THE

REPRESSOR OF OVER MUCH BLAMING OF THE CLERGY.

BY

REGINALD PECOCK, D.D.,

SOMETIME LORD BISHOP OF CHICHESTER.

EDITED

BY

CHURCHILL BABINGTON, B.D.,

FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE LORDS COMMISSIONERS OF HER MAJESTY'S TREASURY, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, AND ROBERTS.

1860.

Digitized by Google

Printed by
EYRE and SPOTTISWOODE, Her Majesty's Printers,
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

	Page
Introduction - - - - - -	ix
Summary of Contents - - -	lxxxvii
Pecock's Repressor - - - - -	1
Excerpts from Bury's Gladius Salomonis -	567
Abbreviatio Reginaldi Pecock - - -	615
Extract from Gascoigne's Theological Dictionary	621
Glossary - - - - - -	625
Index - - - - - - -	685

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

INTRODUCTION.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

INTRODUCTION.

THE life of Reginald Pecock has been made the subject of a special work by Lewis,[1] who has con- Sources of information respecting Pecock.

[1] The Life of the learned and right reverend Reynold Pecock, S.T.P., lord bishop of St. Asaph and Chichester, 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 Mergate 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, sæc. 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 : "Hactenus de Pecockio illo de quo certe hæc referenda duxi . . . . quod Oxoniensis fuerit, præsertim vero quod illa scriptorum neminem attigisse crediderim præter unicum Gascoignum, cujus cum eorum quæ refert pleraque oculis et auribus præsens hauserit vestigia premenda mihi religiose videbantur." Many excerpts from this Dictionary relating to Pecock are given by Hearne at the end of his edition of *Walter Hemingford*, 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

Digitized by Google

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.

Pecock's early life, circa A.D. 1395–1430.

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 diœcesis Menevensis.*[1] 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.

(4.) Lelandi *Collectanea*, tom. 2, pp. 409, 410 (Hearne's edition), ejusd. *Comm. de Scriptt. Britt.*, c. 565, pp. 458, 459 (Hall's edition).

(5.) Bale, *Scriptt. Brit.*, foll. 204, 205, Wesal. 1548; and more fully but very inaccurately, pp. 594, 595. Ed. Basil, 1559.

(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 criticisms; 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 *Hemingford*, pp. CLI.–CLIII.)

(7) There are also besides these various incidental allusions to him in the chroniclers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Caxton, Hall, Fabyan, 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, sæc. xv.) 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 diœcesis in artibus magistrum*

Digitized by Google

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.[1] 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 1425,[2] 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 hæc 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 Assavensis* are still preserved at Lambeth.

[1] "Wallicus origine," Gascoigne in Hearne, *u. s.*, 514, 516, and 548. "natione Wallicus," Incert. Chron. in Leland Collect., tom. ii. p. 409; "relicta Cambria, patrio solo." Leland, *De Scriptt. Britt.*, 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, 1559). 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.

Digitized by Google

"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]

Pecock promoted to the mastership of Whittington College and the rectory of St. Michael in Riola, A.D. 1431.

Soon after this time he was summoned to court, where, according to Leland, his services were so acceptable 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 probably 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 controversy 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. Britt.*, *u. s.*, ejusd. *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 information about Whittington College will be found. It is marked in a map of London in 1563 (copied in Pennant's *London*), being situated near the Three Cranes in the Vintree, about half way between St. Paul's and old London Bridge.

Digitized by Google

But Pecock was destined to rise to higher honours. The protector's influence procured him a bishopric.[1] 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.[2]

Consecrated bishop of St. Asaph, A.D. 1444.

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

He defends unpreaching and non-resident prelates in a sermon at Paul's Cross, A.D. 1447.

[1] So Bale says expressly (*De Scriptt. 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, *u. 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 theologia, an postea faciet nescitur a nobis. Per omnes annos a die inceptionis suæ in Oxonia usque ad diem præsentis scripturæ nullum actum fecit scholasticum, nec legendo, nec prædicando, nec disputando, nec determinando." And again (p. 548):—"Recepit illum gradum per dispensationem, *i. e.* per dissipationem seu licentiam ad malum per regentes in Oxonia."

Digitized by Google

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 præclarissimum prædicandi 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. Pecock 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.

Digitized by Google

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.[1] 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 *Moriæ encomium*, or Lewis, p. 139. For the Franciscan rule, thus eluded, see *Monumenta Franciscana*, p. 576, in the present series.

Digitized by Google

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 Wiclif 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.[1]

The effects of the sermon. Opposition made to it from various quarters.

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

[1] Pecock's *Repressor*, p. 106. Nicolaus de Clamengiis in Brown. *App. ad Fasc. Rerum* (passim). Gascoigne, *u. s.*, pp. 516, 517, 520, 528, 529. Lewis, pp. 17, *sqq.* where a great deal of collateral information will be found. His translation of the seven conclusions is taken from a Latin MS. at Oxford, Bodl. 117, fol. 11, *sqq.*, called *Abbreviatio Reginaldi Pecock*, printed in the Appendix to the present work.

Digitized by Google

form of seven conclusions, which he transmitted to divers persons after its delivery,[1] 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.[2] 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 "conclusiouns publisshid" in the *Follower to the Donet* (fol. 49): "Y wote wel tho conclusions wolen be holde for trewe of ech greet leernyd man in dyuynite or in lawe of canoun, while the world schal dure.... No clerk ȝit hitherto into this present day bi more than vi ȝeer passid after the bigynnyng of the strijf durste take vpon him forto answere to the proofis of hem, thouȝ summe clerkis han be ful redi forto argue and make motynes aȝens hem and aȝens side half maters, which is ful liȝt and esi in reward of the answeryng to the proofis of hem." The "principal mater" in these conclusions is "of bisshopis 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 Askew, 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.*

Digitized by Google

vost of King's College, Cambridge,[1] 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.[2]

Pecock escapes official censure.

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. 287–328 (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.

[2] Gascoigne, *u. s.*, pp. 514, 517, 518, 524, 542; Abbrev. Reg. Pecock.

Digitized by Google

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.[1]

His motives considered. His practice in his own diocese.

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]

---

[1] Gascoigne, *u. s.*, pp. 514, 537, 541, 542, 543. Leland *de Scriptt. Britt.*, *u. s.*

[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*

Digitized by Google

Pecock's works. Their dates uncertain.

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.

His *Donet*, circa A.D. 1440.

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

---

the Donet (MS. fol. 100), may be thought to allude to this controversy: "How my wordis han be thus chalengid, whanne ech witti welwilli man to trouth myȝte knowe that y other wise meenyd, writyngis in the repliers side and writyngis aȝen in my side beren witnes. No man wijte me, thouȝ y speke and write so oft for my defensis; the malice of summe clerkis (as y heere and sumwhat haue felid) is so greet aȝens me, that this and mych more is litil ynouȝ forto aȝenstonde it."

[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 comune crede, which article is this, "Y bileeue into God ye Fadir maker of heuene and of erthe" thon schalt fynde in ye xiiii^e and xv^e chapitris of the first party aforegoing. For whi in the xiiii^e chap. it is tauȝt, that God is thre persoonys, Fadir, Sone, and Holi Goost, and ȝitt that therwith he is not bnt oon and the same substaunce in alle thre persoonys. Also in ye bigynnyng of the xv^e chap., where benefetis vndirgraciose or louȝer than graciose ben tauȝt, it is seid, that God maad henene and erthe and alle her contentis: and how manye mo articlis of bileeue touching ye Godhede and touching his benefete in making creaturis ben tauȝt in the seid xiiii^e and xv^e chap., which articlis ben as necessary to be bileeuid as this seid first article of the comune crede is to be bileeuid, it is liȝt to turne thidir and to se. Alle the othere xi. articles of the comune crede . . . . ben these. And y bileeue into Ihesu Crist his oon bigeten Sone oure Lorde which was conceyued of the Holy Goost and born of Mary the maide, which Ihesus

Digitized by Google

uncertain.[1] 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.

His *Follower to the Donet*, circa A.D. 1454. He complains that some of his works had been published without his consent.

Both the *Donet* and the *Follower to the Donet*, which appeared some time[2] afterwards (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*,[3] 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 aȝens my wille and myn "entent, as y haue openly prechid at Poulis." In the same book he affirms that if through "eny vnad-"visidnes, hastynes, or ignoraunce" 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 chirche."[4] From all this it is evident that Pecock had, in these his earlier and

---

suffrid vndir Pounce Pilate, was crucified, was deed and biried, and rose in the iii° daie to lijf, stiȝed vp into heuene, sittith at the riȝt 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 vniuersal or general chirche to be. Y bileeue the comunyng of seintis or of holy men to be. Y bileeue forȝeuenes of synne to be. I bileeve the aȝen rising of deed men, that is to sei to be or to come. And I bileeue euerlasting lijf 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 pacience 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. 52.

Digitized by Google

more unfinished treatises, given expression to some sentiments which were not favourably received by certain of the hierarchy.

His *Repressor*, circa A.D. 1449.

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.[1] 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, 517. 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. "Ferthermore, for as myche as soone after that y hadde write the book clepid *The Represser, which is not ȝitt into this present day vtterly into vce delyuered*, fillen to me manye occupacioun̄s by sixe yeere next thanne folowing, that leiser was not to me neither ȝitt is forto write in special aȝens the articlis whiche ben spokun in the eend of *The Represser* and left there vntretid."—Pecock's *Book of Faith*, MS., foll. 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.

Digitized by Google

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] The great historical value of Pecock's work

[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 Auchon (it should have been Anchon) is a name for Avignon (p. 116). This piece of nonsense, like many more absurd

Digitized by Google

consists in this, that it preserves to us the best arguments 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 arguing 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 opponents 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]

---

remarks of which no notice is taken in this edition, is written in the margin of the MS. in a later hand, but Lewis adopted it among his marginal notes without scruple or difficulty.

[1] See *Repressor*, p. 176, *sqq.* There can be no doubt, I think, that Pecock contends against an interpretation which he had actually encountered.

[2] This error is as old as Optatus (or at least it occurs in his present text) :—"Igitur negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse collatam; in qua sederit *omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas appellatus est.*" (Optat., lib. ii. p. 31. Ed. Par. 1702.) If the Donatists had had no greater difficulties than this to contend with, they might probably have vanquished their opponents. Many later writers make the same absurd mistake. See Fulke's *Discovery*, &c., p. 301. (Parker Society's edition.) From some or other of them Pecock, no doubt, derived it, but St. Jerome, to whom he strangely refers (p. 437), would have taught him better. Valla ridicules this popular error in his declamation against Constantine's donation. Brown, *Fasc. Rer.* p. 152.

[3] "By tranquil opposition to the more zealous followers of Wiclif," observes 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

Digitized by Google

and if his character as a reformer leaves something to be desired, it was *multo melior futurus, nisi tempora in quibus viveret obstitissent.*

State of religious parties at the time.

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,[1] 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

(§ 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.

Digitized by Google

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.

Probable sources of Pecock's information.

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 "manners 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."[1] 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 allusions to the story about the angel's voice when Constantine en-

Digitized by Google

doubtfully ascribed to Wiclif,[1] 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.[2] 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.*[3] 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*, iv. 18, and in his treatise *Of Clerks' Possessioners,*) 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.

[3] 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.

Digitized by Google

works extant in MS.[1] 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.[2]

Pecock and Hooker compared.

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,[3] 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.[4] When the lawfulness of any ecclesiastical usage was in debate, the Lollard would ask, *Where groundest 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 "*withdrawing* of teching in word and deed in good ensample," 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 1395, 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 foundid in Holy Scripture openly eyther priuely, eyther in resoun that may not faile." Pecock himself might have written these words.

[4] Scripture itself remands us to reason for such matters. 1 Cor. xiv. 40; xi. 13.

Digitized by Google

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."[1]

Questionable positions of Pecock.

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 versâ*. Or such an opinion again as this, that the doctrine of the sacraments is more founded in reason than revelation.[2]

General character of the work.

Yet, after every deduction has been made, his *Repressor* will ever be regarded as a masterly performance. Fulness 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

[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.

Digitized by Google

in which it appeared, a surprising piece of criticism.[1] And, in palliation of some of Pecock's grossest errors, it may be observed that they arise partly from ignorance of the Greek language,[2] 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.

Historical allusions in the *Repressor* scanty.

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 epistlis of Seynt Ignace ..... for certes red y neuer in no mannys writingis so tenderli charchid the obeisaunce to bischopis." (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*, § 35) and Hallam (*Lit. Eur.* part i. capp. ii., iii.) mention Eston, Richard of Bury, Gunthorpe, Robert Flemming, Bishop Grey, Free, Milling, and Selling, to whom Maundevile (see his *Travels*, pp. 20, 76) may perhaps be added. But Pecock had never travelled (*Repr.* p. 370).

Digitized by Google

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.[3] 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]

Pecock translated to the see of Chichester, A.D. 1450.

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 promotos esse in ecclesia qui sciunt, possunt, et volunt debito modo animabus prodesse." (See also p. 513, &c., and *Repressor*, p. 331.) 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*.

Digitized by Google

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.[1]

His *Book of Faith*, circa A.D. 1456.

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,[2] he gives up the idea of an

[1] Le Neve's *Fasti*, vol. i. p. 247 (Hardy); Gascoigne, *u.s.*, pp. 524, 537, 538, 548; Lewis, 185-199.

[2] 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

Digitized by Google

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. 214. 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.

Digitized by Google

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]

Pecock in disgrace at court, and with the hierarchy.

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 erreth or may err." (Lewis, p. 294.)

[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 scholaris . . . juret quod non favebit opinionibus, damnatis erroribus, aut hæresibus Johannis Wycklyfe, Reginaldi Peacocke, neque alicujus alterius hæretici, quamdiu vixerit in hoc mundo, sub pœna perjurii et expulsionis ipso facto." Statut. Coll. Regal. Cantabr. c. ult. in fine.

Digitized by Google

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-bawlers*.[1] 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.

His history related princi-

It is Pecock's misfortune that we are obliged to

[1] This appellation (*clamitatores in pulpitis*) is contained in a letter to Friar Godhard. His opinion of the preachers of the day expressed in the *Repressor* is not on the whole very flattering. In the same work he intimates that legends contained "full many untrue fables," and promises a treatise on the subject. Gascoigne, p. 528; Repressor, p. 354; Book of Faith, p. 36. The *Follower to the Donet* contains a curious passage, but somewhat too long to quote at large, about a preacher (*i.e.* Pecock himself) "thenking that need was forto reproue mysbering prechers," who "warnede summe of his felawschip that he wolde preche into the now seid entent, and other wise than he euer prechid bifore." His exposition of 2 Tim. iv. 2, *Argue, obsecra, increpa*, &c., was so popular with his audience, that "summe of the heerers profred gold oft forto haue had thilk long antetheme writen, for deynte had therof." But Pecock was "not wonyd to write his solempne sermouns," and being "ȝouun to greet bisynessis" he could not deliver it into their hands. The sequel to this discourse came on in due time "vnder this theme, *Amici mei et proximi mei adversum me appropinquaverunt et steterunt*," the substance of which was "blamyng certein prechers." In order that "his werk schulde take effect, he dide it scharpli, and not without profis therto brouȝt." But this was no sooner done than the people "beere hem anentis the seid precher as wilde vnresonable beestes." (fol. 48.) Compare Wiclif *Dial.* lib. iv. c. 38 (p. 301, Franc. 1753): "Nec dubium quin illi (religiosi nostri) regulariter sint vaniloqui simplicem populum seducendo .... Nec dubium quin hi fratres nimis comiter tam domos corporales temporalium dominorum, quam domos spirituales subvertant docentes apocrypha atque ludicra propter quæstum. Ideo cum oportet ipsos redargui, debet secundum formam ipsos *arguere dure*." Nicolaus de Clamengiis (*ut supra*) speaks equally strongly. See also Lewis' Lives of Pecock and Wiclif, passim, and Wharton's preface to Pecock's *Book of Faith*.

Digitized by Google

pally by his enemies.

depend 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.

Council held at Westminster in the autumn of 1457. Pecock expelled from it, and cited to appear before the Archbishop of Canterbury on Nov. 11.

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 accordant 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.

Digitized by Google

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.[1] When passages from their works had been produced against him, he had been known to say *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

[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 forto fynde out trouthis, as othere men weren in his dayes and now after his daies ȝit 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 Donet*, MS. fol. 68.

Digitized by Google

Bourchier commanded Pecock to withdraw. He quitted the council-chamber accordingly, and left London.[1]

His opponents similarly cited.

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 Lamhith), 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]

Both parties busy meanwhile.

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.

Pecock's examiners make an unfavourable report to the primate.

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

---

[1] Gascoigne, *u. s.*, pp. 542–547; Whethamstede in Hearne, *u. s.*, pp. 490–493.

[2] Quoted by Lewis, p. 216. Foxe gives the document at length, *s. 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.

Digitized by Google

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.[1] 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[2] 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 re-"proaches for having yourself reproached the holy "doctors Augustine and Jerome, and for denying "the truth of their sayings."[3] 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.[4] 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 pileis utentes." (Gascoigne).

[3] Gascoigne, *u. s.*, 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. (Gascoigne,

Digitized by Google

the charges of the doctors, but it may be imagined, from the sequel, that it was tame enough.[1]

John of Bury's reply to Pecock's *Repressor*, accusing him of rationalism and heresy.

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

---

u. s., 515; Lewis, 220, note). It is probable enough that Pecock may have been provoked into saying something foolish by a foolish antagonist, perhaps Eborall; but it would seem that his views of patristic authority were not very wide of that which men of sense and learning ordinarily take of it, being removed from the superstitious veneration for a great doctor which prevailed in his own age, and from the still more superstitious patrophobia which has prevailed in some quarters subsequently. His own notions may be partly collected from the *Repressor* (pp. 71, 72, 334, *sqq.*, 446, 459), from his *Book of Faith* (pp. 14, 40, Wharton), and from some extracts printed by Foxe (*Comment.*, fol. 199–203), and from another preserved in the Bodleian (*n.* 117, fol. 13, b.): "Dicta Sanctorum non sunt tantæ auctoritatis, quin liceat sentire contrarium in eis quæ non sunt per S. Scripturam determinata. Unde dicit Augustinus in Epistola ad Vincentium Donatistam de scripturis SS. Doctorum: *Hoc genus scripturarum a canonicis distinguendum est*," &c. In his *Follower to the Donet* (MS. fol. 6) he says: "God forbede that y or eny other man schulde feele that writyngis of doctouris weren to be dispisid, or were to be sett at nouȝt, or to be sett litil bi: for tho writyngis ben ful profitable, namelich *if thei be take into vse bi a good discrecioun*." See also fol. 100.

[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 decretists, 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.

[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.

Digitized by Google

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 drowsy 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 *Timæus* (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

Digitized by Google

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, after repeated examinations, condemned by the primate, Nov. 28.

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 *lædet* for *parcet* (p. 573, l. 9). A glossary to the Excerpts has not been deemed necessary; the sense of *viator*, strange principally as occurring in such an unpoetical place as a table of contents, is noticed at p. 568. (See also *Fasc. 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. dxlv.), Bale (*Cent.*, viii. n. xx. p. 595, ed. Bas. 1559), and Oudinus (*De Script. Eccl.*, tom. iii. p. 2594). 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

Digitized by Google

up a condemnation of a creed[1] 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

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.

[1] 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 Apostlis maad the comune crede or not, schal not be seid here, but it schal be tretid in *The Book of Faith*." Now Gascoigne says, *u. s.*, 511: "Scripsit in suo symbolo magno Anglicano . . . . . quod Apostoli non "fecerunt symbolum nostrum com-"mune." This looks very much as though his *Creed* and *Book of Faith* were united together or identical.

[2] Gascoigne, *u. s.*, 528, 529.

Digitized by Google

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 in-"quiry 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.*

Digitized by Google

" 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 reverenced 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 infected, 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, *u. s.*, 546, 547; Whethamstede, *u. s.*, 493–496. The archbishop's speech, here somewhat compressed, is open to serious exception both as to facts and the interpretation of facts. His quotation from St. Gregory is not quite accurate, and his citation from St. Augustine is in reality nothing to the purpose. On these points, how-

Digitized by Google

Pecock abjures his opinions before the archbishop, and afterwards publicly at Paul's Cross, Dec. 4.

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.[1] 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.[2] That day was Sunday.[3] 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 Athanasian creed.

[1] Whethamstede, *u. s.*

[2] It exists in MS. at Lambeth, n. 577, Wharton MSS., p. 25, and is headed "Reginaldi Pecock episcopi Cicestrensis abjuratio in foro judiciali." 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 ecclesiæ*. The seventh article is wanting. My best thanks are due to F. Knyvett, 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.

Digitized by Google

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:

His recantation at Paul's Cross.

"In the name of the Holy Trinity, Father and Son "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 judg-"ment of natural reason before the New and the "Old Testaments, and the authority and determina-"tion of our mother Holy Church, have holden, "feeled, and taught otherwise than the Holy Roman "and Universal Church teacheth, preacheth, and ob-"serveth; 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 cre-"dere in Spiritum Sanctum.

(iii.) "Item, quod non est de necessitate salutis cre-"dere in sanctam ecclesiam catholicam.

(iv.) "Item, quod non est de necessitate salutis cre-"dere in sanctorum communionem.

(v.) "Item, quod ecclesia universalis potest errare in "iis quæ sunt fidei.

(vi.) "Item, quod non est de necessitate salutis cre-"dere et tenere quod illud, quod concilium generale "universalis ecclesiæ statuit, approbat, seu determinat "in favorem fidei et ad salutem animarum, est ab uni-

Digitized by Google

" versis Christi fidelibus approbandum et tenendum;
" et quod reprobat et determinat seu condemnat esse
" fidei catholicæ 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 inhærere.]

" 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 spices (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,
" heresies, 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

Digitized by Google

"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]

Pecock's books burnt at the Cross.

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. ccv.), 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°) Bisshop Pecok was abioured at Powlis Crosse, beyng bisshop of Chychestir, and his bookys brent."

789 ?

Digitized by Google

sumption have brought upon me these troubles and reproaches!

His cowardice.

"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]

---

[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 beleeue the comuning 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 ordinaunce that we mowe preie to him and to aungelis and to seintis for vs silf and for our neiȝbouris and be herd." (*Donet* MS., *u.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 thre persons;" and again, "three persoones 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 dignitees afore rehercid ful and hooly lijk miche: and such an other beyng, substaunce, or godhede is ther noon, neither may be"), besides inserting the article in his above-mentioned creed in the expressive form: "I beleeue 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

Digitized by Google

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.

---

communion of saints, condemned Pecock as holding it unnecessary to believe *in* the Holy Ghost, because he affirmed it unnecessary to believe *in* the Holy Catholic Church. With respect to the infallibility of the Universal Church or of ecumenical councils (see the fifth and sixth heads), Pecock's sentiments were no doubt in opposition to those maintained by many in that age in the Church of England and by some (as it would appear from the writings of Hammond and others) since the Reformation. Yet if he was to be condemned for a heretic for not holding the representative Church to be infallible, so was the great canonist, Marsilius of Padua, in the fourteenth century, a heretic who maintained that "the pope and the bishops had so much power as we can prove by Scripture to have been conferred on them, and no more;" and also "that we are bound to place faith or certain credence or confession of truth in no speech or writing except such as is called canonical, that is to say, is contained in the volume of the Bible" (Marsil. Patav. *Defens. Pac.*, lib. ii. cap. 4 et cap. 28). As much or more is said by Nicolaus de Clamangiis and Thomas Waldensis (an Englishman) in the fifteenth century, whose testimonies are collected by Henry Wharton in his preface to Pecock's *Book of Faith*, where that of Marsilius Patavinus may also be seen (pp. xix.—xxv). To these others (as Tostatus) might be added. As regards the first particular alone, Pecock seems to have laid himself open to just reprehension. He knew (what almost everybody now knows and admits) that the Apostles did not compose the creed which bears their name, and that the descent into hell was not contained therein till a later period. To make, however, such an assertion then, and still more to make an omission in the common creed, was a very perilous affair. "Præcipue provocavit omnes dominos temporales tunc regni in odium ipsius Pecock episcopi, quod mutavit symbolum nostrum commune, quod ediderunt Apostoli Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Ipse enim episcopus Pecock scripsit et dixit quod Apostoli non fecerunt illud symbolum nostrum commune." Thus Gascoigne (*u. s.*, p. 546), who says elsewhere (*u. s.*, p. 542): "Dicit ibi (in his *Book of Faith*) prædictus Pecock, quod in tempore Augustini non fuit ille articulus in symbolo, et sic non est verum quod Apostoli posuerunt illum in symbolo," adding, with amusing simplicity, "hæc ille Pecock ibidem contra omnia testimonia sanctorum Patrum." Yet this superior knowledge by no means warranted him, after writing thus (*Book of Faith*, ii. 5, p. 41): "Oon of the best clerkis and wisist divins, and clepid therefore the Doctour Sutel, Scotus, seith in his writing that this article, *Crist in his deeth of bodi discendid into hellis*, is an article of necessary faith;"—Scotus had affirmed that this article must be apostolical, because the Apostles put it into the creed, rashly enough

Digitized by Google

Pecock's disgrace spread abroad. His books burnt at Oxford.

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.[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 Quatrevoix 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 letter to the primate, avowing their detestation of the

adding that it had no ground in Scripture; — in thereupon assuming that Scotus was correct so far as the Scriptural argument was concerned, and that the article was consequently not apostolical: "And so the ground, foundement, and cause whi the seid doctour held the seid article to be a feith is not trewe, that is to seie, that the Apostlis puttiden 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 dirtied his own fingers (p. 260). However, 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 *particular 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 descendit in inferna," *u. s.*, 511). Lewis himself must in common candour be so understood and his own quotation (p. 340, Addenda) from Thomas Burnet (*De Fid. Christ.*) may be taken to imply so much: "Quod symbolo apostolico interseritur de descensu Christi ad inferos, de ecclesia catholica, et communione sanctorum sequioris est ævi, et *explicationis magis dubiæ*." 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.

[1] Wharton's MS. (Lambeth MSS. 594, p. 33) gives a copy of Pecock's abjuration from the register of a mandate of Neville, Bishop of Exeter: — "Archidiaconis suis directum, 1457 (*i.e.*, 1458, modern style) 12 Jan., ut publicari . . . faciant per totam diœcesin Exon. revocationes et renuntiationes Reginaldi Pecock episcopi Cicestrensis, quas archiepiscopus Cantuariensis transmiserat episcopo Exoniensi, mandans ut easdem sic publicari faciat."

Digitized by Google

man, and begging him to pardon the lukewarmness of which they had hitherto been guilty.[1]

Triumphant tone assumed by Pecock's enemies.

Pecock's enemies now everywhere set up a note of triumph. Doggrel 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, quæ nomen habebat honoris,
" Bubo non pavo dicitur esse modo.
" Nomine privari vult atque gradu spoliari,
" Qui violat fidei dogmata sive Dei.
" Ne sic priveris, hæc 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 impiissimus, qui perfidiæ venenum imbiberat, " 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 rebibere seu reglutire nullatenus ausus erit."[2]

Pecock put in confinement by the archbishop. He appeals to

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, *u. s.* Lewis (p. 248), professing to follow Wood, carelessly makes the conflagration 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 vexatious 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, *u. s.*, 501, who has also immortalized the foregoing poem.

Digitized by Google

Rome. The pope favours him. Conduct of the king. Royal commission issued Sept. 17, 1458.

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. 236), 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 subjecit, *Leave reason*," &c. So also B. Twynne before him. (*Ant. Acad. Oxon.*, p. 309.)

[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 Bale, *Cent.* viii. n. 44.

Digitized by Google

"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]

---

[1] The 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*.

[2] Lewis, pp. 250–254, 270 (where the documents are quoted, from Kennet, at greater length); Gascoigne, *u. 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 exceedeth in malice and horribility all other heresies and sects of heretics to us herebefore known by hearing or writing, in the which the said Reynold destroyeth not only the pouvoir and jurisdiction of regalie (regality) and priesthood . . . but also despiseth 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

Digitized by Google

The king offers Pecock a pension if he will resign.

The king tendered his thanks to the commissioners[1] 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."[2] Pecock's subsequent history has been thought, perhaps erroneously, to indicate that he declined the king's offers and refused to resign;[3] but be this as it may, John Arundel, the king's

---

in making the holy prayer of the *Pater noster*, and, over that, of his arrogance and presumption, reproveth 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] dicts 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. 577, p. 29, directed to Mr. Stillington and Hugh Tamelet.

[2] Wharton's MS., *u. 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. 32.

[3] "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 painfully rigorous, but rather indulgent" (*Hist. Middle Ages*, book iii. c. 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.

Digitized by Google

physician and archdeacon of Richmond, was soon afterwards appointed as his successor, and the temporalities were restored to him March 26, 1459.[1]

Pecock sent to Thorney Abbey.

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[2] 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, con-"veniently after the good discretion of the said "abbot."[3] "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 Wysbich 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.

Digitized by Google

His character.

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

---

7048, (*i.e.* Baker's MSS. vol. xxi. p. 516). See catalogue of the Harleian MSS. (vol. iii. p. 513). It is entitled "Instructions given by us, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, with the advice of our brethren of this land, to the abbot of Thorney, how Reginald Pecock, whom we have sent unto him, shall be treated in the monastery aforesaid." The orthography in the text is modernised by Turner, who has also (as I now perceive) somewhat compressed Baker's transcript. Baker adds: "Collect. H. Wharton, vol. notat. v. [Lambeth MSS. 594], p. 32, e libro formularum temp. H. 6 penes El. Ashmole. Copied by John Anstis, Esq." Henry Wharton's MS. at Lambeth, n. 577, p. 30 (as well as n. 594, p. 32, copied from Ashmole) gives a copy of the instructions somewhat more fully than Baker's MS. does, and includes the clause named below under the second head: his copy has forty pounds. The other additional parts are here subjoined:—"Item, in case it shall need any window or closure, or any other necessary thing in the chamber above said only for the ease of the said Reynold, the cost thereof shall be born of the forty pound that is assigned to the said abbey for his finding. And that he, the first quarter after his coming thither, content himself to fare no better than a brother of the same place doth out of the freytour; afterward to fare as is above rehearsed. Provided in all wise that all the forty pounds above written be not expended about his finding; but a competent part thereof, as his necessity shall require; and that the remanent thereof be disposed to the common weal of the behoof of the said place."

All these are copies from the original copy in MS. Ashm. 789 fol. 326, which is also fully transcribed in MS. Bodl. Add. C. 64, fol. 192v.

Lewis (who knew Baker's MS.) had another copy, which the Bishop of Peterborough (White Kennet) sent him, in which the sum is stated to be eleven (not forty) pounds; this copy also adds, under the second head, "that no one else (*i.e.* except his bed-maker) shall speak to him without leave and in the presence of the abbot, unless the king or archbishop send to the abbey any man with writing specially on that behalf." The words inclosed in brackets in the text are added from this MS., which otherwise appears to agree with Baker's, except that it makes eleven pounds (and not forty) the sum allowed for his maintenance, but I believe that xi. was written by a mere clerical error for xl., although Lewis is in favour of the smaller sum.

[1] In this point I agree in opinion with Hearne (Hemingford, vol. 2, p. 488, note), but the accounts of the remainder of his life are very various. Fabyan's chronicle (*u.s.*) says that Pecock was "kept in mewe ever while he lyved after." The Camden Society's chronicle

Digitized by Google

Pecock is known,[1] 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.[2] 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,[3] "by far the most eminent and learned

---

says that he had "a certayne pensione assigned vn to hym for to lyue on in an abbey, and sone 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 "awne house." A MS. chronicle, quoted by Waterland (Works x. p. 235), says:—

"His bookes brent at Paulis Cross,
he in Newgate kept
All hys liffe after, for the heresyes he had hept."

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. Cautley, 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.

[1] 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.

[2] Whethamstede, *u. s.*, p. 491; Gascoigne, *u. s.*, p. 518.

[3] 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 communion

Digitized by Google

"bishop of the Church of England in his time." Yet evil report pursued him through life, and even long after his death,[1] 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 footsteps 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 Archdeacon 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 zeal 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. 1559) consists of little else. For some of these facts, see Lewis, *passim*.

Digitized by Google

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.

His works.

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^{e} party longing to the lawe of God."

An early note says that "this booke was compiled "by Reynolde Pecocke, Bisshope of Asaphensis and "after Bysshope 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 *Reginald Pecock's Donet.*

Begins:

"Whereas the booke ycalled *The Reule of Cristen* "*Religioun.*"

Ends:

"Thouȝ thou be in placis privyist." (Compare the foregoing MS. fol. 102, a.)

Digitized by Google

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 "therfore is maad " this litil present boke and anothir book callid *The* " *Folewer* herto . . . in foorme 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 religioun.*" 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 Represser of over myche blamyng 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 Lamhith* [*i.e.*, Lambeth], *xi. Novembr.* A.D. 1457 which, as Lewis (p. 319) observes, "is very probably " the entry of the notary after reading this book

Digitized by Google

" 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 corrections 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 principal corrections upon the erasures are almost certainly written in Pecock'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 demands that *early English texts* should be edited with more minute exactness. 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 excepted, which (contrary to Wiclif's usage) are always the same in both numbers. Again, *his, hise; al, alle*, &c. &c., usually, *and yet not constantly*, denote different numbers. Under such circumstances, it may be conceived what annoyance a MS. full of erasures 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 exceptions being made (somewhat reluctantly) 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, however, it is separated. It is quite certain that the scribe observed no law in this disjunction or conjunction. Thus, on the very same leaf (fol. 65, b. col. 1), we have *that it is a miracle*, and also *that it is amyracle*. Whenever the word itself is unusual, the coalition might have occasioned a difficulty, *e. g.*, "to make a ring of arische" (*i. e.*, a rush), p. 166; and even when not unusual, some unpleasant hesitation. But yet this form of composition is interesting, not only as illustrating the crasis of the definite article in other languages, but as showing the origin of our modern compounds *another, awhile*, &c. For a like reason, prepositions in composition are printed *conjunctim* 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 subsists between the preposition and its verb, just as in Greek the position

Digitized by Google

The names of several persons are written in the MS. who must be presumed to have owned it, viz.: John Stephinson, 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 nouȝ*, they are edited *conjunctim*, *yclepid*, *ynouȝ*, 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 cause*, *al oon*, &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 *in lasse thanne* (so written in the MS.), corresponding to *in 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*: "Al this now rehercid *foule and mys bering* and vniust chalenging and blamyng is reproued and vnproued," p. 564.

Upon this subject the prudent caution to editors from the pen of the Master of Caius 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

Digitized by Google

Atkyns, of Lincoln College in Oxford, and John Stowe, the chronicler, who has written a catalogue of Pecock's works at the beginning; also at the end, after assign-

---

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 (þ) 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 *h* is hard (as in knyȝthode, 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 þ, the last sometimes having it, sometimes not. It may also deserve notice that the scribe never uses a capital þ, but writes the *t* only as a capital followed by a small *h*; 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 ð and þ 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 *c* and *t* are written so similarly, that it is sometimes impossible to say whether *resurrecciouu* or *resurrectiouu*, &c. be the orthography intended; *n* and *u* 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*, *aftir*, *entre*, *sufferable*, *othir*, *othire*, *eeldir*, *poorer*, *Petre*, *Petir*, *Arthir*, *Artur*, *chaumbre*, *chaumbir*, *viker*, *vikir*, *writer*, *maistir*, *fadir*, *techer*, *vnpropre*, *propirli*, *properest*, *chapiter*, *chapitre*, *chapitres*, *chapitrees*, *chapitris*. In the same way *par*, *por*, and *per* are expressed by the same character ꝑ; the plural terminations also, *es* and *is*, as well as the letters *m* and *n*, 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 *parsoon*, *peraventure* or *paraventure*, *images* or *imagis*, *improue* or *inprouе*, &c. &c.

Digitized by Google

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 MS. Catalogue preserved in the Library itself, that Archbishop Rotheram (who died in 1500) gave the MS. 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 Bale.

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 inimi-*
"*cus;* that is to seie in Englisch 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 ꝑ in this MS., not ꝑ as in the *Repressor*.

Digitized by Google

Ends (abruptly):

thei ouerleepen this arti[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 Gascoigne 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 *verri* is wrongly printed *urri* more than once (pp. xxii., xxviii.), the imaginary word being also inserted in the Glossary; the *philsophir* 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.).

Digitized by Google

(*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 con-"jectured from the present emendations and addi-"tions inserted in the margin and bottom of the "pages by the same hand" (Preface, p. xxxix.). This is certainly not impossible,[1] 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. Angliæ et Hiberniæ* (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[2] 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.*

Digitized by Google

the British Museum, *Bibl. Reg.* 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 bigynneth the book ycallid *The Folewer to* "*the Donet.* Sithen it is so that in the first and "secund parties of *The Donet into Cristen Religioun* "bifore 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 fittyng 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' virtues), "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.

Digitized by Google

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.[1]

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,[2] 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 withstonding that I haue maad the
" first parti of the book clepid *The Donet of Cristen*
" *Religioun* to be of litil quantite, that welniȝ ech
" poor persoon mai bi sum meene gete coost to haue
" it as his owne; ȝit in to the moor eese of the
" persoone poorist in hauer and in witt I haue

[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 vellum of the middle of the fifteenth century, of 384 pages, ending abruptly. Begins: "Here bigynneth the prolog into the book ycallid the reule of Crysten religioun." The work itself begins p. 28: "Here begynneth the firste tretice of this firste partie, in which tretice is tauȝt the firste pryncipal mater of this book, that is to seye, what God is in hise worthi dignitees."

[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.

Digitized by Google

" drawen this now folewyng extract or outdrawȝt fro
" the first parti of the seid *Donet*, that no persoon
" Cristen growen in to discrecyoun of resoun, or fewe
" of hem, aftir sufficient pupplisching of this book
" to hem, schulde haue eny excusacioun 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 maters conteyned among the
" vij. maters necessarie to be knowen sum what more
" or lasse of ech Cristen persoon which hath vse of
" his kindeli discrecioun 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 eending, and
" that thou with God euer blissfulli wone. 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 Pecock may have written any of them or not.

(a.) *These ben the gadered councels of Seint Ysidre* (sic) *to enforme man how he schulde fle vicis and vse vertuis*:

" *Consideracioun of a man him silf.*"

"O man, knowe thi silf: knowe what thou art: knowe thi bigynnynge, 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 opinioun, but oonli for lijf euerlasting. Amen. These ben counceilis good and holsum, if thei haue wilful execucioun," foll. 134, 135.

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

Digitized by Google

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, Asaph-
"ensis 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]

(β.) *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 welthis ben vncertein?"

Ends (fol. 137, b):

"Whanne lijf is moost loued and deeth is moost hatid,
Thanne deeth drawith his drauȝt, and makith man ful nakid."

(δ.) *De terra plasmasti me.*

Begins (fol. 137, b):

"Erthe out of erthe is wondirli wrouȝt,
Erthe of erthe hath gete a dignite of nouȝt."

Ends (foll. 139, 140):

"Lord that erthe madist for erthe and suffridist peynes ille,
Lete neuer this erthe for this erthe myscheue ne spille;
But that this erthe in this erthe be worching thi wille,
So that erthe fro this erthe stiȝ up to thin hiȝ hille. Amen."

"Memento homo quod cinis es, et in cinerem reverteris."

"Fac bene dum vivis, post mortem vivere si vis;
Tangere qui gaudet meretricem, qualiter audet
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-

Digitized by Google

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.[1]

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.] Fadir, to what purpos, entent, and eend ordeyned God the eukarist to be receyued and hauntid? [FATHER.] Sothli, sone, for that the receyuer in the eukarist receiuyng schuld oft remembre him silf therbi vpon Cristis holi lijf and passioun, and vpon his benefetis, and his lawe, and folewyngly schulde take and make a sadde purpos to God (thouȝ without newe bond and couenant) that he wole be oon to God, and to his neiȝbore in charite and in kepiug vertues and the lijf which Crist kepte and tauȝt in erthe; riȝt as thilk signes which he etith and drynkith be made or semen to be made oon to hym, or ioyned to him in his bodili substaunce. And for to make oft this remembraunce and oft this purpose was ordeyned the eukarist oft to be eten and drunke, as to be ofte of this purpos a remembrauncing tokene or signe of witnesse therof."

[1] The following works of Pecock are referred to therein:

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

The book clepid *The Sufficience of the iiij. Tablis*, pp. 3, 21. (The same as *The Filling of the iiij. Tablis?*)

The Just Apprising of Holy Scripture, p. 7.

The Afore-crier, p. 7.

The Rule of Christian Religion, pp. 7, 16, 22, 49, 84, 94, 97, 99, 108, 111.

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.

The Book of Divine Office, pp. 84, 97, 100, 108, 116.

"A preciose book, clepid *The Proof of Cristen Faith*," p. 117.

Digitized by Google

(a.) *Collectanea quædam ex Reginaldi Pecock Cicestrensis episcopi opusculis exustis conservata, et ex antiquo psegmate 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 præbet experimentum;* to the difference between *Credere ecclesiam* and *Credere ecclesiæ,* &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.

Digitized by Google

(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 zeal 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, 145⅞, 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 alios 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 comburendos." The Bishop of London is to apprise "omnes et singulos coepiscopos et suffraganeos nostros in nostra Cantuariensi 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 pœna 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 potuimus qui 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. Bubbewith, Bishop of Bath and Wells, printed by Hearne (*App. to Hemingford*, p. 549). Lewis (following Wood) gives an account of Edward IV.'s mandate to the University of Oxford in 1476, pp. 310, 311. See also Bryan Twynne, *Ant. Acad. Oxon.*, p. 322. This, I presume, is the letter printed at length from the MS. in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, among *The writings and examinations of Brute, 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

Digitized by Google

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 attached 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 quoddam Reginaldi Peacock, Episcopi Asaphensis. 8vo." Many of these MSS. are now in the Bodleian, but Mr Coxe informs me that this is not among them.

Digitized by Google

(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 worschipping." (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*.[1] (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 ycalled my *Manual*, or my *En-* "*chiridion*, whereinne is devised the rialist foorme of "preying with *Paternoster* 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 conteyne these viij. pointis of meenal vertu, that is to seie, forto gouerne vs leernyngly, preisyngly, dispreisyngly, preiyngly, thankingly, worschipingly, disworschipingly, and sacramentingly (the other three contain 'eendal' virtues) . . . The ij^e table . . . these vij. poyntis, that is to seie, forto lyue and gouerne vs anentis God at the next goostly, obediently, riȝtwisely, mekely, treuly, benyngnely, and largely . . . The iij^e table . . . these viij. poyntis, that is to seie, forto lyue and gouerne vs silf anentis vs silf at the next goostly, fleischely, worldly, clenly. honestly, paciently, douȝtili, and largely . . . . the iiij^e table . . . these viij. poyntis, that is to seie, forto lyue and governe us anentis oure neiȝboris at the next, goostly, attendauntly, riȝtfully, mekely, accordingli, treuly, benyngnely, and largely."

Digitized by Google

devised." *Donet* MS., p. 78 (James' transcript). To this book Whethamstede (*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 composuit, 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 (sæc. xv.) in the British Museum (*Bibl. Reg.* 17 A. xxvi. fol. 27, b–28, b), entitled: "Here bigynneth 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 roos on "the thridde dai in fleisch, and steiȝ to heuene?" 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 "*Counceilis*" 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

Digitized by Google

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 Boke 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. 163, 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.

Digitized by Google

(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 Feith 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* MS. fol. 30, "as herof y write in oon of "the bookis of feith, and in the book of iust apprising "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. MS. 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

Digitized by Google

(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 *litil 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 litil 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 ferther this which now is this "present ij^e partye for a defensorye and an excusa-"torye and sumwhat a declaratorye of the other first "seid party." (*Donet* MS. fol. 85.) Consequently the second part of the *Donet* may be the *Declaratorium* or the *Defensor* of Bale. The "litil booke" is probably intended by Stowe: "Of Christian Religion, *and a book pertaining thereunto*" (*Chronicle*, p. 403,) and by Pecock (*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 maad in the firste parti "of *Cristen Religioun*, the thridde 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 Trynitees Sundaye." (*Donet*,

Digitized by Google

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, thouȝ y speke "and write *so oft* for my defensis." 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 sæcularium potestate. (4.) Contra dotationem Constantini. (5.) De æqualitate 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

Digitized by Google

may very probably be a portion of his *Book of Eucharist;* and No. 9 the letter to the pope mentioned 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. Eccles.*, tom. iii. pp. 2593, 2594), without the smallest reason, imagines that several anonymous treatises, contained in a MS. now preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, are the works of Pecock. They appear to be the works of a Frenchman. One of them is headed: "Quod Rothomagensis ecclesia ecclesiæ Romanæ non subjecta sit." The MS. itself must, in my judgment, have been written before Pecock was born.

[2] The mandate of Bourchier 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.

Digitized by Google

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., LL.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. Pecock in his *Book of Faith* (p. 13, Wharton's ed.) observes "hou that langagis whos reulis ben not writen, as ben English, Freensch, and manye othere, ben chaungid withynne yeeris and cuntrees, that oon man of the oon cuntree and of the oon tyme myghte not and schulde not kunne undirstonde a man of the othere kuntre and of the othere tyme, *and al for this, that the seid langagis ben not stabili and foundamentali writen.*" 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 Wiclif's Bible, edited by Mr. Forshall and Sir F. Madden.

Digitized by Google

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.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS.

PROLOGUE.

The Lollards, who find fault with divers ordinances of the clergy, should take a lesson from St. Paul's advice to Timothy, respecting the manner of administering reproof. Pecock does not deny that there are some abuses among the clergy, but undertakes to defend eleven particulars against the objections of the Lollards. These are: (1) The use of images; (2) The going on pilgrimage; (3) The holding of landed possessions by the clergy; (4) The various ranks of the hierarchy, *i. e.* papacy and episcopacy; (5) The framing of ecclesiastical laws and ordinances by papal and episcopal authority; (6) The institution of the religious orders; (7) The invocation of Saints and priestly intercession; (8) The costliness of ecclesiastical decorations; (9) The ceremonies of the mass and the sacraments generally; (10) The taking of oaths; (11) The maintaining war and capital punishment to be lawful. The plan of Pecock's work. The first part shall contain a general answer to the general objections against these eleven points. The remaining four parts shall contain special answers to the particular objections to the same eleven points. - - - - - - - pp. 1–4.

THE FIRST PART.

The General Answer in vindication of the Eleven Points.

Chapter I.

The general objections to the said eleven points arise from these three false opinions: (1) No ordinance is to be esteemed a law of God, which is not grounded in Scripture; (2) Every humble Christian shall arrive at the true sense of Scripture; (3) When the true sense of Scripture has been discovered by humble diligence, all human arguments which oppose that sense are to be discarded. - - - pp. 5–7.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II.

The first error refuted by thirteen conclusions, the first and principal of which is this: It is no part of the office of Scripture to found any law of God which human reason may discover. Arguments in favour of this conclusion. No truth of God's moral law is fully taught by Scripture only. - - - - - - - - pp. 8–12.

CHAPTER III.

The same subject continued. The knowledge of God's moral law is based not on Scripture but on reason. The teaching of Scripture scanty concerning many moral truths. Moral truths might be discovered if the Scripture did not exist or were destroyed. - - - - - pp. 12–18.

CHAPTER IV.

The same subject. Before the time of Abraham men lived by the light of nature, but were bound to observe the same moral precepts by which Christians are bound now. pp. 18–22.

CHAPTER V.

The same subject. Scripture presupposes moral truths to be known. If any moral truth delivered in Scripture seems to contradict the moral law written in man's soul, Scripture must be accommodated to the reason, not vice versâ. pp. 23–27.

CHAPTER VI.

The same subject. Illustrations in favour of the conclusion, from an old custom among Londoners at Midsummer eve, from the Apostles selling fish, and from preaching at Paul's Cross. - - - - - pp. 27–32.

CHAPTER VII.

Other conclusions against the first error. Scripture only bears witness to moral virtues, and exhorts to their better fulfilment. The province of Scripture is to ground articles of faith. - - - - - - pp. 32–37.

CHAPTER VIII.

Other conclusions against the first error. The province of reason defined. The greater part of God's law to man is grounded in reason and not in revelation. - pp. 37–42.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IX.

Other subordinate conclusions against the first error. Pecock's enumeration and commendation of his own works. pp. 43–48.

CHAPTER X.

The last conclusion against the first error. It is as unreasonable to expect a truth of moral philosophy or natural religion to be grounded in Scripture, as to expect the principles of one trade to be grounded in another. Certain texts relied on by the Lollards, as favouring the first error, discussed and explained. - - - pp. 48–53.

CHAPTER XI.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 53–59.

CHAPTER XII.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 59–65.

CHAPTER XIII.

The sweetness of Scripture a great cause of the above-named first error of the Lollards. The true dignity of Scripture explained. The weight to be attached to the writings of the Fathers, to which the Lollards make an insincere appeal, duly estimated. - - pp. 66–72.

CHAPTER XIV.

An objection that reason is fallible, considered and answered. pp. 73–80.

CHAPTER XV.

An objection that Scripture is more worthy than reason, considered and answered. - - - - pp. 80–85.

CHAPTER XVI.

The necessity of a learned clergy to expound the Scriptures insisted upon. - - - - - pp. 85–92.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVII.

The second error of the Lollards, that every humble Christian shall infallibly discover the true sense of Scripture, examined and refuted. All experience makes against it. Their third error refuted by Scripture and experience. All true opinions will bear argument and discussion, and the contrary opinion is more worthy of Mohammedans than of Christians. The texts of Scripture adduced by the Lollards discussed and explained. - - pp. 92-101.

CHAPTER XVIII.

A fourth erroneous opinion of the Lollards, that if a man keep God's law, he shall always have the true knowledge of the sense of Scripture; but if not, never. This opinion refuted by manifest experience. The texts quoted in favour of it discussed and explained. Vindication of the bishops and clergy from calumnies brought against their lives and conduct and ecclesiastical policy. Caution necessary in making appeals to ancient practice, which is often ill suited to later times. - - - - - - pp. 102-110.

CHAPTER XIX.

A general vindication of the eleven matters objected to may be set down thus: Whoever expressly or else by implication either bids or indicates that any thing is to be performed, does thereby inclusively bid, imply, or indicate that every thing is to be done which follows from it, or is necessary or profitable to the performance thereof. Various general conclusions hence deduced in faovur of the eleven ordinances, which in a large sense are grounded in Scripture. pp. 110-116.

CHAPTER XX.

Confirmation of these conclusions. Express mention is not made in Scripture of many things which are lawful. The same arguments which prove the lawfulness of drinking beer, or reading the Bible in English, prove the lawfulness of using images and going on pilgrimage. Pecock's enumeration and commendation of his English works for the refutation of Lollard opinions. - - - pp. 117-130

Digitized by Google

THE SECOND PART.

Vindication of Images and Pilgrimages.

Chapter I.

Preliminary considerations. Explanations of the meaning of certain theological terms. - - - - pp. 131–136.

Chapter II.

Various scriptural arguments for retaining images, and divers texts of Scripture seeming utterly to forbid images, explained. - - - - - pp. 136–147.

Chapter III.

Arguments derived from reason for retaining images to be used as commemorative signs, notwithstanding some abuses which may spring from their use. - - pp. 148–154.

Chapter IV.

The same subject. - - - - pp. 155–161.

Chapter V.

Various other subordinate arguments both from Scripture and reason in favour of images. - - - pp. 161–168.

Chapter VI.

Sundry minor objections to images considered and answered. pp. 169–175.

Chapter VII.

Various arguments from Scripture and reason in favour of going on pilgrimage and venerating relics; and arguments to the contrary invalidated. - - - pp. 175–181.

Chapter VIII.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 181–190.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IX.

Various objections against images and pilgrimages made by the Lollards stated, such as these: A Christian man is a more perfect image of Christ, and more deserving our care than a lifeless stock. Pilgrimage to Walsingham is in vain, seeing that God is present everywhere. The devil works in images. Images have the appearance of evil. Images and pilgrimages are virtually forbiden by Christ's discourse with the woman of Samaria. Images have been and are the occasion of idolatry. - - - - - pp. 191–199.

CHAPTER X.

The same subject. The last and most serious objections made to images. Various hymns, sequences, proses, genuflexions, and ceremonies evidently show that images are worshipped with an idolatrous adoration in divine service, as performed in England in the fifteenth century. - - pp. 199–208.

CHAPTER XI.

Reply to these various arguments. - - pp. 208–216.

CHAPTER XII.

The same subject. - - - - pp. 216–222.

CHAPTER XIII.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 222–228.

CHAPTER XIV.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 229–233.

CHAPTER XV.

The same subject. - - - - pp. 233–239.

CHAPTER XVI.

The same subject. Disquisition on the origin of idolatry. pp. 240–247.

CHAPTER XVII.

Continuation of the same disquisition. The Book of Wisdom, which contradicts Pecock's view, is apocryphal and of little authority. Ecclesiastical history, from the eighth century downwards, shows that opposition to images will never prevail. - - - - - - pp. 247–255.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVIII.

Reply to the arguments derived from the service books of the church. - - - - - - pp. 255–263.

CHAPTER XIX.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 263–267.

CHAPTER XX.

The same subject. Concluding remarks on the relative value of outward signs and the word of God. - - pp. 267–274.

THE THIRD PART.

VINDICATION OF THE REVENUES OF THE CLERGY.

CHAPTER I.

Scriptural arguments from the Old Testament to show that the clergy may lawfully possess landed property, and the contrary arguments from it refuted. - - pp. 275–281.

CHAPTER II.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 281–287.

CHAPTER III.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 287–292.

CHAPTER IV.

Scriptural arguments on both sides from the New Testament similarly discussed. - - - - pp. 292–302.

CHAPTER V.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 303–309.

CHAPTER VI.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 309–315.

CHAPTER VII.

The same subject. The writings of the Fathers on this matter are discordant. - - - - - pp. 316–321.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VIII.

Five arguments which some of the laity bring against the endowments of the clergy stated. Simony and avarice are their natural fruit. Christ did not appoint them. Ecclesiastical history testifies that the church became more corrupt as it became richer. When Constantine made his donation to the Church of Rome, an angel exclaimed that poison was that day infused into the church. Ecclesiastical endowments, to which power of life and death in a bishop's or abbot's court is attached, are most objectionable and cruel. Reply to the first argument. - - - pp. 321–331.

CHAPTER IX.

Reply to the second argument. - - - pp. 331–334.

CHAPTER X.

Reply to the argument from ecclesiastical history. pp. 334–339.

CHAPTER XI.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 339–350.

CHAPTER XII.

Reply to the argument founded on the donation of Constantine. This donation shown by a variety of historical considerations to be fabulous. - - - - - pp. 350–357.

CHAPTER XIII.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 357–366.

CHAPTER XIV.

Reply to the last argument respecting the capital punishment inflicted by ecclesiastical courts. Their true constitution explained. - - - - - - pp. 366–374.

CHAPTER XV.

Other arguments from Scripture and reason to show the lawfulness of the endowments of the clergy. - pp. 374–379.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVI.

The opinion of some Lollards that church endowments are lawful, but that if the clergy do not make a proper use of them they may be taken away from them, stated. This opinion proved false from a consideration of the nature of different kinds of payments. - - - pp. 380–386.

CHAPTER XVII.

The same subject. The proper punishments for different kinds of criminous clerks. - - - - pp. 387–396

CHAPTER XVIII.

Further refutation of this opinion. The historical circumstances under which the religious houses and the clergy became possessed of their endowments considered. pp. 396–405.

CHAPTER XIX.

The same subject. Wiclif's modification of this opinion stated and confuted. - - - - - pp. 406–415

THE FOURTH PART.

VINDICATION OF THE VARIETY OF RANKS AND DEGREES AMONG THE CLERGY: ALSO OF THE LAWFULNESS OF STATUTES AND CANONS MADE BY PAPAL AND EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY.

CHAPTER I.

The Lollards object to the government of the church by bishops, archbishops, patriarchs, and the pope, and would have no other orders except those of priests and deacons. The ecclesiastical polity complained of is not forbidden by Scripture. - - - - - - pp. 416–422.

CHAPTER II.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 422–427.

CHAPTER III.

This polity is not forbidden by reason, and is not unlawful. pp. 427–436.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV.

It is approved by Scripture. Peter is the Head (Cephas) of the Apostles and the Rock of the Church. - pp. 436–449.

CHAPTER V.

This polity is sanctioned by reason, is strictly lawful, and is an ordinance of God's law. - - - pp. 449–452.

CHAPTER VI.

The Lollards further object that the pope and the bishops impose ecclesiastical laws over and above the divine law, and often contrary thereto. Proofs of the general lawfulness of ecclesiastical ordinances made by the clergy in addition to the divine law. - - - pp. 452–455.

CHAPTER VII.

The same subject. Dionysius the Areopagite shows that ecclesiastical laws were introduced by the consent of the Apostles. - - - - - - pp. 455–463.

CHAPTER VIII.

Arguments of the Lollards against ecclesiastical laws stated. Human traditions are condemned by Christ, are the cause of much evil, and would have been ordained by Christ, if they had been profitable. - - - pp. 463–468.

CHAPTER IX.

Reply to these arguments. - - - pp. 468–475.

THE FIFTH PART.

VINDICATION OF THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS, AND OF THE REMAINING FIVE MATTERS OBJECTED AGAINST.

CHAPTER I.

The Lollards object to the religious orders as unscriptural and antichristian. They are not forbidden by Scripture. Certain texts adduced by the Lollards, and their expositions of them stated, as well as the prophecies of St. Hildegard. pp. 476–484.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II.

Reply to the arguments derived from these texts and prophecies. - - - - - - pp. 484–495.

CHAPTER III.

The true application of the texts in question is shown to belong to the ancient heretics, who have indeed departed from the faith. - - - - - pp. 496–502.

CHAPTER IV.

Arguments derived from reason against the religious orders stated. They hinder men from relieving the necessities of their parents, are the cause of much mischief, and their variety breeds discord. - - - - pp. 502–505.

CHAPTER V.

Reply to these arguments. - - - pp. 505–512.

CHAPTER VI.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 512–518.

CHAPTER VII.

The same subject. - - - - - pp. 518–524.

CHAPTER VIII.

Scripture allows of religious orders. - - pp. 525–530.

CHAPTER IX.

The same subject. Ecclesiastical history testifies that monastic institutions are contemporary with the Apostles. pp. 530–534.

CHAPTER X.

The statutes of the religious orders are not contrary to the laws of Christ. When necessity so requires, a man has a dispensation from observing them. - - pp. 535–539.

CHAPTER XI.

Reason does not condemn the religious orders. They have made many men better or less bad than they would otherwise have been. Corrupt state of English society in the middle of the fifteenth century. - - - pp. 539–543.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XII.

Other objections made against the religious orders: their strange costume; their stately dwellings and churches; the practice of counting money with a stick among the Franciscans, so as to evade the rule which obliges them not to touch it. Vindication of the monastic habits. - - pp. 543–548.

CHAPTER XIII.

Vindication of the ample mansions and churches of the monastic orders. - - - - - - pp. 548–554.

CHAPTER XIV.

Vindication of the Franciscan friars' practice from hypocrisy. An imaginary conversation between a Franciscan and his opponent. - - - - - - pp. 554–561.

CHAPTER XV.

A brief vindication of the remaining five matters objected against, and reference made to other works of Pecock, where the various subjects are fully discussed. - pp. 561–565.

EXTRACTS FROM BURY'S GLADIUS SALOMONIS. - pp. 567–613.
ABBREVIATIO REGINALDI PECOCK. - - - pp. 615–618.
EXTRACT FROM GASCOIGNE'S THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY. pp. 621–624.
GLOSSARY. - - - - - - pp. 625–683.
INDEX. - - - - - - pp. 685–696.

Digitized by Google

PECOCK'S REPRESSOR.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

PECOCK'S REPRESSOR.

PROLOG.

Vndirnyme thou, biseche thou, and blame thou, in al pacience and doctrine. (ij^{e}. Thi. iiij^{e}. c̃.)

THOUȝ these wordis weren writen[1] bi Seint Poul to Thimothe being a bischop[2] and not a lay persoon of the comon peple, ȝit in tho wordis Seint Poul ȝeueth not to Thimothe instruccioun of eny hiȝer gouernaunce than whiche also he myȝte haue ȝeue to a lay persoon of the comoun peple, bi cause that in tho wordis Poul ȝeueth 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 ȝeueth instruccioun of correpcioun 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^{e}. ad Thessalonic. iij^{e}. c̃. and Math. xviij^{e}. c̃., and as resoun also it weel[3] confermeth; so that it be do with honeste and reuerence, and with other therto bi reson dewe circumstauncis. Of which correpcioun first openyng or doing to wite, thanne next blamyng,

St. Paul's instructions to Timothy about the manner of administering reproof concern the laity as well as the clergy.

[1] *werē writē*, MS.; but the stroke above is in a later hand, and so elsewhere often, but not always.

[2] *abischop*, MS.; and so elsewhere very often, but not constantly: here the indefinite article is always printed as a word by itself.

[3] *weel it*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

and aftirward biseching ben parties: and therfore these same wordis speking oonli of correpcioun, 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 ech lay persoon, forto ther yn ȝeue to him instruccioun, how he schulde reule him, whanne euer he takith vpon him for to in neiȝbourli or brotherli maner correpte his Cristen neiȝbour or brother, namelich being in other wise to him his ouerer. In which wordis (as it is open ynouȝ for to se) ech man, which takith vpon him the deedis of brotherli correpcioun, is enformed, that the parties of thilk correpcioun (whiche ben vndirnymyng, 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 proue it to be a defaute for which he vndirnymeth and blameth, and the persoon so vndirnome and blamed to be gilti in the same defaut and synne.

They are very applicable to the overhasty blamers of the clergy in these days.

And for as miche as after it what is write, Rom. x^e. c̃., manie han *zeel of good wille, but not aftir kunnyng*, and han ther with take upon hem forto vndirnyme 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 defautis,[4] whiche gouernauncis tho blamers kunnen not schewe, teche, and proue to be defautis and synnes; and han therbi maad ful miche indignacioun, distur-

[1] *it longith*, MS.; but *it* is cancelled by a later hand.

[2] *y now*, MS.; but elsewhere conjunctim; similarly *y clepid*, &c. elsewhere, but not constantly; in such cases here printed uniformly conjunctim.

[3] *bothe in speche and* added in the margin by a different hand.

[4] *indefautis*, MS.

Digitized by Google

blaunce, cisme, and othere yuelis, forto rise and be contynued in manie persoones bi long tyme of manye ȝeeris: therfore to ech such vngroundid and vnredy and ouer hasti vndirnymer and blamer y seie the bifore rehercid wordis of Seint Poul: *Vndirnyme thou, biseche thou, and blame thou, in al pacience and doctrine:* as thouȝ y schulde seie thus: If thou cannest teche, schewe, and proue that the deede of which thou vndirnymest and blamest the persoon or persoones is a defaute and a trespace, and thanne that he is gilti ther of; vndirnyme 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 vndirnyme and blame.

Those who correct others should first look to themselves; ill-founded complaints lessen the effect of such as are well-founded.

For ellis Seint Poul schulde not haue seid thus, *Vndirnyme thou, blame thou, in al pacience and doctrine:* ȝhe, and ellis thou ouȝtist vndirnyme and blame first thi silf of this defaute, that thou vndirnymest and blamest not hauyng the doctrine which thou ouȝtist haue, eer than thou take vpon thee forto vndirnyme and blame: and so to ech such ouer hasti and vnwijs blamer myȝte be seid what is writun, Luk iiij^e. c̃., thus: *O leche, heele thi silf.* ȝhe, perauenture to summe suche blamers and for sumwhilis myȝte be seid what is writen, Luk the vj^e. c̃., thus: *Ypocrite, take first the beem out of thine owne iȝe, and thanne thou schalt se forto take the mote out of thin neiȝboris iȝe.* And ferthermore sithen it is so, that suche vnwise, vndiscrete, and ouerhasti vndirnymers letten the effect of her wijs and discrete and weel avisid vndirnymyngis, whiche thei in othere tymes maken or mowe make to the clergie; and so ȝeuen occasioun that bothe thei hem silf and her iust vndirnymyngis ben despisid and ben not seet bi, and so maken therbi hem silf 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

Digitized by Google

and blamers of the clergie, kepe weel what is seid to be the menyng of Seint Poul in the bifore rehercid wordis, *Vndirnyme thou, biseche thou, blame thou, in al pacience*[1] *and doctrine.*

The present work a vindication of eleven ordinances of the clergy which are unjustly condemned; its title, plan, and divisions.

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 harmes 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 vntreuli iugen and condempnen to be yuele; of whiche xj. gouernauncis oon is the having and vsing of ymagis in chirchis; and an othir is pilgrimage in going to the memorialis or the mynde placis of Seintis, 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 preestis and of bischopis. And this y schal[2] do bi writing of this present book in the comoun peplis langage pleinli and openli and schortli, and to be clepid *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 ij^{e}. iij^{e}. iiij^{e}. and v^{e}. principal parties schal be maad in special maner the seid repressing; and in special maner the proof to the same xj. gouernauncis; thouȝ alle othere gouernauncis of the clergie, for whiche the clergy is worthi to[3] be blamed in brotherly and neiȝbourly correpcioun, 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.
[2] *schal y*, MS. (first hand).
[3] *to* is inserted by a later hand, perhaps wrongly.

Digitized by Google

THE FIRST PART.

THE FIRST CHAPITER.

THRE trowingis or opiniouns ben causis and groundis of manie and of weel nyȝ alle the errouris whiche manie of the lay partie holden, and bi which holding thei vniustly and ouermyche wijten and blamen the clergie and alle her othere neiȝbouris of the lay side, which not holden tho same errouris accordingly with hem, and therfore it is miche nede forto first ȝeue bisynes to vnroote and ouerturne tho thre trowingis, holdingis, or opiniouns, bifore the improuyng of othere; sithen if tho thre be sufficiently improued, that is to seie, if it be sufficientli proued that tho thre ben nouȝt and vntrewe and badde, alle the othere vntrewe opiniouns and holdingis bildid vpon 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 GENERAL ANSWER: Three erroneous opinions the grounds of almost all the complaints made against the clergy.

The firste of these thre trowingis, holdingis, or opiniouns is this: That no gouernaunce is to be holde of Cristen men the seruice or the lawe of God, saue it which is groundid in Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament, as summe of the bifore 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 wantoun, that whanne euer eny

THE FIRST ERROR: That no ordinance is to be esteemed a law of God, unless it be grounded in Scripture.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. I.

clerk affermeth to hem eny gouernaunce being contrarie to her witt or plesaunce, thouȝ it ligge ful open and ful sureli in doom of resoun, and ther fore sureli in moral lawe of kinde, which is lawe of God, forto be doon; ȝit 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-"uokid?" And if thei heere not where so in Holi Scripture it is witnessid, thei it dispisen and not receyuen as a gouernaunce of Goddis seruice and of Goddis moral lawe. This opinioun thei weenen to be groundid, Mat. xxij^e. c̃., where Crist seide to the Saduceis thus: *Ȝe erren, not knowing Scripturis, neither the vertu or strengthe of God. In the resurrectioun forsothe thei schulen not wedde neither be weddid, but thei schulen be as aungelis of God in heuen. Han not ȝe rad of the resurrectioun of dede men, that it is seid to us of God, I am God of Abraham, God of Ysaac, God of Iacob, et cætera.* Also thei weenen this opinioun be groundid, Iohun v^e. c̃., where Crist seide to the Iewis thus: *Serche ȝe Scripturis, for ȝe trowen ȝou forto haue euerlasting lijf in hem, and thei ben whiche beren witnes of me.*

THE SECOND ERROR: That every humble-minded Christian shall without fail arrive at the true sense of every place of Scripture.

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 vndirstonding of Holi Scripture in what euer place he or sche schal rede and studie, thouȝ it be in the Apocalips or ouȝwhere ellis: and the more meke he or sche be, the sooner he or sche schal come into the verry trewe and dew vndirstonding of it, which in Holi Scripture he or sche redith and studieth. This ij^e. opinioun thei wenen to be groundid in Holi Scripture, Ysaie lxvj^e. c̃. in the bigynnyng, where God seith thus: *To whom schal y biholde but to a litle pore man,*

Digitized by Google

broken in herte, and trembling at mi wordis? And also Iames the iiij^e. c̃., and i^e. Petre v^e. c̃., where it is seid thus: *God azenstondith proude men, and he zeueth grace to meke men.* Also Ysaie lvij^e. c̃. where it is seid, *that God dwelling in euerlastingte dwellith with a meke and a contrite spirit, that he quykee the spirit of meke men and that he quykee the herte of contrite men.* And in othere dyuerise placis of Scripture mensioun is mad that God zeueth goode thingis to meke men more thanne if thei were not so meke.

THE THIRD ERROR: That when the true sense of Scripture has been discovered in the manner aforesaid by any one, he should listen to no arguments of clerks to the contrary.

The iij^e. trowing or opinioun is this: Whanne euere a persoon hath founde the vndirstonding of Holi Scripture into which he schal come bi the wey now bifore seid of the ij^e. opinioun, he or sche ouzte bowe awey her heering, her reeding, and her vndirstonding fro al resonyng and fro al arguyng or prouyng which eny clerk can or wole or mai make bi eny maner euydence of resoun or of Scripture, and namelich of resoun into the contrarie, thouz the mater be such that it passith not the boondis neither the capacite of resoun forto entermete therwith and forto iuge and zeue kunnyng ther upon; which trowing and opinioun to holde and fulfille thei wenen hem be bede bi Poul, Colocens. ij^e. c̃., where he seith thus: *Y seie 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 philsophi and veyn falsnes aftir the tradiciouns of men and after the elementis of the world, and not aftir Crist.* Also i^e. Cor. i^e. c̃., weelnyz thoruz al the chapiter, Poul meeneth that Cristen bileeuers ouzten not recche of wisdom such as wise worldli men vsen and setten miche therbi.

Digitized by Google

ij. CHAPITER.

Thirteen principal conclusions shall be made against the first error. Explanation of certain logical terms premised.

FORTO meete azens the firste bifore spoken opinioun, and forto vnroote and updrawe it, y schal sette forth first xiij. principal conclusiouns. But for as miche as this vnrooting of the first opinioun and the proofis of tho xiij. conclusiouns mowen not be doon and made withoute strengthe of argumentis, therfore that y be the better and the cleerer vndirstonde of the lay peple in summe wordis to be aftir spoken in this present book, y sette nowe bifore to hem this doctrine taken schortli 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 ij. first ben clepid premissis, and the iij^e. folewing out of hem is clepid the conclusioun of hem. And the firste of tho ij. premissis is clepid the first premisse, and the ij^e. of hem is clepid the ij^e. 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. Ensaumple 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 ij. proposicions, which ben these, "Ech man is at Rome;" and "The Pope is a man;" and these ben the ij. premyssis in this argument, and thei dryuen out the iij^e. proposicioun, which is this, "The Pope is at Rome," and it is the conclusioun of the ij. premissis. Wherfore certis if eny man can be sikir for eny tyme that these ij. premyssis be trewe, he mai be sikir that the conclusioun is trewe; thouz alle the aungelis 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 ouzte be avowid for trewe, what euer creature wole seie the contrarie.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II.

Advantages which would arise to the common people and others from a compendious treatise on logic in the vulgar tongue. Pecock hopes some day to write such a treatise.

What propirtees and condiciouns ben requirid to an argument, that he be ful and formal and good, is tauȝt in logik bi ful faire and sure reulis, and may not be tauȝt 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 concludith and proueth his conclusioun and whanne he not so dooth; and thanne thei schulden kepe hem silf the better fro falling into errouris, and thei myȝten the sooner come out of errouris bi heering of argumentis maad to hem, if thei into eny errouris weren falle; and thanne thei schulden not be so blunt and so ruyde and vnformal and boistose in resonyng, and that bothe in her arguying and in her answering, as thei now ben; and thanne schulden thei not be so obstinat aȝens clerkis and aȝens 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 oonli so do. And miche good wolde come forth if a schort compendiose logik were deuysid 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 preciose. Into whos making, if God wole graunte leue and leyser, y purpose sumtyme aftir myn othere bisynessis forto assaie.

THE FIRST OF THE THIRTEEN CONCLUSIONS: That it is no part of the office of Scripture to found any law of

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 thoruȝ this present book, y wole come doun into the xiij. conclusiouns, of whiche the

[1] *askile*, MS.; but the words are divided by a later hand. See p. 1, note.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II.

God which man's reason may discover by the light of nature.

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 seruice of God, or eny lawe of God, or eny trouthe which mannis resoun bi nature may fynde, leerne, and knowe.

THE FIRST ARGUMENT FOR THE FIRST CONCLUSION: Whatever is ordained by God to be the ground of any truth must so fully declare it, that it cannot be known without such ground; but no truth of God's moral law is fully taught by Scripture only; consequently no truth of natural religion is grounded on Scripture.

That this conclusioun 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 treuth, thilk same thing muste so teche and declare and seie out and ȝeue forth al the kunnyng vpon the same vertu or gouernance or trouthe, wher with and wherbi thilk same vertu, gouernaunce, or trouthe is sufficientli knowen, that withoute thilk same thing the same kunnyng of thilk same vertu, gouernaunce, or trouthe may not be sufficientli knowen, so that thilk same vertu, gouernance, or trouthe, in al the kunnyng withoute which he may not at fulle be leerned and knowen, muste nedis growe forth and come forth out and fro oonli 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 treuthe of Goddis moral lawe and seruice, into whos fynding, leerning, and knowing mannis witt may by his natural strengthe and natural helpis come, Holi Scripture al oon ȝeueth 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 gidere, as anoon after schal be proued, growith 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 first premiss proved.

The firste premisse of this argument muste needis be grauntid. Forwhi, if the sufficient leernyng and

Digitized by Google

kunnyng of eny 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 ij. diuerse groundis and schulde be bildid vpon ij. fundamentis, of which the oon is dyuers atwyn fro the other, which forto seie and holde is not takeable of mannis witt. Wherfore 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 treuthe or gouernaunce, that ech man schulde kepe mekenes, were knowe bi sum other thing than bi Holi Scripture, and as weel and as sufficiently as bi Holi Scripture, thilk gouernaunce or trouth were not groundid in Holi Scripture. Forwhi he stood not oonli ther on; and therfore 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 substaunce of the wal, or of the tree, or of the hous stondith, and out of which oonly the wal, tree, or hous cometh. Wherfore bi lijk skile, no thing is ground and fundament of eny treuthe 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 treuthe or gouernance cometh.

The second premisse proved.

That also the ij^e. premisse is trewe, y proue thus: What euer deede or thing doom of resoun dooth as fulli and as perfitli as Holi Scripture it dooth, Holi Scripture it not dooth oonli or al oon; but so it is, that what euer leernyng and kunnyng Holi Scripture ȝeueth upon eny of the now seid gouernauncis, trouthes, and vertues, (that is to seie, upon eny gouernaunce, trouthe,

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II.

and vertu of Goddis lawe to man, in to whos fynding, leernyng, and knowing mannis resoun may bi him silf aloon, or with natural helpis, rise and come,) mannis resoun may and can ȝeue the same leerning and knowing, as experience ther upon to be take anoon wole schewe; for thou canst not fynde oon such gouernaunce tauȝt in Holi Scripture to be doon, but that resoun techith it lijk weel and lijk fulli to be doon; and if thou wolt not trowe this, assigne thou summe suche and assaie. Wherfore folewith that of noon suche now seid gouernauncis the leernyng and knowing is had and tauȝt bi Holi Scripture oonli or aloone; and therfore the ij^e. premisse of the firste principal argument muste needis be trewe.

The first conclusion proved.

And thanne ferther, thus: Sithen the bothe premissis of the first 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 bifore set first principal conclusioun.

iij. CHAPITER.

THE SECOND ARGUMENT FOR THE FIRST CONCLUSION AGAINST THE FIRST ERROR: That only is the true ground of anything, upon which it would rest, in the absence of all other pretended grounds; but the truth of God's moral law does in fact rest not upon Scripture, but on the judgment of the reason; so that Scripture cannot be the ground of the moral law.

THE ij^e. principal argument into the first bifore sett and spoken conclusioun or trouthe is this: Thilk thing is the ground of a gouernaunce, or vertu, or trouthe, out of which al the sufficient leernyng and knowing of the same gouernaunce, trouthe, and vertu cometh, procedith, and growith, and may be had, thouȝ al other thing pretendid to be ground ther of be awey or were not in being; but so it is, that al the leernyng and knowing, which Holi Scripture ȝeueth vpon eny bifore seid gouernaunce, deede, or trouthe of Goddis moral lawe, mai be had bi doom of natural resoun; ȝhe, thouȝ Holi Writt had not spoke ther of, or thouȝ he schulde neuere fro hens forthward speke ther of, as anoon aftir schal be proued; and ouer it al the forther kunnyng which Holi Writt ȝeueth not upon eny seid gouernaunce or deede or treuthe of Goddis lawe and

Digitized by Google

seruice, 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 first premiss proved before; the second premiss proved.

The firste premisse of this ij^e. principal argument is proued bifore bi proof of the first premisse in the first principal argument; and the secunde premisse in this principal argument mai be proued thus: Ech of these gouernauncis, trouthis, and vertues, now to be rehercid, mowe be knowen bi doom of resoun as sufficientli as Holi Scripture techith hem to be don, thouȝ 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 silf and his neiȝbore as him silf, thouȝ not so miche as him silf; 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 aȝens 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 ouȝte be temperat in eting and drinking, and not be glotenose; and that he ouȝte be contynent or holding mesure in deedis of gendring; and that he ouȝte be meke to othere men and not proud; and that he ouȝte be trewe and iust to othere men; and that he ouȝte be mylde in speche and answere; and that he ouȝte be pacient and sobre in tribulaciouns; and that he ouȝte be douȝty 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 lijk mannis witt can teche and schewe that ech of hem ouȝte be doon of man, as ferforth

Digitized by Google

CHAP. III.

as Holi Scripture techith of eny of hem that he ouȝte be don of man, as experience soone can ther of make proof. And also hethen philsophiris bi her studie in natural witt founden and grauntiden alle hem to be doon; and that these philsophiris so founden and grauntiden bi her naturall witt, it is to be holde. Forwhi thei hem silf knewe of noon reuelacioun mad to hem bi God ther upon; and if eny such reuelacioun hadde be maad to hem, thei schulden bifore othere men haue knowe it so to be mad to hem. Neither othere men euere knewen that to tho philsophiris was maad such reuelacioun. Forwhi, if eny men wolen so holde, thei kunnen not schewe therto eny proof forto saue her seiyng and holding fro feynyng; no more than if it had likid to hem forto haue holde that an aungel spake to tho philsophiris fro heuene, as an aungel spake to Abraham and to Moises; and sithen to neuerneither thei han sufficient euydence, it folewith that forto eny of hem bothe holde is not but feyned waar; forwhi it is waar which lackith his ground, proof, and fundament. Ferthermore, with this now seid and ouer this now seid of the bifore 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 ȝeue miche more leernyng and kunnyng than is therof ȝouen in Holi Scripture, as experience ther upon openli schewith; ȝhe, ther is noon such now seid gouernaunce or vertu or trouthe of Goddis moral lawe tauȝt bi Scripture to be had and vsid: but that six sithis[1] more leernyng and knowing muste be had upon him, eer he schal be sufficientli leerned and knowun, than is al the leernyng and know ing which is writun upon him in Holi Scripture, as it mai weel be seen to ech reeder in the book

[1] *sixsithis*, MS.; but the words are divided by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

clepid *Cristen religioun* and in the bookis perteynyng therto. Wherfore the ij^e. premisse of the ij^e. principal argument is trewe thoruȝ hise bothe parties: ȝhe, upon sum trouthe or gouernaunce of Goddis lawe lenger writing muste be had, eer it be sufficientli knowe, than is al the writing of Mathewis Gospel; and ȝit of thilk vertu or gouernaunce scantli is writen in al Holi Writt ten lynes, as it is open to ech reeder and vnderstonder in the seid bokis. Wherfore folewith that the ij^e. premisse of the ij^e. principal argument for his ij^e. partie is trewe.

Teaching of Scripture concerning matrimony scanty.

I preie thee, Sir, seie to me where in Holi Scripture 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 ȝit rede who so wole thilk book *Of matrimonie*, and he schal fynde al the hool teching of thilk book litil ynouȝ or ouer litle forto teche al what is necessarie to be leerned and kunnen vpon matrimonie. Hast thou eny more teching in Holi Scripture upon matrimonie than a fewe lynes writen, Mat. v^e. c̃. and Mat. xix^e. c̃., Mark x^e. c̃., and Luk xvj^e.[1] c̃., and Genesis i^e. and ij^e. c̃.? And ȝit alle thilk vj. places speken not saue tweyne pointis of matrimonie, which ben vndepartabilnes and fleischli vce of bodies into childe bigeting. What therfore a grounde ouȝte eny man seie that Holi Scripture is to matrimonie, sithen al Holi Scripture techith not but these ij. pointis of matrimonie? For thouȝ Poul bidde ofte that a man schulde loue his wijf, and that the wijf schulde obeie to hir husbonde, ȝit what is this to kunnyng of matrimonye in it silf, and into the propirtees of it, and into the circumstauncis of it, withoute which matrimonie is not vertuose? And so forth of manie purtenauncis and longingis to matrimonye.

---

[1] *xviij^e.*, MS. See Luke xvi. 18.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. III.

Similarly concerning usury.

Seie to me also where in Holi Scripture is ȝouen the hundrid parti of the teching which is ȝouen upon vsure in the thridde parti of the book yclepid *The filling of the iiij. tablis:* and ȝit al thilk hool teching ȝouen upon vsure in the now named book is litil ynouȝ or ouer litle forto leerne, knowe, and haue sufficientli into mannis bihoue and into Goddis trewe seruice and lawe keping what is to be leerned and kunnen aboute vsure, as to reeders and studiers ther yn it muste needis be open.

In this and other cases Scripture presupposes a knowledge acquired by the judgment of the natural reason.

Is ther eny more writen of vsure in al the Newe Testament saue this, Luk vj^e. c̃., *ȝeue ȝe loone, hoping no thing ther of?* and al that is of vsure writen in the Oold Testament fauorith rather vsure than it reproueth. How euere, therfore, schulde eny man seie that the sufficient leernyng and kunnyng of vsure or of the vertu contrarie to vsure is groundid in Holi Scripture? How euere schal thilk litil now rehercid clausul, Luk vj^e. c̃., be sufficient forto answere and assoile alle the harde scrupulose doutis and questiouns which al dai han neede to be assoilid in mennis bargenyngis and cheffaringis to gidere? Ech man having to do with suche questiouns mai soone se that Holi Writt ȝeueth litil or noon liȝt therto at al. Forwhi al that Holi Writt seith ther to is that he forbedith vsure, and therfore al that mai be take therbi is this, that vsure is vnleeful; bnt thouȝ y bileeue herbi that vsure is vnleeful, how schal y wite herbi what vsure is, that y be waar 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 Holi Scripture bidde that we tempte not God amys and aȝens resoun, certis resoun techith the same. But ȝit where ellis than in doom of resoun schule[1] we fynde what tempting is, and which tempting of God

[1] *schulde*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

is leeful and which is not? Certis not in al Holi Scripture. Also, thouȝ Holi Scripture bidde that a man be iust to his neiȝbour, and resoun techith as fulli the same, ȝit what riȝtwisnes is and whiche ben hise spicis, muste be founden in doom of resoun and not in Holi Scripture; and whanne eny plee is bitwix man and man, and euereither party trowith to haue riȝt, the iugement 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 induccioun of ech gouernaunce longing to Goddis lawe weelnyȝ. Wherfore the secunde premisse of the ij^e^. principal argument for his ij^e^. party is trewe.

Confirmacioun to this ij^e^. principal argument is this: Euery 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 ȝeue. Forwhi al this kunnyng myȝte be had bi labour in doom of resoun, thouȝ no biholding therto were maad into Holi Scripture, or thouȝ Scripture were distroied and brent, as summen[1] trowen that it so was, with al the writing of the Oold Testament in the tyme of transmigracioun into Babilony, as it is now bifore schewid;

Confirmation of the second argument. The doctrine of Scripture on such subjects might be equally well discovered by reason, if Scripture did not exist.

[1] "If this be trewe . . . . . it "folewith that forto seie this "whiche summe doctouris com- "ounli holden with the Maistir of "Stories (*i.e.* Petrus Comestor), "that Esdras by inspiracioun "wrote without eny copi alle the "fiue bokis of Moyses and alle "the othere bokis of stories and of "prophecies in to hise daies, is not "but a feynyd thing." Pecock's *Book of Faith*, p. xxiii. (Wharton); but the notion is as old as Tertullian (*de Cult. Fœm.*, lib. I. c. 3): "Perinde potuit abolefactam eam "violentia cataclysmi in spiritu "rursus reformare; quemadmodum "et Hierosolymis Babylonia ex- "pugnatione deletis, omne instru- "mentum Judaicæ litteraturæ per "Esdram constat restauratum."

Digitized by Google

CHAP. III.

wherfore needis folewith that Scripture is not ground to eny oon such seid vertu, gouernaunce, deede, or trouthe, of which the firste conclusioun 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.

iiij. CHAPITRE.

THIRD ARGUMENT FOR THE FIRST CONCLUSION AGAINST THE FIRST ERROR: Before the law was given to the Jews, they were bound by the moral law; the ceremonial law being afterwards given and abiding till Christ came.

THE iij^e. principal argument into the same firste and principal conclusioun is this: Bifore that eny positijf lawe of God, that is to seie, eny voluntarie or wilful assignement of God, was ȝouen to the Iewis fro the long tyme of Adamys comyng out of Paradijs into the tyme of circumcisioun in the daies of Abraham, and into the positijf lawe ȝouen bi Moyses, the peple lyueden and seruiden God and weren bounde weelniȝ bi alle tho moral vertues and moral gouernauncis and treuthis whiche bi doom of her natural resoun thei founden and leerneden and camen to, and so thei weren bounde[1] weelnyȝ to alle moral gouernauncis and moral trouthis into whiche Cristen men ben bounden now in tyme of the Newe Testament. Aftirward, whanne tyme of Iewis came and the positijf lawe of the cerymonyes, iudicialis, and sacramentalis weren ȝouen to the Iewis, the othere now bifore seid lawis of resoun weren not reuokid, but thei contynueden into charge of the Iewis with the lawis of cerymonies,

[1] *boūdē*, MS.; but the stroke over the *e* has been erased. Just above, the strokes over *camē* and *werē* seem to be a later hand. Just below, *boūden* 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).

Digitized by Google

iudicialis and sacramentis, so that the Iewis weren chargid with alle the lawis of resoun with whiche the peple fro Adam thidir to weren chargid and also ouer that with the positijf lawis of God thanne ȝouen. 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 chargid bifore the tyme of Iewis aboden, stille charging also the Iewis into the tyme of Cristis passioun.

Christ did not abrogate the moral, but only the ceremonial law; Christians now bound by the moral law, as all men were before, and also by the positive law of a few Christian sacraments.

And thanne ferther, thus: Whanne Crist prechid and suffrid, alle the peple of Iewis were chargid with the hool lawe of kinde and of resoun and with al the positijf lawe of cerimonies iudicialis and oold sacramentis, but so it is that to Cristen men succeding next after the Iewis weren not reuokid eny lawis bi Crist and his newe lawe saue the positijf lawis of cerymonies iudicialis and oolde sacramentis: wherfore in to the charge of Cristen men abidith ȝit the hool birthen which was to the Iewis, excepte the birthen of cerymonies iudicialis 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 philsophie, which was birthen and charge bothe to the Iewis and to alle peplis bifore the Iewis fro Adamys comyng out of Paradijs. And sithen it is not founde in the Newe Testament that Crist made eny positijf lawe bisidis the oolde law of kinde and of resoun which euere was bifore, except oonli his positijf lawe of hise newe sacramentis with whiche he chargid the peple of Cristen, instide of[1] cerymonies iudicialis and oold sacramentis with whiche the Iewis weren chargid,

[1] *of the*, MS.; but *the* is cancelled by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV.

it folewith that Cristen peple abiden ȝit hidir to chargid with the seid ful al hool moral lawe of kinde, and with the positijf lawis of Cristis newe sacramentis, so that welnyȝ 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 philsophie 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 ynouȝ lad forth to be trewe, it muste nedis folewe that welnyȝ or weel toward al the hool lawe of God in tyme of the Newe Testament, except a fewe positijf lawis of Cristis fewe newe sacramentis, is not ellis than the same lawe of kinde which was long bifore the tyme of Abraham and of Iewis.

This moral law not founded on the Old or New Testament, but written in the book of natural reason.

And thanne ferther ther of y argue thus: But so it is that al thilk now seid lawe of kinde which was bifore the tyme of Iewis, not withstonding 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 folewith 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 bifore the daies of Abraham and of Iewis. Whi in this iij°. principal argument y haue seid these wordis welnyȝ or weel toward schal appere and be seen bi what schal be seid aftir in proofis of the vij°. and x°. conclusiouns, and more openli by the place there alleggid in the book clepid *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture.*

FOURTH ARGUMENT FOR THE

The iiij°. principal argument is this, What euer

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV.

FIRST CONCLUSION AGAINST THE FIRST ERROR: Whatever only stirs men to keep certain laws does not thereby become the ground of those laws.

thing oonli remembrith, stirith, and exortith, or biddith or counseilith men forto kepe certein gouernauncis, vertues, and treuthis groundith not as in that tho gouernauncis, vertues, and treuthis. Forwhi as in that he presupposith tho gouernauncis, vertues, and trouthis to be bifore knowen of tho same men, and ellis in waast he schulde so speke to tho men of hem not bifore knowen; and ther fore as in that he not hem groundith. But so it is that Holi Scripture dooth not ellis aboute the moral vertues and gouernauncis and treuthis of Goddis moral lawe and seruice bifore seid in the firste conclusioun, saue oonli this, that he remembrith, or exortith, or biddith, or counseilith men upon tho vertues and gouernauncis and forto vse hem, and forto flee the contrarie vicis of hem, as ech man mai se bi reding where euere he wole where mensioun is mad of eny moral vertu in the Oold Testament or of the Newe. For he biddith a man to be meke, and he techith not bifore what mekenes is. He biddith a man to be pacient, and ȝit he not bifore 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 Holi Scripture, no more than it ouȝte be seid if a bischop wolde sende a pistle or a lettre to peple of his diocise, and ther yn wolde remembre hem, exorte hem, and stire hem, and bidde hem or counseile hem forto kepe certeyn moral vertues of lawe of kinde, that therfore 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 vpon such seid vertues Poul wrote in hise epistlis, neither Petir, neither Iame, neither Iohun, neither Iudas wroten in her epistlis and writingis.

Confirmation of the argument by an illustration from the English constitution.

Confirmacioun to this argument mai be this: If the King of Ynglond dwellid in Gascony, and wolde sende a noble longe letter or epistle into Englond,

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV. bothe to iugis and to othere men, that ech of hem schulde kepe the pointis of the lawe of Englond, and thouȝ he wolde reherce tho pointis and gouernauncis, vertues,[1] and trouthis of the lawe forto remembre the iugis and the peple ther upon, and thouȝ he schulde stire and prouoke, and exorte, bidde, or counseile hem therto, ȝit it ouȝte not be seid that thilk epistle[2] groundid eny of tho lawis or gouernauncis of Englond, for her ground is had to hem bifore thilk epistle of the King, and that bi acte and decre of the hool Parliament of Englond which is verry ground to alle the lawis of Englond, thouȝ 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 knowen bifore of hem to whom he biddith tho deedis to be kept as lawis. Wherfore bi lijk skile, thouȝ Crist and thouȝ Poul and othere Apostlis wroten to peple epistlis or lettris or othere writingis, ȝit sithen tho truthis which thei so wroten weren groundid bifore tho writingis and hengen upon the doom of resoun which is lawe of kinde and moral philsophie and schulden bi dewte haue be kept of men thouȝ tho writingis hadden not be maad, it folewith that tho spoken gouernauncis ouȝten not be trowid groundid in the now seid writingis of Crist or of the Apostlis. Who euer mai seie that eny thing was bifore his ground, and ouȝte be thouȝ his ground were not, and thouȝ his ground had not be? Wherfore needis folewith that the firste bifore sett and principal conclusioun is trewe.

---

[1] *and vertues*, MS.; but *and* is cancelled.

[2] *pistle*, MS.; *e* added above in a different hand.

Digitized by Google

v. CHAPITER.

The v^e^. principal argument into the same firste and principal conclusioun is this: Who euer in his speche bi which he spekith of a gouernaunce or treuthe presupposith the same gouernaunce to be knowen bifore his same speche and to be knowen eer[1] he so ther of spekith or spak, he as in thilk speche groundith not thilk gouernaunce or trouthe; for thanne the thing groundid schulde be bifore his ground. But so it is, that whanne euere Holi Scripture or Crist or Apostle spekith or spak of eny of the seid gouernauncis or moral trouthis thei in the same speche presupposen the same gouernaunce to be bifore her speking ther of. Forwhi in thilke spechis thei bidden or counseilen or exorten or remembren to men tho deedis to be doon of hem; and who euer so dooth presupposith the same deedis to be bifore knowen of hem to whom tho deedis ben so beden, counseilid, exortid, or remembrid to be doon, as it is bifore seid in the iiij^e^. argument. And also in thilk speche thei speken of the gouernaunce not as of a thing which thei thanne first maken, but as of thing[2] bifore being eer eny lawe was ȝouen to the Iewis, as it is riȝt euydent that Crist and hise Apostlis it weel knowen and in to whos performyng thei remembren men and stiren and prouoken. Wherfore needis folewith that noon such seid gouernaunce is groundid in eny speche of Holi Scripture or of Crist or of Apostle.

FIFTH ARGUMENT FOR THE FIRST CONCLUSION: Whoever in his speech presupposes a governance to be known does not lay the ground of that governance. Hence it appears that moral truths are not grounded on any speech of Christ or his apostles.

---

[1] *heer*, MS.; but the first letter is in paler ink, and *eer* is no doubt the reading intended by the corrector.

[2] The indefinite article should probably be inserted.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. V.

SIXTH ARGUMENT FOR THE FIRST CONCLUSION: Mere mention of any moral truth in Scripture does not prove Scripture to be the ground of it.

The vj^e^. principal argument into the same firste and principal conclusioun is this: No sufficient cause hast thou forto seie and holde that Holi Scripture groundith eny of the gouernauncis, trouthis, and vertues bifore seid in the firste conclusioun saue this, that in Holi Scripture mensioun 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.

If the opposite of this were the case, Scripture would also be the ground of truths of natural philosophy; which is absurd.

The ij^e^. premisse of this vj^e^. argument may be proued thus: If thilk now seid cause were sufficient forto so holde, thanne, sithen Holi Scripture makith mensioun M^t^. xvi^e^. c̃. of treuthis longing to natural philsophi and approueth hem there weel to be treuthis, it wolde folewe that Holi Scripture groundith treuthis of natural philsophie; which no wijs man wole graunte: wherfore the ij^e^. premysse of this vj^e^. argument is trewe. Schal y seie for this that Crist rehercith Math. xvj^e^. c̃., how that *whanne heuen is rody in the euentid a cleer dai schal be the morcwe, and whanne in the morntide heuene schineth heuyli in thilk dai schal be tempest,* that in Holi Scripture this treuthe of natural philsophie now rehercid 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. Forwhi the kunnyng ther of was had eer Crist there and thanne tho wordis spake, and no thing is bifore his owne ground, and the kunnyng of thilk mater is largir in his ground which is natural philsophi than is many hool chapitris to gidere ligging in Matheu. And ȝit bi lijk skile it schulde be holde and seid that the now rehercid pointis of natural philsophie were groundid there, if eny oon point of the seid moral philsophie were groundid in Holi Scripture; wherfore sithen thilk

Digitized by Google

kunnyng of cleernes and of derknes in the dai is not groundid in the Gospel thouȝ the Gospel make a schort rehercel ther of, it folewith bi lijk skile that of no moral vertuose gouernauncis the sufficient kunnyng is groundid in Holi Writt, sithen al Holi Writt techith not forth the ful and sufficient and necessarie kunnyng of eny oon moral vertu in Goddis lawe or Goddis seruice, thouȝ of many of hem Holi Scripture makith schort remembrauncis to us that we schulde hem kepe and not aȝens hem do. And it is welnyȝ al that Holi Writt dooth or namelich entendith forto teche aboute eny moral vertu or point of Goddis moral lawe: and Goddis forbode that this litle were sufficient ground of the ful hool leernyng necessarie to be had upon eny 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 hauyng an hundrid feet in brede is groundid upon lond in which he takith not but oon foot? Goddis forbode y schulde be so lewde forto so seie. Forwhi miche rather y ouȝte seie that this hous takith his grounding upon thilk lond in which ben alle the feetis mesuris of the same hous, and therfore nedis ech witti man muste graunte that the first principal conclusioun bifore sett is trewe.

COROLLARY TO THE FIRST CONCLUSION: Whenever any moral truth as delivered in Scripture appears to contradict the moral law written in man's soul, the sense of Scripture must be accommodated to the judgment of the reason; not *vice versa*.

Of whiche first principal conclusioun thus proued folewith ferther this corelarie, that whanne euere and where euere in Holi Scripture or out of Holi Scripture be writen eny point or eny gouernaunce of the seide lawe of kinde it is more verrili writen in the book of mannis soule than in the outward book of parchemyn or of velym; and if eny semyng discorde be bitwixe the wordis writen in the outward book of Holi Scripture and the doom of resoun, write in mannis soule and herte, the wordis so writen withoutforth ouȝten be expowned and be interpretid

Digitized by Google

CHAP. V.

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 euer 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 mad 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 folewith that the treting doon bi it which is not the ground ouȝte be[1] mad for to accord with the treting which is maad bi the ground. And therfore this corelarie conclusioun muste nedis be trewe.

Further proofs of the first conclusion to be found in Pecock's *Just apprising of Holy Scripture.*

More, for proof of the firste principal conclusioun and of al what is seid fro the bigynnyng of the same first principal conclusion hidir to, is sette and writen in the book clepid *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture,* which book if he be rad and be weel vnderstonde thoruȝout, hise iij. parties schal conferme vndoutabli al what is seid here fro the bigynnyng of the firste principal conclusioun hider to.

Though the word *grounding* can properly be used only in the above sense, yet Pecock himself sometimes uses it in the improper or popular sense of witnessing or affirming.

Weel y woot that not withstonding no verri and trewe grounding (propirli forto speke of grounding) is saue such as is now spoken of in the firste and ij^e^. argumentis to the firste conclusioun, ȝit whanne a mater or a trouthe is witnessid or affermed or denouncid or mad be remembrid to persoones, and that bi a reuerend and worthi witnesser or denouncer or remembrer (as is God, an Apostil, or a Doctour), thanne thilk witnessing or denouncing or remembraunce making is woned be clepid a grounding of the same mater or trouthe so witnessid,

[1] *to be*, MS.; *to* is cancelled by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

rehercid, or into remembraunce callid, not withstonding 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 likenes; and to this maner of vnpropre speche y conforme me in othere wheris of my writingis, bi cause that (as the philsophir 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 feelen; and ther fore where euer in mi writingis y speke of grounding and calle grounding which is not verri grounding y wole that y be vnderstonde 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 bicause[1] such speche is famose in vce, ȝit y wole be vndirstonde that my feeling in thilk mater is other wise than the speche sowneth, 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. CHAPITER.

The first conclusion proved by an illustration from an old custom among the Londoners at Midsummer eve.

AFTIR that y haue thus argued now bifore bi resoun into proof of the firste principal conclusioun y schal argue now in to the same by ensaumplis thus:

[1] It is not clear whether *bicause* is meant to be written conjunctim or disjunctim in the MS. It is written both ways elsewhere.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VI.

Seie to me, good Sire, and answere herto, whanne men of the cuntre vplond bringen into Londoun in Mydsomer eue braunchis of trees fro Bischopis wode and flouris fro the feeld, and bitaken tho to citeseins of Londoun forto therwith araie her housis, schulen men of Londoun receyuyng 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[1] Londoun, and wolden delyuere to men that thei make there with her housis gay, into remembraunce 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 receyuyng 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 receyuers 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 nexte erthe therto upon which and in which the roote is buried, so that neither the cart, neither the hondis of the bringers, neither 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 interlineated in an ink of the same colour.

Digitized by Google

hondis of the gaderers, neither tho bringers. Certis, but if ech man wole thus feele in this mater, he is duller than eny man ouȝte to be. And sithen in lijk maner it is that the maters and conclusiouns and trouthis of lawe of kinde, (of which lawe myche is spoken in the first parti of the book clepid *The iust apprising 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 folewith ther of and is necessarili longing therto leggith ful fair abrood sprad growing in his owne space, the feeld of mannys soule, and there oon treuthe cometh out of an other treuthe, and he of the iij^{e}., and the iij^{e}. out of the iiij^{e}., and into tyme it bicome vnto openest treuthis of alle othere in thilk faculte of moral philsophie, and to the principlis 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 weelnyȝ with al 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 wijs man muste graunte and consent that noon of the now seid treuthis and conclusiouns 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 treuthis mowe be take treuthis and conclusiouns, and be sett into open knowing of the fynder and of othere men, thouȝ not withoute labour and studie thoruȝ manie ȝeeris. And herto seruen clerkis of moral philsophie whiche now ben clepid Dyuynes riȝt as forresters and othere men seruen for to hewe doun braunchis for hem silf, and

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VI.

for to delyuere hem to citeseins in Londoun that her housis be maad the more honest ther with and therbi.

Another illustration from selling fish.

Go we ferther now thus: What if Crist and hise Apostlis wolden fische with bootis in the see, and wolden aftirward carie tho fischis in paniers vpon horsis to London, schulde men seie for reuerence or loue to Crist and hise Apostlis that tho fischis grewen out of the panyeris or dossers, or out of the hondis of Crist and of hise Apostlis, and that the ground and fundament of the fischis substauncis and beingis were the houndis[1] of Crist and of hise Apostlis whilis thei toke tho fischis, or whilis thei carieden tho fischis? 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 lesing azens treuthe. And thanne ferther thus: Certis treuthis of lawe of kind which Crist and hise Apostlis schewiden forth to peple were bifore 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 bifore proued; and ther fore 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 kinde whiche thei tauzten and prechiden to the peple, and therfore for no reuerence or loue to be zouen to God or to hise Apostlis, or to her writingis, it is to be seid and feelid that tho now seid treuthis weren or ben foundid and groundid in the seiyngis or writingis of Crist and of hise Apostlis.

Another illustration from sermons preached at St. Paul's Cross.

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 aftirward reporte and reherce 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 freendis vnder entent of reporting the sentence of the seid proces, schulde the heerers[2] of thilk

[1] Probably we should read *hondis*. | [2] *heeres*, MS.

Digitized by Google

reportyng and remembring 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 ouȝten seie and feele rathir[1] that thilk sentence is groundid in the seid book ligging in the librarie. And in caas 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 ouȝten seie and feele that hise wordis and hise writingis ouȝten be glosid and be expowned and be brouȝt in to accordaunce with the seid book in the librarie, and the seid book in thilk proces ouȝte not be expowned and be brouȝt and wrestid into accordaunce with the seid clerkis wordis[2] and writingis: ȝhe, thouȝ Crist and hise Apostlis wolden entende and do the same as this clerk dooth, the peple ouȝte in noon other wise than which is now seid here hem anentis Crist and hise Apostlis in this case, as it is opene ynouȝ. And sithen it is so, that alle the trouthis of lawe of kinde whiche Crist and hise Apostlis tauȝten and wroten weren bifore her teching and writing, and weren writen bifore 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 Ieremye spekith in his xxxj^{c}. c̃. and Poul in his epistle Hebr. viij^{c}. c̃., it muste needis folewe that noon of the seid treuthis 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 studiyng of clerkis mo con-

[1] *rathir* is added by a later hand. | [2] *wordris*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VI.

clusiouns and treuthis and gouernauncis of lawe of kinde and of Goddis moral lawe and seruice than myȝten be writen in so manie bokis whiche schulden fille the greet chirche of Seint Poul in Londoun.

vij. CHAPITER.

THE SECOND PRINCIPAL CONCLUSION AGAINST THE FIRST ERROR: Though Scripture be not the ground of any moral truths discoverable by reason, yet it bears witness to them, and exhorts to their better fulfilment.

THE secunde principal conclusioun and trouthe is this: Thouȝ it perteyne not to Holi Scripture forto grounde eny natural or moral gouernaunce or trouthe into whos fynding, leernyng, and knowing mannis reson may bi him silf and bi natural help come, as it is open now bifore bi proofis of the firste principal conclusioun, ȝit it mai perteyne weel ynouȝ to Holi Scripture that he reherce suche now seid gouernauncis and treuthis, and that he witnesse hem as groundid sumwhere ellis in the lawe of kinde or doom of mannis resoun. And so he dooth (as to ech reder ther yn it mai be opene) that bi thilk rehercing and witnessyng so doon bi Holi Scripture to men tho men schulden be bothe remembrid, stirid, prouokid, and exortid forto the rather performe and fulfille tho same so rehercid and witnessid gouernancis and trouthis.

Proofs of the conclusion. Though grammar and divinity be different sciences, yet grammatical works, as the *Catholicon* of Johannes Januensis, may illustrate and bear witness to some truths of divinity.

This conclusioun mai sone be proued. Forwhi we seen that not withstonding bookis and writingis of grammer han noon riȝt neither power forto grounde eny governaunce or trouthe of dyuynyte, bi cause that grammer and dyuynyte ben ij. 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 trouthis, ȝit the bokis of grammer rehercen with inne hem and witnessen summe treuthis of dy-

[1] *sondir*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

uynyte as in *Catholicon*, which is a book of gramer, in the word of . . . .[1] CHAP. VII.

Also thouȝ the faculte of Canon Lawe and the faculte of dyuynyte be ij. departid atwynne facultees, and ther fore thouȝ ech of hem hath his propre to him lymytid 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 groundith constitucioun and ordinancis of general counseilis and of popis and prouyncial and synodal constitucioun as hise propre to him trouthis and conclusiouns; and dyuynyte, in verri maner forto speke of diuinite, groundith articles of feith, 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 sufficientli with oute reuelacioun ascende and come to;) and, ther fore, Canoun 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 chirche lawis and constitucioun rehercen manie trouthis and conclusiouns whiche ben propre to the grounding in diuynite, and aȝenward bokis of diuinite bisidis her treting of articles of feith reuelid fro God rehercen manye treuthis 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 philsophi, and summe ben propre to moral philsophi. And ȝit it may not be seid herfore

The same remark to be made of Canon Law.

[1] Six lines of the MS. are left blank, *i.e.* about forty words may probably be missing.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VII. that Lawe of Canon groundith eny article of feith reuelid fro God, or that divynite groundith eny constitucioun or lawe maad bi the chirche or bi the pope, or that he groundith eny trouthe or conclusioun of methaphisik or of natural philsophi or of moral philsophie. Forwhi thanne these facultees were not separat and departid atwynne facultees hauyng 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 philsophie and of moral philsophie myȝten be thouȝ 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 lijk skile, thouȝ it may not longe and perteyne to Holi Scripture forto grounde eny treuthe or gouernaunce of moral philsophie, into whos fynding and knowing natural resoun with natural helpis mai suffice, as it is proued bifore in the proof of the firste conclusioun, ȝit herwith mai weel stonde that Holi Scripture reherce trouthis and gouernauncis whiche ben propre to moral lawe of kinde, that is to seie, propre to moral doom of resoun, which is not ellis than moral philsophie. And that Holi Scripture so doth it is open; forwhi he rehercith to us that we schulden be meke 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 othere gouernancis, whiche alle ben tauȝt in the lawe of kinde bi doom of resoun more fulli than thei ben rehercid in Holi Scripture bi tenfold and more. And so al that Crist dide in teching eny of these was not ellis than that what he siȝe to be

Digitized by Google

trewe bifore in doom of resoun and lawe of kinde he toold 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 THIRD PRINCIPAL CONCLUSION: The whole design of Scripture is (1) to ground articles of faith, and (2) to witness the truths of natural religion, in order to their better performance; and of these articles of faith (3) some are laws and some are not laws.

The iij°. principal conclusioun is this: The hool office and werk into which God ordeyned Holy Scripture is forto grounde articlis of feith and forto reherce and witnesse moral trouthis of lawe of kinde groundid in moral philsophie, 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 fulfille hem. Of whiche articlis of feith summe ben not lawis as these: that God made heuen and erthe in the bigynnyng of tyme, and that Adam was the firste man and Eue was the first womman, and that Moises ladde the peple of Israel out of Egipt, and that Zacharie was fadir and Elizabeth was modir of Iohun Baptist, and that Crist fastid xl. daies; and so forth of many like. And summe othere ben lawis, as that ech man ouȝte be baptisid in water, if he may come therto; and that ech man ouȝte be hosilid, if he mai come ther to.

First part of the conclusion proved.

This conclusioun may be proued thus. Sithen it is so that Holi Scripture muste founde and grounde sum to him propre trouthis and conclusiouns, (for ellis he were not vnlackeabli necessarie to Cristen men,) he muste needis grounde treuthis and conclusiouns 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 Holi Scripture groundith not the treuthis of the firste maner now rehercid, that is to seie trouthis and conclusiouns into which manys witt mai in the seid maner

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VII.

rise, as it is proued bi the firste principal conclusioun. Wherfore he muste needis grounde treuthis and conclusions of the ij^e. maner now seid, that is to seie, treuthis and conclusiouns into whiche mannis witt mai not bi it silf and bi natural help without reuelacioun mad therto fro God uprise[1] and come to, forto hem kunne and knowe. And these ben articlis of feith as it is schewid in *The folwer to the donet;* and so the firste partie of this iij^e. conclusioun is schewid to be trewe.

Second part of the conclusion proved.

Also that Holi Scripture makith rehercel of many treuthis and conclusiouns groundid in moral philsophi for the entent here in this iij^e. conclusioun seid, it is schewid bifore in proof of the ij^e. conclusioun. Wherfore the ij^e. parti of this iij^e. principal conclusioun is needis to be holde for trewe.

Third part of the conclusion proved.

Also that tho feithis whiche now here ben rehercid as for no lawis to Cristen men ben not lawis to hem, and that tho feithis whiche now here ben rehercid as for lawis to Cristen men ben lawis to hem; it is schewid in the firste parti of the book clepid *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture;* and ther yn the reder mai it leerne, if he wole. But y wolde se that oure Bible men whiche holden hem so wise bi the Bible aloone, ȝhe, 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 seruice to man, whiche mowe not be knowen bi oonli the Bible but by doom of resoun and moral philsophi, (as it is weel open thoruȝ manye treticis in the book of *Cristen religioun* and in the *Filling of the iiij. tablis* and other mo,) tho Bible men mowe take good

[1] Perhaps meant to be written divisim in the MS.

Digitized by Google

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 iij^e^. parti of this present iij^e^. principal conclusioun is trewe.

These remarks not intended to discourage the reading of Scripture by laymen, with permission had from their superiors, but only the presumptuous misuse of it.

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 vnleeful laymen forto reede in the Bible and forto studie and leerne ther yn, with help and counseil of wise and weel leerned clerkis and with licence of her gouernour the bischop; but forto rebuke and adaunte the presumpcioun 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 othere—mowe come to, bi the Bible oonli withoute moral philsophie and lawe of kinde in doom of weel disposid resoun, y haue seid of and to Bible men what is now seid.

viij. CHAPITER.

THE FOURTH CONCLUSION AGAINST THE FIRST ERROR: It is not the office of the law of nature to ground any articles of faith grounded in Scripture. Proofs of the conclusion.

THE iiij^e^. principal conclusioun is this: It is not the office longing to moral lawe of kinde for to grounde eny article of feith groundid by Holi Scripture. For whi al that the now seid moral lawe of kinde or moral philsophie groundith is groundid bi doom of mannis resoun, and therfore is such a treuthe and a conclusioun that into his fynding, leernyng, and knowing mannis witt mai bi it silf aloone or bi natural helpis withoute reuelacioun fro God rise and suffice. But so it is that noon article of feith mai be groundid

[1] The MS. altered from *the* into *tho* by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VIII.

in doom of resoun sufficientli; neither into his finding, leerning, and knowing mannis resoun bi it silf and bi natural help may rise and suffice, withoute therto maad reuelacioun or affirmyng fro God. Forwhi thanne feith were no feith, as it is tauȝt 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 philsophie writen depe in mannis soule, there ligging with the prent and the ymage of God,) mai not grounde eny article or treuthe or conclusioun of feith: but into the grounding of feith serueth Holi Scripture, as it is bi the iij^e^. conclusioun proued. And so this present iiij^e^. conclusioun muste needis be a trouthe.

THE FIFTH CONCLUSION AGAINST THE FIRST ERROR: Though treatises on natural religion cannot ground articles of faith, they may, nevertheless, rehearse and bear witness to them. Proofs of the conclusion.

The v^e^. principal conclusioun is this: Thouȝ neither the seide moral lawe of kinde neither outward bokis therof writen mowe grounde eny trouthe or conclusioun of verry feith, ȝit tho outward bokis (as Cristene men hem maken) mowe weel ynow reherce and witnesse trouthis and conclusiouns of feith groundid bifore in Holi Scripture; and so thei doon. Forwhi it is no more repugnant that bokis of moral philsophie reherce trouthis and conclusiouns propre to the grounding of Holy Scripture, than that bokis of Holi Scripture reherce trouthis and conclusiouns propre to the grounding of moral philsophie, and that bokis of grammer reherce treuthis and conclusiouns propre to the grounding of Holi Scripture. But so it is that bokis of Holi Scripture rehercen treuthis longing to the grounding of moral philsophie, as it is bifore schewid in proof of the secunde conclusion; wherfore it is not repugnant that bokis of moral philsophie, namelich tho whiche Cristen men maken, reherce treuthis 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.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VIII.

THE SIXTH CONCLUSION: The office of moral philosophy is to express in writing the truths of natural religion, and by rehearsing some articles of revealed religion, to exhort to their better fulfilment. Proof of the conclusion.

The vj^e^. principal conclusioun is this: The hool office and werk into which ben ordeyned the bokis of moral philsophie (writen and mad bi Cristen men in the maner now bifore spoken in the v^e^. conclusioun) is forto expresse outwardli bi writing of penne and ynke the treuthis and conclusiouns, whiche the inward book of lawe of kinde, biried in mannis soule and herte, groundith; and forto reherce summe treuthis and conclusiouns of feith longing to the grounding of Holi Scripture, that the reders be the more and the oftir remembrid and stirid and exortid bi thilk rehercing into tho treuthis of feith so rehercid. Of whiche summe ben positijf lawis, as ben oonli the treuthis aboute the newe sacramentis of Crist and aboute the vsis of hem: and summe ben not lawis, as that thre persoones ben oon God, and that the ij^e^. of hem was mad man, and that he died and roos fro deeth, and so forth. This conclusioun is so open bi miche what is seid bifore, that weelnyȝ he needith no newe proof to be sette to him. Neuertheless into his prouyng mai be seid thus: The seid bokis of moral philsophie doon these ij. now seid officis and werkis, as it is open by the v^e^. conclusioun; and thei doon noon othir or noon more notable office or werk than oon of these ij.: wherfore these ij. officis maken the hool al werk into which tho bokis ben principali or notabli entendid to be maad.

THE SEVENTH CONCLUSION: The greater part of God's law is grounded in natural, and not in revealed religion. Argument for the conclusion stated. All truths of natural religion receive no new proof from

The vij^e^. principal conclusioun is this: The more deel and party of Goddis hool lawe to man in erthe, and that bi an huge gret[1] quantite ouer the remanent parti of the same lawe, is groundid sufficiently out of Holi Scripture in the inward book of lawe of kinde and of moral philosphie,[2] and not in the book of Holi Scrip-

[1] *gret* is interlineated in a later hand.

[2] *philsophie*, so the MS. originally, but a later hand, contrary to the usage of the MS., has corrected it to *philosophie*.

Digitized by Google

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.

ture clepid the Oold Testament and the Newe. That this conclusioun is trewe y proue thus: Alle tho gouernauncis, trouthis, and vertues, into whos fynding, leernyng, and knowing mannys resoun bi him silf or with natural helpis withoute supernatural reuelacioun ther upon mad fro God mai rise and come, ben groundid at fulle out of Holi Scripture of the Oold Testament and of the Newe in the inward book ligging in mannis soule, which is there the writing of lawe of kinde and of doom of resoun and moral philsophie; and thei taken noon newe prouyng in eny point by the seid Holi Scripture, as it is open bi the first conclusioun and hise profis. And so it is, that these same now seid gouernauncis, treuthis, and vertues thus not groundid in Holi Scripture ben the more deel and the more parti bi an huge greet quantite ouer the remanent of the al hool Goddis lawe bitaken to man in erthe forto therbi serue God, as anoon aftir her schal be proued. Wherfore folewith that the miche more deel of Goddis hool lawe to man in erthe is groundid sufficientli out of Holi Scripture in doom of resoun and in moral philsophie, and not in Holi Scripture of the Oold Testament and of the Newe.

The first premiss of the argument proved.

The first premisse of this present argument is openli proued bi the first principal conclusioun and bi the argumentis and euydencis prouying him, and therfore the firste premisse of this present argument is to be holde for trewe.

The second premiss proved.

That the ij^e^. premisse of this present argument[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 [2] c̃., which processe were ouer long to be azen rehercid here.

[1] *argumet*, MS.

[2] Space left in the MS. for the number.

Digitized by Google

Neuertheles that the same ij^e^. premisse of this present argument is trewe sure experience may schewe at the ful. Forwhi lete a man renne thoruȝ alle the xxxi^ti^. pointis of the iiij. 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 inne[1] hem and vnder hem, and let him also renne thoruȝ al Holi Scripture fro the bigynyng into the eende forto marke al that he can marke there to be rehercid for gouernauncis, trouthis, and vertues of Goddis lawe to man in erthe, and he schal fynde bi opene experience and open assaie surely ynouȝ, that in huge quantite many mo of hem ben fyndeable and knoweable bi mannis resoun withoute help of Holi Scripture, than ben tho of hem whiche ben not fyndeable and knoweable bi mannis resoun without Holi Scripture. Namelich if he haue leerned bifore this that mannis resoun withoute Holi Scripture may fynde and knowe that oon God is, and that he is maker of alle creaturis out of nouȝt, (whether therwith be holde that creaturis weren euer so mad and so brouȝt forth bi God bifore now, or that thei biganne to be brouȝt forth bi God in a certein bigynnyng of tyme;) and that man is maad into an eende, which eend is forto be couplid and ooned to God bi knowing and louyng and seruyng: 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 leernyng certein it is that mannis resoun bi him silf and with natural helpis withoute 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 conjunctim or divisim in the MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VIII.

and kunnyng geten therbi mai and schal be sufficient forto reule and dresse and move mannis wille into choicis withinforth and into comaundis and outward deedis answering to thilk same so getun leernyng and kunnyng, thouȝ thilk kunnyng be not demonstratijf, that is to seie more sure than is probable and likeli kunnyng. Forwhi thilk kunnyng is so probable and likeli that into the contrarie parti is not had nouȝwhere nyȝ so probable and so likeli euydencis, and therfore thilk kunnyng so geten is strong ynouȝ forto make the hauers of it lyue and lede her conuersacion 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 conuersacioun to God, as it is sumwhat tauȝt in the firste parti of *Cristen religioun* and in *The folwer to the donet*, and more schal be tauȝt in the book *Of feith and of sacramentis* in Latyn.

The conclusion of the argument proved.

But forto turne aȝen into the fynysching of the proof bifore sett for the vij^e^. conclusioun y argue thus: The argument maad into the proof of the vij^e^. conclusioun is formal, as mai be iugid bi hem whiche in logik knowen the reulis longing to a formal argument, and the bothe premissis of the same argument ben trewe, as it is now bifore openli schewid. Wherfore needis it mustebe[1] that the conclusioun concludid and dryuen out and forth fro hem bi strengthe of hem is trewe: and thilk same conclusioun of hem is the vij^e^. principal conclusioun. Wherfore the vij^e^. principal conclusioun is trewe.

[1] So the MS.

Digitized by Google

ix. CHAPITER.

THE viij^e. principal conclusioun 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 philsophi; and the more that he can in moral philsophie, bi so miche the more he can of Goddis lawe and seruice. This conclusioun folewith out of the vij^e. conclusion openly ynouȝ. Forwhi lawe of kinde and moral philsophie 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 bifore in the vij^e. conclusioun.

THE EIGHTH CONCLUSION AGAINST THE FIRST ERROR: No one can know God's whole law without a knowledge of moral philosophy. Proof of the conclusion.

The ix^e. conclusioun is this: No man schal perfitli, sureli, and sufficienti vndirstonde Holi Scripture in alle tho placis where yn he rehercith moral vertues not being positijf lawe of feith, but being such as mannys resoun may fynde, leerne, and knowe, but if he be bifore weel and perfitli, suerli, and sufficiently leerned in moral philsophie; and the more perfitli, sureli, and sufficientli he is leerned in moral philsophie 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 conclusioun folewith out of the vij^e. and the viij^e. conclusions: wherfore he is to be holde trewe.

THE NINTH CONCLUSION: No one can fully understand Scripture where it rehearses truths of moral philosophy without being skilled in moral philosophy. Proof of the conclusion.

The x^e. principal conclusioun is this: The leernyng and kunnyng of the seid lawe of kinde and of the seid moral philsophie is so necessarie to Cristen men, that it mai not he lackid of hem if thei schulen thriftili serue to God and kepe his lawe bitake to hem in erthe. This conclusioun mai be proued thus. Thilk leernyng and kunnyng is so necessarie that it

THE TENTH CONCLUSION: The knowledge of moral philosophy indispensably necessary to Christians. First argument for the conclusion. Moral philosophy comprises the greater part of God's law to man.

---

[1] *to* is interlineated, apparently by the same hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IX.

mai not be lackid of Cristen men which leernyng and kunnyng is the leernyng and kunnyng of the more deel of Goddis law 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 philsophie is the leernyng and kunnyng of the more parti and deel of Goddis lawe, bi which man ouȝte serue to God in erthe, as it is proued bi the vij^e. and viij^e. principal conclusiouns to gidere. Wherfore nedis folewith that the leernyng and kunnyng of the bifore seid lawe of kinde and of the seid moral philsophie is so necessarie to Cristen men, that thei mowe not lacke it forto serue God bi eny thrift. The firste premisse of this argument is open ynouȝ that ech man wole him graunte. The ij^e. premisse is proued bi the vij^e. bifore 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.

Second argument for the same conclusion. Moral philosophy indispensable to the understanding those places of Scripture which rehearse its truths.

Also thus: Thilk leernyng and kunnyng is necessarie and vnlackeable 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. Forwhi 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 bifore schewid bi the ix^e. principal conclusioun. Wherfore this present x^e. conclusioun is trewe.

Third argument for the same conclusion. All truths of revealed religion itself relating to the Sacraments require the

Also thus: The leernyng and kunnyng of it is necessarie and vnlackeable to mankinde, in which alle the gouernauncis, treuthis, and vertues of Goddis lawe being the lasse deel and beyng the remanent to the

Digitized by Google

other more deel and parti bifore seid in the vij^e. conclusioun of Goddis lawe ben more foundid and groundid than in Holi Scripture, that is to sey positijf 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 philsophie, alle the gouernauncis, treuthis, and vertues of Goddis lawe whiche ben the lasse deel and ben the remanent to the more deel bifore seid of Goddis lawe in the vij^e. conclusioun 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,[1] the euidencis which doom of reson ȝeueth 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 euidencis whiche Holi Scripture ȝeueth into the grounding of eny of hem which ben the makingis and vsingis of the newe sacramentis and tho whiche folewen of hem bi formal argument, as n *The folewer to the donet* and in *The book of feith* ioyned therto, othire of my writingis, it is sufficiently tauȝt; whiche processe were ouer long and sumwhat ouer hard to be eftsoone sett here.

CHAP. IX.

evidence of reason more than that of Scripture.

ȝhe, and ȝit with al this that is now seid treuth is also that the makingis and the vsingis of the seid

Reason our guide for retaining the use of Sacraments now.

[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.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IX.

newe sacramentis mowe not be groundid bi Holi Scripture to be oure gouernauncis now lyuyng in erthe withoute help of resonys doom, and withoute that lawe of kinde and moral philsophi and Holi Scripture grounde hem to gidere; and that into the grounding of hem the euydencis or premyssis which Holi Scripture bringith ben not more substancial and strenger into the grounding, than ben the euydencis and premissis which doom of resoun therto bringeth, as in the now alleggid bookis it is openli declarid. Wherfore folewith the treuth of this present x^e^. conclusioun, that the leernyng and kunnyng of lawe of kinde and moral philsophie in doom of resoun is so necessarie to Cristen men, that it is vnlackeable to hem forto be in eny worth seruauntis to God and kepers of his lawe in erthe.

THE ELEVENTH CONCLUSION: The unlearned laity ought highly to esteem clerks learned in moral philosophy. Proof of the conclusion.

Out of these bifore sett vij^e^. viij^e^. ix^e^. and x^e^. conclusiouns and trouthis cometh forth ful openli and sureli this xj^e^. conclusioun and trouthe. Ful weel ouȝten alle persoones of the lay parti not miche leerned in moral philsophi and lawe of kinde forto make miche of clerkis weel leerned in moral philsophi, that tho clerkis schulden helpe tho lay persoones forto ariȝt vndirstonde Holi Scripture in alle tho placis in which Holi Scripture rehercith the bifore spoken conclusiouns and treuthis of moral philsophi, that is to seie of lawe of kinde. Forwhi withoute tho clerkis so leerned in moral philsophi and with oute her direccioun the now seid lay persoones schulen not esili, liȝtli, and anoon haue the dew vndirstonding of Holi Scripture in the now seid placis, as is bifore proued in the ix^e^. conclusioun.

THE TWELFTH CONCLUSION: The same persons ought highly to esteem English books on moral philosophy.

Also out of the same bifore sett vij^e^. viij^e^. ix^e^. and x^e^. conclusions and trouthis and out of the assay and experience which mai be had in the ouer reding and studiyng the bokis anoon aftir to be rehercid folewith this xij^e^. conclusioun and trouthe. Ful weel ouȝten

Digitized by Google

alle persoones of the lay parti not leerned ouȝwhere ellis bi the now seid clerkis or bi othere bokis of moral philsophie forto make miche of bokis maad to hem in her modiris langage whiche ben clepid thus: *The donet into Cristen religioun: The folwer to the donet: The book of Cristen religioun,* (namelich the first parti fro the bigynnyng of the iij^e^. treti forthward): *The book filling the iiij. tablis: The book of worschiping:* The book clepid *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture:* The book clepid *The prouoker of Cristen men: The book of Counceilis,* and othere mo pertenyng to the now seid *Book of Cristen religioun.* 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 bifore seid moral philsophie being so necessarie forto be vndirstonde, and being in it silf the more parti of al her moral lawe and seruice to God, as it is open bi the vij^e^. conclusioun; 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 seruice, 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^e^. bifore sett conclusioun. Wherfore miche ouȝten lay persoones forto make and apprise and loue the now spoken bokis. And fertherfore ouer this now seid the now spoken bokis techen ful clereli and bihouefulli the treuthis and gouernauncis 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 therfore ful miche good (as y hope) schal come bi the reeding, leernyng, and vsing of the now spoken bokis.

Pecock's good wishes for the presumptuous Lollards.

Of this same mater it is quikli and smertli spoken in a litil book therto and therfore maad, which y

CHAP. IX.

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 perfitli 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 comende he myȝte blame or comende; and not bifore eer he eny suche causis fyndeth, and eer he aftir eny suche causis sechith. And certis the contrarie doing of this wijs prouerbe dooth miche sorow among simple lay peple, yuel lad forth bifore and wors confermed bi a wickid scole of heretikis, which is not ȝit al quenchid.

X. CHAPITER.

THIRTEENTH AND LAST CONCLUSION AGAINST THE FIRST ERROR: It is as unreasonable to expect a Scriptural proof for a truth of moral philosophy, as to expect a truth of grammar to be founded in sadlery.

THE xiij^{e}. principal conclusioun or trouthe is this: Thei that wolen aske and seie, thus, "Where fyndist "thou it groundid in Holi Scripture?" as thouȝ ellis it is not worthi to be take for trewe, whanne euere eny gouernance or trouthe sufficientli grondid in lawe of kinde and in moral philsophi is affermed and mynystrid to hem, (as ben many of tho xj. gouernauncis and treuthis whiche schulen be tretid aftir in this present book: whiche ben setting vp of ymagis in hiȝe placis of the bodili chirche, pilgrimages doon priueli, and pilgrimages doon openli bi lay men and bi preestis and bischopis vnto the memorialis or

Digitized by Google

mynde placis of seintis, and the endewing of preestis bi rentis and bi vnmoueable possessiouns, and suche othere) asken tho whilis in lijk maner vnresonabili and lijk vnskilfulli and lijk reprouabili, as if thei wolden aske and seie thus,—"Where findist thou it "grondid in Holi Scripture?" whanne a treuth and a conclusioun of grammer is affermed and seid to hem: or ellis thus, "Where findist thou it groundid in tailour "craft?" whanne that a point or a treuthe and a conclusioun of sadeler craft is affermed, seid, and mynistrid to hem: or ellis thus, "Where fyndist thou it groundid "in bocheri?" whanne a point or a treuthe and conclusioun of masonrie is affermed and seid and mynystrid to hem.

Proof of the conclusion. Divinity and moral philosophy are two distinct sciences.

This present xiij°. conclusioun mai be proued thus: Euen as grammer and dyuynyte ben ij. dyuerse 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 himsilf vpon maters, treuthis, and conclusions, and not to[1] entirmete neither entermeene with eny other facultees boundis; and euen as sadelarie and talarie ben ij. dyuerse 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 conclusions, and not entircomune with eny other craft or faculte in conclusiouns and treuthis: so it is that the faculte of the seid moral philsophie and the faculte of pure dyvynite or the Holi Scripture ben ij. dyuerse facultees, ech of hem hauyng 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 bifore sett six firste conclusiouns schewen.

[1] *to* inserted, perhaps wrongly, by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. X.

Wherfore folewith that he vnresonabili and reprouabili askith, which askith where a treuthe of moral philsophi 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.

An objection answered.

No man obiecte here azens me[1] to be aboute forto falsifie this present xiij^{e}. conclusioun; and that, forasmiche as sporiers in Londoun gilden her sporis whiche thei maken, and cutelers in Londoun gilden her knyfis whiche thei maken, as thouz therfore sporiorie and cutellerie entermeeneden and enterfereden with goldsmyth craft, and that these craftis kepten not to hem silf her propre and seuerel to hem silf boundis and markis. For certis thouz the sporier and the cuteler be leerned 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, thouz oon werkman be leerned in hem bothe and vse hem bothe, rizt as if oon man had lernid[2] the al hool craft of goldsmythi and the al hool craft of cutleri, and wolde holde schoppis of bothe, and wirche sumwhile the oon craft and sumwhile the other craft. Zit herfore tho craftis in thilk man ben not the lasse dyuerse, ne neuer the lasse kepen her seueralte in boundis and markis as in hem silf, thouz oon man be leerned in hem bothe and can wirche 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, thouz oon man can wirche in hem bothe: for

[1] The MS. originally had *to me*, but the *to* is scraped out.

[2] *lernid* interlineated in a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

thanne tho ij. craftis weren not ij. dyuerse craftis not subordynat. And thus ouȝte be avoidid this obiecioun, riȝt as thouȝ a man were a knyȝt and a preest; ȝit knyȝthode in thilk man is as fer a twynne fro preesthode in the same man, (as bi her bothe naturis and beingis, thouȝ not yn place or persoon,) as ben knyȝthode in oon persoon and preesthode in an other persoon.

These thirteen principal conclusions are a sufficient refutation of the first error.

In this wise bi these xiij. bifore going conclusions is vnrootid and uppluckid, and sufficientli rebukid and proued for vntrewe, the firste of the iij. opiniouns spoken and sett forth in the bigynnyng of this present book in the first chapiter. And also bi these same xiij. conclusiouns and her proofis ben weel adauntid the wanton and vnkunnyng bering of hem whiche wolen not allowe eny gouernaunce to be the lawe and seruice of God, inlasse than it be grondid in Holi Scripture; as thouȝ thei schulden preise and worschipe ther yn God the more and plese God the more, that thei apprisen so miche Holi Scripture. For wite thei weel with oute eny doute that God is neither preisid, neither worschipid, neither plesid bi vntrouthe or bi lesing. If eny man make of Holi Scripture and apprise it, euen as treuthe is and no more than truthe is, God is ther yn plesid; and if eny man wole make of Holi Scripture or of eny creature in heuene or in erthe more than treuthe is that he be maad of and be apprisid, God is ther yn displesid.

There is as much danger in undervaluing the inward Scripture of reason as in undervaluing the outward Scripture of the Bible.

And ferther thus: If eny man be feerd lest he trespace to God if he make ouer litle of Holi Scripture, which is the outward writing of the Oold Testament and of the Newe, y aske whi is he not afeerd lest he make ouer litle and apprise ouer litle the *inward Scripture* of the bifore spoken lawe of kinde writen bi God[1] him silf in mannis soule, whanne he

[1] *bigod*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. X.

made mannis soule to his ymage and liknes? Of which inward Scripture Poul spekith, Romans ij^{e}. c̃., and Ieremye in his xxxj^{e}. chapiter; and Poul takith the same processe, Hebr. viij^{e}. c̃. 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^{e}. conclusioun and his proof, and bi the x^{e}. conclusion and his proof.

Further proof to be found in Pecock's *Just apprising of Holy Scripture.*

And more proof therto ech man may se at ful, if he wole rede and studie in the book clepid *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture*, which book if eny man wole wijsli reede and perfitli vndirstonde 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 consente in his witt withinforth, wole he nyle he, amagrey his heed, that alle these now bifore going xiij. conclusiouns ben trewe, and that the firste of the iij. opinions sett bifore in the bigynnyng of this book is vntrewe.

Certain texts of the Gospels, quoted in favour of the first opinion, discussed and explained.

The textis bifore alleggid in the firste chapiter of this book, Mat. xxij^{e}. c̃. and Iohun v^{e}. c̃., which the holders of the now seid first opinioun weenen grounden thilk same opinioun, goon not therto. Forwhi, if the processis forth and afore tho 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 othere Scripturis 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 philsophie

Digitized by Google

to be groundid ther yn, therfore neuer neither of tho ij. textis, the oon Mat. xxij^{e}. c̃. and the other Iohun v^{e}. c̃. alleggid bifore in the firste chapiter, where the firste opinioun is sett, serueth neither forto grounde neither forto verrifie the seid firste opinioun. And thouȝ the lay peple wolden holde that eche treuthe and conclusioun 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 bisi forto seie ther aȝens.

xj. CHAPITER.

Other texts of the Epistles and Revelation shall be similarly discussed in this chapter.

FERTHERMORE, for as miche as holders of the first opinioun glorien miche in these textis now to be rehercid, it is ful good with this that is seid forto sette forth also dewe vndirstondingis of tho textis.

The first text, and the use made of it: Origin of the expression *known men*, as applied by the Lollards to themselves.

The firste of tho textis is writen i. Cor. xiiij^{e}. c̃. 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 mai his bisynes 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 silf forto leerne and knowe the Bible, namelich the Newe Testament, in the forme as it is writun word bi word in the Bible, thei ȝeuen a name propre to hem silf and clepen hem silf "*knowun men,*" as thouȝ alle othere than hem ben vnknowun; and whanne oon of hem talkith with an other of hem of sum other iij^{e}. man. the heerer wole aske thus: "Is he a knowen man?" and if it answerid to him thus: "Ȝhe, 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.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XI.

The second text, and the use made of it.

The ij^{e}. text is writun ij^{e}. Cor. iiij^{e}. c̄. in the bigynnyng where Poul seith thus: *That and if oure Euangelie is couered, it is couered to hem whiche spillen; in which God of this world hath blindid the myndis or wittis of vnfeithful men, that the lizting or cleering of the Euangelie of the glorie 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 saluacioun schal soone vndirstonde the trewe meenyng 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 and dewe vndirstonding of Holi Scripture schal not be hid to sechers aftir it, saue to hem whiche schulen perische and be not saued. And ferthirmore alle hem whiche ben bifore clepid knowen men thei holden forto be children of saluacioun or nyze to saluacioun, and alle othere men and wommen thei holden as erring scheep in perel of perisching; and al for that thei taken of the ij^{e}. text that to the bifore seid men callid knowen men the Euangelie is not couered, and to alle othere men the Euangelie is couered; not withstonding that in trouthe to seie of tho men clepid of him silf knowen men the verri lawe of kinde and of feith, (as it is pureli in itsilf, and so the substancial lawe of God to man in erthe,) is wors knowen than of manye othere, whiche it not leernen in wordis of the Bible but in wordis writun in othere bokis, as here upon y durste leie a waiour 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 third text, and the use made of it.

The iij^{e}. text is writun Apocalips[2] laste chapiter in the eende where it is seid thus: *I witnesse to ech*

[1] *schineth*, MS.; but the *th* is scratched out.

[2] *Opoc.*, MS.

Digitized by Google

heerer the wordis of the prophecie of this book. If eny man schal putte to hem, putte God upon him the veniauncis writun in this book. And if eny man schal take awey fro the wordis of the book of this prophecie, God take awey his part fro the book of lijf, and fro the holi citee, and fro tho thingis whiche ben writun in this book. Bi this book of prophecie which is spoken of in this iij^e^. text thei vndirstonden[1] the hool Bible or the Newe Testament, and of this iij^e^. text thei taken this, that to Holi Writt men schulde not sett eny exposiciouns, declaracions, or glosis, no more than that men ouȝten take awei fro Holi Writt eny proces or parti writen in Holi Writt; and if eny man sette such now seid exposiciouns, whiche ben not open bi sum text in Holi Writt, he is cursid.

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

That the now bifore seid vndirstonding, whiche thei ȝeuen to the firste of the iij. textis, is vntrewe and vndew to him, y proue thus: Whanne Poule wroot thilk first texte i. Cor. xiiij^e^. chapiter: *Sotheli if eny man knowith not, he schal be vnknowen,* he spake of a thing to be knowun, which thing than was presentli. Forwhi he seith not thus: *Who euere schal vnknowe, he schal not be knowe,* but he seith thus: *Who euer vnknowith, he schal not be knowun.* 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 vndirstode not in thilke 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 thilk writing he schal be vnknowun of God. That in thilk tyme, whanne Poul wrote tho wordis, the al hool writing of the Newe Testament

[1] *vndirstodē*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XI.

was not, y proue thus. In thilk tyme he wrote his Firste Epistle to the Corintheis. Wherfore in thilk tyme this parti of Holi Writt and of the Newe Testament was not, which is now the ij^e^. Epistle to the Corintheis. Also, whanne Poul wrote the firste text, the Apocalips was not writen; forwhi Iohun wrote the Apocalips whanne he was in exile in Pathmos, as he seith him silf the [first][1] chapiter of the Apocalips; and in thilk exile he was not bifore the laste ȝeer of Domician, Emperour of Rome. But Poul was slain bifore the tyme of this exile bi almost xxx^ti^. ȝeer: for Poul was slain of the Emperour Nero, in the last ȝeer of Nero. Wherfore folewith needis that not al the hool writing of the Newe Testament neither of the al hool Bible was, whanne Poul wrote the first bifore sett text i. Cor. xiiij^e^. c̃.

Other books, as the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, not yet written.

Also Poul wrote hise bothe Epistlis to Corinthies eer he came to Rome, and eer he was prisoned there. Forwhi Poul wrote his Firste Epistle to the Corintheis whanne he was at Ephesie, and whanne he was in purpos for to come aftirward into Corinthe, as it is open bi the last chapiter of the same First Epistle to Corintheis. Also he wrote his ij^e^. Epistle to the Corintheis whanne he was at Troade, as it is open bi the ij^e^. chapiter of the same ij^e^. Epistle to the Corintheis, and whanne he was in hope forto come aftirward to Corinthe, as it is open bi the firste and ij^e^. and last chapiter of the same ij^e^. Epistle to Corintheis. And herwith open it is that Poul came neuer to Effesi, neither to Troade, neither purposid forto come to Corinthe after he was prisoned in Rome, and after he lay in boundis at Rome; for he was not delyuered fro tho bondis into his deeth, as it is open bi the ij^e^. Epistle to Thimothie, the [fourth][1] chapiter. Wher-

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

Digitized by Google

fore nedis it is trewe that Poul wrote hise bothe Epistlis to Corintheis eer he was bounden by prisonyng 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 prisoun at Rome, as it mai be tak bi the same epistlis, and as Ierom therfore witnessith in the prologis[1] of the same epistlis. And also his Secunde Epistle to Thimothie Poul wrote whanne he was in prisoun at Rome litle bifore his deeth, as it is open bi what Poul seith in the same epistle, that *tyme of his resoluciouⁿ* (that is to seie of the departing bitwixe his bodi and his soule) *was than neiȝe.*[2] Wherfore needis folewith 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 bifore sett text i. Cor. xiiij^{e}. c̃. And if this be trewe, he wolde not seie 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 folewith 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.

St. Paul's words would have been equally true before any book whatever of the New Testament was written.

Also thus: Thilk wordis of the first text which Poul writith i. Cor. xiiij^{e}. c̃. were trewe bifore Poul was conuertid to feith, and bifore eny writing of the Newe Testament was bigunne. Forwhi eer Matheu, or Mark, or Luk, or Iohun wroten, and eer Poul or Petir or Iame or Iudas wrote, it was trewe that who euer bi his owne necligence and bi his owne fre wil vnknowith the lawe, which he is bounden to knowe, schal be vnknowen 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 prologue to the *Epist. ad Col.* says: Scribit Apostolus eis ab Epheso.

[2] *thā-neiȝe*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XI.

defaut: and more than this can not be take bi the seid first text of Poul, whanne he seith thus: *Who euer vnknowith, he schal be vnknowen.* Wherfore folewith that the other vndirstonding, 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 vndirstonding of the same text.

The ignorance, of which he speaks, may be removed by other means better than by the Bible. The Lollards reproved for their boast of superior knowledge.

Wherfore sithen ech Cristen man and womman, thouȝ thei neuere rede oon word in the Bible, or thouȝ 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 ouȝten leerne, thei mowe leerne out of the Bible, and bi bokis treuli drawen out of lawe of kinde and out of the Bible:—ȝhe, and sithen al this thei mowe leerne and kunne more pleinli and more fulli and sooner than thei mowe it leerne in the Bible, (as it folewith out and fro the vj^{e}. and vij^{e}. and x^{e}. bifore sett conclusiouns, and as experience wole nedis proue to eche asaier for to lerne *The donet* and his *Folewer in to Cristen religioun, The book of Cristen religioun, The filling of the iiij. tablis,* with othere bookis annexid and knyt to *The book of Cristen religioun*) it muste needis folewe that al the kunnyng, whos igno-

[1] *strynen*, MS., the *e* being in a later hand.

Digitized by Google

raunce is so perilose as Poul spekith of in the firste bifore seid text, may be had better out of the Bible by reding and studiyng and leernyng in the othere seid writingis, than bi reding and studiyng and leernyng in the Bible oonli. And if this be trewe (as it is proued at ful now to be trewe), y mai seie 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 silf in her owne myndes therbi aboue othere men not so in the Bible reding studiyng, and leernyng, what Seint Poul, Romans [third][1] c̃., seith in sumwhat lijk caas to the conuersis of the Iewis, forthat thei enhaunciden hem silf aboue the conuersis of the hethen men, bi cause the conuersis of the Iewis had red bifore and studied and leerned the Oold Testament, and so hadden not leerned the conuersis of the hethen men. Where he seith thus: *Where is thi gloriyng? He is excludid. Bi what lawe is he excludid? Certis bi the lawe of kinde and of feith,* which mowe be leerned of tho lay peple and also of clerkis, thouȝ thei not rede and studie in the Bible oonly forto it leerne: ȝhe, and mowe be leerned[2] of hem sooner, clerelier, and fuller, than bi reeding and studiyng in the Bible oonli, and that bi reding and studiyng in the othere seid bokis. And therfore thi "gloriyng is excludid."

xij. CHAPITER.

The second text discussed. The Gospel spoken of by St. Paul is not the writing

THAT the vnderstonding which thei assignen to the secunde bifore sett text, writen ij^{e}. Cor. iiij^{e}. c̃., forto seie that ther yn thilk text bi the Euangely Poul

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

[2] *lererned*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XII.

of the New Testament, much of which was not then written.

vndirstode and meened the writing of the Newe Testament, is not dewe ther to vndirstonding, y proue thus: Whanne Poul wroot thilk ij^e. text to the Corinthies, seiyng thus, *If oure Euangelie be couered or be hid, it is couered to hem that perischen*, the Euangelie of which he spekith in thilk text was had thanne presentli. Forwhi the text speking of thilk Euangelie 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 bifore in arguyng azens the mis vndirstonding of the firste text. Wherfore by thilk Euangelie, of which Poul spekith in the seid ij^e. text, he vnderstode not the hool writing which is now had of the Newe Testament.

The Gospel anterior to any written document whatever, and dates from the ascension of Christ.

Also thus: Bifore and eer than eny word was writen of the Newe Testament, the Euangelie of God was, which to alle men ouzte be denouncid, and whiche alle men ouzten receyue, whanne it schulde be to hem denouncid. Wherfore the Euangelie of God is not the writing of the Newe Testament, for thanne the same thing had be bifore him silf, and eer than he was him silf, which includith repugnaunce. That the Euangeli of God was, bifore and eer than eny word was writen of the Newe Testament, y proue thus: The Euangelie 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 hise disciplis: *Go ze, and preche ze the Euangelie to ech creature.* And open it is that he thanne bade not to hem forto preche any Euangelie 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 ynouz. Wherfore folewith needis that the Euangelie which alle men schulden aftirward receyue into her saluacioun was, eer eny word was writun of the Newe Testament.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XII.

The Gospel preached by the Apostles on the day of Pentecost. Dates of the four written Gospels.

Also thus: Whanne euere the Apostilis prechiden the Euangelie of God, thanne thilk Euangelie was. For whi no thing was prechid, eer than it was: but so it is that the Euangelie of God was prechid bi the Apostlis soone aftir the Pentecost day, whanne thei hadden receyued the Holi Goost and kunnyng of langage, and whanne thei continueden so in preching bi manye ȝeeris eer they wroten. Wher fore the Euangelie of God (which Poul and othere Apostilis prechiden) was, eer any word was writen of the Newe Testament. And if this be trewe, thanne sithen the ij^{e}. seid text of Poul spekith of noon other Euangelie than of the Euangelie of God, for neither he neither eny creature ouȝte seie him to haue a propre Euangelie bisidis the Euangelie of God, it folewith nedis that Poul in his ij^{e}. text bifore alleggid, ij. Cor. xiiij^{e}. c̃., meeneth and vnderstondith of this Euangelie of God, which was bifore and eer than the Newe Testament was writen, 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^{e}. text ouȝte take his dew vnderstonding.[1] Certis stories maken mension that Matheu wrote what he wrote of the Gospel in the xl^{e}. ȝeer of Crist, and Mark wrote what he wrote of the Gospel in the xliij^{e}. ȝeer 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 lijf aftir his comyng fro exile after the lxxx^{e}. ȝeer of Crist. Wherto sowneth sumwhat the epistle which Dionyse wrote to Iohun being in exile, as thouȝ Dionise schulde in thilk epistle haue prophecied Iohun to be delyuered fro exile and forto write of the Gospel of

[1] *vnderstondinging*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XII.

God.[1] And ȝit in al this while the Euangelie of God was, and the Gospel of God was; and it was not "couered, but to hem that perischiden." Wherfore the sentence and what is vnderstonde bi the seid ij^e^. text of Poul was, eer Poul wroot thilk text, and eer any writing of the Newe Testament was in erthe. And therfore the verri dew sentence and propre vndirstonding of thilk ij^e^. text is not needis to be of the writing of the Newe Testament. Forwhi the sentence of thilk text is of the Euangeli of God prechid bi Poul, which Euangelie was prechid eer Poul was conuertid and eer eny writing of the Newe Testament was.

The true explanation of the second text.

Certis this Euangelie (which includith lawe of kinde and lawe of feith ȝouen bi Crist, and includith also other feith tauȝt bi Crist which is not lawe to man) is not couered, that is to sei, is not so derk that it be not bileeued and receyued and performed; saue in tho men whiche schulen not bileeue to it and receyue it, whanne it is denouncid to hem, and therfore whiche schulen perische, for that thei not receyuen and bileeuen what is bi the Euangelie of God to be bileeued and receyued: and this was trewe eer the writing of the Newe Testament was. And this is the trewe and dew vnderstonding of the seid ij^e^. text ij. Cor. iiij^e^. c̃. where it is seid thus: *If oure Euangelie be couered, it is couered to hem whiche spillen:* and that this is the verri trewe and dew vndirstonding of the same text the processe next without meene therto folewing schewith openli ynouȝ, which processe is bifore with the same text in the bigynnyng of this present chapiter rehercid.

The vainglory of Scriptural knowledge re-

Excludid therfore is thi gloriyng, which thou tookist into thee bi this that thou leernedist 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.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XII.

buked. St. Paul's reproof of the Jews applicable to the Lollards.

in the wordis and letter of the al hool Bible, or of the Newe Testament aloone, and bi the mys vndirstonding of this ij^e^. bifore rehercid text of Poul; and therbi enhauncidist thi silf aboue thi Cristen britheren and sistren not so in wordis and letter of the Bible leerned. Excludid certis is thi gloriyng therbi taken, and verrili it is excludid bi this that thin vntrewe vnderstonding of thilk ij^e^. text, (ȝhe, and thin vntrewe vndirstonding of also the first text) ben inproued here, and the trewe and dewe vndirstondingis ben to hem here sett and assigned. Be waar therfore frohens forthward that noon of ȝou, so as ȝe han bifore this, glorie and enhaunce ȝou silf aboue alle othere Cristen not so leerned in the text of the Bible as ȝe ben, lest that y (which haue experience of ȝoure conuersacioun not according with the comaundementis of the Bible) seie to ech of ȝou what Poul seide in sumwhat lijk caas to the conuersis of Iewis, Romans ij^e^. c̃. fro the bigynnyng of the same chapiter into weel toward the eende, where Poul in the bigynning seith thus: *Wherfore thou art vnexcusable, ech man that deemest: for in what thing thou demest the other man thou condempnest thi silf, for thou doost the same thingis whiche thou deemest, et cetera.* And after there thus: *Accepcioun of persoones is not anentis God: for who euere han synned withoute the lawe schulen perische with oute the lawe. And who euere han synned 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, thanne thei not hauyng such lawe ben lawe to hem silf, that schewen the werk of the lawe writen in her hertis. For the conscience of hem ȝeldith to hem a witnessing bitwixe hem silf of thouȝtis, whiche ben accusing or defending, in the dai whanne God schal deeme the priuy thingis*

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XII.

of men aftir mi Gospel bi Iesu[1] *Crist. But if thou art a named Iew,* (or ellis for this present purpos for to seie thus: but if thou art a named knowun man,) *and restist in the lawe, and hast glorie in God, and hast knowen his wil, and thou leerid in the lawe prouest the more profitable thingis, and trustist thi silf to be a leder of blynd men, the lizt of hem that ben in derknessis, and techer of vnwise men, a maister of zong children, that hast the foorme of kunnyng and of trouthe in the lawe: what thanne?*[2] *techist thou another, and techist not thi silf? Thou that prechist me schal not stele, stelist? Thou that techist me schal do noon aduoutrie, doost avoutrie? Thou that wlatist mawmetrie, doost sacrilegie? Thou that hast glorie in the lawe, vnworschipist God bi breking of the lawe?* Thus miche there and ful miche lijk to this present purpos.

The third text discussed and explained. St. John's curse does not apply to glosses and interpretations of Scripture generally, or of the Apocalypse in particular; it applies to a mutilation of the text of that particular book.

That the vndirstonding which this bifore seid peple zeueth to the iij^{e}. bifore allegid text, Apocalips laste chapiter, in the eende, is not dew vndirstonding, y proue thus: The curs of whiche the iij^{e}. text spekith is not zouen but to hem that amys treten the Apocalips, as it is open bi the same iij^{e}. text. Wherfore bi thilk text it is not seid that eny curs is zouen to eny men amys treting eny other parti of the Newe Testament. Also thus: Oonli he, that makith the text of a book lenger than he is, settith to the wordis of thilk book; and oonli 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 declaracioun 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 puttith not to the book or to the wordis of the book,

[1] *ihū*, MS.

[2] The note of interrogation seems necessary, but there is no stop in the MS.

Digitized by Google

neither takith therfro; and therfore thouȝ a man expowne the Apocalips or eny other book or processe or text of the Newe Testament, he is not therfore in the curs of which it is spoken in the seid iij^e^. text. And so open it is that the bifore seid persoons vndirstonden amys the same seid iij^e^. 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 perauenture, if this thretenyng hadde not be ȝouen, summen wolden haue do in encrecing or decrecing; bicause that the Apocalips is morre wondirful than othere writingis of the Newe Testament ben. Also treuthe is that tho bifore seid men wolen expowne the Apocalips and othere placis of the Newe Testament, whanne euere eny of tho processis ben alleggid aȝens hem and aȝens her opiniouns. Wherfore bi her vnderstonding which thei taken of the seid iij^e^. text, that alle expowners and glose ȝeuers to Holi Scripture ben cursid,[2] thei muste needis graunte hem silf to be cursid.

Apology for the length of this chapter.

Now, Sires, whiche schulen rede this book, thouȝ thoruȝ out this present xij^e^. chapiter y have taried upon thing which is as of in it silf litle worthi or not worthi to be spoken or writun, bi cause this present chapiter is reprouyng a thing which berith openli ynouȝ with him his owne reproof, ȝit bi cause that the persoones bifore seid glorien ful veinli and ful childli and lewdeli in tho iij. textis bifore in this chapiter tretid, and that aboue her gloriyng bi whiche in manie othere thei glorien, ech reder 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).

Digitized by Google

xiij. CHAPITER.

The sweetness of Scripture the ground of the first erroneous opinion above mentioned. Such ground unreasonable.

A GREET cause whi thei of the lay parti which han vsid the hool Bible or oonli the Newe Testament in her modris langage han holde the seid first opinioun 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 graceful, and so delectable, and into the seid eende so profitable, it fil into her conceit forto trowe ful soone, enformyng and tising ther to vnsufficienti leerned clerkis, that God had mad or purueied the Bible to mennis bihoue after as it were or bi the vtterist 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 seruice to God bi Cristen men, withoute nede to haue ther with eny doctrine. ȝhe, and if y schal seie what hath be seid to myn owne heering, sotheli it hath be seid to me thus, "that neuere man errid bi "reding or studiyng in the Bible, neither eny man "myȝte erre bi reeding in the Bible, and that for "such cause as is now seid:" notwithstonding that ther is no book writen 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 ij^{e}. parti of the book clepid *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture.* But certis thei

[1] *vupon*, MS. The word is written *vpon* and *upon* elsewhere.

Digitized by Google

tooken her mark amys: for thei puttiden al her motyue in her affeccioun or wil forto so trowe; and not in her intellecciou 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.

Illustration from the sweetness of honey.

And therfore euen rizt as a man iugid amys and were foule bigilid and took his mark amys, if he schulde trowe that in hony were al the cheer, al the coumfort, al the thrift which is in al other mete, bi cause that hony is swettist to him of alle othere metis; so he is begilid and takith his mark amys, if he therfore trowe that in Holi Scripture is al the doctrine necessarie to man for to serue God and forto kepe his lawe; bi cause that Holi Scripture is so miche delectable, and for that bi thilk delectacioun he bringith yn myche cheer and coumfort and strengthith the wil forto the more do and suffre for God. And so me thinkith to suche men good counseil were forto seie to hem, that thei be waar of childrenys perel, which is that bi cause children louen sweete meetis and drinkis ful miche, 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 miche tho sweete meetis ben the more holsum, how miche 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 miche zeuen hem to reding in the Bible aloone, haue gete to hem losse of sufficient and profitable leernyng

[1] It is not very clear whether the MS. has *affectioun* or *affeccioun*.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIII.

which in other wheris thei mizten haue gete, and also vilonie forto avowe and warante that thei couthen the trewe sentence and trewe vnderstonding of the Bible, whanne and where thei not couthen so vnderstonde, neither couthen mentene what thei ther ynne vnderstoden, and also forto avowe and warante that in the Bible were miche more and profitabiler and of other soort kunnyng than[1] can ther yn be founde. And therfore to alle suche men mai be seid what is seid Prouerbs xxv^{e}. c̃. in sentence thus: *Thou hast founde hony, ete therof what is ynouz and no more; lest thou ouer fillid caste it vp out azen, and thanne is it to thee vilonie:* and what is writen aftir in the same chapiter there in sentence thus: *Forto ete miche of hony is not good to the eter.* So that whanne euere thou takist upon thee forto vnderstonde ferther in the Bible than thi wit may or can therto suffice withoute help of a substancial clerk, thanne etist thou of hony more than ynouz, and doost azens the bidding of Seint Poul, Romans xij^{e}. c̃. soone after the bigynnyng. And whanne thou attendist forto leerne Holi Scripture, and attendist not ther with forto haue eny other leernyng of philsophie or of diuynite, bi thin owne studie in bookis ther of maad or bi teching and informacioun 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 vnhoolsumnes, rizt as if thou schuldist ete in bodili maner noon other mete than hony it schulde not be to thee hoolsum.

The dignity of the Bible has its limits. The Jews of old, like the Lollards now, extolled Scripture above measure. St. Paul's reproof

To zou therfore, whiche fauoren the firste seid opinion, I seie the wordis of Seint Iame writen in his [first][2] c̃. thus: *Take ze or receyue ze this graffid word, which may saue zoure soulis.* Receue ze 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.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIII.

to them applicable to the Lollards also.

parties of *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture*, and receue ȝe it as a graffid word, that is to seie receue ȝe 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 weel considere out of what ground it growith and to what fundament it leeneth, y doute not but that ȝe schulen consente that it is a sureli graffid word, which mai saue ȝoure soulis fro manye perilouse errouris and heresies, if into eny suche ȝe ben come; and mai preserue ȝou that ȝe falle into noon, into which ȝe ellis schulden come. And if ȝe bithenke ȝou weel how it is in werk of this present first parti bitwixe me and ȝou, 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 magnifieden ouermiche the Oold Testament; for thouȝ the oold lawe was good to the kepers therof, ȝit 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 declarid the dignifiyng and the laude of the oold lawe, as he is in treuthe, 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 ȝou and me in these daies. Forwhi many of the lay parti dignifien ouer miche the writing of the Newe Testament, and many other dignifien ouermiche the writing of al the hool Bible, weenyng that of the now seid writing is verified the bifore rehercid firste opinioun: and y, bi what y can, am aboute fro the bigynnyng of this present book hidir to, and thoruȝ out al the book clepid *The iust ap-*

[1] A space left in the MS. for the reference.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIII.

prising of Holi Scripture, for to improue and reproue 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 bifore spokun bi the iij^e^. principal conclusioun. God therfore grante that as the Romayns obeieden to the open resoun and proof which Seint Poul made and wrote azens hem, that so ȝe obeie to the open proof which y make and write azens ȝou, thouȝ y desire not that ȝe obeie to me.

The provinces of Scripture and of moral philosophy must be kept distinct, and they must not be allowed to interfere with one another. Their provinces defined.

And whanne al is doon, what euer wil a man hath forto do reuerence to Holi Scripture, ȝit sithen treuthe is to bè 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, aud not entre into the boundis and the riȝt 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 philsophi, and so that he not wrongee the[1] lawe of kinde. And azenward, that the seid lawe of kinde kepe him withinne hise owne teermys and boundis, and not entre into boundis and riȝt 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 neiȝbourly 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[2] that Holi Scripture schal grounde the conclusiouns and treuthis of Cristen feith, and not eny oon conclusioun or treuthe into whos fynding and

[1] 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.

[2] *biholde*, MS.

Digitized by Google

grounding doom of mannys resoun may suffice, with concours of the grace which God bi his comoun vniuersal lawe is woned and is redi alwey ȝeue; and aȝenward, that doom of mannys resoun or lawe of kinde schal founde and grounde the conclusiouns and treuthis of Cristen lawe into whos fynding resoun in the now seid maner may suffice, and that he not grounde eny oon conclusioun or treuth of feith; and but if this gouernaunce be kept, pees, riȝt, and trouthe is not bitwixe hem kept.

A reply by anticipation to certain passages which might be cited from the Fathers of the Church, affirming Scripture to be the ground of Christian faith and practice. Pecock's Latin work, to be entitled *The just apprising of Doctors*, will discuss this subject at length.

Perauenture here summan of the lay party, holding the seid first opinioun and therfore hoolding aȝens the first bifore sett conclusioun, wole renne aȝens me with summe writingis of oolde and holy Doctouris sownyng into the firste opinioun and aȝens the firste conclusioun: not for that he admyttith, receueth, and allowith the writingis of tho Doctouris, for thanne he schulde smyte him silf with his owne stroke; but for that he knowith me admytte and allowe the writingis of Doctouris, therfore he makith aȝens me this assaut, in pretending as thouȝ he wole do to me as Dauid dide to Golie in smyting of of Golie's heed with his owne swerd. Neuertheles sufficient bokeler aȝens this assailing schal be to me a book which y haue bigunne to[1] write in Latyn, clepid *The iust apprising of Doctouris*. For in hiȝer maner than as thilk book schal teche the writingis of Doctouris to be take in to credence, (whether thei ben of oold or of newe, of holi or of not holi Doctouris), thei ouȝten not be take, as there schal in clerist maner be opened and proued: but bi cause noon of hem, aȝens whom y write this present book, wole so allegge aȝens me for eny zele or credence which he him silf hath to what he schal so allegge, therfore it is no nede me forto as here in this booke encerche the writingis of Doctouris sownyng aȝens mi present entent, and forto expowne and

[1] *to* in a later hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIII. cleree her wordis. Perauentur summe of tho writingis vnderstonden of grounding takun vnpropirli and largeli and not propirly, of which maner of taking this word *ground* or *grounding* y haue spoken bifore 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 figuratijf speche, for whanne vpon eny thing spechis or writingis ben maad bi wey of commendacioun or bi wey of vituperacioun, tho spechis ben[2] woned be myche fauorid bi figuris excusing what ellis in hem schulde be vntrewe and defauti; and a greet licence han writers and spekers in these now seid causis forto write and speke more wijldeli, than thei schulden be suffrid forto write and speke of the same thing out of these now seid causis. And therfore, brother, be not ouerboold vpon wordis and writingis in suche maters where yn resoun hath to deeme; but truste ther yn to cleer doom of resoun, and thenke what an oolde Doctour Hillary seith (and sooth it is) that *the wordis of a speker ben to be referrid into the entent wherto he hem spekith.*[3] For therbi ful ofte and ellis not schal be cauȝt[4] of tho wordis the trewe and dew vndirstonding. But forto seie in oon word what mai be seid in manie, who euer wole for eni Doctouris writing fauore the firste opinioun and countre aȝens the firste conclusioun, assoile he ther with alle the euydencis or argumentis bifore sett into proof of the firste conclusioun. 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 subjectus. S. Hilar., *de Trin.*, lib. iv. (p. 835. Ed. Bened.) Dicti ratio ex sensu erit intelligenda dicendi (dicentis, some MSS.) Id., lib. ii. (p. 803. Ed. Bened.) To one or both of these passages Pecock here alludes.

[4] The MS. probably originally had *tauȝt*, but an erasure has altered it into *cauȝt*.

Digitized by Google

xiiij. CHAPITER.[1]

Two objections that might be made by the holders of the first named opinion stated: (1) Reason is fallible, and therefore an uncertain rule for our service to God. (2) Scripture is more worthy than reason, and therefore ought not to be made subject to reason.

BUT certis more scharpeli here risen ij. obieccions, whiche the holders of the firste opinioun mizten make azens me bi resoun thus: Mannys resoun is a thing whiche in hise doomys and iugementis ofte failith, as experience ofte schewith. Wherfore it myzte seme that God wolde not him to be oure reule in deedis of oure seruice to God. Forwhi this, that God schulde make vs forto leene to a thing deceyuyng and failing forto performe his seruice, bifittith[2] not his wisdom as it wolde seme. The ij^e^. obiectioun is this: Holi Scripture is a reuerend thing and a worthi, sythen that bi it and fro it al the Cristen Chirche of God takith her feith. Wherfore it mizte seme that God wolde not subdewe or submitte and remytte and sende him to resoun, for to be interpretid and be expowned and dressid 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 therfore sithen, as it semeth, God not so reulith him in hise gouernauncis, that he zeueth a reule which is not sufficient forto reule, or that he puttith the worthier thing vndir reule of the vnworthier thing, it mizte seme miche of al what y haue bifore tauzt in this present book be vntrewe.

---

[1] 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.

[2] The MS. has been corrected from *bisittith* into *bisettith*; but *befittith* is probably the true reading.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIV.

THE FIRST OBJECTION ANSWERED. Our senses are the only guide given us by God for sensible truths, yet they are fallible. Error therein excusable, if involuntary. The same remark to be made of reason and reasonable truths, and the difficulty urged by the objection solved.

To the firste of these ij. obieccioun y answere thus: It is ful profitable to mankinde that he haue of seable treuthis sure knowing, and that bi siȝt of iȝen; and ȝit what othere iȝen or seing power hath God ȝouen to mankinde forto therwith se, than which at sumtyme wolen faile and erre? It is also ful profitable to mankinde that he haue sure knowing of heereable treuthis, and that bi heering of eeris; and ȝit what othere 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 othere feet or leggis hath God ȝoue to man, than whiche schulen at sumtyme slide and at sumtyme stumble fro the riȝt going and moving? And if this be trewe, certis thouȝ it be ful profitable to mankinde forto knowe with and bi the power of resoun resonable trouthis, (that is to seie suche as mowe not be knowe bi seing or heering or eny outward sensitijf wit,) and also tho[1] same treuthis whiche outward sensityue wittis knowen, it is not merveil, thouȝ God ȝeue noon other power of resoun to man forto bi it knowe these treuthis, than whiche power of resoun schal[2] at sumtyme and ofte faile in his resonyng and iuging. And, namelich, herfore it is the lasse merveil. For bi cause that God hath ȝouen to vs noon othere iȝen and power of seing than whiche wolen at sumtime erre, and noon other power of heering than whiche wolen at sumtime erre, and noon othere feet than whiche wolen ofte slide and stumble; therfore if we dó 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.

Digitized by Google

he erre not, oure feet that thei slide not and stumble not, God wole holde us excusid, thouȝ oure power of seing erre, and thouȝ oure power of heering erre, and thouȝ oure feet stumble; and it schal be allowid to us as miche of God as if it be seen ariȝt, herd ariȝt, and walkid ariȝt. And euen so, bi cause that God hath ȝouen to vs noon other power of resonyng than which may faile and erre, he wole holde us excusid, thouȝ we folewe an erroneose doom of resoun, whilis we ben not necligent but diligent bothe in oure owne avising and bi counseil taking of othere forto haue a riȝt doom in oure resoun; and he wole allowe, rewarde, accepte, and take oure deede which we doon bi such an erroneose doom, as ferforth as it were doon bi a riȝt doom; al the while that thilk errour in oure resounys doom is had aȝens oure wil, and not bi oure consent and willing or necligence. And so, if this be trewe, (as it is proued be trewe in othere placis of my writingis,) noon inconuenience is, if God ordeyne the power of resoun for to be oure reule in his seruice doing, thouȝ thilk power of reson be such that he schal sumtime (ȝhe, and ofte tyme) erre, but if the gretter laboure be mad theraȝens bi avisingis and bi counseil taking and bi leernyng long tyme in scolis.

Another answer to the same objection. God has not ordained the power of reason, simply taken in itself, to be our guide, but the syllogistic judgment of the reason, which is infallible.

Neuertheles it may be answerid to the firste obiecioun in other wise thus: That the power of resoun in him silf is not ordeyned of God to be oure next and best and surest reuler or reule anentis alle resonable treuthis, but the doom of reson is ordeyned to so be; and ȝit not ech doom of resoun, but thilk doom of resoun which is a formal complete argument clepid a sillogisme in resoun, whos bothe premissis ben sureli or likeli knowen for trewe, and that bi hem silf or bi sume othere bifore had lijk sillogisme or sillogismes prouyng the premisse hauyng nede to be proued, into tyme it bicome into premissis openest in suerte or openest in probabilite or likelihode. And

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIV. certis this doom of resoun (in this wise had) failith 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 bischop of London is a man, y mai be sekir and sure that the bischop of London is out of the chirche of Seint Poul at London, thouȝ alle aungels in heuen wolde seie 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 tauȝt in logik bi opene reulis. Lete therfore 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 reducid into formes of sillogismes; or ellis for that thei trusten and trowen 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 probabilite, that noon nede is that eny other premisse be take forto proue hem; or ellis for that thei knowen not bi reulis ȝouen 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 resoning; forwhi ther is noon conclusioun or trouthe in the world, (except tho which ben open bi experience of sensitijf witt or at fulle pleyn in resoun, whiche ben clepid groundis and foundamentis to alle the othere treuthis and conclusiouns in philsophie, 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 premissis be knowen at fulle for sure

Digitized by Google

trouthis, the conclusioun is to be take for sure trouthe; and if the bothe premyssis be knowun 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 premissis be such as is now seid and the other is sure trouthe, thanne the conclusioun is knowen as probabili or likeli trewe.

Distinction between a demonstrative and a probable syllogism. Every truth may be resolved into one of these syllogisms.

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 ȝeueth sure and vndoutable kunnyng and a sillogisme which ȝeueth probable kunnyng oonli, that is to seie kunnyng of likelihode and of opinioun but not of certeinte. And so no treuthe is a this side the openest fundamental treuthis, but that into proof of him mai be had a sillogisme weel reulid forto proue him sureli trewe, or forto proue him likeli to be trewe; ȝhe, 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[1] his contrarie parti be had strenger and euydenter premissis than ben the premyssis whiche ben had into him now. And euen as a premisse, whos suer knowing is lokid aftir and souȝt after, is to be resolued bi arguyng of sillogismes in the maner now seid, into tyme it be come into premissis of openest suerte; so whanne eny premysse is such that his suer trouthe is not lokid aftir neither souȝt after, but his probabilite or likelihode of trouthe is lokid aftir and souȝt aftir, he is to be resolued upward bi sillogismes, into tyme it be come vp into premyssis of whiche euere either is openest in likelihode thouȝ not in suerte, or ellis into premyssis of which oon[2] is openest in suerte of trouthe and the other is openest in suerte of likelihode or of proba-

[1] The word *into* seems required before *his*.

[2] *ooon*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIV.

bilite a this side suerte. So that as ther ben principlis openest in suerte to treuthis whos suer kunnying is souȝt aftir to be had, so ther ben principlis openest in probabilite or likelihode to treuthis whos likeli kunnyng or probable kunnyng is souȝt aftir to be had, and whos suer kunnyng is not souȝt aftir to be had.

Apology for declining to enter here into these abstruse matters: those who cannot comprehend the second answer must be contented with the first.

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 therfore y must here therof abstene and forber. But ȝit thouȝ y schal not be vnderstonde sufficientli of the lay reders in this bifore 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 weene that a good clerk couthe not assoile the firste obiecciou, which y am sikir thei wolden make. And y haue leefir forto seie sumwhat of the trewe substancial answere longing therto, thouȝ y schulde not be sufficientli ther yn vnderstonde of hem, than forto seie not of such sufficient answere bi cause of her insufficience of vndirstonding, and therbi forto suffre vntrewe 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^e. answere to the firste obiecciou, take he him to the firste now bifore seid answere to the same obiecciou; for bothe ben gode ynouȝ, and bothe (thouȝ in her dyuerse maners) ben trewe, sithen the doom of resoun may not be oure next reule in doing Goddis seruice, but if resoun were the romber reule to vs into the same doing of Goddis seruice, bi

Digitized by Google

cause that the doom of resoun cometh out and fro the resoun, as the liȝt of the sunne comith fro the sunne.

Both the power of the reason and the syllogistic judgment of the reason must necessarily be our rule for the moral service of God; because, since Scripture is proved not to be our rule, nothing remains to be our rule but the judgment of the reason, and the power of reason from which it springs.

Aftir that y haue schewid thus: That noon inconuenient is, thouȝ God assigne for oure reule into his seruice 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 seruice than is the power of reson,—now y schal schewe that euereither of hem is needis to be seid oure reule into the moral seruice of God to be doon. And firste thus: Of al the moral seruice of God, which is moral lawe of kinde, Holi Scripture is not the reule. Forwhi than therof Holi Scripture were the ground, which is proued bifore to be vntrewe: Also of al the now seid moral seruice of God, Holi Scripture is oonli a witnesser and a rehercer, and takith it out and fro moral lawe of kinde and out of moral philsophie, as it is bifore proued. Wherfore Holi Scripture is not neither may be reuler of thilk moral lawe and seruice to God. And thanne thus: Of thilk now seid moral lawe and seruice to God Holi Scripture muste be reuler, or sumwhat ellis bisidis Holi Scripture muste be ther of the reuler; but now and bifore it is proued 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 rehercer and witnesser, and taker of it fro an other which is grounder. And herwith 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 sillogisme 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

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIV.

the seid sillogistik doom of resoun ben in her bothe dyuerse maners reulis of al oure moral seruice to God, whiche is moral lawe of kinde, and of al oure 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 ynouȝ for answere to the firste obieccioun.

XV. CHAPITER.

THE SECOND OBJECTION ANSWERED. From the replies just made to the first objection it is evident that no inconvenience arises if reason be a rule to Scripture in all points relating to man's moral service to God without exception.

FOR answere to the ij^e^. obieccioun: Sithen it is so that Holi Scripture hath not to do in him silf forto reule eny trouthe or gouernaunce of natural philsophi or of moral philsophi 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 bifore schewid and proued,) and for that he is reule oonli of feithis whiche he tretith and techith, bi cause that oonli of hem he is founder and grounder; and therfore of tho treuthis and conclusiouns of moral lawe of kinde as thei ben witnessid in Holi Scripture sum thing muste be reule, riȝt 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 power 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 seruice to God, noon except; and that for cause now late bifore 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*

Digitized by Google

feith and of sacramentis:) and ferthermore, sithen the seid sillogistik doom of resoun is a sure reule and vnfailing, and thouȝ the other reule which is resoun be failing at sum while, ȝit God wole haue a man ther yn excusid, and wole allowe thilke failingis whanne man bi his wil is not cause of thilk failing, noon inconuenient is thouȝ God ordeyned the seid resoun, and also his seid doom to be reulers of Holi Writ in alle now seid treuthis and conclusiouns tauȝt bi Holi Writ, thouȝ thilk resoun be at sum tyme failing.

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.

And ferthermore for answere to it that the ij°. obiecioun alleggith Holi Scripture to be worthier than is the doom of resoun, and that therfore the[1] doom of resoun ouȝte not reule Holi Writt, it is to be seid thus: That Holi Writt mai be take for the outward lettris writun and schapun vnder dyuerse figuris in parchemyn or in velim, and forto speke of Holi Writt in this maner is not according to this purpos. For Holi Writt in this wise takun, is not holier neither better than eny other writing is[2] which hath lijk good ynke, and is lijk craftili figurid. In an other maner, accordingli to this present purpos, Holi Writt is takun for the kunnyng wherbi the thing is kunne which is signified and bitokened bi the now seid outward Holi Writt writun in parchemyn or velym, or ellis mai be take for the outward writing, as it signifieth hise trouthis bitokened bi it, and as it is ioyned and couplid with the kunnyng of tho treuthis signified bi the outward writing. Also it is to vndirstonde 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 is*, so as to make *writingis*, but wrongly.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XV. the man bi the power of resoun) resoneth, making proposiciouns of simple wordis and termys knyt to gidere, and making sillogismys of proposiciouns knyȝt to gidere 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 xj^e. chapiter bifore hidir to. In another maner doom of resoun is take for the kunnyng of the conclusioun which is concludid in a sillogisme mad bi doom of resoun takun in the firste maner, and in this ij^e. maner it is spokun bifore fro the bigynnyng of the ij^e. chapiter vnto the eende of the x^e. chapiter, weelniȝ alwey, whanne it is there spokun of doom of resoun, or ellis namelich whanne euere there doom of resoun is clepid lawe of kinde or moral philsophie, and comparisoun is mad there bitwixe lawe of kinde or doom of resoun and Holi Scripture. Now, Sir, if we now in the ij^e. obieccion bifore sett take Holi Scripture in the ij^e. maner, and doom of resoun in the ij^e. maner, sotheli Holi Writt in alle the now seid trouthis, conclusiouns, and gouernauncis, 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^e. maner. Forwhi alle tho trouthis and conclusions[1] Holi Writt takith and borewith out of moral lawe of kinde, and[2] 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 prouer of treuthis is in hem worthier than the rehercer of hem; as the lord of money is worthier in the money than he that hath it[3] bi mustring it and schewing it oonli; and therefore, thouȝ Holi Writt, as anentis alle the treuthis and conclusiouns whiche ben of moral phil-

[1] *conclusions of*, MS. (first hand).
[2] We seem to require *thei* after *and*.
[3] *it* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

sophie or of natural philsophi or of methaphisik rehercid bi him, be reulid bi resoun and his[1] doom (takun in the ij°. maner) in alle tho now seid trouthis, conclusiouns, and gouernauncis, ther of folewith not that the worthier in that that he is worthier is subdewid vndir reule of the vnworthier as he is the vnworthier. Certis, if Holi Scripture be worthier in eny of hise treuthis and conclusiouns than is doom of resoun takun in the ij°. maner, and as he comprehendith natural philsophie and metaphisik and moral philsophie, he is so worthier in hise treuthis of feith whiche ben not lawis to man, whiche Holi Scripture 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 aftir oure deeth, and so forth of othere suche feithis being no lawis to man; and ȝit whether Holi Scripture be worthier or profitabiler to man than is the now seid doom of resoun taken in the ij°. maner, forto serue God and deserue meede in hevene, schal not be disputid and determyned here in this book, but perauenture it schal be determyned in my writingis to heerers of hiȝer vndirstonding. CHAP. XV.

Neuertheles with this y wolde it were not forȝete what y haue tauȝt bifore bi the [seventh][2] principal conclusioun, 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 silf, neither 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

It has been already sufficiently shown that the positive law of faith is less worthy than the moral law.

[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.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XV.

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

Positive law of faith, which relates only to the Christian sacraments, is less profitable to man than the law of nature, which is the cause of all intellectual knowledge, whether relating to faith or not.

And ferthermore, sithen al 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 bifore in proof of the x^e^. conclusioun bi remyssion into the book *Of iust apprising of Holi Scripture,*) it folewith 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. Forwhi thus[1] 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 vsis of tho (as for and bi hem silf) ben vnworthier and lasse profitable to man than is lawe of kinde, as it is bifore proued. If Holi Writt be take in the ij^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 thoruȝ out al the Bible. Forwhi the seid doom of resoun in this firste wise taken is cause of the Holi Writt takun in the ij^e^. wise. Forwhi doom of resoun takun in the firste wise is cause of al kunnyng in the vndirstonding or intellect of man, and that whether thilk kunnying be feith or no feith; and Holi Scripture in the ij^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 first maner; and therfore Holi Writt in this ij^e^. maner takun is vnworthier than is doom of resoun takun in the first maner, and that as weel where Holi

[1] *thus* is by a later hand, the original reading having been erased; this word may have been *propirli*, which the sense seems to require.

Digitized by Google

Writt techith articlis of feith as ellis where. And here y make an eende of my answeris ȝouun to the ij. bifore rehercid obieccioun̄s.

xvj. CHAPITER.

The necessity of a learned clergy to expound the Bible. Evils of private expositions of Scriptur infinite and irremediable.

IN whiche answeris thouȝ y haue write or seid more than wole anoon accorde with the capacite of the Bible men, to whom and aȝens whom this book is principaly maad, ȝit y haue leefir so do than forto seie and write lasse; lest therbi schulde seeme to hem, that sufficient answere couthe not be ȝouun to her seid ij. obieccioun̄s; and lest that ellis thei myȝten trowe, that bi her powring in the Bible aloon thei miȝten leerne for to assoile sufficientli alle obieccioun̄s biholding the Bible, thouȝ thei hadden no counseil of substancial clerkis weel leerned in logik and in moral philsophie. And ther fore of oon thing y warne al the world, which is this. If substanciali leerned clerkis in logik and in moral philsophie and in dyvynyte, and ripeli exercisid ther yn, weren not and schulden not be forto wiseli and dewli ȝeue trewe vndirstondingis and exposicioun̄s to textis of Holi Scripture: or ellis, thouȝ 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) mynystre 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 dyuerse opinions schulden[1] rise in lay mennys wittis bi occasioun of textis in Holy Scripture aboute mennys moral conuersacioun, that al the world schulde be cumbrid therwith, and men schulden accorde to gidere in keping her seruice to God, as doggis doon

[1] *schulde*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVI.

in a market, whanne ech of hem terith otheris coot. For whi oon man wolde vnderstonde a text in this maner, and an other man wolde vnderstonde it in an other dyvers maner, and the iij^e. man in the iij^e. maner; namelich for that weelniȝ in ech place where Holi Writ spekith of eny point of moral lawe of kinde, it is so spoken that it nedith forto haue a redressing of it into accordaunce with lawe of kinde and with doom of reson; and than if no iuge schulde be had forto deeme bitwixe hem so diuersely holding, eende schulde ther neuere be of her strijf, into tyme that thei schulden falle into fl̄ȝting and into werre and bateil; and thanne schulde al thrift and grace passe awey, and noon of her holdingis schulde in eny point be therbi strengthid or confermed.

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 rewful and wepeable destruccioun of the worthi citee and vniuersite of Prage, and of the hool rewme of Beeme, as y haue had ther of enformacioun ynouȝ. And now, aftir the destruccioun of the rewme, the peple ben glad for to resorte and turne aȝen into the catholik and general feith and loore of the chirche, and in her pouerte bildith up aȝen what was brent and throwun doun, and noon of her holdingis can thriue. But for that Crist in his prophecyng muste needis be trewe, *that ech kingdom deuidid in hem silf schal be destruyed*, therfore to hem bifille the now seid wrecchid mys chaunce. God for his merci and pitee kepe Ynglond, that he come not into lijk daunce. But forto turne here fro aȝen vnto oure Bible men, y preie ȝe seie ȝe to me, whanne among you is rise a strijf in holdingis and opiniouns, (bi cause that ech of you trustith to his owne studie in the Bible aloon, and wole haue alle treuthis of mennys moral conuersacioun there groundid,) what iuge mai therto be assigned in erthe, saue resoun and the bifore seid doom of resoun? For thouȝ men schulden be

Digitized by Google

iugis, ȝit so muste thei be bi vce of the seid resoun 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 bifore seid clerkis. And therfore, ȝe Bible men, bi this here now seid which ȝe muste needis graunte, for experience which ȝe han of the disturblaunce in Beeme, and also of the disturblaunce and dyuerse feelingis had among ȝou silf now in Ynglond, so that summe of ȝou ben clepid *Doctour-mongers*, and summe ben clepid *Opinioun-holders*, and summe ben *Neutralis*, that of so presumptuose a cisme abhominacioun to othere men and schame to ȝou it is to heere; rebuke now ȝou silf, for as miche as ȝe wolden not bifore this tyme allowe, 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.

The Bible-men advised to have recourse to learned clerks, and to be careful in their selection. A Doctor's hood no sure criterion. Mere popular preachers to be avoided as expositors.

And also herbi take ȝe a sufficient mark, that ȝe haue nede forto haue ȝoure recours and conseil with suche now biforeseid clerkis, thouȝ ȝe wolden labore, and powre, and dote alle the daies of ȝoure lijf in the Bible aloon. And drede ȝe of the effect which bifille to Bohemers for lijk cause, and mys gouernaunce in holding the first seid opinioun; and bi so miche the more drede ȝe thilk effect, bi how miche bi Crist it is pronouncid forto falle, where euer cysme and dyvisyoun is contynued; for he seith [Matth. xij.][1] č., *that euery kingdom or comounte dyvidid in him silf schal be destruyed.* But thanne aȝenward ȝe must[2] be waar 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] *ȝe must* interlineated in a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVI.

oon clerk is different from an other in kunnyng. And ther fore, brother, take heede to doom of cleer resoun in this mater, which also is remembrid to vs bi the wise man, Ecclesiastici vj°. c̄., thus: *Manie be to thee pesible, but of a thousind oon be thi counseiler.* And in special be waar that thou not accepte, chese, 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 plesaunt precher to peple in a pulpit; neither bi this, that he is a greet and thikke rateler out of textis of Holi Scripture or of Doctouris in feestis or in othere cumpanyingis: for certis experience hath ofte tauȝt and mai here teche surely ynouȝ, 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 ij°. and iij°. soortis appeering ful gloriose[1] to the heering of the lay parti, and also summe of othere maner of clerkis, whanne thei schulden come forto dispute and examyne and trie and iuge in harde[2] 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 silf to be noon such as y haue here now spoken of, he therbi schewith weel him to be noon of hem.

The office of preaching is to exhort rather than to demonstrate. The office of exposition is to ground the truths of Divinity. The two offices not always combined in the same person.

Weel y wote, that thouȝ the office of preching is ful profitable into the eende of exortacioun and of remembrauncing, certis it is not so into the eende of best teching. Forwhi it is not so into the eende of formal and groundli disputing, arguing, and prouyng, withoute which no sure trial mai be maad upon eny hard and doutable questioun of mannis conuersacioun; and ȝit if such maner of arguyng and groundli prouyng schulde be sett in sermonyng, the sermon schulde

[1] *gli°ose*, MS.

[2] *her harde*, MS.; but *her* is cancelled by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

be ful vnsauory; and if the maner of outring which is sauory 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 vnspedier. And therfore[1] the office and werk, (wherof y have spoke bifore to be so necessari as is said to al the world,) into repressing of errouris and into grounding of al Goddis lawe, the teching muste be take bi othir testimonie and witnessing than bi wering of pilleoun, or bi greet kunnyng of preching and bi sauory vttring therof, or bi greet plenteuose out hilding of textis writen in the Bible or in Doctouris. For manye, whiche neuere leerned ferther in scolis than her grammer, kunnen suche textis bi herte and bi mouth, and kunnen bi textis and by narraciouns and parabolis and lijknessis preche ful gloriosely into plesaunce of the peple and into profite of the peple, and semen therfore and therbi ful wise. And if thei were weel apposid in eny of tho textis and parabolis and othere precheable processis, thei couthe not defende and meyntene eny oon of hem, neither couthen putte out sufficientli the very and ful dewist vndirstonding of eny oon of hem.

Lack of attention to these matters a great cause of heresy in England.

This is now seid of me, (God y take therto into witnes,) for harme which y haue knowen come bi defaut 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 bifore mad. For, as sikir as the sunne schineth in somerys dai, the vnconsideracion of this, whereof y haue ȝouen now warnyng, hath be a greet cause of the wickidli enfectid scole of heresie among the lay peple in Ynglond, which is not ȝit conquerid. And therfore

[1] Possibly *of* should be inserted after *therfore*.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVI.

into plesaunce bi which y wolde plese God and serue to God, and do sumwhat into goostli profite of myn euene Cristen, and for drede of God, (lest so profitabli to be spoken a thing y schulde spare, speke, and write for fere of bachitingis,) y write and outre what y now haue outrid. And if any man iuge me in eny other wise, be waar he thanne of him which schal ther upon iuge vs bothe.

The king of England would be better employed in repressing heresy than in conquering France.

But wolde God that the king of Ynglond wolde sette so myche bisynes forto conquere and reforme his lond of Ynglond fro this seid wickid scole, and fro othere defautis, as miche as he dooth aboute the conquest of his lond of Normandi and of Fraunce, and perauenture he schulde thanne haue more thanke and reward at his laste comyng hoom to the King of blisse, and more noble flauour of digne fame among alle the princis of the world and the worthi peeris of heuen, than he schal haue bi miche of his labour and cost doon aboute the worldli conquest of Fraunce.

It would be well if school degrees were given only to men of school learning.

Verili to seie 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 euer the persoone desiring the gree is able therto in scolis bi kunnyng longing to the same gree, and ellis not, thouȝ he be able into othere deedis profitabili 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 execucioun, and God forbede that y schulde in contrarie wise feele or meene. But certis her withal y wolde that profound and groundli scoling in logik, philsophi, and dyuynyte, and lawe were not left bihinde, 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] *gõon*, MS.

Digitized by Google

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

The people apt to depreciate school-learning, and to receive the assertions of any popular preacher or doctor.

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 therfore trowe noon such so preciose and vnlackeable occupacioun to be had and laborid among hem that in scolis waken, studien, and disputen, thouȝ thei not into preching attenden; neither that therfore the lay peple schulden lacke wil and purpos forto bisette notable costis vpon hem, whiche so in scolis laboren; neither that the lay peple holden hem silf theryn deceyued, if therto thei han eny expensis bifore leid out and mynystrid. Certis ofte han men and wommen 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 aȝen thus: "Thouȝ "he and he and he and he han so tauȝt and "prechid, ȝit [it] is not therfore and therbi euer "the rather trewe, but it is vntrewe, and needis "muste be vntrewe, and mai be schewid and proued "undoutabili to be vntrewe." No man conceyue bi my wordis here that y meene and lete as thouȝ y 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 othere doctouris and prechers, that y myȝte the suerlier therby warne peple vpon the failing of clerkis, ther fore y haue seid what is now seid: and y haue lefir forto mekeli

[1] *layfe*, MS. (first hand): but a stroke is added in a darker ink, changing the word into *layfe*. The correction *layte* is tempting: but see Glossary.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVI.

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 preching 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 silf which y haue seid and knoulechid of hem.

The people should be cautious whom they take into their counsels. If they are so, they are excused before God for any errors into which their counsellor may lead them.

Neuertheles, whanne the comoun lay peple doon as weel and as diligentli as thei kunnen forto chese to hem a wijs and a sufficient clerk into her counseiler, thei ben excusid anentis God in trowing to his counseil and in folewing it, thouȝ his counseiling be vntrewe, vnto tyme thei mowe aspie the defaut 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^e. parti of *Cristen religioun*, the [1] treti the [1] chapiter, to be kept, whanne euer oon man requirith and sechith and askith an other mannys counseil in eny mater, y wote weel that he schal therbi take greet waarnes that he be not bi vnsufficient and vnwijs counseil bigilid.

xvij. CHAPITER.

THE SECOND ERROR DISPROVED BY EXPERIENCE AND BY REASON: It is

THAT the ij^e. opinioun sett and spoken bifore in the firste chapiter[2] of this present book is vntrewe, y mai proue bothe bi experiencis and bi resoun. Bi ex-

[1] Spaces left in the MS. for the numbers.

[2] See page 6.

Digitized by Google

perience thus: Among hem that holden the seid ij^e. opinioun many ben whiche han vndirstonde certein processis of Holi Scripture in oon certein maner of vnderstonding, whanne thei helden hem silf meeke and in good wil forto receyue and haue the trewe and dew vndirstonding therof; and ȝit aftirward, 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^e. opinioun, ouȝten bi her owne experience takun vpon her owne deedis proue the same ij^e. opinioun to be vntrewe.

confuted by these men's experience of themselves.

Also thus: Of the same noumbre which holden the seid ij^e. opinioun manye vndirstonden a processe of Holi Scripture in oon maner and wolen needis so vndirstonde it, and manye othere of the same noumbre wolen needis vndirstonde the same processe in an other maner not according therto: and in this tho ij. soortis of men stryuen, and ȝit ech soort of hem holdeth him[1] silf so meke and so disposid, that he ouȝte haue the trewe vndirstonding of thilk same processe. And thilk same processe mai not haue bothe ij. vndirstondingis to gidere, (as it is proued 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^e. opinioun mai be openli knowe, that the same ij^e. opinioun is vntrewe.

Also by their experience of others.

Also thus: Open experience schewith that a viciose 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 vnderstondingis thei to

Experience also shows that a bad clerk may be as good an expositor of Scripture as a good one.

[1] *holden hem* MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVII.

gidere accordingli fallen. Wherfore experience conuicteth the ij^e. opinioun to be vntrewe.

The second error disproved by reason. The power of exposition varies with the intellectual, not with the moral powers; consequently a vicious man may be a better expositor than a virtuous one.

Now forto proue the same ij^e. opinioun to be vntrewe bi resoun, y procede thus: Forto fynde the verri and iust vndirstonding of processis in Holi 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 affecte or of the appetite: 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 thingis to be founde bi witt, as hath a good man weel disposid in maners of his affect and wil: wherfore folewith bi resoun, that as soone may a viciose man come to and fynde the dew vndirstonding of Holi Scripture, how soone mai a vertuose man finde, so that thei ben lijk witti in nature, or so that the viciose man haue a cleerer witt than the vertuose man hath.

A possible answer to this argument supposed. Pecock'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.

If eny 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 vndirstonding of Holi Scripture, as schulde a vertuose euen witti or lasse witti man; neuertheles so it is, that God ȝeueth not hise ȝiftis to a viciose man lijk plenteuoseli as he ȝeueth to a vertuose man.

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

Aȝens this answere 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 othere divyne and godli trouthis rathir or latir, as thei ben disposid kindeli in her resoun and witt. And what euer 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

Digitized by Google

were feyned, and lackid euydence 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 bifore seid, that men comen into the dew vndirstonding of Scripture rathir or latir, as thei therto ben kindeli disposid. And ferthermore, thouȝ God schulde not and wolde not suffre eny man to haue the dew vndirstonding of Holi Scripture saue bi his ȝifte, ȝit we mowe haue that hise ȝiftis and gracis 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 prophetis, or what euere men hadden reuelaciouns, were holier than eny othere men whiche hadden noon reuelaciouns and visiouns; and the holier that eny man or womman is, the more he or sche hath prophecie and reuelacioun than an othir lasse holi; which is knowun as vntrewe bi open experience. Wherfore folewith that thouȝ God wolde not suffre eny man to haue the dew vnderstonding of Holi Scripture bi his natural witt, but bi ȝifte of God, ȝit herwith stondith weel that a bad man haue as plenteuosely thilk ȝifte as a good man, and that sum bad man haue thilk ȝifte more plenteuoseli than sum good man, riȝt as sum bad man or sum lasse good man hath ȝiftis of helth and of miraclis doing more plenteuoseli ȝouen to him than a good man or than a more good man, as it is open in the Gospel [2] that a man not folewing the trewe and dew wey of Crist dide miraclis bi ȝifte 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, sqq. (Cf. Luke ix. 49); although Matth. vii. 22, would be in fact more to his purpose.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVII.

trewe Apostlis diden. Wherfore folewith needis that the seid ij^{e}. opinioun is vntrewe.

The texts of Scripture, produced in behalf of this second error, do nothing to the purpose.

Tho textis of Holi Scripture, whiche ben alleggid bifore in the firste chapiter for grounding of the ij^{e}. opinioun, doon no thing therto. Forwhi, thouȝ it mai be had bi tho textis that God schal ȝeue and do singulerli 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 ȝifte which he wole ȝeue into the resoun or vndirstonding of vnmeke men. And therfore thilke textis speken 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 visitingis, than ben the visitingis and the ȝiftis of kunnyng. And verili to seie in myn experience, ful manye passyng meke men y haue knowe, whiche han be 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 mekenes forto haue it in greet mesure, whilis thei myȝten[1] haue laborid forto haue had kunnyng of moral vertuosenes. And thus miche is ynouȝ for improuyng and reprouyng of the ij^{e}. opinioun.

THE THIRD ERROR DISPROVED BY SCRIPTURE AND BY REASON.

The iij^{e}. opinioun put bifore in the first chapiter[2] of this present book muste needis be vntrewe, for he is aȝens Holi Scripture and also aȝens resoun.

It is disproved by Scripture. Reason and argument are commended in the New Testament.

He is aȝens Holi Scripture; forwhi i. Petri iij^{e}. c̃. it is writun in sentence thus: *That ech Cristen man schulde be redi forto answere and ȝeue satisfaccioun to ech asker of him resoun* (that is to seie, argument) vpon his feith and his hope; and so wole not the iij^{e}. opinioun graunte or suffre. Also Iohun vj^{e}. c̃. 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). | [2] See p. 7.

Digitized by Google

ward werkis comaundid bi the wil to be doon, but also mennis werkis ben inward werkis of his intellect or vndirstonding, and therfore ben hise opiniouns 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 folewen choicis and deedis of the wil, as it is tauȝt in *The folewer to the donet,* and as it is open by Cristis wordis, Iohun the vj^e^. c̃. Forwhi whanne the Iewis askiden of him thus: *What schulen we do that we worche the werkis of God?* Iesus[1] answeride and seide to hem thus: *This is the werk of God that ȝe bileeue in to him which he sende.* And sithen herby it is open that mennis feithis ben her werkis, it folewith that tho men whiche reulen hem bi the iij^e^. opinioun and wolen not bringe forth and schewe her feithis at liȝt (that is to seie, at argumentacioun) ben of thilk soort of peple which God reproueth, Iohun the iij^e^. c̃., where Crist seide thus: *This is the iugement, for liȝt came in to the world, and men loued more derknes than liȝt, sotheli her werkis weren yuel. Forsothe*[2] *ech that doith yuel hatith liȝt, and he comith not to liȝt, that hise werkis ben not vndernome. He that doith treuthe cometh to liȝt, that hise werkis be*[3] *mad open, for that thei ben doon in God.* Thus miche there. Se now therbi how openli men of the iij^e^. opinioun ben reproued of Crist, and therfore the iij^e^. opinion is aȝens Holi Writt.

No truth whatever can be known without argument, either in natural or revealed religion.

Certis withoute argument can no trouthe be knowe neither leerned in the intellect of man, and that whether 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] *Ihs*, MS.

[2] *for sothe*, MS., apparently; but elsewhere conjunctim.

[3] The MS. had originally *ben*, but the last letter is scraped out.

Digitized by Google

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; because every true opinion will bear the light.

That the iij[e]. opinioun is also aȝens reson, y mai schewe thus: Euen as thilk opinioun or conclusioun 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 skilis in lawe of kinde: riȝt so thilk feith or conclusioun of bileeue is not worthi to be holde trewe, but if he may be susteyned bi hise propre to him groundis and evidencis 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 knowun for a treuthe (whether it be a treuthe of lawe of kinde or of lawe of feith), but that if he be knowe perfitli 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 ȝeuun[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 *ȝeuun* was the original form; it occurs however in Gen. xxx. 18. (Wicl. Vers.)

Digitized by Google

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 ferthermore the more eny treuthe, 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 goold, 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 trowe to be a trewe and a good gouernance forto kepe hise feithis and his othere opiniouns priuey, and lete 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 hise 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 ricches or of his fame. Certis if eny man dare not in the now seid casis suffre his feith and hise othere opiniouns be brouȝt into liȝt 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 liȝt and fier.

Also that this iij^e. opinioun 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 suffring, that no

This error resembles the most unreasonable tenet of the Mahommedan religion.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVII.

man aftir he hath receyued the feith of thilk lawe dispute or argue with eny other man upon eny point, article, or conclusioun of thilk lawe: and bi this wrecchid and cursid maundement the peple of thilk secte ben so miche lockid up vndir boond, that manie mo of hem myȝten be conuertid into trewe feith than ȝit ben, if thilk so vnresonable maundement of the same lawe ne were. And if any Cristen men wolen locke hem silf so up in her feithis and othere opiniouns 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 doon foul vilonie to Cristis lawe of feith and of lawe of kinde, making as thouȝ Cristis seid lawe were so feble chaffare and so countirfetid and so vntrewe, that it durst not saue his worschip if he were thriftili examyned. And thei doon also ful periloseli to hem silf for to make hem so sikir in a feith, eer it be sufficientli tried and proued forto be holde worthi a trewe feith or no. And therfore the thridde bifore sett opinioun in the first chapiter of this book is vnresonable.

Reply to the arguments from Scripture. The passage from the Epistle to the Colossians explained.

Now forto answere to tho textis, whiche ben there bifore alleggid for grounding or ellis witnessing or prouyng of the iij°. opinioun, it is liȝt forto answere. Forwhi to ech diligent considerer vpon the processis forth and aftir, bifore and behinde, where thilke textis ben writun, it schal be riȝt liȝtli and soone seen, that the first text there alleggid, Coloc. ij°. c̃., wole that in mater of Cristis Incarnacion, which is a mater of pure feith, no man schulde be bigilid bi philsophi; that is to seie, no man schulde be moved aȝens 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. Forwhi tho ben argumentis of pure philsophie, and thei ben

Digitized by Google

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[1] 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 philsophie) 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 therfore the first text alleggid gooth not into the proof of the iij°. opinioun.

The passage from the First Epistle to the Corinthians explained.

And in lijk maner it is to be seid that Poul meened in the ij°. place, alleggid bifore to be i. Cor. i. c̄., that in mater of feith Poul vsid not hiȝnes of wisdom and of pure resoun oonli, thouȝ not al maner of arguyng may be excludid fro the fynding, the leernyng, the knowing, and the prouyng of feith, as it is proued weel in the book clepid *The book of feith and of sacramentis*, and as it is tauȝt in *The folewer to the donet* and in the i°. partie of *Cristen religioun;* bicause that no treuthe (except tho which ben at vttrist degre pleyn 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 chapiter of this book ben brouȝt into proving of the iij°. opinioun.

---

[1] *or of*, MS., but *of* is scraped out.

Digitized by Google

xviij. CHAPITER.

Another erroneous opinion, which came more recently to Pecock's knowledge. If a man keep God's law, he shall have the true understanding 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 iij. opiniouns, ther came into my knowing that among the peple bifore spokun is holde this iiij^e. now to be rehercid opinioun. And for as myche as he is ful perilose and worthi it is forto him azenstonde and him forto proue be vntrewe, therfore y thouzte forto plaunte into this book the writing of him here next to the othere thre opiniouns, and forto sette my bisynes forto bringe him into nouzt. The opinioun in him silf 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 longing to him forto it kepe and fulfille, he schal haue the trewe vndirstonding of Holi Scripture, thouz 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, thouz thei putte therto al her natural power and diligence, with the help and counseil of othere suche persoones like to hem. And thanne here by for as miche as to her seming the bischopis and archidenes,[1] doctouris, and othere clerkis lyuen alle out of Goddis lawe, therfore thei wenen that noo bischop or archideken or doctour or eny other such persoon of the clergie cometh into the trewe and dew vndirstonding of Holi Scripture; and therfore thei trowen that ech bischop and ech such other clerk bileeueth amys and techith amys, and thei wolen not trowe to his teching, but thei trowen to the doctrine which thei fynden among hem silf bi studiyng in the Bible oonli. For hem silf oonli thei

[1] Probably we should read *archidekenes*.

Digitized by Google

holden trewe feithful lyuers according with the lawe of God. CHAP. XVIII.

This iiij^e. opinioun, as y weene, thei trowen be groundid in the textis now to be rehercid. The firste is writun Iohun viij^e. c̃. thus: *Iesus seid to hem of the Iewis, whiche bileeueden to him: If ȝe schulen dwelle in my word ȝe schulen be my very disciplis, and ȝe schulen knowe trouthe, and trouthe schal delyuere ȝou.* The ij^e. text is writun Iohun xiiij^e. c̃. thus: *He that loueth me schal be loued of my Fadir, and y schal loue him, and y schal schewe my silf to him.* The iij^e. text is writen Iohun xv^e. c̃. thus: *I schal not now clepe ȝou seruauntis or bond men, for the seruaunt woot not what his lord schal do; but y haue clepid ȝou freendis, for alle thingis what euer y herde of my Fadir y mad knowun to ȝou.*

Certain texts alleged in behalf of this opinion.

This iiij^e. opinioun may ful liȝtli be improued. Forwhi aȝens him is had the grettist certeinte which mai be had in oure knowing, and it is clepid experience: ȝhe, such experience is aȝens him had, that the holders of him kunnen not and mowe not aȝens thilk experience seie nay, and therfore needis fro this iiij^e. opinioun thei musten falle. As for the seid experience had aȝens the seid iiij^e. opinioun, sotheli y haue mad inquisicioun therto sufficient and diligent, and y am certified at fulle that among the holders of this same iiij^e. opinioun summe ben founde and knowun openli among hem silf and of othere neiȝboris to be greet lecchouris, summe to be avoutreris in greet haunt and contynuaunce, summe to be theefis, euen aȝens her owne leernyng and aȝens her owne holding and doctrine. ȝhe, thei that han be and ben riȝt grete in auctorite of teching among hem han be and ben suche, and in other wise miche viciose persoones, so that thei mowe not here aȝens seie nay, for y can make it vndoutabili be proued. And alle men witen that these ben grete synnes and miche

This opinion confuted by manifest experience. Some persons holding Lollard opinions are notorious evil livers.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVIII. azens the keping of Goddis moral lawe; and thei hem silf knoulechen that these dedis ben grete synnes and azens Goddis lawe. And zit thei weenen and holden hem silf for to haue the trewe and dewe vndirstonding of Holi Scripture; zhe, that no men han bettir the trewe vndirstonding ther of than thei han. Wherfore needis folewith that thei hem silf muste holde the seid iiij^e. opinioun to be vntrewe, and that for open knowing of experience which is had among hem silf of these now bifore rehercid vicis, and of many othere vicis. And therfore fro this dai forth ward y hope noon holder of the iiij^e. opinioun schal mowe for schame holde the same iiij^e. opinioun, but rather he schal be schamed that he hath it bifore so vngroundabili holde, and withoute suficient evidence therto bifore had he hath so faste therto cleued and lened. Ferthermore y dare weel seie, if alle the evidencis whiche ben late bifore writun in the next chapiter, azens the ij^e. opinioun be weel considerid thei schulen suffice forto vnprove this iiij^e. opinioun here, as thei vnproven the ij^e. opinioun there. And therfore more than this no nede is forto write now and here azens the seid iiij^e. opinioun.

The tests of Scripture irrelevant to the purpose for which they are quoted. This has been, in fact, already proved.

Tho iij. textis of Holi Scripture, whiche bifore in this present chapiter ben alleggid into the grounding of this iiij^e. opinioun, availen not therto. Forwhi, lijk wise as bifore (in the eende of the ix^e. chapiter in this present i^e. partie) to ij. textis of Holi Scripture brouzt forth into helping of the firste opinioun y haue answerid there, that tho ij. textis speken of leernyng 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 brouzt forth in this present chapiter for grounding of the iiij^e. opinioun, that ech of these iij. textis spekith of leernyng and knowing which is feith, namelich vpon Cristis Persoon and upon his Incarnacioun, and not of leernyng and

Digitized by Google

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 tho textis. And therfore these iij. textis ben not for the purpos for to grounde the iiij°. opinioun. CHAP. XVIII.

As to this, that the holders of the iiij°. opinioun deemen prelatis of the chirche forto be mys lyuers and trespacers azens Goddis lawe, weel y wote that in summe thingis prelatis synnen and amys[1] doon. For, thouz thei ben prelatis in the chirche, thei ben men and not pure aungels, and therfore 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 gilti than thei ben, and also in summe thingis thei ben iugid to be gilti whanne thei not gilti ben, as tho same iugers schulden weel wite, if thei were homeli with the same prelatis, and weren priuey to the same gouernauncis and to alle the causis and motyues and circumstauncis of the same gouernauncis whiche thei blamen.

Reply to the charge that the prelates are evil livers. They are but men, and therefore liable to human infirmity; the charges against them exaggerated.

Wolde God that men, eer thei wolden[2] blame eny mannys gouernaunce, wolden weel leerne and wolden be remembrid weel vpon the same leerning wher of a deede or a gouernaunce takith his moral godenes and his moral badnes, and that a gouernaunce is not moraly[3] good for and bi his owne substaunce, but for and bi his causis, hise motyues, and hise circumstauncis, as it[4] is tauzt in othere placis of my writingis, namelich in *The folewer to the donet:* zhe, and that moral gouernaunces of mennis conuersacioun, 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)

Bishops often condemned unjustly.

[1] *mys*, MS. (first hand).
[2] *wolde*, MS. (first hand).
[3] *moral*, MS. (first hand).
[4] *as is*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVIII.

stonden neuere thoruȝ long tymes vndir oon reulé, 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; thouȝ 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[2] part, that how men han iugid me and my gouernaunce anentis my diocise, hath come to myn eeris; and ȝit y knowe the wittis and the disposiciouns 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 therto priuei, thei wolden be of the firste whiche schulden counseile me to kepe and fulfille the same gouernaunce.

This remark applies to Pecock himself, amongst the rest.

Of mi parti y speke in special more than of the parties of othere[3] prelatis: for the vniustnes of iuging which is ȝouun upon me y knowe better than the vniustnes of iugingis doon vpon othere. 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 knowen in special al that ouȝte be considerid aboute a gouernaunce, eer than thilk gouernaunce ouȝte of hem be iugid morali good or bad.

Readers of ancient books, being unskilled in moral philosophy, apt to

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

[1] *in causis*, MS. (first hand).
[2] *formy*, MS.
[3] *the othere*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

mennys doctrines and in holi mennys exortaciouns, semyngli as that tho gouernauncis schulden alwey be contynued vndir lijk reule. Thanne comen forth men sumwhat lettrid as in grammer oonli or litle ferther, and not instructid in the kunnyng of moral philsophie and of lawe of kinde, neither considering or remembring 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 ouȝte not abide and be contynued vndir oon and the same reule forto be good; and not considering that in lengthe of tyme ful greet transmutacioun and chaunge is alwey maad in and aboute the circumstauncis of politik gouernauncis, ȝhe, and of monastik gouernauncis (that is to seie, of gouernauncis bi whiche oon man gouerneth him silf aloon); and thei reden these writingis so writen in eeldir daies, and anoon thei iugen that vndir lijk reule and maner thilke gouernauncis ouȝte be contynued now and alwey with oute excepcioun and without dyuersite, namelich forthat tho eeldir writingis were writingis of holi men. But, lo, how foule thei ben bigilid; for thei not consideren ferther in the writingis than is expressid in the same writingis, neither thei consideren that no man euere wrote in suche gouernauncis alle the excepciouns and alle the priuey condiciouns whiche ben priueily and impliedli 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 doóm of resoun manie excepciouns and condiciouns, and myche more thing vnwritun of hem concernyng the same maters than is al what he ther of writith expresseli; and that bi cause of the seid transmutacioun which is alwey in the world; and therwith bicause that a gouernaunce is not good but bi hise circumstauncis, whiche ben thus changeable and trans-

CHAP. XVIII.

suppose that all things ought to be in the Church now, as they were in old time. This opinion false; for a change of time and circumstances introduces changes into church government.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVIII.

mutable. For certis ellis it wolde needis folewe that tho writers, how euere holi thei were, wroten and tauȝten aȝens trewe philsophie and aȝens trewe diuinyte and aȝens trewe doom of resoun, which as for thilk euidence is not to be grauntid.

The same changes introduce changes into things of common life.

And therfore wolde God that men wolden bithenke weel, that no man may vndir oon reule and oon maner kepe his gouernaunce toward him silf, toward his meynee, and toward hise othere peple, in wynter and in somer, in a ȝeer of derth and in a ȝeer of greet cheep, in tyme of wete and in tyme of drouȝth; and if in oon ȝeer such transmutacioun and chaunge of wether muste make a man chaunge his moral gouernaunce anentis him silf and anentis his peple, whi not bi lijk skile if thoruȝ hundridis of ȝeeris ben falle manye transmutaciouns 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 doon 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 doon bifore in eeldir daies, and in which thouȝ it be writun that in thilk reule that it was doon in eeldir daies bifore; ȝhe, and if such transmutacioun and greet dyuersyte be in oon diocise, miche more and miche other wise than in an other diocise, whi schal not the gouernaunce in thilk[1] diocise be doon bi doom of resoun myche other wise than the same kinde of gouernaunce ouȝte be doon in an other[2] diocise?

Necessity of caution in making appeals to ancient practice.

If therfore reders in lawis and writingis 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 ȝeue such

[1] *thik*, MS. | [2] *a other*, MS.

Digitized by Google

vnwise and vntrewe doomes upon prelatis of the chirche and vpon religiose persoones for chaunging of gouernauncis bifore 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 considerid mo than oon in iuging of a gouernaunce, and thei wolden[1] thenke that thei knewen not al that ouȝte be considerid aboute thilk gouernaunce or thilk gouernaunce, as causes, motyues, ententis, helpis, lettis, lackis of meenis, chaungis of the better good which may not be differrid, neither mai be doon of othere men for the lasse good, and manye suche othere; and thanne thei wolden thenke and seie, that thei hadden not sufficient ground forto deeme and ȝeue iugement, whether thilk gouernaunce be good or bad.

Prelates not to be condemned hastily by those who know nothing of the difficulty of their situation.

And ferthermore, to seie redili 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 weel that he gouerneth him weel or yuel in so ascending or descending as he him silf which so ascendith or descendith, neither he woot so weel as if he him silf were sett into lijk werke of clymbing or of doun comyng, and ful liȝtli ech such biholder schal deeme amys the clymber, if he make soone eny iugement ther upon without priuey counseiling with the clymber, to wite of him whi he is moved forto sette his foot rather there than here, and so of other[2] dyuersitees: euen so it is in oure now present purpos. And therfore not for nouȝt God seid in the Gospel,[3] Matheu vij^{e}. c̃.: *Nile ȝe deeme and ȝe schulen not be deemed: in what euer doom ȝe schulen deeme ȝe schulen be deemed.* Vpon which sentence it were good that men hem bithouȝte, and of which sentence it

[1] *wolde*, MS. (first hand).
[2] *otherer*, MS.
[3] *Golpel*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVIII.

were good that men were afeerd. Forwhi tho wordis ben the wordis and the thretenyngis of God, namelich if men myȝten not be reulid fro mys deemyng bi wisdom sumwhat now schortli bifore tauȝt of moral philsophie. And ȝit ferther, if suche hasti demers bi her vnwise and vntrewe 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 hauour, if thei take ther of eny thing vntreuli fro him; and ellis thei kunnen not haue of thilk trespas forȝeuenes of God. And sithen restitucioun of fame to be doon to a man aȝens diffame is ful hard, and myche hardir than is restitucioun of worldli good, it folewith that a perilose thing is it forto[1] appeire vntreuly a mannys name, and namelich a prelatis name, thoruȝ suche now seid vnwijs and hasti deemyng.

xix. CHAPITER.

A general proof of the eleven ordinances of the clergy, which are complained of, may be set down under three rules. Special proofs of each of them shall follow.

THOUȝ, fro the bigynnyng of the firste chapiter in this book hidir to, y haue thus laborid forto distroie it which schulde and wolde ellis ful miche lette my purpos and entent forto turne many of the comoun peple fro mys holding aȝens xj. gouernauncis, whiche aftir in this present book schulen be proued for leeful and gode and profitable to Cristen men; ȝit, eer y schal come doun into the special profis of tho xj. gouernauncis, y schal proue hem alle to gidere vnder general profis, and that bi setting[2] forth of iij. suppo-

[1] *for* inserted in MS. by a later (?) hand.

[2] *bisetting*, MS.

Digitized by Google

siciouns or iij. reulis, and with taking out of hem iiij. conclusiouns. And thanne, aftir it is so doon, y schal descende into special profis of tho xj. gouernauncis, of whiche gouernauncis the oon is the hauyng and vsing of ymagis in chirchis; an othir is pilgrimage in going into memorialis or into mynde placis of Seintis.

THE FIRST RULE. Whoever *expressly* bids any ordinance to be performed, bids inclusively every thing to be done which logically springs from it. All this is to be done in the best manner and way possible.

The i^e^. supposicioun or reule is this: Who euere (whether he be God, man, aungel, or Scripture) biddith bi word or bi ensampling of deede expresseli eny gouernaunce to be doun, he theryn[1] and therbi biddith includingli or closingli al it to be doon, which folewith in formal argument of resoun out of thilk gouernaunce bedun. And also theryn and therbi he biddith al it to be doon, withoute which the seid gouernaunce may not be sufficientli doon into the entent of the biddir; and also if into the same gouernaunce to be doon ben manye dyuerse weies and meenis, of which ech bi him silf is a good and a speedful wey and meene into the seid gouernaunce to be doon, he in the bidding of the seid gouernaunce to be doon, allowith ech of thilke weies vndir fre choice of the taker to be take and doon, and also he allowith thilk wey and meene rather and more to be chose, take, and doon, bi which the seid gouernaunce schal be the more or the better doon. And also in the same bidding of the seid gouernaunce he counseilith and willith thilk gouernaunce to be doun in the better maner, rather than to be doon in the lasse good maner.

THE SECOND RULE. Whoever *by implication* counsels any ordinance to be performed, counsels inclusively every thing to be done which logically springs from it. All this is to be done in the best manner and way possible.

The ij^e^. supposicioun or reule is this: Who euer (God, aungel, man, or Scripture) counseilith and willith with oute comaundement bi word or bi ensampling of deede expresseli eny gouernaunce to be doun, he theryn and therbi counseilith and willith includingli or closingli al it to be doon, which folewith in formal argument of reson out of thilk same gouernaunce

[1] *yn*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIX.

counseilid and willid; and also ther yn and therbi he counseilith al it to be doon, withoute which the same said counseilid gouernaunce mai not be doon as it is so counseilid to be doon. And also, if into the same gouernance 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 counseiling 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 gouernance. 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 counseiler or willer. And also in the same counseiling of the seid gouernaunce he counseilith and willith thilk same gouernance to be doon in the better maner, rather than to be doon in the lasse good maner.

THE THIRD RULE. Whoever, by either of the beforesaid manners, or by any other manner, indicates that any ordinance is to be performed, indicates inclusively that every thing is to be done which is included in it, and follows from it, and is necessary for its performance.

The iij^{e}. supposicioun or reule is this: Who euer (God, aungel, man, or Scripture) rehercith, witnessith, or denouncith bi such bidding as is bifore seid in the firste reule, or bi such counseiling as is bifore seid in the ij^{e}. reule, or bi eny other maner eny gouernaunce to be doon, he ther yn and therbi rehercith, witnessith, or denouncith includingli or closingli al it which folewith out of thilk gouernaunce and is includid formali in thilk gouernaunce, and al it with out which thilk gouernaunce mai not be doon; and so forth in alle the othere pointis and degrees rehercid now bifore in the firste and ij^{e}. reulis.

The three rules proved by the illustration of Pecock's servant being ordered to go from Whitington College to St. Paul's Cross to hear a sermon.

These iij. supposiciouns 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 Whitington, bidde or counseile or witnesse to my seruaunt there being with me, that he go to Poulis Cros forto heere there attentifli a sermon to be prechid, it muste nedis be grauntid, that y in

Digitized by Google

so bidding, counseiling, 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, counseiling, or witnessing, y witnesse that, which euere of thilke weies he take, y it allowe; and if cause be founde in eny of tho weies that bi doom of resoun thilk weie ouȝte be left (as if perauenture 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, counseiling, or witnessing, y wole 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 folewith that the iij. bifore sett supposiciouns or reulis ben trewe and ben to be grantid.

CHAP. XIX.

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

Four conclusions follow from the three rules.

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

THE FIRST CONCLUSION Scripture in bid-

[1] *seid* is added by a later hand. | [2] *the*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIX.

ding a man to love God, thereby bids him to love all things that God loves, and hate all that he hates, and to use ways and means for knowing and remembering what these things are. Pictures, relics, images, reading, and hearing Scripture such means. Proof of the conclusion.

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 wole him loue, and hate al what God wole him hate, and that Holi Scripture ther yn wole a man forto do Goddis seruicis whiche God biddith him to do, and forto do and suffre for God in his seruice. 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 hise dignitees, nobilitees, and perfeccioun; whiche ben hise benefetis ȝouen and bihiȝt to man in this lijf and in the lijf to come; whiche ben hise punyschingis ȝouun and to be ȝouun in this lijf and in the lijf to come; whiche ben pointis and articlis of his lawe and his seruice; that man ther yn serue to him; whiche ben mannys natural freelnessis and yuel disposiciouns and redinessis into synne and lothinessis into good; whiche ben mannys synnes doon aȝens the lawe of God; and which ben remedies aȝens the now seid freelnessis and aȝens the now 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 ferthermore, sithen this mynde, remembraunce, and meditacioun mai not be had upon these seid maters withoute summe of these weies or meenes, that is to seie, reding or heering of Holi Scripture and of othere writingis, heering of sermons prechid, biholding upon picturis or purtraturis or graued werk or coruun werk, visiting and going into the placis in whiche holi men han lyued, or in whiche holi men dwellen, or in whiche the relifis or the relikis of hem abiden; as bi whiche meenis alle or

Digitized by Google

summe of the seid vij. maters mowen be representid, signified, and be brouȝt into mynde, meditacioun, and remembraunce, and ech of these weies and meenis is profitable and speedful into the seid remembraunce 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 loue and drede God with al his herte, soul, and wil, Holi Scripture allowith weel that a man take in to vse ech of these now bifore rehercid meenis (now oon of hem, now an other of hem) at his liberte, as him likith forto so take. This firste conclusioun folewith openli out of the iij. seid supposiciouns and reulis, and out of the ensaumpling bifore upon hem. Wherfore, if thei be trewe, this firste conclusioun muste nedis be trewe. CHAP. XIX.

The ij°. conclusioun is this: Thilk xj. gouernauncis whiche y schal susteyne, meyntene, iustifie, and defende aftir in this present book, ben bede or counseilid or witnessid bi Holi Scripture to be doon. This conclusioun y proue thus. Ech gouernaunce which is expresseli bede, counseilid, or witnessid bi Holi Scripture to be doon, or is includingli or closingli in eny of the now biforeseid maners bede, counseilid, or witnessid bi Holi Scripture to be doon, is bede or counseilid or witnessid [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 counseilid or witnessid bi Holi Scripture to be doon, or is includingli or closingli bede, counseilid, or witnessid in summe of the maners now bifore seid in a gouernaunce bede, counseilid, or witnessid 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 counseilid or witnessid of Holi Scripture to be doon.

THE SECOND CONCLUSION. The eleven above-named ordinances are bid or counselled or witnessed by Scripture. Proof of the conclusion.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIX.

THE THIRD CONCLUSION. Each of the above-named ordinances are in a large sense grounded in Scripture. Proof of the conclusion.

The iij^e^. conclusioun is this: In thilk maner of vnpropre and large speche, in which it may thouȝ vnpropirli be seid that what is bede or counseilid or witnessid bi Holi Scripture in eny of the now bifore seid maners of bidding, counseiling, or witnessing is therfore and therbi groundid in Holi Scripture, it is trewe that ech of the xj. gouernauncis, which y schal aftir in the ij^e^., iij^e^., iv^e^., and v^e^.[1] parties of this book menteyne and defende is groundid in Holi Scripture largeli and vnpropirli forto speke of grounding, as it is ther of seid bifore in the [fifth][2] chapiter of this present firste parti of this book. This iij^e^. conclusioun folewith pleinli at the ful out of the ij^e^. now bifore going conclusioun. Wherfore, if the ij^e^. conclusioun is trewe, this iij^e^. conclusioun is needis trewe.

THE FOURTH CONCLUSION. If the witnessing of Scripture to a moral truth in any of the above-named ways were a proper grounding of it, then each of the eleven ordinances aforesaid were properly grounded in Scripture. Proof of the conclusion.

The iiij^e^. conclusioun is this: If the bidding or counseiling or witnessing of Holi Scripture in eny of the bifore seid maners upon a mater or a conclusioun or a trouthe of moral lawe of kinde were a gronding in Scripture, forto speke propirli and verili and dewli of a ground and of grounding to a thing, in the maner which is bifore spokun in the ij^e^. and iij^e^. chapitris of this present first parti, certis thanne ech of the xj. gouernancis (whiche aftir in the ij^e^., iij^e^., iv^e^., and v^e^. parties of this present book y schal defende and menteyne) were groundid in Holi Scripture bi grounding in propre maner vndirstondun and takun. This iiij^e^. conclusioun folewith openli out of the ij^e^. and iij^e^. conclusiouns. Wherfore, if thei be trewe, he is trewe.

---

[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.

[2] A space left in the MS. for the number.

Digitized by Google

xx. Chapiter.

Confirmacioun to the i^e^. and ij^e^. of these iiij. now putt conclusiouns is this. Who euer for deuocioun and loue 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 hool Bible, (as summe othere holdun,) and ellis it is not to be take for a point and deede or gouernaunce of Goddis lawe and of Goddis seruice, ȝit 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 closingli in eny of the bifore spokun maners bi the thre reulis, it is ynowȝ 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. gouernauncis whiche y schal aftir in the ij^e^., iij^e^., iv^e^., and v^e^. parties of this book defende and iustifie, (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 closingli groundid or witnessid in Holi Scripture bi eny of the maners bifore seid in the iij. reulis, (as aftir in the ij^e^. parti of this book it schal be schewid,) he muste needis lijk weel graunte that ech of tho xj. gouernauncis is groundid or witnessid in Holi Scripture.

Confirmation of the above-named first and second conclusions. It must be granted that anything is grounded in Scripture which is inclusively comprehended by it, though not expressly; and so it will appear that each of the eleven ordinances is grounded in 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-

Express mention is not made in Scripture of many things, which are law-

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

fully used in the service of God. Various garments, clocks, and veils not expressly mentioned in Scripture.

uice and a deede of Goddis lawe, lo thou maist se herbi. In al Holi Scripture it is not expressid bi bidding, counseiling, or witnessing, or bi eni[1] ensaumpling of persoon, that a lay man not preest 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[2] bake eny fleisch or fisch in an ovyn, or that men schulde make and vse clockis forto knowe the houris of the dai and nyȝt; for thouȝ in eeldist daies, and thouȝ in Scripture mensioun is maad of orologis, schewing the houris of the dai bi schadew maad bi the sunne in a cercle, certis neuere saue in late daies was eny clok telling the houris of the dai and nyȝt bi peise and bi stroke, and open it is that nouȝwhere in Holi Scripture is expresse mensioun mad of eny suche. Also nouȝwhere in Holi Scripture is mensioun mad or eny ensaumpling doon, that a womman schulde were upon her heer and heed eny couerchief of lynnen threde or of[3] silk. Forwhi the coueryng with which a wommannys heed ouȝte be couered, wherof Holi Scripture spekith in the pistlis of Poul,[4] was only the heer of wommennys heed vnschorn, and of noon other coueryng to wommennys heedis spekith Holi Scripture. And here aȝens Holi 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 schulden 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 ἐξουσία of v. 10 being certainly *a veil*. Veils are also several times mentioned in the Old Testament. See Kitto, *Cycl. Bibl. Lit.*, s. v. *Veil*.

Digitized by Google

ture, as wijs as thou makist thee in the Bible forto reproue pilgrimage and setting up of ymagis and worschiping doon bifore ymagis, thou couthist not aspie this laste seid point of wommannis coueryng: therfore how thou canst fynde it bi Holi Scripture, lete se; and if thou canst not it fynde, it may be founde and proued so bi Holi Scripture that thou schalt not kunne seie nay; and ȝit it is holde for a dede alloweable and vertuose that wommen were couerchefis, and that men and wommen were gownys and clokis, not withstonding that more synne cometh bi wering of wommennys couercheefis and bi wommennys gownis than by vce of ymagis and bi pilgrimagis, 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 pilgrimagis in the ij^e. partie of this present book, and bi what is al redi therof clereli seid and proued in *The book of worschiping.*

The same argument continued. English or Latin versions of the Bible not mentioned in Scripture.

Also thou schalt not fynde expresseli in Holi Scripture 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 ȝit ech of these gouernauncis thou wolte holde to be leeful, and to be a meritorie vertuose moral deede forto therbi deserue grace and glorie, and to be the seruice of God, and therfore to be the lawe of God; sithen bi no deede a man hath merit, saue bi a deede which is the seruice and the lawe of God; and ech moral vertu is the lawe of God, as it is proued weel in othere place[1] of my writingis.

Other instances of the same kind. Various lawful

Also thus: Where it is[2] groundid expresseli in Scripture, that men mowe lete schaue her berdis. And how

[1] Probably we should read *placis.*

[2] Perhaps we should read, *Where is it,* &c.; if not, we must understand from above, [*Thou shalt not find*] *where,* &c.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

usages and games not found in Scripture.

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 Holi Scripture that men leten her berdis growe withoute schering or schauyng, and also sithen it was the oolde vsage thoruȝ 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 Holi Scripture, Mat. v^e. c̃., where it is seid thus: *Blessid ben thei that moornen or weilen, for thei schulen be coumfortid;* and also, Gen. [xviij^e.][2] c̃., Sara the wijf of Abraham was punyschid, for that sche lauȝed bihinde the dore of the tabernacle. Where is it also grondid in Holi Scripture that men myȝten alloweabili or schulden pleie in word bi bourding, 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.

Singing, as an amusement, not sanctioned by the Bible.

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

No authority from Scripture for making ale or

Where is it expressid bi word or bi eny persoonys ensaumpling in Holi Scripture that men schulden make

[1] *Holi* is inserted in the MS. before *Scripture*, but cancelled by a later (?) hand.

[2] A space left in the MS. for the number.

Digitized by Google

ale or beer, of whiche 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 liȝter and esier 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 myȝte lyue ful long, and lenger than thei doon now, and in lasse iolite and cherte of herte forto bringe hem into horrible grete synnes. And ȝit 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 seruice; and ech deede which is his seruice is a deede of his lawe.

beer, from which more sin springs than from images.

That in Holi Scripture is noon of these now rehercid gouernauncis groundid or witnessid or ensaumplid bi eny persoon expresseli, lo, y proue 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 lay 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. Wherfore the vse of these thingis, as to be doon bi tho thingis, is not there expressid. Also thus: No gouernaunce or treuthe is expresseli groundid or witnessid in Holi Scripture, which mai not be knowen[3] bi the Scripture aloone, without more sett therto of propo-

Proof that none of those things are expressly grounded in Scripture. They are not even specially named there, and the lawfulness of them cannot be concluded thereby without the additional aid of reason.

[1] *is* is interlineated in a later hand, which has also made some erasures.

[2] After this follows, *neither Latyn tunge 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] *knowe*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

cisiouns in the resoun of him which redith and vndirstondith there the Scripture. Forwhi in this case thilk gouernaunce schulde be grondid or witnessid sumwhat and in parcel bi tho proposiciouns 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 gouernance bi the Scripture and bi resoun to gidere. Wherfore noon of alle these seid gouernauncis is groundid or witnessid expresseli in Holi Scripture.

Confirmation of the proof by other arguments of a similar kind.

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, witnessid, or denouncid, or tauȝt. Also thus: Oonli it is expressid or expresseli toold and tauȝt in Holi Scripture, which is knowun for trewe or to be doon, thouȝ no thing ellis in[1] doom of resoun be sett ther to; but so is not of eny of the bifore rehercid gouernauncis: wherfore noon of hem is expressid or expresseli toold, or tauȝt, witnessid, rehercid, or groundid in Holi Scripture.

The Lollards would be puzzled to shew on their own principles that ale and beer and many other things might be used lawfully. The same arguments that prove them lawful

Now, Sir, to thee thus: In caas 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 couerchefis of lynnen or of silk, of whiche so miche synne cometh; or if y wolde holde that it were not Goddis seruice forto at sum while lauȝe or make

[1] *in* is interlineated by a later (?) hand, and *doom* written on an erasure.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

prove images and pilgrimages to be lawful.

feeste or pleie; and namelich if y wolde seie to thee thus: "Where ben these bifore rehercid gouernauncis "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 wommannys 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 bifore 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. gouernauncis aftir to be iustified in the ij^{e}., iij^{e}., iiij^{e}., and v$_{e}$. 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 schalt openli after in the ij^{e}. parti of this book se. Wolde God thilk men and wommen, (and namelich thilk wommen whiche maken hem silf so wise bi the Bible, that thei no deede wollen allowe to be vertuose and to be doon in mannis vertuose conuersacioun, saue what thei kunnen fynde expresseli in the Bible, and ben ful coppid of speche anentis clerkis, and avaunten and profren hem silf whanne thei ben in her iolite and in her owne housis forto argue and dispute aȝens clerkis,) schulden not were couercheefis into tyme thei couthen[1] schewe bi her Bible where it is expresseli bede, conseilid, or witnessid in her Bible to be doon; neither schulde sette hem silf for to sitte at priuey; neither schulden rise therfro, whanne thei were so set or sitting, into tyme thei hadden groundid expresseli in Holi Scripture that thei ouȝten alle tho deedis do, but if thei wolen leue her vnwijs and proud folie. And ȝit ech of tho deedis, whanne he is doon aftir doom of resoun and for God,

[1] *couthe*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

is seruice 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 deedis, whanne thei ben[1] doon bi resoun and for God, is a seruice and a lawe to God, namelich sithen ech deede, which eny Cristen man schulde wirche and do bi avisement and in which he schulde bi avisement be occupied, ouȝte be a lawe to God. Forwhi eche such dede ouȝte be a seruice to God, sithen Poul seith i^e^. Cor. x^e^. c̃. thus: *Whether ȝe ete or drinke or eny other thing doon, alle do ȝe into the glorie of God.*

Lollard women could not prove it lawful for themselves to wash, bathe, or wear veils on their own principles. The 'decent apparel' mentioned by St. Paul will not stand them in stead.

Also y wolde that no suche wommen schulden anointe, waische, or bathe hem silf into tyme thei couthen alle tho deedis grounde expressely in the Bible to be doon. Certis wommen mowe not so grounde the wering of her silken or lynnen couerchefis bi it what is writen i^e^. Thimothe, ij^e^. c̃., 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 peerlis, or preciose clooth; but that that bicometh wommen biheting pite, bi gode werkis.* Forwhi in tho daies of Poul summe wommen weriden couenable habit, and ȝit noone wommen weriden thanne eny lynnen or silken keuercheefis, but weriden her open heer, as sumwhat therto sownith this same now rehercid processe of Poul, and bettir it mai be proued bi processe of Poul [2] 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 sometimes 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. *Velum.*

Digitized by Google

mai not be so groundid that thei schulden[1] haue lynnen or silken keuerchefis.

St. Paul refers us to the judgment of the reason in matters of this kind: consequently the reason and not Scripture is the ground of them. Illustration from a royal injunction to paint crucifixes with 'decent colours.'

Also thus: Whanne Poul seith that wommen schulden 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 couercheefis is couenable; or that it is not couenable. Wherfore forto haue al this pointid he remittith and sendith us sumwhere ellis, and wole 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 purpos, saue in to doom of resoun and into lawe of kinde and moral philsophie. Forwhi nowhere in Holi Scripture this mater is pointid and tauȝt expresseli. Wherfore it was the entent of Poul in the seid proces, i^{e}. Thim. ij^{e}. c̃., that forto fynde, know, and iuge expresseli which habit is couenable, and whether forto were lynnen or silken couercheefis 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 couercheefis, if it be in eny wise groundable and leeful. Forwhi whanne Holi Scripture remittith from him or leueth 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 however being made by a later, though early, corrector. Some considerable erasures occur also in the preceding paragraph.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

which Holi Scripture so remyttith, it so groundith. Wherfore needis if it be leeful wommen forto were lynnen and silken couercheefis, doom of resoun muste expresseli grounde thilk wering; and Holi Scripture not so it groundith. Ensaumple 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 othere 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 comaunde to goldsmythis, that whanne euer thei schulden enamele eny cuppe or other iewel, thei schulden enamele it couenabili; certis herbi the king schulde not grounde to hem, that there in such a place of the iewel thei schulden leie rather blew enameling than reed or whijt, and that in this place thei schulden[1] 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.

The history of Susannah will not serve their turn. That history not canonical, but apocryphal.

Ferthermore forto iustifie her bathing, waisching, and anointing wommen mowe not allegge the storie of Sussanne, Daniel xiij^{e}. c̃.; for thilk processe and storie is not Holi Writt, but Apocrif; and the verri book of Daniel (as miche as is Holi Writt) is eendid with the xij^{e}. chapiter of the same book, as Ierom[2]

[1] *schulde*, MS. (first hand).

[2] "Hæc idcirco, ut difficultatem vobis Danielis ostenderem: qui apud Hebræos nec Susannæ habet historiam, nec hymnum trium puerorum, nec Belis draconisque fabulas: quas nos, quia in toto orbe dispersæ sunt, veru anteposito, easque jugulante, subjecimus, ne videremur apud imperitos magnam partem voluminis detruncasse." S. Hieron. *Præfat. in Dan. Proph.* (Op. t. ix. pp. 1361, 1362. Ed. Vall. 1738.)

Digitized by Google

the translatour witnessith; and ȝit in thilk story is no mension maad of alle the wommennys deedis now rehercid, saue oonli of bathing and of waisching with oyl and swope, and ȝit not of these bi wey of comending or bi wey of ensaumpling that othere persoones schulde do the same.

Another manner of grounding truths by Scripture mentioned in *The just apprising of Holy Scripture.*

Thouȝ the thre reulis or supposiciouns, whiche y haue sett bifore in the xix^e^. chapiter, ben sufficient into the purpos of the iiij. conclusiouns there drawen out of hem, and into the purpos of a general proof there mad upon[1] the xj. bifore spokun gouernauncis, (and therfore y there settid no mo reulis than was nedeful to myn there purposid entent,) ȝit lest that summe reders wolden conceyue and trowe ther bi that in tho iij. reulis or supposiciouns y weene and vnderstonde to be alle maners bi whiche eny trouthe, gouernaunce, or conclusiouns is bede, counseilid, or witnessid includingli or impliedli in Holi Scripture; therfore into oon other maner bi which a gouernaunce or treuthe is bede, counseilid, or witnessid bi Holi Scripture, y remytte and send ech man desiring forto it leerne or knowe into the firste parti of the book clepid *Iust apprising of Holi Scripture.* For there in the [2] chapiter in prouyng of the [2] trouthe schal be schewid this other maner of gronding, bidding, counseiling, or witnessing bi Holi Scripture, which is left here vnseid and vntauȝt.

THE FIFTH CONCLUSION. Various English works of Pecock are an excellent remedy for the errors of the Lollards.

Aftir that (fro the bigynnyng of this present chapiter hidir to) y haue thus confermed the firste and[3] ij^e^. conclusiouns, put and proued in the next bifore going chapiter, y putte now here the v^e^. conclusioun as for an eende of this present first parti, which v^e^. conclusioun is this. For to conuicte and ouercome tho erring

[1] *upon* is inserted by a later (?) hand.

[2] Spaces left in the MS. for the numbers.

[3] *and the*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

persoones of the lay peple whiche ben clepid Lollardis, and forto make hem leue her errouris is a ful notable, ȝhe, 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 tho bokis into her vce of reding and studiyng.

Proof of the conclusion. The Lollards must be convinced that they must learn more than what they can learn in the Bible only; and to accomplish this, nothing but such kind of books, as those named above, will serve.

That this conclusioun is trewe y proue thus: Forto conuicte and ouercome tho seid erring persoones of the lay peple, and for to make hem leue her errouris, an excellent remedie is the dryuyng of hem into sure knowing or into weenyng or opinioun, that thei neden miche more to leerne and knowe into the profit and sure leernyng and knowing of Goddis lawe and seruice, than what thei mowe leerne and knowe bi her reeding and studiyng in the Bible oonli; but so it is, that forto dryue hem into the now seid knowing, trowing, or opinioun seruen at ful in an excellent maner the writing of this present firste parti in her modris langage, with lijk 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 first parti and of *The iust apprising*, or with out sum other writing lijk to hem, tho persoones wolen in no wise be so conuictid and ouercome, as assay therto mad bifore this present day thoruȝ this sixti wyntris by his ther yn vneffectual speding makith open experimental witnessing. Wherfore for to conuicte the seid persoones and forto make hem leue her errouris is an excellent remedie, (ȝhe, and as it were an vnlackeable remedie,) the seid writing of the now spoken bokis and the bitaking of tho seid bokis into the reeding and studiyng of the same persoones.

The first premiss of the argument proved.

The firste premisse of this proof and argument is trewe. Forwhi, if tho persoones were dryue into sure

Digitized by Google

knowing or into trowing, that thei neden leerne and knowe miche more into the profit and ful leerning 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 silf verry foolis; and thei schulden se and knowe weel hem silf to be fonnys and foolis, as anentis ful manye of the thingis whiche ben necessarili to be leerned and kunne of hem bisidis the Bible, ȝhe, and in the Bible; and thei schulden se that thei han miche nede to clerkis, and thei schulden[1] be aschamed of her bifore 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 experience may be had, how ofte euer eny of tho persoones talken in long leiser eernestli upon eny point of Goddis lawe and seruice with a sad and weel leerned clerk in moral philsophie 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 silf abrode in large cleernes: *Verrili the thing which we knowen we now speken, and the thing which we han seen we witnessen:*[2] where now aȝenward, (bi cause it seemeth to hem that thei neden nothing into the scole of Goddis lawe and seruice saue Holi Scripture aloone, and that therto Holi Scripture sufficith, and thei weenen hem silf forto kunne at ful and substanciali and piththeli 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.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

The second premiss proved.

And that the ij^e. premysse of the same proof and argument is trewe in his firste parti, it schal be openli knowen to ech diligent of tho bokis the ouerreder and attentijf studier. Forwhi this firste parti of this present book and *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture* as in generalte schewen vndoutabli and vnazenseiabily, that myche moral philsophie and miche lawe of kinde is algatis necessarie to be leerned, as weel as the Bible; and that withoute the leerning of the seid moral philsophie and lawe of kinde the Bible may not be arizt vndirstonde; and that the seid philsophie and lawe of kinde is the more parti of Goddis lawe and seruice; and the othere bokis, whiche ben named in these now seid ij. bokis, schewen the same in specialte: and therfore the reders and studiers in these bookis muste nedis be dryue herto, that thei han nede to the help and counseil and direccioun of clerkis, and han nede to miche other thing than to the Bible aloon. And therfore the ij^e. premisse of the principal argument is trewe as for his first parti, whos also secunde parti is confermed bifore bi experience and assay spoken bifore, where the same secunde parti is sett forth in the principal argument.

The conclusion proved.

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

Here eendith the firste party of the book clepid THE REPRESSER OF OVER MOCHE WIJTYNG THE CLERGIE.

Digitized by Google

Here bigynneth the ij^e. pārti of this book clepid
THE REPRESSER.

THE FIRST CHAPITER.

EER than y schal come doun so speciali into the ij^e. iij^e. iiij^e. and v. parties of this present book forto reherce, proue, and iustifie the xi. gouernauncis, for whiche manye of the lay peple blamen ouermiche the clergie, y schal sende and putte bifore certeyn supposiciouns or reulis opene ynouȝ to be grauntid of ech man, and whiche schulen helpe and availe into the prouyng and iustifiyng of ech of tho 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^e. chapiter of this same ij^e. partie, vnto tyme his witt be growen hiȝer.

Before special proof made of the eleven ordinances, certain rules or suppositions shall be put down here.

Of whiche supposiciouns or reulis the firste is this: Ech treuthe which is knowen in mannys vndirstonding is knowen bi doom of resoun rennyng vpon the mater of thilk trouthe, and upon hise causis and circumstauncis and purtenauncis; or ellis[1] it is knowun by the assercioun or the[2] 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 aȝens seie nay. Forwhi no man can fynde or assigne eny maner in which a man mai leerne and kunne eny thing, save oon of these ij. maners now seid.

THE FIRST RULE. Every truth known by man's understanding is known by reason or credible testimony.

[1] *ellis* in a later hand. [2] *the* in a later hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. I.

THE SECOND RULE. All the knowledge acquired by the first of these ways is called *Philosophy*: all acquired by the other is called *Theology*.

The ij^{e}. reule or supposicioun is this: Al the kunnyng or knowing gete and had in the firste of these ij. maners now seid is clepid *Philsophie*, 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 ij^{e}. now seid maner is credence[1] or feith, and is dewli to be clepid *Pure Divynite* or *Pure Theologie*, forto speke propirli of divynite and theologie as it is dyuerse fro philsophie. This reule is open bi what y haue write in the book clepid *The*[2] *iust apprising of Doctouris*, and mai be proued thus. Sum kunnyng gete bi mannys resoning, without certifiyng ther of fro aboue kinde, is to be clepid *Philsophie;* and skile is noon whi eny oon such kunning or knowing schulde be seid *Philsophie*, more than ech other such kunnyng or knowing schulde be clepid *Philsophie*. Wherfore ech kunnyng or knowing, getun and had bi labour of mannis kindeli resoun without the seid affermyng and certifiyng mad ther upon fro God aboue, is to be clepid *Philsophie*. And if this be trewe, thanne, (sithen ech kunnyng or knowing of mannis vndirstonding is gete and had in this now seid maner, or ellis in certifiyng and assercioun maad fro God as the firste reule seid,) it muste nedis folewe that if eny kunnyng or knowing is to be clepid propirli divynyte (as he is dyuers fro philsophie), he must be oonli the kunnyng or knowing gete and had in the ij^{e}. now seid maner, that is to seie, bi assercioun and certificacioun and reuelacioun mad fro God to man. And so it is open that the ij^{e}. reule is trewe.

THE THIRD RULE. If a truth is known by reason it is known either

The iij^{e}. reule or supposicioun is this: If a treuthe be knowen bi doom of resoun, thanne it is knowen or sureli and sikirli; or it is knowen oonli probabili

[1] *crdence*, MS.

[2] *The* in a later hand.

Digitized by Google

and likeli. This reule is open at the fulle. Forwhi mo maners or eny other maner, dyuers from oon of these now seid ij. maners, no man can assigne and ȝeue, in which a treuthe may be knowun.

CHAP. I.

as certain or as probable.

The iiij^e. reule 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 opinioun vpon the mater of science, craft, or prudence; for vndirstonding of which now spokun names recours is to be had into *The folewer to the donet*, the [1] chapiter, and therbi this present reule schal be open ynouȝ.

THE FOURTH RULE. If a truth is known certainly, knowledge upon it is called *Science*; if only probably, *Opinion*.

The v^e. reule or supposicioun is this: If a treuthe which we mowe not knowe in the now bifore seid maner bi doom of resoun, withoute assercioun of an other trewe persoon, be knowen in mannys vndirstonding bi the seid assercioun or witnessing of a trewe persoon, which assercioun is the ground of feith; thanne it is knowe bi assercioun or witnessing of God doon bi his Holi Scripture, or bi eeldist and lengist vce of bileeuyng in the Chirche, or bi godli myracle doon into witnessing of it, or bi speche of God doon bi him silf, or bi his suer messanger withoute writing; and in ech of these caasis the knowing is holi feith or goostli feith. Or ellis it is knowe bi assercioun or witnessing of man or aungel not as messanger of God; and that, or bi his writing in storiyng or cronycleing, or bi spech of him silf, or of his messanger without writing: and in ech of these caasis is credence or worldli ithfe and not goostli feith, sich as is in the next maner now bifore seid. Al this is so open to be grauntid, that who euer

THE FIFTH RULE. If a truth is known by the assertion of another, the knowledge of it is called *Faith*. Two kinds of Faith, human and divine.

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

Digitized by Google

CHAP. I.

denyeth eny point of it, he is vnable to be admittid and to be receyued into eny enquiraunce or communaunce forto fynde, leerne, and knowe treuthis, so that the significacioun of these wordis be maad open to him, that he vnderstonde what the wordis meenen.

THE SIXTH RULE. Everything known to be untrue is known to be so by the judgment of the reason, or by the assertion of a credible witness.

The vj^e^. supposicioun or reul is this: What euer thing is knowe in mannys vndirstonding to be vntrewe is knowe to be vntrewe bi the same ij. kindis of groundis bifore rehercid, bi which treuthe 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 bifore ij^e^. reule hem dividith and departith. This reule is openli trewe. Forwhi what other ground than eny of these now rehercid couthe be assigned, forto bi it knowe a thing to be vntrewe, no man can seie. Also, whan euer a thing is knowun to be vntrewe, than al it which is ther in[2] 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^e^. reule schewen. Wherfore nedis this, that this is vntrewe, is knowe bi the same kindis of groundis oonli. And therfore this vj^e^. reule is nedis to be grauntid as for trewe.

THE SEVENTH RULE. Every known truth is either speculative or practical. Examples of each kind.

This vij^e^. reule is this: Ech treuthe knowun in mannis vnderstonding is a treuthe considerable or speculable or biholdable oonli, that is to seie, such as where vpon neither mannis doing in moral conuersacioun, neither mannis making in craft fallith; as is this, that aungelis ben vnbodili substauncis; and this, that the planetis moven fro eest into west, and suche othere; or it is a treuthe doable or makeable, that

[1] *into the membris*, MS.; but *the* is cancelled by a later hand.

[2] A later hand has joined this word to the foregoing, needlessly and against the more *usual* division in this MS.

Digitized by Google

is to seie, upon which mannys doing in moral conuersacioun leding 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 by[1] cumpas, and thilk werk is to be mad bi squyer, and suche othere.

THE EIGHTH RULE. Every human action relating to morals is either approved, disapproved, or left undecided by faith and reason.

The viij^e^. reule is this: Ech thing, which is doon of man in his moral conuersacioun, 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 wijf into fleischli comunyng; and this,[2] that we waite not aftir to be hoosilid 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 hise eeris, or that he wole haue hise 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 suche.

THE NINTH RULE. All actions so approved, disapproved, or left undecided are lawful, unlawful, or indifferent respectively.

The ix^e^. reule or supposicioun is this: Ech doable thing longing to moral conuersacioun, which thing doom of resoun or ground of feith approueth, is leeful; and it is leeful in propre maner forto 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 conuersacioun, 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.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. I.

leefulnes, for that it is bi resoun or bi ground of feith reproued. And ech such doable thing, which neither doom of resoun neither ground of feith approueth neither reproueth, is in it silf neither leeful neither vnleeful, in eny of the ij. now seid maners of propre taking leefulnes and vnleefulnes. And it is so neither leeful neither vnleeful, for that it is neither approued neither reproued bi resoun or bi ground of feith.

THE TENTH RULE. Indifferent things may in a large sense be called lawful.

The x°. reule or supposicioun is this: Al doable thing which in propre maner now bifore sett is neither leeful neither vnleeful, and namelich if it be not vnleeful, mai and is woned conuenientli ynouȝ 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, thouȝ not so propirli as it is leeful which doom of resoun or ground of feith approueth.

He that cannot comprehend or will not allow these ten rules is not to be argued with.

I wote not that it is worth forto talke in[1] resonyng with eny persoon of the laife vpon eny mater of Goddis lawe, but if he be able forto vndirstonde thes now bifore sett x. reulis, and but if he graunte hem and holde hem for trewe.

ij. CHAPITER.

The first ordinance for which the clergy are found fault with is the having and using of images.

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

THE FIRST CONCLUSION IN FAVOUR OF RETAINING IMAGES. The

Vpon which gouernaunce y sette forth this firste conclusioun. The hauing and the setting vp of ymagis in chirchis and the vsing of hem as rememoratijf

[1] *in* is interlineated by a later (?) hand, which has also altered the preceding word by an erasure.

Digitized by Google

or mynding signes is not reproued by eny ground of feith, that is to seie not bi Holi Scripture, neither by long vse of the Chirchis bileeuyng, neither bi eny myraculose therto of God wirching. That this conclusioun, namelich as for Holi Scripture, is trewe, y proue thus: If eny text or processe of Holi Scripture schulde reproue the seid firste gouernaunce, that is to seie, the seid hauyng and vsing of ymagis, thilk text or processe schulde be oon of these, of which the firste is writun Exodi xx^e^. c̃. thus: *Thou schalt not make to thee eny graued thing;* and the same text word bi word in processe bifore and aftir is writun Deutron. v^e^. c̃. in the bigynnyng; but so it is, that neither this text neither eny of the othere aftir to be rehercid textis of Holi Scripture reproueth or lettith ymagis to be had and to be vsid in the maner now spokun in this present firste conclusioun. Wherfore this present i^e^. conclusioun is trewe.

Use of images as reminding signs is not condemned by Scripture, nor by the belief of the Church, nor by miracle done by God. The Second Commandment does not condemn them.

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

Six arguments to prove that this Commandment does not condemn the use of images *in toto*. The first argument. God himself commanded images of cherubim to be made for the Tabernacle; but God is not contrary to himself.

[1] *v.* MS.; but the chapter contains *six* '*principal* arguments.'

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II.

The second argument. The brazen serpent and other images were made for the Israelites by command or approval of God; if they were lawful for them, images are lawful for Christians.

The ij^e^. argument is this: Numeri xxj^e^. c̃. it is writun, that God bade the peple of Israel forto make a brasen ymage of a serpent as for a signe, and forto sette him up an hiȝe in the eend of a long pole for to be biholde of alle the peple: Wherfore 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 silf; 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 metallis, and noone ymagis graued of tre or of stoon: which seiyng is not but a feyned trifle. 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 lettith not what the lay partie is aboute forto lette in the clergie, that noon ymagis of God or of Seintis be in chirchis: and therfore this seiyng is to be cast aside as a iaperi.

Solomon made various images for his Temple, for all which deeds he was commended of God.

Also iij^e^. Regum vj^e^. c̃. it is writun, that Salomon made in the temple ij. ymagis of cherubyn of tree. Therfore open it is that thei were graued, and hem he couered and clothid al-aboute[1] 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 thouȝ thei were going and passing out of the wal. Also in the dooris of the temple he graued in a greet out-boocing[2] 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] *alaboute*, MS. [2] *out boocing*, MS.

Digitized by Google

of oxen, and in the sidis of the same ymage he made stories[1] in ymagerie in a greet lengthe and heiȝte, as it is open iij^e. Reg. vij^e. c̃. Also in the veil which heng bifore the dore of the temple Salomon made weue ymagis of cherubin, as it is writun ij^e. Paralipo. iij^e. c̃. And for alle these dedis he was weel allowid of God, as it is open ynouȝ iij^e. Reg. ix^e. c̃. and ij^e. Paralipo. vij^e. c̃. And this myȝte not stonde, if God hadde forbode alle graued ymagis to be had and vsid. Wherfore the dew vndirstonding of thilk text Exodi xx^e. c̃. and Deut. v^e. c̃., *Thou schalt not make to thee eny graued thing*, that is to seie, eny graued ymage, is not to be vndirstonde so that he weerned eny 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 folewith that thilk same text weerneth not graued ymagis to be vsid.

The lawfulness of Christian images proved by these examples. The schismatical disposition of the Lollards rebuked.

And ferthermore, if to the peple of Israel it was leeful forto make and rere up an hiȝe a brasen ymage of a serpent, forto biholde it; wondir it were but that it were leeful to Cristen men forto make and rere up an yȝe an ymage of Crist crucified, forto biholde into it; and if it was leeful to the seid oold peple forto haue xij. ymagis of oxen bering vp the brasen see, forto biholde hem, wonder it were whi it schulde be vnleeful to Cristen peple forto haue xij. ymagis of the xij. Apostiles, and forto biholde hem in remembring that the Apostilis were bede go and baptise a the world in water. And therfore the aȝenseiers her of ben to be reiatid and rebukid as nyce, fonned, wilful, wantoun, scisme sowers and disturblers of the peple, in mater which thei mowe neuer her entent bringe aboute.

The third argument. Christ approved of using money, on which the image

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

[1] *strories*, MS. See 1 Kings vii. 24, where Wiclif's version has *stories*.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II.

of Cæsar was stamped. If we may have an image of an earthly king, we may have an image of the King of Heaven.

"paie tribute to Cesar the Emperour of Rome," Crist answerid and seide, *Schewe ȝe to me the koyne of the money*, and thei offriden to him a denarie. Thanne Crist askide: *Whos is this ymage and the aboute-writing?*[1] And thei seiden: *It is the ymage and the aboute-writing of Cesar, the Emperour.* Thanne seid Crist: *Ȝelde ȝe therfore to the Emperour that that is his, and ȝelde ȝe to God what is Goddis.* Lo how Crist approued weel hem forto ȝelde to the Emperour the denarie, in which the ymage of the Emperour was graued; and alle men witen weel that thei myȝten not ȝelde to the Emperour such money so koyned, but if thei schulden haue and vse the ymage of the Emperour graued in thilk money. Wherfore nedis folewith that Crist approued weel hem forto haue and vce a graued ymage of the Emperour, as of her souereyn lord in erthe. An whi not thanne Crist schulde allowe and approue men forto haue and vse a grauen ymage of the Emperour in heuene, as of her Souereyn Lord in heuene? And at the leest herbi folewith needis, that bi the seid text Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deutron. v^e^. c̃., *Thou schalt not make to thee eny graued ymage*, is not forbode alle graued ymagis to be had and vsid; for thanne God hadde be contrarie to him silf.

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 iiij^e^. principal argument is this: If in sum other place of Holi Scripture than in the bifore alleggid text Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. 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 bifore rehercid text Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. this word "graued thing" schulde needis bitokene a graued ymage dyuers fro a mawmet and fro a graued feyned God. Forwhi no skile he can fynde whi this word "graued thing" in eny othere placis of Scripture

[1] *aboute writing*, MS.; but *aboutewriting* just below.

Digitized by Google

schulde be take for a fals God, and not in the text of[1] Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃.; but so it is that in manye othere placis of Holi Scripture than Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. 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 bifore alleggid Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. lettith in no point graued ymagis to be had and to be vsid.

Various texts in which an image signifies a false God. Deductions from this. The haste and ignorance of the Lollards.

Lo y rede Abacuk ij^e^. c̃. thus: *Lo, what profitith the graued thing, for his maker graued it; a wellid thing to gidere and a fals ymage, for the maker therof hopid in making, that he made doumbe symylacris? Wo to him that seith to a tre, Wake thou; Rise thou,*[to[2]] *a stoon, being stille. Whether he schal mowe teche? Lo, this is couered 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 rehercid 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 weeneden to haue be 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, thouȝ in noon other place of Holi Scripture than in this oon place, dyuers fro the xx^e^. c̃. of Exodi and the v^e^. c̃. of Deut. this word "graued thing" muste nedis bitokene oonli a graued God, it were ynouȝ forto schewe that the text Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. bifore

[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. Bibl. vol. iii. p. 733.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II. allegid, *Thou shalt not make to thee a graued thing*, constreyneth not that this word "graued thing" in thilk text bitokeneth an ymage of God not pretendid to be a God. But ȝit ouer this, in mo than in a dosen placis of Holi Scripture, this word "graued thing" is take in lijk maner as it is take in the now rehercid processe of Abacuk ij^{e}. c̃. for a graued God. For whi[1] Leuit. xvj^{e}. c̃. in the bigynnyng, Deut. vij^{e}. c̃. soone aftir the bigynnyng, ij^{e}. Reg. v^{e}. c̃. aboute the myddis, ij^{e}. Paralip. xxxiij^{e}. c̃. soone aftir the bigynnyng, Isaie xxx^{e}. c̃. in the middis, and in the xl^{e}. c̃. aftir the myddis, and in the xlij^{e}. c̃. soone after the bigynnyng and also in the myddis, and in the xliiij^{e}. c̃. aftir the bigynnyng and eftsoone aboute the myddis, also notabili Ieremye the x^{e}. c̃. aboute the myddis, and Daniel the xj^{e}. c̃. after the bigynnyng, and notabili Michee in the v^{e}. c̃. aftir the myddis, and in the Sauter in psalmis, as in the psalme which bigynneth thus: *In exitu Israel de Ægypto, et cætera*, and in the psalme which bigynneth thus: *Laudate nomen Domini, laudate serui Domini, et cætera.* Wherfore if it like to eny man for to holde, that in lijk maner this word "graued thing" in the text alleggid Exodi xx^{e}. c̃. and Deut. v^{e}. c̃. bitokeneth a graued fals pretendid God, certis no man mai dryue him ther fro; and therfore folewith that this text Exodi xx^{e}. c̃. and Deut. v^{e}. c̃. soone after the bigynnyng weerneth not neither reproueth alle graued ymagis to be had and vsid; neither eni man may seie for vndoutable sooth, that in the seid text Exodi xx^{e}. c̃. and Deut. v^{e}. c̃. is groundid that noon graued ymagis ouȝte be had and be vsid. Who therfore may make him so boold for to reproue alle

[1] After this word we must suppose some such words as '*it must be so understood in*' to have been accidentally omitted, or else that the sentence is wholly ungrammatical.

Digitized by Google

graued ymagis in the chirche to be had and vsid, and that bi the seid text Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and bi lijk text Deut. v^e^. c̃., saue he which hath not therwith seen the othere now alleggid placis of Holi Scripture, (in which is conteyned also this word "graued thing,") and is therfore ouerhasti iuger and sentence ȝeuer, eer he haue seen al that ouȝte be seen bifore sentence bi the text Exodi xx^e^. c̃. to be ȝouun? And alle such ouerhasti iugers and wijters God amende, for miche harme han thei doon. God lete hem do no more! Wolde God, that bi the schame which thei ben worthie in this partie for evidences now mad, thei wolden be waar of like defautis in othere maters forto iuge, eer thei ben ful leerned ther yn. Ferthermore, othere evidencis for myn entent in this mater and for confermyng of these here maad argumentis into the proof of the firste conclusioun y haue sett in the ij^e^. partie of *The donet into Cristen religioun*, the [1] chapiter; se hem there who so se wole.

The fifth argument. If the word *image* in this Commandment signify no more than a false God, it forbids not images to be used, when not used as Gods. Proof that this is its true signification here.

The v^e^. principal argument is this: If this word "graued thing" muste needis in the text of Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. bitokene no thing ellis than a graued God, thilk text weerneth not graued ymagis to be had and to be vsid not as Goddis. This ech man wole sone graunte; but so it is that thilk word "graued thing" in the seid text Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. muste nedis signifie and bitokene no thing ellis than a graued fals God, as now anoon after schal be proued. Wherfore nedis it muste be holde, (it may be noon otherwise,) that the seid text of Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. weerneth not and reproueth not vtterli ymagis of God and of Seintis to be had and to be vsid. That the ij^e^. premisse of this argument is trewe y proue thus: This word "graued thing" in

[1] A space in the MS. for the number.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II.

the text Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. muste nedis bitokene al maner graued ymage indifferentli, so that therbi al graued[1] ymagirie be forbode to be had; or ellis it muste nedis bitoken oonli a graued God, that ther bi be forbode oonli a graued God to be had. This ech man wote weel ynouȝ; but so it is, that it mai not be hold that in the seid text Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. this word "graued thing" bitokeneth in the firste of these now spokun ij. maners. Forwhi ther aȝens meeten the iij. principal argumentis bifore goyng prouing vnsoilabili that thanne God were contrarie to him silf. Wherfore nedis folewith that in the seid text of Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. this word "graued thing" muste nedis bitokene in the ij^e^. now spokun maner, that is to seie, that he bitokene and signifie oonli a graued God; and so the ij^e^. premisse of this v^e^. principal argument is openly at the fulle proued: and therbi the v^e^. argument proueth vnsoilabli his entent. And thus myche fro the bigynnyng of the i^e^. principal argument in to the eende of this present v^e^. argument is ynouȝ for schewing, that the seid text Exodi xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃., *Thou schalt not make to thee eny graued thing*, reproueth not and lettith not graued ymagis of very God and of Seintis to be had and to [be][2] vsid vtterly.

The sixth argument. All other places of Scripture, seeming to condemn images in general, are to be understood in the same manner.

The vj^e^. principal argument for the firste conclusioun is this: Alle othere[3] processis of Scripture bi eny colour speking aȝens graued thingis, that is to seie aȝens graued ymagis, ben writun in the now late named psalmes of the Sauter and Sapience the xiiij^e^. c̃., Ysaie xliiij^e^. c̃., and Baruk the vj^e^. c̃., whiche ben ouer long to be rehercid word bi word here;

---

[1] *graue*, MS.; the *d* is added above by a later (?) hand.

[2] Either *be* must be inserted, or *to* must be cancelled.

[3] *othere* is interlineated by a later (?) but early hand.

Digitized by Google

but this y dare avowe and dare leie what waiour eny man wole me forto leie, that in ech of these now alleggid iiij. placis the processe considerid weel bifore and aftir wole schewe openli ynouȝ, that al the rebuk which is ȝouun there to men making and vsing graued ymagis, is ȝouun to hem whiche token and helden tho ymagis to be her Goddis; and therfore noon of these iiij. now alleggid placis in Holi Scripture lettith alle graued ymagis to be had and vsid in the chirche, so that tho ymagis ben not bileeued to be Goddis; and so folewith that no man, saue he which is vnable forto entermete with eny partie of the Bible, wole bi eny of thes[1] iiij. placis now alleggid trowe alle graued ymagis in the chirche to be reproued. Be war,[2] therfore, who euer be war[2] wole; for who euer schewith him lewid, so as is now touchid, he is worthi to be forbode fro entermeting with the Bible in eny party ther of.

Further proof of this. Certain passages in the Books of Kings and in the Acts of the Apostles discussed.

Also the place of Holi Writt iij^{e}. Reg. xj^{e}. c̃., where into rebuke of Salomon it is rehercid that he, fonned and bidotid with hise wijfis, made ydolis false Goddis and worschipid 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 worschipid tho ydolis as Goddis, for so seith Holi Scripture there; but so no persoon dooth in these daies aboute the ymagis had and vsid in the chirche. Wherfore men now hauyng 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^{e}. Reg. xj^{e}. c̃. weerneth not graued[3] ymagis to be had and vsid in the chirche, as thei 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 conjunctim or (as usually) disjunctim.

[3] *grauēd*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II. Ferthermore thilk proces writun Acts xvij^{e}. c̃. 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*[1] *erthe, dwellith not in templis mad with hond, neither is worschipid with mannys hondis, neither hath nede of eny thing; for he ȝeueth lijf to alle men and brething and alle thingis, and made of oon alle the kinde of men forto enhabite on al the face of the erthe, determynyng tymes ordeyned and termes of the dwelling of hem, to seke God, if perauenture thei feelen him*[2] *or fynden; thouȝ he be not fer fro ech of ȝou, for in him we lyuen, moven, 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 haue housis ouer "him for to couere him fro reyne and fro othir sturne "wedris, neither he nedith housis to be lockid, leste "men steele awey him or his godis; and these ydolis "or symylacris, whiche ȝe worschipen here in this "hous, neden these thingis; and therfore ȝe maken to "hem these thingis. Wherfore noon of these ydolis "whiche ȝe worschipen in these housis, (whether thilk "ydol be Saturne or Iupiter or Mars or thilk ydol "which ȝe clepen Vnknowen 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 strengthe forto weerne ymagis of God to be had and vsid in the chirche, so that thei be not worschipid as for very God him silf. Also the proces writun iiij^{e}. Reg. xvij^{e}. c̃., in which it is writun into the commending

[1] *of* is added by a later hand.
[2] *him* is interlineated by a later hand, but the sign of omission is by the first hand, apparently.

Digitized by Google

of King Ezechie, that he brake the brasen serpent which Moyses lete make, Numeri xxj°. c̃., 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 bifore be? And therfore thilk proces rather confermeth ymagis to mowe lawfulli be, than that thei alle to be is vnleeful. Al that this proces wole or may dryue to is this: That ymagis mowe leeffulli be broke, whanne thei ben vsid in ydolatrie irremediabili, for so it was in the caas of the brasen serpent in the tyme of Ezechie, as the storie schewith; or at the leeste, that ymagis mowe leefulli be brokun, whanne more harme irremediabili cometh bi the hauyng and vsing of hem, than is al the good which cometh bi the hauyng[1] and the vsing of hem; and more than this cometh not forth bi this[2] proces of Ezechie, iiij°. Reg. xviij°. c̃. And therfore thilk proces is ouerfeble 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 comyng bi the vce of tho ymagis.

The general conclusion from these six arguments. Neither Scripture nor any other ground of faith forbids images to be used.

Finali, therfore, y mai conclude bi al what is seid fro the bigynnyng 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 sithen her with it is open, that neither long customed vce of bileeuyng in the chirche weerneth and reproueth hem, neither eny myracle doon bi God into her reprouyng reproueth or weerneth hem, it folewith that noon sufficient ground of feith reproueth and weerneth hem. And so is the firste conclusioun bifore sett sufficientli proued.

---

[1] *hauyng of hem*, MS. (first hand). | [2] *the*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

iij. CHAPITER.

THE SECOND CONCLUSION IN FAVOUR OF RETAINING 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 occasion 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^e^. principal conclusioun is this: Doom of naturali weel disposid resoun weerneth not and reproueth not ymagis to be had and to be vsid as rememoratijf and mynding signes. That this conclusioun is trewe y proue thus: If eny doom of resoun schulde weerne and reproue ymagis to be thus had and vsid, thilk doom of resoun schulde be oon of these iij. doomys, of whiche the firste is this: That peple doon ydolatrie bi and with tho ymagis. The ij^e^. is this: That the peple trowen or bileeuen summe wrong and vntrewe opiniouns bi occasioun of ymagis, as that sum godli vertu is in tho ymagis, or that tho ymagis doon myraclis, or that thei ben quyk and seen, heeren,[1] or speken at sum while, or that thei sweten at sum while. The iij^e^. doom is: That ymagis ben occasiouns of summe moral vicis in the peple, as of overmyche worschiping[2] doon to hem, or of pride, or of coueitise, or of suche othere. But so it is, that noon of these iij. doomys sufficith forto reproue and weerne the seid hauyng and vsing of ymagis; wherfore no doom of weel disposid resoun reproueth and weerneth the seid hauyng and vsing of ymagis in the chirche.

Reason does not forbid them on the ground that they give rise to idolatry; for no one of common sense believes an image to be his God, or worships it as such.

The ij^e^. premysse of this now maad argument, as anentis the firste doom, schal be openli proued thus: Peple in hauyng and vsing ymagis sett vp in the chirche doon noon ydolatrie by hem. Forwhi ydolatrie is neuere doon,[3] saue whanne a man takith a creature for his God and worschipith thilk creature as for his God; but so doith no man with eny ymage now in

---

[1] *and heere*, MS. (first hand).
[2] *worchiping*, MS. (first hand).
[3] *dooū* or *dooñ*, MS.

Digitized by Google

Cristendoom, aftir that the man is come into ȝeeris of discrecioun and is passid childhode, and which is not a natural fool. Forwhi, if of eny of hem it be askid, whether this ymage is God in heuen, which made al thing, and which was euer withoute bigynnyng, and was therfore eer this ymage was maad; he wole seie anoon, 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, certis he wole not therwith worschipe him as his God; neither he wole ȝeue to him the worschip which he knowith to be dew to God oonli; neither he wole be aknowe that the ymage is his God. Forwhi ther yn he dide repugnaunce in sum maner, or ellis certis 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 having and vsing ymagis, doom of resoun hath not forto weerne and reproue ymagis to be had and vsid.

Those who are most prone to accuse their neighbours of idolatry do not so much as know what idolatry is.

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 argument now maad muste needis haue his entent. Ful ofte haue y herd men and wommen vnwiseli iuge and diffame ful scherpli weelnyȝ alle Cristene to be ydolatreris, and al for the hauyng and vsing of ymagis. And ȝit whanne it hadde be askid of hem what ydolatrie is, forsothe thei couthe not seie neither feele what it is in his trouthe, thouȝ thei schulden haue wonne therbi al the worldis blis or the blis of heuen. And whether this was not an horrible abhomynacioun and a vile stinking presumpcioun hem forto so sturdili bi manye ȝeeris iuge and diffame bothe the clergi and weelnyȝ al the lay party of Goddis chirche in so greet a cryme, which thei couthen neither myȝten proue to be doon, (for whi thei wisten not what thing thilk cryme is, and therfore thei myȝten not knowe whether it was doon

Digitized by Google

CHAP. III.

or not doon,) and whether such peple be able and worthi to be admyttid into the homeli reding of Holi Writt, eer thei be weel adauntid and weel schamed of her folie and of her vnwisdom and pride, seie who euere schal this heere. And y trowe he may not azens this seie and holde, if he haue eny quantite of discrecioun. Manye lesingis y haue herd hem lie, how thei knowen that persoones reulen hem in amys bilyuyng fonnedli aboute ymagis; but whanne profris of greet meede (zhe, of xl. pound and of more) hath be mad to hem forto bringe forth ij. or iij. of suche persoones, thei couthen[1] bringe forth noon of hem.

An objection stated, that many call images by the name of God and of saints, and therefore consider them as such. This objection answered. We are accustomed to call figures of persons represented in fresco or tapestry by the names of those persons, without thinking them to be very persons.

Perauenture thei wolen seie 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 othere; and thei wolden not so clepe, but if thei feeliden and bileeueden withinneforth as thei clepen withouteforth; for ellis thei weren double. Wherfore alle tho hundridis bileeuen amys aboute tho ymagis. Herto it is ful lizt forto answere. Whanne y come to thee in thi parisch chirche thou wolt perauenture seie to me thus: Lo here lieth my fadir and there lieth my graunt fadir, and in the other side lieth my wijf; and zit thei liggen not there, but oonli her boonys liggen there. If y come to thee into thin halle or chaumbir thou wolt perauenture seie to me in descryuyng the storie peintid or wouun in thin halle or chaumbre: "Here ridith King Arthir, and there fiztith "Iulius Cesar, and here Hector of Troie throwith doun "a knyt," and so forth. For thouz thou thus seie thou wolte not holde thee forto seie ther yn amys. Schal y therfore bere thee hoond that thou trowist thi

[1] *couthe*, MS. (first hand).

fadir and thi graunt fadir and thi wijf for to lyue and dwelle in her sepulcris, or schal y bere thee an hond that thou trowist 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 vnwijs and folisch, if y schulde beere thee so an honde, if it likid thee forto so speke. And, if this be trewe, it folewith that as weel thou art vncurteis, or ellis thou art to be excusid 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 clereli this same answere to be vndirstonde) it is to wite, that if figuratijf 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 han lyued xl. wynteris, meenyng therbi that thei han lyued fourti ȝeeris, certis thi chalenge myȝte weel procede and haue his entent; but aȝenward it is so that such figuratijf and vnpropre 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 peplis. And therfore, thouȝ men in such woned figuratijf speche seie, "Here at this autir is the Trinyte, and there at thilk "auter is Iesus, and ȝondir 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).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. III.

nedith not that therfore be seid that[1] thei meenen and feelen that this ymage is the Trinyte, or that thilk ymage is verili Iesus, and so forth of othere; but that these ymagis ben the liknessis or the ymagis of hem.

In Scripture images of cherubim are called cherubim; and other images similarly.

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. xxv^{c}. c̃. that God bade to Moyses thus: *Thou schalt make on euer-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 aungelis of cherubym, or ellis ij. ymagis of cherubyim?[2] 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 bifore in answering; or ellis thou muste make thi chaleng azens God, which thou bifore madist azens man, that God schulde feele amys or that he schulde be double. Ferthermore, not oonli in this now alleggid place Exodi xxv^{c}. c̃., 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 xxxvj^{e}. c̃., i^{e}. Reg. iiij^{e}. c̃., ij^{e}. Reg. vj^{e}. c̃., iij^{e}. Reg. vj^{e}. c̃., iij^{e}. Reg. vij^{e}. c̃., iij^{e}. Reg. viij^{e}. c̃., i^{e}. Paralip. xxviij^{e}. c̃., ij^{e}. Paralip. iij^{e}. c̃., ij^{e}. Paralip. v^{e}. c̃., whos textis or processis weren ouerlong to be here writun and rehercid. Also in the c. and xiij^{c}. Psalme, where it is spokun of ydolis, that is to seie of graued

[1] *that* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

[2] So the MS., possibly accidentally for *cherubym*.

Digitized by Google

Goddis, it is seid of hem there thus: *Thei han mouth and thei schulen not speke, thei han iȝen and thei schulen not se, thei han eeris and thei schulen not heere, thei han feet and thei schulen not walke.* And ȝit 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 iȝen 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 bifore sette answere is confermed, 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 Iesus, of the Holi Goost, makith not that the callirs ben ydolatreris; neither that therfore doom of resoun schulde schewe ymagis to be not had and vsid, as that bicause that ydolatrie is doon bi hem.

Another objection, that some persons consider a divine power to reside in images, stated and answered. This opinion, though it may be false, does not amount to idolatry.

Thou maist not seie that hauers and vsers of ymagis ben ydolatrers; 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 haue such as now is seid a godli vertu, saue God him silf. Wherfore no Cristen man trowith eny ymage to haue such now seid godli vertu; and therfore 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 thouȝ Cristen men trowen that ymagis han such vertu, ȝit tho men

Digitized by Google

CHAP. III.

for thilk trowing ben not ydolatrers. Forwhi no man is bi eny thing an ydolatrer, saue by which he takith and makith a creature to be his God, and worschipith him as his God; but so dooth no man, thouȝ he trowe ymagis haue suche now seid vertu. Neither eny man so dooth, thouȝ he trowe that ymagis doon myraclis in such wise as creaturis,— the Apostilis, and othere Seintis,— diden myraclis; and thouȝ he trowe that ymagis ben quyke, or that thei seen or speken or heeren or sweten at summe whilis, as it is open ynouȝ 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 opinioun or feith which [1] he hath vpon ymagis, thouȝ thilk opinioun or feith be vntrewe, is an ydolatrer.

Neither does an undue veneration of images amount to idolatry, so that they be not taken for Gods.

And ferthermore, thouȝ a Cristen man worschipe an ymage more than dewli, so that he worschip not it as God and with worschip of herte withyn forth dew to God oonli, ȝhe, and thouȝ he take occasioun bi ymagis to do synne of pride or of coueitise or othere moral synnes, ȝit fer is al this fro ydolatrie. Forwhi in noon of these casis the man takith and makith eny creature to be his God; and therfore the firste bifore spokun doom of resoun, which is bering an hond Cristen men vsing ymagis to be gilti of ydolatrie, is not sufficient forto reproue and weerne ymagis to be had and vsid of Cristen men as rememoratijf or mynding signes or tokenes. Forwhi thilk doom of resoun and thilk bering an hond and putting upon men, that thei ben ther fore and ther yn ydolatrers, is schewid now bifore to be vntrewe.

---

[1] *which* is added in the MS. by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

iiij. CHAPITER.

THE ij^e^. bifore sett and spoken doom of resoun, wijting hauers and vsers of ymagis to be gilti of vntrewe feith or vntrewe opinioun had upon tho ymagis, is not sufficient for to reproue and weerne the hauyng and the vsing of hem as for mynding signes. Forwhi thilk doom and thilk wijting and bering an hond is vntrewe.

Secondly, reason does not forbid the use of images in consequence of untrue opinions held about them.

And that y schal proue, so that y sette bifore a reule or supposicioun which is this. Sum vntrewe opinioun of men is such that for it her conuersacioun is the worse morali, for it is leding into deedis 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 nò synne; and this opinioun, ech man forto take as myche as hym lustith and may holde withoute clayme and victorie of hise neiȝboris worldli good is no synne; and this opinioun, a man for to smyte and bete his neiȝbour a this side deeth for wraththe or trespace is no synne; and suche othere opiniouns. Sum other vntrewe opinioun of men is such that for it her conuersacioun schal not be maad the worse moralli, or ellis not aȝens 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 iij. sistris (whiche ben spiritis) comen to the cradilis of infantis, forto sette to the babe what schal bifalle to him; and suche othere manye. Forwhi more than the dotage or deceit or folynes or the bigiling of the persoones so trowing,

Untrue opinions of two kinds, either morally vicious or harmlessly superstitious.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV.

at whiche men mowe lawȝe and take bourde for her symplenes or her vnkunnyng as of folis, cometh not of suche now laste spokun opiniouns.

For untrue opinions of the latter sort good and ancient customs are not to be laid aside. Application of this argument to images, and to false opinions about them.

Thanne upon this reule or supposicioun y argue thus: For noon such fonnys opinioun, of which it is now last spokun in the ij^e^. parti of this reule or supposicioun, is eny long bifore stabilid gouernaunce to be left and to be leid aside, which is in him silf resonable, honest, and expedient, namelich if thilk fonnysch opinioun may soone bi wise men be schewid to the holder to be vntrewe. But so it is that these opiniouns, 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 opiniouns of the ij^e^. now seid soort; that for hem discrete men mowe oonli lauȝe at suche folies of men, as thei doon at her othere folies, of whiche no moral harme cometh. Wherfore for noon such opinioun the hauyng, and the vpsetting of ymagis, whilis therbi myche moral good cometh, (as schal be proued aftir and as is proued al redi in *The book of worschiping*,) ouȝte be left and leid aside; namelich, sithen these now seid folisch opiniouns mowe liȝtli be schewid to her holders forto be vntrewe.

Confirmation of the argument. Because some men had absurd opinions about the miracles wrought by Saints, those Saints ought not therefore to be put to death and prevented from working miracles.

Confirmacioun 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 many 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 ȝouun to hem fro God, bi which thei in hem silf diden tho miraclis; but ȝit not therfore and bi cause

[1] *now* is interlineated in a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

that summe symple persoones hadden thilk opinion, tho iij. seid persoones ouȝtiden to be slayn and to be take[1] fro lijf and fro siȝt of men and fro worching of myraclis, bi cause that foolis and symple persoones hadden suche seid vntrewe opiniouns upon the seid worching of myraclis.

Other false opinions about things and persons do not necessitate the destruction of those things and persons.

Also thouȝ men trowen that my precious stoonys, whiche y haue, han vertues whiche in trouthe thei han not, schal y therfore breke hem or caste hem awey, that suche lewid men haue no such wrong opinioun vpon hem? Also if men trowe that sum aldirman in Londoun is miche riccher than in trouthe he is, schal therfore thilk aldirman be slayn or be banyschid out of the citee, that men haue no such folisch vntrewe opinioun upon his ricches? God forbede. Wherfore lijk wise 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 opiniouns of the ij^{e}. bifore spokun soort vpon tho ymagis and vpon the vsis of hem.

But in truth it is not a false or foolish opinion to believe that some images have wrought miracles.

And ȝit ferthermore, that men mowe haue withoute blame and withoute folie this opinioun 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 mannys therto doing, and suche othere like opiniouns, schal be schewid after in the ij^{e}. principal gouernaunce, whanne y schal trete of pilgrimage. And thus myche is ynouȝ, that the ij^{e}. bifore spokun doom of resoun is not sufficient forto lette ymagis to be had and vsid.

Thirdly, reason does not forbid the use of images

That the iij^{e}. bifore spokun and sett doom of resoun, which is that ymagis ouȝten[3] not be had and

---

[1] *take* is interlineated in a later (?) hand.

[2] *the vsing*, MS. (first hand).

[3] *ouȝte*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV.

because moral evil springs from them. Some moral vices springing from a good ordinance are small and curable, others are great and irremediable. For vices of the first sort good ordinances are not to be laid aside. Application of the argument to images. The moral evils arising from them are not greater than those which spring from other profitable things, as from reading the Bible or hearing sermons.

vsid, and that for therof cometh moral yuel (as ouermyche worschiping not being ydolatrie, or ellis coueitise or pride or suche othere moral vicis,) y schal proue, so that y sette and sende bifore a reule or supposicioun, which is this.[1] Summe moral vicis comyng bi occasioun of a vertuose gouernaunce ben litle, and suche as wolen soone be amendid with labour, thouȝ the same vertuose gouernaunce 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 gouernaunce in his contynaunce. Vpon this reule y argue thus. For such yuelis, of whiche it is now spokun in the firste parti of this reule or supposicioun, a notable vertuose gouernaunce, 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 tho moral vicis so comyng be amendid bi good informacioun and othere good labouris. Forwhi thanne ech good and profitable craft, ȝhe, and weelnyȝ ech notable vertuose gouernaunce ouȝte 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 bifore going supposicioun or reule. But so it is, that the yuelis whiche comen out and bi the having 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 ȝit ferther to seie, thei ben not gretter than the yuelis whiche occasionarili comen out fro the having 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 sufficient forto reproue the hauyng of ymagis vttirly*,' or something to that effect.

Digitized by Google

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^e^. bifore seid and sett doom of resoun is not sufficient for to lette the having and the vsing of ymagis, but if he schulde lette the hauyng and the vsing of alle maners of craftis, and the hauing and vsing of Holi Scripture among the lay persoones, ȝhe, and but if he schulde lette the being of alle preestis and of alle prechouris, namelich sithen the worschiping, bi which perauenture 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 bifore it is schewid, that no persoones taken eny ymage for verri God.

Confirmacioun to this argument is this: Summen wolen knele deppir and louȝer to a knyȝt, than summe othere men wolen; ȝhe, and thei wolen sixe sithis more preise and worschipe him in word and dide, than summe othere men wolen;[1] ȝhe, and perauenture more than resoun wole that he be worschipid. What harme or yuel is this forto be so myche chargid, that the good knyȝt be put out of mennys cumpanying: sithen this worschiping is fer fro godli worschiping; and fer fro this, that eny worschipers of him takyn hym for her God? Wherfore folewith bi sufficient likenes, that thouȝ men worschipen ymagis more than resoun wole hem be worschipid, ȝit this is not vice of so greet fors that for it ymagis be put doun; namelich, sithen thilk worschip is noon such, wherbi the worschipers maken tho ymagis to be her God or her Goddis. Goddis forbode that for ech folis folie stable gouernaunces weel takun of wise men

Confirmation of the argument. If a man of rank be unduly venerated, that is no reason for banishing him; neither if images be unduly venerated, is that a reason for banishing them altogether.

[1] *wolen* is interlineated by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV.

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[1] eny while contynued: but certis aȝens such vicis comyng bi tho gouernauncis labour ouȝte be maad, and tho gouernauncis ouȝten be suffrid to stonde and contynue stille.

Again, if a good fruit tree be partly cankered, or bear bad fruit on some of its boughs, that is no reason for cutting down the whole tree. Application of this argument to images.

Another confirmacioun into this present purpos may be this: If y haue a fruyteful tre, which in oon or in summe of hise braunchis hath a canker, schal y therfore hewe doun al my tre? Goddis forbode y schulde be so lewid; but y ouȝt rather pare awey the canker, and sette medicyn therto, and lete the tre stonde forto bringe forth good fruyt. Also in caas 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 come of dyuerse graffis in oon stok, or if perauenture many of tho applis roten upon the tre, eer it be tyme to schake the tree, schal y therfore hewe doun 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[2] it were for[3] to caste awey the having and vsing of ymagis for ech moral vice which myȝte rise therbi, namelich sithen the havyng and vsing of ymagis is fruyteful into moral good, and the yuel therbi comyng is pareable and kutteable awey bi good and thrifti bisynes therto sett. And this is ynouȝ forto schewe, that the iij°. bifore spokun and sett doom of resoun is not sufficient forto weerne and lette the hauyng and vsing of ymagis into rememoratijf or mynding signes.

---

[1] *bi* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

[2] *husbondie*, MS. (first hand).

[3] *for* is interlineated in a later hand.

Digitized by Google

And so fynaly it is lad thus fer forth fro the bigynnyng of the iij^e. 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 ij^e. principal conclusioun.

CHAP. IV.

On the whole, then, the use of images is not forbidden by reason.

v. CHAPITER.

THE iij^e. principal conclusion is this: It is not vnleeful ymagis to be had and vsid as rememoratijf signes. This conclusioun y proue thus: What euer gouernaunce neither Holi Scripture, neither doom of resoun, neither mennys iust positijf lawe weerneth, is not vnleeful; 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 ij^e. principal conclusioun; neither it is weerned bi eny mennys iust positijf lawe, as it is open ynow to alle men. Wherfore this iij^e. principal conclusioun is needis trewe, that it is not vnleeful ymagis to be had and vsid as rememoratijf signes of God, and of his benefetis of Seintis, and of her conuersacioun.

THE THIRD CONCLUSION. It is not unlawful to have and use images as reminding signs. Proof of the conclusion.

The iiij^e. principal conclusion is this: It is leeful, in the maner of leefulnes spokun bifore in the firste chapiter of this ij^e. partie in the x^e. reule or supposicioun, that ymagis be had and vsid as rememoratijf signes in the maner now last bifore spokun. That this conclusioun is trewe, y proue thus: What euer gouernaunce is not vnleeful, is leeful in this maner of leefulnes, as it is open bi the now seid x^e. reule or supposicioun: but so it is, that the now seid hauyng and vsing of ymagis is not vnleeful, as it is open ynouȝ bi the iij^e. next bifore going principal conclusioun. Wherfore needis folewith that this present iiij^e. conclusioun is trewe.

THE FOURTH CONCLUSION. It is lawful in a large sense to have and use images as reminding signs. Proof of the conclusion.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. V.

THE FIFTH CONCLUSION. Scripture allows images to be had and used as reminding signs. Proof of the conclusion from what has been already said.

The v^e^. principal conclusioun is this: Holi Scripture bothe in the Oold Testament and in the Newe allowith[1] to haue and vse ymagis as rememoratijf signes in the maner now laste bifore seid. That this conclusioun is trewe, it is open ynouȝ bi it what is bifore argued in the ij^e^. chapiter in the iij. firste principal argumentis to the first principal conclusioun. Wherfore this v^e^. principal conclusioun is to be holde for trewe.

Further proof of the conclusion from the actions of Mary Magdalen.

Also, Matheu xxvj^e^. c̃., Crist allowid and approued the deede of Marie Magdalen, in that that sche vsid the oynement as a seable and a smelleable rememoratijf signe, and in that that sche vsid the dede[2] of anoynting[3] as a seable rememoratijf signe. Forwhi he seide: *What ben ȝe greuose to this womman? Sche hath wrouȝt 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 vce of the seid oynement, in that that it was vsid as a seable or smelleable rememoratijf signe. And sithen this is approued of Crist, certis[5] bi lijk skile othere seable signes as ymagis, and othere 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 vce of sensible rememoratijf signes ben allowid.[6]

Another proof of the conclusion from the con-

Also an[7] other vnsoilable proof for this v^e^. principal conclusioun is sett bifore in the firste parti of this

---

[1] *allowith and approueth*, MS. (first hand).

[2] *the dede* is interlineated by an early but later hand.

[3] *an oynting*, MS.

[4] This blundering translation of "*dicetur et quod hæc fecit in memoriam ejus*," (ἀπτῆς), Vulg., occurs in both forms of Wiclif's version, from which this citation is mostly taken.

[5] *certis* is added by a later hand.

[6] *allowid and approued*, MS. (first hand).

[7] *in other*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

present book, the [xix^{e}.][1] chapiter, where bi setting[2] bifore of iij. reulis and bi iiij. conclusiouns drawun out from hem this v^{e}. principal conclusioun is vndoutabili proued bi this meene; that whanne euere Holi Scripture biddith, counseilith, or allowith eny eende, he ther yn and ther bi biddith, counseilith, or allowith, or approueth ech meene profitable into the same eende. Se there who so wole the proof mad there in his lengthe and forme.

CHAP. V.

sideration that when Scripture allows any end it allows each profitable mean contributing to that end.

Also noman[3] may seye nay, but that Crist ordeyned in the newe lawe visible sacramentis to be take and vsid as seable rememoratijf signes of Crist, and of his passioun and deeth, and of his holi lijf, as it schal be proued in *The book of Sacramentis* and in *The bookis*[4] *of Baptim and of Eukarist.* Wherfore Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament witnessith thus miche in this purpos, that forto haue and vse seable rememoratijf signes is leeful, expedient, and profitable; for ellis the sacramentis of Crist weren vnleeful, vnexpedient, and vnprofitable. And thanne her of ferther thus: If and whanne it is leeful and expedient forto haue and vse eny seable rememoratijf signes being lasse lijk to the thingis signified, it is leeful 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,) wole helpe the signe forto signifie and forto make remembraunce the bettir upon the thing signified; but so it is, that ymagis graued, coruun, or ȝut ben more lijk to Crist and to his passioun, than ben the sacramentis whiche Crist ordeyned; thouȝ Crist hem ordeyned, (being so vnlike

Application of this consideration. Scripture allows certain reminding signs of Christ's life and death by allowing sacraments: and therefore by implication allows images, which are more lively signs of the same things.

[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).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. V.

to him and to his passion,) for fauour into us, that we schulde haue bi his ordinaunce signes and sacramentis, into whos geting we myȝten not allegge forto excuse us bi labour to gete hem and make hem into the werk of her sacramental vsing. Wherfore folewith, sithen bi Holi Scripture it is leeful and expedient forto 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 ȝut of Cristis persoon, figurid lijk to his persoon, with purtenauncis of his passioun and deeth, forto make us remembre upon him and his passioun and deeth. And in this wise mai be proued this present v^e^. conclusioun, that Holy Scripture wele[1] allowith[2] impliedli and priueli forto haue and vse ymagis of Crist and of Seintis figurid bi grauyng aftir hem.

Confirmation of the argument. Whoever allows a less effective mean to an end thereby allows the more effective mean to the same end.

Confirmacioun herto is this: Who euer counseilith, allowith, or approueth the lasse doing meene into an eende; in that he counseilith, allowith, or approueth the more doing meene into the same eende, *et cœtera.*

THE SIXTH CONCLUSION. Reason allows images to be had and used as reminding signs. Proof of the conclusion drawn from the use of portraits and statues.

The vj^e^. principal conclusioun is this: Sufficient doom of weel disposid resoun allowith and approueth to haue and vse ymagis as rememoratijf signes in the maner after bifore seid. That this conclusioun is trewe y proue bi these folewing argumentis, of whiche the firste is this. Sufficient doom of resoun allowith and approueth us forto make and haue for us silf and for othere men ymagis of men and wommen, that tho men and wommen be therbi the oftir thouȝt upon, and therfore be therbi the more loued and the better serued, and that the more be doon and suffrid of us and of othere 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.

[2] *allowith and approueth*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

tho persoones or the ensaumpling of the persoones so representid bi the ymagis, and that the more be doon and suffrid for her sake of us silf and of othere men seing the same ymagis with vs. Wherfore, bi like skile, sufficient doom of reson allowith and approueth forto make and haue for us silf 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, lijk to the deedis and werkis whiche ben now bifore rehercid for the sake of creaturis to be doon.

Another proof drawn from the necessity of having outward signs to remind us of important matters which we are apt to forget.

Also thus: Whanne euer it is so, that we han in greet charge to performe and do eny dede or gouernaunce, and we ben freel and redi to forȝete and to lete slippe out of mynde thilk deede or gouernaunce, it lijth in the doom of resoun ful weel that we take to us sum seable rememoratijf or mynding signes and tokenes forto therbi remembre us silf upon the deede or gouernaunce being to vs of so greet charge. For whi thus bi doom of resoun men doon anentis worldli deedis of charge, wher ynne 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 drede God, that he mai therbi be hertid and strengthid in wil forto serue God; and he hath nede forto ofte thinke vpon tho thingis and meenis, whiche schulden stire him forto loue God and drede God, and forto haue wil to serue God and forto thenke vpon tho pointis in whiche he schulde serue to God. And ȝit forto so ofte remembre we ben ful freel and forȝeteful. Wherfore resoun wole weel iuge, allowe, and approue forto take, haue, and vse alle maners of suche deedis and thingis, whiche schulden remembre 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 seable rememoratijf thingis and deedis, as ben ymagis and the seid vsis of hem. Wherfore it folewith that doom of

Digitized by Google

CHAP. V.

resoun iugith, allowith, and approueth that ymagis be had and vsid into the entent and[1] in the maner bifore seid.

Confirmat ion of the argument. A man ties a knot on his girdle to remind himself of what he has to do on an errand.

Confirmacioun 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 rememoratijf 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 he write sum seable cros or mark[2] or carect with cole or chalk in the wal of his chaumbre or hal, or that he hange up bifore his siȝt sum hood 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 rememoratijf signes (as ymagis and othere seable thingis or deedis,) into this eende, that he therbi the oftir thenke on Goddis worthinesse, Goddis benefetis, 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 ynouȝ for proof of the vj^e^. principal conclusioun.

Further proof of the conclusion to be found in Pecock's *Book of worshiping*.

Who euer wole se more proof for this present vj^e^. principal conclusioun, rede he in *The book of worschiping* in the first parti, the vij^e^. and viij^e^. chapiters; and there he schal fynde profis for this present vj^e^. conclusioun, whiche profis he schal not, (as y weene,) assoile.

THE SEVENTH CONCLUSION. It is lawful in the strictest sense to have

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

[1] *and* added by a later hand. | [2] *mk*, MS.

Digitized by Google

in the first chapiter,) that ymagis be had and vsid in the maner ofte bifore seid. That this conclusioun is is trewe, y proue thus: What euer gouernaunce Holi Writt allowith and approueth, and doom of weel disposid in kinde reson allowith and approueth, is leeful in propre maner of taking leefulnes; but so it is, that forto haue and vse ymagis in the maner now seid is allowid and approued bi Holi Scripture, as is open bi the v^e^. principal bifore goyng conclusioun, and is allowid and approued bi doom of deuli[1] disposid resoun in kinde, as it is open bi the vj^e^. principal bifore going conclusioun. Wherfore this present vij^e^. principal conclusioun is trewe, that it is leeful in propre maner taking leefulnes, (wherof it is spokun bifore in the first chapiter of this ij^e^. partie, in the ix^e^. reule,) that ymagis be had and vsid as rememoratijf signes of God, and of hise benefetis, and of his holi lijf and passioun, and of Seintis and of her holi conuersacioun.

CHAP. V.

and use images as reminding signs. Proof of the conclusion.

The viij^e^. principal conclusioun schal be this: It is a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt seruice for to haue and vse and sette up ymagis 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 conclusioun is trewe y wole proue thus: What euer gouernaunce doom of kindly weel disposid resoun biddith to be doon, or counseilith to be doon, or allowith and approueth to be doon, (namelich if Holi Scripture it not weerneth and lettith, and if Holi Scripture it allowith and approueth,) God biddith the same to be doon, or counseilith the same to be doon, or allowith and approueth the same to be doon as a point of his moral lawe and seruice, as it is sufficiently bifore proued in the firste parti of this present

THE EIGHTH CONCLUSION. It is a point of God's moral law to have and use images in order to be reminded thereby of God's benefits and of the lives of Saints. Proof of the conclusion.

[1] The MS. reading is more like *clenli*.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. V.

book, and in the firste parti of the book clepid *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture;* but so it is, that resoun biddith or counseilith or allowith and approueth ymagis to be had and to be vsid in the maner oft bifore seid, as it is open by the vij. next bifore going principal conclusiouns; ȝhe, and Holi Scripture the same allowith,[1] as it is open bi the v^c^. next bifore going conclusion. Wherfore to haue and vse ymagis in the maner now seid is approued and allowid of God as for a point of his moral lawe and of his plesaunt seruice.

THE NINTH CONCLUSION. It is no sin, but a meritorious deed, to set an example to others of using images in the manner before said. Proof of the conclusion.

The ix^c^. principal conclusioun is this: It is not synne a man bi hise werkis forto ensaumple to othere men, that thei haue and vse ymagis in the maner bifore tauȝt; and that thei do as he dooth, if he do in the maner bifore tauȝt; but it is a merytorie and a weel doon dede for to it[2] so ensaumple. That this conclusioun is trewe, y proue thus: It is not synne a man bi hise werkis forto ensaumple to othere men, that thei do a deede and a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt seruice; but it is a merytorie deede for to it ensaumple to othere. And herwith so it is, that forto vse ymagis in the maner bifore tauȝt is a deede of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt seruice, as it is proued weel bi the next bifore going conclusioun. Wherfore it is not synne a man forto ȝiue ensaumple to othere men that thei vse ymagis in the maner bifore tauȝt, as bokis to hem; but it is a merytorie deede forto ȝeue thilk ensaumple. And so this present ix^c^. conclusioun is to be holde trewe.

---

[1] *allowith and approueth,* MS. (first hand).

[2] *it* is interlineated, perhaps by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

vj. CHAPITER.

PERAUENTURE summe men wolen seie and knouleche here, as so nedis thei musten do, that it is leeful ynouȝ and expedient that ymagis be had and vsid in the chirche; but it is not leeful and expedient that men knele bifore hem, or preie bifore hem, or cense bifore hem, or sette liȝtis or laumpis bifore hem, or holde or bere eny suche rememoratijf signes bifore hem.

An objection stated. It may be lawful and expedient to have images in churches, but it is not so that men kneel, pray, or burn incense and lights before them.

Aȝens which now rehercid holding y mai argue thus: It is leeful and expedient to do these now rehercid deedis to God and to Seintis bifore a bare wal in a chirche, or in a corner of a chirche or of an other hous, or in the feeld. Forwhi into al this proceden bifore proued the vij. principal conclusiouns; but so it is, that what euer vertuose gouernaunce mai be do to God or to a Seint bifore a bare wal, mai be do to God or to a Seint bifore a wal peintid 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[1] 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 lijf of the Seint. Wherfore bi lijk good skile alle suche other now rehercid deedis mowe be doon bifore ymagis.

Answer to the objection. All these things may be done to God or to a Saint before a bare wall, and may therefore be done before a wall painted with the actions of God or of a Saint, and consequently before any image of God or of a Saint.

Also into this same purpos y argue thus: It is leeful and expedient a man knele to God or to a Seint, (ȝhe, and ligge prostrate to God or to a Seint,) bifore an auter; and it is leeful him forto preie to God or to a Seint bifore an auter; wherfore it is bi lijk skil leeful to bere a liȝt in presence of God bifore the auter, and forto encense to God or to a Seint bifore 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 deeds may be performed *before* any image of God, if not done *to* the image.

[1] *graue*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

do alle these same deedis bifore an ymage of God or of a Seint, sithen the auter in alle these casis is not take but as an ymage of God or of a Seint? And so takith Sent Ambrose in his *Book of Mysteries* and in his *Book of Sacramentis*, and holi Dionyse, the disciple of Poul, in his *Book of the Chirchis Ierarchie*.[1] It is also leeful and expedient[2] a man forto knele to God, preie to God, and holde vp hise hondis to God, and make a vowe to God bifore a preest, or an othir man; and ȝit herbi thilk man so kneling takith not the preest for his God,[3] neithir he dooth tho now seid deedis to the preest. Wherfore in lijk maner, thouȝ a man do the same deedis bifore an ymage, he makith not thilk ymage therbi his God, neithir he dooth tho deedis to the ymage.

A third answer to the objection. A man may lawfully offer to God or a Saint before an image, and may therefore pray and set up candles before it. The use of lights before images defended.

Also ferther thus: It is leeful ynouȝ a man to offre to God or to a Seint bifore an ymage of God or of a Seint, so that he offre not to the ymage but bifore the ymage. Wherfore bi lijk skile it is leeful ynouȝ forto knele and preie and bere liȝt and sette up candelis bifore an ymage, whilis these deedis ben not doon to the ymage but to God or to a Seint. And if thou aske: "Wherto or in to what effect schulen[4] "suche liȝtis be born or be sett bifore ymagis?" Y answere thus: Tho liȝtis men mowe take and vse bi siȝt of hem as rememoratijf signes and mynding signes that greet cleernes of wisdom, greet solace is

---

[1] See Ambros. *De Myst.*, c. 8. (Op. tom. II., p. 336. Ed. Benedict.) *De Sacram.*, lib. iv. c. 2 (id. p. 366). "Quid est enim altare, nisi forma corporis Christi?" id. lib. v. c. 2. (id. p. 374). "*εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ θειότατον ἡμῶν θυσιαστήριον Ἰησοῦς ἡ θεαρχικὴ τῶν θείων νοῶν ἀφιέρωσις, ... ὑπερκοσμίοις ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐποπτεύσωμεν αὐτὸ τὸ θειότατον θυσιαστήριον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ τελούμενα τελεῖται καὶ ἁγιάζεται, πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ θειοτάτου μύρου συντελούμενον.*" Dionys. Areop. *De Eccles. Hierarch.*, c. iv. § 12. (Op. tom. I., p. 340. Ed. Cord.) Each of these works is doubtful or spurious.

[2] *and expedient*, by a later (?) hand in the margin.

[3] *good*, MS.

[4] *schulde*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

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

Another objection stated. Perhaps images may be defended by reason; but if they cannot be defended by Scripture, we will have nothing to do with them.

Perauenture summen wolen in other wise seie, knouleche, and holde that al what is proued bi the firste vij. bifore going principal conclusiouns is trewe, but thei wolen seie thus, "What is it to us, that a "thing is trewe in doom of reson? We wolen holde "and knouleche and performe oonli it what Holi "Scripture withnessith 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 doon." 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.

Answer to the objection. If images could be defended by reason only, that would be sufficient; because God's moral law is made up of natural reason and of inspired Scripture.

But here aȝens y meete thus: The moral lawe of God is mad of ij. parties, of whiche the oon partie is lawe of kinde, (that is to seie, doom of resoun, and writun in the tablis of mennys weel disposid hertis,) and the other partie is lawe of feith vpon tho treuthis oonli, into whos fynding, leernyng, and kunnyng 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 delyuere to us this now seid ij^e^. partie of Goddis lawe serueth Holi Scripture, and not forto grounde to us the i^e^. 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.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VI.

Notwithstonding that of Goddis lawe the firste now seid partie, (which is lawe of kinde and of resoun,) is xxs. sithis, (ȝhe, an hundrid sithis,) largir and more than is of Goddis lawe the ijᵉ. partie, (which is lawe of feith,) as it is open ynouȝ 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 bifore 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 bigynnyng of the firste parti into the eende of the [1] chapiter, and eftsoone fro the bigynnyng of the [1] chapiter, into the eende of the firste parti.

A different answer to the same objection. It is in fact not true that Scripture disapproves of images. Proof of this by the instance of the Cherubim:

Also it is schewid bifore in this present ijᵉ. partie, the ijᵉ. chapiter, bi the firste and ijᵉ. principal argumentis into proof of the firste principal conclusioun, that Holi Writt weel allowith[2] ymagis to be had and to be vsid as mynding signes of aungelis in heuen and of othere thingis of moral gouernaunce in erthe. Wherfore bi thin owne seiyng that thou wolt folewe Holi Writt, and take for the lawe and seruice of God what that Holi Writ allowith,[2] thou muste needis allowe and approue for a point of Goddis lawe and of Goddis office and seruice forto haue and vse ymagis; thouȝ y wole not 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 whos fulfilling the doer schal be weel allowid and approued, as ther yn fulfilling a point of Goddis lawe and a seruice to God.

Also by the history of Micah and his Levite:

Also thus: Iudic. xvijᵉ. and xviijᵉ. c̃. 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 approueth*, MS. (first hand), twice.

Digitized by Google

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, ȝhe, and a God, with feeling good ynouȝ that the ymage was not God; and ȝit 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 aftirward he made mo of hem, he clepid hem there in the xviij^c^. c̃. hise Goddis. This Michas made oon of hise sones to be a preest in officiyng to God bifore these ymagis, and aftirward he made a straunge deken comyng to his hous forto be a preest in his hous into the seid officiyng to God bifore the seid first mad principal ymage and the othere aftir maad ymagis. Aftir al this, the sones of Dan tooken awey bi strengthe these same ymagis and the seid preest which was bifore a deken oonli, and vsiden tho same ymagis, and ordeyneden that the same preest schulde office to God bifore tho ymagis in her tribu or kinred as he dide bifore in the hous of Miche. And in this officicing[1] the tribu of Dan contynued bi manye hundridis of ȝeeris, as it is open there in the eende of the xviij^c^. c̃. Now, Sir, to thee thus: Neither Miche, neither his modir, neither aftirward the tribu or kinred of Dan, was holde eny ydolatrers, neither it was holde as for reprouable gouernaunce here now bifore spokun gouernaunce in having and vsing ymagis of God and in officiyng to God bifore tho ymagis; but it was take for a deuout and a preiseable gouernaunce.

And by the history of others living in those times:

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

[1] Probably a clerical error for *officiyng*.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VI.

he clepid God or Goddis,) so it[1] was in manye other worthi mennys housis. For whi in the xix^e^. c̃. of Iudicum mensioun is mad of an othir deken dwelling in the hil of Effreym, and also in the xvij^e^. c̃. it is seid that a straunge deken came fro an othir place into the hous of Miche; and it is not to be trowid that dekenes officicieden,[2] where that preestis were not officiyng. Wherfore preestis in manye placis of Israel out of the temple officieden, and oratories in worthi mennys housis weren sumwhat bifore thilk tyme forto represente God, euen as the ark or chest of witnessing with propiciatorie representid God in the[3] tabernacle and in the temple.

Also by the history of Laban.

And in lijk maner as Miche dide in this principal purpos, Laban the vncle of Iacob dide, in that that he hadde in his hous ymagis of God, whiche ymagis his owne douȝter Rachel, the wijf of Iacob, took awey with hir priueli, whanne sche departid from her fadris hous, and schulde iorney with hir husbond Iacob into the lond of Chanaan, as it is open Gen. xxxj^e^. c̃. And ȝit 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 gouernaunce was blamed theryn;[4] 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^ti^. wyntir, if the hous of Laban hadde be wemmed so cursidli as with the synne of ydolatrie.

On the whole then, Scripture allows images of

Wher fore folewith that Holi Writt wel allowith[5] 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] So the MS.; but probably a clerical error for *officieden*.

[3] *the* is added by a later hand.

[4] *theryn* is added by a later hand.

[5] *allowith and approueth*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

maist not aschape, but that therfore thou allowe and approue it to be a point of Goddis moral lawe and a point of his seruice; inlasse[1] than thou wolte refuse al what is writun in the Oold Testament for eny 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 xx^e^. c̃. and Deut. v^e^. c̃. *Thou schalte not make to thee eny grauen thing, et cætera?* 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 feblist bi a greet deel the euydencis whiche thou hast and holdist azens the hauyng and the vsing of ymagis. And zit, the sothe to seie, what Laban dide aboute the ymagis was bifore 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.

CHAP. VI.

God to be had and used. The Lollards posed on their own principles.

vij. CHAPITER.

THE secunde principal gouernaunce to be tretid in this present secunde partie, of which gouernaunce manye of the layfe ouer myche wijten the clergie, is this: That pilgrimagis to dyuerse bodies and bonys of Seintis be mad, and also ben mad to ymagis of Crist crucified 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.

The second ordinance objected to is the going on pilgrimage to relics and images.

[1] Both here and elsewhere it is not very clear whether the scribe intended to write *inlasse* conjunctim or disjunctim.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VII.

THE FIRST CONCLUSION IN FAVOR OF PILGRIMAGES. They are not forbidden in Scripture, either by St. Peter or any other writer.

Into iustifiyng of this ij^e^. principal gouernaunce y procede bi certein conclusiouns, of whiche the firste is this: Holi Scripture weerneth not and lettith not neither reproueth suche now seid pilgrymagis to be don. This conclusioun y proue thus: If eny place of Holy Scripture schulde so weerne, thilk place were this i^e^. Petri iiij^e^. c̃. where it is writun thus: *Moost dere britheren, nile ȝe go in pilgrimage in feruour which is maad to ȝou to temptacioun:*[1] but so it is, that this now rehercid text of Scripture lettith not such bifore seid pilgrimage; and noon other place of Scripture is founde for to weerne suche seid pilgrimage. Wherfore noon place of Holy Scripture it weerneth, reproueth, or lettith.

A passage from St. Peter, in which pilgrimages are supposed to be forbidden, discussed. Bodily pilgrimages not alluded to in that passage.

The ij^e^. premisse of this argument mai be proued thus: The now rehercid proces of Petri (i^e^. Petri iiij^e^. c̃.) spekith not of pilgrimage 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 persecucioun which is don to him for the holding and keping of thilk lawe of God; which variaunce and awey going now seid Seint Peter clepith there pilgrimage bi a likenes to bodili pilgrimage and bi a figuratijf speche, which pilgrimage 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 inforth*, MS., the hyphen at the end of the line being (accidentally ?) omitted. It is distinctly written conjunctim just below.

Digitized by Google

lettith no thing bodili pilgrimage of which spekith the firste now bifore sett principal conclusion.

Further proof of this. The context of the passage discussed.

That this vnderstonding now bi me ȝouun is the verry and dew litteral vndirstonding of the text i°. Petri iiij. c̃. it is open ynouȝ to alle hem, whiche wolen biholde al the hool proces fro thens into the eende of the chapiter. Forwhi euene immediatli at next to the now bifore alleggid text of Peter this proces folewith; *as if eny newe thing bifalle to ȝou; but comune ȝe with the passiouns of Crist and haue ȝe ioie, that also ȝe be glad and haue ioie in the reuelacioun of his glorie. If ȝe ben dispisid for the name of Crist, ȝe 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 ȝou. But no man of ȝou suffre as a mansleer, or a theef, or curser, or desirer of othere mennys goodis; but if as a Cristen man, schame he not; but glorifie he God in this name, et cætera.* Lo hou open it is, (if these wordis of Peter be ioyned to the former wordis of Peter,) that Petir[1] meeneth forto remove bi the former wordis al vnstable vnconstaunce and variaunce and vnperseueraunce, which peple happili wolde haue in leuyng the lawe of God for persecucioun. Forwhi thoruȝ out al the wordis therto pertinentli ioyned and cleuyng Petir stireth tho same men for to haue pacience and perseueraunce in her persecucioun and abiding in the lawe of God, so that thei suffre thilk persecucioun for keping[2] of the lawe of God and not for her trespacis doon aȝens the lawe of God.

The necessity of taking the context and historical scope of passages of

And therfore myn vndirstonding ȝouun bifore 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).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VII.

Scripture into the account, before interpreting them. St. Augustine a follower of the literal and historical method of interpretation.

writith. And alle men musten[1] nedis graunte, that bi circumstauncis of the textis and processes ligging bifore or bi hinde a text in Holi Scripture ouȝte be take which is the verri and dew litteral vndirstonding of thilk text ful ofte and miche and euere, but if sum special skile it lette. And so Austin knoulechid him silf hunte out the dew litteral vndirstonding of Holi Scripture.[2] Wherfore the bifore set vnderstonding to the seid former text of Peter is trewe and dew.

If the text were understood so as to condemn pilgrimages, it would be contrary to other texts of the New Testament. The women who visited Christ's tomb were in fact pilgrims.

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 aȝens the doctrine of the Gospel and aȝens the doctrine of Crist. Forwhi it is writun pleinli Matheu xxviij^{e}. c̃., and Mark xxij^{e}. c̃., and Luk the xxiiij^{e}. c̃., and Iohun the xx^{e}. c̃. that deuoute and holi wommen, as weren thanne certein Maries, camen to the sepulcre of Crist for to visite his sepulcre and his deed bodi, and forto do office of remembrauncing bi the signe of oynement, lijk as Crist bifore spake and prophecied ther of, Matheu xxvj^{e}. c̃., that it schulde be so doon to his bodi, whanne he seid thus: *This womman sending this oynement into my bodi dide to biriẽ me. Treuly y seie to ȝou, where euere this gospel schal be prechid in al the world, it schal be seid that sche dide this into the mynde of him.* And no man mai seie nay, but that tho 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.) figurate intelligendus est, quis genuit Cain et Abel et Seth? An et ipsi figurate tantum fuerunt, non etiam homines ex hominibus nati? De proximo ergo attendant istam præsumtionem quo tendat, et conentur nobiscum cuncta primitus quæ gesta narrantur in expressionem proprietatis accipere." S. August. *de Genes. ad litt.*, lib. viii. c. i. § 4. (tom. iii. p. 170. Ed. Benedict., Ant., 1700.)

Digitized by Google

bodi and forto do there sum bodili deede, wherbi thei schulden the more mynde haue of him, maden a bodili pilgrimage, euen lijk to the bodily pilgrimagis whiche of deuout and weel gouerned pilgrimes ben now woned be doon. Wherfore the text and teching of Petir weren[1] contrarie to these now rehercid placis of the Gospel in whiche pilgrimagis ben allowid of Crist, if thilk text of Peter schulde be vndirstonde forto weerne and lette alle bodili pilgrimagis, that thei ben not doon. And so is the firste principal conclusion sufficientli proued.

THE SECOND CONCLUSION. Reason does not condemn pilgrimages. Proof of the conclusion.

The ij°. principal conclusioun is this: Doom of kindeli weel disposid resoun weerneth not and lettith not bodili pilgrymagis to be doon in the maner now bifore 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 bifore spoken in the iij°. and iiij°. chapitris of this present ij°. partie, there brouȝt forth in treting of the ij°. principal conclusioun mad for iustifiyng of ymagis. Or ellis it muste be oon of the domes whiche schulen be rehercid soone aftir in the ix°. c̄. in arguyng aȝens the firste and the ij°. seyde principal gouernaunces. But so it is, that noon of the iij. bifore sett out doomys of resoun may weerne and lette the seid pilgrimagis. Forwhi to ech of tho iij. kindis of domes it is bifore sufficientli answerid bothe for ymagis and for pilgrimagis to gidere, neither eny of the domes soone after in argumentis to be brouȝt forth in the ix°. chapiter weerneth and lettith. Forwhi to ech of hem anoon aftir in the x°. xj°. xij°. xiij°. xiiij°. and xv°. chapitris it schal be sufficientli answerid. Wherfore no doom of weel disposid resoun in kinde schal lette and weerne or reproue the bifore seid pil-

[1] *were*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VII.

grimage, that it be not doon. And so this ij^{e}. principal conclusioun is to be holde for trewe.

THE THIRD CONCLUSION. It is not unlawful that pilgrimages be performed. Proof of the conclusion.

The iij^{e}. principal conclusioun is this: It is not vnleeful pilgrimagis to be doon. That this conclusion is trewe, y proue thus: What euer gouernaunce neither Holi Scripture, neither doom of weel disposid 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 bifore going principal conclusioun; neither doom of resoun it weerneth or reproueth, as it is open bi the ij^{e}. next bifore sett principal conclusioun. Wherfore folewith that suche pilgrimagis ben not vnleeful. And so this principal iij^{e}. conclusioun is trewe.

THE FOURTH CONCLUSION. It is in a large sense lawful to perform pilgrimage. Proof of the conclusion.

The iiij^{e}. principal conclusion is this: It is leeful, in maner of the bifore set x^{e}. reule or supposicioun, that pilgrimagis be doon. This conclusioun y proue thus: What euer gouernaunce is not vnleeful is leeful; for so schewith the bifore sett x^{e}. reul in the firste chapiter of this present ij^{e}. partie. But so it is, that pilgrimagis to be doon is not vnleeful, as it is open bi the next bifore going conclusioun. Wherfore that pilgrimagis be doon, it is leeful. And so this present iiij^{e}. conclusioun is proued to be trewe.

THE FIFTH CONCLUSION. Scripture allows pilgrimages. Proof of the conclusion.

The v^{e}. principal conclusioun is this: Holi Scripture allowith[1] that pilgrimage be doon. This conclusioun is sufficientli proued bifore bi what is alleggid bifore in this present chapiter, in proof of the next firste conclusioun in this ij^{e}. partie, of the holi deuoute wommen, whiche wenten in pilgrimage to Cristis sepulcre and to his deed bodi forto be the more remembrid of him; and bi this that Crist prophecied that Marie Magdalen schulde so do; and he approued

[1] *allowith and approueth*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

and iustified her dede ther yn, as it is open Math. xxviij°. c̃., whanne he seide, "that sche dide a good "werk into him; and that where euer in the world "schulde be prechid thilk gospel, it schulde be seid "that sche dide it into the mynde of him, and that "sche dide it into the biriyng of him," and so forth, as y haue write herof more pleinly in dyuerse placis. Wherfore this v°. conclusioun is trewe.

The present conclusion proved also in another manner in the earlier part of this book.

Also this present v°. conclusioun is proued vnsoilabili bi a proof mad bifore in the firste parti of this present book, the [xix°.][1] chapiter, bi setting forth of iij. reulis and thanne bi taking[2] of iiij. conclusiouns there formed upon hem. Se there the proof who euer wole.

viij. CHAPITER.

THE SIXTH CONCLUSION. Reason allows and approves of pilgrimage. This conclusion shall be proved by seven rules or suppositions, from which it will necessarily follow.

THE vj°. conclusioun is this: Doom of weel disposid resoun allowith and approueth that pilgrimagis be doon. This conclusioun y schal proue bi setting and sending bifore of open reulis and supposiciouns, and bi from hem falling doun into special proof of this present conclusioun.

The first rule. The lives of Christ and of the Saints are great benefits to Christians; and are therefore most profitable to be remembered by them. This rule self-evident.

The firste reule or supposicioun is this: The holi lijf and passioun of Iesus Crist was to alle Cristen a passing greet benefet: the ȝiftis of gracis, the glories of heuen bihiȝt ben to alle Cristene passyng greete benefetis: the holi lijf and conuersacioun of ech Seint is to alle Cristen a greet benefet of God ȝouun to hem. The dignite and worthines of God, his loue, and his riȝtwisnes ben ful worthi and reuerend, gode, and preciose. And alle these now bifore

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

[2] *bitaking*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VIII.

rehercid thingis ben therfore ful profitable to be knowe and to be remembrid of alle Cristene, that God be therbi the more loued of us and that we haue the ferventir wil forto do and suffre in seruyng him and in keping hise lawis. This reule or supposicioun is so open that he nedith no proof at al.

The second rule. It were most hurtful to all Christians, that these and other like things should not be remembered. Proof of the rule.

The ij^e^. reule or supposicioun is this: It were ful vnprofitable and damageful to alle Cristene, but if these now bifore seid benefetis and these seid dignitees of God were of al Cristen remembrid. Forwhi, if thei be not remembrid, thei schulen not be reckid[1] 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 eny thing which he schulde do ther with or ther bi, deed or lost or not being.

The third rule. It is most reasonable that reminding signs should be had of all these things. Proof of the rule. The custom of going on pilgrimage to relics, images, crucifixes, &c., defended on this ground.

The iij^e^. reule or supposicioun is this: It is ful resonable and ful worthi that rememoratijf visible signes be had of alle these now spokun thingis in the firste and ij^e^. reulis or supposicions. Forwhi withoute rememoratijf signes of a thing or of thingis the rememoracioun or the remembraunce of thilk thing or thingis muste needis be the febler, as experience sufficientli witnessith; and therfore, sithen the bodi or the bonis or othere relikis of eny persoon is a ful nyȝ rememoratijf signe of the same persoon, it is ful resonable and ful worthi that where the bodi or bonis or eny releef or relik of a Seint mai be had, that it be sett up in a comoun place to which peple may haue her deuout neiȝing and accesse, forto haue her deuout biholding ther upon forto make the seid therbi remembraunce. And ferther, sithen it is not resonable and conuenient that suche bodies or bonis or relikis be left withoute in the baar feeld, (and that bothe for it were aȝens the eese of the peple whiche schulde

[1] *reckd*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

come therto in reyny and wyndi wedris, and for that thei myȝten thanne be take awey bi wickid men not dreding God,) therfore it is ful resonable and worthi forto bilde ouer tho bodies and bonis and othere relikis chapellis or chirchis; ȝhe, and forto bilde bisidis hem auter and queris, that the office of preising God and of preiyng to God and to Seintis be in the better forme doon. And aȝenward, 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 remembraunce of the bifore seid thingis in the firste and ij^e. 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 bifore 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, therfore 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 therto longing, and that thei be housid and doon to as it is now bifore writun of the ymagis of othere Seintis. This reule or supposicioun hath withinne him sett forth sufficient euydencis for his proof, and therfore he is to be holde for trewe.

The iiij^e. reule or supposicioun is this: If bi the ymagis of which it[1] is spokun in the next bifore going reule or supposicioun schulde be maad eny quyk and feruent and solempne and miche deuout remembraunce vpon the thingis spokun of in the firste and ij^e. bifore going reulis, thei mowe not be multiplied so wijde

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

[1] *it* is interlineated by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VIII.

had for purposes of devotion. Proof of the rule.

that at ech chirche, 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 remembrauncing upon the seid thingis, thei mowe 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 noumbre 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, thouz in ech chapel or chirch may 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 fifth rule. If God appoint, as he does appoint, certain places for the working of miracles, it is more reasonable that we stand to his appointment than to our own in placing of images there for purposes of pilgrimage. The reality of these miracles asserted.

The v^e. reule or supposicioun is this: If God take upon him forto pointe and chese tho placis in whiche schulen be the noumbre 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 oonli therto studie and devise forto make eny such pointing, chesing,[1] or assignyng. And ferthermore it is so, that God takith vpon him forto make such now seid[2] pointing and chesing.

[1] *or chesing*, MS. (first hand). | [2] *seint*, MS.

Digitized by Google

Forwhi he hath wrouȝt myraclis 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 myraclis 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 notifie to vs that he chose thilke placis and thilke ymagis forto that in hem schulden be mad solempne and more feruent and more deuoute remembrauncingis 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 myraclis in summe of tho placis more and ofter than in othere placis like. Wherof folewith ferther, 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 myraclis 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 hauyng notable euidencis that it is a miracle of God, and noon miȝti evidence can be obiectid aȝens this that it is a myracle of God, schulde be take and be holde as a myracle of God;

[1] *in lasse*, MS. disjunctim, (at least without an hyphen at the end of the line,) twice: but elsewhere apparently conjunctim. A little below *in conuenient* occurs without an hyphen, (and also more than once is apparently written disjunctim,) but perhaps accidentally.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VIII.

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 folewe, that thouȝ 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 euidence for the miracle) can be brouȝt forth and schewid. Wherfore, alle thingis seen, this present v^e^. reule or supposicion is trewe.

The sixth rule. When God chooses particular images for the end above named it is reasonable to suppose that he will work miracles by them.

The vj^e^. reule or supposicioun is this: Whanne God chesith oon ymage bifore an other ymage into the office now bifore seid and spokun in the iiij^e^. and v^e^. supposiciouns or reulis, it is not inconuenient that God make thilk ymage of stoon or of tre forto swete, and that the ymage be mooued fro oon place vnto an othir place withoute mannis bering and withoute other mannis herto sett bisynes, and that the yȝen of the ymage be turned hidirward and thidirward verrili or semyngly as thouȝ the ymage sie, and that the ymage (in such maner as God made the asse of Balaam) speke.

Proof of the rule. God thus testifies to men, that he appoints particular images for that solemn end. The reasonableness of believing these miracles asserted.

Forwhi, whanne it likith to God forto chese oon ymage bifore an other ymage into the office bifore sett in the iiij^e^. and v^e^. 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 chesith thilk ymage into the seid office, as it is open bi the v^e^. 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.

Digitized by Google

more assignable to be propre into this witnessing and denouncing than is an other miracle doable of God and bi the same ymage; (but alle kindis of myraclis seruen therto rizt weel and as it were lijk weel, and namelich the myracle of sweting and of movyng or walking or of turnyng the izen and the myracle of speking seruen lijk conuenientli to the seid witnessing or denouncing, as othere miracles schulden therto serue:)—it folewith to be trewe, that (for this eende and entent of schewing and denouncing and witnessing, that God chesith this ymage of stoon or tree or of metal bifore othere like ymagis into the seid office spokun in the iiij^{e}. and v$_{e}$. reulis,) it is not inconuenient but it is conuenient ynowz that God at sumwhile make thilk ymage swete, and that the ymage be moued from oon place into an other place with oute mannys labour, and that the izen of the ymage be turned hidirward and thidirward, and that the ymage semyngli speke, that is to seie, that speche and soun be mad in the ymage bi an aungel of God, as it was doon in the asse of Balaam, Numer. xxij^{e}. c̃. And ferthermore herof, if it be not inconuenient these thingis to be doon in ymagis bi God, it is not inconuenient the seers and the next heerers of these thingis so doon forto knowe and wite and witnesse that thei ben so doon; and it is not inconuenient othere 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 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.

The vij^{e}. reule or supposicioun is this: Whi and wherfore God chesith this place more than an other certein place, and wole do miraclis in oon such place and bifore sum such seid ymage more than in an other place and than bifore another lijk ymage, is not of men to be enquerid. Forwhi, that God chesith oon place more than an other and oon ymage more than

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VIII.

anothir, that therbi be mad a solempne and a feruent remembraunce vpon the thingis seid in the firste reule, we mowe knowe and wite bi this, that solempne miraclis (suche as we kunnen not bi sufficient euydence impugne) God dooth in oon place and not in an other, and bifore summe ymage and not bifore an other. And therfore that God so chesith these placis and ymagis bifore othere it is of us to be holde, for therto we han this now seid myȝti evidence; but certis whi and wherfore he chesith this place and this ymage bifore othere, we han noon evidence withinne doom of resoun, neither bi eny mark or evidence ȝouun to vs fro God; and therfore fro enquirancis whi God chesith this place and this ymage bifore othere into the seid effect of solempne remembrauncing vpon the seid thingis, we ouȝten algatis abstene and forbere. And so this present vij^e. reule or supposicioun is trewe.

The proof of the sixth conclusion follows from these rules. Reason approves that men visit those places and images which God appoints for the purposes of devotion by the evidence of miracles, i.e. that they go on pilgrimage thither; for if they do not, they do not conform themselves to God's appointment.

Aftir these vij. reulis or supposiciouns y argue thus: Resoun wole and allowith and approueth nedis that men visite and haunte for the seide eende of solempne remembrauncing tho placis and tho ymagis, which it is sure God to chese into the seid eende and bi the seid euydencis of myraculis doing: forwhi ellis we conformeden not us to it wherto God vs callith and prouokith, wherof we ouȝten be waar. But so it is, that such seid visiting and haunting into the seid eende is not ellis than pilgrimage. Wherfore resoun wele 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 proued this present vj^e. conclusioun, that doom of weel disposid resoun allowith and approueth pilgrimage to be doon.

Further proof of the conclusion to be found in Pecock's *Book of Worshiping*.

Who euer wole se more proof for this present vj^e. principal conclusioun, rede he in *The book of worschiping*, nameliche there in the ij^e. partie; and he

Digitized by Google

schal, what in the firste partie and what in the ij^e. partie, fynde herto proof ynouȝ. CHAP. VIII.

The vij^e. principal conclusioun is this: It is leeful, in proprist maner of leefulnes, that pilgrimagis be doon. This conclusioun may be proued thus: What euer gouernaunce is allowid and approued bi Holi Scripture and bi doom of weel disposid resoun is in proprist maner leeful, as it is open bi the ix^e. reule or supposicioun sett in the first chapiter of this present ij^e. parti. But so it is, that pilgrimagis to be doon is allowid and approued bi Holi Scripture, as it is[1] open bi the next bifore going v^e. principal conclusioun; and it is allowid and approued bi doom of weel disposid resoun, as it is open bi the next bifore going vj^e. principal conclusioun. Wherfore folewith that pilgrymagis to be doon is leeful in proprist maner of leefulnes. And so this present vij^e. conclusioun is trewe.

THE SEVENTH CONCLUSION. It is lawful in the strictest sense to perform pilgrimage. Proof of the conclusion.

The viij^e. principal conclusioun is this: Pilgrimagis doing is a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt seruice, thouȝ it be not alwey vnder comaundement of his lawe. That this conclusioun is trewe, y proue thus: What euer gouernaunce doom of weel disposid resoun biddith, God biddith; and what euer gouernaunce doom of weel disposid resoun counseilith, allowith, or approueth, God the same gouernance counseilith, allowith, or approueth, as it is openli bifore schewid in mentenyng the firste principal gouernaunce bi therto mad and sett forth the viij^e. conclusioun and bi the processe next therto there aftir going. But so it is, that pilgrimagis to be doon doom of weel disposid resoun counseilith, allowith, and approueth, as it is open bi proof of the next bifore going vj^e. conclusioun. Wherfore pilgrimagis to

THE EIGHTH CONCLUSION. The performance of pilgrimage is a point of God's moral law, though not always under commandment of his law. Proof of the conclusion. It is allowed by reason.

[1] *as is*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. VIII.

be doon is a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt seruice.

It is also allowed by Scripture.

Also thus: What euer gouernaunce Holi Scripture allowith[1] and is not bi Holi Scripture reproued, is a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunte seruice. But such a gouernaunce is doing of pilgrimagis, as it is open bi what is bifore seid into proof of the next bifore going firste conclusioun and of the next bifore going v^e^. conclusioun. Wherfore this present viij^e^. conclusioun is trewe.

THE NINTH CONCLUSION. It is not sinful but meritorious for a man to set an example to others of performing pilgrimage. Proof of the conclusion.

The ix^e^. principal conclusioun is this: It is not synne a man bi hise werkis forto ensaumple to othere men, that thei make pilgrimagis in the maner bifore tauȝt; and that thei do as he doith, if he do in the maner bifore tauȝt: but it is a merytorie and a weel doon deede for to it ensaumple. That this conclusioun is trewe, y proue thus: It is no synne a man bi hise werkis forto ensaumple to othere men, that thei do a deede and a point of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt seruice; but it is a merytorie deede forto it[2] ensaumple to othere. And herwith so it is, that forto make pilgrimagis in the maner bifore tauȝt is a deede of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt service, as it is open bifore bi the next bifore going conclusioun. Wherfore it is not synne a man forto ȝeue ensaumple to othere men, that thei make pilgrimagis in the maner bifore tauȝt; but it is merytorie and weel doon forto ȝeue thilk ensaumple. And so this present ix^e^. conclusioun is to be holde trewe.

---

[1] *allowith and approueth*, MS. (first hand).

[2] *it* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

ix. CHAPITER.

AFTIR al this what is tretid upon the firste and ij^e. principal gouernauncis fro the bigynnyng of this ij^e. parti hidirto, (and that bi ix. conclusiouns seruyng to the firste gouernaunce, and bi othere ix. conclusiouns seruyng to the ij^e. gouernaunce,) y schal next now sette forth the argumentis and the obieccioun, whiche the lay peple (being ouer myche wijters of the clergie) maken azens the seid firste and ij^e. gouernauncis.

An enumeration and refutation of the arguments made by some of the laity against images and pilgrimages.

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 rehercid bifore, (in the viij^e. chapiter of this ij^e. partie in the firste and ij^e. reulis or supposicions,) that is to seie, the benefetis of God, his punyschingis, his holi lijf and passioun, the holi lyues of Seintis, and hize dignitees and worthinessis 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 folewingli to therbi the deuouter 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 folewingli therbi into ful deuout preiers to be had, mai and wole serue at ful[1] Holi Scripture with othere writingis of Seintis lyues and othere deuoute treticis of blissis[2] in heuen and of peynes in helle and suche othere treticis. Wherfore the hauyng of ymagis and

THE FIRST ARGUMENT OF THE LOLLARDS. Images and pilgrimages can be defended only as calling to mind the lives of Christ and the Saints; but the reading of Scripture and other devout works does this fully: so that images and pilgrimages may well be dispensed with.

[1] *at the ful*, MS. (first hand). | [2] *blilsie*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IX.

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

Their confirmation of the argument. If anything 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.

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 vsing of this thing is not necessarie, (that is to seie, is not needisly to be had,) but mai rizt weel be forborn. But so it is in this present purpos, that the hauing and vsing 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 zit so it is, that therto writingis mowe serue better than thei. Wherfore thei ben not necessarie, but thei mowe be rizt weel lackid and not had and doon.

Their reply to the argument that many can not read. They think that all might with great advantage be taught to read in their childhood.

And if eny man wole 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 therfore 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 remembrauncis myzte not of hem be had: thanne the seid arguers wolen sette to and fortofie her partie thus: It myzte be ordeyned that alle men and wommen in her zongthe schulden leerne forto rede writingis in the langage in which thei schulden lyue and dwelle; and thanne therbi schulde come forth not oonli this seid good of remembrauncing, but myche othir good also ther with. And therfore thei setten litil bi the answere now maad.

THE SECOND ARGUMENT OF THE LOLLARDS. If

The ij^{e}. argument is this: If bischopis, preestis, and clerkis foundun and endewid therto bi the lay

[1] *the* is interlineated by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

peple wolden preche to the lay peple so ofte and so myche as thei ouȝten 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[1] forto make pilgrimagis into the seid remembrauncis to be therbi gete and had. Wherfore it is not resonable neithir conuenient that the necligence of so weel wagid bischopis, preestis, and clerkis schulde be suffrid to be and contynue; and that the lay peple schulde be dryue bi thilk necligence 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 streeche.

CHAP. IX.

the clergy would preach to the people about the things which are called to their remembrance by images and pilgrimages, these last would be neither necessary nor profitable.

The iij^e. argument is this: Vein and waastful occupacioun it is forto make myche labour and cost forto haue and vse the sympler and vnperfiter and lasse representing ymage of a thing, whanne with lasse labour and cost mai be had the perfiter and fuller and better representing ymage of the same thing. But so it is, that ech lyuyng man is verier and perfiter and fuller and better representing ymage of Crist and of ech Seint, than is eny vnquyk stok or stoon graued and ourned with gold and othere gay peinturis.[2] Wherfore it is vein and waast forto make such labour and cost into the making and hauyng of suche vnquyke gay ymagis.

THE THIRD ARGUMENT OF THE LOLLARDS. It is vain to spend labour and cost about a less perfect image of Christ, as a crucifix is, when they may be better spent on a more perfect image of him, which every living man is.

The iiij^e. argument is this: God is lijk presentli euery where, and therfore he is lijk redi for to ȝeue hise gracis and ȝiftis euery where, where euer a man

THE FOURTH ARGUMENT OF THE LOLLARDS. God is present everywhere alike.

[1] *or* is interlineated by a later hand.

[2] See *The Apology for the Lollards*, ascribed to Wiclif, p. 88.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IX.

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

sechith after hem; and therfore no place in erthe is holier than an other[1] place is,[2] and noon ymage is holier than an other lijk ymage is. Wherfore it is vein waast and idil forto trotte to Wasingam rather than to ech other place in which an ymage of Marie is, and to the rode of the north dore at London rather than to ech other roode in what euer place he be.

THE FIFTH ARGUMENT OF THE LOLLARDS. The devil has enticed men to pilgrimages by working miracles in images, and all Christians should be on their guard against his devices.

The v^e^. argument is this: The feendis wijlis and deceitis ben forto be waarli considerid and forto be smertli fled, as Peter techith, (i^e^. Petri v^e^. c̃. in the eende): but so it is that the feend hath deceyued sliȝli and wijlily men and wommen whiche han worschipid ymagis and han come to ymagis in pilgrimage, as it[3] is open ynouȝ in the lijf and legend of Seint Bartholome,[4] 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[5] come bifore him in pilgrimage and preie; and thanne he wolde make hem hool. And herbi he drowe the peple into mys bileeue and mys lyuyng. Wherfore ech Cristen man ouȝte be waar and kepe him silf fer fro such perel; and ther fore bi tendirnes, which he ouȝte haue to kepe him waarli fro synne, he ouȝte forbere vce of ymagis and going in pilgrimages.

THEIR SIXTH ARGUMENT. Images bear the appearance of evil, against which St. Paul warns us.

The vj^e^. argument is this: Poul techith alle Cristen men (i^e^. Tessalonic. v^e^. c̃.) thus: *Absteyne ȝou from al 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.

---

[1] *other*, MS. (first hand).

[2] *is* is interlineated by a later hand.

[3] *it* is added by a later hand.

[4] The legend (both in its Greek and Latin form) may be seen in Tischendorf's *Act. Apost. Apocr.*, p. 243, sqq., Lips. 1851.

[5] *schulde*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IX.

THEIR SEVENTH ARGUMENT. The cost spent on images might be expended on much better things.

The vij^e.[1] argument is this: It is neither wisdom neither tender loue bering to the seruice of God a man forto leue vndoon many better seruicis of God, for this that he wole do oon myche lasse good seruice of God; but so it is, that thouȝ the seid vsing of ymagis and the seid pilgrimaging weren seruicis to God, ȝit in the whilis and with the costis in and with which thei ben doon manye othere myche better seruicis of God myȝten be doon, as visiting of poor men, and teching of vnwise men, and bisie studie in deuoute bookis and in othere bookis of goostli leernyng. Wherfore folewith that a bad chaunge is forto bisette so mich labour and coste aboute ymagis and pilgrimagis.

THEIR EIGHTH ARGUMENT. It is Christian wisdom to adhere to Scriptural rules only, whatever may be pleaded for other observances by philosophy.

The viij^e. argument is this: It is sure and sikir and greet discrecioun Cristen men forto holde hem to tho gouernauncis which Holy Scripture of the Newe Testament techith hem, and forto caste aside alle othere gouernauncis or reulis whiche ben not tauȝt in the Newe Testament; ȝhe, thou tho gouernauncis and reulis be[2] weel ynouȝ and sufficientli ynowȝ groundid in doom of weel disposid resoun. Forwhi Seint Poul seith, Coloc. ij^e. c̃., thus: *Se ȝe that no man disceyue ȝou bi philsophie and vein fallace aftir the tradicioun of men, aftir the elementis of the world, and not aftir Crist; for in him dwellith bodilich al the fulnes of the Godhede.* But so it is, that Holi Scripture in the Newe Testament techith not the seid[3] vsing of ymagis neither the seid pilgrimaging; but thei ben had withoute forth bi resonyng and arguyng in moral philsophie: and of al such craft and sutiling ouȝten alle Cristen men be waar, 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 interlineated by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IX.

which thei ouȝten haue that thei synne not,) ouȝten be waar and forbere al such craft of ymagis vsing and of pilgrimagis making.[1]

THEIR NINTH ARGUMENT. Images and pilgrimages are virtually forbidden by Christ's conversation with the woman of Samaria.

The ix^e^. argument is this: Iohun iiij^e^. c̃., whanne Crist saat at the welle of Iacob and talkid with the womman Samaritan, he excludid the vce of ymagis and the vce of pilgrimage.[2] Forwhi he seide to the womman thus: *The tyme is come and now it is, whanne trewe worschipers schulen worschipe the Fadir in spirit and trouthe; for also the Fadir sechith such that worschipen him. God is a spirit, and it bihoueth hem that worschipen him to worschipe in spirit and trouthe.* Thus myche Crist seide there: wherbi is excludid and wilned of Crist to be removed, that eny man schulde worschipe God bi eny outward ymagis; in as miche as he wolde ech man aftir him comyng forto be so perfit that he worschipe 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 fadris worschipiden in this hil,* (that is to seie, the hil clepid Garizim,) *and ȝe,* (that is to seie, Iewis,) *seien that at Ierusalem*[3] *is a place where it bihoueth to worschipe:* Iesus seide to hir thus: *Womman, bileeue thou to me, for the hour schal come, whanne neither in this his*[4] *hil neither in Ierusalem ȝe schulen worschipe the Fader. Ȝe,* (that is to seie, Samaritanis or dwellers in the cuntre of Samarie,) *worschipen what ȝe knowen not; we,*

---

[1] *and vsing of pilgrimagis making,* MS. (first hand).

[2] *pilgrimagis,* MS. (first hand).

[3] *ierl^p^m,* MS., and similarly elsewhere.

[4] *his,* so the MS.; but the word should probably be expunged. It is not found in either form of Wiclif's version, from which the citation is made.

Digitized by Google

(that is to seie, Iewis,) *worschipen what we knowen: for helthe is of the Iewis.* Thus miche there. Of which proces folewith that Crist excludid pilgrimage, whanne he seid that peple schulde frothens after worschipe neither in Ierusalem neither in the now seid hil; for the worschiping, 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[1] be among the peple which he came to teche.

THEIR TENTH ARGUMENT. Images and pilgrimages are the signs of vanity and vain-glory.

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 hise deuoute preiers,) but if he desire laude and preising of the peple seiyng that he goith in thilk pilgrimage? Also what skile is therto, that he bere openli bi stretis an ymage of wex or[2] of tre forto offre 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 preie continueli for him in thilk place of pilgrimage bi nyȝt and dai, whanne he were departid frothens and were come hoom aȝen? But certis open it is, that alle these ententis ben or[3] yuel or in vein. Wherfore noon such open going in pilgrimagis bi stretis 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.

THEIR ELEVENTH ARGUMENT. Joshua's command to Israel to put away

The xj^e^. argument is this: Iosue xxiiij^e^. c̃. the duke Iosue seid to the peple of Israel thus: *Do ȝe awey fro the myddis of ȝou alien*[4] *Goddis, and bowe ȝe*

[1] *schulden*, MS. (second hand); but the original reading is manifestly right.

[2] *or* is interlineated by a later hand.

[3] *or* is added by a later hand.

[4] *alien* is added by a later (?) hand. It is found in Wiclif's version.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IX.

strange Gods may be applied to images now.

ȝoure hertis to the Lord God of Israel. Wherfore bi lijk skile and lijk weel it myȝte be seid to Cristen men: "Do ȝe awey fro the myddis of ȝou alien "Goddis, that is to seie, ȝoure ymagis whiche ȝe "worschipen and holden as ȝoure Goddis."

THEIR TWELFTH ARGUMENT. Jews and heathens though civilised and learned fell into idolatry by images; and, consequently, there may be such peril of idolatry by them now among Christians, that they may well be forborn.

The xij^{e}. argument is this: The peple of Iewis 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 conquestis making and her bateilis disposing and her lotting of cuntrees and her beldingis and her othere craftiose doingis whiche thei diden schewen weel the contrarie. Also the hethen men which weren in the daies of Iewis weren ful wise, and thei weren not so vndiscrete as ben now Cristen children of x. ȝeer age, neither as ben folis among Cristen men. Forwhi the fynding of kunnyngis, (as of comoun natural philsophie, of medicinal philsophie, of methaphisik, of astronomye, and of geometrie, and othere particuler sciencis, and of moral philsophie, and of ful discrete policie, and of sutil craftis doon bi hem) schewith ful miche the contrarie. But not with stonding al this, the Iewis weren[1] so cumbrid bi having and vsing ymagis that thei maden hem a calf of siluer, and seiden that it was her God which brouȝt hem out of Egipt, as it is open Exodi xxxij^{e}. c̃., and ofte in othere tymes thei worschipiden ymagis of stoonys or of stockis as for her Goddis, as it is open ynouȝ in ful manye placis of the Book of Kingis in Holi Writt. And also hethen men, how euere greet clerkis thei weren and how euer politik wise men thei weren, ȝit thei also worschipiden ymagis of tre and of stoon for her Goddis, as the Sauter seith therof in the cxiij^{e}. psalme thus: *The symylacris of hethen men ben siluer and gold, the werkis of mennys hondis;*

[1] *were*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

tho han mouth and schulen not speke, et cætera. Thei that maken hem be maad lijk to hem, and alle that trusten in hem. The hous of Israel hopid in the Lord, he is the helper of hem and the defender of hem. Wherfore as weel or miche rather Cristen men ouȝten be waar forto entirmete with like ymagis, lest that thei falle into lijk defaut; for wher yn oon myȝti man stumblith, there an other myȝti man ouȝte drede[1] lest he also stumble. And ellis Cristen men putten hem silf into perel of breking Goddis lawe,[2] which is a trespace in it silf, ȝhe, and ferther sithen so wise and so myȝti men in discrecioun fillen into ydolatrie bi occasioun of entermeting with ymagis, it is likeli that also manye Cristen men and wommen fallen into ydolatrie bi her vce of ymagis, thouȝ it be not knowe openli.

X. CHAPITER.

THE xiij°. argument is this: To what euer 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 othere lay men) preien deuoutli, that he schulde saue hem and kepe hem and make Crist plesid with hem which henge in him, and forto do what mannis power sufficith not forto do to hem. Wherfore alle tho men in thilk while taken a creature to be her God.

THEIR THIRTEENTH ARGUMENT. Whatever men pray to, they take for their God; but some men pray to the cross, and therefore take a creature for their God.

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

The second premiss of the argument proved from

[1] *ouȝte to drede*, MS. (first hand).

[2] *breking of Goddis lawe*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. X.

the hymn sung in Passion Week.

deunt sungun in the Passion Weke in Lent. For ther yn aftir that long speche is mad to the cros, which is not other than a creature, and whiche spechis mowe not be trewe saue as seid to a creature oonli, it is seid thus: *O cros, the oon hope in this tyme of passioun, encrece thou riȝtwisnes to piteful men and ȝeue forȝeuenes to gilti men.*[1] Wherfore the ij^e^. premisse in this principal xiij^e^. argument is trewe.

And from a prose used in the Feast of the Invention of the Cross. (May 3.)

Also in the Feest of the Crossis Fynding at the first euensong, whanne this response: *O crux, viride lignum, et cætera,* is sungun, aftir that manye spechis ben mad to the cros being a creature, (and whiche spechis mowe not be verified but as seide to a pure creature,) it is seid in the prose forth with therto folewing thus: *Thou, which barist the Lord, make the patroun* (that is to seie, Crist) *forto be to vs inclinable or boweable or redi to heere us: and thou stok, which were*[2] *worthi to bere*[3] *the price of the world, ȝeue and graunte to this peple of Crist the beneficie of the crosse.*[4] Wherfore the seid ij^e^. premysse in this present principal xiij^e^. argument is trewe.

And from an anthem sung in the same Feast.

Also in the anteme: *O crux splendidior, et cætera,* sungun at the ij^e^. euensong in the same feeste, it is seid thus: *O sweete stok, bering sweete nailis and*

---

[1] "O crux, ave spes unica!
Hoc passionis tempore,
Piis adauge gratiam,
Reisque 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. 1555), which Pecock follows, badly reads:
"Auge piis justitiam,
Reisque dona veniam."

[2] *weren*, MS. (first hand).

[3] *be*, MS.

[4] The Salisbury Breviary, May 3, (Lond. 1555) has the 'response' "O crux viride lignum, quia super te pependit Salvator, Rex Israel," &c., followed by the prose:
"Crux fidelis, terras cœlis
Miro nectens fœdere:"
which ends thus:
"Nobis pronum fac patronum,
Quem tulisti Dominum:
Salve lignum vitæ, dignum
Ferre mundi pretium!
Confer isti plebi Christi
Crucis beneficium."

Digitized by Google

sweete birthens, saue this present cumpanie gaderid to gidere now this dai in to thi preisingis.[1] In which speche is open ynouȝ 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 xiij°. argument is trewe.

And from an anthem sung in the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross. (Sept. 14.)

Also in the anteme *Crux fidelis et cætera*, which is sungun at the ij°. euensong in the Feeste of the Crossis Hiȝing, it is seid in lijk wise thus: *O sweete stok, bering sweete nailis and bering sweete birthens,* (that is to seie, the bodi of Crist and hise parties,) *be thou to us a ward aȝens 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 ȝit 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.

And from a sequence sung in the same Festival.

Also in the prose clepid a sequence,[3] which is sungun in the Feeste of the Crossis Hiȝing, aftir 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 myȝte mai not, be it doon*

---

[1] "O crux splendidior cunctis astris, mundo celebris, hominibus multum amabilis, sanctior universis! quæ sola fuisti digna portare talentum mundi: dulce lignum, dulces clavos, dulcia ferens pondera! salva præsentem catervam in tuis hodie laudibus congregatam."—Id. It occurs also in the Roman Breviary, May 3.

[2] This hymn occurs in the Salisbury Breviary, Sept. 14, but the last and most important part is not found in it, nor in Mone's *Lat. Hymn.*, vol. i. p. 131. It begins thus:

"Crux fidelis, inter omnes
Arbor una nobilis,
Nulla silva talem profert
Fronde, flore, germine;
Dulce lignum, dulces clavos,
Dulce pondus sustinens."

In another hymn, however, beginning "O lignum venerabile," (Mone, l. c. p. 138,) we have:

"Contra Satanæ jaculum
Sis mihi, crux, obstaculum."

[3] Beginning "Laudes crucis attollamus."

Digitized by Google

CHAP. X.

in thi name.[1] In which speche it is likeli the maker of the prose meene and entende forto speke to the same thing to which he spak in the vers next going bifore there; and sithen in the vers next bifore going he spekith to a pure creature, (forwhi he seith there thus, *O signe of victorie, noon such among stockis, et cœtera,*)[2] it folewith that in this present vers, *O Cristen medicyn,* he spekith to the same pure creature. And so the seid ij^e^. premysse of the xiij^e^. argument is trewe. And so it what the xiij^e^. argument concludith finali muste needis be trewe.

THEIR FOURTEENTH ARGUMENT. Whatever thing men treat as though it were God, they take for their God. And this they do to the cross, and so make it their God.

The xiiij^e^. argument is this: Anentis what euer thing men beren 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 meker or louȝer or deuouter submission, saluting, and seruice than thei doon to thilk thing,—thanne and for thilk while thei maken or holden and taken thilk thing as for her verri God. But so it is, that bifore these daies and in these daies men beren and gouerne hem silf anentis a crosse in this now seid maner, as now anoon aftir schal be schewid. Wherfore tho whilis men maken thilk crosse her God.

The second premiss of the argument proved from the devotions practised in the processions on Palm-Sunday.

That the ij^e^. premisse of this xiiij^e^. argument is trewe mai be argued thus: In eeldir daies, whanne processioun was mad in the Palme-Sundai bifore masse, the eukarist was not brouȝt forth, that the processioun of the clerkis and of the lay peple schulde

---

[1] "Medicina Christiana,
Salva sanos, ægros sana:
Quod non valet vis humana,
Fit in tuo nomine."
Missal. ad consuet. Eccl. Saresb., Sept. xiv. (Ed. Paris. 1513.)

[2] "O crux, signum triumphale,
Mundi vera salus, vale!
Inter ligna nullum tale,
Fronde, flore, germine."

Digitized by Google

meete with him; but a baar vncouered crosse was brouȝt forth aȝens the processioun, that the processioun schulde meete aȝens it, as y haue red in dyuerse oolde ordinalis of cathedrale chirchis and of monasteries in Ynglond:[1] thouȝ in latir daies and namelich in summe chirchis the eukarist is born forth, and the processioun meetith with the eukarist born in a chest among relikis, and in manie placis he is born in a coupe ordeyned therto.[2] Thanne thus: In tho daies and in tho placis whanne and where the processioun mette in Palmesunday with the nakid crosse or with the chest of rilikis withoute the eukarist, summe of the clerkis weren ordeyned forto stonde bifore the seid crosse and forto turne hem toward the processioun and seie in singing to al the clergie and peple thus: *O Sion mysti douȝter, lo, the King mylde and meke sitting vpon beestis cometh to thee; whom the lesson of prophetis hath bifore 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 horsis of bateil, neither in hiȝe touris.*[3] *This is he which as an innocent lomb is bitraied to*

---

[1] In the York Missal (in Dominic. Palm.) printed at Paris in 1533, occurs this rubric: "Deinde, cum ante tentorium processio ordinata fuerit, diaconus, accepta benedictione a prælato, cum presbytero et subdiacono, et *crucifero* et ceroferariis, in medio stans, legat Evangelium S. Matth. xxi.: 'In illo tempore, cum appropinquasset,' &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 Dominic. Palm.):—"Dum distribuuntur rami (palmarum sc.) præparetur feretrum cum reliquiis, in quo Corpus Christi in pyxide dependeat; . . . . lumen deferatur in laterna procedente cum cruce denudata et duobus vexillis præcedentibus." Various anthems accompany these rites, partly taken from Matth. xxi., after which follows the Gospel as before: "Cum appropinquasset Jesus." (Matth. xxi.) The anthems with the notes are given at length in the "Processionale ad usum insign. Eccl. Sarum." (Paris, 1530.)

[3] Pecock badly reads *turribus*.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. X. *the deeth, which is deeth to deeth, and a bitte to helle, ȝeuyng power to lyue bi his deeth, as blessid prophetis sumtyme sungun in prophecie.*[1] And thanne, this[2] thus seid and sungun fro the clerkis in the crossis bihalue to the preestis and lay peple in the processioun, the preestis and peple fillen doun kneling with alle the knees to the grounde, seiyng or singing or in bothe maners toward the seid discouered crosse thus: *Heil thou, whom the peple of Hebrees meeting witnessith to be Iesus, and crien to thee wordis of helth! Heil liȝt of the world, King of kingis, glorie of heuen, to whom abidith or longith empire, preising, and worschip, here and for euere! Heil oure helthe, very pees, redempcioun, and vertu, which with thi fre wil hast goon vndir for us the lawis of deeth.*[3] And

[1] "Finito evangelio, tres clerici de secunda forma exeuntes ex eadem processione, habitu non mutato, conversi ad populum, stantes ante magnam crucem ex parte occidentali, simul cantent hunc versum hoc modo.

"En rex venit mansuetus tibi,
Sion filia mystica, humilis sedens
super animalia, quem venturum jam prædixit lectio prophetica."

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

"Salve quem Jesum testatur plebs Hebræorum
Obvia cum palmis, tibi clamans verba salutis.

"Hic est qui de Edom venit tinctis Bosra vestibus, in stola sua formosus, gradiens virtutibus, non in equis bellicosis, nec in altis curribus.

"Salve, lux mundi, Rex regum, gloria cœli,
Cui manet imperium, laus, et decus, hic et in sæcum.

"Hic est ille qui ut agnus insons morti traditur, mors mortis, inferni morsus, morte donans vivere, ut quondam beati vates prompserunt prophetice.

"Salve nostra salus, pax vera, redemptio, virtus,
Ultro qui mortis pro nobis jura subisti."

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

[2] *this* is added by a later hand.

[3] These words occur in the anthem just quoted. They are to be sung by the chorus: "in prostratione deosculando terram prosequatur resurgendo."—Id. It does not appear distinctly, from the rubrics, whether the Host was then borne in the procession or not; probably it was, as the bier with the relics certainly was. The same words, however, may have been used in either case in different ages.

Digitized by Google

open it is that to Crist him silf (if he had be there present) thei myȝten not haue mad more lowȝli knouleching that he was her God, than thei at thilk tymes and placis maden to the baar crosse or to the chest of relikis in which the eukarist was not. Wherfore thoruȝ alle tho daies and placis in whiche the eukarist was not borne aȝens the processioun in Palmesunday, al the peple of the processioun bare hem silf and gouerned hem silf anentis the crosse, euen as thei wolden haue bore and gouerned hem silf anentis Crist him silf, if he had be visibili present. And so the ij^e^. premysse of this present xiiij^e^. argument is trewe.

Further proof from the same.

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 whiche weren[1] sett on hiȝe sungen toward the crosse and seiden these versis here folewing, *Glorie, preising, and honour be to thee, King Crist! Aȝenbier! to whom childrennys worschiping songe Osanna, the myilde song.* An other vers thus: *Thou art King of Israel and the noble child of Dauid! Blessid King, which camest in the name of the Lord!* An other vers thus: *Alle the cumpenye in hiȝe placis preiseth thee, ech deedli man and alle creaturis.* An other vers thus: *The peple of Hebrees came with palmes meeting to thee, and lo we ben at thee with preier, good wil, and ympne!* Aftir eche of these versis the queer of preestis and of clerkis stonding in processioun binethe bi the crosse singen the firste verse: *Glorie, preising, and honor, et cætera.*[2] Wherebi it is open that the ij^e^. premysse in the xiiij^e^. argument is trewe.

---

[1] *were*, MS. (first hand).

[2] "Finito regressu (cruciferi, presbyteri, &c.) pueri in altum seu ostium ecclesiæ canant versum:

"Gloria, laus, et honor tibi sit,
Rex Christe, Redemptor,
Cui puerile decus prompsit
Osanna pium."

Digitized by Google

CHAP. X.

Still further proof.

Also in an other place of the same processioun it was and is ȝit kept and vsid in manye chirchis, that the principal crucifix of the chirche schal be discouered and schewid baar and nakid to al the peple of the[1] processioun. And in the while the crucifix is in discoueryng the principal preest with the queer schal falle doun to grounde at the leest vpon alle the knees and schal singe thus: *Heil oure King, the sone of Dauid! Aȝenbier of the world! Whom prophetis bifore spaken Sauiour to come to the hous of Israel! Sotheli thee into an hoolsum sacrifice the Fadir sende into the world, whom alle holi men fro the bigynnyng of the world aboden! And now, Osanna to the sone of Dauid! Blessid be he which cometh in the name of the Lord! Osanna in hiȝe thingis!*[2] Also whilis the hool queer of preestis and

---

Chorus cum genuflexione dicat:
"Gloria, laus, et honor tibi sit."
Pueri:
"Israel es tu Rex, Davidis et inclyta proles,
Nomine qui in Domini, Rex benedicte, venis."
Chorus:
"Gloria, laus."
Pueri:
"Cœtus in excelsis te laudat cœlitus omnis,
Et mortalis homo, et cuncta creata simul."
Chorus:
"Gloria, laus."
Pueri:
"Plebs Hebræa tibi cum palmis obvia venit,
Cum prece, voto, hymnis, adsumus ecce tibi."
Chorus:
"Gloria, laus, et honor."

Missal. ad usum Eccl. Ebor. (Dominic. 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] *peple of the* is added in the margin by a later (?) hand.

[2] "In egressu processionis prælatus, ter flexis genibus ante crucem discoopertam, adoret, dicens cantando, Ave Rex. Et chorus idem repetat: Ave, Rex noster, fili David, Redemptor mundi, quem prophetæ prædicaverunt Salvatorem domui Israel esse venturum, te enim ad salutarem victimam 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."—Missal. ad usum Eccl. Ebor. (Dominic. in ram. Palm.) Paris, 1533.

Digitized by Google

clerkis singen thus, al the lay peple in the processioun knelen doun and knocken her brestis and summe fallen so doun that her brestis and mouthis touchen the grounde. And more compunccioun, more deuocioun, and louȝer submissioun thei myȝten not neither couthen araie forto bisette vpon Crist him silf, if he were in stide of the crosse so discouered. Wherfore the secunde premysse of this present xiiij^e^. argument is trewe.

THEIR FIFTEENTH ARGUMENT. The kissing of the cross on Good Friday is idolatrous.

The xv^e^. argument is this: To what euer thing men offren in louȝist wise, comyng toward it bi creping, and whos feet thei kissen in deuoutist maner thei kunnen, thilk thing thei taken for her souereynest and hiȝest Lord. Forwhi ellis it wolde folewe that ther yn thei diden vnaccordingli and vnsemeli, and so therfore 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 louȝest wise creping on alle her knees, and to this crosse in so lowȝe and deuout maner thei offren, and the feet of thilk crosse thei in deuoutist maner kissen. Wherfore thei[1] in these deedis the same crosse for her worthiest Lord thei taken; or ellis thei ouȝten not so creepe, offre, and kisse, and ouȝten be weerned forto so do.

The necessity of refuting the last three arguments more especially.

Miche neede is forto assoile these thre laste principal argumentis, that is to seie, the xiij^e^.,[2] xiiij^e^., and xv^e^., for upon the deedis and gouernauncis of whiche these thre laste principal argumentis maken mensioun alle the seid wijters han greet abhominacioun; and thei ben out of eese, whanne thai seen tho dedis and gouernauncis doon; and whanne thei musten nedis for drede do tho deedis and gover-

[1] Without doubt either this or the following *thei* should be cancelled.

[2] *thrittenthe*, MS. (later hand, and on an erasure).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. X.

nauncis, as othere men hem doon. For certis thei weenen that al the world couthe not saue tho deedis, as thei ben so doon of othere men, fro ydolatrie. And therfore mich neede is forto se how these thre laste principal argumentis and semyng euidencis mowe at the fulle be assoilid.

xj. CHAPITER.

If the above fifteen arguments can be refuted, there is nothing else which can be brought against images and pilgrimages.

THESE xv. ben the argumentis which the repungners aȝens the firste and ij^e. afore tretid gouernauncis maken aȝens the clergie holding with the same gouernauncis. And if these argumentis mowe be cleerli assoilid, sotheli alle tho repugners ben openli ouerthrowe: and if these xv. argumentis mowe not be cleerli assoilid, thanne thei letten the[1] firste and ij^e. principal conclusiouns bifore sett of ymagis, and the firste and ij^e. conclusiouns bifore sett of pilgrymagis. But that these xv. argumentis mowe cleerli be assoilid, y schal now next here aftir withoute eny doute make open.

THE FIRST ARGUMENT ANSWERED. Writing is not the only needful means of reminding men of religious truth. The institution of sacraments proves this.

And firste, as for answere and assoiling to the firste argument, y procede thus. The firste argument and his strengthe hangith here vpon, that Holi Scripture and othere deuoute writingis red and herd schulden[2] be sufficient wey and meene into al profite into which ymagis and pilgrimagis seruen. And if this be denied and be proued vntrewe, thanne the firste argument lackith al his strengthe. And that al such seid writingis (not oonli for that nowhere nyȝ alle men kunnen rede hem, but also thouȝ alle men, wommen, and children couthen rede hem) at the beste sufficen not

[1] *the* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

[2] *schulde*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

into al the good and profite, into whiche mowen suffice bothe togidere tho writingis and vsing of ymagis and pilgrimagis doing, y proue thus: Mankinde in this lijf is so freel, that forto make into him sufficient remembraunce of thingis to be profitabli of him remembrid he nedith not oonli heereable rememoratijf signes, (as ben Holi Scripture and othere deuoute writingis,) but he nedith also therwith and ther to seable rememoratijf signes; as experience wole weel schewe, that thouȝ mankinde take al the avauntage whiche[1] he may forto plucke him vpward and forto holde him upward in good thouȝtis, (bi seable signes of ymagis and picturis as eke bi heereable signes of writingis,) al is litil ynouȝ. And also, if heereable rememoratijf signes hadden be sufficient to Cristen men into al her nedeful goostli remembrauncingis, wherto schulde Crist haue ȝeue to Cristen men vndir comaundement 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 prouidid to us, ellis he wolde not haue bounden Cristen men forto vse seable rememoratijf signes, whiche ben the seid sacramentis. Wherfore folewith that writingis, whiche ben heereable rememoratijf signes to Cristen men, sufficen not into al the remembrauncing which is nedeful to Cristen men; and so it wherbi the firste argument schulde take al his strengthe is take awey.

A reply to this argument anticipated, that those outward signs of remembrance only should be used, which

Perauenture summen wolen answere here and seie that so[2] manye kindis of seable rememoratijf signes and tho oonli, which Crist him silf in special assigned Cristen men to haue and vse, Cristen men ouȝten haue

[1] *whiche* is added by a later (?) hand.

[2] *so* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XI.

Christ appointed. Answer to the reply. By the same reasoning all books except the Bible would be unlawful.

and vse, and no mo; neither otherè seable rememoratijf signes; (and tho ben the sacramentis whiche he wole to be had and vsid, with the hereable rememoratijf signes of deuoute writingis;) and wole not that eny seable rememoratijf signes of mannys fynding schulde be take into vce. That this answere is a feyned and forgid thing bi pure volunte withoute eny for him sufficient evidence, y proue thus: Bi lijk wise it myȝte, ȝhe, and schulde be seid, that oonli tho heereable signes which Crist him silf ordeyned 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 eny 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 eldir holi men schulden[1] not be write, that we myȝten or schulden therbi remembre us upon thingis passid 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 othere seable rememoratijf signes.

A further answer to the same reply. Christ's institution of sacraments proves the general lawfulness of outward means of remembrance.

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 restreyned not us fro vce of eny othere seable rememoratijf signes. Forwhi nowhere it can be founde, that he seide we schulden[2] vce noon othere seable signes into rememoracioun than the sacramentis. Wherfore forto vse alle othere maners of seable signes into rememoracioun and re-

[1] *schulde*, MS. (first hand).

[2] *schulde*, MS. (first hand), apparently.

Digitized by Google

membraunce, whiche doom of resoun forbedith not, it is in oure liberte forto vse. Also ellis we schulden holde us silf in a bondage azens oure liberte, of which bondage we han no ground neither sufficient euydence; and zit al such bondage the seid repugners holden to be azens the fredom of the Gospel and of the newe lawe; and so bi this answere thei schulden be contrarie to hem silf.

Confirmacioun herto is this: Therfore it is in oure fre liberte forto vse othere heereable signes allowe-able bi resoun into oure remembraunce making thanne the writingis of the Bible, bi cause that it is not founde ouzwhere in Holi Scripture neither in doom of resoun, that it is forbodun to us forto vse the othere writingis dyuerse fro Holi Scripture which Crist prouidid to us. Wherfore, bi lijk skile, by cause it is not founde ouzwhere in Holi Scripture neither in doom of reson, that it is to us forbode vse othere seable signes into oure remembring than ben[1] the sacramentis whiche Crist zaue to us, (as therto helpen ful weel the firste and ij^e^. principal conclusiouns of ymagis bifore sett in the ij^e^., iij^e^., and iiij^e^. chapitris of this present ij^e^. partie,) it folewith that it is leeful to us forto vse othere seable signes into oure remembraunce than tho sacramentis ben.

Confirmation of the argument. The general lawfulness of using other visible signs besides the sacraments follows from the admitted lawfulness of using other books besides the Bible.

Also thus: What euer is not forbodun to be vsid is leeful ynouz to be vsid: but so it is, that forto vse othere seable signes than the sacramentis is not more forbodun than forto vse othere heereable signes than Holi Scripture; zhe, and nouzwhere it is forbodun such seid seable signes dyuerse fro Cristis sacramentis be vsid, as it is proued bifore bi the now spokun firste and ij^e^. principal conclusiouns of ymagis. Wherfore needis folewith that we ben fre with oute synne for to vse hem.

Neither being forbidden by Scripture or reason, both are equally lawful.

[1] *be*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XI.

Further, visible signs are profitable to all Christians for some ends, for which writings are less available.

Also thus: Thouȝ heereable signes availen to Cristen men into manye pointis and godis of remembrauncing into whiche seable signes not so myche availen, ȝit aȝenward 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 heereable signes, that is to seie writingis upon the same maters, as anoon aftir schal be proued. Wherfore folewith that thouȝ writingis availen bi sumwey more into remembrauncing than ymagis and pilgrimagis availen, ȝit the vsis of ymagis and of pilgrimagis ouȝten to be not leid aside or awey, but ouȝten be take in to vce with the vce of writingis, that the hool profite of remembring which mai come bi hem both to gidere be not lost and vnhad, but that bothe to gidere profitis be had.

Proof of this. A good scholar may much more quickly learn the passion of a Saint by sight of pictures and images than by reading about it in a book: while those who are no scholars, and can only hear a book read occasionally, must depend on them almost wholly.

That riȝt synguler avauntagis of remembring comen bi ymagis and pilgrimagis which not comen or not so weel and so soone comen bi writingis, I proue 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 thouȝ he couthe rede in a book the storie therof, ȝit he schulde rede vj. or vij. or mo leevis 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 siȝt of the iȝe 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 iȝe siȝt 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 traueil and peine, than the heering of the eere

Digitized by Google

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 remembraunce 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 kunnen 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 chirche peintid or a clooth steyned or ymagis sprad abrood in dyuerse placis of the chirche.

The histories of all the Saints whose images and pictures are in a church may be learnt more easily by them than the history of any one of them by reading in a book.

Also, in biholding bi siȝt of iȝe upon manye dyuerse stories or ymagis in the chirche a man schal in a litil 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 chirche were not ymagis and picturis, he schulde not bi reding in a book in xx^ti^. sithis lenger tyme come into so miche remembraunce, 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 perfitli, a gretter tyme schulde be spend than in the perfit ouer seing of alle tho seid passiouns.

Again, when a overworked or infirm man sees in a church images and pictures, his feelings will be more deeply and more readily touched by them than by any reflections

Also ful ofte, whanne a man cometh to chirche[1] and wole be remembrid vpon suche now seid thingis, his heed is feeble for labour or studie bifore 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 bifore thilk

[1] *the chirche*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XI.

which he could make on what he had before heard, or read, or seen.

day red or herd red in book,[1] or herd prechid, or seen peinted, it schal be to him miche gretter labour for to laboure so in his brayn bi taking mynde and for to withinneforth calle into mynde without siȝt of the iȝe withouteforth vpon ymagis what he bifore knewe and thouȝte vpon, than it schulde be to him if he biholde bi iȝe siȝt upon ymagis or other peinting according to his labour. And aȝenward, bi biholding upon ymagis or upon such peinting his witt schal be dressid and lad forthe euener and more stabili and with myche lasse peyne and labour, than forto wrastle withinneforth in his owne ymaginaciouns withoute leding withouteforth had bi biholding upon ymagis; as experience vndoutabili wole schewe, and as men woned forto haunte daili contemplacioun wolen bere witnes herto upon perel of her soule. Wherfore, thouȝ for noon other commodite than for this now seid, the vce of ymages[2] were so profitable, certis the vce of hem were weel worthi be[3] meyntened.

Also images may be seen in open churches every hour of the day, but books are not so easily accessible to all.

Also here with al into the open siȝt of ymagis in open chirchis 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 delyuered to hem neither to be red bifore hem; and therfore as forto soone and ofte come[4] into remembraunce of a long mater bi ech oon persoon, and also as forto make that the mo persoones come into remembraunce of a mater, ymagis and picturis seruen in a specialer maner than bokis doon, thouȝ in an other maner ful substanciali bokis seruen bettir into remembrauncing of tho same materis than ymagis and picturis doon; and ther fore thouȝ writingis seruen weel into remembrauncing

[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.

Digitized by Google

upon the bifore seid thingis; ȝit not at the ful, forwhi the bokis han not the avail of remembrauncing now seid whiche ymagis han.

Confirmation of the argument. Effects of the pilgrimage to St. Catherine's College in London on November 25.

Confirmacioun 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 whiche ben in Londoun writun upon Seint Kateryn's lijf and passiouns, and y dare weel seie that thouȝ ther were x. thousind mo bokis writun in Londoun in thilk day of the same Seintis lijf and passioun, thei schulden not so moche turne the citee into mynde of the holi famose lijf of Seint Kateryn and of her dignitee in which sche now is, as dooth in ech ȝeer the going 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 riȝt greet special commoditees and profitis into remembraunce making ymagis and pilgrimagis han and doon, whiche writingis not so han and doon.

And of the two annual commemorations of Bishop Gravesend in St. Paul's Cathedral.

Another confirmacioun into this same purpos is this: In Londoun sumtyme was a bischop whos name was Gravyseende,[2] and which lijth now buried in the chirche of Seint Poul at London in the plein pament of the chirche weel binethe the myddis of the chirche. This bischop 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 ȝeer 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. 1319–1338.

[3] *Sein Poulis*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XI.

seie *De profundis* for his soul. Now, thouȝ it so had be that this bischop hadde not intendid this to be doon for him into this eende, that his greet benefeting whiche he dide to London schulde be had and contynued in mynde of the citezeins; but that he entendid oonli this, that preiers ther bi schulden ȝeerli be mad the sikirer for his soul, (as dout is to me, whether he entendid these bothe effectes or the oon of hem oonli:) ȝit treuthe is, that if the seid bischop wolde haue ordeyned xx. thousand bokis to be writun of his seid benefeting, and wolde haue ordeyned hem be[1] spred abrode in dyuerse placis of the cite, and forto haue be cheyned in tho dyuerse placis of the cite, that of the peple who so wolde myȝte 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 bischopis benefeting, as the seid solempne ȝeerli goyng bi ij. tymes in ech ȝeer (doon bi the meir and aldir men of Londoun) hath do and schal do in ech ȝeer to come. Wherfore 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 ȝeue and is redi forto ȝeue. And so bi al this, what is now seid, answerid, and proued aȝens the firste argument, it is open that the firste argument procedith not into his entent.

xij. CHAPITER.

THE SECOND ARGUMENT OF THE LOLLARDS AGAINST IMAGES AND PILGRIMAGES ANSWERED. Every man is bound in reason to attend to himself more than to

FOR answere to the ij°. argument it is to wite that bischopis and othere preestis and clerkis ben not bounde more or ferther for to preche or in other wise teche her peple vndir hem, than that therwith tho same bischopis and othere clerkis attende to hem silf

[1] *to be*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

bothe for gouernaunce of her bodies in helthe and strengthe, and for gouernaunce and reule of her lijflode into the fynding of hem silf and of summe seruauntis longing to hem, and for gouernaunce of her owne goostli conuersacioun to be led anentis God and anentis hem silf and anentis her othere neiȝbouris and anentis her sugettis, in manye maners mo than whanne he couplith with hem forto teche hem. Forwhi thouȝ in dew and resonable vndirstonding tauȝt in othere placis of my writingis ech man ouȝte loue his neiȝbour as him silf, ȝit euery man ouȝte loue him silf more than an other man; and therof folewith this, that euery man ouȝte attende[1] to him silf in goostli and bodili needis more than to eny other man. And therfore ther was neuere lawe of resoun neither of God ȝit maad forto binde a curat forto attende to his suget so myche as the curat is bounde forto attende to himsilf, neither so myche as the suget is bounde forto attende to him silf.

CHAP. XII.

others, and therefore the clergy 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.

Wherto accordith weel what Poul seith i°. Thi. iiij°. c̃., *Attende to thi silf and to doctrine*, as thouȝ he schulde meene that for the attendaunce which Bischop Thimothi schulde make to his peple he schulde not leeue the dew attendaunce bifore to be maad to him silf. And that Poul meened so as y haue now seid, it is open by Poul him silf there. Forwhi, whanne Poul had seid to Bischop Tymothi thus: *Take tent to thi silf and to doctrine*, (that is to seie of othere persoones,) he seith forwith[2] there thus: *Be bisie in hem* (that is to seie, in tent to him silf and in doctrine to othere), *for thou doing these thingis*, (that is to seie, tente to thi silf and doctrine to othere,) *schalt make thi silf saaf and hem that heeren thee.* Lo, Sir, bi this it is open Poul for to haue meened that ech man ouȝte more

This doctrine is confirmed by St. Paul's instructions to Timothy. Every priest must pay more heed to his own soul than to the souls of others.

[1] *to attende*, MS. (first hand).

[2] Perhaps a clerical error for *forthwith*.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XII.

coueite that he him silf be saaf than that eny other persoon be saaf; so he ouȝte more tente ȝeue to his owne good lyuyng, (which stondith in many mo pointis anentis God and anentis him silf than in teching and reuling his neiȝbour oonli,) than he out ȝeue tent to the good lyuyng of eny other persoon. And herof folewith in open resoun that sum curat ouȝte and is bounde bi lawe of God forto ȝeue double[1] or treble more tent to him silf ward and double or treble lasse tent to doctrine or to his sugetis lyuyng, than sum other curat is bounde; and that for as miche as sum curat is in double or treble more sijk, more freel, or in sum other wise hath in double or in treble more neede forto ȝeue tent to him silf than sum other curat hath. And ȝit euereither of hem, in so reuling him anentis himsilf and hise sugettis, is weel allowid of God.

Application of the argument. When the clergy have done all, every one must attend to his own salvation, more than any one else can attend to it. Consequently he must have recourse to means of various kinds, as images, books, &c., besides the teaching of the clergy, whose instructions must consist greatly in showing men how to learn by themselves.

And certis the vnknowing of this now tauȝt causith ouer myche vnwijs hasti iugement and ouer myche vnwijs bacbiting in the lay peple anentis curatis. And so whanne al the attendaunce is doon which resoun or eny other lawe of God or of man bindith a curat forto do anentis his sugetis bisidis the attendaunce which the same curat is bounde forto make aboute him silf, 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 attendance tho sugetis musten helpe in her side, and musten the lenger parti of attendaunce make aboute hem silf, as bi reding in her bokis at her owne housis, or bi heering suche bookis red of her neiȝboris, (as y haue proued in the book clepid *The Bifore-crier*,) and also

[1] *doube*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

bi vce[1] of preisyngis and of preiers, and bi vce of worschiping doon bi seable rememoratijf signes. And so what is take in the bigynnyng of the ij^e^. argument for his substance and strengthe is vntrewe, that if bischopis and othere curatis diden her dew diligence in teching her peple, thilk peple schulde haue no nede or profit forto haue and vce ymagis and make pilgrimagis. And therfore the same ij^e^. argument not proueth neither procedith. For euen 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 silf, (and in lijk maner doon foulis to her briddis,) so a curat mai not neither ouȝte forto alwey rynge at the eeris of hise suggettis; but he may so bigynne, and afterward he ouȝte teche hem that thei leerne bi hem silf and practize meenis into leernyng of good lyuyng bi hem silf; and ellis he schal make hem to be euere truauntis in the scole of God, and litil good forto perfitli kunne and litle good forto perfitli wirche.

THE THIRD ARGUMENT OF THE LOLLARDS ANSWERED. It is not true that every Christian is a more perfect image of Christ than carved wood or stone can be. Three conditions required in a thing to be a perfect image of another thing.

Answere to the iij^e^. argument schal be this: The ij^e^. premisse of the iij^e^. 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 vntrewe; and therfore the iij^e^. argument bildid ther upon lackith strengthe for to proue his entent. That this now rehercid ij^e^. premysse is vntrewe, y schewe thus: Thre condiciouns muste be had in a thing, that he be a perfit and a ful and a spedy ymage or representer or remembrer of another thing bi wey of ymage being of the same other thing.

The first condition. It must resemble the

Oon condicioun is, that he be lijk myche or sumwhat to the othir thing, and the more lijk he be to

[1] *the vse*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XII.

other thing; and the more the better.

the other thing, the more able he is, as bi that, forto be the perfit and ful ymage of the other thing.

The second condition. It must be designed to represent the other thing. Illustrations from the sacraments.

The ij^e^. 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; ȝit the deputacioun and the assignyng bi which the visible eukarist is ordeyned and assigned forto represente the bodi of Crist and forto remembre vs upon the persoon of Crist and hise benefetis, (as it is open Luk xxij^e^. c̃. and i^e^. Cor. xj^e^. c̃.) 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. vj^e^. c̃. 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 ij^e^. condicioun is a spedi condicioun and a myȝti forto helpe that a thing be a perfit and ful ymage of an othir thing.

The third condition. The thing so designed to be an image must not at the same time be designed to be any thing else.

The iij^e^. condicioun is, that the thing so deputid forto represente to us the othir thing, haue not (at leest for thilk while) eny plites or officis or deputaciouns or disposiciouns, wherbi we muste haue manye[1] othere entermetingis with him than the entermeting of remembring oonli; and that he haue not with us eny entermetingis saue the entermeting of[2] 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. Probably we should read *eny*.

[2] *or*, MS.

Digitized by Google

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 other office of us to be take than in office of representing the other thing.

Application of these considerations. No living man can fulfil these three conditions so well as a crucifix can, in order to be an image of Christ crucified, unless (as in a miracle-play) he actually hang upon a cross. Reproof of the ignorance and presumption of the Lollards.

Now, Sir, herbi it is open that no thing is so verrili an ymage of an other thing if he haue not these iij. condiciouns, as he schulde be if he haue these iij. now seid condiciouns. And thanne ferther thus: But so it is, that no Cristen man now lyuyng hath these iij. 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 therto purtenauncis, (as it is open ynouȝ to euery man therto weel biholding and assaiyng thoruȝ alle these iij. condiciouns 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 bifallith ful seelde and in fewe placis and cuntrees. Wherfore no man lyuyng and walking in erthe and occupiyng him silf and occupied of othere men, as othere men lyuen and walken and occupien 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 therto schapun is. And her bi it is open that the iij°. argument hath no quyk foot for to go. Fy! fy! fy! therfore vpon presumpcioun and obstynacie in the lay party, of whiche y herde summe seie with a strong herte, (as thouȝ he hadde be ful of kunnyng, whanne he was therof ful empti,) that a greet heresie it is for to

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XII.

holde that a stok or a stoon graued is a fuller and a perfiter ymage of Crist than is a Cristen man. Certis, (as it is ful open bi what is now seid for answere to the iij^e. argument,) litil wist he what longith to a thing, that he be a perfit ymage of an other thing.

xiij. CHAPITER.

THE FOURTH ARGUMENT OF THE LOLLARDS AGAINST IMAGES AND PILGRIMAGES ANSWERED. It is false that all places and images are equally holy. God chooses one place rather than another in which to work miracles, and this choosing makes one place holier than another: and by like reasoning one image holier than another.

THE iiij^e. argument leeneth here to, that bi cause God is lijk weel in his substaunce and being euery where, ther fore God schulde be lijk redi forto ȝeue his gracis to askers and sechers euerywhere; and that also therfore no place in erthe is holier than an other place, and noon ymage of a thing is holier than an other ymage of the same thing. But certis al this is vntrewe and to be denyed. And cause whi God wole ȝeue hise gracis rather in oon place to sechers aftir hise gracis than in an other place, is this: God chesith therto, that is to seie, forto ȝeue hise gracis oon place bifore an other place, as it is bifore proued in the viij^e. chapiter of this present ij^e. partie. And if this be trewe, certis therof folewith that bi cause God chesith oon place bifore an other forto therinne wirche holi deedis of myraclis and of gracis more than in an othir[1] place, therfore the oon place is holier than the other place is.[2] And if this be trewe, certis so bi lijk skile, bicause that God chesith oon ymage bifore an other forto wirche bi it or bifore it miraclis and gracis more than bi an other ymage or more than bifore another ymage, therfore it is riȝtli to be seid that oon ymage of Marie is holier than an other ymage of Marie is, and oon ymage of a crucifix is holier than an other ymage of

[1] *a othir*, MS.

[2] *is* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

the same crucifix is. And that God chesith (so as now is seid) oon place bifore an other and oon ymage bifore an other, it is vndoutabili schewid and proued bifore in the place now alleggid, that is to seie, in the viij^e. chapiter of this ij^e. partie and in therof the iiij^e., v^e., and vj^e. reulis or supposiciouns, whiche wolden be rehercid to ech man which wole obiecte bi the seid iiij^e. argument. And herbi the strengthe of the iiij^e. argument is leid aside.

This false opinion of the common people, that all places are equally holy, has been a great hindrance to pilgrimages.

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 vce of ymagis and the doing of pilgrimagis. But now sithen this conceit is vndoutabili schewid to be vntrewe, it is to hope that (as bi eny strengthe of the iiij^e. argument) thei schulen no longer so erre, aftir this answere schal be cleerli opened to hem.

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.

For the more cleering of this present answere, it is to wite that a thing is holi in three maners. In oon maner (which is propir maner of speking) a thing is holi, for that it doith good moral deedis; and in this maner God is holi, and aungel is holi, and mannys soul and man is holi, if and whanne he doith eny good moral deedis. And in this maner of holines no thing is holi 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 holi, neither eny ymage is holi, neither eny other thing than which

[1] *peple* is added by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIII.

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^e^. c̃. where God seith thus: *I am holi, which make ȝou holi.* Also Leuit. the xj^e^. c̃. God seide: *Be ȝe holi, for y am holi.* Also Exodi xxij^e^. c̃. God seide thus: *Ȝe schulen be holi men to me.*

Secondly, a thing is holy, when in it or by it holy deeds are performed by God or man. Thus certain places or images are holier than others; Jacob's resting-place at Bethel an example of this.

In an other maner a thing is holi, for it is chosun that in it or bi it or with it or bifore 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 ȝouun than bi an othir ymage or than bifore[1] an other ymage; and therto God chesith the place and the ymage. Wherto ful weel accordith Holi Scripture, Genes. xxviij^e^. c̃., where it is seid, that whanne Iacob wente forto seche to him a wijf, he came after the sunnys going doun into a place in which he leide him doun forto there slepe and reste in the nyȝt folewing; and he in thilk reste hadde suche visiouns maad to him bi God, as it is seid there, that whanne he woke he seide these wordis: *Sotheli the Lord is in this place and y knewe not! And he dreding seide: Hou gastful is this place! here is noon other thing no but the hous of God, and the ȝate of heuen!*

---

[1] *bi*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIII.

The fiery bush in Horeb, another instance of holy ground.

Also Exodi iij^e. c̃., whanne Moyses kepte the schep of Ietro preest of Madian, he came with his scheep to the Mount of Oreb. *And God apperid to him in the flamme of fier fro the myddis of a busch, and he siȝ that the busch brent, and ȝit was not therbi waastid. Therfore Moises seide: I schal go and y schal see this greet siȝt, whi the busch is not wastid. Sotheli the Lord sie that Moyses ȝede to se, and he clepid Moyses fro the myddis of the busch, and seide: Neiȝe thou not hidir, but vndo the scho of thi feet; for the place in which thou stondist is holi lond, et cætera.* 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 ȝouun to the Iewis: and therfore this holynes of the ij^e. maner was neuere reuokid bi Cristis passioun.

Thirdly, a thing is holy, when it is set apart for sacred uses. Thus vestments, vessels, bread, &c., which are used in God's service are holy.

In the iij^e. maner a thing is holi, (thouȝ also in an vnpropir maner, in reward of the first maner;) whanne[1] it is departid and take fro worldli and fleischli vce, and is deputid and assigne to more goostli vce anentis God than it was bifore. And in this maner breed, water, erthe, or place, hous, candil, oile, vestimentis, vesselis, and suche othere 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 bifore, and thei ben assigned and deputid into more goostli vsis, (that is to seie, that men vse hem aftirward in a certein office of worschiping toward God,) ben holi. In this maner Seint Dionyse, the disciple of Seint Poul, in his book *Of the Chirchis Ierarchie*[2] clepith alle suche

[1] *whanne euere*, MS. (first hand).

[2] "Τὰ μὲν αἰσθητῶς ἱερὰ τῶν νοητῶν ἀπεικονίσματα, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὰ χειραγωγία καὶ ὁδός· τὰ δὲ νοητὰ τῶν κατ' αἴσθησιν ἱεραρχικῶν ἀρχὴ καὶ ἐπιστήμη." Dionys. Areop. *de Eccl. Hierarch.* c. 2. (Op. tom. 1. p. 255. Ed. Cord.) Pecock, however, does

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIII.

thingis in this wise deputid holi. And in this maner God clepid the clothing of the bischop and of the preestis in the oolde lawe holi; and also the tabernacle, the temple, alle the vessellis and purtenauncis ther to weren clepid holi, as it is open ynouȝ in manye placis of the Oold Testament. And this is ynouȝ for answere to the iiij^e. argument.

THE FIFTH ARGUMENT OF THE LOLLARDS AGAINST IMAGES ANSWERED. If we should flee from all images, because the Devil has sometimes spoken in an image, by like reasoning we should flee from the company of all mankind, because the Devil has sometimes spoken in men and women.

That the v^e. argument goith not forth y schewe thus: If the v^e. argument were good, thanne this argument were good. The feendis wilis and hise deceitis ben fer awey to be fled; but so it is, that it hath ofte be knowun that feendis han spoke in men and wommen, as witness herof is had in the Gospelis in dyuerse placis, and Acts xvj^e. c̃. of a ȝong womman, which gate myche money to her maistris bi answeris which the feend ȝaue and spake in hir and bi hir. And alle men mowe soone vndirstonde, that not but forto deceyue men the feend wolde take such an occupacioun vpon him, sithen he is euere oure enemy and not oure freende as Peter witnessith i^e. Petri v^e. c̃. Wherfore no man speke or entermete or haue to do with eny other man or womman, or bileeue and truste to eny man or womman; bi cause that it is founde that the feend hath spoke bi men and wommen, euen as he hath spoke bi ymagis. Certis this argument is lijk to the v^e. argument, as ech man mai soone se; and this argument is nauȝt and hath no strengthe. Wherfore neither the v^e. argument hath strengthe.

The rule to be observed in such matters. Inquiry is to be made into suspected cases, and our conduct to

This therfore is the consideracioun and the obseruaunce, awaite, and diligence which is to be had in such mater. It is diligentli to be awaitid whether the feend entermetith him with eny thing, (as ymage

---

not so much seem to have any particular passage in his eye, as to note the fact that Pseudo-Dionysius applies such epithets as ἱερὸς, θεῖος, ἅγιος, to the chrism, the altar, the eucharistic elements, &c. See pp. 294, 295, 339, &c.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIII.

be determined by its results. Application of these remarks to the present purpose, and to the legend of St. Bartholomew.

or man or eny othir thing,) and if it can be aspied bi eny sufficient or eny myche likeli evidencis that the feend puttith there his partie and his entermeting, thanne first the vce of thilk thing is to be shoned, eschewid, and avoidid; and azenward if, after that sufficient enquerauncе is mad, it kan not be knowe that the feend dooth eny thing aboute the seid thing, than the vce of the seid thing ouzte not be[1] refusid. Forwhi ellis we schulden neuere be boold forto vce eny thing, (neither mete ne drinke ne hors ne asse ne man ne womman,) and that bi cause the feend hath putte him into suche thingis, as we mowe haue in oold recordis. And now neerer to oure purpos. Bi cause the peple of which the legend of Seint Bartholome spekith were necligent forto aspie that the feend spake in the ymage, and that he hurtid hem, and thei myzten[2] haue wist this weel ynowz if thei wolden have zeue therto sufficient diligence; and azenward now adaies no man can fynde eny sufficient euydence or eny greet likelihode that feendis speken now bi ymagis, as it wole appere ful weel how tho euydencis mowe be answerid to and assoilid if thei be brouzt forth into lizt:—therfore the peple of which the legende of Seint Bartholome spekith weren to be blamed for that thei attendiden to thilk greet ymage as to her God, and peple now adaies ben not to be blamed thouz thei attenden[3] to ymagis forto vse hem as signes and tokenes of God. And this is ynouz for answere to the v^e^. argument.

THE SIXTH ARGUMENT AGAINST IMAGES AND PILGRIMAGES ANSWERED. If every good ordinance should

To the vj^e^. argument it is answerid sufficientli bifore in the first[4] parti of this present book toward the eende, in the [v.][5] chapiter, that if ech gouernaunce schulde be left of which cometh yuel, certis no

[1] *to be*, MS. (first hand).
[2] *myzte*. MS. (first hand).
[3] *attende*, MS. (first hand).
[4] See the following note.
[5] A space left in the MS. for the number. Pecock's memory has failed him: he appears to mean Part ii. c. iv. See p. 158.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIII.

be set aside, from which evil sometimes springs, not one good ordinance would remain. The discretion necessary in such cases. The 'appearance of evil' spoken of by St. Paul discussed.

gouernaunce in the world ouȝte be holde, meyntened, and kept; (for no gouernaunce in craft or out of craft is, but that[1] of it cometh yuel;) and if alle tho gouernauncis schulden therfore be forbore, no good gouernaunce schulde be had and vsid. And therfore aȝens this myschaunce that yuel cometh out of the good, the discrecioun and wijsdom wolde be had, which is had if a man that tilieth his gardein or feeld and sowith it with good seed, certis thouȝ there growe manye wedis bi occasioun of his planting, deluyng, ering, and sowing, ȝit he wole not ceese, but he wole drawe vp the wedis and lete 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 schulen[2] lacke al good. And this is ynow for answere to the vj^e^. argument, thouȝ miche more therto perteynyng is seid bifore toward the eende of the first parti, and aftir in the iij^e^. parti of this book, the [viij^e^.] chapiter. And as to the text of Seint Poul i^e^. Tessalonic. v^e^. c̃. whanne he seith thus: *Abstene ȝou from al yuel spice;* the dewe vnderstonding 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 glotenie, leccherie, pride, envie, and suche othere. But this makith not that a man abstene[3] fro eny morali good spice or fro eny spice of moral good, thouȝ therof, as bi occasioun, cometh sum moral yuel. And therfore thilk text of Seint Poul is not forto helpe forth the vj^e^. argument.

---

[1] *that* is added in the margin.

[2] *schulden*, MS. (first hand, apparently).

[3] *abstene him*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

xiiij. CHAPITER.

FOR answere to the vij^e^. argument y schal sette forth iij. open reulis, of whiche the firste is this: Whanne euere it is so, that ij. dyuerse werkis of Goddis lawe and seruicis ben euen like present in oon and the same while after her alle dewe circumstauncis to a man forto be doon and wrouȝt of him in the same while, and oon of hem is myche better than 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 bifore the lasse good werk, he is not to be ther yn preisid, as y haue schewid bi ensaumple of Holi Writt and bi ensaumple out of Holi Writt in *The Crier*[1] and in othere placis of my writingis.

THE SEVENTH ARGUMENT AGAINST IMAGES AND PILGRIMAGES ANSWERED. Three plain rules shall be premised. The first rule. If a man prefers to do a less good work, when he may do a better one with equal ease at the same time, he is not therein to be praised.

The ij^e^. reule is this: Whanne ij. werkis of Goddis lawe and seruice thoruȝ 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 work is so present chese not and take not the lasse good werk for the while, he is not to be preisid. Forwhi ellis, as for thilk while, he schal lese the bothe seid godis, that is to seie, the bettir and the lasse good.

The second rule. In case that a man may do a less good work, but not a better one at the same time; if he take not the less good work, he is not therein to be praised.

The iij^e^. reule is this: It is not in eny mannys 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 third rule. No man can always perform better works, when less good works offer themselves.

The iiij^e^. reule folewing of these iij. bifore going reulis is this: That if a man, whanne he is to wirche

Corollary from these rules. A man must not

[1] This is no doubt the same work as *The Before-crier* mentioned above, p. 218.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIV.

perplex himself by thinking whether he might do a better work than the good one, which then offers itself; for he would in that case often be idle, when he might be well occupied. Illustrations from the varied tasks of a good housewife, and from the variety of garments of a well-clothed man.

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 thouȝtis and studies, that he schulde leue the good werk vndoon which for the while profrith him silf to be doon, and he schulde lese the other werke aboute which he studieth whether it mai as for thanne be doon or no. And therfore, riȝt as a good huswijf in an hous now doith oon werk now an othir werk, as thei comen to hond; and now sche brewith, now sche bakith, now sche sethith, now sche rostith, now sche weischith disschis, now sche berith aischis out, now sche strawith rischis in the hallo; and thouȝ these werkis ben not like gode and like worthi into the seruice of hir husbonde, ȝit sche ouȝte do the oon with the other as thei comen forth to be doon in dyuerse whilis, and ellis if sche schulde seie to hir self: "Y wole not "do this, perauenture y schal fynde a better werk," sche schulde make badde husewijfschip, and in thilk studie sche schulde ofte be troublid, ȝhe, and be idil fro al good werk, and ofte be bigilid in chesing the lasse good in stide of the better good to be doon:— so a seruaunt of God in the goostli hous of the Vniuersal Chirche muste bere him, now occupiyng him in smale werkis whiche for the while ben present, and now occupiyng him with gretter, 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 ynouȝ for answere to the vij°. argument: not withstonding that herto y haue answerid sufficientli othir wise in *The book of worschiping*, the [1] partie, the [1] chapiter, bi a likenes that a man is not sufficientli clothid in bodili maner, but if he haue on

[1] Spaces left in the MS. for the numbers.

Digitized by Google

him his scho, his slyue, his coot; as he hath on him better and costioser and precioser garnementis, as ben his gowne, his cloke, his hood, his cappe: and, in like maner, a man is not sufficientli araied with vertues of Goddis lawe, but if he be araied 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^e^. argument here.

THE EIGHTH ARGUMENT ANSWERED. It is not true that we must abide by Scriptural rules only, but we must be governed also by reason. But in truth images and pilgrimages are sanctioned in Scripture by implication, as well as by reason.

For answere to the viij^e^. argument, the firste premysse, upon whiche hangith the strengthe of the viij^e^. argument, is to be denied for vntrewe. Forwhi bifore in the [vj^e^.][2] chapiter of this ij^e^. partie it is seid, (ȝhe, and bifore in the first partie of this book fro the bigynnyng bi xiij. conclusiouns it is proued, and the same is proued in the firste partie of the book clepid *The iust apprising of Holi Scripture,*) that more than xx^ti^. partie of Cristis moral lawe and seruice stondith in deedis and gouernauncis knoweable and groundable in doom of resoun, and whiche ben not groundid in Holi Scripture; thouȝ summe of hem or alle perauenture ben witnessid afer and in general bi Holi Scripture. And therfore, needis the seid firste premysse is vntrewe. And trewe it is, that what euere resoun deemeth, counseilith, allowith, or approueth to be doon is moral lawe of God and his plesaunt seruice, thouȝ in caas it can not be founde speciali witnessid bi Holi Scripture. And therfore, sithen the vce of ymagis and the doing of pilgrimagis ben sufficientli groundid in doom of weel disposid resoun, thei ben to be take as deedis of Goddis moral lawe and of his plesaunt seruice, thouȝ thei weren neither in general neither in special touchid bi Holi Scripture. Neuertheles in the

[1] So the MS., but the sense requires *grete*.

[2] A space left in the MS. for the number. See p. 172.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIV.

firste partie of this present book, the [xix^e.][1] chapiter it is proued that priuely and impliedli thei ben witnessid bi Holi Scripture, and also bifore in the [ij^e.][1] chapiter of this present ij^e. partie it is opened that thei ben expresseli witnessid bi Holi Scripture; and therfore needis the viij^e. argument in no wise proueth his entent.

The text in the Epistle to the Colossians discussed. The vain deceit there condemned is the philosophy which opposed the doctrine of Christ's incarnation.

And as for the text of[2] which is alleggid Coloc. ij^e. c̃., as thouȝ he schulde helpe, thouȝ that he in no thing helpith, it is to be seid thus: That in thilk text Poul wole that men leene not to eny philsophie which is aȝens feith, namelich aȝens the feith which is of Christis persoon and of his incarnacioun. And thouȝ men ouȝten not forto attende, trust, lene, and bileue to philsophie in mater of feith; hereof folewith not that thei ouȝten[3] not truste and lene to philsophie in mater being not of feith. And that Poul so vnderstondith as now is seid of philsophie strecching him aȝens feith of the incarnacioun of Crist, it is open bi this: that the text and processe going next bifore this alleggid text spekith of feith to be had into Iesus Crist for his incarnacioun. Forwhi it is seid there thus: *Thouȝ y be absent in bodi, ȝit bi spirit y am with ȝou, ioiyng and seyng ȝoure ordre and the sadnes of ȝoure bileeue which is in Crist. Therfore as ȝe han take Iesus Crist oure Lord, walke ȝe*[4] *in him; and be ȝe rootid and bildid aboue in him, and confermed in the bileeue as ȝe han leerned, abounding in him in doinge of thankingis.* Thus miche there. And thanne next after Poul settith herto the text alleggid bifore in the viij^e. argument thus: *Se ȝe that no man deceyue ȝou bi philsophie*[5] *and vein fallace,*

---

[1] Spaces left in the MS. for the numbers. See pp. 115, 137.

[2] Either *of* should be cancelled or *Poul* added.

[3] *oute*, MS. (first hand).

[4] *ȝe* is interlineated by a later hand.

[5] *vein philsophie*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

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^e^. text be knyt to the former text, as it is likeli that he so is, it must nedis be that the ij^e^. text spekith of philsophie which is azens 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^e^. text, whanne it is seid thus, *and not aftir Crist.* So that not ech philsophie neithir ech doctrine which is aftir elementis of this world is to be fled, but the philsophie and doctryne after elementis[1] "which is not aftir Crist," that is to seie, which is contrarie to feith of his persoon and of his incarnacioun. For certis more or other than this vndirstonding can not be had bi maistrie of Poules processe there. And this is ynouz for answere to the viij^e^. argument.

XV. CHAPITER.

THE NINTH ARGUMENT ANSWERED. Christ reproved the Samaritan idolaters who worshipped false material Gods, and consequently worshipped neither 'in spirit' nor 'in truth.' Their idolatry ceased according to his prediction, which does not forbid the use of images here maintained.

FOR answere to the ix^e^. argument, it is to be seid, that Samaritanys or peple of Samarie, which oon was the womman with which Crist talkid, Iohun iiij^e^. c̃., 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 worschipiden vntrewe visible goddis. Al this weel groundid clerkis in diuinite knowen weel ynouz. Thanne thus, whanne Crist seide to the womman:

[1] *the elementis*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XV.

The tyme is come and now it is, whanne trewe worschipers schulen worschipe the Fadir in spirit and trouthe, et cætera; Crist meened therbi, that that[1] the ydolatrie of Samaritanys schulde ceese and be at an eende. Forwhi tho that thanne among the Samaritanys worschipiden God, thei worschipiden him as a bodili thing, and therfore not "in spirit" or not as a pure spirit oonli; and also thei worschipiden God bi ydolatrie, and therfore bi vntrouthe and so not "in "trouthe." And al this Crist seid schulde be left and schulde ceese bi Crist, and so dide it. And herbi and in al this is not includid, that God excludid or forbade the hauyng and the vce of ymagis in the maner bifore tauȝt in this present ij^e^. parti of this book. Therfore the first proces, which the ix^e^. argument alleggith, Iohun iiij^e^. c̃., lettith no thing the hauyng and the vsing bifore seid of ymagis.

Neither does Christ forbid pilgrimages, but only prophecies that the Romans shall so destroy the places of Samaritan and Jewish worship, that prayer and pilgrimage shall be made there no more.

Ferthermore, that the ij^e^. processe of Iohun iiij^e^. c̃. alleggid in the ix^e^. argument lettith not pilgrimage to be doon, y proue thus: The wordis therto allegged ben these: *Womman, bileue thou to me for the hour schal come, whanne neither in this hil,* (that is to seie, of Garizim,) *neither in Ierusalem ȝe schulen worschipe the Fadir, et cætera.* Thanne thus: Bi these wordis can not be more or other had, than that Crist prophecied the seid hil and Ierusalem to be distruyed; and so myche to be distroied, that ther schulde not be eny preier mad or eny pilgrimage maad in the seid hil or in the temple of Ierusalem. And this distruccioun was maad bi Vaspacian and Tite, Emperouris of Rome, the xlij^e^. ȝeer aftir Cristis passion; but open it is, that herof 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. 13.

Digitized by Google

which neither in thilk hil neither in Ierusalem schal eny preching of Goddis lawe be, schulde folewe that therbi Crist schulde teche preching of Goddis lawe to be vnleeful. Wherfore open it is, that of the seid and alleggid ij^e^. processe of Ioon the iiij^e^. c̃. in the ix^e^. argument can not be had in eny wise, that Crist schulde therbi reproue pilgrimagis, that thei be not leefulli to be doon. And this is ynouȝ for answere to the ix^e^. argument.

THE TENTH ARGUMENT ANSWERED. A man does not necessarily go on pilgrimage for vainglory; but he may either do so for his own edification:

For answere to the x^e^. argument it is to wite, that vndir thre ententis and purposis a man mai go in pilgrimage; and ech of tho iij. ententis is leeful, honest, and expedient. The firste is forto be quykli and deuoutli remembrid in the place of pilgrimage upon Goddis worthinessis, hise benefetis, and punyschingis, his holi lijf and passioun, or upon summe Seintis holi conuersacioun, 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 therfore 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 wole do and wirche and ȝeue singulerli bifore that he wole do ȝeue and wirche in manie othere placis; as it is bifore schewid, that he wole in summe placis bifore othere 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 ensaumple his deede of vertu to eny othir persoon.

Or for the purpose of setting a good example:

But ferthermore, for as miche as we han teching of Crist, Mat. v^e^. c̃., that we mowe leefulli and merytorili do oure vertuose deedis openli bifore othere men, vndir this entent that thei be moued forto do in lijk maner vertuoseli, therfore vndir an other entent, which

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XV.

is the ij°. entent, a man mai vertuoseli, honestli, and expedientli go in pilgrimage in such maner that therbi he ensaumple his dede of pilgrimage to be folewid of othere men, that thei go in pilgrimage thanne or in sum other leiser which thei wolen[1] 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 wole go in pilgrimage vnder this ij°. entent, he muste do it openli and not priueli; and ellis he failith in his pilgrimage. Forwhi ellis his deede answerith not to his entent, as it is open ynouȝ.

Or else, in order to keep up the memory of the Saint and the fame of the place.

In the iij°. 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 hath ȝouun 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 forȝeting. For thouȝ it be sufficientli in Goddis power forto menteyne the fame of thilk place and of the ymage and of the seid chesing and of her holynes, ȝit men ouȝten 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 meyntenaunce 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 ynouȝ to ech mannys resoun.

These are three lawful intents of doing pilgrimage, and the two last intents require

And sithen it is[2] openli schewid that a man may leefully and expedientli and honestli do a pilgrimage, not oonli in the firste maner but also in the ij°.

---

[1] *wole*, MS. (first hand).

[2] *is* is interlineated by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

maner, ȝhe, and also in the iij^{e}. maner, tho clerkis whiche seen and knowen oonli the firste maner of doing pilgrimage and not seen and knowen the ij^{e}. and iij^{e}. maners, ben ouer hasti, eer thei be ful leerned, forto blame eny man for this, that he doith his pilgrimage miche openli vndir the ij^{e}. or iij^{e}. seid ententis or maners of pilgrimage doing.

CHAP. XV.

that it should be in public.

And thanne ferther in this mater thus: Sithen it is leeful, honest, and expedient a man forto do his pilgrimage in the ij^{e}. and iij^{e}. now bifore 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 prouoke hem into pilgrymage or forto quykee in hem the mynde and remembraunce of the bifore seid thingis, (and open it is that this denouncing to othere seers and biholders may not be mad so effectuali to hem bi the oonli open going of the pilgrim[1] in his persoon and with his meyne thoruȝ the wey or the strete thidirward, as if he schulde proclame bi his owne speche or bi hise seruauntis speche to ech man which he schulde meete forto seie thus: "Lo, biholde "weel y go now a[2] pilgrimage into such a place," and ȝit forto denounce and publische his going in pilgrimage bi this maner is not so eesi and so effectual, neither so continuel, 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[3] a ful good and a resonable cause it is to ech pilgrime, which wolde make his pilgrimage vndir the ij^{e}. or iij^{e}. bifore weel approued entent, that he bere openli an ymage of wex or of tree or of metal or of stoon in his hond, that

Since the two last-named motives of doing pilgrimage require that it be done publicly, a pilgrim may well and reasonably carry visible tokens indicative of his designed journey.

[1] *of pilgrimage*, MS. (first hand).
[2] *of*, MS. (first hand).
[3] Perhaps we should read *therfore*.

Digitized by Google

[CHAP. XV.

alle men whiche schulen se him go or meete with him, be remembrid therbi that he gooth in pilgrimage and that thei bi thilk ensaumpling 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 x^e. argument spekith of, which is the vein glorie of the berer.

Further, if the pilgrim's tokens be left as votive offerings in the place of pilgrimage, others will be the more kindled into devotion towards God or the Saint in that place; more especially if these be the costly offerings of men of rank and station.

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 siȝt forto there abide, vndir this entent that who euer schal aftirward come into the same place he schal weel se bi thilk ymage that sum man, (as the offrer 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 offrid thilk ymage; and if it be answerid, that a bischop or an other notable man it offrid there and it brouȝt thidir bi pilgrimage, the seer and heerer hereof schal thinke that the offrer therof hadde sum notable cause forto so bringe thilk ymage thidir and so offre it, and therbi be the more stirid into deuocioun toward God or the Seint in thilk place. Wherfore it folewith, that a ful good cause is forto offre and leue such an ymage for to contynueli abide openli in the place of pilgrimage, (ȝhe, a myche better cause than is the feyned scornefully cause of which the x^e. argument makith mension,) and therfore alle tho persoones whiche blamen pilgrimes, (and namelich notable per-

[1] *pilgrimage*, MS. (first hand).

[2] A hyphen (at the end of the line) joins the words *up there* in the MS.

Digitized by Google

soones, as bischopis or knyȝtis,) forto bere 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 foolis. Forwhi thei schewen hem silf not to vndirstonde that suche deedis mowen[1] be doon vnder suche now seid ententis, whiche ententis ben openli to al the world leeful, honest, and expedient ynouȝ. And ferthermore, sithen it longith to preestis and to bischopis forto ensaumple vertuose and deuoute deedis rather than to othere louȝer men, whiche deedis for to ensaumple is not vnaccording to preestis and bischopis, it folewith that these seid[2] beringis 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, ȝhe, and more than othere louȝer men. And this is ynouȝ for answere to the x^e^. argument.

THE ELEVENTH ARGUMENT ANSWERED. Joshua no more forbad all images to be used, by ordering strange gods to be put away, than God forbad all thinking when he ordered evil thoughts to be put away.

To the xj^e^. argument y answere by likenes thus: It is writun, Ysaie i^e^. c̃., that God seid to the peple thus: *Do ȝe awey the yuel of ȝoure thouȝtis fro the myddis of ȝou*, euen as, Iosue xxiiij^e^. c̃.,[3] Iosue seide: *Do ȝe awey alien Goddis fro the myddis of ȝou:* but certis open it is, that it folewith not bi vertu and strengthe of the seid text, Ysaie[4] i^e^. c̃., that therfore men ouȝten do awey fro hem good thouȝtis. Wherfore of the text bifore alleggid in the xj^e^. argument, Iosue xxiiij^e^. c̃., whanne it is seid thus: *Do ȝe awey alien Goddis fro the myddis of ȝou,* folewith not therof or therbi, that men ouȝten do a wey fro the myddis of hem ymagis, whiche ben not alien Goddis. And thus it is liȝt and esy forto answere to the xj^e^. argument.

---

[1] *mowe*, MS. (first hand).

[2] *seid* is interlineated by a later hand.

[3] *as Iosue seide*, MS. (first hand).

[4] *of Ysaie*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

xvj. CHAPITER.

THE TWELFTH ARGUMENT ANSWERED. It is not true that Jews or heathens worshipped the work of men's hands for gods, without further qualification. Proof of this from Scripture, where the gods of the heathen are called *devils*. (Ps. xcvi.)

FOR answere to the xij^e^. argument y graunte the i^e^. premisse of the argument, and y denye the ij^e^. premysse of it; which ij^e^. premisse is this: That bothe Iewis and hethen men worschipiden ymagis for Goddis, whiche thei wisten be[1] mad bi mannys 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 schewe bi witnessing of Holi Scripture, and bi witnessing of him which was an ydolatrer and a greet clerk among hethen men, (whos name is Hermes Trismegistus,[2]) and also bi doom of resoun. First, bi testimonye of Holi Scripture thus. It is writun in the lxxxxv^e^. Psalme thus: *Alle goddis of hethen men ben feendis, forsothe God made heuenes.* But so it is, that noon ymagis maad bi mennys hondis ben feendis or weren euere feendis. Wherfore no Goddis of hethen men ben or weren oonli ymagis mad bi mennys hondis. 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 Holi Scripture in lxxxxv^e^. Psalme, and the ij^e^. premysse is open and sure ynouȝ in ech mannis resoun. Wherfore the conclusioun of the same argument is also needis to be trewe.

Further proof from the testimony of Hermes Trismegistus, who held that

Also Hermes Trismegistus in his book, (as Austyn rehercid, [Lib.] viij. *De Civ. Dei*, c. xxiij. and c. xxiiij.[3],) seith pleinli, "that tho ymagis whiche he

---

[1] *ben*, MS. (first hand).

[2] *Trimegistus*, MS., and so also below.

[3] "Ille (Hermes Trismegistus) visibilia et contrectabilia simulacra velut corpora Deorum esse asserit; inesse autem his quosdam spiritus invitatos, qui valeant aliquid, sive ad nocendum, sive ad desideria eorum nonnulla complenda, à quibus eis

Digitized by Google

Images were vivified by indwelling gods.

"and othere hethen men worschipiden for Goddis, "weren ymagis maad quyke bi pure Goddis descend-"ing and aliȝting 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 mennys hondis. And no man couthe ȝeue to us surer and sikerer and trewer instruccioun how ydolatrers diden, than he which was an ydolatrer in him silf, and was a greet clerk among hem, and was a greet defender of ydolatrie bi hise writingis..

The same thing proved by reason. The learned Jews and heathens never stupidly imagined that a workman could frame God.

Bi resoun also y mai proue this same present purpos thus: Hethen men and also Iewis weren[1] neuer so lewid that thei passiden in lewidnes children of x. ȝeer age now lyuyng, or suche persoones whiche in these daies ben clepid and take for foolis. Forwhi the deedis of greet wisdom which thei diden schewen[2] weel that thei weren[3] ful wise, and as wise as ben now the wisist of Cristen men, as euydence herto ful good is sett in the firste premysse of the xij^e^. argument. And sithen it is so, that no child neither eny other fonnysch man now lyuyng wole knouleche and bileeue, that a carpenter or a masoun schal or mai make a thing better than him silf, 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 folewith that the grete naciouns of hethen men and of Iewis with solempne kingis and emperouris and othere lordis and grete clerkis neuer so myche dotiden and erriden forto worschipe 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 obsequia deferuntur." S. Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, lib. viii. c. 23., where much more may be seen to the same purpose. The work referred to by S. Augustine is the *Asclepius*, or Λόγος τέλειος, 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] *schewith*, MS. (first hand).

[3] *were*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVI.

A disquisition into the origin of idolatry. Many in old times lived only by the light of nature, without revelation made from God or angels. Some of these could discover no other than material substances in the universe, which they regarded as eternal; and they conceived that the harmoniously-moving planets ruled men and the irregular elements. Accordingly they chose some or other of those as their gods.

What thanne was the hool thing which thei worschipiden for eny God, good it were forto here leerne and knowe. And forto here the treuthe herof this muste be seid in this mater. Soone aftir the bigynnyng of the world, bisidis hem that lyueden in doom of resoun and therwith recuyueden bileeue fro God and aungelis, summe othere and manye lyueden in doom of resoun oonli and receyueden not such now seid bileeue delyuered to the world bi God and bi aungelis. And of these men summe in her resonyng couthen not fynde that ther was or is eny other substaunce being saue bodili substaunce, as the iiij. elementis 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 vij. planetis of heuen with her orbis and whelis, and as the fix sterris with her orbe or whele. And ferthermore these men, bi cause thei fonden that in the planetis and sterris and her seid orbis and whelis weren noon contrarietees[1] suche as ben in the iiij. elementis bynethe, therfore thei concludiden and helden that al the bodili heuen aboue the iiij. elementis with alle hise parties was vnmaad, and was euer withoute bigynnyng of tyme, and schal euer be withoute corrupcion and withoute noon being. And ferthermore, for as myche as these men aspieden weel bi greet witt, that the seid parties of heuen reuliden ful myche the worchingis of bodies here binethe in the louȝer world, and thei couthen not come ferther forto wite what was doon in eny bodi here binethe which deede was not reulid bi hem aboue, therfore thei helden and trowiden that the bodili heuen and hise seid parties reuliden al that was reuleable here bynethe among men and among othere bodies and thingis; and folewingli herof thei helden and trowiden that heuen and

[1] *contraritees*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

hise parties weren the best thingis in al the hool vnyuersite of thingis and of beingis. And sithen ech of these men feelid weel in himsilf, that he hadde nede for to haue help and reuling more than an other man myȝte do to him, and that in manye caasis; and bettir help myȝte he not loke aftir than summe of tho thingis whiche he trowid to be beste thingis, as weren in his conceit and semyng the bodili heuen and hise seid 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 souereyn helper and lord of hise 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 withoute feith, and which myȝten not in doom of her resoun rise hiȝer or fynde ferther, than that alle substauncis in the hool vnyuersite of thingis ben bodies oonli.

Summe othere and manye weren quycker in natural witt and waxiden better[1] philsophiris, and in her resonyng thei founden that in the hool vniuersite of thingis ben vnbodili substauncis, (that is to seie, spiritis,) bisidis the bodili substauncis 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 substauncis, being parties of the bodili heuen, weren[2]

Others discovered by reason that the universe contained spiritual as well as material substances; and conceived spirits to be uncreated and immortal, and the principal rulers of human destiny. These they accordingly chose for their gods, and imagined that they would vouchsafe to descend into rich and precious images made in

[1] *better* added in the margin in a later (?) hand.

[2] *were*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVI.

their honour, and unite themselves to them; and so worshipped these images, which they had themselves made, for very gods; but under the idea that the Godhead had incorporated itself with the image.

reulers of chauncis here bynethe. And whether among these spiritis oon was worthiest and hiȝest ouer alle the othere or no, thei wisten not; but thei trowiden weel that ech of hem was a greet prince and a reuler of this world, and that ech man hadde nede forto haue loue and fauour and good lordschip of ech of hem. And thanne for as miche as ech such seid man knewe weel and feelid weel in him silf, that he hadde nede to more help and to better lordschip than eny man myȝte do and ȝeue to him in erthe; and he herwith trowid no thing be better and myȝtier and vertuoser than ech of these spiritis to be, and that ech of tho 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 chese to him such a spirit to be to him his Souereynest Lord and so to be to him his God. And thanne ferther, sithen him thouȝte in his resoun that forto cleue to a thing as to his Souereyn Lord, whom he wolde worschipe, loue, and serue, and ȝit 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 seruice this man schulde do to him,) and her with al him thouȝte that thilk Lord was resonable, was curteis, was gentil, and louyng, and also wijs forto consente 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 preciose ymage vndir this entent, that oon such seid hiȝ spirit schulde vouche saaf forto aliȝte and descende into it, thilk spirit wolde al redi conforme him to the seid entent of the man. And ferthermore, sithen men knewen weel the power of spiritis to be ful grete and to be gretter than men myȝten comprehende, men trowiden that tho spiritis wolden so ioyne hem silf with tho

Digitized by Google

ymagis in so curiose and hiȝe 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 lijk to the maner in which we Cristen men bileeuen that God descendid into mankinde and couplid so to him a singuler mankinde, that he which was bifore pure God invisibili was aftirward 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 stire and prouoke suche seid spiritis forto descende and come into tho maad ymagis, and where and whanne thei weeneden and trowiden gode spiritis forto haue come into tho ymagis, badde spiritis entriden into tho ymagis; and bi certein whilis wolden moue and speke and wirche sensibili in tho ymagis, and bi manye othere whilis thei wolden[1] do no thing sensibili in the same ymagis, and herbi tho feendis lettiden and bigileden thilk men forto labore ferther that thei myȝten 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 ȝit the hethen men helden her God to be bodili and bodied in a maner which thei couthen not at fulle vndirstonde, euen 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 comprehende and vndirstonde. 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).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVI.

the pure manhode in him silf with oute more thert sett; so the hethen men worschipiden an ymage and a bodili graued thing for her God, but not the pure bodili graued ymage in him silf with oute more for her God. And so these ij^e^. thingis whiche Scripture seith of ydolatrers stonden to gidere and ben trewe: *that alle Goddis of hethen men ben feendis;* and also in the cxxxiiij^e^. Psalme, that *the Goddis of hethen men ben gold and siluer, the werkis of mennis hondis;* euen as Cristen men wolen graunte these ij. thingis stonde to gidere and be to gidere trewe; that God is a Spirit vnbodili; and the same God is a man, and a bodi bigete of a womman, and nurischid of hir, and which was slein, and was mad deede. Thus miche is ynouȝ, as for now and here, forto knowe how ydolatrie came vp.

Confirmation of this account of the origin of idolatry. The passages of Scripture which speak of idols as devils reconciled with other passages which speak of them as only the works of men's hands.

And that this conceit of ydolatrie is not feyned, it is open. Forwhi ellis Holi Scripture herto bifore alleggid mai not conuenientli and likely be saued, neither 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. Ferthermore, for as myche as the seide hethen men trowiden the seid ymagis to haue be quyke continueli with the seid spiritis whom thei trowiden to haue be Goddis, therfore tho hethen men trowiden tho ymagis to haue alwey herd what men spaken to hem and haue seen what was doon to hem; thouȝ for hiȝ dignite thei wolden not at alle tymes ȝeue answeris, neither at alle tymes schewe that thei herden and sawen and myȝten move hem silf, into tyme thei weren myche preied and weel serued and plesid of men. And ȝit al this was vntrewe; for feendis, whiche ben bad spiritis and enemyes to men, entriden 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

Digitized by Google

entrid; but the feendis moveden tho ymagis, and spaken bi hem, and ful ofte left tho ymagis to be bi hem silf withoute eny feend mouer and withoute eny speker bi hem and in hem. And therfore alle the vpbreidis and alle the reproues which Holi Writ ȝeueth to the worschipers of tho ymagis (as Baruch vj^e. c̃., Ysaie xliiij^e. c̃., and in the Sauter, the cxiij^e. and the cxxxiiij^e. psalmes, and in manye othere placis,) were treuly ȝouun to tho ydolatrers in this sentence and vndirstonding, that in tho ymagis, whiche ydolatrers taken with more therto sett for her Goddis, weren noon othere spiritis thanne feendis, and that in manye tymes whanne tho ydolatrers worschipiden tho ymagis as hauyng in hem summe othere thingis, tho ymagis hadden in hem noon othere thingis than gold and siluer and the werkis of mennys hondis. And if Holi Scripture in the placis of Scripture now spokun be vndirstonde in this now bi me formed sentence, certis alle tho reprouyng and upbreiding processis vpon ydolatrers ben trewe, and alle her vpbreidingis mad ben iust; and that whether tho idolatrers weren hethen men or Iewis.

xvij. CHAPITER.

THE TWELFTH ARGUMENT ANSWERED. The learned heathen, and the common people by their example, fell into idolatry by not attending to the reasonable evidences of the faith which others received.

FORTO make bi al this proces an answere to the xij^e. 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 ydolatrers) 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 myȝten bi doom of re-

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVII.

soun haue had for the feith, which othere men in tho daies hadden and to whiche thei attendiden. And therfore the principal clerkis and grettist and worthiest reulers of tho hethen men fillen into idolatrie bi the now discriued and tauȝt maner, and the sympler partie of hem folewiden the worthier and the more wijs partie, as hem thouȝte it was conuenient forto do; and thus al the greet multitude fil into ydolatrie and continueden therin.

Many also of the Jews fell into idolatry by not continuing to attend to the evidences of their own faith, and by following their own and other nations' conceits.

Manye also of the Iewis, whiche weren[1] bifore sufficientli instructid in the feith of oon God and of veri God and in the evidencis longing therto, fillen bi her necligence fro the attendaunce which schulde haue be ȝouun bi a continuaunce 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 wijse and grete philsophiris. And therfore and therbi manie of the Iewis at dyuerse tymes fillen into ydolatrie and continueden therinne.

But now both Heathens, Jews, and Christians are so well convinced of the unity of God, that there is no peril of idolatry to any one from the use of images.

But now sumwhat bifore the birthe of Crist alle Iewis camen into so greet attendaunce to the euydencis of verry feith teching oon God to be, and also aftir the passioun of Crist hider to in this[2] 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 grete evidencis of the feith teching oon God to be aloon ben hadde in so greet haunt and vce and in so long confermed continuaunce, 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.

Digitized by Google

ech wijs man can it recorde to be trewe,) herof it muste nedis folewe that now adaies it is not perel to Cristen men neithir to the Iewis neither to hethen men forto haue and entermete with ymagis of God, as it was in the daies fer bifore going the incarnacioun of Crist. And the cause herof is now next bifore seid, that the knowing of oon verri God is more substanciali and more sureli and confermedli had now than it was bifore in tho eeldist daies. Neither it is to be drad that eny Cristen men ben priueli ydolatrers bi occasioun of ymagis. And the cause is now bifore seid, which [is] that the feith of oon God is so weel attendid to and so weel confermed, and doom of resoun longing therto is so miche hiȝed aboue that it was in eeldist daies, that noon such drede is to be had now of ydolatrie as was longe bifore in eeldist daies to be drad. And this is ynouȝ for answere to the xij^e^. argument.

It may be objected that the origin of idolatry is affirmed in the Book of Wisdom to have sprung from the deification of dead men. The objection answered. Scripture, reason and the testimony of Hermes are more to be credited than an apocryphal book written by Philo Judæus. Moreover, the origin assigned in that book is too late: for the full causes of idolatry existed earlier, and therefore no doubt idolatry itself also.

If eny man wole obiecte aȝens my conceit now bifore sett vpon the bigynnyng and cause of idolatrie, and wole allegge aȝens me what is writen in Sapience xiiij^e^. c̃. of the bigynnyng and the cause of ydolatrie thus: *Forsothe idolis weren*[1] *not at the bigynnyng, neither tho schulen be withoute ende. Forwhi the voidnessis of men founden these ydolis into the world, and therfore the eend of tho is founden schort. Forwhi the fadir making sorowe with bitter moorning, made soone to him an ymage of the sone which was rauischid, and biganne to worschipe him now as God, which was deed thanne as man: and he ordeyned holi things and sacrificis among hise seruauntis. Aftirward in the tyme comyng bitwixe, whanne the wickid custom was strong, this errour was kept as a lawe, and ymagis*

[1] *were*, MS. (first hand).

CHAP. XVII. *weren worschipid bi lordschip of tyrannys, et cætera:* —certis herto y answere thus: If this processe writun Sapience xiiij^{e}. c̃. meene that thilk maner, which is there sett and seid, ydolatrie biganne in the world, as it semeth that thilk processe schulde it meene, thanne y seie and holde that thilk proces, Sapience xiiij^{e}. c̃., is vntrewe. 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 idolatrers, y may be bold ynowȝ. 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,[1] is not so myche to be bileeued neither so myche to be cleued to[2] as it is to bileeue or cleue to Holi Scripture, and to the euydencis which y haue bifore here write and sett for fundacioun of my conceit vpon the bigynnyng and cause of ydolatrie. And ȝit ferther 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 bifore here write weren bifore thilk fadiris dai of which the xiiij^{e}. chapiter of Sapience spekith, and that as miche and as ful as thei han be a this side the deies of thilk fadir. And no mann[3] maie seie but that tho causis musten[4] needis bringe forth ydolatrie, whanne euere thei were. Wherfore it is rather to be holde that ydolatrie was bifore the daies of thilk fadir, (as it was aftir hise 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 Sapientiæ apud Hebræos nusquam est. Unde et ipse stylus Græcam magis eloquentiam redolet. Hunc Judæi Philonis esse affirmant."

[2] *to* is added by a later hand.

[3] *man*, MS. (first hand).

[4] *muste*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

in the daies of thilk fadir. And so (as it semeth to me) credence is not to be ȝouun to the xiiij^e. chapiter of Sapience, as in that.

The reason why the books of the Apocrypha are united to the Canonical books in our Bibles explained.

If symple men wolen wondre here whi that thilk book of Sapience is so famoseli sett in Biblis now adaies, ȝhe, and lijk solempneli as othere bokis of Holi Scripture ben sett in the Bible, herto y mai answere thus: That in the bigynnyng of the chirche, soone aftir Cristis passioun, writingis dressing men into holynes weren scant and fewe in reward that thei han ben sithen and aftir in tyme, and Cristen men[1] weren thanne ful myche desirose forto haue deuoute writingis; 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 witnessen that tho bokis ben not of Holi Scripture.[3] And this oolde deuocioun forto plante the seid bokis into Biblis, whanne euere Biblis weren in writing, ceecid not into al tyme after. And ȝit herbi is not the auctorite of tho bokis reisid hiȝer than it was bifore; and namelich it cannot be reisid therbi so hiȝe, that it be putt bifore gretter euydencis than is the nakid seiyng of hem. And thus y answere to the laste moued dout.

---

[1] *men* is added by a later hand.

[2] *hadde*, MS. (first hand).

[3] "Porro in eo libro, qui a plerisque Sapientia Salomonis inscribitur, et in Ecclesiastico, quem esse Jesu filii Sirach nullus ignorat, calamo temperavi: tantummodo Canonicas Scripturas vobis emendare desiderans." S. Hieron. *in libros Salom. juxt. LXX.* (Op. tom. x. p. 436., Ed. 1740.)

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVII.

Possibly 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 reminded of God and his benefits.

Perauenture, whanne al this what y haue write of the ij^e. and iij^e. principal gouernauncis in the firste and in the ij^e. and iij^e. parties of this book hiderto schal be weel ouer red and schal be weel vndirstonde, the men whiche were bifore impugners of the seid first and ij^e. gouernauncis, that is to seie, of having and vsing ymagis and of doing pilgrimagis, wolen agree and accorde to al what is entendid fro the bigynnyng of the ij^e. parti of this book hidir to, (or perauenture fro the bigynnyng of the first parti of this book hidir to,) but thanne thei wolen seie thus: "Thouȝ it be leeful and expedient to manie folk "for to haue the seid vce of ymagis and for to do "pilgrimagis, ȝit we seen so manye viciose gouer-"nauncis mengid ther with or comyng forth therfro, "that we wolen be free forto speke aȝens tho syn-"ful gouernauncis. And also, thouȝ it be leeful and "expedient to manye folkis forto vce in the seid "maner ymagis and forto haunte pilgrimagis, ȝit "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 liberte forto be "remembrid upon God and hise benefetis and the "othere fer bifore rehercid thingis bi suche ymagis "and pilgrymagis, or by redingis and heringis of Holi "Scripture, or by inward meditaciouns, or bi talking "to gidere of oure neibouris or with oure curat "hauyng cure of oure soulis."

Reply to these reasoners. Let them first be sure of the existence of abuses, and next let them proceed discreetly while they blame them. Nobody is obliged to use

Sotheli if the men, whiche weren sumtyme impugners aȝens ymagis and pilgrimagis, wolen in this now rehercid maner seie and holde, y wole seie to hem aȝenward as for her firste seiyng thus: Be ȝe weel avisid what is vicioseli doon and vsid aboute ymagis and pilgrimagis, and be ȝe siker of the treuthe, bifore

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVII.

ȝe bigynne to vndirnyme it; and whanne ȝe ben ther of sufficientli leerned and instructid, se ȝe that in ȝoure vndirnymyng ȝe bere ȝou discreetli, as the office of vndirnymyng askith, which is sumwhat tauȝt bifore in the prolog of this present book: and Goddis forbode that eny man forbede ȝou forto make such vndirnymyng. And ferthir as anentis the ij°. seiyng y haue not herde ȝit into this day, that eny prelat hath compellid ȝou for to vce ymagis or forto make pilgrimagis: but sithen it is a trouthe of Goddis lawe that ymagis mowen be vcid profitabili and a trouthe it is of Goddis lawe that pilgrimagis mowen be doon fruytefulli, therfore prelatis of the chirche mowen[1] leeffulli compelle ȝou that ȝe not seie aȝens these treuthis of Goddis lawe; and that ȝe lette not othere men forto vce ymagis into the seid dew maner and forto make pilgrimagis in the seid dew maner, thouȝ to ȝou silf it likith not forto haue and vse ymagis and forto make pilgrimagis; and that ȝe lette not eny othere persoones forto take the seid vce of ymagis and of pilgrimagis in dew maner; and that ȝe make no cisme neither disturblaunce neither debate among Cristen peple bi holding[2] aȝens the seid dew vce of ymagis and of pilgrimagis; and that ȝe not diffame alle vsers of ymagis and pilgrimagis, bering an hond upon hem that thei ben ydolatrers, whilis they ben[3] noon. And if ȝe wolen not obeie herto with good wil, after that the cleer teching of this book fro the bigynnyng of it hidir to is to ȝou mynystrid, (namelich with therto ioyned *The book of worschiping*,) sotheli y schal neuere birewe ȝou, thouȝ ȝe be therto dryue bi peynes, and thouȝ ȝe for so greet and so perilose obstinacie be soor punyschid.

images or go on pilgrimage, but as these are lawful, men may fairly be compelled to abstain from slandering them and from causing schisms about them.

---

[1] *mowe*, MS. (first hand), and *perhaps* so also in the two instances preceding.

[2] *biholding*, MS.

[3] *be*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVII.

Let them also be well assured that their cause will never prevail. Images established by a great council at Rome, A.D. 726, under Gregory II. against Leo the Isaurian who persecuted their maintainers.

And oon thing truste ȝe weel, that thouȝ ȝe wolde wyncy and repugne aȝens the clergie and aȝens alle tho whiche wolen deuoutli and profitabli vce ymagis and pilgrimagis, ȝe schulen neuer haue the maistrie. Forwhi Leo the Thridde Emperour, whanne he was emperour of the hool Eest and Weest Cristendom, impungned ymagis with al his power, and he brake ymagis, and punyschid men soor whiche wolde vse hem; and myche of the Eest cuntre helde with him: but ȝit, ther upon was mad a greet counceil of all the Eest and Weest clergie bi Gregori the ij^e. Pope of Rome; and it was so stabilid ymagis to be had in chirchis aȝens the Emperouris entent, and the deuocioun of al the peple in the West partie was therto so greet, that tho which wolden haue had ymagis to be leid doun myȝten not haue her entent.

Images defended against Constantine Copronymus by Stephen II. A.D. 754, and confirmed by the Second Nicene Council A.D. 787 under Adrian I. and Tarasius.

Also Constantyn the v^e. (sone of the seid Leo and emperour next aftir his fadir,) attemptid the same which his fadir bifore attemptid; but ȝit Stevyn the ij^e. Pope aȝenstode him, and aftirward a greet counceil was mad bi Pope Adrian[1] and bi the Patriarke of Constantinople,[2] Tharasi, in which counceil in the citee of Nycee the riȝt vce of ymagis was eftsoone confermed.

All attempts against the lawful use of images will in like manner fail, and cause nothing but evil.

And certis in lijk maner it wole fare, who euer attempte aȝens the seid vce of ymagis. And ther fore, sithen ymagis and pilgrimagis ben leeful and mowe be profitabili vsid, (as it is sufficientli bi me proued here and in *The book of worschiping*,) and peple ben so sett that thilk vce thei wolen not lacke and leue, it is a greet folie forto theraȝens repugne; and a greet folie it is forto counceile 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.

Digitized by Google

defaut make ten tymes gretter yuel come forth, which ouȝte not bi eny lawe of God to be doon.

Further justification of images and pilgrimages to be found in *The book of worshipping.*

Who euer wole se more for iustifiyng of the seid first and ij^e^. principal gouernauncis now bifore tretid thoruȝout this present ij^e^. partie of this book, rede he ouer weel *The book of worschiping* thoruȝ hise bothe parties, and there of this mater he schal se more toward the fulnes.

xviij. CHAPITER.

THE THIRTEENTH ARGUMENT ANSWERED. Six rules shall be premised. The first rule. From time immemorial figures of rhetoric have been usod to adorn and diversify men's discourse. This rule self-evident.

FOR to make a cleer soiling answere to the xiij^e^. argument y putte bifore these vj. reulis or supposiciouns. Oon is this: Fro eeldist daies contynueli hidir to men weren[1] 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 rethorik, that with hem her spechis schulde be the more lusti, and thei ordeyneden summe certeyn figuris rennyng therwith forto excuse tho colourid spechis fro vntrouthe, and summe othere certein figuris for to excuse tho spechis fro vncongruyte 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 therfore thei ordeyneden 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 han be maad and ȝit ben mad, that nede is not forto make therto eny proof.

---

[1] *were*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVIII.

The second rule. When a man does anything with one of his limbs or with an instrument, we say by a figure that his limb or the instrument does it. Proof of the rule from Scripture and experience.

The ij°. reule or supposicioun is this: Among suche now seid colouris and figuris of spechis and of writingis, summe ben these ij. now to be rehercid. 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 withstonding 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 ȝit 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 lijk maner, whanne a man dooth a deede bi an other thing being an instrument forto therbi do the deede, (as is a spere forto ouerthrowe another[1] man in iowsting,[2] or an hamer forto make a knyf in smythiyng,) we vsen forto seie that the instrument doith the deede, (as that the spere throwith doun the other man, and that the hamer maketh the knyf), notwithstonding that in speche of pure trouthe to be take withoute colour or figure, it ouȝte be seid that oonli this man throwith doun bi his spere, as bi therto an instrument, the other man, and the smyth 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 ȝit bi cause that euereither of hem is an instrument to the doer of a deede, it is woned be seid that euereyther 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 disjunctim.

[2] *iniowsting*, MS.

Digitized by Google

Open experience is sufficient proof to this present ij^e. reule; ȝhe, and not oonli these colouris and figuris han ben vsid in spechis and writingis out of Holi Writ, but also Holi Writt vsith ful manye dyuerse colouris and figuris for cause seid bifore in the firste reule. And among al other Holi Writt vsith these ij. bifore ensaumplid colouris. Forwhi as to the firste colour ensaumpling therof is writun Iob xvij^e. c̃. in the bigynnyng thus: *Lord, delyuere thou me, and sette thou me bisidis thee; and the hond of ech fiȝte aȝens me,*[1] and as to the ij^e. colour ensaumpling therof is writun, i^e. Regum ij^e. c̃., thus: *The bowe of strong men is ouercome, and infirme or feble 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 fiȝting. And in lijk maner it is seid that the bowe of strong men ben ouercome, thouȝ in verri trouthe of propre speche the bowe is not ouercome; forwhi the bowe fiȝtith not, but the strong man is ouercome in and bi his bowe as his instrument. And thus it is open that Holi Writt witnessith this ij^e. reule to be trewe.

The third rule. One thing is wont to be called by the name of another thing which is like it, both in Scripture and in common speech, by the figure called *transumption.*

The iij^e. reule or supposicioun is this: Whanne oon thing is lijk to an othir thing in substaunce or being or in gouernaunce or in worching, thilk thing is woned be clepid vndir name[2] 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 Wiclif's version of Job xvii. 3. in its later form.

[2] *the name,* MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVIII.

This maner of speche is had not oonli in comoun vce out of Holi Scripture, but also this maner of colouring speche is ofte and myche had in Holi Scripture. Forwhi bi this colour of speche, which in rethorik is clepid *transsumpoioun*, Crist seid that he was a vyne, and hise disciplis weren braunchis, and his Fadir was an erthe tilier, and Iohun the Baptiste was Helie.[3] And al for this, that he was lijk in wirching to a vyne, and hise 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 fourth rule. One thing is wont to be called by the name of another thing, which it is designed to represent, both in Scripture and in common speech.

The iiij^{e}. reule 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 signified or representid. Forwhi in this maner 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 leieth a sege to Harflew; in this dai, "which we now in this ȝeer halewen, Crist was born; "in this dai, which now is at Mydsomer, Iohun Bap-"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 Herry, and this dai in this ȝeer is deputid forto represente and signifie the same dai in which Crist was born, and this other day in this same ȝeer is deputid forto represente the same dai in which Iohun Baptist was born. And not oonli the spechis of this iiij^{e}. reule ben vsid out of Holi Scripture, but also in Holi Scripture. Forwhi in Holi Scripture, Genes. xli^{e}. ē., vpon

[1] See John xv. 1; Matth. xvii. 12.

Digitized by Google

the dreem of Pharao is is seid thus: *The vij. faire kijn and the vij. ful eeris of corn ben vij. ȝeeris of plente; and the vij. kijn thynne and leene, whiche stieden up after tho, and the vij. thinne eeris of corn and smyten with brennyng wijnd ben vij. ȝeeris of hungir to comyng.* Also, i°. Cor. x°. c̃., it is seid thus: *Crist was the stoon which ȝaue water in desert,* Numeri the xx°. chapiter. And also, Ephes. ij°. c̃., it is seid that *Crist was the corner stoon,* ioynyng the ij. wallis to gidere in Salamonis temple, of which it is writun in the cxvij°. Psalme. And al for that the stoon in desert signified and representid Crist, and also the other corner stoon in the temple of Salamon signified and representid Crist, and the vij. fatte kijn and the vij. ful eeris[1] of corn signifieden the vij. plenteuose ȝeeris next thanne comyng.

The v°. reule or supposicioun is this: Ech spech or writing so colourid and figurid as the i°., ij°., iij°. and iiij°. reulis techen, ouȝten be reducid and brouȝt into the meenyng and vndirstonding of a speche or writing, which in him silf is trewe with out such colour and figure. Forwhi no vntrewe speche, as and for that he is vntrewe, is alloweable and vsable; but ech such speche, as in that, is reprouable: for al vntreuthe, as such, is viciose, and ther fore ech such speche is alloweable and vseable 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 therfore the dewe menyng or vnderstonding of this speche or writing; "Thi riȝt hand dide this dede," is to be seid thus: "Thou bi thi riȝt hond, as bi thi partie "therto seruyng, didist this deede." And the dew meenyng or vndirstonding of this speche or writing;

The fifth rule. Each of the figurative speeches in the four rules above named may be reduced into a speech without a figure, which is literally true. Illustrations of this.

[1] ȝeeris, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVIII. "Thi spere threwe doun hors and man," ouȝte be this: "Thou bi thi spere, as bi thin therto seruyng "instrument, threwist doun hors and man." The dew vndirstonding of this speche; "Hector cometh now," is this: "Oon lijk to Hector cometh now." The dew vndirstonding of this speche; "Iohun[1] was Helie," is this: "Iohun was lijk to Helie." The dew vnderstonding of this speche; "Crist was the corner stoon," is this: "Crist was representid and signified bi the "corner stoon."

The sixth rule. As we may say that an instrument does a thing, which a man does there by, so we may pray to an instrument to do that, which we pray to any one to do thereby.

The vj^e. 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 lijk skile it is alloweable me forto 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 proue thus: It is alloweable me to seie to the spere of this man thus: "Thou threwist doun the other man;" for that the dew meenyng and vndirstonding of this speche is this: "Thou, man, bi thi spere threwist doun the "other man," (as it is open bi the v^e. 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^e. reule; and this meenyng and vndirstonding is alloweable and conuenient, as it is open bi the same v^e. 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 threwist

[1] *Iohun Baptist*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

"doun the other man," or ellis thus: "O thou spere, "throwe doun the other man."[1]

Application of these rules to the addresses made to the cross. Some of those addresses and prayers explained.

Certis these vj. reulis or supposiciouns ȝeuen sufficient and cleer iustifiyng to manye spechis and writingis seid to crossis and of crossis. Forwhi if it be seid or writun to the same crosse in which Crist henge: "Thou, crosse, aȝenbouȝtist man," the dewe meenyng and vndirstonding ther of is this: "Sum "persoon aȝenbouȝte man bi thee, crosse, in that "that thou were an instrument forto aȝenbie man." And if it be seid or writun of the same crosse thus: "The crosse of Crist saued the world and "clensid the world," the dewe vndirstonding ther of is this: "Crist bi his crosse as bi therto a seru-"yng instrument saued 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 Sauiour 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 Sauiour 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 bifore rehercid in the xiij^e. argument and conteyned in this ympne, *Vexilla Regis prodeunt, et cætera,*

---

[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 ferther, if this speche is alloweable: 'Y preie thee, spere, throwe thou doun the other man,' this present vj^e. reule muste nedis be trewe, that it is alloweable and conuenient speche forto seie, 'That y preie thee, spere, that thou ouerthrowe the othir man.'"

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XVIII. whanne it is seid[1] thus: *O cros, the oon hope in this tyme of passioun, encrese thou riȝtwisnes to piteful men, and ȝeue forȝeuenes to gilti men*, may be this, if the speche be maad to a crosse in oure chirche: "O God, encrece riȝtwisnes to men hauyng pitee, "and ȝeue forȝeuenes to gilti men bi the cros, which "representith and signifieth the instrument of oure "oon hope in this tyme representing the tyme of "passioun." And in lijk maner dew vnderstonding of the preier, which is conteyned in the prose of the response, *O crux viride lignum, et cætera*, whanne it is preied there 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 price of the world, ȝeue and graunte to this peple the benefice of the crosse*, mai be this, if the preier be mad to eny crosse now being in oure chirche: "O God make the patroun (that is "to seie, Crist) be to us inclynable bi this cros signi-"fiyng the instrument or the crosse which bare the "Lord: and, O Lord, ȝeue and graunte to this peple "of Crist the benefet of the crosse, bi the stok which "signifieth the stok that deserued bere the price of "the world." And eftsoone in lijk maner the dew vndirstonding of the preier conteyned in the anteme *O crux splendidior, et cætera*, if it be preied ther to[2] a comon crosse among us thus, *O sweete stok, bering sweete nailis and sweete birthens, saue thou this present cumpany gaderid into thi preising*, may be this: "O God, this present cumpany gaderid into the "preising of thee to be doon bi the crosse saue thou "bi this stok, signifiyng the sweete crosse instrument "bering sweete nailis and sweete birthens." And in lijk maner dew vndirstondingis mowen be ȝouun to

[1] *seid there thus*, MS. (first hand, but the whole written on an erasure).
[2] *therto*, MS.

Digitized by Google

the othere preieris mad to the cros, and rehercid bifore in the xiij^e. argument in the [x^e.][1] chapiter of this present ij^e. partie.

xix. CHAPITER.

NEUERTHELES, thouȝ bi these vj. reulis these preiers, whiche mowen be seid as mad to the cros, mowen be saued fro inconuenience[2] and vnaccordaunce, (and that for the dew vnderstonding which mai be ȝouun to hem bi these vj. reulis,) ȝit also sureli and vndoutabili tho preiers mowen be excusid fro inconuenience, and mowen be mad ful alloweable, fair, and honeste bi the vij^e. and viij^e. reulis or supposiciouns whiche now schulen be put forth.

These six rules are a sufficient vindication of the prayers offered to the cross; yet two other rules shall be laid down by which their use and lawfulness shall be made yet more evident.

The vij^e. reule or supposicioun myche lijk to the ij^e. reule is this: Whanne a man doith or suffrith a deede bi eny thing which is a meene prouoking or stiring notabili the doer or suffrer for to it do or suffre, or which is in eny other wise a notable meene therto, it is woned be seid that thilk meene dooth the deede; in this vnderstonding, that thilk meene helpith and fortherith in meenyng that the deede be don of his veri doer: as, if Iohun be a prouoking meene that the King ȝeue[3] to me xx^ti. pound of ȝeerli fee, whilis Iohun preieth the King that he so do, it mai be seid and is woned be seid that Iohun dooth and ȝeueth to me thilk fee, and his preier doith and ȝeueth to me the same fee; in this vndirstonding, that Iohun meeneth or helpith, and fortherith in meenyng that the ȝeuyng be doon, and his preier doith in meenyng

The seventh rule. When a man does anything by the intervention of any provocative medium, it may be said that the medium itself does it, as helping thereto by its mediation. Proof of the rule from Scripture and experience.

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

[2] *in conuenience*, MS., and so just below, where *in* (at the end of the line) has no hyphen.

[3] *ȝeueth*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIX.

that the same ȝeuyng be doon. This reule is open bi experience. Also in Holi Writt the colour of this present vij^e. reule is ensaumplid and vsid. Forwhi, Iames the v^e. chapiter, it is seid thus: *If eny of ȝou is sijk, lede 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[1] thilk deede of sauyng; and the preier wirchith oonli as a meene in prouoking ther to, and the man preiying wirchith also oonli as a meene prouoking in to the saaf sauyng. Thus it is open that the vij^e. reule is witnessid bi Holi Scripture to be trewe.

The eighth rule. We may lawfully pray both to the man and to the provocative medium to perform our petitions. Proof of the rule.

And if this reule be trewe, certis thanne folewith ther of that the viij^e. reule or supposicioun is trewe, which is this: It is allowable that y seie thus: "I "preie Iohun forto ȝeue to me the seid fee;" and it is allowable that y seie thus: "I preie the seid "preier of Iohun to be maad to the King, that "thilk preier ȝeue to me the same fee of xx^ti. pound." For whi, if this speche is alloweable: "Iohun ȝeuyth[2] "to me the seid fee of xx^ti. pound;" and if this speche be alloweable: "The seid preier of Iohun "ȝeuith[2] to me the seid xx^ti. pound;" certis thanne it is alloweable that I seie thus: "I preie bothe to

[1] *doith* is interlineated in a later (?) hand.

[2] *ȝeuyth* and *ȝeuith* (as well as *prouid* 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.

Digitized by Google

"Iohun and to his preier, that thei ȝeue to me the "seid fee of xx^ti. pound." But so it is, that euereither of the ij. former seid spechis is alloweable. Wherfore euereither of the[1] ij. spechis of preiers ben also allowable. The first premisse is open ynouȝ, as is prouid bifore bi the vj^e. reule and his proof. And that the ij^e. premisse is trewe, it may be prouid thus: To this speche, "Iohun ȝeueth to me this seid fee "of xx^ti. pound," and to this speche, "His preier "ȝeueth to me the same xx^ti. pound," the dewe vndirstondingis ben these: "Iohun is meene that the "seied fee be ȝouun to me, and his preier is also "meene that the same seid fee is ȝouun to me," as schewith the vij^e. reule. And open it is bi the v^e. rewle that this vndirstonding is allowable and convenient ynouȝ. Wherfore the ij^e. premysse is trewe. And so nedis the conclusioun of the bothe premyssis is trewe, namelich sithen in lijk maner lijk verrili the dewe vndirstonding of this speche: "Y preie "Iohun that he ȝeue to me the seid fee, and y preie "his preier forto ȝeue to me the same fee," is this: "I preie Iohun that he be meene into the ȝeuyng of "the seid fee, and y preie Iohun that he make the "preier of him to be also meene into the same "ȝeuing of the same fee," as it is open bi the vj^e. and bi the vij^e. reulis. And this vndirstonding is allowable and conuenient ynouȝ. Wherfore nedis folewith that the seid conclusioun is trewe.

And thus these vij^e. and viij^e. rewlis schewen openli ynouȝ and sureli ynouȝ, that ech of the preiers whiche semen to be mad to the crosse (and rehercid bifore in the xiij^e. argument) is alloweable and conuenient ynouȝ. Forwhi the vij^e. and viij^e. reulis schewen that the dewe vndirstonding of the firste

These two last rules prove the lawfulness of all the prayers before cited, which are made in appearance to the cross. A full explanation and paraphrase of one of these prayers.

[1] *these*, MS. (first corrector).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XIX. preier there reherchid in the ympne, *Vexilla Regis prodeunt*, is this: "O thou God, bi whom[1] the cros is "the prouocative meene of oure oon hope in tyme of "this passioun, encrese riȝtwisnes to men hauyng pite, "and [make] that God ȝeue forȝeuenes to gilti men;" and sotheli so the cros is therto prouocatijf meene. Forwhi God bi biholding to the cros is stirid and prouokid forto do alle maners of good to us, sithen a cros was the instrument wher yn Crist, in sum maner of deseruyng, deserued to us al oure good. And for as miche as if we desire and preie that the cros be such a prouocatijf meene into the seid ȝeuyng, thanne oure desijr therto schal encrece and be the gretter; and aftir that oure desijr schal therto be the grettir, God schal make that the crosse schal the more prouoke him or schal make him silf so that he the more be prouokid bi the cros into the seid forȝeuyng,—therfore it is not veyn but it is ful profitable that we desire and preie to God, that he ȝeue to us oure goodis in this now spokun vnderstonding, that the cros be meene into the ȝeuyng to be doon to vs fro God him silf as the verry doer and ȝeuer therof. Neuertheles, thouȝ this preier be mad as in voice or in inward speche to the cros, ȝit in the trewe vnderstonding therof it is maad to God, as is now next bifore expowned.

A similar explanation might be given of all the other prayers. Further justifica- And euen as it is now answerid bi the vij^{e}. and viij^{e}. rewlis for iustifiyng of the first there rehercid preier maad (as in voice thouȝ not in the vnder-

[1] The erasures on both sides of the leaf have produced holes in the MS.: between *whom* and *the* are traces of another letter, in the hand of the corrector, either *p* or possibly the Saxon *th*, having a trace of some contraction above, or perhaps a mark intended to cancel it. Possibly we should read *this the cros*, but more probably the text, as edited, is correct. Much of this paragraph is re-written on an erasure.

Digitized by Google

stonding) to the cros, so in lijk wijse it mai be answerid bi the same vij^e^. and viij^e^. reulis into the iustifiyng of alle othere preiers there maad (as in voice thouȝ not in the vnderstonding) to the cros, whiche ben rehercid bi fore in the xiij^e^. argument. And for that this is open ynouȝ, therfore more speche therof y ouer passe. In other wise into iustifiyng of the seid preiers mad to the cros, I haue answerid in *The book of worschiping*, the ij^e^. parti, the iiij^e^. chapiter. Chese the seers which of tho answers to hem lijkith; for these answers here mad and the answer ther mad ben vndoutabli and at fulle[1] euydently trewe.

tion of them to be found in Pecock's *Book of worshipping*.

XX. CHAPITER.

FOR answere to the xiiij^e^. and xv^e^. argumentis to gidere vndir oon, y sende bifore these iij. reulis or supposicions.

THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH ARGUMENTS ANSWERED.

Oon is: That a man schal haue more feruentli hise affeccioun and loues anentis his loued freend, whanne and whilis thilk freend is at sumwhile present personali with him and bisidis him, than he schal haue, if the freend be absent alwey and not personali present with him. This reule is openli trewe bi experience. Forwhi, (not withstonding a man talke and speke of his freend at the mete table or in sum other place, and haue as good affeccioun as he can haue upon the same freend in such absence,) ȝit if in the meene while the freend come into him personali and sitte doun with him, he schal haue miche gretter affeccioun vpon the seid freend than he hadde in the freendis absence. Wherfore this firste reule is trewe.

Three rules premised. The first rule. A man will have his affection more fervently kindled towards his friend while present than while absent. Proof of the rule.

[1] *the fulle*, MS. (first corrector). The whole of this paragraph is re-written on an erasure.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

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.

The ij^e. reule is this: If a man wole encrese his gode affeccioun 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 ȝeuen hem wijsly to the bisynes of contemplacioun, namelich in the bigynnyng of her contemplatijf lijf. Wherfore this reule is trewe.

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.

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 meene 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 ij^e. reule is trewe: That it is ful profitable into gendring of affeccioun upon the absent freend, that the desirer of the affeccioun haue ymaginacioun that thilk freend is in[1] bodili maner present.

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 iij^e. reule is this: It is esier forto ymagyne a thing absent to be present in an other thing lijk therto, than withoute eny other thing lijk therto. Forwhi euery thing lijk to an othir thing bringith into ymaginacioun and into mynde better and liȝtir 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 ymagine the dai of Cristis birthe to be present in the dai as lijk therto markid in the

[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.

Digitized by Google

ȝeer, than in an other dai not so lijk therto; and men schulen esier ymagine the dai of Cristis resurreccioun and the dai of Pentecost in the daies therto assigned bi more lijknes in the ȝeer, than in othere daies lasse therto like.

Now the crucifix or cross serves to make us imagine Christ to be visibly present; and the prayers toward it on Palm-Sunday were said to Christ imagined to be then present.

Now after these thre reulis and vpon hem y procede thus: Ech man hath nede forto haue gode affeccioun anentis Crist, as upon his best freend; and this freend ȝeueth 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 serueth ful weel and ful myche the ymage of Crist crucified, whilis and if the biholder ymagineth Crist to be streiȝt abrode bodili thoruȝ 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 ymagyne; thouȝ thei knewen and bileeueden weel ynouȝ, that it was not so in deede as thei deuoutli ymagineden. In this ymaginacioun thei helden hem silf forto meete bodili and presentli with Crist in Palme-Sunday, in which dai ȝeerli thei ymagineden the same firste dai be in which Crist came visibli riding into Ierusalem and was mett of the Iewis singing to him: *Osanna to the sone of Dauith.* And so al what in suche processiouns was seid and sungun toward the crosse in eelde daies of the chirche in Palme-Sundai 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.

The ceremonies used on Good Friday to be explained on the same principle.

And herbi ȝit into ferther encrecing of deuocioun and good affeccioun to be gendrid upon Crist, thei crepiden to ward and to such an ymage of the crucifix in Good Fridai; not as thouȝ thei crepiden thanne and there to noon other thing saue to the ymage, but that thei aftir her ymaginacioun crepiden to the persoon of Crist, which bi her ymaginacioun was

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

bodili streiȝt forth with the bodi of the ymage. And ȝit ferther into more loue and good affeccioun to be gendrid, thei kessiden the feet of the ymage; not as that the feet of the ymage weren al that thei there kissiden, but that ther with thei kessiden the feet of Crist whom thei ymagineden to be there in bodili maner present. And this deuout practik, namelich in his outward deede, abidith ȝit in al the West Chirche a this[1] side Greek lond; how euer it be of the inward ymaginatijf 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 Palme-Sundai, neither 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 thoruȝ the ymage crucified, heed to heed, hond to hond, foot to foot; thouȝ it be not trowid so to be, but thouȝ the contrarie is trowid to be. And herbi is sufficient answere ȝouun to the xiiij^e. and xv^e. argumentis to gidere.

These arguments will also vindicate the devotions paid to images by kissing the hands which touched them. As our affection towards Christ would be increased if we could actually touch his body, so it is increased by our touching it by imagination in a crucifix with our hands. And we consequently love to touch with our mouth the hand which touched the

Who euer schal cleerli and perfitli vndirstonde the answere which is now bifore maad to the xiiij^e. and xv^e. argumentis, he schal therbi take sufficient ground forto excuse fro blame and fro vnfruytful and lewid gouernaunce alle tho whiche wolen touche with her hondis the feet and othere 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 clothingis of the ymagis. Certis,—sithen it is openli knowe for sooth, that thou woldist be riȝt weel plesid and thou woldist myche make

[1] *athis*, MS. See note on p. 268.

Digitized by Google

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.

therof, if Crist were now in erthe in a greet prece of peple, and thou myȝtist come so nyȝ that thou schuldist touche with thin hond hise feet or his hond his breste or his cheke or hise clothis, and woldist therbi gendre to thee bi so myche the more affeccioun anentis him than if thou myȝtist not so touche him or his clothing, (euen riȝt 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 nyȝ to him and not biclippid him,)—it muste nedis folewe, if thou ymagine Crist or an other Seint for to be bodili streiȝt thoruȝout 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 wole be weel paied and weel plesid for to haue it mediatli, (that is to seie, forto haue it arombe and bi a meene,) it folewith that it is coueitable to a man into the gendring or the contynuyng of such seid affeccioun to God and to Seintis for to desire haue, and for to gete to him and haue vnto his visage or iȝen 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 receyuyng thilk cosse, handling, biclipping, or othere touching of him immediatli, and delyueryng to thee as fro him mediatli:) 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 miȝten make euereither of hem forto entre into the

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

ful hool persoon of the other of hem and forto be streiȝt thoruȝ out the bodi 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 disseuering and into rombe distaunt being of euereither of hem from the other of hem atwyn.

Thus the least union to the person of God or a Saint increases our affection proportionably to its closeness. Illustrations from human intercourse.

And so, therfore, the leest degree of ooning or ioynyng 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 encrece 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 lijk maner the more loue and good affeccioun 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 admittid for to ligge in the same chambir with the lord, certis therbi schal good loue and affeccioun be gendrid. And therfore such good symple bisynessis 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 iustifie tho symple persoones deedis.

[1] *knowe*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

Further justification of these kinds of devotion to images to be found in Pecock's *Book of worshiping.*

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 ij^e^. parti, the iiij^e^. chapiter. Of whiche answeris euer either is good ynouȝ and trewe ynowȝ, and neuerneither of hem is contrarie to other of hem; and therfore chese the reder of this place and of thilk place whether this or thilk or bothe he wole holde.

The reason for the length of the reply to the three last arguments of the Lollards.

I haue bisett the lenger bisynes forto answere sufficientli and cleerli to the xiij^e^. and xiiij^e^. and xv^e^. argumentis, bi cause that in tho deedis of Palme-Sunday and Good Fridai, where upon the xiij^e^. and xiiij^e^. [and] xv^e^. argumentis rennen, the aduersaries holden to be greet and cursid wickidnes. Not withstonding that if the conceitis ben had in vce, whiche the bifore[1] reulis ȝeuen and techen, alle tho deedis doon in Palme-Sundai and in Good Fridai schulen be doon ful miche holili and blessidli and ful profitabli into making the doer strong and myȝti in othere tymes forto do and suffre for the loue and the lawe of Iesus Crist.

Still, though visible signs in devotion rightly understood are profitable at certain times, they are not to be so exclusively attended to as to put God's word out of sight. This is as much superior to such exercises as sunlight to moonlight.

Neuertheles this y wolde that ech man knewe, (and herto y wolde that ech man toke hede,) thouȝ the excercise and vce of suche now seid visible signes, doon in deuocioun and with vndirstonding of tho signes what thei bitokenen, is good and profitable to be had at certein whilis, namelich of hem whiche kunnen not rede or moun not here the word of God red or prechid to hem,—ȝit y wole not that men schulden[2] haunte as it were alwey the excercise in suche visible signes, whanne thei coueiten 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 *bifore seid.*

[2] *schulde not,* MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. XX.

so miche or so ofte the vce of suche visible signes, that thilk haunte and vce lette hem fro vce of a better excercise; and speciali that he not drenche al the leiser, which tho men mizten and schulden haue forto reede or heere the word of God vndirstonden sumwhat of hem or declarid sumwhat to hem. For certis, how the sunne passith in cleernes, cheerte, and coumfort the moone, 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 zeuyng forto do and suffre for God in his lawe keping al the excercise had, or which can be had, in suche now bifore seid visible signes deuisid bi man.

The word of God is proved both by experience and by Christ's remark to be the true life of man. Yet this word is not Scripture only.

The experience had in this mater is so sure, that therfore y am bold forto it knouleche; in so miche that it is weel aspied bi assai whi[1] Crist was moued forto seie, that "man lyueth not oonli bi breed, but "bi ech word which passith fro the mouth of God."[2] Certis to hem which assaien 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 vndirstonde not y of the Bible aloon, as summen ouer vnredili and ouer myche syngulerli vndirstonden.

Here eendith the ij^s. parti of THE REPRESSER.

---

[1] *which*, MS. (first hand).

[2] See Matth. iv. 4.

Digitized by Google

And here bigynneth the iij^e. parti of
THE REPRESSER.

i. CHAPITER.

THE iij^e. principal gouernaunce, for which many of the laife blamen vniustli the clergie, is this: Persoones of the clergie receyuen, holden, and occupien lordschip of housis and feeldis, not oonli in which thei hem silf dwellen and which thei hem silf tilien, but also which thei hem silf setten forth to be fermed of othere occupiers, and receyuen rente therfore of the same occupiers. Certis summe persoones of the lay peple beren an hond this now seid iij^e. principal gouernaunce to be azens the lawe of God, how euer litle or fewe tho vnmouable godis ben; and therfore thei beren an hond that alle tho persoones of the clergie whiche willingli contynuen the now seid iij^e. principal gouernaunce ben thoruz al thilk while in state of dampnacioun, what euere gode deedis thei doon.

The landed property of the clergy is the third ordinance complained of. Some men consider those clergy who defend the possession of immoveable property, whether great or small, to be in a state of damnation.

That this bering an hond is vntrewe, (and that for that the seid iij^e. principal gouernaunce is not azens the lawe of God,) y schal proue bi vj.[1] conclusiouns; of whiche the firste is this: The seid iij^e. principal gouernaunce is not azens Holi Scripture of the Oold Testament neither of the Newe Testament.

Six conclusions shall be made against their exceptions.

THE FIRST CONCLUSION. The institution is not contrary to the Old or New 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 rehercid; of which oon is writun, Numeri xviij^e. c̃., where it is seid thus: *And the Lord seid to Aaron,*

THE FIRST ARGUMENT FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE FIRST CONCLUSION. No text of the Old Testament forbids it. Certain texts discussed. The first text. (Num. xviii.)

[1] vj^e., MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. I.

ȝe schulen[1] *not weelde eny thing in the lond of hem, neither ȝe schulen haue part among hem; I am thi part and heritage in the myddis of the sones of Israel. Forsothe y ȝaf to the sones of Leuy alle*[2] *the tithis of Israel into possessioun for the seruice, bi which thei seruen me in the tabernacle of boond of pees, that the sones of Israel neiȝe no more to the tabernacle of boond of pees, neither do deedli synne. To the sones aloon of Leuy, seruyng me in the tabernacle and bering the synnes of the peple, it schal be a lawful thing euerlasting in ȝoure generaciouns. Thei schulen*[1] *weelde noon othir thing, and thei schulen be apaied with the offring of tithis, whiche y departid into vsis and necessaries of hem.*

The second text. (Deut. x.)

An other processe is writun, Deut. x^{e}. c̃., where Moyses seide thus: *In that tyme y departid the lynage of Leuy, that it schulde bere the arke*[3] *of boond of pees of the Lord, and schulde stonde bifore him in seruice, and schulde blesse in his name til into present dai; for which thing Leuy hadde not part neither possessioun with hise britheren, for the Lord him silf is his possessioun, as thi Lord God bihiȝte to him.*

The third text. (Deut. xviii.)

The iij^{e}. processe is writun Deut. xviij^{e}. c̃. in the bigynnyng, where Moyses seide thus: *Preestis and dekenes and alle men that ben of the same lynage schulen not haue part and heritage with the othere peple of Israel, for thei schulen ete the sacrificis of the Lord and the offringis of him. And thei schulen not take eny other thing of the possessioun of her britheren, for the Lord him silf is the*[4] *heritage of hem, as he spak to hem.*

---

[1] *schulde*, MS. (first hand), apparently, t

[2] *alle* is added in the margin by a later (?) hand, the same which rubricated the MS. apparently: it occurs in Wiclif's version.

[3] *ark*, MS. (first hand).

[4] *the* is interlineated by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

The iiij^e. processe is writun Iosue xiij^e. c̃. in the eende, where it is seid thus: *Forsothe Iosue*[1] *ȝaf not possessioun to the lynage of Leuy, for the Lord God him silf of Israel is the possessioun of Leuy, as the Lord spak to him.*

The fourth text. (Josh. xiii.)

The v^e. processe is writun Ezek. xliiij^e. c̃., 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 ȝe schulen not ȝeue to hem possessioun in Israel; for y am the possessioun of hem.*

The fifth text. (Ezek. xliv.)

The vj^e. processe is writun Ecclesiastici xlv^e. c̃., where of Aaron and of hise sones Scripture seith there thus: *Thei schulen ete the sacrificis of the Lord, which he ȝaf to him and to his seed; but in the lond of his folk he schal not haue heritage, and no part is to him among the folk; forwhi God is the part and heritage of him.*

The sixth text. (Ecclus. xlv.)

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 haue part and lott in the firste parting of the lond of Iewry to the children and kinredis comyng out of Iacob, as it is open ynouȝ to ech man diligentli reding the placis out of whiche the now alleggid textis ben drawe. And also ellis God schulde haue be contrarie to him silf in hise owne ordinauncis, as schal be open aftir in this present chapiter, (bi the iij^e. argument,) and bi[2] the iiij^e. chapiter. Wherfore no strengthe of the seid textis gooth not so fer as forto forbede to preestis and dekenys of tho daies forto haue lordschip of immouable godis bi othere weies,

These texts explained. They only refer to the first partition of the land of Canaan among the twelve tribes of Israel, in which the tribe of Levi was to have no share; but this tribe was not thereby forbidden to possess property by other ways: so that no text of the Old Testament forbids the temporal endowment of the priesthood.

[1] Pecock should have written *Moyses*. Wiclif's version has *he ȝaf not*, &c.; where however there is a various reading *Moises*, which is expressed in the Hebrew and in the authorized version.

[2] *bi* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. I. 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 chase to be preestis and dekenis as for the tyme of the Oold Testament. And for the reuerence which God wolde be ȝouun 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 withstonding 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 conquest 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 wole purueie in othere wisis for hem, as sumwhat is open bi the textis bifore alleggid, and sumwhat more ther of schal anoon aftir here be seid. And into ferther purpos than in to this purpos now here seid strecchith not eny of the textis now bifore alleggid, as is open ynouȝ to ech diligent reder of the processis in whiche tho textis ben sett. Wherfore nedis folewith, that bi textis of the Oold Testa-

Digitized by Google

ment can not be founde that the seid iij^e. principal gouernaunce was forbode to the clergie of the Oold Testament.

THE SECOND ARGUMENT FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT. The lawfulness of the endowment of the priesthood is proved by the fact that forty-eight cities and their suburbs were, after the first partition of Canaan, assigned to the Levites.

The ij^e. argument to the same purpos is this: Thouȝ God forbade that the kinrede of Leuy, being as for thanne his clergie, schulde haue part in the seid firste departing and lotting of the al hool lond, as is open bi the textis bifore sett in this i^e. chapiter, ȝit God purueied for hem in other wise; and bade, Numeri xxxv^e. c̃., to al the hool multitude of the seid xij. kinredis receyuyng the al hool lond bi the seid departing and lotting, that after the seid departing and lotting mad to hem of al the hool lond, they schulden ȝeue to the kinrede of Leuy, being the clergie of preestis and dekenis, certein citees bi lott of her al hool recēit with the suburbis of pasturis ligging to the same citees, that in tho citees the peple of clerkis myȝten sufficientli ynouȝ dwelle, and that in the seid pasturis of suburbis the same clerkis myȝte sufficientli pasture her beestis. And in the performyng and executing of this now rehercid comaundement of God xlviij. citees with her suburbis weren ȝouun to the preestis and dekenes, as it is open, Iosue xxj^e. c̃. And so, if good rekenyng in this mater be mad, it schal be founde tha the kinrede of Leuy hadde mo citees ȝouun to hem than hadde eny oon other of the seid xij. kinredis, except the kinrede of Iuda; namelich sithen summe of the seid kinredis hadde not mo than ten citees in his part and lott of the firste departing and lotting, as it is open, Iosue xvj^e. c̃. Wherfore needis folewith, that the Holi Scripture in the Oold Testament grauntid and licencid preestis and dekenys of thilk tyme forto haue in lordschip and in possessioun vnmouable godis, as citees, housis, and pasturis; namelich so manye as thei hem silf, withoute into ferme to othere men leting, hadden nede or profit for to haue, holde, and occupie.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. I.

Proof from the Old Testament that this assignation was both commanded and executed.

That al this which is take in this ij°. argument forto proue and conclude his conclusioun is trewe, lo what is writun Numeri xxxv°. c̃. in the bigynning thus: *And the Lord spak these thingis to Moyses in the feeldi placis of Moab aboue Iordan azens Ierico: Comaunde thou to the sones of Israel that thei ȝeue to dekenes of her possessiouns citees to dwelle and the subarbis of tho bi cumpas, that thei dwelle in the citees; and the subarbis be to beestis and werk beestis: whiche subarbis schulen be strecchid forth fro the wallis of citees without forth bi cumpas in the space of a thousind pacis; azens the eest schulen be ij. thousind cubitis, and azens the south in lijk maner schulen be ij. thousind cubitis, and at the see that biholdith to the west schal be the same mesure, and the north schal be eendid by euen terme. And the citees schulen be in the myddis, and the subarbis withoute forth.* Thus myche there. Ferthermore, that this comaundement of God was executid, performed, and fulfillid, it is openli expressid, Iosue xxj°. c̃., where mensioun is maad that to the dekenis were ȝouun xlviij. citees with her subarbis in the maner now bifore comaundid bi God, and the names of tho citees ben there in the same chapiter rehercid. Wherfore what is seid and take into making and formyng of this present ij°. argument is trewe.

THE THIRD ARGUMENT FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

In addition to the forty-eight cities which God assigned to the Levites, he allowed them to possess any landed property which might be given to them by individuals.

The iij°. argument is this:[1] Ouer and biȝonde alle the xlviij. citees with her seid suburbis, which God ordeyned to be ȝouun to the clergie of the oold lawe, God licencid to ech persoon of the lay party forto ȝeue bi vow to the preestis and dekenis of the seid clergi his feeld and his hous, whether he hadde hem bi heritage or bi purchase; and if he for deuocioun wolde not bigge azen hem so ȝouun to the clerkis,

[1] *this* is added in the margin by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

but wolde hem abide for euer so ȝouun 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 ynouȝ, Leuiticus the laste chapiter. Wherfore folewith that Holi Scripture of the oold lawe licencid and not forbade preestis and dekenis of thilk tyme forto haue in her lordschip immovable godis, (as ben housis and feeldis,) ȝouun to hem thanne bi deuocioun of the lay peple, ouer and biȝonde the xlviij. citees and the suburbis of pasturis, ȝouun to hem soone aftir the firste departing of the al hool[2] lond to the xij. kinredis.

ij. CHAPITER.

To the ij^e^. bifore going argument mowe be ȝouun ij. answeris, of whiche the firste is this: That tho xlviij. citees, of whiche speken the textis of the ij^e^. argument, weren not ȝouun into the propre hauour and lordschip of the preestis and dekenys, but into her vse oonli; so that the lordschip and propirte of tho citees abode in the lay persoones, whiche ȝauen the perpetuel vse of tho same citees to the preestis and dekenys.

Two possible answers of Pecock's opponents 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 proprietors being still those who made the original assignation.

And into this answere thei wolen take ij. colouris, of the which oon is bi the text of Numeri xxxv^e^. c̃., alleggid bifore in the ij^e^. argument, for as miche as God seide there thus: *Comaunde thou to the sones of Israel, that thei ȝeue to the dekenis of her possessiouns citees forto dwelle in hem, and the suburbis of tho citees in cumpas; that thei dwelle in*

One plausible ground for this answer is the expression 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: *thilk* would be the most natural reading.

[2] Perhaps it deserves notice that the scribe had written *al the hool lond*, but afterwards placed over the words the marks of transposition.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II.

tho townes, and the suburbis be to beestis and helping beestis: whiche suburbis schulen streeche withoute forth fro the wallis of the citees bi space of[1] *a thousind pacis*, that is to seie, a myle. Thanne, sithen it is seid that tho citees weren ȝouun for to in hem dwelle, summen wolen thenke 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 citees; and if this be trewe, that al her riȝt had into tho citees was for to in hem[2] dwelle, folewith nedis that al her riȝt had into tho citees was the riȝt to vse tho citees, sithen indwelling[3] is no more than an vsing; and so folewith ferther, that bi thilk ȝift mad to hem thei hadden no riȝt of lordschip, sithen riȝt of vce is dyuers and departable fro the riȝt of lordschip.

That this is the true view of the matter appears further, in their opinion, from the fact that Hebron was in the occupation of the Levites, but in the possession of Caleb at one and the same time.

The ij^{e}. colour forto grounde and strengthe the seid answere mai be this: That Ebron was oon of the seid xlviij. citees ȝouun to preestis and dekenes, as it is open, Iosue xx^{e}. c̃.; and ȝit this same Ebron was[4] ȝouun into the propre lordschip of Caleph, as is open, Iosue xv^{e}. c̃. But so it is, that thilk citee 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 vce of Caleph; for it was in the vce of preestis or Leuitis, as it is open, Iosue xxj^{e}. c̃. Wherfore thei wolen seie to folewe nedis, that the seid citee was of Caleph as in propirte and in lordschip, and was of the clergie as for her vce without theryn had lordschip.[5]

---

[1] *of* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

[2] *inhem*, MS.

[3] *in dwelling*, MS., and so also on p. 283 and p. 288.

[4] *was* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

[5] *lorschip*, MS. The same clerical (?) error occurs at p. 287.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II.

Reply to the first argument of the first answer. If a giver states the object of his gift, such statement hinders not the gift from being a gift; and the expression of a gift is a conveyance of more right than is the expression of any circumstance belonging to it. Application of these principles to the case of the Levites.

Certis the seid answere may not be strengthid bi the i°. now rehercid colour or evidence. Forwhi whanne a persoon makith a ȝifte, and to gidere therwith the ȝeuer expressith his entent or eende into which and for which he makith his ȝifte, thilk expressioun of his intent and of the eende entendid to be had bi the ȝift lettith not the ȝift to be a ȝift, but suffrith it to be a ȝifte as ferforth as thouȝ he had mad the ȝift withoute the expressioun or the open pronouncing of the same entent or eende: as if a man wolde seie; "Y ȝeue to "thee a[1] peny forto spende it at the wijn;" the expressioun of his entent lettith not but that he ȝeueth the peny, and makith the receyuer of the peny to be lord of the peny. But so it is, that whanne God seide that the laife of Israel schulde ȝeue of her possessiouns to the clergie of Israel citees to dwelle in hem; here in these wordis is expressid the ȝifte, and therwith is expressid the eende which the ȝeuer wolde be had bi the same ȝifte. Wherfore bi these wordis is not lett maad, that this same ȝifte into the now seid eende be a verri ȝifte; as it schulde haue be, thouȝ the eende of indwelling hadde not be expressid, but hadde oonli be entendid and hopid withoute expressioun. And so it is vntrewe, that[2] whanne it is seid that in these wordis "forto dwelle in tho citees" is expressid al the riȝt whiche preestis and dekenis hadden into tho citees; for more riȝt than so is expressid in these wordis, *ȝeue to the dekenys citees.* And the ful hool riȝt is expressid in these to gidere wordis, *ȝeue to the dekenis citees forto dwelle in hem;* for in the firste parti of these wordis is expressid the substaunce of the ȝifte, and in the ij°. parti of tho wordis is

[1] *a* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

[2] *that* seems to be superfluous and unmeaning; probably it should be cancelled.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II.

expressid a circumstaunce of the same ȝifte; which circumstance is the eende for which the ȝifte is maad. And open to ech man it is, that the expressioun of a ȝifte is an expressioun of more riȝt than is the expressioun of a circumstaunce longing to the same ȝifte; thouȝ it be the cheef and principal circumstaunce, worthier than eny othir circumstaunce of the same deede of ȝifte, as is now this present circumstaunce of eende. 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 ȝouun to the same firste colour.

Confirmation of the reply from the language of common life.

Confirmacion to this answere, now maad aȝens the same firste colour and the former answere groundid ther upon, mai be bi these ensaumplis. If a man ȝeue to me a gowne that y were it, certis herof folewith that he ȝeueth to me thilk gowne; and thilk gown is myn in lordschip as verrili as, if he ȝeue to me a pijnt of wijn forto drinke it, thilk wijn is mad myn in verri lordschip; and as, if a man ȝeue to me a peny to spende at the wijn, certis he ȝeueth to me the peny, and the peny is myn in verri lordschip of it. Forwhi, if he wolde that y haue the vce of a thing with outen lordschip of the same thing, he wolde seie thus: "Y delyuere or y bitake to thee this gowne "for to were it; y delyuere to[1] thee this hous forto "dwelle in it; y delyuere to thee this feeld forto tile "it:" euen as an oosteler seith to his gist; "Sir, y "take this chaumbir to ȝou forto ligge in it; y take "this bed to ȝou 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 ȝeue to thee this chambir, "that thou reste in it; y ȝeue to thee this bed, that

[1] *to* is interlineated, perhaps by a later hand.

Digitized by Google

"thou slepe in it," neither the scoler seith to his felow thus: "Y ȝeue to thee this book, that thou "leerne in it;" for certis, if he so seide, the receyuer myȝte cleyme the book for his in lordschip, as bi vertu and strengthe and forme of tho wordis. And therfore, sithen God seid that the lay parti of Israel "schulde "ȝeue to the dekenys citees forto in hem dwelle," and seith not thus, "that the lay parti schulde take "or delyuere to the dekenis citees forto in hem "dwelle," it folewith openli ynouȝ bi likenes of these now bifore rehercid ensaumplis, that it is to be vndirstonde and deemed that God wolde the dekenis to be verri lordis of tho citees, whiche thei schulde receyue bi ȝifte of the lay parti mad ther upon to hem. And this is ynouȝ aȝens the answere and his i°. colour.

Reply to the second argument of the first answer. Hebron at the first allotment was made over to Caleb, but at the second allotment to the Levites; and so passed away from the lordship of Caleb altogether.

That the ij°. colour bifore sett for to fortofie and strengthe the same badde answere[1] availith not, lo y mai schewe bi this ensaumple. If the king of Englond ȝeue to me a citee with manye villagis theraboute in cumpas ligging, and sone aftir this ȝift y ȝeue the same citee with hise suburbis to an other man Robert, reseruyng to my silf the seid villagis, what schal herof folewe? Schal it be seid that Robert is not lord of this citee, aftir y haue ȝouun this citee to him; and that, bi cause that bifore y was lord of the same citee bi ȝifte 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, thouȝ in the firste soorting and lotting of the al hool lond of Iewis the cite of Ebron fille bi lott to Caleph, (and therbi Caleph was very lord of it, as it is open therof, Iosue xv°. c̃.) ȝit her of folewith not neither colour is worth forto seie, that ther-

[1] *answere* is inserted by a later (?) hand, which has erased and re-written the two lines preceding.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. II.

fore afterward—whanne the secunde lotting was mad for the xlviij. citees to be ȝouun to the dekenes, and this ij^e^. lott fill upon Ebron, as forto be oon of tho xlviij. citees, as it is open, Iosue xxj^e^. c̃.—this Ebron herwith myȝte not be in the lordschip of the dekenis, bi cause the same Ebron was ȝouun bifore into the lordschip of Calepf. And so open it is herbi, that the ij^e^. bifore sett colour helpith not the bifore seid mad bad answere.

This answer, even supposing it were a refutation of the second argument, will not at all apply to the third: for it is certain that the fields, which devout men gave to the Levites, became their actual property, held only under God, to whom it was hallowed.

Ferthermore thouȝ the seid answere myȝte lette the ij^e^. bifore going argument, as treuthe is that he may not lette; (for the worse plite, in which the seid proces, Numeri xxxv^e^. c̃., mai be take aȝens this iij^e^. principal gouernaunce, is such that thilk proces is indifferent[1] to bothe sidis, that is to seie, to the iij^e^. principal gouernaunce and to his contrarie,) ȝit thilk answere mai not lette the iij^e^. bifore going argument fro his proof. Forwhi as it is open, Leuiticus the laste chapiter, tho housis and tho feeldis,[2] whiche weren ȝouun to the preestis and dekenis bi deuoute vowis of the comoun peple, fillen into lordschip of the preestis and dekenis; thouȝ it be seid there sumwhilis, that thei weren ȝouun to God and weren halewid to God. Forwhi of a feeld so ȝouun 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 perteyneth or longith to the riȝt of the preestis.* Lo, how in the wordis of God these tweine stoden weel to gidere and weren trewe to gidere, that an hous or a feeld or a citee was ȝouun to God, and ȝit was also therwith ȝouun to preestis into her lordschip; riȝt euen as in the same laste chapiter of Leuitik it is seid, that mouable godis (as money) weren ȝouun to God and

[1] *in different*, MS. | [2] *feeeldis*, MS.

halewid to God, and ȝit 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 euere dekenis hadden nede forto bigge ther with wijn or corn or breed or othere to hem necessarie thingis.

CHAP. II.

Also thus: No persoon mai in his owne name sille eny 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 ȝaue to God and to hem bi deuoute vowis, as is open ynouȝ, Leuiticus the laste chapiter. Wherfore nedis folewith, that tho housis and feeldis weren of the prestis 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 ȝift[1] of the comoun peple aftir her first endewing in the xlviij. citees; certis, bi lijk skile, it is not to be denied but that thei hadden veri cyuyl lordschip vpon the xlviij. citees receyued of hem in her firste endewyng,—namelich sithen noon skile of dyuersite is seen, whi the preestis and dekenys ouȝten not haue lordschip[2] upon tho xlviij. citees, as weel as upon the othere immouable godis.

Neither would it have been lawful 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 sense.

iij. CHAPITRE.

THE ij°. answere which may be mad to the ij°. bifore going argument sett in the firste chapiter of this iij°. parti mai be this: Thouȝ bi the bidding of God the preestis and dekenys hadden in her verri lordschip

The second possible answer to the above-made second argument from the Old Testament. Although the

[1] *ȝist*, MS., but without doubt accidentally.

[2] *lorschip*, MS.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. III.

Levites 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.

tho xlviij. citees with the suburbis of the same citees; ȝit herbi rose not this, that thei hadden eny more of immouable godis in her lordschip and possessioun than was nedeful hem to vse and occupie in her owne demenyng. And therto sownen tho wordis, Numeri xxxv^{e}. c̃., whiche ben bifore rehercid in the firste colour to the firste answere, whanne God seid thus, *ȝeue ȝe to the dekenis citees forto dwelle in hem:* wherbi it wolde seme folewe ferther, that mo citees or othere citees than in whiche the preestis and dekenys hadde nede to dwelle yn, was not Goddis wil that schulden be ȝoue to hem; and thanne folewith ferther, that it was not leeful thanne preestis and dekenys forto haue so manye housis and feeldis, that thei myȝten sette hem out to ferme and receyue ȝeerli rentis for hem.

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 laity, 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.

To this answere muste be seid thus: This answere seith sooth in this, that it is likeli 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 immouable godis than was necessarie hem silf to occupie in her owne demenyng; but whanne it is concludid forto folewe herof, that it was Goddis wil that the same preestis and dekenys schulden neuer aftirward receyue and haue into her lordschip eny immouable godis, whiche thei hadden no nede bi hem silf occupie bi her owne indwelling or tiling: certis it is to be seid, that this folewith not in fourme of gode argument. And also the contrarie ther of folewith of it which was ordeyned of God him silf to be doon, Leuyticus the laste chapiter. Forwhi it was ordeyned of God him silf, that if a lay persoon wolde offre and ȝeue an hous or a feeld to the clergie in the next ȝeer bifore the iubile ȝeer, (ȝhe, thouȝ it were so nyȝ to the iubile ȝeer, that it were not but iiij. or v. daies bifore the iubile ȝeer,) the clergye myȝte sille this hous or

Digitized by Google

feeld to an other persoon than to him which ȝaue it to hem. And thanne anoon aftir, as soone as the iubile ȝeer were come, the same hous or feeld schulde turne aȝen into the lordschip of the clergie for euermore, as it is open, Leuytik the last chapiter. And as oon lay man myȝte 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 myȝten so do, that ech of hem schulde offre and ȝeue to the clergie an hous or a feeld; ȝhe, and oon man myȝte offre and ȝeue ij. or iij. housis and ij. or iij. feeldis, as is open ynouȝ to folewe of the proces there, which ȝeueth such licence in general withoute eny restreynyng.

Hence it appears that, after the Levites had been sufficiently endowed, they might at any time receive one or more fields in perpetuity; consequently it accorded with God's will that the priesthood might receive more land than they had need to occupy, *i. e.*, so much as they might let out to farm.

Here upon y argue thus: In the next ȝeer going bifore the iubile ȝeer, (ȝhe, in the iiij^{e}. day bifore the iubile ȝeer,) whanne the clergie was endewid with immouable godis sufficientli forto exclude al nede to haue more of immouable godis, the clergie miȝte receyue an hous or a feeld ȝouun to hem of the laife; (and bi lijk skile iiij. housis and iiij. feeldis ȝouun to hem of the layfe;) and the clergie myȝte thanne anoon forth with sille hem to lay persoonis othere and dyuerse fro the ȝeuers. And thouȝ in the next ȝeer folewing, which is iubile ȝeer, the clergie schulde as litle be nedi to haue tho housis and feeldis as thei were in the iiij^{e}. dai bifore the iubile ȝeer, ȝit 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 laste chapiter. Wherfore it accordid with the lawe of God and with his ordinance, that the clergie myȝte receyue[1] and haue mo housis and feeldis than thei hadden nede to occupie in her owne demenys; and thanne folewith herof, that thei myȝten putte tho same housis and

[1] *recey*, MS., but a hyphen follows at the end of the line.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. III.

The power of sale possessed by the Levites shows also that the laity might give them more land than the Levites could themselves occupy. So that the Old Testament allowed the priesthood to possess houses and land both to occupy and to let; and so affords no argument against the endowment of the Christian priesthood with fixed possessions.

feeldis into ferme and rente; for[1] ellis tho housis and feeldis schulden[2] not be to hem availing.

If eny man wolde seie here, that in tho daies no lay persoon ouȝte ȝeue eny hous or feeld[3] to the clergie of thilk tyme, saue whanne the clergie had nede to occupie bi her owne vse thilk same or summe othere 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 eny hous or feeld, which the lay peple hadde ȝeue to hem; and ȝit pleinli in the laste chapiter of Leuitik it is licencid to preestis and dekenis for to sille the hous or feeld which a lay persoon schal ȝeue to hem; ȝhe, forto sille it anoon aftir the ȝifte maad to hem; ȝhe, and forto sille anoon forthwith to hem that ȝauen the hous and the feeld or to othere persoones whiche ȝauen[4] hem not. And so bi al this processe now bifore going (fro the bigynnyng of the firste argument markid in the firste chapiter of this present iij°. parti hiderto) it is weel proued, that to preestis and to othere clerkis of the Oold Testament it was not forbodun bi the lawe of God forto haue lordschip and in possessioun immouable godis; but it was licencid and grauntid to hem bi the lawe of God for to haue in lordschip and in possessioun citees, housis, and feeldis, and pasturis,—not oonli tho whiche thei helden in her owne demenys, but also mo othere[5] whiche thei myȝten sette forth to ferme and rente. And therfore Holi Scripture of the Oold Testament forbedith not to preestis and clerkis of the Newe Testament forto haue in lijk maner like immouable goodis.

[1] *or*, MS. (first hand).
[2] *schulde*, MS. (first hand).
[3] *or feeld* is added by a later (?) hand.
[4] *ȝaue*, MS. (first hand).
[5] Perhaps we should read *othere mo*.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. III.

Even if it had been true that the Jewish law had not sanctioned the endowment of the priesthood, that would not have made such endowment unlawful for Christian priests, unless it had also been contrary to reason, as it is not.

And ȝit wherto schal y make me so bisy forto defende the firste[1] principal gouernaunce aȝens eny forbode which schulde be pretendid to be ther aȝens in the lawe of Iewis? Forwhi, ben not alle the lawis of the Iewis reuokid bi Crist ech 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 bileeuen, and as it is open bi Poul in his Epistle to the Romayns and in his First Epistle to Corinthies and in his Epistle to Galathies and Acts xv^e^. c̃.? And therfore, thouȝ it hadde be trewe, (as it is not trewe,) that vnmouable endewing in propirte of lordschip hadde be[2] forboden to preestis and clerkis of the Iewis, what is it forto forbede to preestis of Cristen men, but if Cristen preestis weren Iewen preestis; or but if the lawis of Iewis weren not ceesid; or but if doom of cleer resoun wolde nedis dryue and proue that Cristen preestis ouȝten not haue eny vnmouable endewing? Which thing doom of cleer resoun can not proue, (as in the ij^e^. principal conclusioun of this iij^e^. present parti it schal be proued,) but y can proue the contrarie, as schal be seen aftir in this present iij^e^. partie in the v^e^. principal conclusioun. Wherfore, forto answere to eny colour taken bi Iewes lawes aȝens the seid firste principal gouernaunce had and vsid in the clergie of Cristis chirche is more than is nede forto take upon me.

For if one prohibition of the Jewish law binds Christian priests, so does every other: and so it should be unlawful for them to drink intoxicating liquors.

Also thus: If eny oon forbode maad in Iewis lawe to preestis schulde binde also Cristen preestis, bi lijk skile ech other forbode maad in Iewis lawe to preestis schulde[3] also binde Cristen preestis. And so wolde folewe this, that if this forbode mad to Iewen preestis, that thei schulden not haue vnmouable endewing,

[1] Both here and below Pecock should have written *thridde* instead of *firste*.

[2] An erasure of a letter (*n* ?) has been made at the end of *be*.

[3] *schulden*, MS. twice (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. III.

schulde strecche to Cristen preestis; bi lijk skile this forbode mad to Iewen preestis, that thei schulden drinke no wijn, neither sidir, neither eny drinke, which myȝte make the drinker drunke, thoruȝ al the tyme whilis he schulde offre sacrificis in her cours, (which forbode is writun Leuiticus x^e^. c̃.) schulde also binde Cristen preestis, that al the while thei were wekeli 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 Iewen 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 vnmouable possessiouns. And thus miche fro the bigynnyng of this chapiter in this present iij^e^. partie hidir to is ynouȝ for proof of the firste conclusioun for his firste partie, that Holi Scripture forbedith not neither weerneth in eny place of the Oold Testament the seid firste principal conclusioun.

iiij. CHAPITER.

The second part of the first conclusion proved, viz., that the New Testament does not forbid the endowment of the priesthood. Each part of the New Testament is either purely historical, or purely doctrinal, or historically ensampial.

Now that the same firste conclusioun is trewe for his ij^e^. party, (which is this, that Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament forbedith not the seid gouernaunce, which is that preestis and clerkis in the Newe Testament haue in her lordschip and possessioun 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] *iny*, MS.

[2] *sorortis*, MS. (partly written on an erasure).

Digitized by Google

historial oonli as is this, that Gabriel was sent to Marie; and seide to hir thus; and that sche answerid thus; and that sche childide hir Sone in Bethleem; and that he aftirward dide this miracle, and thilk miracle: or it is doctrinal oonli, that is to seie, loor of moral conuersacioun how a man schal gouerne him in his lyuyng immediatli anentis God, anentis him silf, and anentis hise neiȝboris, as is this, *Thou schalt loue God of al thin herte and thi neiȝbour as thi silf;* and so of othere like: or it is historial ensampial of the now bifore seid moral conuersacion, as is this, that Crist or eny of hise Apostlis in his moral lyuyng anentis God or him silf or his neiȝbour lyued thus or thus.

If the New Testament does forbid it at all, it must do so by one or both of the latter named parts.

Here upon y argue thus: If Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament schulde forbede the seid gouernaunce, he muste nedis so do bi sum party of the ij^e^. or the iij^e^. seid soort; for the firste seid soort longith not to bidde or forbede eny vertu or eny vice, as is open ynouȝ, for he is historial oonli withoute doctrine of moral conuersacioun. But so it is, that no Scripture of the ij^e^. or of the iij^e^. soort in the Newe Testament so forbedith. Wherfore folewith, that no parti of the Newe Testament so forbedith.

CERTAIN DOCTRINAL TEXTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WHICH APPARENTLY CONDEMN THE ENDOWING OF THE CLERGY DISCUSSED. The first text considered, (Matth. xix.), where Christ orders a rich young man to sell all that he has, and declares the difficulty of the salvation of the rich.

That no parti of the ij^e^. seid soort so forbedith, y proue thus: If eny such party of the ij^e^. seid soort schulde forbede the seid thridde gouernaunce, it schulde bi[1] this processe writun Math. xix^e^. c̃., where it is seid thus: *Lo, oon came and seid to Iesus, Good maister, what good schal*[2] *y do, that y haue euerlasting lijf? Which seide to him, What askist thou me of good thing? Ther is oon good God. But if thou wolte entre to lijf, kepe the comaundementis. He seith to him, Whiche? Iesus seide, Thou schalt*[3]

[1] Perhaps a clerical error for *be*.

[2] *what schal*, MS. (first hand).

[3] *schal*, MS.; but *schalt* is the reading of Wiclif's (later) version, whence this is quoted.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV.

not do mansleing, Thou schalt not do avoutrie, Thou schalt not do thefte, Thou schalt not seie fals witnessing, Worschipe thi fadir and thi modir, and, Thou schalt loue thi neiȝbour as thi silf. The ȝong man seith to him, Y haue kepte alle these thingis fro my ȝongthe, what ȝit failith to me? Iesus seith to him, If thou wolte be perfit, go and sille alle thingis that thou hast and ȝeue to poor men, and thou schalt haue tresour in heuen; and come and sue me. And whanne the ȝong man had herd these wordis, he wente awey soruful; for he hadde manye possessiouns. And Iesus seide to hise disciplis, I seie to ȝou treuthe, a riche man of hard schal entre into the kingdom of heuens. And eftsoone y seie to ȝou, it is liȝter a camel to passe thoruȝ a needlis iȝe, than a riche man to entre into the kingdom of heuenes. Whanne these thingis weren herd, the disciplis wondriden greetli 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 there. Lijk processe thoruȝ al is had and writun Luk xviij^{e}. c̃. In this processe ben ij. seiyngis, whiche myȝten seme forto lette the seid iij^{e}. principal gouernance. Oon is this, that Crist seide to the ȝong man comyng to him: "Go and sille alle thingis that thou hast and ȝeue "to poor men, and come and sue me." The other seiyng is this: "It is liȝter a camel to passe throuȝ "a needelis iȝe, than a riche man to entre into the "kingdom of heuenes."

Christ's command to this young man who 'trusted in riches,' and so was unfit to possess them, does not prove that others are equally unfit, and ought not to have them.

That the first seiyng helpith not in this wey, y mai proue. Forwhi, Mark the x^{e}. c̃., where this same storie is writun with lijk proces, it is meened that this ȝong man (which in the now seid maner came to Crist) was so vndisposid anentis hise richessis, that he hadde trust in hem. Forwhi there, Mark x^{e}. c̃., in the same speche and proces longing to the same ȝong man, Crist seid thus, *How hard is it for men that trusten*

Digitized by Google

in ricchessis to entre into the kingdom of God. So that therbi it may be take and vndirstonde, that therfore Crist seide and counseilid or bade to him forto forsake and sille hise ricchessis, bi cause that he was, as it were, vnable forto haue to do with tho ricchessis; and that for his natural indisposicioun and ouer soor inclinacioun of loue anentis hem, and for his ouer greet trust which in his witt he bisettid upon hem. Wherof folewith not, that Crist schulde wilne and bidde in lijk maner to eny other man, (preest or no preest,) which is not so vndisposid anentis ricchessis as this ȝong man was; and therfore al this what Crist seide to the seid ȝong man groundith not, that nedisly ech preest owith to lacke and forsake alle immouable possessiouns; no more than folewith, thouȝ the riche man, of whom it is writun Luk xij°. c̃., was vndisposid and vnable to haue and reule and dispense ricchesis, that therfore Zache and Abraham and Iosep of Armathie and king Dauith were vnable and vnworthi and vndisposid[1] forto haue and reule and demene ricchessis.

Moreover it is clear that Christ called him to be an apostle, and in those days apostleship and holding of property were inconsistent for reasons which have now ceased.

Also this present processe sowneth and berith ful greet euydence, that Crist here clepid this ȝong man into apostilhode[2] or into disciplehode; and her with open trouthe it is, that the state and condicioun of tho daies weren such, that it accordid not with resoun eny man forto holde to gidere apostilhode or discipilhode and possessioun of immouable godis or holding houshold and reuling of meyne and of movable godis, as it is schewid in *The book of counseilis;* thouȝ now adaies it may weel ynowȝ accorde with resoun, as soone aftir here schal be schewid. Forwhi ech man thanne stonding in apostilhode or discipilhode hadde

[1] *vnworthi disposid,* MS. (first hand).

[2] *apostil hode,* MS. (no hyphen following *apostil* at the end of the line; but *apostilhode* and *disciplehode* distinctly just below).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV.

nede forto ech dai make him redi to die bi martirdoom of tirantis, and therfore hadde nede more forto ȝeue awey good than forto gadere, reule, gouerne, or kepe; and also ech such man was to traueile into straunge cuntrees forto preche the feith; and also he muste nedis leeue hise godis, if he eny[1] hadde, into his enemyes hondis. 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 vnmouable 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^e. principal bifore seid gouernaunce of this book is aȝens Holi Scripture of the Newe Testament.

Christ's remark about the difficulty of the salvation of rich men applies to those only who trust in riches.

That the ij^e. seiyng of Crist lettith not the seid iij^e. principal gouernaunce, y proue thus: The riche man, of which Crist spekith in thilk ij^e. seiyng, is he which not oonli hath ricchessis, but which therwithal tristith ouer myche in hise ricchessis, and therfore folewingli loueth ouer miche hise ricchessis; as the text of Mark x^e. c̃., writing the same storie, declarith openli in this that Crist seide thus: *How hard it is for men that trusten in richessis to entre in to the kingdom of God!* Wherfore this ij^e. seiyng of Crist touchith not suche riche men, whiche han ricchessis and not ouer myche trusten in hem, neither ouer myche louen hem. And so folewith, that if eny man be so disposid that he can forbere ouermyche trust and ouer myche loue to ricchessis, he mai weel ynouȝ holde prelacie and ricchessis to gidere for eny lett which this ij^e. seiyng of Crist makith ther aȝens.

Moreover Christ allows that 'with God' it is possible for a rich man to be saved.

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.

Digitized by Google

which God profrith and ȝeueth to a riche man he mai entre into the kingdom of heuen; thouȝ he abide stille riche, and thouȝ 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 aȝens Goddis forbode. And if it be not forbode eny man to be riche, certis thanne it is leeful ynouȝ ech man to be riche; in lasse than he vowe the contrarie, or that he knowith bi assay and experience him silf so miche indisposid anentis ricchessis, that he schal not mowe rewle him silf ariȝt anentis tho ricchessis: for in thilk caas he is bonde to holde him silf in pouerte, accordingli to this that Crist seith in the Gospel, Math. v^c. c̃., *If thi riȝt iȝe or thi riȝt hond sclaundre thee, kutte him of and caste him fro thee.* And here bi it is euydent ynouȝ, that the ij^e. seiyng of Crist gooth not aȝens the iij^e. bifore principal seid gouernaunce.

CHAP. IV.

from which the abstract lawfulness is proved, certain cases only being excepted.

The ij^e. principal processe of Holi Scripture in the Newe Testament, which myȝte seme forto lette the seid iij^e. principal gouernaunce, it is which is write, Luk xiiij^e. c̃., thus: *So therfore ech of ȝou, that forsakith not alle thingis that he hath, may not be my disciple.* But certis, the hool chapiter in which this text is sett schewith well ynouȝ, that this text was seid as weel to al the comoun peple folewing Crist in thilk tyme, as it was seid to hise Apostlis and disciplis; and therfore it reulith no more prelatis into pouerte than ech lay persoon into pouerte. Wherfore it is to be seid, that in this now alleggid text Crist meened of forsaking of ouer myche trust and of ouer myche loue to ricchessis, (in the maner now late bifore declarid upon the first principal processe,) and not that he meened a forsaking of ricchessis vttirli. Forwhi ellis ech lay man ouȝte needis be

The second text (Luke xiv.) considered, where Christ commands all his disciples to forsake all that they have. He there commands laity and clergy alike to forsake all inordinate love of riches.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV.

poor vttirly, sithen this text was seid to hem as weel as to the Apostlis and disciplis.

This view confirmed from Christ's command to all his disciples to hate their parents and their own lives, *i. e.*, to abstain from excessive love of them.

Also, in the same chapiter of Luk, Crist seid to the same peple of hise Apostlis and of the othere comoun peple thus: *If eny man cometh to me, and hatith not his fadir and moder and wijf and sones and britheren and sistren and ȝit his owne lijf, he mai not be my disciple.* Who may seie other wise, but that Crist in this now laste alleggid text meened oonli thus, that ech man ouȝte forbere ouer myche loue to his fadir and modir, wijf and sones, britheren and sistris, and to his owne lijf; and not that he ouȝte forbere[1] his al loue fro hem; namelich sithen Crist comaundid a man to worschipe his fadir and moder, and that he schulde loue ech neiȝbore as him silf, and so loue bothe his neiȝbour and him silf? Wherfore bi lijk skile the other alleggid text in the same xiiij^{e}. c̃. of Luk mai resonabili and colorabili ynouȝ be vndirstonde, that Crist meened in it the forbering of ouer myche trust and loue to riccheſsis. And if this be trewe that thilk text, Luk xiiij^{e}. c̃., mai be so vndirstonde colorabili ynouȝ, it folewith needis that bi thilk text mai no ground be take aȝens the seid iij^{e}. principal gouernaunce of prelatis endewing.

The third text (Matth. 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^{e}. principal processe of the Newe Testament which seeme[2] to meete aȝens the seid gouernaunce of prelatis endewing is write, Math. xx^{e}. c̃., where Crist seid to hise Apostlis thus: *Ȝe witen that princis of hethen men ben lordis of hem, and thei that ben gretter vsen power on hem; it schal not be so among ȝou; but who euer wole be mad gretter among ȝou, be he ȝoure mynystre; and who euer among ȝou wole be the firste, he schal be ȝoure seruaunt; as*

[1] *for bere*, MS. (without hyphen).

[2] Probably we should read *myȝte seeme*.

Digitized by Google

Mannis Sone came not to be serued but to serue, and to ȝeue his lijf redempcioun for manye. Lijk processe thoruȝ out is write Mark the x^e^. c̃. Out of this processe semeth to folewe, that preestis ouȝten not haue ouerte among hem silf, oon of hem vpon an other of hem; neither eny preest ouȝte haue ouerte upon eny lay persoon of hise neiȝboris. And if this be trewe, than schulde no preest haue immouable godis in lordschip. Forwhi thanne he muste nedis comaunde and regne upon hise tenauntis, and thei muste needis obeie and do sewtis and seruicis to him. But certis if this processe be weel in seen and thoruȝ seen, he gothe[1] not for this purpos. Forwhi in two maners ouerers mowen holde and vse her ouerte vpon her vndirlingis.

The lordship condemned by Christ is tyranny, which seeks its own profit only.

Oon maner is bi tiranrie, which is forto in alle deedis of ouerte awaite and performe her owne profit oonli, and not the profit of her vndirlingis; 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 bifore alleggid processe, which maner of ouerte Crist wolde not to be bitwixe preestis and her vndirlingis, neithir bitwixe oon persoon of hem and another of hem. And more than this can not be proued and schewid the seid processe to[2] bere in him; and therfore this processe makith not sufficientli aȝens the seid iij^e^. gouernaunce of preestis endewing. And that this is trewe, lo, the processe, which Luk writith in his xxij^e^. chapiter, sumwhat 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. See Maundevile's Travels, p. 111. (Lond. 1839).

[2] *to* is added in the margin by a later (?) hand.

[3] *there* is interlineated by a later (?) hand.

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV. *and thei that han power of hem ben clepid gode doers; but ȝe not so; but he that is grettist among ȝou be mad as ȝonger, and he that is bifore goer as a seruaunt. For who is gretter, he that sittith at the mete or he that mynystrith? whether not he that sittith at the mete? And y am in the myddil of ȝou as he that mynystrith.* Certis in this that Crist seide, *Thei that han power of hem ben clepid gode doers, but ȝe not so,* Crist meened not of hem whiche ben verrili gode doers to her vndirlingis, but whiche ben not gode doeris, and ȝit for flatery and plesaunce, (lest gretter tirantrie be doon,) ben clepid gode doeris of her vndirlingis.

Another kind of lordship seeks the profit of the inferior; this kind of lordship practised by Christ himself over his Apostles, and commended to them by way of example.

An other maner of ouerte bering and vsing is for to (in alle deedis of thilk ouerte vsing and executing) awaite and performe the profit of the vndirlingis in hem weel reuling bi doom of resoun, and of hem not more or other asking than as resoun or feith wole; which maner of ouerte holding and vsing mai be clepid therfore seruice to the vndirlingis, bi cause it is into the profit of the vndirlingis; thouȝ it be ther with an ouerte beryng and hauyng and holding. And of this ouerte spekith Crist in the place now bifore alleggid, Luk xxij°, c̃., *Who is gretter, he that sittith at the mete, or he that mynystrith? whether not he that sittith at the mete? And y am in the myddil*[1] *of ȝou as he that mynystrith.* Lo, how Crist pleinli and openli was aknowe that he took upon him to be the gretter, in that that he settid him silf in the myddil; and seith that therfore he sate in the myddil, forto schewe that he bare him as her gretter and worthier. And ȝit therwith, in that that in so sit-

[1] *myddis*, 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.

Digitized by Google

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 bettir,) he seith that his sitting in the myddil and his ther yn ouerte bering is as seruice to hem alle. Certis this ij^e. maner of ouerte bering, holding, and vsing Crist weerned not hise Apostlis forto haue and holde in the alleggid processe, Math. xx^e. c̃., and Mark the x^e. c̃., and Luk xxij^e. c̃.: for thanne Crist hadde weerned to hem the same gouernaunce which he ensaumplid him silf to hem and bifore hem at his soper. And also the same bifore allegid processe, Math. xx^e. c̃., Mark x^e. c̃., and Luk xxij^e. c̃., wolen proue sufficientli ynouȝ, that Crist ther yn ȝaue ground and teching that thei schulden haue, holde, and vse the ouerte of the ij^e. maner. Forwhi how euere schulde Crist teche and bidde to hem thus: *He that is grettist among ȝou be maad as ȝonger, and he that is a bifore goer be mad as seruaunt*[1]; but if[2] ther yn he schulde meene that among hem schulde oon be gretter than an other, and that oon schulde go bifore an other; and ȝit ther with in sum maner[3] serue to the same othere bifore whom he gooth, and to whom he holdith him as gretter? 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 bifore goers to othere, and ȝit 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 aseruaunt*, MS. (first hand).

[2] *btuf*, MS.

[3] *summaner*, MS. (perhaps not accidentally. Cf. *summan*).

[4] *contrarite*, MS. (first hand).

Digitized by Google

CHAP. IV.

and othere persoonis be ouerte, in the ij^e. seid maner, al into the avail of the vndirlingis; and not in the firste seid maner, by tyranrie into the avail oonli of the ouerers.

This interpretation of Christ's word confirmed from a passage of Ecclesiasticus.

In lijk maner, Ecclesiastici iij^e. c̃., it is writen thus, *In how miche thou art greet, louȝe thou thee in alle thingis; and thou schalt fynde grace bifore 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^e. c̃., in the bigynnyng; and also for as miche as in this same now alleggid text he implieth, includith, and meeneth, that he which is ouerer, and whilis he is ouerer, and berith him silf as ouerer, schulde louȝe him silf in sum other maner; as, whilis that he berith him as ouerer in outward countenaunce, he schulde louȝe him silf in inward feeling of herte. And ellis these wordis myȝten 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 bifore 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^e. c̃., *He that is grettist among ȝou be mad as ȝonger;* he muste nedis meene that he allowith oon to be grettist among hem, and that he in sum other maner louȝe him as a ȝonger. Wherto ful miche accordith and helpith this maner of seiyng and writing, "be "he maad as ȝonger and as a seruant;" that is to seie, "be he maad lijk to a ȝongir, and be he maad "lijk to a seruaunt."

END OF VOL. I.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

LONDON:
Printed by GEORGE E. EYRE and WILLIAM SPOTTISWOODE,
Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty.
For Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Digitized by Google