde the proof mad
there in his lengthe and forme.

Also noman* may seye nay, but that Crist ordeyned
in the newe lawe visible sacramentis to be take and
vaid as seable rememoratijf signes of Crist, and of his
passioun and deeth, and of his holi lijf, as it schal
be proved in The book of Sacramentis and in The
bookie* of Baptim and of Eukarist. Wherfore Holi
Scripture of the Newe Testament witnessith thus
miche in this purpos, that forto haue and vse seable
rememoratif signes is leeful, expedient, and profitable;
for ellis the sacramentis of Crist weren vnleeful,
vnexpedient, and vnprouitable. And thanne her of
ferther thus: If and whanne it is leefull and expedi-
ent forto haue and vse eny seable rememoratif
signes being lasse lijk to the thingis signified, it is
leefull and expedient forto make, haue, and vse signes
being more like to the same thingis signified. Forwhi
the likenes of a signe to his significat, (that is to seie,
to the thing signified bi him,) wol helpe the signe
for to signifie and forto make remembrancc the bettir
upon the thing signified; but so it is, that ymagis
graued, oruun, or jut ben more lijk to Crist and to
his passioun, than ben the sacramentis whiche Crist
ordeyned; thon3 Crist hem ordeyned, (being so vnlike

---

1 A space left in the MS. for the number. See p. 110.
2 bisetting, MS.
3 The last three letters are written on an erasure in a later hand. The word is also sometimes written disjunctim.
4 book, MS. (first hand).
to him and to his passion,) for favour into us, that we scheulde haue bi his ordinunce signes and sacramentis, into whos getting we mysten not allege forto excuse us bi labour to gete hem and make hem into the werk of her sacramental vsing. Wherfore folowith, sithen bi Holi Scripture it is leeful and expedient for to haue and vse the seable sacramentis, whiche Crist made as seable ymagis of Crist and of his passioun and deeth, it is ther yn impliedli bi Holi Scripture leeful and expedient for to haue seable ymagis graued, coruun, and zut of Cristis persoon, figurid lijk to his persoon, with purtenancis of his passioun and deeth, forto make us remembre upon him and his passioun and deeth. And in this wise may be proued this present vᵗʰ. conclusioun, that Holy Scripture wele¹ allowith⁴ impliedli and priueli forto haue and vse ymagis of Crist and of Seintis figurid bi greyng aft hem.

Confirmaicioun herto is this: Who euer counsellith, allowith, or approueth the lasse doing meene into an eende; in that he counsellith, allowith, or approueth the more doing meene into the same eende, et cetera.

The vᵗʰ. principal conclusioun is this: Sufficent doom of weel disposioun allowith and approueth to haue and vse ymagis as rememoratif signes in the maner after bifore seid. That this conclusioun is trewe y proue bi these folewing argumentis, of whiche the firste is this. Sufficent doom of resoun allowith and approueth us forto make and haue for us silf and for other men ymagis of men and wommen, that tho men and wommen be therbi the ofter thout upon, and therfore be therbi the more loued and the better serued, and that the more be doon and suffrifd of us and of otheri biholders, for as miche as we bithenken

¹ This word has been partly erased and retouched by a later (?) hand. The orthography is against the common usage of the MS.
⁴ allowith and approueth, MS. (first hand).
Tho persones or the ensamplong of the persones so representid bi the ymagis, and that the more be doon and suffrid for her sake of us sylf and of othere men seing the same ymagis with va. Wherfore, bi like skile, sufficient doom of reson allowith and approueth forto make and haue for us sylf and for othere men also with us ymagis of God and of holi Seintis for ententis and deedis and werkis to be therbi for her sake doon, lijtk to the deedis and werkis whiche ben now before rehercicd for the sake of creaturis to be doon.

Also thus: Whanne euer it is so, that we han in greet charge to perfoarme and do eny deede or governaunce, and we ben freel and redi to forzetete and to lete slippe out of mynde thilk deede or governaunce, it lijth in the doom of reson ful weel that we take to us sum seable rememoratiijf or mynding signes and tokenes forto therbi remembrec us sylf upon the deede or gouernaunce being to vs of so greet charge. For whi thus bi doom of reson men doon anentis worldli deedis of charge, wher yonne lijth oonli worldli wynnyng or ascaping of worldli punysching; but so it is, that ech man hath in ful greet charge to loue God and rede God, that he mai therbi be hertid and strengthid in wil forto servie God; and he hath nede forto ofte thinke vpon tho thingis and meenis, whiche schulden stire him forto loue God and rede God, and forto haue wil to servie God and forto thinke vpon tho pointis in whiche he schulde servie to God.

And tit forto so ofte remembrec we ben ful freel and forzeteful. Wherfore reson wol weel iuge, allowe, and approue forto take, haue, and vse alle maners of suche deedis and thingis, whiche schulden remembrec us myche upon the dignitees, benefetis, and punyschingis of God, and upon the pointis of his lawe. And among alle tho maners of thingis and deedis ben sable re-

memoratiijf thingis and deedis, as ben ymagis and the seid vsis of hem. Wherfore it folewith that doom of
resoun ingith, allowith, and approueth that ymagis be had and vaid into the entent and\textsuperscript{1} in the maner biforn seid.

Confirmation herto is this: If a marchant or eny other man haue myche nede forto bithenke upon a certeine erand, it is weel allowid and approued in resoun that he take and vse sum seable rememoratiij signe and tokene forto mynde and remembre him upon the same erand; and it is weel allowid and approued bi resoun that he make a ring of a rische and putte it on his fynger, or that be write sum seable croe or mark\textsuperscript{2} or carect with cole or chalk in the wal of his chaumbre or hal, or that he hange up before his siȝt sum hooi or girdil or staf or such other thing, or that he make a knot on his girdil or on his tipet, as alle men wolen herto consente. And if resoun schulde not as weel and as soone or miche more allowe and approue that a man make and vse seable rememoratiij signes (as ymagis and othere seable thingis or deedis,) into this eende, that he therbi the ofthe thynke on Goddis worthinesse, Goddis benefitis, and hise punyschingis, and on vertues of hise lawis, ouermiche wondir it were. Wherfore resoun it to be doon allowith and approueth. And thus myche is ynot for proof of the vij. principal conclusioun.

Who euer wolde se more proof for this present vij. principal conclusioun, rede he in The book of worshipp\textsuperscript{ing} in the first parti, the vij. and viij. chapteris; and there he schal fynde profis for this present vij. conclusioun, whiche profis he schal not, (as y weene,) assoile.

The vij. principal conclusioun is this: It is leeful in properist maner of speking and taking leeful, (as it is take biforn in the ix. reule or supposicioun sette biforn

\textsuperscript{1} and added by a later hand.\textsuperscript{2} wh, MS.
in the first chapter,) that ye magis be had and vaid in
the maner ofte before seid. That this conclusion is
is trewe, y proue thus: What euere gouernaunce Holi
Writt allowith and approueth, and doon of weel dis-
posid in kinde reson allowith and approueth, is leeful
in propre maner of taking leefulnes; but so it is, that
forto haue and vse ye magis in the maner now seid is
allowid and approued bi Holi Scripture, as is open bi
the v\textsuperscript{e} principal before goyng conclusion, and is al-
lowid and approued bi doon of deuli\footnote{The MS. reading is more like cleuti.} disposid reason
in kinde, as it is open bi the vj\textsuperscript{e} principal before
going conclusion. Wherfore this present vij\textsuperscript{e} prin-
cipal conclusion is trewe, that it is leeful in propre
maner taking leefulnes, (wherof it is spokun before in
the first chapter of this ij\textsuperscript{e} partie, in the ix\textsuperscript{e} reule,) that ye magis be had and vaid as rememorratijf signes of
God, and of hise benefetis, and of his holi lijf and
passioun, and of Seintis and of her holi convorsacioun.

The vij\textsuperscript{e} principal conclusion schal be this: It is
a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his pleaunt
service for to haue and vse and sette up ye magis of
God and of Seintis into vce of remembring therbi the
better God, his passioun, and his othere benefetis, holi
Seintis, and her holy lyues, and her suffringis. That
this conclusion is trewe y wolde proue thus: What
euere gouernaunce doon of kindly weel disposid reason
biddith to be doon, or counsellith to be doon, or al-
lowith and approueth to be doon, (nemelich if Holi
Scripture it not weerneth and lettith, and if Holi
Scripture it allowith and approueth,) God biddith the
same to be doon, or counsellith the same to be doon,
or allowith and approueth the same to be doon as a
point of his moral lawe and service, as it is suffici-
ently before proued in the firste parti of this present
book, and in the first part of the book cessler The
iust apprising of Holi Scripture; but so it is, that
resoun biddith or counselith or allowith and approueth
ymagis to be had and to be vsid in the maner oft
bierse seid, as it is open by the viij. next bierse
going principal conclusionis; the, and Holi Scripture
the same allowith, as it is open bi the vij. next
bierse going conclusion. Wherfore to haue and vse
ymagis in the maner now seid is approwed and al-
lowid of God as for a point of his moral lawe and
of his plesaunt servise.

The ixº. principal conclusion is this: It is not
syne a man bi his werkis forto ensaumle to othere
men, that thei haue and vse ymagis in the maner
bierse tauȝt; and that thei do as he dooth, if he do
in the maner bierse tauȝt; but it is a merytorie and
a weel doon dede for to itº so ensaumle. That this
conclusion is trewe, y proue thus: It is not syne
a man bi his werkis forto ensaumle to othere men,
that thei do a deede and a point of Goddis moral
lawe and of his plesaunt servise; but it is a mery-
torie deede for to it ensaumle to othere. And her-
with so it is, that forto vse ymagis in the maner
bierse tauȝt is a deede of Goddis moral lawe and of
his plesaunt servise, as it is proewed weel bi the next
bierse going conclusionn. Wherfore it is not syne a
man forto þiue ensaumle to othere men that thei
vse ymagis in the maner bierse tauȝt, as bokis to
hem; but it is a merytorie deede forto þeue thilk
ensaumle. And so this present ixº. conclusion is
to be holde trewe.

¹ allowith and approueth, MS. ² it is interlined, perhaps by
(first hand) a later hand.
The Second Part.

vii. Chapter.

Perauentre summe men wolen seie and knouleche here, as so nedis thei musten do, that it is leefull ynow and expedientes that ymage be had and vuid in the chirche; but it is not leefull and expedientes that men knele bifo r hem, or preie bifo r hem, or cense bifo r hem, or sette lihtis or laumpis bifo r hem, or holde or bere eny suche rememoratif signes bifo r hem.

Azenes which now rehercid holding y mai argue thus: It is leefull and expedientes to do these now rehercid deedes to God and to Seintis bifo r a bare wal in a chirche, or in a corner of a chirche or of an other hous, or in the feeld. Forwhe into al this proceden bifo r proud the vij. principal conclusionis; but so it is, that what euer vertuose gouernaunce mai be do to God or to a Seint bifo r a bare wal, mai be do to God or to a Seint bifo r a wal paintid with the passioun of God or with the passioun of a Seint; and if this be trewe, bi lijk maner it mai be do to God or to a Seint, if the graued ymage of God or the graued ymage of a Seint be sett vp in the same wal with picturis, schewing the passioun of Crist or the passioun or the holi liht of the Seint. Wherfore bi lijk good skile alle suche other now rehercid deedes moe be doon bifo r ymagis.

Also into this same purpos y argue thus: It is leeluful and expedientes a man knele to God or to a Seint, (the, and ligge prostrate to God or to a Seint,) bifo r an auter; and it is leefull him forto preie to God or to a Seint bifo r an auter; wherfore it is bi lijk skile leeful to bere a liht in presence of God bifo r the auter, and forto encense to God or to a Seint bifo r an auter. And if this be trewe, what schal weerne to

Another answer to the objection. A man may do all these things before an altar, but the altar, according to the Fathers, is the Image of God; therefore these deedes may be performed before any image of God, if not done to the image.

1 graue, MS. (First hand).
do alle these same deedis bfore alle aymage of God or of a Seint, sithen the auter in alle these casis is not take but as an aymage of God or of a Seint? And so takith Sent Ambrose in his Book of Mysteries and in his Book of Sacramentis, and holi Dionys, the disciple of Poul, in his Book of the Chirchis Iterarchie. It is also leeful and expedient a man forto knele to God, preie to God, and holde vp hise hondis to God, and make a vowe to God bfore a preest, or an othir man; and zit herbi thilk man so kneling takith not the preest for his God, neithir he dooth tho now seid deedis to the preest. Wherfore in lik maner, thou a man do the same deedis bfore an aymage, he makith not thilk aymage therbi his God, neithir he dooth tho deedis to the aymage.

Also ferther thus: It is leeful ynoy a man to offre to God or to a Seint bfore an aymage of God or of a Seint, so that he offre not to the aymage but bfore the aymage. Wherfore bi likke skile it is leeful ynoy forto knele and preie and bere liyt and sette up candelis bfore an aymage, whils these deedis ben not doon to the aymage but to God or to a Seint. And if thou aske: "Wherto or in to what effect schulen suche liytis be born or be sett bfore aymagis?" Y answere thys: Tho liytis men mowe take and vse bi siyt of hem as rememartijfe signes and mynding signes that greet cleernes of wisdom, greet solace is

---

2 Quid est enim altare, nisi forma corporis Christi?" Id. lib. v. c. 2. (id. p. 374).
4 and expedient, by a later (?) hand in the margin.
5 good, MS.
6 schulde, MS. (first hand).
THE SECOND PART.

and schal be in heuen biforn God and among Seintis; and bi this rememoraunce the remembrer, if he wole, schal be the more strid to araie him and dispose him thidirward. And forthermore, sithen forto vse tho liȝtis into this vce biforn ymagis, a man schal not be lettid bi presence of tho ymagis, but he schal the rather and the more ther to be forthererid; it folowith that it is leeful and expedient a man to bere and holde and sette suche liȝtis biforn ymagis, in this now rehercided entent of remembraunce to hisimself and to othere biholders ther bi making.

Perauenture summen wolen in other wise seie, knouleche, and holde that al what is proued bi the firste vij. bifore going principal conclusionis is trewe, but thei wolen seie thus, “What is it to us, that a thing is trewe in doom of resoun? We wolen holde “and knouleche and performe oonli it what Holi “Scripture withneseth or groundith, and ther bi and “ther fore what the lawe of God is. And we wole “not attende to it what resoun iugith to be doom.” Thus thei wolen seie sturdili and folili, as thouȝ the lawe of God were not ellis saue what is writun in the Bible, namelich in the Newe Testament.

But here aȝens y mette thus: The moral lawe of God is mad of ij. partie, of whiche the oon partie is lawe of kinde, (that is to seie, doom of resoun, and writun in the tablis of mennyys weel disposeid hertis,) and the other partie is lawe of feith vpon threuthis oonli, into whoes fynding, leernynge, and kunynge mannis resoun mai not suffice to arise and come withoute reuelacioun and assercioun ther of made bi God immediatli or mediatli, as bi sum aungel or apostil. And for to deluyere to us this now seid ij° partie of Goddis lawe serueth Holi Scripture, and not forto grounde to us the i°. now seid partie of Goddis lawe, which is lawe of kinde or doom of natural resoun, as it is sufficientli schewid and proued weel nyȝ thoruȝ al the firste partie of this present book.
Notwithstanding that of Goddis lawe the firste now seid partie, (which is lawe of kinde and of resoun,) is xxx. sithis, (the, an hundrid sithis,) largir and more than is of Goddis lawe the ij. partie, (which is lawe of feith,) as it is open ynow2 bi the firste partie of this present book. And therfore who euer wole seie and holde that forto haue and vse ymagis into the ofte before seid vce is not a point of Goddis lawe, and that bi cause it hangith in resoun and is not, as thou seist, expressid in the Bible, may se his owne confusioun and schame bi reding in the firste parti of this present book fro the bigynnnyng of the firste parti into the eende of the 1 chapiter, and eftsoone fro the bigynnnyng of the 1 chapiter, into the eende of the firste parti.

Also it is schewid bifoer in this present ij. partie, the ij. chapiter, bi the firste and ij. principal argu-

mentis into proof of the firste principal conclusion, that Holi Writt weel allowith ymagis to be had and to be vaid as mynding signes of angellis in heuen and of othere thingis of moral gouernaunce in erthe. Wherfore bi thin owne seiyng that thou wolt solewe Holi Writt, and take for the lawe and service of God what that Holi Writt allowith, thou muste needis allowe and approve for a point of Goddis lawe and of Goddis office and service forto haue and vse ymagis; thou3 y wol aff seie that it is to ech man vnder maundement of Goddis lawe to haue hem and vse hem, but that it is a point for whose fulfilling the doer schal be weel allowid and approoved, as ther yn fulfilling a point of Goddis lawe and a service to God.

Also thus: Iudic. xvij. and xviiiij. ē. is writun a long storie, how a womman vowid that of a summe

---

1 Spaces left in the MS. for the numbers, which are perhaps intended to be xv. and xix. respectively.
2 allowith and approveth, MS. (first hand), twice.
of siluer schulde be mad an ymage of God; and her sone, clepid Michas, ordeyned the same ymage to be mad. And thilk ymage is clepid there a graued thing, and a wellid to gidere thing, þie, and a God, with feeling good ynouȝ that the ymage was not God; and þit he clepid it God, for that it was the ymage of God, as ymagis of othere thingis ben clepid vndir the names of the thingis of whiche thei ben the ymagis; and, for as miche as afterward he made mo of hem, he clepid hem there in the xvijth. c. his Goddis. This Michas made oon of his sones to be a preest in officiynge to God before these ymagis, and afterward he made a straunge deken comynge to his hous forto be a preest in his hous into the seid officiynge to God before the seid first mad princi-pal ymage and the othere after maad ymagis. After al this, the sones of Dan tooken awey bi strengthe these same ymagis and the seid preest which was before a deken oonli, and vaiden tho same ymagis, and ordeyned that the same preest schulde office to God before tho ymagis in her tribu or kinred as he dide before in the hous of Miche. And in this officying the tribu of Dan contynued bi manye hundridis of þeeris, as it is open there in the eende of the xvijth. c. Now, Sir, to thee thus: Neither Miche, neither his modir, neither afterward the tribu or kinred of Dan, was holde any ydolatrers, neither it was holde as for reprouable gouernauce here now before spokun gouernauce in having and vnsing ymagis of God and in officiynge to God before tho ymagis; but it was taka for a devout and a preiseable gouernauce.

And as it was thanne there, that thilk riche and worthi man hadde in his hous such a chapell and such officiynge before ymagis of God, (which therfore

1 Probably a clerical error for officiynge.
he clepid God or Goddis;) so it
was in manye other
worthi mennys housis. For whi in the xix. c. of
Judicum mensioun is mad of an othir deken dwelling
in the hil of Effreym, and also in the xvij. c. it
is seid that a straunge deken camc fro an othir
place into the hous of Miche; and it is not to be
trowid that dekenys officiiden, where that preestis
were not officiying. Wherfore preestis in manye placis
of Israel out of the temple officiiden, and oratories
in worthi mennys housis werem sumwhat bifoere thilk
tyme forto represente God, even as the ark or chest
of witnessing with propiciatorie representid God in the
tabernacle and in the temple.

And in lijk maner as Miche dide in this principal
purpos, Laban the vnclle of Iacob dide, in that that he
hadde in his hous ymagis of God, whiche ymagis his
owne douxter Rachel, the wijf of Iacob, took awey
with hir priueli, whanne sche departid from her fadris
hous, and schulde iorney with hir husband Iacob into
the lord of Chanaan, as it is open Gen. xxxij. c.
And zit for al this that Laban hadde suche ymagis,
and for al this that he clepid hem hise Goddis, he
was not holden an ydolatrer, neither his gouernauce
was blamed theryn; for thanne wolde not the modir
of Iacob haue send him into the hous of Laban forto
haue take a wijf there in ydolatrie, neither Iacob
wolde haue dwellid and serued so long in the hous of
Laban, that is to seie xx. wyntir, if the hous of
Laban hadde be wemmed so cursidli as with the synne
of ydolatrie.

Wherfore folewith that Holi Writt wel allowith the
seid having and vsing of ymagis of God, so that thou

1 it is interlineated in a later
hand, which has made considerable
erasures.
2 the is added by a later hand.
3 theryn is added by a later hand.
4 allowith and approveth, MS. (first
hand).

So the MS.; but probably a
clerical error for officiiden.
maist not aschape, but that therfore thou allowe and approve it to be a point of Goddis moral lawe and a point of his servuice; inlasse\(^1\) than thou wolte refuse al what is writun in the Oold Testament for ey moral lawe, and if thou wolt so do, whi schalt thou and wolte thou so bisili and so feruentli and sturdili stonde vpon this text and processe writun Exodi xxv. c. and Deut. v. c. Thou schalite not make to thee eny grauen thing, et cetera? If thou go fro oon such proces of the Oold Testament writun thanne for a point and a gouernance of Goddis lawe, go thou fro alle other like; and thanne thou infirmyst and feblis bi a greet deel the euydancis whiche thou hast and holdist a\(\text{\'}\)zens the hauyling and the vsing of ymagis. And 3it, the sothe to seie, what Laban dide aboute the ymagis was biforn the lawe of Iewis; and therfore if the gouernaunce of Laban was good and alloweable, it was not reuokid, as was the gouernaunce and lawe of the Iewis.

vij. CHAPTER.

THE secunde principal gouernaunce to be tretid in this present secunde partie, of which gouernaunce manye of the layse ouer myche wijten the clerige, is this: That pilgrimagis to dyuerse bodies and bony of Seintis be mad, and also ben mad to ymagis of Crist crucifid and of Marie and of othere Seintis; and namelich for that pilgrimagis ben mad into summe placis more in which ben ymagis of the crucifix and of Marie and of Seintis, than into summe othere placis in whiche ben like ymagis of the crucifix and of Marie and of the same othere Seintis.

\(^1\) Both here and elsewhere it is not very clear whether the scribe intended to write inlasse conjunction or disjunction.
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the first conclusion in favor of pilgrimage. they are not forbidden in scripture, either by st. peter or any other writer.

into justifying of this ij. principal governaunce y proceode bi certein conclusiouns, of whiche the firste is this: Holi scripture weerneth not and lettith not neither reproveth suche now seid pilgrymages to be don. This conclusioun y proue thus: If any place of Holy Scripture schulde so weerne, thilk place were this v. Petri iiiij^e. where it is wrtun thus: Most dere britheren, nile 2e go in pilgrymage in fervour which is maad to you to temptacioun.\(^1\) but so it is, that this now reherced text of Scripture lettith not such biforn seid pilgrymage; and noon other place of Scripture is founde for to weerne suche seid pilgrymage. Wherfore noon place of Holy Scripture it weerneth, reproveth, or lettith.

The ij^e. premisse of this argument mai be proued thus: The now reherced proces of Petri (v. Petri iiiij^e. \(\text{\textit{ee}}\) spekith not of pilgrymage which is a bodili going or a bodili remouyng fro oon place into an other, but he spekith of a variaunce and of a chaunging withinforth\(^2\) in mannis wil, bi which a man leueth and forsakith and passith withinforth fro that that he hath take upon him to kepe as lawe of God, and that for persecucion which is don to him for the holding and keping of thilk lawe of God; which variaunce andawy going now seid Seint Peter clepith there pilgrymage bi a likenes to bodili pilgrymage and bi a figuratijf speche, which pilgrymage of the now seid variaunce he wolde that no Cristen man schude do. And this is al the meenyng of the now alleggid text. And if this be the meenyng ther of, certis he thanne

---

\(^1\) This is Wiclif's rendering of the Vulgate, "Carissimi, nolite peregrinari in fervore, qui ad tentationem vobis fit." Both here and elsewhere Pecock's citation agrees best with the later form of Wiclif's version. See Wycl. Bibl. vol. 4, p. 612.

\(^2\) with in forde, MS., the hyphen at the end of the line being (accidentally?) omitted. It is distinctly written conjunction just below.
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lethith no thing bodili pilgrimage of which spekith the
firste now before sett principal conclusion.

That this understonding now bi me ʒouvun is the
very and dew litteral vn destinedg of the text it:
Petri iiiij. c. it is open ynow to alle hem, whiche wol
bigholde al the hool proces fro thens into the eende of
the chapter. Forwhi euene immediatli at next to the
now before alleggid text of Peter this proces folewish;
as if eny newe thing biffalle to ʒou; but comune ze
with the passiouns of Crist and haue ze ioie, that
also ze be glad and haue ioie in the revelacioun of
his glorie. If ze ben disieisd for the name of Crist,
ze schulen be blessid, forthat that is of the honour
and of the glorie and of the vertu of God; and
the Spirit that is his schal reste on ʒou. But no
man of ʒou suffer as a manseleer, or a thieff, or
curseur, or desirer of othres mennys goodis; but if as
a Cristen man, schame he not; but glorifis he God
in this name, et cetera. Lo hou open it is, (if these
wordis of Peter be ioyned to the former wordis of
Peter,) that Petir¹ meeneth forto remove bi the for-
mer wordis al vnstable vnconstaunc and variaunc
and vnperseueraunc, which peple happili wolde haue
in leuyng the lawe of God for persecucion. Forwhi
thorought out al the wordis therto pertinentli ioyned
and leuyng Petir stireth the same men for to haue
pacience and perseueraunc in her persecucion and
abiding in the lawe of God, so that thei suffer thilk
persecucion for kepog² of the lawe of God and
not for her trespassis doon æzens the lawe of God.

And therfore myn vn destinedg ʒouvun before to
the former text of Petir is not feyned, but according
to the hool al processe which Petir in the mater

¹ that Petir is interlineated by an early, but later hand.
² the keping, MS. (first hand).
writh. And alle men musten\(^1\) neda graunte, that bi circumstauncis of the textis and processes ligging before or bi hinde a text in Holie Scripture ouste be take which is the verri and dew litteral vndirstonding of thilk text ful ofte and miche and eure, but if sum special skile it lette. And so Austin knowlechid him sylf hunte out the dew litteral vndirstonding of Holie Scripture.\(^8\) Wherfore the bifer seid vnderstanding to the seid former text of Peter is trewe and dew.

Also thus: But if the seid vndirstonding were the trewe and dew litteral vndirstonding to the seid text, and if thilk text schulde weerne alle bodili pilgrimages, thanne thilk text were agens the doctrine of the Gospel and agens the doctrine of Crist. Forwhi it is writun pleynli Matheu xxviij.\(^6\), and Mark xxij.\(^8\), and Luk the xxiiij.\(^8\), and Iohnun the xx.\(^8\) that denoue and holie wommen, as weren thanne certein camen, to the sepulcre of Crist for to visite his sepulcre and his deed bodi, and forto do office of remembrannunc bi the signe of oynement, lijk as Crist bifer spake and prophecied ther of, Matheu xxvj.\(^8\), that it schulde be so doon to his bodi, whanne he seid thus: This womman sending this oynement into my bodi dide to birse me. Treuly y seis to you, where eure this gospel echal be prechid in al the world, it echal be seid that eche dide this into the mynde of him. And no man mai seis nay, but that the wommen in so going forto visite the sepulcre of Crist and his deed.

\(^1\) muste, MS. (first hand).

\(^2\) It is not easy to say what passage of Augustine Pecock may have had in view: the following remarks bear out, at all events, the assertion in the text. "Aut si et ipse (Adam sc.) figuraret intelligendus est, quis genuit Cain et Abel et Seth? An et ipse figuraret tantum fuerunt, non etiam homines ex hominibus nati? De proximo ergo attendant istam presumptionem quo tendat, et co- nentur nobiscum cumeta primitus quae gesta narratur in expressionem proprietatis accipere." 8. August. de Genes. ad litt., lib. viii. c. I. § 4. (tom. iii. p. 170. Ed. Benedict, Ant., 1700.)
bodi and forto do there sum bodili deede, wherbi thei schulden the more mynde haue of him, maden a bodili pilgrimage, even lijk to the bodily pilgrimagis whiche of deuout and weel governed pilgrimes ben now woned be doon. Wherfore the text and teching of Petir weren¹ contrarie to these now reherced placis of the Gospel in whiche pilgrimagis ben allowid of Crist, if thilk text of Peter schulde be vnderstonde forto weerne and lette alle bodili pilgrimagis, that thei ben not doon. And so is the firste principal conclusion sufficientli proued.

The iij. principal conclusioun is this: Doom of kindeli well disposid resoun weerneth not and lettith not bodili pilgrymagis to be doon in the maner now bfore seid. This conclusioun y may proue thus: If eny doom of resoun schulde so weerne and lette, certis thilk doom of resoun muste be oon of the iij. domes bfore spoken in the iij. and iiiij. chapitris of this present iij. partie, there brouȝt forth in treting of the iij. principal conclusioun mad for iustifying of ymagis. Or ellis it muste be oon of the domes which schulen be reherced soone aftar in the ix. c. in arguyng ażems the firste and the iij. seyde principal gouvernaunces. But so it is, that noon of the iij. bfore sett out doomyes of resoun may weerne and lette the seid pilgrimagis. Forwhi to ech of the iij. kindis of domes it is bfore sufficientli answerid bothe for ymagis and for pilgrimagis to gidere, neither eny of the domes soone aftar in argumentis to be brouȝt forth in the ix. chapiter weerneth and lettith. Forwhi to ech of hem anoon aftar in the x. xiij. xiiij. xiiiij. and xv. chapitris it schal be sufficientli answerid. Wherfore no doom of weel disposid resoun in kinde schal lette and weerne or reprowe the bfore seid pil-

¹ were, MS. (first hand).
grimage, that it be not doon. And so this ijᵗʰ principal conclusion is to be holde for trewe.

The ijᵗʰ principal conclusion is this: It is not vnleeful pilgrimagis to be doon. That this conclusion is trewe, y proye thus: What euer gouernaunce neither Holi Scripture, neither doom of weel disposed resoun, neither mannis positijf lawe weerneth or reproueth, is not vnleeful. But so it is, that Holi Scripture weerneth not and reproueth not pilgrimagis, as it is open bi the firste now next before going principal conclusion; neither doom of resoun it weerneth or reproueth, as it is open bi the ijᵗʰ next before sett principal conclusion. Wherfore folewith that suche pilgrimagis ben not vnleeful. And so this principal ijᵗʰ conclusion is trewe.

The iiiijᵗʰ principal conclusion is this: It is leeful, in maner of the bifoire set xᵗʰ reule or supposicioun, that pilgrimagis be doon. This conclusion y proye thus: What euer gouernaunce is not vnleeful is leeful; for so schewith the bifoire sett xᵗʰ reul in the firste chapter of this present ijᵗʰ partie. But so it is, that pilgrimagis to be doon is not vnleeful, as it is open bi the next before going conclusion. Wherfore that pilgrimagis be doon, it is leeful. And so this present iiiijᵗʰ conclusion is proved to be trewe.

The vᵗʰ principal conclusion is this: Holi Scripture allowith¹ that pilgrimage be doon. This conclusion is sufficientli proved bifoire bi what is alleggid bifoire in this present chapter, in proof of the next firste conclusion in this ijᵗʰ partie, of the holi denoute wommen, whiche wenten in pilgrimage to Cristis sepolcre and to his deed bodi forto be the more remembrid of him; and bi this that Crist prophesied that Marie Magdalen schulde so do; and he approved

¹ allowith and approueth, MS. (first hand).
and justified her deede ther yn, as it is open Math. xxviii: c., whanne he seide, “that shee dide a good “werk into him; and that where euer in the world “schulde be prechid thilk gospel, it schulde be seid “that shee dide it into the mynde of him, and that “shee dide it into the biryng of him,” and so forth, as y haue write herof more pleinly in dyuarse placis. Wherfore this v* conclusion is trewe.

Also this present v* conclusion is proved unsoila- bili bi a proof mad bifoire in the firste part of this present book, the [xix*]¹ chapiter, bi setting forth of iij. reulis and thanne bi taking* of iiiij. conclusionus there formed upon hem. Se there the proof who enuer wole.

vij. CHAPETER.

The vj* conclusion is this: Doom of weel disposed resoun allowith and approueth that pilgrimagis be doon. This conclusion y schal prove bi setting and sending bifoire of open reulis and supposiciones, and bi from hem falling down into special proof of this present conclusion.

The firste reule or supposicion is this: The holy lijf and passioun of Iesu Crist was to alle Cristen a passing greet benefet: the zifithis of graciis, the glo- ries of heuen biihizt ben to alle Cristene passyng greete benefetis: the holii lijf and conversacioun of ech Seint is to alle Cristen a greet benefet of God zouun to hem. The dignyte and worthines of God, his loue, and his riȝtwisnes ben ful worthi and re- uerend, gode, and precioso. And alle these now bifoire

¹ A space left in the MS. for the number.

² bitaking, MS.
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reherced thingis ben thercfore ful profitable to be
knowe and to be remembred of alle Cristene, that
God be therbi the more loued of us and that we
have the ferventir wil forte do and suffre in seruyng
him and in keping hise lawis. This reule or supposi-
cioun is so open that he nedith no proof at al.

The ii. reule or supposicioun is this: It were ful
unprofitable and damageful to alle Cristene, but if
these now bfore seid benefetis and these seid dignitees
of God were of al Cristen remembred. Forwhi, if
thei be not remembrd, thei schulen not be reckid1
neither bi hem men schulen be stirid into good and
fro yuel; sithen al thing which is not had in mynde
of a man is, as toward any thing which he schulde
do ther with or ther bi, deed or lost or not being.

The ii. reule or supposicioun is this: It is ful re-
sonable and ful worthi that rememoratiijf visible signes
be had of alle these now spokun thingis in the firste
and ii. reulis or supposicions. Forwhi withoute reme-
moratiijf signes of a thing or of thingis the rememo-
racioun or the remembrance of thilk thing or thingis
muste needis be the febler, as experience sufficientl
witnessith; and thercfor, sithen the bodi or the bonis
or othere reliiks of eny persoun is a ful nyz rememo-
ratiijf signe of the same persoon, it is ful reasonable
and ful worthi that where the bodi or bonis or eny
releef or relik of a Seint mai be had, that it be set
up in a comoun place to which peple may haue her
deuout neiţing and accesse, forte haue her deouot
biholding ther upon forte make the seid therbi re-
membraunce. And fether, sithen it is not reasonable
and conuenient that suche bodies or bonis or reliiks
be left withoute in the baar feeld, (and that bothe
for it were aţens the eese of the peple whiche schulde

1 reckd, M3. (first hand).
come thereto in reyny and wyndy wedris, and for that thei my\'ten thanne be take awey bi wickid men not dreding God,) theryfore it is ful resonable and worthi forto bilde ouer tho bodies and bonis and othere relikis chapellis or chrichis; the, and forto bilde bisidis hem auter and queris, that the office of preising God and of preiying to God and to Seintis be in the better forme doon. And a\'zenward, in a cuntrey where that of a Seint can not be had his bodi or bonis or eny relik of him, it is resonable and worthi that an ymage of him be mad and be sett vp in place into which peple mai come forto it biholde, and therbi make remembrunce of the biforn seid thingis in the firste and ij\'reule: and it is ful resonable and worthi that ther ouer be bildid chapel or chirche, and that auters and queris be maad therbi, for causis now next biforn spokun. And sithen of Crist crucified and of Marie his modir we han not the bodies or bonis, neithir in ech cuntre is eny relik had of hem, theryfore it muste needis be more resonable and more worthi that in dyuerse placis of cuntrees be maad ymagis of Crist crucified and of his modir Marie with purtenauncis thereto longing, and that thei be housid and doon to as it is now biforn writun of the ymagis of othere Seintis. This reule or supposicioun hath withinne him sett forth sufi- cient euydencis for his proof, and theryfore he is to be holde for trewe.

The iii\'reule or supposicioun is this: If bi the ymagis of which it\' is spokun in the next biforn going reule or supposicioun schulde be maad eny quyk and fervent and solempne and miche denout remembrance vpon the thingis spokun of in the firste and ij\' biforn going reulis, thei mowe not be multipli\'d so wijd

The fourth rule.
There must in each country be appointed by God or man a certain number of images, (neither over many nor over few,) to which solemn recourse must be

\'it is interlineded by a later hand.
that at ech chircbe, at ech chapel, at ech stretis eende, or at ech heggis eende in a cuntre be sett such an ymage, for certis thanne tho ymagis schulden be as foule or of litil reputacioun and schulde be vndeinteose for the grete plente of hem, that bi hem no solempne and feruent remembraunce schulde be maad upon the bifore seid thingis in the firste reule; as experience wole weel schewe that plente is no deinte, and ouermyche homelines with a thing gendrith dispising toward the same thing. And azenward, if bi tho now seid ymagis schulde be maad solempne and worthi and deuout rememrauncing upon the seid thingis, thei move not be ouer scant or ouer fewe in a cuntre or in a land. For thanne the hauyng of hem schulde be ouer thinne and ouer bareyn forto make to many folk the seid solempne and feruent and deuout remembraunce. Wherfore it muste nedis be, that in oon cuntre or lond be a certein noombre of placis and of ymagis pointid and chosun bi God or bi man, in whiche placis such ymagis schulen be; and that in not mo or othere placis eny such ymage be, thou in ech chapel or chirc be ymagis of God and of Marie and of Seintis forto make bi hem sengil and leuke remembrauncis, suche as it mai happe forto come forth bi hem.

The v. reule or supposicion is this: If God take upon him forto poynte and chese the placis in whiche schulen be the noumber of the seid ymagis in oon lond or cuntre, it is more according that we stonde to his pointing and chesing and assignyng, than that men bi her wittis onli therto studie and devise forto make eny such pointing, chesing,' or assignyng. And furthermore it is so, that God takith uppon him forto make such now seid second pointing and chesing.

1 or chesing, MS. (first hand). 2 seint, MS.
Forwhi he hath wrouȝt myraulis in summe placis in whiche ben ymagis of Marie, and in manye othere mo placis in whiche ben ymagis of Marie he hath not so wrouȝt; and in lijk maner he hath do in placis in whiche ben ymagis of Crist crucified and of Seintis. And skile can be founde noon whi tho myraulis schulde be wrouȝt and don in summe suche placis and not in alle othere placis like, and bi summe suche ymagis and not bi alle othere ymagis like in the same chirche; saue this cause, that God wolde therbi notifike to vs that he chose thilke placis and thilke ymagis forto that in hem schulden be mad solemnpe and more feruent and more deuoute remembrancingis upon the thingis spokun in the firste reule, and forto prouoke us therbi that we conforme us to his pointing, chesing, and assignyng. Wherfore it is to be holde, that for the now seid cause God wrouȝte tho myraulis in summe of tho placis more and ofter than in othere placis like. Wherof folowing-ith further, that alle Cristen ouȝten stonde to the seid pointing and chesing of God and conforme hem therto; inlasse \(^1\) than men wolen frowardli and causeles seie and holde, that tho myracles, whiche ben callid myraulis of God and ben doon in the now seid placis, ben not verry and trewe myracles of God; but certis thei ouȝten not and mowe not so seie and holde. Forwhi, but if that ech deede semyng to be a verri miracle of God, and hauynge notable evidencis that it is a miracle of God, and noon miʒti evidence can be obiectid aʒens this that it is a myracle of God, schulde be take and be holde as a myracle of God;

---

\(^1\) in lasse, MS. disjunctum, (at least without an hyphen at the end of the line,) twice; but elsewhere apparently conjunctum. A little below is consuenient occurs without an hyphen, (and also more than once is apparently written disjunctum,) but perhaps accidentally.
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Ellis we schulden not wite which such deede we ouȝten holde as for a miracle of God, and which such deede we ouȝten not so holde to be a miracle of God. And so herof it wolde folowe, that thou; a man wolde denye ech miracle which Apostle dide or which Crist dide, we myȝten not weerne him so denie, but if this reule muste be ther yn: That ech such deede, myche semyng to be a myracle of God, is to be so take for a myracle of God ; inlasse 1 than sum notable obieccion, (more likeli and more probable than is the evidence for the miracle) can be brouȝt forth and schewid. Wherfore, alle thingis seen, this present v. reule or supposicion is trewe.

The vij. reule or supposicioun is this: Whanne God cheedith oon ymage bifoire an other ymage into the office now bifoire seid and spokun in the iiiij. and v. supposiciouns or reulis, it is not inconuenient that God make thilk ymage of stoon or of tre forto swete, and that the ymage be moued fro oon place vnto an othir place withoute mannis bering and withoute other mannis herto sett bisynesse, and that the yȝen of the ymage be turned hidirward and thidirward verrili or semyngly as thou: the ymage sie, and that the ymage (in such maner as God made theasse of Balaam) speke.

Forwhi, whanne it likith to God forto cheese oon ymage bifoire an other ymage into the office bifoire sett in the iiiij. and v. reulis or supposiciouns, it is not inconuenient but it is conuenient that God wirche sum myracle in and bi thilk ymage, that therbi God notifie and witnesse and denounce to vs that he cheedith thilk ymage into the seid office, as it is open bi the v. reule. And sithen noon oon kinde of miracle to be doon of God in and bi the ymage is

---

1 in lasse, MS. ; see note in preceding page.
more assignable to be propre into this witnesse and

more assigne to be propre into this witnesse and
denouncing than is an other miracle doable of God
and bi the same ymage; (but alle kindis of myraclis
seruen therto riht weel and as it were lijk weel,
and namelich the myracle of sweting and of movynge
or walking or of turnyng the iżen and the myracle
of speking seruen lijk conueniencly to the seid wit-
nessing or denouncing, as other miracles schulden
thero serue;)—it foloowlith to be trewe, that (for this
ennde and entent of schewing and denouncing and
witnesse, that God chesith this ymage of stoon or
tree or of metal bfore other like ymagis into the
seid office spokyn in the iiiij. and v. realia,) it is
not conuenienc but it is conuenienc ynow; that
God at sumwhile make thilk ymage swete, and that
the ymage be moved from oon place into an other
place with oute manyns labour, and that the iżen
of the ymage be turnd hidirward and thidirward,
and that the ymage seynyngli speke, that is to seie,
that specke and sonn be mad in the ymage bi an
aungel of God, as it was doon in the asse of Balaam,
Numer. xxij. 2. And furthermore herof, if it be not
conuenienc thesee thingis to be doon in ymagis bi
God, it is not conuenienc the seers and the next
heerers of these thingis so doon forto kowewe and wite
and witnesse that thei ben so doon; and it is not
conuenienc other men trowe vndoutabili the same
thingis as doon, whanne thei heeren credible seers and
next heerers reporte and telle what thei presentli sien
and herden so doon.

The viij. reule or supposcioun is this: Whi and
wherefore God chesith this place more than an other
cerain place, and wole do miraclis in oon such place
and bfore sum such seid ymage more than in an
other place and than bfore another lijk ymage, is not

The seventh
rule. Men must
not inquire why
God chooses one
place or image
rather than
another for the
working of
miracles. Proof
of the rule.

of men to be enquierd. Forwhi, that God chesith oon
place more than an other and oon ymage more than
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anothir, that therbi be mad a solempe and a fer-
uent remembrance vpon the thingis seid in the firste
reule, we mowe knowe and wite bi this, that so-
lempne miraclis (suche as we kunnen not bi sufficient
euynence impugne) God dooth inoon place and not in
an other, and bifoire summe ymage and not bifoire an
other. And thefero that God so che sisth these placis
and ymagis bifoire othere it is of us to be holde, for
therto we han this now seid mysti evidence; but cer-
tis whi and wherfore he che sisth this place and this
ymage bifoire othere, we han noon evidence withinne
doom of resoun, neither bi eny mark or evidence
3oun to vs fro God; and therofore fro enquirancis
whi God che sisth this place and this ymage bifoire
othero into the seid effect of solempe remembrancing
vpon the seid thingis, we ousten algatis abstene and
forbere. And so this present vij. reule or supposicioun
is trewe.

Aftir these vij. reulis or supposiciouns y argue thus:
Resoun wole and allowith and approueth nedis that
men visite and haunte for the seid eende of solempe
remembrancing tho placis and tho ymagis, which it
is sure God to chese into the seid eende and bi the
seid euyden cis of myraculis doing: forwhi ellis we
conformeden not us to it wherto God vs callith and
proukith, wherof we ousten be waer. But so it is,
that such seid visiting and haunting into the seid
eende is not ellis than pilgrimage. Wherfore resoun
wole iugith, allowith, and approueth pilgrimagis to be
doon; and in this wise, fro the bigynnyng of the
firste reule and supposicioun in this present chapiter
hider to, is proved this present vij. conclusioun, that
doom of weel disposid resoun allowith and approueth
pilgrimage to be doon.

Who euer wole se more proof for this present vij.
principal conclusioun, rede he in The book of wor-
schiping, nameliche there in the ij. parte; and he
THE SECOND PART.

schal, what in the firste partie and what in the ij. partie, fynde herto proof ynow.

The viij. principal conclusioun is this: It is leeful, in proprist maner of leefulnes, that pilgrimagis be done. This conclusioun may be proved thus: What euer gouernance is allowid and approved bi Holyscripture and bi doom of weel disposed resoun is in proprist maner leeful, as it is open bi the ix. reule or supposicioun sett in the first chaptor of this present ij. parti. But so it is, that pilgrimagis to be done is allowid and approved bi Holyscripture, as it is open bi the next biforme going v. principal conclusioun; and it is allowid and approved bi doom of weel disposed resoun, as it is open bi the next biforme going viij. principal conclusioun. Wherfore followeth that pilgrimagis to be done is leeful in proprist maner of leefulnes. And so this present viij. conclusioun is trewe.

The viij. principal conclusioun is this: Pilgrimagis doing is a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt servise, thowz it be not alwey vnder commandement of his lawe. That this conclusioun is trewe, y prove therus: What euer gouernance doom of weel disposed resoun biddith, God biddith; and what euer gouernance doom of weel disposed resoun counseilith, allowith, or approueth, God the same gouernance counseilith, allowith, or approueth, as it is openli biforme schewid in mentenyng the firste principal gouernance bi therto mad and sett forth the viij. conclusioun and bi the processe next therto there after going. But so it is, that pilgrimagis to be done doom of weel disposed resoun counseilith, allowith, and approueth, as it is open bi proof of the next biforme going viij. conclusioun. Wherfore pilgrimagis to

\[1 \text{as is, MS. (first hand).}\]
be doon is a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt servise.

Also thus: What ever gouernaunce Holi Scripture allowith\(^1\) and is not bi Holis Scripture reproued, is a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunte servise. But such a gouernaunce is doing of pilgrimagis, as it is open bi what is bifoire seid into proof of the next bifoire going first conclusion and of the next bifoire going v\(^{th}\) conclusion. Wherfore this present viij\(^{th}\) conclusion is trewe.

The ix\(^{th}\) principal conclusion is this: It is not synne a man bi his werkis forto ensaumple to othere men, that thei make pilgrimagis in the maner bifoire tau\(\partial\); and that thei do as he doith, if he do in the maner bifoire tau\(\partial\); but it is a merytorie and a weld doon deede for to it ensaumple. That this conclusion is trewe, y proue thus: It is no synne a man bi his werkis forto ensaumple to othere men, that thei do a deede and a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt servise; but it is a merytorie deede forto it\(^2\) ensaumple to othere. And herwith so it is, that forto make pilgrimagis in the maner bifoire tau\(\partial\) is a deede of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt servise, as it is open bifoire bi the next bifoire going conclusion. Wherfore it is not synne a man forto ȝeue ensaumple to othere men, that thei make pilgrimagis in the maner bifoire tau\(\partial\); but it is merytorie and weld doon forto ȝeue thilk ensaumple. And so this present ix\(^{th}\) conclusion is to be holde trewe.

---

\(^{1}\) *allowith* and *approveth*, MS.  
\(^{2}\) *it is interlineded by a later (?) hand.*
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ix. CHAPTER.

AFTER al this what is tretid upon the firste and ij\(^{\text{th}}\) principal gouernauncis fro the bigynnyng of this ij\(^{\text{th}}\) parti hidirto, (and that bi ix. conclusioune servyng to the firste gouernaunce, and bi othere ix. conclusioune servyng to the ij\(^{\text{th}}\) gouernaunce,) y schal next now sette forth the argumentis and the obiecioun, whiche the lay peple (being ouer myche wijters of the clergie) maken ażens the seid firste and ij\(^{\text{th}}\) gounernauncis.

Of whiche argumentis the firste is this: No cause can be assigned whi ymagis schulden be had and vsid, and whi pilgrimagis schulden be doon saue this, that bi hem remembraunce and mynde schulde be maad vpon tho thingis whiche ben seid and rehercicd bificore, (in the viij\. chapter of this ij\. partie in the firste and ij\. reulis or supposicions,) that is to se, the benefetis of God, his punyschings, his holij liyf and passioun, the holi lynes of Seintis, and hiz\(^{\text{th}}\) dignitees and worthiness of God, and suche othere thingis, (certis if ymagis and pilgrimagis schulden not serue to suche now seid remembrauncis bi hem to be had, and folowingli to therbi the deouter preiers to be had, ymagis and pilgrimagis weren in vein;) but so it is, that into suche now seid remembrauncis and myndingis to be gendrid and had, and folowingli therbi into ful deouter preiers to be had, mai and wole serue at ful\(^{\text{1}}\) Holi Scripture with othere writ- ings of Seintis lynes and othere deoute treticis of blisse\(^{\text{2}}\) in heuen and of peynes in helle and suche othere treticis. Werthere the hauynge of ymagis and

\(^{1}\) at the ful, MS. (first hand).  \(^{2}\) blisse, MS.
CHAP. IX.

Their conformation of the argument. If any thing is good only because it answers a certain end, it becomes unnecessary when that end is better answered by other means. Application of the argument to images and pilgrimages.

The doing of pilgrimagis mowe be weel forborn. And it is no nede that thei be.

Confirmacioun herof mai be this: Whanne euer eny thing is not good saue for a certein fruyt and good which schulde come therbi, thanne if thilk same fruyt and good mai be gete and had lijk wel or better bi an other meene than bi this thing, the hauing and vaug of this thing is not necessarie, (that is to seie, is not needisly to be had,) but mai riȝt weel be forborn. But so it is in this present purpos, that the hauing and vaug of ymagis and the\(^1\) doing of pilgrimagis ben idil and waastful, inlasse than thei be meenys into the seid remembrancis and preiers to be mad bi occasion of hem. And ȝit so it is, that therto writengis mowe serue better than thei. Wherefore thei ben not necessarie, but thei mowe be riȝt weel lackid and not had and doon.

And if eny man wolde be aboute forto answere herto and seie, that not alle men and wommen mowe come into this, that thei schulen kunne rede writingis in bokis; and thercfor for suche vnlettrid men and wommen ymagis musten be had as bokis to hem, and of hem pilgrimagis musten be doon, and ellis the seid remembrancis myȝte not of hem be had: thanne the seid arguers wolten sette to and fortofe her partie thus: It myȝte be ordeyned that alle men and wommen in her zongthe schulden leerne forto rede writingis in the langage in which thei schulden lyn and dwelle; and thanne therbi schulde come forth not oonli this seid good of remembranding, but myche othir good also ther with. And thercfol thei settyn litil bi the answere now maid.

The ij\(^\text{th}\) argument is this: If bishopis, preestis, and clerkis foundun and endewid therto bi the lay

\(^{1}\text{The is interlineated by a later hand.}\)
peple wolden preche to the lay peple so ofte and so. [CHAP. IX. myche as thei ofte ten do bi her office, the seid thingis whiche mowe be remembrid to the lay peple bi ymagis and bi pilgrimagis, the lay peple schulde be so sufficientli remembrid upon tho thingis, that thei schulden haue no neede neither profit at al for to haue and vse ymagis, or forto make pilgrimagis into the seid remembrauncis to be therbi gete and had. Wherfore it is not resoneable neiurther conuenient that the negligence of so weel wagid bischopis, preestis, and clerkis schulde be suffrid to be and conyne; and that the lay peple schulde be dryue bi thilk negligence of prelatis and preestis into cost and labour, and into purchasing to hem of new meenis into the same eende into whiche the diligence of preestis and clerkis bi hem costioseli founde schulde serue and streoche.

The iiij. argument is this: Vein and waastful occu-
pecioun it is forto make myche labour and cost forto haue and vse the sympler and vnpertifer and lasse representing ymage of a thing, whanne with lasse labour and cost mai be had the pertifer and fuller and better representing ymage of the same thing. But so it is, that ech lyuyng man is verier and pertifer and fuller and better representing ymage of Crist and of ech Seint, than is eny vnquyke stok or stoon graued and oumed with gold and other gy peinturie. Wherfore it is vein and waast forto make such labour and cost into the making and hauynge of suche vnquyke gay ymagis.

The iiij. argument is this: God is lijk presentli every where, and therfore he is lijk redi for to zeue hise gracies and fiztis every where, where euery a man

---

1 or is interlineated by a later hand.
2 See The Apology for the Lo.
lars, ascribed to Wiclif, p. 88.

N
and no place of image is holier than another: so that pilgrimages to Walsingham and other places are vain.

The fifth argument is this: The feendis wijdis and deceitis ben forto be waarli considerid and forto be smertli fled, as Peter techith, (i. Petri v. 2. in the ende): but so it is that the feend hath deceuyed slijli and wijdily men and wommen whiche han worschipid ymagis and han come to ymagis in pilgrimage, as it is open ynow; in the lijf and legend of Saint Bartholome, where it is seid that the feend which was in a famose ymage in a temple made the peple sijk in her bodies, that thei schulden come before him in pilgrimage and preie; and thanne he wolde make hem hool. And herbi he drowe the peple into mys bileene and mys lyuyng. Wherfore ech Cristen man ouchte be waar and kepe him sylf far fro such perel; and therfore bi tendirnes, which he ouchte haue to kepe him waarli fro synne, he ouzte forbere vce of ymagis and going in pilgrimages.

The vi. argument is this: Poul techith alle Cristen men (i. Tesselonic. v. 6.) thus: Absteyne zou fro all yuel spice; but so it is, that the seid hauyng and vsing of ymagis and pilgrimagis doing ben occasiouns of myche synne and of other yuel. Wherfore thei ben to be forborn.
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The viij. argument is this: It is neither wisdom neither tender loue bering to the seruice of God a man forto leue vndoon many better seruics of God, for this that he wole do oon myche lase good seruice of God; but so it is, that thou: the seid using of ymagis and the seid pilgrimaging weren seruics to God, sit in the whilis and with the costis in and with which thei ben doon manye othere myche better seruics of God myzten be doon, as visit- ing of poor men, and teching of vnwise men, and bisie studie in deoute bookis and in othere bookis of goestli leernynge. Wherfore folewith that a bed change is forto bissette so mich labour and coste aboute ymagis and pilgrimagis.

The viij. argument is this: It is sure and sikir and greit discrecioun Cristen men forto holde hem to the gouernauncis which Holy Scripture of the Newe Testament techith hem, and forto caste aside alle othere gouernauncis or reulis whiche ben not tauft in the Newe Testament; the, thou thou gouernauncis and reulis be* weel ynowe and sufficientli ynowe groundid in doom of weel dispose resoun. Forwhi Seint Poul seth, Coloc. ii* 2, thus: Se zë that no man disseyue zou bi philosophie and vein fallace aftir the tradi- cioun of men, aftir the elementis of the world, and not aftir Crist; for in him dwelth bodilich at the fulnes of the Gotheide. But so it is, that Holi Scripture in the Newe Testament techith not the seid* using of ymagis neither the seid pilgrimaging; but thei ben had withoute forth bi resonyng and arguyng in moral philosophie: and of al such craft and sutiling ouzten alle Cristen men be waer, that thei therbi be not bigilid. Wherefore Cristen men, (for tendirnes

---

1 seuenthe, MS.: but written on an erasure: the first hand almost always uses Roman numbers.

2 ben. MS. (first hand).

3 seid is interlined by a later hand.
which thei ousten haue that thei synne not,) ousten be waer and forbere al such craft of ymagis vaising and of pilgrimagis making.1

The ixth argument is this: Iohn iiiij. 5, whanne Crist saat at the welle of Iacob and talkid with the womman Samaritan, he excludid the voe of ymagis and the voe of pilgrimage.2 Forwhi he seide to the womman thus: The tyme is come and now it is, whanne trewe worschipers schulen worschip the Fadir in spirit and trouthe; for also the Fadir sechith such that worschipen him. God is a spirit, and it bivouth hom that worschipen him to worschip in spirit and trouthe. Thus myche Crist seide there: wherbi is excludid and wilned of Crist to be removed, that eny man schulde worschip God bi eny outward ymagis; in as miche as he wolde ech man aftir him comyng forto be so perfitt that he worschip God in spirit and in trouthe of Goddis being, and not in an ymage feyned to be in Goddis stide. Also Crist in the same chapiter, speking with the same womman removed pilgrimagis. Forwhi whanne the womman had seid to him thus: I se that thou art a prophet. Oure fadiris worschipiden in this hil, (that is to seie, the hil clepid Garizim,) and 3e, (that is to seie, Iewis,) seien that at Ierusalem.3 is a place where it bivouth to worschip: Iesus seide to hir thus: Womman, bileueu thou to me, for the hour schal come, whanne neither in this his4 hil neither in Ierusalem 3e schulen worschipes the Fader. 3e, (that is to seie, Samaritanis or dwellers in the cuntre of Samarie,) worschipen what 3e knowen not; we,
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That is to seie, Iewes,) worshipen what we known: for heithe is of the Iewes. Thus miche there. Of which proces folewith that Crist excludid pilgrimage, whanne he seid that peple schulde frothen after worschippe neither in Ierusalem neither in the now seid hil; for the worsching, which the peple made in tho ij. placis, was bi pilgrimage going into tho placis. And so Cristis entent was, that neither vce of ymagis neither doing of pilgrimagis schulde be among the peple which he came to teche.

The x^e. argument is this: If a man wole go in pilgrimage into sum memorial of God or of a Seint, what skile is therto that he go thidir in pilgrimage openli, (sithen he mai go thider priueli forto make his deuout remembrauncis and hisse deuoute preiers,) but if he desire launde and preising of the peple seiyng that he goith in thilk pilgrimage? Also what skile is therto, that he bere openli bi streitis an ymage of wex or of tre forto ofre it up at the place of pilgrimage and forto lete it abide there contynuely aftir him, but if he wolde meene that thilke ymage schulde preis continueli for him in thilk place of pilgrimage bi nyzt and dai, whanne he were departid frothenes and were come hoom agen? But certis open...it is, that alle these ententis ben or yuel or in vein. Wherefore noon such open going in pilgrimagis bi streitis and townes, (and namelich with open bering of an ymage of wex or of tre, and forto hange thilk ymage vp in the place of pilgrimage,) is to be doon.

The xj^e. argument is this: Ioseue xxiiiij. c. the duke Ioseue seid to the peple of Israel thus: Do zō away fro the myddis of zou alien Goddis, and bowe zō...
...hers to the Lord God of Israel. Wherefore bi lijk skile and lijk weel it myȝte be seid to Cristen men: "Do se awy fro the myddis of zou alien " Goddis, that is to seie, zoure ymagis whiche se " worshipen and holden as zoure Goddis."

The xiij. argument is this: The peple of Iewes weren not so vnwise and so lewid as ben Cristen children now of x. ȝeer age, neither as ben foolis now among Cristen men. Forwhi her werkis in con-
questis making and her bateillis disposing and her lottung of cuntees and her beldingis and her othere craftiouse doings whiche thei diden schewen weeul the contraria. Also the heten men which weren in the daies of Iewes weren ful wise, and thei weren not so vndiscreete as ben now Cristen children of x. ȝeer age, neither as ben folis among Cristen men. Forwhi the synding of kunnyngis, (as of comoun natural phil-
sophie, of medicinal philosphie, of methaphisik, of astronomeye, and of geometrie, and othere particuluer scienois, and of moral philosphie, and of ful discrete policiye, and of sult craftis doon bi hem) schewith ful miche the contrarie. But not with standing al this, the Iewes weren' so cumbrid bi having and vnsing ymagis that thei maken hem a calf of siluer, and seiden that it was her God which brouȝt hem out of Egipt, as it is open Exodi xxxij. c., and ofte in othere tyymes thei worshipiden ymagis of stoonys or of stockis as for her Goddis, as it is open ynoȝt in ful manye placis of the Book of Kingis in Holi Writt. And also heten men, how euere greet clerkis thei weren and how euere politik wise men thei weren, ȝit thei also worshipiden ymagis of tre and of stoon for her Goddis, as the Sauter seith therof in the cxij. psalme thus: The symylaoris of heten men ben siluer and gold, the werkis of mennys hondis;

1 were, MS. (first hand).
The Second Part.

Chapter IX.

The Second Argument. The xiij. argument is this: To what ever thing men preien deuoutli that it saue hem, or to do hem what thei knowen weel no persoon may do to hem saue God, the same thing thei taken for her God. But so it is, that to the crosse, which is a creature, men (both preestis and other lay men) preien deuoutli, that he schulde saue hem and kepe hem and make Crist plaid with hem which henge in him, and forto do what mannis power sufficheth not forto do to hem. Wherfore alle tho men in thilk while taken a creature to be her God.

The ij. premisse of this argument is open bi what is red and sungun in the ympne Vexilla Regis pro-

---

1 ouzte to drede, MS. (first hand).  
2 breking of Goddis lawe, MS. (first hand).
deunt sungun in the Passion Weke in Lent. For ther yn aftir that long speche is mad to the croe, which is not other than a creature, and whiche spechis mowe not be trewe saue as seid to a creature onli, it is seid thus: O croe, the oon hope in this tyme of passion, encrese thou riztwiemes to piteful men and zevc forzeuences to gilte men.1 Wherfore the ijth pre-
misse in this principal xiiijth argument is trewe.

Also in the Feest of the Crossis Fynding at the first euensong, whanne this response: O crux, viride 
lignum, et cetera, is sungun, aftir that manye spechis ben mad to the croe being a creature, (and whiche 
spekis mowe not be verified but as seide to a pure 
creature,) it is seid in the prose forth with therto fol-
rowing thus: Thou, which barist the Lord, make the 
patroun (that is to seie, Crist) forto be to vs inclin-
able or boueable or redi to heere us; and thou stok, 
which were worthi to bere3 the price of the world, 
zevc and grawnte to this peple of Crist the beneficie 
of the crosse.4 Wherfore the seid ijth premyse in this 
present principal xiiijth argument is trewe.

Also in the antemae: O crux splendidior, et cetera, 
sungun at the ijth euensong in the same feeste, it is 
seid thus: O sweete stok, bering sweete nailis and

1 "O crux, ave spec unica! 
Hoc passionis tempore, 
Piis adauge gratiam, 
Restue dele crimina."
These are the concluding words of 
the hymn beginning "Vexilla Regis 
prodeunt," which is still retained in 
the Roman Breviary for the Eve of 
Passion Sunday. The Salisbury 
Breviary, (Lond. 1553), which Pe-
cock follows, badly reads:
"Auge piis justitiam, 
Restue dona veniam."
2 rever, MS. (first hand).
3 be, MS.
4 "The Salisbury Breviary, May 3, 
(Lond. 1555) has the 'response' 
"O crux viride lignum, quia super 
tependit Salvator, Rex Israel," 
&c., followed by the prose:
"Crux fidelis, terras coniis 
Miro nectens sedere;"
which ends thus:
"Nobis pronom fac patronum, 
Quem tulisti Dominum; 
Salve lignum vitae, dignum 
Ferre mundi pretium! 
Confere isti plebi Christi 
Crucis beneficiu."
THE SECOND PART.

sweete birthens, saue this present cumpanic gaderid to
gidere now this dai in to thi preisingis. 1 In which
speche is open ynow that to the creature is preied
forto do what he may not do, but what oonli God
mai do. Wherfore the ij. premisse in the xiiiij. argu-
ment is trewe.

Also in the antene Crux fidelis et cetera, which is
sungun at the ij. euensong in the Feeste of the
Crossis Hijing, it is seid in lijk wise thus: O sweete
stok, bering sweete naitis and bering sweete birthens,
(that is to seie, the bodi of Crist and hishe parties,) be
thou to us a ward azens the dartis of the enemy: 2
which speche can not be dressid treuli saue to a
creature, and for that he is a creature; and zit of
the same creature it is askid, that he do what he mai
not do, and what oonli God mai do. And so eftsoone
the seid ij. premysse is schewid to be trewe.

Also in the prose clepid a sequence, 3 which is sun-
gun in the Feeste of the Crossis Hijing, after that
manye spechis there ben mad to the cros, it is seid
toward the eende in a vers therof thus: O Cristen
medicyn, saue thou hool men, and, hele thou sike
men! And what mannis myzte mai not, be it doon

---

1 "O crux splendidior cunctis
astris, mundo celebris, hominibus
multum amabilis, sanctior univers-
sta! qua sola fusti digna portare
talentum mundi: dulce lignum,
dulces clavos, dulcis ferens pon-
dera! salva presentem catervam
in tuis bodie laudibus congrega-
tam."—Id. It occurs also in the
Roman Breviary, May 3.

2 This hymn occurs in the Salis-
bury Breviary, Sept. 14, but the
last and most important part is not
found in it, nor in Mone's Lat.
Hymns., vol. i. p. 181. It begins
thus:

"Crux fidelis, inter omnes
Arbor una nobilis,
Nulla silva talum proferit
Fronsae, flore, germine;
Dulce lignum, dulces clavos,
Dulces ponundus sustinentes."

In another hymn, however, be-
ginning "O lignum venerabile,"
(Mone, l. e. p. 138,) we have:

"Contra Satane jaculum
Sic mihi, crux, obstaculum."

3 Beginning "Landes crucis at-
tollanmus."
in this name. In which speche it is likely the maker of the prose meene and entendre forst spoke to the same thing to which he spak in the vers next going before there; and sithen in the vers next before going he spekith to a pure creature, (forwhil he seith there thus, O signe of victorie, noon such among stockis, et cetera,) it folowith that in this present vers, O Cristen medicyrn, he spekith to the same pure creature. And so the seid ijth premysse of the xiiijth argument is trewe. And so it what the xiiijth argument concluseth finali must needis be trewe.

The xiiijth argument is this: Anentis what ever thing men bener hem silf and gouerne hem silf as thei wolden bere hem and gouerne hem, if thilk thing were God hem silf, and namelich whilis anentis God him silf (if he were there visibili present) thei couthen not do or make maker or louzer or dewouter submission, saluting, and servise than thei doon to thilk thing,—than ne and for thilk while thei maken or holden and taken thilk thing as for her verri God. But so it is, that before these daies and in these daies men benen and gouerne hem silf anentis a crosse in this now seid maner, as now anon after schal be schewid. Wherfore tho the whilis men think crosse her God.

That the ijth premisse of this xiiijth argument is trewe mai be argued thus: In eeldir daies, whanne processioun was mad in the Palm-Sunday before masse, the eukarist was not brouȝt forth, that the processioun of the clerksis and of the lye peple schulde

---

1 "Medicina Christiana, Salva sanos, agros sans: Quod non valet vis humana, Fit in to nomine."


2 "O crux, signum triumphale, Mundi vera salus, vale! Inter ligna nullum tale, Trivae, flore, germine."
meete with him; but a bær vncouered crosse was brouȝt forth açens the processiou, that the processiou schulde meete açens it, as y haue red in dyuurse colde ordinals of cathedrale chyrchis and of monasṭaries in Ynglond:1 thouȝ in latir daies and nameĭlish in summe chyrchis the eukarist is born forth, and the processiou meetith with the eukarist born in a chest among relikis, and in manie placis he is born in a coupe ordeyned thereto.2 Thanne thys: In the daies and in the placis whanne and where the processiou mette in Palmesunday with the nakid crosse or with the chest of rilikis withoute the eukarist, summe of the clerkis weren ordeyned forto stonde before the seid crosse and forto turne hem toward the processiou and seie in singing to al the clergie and peple thys: O Sion mysti douȝter, lo, the King mylde and meke sitting upon beestis cometh to thee; whom the lesson of prophetic hath biforn spokun: This is he which cometh fro Edom, in clothis died with blood, ful comeli in his garnement, passing forth in vertues, and not in hris of bateil, neither in hirs touris.3 This is he which as an innocence lumb is bitraied to

1 In the York Missal (in Dominice. Palm.) printed at Paris in 1538, occurring this rubris: "Si deside, sum ante territorium processio ordinata fuerit, discons, accepta benedicensio a prelate, sum presbytero et subdiacono, et crucifero et coelis in media stans, leget Evangelium S. Matth. xxl.: 'In illo tempore, sum appropriquasset,' &c. The adoration of the Host occurs later in the service.

2 The Salisbury Missal (Paris, 1513.) agrees very nearly with Pecock's account; we have there the following rubric (in Dominice. Palm.):—"Dum distribuantur rami (palmarum sae.) preparetor facetrum cum reliquis, in quo Corpus Christi in pyxide dependeat; . . . . lumen defertut in latera processamente cum crucem desunet et ducibus vexillis praecedentibus." Various anthems accompany these rites, partly taken from Matth. xxl., after which follows the Gospel as before: "Cum appropriquasset Jesus." (Matth. xxl.) The anthems with the notes are given at length in the "Processionale ad usum insign. Ecol. Sarum." (Paris, 1550.)

3 Pecock badly reads terribus.
the death, which is death to death, and a bite to helle, youthful power to lyse bi his death, as blessed pro-
phetis sumtyme sungun in prophetic. And thanne,
this thus seid and sungun fro the clerks in the
crossis bihale to the preestis and lay peple in the
procesioun, the preestis and peple fillen down knelling
with alle the knees to the grounde, seying or singing
or in bothe maners toward the seid discouered crosse
thus: Heil thou, whom the peple of Hebrees meeting
witnesseth to be Iesus, and crien to thee wordis of
helth! Heil liȝt of the world, King of kings, glorie
of heuen, to whom abidith or longith empire, preising,
and worship, here and for evere! Heiloure helthe,
very pees, redempcioun, and vertu, which with thi fre
wil hast goon vndir for us the lawis of death. And

1 "Finito evangello, tres clerici de
secunda forma exunctes ex eadem
processione, habitum non mutato, con-
versi ad populam, stantes ante mag-
nam crucem ex parte occidentali,
simul cantem hunc versum hoc
modo.

"En rex venit manusetus tibi,
Sion filia mystica, humilla sedens
super animalia, quem venturum jam
predixit lectio prophetica."

Various rubrics are prefixed to
the remaining parts of the anthem,
which proceeds thus:

"Salve quem Jesum testatur plebe
Hebraeorum

Obvia cum palmis, tibi clamans
verba salutis.

"Hic est qui de Edom venit tinctis
Bostra vestibus, in stola sua formos-
sus, gradiens virtutibus, non in equis
bellicosis, nee in alis curribus.

"Salve, lux mundi, Rex regum,
gloria oculi,
Cui manet imperium, laus, et
deus, hie et in avrum.

"Hic est ille qui ut agnus insons
morti traditur, more mortis, inferni
morsus, morte donans vivere, ut
quondam beat vates prophetae
prophetice.

"Salve nostra salus, pax vera,
redemptio, virtus,
Ultrum qui mortis pro nobis jura
subsit.

Processionale Sariba, fol. iv. lvi.
The parts here printed as prose
may have been meant for a kind of
barbarous verse, which is perhaps
a little corrupted.

* This is added by a later hand.
* These words occur in the anthem
just quoted. They are to be sung
by the chorus: "In prostracione
deseculando terram prosequatur
resurgendo."—Id. It does not ap-
pear distinctly, from the rubrics,
whether the Host was then borne
in the procession or not; pro-
ably it was, as the bier with the
relics certainly was. The same
words, however, may have been
used in either case in different ages.
open it is that to Crist him self (if he had be there present) thei myßten not have mad more lowßil know-laching that he was her God, than thei at thilk tymes and placis maden to the baer crosse or to the chest of relikis in which the eukarist was not. Wherfore thornz alle tho daies and placis in wiche the eukarist was not borne azens the processioun in Palmesunday, al the peple of the processioun bare hem self and gouverned hem self anentis the crose, euen as thei wolden haue bore and gouverned hem self anentis Crist him self, if he had be visibili present. And so the ij*. premysse of this present xiiij*. argument is trewe.

Also in an othir place of the same processioun, in the daies and placis whanne and where the eukarist came not forth into processioun, children which werren1 sett on hîze sungen toward the crosse and seiden these versis here folowing, Glorie, preising, and honour be to thee, King Crist! Azenzier! to whom children-nys worshiping songe Osanna, the myilde song. An other vers thus: Thou art King of Israel and the noble child of David! Blessid King, which camest in the name of the Lord! An other vers thus: Alle the cumpeny in hîze placis preiseth thee, ech deedli man and allz creaturis. An other vers thus: The peple of Hebrewes came with palmes meeting to thee, and lo we ben at thee with preier, good wil, and sympe! Aftr ech one of these versis the queer of preestis and of clerkis standing in processioun binethe bi the crose singen the firste verse: Glorie, preising, and honor, et cetera.2 Wherebi it is open that the ij*. premysse in the xiiij*. argument is trewe.

---

1 were, MS. (first hand).
2 “Finito regessu (cruciferi, presbyteri, &c.) paeri in altum seu ostium ecclesie canant versum:”

“Gloria, laus, et honor tibi sit,
Rex Christe, Redemptor,
Cui puerile deus prompseit
Osanna pluma.”
Also in an other place of the same processioun it was and is set kept and void in manye churcheis, that the principal crucifix of the churche schal be discovered and shewid bear and nakid to al the peple of the\(^1\) processioun. And in the while the crucifix is in discoveryng the principal preest with the queer schal falle down to grounde at the leste vpon alle the knees and schal singe thus: \textit{Hail our King, the son of David! Azenbier of the world! Whom prophesis before spaken Saviour to come to the house of Israel! Sothely thee into an hoolcem sacrifice the Fadir sende into the world, whom alle holi men fro the bigynnyng of the world aboden! And now, Osanna to the son of David! Blessid be he which cometh in the name of the Lord! Osanna in hiz things!}\(^2\) Also whillis the hool queer of preestis and

\begin{align*}
\text{Chorus cum genuflexione dicat:} \\
& \quad \twoquote{Gloria, laus, et honor tibi sit.}\footnote{Also in egressu processionis praebatus, ter flexis genibus ante crucem discopertam, adorem, dicemus cantando, Ave Rex. Et chorus idem repetat: Ave, Rex nostro, fili David, Redemptor mundi, quem prophetae pradictaverunt Salvatorem domui Israel esse venturum, te enim ad salutarem victuanam Pater misit in mundum: quem expectabant omnes sancti ab origine mundi: et nunc Osanna filio David: benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini: Osanna in excelsis.} \\
\text{Pueri:} \\
& \quad \twoquote{Israel es in Rex, Davidis et in clytas proses, Nomine qui in Domini, Rex benedicte, venias.}\footnote{Pueri: \twoquote{Gloria, laus.}} \\
\text{Chorus:} \\
& \quad \twoquote{Gloria, laus.}\footnote{Chorus: \twoquote{Gloria, laus.}} \\
\text{Pueri:} \\
& \quad \twoquote{Cantis in excelsis te laudat celestis omnis, Et mortalis homo, et onusta create simul.}\footnote{Pueri: \twoquote{Plebs Hebræa tibi cum palmis obvita venit, Cum prece, voto, hymnæis, adsumus ecce tibi.}} \\
\text{Chorus:} \\
& \quad \twoquote{Gloria, laus, et honor.}\footnote{Chorus: \twoquote{Gloria, laus, et honor.}} \\
\end{align*}

\footnote{Missal. ad usum Eccl. Ebor. (Dominico. in ram. Palm.) Paris, 1533. The Host had been a little before carried into the church; whether it was afterward borne in the procession does not appear from the rubrics.\(^1\)\textit{People of the} is added in the margin by a later (\?) hand.\(^2\)}
Clerkis singen thus, al the lay peple in the proces-
sioun knelen doun and knocken her breasitis and
summe fallen so doun that her breasitis and mouthis
touchen the grounde. And more compunecioun, more
deuocioun, and louer submissioun thei myzten not
neither couthen araise forto bi sette vpon Crist him self,
if he were in stide of the crosse so discouered. Where-
fore the secunde premysse of this present xiiiij. argu-
ment is trewe.

The xv. argument is this: To what ever thing
men offeren in lougist wise, comyng toward it bi
creeping, and whose feete thei kissen in deuoutist maner
thei kunnen, thilk thing thei taken for her soue-
reynest and higest Lord. Forwhi ellis it wolde folewe
that ther yn thei diden vnaccordingli and vnsemeli,
and so therefore reprouabili and in such wise that it
were worthi be forbodun. But so it is, that to the
crosse in Good Fridai men comen in louggest wise
creeping on alle her knees, and to this crosse in so
lowze and deuout maner thei offeren, and the feet of
thilk crosse thei in deuoutist maner kissen. Where-
fore thei¹ in these deedis the same crosse for her
worthiest Lord thei taken; or ellis thei ouzten not
so creepe, offer, and kisse, and ouzten be weerned
forto so do.

Miche neede is forto assoile these thre laste prin-
cipal argumentis, that is to seie, the xiiij,"² xiiiij","³
and xv,"⁴ for upon the deedis and gouernauncis of
whiche these thre laste principal argumentis maken
mensioun alle the seid wijters han greet abhominac-
ium; and thei ben out of ese, whanne thai seen
the dedis and gouernauncis doon; and whanne thei
musten nedis for drede do the dedis and gover-

¹ Without doubt either this or thrissente, MS. (later hand, and the following thei should be can-
celled.
² thrissente, MS. (later hand, and on an erasure).
nauncis, as othres men hem doon. For certis thei weenen that al the world couthe not sane thodeedis, as thei ben so doon of othres men, fro ydolatrie. And theryfore mich neede is forto se how these thre laste principal argumentis and semyng evidencis mowe at the fulle be assoild.

\textbf{Xj. Chapter.}

These \textit{xv.} ben the argumentis which the repungners \textit{a}çens the firste and \textit{i}j* afore tretid gouernauncis maken \textit{a}çens the clergie holding with the same gouernauncis. And if these argumentis mowe be clerli assoild, sotheli alle tho repungners ben openli ouerthrowe: and if these \textit{xv.} argumentis mowe not be clerli assoild, thanne thei letten the\textsuperscript{1} firste and \textit{i}j*. principal conclusionis biforn sett of ymagis, and the firste and \textit{i}j*. conclusiouns biforn sett of pilgrymagis. But that these \textit{xv.} argumentis mowe clerli be assoild, y schal now next here aftir withoute eny doute make open.

And firste, as for answere and assoyling to the firste argument, y procede thus. The firste argument and his strengthe hangith here vpon, that Holi Scripture and othre deouote writtingis red and herd schulden\textsuperscript{2} be sufficient wey and meene into al profite into which ymagis and pilgrymagis seruen. And if this be denied and be proued vntrew, thanne the firste argument lackith al his strengthe. And that al such seid writtingis (not oonli for that nowhere nyʒ alle men kunnen rede hem, but also thouʒ alle men, wommen, and children couthen rede hem) at the beste sufficen not

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1} the is interlineated by a later (\textdegree) \textsuperscript{2}schulde, MS. (first hand).}

hand.
into al the good and profite, into whiche mowen suf-
fice bothe togidere tho writingis and vsing of ymagis
and pilgrimagis doing, y prowe thus: Mankinde in
this lijf is so frell, that forto make into him sufficient
remembraunce of thingis to be profitabli of him re-
membrid he nedith not oonli heereable rememoratijf
signes, (as ben Holis Scripture and other deuoute
writingis,) but he nedith also therwith and ther to
seable rememoratijf signes; as experience wole weel
schewe, that thou$ mankinde take al the avautage
whiche$ he may forto plucke him vpward and forto
holde him upward in good thou$tis, (bi seable signes
of ymagis and picturis as eke bi heereable signes of
writingis,) al is litil yno$. And also, if heereable re-
memoratijf signes hadden be sufficient to Cristen men
into al her nedeful goostli rememrauncingis, wherto
schulde Crist haue $eue to Cristen men vndir co-
moundement seable rememoratijf signes, as ben hise
sacramentis of the Newe Testament? Alle men muste
needis graunte, that but if Cristen men hadden had
neede to seable rememoratijf signes ouer and with
heereable signes of writingis, which also Crist proudid
to us, ellis he wolde not haue bounden Cristen men
forto vse seable rememoratijf signes, whiche ben the
seid sacramentis. Wherfore foleth with that writingis,
whiche ben heereable rememoratijf signes to Cristen
men, sufficent not into al the remembranuing which
is nedeful to Cristen men; and so it wherbi the firste
argument Schulde take al his strengthe is take awaye.

Perauenture summen wolen answere here and seie
that so 9 manye kindis of seable rememoratijf signes
and tho oonli, which Crist him siff in special assignd
Cristen men to haue and vse, Cristen men ou$ten haue

---

1 whiche is added by a later (?) hand.
2 so is interlineated by a later (?) hand.
and vse, and no mo; neither other seable rememoratijf signes; (and tho ben the sacramentis whiche he wole to be had and vaid, with the hereable rememoratijf signes of deuoute writtingis;) and wole not that any seable rememoratijf signes of mannys fynding schulde be take into vce. That this answere is a feyned and forgid thing bi pure voluntee withoute eny for him sufficient evidence, y proue thus: Bi lijk wise it myȝte, the, and schulde be seid, that oonli tho heereable signes which Crist him sylf oderneyd and assigned and purueied to Cristen peple, as ben the bokis of the Bible, schulde be take into vce of Cristen men forto be to hem heereable rememoratijf signes; and so no deuoute writing mad bi man schulde be take of any Cristen man to be an heereable rememoratijf signe: which is nedis vntrewe. Forwhi thanne the passiouns of Seintis and her holy lyues and conuersaciouns and the deedis of eldriholi men schulden\(^1\) not be write, that we myȝten or schulden therbi remembre us upon thingis passaid so necessarie of us to be remembrid. And therfore vntrewe it is that Crist in this that he ȝaue to us these seable rememoratijf signes, he excludid fro oure hauyng and vsing alle otherse seable rememoratijf signes.

Also thus: Bi this that Crist wolde us vse seable rememoratijf signes, we mowe holde that the vce of seable rememoratijf signes is leeful and expedient; and herewith Crist restreynd not us fro vce of eny otherse seable rememoratijf signes. Forwhi nowhere it can be founde, that he seide we schulden\(^2\) vce noon otherse seable signes into rememoracioun than the sacramentis. Wherfore forto vse alle otherse maners of seable signes into rememoracioun and re-

\(^1\) schulde, M.S. (first hand).

\(^2\) schulde, M.S. (first hand), apparently.
membraunce, whiche doom of resoun forbedith not, it is in oure liberte forto vse. Also ellis we schulden holde us siff in a bondage ażens oure liberte, of which bondage we han no ground neither sufficient euycence; and ʒit al such bondage the seid repugners holden to be ażens the fredom of the Gospel and of the newe lawe; and so bi this answere thei schulden be contrarie to hem siff.

Confirmancioun herto is this: Therfore it is in oure fre liberte forto vse other heereable signes alloweable bi resoun into oure remembraunce making thanne the writings of the Bible, bi cause that it is not founde ouʒwhere in Holi Scripture neither in doom of resoun, that it is forbodun to us forto vse the other writings dyuerse fro Holi Scripture which Crist pro-uidid to us. Wherfore, bi lijk skile, by cause it is not founde ouʒwhere in Holi Scripture neither in doom of reson, that it is to us forbode vse other seable signes into oure remembring than ben the sacramentis whiche Crist ʒauе to us, (as therto helpful weel the firste and ii.j. principal conclusionis of ymagis bfore sett in the ii.j., ii.j., and iii.j. chapitris of this present ij. partie,) it folerith that it is leeful to us forto vse other seable signes into oure remembraunce than the sacramentis ben.

Also thus: What euer is not forbodun to be vsid is leeful ynuʒ to be vsid: but so it is, that forto vse other seable signes than the sacramentis is not more forbodun than forto vse other heereable signes than Holi Scripture; ʒhe, and nouʒwhere it is forbodun such seid seable signes dyuerse fro Cristis sacramentis be vsid, as it is proued bfore bi the now spokun firste and ii.j. principal conclusionis of ymagis. Wherfore needis folerith that we ben fre with oute synne for to vse hem.

1 be, MS. (first hand).
Also thus: Thou heedable signes availen to Cristen men into manye pointis and godis of remembrauncing into whiche seable signes not so myche availen, þit aþenward seable signes availen to Cristen men (whether thei ben lettrid or not lettrid) into manye greet availis of remembrauncing, into whiche not availen or not so soone and so myche and so weel availen heedable signes, that is to see writingsis upon the same maters, as anon aftir schal be proudis. Wherfore folewith that thou þ þ writingis availen bi sumwey more into remembrauncing than ymagis and pilgrimagis availen, þit the visis of ymagis and of pilgrimagis ouþten to be not leid aside or away, but ouþten be take in to vce with the vce of writingis, that the hool profile of remembring which mai come bi hem both to gidere be not lost and vnhad, but that bothe to gidere profitis be had.

That riþ synguler avauntagis of remembring comen bi ymagis and pilgrimagis which not comen or not so weel and so soone comen bi writingis, I prowe thus: If a man wolde be remembrid on the passioun of Seint Petir or of Seint Poul or of the holi lijf of Seint Nicholas, certis thou þ he couthe rede in a book the storie therof, þit he schulde rede vj. or vij. or mo leveis in the book, eer he schulde bringe into knowing or into remembraunce so myche as he may knowe and remembre ther of in a litil and myche lasse while bi siþt of the iþe in biholding an ymage coruen with purtenancis sett aboute him, or in biholding a storie openli ther of purtreied or peintid in the wal or in a clooth. As that this is trewe y comytte me to the doom of experience and of assay, and to the experience of this point,—that the iþe siþt schewith and bringith into the ymaginacioun and into the mynde withynne in the heed of a man myche mater and long mater sooner, and with lasse labour and trauel and peine, than the heering of the eere
dooth. And if this now seid is trewe of a man which can rede in bokis stories writun, that myche sooner and in schortir tyme and with lasse labour and pein in his Brayn he schal come into remembranence of a long storie bi siȝt, than bi the heering of othere mennys reding or bi heering of his owne reding; miche rather this is trewe of alle tho persoones whiche kunne not rede in bokis, namelich sithen thei schulen not fynde men so redi for to rede a dosen leeuys of a book to hem, as thei schulen fynde redy the wallis of a chyrche peintid or a clooth steyned or ymagis spred abrood in dyuerse placis of the chyrche.

Also, in biholdynge bi siȝt of ȝe upon manye dyuerse stories or ymagis in the chyrche a man schal in a litle while be remembrid now upon the passioun of Seint Laurence, and now anoon aftir upon the passioun of Seint Steuen, now anoon aftir vpon the passioun of Petir, and so forth of manye chaungis. And if in thilk while in the chyrche were not ymagis and picturis, he schulde not bi reding in a book in xx. sithis lenger tyme come into so miche remembranence, and namelich of so manye dyuerse passiouns to be rad; namelich sithen the reder schal not fynde writingis of alle tho passiouns saue in dyuerse bokis, or at the leste in dyuerse placis of oon book; and eer oon of tho writingis schulde be ouer rad perfitt, a gretter tyme schulde be spend than in the perfitt ouer seing of alle tho seid passiouns.

Also ful ofte, whanne a man cometh to chyrche and wole be remembrid vpon suche now seid thingis, his heed is feeble for labour or studie before had or for sikenes or for age; and certis if he schulde be aboute forto remembre him vpon suche seid thingis, and that bi calling in to mynde what he hath biforn thilk

---

1 *the chirche,* M.S. (first hand).
day red or herd red in book,

 which he could

 make on what

 he had before

 heard, or read,

 or soon.

 Also images may

 be seen in open

 churches every

 hour of the day,

 but books are not

 so easily access-

 able to all.

 Also here with all into the open siêt of ymagis in

 open churche alle peple (men and wommen and

 children) mowe come whanne euere thei wolen in ech

tyme of the day, but so mowe thei not come in to

 the vce of bokis to be deluyered to hem neither to

 be red before hem; and therfore as forto soone and

 ofte come into remembrance of a long mater bi eoch

 oon persoon, and also as forto make that the mo

 persones come into remembrance of a mater, ymagis

 and picturis seruen in a specialer maner than bokis

 doon, thou in an other maner ful substantiiali bokis

 seruen bettir into remembrance of the same

 materis than ymagis and picturis doon; and therfore

 thou writingis seruen weel into remembrance


1 the book, MS. (first hand).

2 ymage, MS. (first hand).

3 to be, MS. (first hand).

4 to come, MS.; but the to has been

 erased.
upon the before seid thingis; sit not at the ful, forwhi the bokis han not the avail of remembrancing now seid whiche ymagis han.

Confirmation into this purpos mai be this: Whanne the dai of Seint Kateryn schal be come,1 marke who so wole in his mynde alle the bokis which ben in Londoun writun upon Seint Kateryn’s lijf and passiouuns, and y dare wel seie that thouz ther were x. thousind mo bokis writun in Londoun in thilk day of the same Seintis lijf and passiou, thei schulden not so moche turne the citee in mynde of the holi famose lijf of Seint Kateryn and of her dignitee in which sche now is, as dooth in ech zeer the goinge of peple in pilgrimage to the College of Seint Kateryn bisidis London, as y dare putte this into iugement of whom euer hath seen the pilgrimage doon in the vigil of Seint Kateryn bi persoones of London to the seid College. Wherfore riht greet special commoditees and profitis into remembrance making ymagis and pilgrimagis han and doon, whiche writingis not so han and doon.

Another confirmation into this same purpos is this: In Londoun sumtyme was a bishop whose name was Gravesend,2 and which lijth now buried in the chirche of Seint Poul at London in the pleyn pament of the chirche weeel binethe the myddis of the chirche. This bishop whanne he was Chaunceler of Ynglond dide grete benefetis to the citee of Londoun, and ordeyned therfore that the meir and the aldir men of Londoun with manye mo notable persoones of craftis in Londoun schulden at dyuerse tymes in the zeer come openli to the chirche of Poulis,3 and stonde in euereither side of his sepulcre bi ij. longe rewis, and

1 schal come, MS. (first hand, which however has inserted the sign of omission).
2 *Stephen Gravesend was Bishop of London from A.D. 1319–1336.
3 *Sein Poulis, MS. (first hand).
seie De profundis for his soul. Now, thou, it so had be that this bishop hadde not intendid this to be doon for him into this ende, that his greet benefeting which he did to London schulde be had and contynued in mynde of the citezains; but that he entendid oonli this, that preiers ther bi schulden zeerli be mad the sikirer for his soul, (as dout is to me, whether he entendid these bothe effectes or the oon of hem oonli :) zit treuth is, that if the seid bishop wolde haue ordeyned xx. thousand bokis to be writun of his seid benefeting, and wolde haue ordeyned hem be spred abrode in dyuerse placis of the cite, and forto haue be cheyned in the dyuerse placis of the cite, that of the peple who so wolde myste rede ther in the seid benefeting, thilk multitude of bokis schulden not haue contynued so myche and so weel into this day the mynde of thilk bishopis benefeting, as the seid solempe zeerli goyng bi ij. tymes in eeh zeer (doon bi the meir and aldir men of Londoun) hath do and schal do in eeh zeer to come. Wherefore needis it is trewe, that writing mai not conteyne and comprehende in him al the avail which the siȝt and the biholding of the iȝen mai zeue and is redi forto zeue. And so bi al this, what is now seid, anserwed, and proved aȝens the firste argument, it is open that the firste argument procedith not into his entent.

xij. Chapiter.

For answere to the ij° argument it is to wite that bishhopis and other preestis and clerkis ben not bounde more or fother for to preche or in other wise teche her peple vndir hem, than that therwith tho same bishopis and other clerkis attende to hem siff

1 to be, MS. (first hand).
bothe for gouernaunce of her bodies in helthe and
strength, and for gouernaunce and reule of her liffode
into the fynding of hem sylf and of summe seruauntis
longing to hem, and for gouernaunce of her owne
goostli conversacioun to be led anentis God and anentis
hem sylf and anentis her othere neibouris and
anentis her sugettis, in manye maners mo than whanne
he couplith with hem forto teche hem. Forwhi thou; in
dew and resonable vnnderstanding tau̇t in othere placis
of my writtingis ech man ou̇te loue his neibour as
him sylf; zit every man ou̇te loue him sylf more than
an other man; and therof folowith this, that every
man ou̇te attende 1 to him sylf in goostli and bodili
needis more than to eny other man. And therfore
ther was neuere lawe of resoun neither of God zit
maad forto binde a curat forto attende to his suget
so myche as the curat is bounde forto attende to
himsell; neither so myche as the suget is bounde forto
attende to him sylf.

Wherto accordith weel what Poul seith ‡ Th. iiiij. č., 
Attende to thi sylf and to doctrine, as thou; he
schulde meene that for the attendaunce which Bischop
Thimothi schulde make to his peple he schulde not
leeue the dew attendaunce bifoere to be maad to him
sylf. And that Poul meened so as y haue now seid, it
is open by Poul him sylf there. Forwhi, whanne Poul
had seid to Bischop Tymothi thus: Take tent to thi sylf
and to doctrine, (that is to seie of othere persones,) he
seith forwith 3 there thus: Be bisie in hem (that is
to seie, in tent to him sylf and in doctrine to othere),
for thou doing these thingis, (that is to seie, tente to
thi sylf and doctrine to othere,) schalt make thi sylf
saaf and hem that heeren thee. Lo, Sir, bi thi this it is
open Poul for to haue meened that ech man ou̇te more

1 to attende, MS. (first hand). 3 Perhaps a clerical error for
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others, and therefor the clerisy
have many more
duties than merely to teach
their people.
Hence the use of
other means of
instruction is not
set aside when
the clergy have
done their duty
as teachers.
couseite that he him self be saaf than that any other person be saaf; so he ouȝte more tente ȝewe to his owne good lyuynge, (which stondith in many mo pointis anentis God and anentis him self than in teching and reuling his neiþbour oonli,) than he out ȝewe tent to the good lyuynge of any other person. And herof folewith in open resoun that sum curat ouȝte and is bounde bi lawe of God forto ȝewe double1 or treble more tent to him self ward and double or treble lasse tent to doctrine or to his sugetis lyuynge, than sum other curat is bounde; and that for as miche as sum curat is in double or treble more sijk, more freol, or in sum other wise hath in double or in treble more needes forto ȝewe tent to him self than sum other curat hath. And ȝit euereither of hem, in so reuling him anentis himself and hise sugettis, is weel allowid of God.

And certis the vnknowing of this now taulȝ causith ouer myche vnweis hasti iugement and ouer myche vnweis babediting in the lay peple anentis curatis. And so whanne al the attendaunce is doon which resoun or any other lawe of God or of man bindith a curat forto do anentis his sugetis biasidis the attendaunce which the same curat is bounde forto make aboute him self, thilk attendaunce which he is bounde to make aboute hise sugetis is ouer litil into the ful attendaunce which muste be maad aboute the same sugetis, thouȝ thei were as fewe as fourti or twenti; so that forto make the ful attendaunce the sugetis musten helpe in her side, and musten the lenger parti of attendaunce make aboute hem self, as bi reding in her bokis at her owne housis, or bi heering suche bookis red of her neiþboris, (as y hane proued in the book clepid The Bifore-crier,) and also

1 doube, MS. (first hand).
bi voce of preisyngis and of preyers, and bi voe of worshipping doon bi seable rememoratif signes. And so what is take in the bigynnyng of the ij. argument for his substance and strengthe is vntrewes, that if bishopis and othere curatis diden her dew diligence in teching her peple, thilk peple schulde haue no nede or profit forto haue and voe ymagis and make pil-grimagis. And therefore the same ij. argument not proueth neither procedith. For even as a nurisch or a modir is not bounde forto alwey and for euere fede her children and putte meete in her mouthis, but sche muste teche hem that thei fede hem sifl, (and in lijk maner doon foulis to her briddis,) so a curat mai not neither ouzte forto alwey rynge at the seris of hise suggettis; but he may so bigynne, and afterward he ouzte teche hem that thei leerne bi hem sifl and practize meenis into leernyng of good lyuyng bi hem sifl; and elli he schal make hem to be euere trauantts in the scole of God, and litil good forto perfittl kunne and litel good forto perfittl wirche.

Answer to the ij. argument schal be this: The ij. premisse of the ij. argument in which it is seid thus, "that ech Cristen man is a perfiter and a fuller " and a spedier ymage of Crist than is eny stok or " stoon graued," is vntrewes; and threfore the ij. argu- ment bildid ther upon lackith strengthe for to proue his entent. That this now rehercید ij. premysse is vntrewes, y schewe thus: Thre condiciouns muste be had in a thing, that he be a perfiter and a ful and a spedy ymage or representer or remembrer of another thing bi wey of ymage being of the same other thing.

Oon condicioun is, that he be lijk myche or sum- what to the othir thing, and the more lijk he be to

---

1 the voe, MS. (first hand).
the other thing, the more able he is, as bi that, forto be the perfite and ful ymage of the other thing.

The iij. condicioun is, that he be deputid or assigned forto represente and bringe into mynde the other thing. This condicioun dooth ful myche that a thing be ymage of an other thing. Forwhi whanne a thing is ful litil lijk to another thing, as the visible eukarist to the persoon of Crist, and the water of baptim to the sepulcre of Crist; zit the deputacioun and the assignyng bi which the visible eukarist is ordeyne and assigned forto represente the bodi of Crist and forto remembre vs upon the persoon of Crist and his benefetis, (as it is open Luk xxijst. 5. and f. Cor. xijst. 5.) and the deputacioun or ordinaunce bi which the water of baptim is assigned for to represente to us the deeth and the sepulcre of Crist, (as Poul seith and meeneth Rom. vjst. 6. toward the bigynnyng,) maken hem to be ymagis of Cristis persoon and of his sepulcre; and if tho deputaciouns or assignaciouns weren not, tho seid sensible signes were litil able or not able forto represente to us these othere now seid thingis. And therfore this iij. condicioun is a spedi condicioun and a mystii forto helpe that a thing be a perfite and ful ymage of an othr thing.

The iij. condicioun is, that the thing so deputid forto represente to us the othr thing, haue not (at least for thilk while) eny plites or officis or deputaciouns or disposiciouns, wherbi we muste haue manye othere entermetingis with him than the entermeting of remembering oonli; and that he haue not with us eny entermetingis saue the entermeting of representing oonli. Forwhi, if the thing which is deputid forto represente to us an other thing be such that we haue manye vsis of it and many entermetingis with it

1 Written on an erasure. Pro- 2 or, MS. bably we should read eny.
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dyuers fro remembring bi it the othir thing, oure witt schal falle so miche and so ofte vpon the same thing in othere wisis than as he is representing the other thing, that he schal seelde among be occupied of us as representing the othir thing. Forwhi he muste be considerid of us in manye othere maners than in the maner of representing; and therfore at the leest needis it muste falle, that he represente not to us the othir thing so ofte and so stabili, as if he were in noon othere office of us to be take than in office of representing the other thing.

Now, Sir, herbi it is open that no thing is so verrilli an ymage of an other thing if he haue not these iiij. condicions, as he schulde be if he haue these iiij. now seid condicions. And thanne fether thus: But so it is, that no Cristen man now lyuyng hath these iiij. condicions anentis the persoon of Crist in his manhode, as hath a stok or a stoon graued into the likenes of Crist hanging on a cros nakid and woundid, with othere thersto purtenauncis, (as it is open ynoy, to ebery man thersto weel biholdeing and assaiyng thorou; alle these iiij. condicions to gidere;) except whanne a quyk man is sett in a pley to be hangid nakid on a cros and to be in semyng woundid and scourgid. And this biffalith ful seelde and in sewe places and cuntrees. Wherfore no man lyuyng and walking in erthe and occupyiyn his sylf and occupied of othere men, as othere men lyuen and walken and occupiyn and ben occupied, is so perfit and so ful an ymage of Crist crucified or of Crist doing this miracle or that myracle, as graued stok or stoon thersto schapun is. And her bi it is open that the iiij. argument hath no quyk foot for to go. Fy fy fy therfore vpon presumpoion and obstynaci in the lay party, of whiche y herde summe seie with a strong herte, (as thou; he hadde be ful of kunnyng, whanne he was therof ful empti,) that a greet heresie it is for to
holde that a stok or a stoon graued is a Fuller and a
perfit yemage of Crist than is a Cristen man. Certis,
as it is ful open bi what is now seid for answere to
the iiij. argument, ltil wist he what longith to a
thing, that he be a perfit yemage of an other thing.

xiiij. Chapiter.

The iiij. argument leeneth here to, that bi cause
God is lijk weel in his substance and being every
where, therfore God schulde be lijk redi forto zeue
his gracis to aekers and sechers everywhere; and that
also therfore no place in erthe is holier than an other
place, and noon yemage of a thing is holier than an
other yemage of the same thing. But certis al this
is vntrewe and to be denied. And cause whi God
wole zeue hise gracis rather in oon place to sechers
after hise gracis than in an other place, is this: God
chesith therto, that is to seie, forto zeue hise gracis
oon place before an other place, as it is before proued
in the viij. chapiter of this present ij. partie. And
if this be trewe, certis therof foloweth that bi cause
God chesith oon place before an other forto therinne
wirche holi deedis of myraclis and of gracis more
than in an othir place, therfore the oon place is
holier than the other place is. And if this be
trewe, certis so bi lijk skile, bicause that God chesith
oon yemage before an other forto wirche bi it or
before it miraclis and gracis more than bi an other
ymage or more than before another yemage, therfore
it is riʒtli to be seid that oon yemage of Marie is
holier than an other yemage of Marie is, and oon
ymage of a crucifix is holier than an other yemage of

1 a othir, MS.  
2 is is interlineated by a later (?) hand.
the same crucifix is. And that God cheasith (so as now is seid) oon place bifoere an other and oon ymage bifoere an other, it is vnndoutabili schewid and proued bifoere in the place now alleggd, that is to seie, in the viij*. chapiter of this ij* partie and in therof the iiij*, vi*, and vij* reulis or supposiciouns, whiche wolden be relierid to ech man which wole obiecte bi the seid iiij* argument. And herbi the strengthe of the iiij* argument is leid aside.

The conceit of the comoun peple which thei hadden, that no place is holier than an other place is, and in lijk maner that noon ymage is holier than an othir ymage is, and that God chesith not more oon place than an othir, neither oon ymage more than an othir, forto helpe mannis needis the rather, hath be a ful greet lett to the comoun peple 1 forto allowe the hauyng and the vee of ymagis and the doing of pil-grimagis. But now sitthen this conceit is vnndoutabili schewid to be vntrewwe, it is to hope that (as bi eny strengthe of the iiij* argument) thei schulen no longer so erre, aftar this answere schal be cleerli' opened to hem.

For the more cleering of this present answere, it is to wite that a thing is holii in three maners. In oon maner (which is propir maner of speking) a thing is holii, for that it doith good moral deeds; and in this maner God is holii, and angel is holii, and mannyes soul and man is holii, if and whanne he doith eny good moral deeds. And in this maner of holines no thing is holii saue it which worchith holili, that is to seie, which wirchith bi fre choise what resoun deemeth to be doon for God: and that is to wirche morali weel. And so in this maner no place is holii, neither eny ymage is holii, neither eny other thing than which

---

There are three ways in which a thing may be holy: and first and properly when it performs moral actions. This kind of holiness implies free will in the agent as in God, men, and angels.

---

1 peple is added by a later hand.
hath fre wil to do moral yuel and good in the maner now seid. Of this maner of holynes spekith Holi Writt in manye placis, as Leuitic. v^t. 3, where God seith thus: I am holi, which make zow holi. Also Leuit. the xj^t. 7. God seide: Be ze holi, for y am holi. Also Exodi xxij^t. 7. God seide thus: Ze schulen be holi men to me.

In an other maner a thing is holi, for it is chosun that in it or bi it or with it or bfore it a persoon wirche such seid holi deedis; and that whethir the wircher be God, aungel, or man: for skile is ther noon that a man bi suche gode deedis schulde make a place to be holi, but that God and aungel bi her moraly vertuose wirching of miraclis schulde in lijk maner make a place to be holi. And in this maner oon place is holier than an other place is, and oon ymage is holier than an other ymage is, bi cause in oon place more grace and more other benefet into mannis profite is doon than in an other place, and bi oon ymage more grace and more other benefet into mannis profit is zouun than bi an othir ymage or than bfore^1 an other ymage; and therto God cheath the place and the ymage. Wherto ful weel accordith Holi Scripture, Genea. xxvij^t. 7, where it is seid, that whanne Jacob wente forto seche to him a wiff, he came after the sunnys going don into a place in which he leide him don forto there slepe and reste in the ny^t folewing; and he in thilk reste hadde suche visiouns maad to him bi God, as it is seid there, that whanne he wokse he seide these wordis: Sotheli the Lord is in this place and y kewe not! And he dредing seide: Hou gastful is this place! here is noon other thing no but the hous of God, and the zate of heuen!

^1 bi, MS. (first hand).
Also Exodi iij. c., whanne Moysees kepte the schein of Ietro preest of Madian, he came with his schein to the Mount of Oreb. And God apperid to him in the flamme of fier fro the myddis of a busche, and he siz that the busche brennt, and hit was not therbi vaastid. Therfore Moyses seide: I schal go and y schal see this gret siz, whi the busche is not vaastid. Sotheli the Lord seid that Moyses zede to se, and he clepid Moysees fro the myddis of the busche, and seide: Neize thou not hidir, but vndo the echo of thi feet; for the place in which thou stondist is holi lond, et cetera. Certis no man may seie that this holines of place came yn bi sum cerimonie of Iewis lawe, for euereither of these stories were doon eer eny lawe was zoun to the Iewis: and therfore this holynes of the iij. maner was neuere reuokid bi Cristis passioun.

In the iij. maner a thing is holi, (thou, also in an vnappropriiner, in reward of the first maner;) whanne it is departid and take fro worldli and fleischli vce, and is deputid and assigne to more goosstli vce anentis God than it was biforn. And in this maner brede, water, erthe, or place, hous, candil, oile, vestimentis, vessels, and suche other thingis, whanne ouer hem ben blessingis maad, (that is to seie, whanne ouer hem preiers be mad,) and thei ben aliened and take fro wordli vsis in whiche thei were biforn, and thei ben assigned and deputid into more goosstli vsis, (that is to seie, that men vse hem afterward in a certaine office of worshipping toward God,) ben holi. In this maner Seint Dionysye, the disciple of Seint Poul, in his book Of the Chirchis Ierarchie clepith alle suche

1 whanne ecure, MS. (first hand).
2 "Τά μὴ αἰείθεσι σημάτα τῶν νοστῶν ἀπεικονισμένα, καί ἐν αὐτᾶ τῇ κερα-

γωγῇ καὶ ὄψις τὰ δὲ νοστὰ τῶν κατ' αὐτάν ιεραχικῶν ἄρχῆ καὶ ἐπι-

thingis in this wise deputid holi. And in this maner God clepid the clothing of the bischop and of the preestis in the olide lawe holi; and also the tabernacle, the temple, alle the vessellis and purtenaucis ther to weren clepid holis, as it is open ynow; in manye placis of the Oold Testament. And this is ynow; for answere to the iiiijth argument.

That the viijth argument goith not forth y schewe thus:

If the viijth argument were good, thanne this argument were good. The feendis willis and hisse deceitis ben fer awey to be fled; but so it is, that it hath ofte been knowun that feendis han spoke in men and wommen, as witness herof is had in the Gospels in dyuerse placis, and Acte xvj. c. of a zong womman, which gate myche money to her maistris bi answereis which the feend zauo and spake in hir and bi hir. And alle men mowe soone vnestrondde, that not but forto deceyue men the feend wolde take such an ocupaicoun vpon him, sitthen he is euereoure enemy and not oure freende as Peter witnesseith i. Petri viij. c. Wherfore no man speke or enterne or haue to do with any other man or womman, or bileuee and truste to eny man or womman; bi cause that it is founde that the feend hath spoke bi men and wommen, euon as he hath spoke bi ymagis. Certis this argument is lijk to the viijth argument, as ech man mai soone se; and this argument is nauȝ and hath no strengthe. Wherfore neither the viijth argument hath strengthe.

This therfore is the consideracioun and the observaunce, awaite, and diligence which is to be had in such mater. It is diligenti to be awaitid whether the feend entermetith him with eny thing, (as ymage not so much seem to have any par-

\[\text{not so much seem to have any particular passage in his eye, as to note the fact that Pseudo-Dionysius applies such epithets as } \text{epos, Deos,} \]

\[\text{Epos, to the chrisim, the altar, the eucharistic elements, &c. See pp.} \]

\[\text{224, 295, 339, &c.}\]

guernaunce in the world ouzte be holde, meyntened, and kept; (for no guernaunce in craft or out of craft is, but that of it cometh yuel;) and if alle the guernaunce schulden thfore be forborne, no good gueernaunce schulde be had and vseid. And thfore azens this myschaunce that yuel cometh out of the good, the discresioun and wijsdom wolde be had, which is had if a man that tilieth his gardein or feeld and sowith it with good seed, certis thou3 there growe manye wedis bi occasioun of his planting, deluyng, ering, and sowing, zit he woole not ceeze, but he woole drawe vp the wedis and let the herbis stonde; so it muste be in this present purpos, and ellis, if for yuel which cometh bi occasioun of good we wolen forbere the good, thanne we schulen3 lacke al good. And this is ynow for answere to the vi. argument, thou3 miche more therto perteynyng is seid biore toward the eende of the first parti, and affir in the iij. parti of this book, the [viiij.] chaperter. And as to the text of Seint Poul i. Tessalonic. v. i. whanne he seith thus: Abatene zou from al yuel spice; the dewe vnderstanding is this: that we abstene us fro ech spice of moral yuel. And open it is to ech leerned man, that ech spice of moral yuel is moral yuel, and is a morali yuel spice: and Goddis forbode, but that ech man schulde be aboute forto abstene him fro ech such spice; forwhi suche spicis ben glo- tenie, lecherie, pride, envie, and suche othere. But this makith not that a man abstene3 fro eny morali good spice or fro eny spice of moral good, thou3 therof, as bi occasioun, cometh sum moral yuel. And thfore thilk text of Seint Poul is not forto helpe forth the vi. argument.

1 that is added in the margin.
2 schulden, MS. (first hand, apparendy).
3 abatene him, MS. (first hand).
The Second Part.

XIII. Chapter.

For answere to the vij. argument y schal sette forth

The Seventh
Argument
Against Images
And Piissing.

Suyne, it is so, that ij. dyuerse werkis of Goddis lawe
and serviciis ben euene like present in oon and the
same while after her alle dewe circumstauncis to a
man forto be doon and wrouzt of him in the same
while, and oon of hem is myche better then the
other; certis thanne if the man, to whom these werkis
in lijk wise so profren hem silf to be doon, chese not
to do the better werk biforn the lasse good werk, he
is not to be ther yn presid, as y haue schewid bi
ensamiple of Holi Writt and bi ensamiple out of
Holi Writt in The Crier 1 and in othere placis of my
writings.

The ij. reule is this: Whanne ij. werkis of Goddis
lawe and service thoruz out alle her dewe to hem
circumstauncis ben not lijk present to the doer, but
the lasse good werk is so present to the doer and the
better good werk is not so present; certis than, if the
man to whom this lasse good werk is so present
chese not and take not the lasse good werk for the
while, he is not to be presid. Forwhi ellis, as for
thilk while, he schal lese the bothe seid godis, that
is to seie, the bettir and the lasse good.

The iiij. reule is this: It is not in eny manyns
power forto haue for ech while the better werkis of
Goddis lawe to him present, whilis lasse good werkis
of Goddis lawe ben present to him and profren hem
silf to be doon of him.

The iiiij. reule folowing of these iiij. before going
Corolary from
these rules. A
man must not

---

1 This is no doubt the same work as The Before-crier mentioned
above, p. 216.
a good werk, schulde bithenke him whethir he in thilk tyme mai do a better werk, and schulde studie ther aboute; certis he schulde haue so manye thouztis and studies, that he schulde leue the good werk vn-
doon which for the while proifith him silf to be doon, and he schulde lese the other werk aboute which he studieth whether it mai as for thanne be doon or no. And therfore, riȝt as a good huswif in an hous now doith oon werk now an othir werk, as thei kommen to hond; and now schë brewith, now schë bakith, now schë sethith, now schë rostith, now schë weischith disschis, now schë berith aischis out, now schë straw-
ith rischis in the hallis; and thouz these werkis ben not like gode and like worthi into the servise of hir husbonde, ßit schë ouȝte do the oon with the other as thei komen forth to be doon in dyuere whilis, and ellis if schë schulde seie to bir self: "Y wol not "do this, perauinture y schal fynde a better werk," schë schulde make badde husewijfschip, and in thilk studie schë schulde ofte be troublid, ßhe, and be idil fro al good werk, and ofte be biglidi in cheeing the lass good in stide of the better good to be doon:— so a seruaunt of God in the goostli hous of the Vni-
versal Chirche muste bere him, now occupiyng him in smale werkis whiche for the while ben present, and now occupiyng him with grettir, whanne thei profren hem at good leiser to be doon; and ellis he schal ful ofte bi masing studie be ful idil, whanne he myȝte be weel and fruytfulli occupied. And thus myche is ynoȝ for answer to the viȝ* argument: not with-
standing that herto y haue answerid sufficienli othir wise in The book of worschiping, the ¹partie, the ¹chapiter, bi a likenes that a man is not sufficienli clothid in bodili maner, but if he haue on

¹ Spaces left in the MS. for the numbers.
him his scho, his slyue, his coot; as he hath on him better and costiooser and preciooser garnementis, as ben his gowne, his cloke, his hood, his cappe: and, in like maner, a man is not sufficientli araith with ver-
tues of Goddis lawe, but if he be araith with smale
and lowe vertues in meryt, as with grace\(^1\) and hiȝe
vertues in meryt. And therefore no more for answere
to this vij\(^*\) argument here.

For answere to the viij\(^*\) argument, the firste pre-
mysse, upon whiche hangith the strengthe of the viij\(^*\)
argument, is to be denied for vntrew. Forwhi biforn
in the [vj\(^*\)]\(^2\) chapter of this ij\(^*\) partie it is seid,
(ȝhe, and biforn in the first partie of this book fro
the bigynnyng bi xij. conclusions it is proued,
and the same is proued in the first parte of the
book clepid The iust apprising of Holi Scripture,
that more than xx\(^4\) partie of Cristis moral lawe
and servuce stondith in deedis and gouernauncis
knoweable and groundable in doom of resoun, and
whiche ben not groundid in Holi Scripture; thowz
summe of hem or alle perauntere ben witnesseid aser
and in general bi Holi Scripture. And therfore,
needis the seid firste premyssse is vntrew. And
trewwe it is, that what euere resoun deemeth, coun-
seilith, allowith, or approueth to be doom is moral lawe
of God and his plesaunt servuce, thowz in caas it
can not be founde speciali witnesseid bi Holi Scrip-
ture. And therfore, sithen the vee of ymagis and
the doing of pilgrimagis ben sufficientli groundid in
doom of weel disposed resoun, thei ben to be take as
deedis of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt ser-
vice, thowz thei weren neither in general neither in
special touchid bi Holi Scripture. Neuertheles in the

\(^1\) So the MS., but the sense
\(^2\) A space left in the MS. for the
requires grete.

number. See p. 172.
firste partie of this present book, the [xix.][1] chapiter it is proved that priuely and impliedli thei ben witnessid bi Holi Scripture, and also biforn in the [ij.][1] chapiter of this present ij. partie it is opened that thei ben expresseli witnessid bi Holi Scripture; and theryfore needis the viij. argument in no wise pouvoir his entent.

And as for the text of[2] which is alleggid Coloc. iij. c., as thouz he schulde helpe, thouz that he in no thing helpith, it is to be seid thus: That in thilk text Poul wole that men leene not to eny philosophie which is azens feith, namelich azens the feith which is of Christis persoon and of his incarnacioun. And thouz men ouzten not forto attende, truste, lene, and bileue to philosophie in mater of feith; hereof foloweth not that thei ouzten[3] not truste and lene to philosophie in mater being not of feith. And that Poul so vnderstondith as now is seid of philosophie streching him azens feith of the incarnacioun of Crist, it is open bi this: that the text and processe going next biforn this alleggid text spekith of feith to be had into Jesus Crist for his incarnacioun. Forwhi it is seid there thus: Thouz y be absent in bodi, zit bi spiritt y am with zou, ioynyn and seyng zoure orde and the sadnees of zoure bileue which is in Crist. Theryfore as ze han take Jesus Crist owre Lord, walke ze[4] in him; and be ze rootid and bildid aboue in him, and confermed in the bileue as ze han leermid, abounding in him in doinge of thankinges. Thus miche there. And thann next after Poul settith herto the text alleggid biforn in the viij. argument thus: Se ze that no man deceythe zou bi philosophie[5] and vein fallace,
after the tradicioun of men, after the elementis of
the world, and not after Crist. Whiche ij. textis, if
thei ben considered as thei liggen to gidere in rewe,
it schal be seen that if the ij. text be knyt to the
former text, as it is likely that he so is, it must
nedis be that the ij. text spekith of philosophie which
is a|ens the feith of the incarnacioun of Crist, of
which feith spekith the former of tho ij. textis. And
herto is ful good confirmacioun bi these wordis in
the ij. text, whanne it is seid thus, and not a|er
Crist. So that not ech philosophie neithir ech do-
ctrine which is a|er elementis of this world is to be
fled, but the philosophie and doctryne after elementis1
" which is not a|er Crist," that is to seie, which is
contrarie to feith of his persoon and of his incarnac-
ioni. For certis more or other than this vn|irdond
ning can not be had bi maistrie of PoulEs processe there.
And this is ynowz for answere to the viiij. argument.

xv. Chapter.

For answere to the ix. argument, it is to be seid,
that Samaritanys or peple of Samarie, which oon was
the womman with which Crist talkid, Iohun iiiij. c., at
the welle of Iacob, weren not perfite and ful Iewis,
neither thei were perfite and ful hethen; for thei
helden not al the hool lawe of Iewis, neither thei
leften al the hool lawe of Iewis, as othere hethen men
diden, but thei tooken and helden summe of the
Iewis lawis. Neuertheles thei weren ydolatreris and
worshipiden vntrew re visible goddis. Al this weil
groundid clerkis in diuinite knowen weil ynowz.
Thanne thus, whanne Crist seide to the womman:

1 the elementis, MS. (first hand).
The tyme is come and now it is, whanne trewe worshipers schulen worshipes the Fadir in spirit and trouthe, et cetera; Crist meened therbi, that that the ydolatrie of Samaritanys schulde ceese and be at an eende. Forwhi tho that thanne among the Sama- ritanys worshipiden God, thei worshipiden him as a bodili thing, and therofore not "in spirit" or not as a pure spirit oonli; and also thei worshipiden God bi ydolatrie, and therofore bi yntrouthe and so not "in " trouthe." And al this Crist seid schulde be left and schulde ceese bi Crist, and so didde it. And herbi and in al this is not includid, that God excludid or forbade the hauynge and the vse of ymagis in the maner bifoire taught in this present iij. parti of this book. Therofore the first proces, which the ix. argument allegdith, Iohn iiiij. e., lettith no thing the hauynge and the ysing bifoire seid of ymagis.

Furthermore, that the iij. processe of Iohn iiiij. e. allegdith in the ix. argument lettith not pilgrimage to be doon, y prowe thus: The wordis therto allegdeth ben these: Womman, bleeue thou to me for the hour schal come, whanne neither in this hil, (that is to seie, of Garizim,) neither in Ierusalem ze schulen worshipes the Fadir, et cetera. Thanne thus: Bi these wordis can not be more or other had, than that Crist prophesied the seid hil and Ierusalem to be distroyed; and so myche to be distroyed, that ther schulde not be eny preier mad or eny pilgrimage maad in the seid hil or in the temple of Ierusalem. And this distruc- cioun was maad bi Vaspacion and Tite, Emperouris of Rome, the xlij. zeer aftir Cristis passion; but open it is, that heof may not be take that Crist therbi schulde seie or teche pilgrimage to be vnleeful, no more than if he had seid, that the hour schal come in

1 So the MS., and the repetition is perhaps not accidental: cf. p. 236. l. 18.
which neither in thilk hil neither in Ierusalem schal eny preching of Goddis lawe be, schulde folewe that therbì Crist schulde teche preching of Goddis lawe to be vnleesful. Wherfore open it is, that of the seid and allegrid iij'. processe of Ioon the iij'. ĉ. in the ix'. argument can not be had in eny wise, that Crist schulde therbi reprouе pilgrimage, that thei be not leefulli to be doon. And this is ynoȝ for answer to the ix'. argument.

For answer to the x'. argument it is to wite, that vndir thre ententis and purposis a man mai go in pilgrimage; and ech of tho iij ententis leeful, honest, and expedient. The firste is forto be quykliȝ and deuoutli remembrid in the place of pilgrimage upon Goddis worthiness, his benefetis, and punyshings, his holi liȝf and passiouen, or upon summe Seintis holi conversacioun, or forto haue quietnes and soolnes to preie to God or to a Seint; and al this forto do there, bi cause that bothe he schal be there fer fro his owne hous, (and therafor fer fro thouȝtis whiche wolde come into him, if he were in his owne hous and with his owne meyne,) and also for that God hath chose thilk place in which he wolde do and wirche and þeue singulerli bifoře that he wolde do þeue and wirche in manie others placis; as it is bifoře schewid, that he wolde in summe placis bifoře others placis so do. And if a man go in pilgrimage to a place for this entent oonli, which is for his owne edificacioun oonli, he mai go priueli thIDER as weel as openli, and aboute mydnyȝt as wel as about myddai; for he entendith not to ensaemple his deede of vertu to eny othir persoon.

But furthermore, for as miche as we han teching of Crist, Mat. v'. ĉ., that we mowe leefulli and merytorili do oure vertuose deedis openli bifoře othere men, vndir this entent that thei be moued forto do in lījk maner vertuoselī, therafore vndir an other entent, which
is the ij*. entent, a man mai vertuousel, honestli, and expedientli go in pilgrimage in such maner that therbi he ensample his dede of pilgrimage to be folewid of othere men, that thei go in pilgrimage thanne or in sum other leiser which thei wolent to hem silf point forto edifie hem silf, as he goith thidir for to edifie him silf. And open ynow it is, that who euer wolent go in pilgrimage vnder this ij*. entent, he muste do it openli and not prueli; and ellis he failith in his pilgrimage. Forwhi ellis his deede answerith not to his entent, as it is open ynow.

In the ij*. maner a man mai go in pilgrimage vndir entent forto supporte and menteyne that the mynde of the Seint and the mynde of his lyuyng and the mynde of the benefet, which God hath으로n to us, bi that thilk Seint lyued so weel; or ellis forto supporte and menteyne the mynde herof, that God hath chose thilk place and thilk memorial, (whether it be an ymage or a relik,) that thilk mynde die not and falle not into for哲t ing. For thoʒ it be suffi- cientli in Goddis power forto menteyne the fame of thilk place and of the ymage and of the seid chesing and of her holynes, zit men ouṃten do her part bi kindenes and gentilnes for to bi her power menteyne the same, and that bi word and bi deede of haunting and comyng thidir. And this supporting and meyn- tenance of this fame of the place of the ymage and of the Seint and of the seid chesing, which God hath maad there to be doon bi pilgrimage, cannot be do anentis othere folk, but if the pilgrimage be don openli, as it is open ynow to ech mannys resoun.

And sithen it is* openli schewid that a man may leefully and expedientli and honestli do a pilgrimage, not onli in the firste maner but also in the ij*.
maner, & he, and also in the iiijth maner, tho clerkis
whiche seen and knouen oonli the firste maner of
doing pilgrimage and not seen and knouen the iijth and
iiijth maners, ben ouer hasti, eer thei be ful learned,
forto blame eny man for this, that he doith his pil-
grimage miche openli vndir the iijth or iiijth seid ententis
or maners of pilgrimage doing.

And thanne farther in this mater thus: Sithen it
is leefull, honest, and expedient a man forto do his
pilgrimage in the iijth and iiijth now bifoire seid maners
and ententis forto denounce to the peple dwelling or
to be mett in the wey of the pilgrimage, that he
goith into such or such a place in pilgrimage, for to
proouke hem into pilgrimage or forto quyke in hem
the mynde and remembraunce of the bifoire seid
thingis,(and open it is that this denouncing to othere
seers and bitholders may not be mad so effectuali to
tem bi the oonli open going of the pilgrim 1 in his
person and with his meyne thorou the wey or the
strete thidirward, as if he schulde proclaime bi his
owene speche or bi hise seruauntis speche to ech man
which he schulde meete forto seie thus: "Lo, bitholde
" weel y go now a 5 pilgrimage into such a place," and
3i forto denounce and publishe his going in pil-
grimage bi this maner is not so eesi and so effectual,
nether so continual, as if the pilgrime bere openli
visibili in his hond to alle men whiche schal meete a
signe bitokenyng openli that he goith into such a
place in pilgrimage, which signe is an ymage of wex
or of tre or of sum metal,—wherfore 5 a ful good and
a resonable cause it is to ech pilgrime, which wolde
make his pilgrimage vndir the iijth or iiijth bifoire weel
approued entent, that he bere openli an ymage of wex
or of tree or of metal or of stoon in his hond, that

1 of pilgrimage, MS. (first hand).  5 Perhaps we should read ther-
5 of, MS. (first hand).  5 fore.
alle men whiche schulen se him go or meete with 
him, be remembrid therbi that he gooth in pilgrimage 
and that thei bi thilk ensaumling be stirid for to at 
sumwhile make her pilgrimages.¹ And so a ful good 
and a ful resonable cause mai be, for which a pilgrime 
may bere an ymage openli in the wey, other than the 
cause which the xᵗʰ argument spekith of, which is the 
vein glorie of the berer.

And ȝit ferther in this mater thus: If thilk ymage 
be offrid up in the place into which the pilgrimage 
is mad, and be hangid up into open ȝit forto there 
abide, vndir this entent that who euer schal afterward 
come into the same place he schal weel se bi thilk 
ymage that sum man, (as the offer of thilk ymage,) 
hadde deuocioun forto visite thilk place bi pilgrimage, 
and mai therbi be stirid forto do pilgrimage into the 
same place, (and the mo suche ymagis up offrid hange 
there, the more ech comer thidir and biholder of hem 
mai be stirid forto visite thilk place bi pilgrimage); 
and if a notable ymage be offrid up there,² it 
schal moue the seers for to enquere who offerd thilk 
ymage; and if it be answerid, that a bishop or an 
other notable man it offrid there and it brouȝt thidir 
bi pilgrimage, the seer and heerer heresof schal thinke 
that the offer therof hadde sum notable cause forto 
so bringe thilk ymage thidir and so ofre it, and 
therbi be the more stirid into deuocioun toward God 
or the Seint in thilk place. Wherfore it folowith, 
that a ful good cause is forto ofre and leue such an 
ymage for to contynuoni abide openli in the place of 
pilgrimage, (ȝhe, a myche better cause than is the 
feyned scornfully cause of which the xᵗʰ argument 
maikit mension,) and therfore alle the persoones 
whiche blamen pilgrimes, (and namelich notable per-

¹ pilgrimage, MS. (first hand). — line) joins the words up there in 
² A hyphen (at the end of the | the MS.
soones, as bischopis or knyghtis,) forto bære openli
ymagis in pilgrimagis, and forto offre up and leue
tho ymagis in the placis of pilgrimagis for the now
seid ententis, schewen hem silf at the leest as ther
yn fools. Forwhi thei schewen hem silf not to vnder
dirstone that suche deedis mowen be doon vnder
suche now seid ententis, whiche ententis ben openli
to al the world leeful, honest, and expedient ynowe.
And furthermore, siteth it longith to preestis and to
bischopis forto ensample vertuose and deuoute deedis
rather than to othere louzer men, whiche deedis for to
ensample is not vnaaccording to preestis and bi-
schopis, it foloweth that these seid berings of ymagis
in pilgrimage, and the leeuyngis of tho ymagis in the
placis of offring, bisemen and bicomen preestis and
bischopis as weel as othere men, zhe, and more than
othere louzer men. And this is ynowe for answere to
the xst argument.

To the xst argument y answere by likenes thus:
It is wriuten, Ysaie ist. c., that God seid to the peple
thus: Do ze awey the yuel of zoure thouztis fro the
myddis of zou, even as, Iosue xxiiiij. c., Iosue seide:
Do ze awey alien Goddis fro the myddis of zou: but
certis open it is, that it foloweth not bi vertu and
strengthe of the seid text, Ysaie ist. c., that therfore
men ouztent do awey fro hem good thouztis. Where-
fore of the text before alleggid in the xst argument,
Iosue xxiiiij. c., whanne it is seid thus: Do ze awey
alien Goddis fro the myddis of zou, foloweth not therof
nor therbi, that men ouztent do a wey fro the
myddis of hem ymagis, whiche ben not alien Goddis.
And thus it is lixt and esy forto answere to the xst
argument.

---

1 mowe, MS. (first hand).
2 as Iosue seide, MS. (first hand).
3 seid is interlineded at a later hand.
4 of Ysaie, MS. (first hand).
For answere to the xij. argument y graunte the i. premisse of the argument, and y denye the ij. premysse of it; which ij. premisse is this: That bothe Iews and hethen men worschipiden ymagis for Goddis, whiche thei wisten be\(^1\) mad bi manmys hondis,—if thilk premysse be vndirstonde thus, that thei worschipiden eny suche ymagis withoute more therto sett, as for eny ful hool God. For that this is vntrewe y schal scheewe bi witnessing of Holyscriptur, and bi witnessing of him which was an ydolatrer and a greet clerk among hethen men, (whos name is Hermes Trismegistus\(^5\)) and also bi doom of resoun. First, bi testimone of Holyscriptur thus. It is writun in the lxxxxv. Psalme thus: *Alle goddis of hethen men ben feenies, forsothe God made heuenes.* But so it is, that noon ymagis maad bi mennyis hondis ben feendis or weren euere feendis. Wherfore no Goddis of hethen men ben or weren oonli ymagis mad bi mennyis hondia. Certis this argument is so formal a sillogisme that no man may denye his forme in proceding: and the firste premysse is witnessid pleinli bi Holyscriptur in lxxxxv. Psalme, and the ij. premysse is open and sufe ynouz in ech mannys resoun. Wherfore the conclusioun of the same argument is also needis to be trewe. 

Also Hermes Trismegistus in his book, (as Austyn rehercid, [Lib.] viij. De Civ. Dei, c. xxij. and c. xxiiij.\(^3\)) seith pleinli, “that tho ymagis whiche he

---

\(^1\) *ben,* MS. (first hand).

\(^2\) *Trismegistus,* MS., and so also below.

\(^3\) *Ile (Hermes Trismegistus) visibilis et contrectabilia simulacra velut corpora Deorum esse auserit; inesse antem his quodam spiritus invitatos, qui valeant aliquid, sive ad nocendam, sive ad desideria eorum nonnulla complenda, à quibus eis
"and othere hethen men worschipiden for Goddis,
"weren ymagis maad quyke bi pure Goddis descend-
"ing and alihting into hem;" and so bi witnessing of
this greet clerk ydolatrer he and othere hethen men
worschipiden not for Goddis the baar ymagis, as thei
weren made bi mennyx hondis. And no man couthe
̓ theue to us surer and aikerer and trewer instrucıon
how ydolatres diden, than he which was an ydolatrer
in him sìlf, and was a greet clerk among hem, and
was a greet defender of ydolatrie bi hise writingis..

Bi resoun also y mai proue this same present pur-
pos thus: Hethen men and also Iewis weren' neuer
so lewd that thei passiden in lewidnes children of x.
̓ 3eey age now lyuyng, or suche persoones whiche in
these daies ben clepid and take for fools. Forwhi
the deedis of greet wisdom which thei diden schewen3
weel that thei weren 4 ful wise, and as wise as ben
now the wisist of Cristen men, as eyndence herto ful
good is sett in the froste premysse of the xij' argu-
ment. And sithen it is so, that no child neither eny
other fonynsch man now lyuyng wole knouleche and
bileeue, that a carpenter or a masoun schal or mai
make a thing better than him sìlf, and such a thing
that schal helpe men and do weel to hem, and to
whiche thei mowe weel preie for help in her nedis;
it foloweth that the grete naciouns of hethen men and
of Iewis with solemne kingsis and emperouris and
other lordinis and grete clerkis neuer so myche dotiden
and erriden forto worschipre and take eny ymage maad
bi man, that it withoute more therto had schulde be
to hem her Souereyn Lord and her God.

---

divini honores et cultus obsequiis
dererunt," S. Aug., De Civ. Dei,
lib. viii. c. 28., where much more
may be seen to the same purpose.
The work referred to by S. Augustine
is the Asclepius, or Ἀσκληπειον, a
Neo-Platonic production, which
may be assigned to the third century
after Christ, being probably the
earliest of the works attributed to
Hermes Trismegistus.

1 were, MS. (first hand).
2 schewen, MS. (first hand).
3 were, MS. (first hand).

Q
What thanne was the hool thing which thei wor-
schipiden for eny God, good it were forto here leerne
and knowe. And forto here the treuthethe herofof this
must be seid in this mater. Soone after the bigyn-
nynge of the world, bisidis hem that lyuuen in doom
of resoun and therwith recuyueden bileene fro God
and angelis, summe othere and manye lyuueden in
doom of resoun oonli and receuyueden not such now
seid bileene delyuered to the world bi God and bi
angelifis. And of these men summe in her resonyng
couthen not fynde that ther was or is eny other sub-
staunce being saue bodili substaunce, as the iiiij. ele-
mentis binethe, with alle the mengid bodies maad of
hem in the eir, in the see, and in the erthe, summe
lyuyng summe not lyuyng, and as the viij. planetis
of heuuen with her orbis and whelis, and as the fix
sterris with her orbe or whele. And furthermore
these men, bi cause thei fonden that in the planetis
and sterris and her seid orbis and whelis waren noon
contrarietees1 suchas ben in the iiiij. elementis by-
ethe, therfore thei concluididen and helden that al
the bodili heuuen aboue the iiiij. elementis with alle
hise parties was vnmaad, and was euer withoute bi-
gynnynge of tyyme, and schal euer be withoute corru-
cipcion and withoute noon being. And furthermore, for
as myche as these men aspiden weel bi greeit Witt,
that the seid parties of heuuen reuileden ful myche the
worschingis of bodies here binethe in the louzer world,
and thei couthen not come ferther forto wite what
was doon in eny bodi herbinothe which deede was
not reuiled bi hem aboue, therfore thei helden and
trowiden that the bodili heuuen and hise seid parties
reuileden al that was reuileable here bynethe among
men and among othere bodies and thingis; and folew-
in. li herof thei helden and trowiden that heuuen and

1 *contrarietees, MS. (first hand).*
hise parties weren the best thingis in al the hool vnyuersite of thingis and of beingis. And sithen ech of these men feelid wee in himsylf, that he hadde nede for to haue help and reuling more than an other man myyte do to him, and that in manye caasis; and bettir help myyte he not loke affir than summe of tho thingis whiche he trowid to be beste thingis, as weren in his conceit and semyng the bodili heuen and hisid bodili parties; therfore ech such man was stirid and moved forto chese to him summe of these planetis or sterris forto be to him his souresyn helper and lord of hisy nedis, and therbi ech such man made to him sum planet or sterre forto be to him his God. And manye of these men accordiden to gidere in chesing to hem oon and the same thing for her God, and manye othere accordiden to gidere in chesing to hem an other thing for her God. And thus it was with men of the seid soort lyuyng in resoun oonli without feith, and which mystén not in doom of her resoun rise hízer or fynde fether, than that alle subsstauncis in the hool vnyuersite of thingis ben bodies oonli.

Summe othere and manye weren quycker in natural witt and waxiden better1 philosophris, and in her resonyng thei founden that in the hool vniuersite of thingis ben vnboildi subsstauncis, (that is to seie, spiritis,) bisidis the bodili subsstauncis in the same hool vniuersite of thingis; and thei couthen not fynde bi her resoun, but that tho spiritis weren vnmade and vndeedli withoute bigynnyng or eending in tyme; and that these spiritis weren gretter reulers of chauncis and deedis doon here bynethe than the bodili subsstauncis, being parties of the bodili heuen, weren2

---

1 better added in the margin in a later (?) hand.
2 were, MS. (first hand).

q 2
reulers of chauncis here bynethe. And whether among
these spiritis oon was worthiest and higest ouer alle
the otheres or no, thei wisten not; but thei thowden
weel that ech of hem was a greet prince and a reuler
of this world, and that ech man hadde nede forto
have loue and fauour and good lordschip of ech of
hem. And thanne for as mich as ech such seid man
knewe weel and feelid weel in hym sylf, that he hadde
nede to more help and to better lordschip than eny
man myȝte do and þeue to him in erthe; and he her-
with thowid no thing be better and myȝtier and ver-
tuoser than ech of these spiritis to be, and that ech
of the spiritis was sufficient forto be his good lord,
louer, helper and socorer in needis, therfore ech such
man was moued bi doom of resoun forto cheze to hym
such a spirit to be to hym his Souereynest Lord and
so to be to hym his God. And thanne fether, sithen
him thouȝte in his resoun that forto cleue to a thing
as to his Soureyn Lord, whom he wolde worschippe,
loue, and servye, and þit for to haue noon homelynes
with the same thing were an vnchereful thing to the
same man, and it were damageful to the Lord so
chosun, (in as myche as in this straungenes the lasse
worschip and the lasse loue and servise this man
schulde do to him,) and her with al him thouȝte
that thilk Lord was resonable, was curteis, was gentil,
and louynge, and also wiȝs forto consentte into a purpos
strecching in to his more worschiping and seruyng;
therfore thilk man deemed in his resoun that if he
wolde make an honest, fair, riche, and precious ymage
vndir this entente, that oon such seid his spirit schulde
vouche saaf forto aliȝte and desende into it, thilk
spirit wolde al redi conforme him to the seid entent
of the man. And fethermore, sithen men knewen
weel the power of spiritis to be ful grete and to be
gretter than men myȝten comprehend, men thowden
that tho spiritis wolden so icyne hem sylf with tho
ymagis in so curiose and hîse and incomprehensible maner aboue mannys witt, that of the spirit and of the ymage to gidere in an vndeclarable maner schulde be maad a sensible God; sumwhat lîk to the maner in which we Cristen men bileueen that God descen-
did into mankinde and couplid so to him a singular mankinde, that he which was bîfore pure God invis-
ibili was afterward sensible visibil man, and wolde so be and lyue among men for loue which he hadde to men and for nede which men hadden therto. And her upon men maden suche seid ymagis and assaieden forto stiere and proucke suche seid spiritis forto de-
scende and come into tho maad ymagis, and where and whanne thei weeneden and trawiden gode spiritis forto haue come into tho ymagis, badde spiritis en-
triden into tho ymagis; and bi certein whîlis wolden moue and speke and wirche sensibili in tho ymagis, and bi manye othere whîlis thei wolde do no thing sensibili in the same ymagis, and herbi tho feendis lettiden and bigileden thilk men forto labore ferther that thei mystên fynde the verri God which is God of Cristen men. And so, forto come into the point for which y write this processe, these hethen men worschipiden not the pure ymage in it silf as for her God, (no more than Cristen men worschipen now the singuler manhede of Crist as for Crist and as for God,) and jît the hethen men helden her God to be bodili and bodied in a maner which thei couthen not at fulle vnîrstonde, even as we Cristen men holden now oure God to be bodili and to be bodied in a maner which no Cristen man kan at the ful com-
prehende and vnîrstonde. And as it is trewe that Cristen men worschipen a man and a born man in this world for her God, but thei worschipen not so

1 wolde, MS. (first hand).
the pure manhode in him sylf with oute more thert sett; so the heten men worshipiden an ymage and a bodili graued thing for her God, but not the pure bodili graued ymage in him sylf with oute more for her God. And so these ij* thingis whiche Scripture seith of ydolatrys stonden to gidere and ben trewe: that alle Goddis of heten men ben feendis; and also in the cxxxiiij* Psalme, that the Goddis of heten men ben gold and siluer, the werkis of mennis hondis; even as Cristen men wolen graunte these ij. thingis stonde to gidere and be to gidere trewe; that God is a Spirit vnbdili; and the same God is a man, and a bodi bigete of a woman, and nurischid of hir, and which was slein, and was mad deede. Thus miche is ynow, as for now and here, forto knowe how ydolatrie came vp.

And that this conceit of ydolatrie is not feyned, it is open. Forwhi ellis Holi Scripture herto bifore alleggid mai not convenientli and likely be saued, nei- ther the testimonye of Hermes mai ellis weel stonde, neither resoun mai consent how ydolatrie in so wise persoones schulde in other wise bigynne and be doon. Furthermore, for as myche as the seide heten men trowiden the seid ymagis to haue be quyke continueli with the seid spiritis whom thei trowiden to haue be Goddis, therfore tho heten men trowiden tho ymagis to haue alwey herd what men spaken to hem and haue seen what was doon to hem; thoo3 for hi3 dig- nite thei wolden not at alle tymes 3eue answeris, nei- ther at alle tymes scheewe that thei herden and sawen and my3ten move hem sylf, into tyme thei weren myche preyed and weel served and plesid of men. And zit al this was vntrewe; for feendis, whiche ben bad spiritis and enemies to men, entridden at summe whilis tho ymagis, not making tho ymagis to be quyke, neither forto heere or se or speke, neither making oon persoon of the ymage and of the feend
entr'd; but the feendis moven the ymagis, and spaken bi hem, and ful ofte left the ymagis to be bi hem sylf withoute eny seend mouer and withoute eny speker bi hem and in hem. And therafore alle the vpbreidis and alle the reproues which Holi Writ þeueuth to the worshipers of tho ymagis (as Baruch vij. c., Ysaie xliiiij. c., and in the Sauter, the cxiij. and the cxxxiiiij. psalmes, and in manye othere placis,) were treuly zoun to tho ydolatres in this sentence and vndirstonding, that in tho ymagis, whiche ydolatres taken with more thertoo sett for her Goddis, weren noon othere spiritis thanne feendis, and that in manye tymes whanne tho ydolatres worschipiden tho ymagis as hauyn in hem summe othere thingis, tho ymagis hdden in hem noon othere thingis than gold and siluer and the werkys of mennys hondis. And if Holi Scripture in the placis of Scripture now spokun be vndirstondde in this now bi me formed sentence, certis alle tho reproynge and upbreiding processis vpon ydolatres ben trewe, and alle her vpbreidings mad ben iust; and that whether tho idolatres weren hethen men or Iewis.

xvij. Chapiter.

For to make bi al this proces an answer to the xij. argument it is to be seid thus: The hethen men, of which it is now seid that thei worschipiden ymagis for her Goddis, diden so and camen into thilk greet synne of ydolatrie, bi cause thei neuer receyueden the feith which othere men (not being ydolatres) in tho same daies receyueden: but tho hethen men trustiden as into al her reule to the doom of resoun, and wolden not seche aftir forto attende to the euydencis whiche thei myzten bi doom of re-
soun haue had for the feith, which othere men in the daies hadden and to whiche thei attendiden. And therofore the principal clerkis and grettist and worthiest reulers of tho hethen men fallen into idolatrie bi the now discruied and tawzt maner, and the sympler partie of hem folowiden the worthier and the more wijs partie, as hem thougte it was conveniunt forto do; and thus al the grett multitude fil into ydolatrie and continuened therin.

Manye also of the Iewis, whiche weren¹ before sufficienli instructid in the feith of oon God and of veri God and in the evidencis longing therto, fallen bi her negligence fro the attendaunce which schulde haue beenoun bi a continuance to tho evidencis; and thanne thei reuliden hem after her owne witt and after the wittis of the hethen men, whiche weren in tho daies miche wijs and grete philosophiris. And therofore and therbi manie of the Iewis at dyuerse tymes fallen into ydolatrie and continuened therinne.

But now sumwhat bfore the birthe of Crist alle Iewis camen into so grett attendaunce to the euydencis of verru feith teching oon God to be, and also aftir the passioun of Crist hider to in this² present day so gret doom of resoun hath be founde bothe of hethen men and of Iewis and of Cristen men, and herwith also so gret evidencis of the feith teching oon God to be alon ben hadde in so gret haunt and vce and in so long conformed continuance, that a this side the passioun of Crist was not into this present dai eny ydolatrie among Iewis neither among hethen men, whiche lyuen in eny notable famose sect; or, if among hethen men be eny ydolatrie, it is in ful fewe placis among wrecchid persoones not sett bi of othere hethen men. And sithen al this is trewe, (as

¹ were, MS. (first hand).
² inthis, MS.
ech wijs man can it recorde to be trewe,) herof it
muste nedis folewe that now adaies it is not perel to
Cristsen men neithir to the Iews neither to hethen
men forto haue and entermete with ymagis of God,
as it was in the daies fer bifoire going the incarn-
cation of Crist. And the cause herof is now next
bifoire seid, that the knowing of oon verri God is
more substancliali and more sureli and confermeddli
had now than it was bifoire in the eeldst daies.
Neither it is to be drad that eny Cristen men ben
pruelli ydolatres bi occasioun of ymagis. And the
cause is now bifoire seid, which [is] that the feith of
oon God is so weel attendid to and so weel confer-
med, and doom of resoun longing therto is so miche
hized aboue that it was in eeldst daies, that noon
such drede is to be had now of ydolatrie as was longe
bifoire in eeldst daies to be drad. And this is ynoy
for answere to the xij'. argument.

If eny man wole obiecte ažens my conceit now
bifoire sett upon the bigynnyng and cause of idolatrie,
and wole allegge ažens me what is writen in Sa-
pience xiiij'. ç. of the bigynnyng and the cause of
ydolatrie thus: Fersothe idols weren¹ not at the
bigynnyng, neither tho schulen be withoute ende.
Ferwhi the voidnessis of men founden these ydolis
into the world, and therfore the end of tho is
founden schort. Fergi the fadir making sorowe
with bitter moorning, made soone to him an ymage
of the sone which was rauschid, and biganne to
worschipe him now as God, which was deed thanne
as man: and he ordeyned holi things and sacrificis
among hise servannts. Afterward in the tyme
comyng bitwize, whanne the wickid custom was
strong, this errore was kep as a laxe, and ymagis

¹ were, MS. (first hand).
werten worschipid bi lordschip of tyranny, et cætera:—certis herto y answere thus: If this procese writun Sapience xiiiij. c. meene that thilk maner, which is there sett and seid, ydolatrie biganne in the world, as it semeth that thilk procese schulde it meene, thanne y seie and holde that thilk proces, Sapience xiiiij. c., is vntrewa. And forto so holde, whilis y haue strong euydence bi Holi Scripture and bi resoun and bi witnes of him which was a greet clerk among idolatres, y may be bold ynow. For the Book of Sapience is not a book of Holi Scripture, and the nakid affermyng of the writer and maker of thilk book of Sapience, whos name was Philo, is not so myche to be bileueed neither so myche to be cleued to as it is to bileue or cleue to Holi Scripture, and to the euydencis which y haue biforme here write and sett for fundacioun of my concei vp.pon the bigynnyng and cause of ydolatrie. And hit farther and more to hem y mai sette this skile thus: Whanne euer weren the ful causis of ydolatrie, was ydolatrie: but so it is, that ful causis of ydolatrie whiche y haue biforme here write weren biforme thilk fadiris dai of which the xiiiij. chapter of Sapienç spekith, and that as miche and as ful as thei han be a this side the deies of thilk fadir. And no man male seie but that the causis musten needis bringe forth ydolatrie, whanne euere thei were. Wherfore it is rather to be holde that ydolatrie was biforme the deies of thilk fadir, (as it was aftir his daies,) than that idolatrie biganne

1 Pecock got this notion from the Prologue to Wisdom in the Vulgate, which is also prefixed to the book in Wiclif's translation, from which (in its later form) he has cited the above passage. See Wicl. Bibl. vol. 3, p. 85. The prologue runs thus: "Liber Sapiençæ apud

Hebraeos usquam est. Unde et ipse stylus Graecam magis eloquentiam redolit. Hunc Judæi Philonis esse affirmant."
in the daies of thilk fadir. And so (as it semeth to me) credence is not to be zonuyn to the xiiiij. chapter of Sapience, as in that.

If symple men wolen wondre here whi that thilk book of Sapience is so famoseli sett in Biblis now adaien, the, and liik solempneli as othere bokis of Holi Scripture ben sett in the Bible, herto y maie answere thus: That in the bigynnyng of the chirche, soone aftir Cristis passioun, writingis dressing men into holynes weren scant andfewe in reward that thei han ben athen and aftir in tyme, and Cristen men\(^1\) weren thanne ful myche desirose forto haue deuoute wrintingis; and therfore for deuocioun and avidite whiche men in tho daies hadden into goostli techingis thei wroten into her Biblis the book of Philo which is clepid Sapience, and the book of Iesus the sone of Sirak which is clepid Ecclesiastik, and othere mo, for greet deinte which Cristen men hadden\(^2\) of tho bokis in tyme of so greet scarsenes of deuoute bokis; not with stonding that thei wisten these seid bokis not be of Holi Scripture, as Ierom and othere mo openli witnesseen that the bokis ben not of Holi Scripture.\(^3\) And this oolde deuocioun forto plante the seid bokis into Biblis, whanne euere Biblis weren in writing, cecid not into al tyme after. And zit herbi is not the auctorite of tho bokis reisid hizer than it was before; and namelich it cannot be reisid therbi so hige, that it be putt before greater euydencis than is the nakid seiyng of hem. And thus y answere to the laste moued doute.

---

\(^1\) men is added by a later hand.

\(^2\) hadde, MS. (first hand).

Posibly some may agree with what is here said of the abstract lawfulness of images and pilgrimages, but may argue that there is so much mischief mixed up with them, that they will be free to speak against them; and will prefer other means of being remembred of God and his benefits.

Perauenure, whanne al this what y haue write of the ij. and iiij. principal gouernauncais in the firste and in the ij. and iiij. partie of this book hiderto schal be wee ouer red and schal be wee vndir-stonde, the men whiche were biforn impugners of the seid first and ij. gouernauncais, that is to seie, of having and vsing ymagis and of doing pilgrimantis, wolen agree and accorde to al what is entendid fro the bigynnyng of the ij. parti of this book hidir to, (or perauenure fro the bigynnyng of the first parti of this book hidir to,) but thanne thei wolen seie thus:

"Thou; it be leefull and expedient to manie folk "for to haue the seid vce of ymagis and for to do "pilgrim vagis, þit we seen so manye viciose gouernauncais mengid ther with or comyng forth therforso, "that we wolen be free forto speke ægens tho syn-

ful gouernauncais. And also, thou; it be leefull and "expedient to manye folkis forto vce in the seid "maner ymagis and forto haunte pilgrimagis, þit "sithen it is not to alle folk lijk expedient and "profitable, and it is not to eny persoon comaundid "bi doom of resoun or bi Holi Scripture, we wolen "not holde us bounde as bi eny precept of lawe of "kinde or of God forto vce ymagis and do pilgrim-

agis; but we wolen stonde in oure libertie forto be "remembrid upon God and hise benefetis and the "other for biforn reherced thingis bi suche ymagis "and pilgrymagis, or by redingis and heringis of Holi "Scripture, or by inward meditacioneis, or bi talking "to gidere of oure neibouris or with oure curat "hauyng cure of oure soulis."

Sotheli if the men, whiche weren sumtyme impug-

ers ægens ymagis and pilgrimagis, wolen in this now reherced maner seie and holde, y wole seie to hem sþenward as for her firste seiyng thus: Be þe weel

avisid what is vicioeli doon and vsid aboute ymagis and pilgrimagis, and be þe siker of the treuth, biforn
3e bigynne to vndyrnymye it; and whanne 3e ben ther of sufficientli learned and instructid, se 3e that in 3oure vndyrnymying 3e bere 3ou discreetli, as the office of vndyrnymying askith, which is sumwhat tauxt biforn the prolog of this present book: and Goddis forbode that eny man forbede 3ou forto make such vndyrnymying. And therthir as anentis the ij. seiyng y haue not herde 3it into this day, that eny prelat hath compellid 3ou for to vce ymagis or forto make pilgrimagis: but sithen it is a trouthe of Goddis lawe that ymagis mowen be void profitabili and a trouthe it is of Goddis lawe that pilgrimagis mowen be doon fruytlulli, therfore prelatis of the chirche mowen leefulli compelle 3ou that 3e not seie æzens these treuthis of Goddis lawe; and that 3e lette not othere men forto vce ymagis into the seid dew maner and forto make pilgrimagis in the seid dew maner, thow3 to 3ou silf it likith not forto haue and vce ymagis and forto make pilgrimagis; and that 3e lette not eny othere persons forto take the seid vce of ymagis and of pilgrimagis in dew maner; and that 3e make no cisme neither disturblance neither debate among Cristen peple bi holding æzens the seid dew vce of ymagis and of pilgrimagis; and that 3e not diffame alle vsers of ymagis and pilgrimagis, bering an hond upon hem that thei ben ydolatrets, whilis they ben noon. And if 3e wolen not obei herto with good wil, after that the cleer teching of this book fro the bigynnyng of it hidir to is to 3ou mynystrid, (namelich with therto ioyned The book of worshiping,) sotheli y schal neuere birewe 3ou, thow3 3e be thereto dryue bi peynes, and thow3 3e for so gret and so perilose obstinacie be soor punyschid.

---

1 mone, MS. (first hand), and perhaps so also in the two instances preceding.  
* biholding, MS.  
* be, MS. (first hand).
And oon thing truste ʒe weel, that thouʒ ʒe wolde wyncy and repugne æzens the clercie and æzens alle tho whiche wolen deuoutli and profitabli vce ymagis and pilgrimagis, ʒe schulen neuer haue the maistrie. Forwhi Leo the Thridde Emperour, whanne he was emperour of the hool Eeast and Weest Cristendom, impunged ymagis with al his power, and he brake ymagis, and punyschid men soor whiche wolde vse hem; and myche of the Eeast cuntre helde with hym: but ʒit, ther upon was mad a greet counceil of all the Eeast and Weest clercie bi Gregori the ij. Pope of Rome; and it was so stabild ymagis to be had in chirisæ æzens the Emperouris entent, and the deuocioun of al the peple in the West partio was therto so greet, that tho which wolden haue had ymagis to be leid doun myſten not haue her entent.

Also Constantyn the v. (some of the seid Leo and emperour next aftir his favir,) attemptid the same which his favir before attemptid; but ʒit Stevyn the ij. Pope æzenstode him, and aftirward a greet counceil was mad bi Pope Adrian and bi the Patriark of Constantinople, Tharasi, in which counceil in the citee of Nyce the riʒt vce of ymagis was eftsoone conformed.

And certis in lijk maner it wole fare, who euer attempte æzens the seid vce of ymagis. And ther fore, sithen ymagis and pilgrimagis ben leeful and moye be profitabli vsid, (as it is sufficientli bi me proved here and in The book of worshiping,) and peple ben so sett that thilk vce thei wolen not lacke and leue, it is a greet folie forto theraæzens repugne; and a greet folie it is forto counciel men into the contrarie, but if a man wole make myche yuel come whanne noon is had, and but if he wole of a litil

---

1 Audrian, MS. | 2 Constantyn, MS.
default make ten tyme more gretter yuel come forth, CHAP. XVII.
which ouȝte not bi eny lawe of God to be doon.

Who euer wole se more for iustifying of the seid
first and ij. principal gouernaunces now bifoire tretis
thorough this present ij. partie of this book, rede
he ouer weel The book of worshipping thorȝ his
bothe partyes, and there of this mater he schal se
more toward the fulnes.

xviii. CHAPITER.

For to make a cleer soiling answere to the xij. the
argument y putte bifoire these vj. reulis or supposi-
cions. Oon is this: Fro eeldist daies contynuelli
hidir to men weren1 woned forto speke and write
her wordis not oonli in treuthe, but also ther with
to gidere for to speke and write tho wordis in sum
gaynes and bewte or in sum deliciosite; and into this
eende and purpos thei vsiden certein colouris of re-
thorik, that with hem her spechis schulde be the more
lusti, and thei ordeynedden summe certeyn figuris
rennyng therwith forto excuse tho colourid spechis
fro vntrouthe, and summe othere certein figuris
for to excuse tho spechis fro vncongryyte of gramer:
euen riȝt as menn fro eeldist daies hider to weren
woned not oonli for to ete her mete, but also ther
with forto ete her mete in deliciose maner; and
therefor thei ordeynedden spicis and saucis forto
therwith make her mete the more sauori and more
plesant. This reule is so open to alle men, which
taken heede how the myche custom of spechis and
writingis ban be maad and þit ben mad, that nede
is not forto make theerto any proof.

1 were, MS. (first hand).
The ij†. reule or supposicioun is this: Among suche
now seid colouris and figuris of spechis and of
writings, summe ben these ij. now to be hercicid.
Whane a man doith a deede bi a partie of him, (as
bi his hond or his foot,) we vsen for to seie that his
hond or his foot dooth thilk deede: not withstanding
that in the speche of verri pure trouthe to be take
withoute colour and figure, it is to be seid that the
hond doith not the deede neither the foot dooth the
deede, but the ful hool man doith the deede bi his
hond or foot, as bi a parti of him seruyng to thilk
deede; and zit bi cause the hool man doith the
deede bi his hond or foot as a parti therto seruyng
we vsen forto seie that his hond or foot dooth
thilk deede. In liken maner, whanne a man dooth a
deede bi an other thing being an instrument forto
therbi do the deede, (as is a spere forto overthrowe
another\(^1\) man in iowsting,\(^2\) or an hamer forto make
a knyf in smything,) we vsen forto seie that the in-
strument doith the deede, (as that the spere throwith
doun the other man, and that the hamer maketh the
knyf), notwithstanding that in speche of pure trouthe
to be take withoute colour or figure, it ouyte be seid
that oonli this man throwith doun bi his spere, as bi
therbi an instrument, the other man, and the smything
bi the hamer so makith the knyf; and the spere
throwith not the other man doun, neither the hamer
makith the knyf, for neuerneither of tho instrumentis
hath the craft which is doon and bisett into the
knyfis making. And zit bi cause that euereithor of
hem is an instrument to the doer of a deede, it is
woned be seid that euereuther of these instrumentis
dooth the deede which the man doith bi eny of hem.

---

\(^1\) Possibly here also the word may have been intended to be written disjunctivm.
\(^2\) iowsting, MS.
Open experience is sufficient proof to this present iij. reule; the, and not onli these colouris and figuris haue ben vsid in spechis and writingis out of Holi Writ, but also Holi Writt vseth ful manye dyuerse colouris and figuris for cause seid bfore in the firste reule. And among al other Holi Writt vseth these iij. bfore enassamplid colouris. Forwhi as to the firste colour enassampling therof is writun Iob xvij. e. in the bigynyng thus: Lord, deluere thou me, and sette thou me bisidis thee; and the hond of ech fiȝte aȝens me,1 and as to the iij. colour enassampling therof is writun, i. Regum iij. e., thus: The bowe of strong men is overcome, and inffere or foble men ben gird with strengthe. Lo, it is seid that the hond of ech schulde fiȝte aȝens him, and ȝit open it is that the hond of a man fiȝtith not, but the hool man fiȝtith and not his hond; but he aloone fiȝtith bi his hond, as bi a parti seruyng in to thilk fiȝtynge. And in lijk maner it is seid that the bowe of strong men ben overcame, thow; in verri trouthe of propre speche the bowe is not overcome; forwhi the bowe fiȝtith not, but the strong man is overcame in and bi his bowe as his instrument. And thus it is open that Holi Writt witnesseith this iij. reule to be trewe.

The iij. reule or supposicioun is this: Whanne on thing is lijk to an othir thing in substauence or being or in gouernaunce or in worching, thilk thing is woned be depid vndir name2 of the othir thing. Forwhi we seien that this knyȝt is Hector or Arthur, for that this knyȝt is strong and douȝti as was Hector or Arthur; and where euer this knyȝt is seen or cometh, it mai be seid in lijk maner of speche: "Arthur or Hector is here or is come:" bi cause that oon which is lijk to Arthur or Hector is come.

---

1 This is Wyclif's version of Job xvii. 3. in its later form.
2 the name, MS. (first hand).
This manner of speche is had not oonli in comoun voe out of Holi Scripture, but also this manner of colouring speche is ofte and myche had in Holi Scripture. Forwhi bi this colour of speche, which in rethorik is clepid transsumpoionu, Crist seid that he was a vyne, and his disciplis weren braunchis, and his Fadir was an erthe tilier, and Iohun the Baptiste was Helie. And al for this, that he was lijk in wriching to a vyne, and his disciplis weren lijke to braunchis of a vyne, and his Fadir was lijk to an erthe tilier, and Iohun Baptist was lijk to Helie.

The iiiijreule is this: Whanne oon thing is ordeyned and deputid forto represente and signifie and bringe into mynde or consideracioun an other thing, thilk thing is woned be clepid vndir the name of the other thing so signifie or representid. Forwhi in this manner of colourid speche we seien: "This ymage is Seint Peter; and this ymage is Seint Marie; and here stondith Seint Iame; and a laumpe hangith bi-fore Seint Kateryn; and in this steyned clooth ridith Hector of Troie; and here in this steyned clooth King Herri leith a sege to Harflew; in this dai, which we now in this seer halewen, Crist was born; in this dai, which now is at Mydsomer, Iohun Bapti-tist was born." And al for this, that this ymage representith Seint Peter or Seint Marie or Seint Iame or Seint Kateryn, and this ymage representith Hector or King Harry, and this dai in this seer is deputid forto represente and signifie the same dai in which Crist was born, and this other day in this same seer is deputid forto represente the same dai in which Iohun Baptist was born. And not oonli the spechis of this iiiijreule ben vsid out of Holi Scripture, but also in Holi Scripture. Forwhi in Holi Scripture, Genes. xliij. 8, vpon

1 See John xv. 1; Math. xvii. 12.
the dreem of Pharso is is seid thus: The vij. faire CHAP. XVIII. kijn and the vij. ful eeres of corn ben vij. zeeris of plente; and the vij. kijn thynnne and leene, which stieden up after tho, and the vij. thinne eeres of corn and smyten with brennyng wijnnd ben vij. zeeris of hungir to comyng. Also, i*. Cor. x*. 6., it is seid thus: Crist was the stoong which zauz water in desert, Numeri the xx*. chapiter. And also, Ephes. ij*. 6., it is seid that Crist was the corner stoong, ioynyng the ij. wallis to gidere in Salamonis temple, of which it is wriet in the cxvij*. Psalme. And al for that the stoone in desert signified and representid Crist, and also the other corner stoone in the temple of Salamon signified and representid Crist, and the vij. fette kijn and the vij. ful eeres of corn signifiden the vij. plenteouse zeeris next thanne comyng.

The v*. reule or supposicioun is this: Ech spech or writing so colourid and figurid as the i*, iij*, iij* and iiij*. reulis techen, ouzten be reducid and brouzt into the meenyng and vndirstonding of a speche or writing, which in him sylf is trewe with out such colour and figure. Forwhe no vntrewes speche, as and for that he is vntrewe, is alloweable and vsable; but ech such speche, as in that, is reprouable: for al vntreuth, as such, is viciouse, and ther fore ech such speche is alloweable and vsable in that, and for that, that he is mad trewe bi bringing and reducing him into the meenyng and vndirstonding of a speche, which is trewe withoute such colour and figure. And therefore the dewe meenyng or vnderstanding of this speche or writing; "Thi ríȝt hand dide this dede," is to be seid thus: "Thou bi thi ríȝt hond, as bi thi partie therto seruyng, didist this deede." And the dew meenyng or vndirstonding of this speche or writing;

---

1: zeeris, MS. (first hand).
"Thi spere throwe doun hors and man," ouȝte be this: "Thou bi thi spere, as bi thin therto seruyng " instrument, throwist doun hors and man." The dew vndirstonding of this speche; "Hector cometh now," is this: "Oon lījk to Hector cometh now." The dew vndirstonding of this speche; "Iohun¹ was Helie," is this: "Iohun was lījk to Helie." The dew vnder- standing of this speche; "Crist was the corner stoon," is this: "Crist was representid and signified bi the "corner stoon."

The vj. reule is this: Euen as it is alloweable me for to seie that the instrument dooth the deede, for that the man dooth thilk deede bi the instrument; so bi lījk skile it is alloweable me forte seie thus: I "preie the instrument to do the same deede," for that y preie the man to do thilk deede bi the same instrument. That this reule is trewe y proye thus: It is alloweable me to seie to the spere of this man thus: "Thou throwst doun the other man;" for that the dew meenyng and vndirstonding of this speche is this: "Thou, man, bi thi spere throwist doun the "other man," (as it is open bi the v. reule, and this meenyng and vnderstonding is alloweable as conuenient;) but so it is, that as weel and as dewely the dew vnderstonding of this speche; "Y preie thee, O "spere, throwe thou doun the othir man," is this: "Y preie thee, O man, throwe thou doun bi this "spere the other man," as it is open bi the same v. reule; and this meenyng and vnderstonding is alloweable and conuenient, as it is open bi the same v. reule. Wherfore as weel and as alloweabili y mai seie this speche: "Y preie thee, spere, throwe doun "this man," how weel and alloweabili y mai seie this speche: "I seie to thee, spere, that thou throwist

¹ Iohn Baptist, MS. (first hand).
"doun the other man," or ellis thus: "O thou spere, throwe doun the other man." 1

Certis these vj. reulis or supposicions žeuen sufficiant and cleer justifiyng to manys speches and writyngis seid to crosseis and of crosseis. Forwhi if it be seid or writun to the same crosse in which Crist henge: "Thou, crosse, aženboutist man," the dewe meenyng and vndirstonding ther of is this: "Sum persoon aženbouȝte man bi thee, crosse, in that that thou were an instrument forto aženbie man." And if it be seid or writun of the same crosse thus: "The crosse of Crist sauëd the world and clensid the world," the dewe vndirstonding ther of is this: "Crist bi his crosse as bi therto a seru- yng instrument sauëd the world and clensid the world." And if it be seid or writun to an other crosse sett vp in a chirche: "In thee the Sauïour of the world henge," the dew vndirstonding ther of is this: "In oon thing lijk to thee (or in oon thing, which thou representist,) the Sauïour of the world henge." And if to the same crosse in which Crist died it be preied thus: "O crosse of Crist, y preie thee helpe me and defende me and iustifie me," the dew vndirstonding her of mai be this: "O Crist, y preie thee helpe me and iustifie me bi thi crosse as therto the helping instrument." And herbi it is open that the dew vndirstonding of thilk preier biforn rehercid in the xiiij argument and conteyned in this ympne, Vezilla Regis prodeunt, et cetera,

1 The following words occur in the MS., being in part written on an erasure by a later (?) hand, but some still later corrector has drawn a pen through every line:—"And thanne thether, if this speche is alloweable: 'Y preie thee, spere, throwe thou doun the other man; this present vj. reule muste nedis be trewe, that it is alloweable and conuenient speche forto see, 'That y preie thee, spere, that thou ouer-throwe the othir man.'"
whanne it is seid\textsuperscript{1} thus: *O coro, the oon hope in this tyme of passioun, encrese thou riȝtwinnes to piteful men, and zeue forȝeweuenes to giliki men, may be this, if the speche be maad to a crosse in oure chirche: *“O God, encrese riȝtwinnes to men hauynge pitee, and zeue forȝeweuenes to giliki men bi the cros, which representith and signifieth the instrument of oure *oon hope in this tyme representing the tyme of *passioun.” And in liyke maner dew understandynge of the preier, which is conteyned in the prose of the response, *O crux virida lignum, et cetera, whanne it is pried ther thus: *Thou, which barist the Lord, make the patroun (that is to seie, Crist) forto be to us redi or boweable; and thou, stok, which were worthi to bere the priose of the world, zeue and graunte to this peple the benefice of the crosse, mai be this, if the preier be mad to any crosse now being in oure chirche: *“O God make the patroun (that is to seie, Crist) be to us inclynable bi this cros signifiying the instrument or the crosse which bare the *Lord; and, O Lord, zeue and graunte to this peple *of Crist the benefet of the crosse, bi the stok which *signifieth the stok that deserued bere the priose of *the world.” And efsoones in liyke maner the dew undirstanding of the preier conteyned in the anteme *O crux splendidior, et cetera, if it be pried ther to* a comon crosse among us thus, *O sweete stok, bering sweete nailis and sweete birthens, saue thou this present cumpyny gaderid into thi preising, may be this: *“O God, this present cumpyny gaderid into the *preising of thee to be doon bi the crosse saue thou *bi this stok, signifiying the sweete crosse instrument *bering sweete nailis and sweete birthens.” And in liyke maner dew undirstandingis mowen be ȝouuyn to

\textsuperscript{1} seid there thus, MS. (first hand, but the whole written on an erasure).  
\textsuperscript{2} therto, MS.
the others preyaris mad to the cros, and rehercoid bi-
fore in the xiiij. argument in the [x.]
chap. xviii.
this present ij. partia.

xix. Chapiter.

Nevertheless, thou bi these vij. reulis these preiers,
which mowen be seid as mad to the cros, mowen be
saved fro inconuenience and vnaccordaunce, (and that
for the dew vnderstanding which mai be zouan to
hem bi these vij. reulis,) zit also sureli and vnoutabili
the preiers mowen be excusid fro inconuenience, and
mowen be mad ful alloweable, fair, and honeste bi
the vij. and viij. reulis or supposiciouns whiche now
schulen be put forth.

The vij. reule or supposicioun myche lijk to the ij.
reule is this: Whanne a man doith or suffrith a deede
bi eny thing which is a meene prouoking or stirring
notabili the doer or suffrer for to it do or sufere, or
which is in eny other wise a notable meene therto,
it is woned be seid that thilk meene dooth the deede;
in this vnderstanding, that thilk meene helpith and
fortherith in meenyng that the deede be don of his
veri doer; as, if Iohn be a prouoking meene that
the King ȝewe to me xx. pound of ȝeerli fee, whillis
Iohn preieth the King that he do so, it mai be seid
and is woned be seid that Iohn dooth and ȝeueth
to me thilk fee, and his preier doith and ȝeueth to
me the same fee; in this vnderstanding, that Iohn
meeneth or helpith, and fortherith in meenyng that
the ȝeuynge be don, and his preier doith in meenyng

1 A space left in the MS. for the number.
2 in convenienc, MS., and so just below, where is (at the end of the line) has no hyphen.
3 ȝeueth, MS. (first hand).
that the same zeuyng be doon. This reule is open bi experience. Also in Holi Writt the colour of this present vii* reule is ensaumplid and void. Forwhi, James the v* chaper, it is seid thus: If eny of you is sijk, lade he in preestis of the chirche, and preie thei for him, and anointe thei in the name of the Lord: and the preier of feith schal saue the sijk man. Lo how Holi Writt seith that the preier schal saue the sijk man, not withstonding that in very trouthe of propre speche neither the preier neither he that preieth dooth thilk deede of sauyng, but God aloone doith thilk deede of sauyng; and the preier wircith oonli as a meene in prouoking ther to, and the man preiying wircith also oonli as a meene prouoking in to the saaf sauyng. Thus it is open that the vij* reule is witnessid bi Holi Scripture to be trewe.

And if this reule be trewe, certis thanne folowth of that the vii* reule or supposicioun is trewe, which is this: It is allowable that y seie thus: "I preie Iohn forto zeue to me the seid fee;" and it is allowable that y seie thus: "I preie the seid preier of Iohn to be maad to the King, that thilk preier zeue to me the same fee of xx*. pound." For whi, if this speche is alloweable: "Iohn zeuyth to me the seid fee of xx*. pound;" and if this speche be alloweable: "The seid preier of Iohn zeuith to me the seid xx*. pound;" certis thanne it is alloweable that I seie thus: "I preie bothe to

---

1 doith is interlinedad in a later (?) hand.
2 zeuyth and zeuith (as well as provid below) are not forms used in the body of the MS.; they occur in the midst of words written on erasures, which are very extensive throughout this paragraph, two-thirds of which have been re-written in a very similar style, but not by the same hand as the rest. The y, which the original scribe dots, is here undotted.
"Iohun and to his preier, that thei zeue to me the "seid fee of xx" pound." But so it is, that euere-
either of the ij. former seid spechis is alloweable.
Wherfore euereither of the 1 ij. spechis of preiers ben
also alloweable. The first premisse is open ynoun, as
is proud before bi the vij. reule and his proof. And
that theij. premisse is trewe, it may be proud thus:
To this speche, "Iohun 3euneth to me this seid fee
"of xx" pound," and to this speche, "His preier
"3euneth to me the same xx" pound," the dewe vn-
dirstondingis ben these: "Iohun is meene that the
"seied fee be zounn to me, and his preier is also
"meene that the same seid fee is zounn to me," as
scheweth the vij. reule. And open it is bi the v.
rewle that this vnndirstonding is alloweable and con-
venient ynoun. Wherfore the ij. premysses is trewe.
And so nedis the conclusioun of the bothe premyssas
is trewe, namelich sithen in lijk maner lijk verrili
the dewe vnndirstonding of this speche: "Y preie
"Iohun that he zeue to me the seid fee, and y preie
"his preier forto zeue to me the same fee," is this :
"I preie Iohun that he be meene into the zeuyng of
"the seid fee, and y preie Iohun that he make the
"preier of him to be also meene into the same
"zeuing of the same fee," as it is open bi the vij.
and bi the vij. realis. And this vnndirstonding is
alloweable and convenient ynoun. Wherfore nedis
folewith that the seid conclusioun is trewe.

And thus these vij. and viij. realis schewen openli
ynouz, and sureli ynoun, that ech of the preiers
whiche semen to be mad to the crosse (and rehercide
before in the xiij. argument) is alloweable and con-
venient ynoun. Forwhi the vij. and viij. realis
schewen that the dewe vnndirstonding of the first

1 these, MS. (first corrector).
preier there rehercied in the ympne, *Vexilla Regis prodeunt*, is this: "O thou God, bi whom the cros is the provouctye meene of oure oon hope in tyme of this passioun, enerece riȝtwisnes to men hauynge pite, and [make] that God ȝene forȝeuenes to gilti men;" and sothel so the cros is therto provouctijf meene. Forwhi God bi biholding to the cros is stirid and provokid forto do alle maners of good to us, sithen a cros was the instrument wher yn Crist, in sum maner of deserynyng, desered to us al oure good. And for as miche as if we desire and preie that the cros be such a provouctijf meene into the seid ȝenyng, thanne oure desiyr therto schal encrese and be the gretter; and aftir that oure desiyr schal therto be the grettir, God schal make that the crosse schal the more prouke him or schal make him silf so that he the more be proukokid bi the cros into the seid forȝeuyng,—therefor it is not veyn but it is ful profitable that we desire and preie to God, that he ȝene to us oure goodis in this now spokyn vnderstondding, that the cros be meene into the ȝeuynge to be doon to vs fro God him silf as the verruy doer and ȝeuere therof. Neuertheles, thou; this preier be mad as in voice or in inward speche to the cros, hit in the trewe vnderstondding therof it is maad to God, as is now next bifornes expowned.

And even as it is now answerid bi the viij. and viij. revelis for justiyynge of the first there rehercied preier maad (as in voice thou; not in the vnder-
standing) to the cros, so in lijk wijsse it mai be an-
swerid bi the same vij. and viij. reulis into the
iustifiying of alle others priers there mad (as in
voice thouʒ not in the vnderstonding) to the cros,
whiche ben reherced bi fore in the xiij. argument.
And for that this is open ynowʒ, therfore more speche
therof y ouer passe. In other wise into iustifiynyng
of the seid priers mad to the cros, I haue answerid
in The book of worshiping, the ij. parti, the iiij. chapiter.
Cheze the seers which of tho answers to hem
lijkith; for these answers here mad and the answer
ther mad ben vndoutablī and at fulle⁴ euydently
trewe.

XX. Chapiter.

For answere to the xiiiij. and xv. argumentis to
gidere vndir oon, y sende before these iij. reulis or
supposicions.

Oon is: That a man schal haue more feruentli hisse
affeccions and loues anentis his loued freend, whanne
and whilis thilk freend is at sumwhile present per-
sonali with him and bisidis him, than he schal haue,
if the freend be absent alway and not personali pre-
sent with him. This reule is openli trewe bi expe-
rience. Forwhi, (not withstonding a man talke and
speke of his freend at the mete table or in sum other
place, and haue as good affecciou as he can haue
upon the same freend in such absence,) sit if in the
meene while the freend come into him personali and
sitte doen with him, he schal haue mich greter af-
fecciou vnpon the seid freend than he hadde in the
freendis absence. Wherfore this firste reule is trewe.

¹ the fulls, MS. (first corrector). The whole of this paragraph is
re-written on an erasure.
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The second rule.
If our friend be not actually present, our affection is increased by imagining him to be present. Proof of the rule by experience.

Another proof of the rule by reason. Bodily presence being the best means of calling out our affection, presence in imagination, which is the next nearest presence, is the next best means.

The third rule.
It is easier to imagine an absent thing present by the aid of something like it than without such aid. Proof of the rule, and illustration from the calendar.

The ii\textsuperscript{v}. reule is this: If a man wole encresse his gode affecciouns anentis his absent freend, whilis he mai not haue the same freend visibili present, it is profitable to him that he ymagine thilk freend to be with him present bodili. This is euydentli trewe bi assay of experience to alle hem whiche zeuen hem wjisly to the bisynes of contemplacioun, namelich in the bigynnyng of her contemplatiijf lijf. Wherfore this reule is trewe.

Also thus: If the freend were bodili visibili present, thilk presence were best forto gendre the seid affeccioun. Wherfore the other next present being of his freend, which is next aftir his bodili present visible being, is the next grettist meane aftir his bodili visible presence into the gendring of the seid affeccioun. And thanne ferther thus: But so it is, that thilk present beyng of the freend, grettist aftir his bodili visible presence, is his presence in ymaginacioun. Wherfore this present ii\textsuperscript{v}. reule is trewe: That it is ful profitable into gendring of affecciouns upon the absent freend, that the desirer of the affeccioun haue ymaginacioun that thilk freend is in bodili maner present.

The iii\textsuperscript{v}. reule is this: It is esier forto ymagynye a thing absent to be present in an other thing lijk theerto, than withoute any other thing lijk theerto. Forwhi every thing lijk to an othir thing bringith into ymaginacioun and into mynde better and lixtir and esier the thing to him lijk, than the thing to him lasse lijk or vnlijk. And herfore it is that miche esier men schulen ymagyne the dai of Cristis birthe to be present in the dai as lijk theerto markid in the

\textsuperscript{1} The preposition in (occurring at the end of the line in the MS.) is joined by a hyphen to its substantive, thus showing that instances of apparent junction of prepositions to their substantives are not purely accidental.
zeer, than in an other dai not so lijk therto; and men schulen esier ymagine the dai of Cristis resurrecioun and the dai of Pentecost in the daies therto assigned bi more lijknes in the zeer, than in othere daies lasse therto like.

Now after these thre reulis and vpon hem y procede thus: Ech man hath nedo forto haue gode affecziouns anentis Crist, as upon his best freend; and this freend zeueth not to us his presence visibili; wherfore it is profitable to ech man for to ymagine this freend be present to us bodili and in a maner visibili. And sithen herto servueth ful weel and ful myche the ymage of Crist crucified, whilis and if the biholder ymagineth Crist to be streižt abrode bodili thoruz the bodi of the same ymage, heed to heed, hond to hond, breste to breste, foot to foot,—therfore the oolde practik of deuoute Cristen men was forto so ymageyne; thouz thei knewen and bileuuden weel ynoʊz, that it was not so in deede as thei deuoutli ymagineden. In this ymagincioun thei helden hem silf forto meete bodili and presentli with Crist in Palme-Sunday, in which dai zeerli thei ymagineden the same firste dai be in which Crist came visibli riding into Jerusalem and was met of the Iewis singing to him: Ossanna to the sone of Davith. And so al what in suche processiouns was seid and sungun toward the crosse in eilde daies of the chirche in Palme-Sunday was seid of Crist and to Crist ymagined to be bodili present with and in the crucifix or crosse, which the peple in processioun bihelden.

And herbi zit into farther encrecind of deuocioun and good affecioun to be gendrid upon Crist, thei crepiden to ward and to such an ymage of the crucifix in Good Fridai; not as thouz thei crepiden thanne and there to noon other thing saue to the ymage, but that thei aftir her ymagincioun crepiden to the persoon of Crist, which bi her ymagincioun was
bodili streiȝt forth with the bodi of the ymage. And
3it fether into more loue and good afeccionoun to be
gendrid, thei keesiden the feet of the ymage; not as
that the feet of the ymage weren al that thei thes
kissiden, but that ther with thei keesiden the feet of
Crist whom thei ymagineden to be there in bodili
maner present. And this devout practik, namelich in
his outward deede, abidith 3it in al the West Chirche
a this¹ side Greek lond; how euer it be of the inward
ymaginatiȝ deede, whiche (as y trowe) abidith ful litil
or nouȝt,—the more harme is! And so it mai be
seid that no thing is seid and sungun to the nakid
and bare crosse in processioun of Palm-Sunday, nei-
ther eny creping or offring or kissing is maad to the
crosse in Good Fridai; but al this is doon to Cristis
persoon in his manhede, which is ymagined there to
be in and with the ymage crucified and streiȝt thorou;
the ymage crucified, heed to heed, hond to hond,
foot to foot; thouȝ it be not trouȝd so to be, but
thouȝ the contrarie is trouȝd to be. And herbi is
sufficient answere ȝouȝn to the xiiiijᵗ and xvᵗ argu-
mentis to gidere.

Who euer schal clerlii and perfittli vndistonde the
answere which is now before maad to the xiiiijᵗ and
xvᵗ argumentis, he schal herbi take sufficient ground
forto excuse fro blame and fro vnfrutyl and lewید
guernaunce alle the whiche wolen touche with her
hondis the feet and othenere parties and the clothis of
ymagis, and wolen thanne aftir sette to her visage
and to her iȝen and to her mouthis her tho hondis,
with whiche in the now seid maner thei touchiden
the ymagis or the clothinis of the ymagis. Certis,—
sithen it is openli knowe for sooth, that thou woldist
be riȝt wel plesid and thou woldist myche make

¹ athis, MS. See note on p. 265.
thereof, if Crist were now in erthe in a greet prece of peple, and thou myztist come so nyʒ that thou schuldist touche with thin hond hise feet or his hond to his breste or his cheke or his clothis, and woldist therbi gendre to thee bi so myche the more affeccioun anentis him than if thou myztist not so touche him or his clothing, (euen riʒt as we han experience that oon persoon gendrith more loue to an other, if he biclippe him in armys, than he schulde, if he not come so nyʒ to him and not biclippid him,)—it muste medis folowe, if thou ymage Crist or an other Seint for to be bodili streiʒt thuroʒout the bodi of the ymage, that thou schalt gendre, gete, and haue bi so miche the more good affeccioun to God or to the Seint, that thou dost to him touching him in the ymage as bi ymaginacioun. And sithen what a man mai not haue and do at the next and immediatli, he wolde be weel paid and weel plesid for to haue it mediatli, (that is to seie, forto haue it arombe and bi a meene,) it folowith that it is couetible to a man into the gendring or the contynuyng of much seid affeccioun to God and to Seintis for to desire haue, and for to gete to him and haue vnto his visage or izen or mouth the touche of Cristis feet or of his mouth or of his hond or breste bi meene of the touche which the hond getith fro hem and vpon hem immediatli; (euen as thou woldist be weel plesid, if thi freend, whom thou louest and which loueth thee, wolde sende to the a cosse or an handling or a biclipping or eny other bodili touching bi a meene persoon receuyuyng thilk cosse, handling, biclipping, or other touching of him immediatly, and delyueryng to thee as fro him immediatli:) namelich sithen the nature of loue bitwixe persones [is] forto be a moving in to oonyng and ioynyng tho persoones to gidere, in so miche that if tho persoones miʒten make euereither of hem forto entre into the

CHAP. XX.

Image, as we receive a kiss from our friend by a third person. The nature of love inclines to the uniting of the bodies of the lovers.
ful hool persoon of the other of hem and forto be
streit therouȝ out the boði or persoon of the other of
hem, than were had a greet entent and purpos into
which her loue enclyneth; euen riȝt as hate bitwixe
twey persoones bi his nature labourith and moueth
into departing and disseuerung and into rombe dis-
taunt being of euereither of hem from the other of
hem atwyn.

And so, therfore, the leest degree of ooming or
ioynynge of a man to Goddis persoon or to a Seintis
persoon is a meene forto gendre loue anentis God or
the Seint, and forto continue and encree the loue
bifore gendrid; and that more or lasse aftir that
thilk ioynyng or coupling to Goddis persoon or to the
Seintis persoon is more or lasse nyȝer or romber.
Seen we not that, if a man loue a child, he wole sette
his cheke to the cheke of the child, his iȝe to the
childis iȝe, his forhede to the childis forhede, his nose
to the childis nose, and therbi the more loue is gendrid
anentis the child? Whi not in lîjk maner the more
loue and good affectioun mai be gendrid anentis God
or a Seint bi such touche to be maad bi the bifore
sett ymaginacioun to God or the Seint? Whethir not
oon man schal loue bi so miche the more a lord, if
he mai be admyttid for to come so nyȝ that he lie
with the lord in oon bed? And if he mai not be
admyttid into so greet nyȝnes, ȝit if he mai be ad-
mittid for to ligge in the same chambir with the lord,
certis therbi schal good loue and affectioun be gendrid.
And therfore such goed symple biynesssis bifore
spokun, whiche lay persoones doon aboute ymagis,
ouȝten not be scorned neither be rebukid, but if the
scorners or rebukers ther yn schewe that thei knowen\(^1\)
not al what mai iustisfe the symple persoones deedis.

\(^1\) Anowe, MS. (first hand).
THE SECOND PART.

In an other maner to such creping toward an ymage crucified and to such kissing doon to the ymagis feet, and (bi lijk skile) to the now seid handling y haue answerid in The book of worschiping, the iiij. parti, the iiiij. chapter. Of whiche answeris euereither is good ynowz and trewe ynowz, and neuerneither of hem is contrarie to other of hem; and therefor chese the redor of this place and of thilk place whether this or thilk or bothe he wolde holde.

I haue bisett the lenger bisynes forto answere suf- ficientli and cleerli to the xiiij. and xiiiij. and xv. argumentis, bi cause that in the deedis of Palme-Sunday and Good Fridai, where upon the xiiij. and xiiiij. [and] xv. argumentis rennen, the aduersaries holden to be greet and cursid wickidnes. Not withstanding that if the conceitis ben had in vce, whiche the bifoere1 reulis zueen and techen, alle tho deedis doon in Palme-Sundae and in Good Fridai schulen be doon ful miche holili and blessidli and ful profitabli into making the doer strong and mysti in uthere tyymes forto do and suffre for the loue and the lawe of Iesu Crist.

Neuertheless this y wolde that ech man kneue, (and herto y wolde that ech man toke hede,) thogh the excercise and vce of suche now seid visible signes, doon in deuocioun and with vndrstonding of tho signes what thei bitokenen, is good and profitable to be had at certein whillis, namelich of hem whiche kunnen not rede or moune not here the word of God red or prechid to hem,—zet y wole not that men schulden haunte as it were alway the excercise in suche visible signes, whanne thei coueten to be mad spiritual, sweete, and deuoute with God, and stronge forto do and suffre for him; neither that thei haunte

---

1 Probably we should read before
2 schulde not, MS. (first hand).
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Further justification of these kinds of devotion to images to be found in Pocock's "Book of worshiping."
so miche or so ofte the voe of suche visible signes, that thilk haunte and voe lette hem fro voe of a better excercise; and speciali that he not drenche al the leiser, which tho men mithen and schulden haue forto reede or heere the word of God vndistonden sumwhat of hem or declarid sumwhat to hem. For certis, how the sunne passith in cleernes, cheerte, and coumfort the moones, and as a greet torche passith a litil candel; so in these seid pointis reding and heering in Goddis word, which is an excercise in hereable signes zouun to us fro God, passith in cleernes of teching and in cheerte of delijt and in coumfort of strengthe zeyng forto do and suffre for God in his lawe keping al the excercise had, or which can be had, in suche now before seid visible signes deuisid bi man.

The experience had in this mater is so sure, that thherefore y am bold forto it knoweleche; in so miche that it is weel aspied bi assai wh1 Crist was mowed forto seie, that "man lyueth not oonli bi breed, but " bi ech word which passith fro the mouth of God."9 Certis to hem which assaiken of thilk word it is (as it were) so deliteful as her lijf, so weel teching and dressing, that withoute it can be to hem (as it were) no good lijf. And zit al this vndistonde not y of the Bible aloon, as summen ouer vnredili and ouer myche syntulerli vndistonden.

Here eendith the iij. parti of THE REPRESSER.

\(^1\) which, MS. (first hand). | \(^9\) See Math. iv. 4.
And here bigynneth the iiij. part of
The Represser.

i. Chapter.

The iiij. principal gouernaunce, for which many of the laife blamen vniustli the clergie, is this: Persoones of the clergie receuyuen, holden, and occupiuen lordship of housis and feeldis, not onli in which thei hem sylf dwellen and which thei hem sylf tilien, but also which thei hem sylf settyn forth to be fermen of othere occupiers, and receyuen rente therfore of the same occupiers. Certis summe persoones of the lay peple beren an hond this now seid iiij. principal gouernaunce to be azens the lawe of God, how euer litle or fewe tho vmmouable godis ben; and therfore thei beren an hond that alle tho persoones of the clergie whiche willingli contynuen the now seid iiij. principal gouernaunce ben thoru; al thilk while in state of dampnacioun, what euere gode deedis thei doon.

That this bering an hond is vntrewe, (and that for that the seid iiij. principal gouernaunce is not azens the lawe of God,) y schal proue bi vj.1 conclusiouns; of whichhe the firste is this: The seid iiij. principal gouernaunce is not azens Holi Scripture of the Oold Testament neither of the Newe Testament.

That this conclusioun is trewe for his first parti, y proue thus: If Holi Scripture of the Oold Testament schulde forbede the seid gouernaunce, it schulde so forbede bi summe of these processis now here anoon aftir to be reherced; of which oon is writun, Numeri xvij*. 

And the Lord seid to Aaron,
Ze schulen\(^1\) not weelde eny thing in the lond of hem, neither ze schulen have part among hem; I am thi part and heritage in the myddis of the sones of Israel. Forsothe y zaf to the sones of Levy alle\(^2\) the tithis of Israel into possesioun for the service, bi which thei serven me in the tabernacle of boond of pees, that the sones of Israel neize no more to the tabernacle of boond of pees, neither do deedli synne.

To the sones aloon of Levy, servynge me in the tabernacle and bering the synnes of the peple, it schal be a lawfull thing everlasting in 3oures generaciouns. Thei schulen\(^1\) weelde noon other thing, and thei schulen be apayd with the offering of tithis, whiche y departid into vsis and necessaries of hem.

An other processe is writun, Deut. x\(^6\). c., where Moyses seide thus: In that tyme y departid the lynage of Levy, that it schulde bere the arke\(^8\) of boond of pees of the Lord, and schulde stonde before him in service, and schulde blesse in his name til into present dai; for which thing Levy hadde not part neither possesioun with hise britheren, for the Lord him sylf is his possesioun, as thi Lord God bihizte to him.

The iiij. processe is writun Deut. xviiij\(^6\). c. in the bigynnyng, where Moyses seide thus: Preestis and dekenes and alle men that ben of the same lynage schulen not have part and heritage with the others peple of Israel, for thei schulen etc the sacrificis of the Lord and the offerings of him. And thei schulen not take eny other thing of the possesioun of her britheren, for the Lord him sylf is the\(^4\) heritage of hem, as he spek to hem.

---

1 `schulde, MS. (first hand), apparently, t` rubricated the MS. apparently: it occurs in Wiciff's version.

2 `alle is added in the margin by a later (?) hand, the same which` `ark, MS. (first hand).`

3 `the is interlineated by a later hand.`
The third part.

The iiiij. processe is writun Iosue xiiij. c. in the ende, where it is seid thus: *Forsothe Iosue*1 zaf not possessioun to the lynage of Levy, for the Lord God him sifl of Israel is the possessioun of Levy, as the Lord spak to him.

The vij. processe is writun Ezek. xlviij. c., where God in discryuyng the lijf which preestis of the oold lawe schulde lede, seide thus: *Forsothe noon heritage schal be to hem: y am the heritage of hem. And ze schulen not zewe to hem possessioun in Israel; for y am the possessioun of hem.*

The vijij. processe is writun Ecclesiastici xlv. c., where of Aaron and of his sones Scripture seith there thus: *Thei schulen ete the sacrifis of the Lord, which he zaf to him and to his seed; but in the lond of his folk he schal not have heritage, and no part is to him among the folk; forwhi God is the part and heritage of him.*

But so it is, that these now rehercid textis and processis meenen not ferther than that the preestis and dekenes of the Oold Testament schulden not have part and lott in the firste parting of the lond of Israel to the children and kinredys comyng out of Iacob, as it is open ynow to ech man diligently reding the placis out of whiche the now alleggid textis ben drawe. And also ellis God schulde have be contrarie to him sifl in hise owne ordinauncis, as schal be open aftir in this present chapter, (bi the iiiij. argument,) and bi* the iiiij. chapiter. Wherfore no strengthe of the seid textis gooth not so fer as forto forbede to preestis and dekenys of tho daies forto have lordship of immuable godis bi othere weies.

---

1 Fecock should have written Moses. Wiclif's version has he zaf not, &c.; where however there is a various reading Moses, which is expressed in the Hebrew and in the authorized version.

* bi is interlineated by a later (?) hand.
cleymes, and riȝtis dyuers fro the firste departing, soorting, and lotting of the al hool lond. For her of the pleyner vndirstonding it is to wite that Iacob hadde xij. sones, out of which xij. sones camen xij. large kinredis of peplis; of whiche xij. sones the names were these: Ruben, Symeon, Leuy, Iudas, Isachar, Zabulon, Ioseph, Beniamyn, Dan, Neptalim, Gad, and Aser; and the oon of these xij. sones and the kinrede which came out of him, (that is to seie, Leuy and hise children or kinrede,) God chasè to be preestis and dekenis as for the tyme of the Oold Testament. And for the reverence which God wolde be þounn to Ioseph, being oon of the xij. seid sones, God wolde that hise children and kinrede comyng out of him schulde be rekened and be takun for ij. kinredis vnder the names of hise ij. sones, whiche weren clepid Effraym and Manasses; and so God wolde that xij. kinredis of Iacobis children schulde be bisidis the kinrede of Leuy, which God chase into his clergie for thilk tyme of the Oold Testament, not withstanding that Iacob had not but xj. sones bisidis his seid sone Leuy. To whiche now seid xij. kinredis God bade that al the lond, (which was afterward clepid lond of Iewis, and into which thei schulden entre bi con- quest for special graunte mad ther upon to hem fro God,) schulde be departid bi lott, whanne thei schulde firste entre into it after her comyng out of Egipt; and the kinrede of Leuy, which God chase in to his clergie, schulde haue no part in this firste departing and lotting; for God wolde purueie in othere wisis for hem, as sumwhat is open bi the textis bifoire alleggid, and sumwhat more ther of schal anon aftir here be seid. And into futher purpos than in to this purpos now here seid streccith not eny of the textis now bifoire alleggid, as is open ynot to ech diligent redr of the processis in which the textis ben sett. Where- fore nedis folowith, that bi textis of the Oold Testa-
ment can not be founde that the seid ij: principal
govenaunce was forbode to the clergie of the Ould
Testament.

The ij: argument to the same purpos is this:
Thou: God forbade that the kinrede of Leyu, being
as for thanne his clergie, shulde haue part in the
seid firste departing and lotting of the al hool lond,
as is open bi the textis before sett in this i: chapiter,
:it God puruied for hem in other wise; and bade
Numeri xxxv: 6., to al the hool multitude of the
seid xij. kinreidis receuyng the al hool lond bi the
seid departing and lotting, that after the seid depart-
ing and lotting mad to hem of al the hool lond, they
schulden tene to the kinrede of Leyu, being the clergie
of preestis and dekenis, certein citees bi lott of her
al hool redit with the suburbis of pasturis ligging to
the same citees, that in the citees the peple of clerkis
myvten sufficientli ynoy dwelle, and that in the seid
pasturis of suburbis the same clerkis myvte sufficientli
pasture her beestis. And in the performynge and ex-
cuting of this now rehercoid comauendment of God
xlvij. citees with her suburbis weren zoun to the
preestis and dekenes, as it is open, Iscue xxij. 6.
And so, if good rekenyng in this mater be mad, it
schal be founde tha the kinrede of Leyu hadde mo
citees zoun to hem than hadde ony oon other of the
seid xij. kinreidis, except the kinrede of Iuda; name-
lich sithen summe of the seid kinreidis hadde not mo
than ten citees in his part and lott of the firste
departing and lotting, as it is open, Iscue xvij. 6.
Wherfore needis folewith, that the Holi Scripture in
the Ould Testament grauntid and licencid preestis and
dekenys of thilk tyme forto haue in lordeschip and
in possessoun vnmoveable godis, as citees, housis, and
pasturis; namelich so manye as thei hem silf, whithout
into ferme to otheren men leting, hadden neede or profi
for to haue, holde, and occupie.
That all which is take in this iij. argument forto proue and conclude his conclusion is trewe, lo what is writun Numeri xxxv. c. in the bigynning thus: And the Lord spak these thingis to Moses in the feeldi placis of Moab aboue Iordan azens Ierico: Comaundide thou to the sons of Israel that thei zeeue to dekenes of her possessiouns citees to dwelle and the suburbanis of the bi cumpas, that thei dwelle in the citees; and the suburbanis be to beestis and werk beestis: whiche suburbanis schulen be strecheid forth fro the wallis of citees without forth bi cumpas in the space of a thousand pacis; azens the eest schulen be iij. thousand cubites, and azens the south in liyk maner schulen be iij. thousand cubitie, and at the see that biholdith to the west schal be the same mesure, and the north schal be eendid by even terme. And the citees schulen be in the myddis, and the suburbanis without forth. Thus myche there. Furthermore, that this comaundement of God was executid, performed, and fullfyllid, it is openli expresseed, Ioseue xxij. c., where mensioun is maad that to the dekenis were souun xlvij. citees with her suburbanis in the maner now before comaundid bi God, and the names of the citees ben there in the same chapiter rehercied. Wherfore what is seid and take into making and formyng of this present iij. argument is trewe.

The iij. argument is this:1 Ouer and bizonde alle the xlvij. citees with her seid suburbanis, which God ordeyned to be souun to the clerige of the oold lawe, God licencid to ech person of the lay party, forto zeeue bi vow to the preestis and dekeuis of the seid clerigi his feeld and his hous, whethre he hadde hem bi heritage or bi purchase; and if he for deuocioun wolde not bigge azen hem so souun to the clerkis,

1 this is added in the margin by a later (?) hand.
THE THIRD PART.

but wolde hem abide for euere so 3ouun to the clerkis, tho 1 hous and feeld schulden be the hous and feeld of the preestis and dekenys for euermore, as it is open ynoy3, Leuiticus the laste chapter. Wherfore folowith that Holie Scripture of the oold lawe licencid and not forbade preestis and dekenys of thilk tyme forto haue in her lordschip immovable godis, (as ben houys and feeldis,) 3ouun to hem thanne bi deocioun of the lay peple, ouer and bysonde the xlviiij. citees and the suburbis of pasturis, 3ouun to hem soone aftir the firste departing of the al hool2 lond to the xij. kin-

redis.

ij. CHAPITER.

To the ij. before going argument mowe be 3ouun ij. answeris, of whiche the firste is this: That tho xlviiij. citees, of whiche spoken the textis of the ij. argument, weren not 3ouun into the propre hauour and lordschip of the preestis and dekenys, but into her vee oonli; so that the lordschip and propirte of tho citees abode in the lay persoones, which 3auen the perpetuel vse of tho same citees to the preestis and dekenys.

And into this answer weilen take ij. colours of the whiche oon is bi the text of Numeri xxxxv. c., alleggid before in the ij. argument, for as miche as God seide there thus: Comauonde thou to the sones of Israel, that thei 3eeu to the dekenis of her pos-

sessionuns citees forto dwelle in hem, and the suburbis of the citees in cumpas; that thei dwelle in

Two possible answers of Peckock's oppo-
ments to the foregoing second
argument. The first answer. The forty-eight cities were not given to
the Levites to possess absolutely, but only
to use and to occupy; the prop-
rietors being still those who
made the original assignment.

One plausible ground for this answer is the ex-
pression in Numbers, that these
forty-eight cities were given to the
Levites 'to dwell
in them,' the
indwelling
amounting to a
right of use only, not of possession.

1 So the MS., perhaps by some clerical error: think would be the most natural reading.

2 Perhaps it deserves notice that the scribe had written at the hool load, but afterwards placed over the words the marks of transposi-
tion.
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the townes, and the suburbis be to bestis and helping bestis: whiche suburbis schulen streche withoute forth fro the wallis of the citie: be space of a thousand paces, that is to seie, a myle. Thanne, sithen it is seid that tho citie were zounn for to in hem dwelle, summen wolen thanke to folewe ther of and ther bi, that in this word "forto in hem dwelle" is expressid al the riȝt which the preestis and Leuytis hadden in tho citie; and if this be trewe, that al her riȝt had into tho citie was for to in hem dwelle, folewith nedis that al her riȝt had into tho citie was the riȝt to vse tho citie, sithen indwelling is no more than an vsing; and so folewe fether, that bi thilk ȝift mad to hem thei hadden no riȝt of lordschip, sithen riȝt of voe is dyuers and departable fro the riȝt of lordschip.

The ij. colour forto grounde and strengthe the seid answere mai be this: That Ebron was of the seid xlviij. citie: zounn to preestis and dekenes, as it is open, Iosue xx. 2; and that this same Ebron was zounn into the propre lordschip of Caleph, as is open, Iosue xv. 3. But so it is, that thilk citie was not in propirte of lordschip to gidere and at oonis to Caleph, (which was a lay man,) and to the clergi of preestis and dekenis: and herwith open it is, that thilk cite was not in voe of Caleph: for it was in the voe of preestis or Leuitis, as it is open, Iosue xxiiij. 3. Wherfore thei wolen seie to folewe nedis, that the seid cite was of Caleph as in propirte and in lordschip, and was of the clergie as for her voe without theryn had lordschip.

1 of is interlineded by a later (?) hand.
2 in hem, MS.
3 in dwelling, MS, and so also on p. 283 and p. 288.
4 was is interlineded by a later (?) hand.
5 lordschip, MS. The same clerical (?) error occurs at p. 287.
Curtis the seid answere may not be strengthid bi the i° now reheroid colour or evidence. Forwhi whanne a perso makith a zifte, and to gidere therwith the zeuer expressith his entent or enende into which and for which he makith his zifte, thilk expressioun of his intent and of the enede entendid to be had bi the zifte lettith not the zifte to be a zifte, but suffrith it to be a zifte as farforth as thou; he had mad the zifte without the expressioun or the open pronouncing of the same entent or enede: as if a man wolde seie; "Y zeue to thee a 1 peny forto spende it at the wijn;" the expressioun of his entent lettith not but that he zeueth the peny, and makith the recuyer of the peny to be lord of the peny. But so it is, that whanne God seide that the laife of Israel schulde zeue of her pos sessiouns to the clergie of Israel citees to dwelle in hem; here in these wordis is expressid the zifte, and therwith is expressid the enede which the zeuer wolde be had bi the same zifte. Wherfore bi these wordis is not lett maad, that this same zifte into the now seid enede be a verri zifte; as it schulde haue be, thou; the enede of indwelling hadde not be expressid, but hadde conli be entendid and hopid without expressioun. And so it is vntrew, that 2 whanne it is seid that in these wordis "forto dwelle in tho citees." is expressid al the rīt which preestis and dekenis hadden into tho citees; for more rīt than so is expressid in these wordis, Zeue to the dekenys citees. And the ful hool rīt is expressid in these to gidere wordis, Zeue to the dekenys citees forto dwelle in hem; for in the firste parti of these wordis is expressid the substance of the zifte, and in the ij° parti of tho wordis is

1 a is interlineated by a later (?) | and unmeaning; probably it should be cancelled.
2 that seems to be superfluous
expressid a circumstaunce of the same zifte; which circumstance is the enende for which the zifte is maad. And open to ech man it is, that the expressioun of a zifte is an expressioun of more rizt than is the expressioun of a circumstaunce longing to the same zifte; thou; it be the cheef and principal circumstaunce, worthier than any othir circumstaunce of the same deede of zifte, as is now this present circumstaunce of enede. Wherfore herbi open it is, that the seid answere mai not be holpe bi the firste colour; and that for this that sufficient answere assoiling is now zounn to the same firste colour.

Confirmation to this answere, now maad ajens the same firste colour and the former answere groundid ther upon, mai be bi these ensaemplis. If a man 3eue to me a gowne that y were it, certis hero of folewith that he 3eueeth to me thilk gowne; and thilk gowne is myn in lوردship as verrili as, if he 3eue to me a pijn of wijn forto drinke it, thilk wijn is mad myn in verri lوردship; and as, if a man 3eue to me a peny to spende at the wijn, certis he 3eueeth to me the peny, and the peny is myn in verri lوردship of it. Forwhi, if he wolde that y haue the vce of a thing with outen lوردship of the same thing, he wolde seie thus: “Y deluyere or y bitake to thee this gowne " for to were it; y deluyere to 1 thes hous forto " dwelle in it; y deluyere to thee this feeld forto tile " it:” even as an oosteler seith to his gist; “Sir, y " take this chaumbir to 3ou forto ligge in it; y take " this bed to 3ou forto slepe in it;” and as oon scoler seith to an other scoler thus: “Y take this book " to thee, that thou leerne in it.” And the oosteler seith not to his gist; “Y 3eue to thee this chambr, " that thou reste in it; y 3eue to thee this bed, that

1 to is interlineded, perhaps by a later hand.
"thou slepe in it," neither the scoler seith to his felow thus: "Y ãeue to thee this book, that thou " loerne in it;" for certis, if he so seide, the receuyer myste cleyme the book for his in lordship, as bi vertu and strengthe and forme of the wordis. And therfore, sithen God seid that the lay parti of Israel "schulde " ãeue to the dekenys citees ferto in hem dwelle," and seith not thus, "that the lay parti schulde take " or deluyeere to the dekenis citees ferto in hem " dwelle," it folewith openli yno" bi likenes of these now bfore reherced ensaumplis, that it is to be vndir- stonde and deemed that God wolde the dekenis to be verri lordis of tho citees, whiche thei schulde receyue bi zifte of the lay parti mad ther upon to hem. And this is yno" a"ens the aynwer and his i. colour.

That the i" colour bfore sette for to fortoifie and strengthe the same badde aynwer 1 availith not, lo y mai schewe bi this ensaumpl. If the king of Englon ãeue to me a citee with manye villagis theraboute in cumpas ligging, and sone after this zifte y ãeue the same citee with his suburbis to an other man Robert, reseruyng to my sifl the seid villagis, what schal berof folewe? Schal it be seid that Robert is not lord of this citee, after y haue zouun this citee to him; and that, bi cause that bfore y was lord of the same citee bi zifte ther of maad to me bi the king? Alle men mowe wite that it is not so to be holde and seid. Wherfore bi lijk skile, thou; in the firste soorting and lotting of the al hool lord of Iewis the cite of Ebron fille bi lott to Caleph, (and therbi Caleph was very lord of it, as it is open therof, Isoue xv. ç.) zif her of folewe- ith not neither colour is worth forto seie, that ther-

1 aynwer is inserted by a later (?) hand, which has erased and re-written the two lines preceding.
fore afterward—whanne the secunde lotting was mad for the xlvij. citees to be ʒouun to the dekenes, and this ij*. lott fill upon Ebron, as forto be on of the xlvij. citees, as it is open, Iosue xxvj*. ē.—this Ebron herwith myʒte not be in the lordschip of the dekenis, bi cause the same Ebron was ʒouun bifoare into the lordschip of Calepf. And so open it is herbi, that the ij*. bifoare sett colour helpith not the bifoare seid mad bad answere.

Furthermore thouʒ the seid answere myʒte lette the ij*. bifoare going argument, as treuthie is that he may not lette; (for the worse plite, in which the seid proces, Numeri xxxv*. ē, mai be take aʒena this iiʒ* principal gouernaunce, is such that thilk proces is indifferent¹ to bothe sidis, that is to seie, to the iiʒ* principal gouernaunce and to his contrarie,) ʒit thilk answere mai not lette the iiʒ* bifoare going argument fro his proof. Forwhi as it is open, Leuiticus the laste chapiter, tho housis and tho feeldis,² whiche weren ʒouun to the preestis and dekenis bi deouute vowis of the comoun peple, llen into lordship of the preestis and dekenis; thouʒ it be seid there sumwhilis, that thei weren ʒouun to God and weren halewid to God. Forwhi of a feeld so ʒouun bi vow in a certeyn caas it is seid there thus: Whanne the dai of iubile schal come, the feeld schal be halewid to the Lord, and the halewid possessioun perteymeth or longith to the riʒt of the preestis. Lo, how in the wordis of God these teweine stoden weel to gidere and weren trewe to gidere, that an hous or a feeld or a citee was ʒouun to God, and ʒit was also therwith ʒouun to preestis into her lordschip; riʒt even as in the same laste chapiter of Leuitik it is seid, that mouable godis (as money) weren ʒouun to God and

¹ in different, MS.   ² feeldis, MS.
halewaid to God, and ʒit thei weren maad therbi the preestis and the dekenis godis in lordschip. Forwhi the preestis and dekenis myȝten turne thilk money into the lordschip of the lay parti, whanne suere dekenis hadden nede forto bigge ther with wijn or corn or breed or othere to hem necessarie thingis.

Also thus: No persoon mai in his owne name sille any good, which is not his in lordschip; but so it was, that preestis and dekenis myȝten sille to lay folk the housis and feeldis, which lai folk ʒaue to God and to hem bi deuoute vowis, as is open ynoʒ, Leuiticus the laste chapter. Wherfore nedis folowe-th, that the housis and feeldis weren of the preestis and dekenis in lordschip and not in vce oonli. And if the preestis and dekenis hadden verri cyuyl lordschip vpon the housis and feeldis, which came to hem bi ʒift of the comoun peple aftir her first endewing in the xliiiij. citees; ожет, bi lijk skile, it is not to be denied but that thei hadden verri cyuyl lordschip vpon the xliiiij. citees receyued of hem in her firste endewayng,—namelich sithen noon skile of dyuersite is seen, whi the preestis and dekenys ouȝten not haue lordschip upon tho xliiiij. citees, as weel as upon the other immovable godis.

iij. CHAPITRE.

The iiij. answere which may be mad to the iiij. biforn going argument sett in the firste chapter of this iiij. parti mai be this: Thouʒ bi the bidding of God the preestis and dekenys hadden in her verri lordschip

Neither would it have been lawfull for the priests and Levites to have sold the lands so given them, unless they had been their absolute property. And if such lands belonged to them absolutely, it is hard to think that the forty-eight cities were not also theirs in the same unlimited some.
chap. iii. levi, the levite, had forty-eight cities assigned to them as their own by god, yet it was not his will that more cities or lands should be given them than they themselves had need to occupy.

reply to the answer. it is probably true that in the first allotment of the forty-eight cities the levites received no more than they could themselves occupy, but the unlimited permission granted to them to receive lands from the leity, which might be sold before the jubilee to another than the giver, and which at the jubilee returned again to the clergy, shows that the supposition made in the answer is unreasonable and false.

tho xlviij. citees with the suburbis of the same citees; sit herbi rose not this, that thei hadden any more of immovable godis in her lordship and possession than was nedeful hem to vse and occupie in her owne demenynge. and thereto sownen tho wordis, numeri xxxv. c., whiche ben before reherced in the firste colour to the firste answer, whanne god seid thus, ioeue 38 to the dekenis citees forto dwelle in hem: wherbi it wolde seme folewe fether, that mo citees or other citees than in whiche the preestis and dekenys hadde nede to dwelle yn, was not goddis wil that schulden be 30ue to hem; and thanne folewith fether, that it was not leeful thanne preestis and dekenys forto haue so manye housis and feeldis, that thei myyste sette hem out to ferme and receyue ioeueri rentis for hem.

to this answer must be seid thus: this answer seith sooth in this, that it is likely to be trewe that, in the firste endewing of the preestis and dekenys bi the xlviij. citees with her suburbis, thei receyueden no more of immovable godis than was necessarie hem sifl to occupie in her owne demenynge; but whanne it is concluided forto folewe herof, that it was goddis wil that the same preestis and dekenys schulden neuer aftirward receyue and haue into her lordship eny immovable godis, whiche thei hadden no nede bi hem sifl occupie bi her owne indwelling or tilinge: certis it is to be seid, that this folewith not in fowrme of gode argument. and also the contrarie ther of folewith of it which was ordeyned of god him sifl to be doon, leuyticus the laste chapter. forwhi it was ordeyned of god him sifl, that if a lay persoon wolde offre and ioeue an hous or a feeld to the clergie in the next ioeuer bifore the iubile ioeer, (3he, thou it were so nyz to the iubile ioeer, that it were not but iiiij. or v. daies bifore the iubile ioeer,) the clergye myyste sille this hous or
feeld to an other persoon than to him which sam to it to hem. And thanne anoon after, as soone as the iubile zeer were come, the same hous or feeld schulde turne azten into the lordschip of the clergie for evermore, as it is open, Leuytik the last chapter. And as oon lay man myzte in this maner offre an hous or a feeld to the clergie, so ij. lay men or iij. lay men or xx. or an hundrid myzten so do, that ech of hem schulde offre and zeue to the clergie an hous or a feeld; zhe, and oon man myzte offre and zeue ij. or iij. housis and iij. or iij. feeldis, as is open ynooz to folewe of the proces there, which zeueth such licence in general withoute any restreynynge.

Here upon y argue thus: In the next zeer going before the iubile zeer, (zhe, in the iijr. day before the iubile zeer,) whanne the clergie was endewid with immouable godis sufficientli forto exclude al neder to haue more of immouable godis, the clergie myzte receyue an hous or a feeld toooune to hem of the laise; (and bi lijk skile iij. housis and iij. feeldis toooune to hem of the lyeve;) and the clergie myzte thanne anoon forth with sille hem to lay persoonis othere and dyuere fro the zeuera. And thouz in the next zeer folowing, which is iubile zeer, the clergie schulde as litle be nedi to haue tho housis and feeldis as thei were in the iijr. dai bforo the iubile zeer, zit tho housis and feeldis schulden needis bi the lawe of God turne into the lordschip and possessioun of the clergie, as is open, Leuyticus the last chapter. Wherfore it accordid with the lawe of God and with his ordination, that the clergie myzte receyue1 and haue mo housis and feeldis than thei hadden nede to occupie in her owne demenys; and thanne foloewith herof, that thei myzten putte tho same housis and

---

1 recey, MS., but a hyphen follows at the end of the line.
feeldis into ferme and rente; for\(^1\) ellis the housis and feeldis schulden\(^2\) not be to hem availing.

If any man wolde seie here, that in the daies no lay person ouȝte ȝeue any houes or feeld\(^3\) to the clergie of thilke tyme, saue whanne the clergie had nede to occupie bi her owne voe thilke same or summe others like hous or feeld, certis this seiyng may be at fulle putt abak and be rebukid. Forwhi if this seiyng were trewe, thanne the clergie schulde not and ouȝte not sille anoon forth with any hous or feeld, which the lay peple hadde ȝeue to hem; and ȝit pleinli in the laste chapter of Leuitik it is licencid to preestis and dekenis for to sille the hous or feeld which a lay person schal ȝeue to hem; ȝhe, forto sille it anoon after the ȝisfe maad to hem; ȝhe, and forto sille anoon forthwith to hem that ȝauem the hous and the feeld or to othere personnes whiche ȝauem\(^4\) hem not. And so bi al this processe now biforn going (fro the bigynnyng of the firste argument markid in the firste chapter of this present iij\(^5\). parti hiderto) it is wel proued, that to preestis and to othere clerkis of the Oold Testament it was not forbodon bi the lawes of God forto hauve lordship and in possesioun immuuable godis; but it was licencid and grauntid to hem bi the lawes of God for to hauve in lordship and in possesioun citezis, housis, and feeldis, and pasturis,—not onyl the whiche thei helden in her owne demeny, but also mo othere\(^6\) whiche thei myȝten sette forth to ferme and rente. And thercorf Holi Scripture of the Oold Testament forbedith not to preestis and clerkis of the Newe Testament forto hauve in lyk maner like immuuable godis.

---

\(^1\) or, MS. (first hand).
\(^2\) schulde, MS. (first hand).
\(^3\) or feeld is added by a later (?) hand.
\(^4\) ȝauem, MS. (first hand).
\(^5\) Perhaps we should read others
\(^6\) mo.
And ist wherto schal y make me so bisy forto defende the firste principal gouernaunce ažens eny forbode which schulde be pretendid to be ther ažens in the lawe of Iewis? Forwhi, ben not alle the lawis of the Iewis reuokid bi Crist egh oon, except what is lawe of kinde, that is to seie, what doom of cleer resoun wole haue to be do or to be left vndo; as alle Cristen men bileuuen, and as it is open bi Poul in his Epistle to the Romayns and in his First Epistle to Corinthis and in his Epistle to Galathis and Acts xv. c. 1 And thernore, thouȝ it hadde be trewe, (as it is not trewe,) that vnmoveable endewing in propirte of lordship hadde be forboden to preestis and clerkis of the Iewis, what is it forto forbode to preestis of Cristen men, but if Cristen preestis weren Iewen preestis; or but if the lawis of Iewis weren not oesid; or but if doom of cleer resoun wolde nedis dryue and proue that Cristen preestis ouȝten not haue eny vnmoveable endewing? Which thing doom of cleer resoun can not proue, (as in the ij. principal conclusion of this iij. present parti it schal be proved,) but y can proue the contrarie, as schal be seen afther in this present iij. partie in the v. principal conclusion. Wherfore, forto answere to eny colour taken bi Iewes lawes ažens the seid firste princible gouernaunce had and vsid in the clergie of Cristis chirche is more than is nede forto take upon me.

Also thus: If eny on forbode maad in Iewis lawe to preestis schulde binde also Cristen preestis, bi liȝt skile ech other forbode maad in Iewis lawe to preestis schulde also binde Cristen preestis. And so wolde folewe this, that if this forbode maad to Iewen preestis, that thei schulden not haue vnmoveable endewing.

---

1 Both here and below Peacock should have written shriddle instead of firste.
2 An erasure of a letter (a f) has been made at the end of be.
3 schulden, MS. twice (first hand).
schulde streche to Cristen preestis; bi lijk skile this forbode mad to Iewn preestis, that thei schulden drinke no wijn, neither sidir, neither eny drinke, which myȝte make the drinker drunke, thorouȝ al the tyme whils he schulde offre sacrificis in her cours, (which forbode is writun Leuiticus x. 6.) schulde also binde Cristen preestis, that al the while thei were wekelei occupied in offring the sacrifice of the auter, thei schulden drinke no wijn, neither ale ne bere, neither sider, neither eny drinke which mai make drunke. But this thing wole not be so hard forto leie upon Cristen preestis, that thei ben bounde therto bi strengthe of a lijk forbode mad to Iewn preestis. Wherfore folewith, that neithir eny man mai make him so streit to Cristen preestis forto pretende, that bi strengthe of eny 1 forbode in Iewis lawe Cristen preestis ouȝten not be endewid bi vnmoveable possesiouns. And thus miche fro the bigynnyng of this chaptor in this present iij. partie hidir to is ynoȝ for proof of the firste conclusion for his firste partie, that Holi Scripture forbedith not neither weerneth in eny place of the Oold Testament the seid firste principal conclusion.

iiiij. Chapiter.

Now that the same firste conclusion is trewe for his iij. party, (which is this, that Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament forbeth not the seid gouvernaunce, which is that preestis and clerkis in the Newe Testament haue in her lordschip and possesioun immouable goodis,) y procede thus: Ech party of Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament is oon of these iij. soortis, 2 or ellis therto longing; for it is pure

---

1 iey, MS.
2 soortis, MS. (partly written on an erasure).
THE THIRD PART.

historial oonli as is this, that Gabriel was sent to Made; and seide to hir thus; and that sche answerid thus; and that sche childide hir Sone in Bethleem; and that he afterward did this miracle, and thilk miracle: or it is doctrinal oonli, that is to seie, loor of moral conversacioun how a man schal gouerne him in his lyuyng immediatli anentis God, anentis him sylf, and anentis hise neiþbors, as is this, Thou schalt love God of al thin herte and thi neiþbour as thi sylf; and so of othe like: or it is historical ensam-pial of the now bifoire seid moral conversacion, as is this, that Crist or eny of hise Apostlis in his moral lyuyng anentis God or him sylf or his neiþbour lyned thus or thus.

Here upon y argue thus: If Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament schulde forbede the seid guernauence, he muste nedis so do bi sum party of the ij. or the iij. seid soort; for the firste seid soort longith not to bidde or forbede any vertu or any vice, as is open ynon3, for he is historial oonli withoute doctrine of moral conversacioun. But so it is, that no Scripture of the ij. or of the iij. soort in the Newe Testament so forbedith. Wherfore foleweith, that no parti of the Newe Testament so forbedith.

That no parti of the iij. seid soort so forbedith, y proue thus: If any such party of the iij. seid soort schulde forbede the seid thridde guernauence, it schulde bi 1 this processe writun Math. xix. 2., where it is seid thus: Lo, oon came and seid to Jesus, Good maister, what good schal 2 y do, that y have everlastinge lijf? Which seide to him, What askst thou me of good thing? Ther is oon good God. But if thou wolst entre to lijf, kepe the comandements. He seith to him, Whiche? Jesus seide, Thou schalt

1 Perhaps a clerical error for be. 2 schal, MS.; but schalt is the reading of Wiclif's (later) version, whence this is quoted.
not do mansleing, Thou schalt not do avoutris, Thou schalt not do thefte, Thou schalt not seie fals witnes-
ning, Worschippe thi fadir and thi modir, and, Thou schalt love thi neibour as thi self. The zong man seith to him, Y haue kepte alle these thingis fro my zongthe, what zit faillith to me? Iesus seith to him, If thou wolst be perfit, go and sille alle thingis that thou hast and zewe to poor men, and thou schalt have tresour in heuen; and come and sue me. And whanne the zong man had herd these wordis, he wente away sorowful; for he hadde manys possessiouns. And Iesus seide to hisse discipuli, I seie to you treuth, a riche man of hard schal entre into the kingdome of heuenes. And eftsones y seie to you, it is liicter a camel to passe throuz a needleis iże, than a riche man to entre into the kingdome of heuenes. Whanne these thingis weren herd, the discipuli wondriden gretti and seiden, Who thanne may be saaf? Iesus biheld and seide to hem, Anentis men this thing is impossible, but anentis God alle thingis ben possible. Thus miche ther. Lijk processe throuz al is had and writun Luk xviiij. ç. In this processe ben iij. seiyngis, whiche myȝten semo forto lette the seid iiij. principal gouernance. Oon is this, that Crist seide to the zong man comyng to him: "Go and sille alle thingis that thou hast and zewe "to poor men, and come and sue me." The other seiyng is this: "It is liicter a camel to passe throuz "a needelis iże, than a riche man to entre into the "kingdome of heuenes."

That the first seiyng helpith not in this way, y mai proue. Forwhi, Mark the x. ç., where this same storie is writun with lijk proces, it is meened that this zong man (which in the new seid maner came to Crist) was so vndisposid anentis hisse richessis, that he hadde trust in hem. Forwhi there, Mark x. ç., in the same speche and proces longing to the same zong man, Crist seid thus, How hard is it for men that trusten
in richeasis to entre into the kingdom of God. So that therbi it may be take and vnndirstonde, that therfore Crist seide and counseilid or bade to him for-
to forsake and sille hise richeasis, bi cause that he was, as it were, vnable forto haue to do with tho richeasis; and that for his natural indisposicion and ouer soor inclination of loue anentis hem, and for his ouer greet trust which in his witt he bisettid upon hem. Wherof folowith not, that Crist schulde wilne and bidde in lijk maner to any other man, (preeest or no preeest,) which is not so vndisposed anentis richeasis as this long man was; and therfore al this what Crist solde to the seid long man groundith not, that nedisay eoh preeest owith to lacke and forsake alle immuable possessiouns; no more than folowith, thogh the riche man, of whom it is writun Luk xij. ἓ, was vndisposed and vnable to haue and reule and dispense richeasis, that therfore Zache and Abraham and Iosep of Armathie and king Dauith were vnable and vnworthi and vndisposed forto haue and reule and demone richeasis.

Also this present processe sowneth and berith ful greet eyudence, that Crist here clepid this long man into apostilhode or into discipylehode; and her with open truthe it is, that the state and condicion of tho daies weren such, that it accordid not with resoun eny man forto holde to gider apostilhode or discipil-
hode and possessioun of immuable godis or holding houshold and reuling of meyne and of movable godis, as it is schewid in The book of counsellis; thogh now adales it may weel ynow3 accorde with resoun, as soone aftir here schal be schewid. Forwhi eoh man thanne stonding in apostilhode or discipilhode hadde

Moreover it is clear that Christ called him to be an apostle, and in those days apostleship and holding of pro-

1 vnworthi disposed, MS. (first hand).
apostil hose, MS. (no hyphen following apostil at the end of the line; but apostilhode and discipile-
hode distinctly just below).
nede forto ech dai make him redi to die bi martirdoom of tirantis, and thercfor hadde nede more forto zeue awey good than forto gadere, reule, gouerne, or kepe; and also ech such man was to trauwel into strauuge cuntrees forto preche the feith; and also he muste nedis leue hise godis, if he eny hadde, into his ene-
myes hondia. And so neither wisdom neither profit were to hem so circumstancid with tho daies, placis, and maners of the peple for to holde eny movable or vnumouable godis, but if it were sumwhat of money oonli. Wherfore folewith nedis, that bi strengthe of the firste seiyng of Crist may not be proued that the iij. principal before seid gouernance of this book is aeazens Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament.

That the iij. seiyng of Crist lettith not the seid iij. principal gouernance, y proye thus: The riche man, of which Crist spekith in thilk iij. seiyng, is he which not oonli hath riccessis, but which therwithal tristith ouer myche in hise riccessis, and thercfor folowingli loueth ouer miche hise riccessis; as the text of Mark x. 5., writing the same storie, declarith openli in this that Crist seide thus: How hard it is for men that trusten in riccessis to entre in to the kingdom of God! Wherfore this iij. seiyng of Crist touchith not suche riche men, whiche han riccessis and not ouer myche trusten in hem, neither ouer myche louen hem. And so folewith, that if eny man be so disposed that he can forbere ouermyche trust and ouer myche loue to riccessis, he maie weel ynuo; holde prelacie and riccessis to gidere for eny lett which this iij. seiyng of Crist makith ther aeazens.

Also Crist seide here in this present proces, that "at God" it is possible a riche man to entre into the kingdom of heuen; that is to seie, with grace

1 eny is added in the margin by a later (?) hand.
which God profrith and zeueth to a riche man he mai entre into the kingdom of heuen; thou, he abide stille riche, and thouz withoute such grace it is ouer hard to him being riche for to entre. Wherfore folewith herof openli, that it is not forbodun of God eny man to be riche; for thanne noon such man schulde euere entre heuen, bi cause he schulde thanne entre azens Goddis forbode. And if it be not forbode eny man to be riche, certis thanne it is leeful ynowz ech man to be riche; in lasse than he vowe the contrarie, or that he knowith bi assay and experience him self so miche indisposid anentis riciochessis, that he schal not mouse rewle him self arizt anentis tho riciochessis: for in thilk caas he is bonde to holde him self in pouerte, accordingli to this that Crist seith in the Gospel, Math. v. c., If thi rizt ixe or thi rizt hond sclaundre thee, kette him of and caste him fro thee. And here bi it is euядent ynowz, the that the ij. seiyng of Crist gooth not azens the ij. biforn principal seid gouernaunce.

The ij. principal processe of Holi Scripture in the Newe Testament, which myȝte seme forto lette the seid ij. principal gouernaunce, it is which is write Luk xiiij. c., thus: So theryfore ech of zou, that forsakith not alle thingis that he hath, may not be my disciple. But certis, the hool chapter in which this text is sett scheweth well ynowz, that this text was seid as weel to al the comoun peple folewing Crist in thilk tyme, as it was seid to hisse Apostlis and disciplis; and theryfore it reulith no more pralatis into pouerte then ech lay persoon into pouerte. Wherfore it is to be seid, that in this now alleggied text Crist meened of forsaking of ouer myche trust and of ouer myche loue to riciochessis, (in the maner now late biforn declarid upon the first principal processe,) and not that he meened a forsaking of riciochessis vttirli. Forwhi ellis ech lay man ouȝte needis be
The third text (Math. xx.) considered, where Christ forbids any of his Apostles to have lordship over others, and so may seem to forbid the clergy to have lands and tenants.

The iij. principal processes of the Newe Testament which seeme to meete azena the seid gouernance of prelatis endewyng is write, Math. xx. 6., where Crist said to his Apostlis thus: 2e witen that princois of heten men ben lordis of hem, and thei that ben gretter venn power on hem; it schal not be so among you; but who ever wolde be mad gretter among you, be he zoure mynystre; and who ever among you wolde be the firste, he schal be zoure servaunt; as

1 for bero, MS. (without hyphen).
2 Probably we should read myste seems.
Mannis Sone came not to be serued but to serue, and to zeue his liij redempcioun for manye. Lijk processe thoruž out is write Mark the x. E. Out of this processe semeth to folewe, that preestis ouȝten not haue ouerte among hem sylf, oon of hem upon an other of hem; neither eny preest ouȝte haue ouerte upon eny lay persoon of his neizboris. And if this be trewe, than schulde no preest haue immouable godis in lordschip. Forwhi thanne he muste nedis comaunde and regne upon his tenauntis, and thei muste needis obeie and do sawtis and servisicis to him. But certis if this processe be weel in seen and thoruž seen, he gothe[1] not for this purpos. Forwhi in two maners ouerers mowen holden and vse her ouerte vpon her vnديرlingis.

Oon maner is bi tirannie, which is forto in alle deedis of ouerte awaite and performe her owne profit conli, and not the profit of her vnديرlingis; and in this maner kingis and princis of hethen folk helden her ouerte in the daies of Crist. And of this ouerte spekith Crist in the now biforn alleggid processe, which maner of ouerte Crist wolde not to be bitwixe preestis and her vnديرlingis, neithir bitwixe oon persoon of hem and another of hem. And more than this can not be prouded and schewid the seid processe to[2] bере in him; and therfore this processe maketh not sufficientli ażens the seid iij. gouernaunces of preestis endewing. And that this is trewe, li, the processe, which Luk writith in his xxiij. chapter, somwhat declarith. Forwhi Luk there[3] storieth Crist to haue seid thus: Kingis of hethen men ben lordis of hem,

---

[1] This and the six words preceding are written on an erasure, in seen being added in the margin, in a later hand. The orthography is against the common usage of this MS.; though occurring in others.

[2] to is added in the margin by a later (?) hand.

[3] there is interlined by a later (?) hand.

See Maundevile's Travels, p. 111. (Lond. 1839).
and the that han power of hem ben clepid gode doers; but ze not so; but he that is grettist among you be mad as zonger, and he that is before goer as a servaunt. For who is grettet, he that sitteth at the mete or he that mynystrieth? whether not he that sitteth at the mete? And y am in the myddil of you as he that mynystrieth. Certis in this that Crist seide, Thei that han power of hem ben clepid gode doers, but ze not so, Crist meened not of hem whiche ben verrilli gode doers to her vnirdlingis, but whiche ben not gode doeris, and hit for flatery and pleasaunce, (lest grettet tirantrie be doen,) ben clepid gode doeris of her vnirdlingis.

An other maner of ouerte bering and usynge is for to (in alle deedis of thilk ouerte usynge and executing) awaite and performe the profit of the vnirdlingis in hem weel reuling bi doom of resoun, and of hem not more or other asking than as resoun or feith woole; which maner of ouerte holding and usynge mai be clepid therselfe service to the vnirdlingis, bi cause it is into the profit of the vnirdlingis; thouz it be ther with an ouerte beryng and hauynge and holding. And of this ouerte spekith Crist in the place now before alleggd, Luk xxij. 2, Who is grettet, he that sitteth at the mete, or he that mynystrieth? whether not he that sitteth at the mete? And y am in the myddil of you as he that mynystrieth. Lo, how Crist pleinli and openli was aknowe that he took upon him to be the grettet, in that that he settid him sylf in the myddil; and seith that therselfe he sate in the myddil, forto schewe that he bare him as her grettet and worthier. And hit therwith, in that that in so sit-

1 myddil, MS. (first hand). myddil is the reading of most MSS. in the later form of Wiclif's version, from which this quotation is made, and is written more than once by the first hand in this MS. just below.
ting in the myddil he was the redier and the abler forto waite into al her good and profit, (for to be seen of hem alle, and forto be herd of hem alle, and alle hem forto receyue mete of him the better,) he seith that his sitting in the myddil and his ther yn ouerte bering is as service to hem alle. Certis this ij. maner of ouerte bering, holding, and using Crist weerned not hise Apostlis forto haue and holde in the alleggid processe, Math. xx. c., and Mark the x. c., and Luk xxij. c.: for thanne Crist hadde weerned to hem the same gouernaunce which he ensaumpild him self to hem and before hem at his soper. And also the same before alleggid processe, Math. xx. c., Mark x. c., and Luk xxij. c., wolen prone sufficientli ynow3, that Crist ther yn 3ane ground and teching that thei schulden haue, holde, and vse the ouerte of the ij. maner. Forwhi how euere schulde Crist teche and bidde to hem thus: He that is grettist among you be maad as zonger, and he that is a before goer be mad as servuant1; but ifa ther yn he schulde meene that among hem schulde oon be gretter than an other, and that oon schulde go before an other; and zit ther with in sum maner2 serue to the same othere before whom he gooth, and to whom he holdith him as grettter? Certis, but if Crist schulde meene thus, ellis he schulde teche such doctryne which includith repugnance and contrariete.4 Forwhi ellis he schulde meene that among hem schulde sum be gretter than othere and before goers to othere, and zit noon schulde be ouerer to othere neither gretter in degree than othere. And therfore needis cost it muste be grauntid, that Crist wolde among preestis be ouerte, and bitwixe hem

1 as servaunt, MS. (first hand).
2 summaner, MS. (perhaps not accidentally. Cf. summan).
3 beuï, MS.
4 contrarie, MS. (first hand).
and other personis be ouerte, in the ij. seid maner, al into the avail of the vndirlingis; and not in the firste seid maner, by tyrannie into the avail ouli of the ouerers.

In lijk maner, Ecclesiastici iiij. c., it is written thus, In how miche thou art greet, louze thou thee in alle thingis; and thou schalt fynde grace before God. If eny man wolde seie, that the wise man in this text entendid to teche that no man schulde bere him as an ouerer to othere, certis he ther yn accusid the wijs man amys: for as miche as the same wijs man approueth weel such ouerte in the same book, the x. c., in the bigynnyng; and also for as miche as in this same now alleggid text he impli- eth, includith, and meeneth, that he which is ouerer, and whils he is ouerer, and berith him self as ouerer, schulde louze him self in sum other maner; as, whils that he berith him as ouerer in outward countenaunce, he schulde louze him self in inward feeling of herte. And ellis these wordis myztyn not stonde to gidere forto make a treuthe; that he which is greet, and how euer greet he is, he ouȝte louȝe him, that he fynde grace before God. And also ellis the wijse man schulde seie in waast, that the greet man schulde louȝe him, but if eny greet man were aboue other men. Wherfore in lijk maner whanne Crist seide, Luk xxij. c., He that is grettiest among you be mad as zonger; he muste nedis meene that he allowith oon to be grettiest among hem, and that he in sum other maner louȝe him as a zonger. Wherto ful miche accordith and helpith this maner of seiyng and writing, “be “he maad as zonger and as a servaut;” that is to seie, “be he maad lijk to a zongir, and be he maad “lijk to a seruaunt.”
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