University of Cambridge

Faculty of English

An edition of the *Conduct of Life* based on the six extant manuscripts with full commentary, complementary critical and codicological analysis, notes and introduction

A dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

April 2018

Robin John Payne

Corpus Christi College

ABSTRACT

An edition of the *Conduct of Life* based on the six extant manuscripts with full commentary, complementary critical and codicological analysis, notes and introduction.

The *Conduct of Life*, also known as the *Poema Morale*, is a verse-sermon that has been largely ignored by literary histories, and despite the longevity of its textual tradition its various texts have never been the subject of extended study. This dissertation brings together the seven manuscript versions of the text, which date from the end of the twelfth to the end of the thirteenth centuries, and re-examines them individually and as a cohort exhibiting variance. It therefore offers a revealing indicator of how continuity and change actually operated through the interaction between preceding tradition and scribes and audiences.

This is achieved through a three-fold analysis of the verse sermon which highlights the fluidity of the manuscript culture during this period and the willingness of scribes to adapt texts to suit new purposes, to create differences due to dialect and comprehension, or copy variants from a now lost exemplar. First, an edition of the text, based on the version found in Cambridge, Trinity College MS B. 14. 52, folios 2^{r}-9^{v} , explores, through the accompanying notes, the themes, style and phraseology which not only reflect the influence of earlier English literary and hortatory texts but also represent a living tradition which found popularity within diverse writing and social environments. Secondly, a diplomatic edition of each text is presented, preceded by an introduction to the text, grammar and dialect, with full codicological and

palaeographic notes. Finally, a parallel text edition bears witness to the copying and reshaping of the text throughout its history. It is accompanied by extensive linguistic notes which highlight the adaptation and textual variance between each version of the *Conduct of Life*.

Each new variant has not only been read in relation to the other versions of the same *work* but also in relation to the manuscript context it newly occupies as a result of its transmission. Each copy reshapes the material within an established structure of rhythm and metre and, therefore, the dissertation concludes that the sermon is recreated as a series of individual texts, which might be individually analysed, because each is different, particularly within their specific physical and historical moments. This fluidity or *mouvance* suggests for the *Conduct of Life* and, for that matter, the texts that preceded it in the historical narrative of the twelfth century that there is no authentic text; that the instability of the manuscript 'tradition' moves from manuscript to manuscript.

STATEMENT OF LENGTH

This dissertation, including footnotes, does not exceed the permitted length.

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

.

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to the University of Cambridge and the Faculty of English for giving me the opportunity to write this dissertation, and the Board of Graduate Studies and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge for supporting me financially by making me a Domestic Research Studentship Scholar.

Without Professor Barry Windeatt, who supervised this dissertation, this project would not have been possible. Thank you for not giving up on me or this dissertation. Your continuing and unwavering support and advice has made all the difference to my completing this dissertation. I would also like to thank Dr Richard Dance for his patient help and guidance with the linguistic and dialectal sections which are so important to this edition.

Thank you to my examiners: Professor Elaine Treharne and Dr Orietta Da Rold. Their scholarly knowledge and direction has helped me to conclude this project and has greatly enhanced this dissertation.

This dissertation could not have been accomplished without access to the manuscripts containing the *Conduct of Life*. For this and for always making me feel welcome, I would like to thank: The British Library, London; Trinity College, Cambridge; The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge; The Bodleian Library, Oxford; and Lambeth Palace Library, London. In addition, thank you to the staff of the

Manuscripts Room at Cambridge University Library, where I worked part time for two-and-a-half years; Louise, I know that you will be smiling as you catalogue this one, finally!

A project of this size and scope could not have been completed without the support of my friends and family. Marco, thank you for being my go-to IT guy – whether it was helping me create the databases of linguistic forms or dealing with the awkward formatting that an edition such as this demands, you were always there. Next, thank you Pete for reading and re-reading everything – I cannot thank you enough but I am going to make you so very awkward by trying. Paddy and Jon, your friendship and support has meant everything during the more difficult times; our mutual understanding that sometimes it is best not to ask allowed me the greatly-needed opportunity to switch off and recharge. Similarly, thank you to Ed, Lisa and Tom, my Kiwi support team, who cheered me on from afar.

Mum and Dad, and my bothers Mark and Nick, thank you for being who you are and for helping me to become who I am. I am lucky to have such a close family who are unquestioningly patient, kind and supportive. Thank you.

Finally, Orla my wife, I cannot put into words how much you contributed to this dissertation and how thankful I am. It was never just me writing this dissertation. You may not have spent the hours in front of the computer but you lived it with me. You encouraged me when I doubted myself, you provided me with focus when I

wandered, you lifted my spirits when I was down, you chastised me when I talked of quitting. I have absolutely no doubt that I could not have done this without you. You have not known me when I wasn't writing this dissertation – what a future we have together.

This dissertation is dedicated to my daughter Méabh, who was born before it was completed and gave me the final motivation to drag myself over the line.

At the conclusion of this PhD, I think that it is safe to say that, like the narrator of the *Conduct of Life*, 'Ich am nu elder þan Ich was a wintre and a lore'.

CONTENTS:

			Page No
Abstract			ii-iii
Statement of Length			iv
Declaration of Originality			v
Acknowledgements			vi-viii
Abbreviations			xii-xviii
1. Introduction			
	i.	The *Conduct of Life*: A History of Modern Versions	1-3
	ii.	The Manuscripts:	4
		i. Cambridge, Trinity College MS B 14 52	5-19
		ii. London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487	20-28
		iii. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4	29-41
		iv. London, British Library MS Egerton 613	42-60
		v. Oxford, Jesus College MS 29 (II)	61-70
		vi. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123	71-95
	iii.	Textual History: The Manuscripts, Reception and Possible Audience	96-119
	iv.	The Language of the *Conduct of Life*	120-193
	v.	Structure and Prosody	194-210
	vi.	Sources and Analogues	211-274

vii. Conclusion 275-277

2. Guiding Principles and Editorial Policy 278-295

3. Edition of the *Conduct of Life* based on Trinity College MS B. 14. 52, ff.2^{r}-9^{v}.

i. Introduction and Format of this Edition: T as Copy Text 296-300

ii. Edition of *Conduct of Life* 301-316

iii. Notes to Edition 317-333

iv. Glossary 334-344

4. Diplomatic Editions

i. Introduction and Format of these Editions 345-346

ii. Cambridge, Trinity College MS B. 14. 52, folios 2^{r}-9^{v} 347-364

iii. London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487, folios 59^{v}-65^{r} 365-383

iv. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4 folios 97^{r}-110^{v} 384-409

v. London, British Library MS Egerton 613, folios 64^{r}-70^{v} 410-429

vi. London, British Library MS Egerton 613, folios 7^{r}-12^{r} 430-448

vii. Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, folios 169^{r}-174^{v} 449-467

viii. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123, folios 115^{r}-120^{r} 468-484

Bibliography 485-498

APPENDICES 499

Combined Parallel Texts of the *Conduct of Life* 500-656

Notes on Phonology and Dialects 657-798

ABBREVIATIONS

I. WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

Abbreviations as specified below are used throughout this dissertation to refer to editions or notes on particular manuscripts by particular authors who have produced a large volume of work, in order to avoid confusion resulting from frequent repetition of full titles of papers which, while their distinctions are important, often have very similar titles.

Brown 1932	Carleton Fairchild Brown, ed. *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century* (Oxford, 1932)
Clemoes 1997	Peter Clemoes, ed., *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series. Text*, EETS, SS 17 (London, 1997)
DIMEV	Linne R. Mooney, Daniel W. Mosser and Elizabeth Solopova with Deborah Thorpe and David Hill Radcliffe, The *DIMEV*: An Open-Access, Digital Edition of *Index of Middle English Verse*, based on the *Index of Middle English Verse* (1943) and its *Supplement* (1965). Available at http://www.dimev.net
Hall 1920	Joseph Hall, *Selections from Early Middle English, 1130-1250*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920)
Hill 1950	Betty Hill, 'Notes on the Egerton *e* Text of the 'Poema Morale'', *Neophilologus*, 66 (1950), 352-9

Hill 1965	Betty Hill, 'Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS. McClean 123', *Notes and Queries*, 12 (1965), 87-90
Hill 1966a	Betty Hill, 'Trinity College Cambridge MS. B. 14. 52, and William Patten', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 4, no. 3 (1966), 192-200
Hill 1966b	Betty Hill, 'The History of Jesus College, Oxford MS. 29' *Medium Ævum*, 32 (1966), 203-213
Hill 1970-72	Betty Hill, 'Early English Fragments and MSS Lambeth Palace Library 487, Bodleian Library Digby 4', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, Literary and Historical Section*, 14 (1970-72), 269-80
Hill 1972	Betty Hill, 'Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS. McClean 123: Addenda', *Notes and Queries* 19 (1972),
Hill 1975	'Oxford, Jesus College Ms. 29: Addenda on Donation, Acquisition, Dating and Relevance of the "Broaken Leafe" Note to 'the Owl and the Nightingale", *Notes and Queries*, 22 (1975), 98
Hill 1977	Betty Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*, Formerly the *Poema Morale* or *A Moral Ode*', *Leeds Studies in English*, 9 (1977), 97-144
Hill 1978a	Betty Hill, 'British Library MS. Egerton 613-I', *Notes and Queries*, 223 (1978), 394-409
Hill 1978b	Betty Hill, 'British Library MS. Egerton 613-I', *Notes and Queries*, 223 (1978), 492-501
Hill 2002	Betty Hill, 'A Manuscript from Nuneaton: Cambridge Fitzwilliam Museum McLean 123', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 12:3 (2002), 191-205

Hill 2003	Betty Hill, 'Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, Part II: Contents, Technical Matters, Compilation, and its History to *c.* 1695', *Notes and Queries*, 50 (2003), 268
IMEV	Carleton Brown and Rossell Hope Robbins, *The Index of Middle English Verse* (New York, 1943), with Rossell Hope Robbins and John L. Cutler, *Supplement to IMEV* (Lexington KY, 1965)
James 1900	M. R. James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), vol. 1: *Containing an Account of the Manuscripts Standing in Class B*
James 1912	M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Manuscripts in the Fitzwilliam Museum* (Cambridge, 1912)
James 1925	M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace* (Cambridge, 1925)
Ker 1936	N. R. Ker, 'MS Cotton Galba A. XIX: *The Proverbs of Alfred*', *Medium Aevum*, 5 (1936), 115-120
Ker 1964	N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books* (London, 1964)
Luria and Hoffman 1974	Maxwell Sidney Luria and Richard L. Hoffman, eds. *Middle English Lyrics* (New York, 1974)
Macray 1883	W. D. Macray, *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae*, 9 (Oxford, 1883)

Morris 1867	Richard Morris, ed., *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,* EETS, OS 29, 34 (London, 1867 and 1868)
Morris 1872	Richard Morris, ed. *An Old English Miscellany: A Bestiary, Kentish Sermons, Proverbs of Alfred and Religious Poems of the Thirteenth Century.* Early English Text Society, o.s. 49 (London, 1872)
Morris 1873	*Richard Morris, ed., Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century: From the Unique MS. B.14.52 in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge*, Early English Text Society, o.s. 53 (London, 1873)
Paues 1907	Anna C. Paues 'A Newly Discovered Manuscript of the Poema Morale' *Anglia*, 30 (1907), 217-37
Sisam 1951	Celia Sisam, 'The scribal tradition of the *Lambeth Homilies*', *Review of English Studies*, 2, n.s. 6 (1951), 105-13
Sisam 1970	Celia Sisam and Kenneth Sisam, eds. *The Oxford Book of Medieval English Verse* (Oxford, 1970)
Strecker 1929	K. Strecker, *Moralisch-Satirische Gedichte Walters von Chatillon* (Heidelberg, 1929)
Swan 2010	Mary Swan, '*Homilies*: London, Lambeth Palace 487', in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, ed. Orietta Da Rold, Takako Kato, Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne (University of Leicester, 2010), available at http://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.Lamb.487.htm; accessed 1 October 2015

Thompson 1958	Meredith W. Thompson, ed., *Ðe Wohunge of Ure Lauerd*, Early English Text Society, o.s. 241 (London, 1958)
Treharne 2010	Elaine Treharne, 'Homilies; *Poema Morale*: Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 14. 52', in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, ed. Orietta Da Rold, Takako Kato, Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne (University of Leicester, 2010), available at https://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.CTC.B.14.52.htm; accessed 1 October 2015
Walther 1959	H. Walther, *Initia Carminum ac versuum medii aevi posterioris Latinorum* (Göttingen, 1959)
Wilcox 2000	Jonathan Wilcox, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile*, Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies (Tempe, Arizona, 2000), Vol. 8: Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials
Zupitza 1878	Julius Zupitza, 'Zum poema morale' *Anglia*, 1 (1878), 5-38
All quotations from the Bible are to:	*Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, ed. R. Weber and R. Gryson (Stuttgart, 2007) (the Vulgate)
All translations from the Bible are to:	*The Holy Bible: Douay-Rheims Version: the Old Testament first published by the English College at Douay, A.D. 1609, and the New Testament first published by the English College at Rheims, A.D. 1582: with annotations and references by Bishop Richard Challoner* (London, 2003)

2. MANUSCRIPT SIGLA

Trinity: Cambridge, Trinity College MS B. 14. 52

Lambeth: London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487

Digby: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4

Egerton: British Library MS Egerton 613

Jesus: Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, Part II

McClean: Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123

Within the section concerning the language of the *Conduct of Life* the sigla for the individual texts is as follows:

T: Cambridge, Trinity College MS B. 14. 52, folios 2^{r}-9^{v}

L: London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487, folios 59^{v}-65^{r}

D: Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4, folios 97^{r}-110^{v}

E1: British Library MS Egerton 613, folios 7^{r}-12^{v}

E2: British Library MS Egerton 613, folios 64^{r}-70^{v}

J: Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, Part II, folios 169^{r}-174^{v}

M: Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123, folios 115^{r}-120^{r}

3. DESCRIPTIVE CONVENTIONS

Codicological:

Rectos and versos are indicated by superscript, e.g. folios 7^{r}-12^{v}. Superscript 'a' and 'b' are used to indicate the columns on a page, e.g. folio 7^{ra}.

Dating Conventions:

The dating of manuscripts is indicated using roman numerals: 's. xii' indicates a 12th-century manuscript, 's. xiii' indicates a 13th-century manuscript, etc.

Suprascript '1' is used for first half of a century: s. xii^{1} for 1100-1150AD.

Suprascript '2' is used for second half of a century: s. xii^{2} for 1150-1200AD.

Suprascript 'in' is used for first quarter of a century: s. xii^{in} for 1100-1125AD.

Suprascript 'ex' is used for final quarter of a century: s. xii^{ex} for 1175-1200AD.

Suprascript 'med' is used for two middle quarters of a century: s. xii^{med} for 1125-1175AD

The turn of a century may be indicated by s. xii^{ex}-s. xiii^{in} (for 1175-1225AD) or by *c.* 1200

A History of Modern Versions

In 1705 George Hicks was the first to publish printed extracts from the *Conduct of Life* taken from Digby and supplied to him by Edward Thwaites.[1] In Hicks' *Thesaurus* he also acknowledges the existence of the version of the verse sermon found in Lambeth and adds variants, in the footnotes, from Trinity. In 1774 Thomas Warton noted the existence of the version found in Jesus.[2] In 1843 both of the texts found in Egerton were added to the *List of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum 1836-1840*.[3] The first printing of a complete text followed in 1862 and was based upon the later of the two versions of the *Conduct of Life* most recently found in Egerton at folios 7^{r}-12^{v} with variants from the other version found at folios 64^{r}-70^{v}.[4]

In 1868 Morris published the first of the three editions of the *Conduct of Life* for which he is responsible. He used the text from Lambeth until it stops imperfectly, setting it out as couplets rather than the prose format that it takes in the manuscript.[5] Morris employed Furnivall's edition of the two texts of Egerton to complete the text found in Lambeth and to '[correct] the scribal blunders that it contains'.[6] The first 272 lines of the text from Egerton folios 7^{r}-12^{v} are added into the Appendix.[7] This 1868 edition is produced with a side-by-side translation of the text. In 1872 Morris produced an edition of the *Conduct of Life* based on the version found in Jesus.[8] Placed alongside other texts from the Library at Jesus College, the British Museum and the Bodleian Library, the texts were brought together because they were

[1] George Hicks, *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archaeologicus* (Oxford, 1705), I, p. 222.
[2] Thomas Warton, *The History of English Poetry, I* (London, 1774), p. 7, note f.
[3] *List of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum 1836-1840*, (London, 1843), p. 43.
[4] F. J. Furnivall, *Early English Poems and Lives of the Saints* (Berlin, 1862), pp. 22-34.
[5] R. Morris, *Old English Homilies*, 1st series, EETS, OS 29, 34 (1867-8), pp. 159-175 (henceforth Morris 1867).
[6] Morris 1867, p. vi.
[7] Morris 1867, pp. 288-295.
[8] Morris, *An Old English Miscellany*, EETS, OS 49 (1872, repr. 1927), pp. 58-71 (henceforth Morris 1872).

'of a religious or didactic nature."[9] In 1873 Morris produced his final edition of the *Conduct of Life* – this time based upon the version found in Trinity.[10] Morris reproduced the *Conduct of Life* in this edition, alongside the remainder of the homiletic material in Trinity and three thirteenth-century hymns from Corpus Christi College, Oxford MS 54 D.4.14 accompanied by music for two of them.

The text of the *Conduct of Life* present in Digby was not published complete until 1878 by Zupitza,[11] although, as noted, extracts were published as early as 1705. In 1881 the first composite text, based on the six then known versions, was published by H. Lewin using the version of the *Conduct of Life* found in Egerton at folios 7^{r}-12^{v} as his base.[12] The final version of the *Conduct of Life* to be discovered, the version of the text found in McClean, was transcribed by Anna C. Paues in February, 1905.[13] Hall produced a parallel-text edition of the *Conduct of Life* in 1920 placing the texts found in Trinity and Lambeth, completed by Egerton from folio 12^{v}, side-by-side.[14] The first critical edition of the *Conduct of Life* based on all seven texts, and the only one to be published, was by Hans Marcus in 1934.[15]

The most significant recent advancement to the editorial history of the *Conduct of Life* comes in the form of an electronic resource; all seven manuscript versions of the *Conduct of Life* are present and searchable on the website *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English 1150-1325* compiled by Margaret Laing and Roger Lass.[16] This resource, which presents all variants of the verse-sermon as lexico-grammatically tagged texts, is designed for the essentially quantitative procedures of grammatical analysis and corpus linguistics; as a linguistic database,

[9] Morris 1872, p. vii.
[10] R. Morris, *Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century*, 2nd series, EETS, OS 53 (1873), pp. 220-232 (henceforth Morris 1873).
[11] Julius Zupitza, "Zum Poema Morale", *Anglia*, 1 (1878), 5-32 (henceforth Zupitza 1878).
[12] H. Lewin: *Das Mittelenglische Poema Morale* (Halle, 1881).
[13] Anna C. Paues: "A Newly Discovered Manuscript of the *Poema Morale*", *Anglia,* 30 (1907), 227-237 (henceforth Paues 1907).
[14] J. Hall, *Selections from early Middle English, 1130-1250: Text.* (Oxford, 1920) (henceforth Hall 1920).
[15] Hans Marcus: *Das Frühmittelenglische "Poema Morale"* (Leipzig, 1934).
[16] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325* [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html] compiled by Margaret Laing and Roger Lass (Edinburgh: © 2007- The University of Edinburgh).

therefore, it is impeccable, but its interface leaves less latitude for engagement with the texts *as texts* – that is, as literary and cultural artefacts, embedded in specific contexts and practices, with their own distinctive approaches to form, content and purpose.

Any study of the *Conduct of Life* is incomplete without acknowledging the significant contribution made by Betty Hill. In 1958 she completed her D.Phil (unpublished) at the University of Oxford, entitled *An edition of the early Middle English Poema Morale with introduction and commentary*.[17] She continued by publishing widely on the verse sermon throughout her career – much of which will be discussed in relation to the individual manuscripts of the *Conduct of Life*. In 1977 she produced a significant article which summarises previous scholarship whilst probing areas for further research. [18] It is, therefore, the first place to go for any study of the *Conduct of Life.* It concludes with a case for the new title assigned to the work - which I have adopted in view of her convincing argument for it. Hill points out that none of the previous titles of the *Conduct of Life* has manuscript authority, except for the late thirteenth-century rubricated title, *Tractatus quidam in anglico*, found at folio 169^{r} of Jesus. She details the history of the adoption of the two most popular titles given to the text, a *Moral Ode* and the *Poema Morale*, and clearly states her objections to both, concluding that ' although the text may be described as "moral", it is neither an "Ode" nor a *Poema.* It is an English verse-sermon'.[19] She, therefore, chooses the title the *Conduct of Life* as:

> This title seems to me to embrace the author's concern with Man in this Life and with the universal theme of the after-life; for he advises his listeners how to conduct their lives and instructs them as to where their lives will conduct them.[20]

[17] Currently closed for an unlimited period.
[18] Betty Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century 'Conduct of Life', Formerly the 'Poema Morale' or 'A Moral Ode', *Leeds Studies in English*, n. s. 9 (1977), 97-145 (Henceforth Hill 1977).
[19] Hill 1977, p. 127.
[20] Hill 1977, p. 128.

THE MANUSCRIPTS

It is appropriate to begin an edition of the *Conduct of Life* with a presentation of the manuscripts containing the text, never before brought together in one place. This is preceded by a summary list of the manuscripts containing the text:

Cambridge, Trinity College MS B 14 52
London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487
Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4
London, British Library MS Egerton 613
Oxford, Jesus College MS 29 (II)
Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123

In the descriptions which follow, dimensions are given in millimetres (height then width), with writing areas measured to the bounding lines, rather than the ends of verses or text that might have overrun. Abbreviations in the descriptions of the manuscripts have been silently expanded.

1. Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 14. 52

Parchment. s.xii^{2}/s.xii^{ex}. Size of Leaves: 138 x 104.

Cambridge, Trinity College B. 14. 52 is a composite manuscript containing the *Conduct of Life* and thirty-four homilies.

1(a). Contents.

Folios i^{v}- ii^{v}, Doctrinal Index of contents in the hand of Abraham Whelock.[21]

Folio 1ra/1-21, *Litany of the Virgin* in a thirteenth-century hand.

Folio 1^{rb}/1-23 and folio 1ra/23-31, table of contents for homilies in a sixteenth-century hand.

Folio 1^{v}/1-2, 'Rithmus anglicus cum omilis anglicis in hoc volumine | continentur' Inscription in a sixteenth-century hand.[22]

Folio 1^{v}/4-11, 'LECTORI, | Abdita quæe tenebrans monumenta recondidit'. Dating formula (23 September 1583) and six lines of Latin verse signed WP [William Patten?].[23] Ed. James 1900, p. 460.

Folio 1^{v}/13-24, 'Manye will Bragge of there knowledge'. The beginning of a truncated sixteenth-century English letter praising unnamed author of verses. Ed. Hill *Transactions* 1966, p. 195.

I. Folios 2^{r}/1 - 9^{v}/21, Ich am nu elder þan ich þas a þintre ⁊ a lore. *Poema Morale* or *Conduct of Life*. IMEV 1272. DIMEV 2113. English. Ed. Morris 1873: 220-32, no. 35; Hall 1920: 31-53, no. 8; see also Hill 1977. The remainder of folio 9^{v} has been left blank.

[21] See fn 24 below.
[22] Wilcox dates the hand to the fifteenth century (Wilcox 2000) and Treharne to the sixteenth century (Treharne 2010).
[23] See Hill 1966a.

2. Folios 10^{r}/1-11^{r}/17, **De aduentu.** | Ecce uenit rex occurramus obuiam saluatori nosto. To dai | is cumen ðe holie tid. *First Sunday in Advent*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 3-7, no. 1.

3. Folios 11^{r}/17-12^{r}/11, **Dominica iia. In aduenta.** | Hora est iam nos de sompno surgere et cetera. Þe lauerd sainte powel þe is | heued lorðeau. *Second Sunday in Advent*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 7-9, no.2.

4. Folios 12^{r}/11-14^{r}/8, **Dominica iiia.** Nox precessit dies autem appropinquabit. Hure heiest lorðeu | after ure louerd ihesu crist. *Third Sunday in Advent*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 9-15, no.3.

5. Folios 14^{r}/9-17^{v}/17, Tria sunt hominum saluti necessaria scilicet fides. *The Creed*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 15-23, no.4.

6. Folios 17^{v}/18-20^{v}/9, Pater noster. & cetera. Ðu singest þe salm þe me clepeð crede. *The Lord's Prayer*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 25-31, no. 5.

7. Folios 20^{v}/9-24^{v}/7, **In die natalis domini.** | Natus est nobis hodie saluator qui est Christus in ciuitate dauið. *The Nativity of our Lord*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 31-41, no.6.

8. Folios 24^{v}/8-26^{r}/17, REGES tharsis ⁊ insule munera offerent. *Epiphany*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873:41-45, no.7.

9. Folios 26r/18-28r/3, OPtulerunt Pro eo domino par turturum aut duos pullos columbarum | et cetera. *The Purification of Saint Mary*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 47-51, no. 8.

10. Folios 28r/4-30r/9, QVomodo cantabimus canticum domini in terra aliena: *Septuagesima*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 51-55, no.9.

11. Folios 30r/10-31r/4, Understondeð get an þi[n]g þat ich giu wile warnie fore. *On Confession*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 57-59, no.10.

12. Folios 31r/4-34r/15, **In Capite Ieiunij.**| Conuertimini ad me in toto corde uestro et cetera. *Beginning of Lent*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 59-67, no. 11.

13. Folios 34r/15-37v/20, [**Dominica Prima**] **In xl[a]** | PReocupemus faciem domini. et in psalmis iubilemus ei. *The First Sunday in Lent*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 67-75, no.12.

14. Folios 38r/1-39v/15, [**Dominica Secunda**] **In quadragesima**. | Ecce nunc tempus acceptabile. ecce nunc dies salutis. *The Second Sunday in Lent*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 77-81, no.13.

15. Folios 39v/15-42v/17, **In media xla.** | CVm inmundus spiritus exierit ab homine ambulat | per loca arida querens requiem et non inueniens dicit. *Mid-Lent Sunday*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 81-89, no.14.

16. Folios 42v/17-44v/10, **Dominica | pal|marum.** Turbe que precedebant dominum. et que sequebantur clamabant | dicentes. osanna filio dauid: *Palm Sunday*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 89-93, no. 15; Hall 1920: 82-88, no. 12.

17. Folios 44v/10-46v/23, **In die pasche.** HEC est dies quam fecit dominus exultemus | et letemur in ea. *Easter Day*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 93-101, no. 16.

18. Folios 47r/1-48r/17, Stetit iesus in medio discipulorum sourum & dixit eis. pax uobis. *The First Sunday After Easter*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 101-5, no. 17.

19. Folios 48r/18-49v/12, Omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum desursum est: *The Fourth Sunday After Easter*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 105-9, no. 18.

20. Folios 49^{v}/12-52^{r}/8, **In ascensionne. | domini.** Eleuatus est sol in celum et[c]. þe holi prophete abacuc. *Ascension Day*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 109-15, no. 19.

21. Folios 52^{r}/8-53^{r}/24, **In die pentecoste.** | Apparuerunt apostolis dispertite lingue tamquam ignis seditque supra sin|gulos eorum spirituc sanctus. *Whit-Sunday*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 117-21, no. 20.

22. Folios 53^{v}/1-54^{v}/17 Dominus de cello prospexit super filios hominum ut uideat si | [est] intelligens aut requirens deum. *Sermon on Psalm LIII. 1.* English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 121-25, no. 21.

23. Folios 54^{v}/17-57^{r}/7, **De sancto Iohanne baptista.** | Ego uox clamantis in deserto parate uiam domini rec|tas facite semitas eius. *St. John the Baptist*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 125-31, no. 22.

24. Folios 57^{r}/7-60^{r}/9, **De sancto Iohanne baptista.** | Inter natos mulierum non surrexit maior iohanne baptista. *St. John the Baptist*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 131-41, no. 23.

25. Folios 60^{r}/9-61^{v}/9, **De sancta maria magdalena.** MVlier que erat ciuitate nomine maria iam | penitens uenit ad domum symonis ubi erat ihesuc. *Mary Magdalene*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 141-45, no. 24.

26. Folios 61^{v}/9-64^{r}/10, **De sancto Iacobo.** | EVntes ibant ⁊ flebant mittentes semina sua. *St. James*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 145-53, no. 25.

27. Folios 64^{r}/10-66^{r}/23, **De sancto laurentio.** | QVi parce seminat parce ⁊ metet. *St Laurence*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 153-59, no. 26.

28. Folios 66^{v}/1-69^{r}/9, MARia uirgo assumpta est ad ethereum thalamum ⁊ cetera. *Assumption of Mary*'. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 159-67, no. 27.

29. Folios 69^{r}/9-71^{v}/6, **De defunctis.** Libera me domine | de morte eterna in die illa tremenda. *The Dead*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 167-73, no. 28.

30. Folios 71^{v}/6-75^{v}/11, **De sancto andrea.** | AMbulans iesus iuxta mare galilee. *St. Andrew*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 173-85, no. 29.

31. Folios 75^{v}/12-78^{r}/13, Esto fortes in bello ⁊ pugnate cum antiquo serpente. *Be Strong in War*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 185-93, no. 30.

32. Folios 78^{r}/14-81^{r}/17, Estote prudentes ⁊ uigilate in oracionibus. *Be Wary and Watchful in Prayers*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 193-201, no. 31.

33. Folios 81^{r}/18-83^{r}/23, QVi uult uenire post me abneget semet ipsum ⁊ tollat crucem suam ⁊ sequatur me. *Sermon on Mark VIII. 34*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 203-9, no. 32.

34. Folios 83^{v}/1-86^{r}/16 Posuerunt peccatores laquem mihi ⁊ de mandatis tuis non erraui. *Sermon on Psalm CXIX. 110*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 209-17, no.33.

[Folio 86r/17-23 blank].

35. Folios 86^{v}1-12,) …Sulphurea id est baline | balanstie id est flores malogranatorum (Line 4). Twelve lines of fifteenth-century Latin lemmata and their accompanying interpretamenta; the opening is illegible; 'a few names explained' James 1900: 461.

[The remainder of folio 86^{v} and the whole of folio 87^{r} have been left blank].

36. Folios 87^{v}/1-88^{r}/12, [E]gredietur uirga de radice iesse. & cetera. *Sermon on Isaiah XI. I.* English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1873: 217-19, no.34.

[Folio 88^{r}/13-23 is blank except for a modern Trinity College Cambridge Library stamp and two 15th century names].

37. Folios 88^{v}/1-15 and 90^{v}/1-26: glossary notes in a sixteenth-century hand.

[the rest of folio 88^{v} and all of folio 89^{r} have been left blank].

38. Folios 89^{v}-90^{r}, Two-line prayer in ink along with extensive, mostly illegible, writing.

1(b). Collation.

ii + 91 + iii (foliated i–ii, 1-91, 91A-93). **1^{8+1}** (folios 1-9, 1 added with stub visible after folio 9), **II-X^{8}** (folios 10-81), **XI^{8}** (folios 82-87, wants two in 6th and 7th position (stubs showing), blank between folios 86 and 87), **XII^{4}** (folios 88-91). The 91 folios are surrounded by a pair of sixteenth-century paper, fly-leaves, and a pair of modern fly-leaves. A slip precedes the end gathering at folio 91A.

Quire I has like surfaces facing, with flesh outside the first sheet. However, folios 2^{r}-9^{v} of Quire I were a later addition to the manuscript having been inserted within a bifolium sheet present in the manuscript as 1^{r} with the stub showing between 9^{v} and 10^{r} (the beginning of Quire II and the homilies).[24] Originally the quire of 8 would have begun with hair outside the first sheet. Quire II-XI: like surfaces facing, with flesh outside the first sheet.

1(c). Writing Grid.

The writing grid for Quire I is *c.* 122-127mm x 80–88mm.[25] Quire 1 has between 24 and 28 lines per page.[26] The writing grid for Quires II to XI is *ca.* 112–116mm x 86–91mm. folios 10^{r}-45^{r} have 21 lines per page and folios 45^{r}-86^{r} have 23 lines per page.

[24] G. S. Ivy, 'The Bibliography of the Manuscript-Book', in Francis Wormald and C. E. Wright (eds.), *The English Library before 1700* Ed. (London, 1958), 32-65 (p. 40).
[25] At folio 3^{v}/20 an erasure has meant that the text runs into the gutter.
[26] 24 lines per page at folios 2^{r}-4^{r}, 8^{v} and 9^{r}; 28 lines per page at folios 4^{v}-5^{r}; 26 lines per page at folios 5^{v}-8^{r} and folios 7^{r}-7^{v} and has 20 lines per page at folio 9^{v} followed by enlarged AMEN and space for a further three lines.

1(d). Textual Presentation.

The decoration and rubrication of Quire I is different from the remainder of the manuscript. Item I begins with an enlarged red opening initial 'I' of four lines in height.[27] A capital letter, written in black ink and placed in the margin, begins each line. The sermon concludes on folio 9^{v}/21 with AMEN in display capitals, touched in red. Other than these features there are no other examples of display characteristics or rubrication throughout the text.

The remainder of the manuscript may also be described as relatively unadorned. However, the homilies do contain occasional rubrication in red script and some capital letters in red. The first letter of each homily is enlarged and written in either red or green.[28] Instruction for a rubricator can be found in the gutter for several of these letters throughout the manuscript.[29] In addition, examples of an indication, mid homily, left by the scribe to the rubricator can also be found at various points throughout the manuscript.[30] Other signs of obscured text are evident in the gutter and can be observed at folios 14^{r}, 21^{r} and 59^{r}.

1.(e). Scribes

The majority of the manuscript is written in two different hands which write in a similar style. The scribes change over throughout the manuscript, often at the start of a new page or part way through a page but never at the beginning of a new item.[31] This would suggest, as Hill

[27] 22mm tall.
[28] An exception to this is the first letter of Item 11 at folio 30^{r}/10 which is not rubricated and begins with an enlarged black initial.
[29] The best example can be found at folio 34^{r}/15 where the letter p can be found in the gutter indicating to the rubricator that the first letter of the word Preocupemus, which begins the homily, should be enlarged and coloured (in this case a large red initial letter is used).
[30] For example, at folios 63^{r}/11 and 63^{r}/20, **V***trasque* and **L***acrima* begin Latin lines and the letters **V** and **L** can be found in the gutter. Further examples of marks for rubrication can be found at folios 21^{r}/11, 67^{r}/17, 68^{r}/11, ^{70r}/14, 20 and 21.
[31] According to Ker's description of the two main hands in the manuscript, hand 1 wrote folios 2^{r}/1-21^{v}, 23^{r}/1-21, 36^{r}/15-21, 38^{v}/6-21, 66^{v}/13-68^{v}/11, 70^{r}/1-71^{r}/23, 73^{v}/1-76^{r}/23, 78^{r}/1-23, 79^{r}/1-23, 80^{v}/1-81^{r}/1, 85^{r}/1-23; hand 2 wrote fols. 22^{r}/1-22^{v}/21, 23^{v}/1-36^{r}/15, 36^{v}/1-38^{v}/6, 39^{r}/1-66^{v}/13, 68^{v}/11-69^{v}/23, 71^{v}/1-73^{v}/1, 76^{v}/1-77^{v}/23, 78^{v}/1-23, 79^{v}/1-80^{r}/23, 81^{r}/23, 81^{r}/1-85^{r}/1, 85^{v}/1-86^{r}/16. Ker, p. 139.

has previously argued, that the two scribes were copying continuously from a similar compilation. [32] Ker asserts that the scribe who wrote Item I on Quire I is the same scribe who begins Quire II.[33] Wilcox, however, believes that this is 'doubtful' arguing that folios 2^{r}-9^{v} may have been written by a distinct third scribe whilst acknowledging that this third scribe had a 'style similar to the two main scribes.'[34] The homilies and the work of the two main scribes conclude at the end of folio 86^{r} and a distinctly different fifteenth-century scribe writes Item 35 on folio 86^{v}/1-12. Item 36 is written by two scribes who have similar hands to the two main scribes.[35] Treharne agrees with Ker stating that 'Hand 1, which copies the *Poema Morale* and the first folios of the *Homilies*, is relatively compressed and angular', whereas, Hand 2 is 'a much more upright and regular hand, but it is very narrow and angular.[36]

Wilcox's assertion that the scribe of Quire I is not one of the two main scribes who wrote the main body of the manuscript is not supported, it would seem, by palaeographical evidence and is based upon the premise that Quire I is a much later addition to the manuscript. Wilcox does concede that a comparison is difficult due to the different mise-en-page and size of script and cannot conclusively say that the scribes are different.[37] The distinctive letter forms present in the script of Scribe I are, from close analysis of the manuscript, also present in Quire I. The assertion that Quire I of the manuscript is a later addition does not abrogate the possibility that the scribe of Quire I is also one of the main hands responsible for the remainder of the manuscript. Any difference in ductus could be attributed to a passage of time between

[32] Hill 1966a, p. 192.
[33] Ker's identification of the two main scribes of the manuscript is based on their distinctly different forms of the letter ð and the abbreviation ⁊ (tironian nota). N. R. Ker, "The Scribes of the 'Trinity Homilies'." *Medium Aevum* 1 (1932), p. 138-140.
[34] Jonathan Wilcox, *Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials*, Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile 8 (Tempe, Arizona, 2000), p. 18.
[35] One scribe wrote folio 87^{v}/1-14 and the other folios 87^{v}/14 - 88^{r}/12.
[36] Treharne makes several other key points of comparison, which can be found in her edition. Of the individual letter forms she states of Hand 1 that '*g* is Caroline for the stop, and insular five-shaped *g* for the spirant'. Whereas, in Hand 2, '*g* is exclusively Caroline, with a rounded tail which flicks sharply down to the right in a hairstroke at the end.' In addition Treharne says of Hand 2 that 'the most notable characteristic distinguishing this hand is the crossed and squiggly ⁊'. Treharne 2010.
[37] Wilcox, p. 18.

the writing of Quire I and the remainder of the manuscript, possible different purposes for the manuscript or, as Wilcox claims himself, the different mis-en-page and size of script. The similarities in letter formation suggest that it is the same hand. It may also give a possible reason for the inclusion of the *Conduct of Life* in a homiliary.

1(f). The *Conduct of Life* as a distinct unit.

Quire I (folios 2^{r} to 9^{v}) should be viewed as a self-contained unit. This unit is not only different in layout but also in content from the rest of the manuscript: it contains a verse-sermon in septenary rhyming couplets as opposed to the remainder of the manuscript which is made up of homilies which roughly follow the liturgical year. The size of script is larger; it has a different number of lines per page and it occupies a larger writing grid. As a result of this it has suffered more from cropping than any of the other items in the manuscript.[38] The first quire is not part of the sixteenth-century foliation or the seventeenth-century pagination and is not included in the sixteenth-century table of contents or in Whelock's seventeenth-century index. In addition, the second quire begins with its own sixteenth-century title, which, as Wilcox states, 'might suggest that the first quire was not in its present place until after the 17c'.[39] However, as Wilcox finds, the opening folio must have been in its present position when it received the sixteenth-century table of contents and probably when it gained the inscription at the head of folio 1^{v}.

Ivy suggests that it is likely that folios 2^{r}-9^{v} originally formed a quire of eight which was placed inside a bifolium. [40] The bifolium, between which the verse-sermon was inserted, is folio

[38] The enlarged capitals which begin each line are missing from the outer margins at: 6^{v}/8-26, 7^{v}/24-26, 8^{v}/6+9-14+16-24, 9^{v}/2-11+13-20. See also Treharne 2010 and Wilcox 2000, p. 17.
[39] Wilcox 2000, p. 17.
[40] G. S. Ivy, 'The Bibliography of the Manuscript-Book', p. 40.

1 of the manuscript and can be detected again as a stub showing between 9^{v} and 10^{r}. Wilcox establishes further proof that the verse-sermon originally occupied a quire of eight which was then placed inside a bifolium through the wormholes found in the opening folios.[41] The quire signature at the end of quire VII adds further weight to this argument – the signature reads 'VI' when it is in fact the 7^{th} gathering of the manuscript.

1(g). Pagination and Foliation

There are three forms of pagination/foliation visible throughout the manuscript. The modern pencil foliation numbers the *Litany of the Virgin* (folio 1^{ra}/1-21) as 1 and is marked on the recto of every folio. It marks the beginning of the *Conduct of Life* as 2 and the beginning of the homilies as 10. It must have been recently completed and corrected, as, at the time of Hill's article folio 3 was not paginated, 5 was repeated for 6, 6 for 7 etc till 10 where the folios were numbered every 10 for the remainder of the manuscript.[42] The manuscript is now numbered correctly on every recto throughout the whole of the manuscript. There is brown ink pagination on the second folio of the homilies (folio 11^{r}) which is numbered 3 and continues on the recto of each leaf 5, 7, 9 etc. to page 161 (folio 90). There is also a black ink foliation, occasionally visible due to cropping, starting with the first page of the homilies.[43]

[41] 68mm down the outer margin of folio 2 there is a wormhole which continues to folio 3. There is, however, no corresponding hole in folio 1.There are also two wormholes on folio 1 which are not present on folio 2. The first is 5mm down the page and approximately 11mm in from the gutter. The second is within the outer margin, 58mm from the top (Wilcox 2000, p. 17). It should also be noted here, not recorded in Wilcox's study, that there are two wormholes on the stub between folio 9^{r} and folio 10^{v} which are not present on either of adjacent folios.

[42] Hill 1966a, p. 192.

[43] The best example of where this is visible is at folio 49^{r} (folio 58^{r} according to modern pencil foliation).

1(h). Contemporary and later additions

There is little evidence within the manuscript of contemporary use. There is some error correction in darker ink at folios 78^{r}/9, 80^{r}/16, 83^{r}/17 and 20 and some of the blank spaces within the manuscript have been used for thirteenth-century additions. At folio 1ra/1-21 there begins the *Litany of the Virgin* in a thirteenth-century hand. A homily on Isaiah has been added in a thirteenth-century hand at folios 87^{v}/1 - 88^{r}/12. There are three examples of faded Latin text at the bottom of the page at folios 33^{v}-34^{r}, 47^{v}-48^{r} and 55^{v}. There is also evidence, although very faded, of what James believes to be thirteenth-century prayers written in pencil on folios 89^{v}-90^{r}.[44]

There are also some examples of later additions within the manuscript. At folio 1^{v} there is a fifteenth-century inscription which reads 'Rithmus anglicus cum omilis anglicis in hoc volumine | continentur'. The two names 'Ser Thomas Stone (or Stow)' and 'Ser John Newson (or John Newbore)' can be found on the blank page at folio 88^{r}. The heading 'Rithmus Anglicus' in a possibly sixteenth-century hand has been added to folio ii^{v}. The blank space on folio 1^{r} has been used for a sixteenth-century table of contents which is linked to the homilies through the early foliation. On folio 1^{v} there is a form of astrological dating which is followed by six lines of Latin; signed W.P or W.L.[45] At the bottom of the same folio there is a truncated letter. At the top of folio 10^{r} there is the later heading 'Homiliæ Anglicæ'. The lack of inclusion of quire I in the sixteenth-century table of contents and the inclusion of a later title at folio 10^{r} adds support to the idea that quire I, as discussed previously, did not originally occupy its present position; as does the doctrinal index found on the flyleaves in the hand of Abraham

[44] James 1900, p. 462.

[45] The astrological dating has been interpreted by Hill as being 23 September 1583 which corresponds to the date given of Archbishop Whitgift's enthronement at Canterbury and is in the hand of Thomas Patten (William Patten's son). Hill also contends that the 'Yor Grace' which begins the truncated letter at the bottom of the page is Archbishop Whitgift although it is written in an unknown hand. It is likely that the initials, therefore, are W[illiam] P[atten], although, the hand itself is of his son, Thomas Patten. (Hill 1966a, pp. 195-200).

Whelock.[46] The index runs from A-J on folios i^{v}-ii^{v} and from K-Z on folios 91^{r}-93^{r}. The index refers only to the homilies and to the earlier pagination and not to Quire I, adding further weight to the argument that the distinct quire did not occupy its current position until after the seventeenth century. The entries in the table are connected to the pointers and underlining throughout the remainder of the manuscript.[47] As well as underlining and pointers being added throughout the manuscript, Hill also notes the use of five sigla keyed to the text throughout the manuscript.[48]

Hill believes that the hand which is responsible for the table of contents linked to the thirty-one homilies, on folio 1^{rb}, was apparently also responsible for the gloss *Manca Mancus* to *manke* folio 3^{r} (*Conduct of Life*, line 70).[49] If this is the case then it would suggest that Quire I was in its present position when the table was produced and that, for some reason, it was left out of the contents. It is not unfeasible, although less likely, however, for the 'distinct unit' which is Quire I to have come under the hand of the glosser at a separate time, although, possibly at the same place.

Hill also recognises six different sixteenth-century hands responsible for English and Latin glosses in the *Conduct of Life*, *Homilies* and the *Sermon on Isaiah*. She divides and provides a description[50] to the glosses as follows: The *Conduct of Life* is underlined and glossed on folio 2^{v} *aihte-goodes* (line 42), folio 3^{r} *ore-favoor grace* (line 53), *lean-dezerving* (line 64). The words *africh* (line 65) and *manke* (line 70) are underlined but not glossed. There are

[46] According to Hill:
Whelocke was at Trinity College from 1611 to 1619. He was Cambridge University Librarian from 1629 to 1653 and in 1640 Anglo-Saxon Lecturer on the Sir Henry Spelman foundation. Whelocke sent transcripts of parts of Ælfric's canons (MS. Harley 440) to Spelman, who in 1637 requested him to compare and note references to 'the marriages of priests, virginity &c.' of the Nicene Council which Ælfric cites and follows. It is apparent from the table, which, in a note on the flyleaf ii^{r}, Mr H. M. Adams attributed to Whelocke, that he extended his studies to Middle English. (Hill 1966a, p. 194).

[47] Hill is uncertain whether Whelocke is responsible for these pencilled pointers and underlining or if they were added at a later point using Whelock's doctrinal index (Hill 1966a, p. 194). However, Timothy Graham confirms this hand is Whelocke's in a personal communication with Elaine Treharne (Treharne 2010).

[48] Hill 1966a, p. 194.

[49] Hill 1966a, p. 193.

[50] The following and fuller description can be found in Hill 1966a, pp. 193-194.

English and Latin glosses to the *Homilies* at folios 10^{r}-12^{r}, 20^{v}-26^{r}, 27^{r}, 43^{r}, 47^{r}, 65^{v}, 66^{r}, 66^{v}, 74^{r} and 75^{v}. There are two heavily cropped marginal Latin comments on the *Homilies* at folio 66^{r}/ 1+9. Folio 88^{r} (*Sermon on Isaiah*) contains one interlinear gloss *gerde-virga* and two badly cropped marginal glosses. Hill establishes that a fourth hand was responsible for marginal glosses on folios 59^{v}, 60^{r}, 62^{v}, 67^{r}, 69^{v}, 70^{v}, 72^{r}, 75^{r}, 76^{v}, 77^{r}, 77^{v}, 78^{r}, 80^{r}, 81^{r}, 83^{v}, 84^{r}, 85^{r} and 86^{v}. She contends that these glosses were made after cropping had taken place and during rebinding. A cross-reference to the gloss on folio 84^{r} shows that the glossator was working whilst the brown ink pagination was in use. The interlinear glosses can be found on fols. 55^{r}, 59^{r}, 68^{r}, 68^{v}, 69^{r}, 73^{r}, two on 75^{v}, 76^{r}, 76^{v}, 77^{v} and 84^{r}. A fifth hand adds the interlinear gloss *abroidene bureh-ruinosam vrbem* and a sixth hand writes *Sax: ærendraca- nuntius*, longwise in the margin of folio 20^{v}.

1(i). Provenance.

What is known of the provenance and early history of the manuscript is extremely limited. According to Hill, the manuscript may have received some of its glosses whilst in the care of Archbishop Parker and was probably held at some point by William Patten.[51] John Whitgift, who became Archbishop on 23 September 1583, bequeathed the manuscript to Trinity College in 1604. It is his coat of arms on the covers and it is he who is most probably responsible for the manuscript's present binding. Abraham Whelocke's doctrinal index has been noted; he may also have been responsible for some of the pointers and underlining throughout the manuscript.[52] The manuscript was repaired and rebound in 1984 by Cockerell.

[51] Hill 1966a, p. 195
[52] Treharne 2010

Although, as discussed, Quire I did not originally occupy its present position until a date after the manuscript was originally put together, it is probable that the hand that writes Quire I also contributed to the remainder of the manuscript. When Quire I and the rest of the manuscript were brought together is still debatable, although its absence from both the contents and the doctrinal index suggest that it may not have occupied its present position until after the beginning of the seventeenth century. It is likely, however, that it did occupy its current place in the manuscript by the time of binding later in the seventeenth century.

1(j). Binding.

The manuscript is bound calf over pulp and, as noted above, embossed with John Whitgift's coat of arms (the See of Canterbury impaling Argent a cross flury with four bezants), in gold on front and back. The manuscript was probably re-bound between 1583 and 1604 when Whitgift was Archbishop of Canterbury. Previous to this Whitgift had been Master of Trinity College between 1567 and 1577, to which he bequeathed the manuscript.[53] There are fittings for two clasps and 'Homiliæ Anglicæ' is toold on the spine. There is a modern binder's note on the final flyleaf, which states:

> Binder's note | B. 14. 52 | DC680 Condition when received: binding rebacked | dark brown calf, over pulp boards, a very heavy | impression of arms in gold on both boards, most | of the gold missing, two clasps clasping on the | back board, crossovers missing, red lettering | piece. Book sewn on white thongs, thongs | broken, sewing broken, gatherings free, vellum | leaves in good condition though very heavily | cropped, coloured edges. | Book taken down, damaged leaves guarded and | repaired, resewn on four cords to the old | marking up. The old boards repaired and laced | on. The spine covered with brown calf. | SMC | Cockerall Bindery | October 1984.

[53] Hill 1966a, p. 192.

1(k). Shelf Marks.

On folio i^{r} the old shelf mark of Trinity, R. 15. 17, has been crossed through and replaced below by the modern shelf mark B. 14. 52. Further down the same folio R. 15. 17 has once more been erased. Modern stamps of Trinity College Library can be found on folio 1^{v}, folio 10^{r}, folio 20^{r}, folio 49^{v}, folio 86^{r} and folio 88^{r}. At folio 91A there is a half page slip stating that 'This book belongs to Trinity College Library in Cambridge.'

1(l). Surrogate Descriptions.

James 1900; Treharne 2010; Wilcox 2000.

2. London, Lambeth Palace Library 487

Parchment. s. xii/xiii. Size of leaves: 176 x 132.

London, Lambeth Palace Library 487 is a composite collection of seventeen anonymous homilies, which roughly follow the liturgical year, and a version of the *Conduct of Life.*

2(a). Contents.

Folio iii^{v}, Table of contents (seventeenth-century).

I. Folios 1^{r}/1 - 3^{r}/3, [C]um appropínquasset iesus ierosolímam. & cetera. *For Palm Sunday*. Ælfric, First Series of Homilies. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 3-11, no. 1.

2. Folios 3^{r}/4 - 9^{r}/10, **hic dicendum est de quadragesima.** | [E]cce nunc tempus acceptabile ecce nunc dies salutis & cetera. *Quadragesima Sunday*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 11-25, no. 2.

3. Folios 9^{r}/11 - 15^{v}/26, [I]n leínten time uwlic mon gað to scrifte; | þer beð summe þe mare herm is þe gað al swa ic nuþe eow tellen wulle. *First Sunday in Lent*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 25-41, no.3.

4. Folios 15^{v}/27 - 18^{v}/9, **In diebus domínícís.** | [L]eofemen ȝef ȝe lusten wuleð. ⁊ ȝe wil | leliche hit understonden we eow wulleð | suteliche seggen of þa fredome þe limpeð | to þan deie þe is icleped su sunedei. *On the Lord's Day*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 41-47, no. 4; Hall 1920: 76-79, no. 10.

5. Folios 18^{v}/9 - 21^{v}/15, **Hic dicendum est de propheta.** | [M]is[s]us est ieremías ín puteum et stetit ibi usque ad os. *Of the Prophet Jeremiah*. Jeremiah in the Pit (Jer. 38:6-13). English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 47-53, no. 5; Hall 1920: 79-82, no. 11.

6. Folios 21ᵛ/16 - 25ʳ/26, **[P]ater noster qui es in celis & cetera** | Vre feder þet ín heouene is þet is al soð ful | iwis. *The Lord's Prayer*. English verse, written as prose, with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 55-71.

7. Folios 25ʳ/27 - 27ᵛ/4, **[T]ria sunt hominum saluti necessaria. | fides. baptismus. mundicia uite.** | þro þing bod þet ech. man. habbe mot þet wile his | cristíndom folge. *The Creed*. English with Latin passages, ends imperfectly. Ed. Morris 1867: 73-77, no. 7.

8. Folios 27ᵛ/6-30ᵛ/16, **[H]omo quídam descendebat ab ierusalem in | ierico & cetera**. God almihti seið an forbis|ne to his folk in þe halie godspel. *The Parable of the Good Samaritan*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 79-85, no. 8.

9. Folios 30ᵛ/17 - 37ᵛ/3, [F]ram þan halie hester dei: boð italde. fiftí. |daga to þisse deíe ⁊ þes dei is ihaten pentecostes. *The Day of Pentecost*. Ælfric, First Series of Homilies. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 87-101, no. 9; Clemoes 1997: 354-64.

10. Folios 37ᵛ/4 - 45ʳ/11, **De octo uicíís, & de duodecím abusíuís huius | seculi. | [O]mnia nímía nocent. & temperantía | materuirtutum dicitur.** | þet is on englisc. alle ofer doneþing denað. | ⁊ ímetnesse is alre míhta moder. *Concerning Eight Vices and Twelve Abuses of this Age*, Ælfric, tracts. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 101-19, no.10 and 296-304, appendix 2.

11. Folios 45ʳ/12 - 47ʳ/17, **[F]actus est filius dei omnibus sibi obtemperan|tibus causa salutis eterne: apellatus a deo |pontifex iuxsta ordinem Melchisedech**. Vre | drihtnes halie passion. þet is his halie þrowunge | þe he for moncunne underfeng. is nu icumen | in. *The Fifth Sunday in Lent*. Includes an extract from Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, First Series, XIV on folio 46ʳ. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 119-25, no. 11.

12. Folios 47^{r}/18 - 49^{r}/5, [Ch]ristus passus est pro nobis uobis relinquens | exemplum. ut sequimini uestigia eius ⁊ cetera. | Al þet mé ret ⁊ singeð on þisse tíman ín há|lie chirché. *The Second Sunday after Easter*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 125-31, no. 12.

13. Folios 49^{r}/6 - 51^{v}/21, [Q]Vi parce semínat: parce & metet. | Vre lauerd seinte paul heges larðewen | efter ure helende seolfe. *Sermon on 2 Corinthians IX. 6*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 131-39, no. 13.

14. Folios 51^{v}/22 - 54^{r}/7, [R]euerenda est nobis hec dies sancta que dicitur | domíníca. & ideo dicitur dominica quoniam | hec dies sola dies domini est. Muchel man ach | to wurþen þis halie dei þat is sunnen dei | icleoped. *The Lord's Day*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 139-45, no.14.

15. Folios 54^{r}/8 - 56^{r}/9, [Q]Vi uult ueníet post me. abneget semet ipsum | & tollat crucem suam & sequatur me. wa is | þet wa is ⁊ me hím mare bihat. *Sermon on Mark VIII. 34*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 145-49, no. 15.

16. Folios 56^{r}/10 - 57^{v}/22, [E]stote fortes in bello & pugnate cum antique | serpente & accipietis regnum eternum dicit dominus. Þis word þe ich nu þe for tech: seide ure | drihten st summe time þa he wunede ine þe londe of ierusalem. *Be Strong in War*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 151-55, no. 16.

17. Folios 57^{v}/23 - 59^{v}/4, [E]untes ibant ⁊ flebant. mittentes semina | sua. Venientes autem uenient cum exultatio|ne portantes manipulos suos. Þe halie prophete dauíd | specð on ane stude ín þe sauter. *Sermon on Psalm CXXVI. 6*. English with Latin passages. Ed. Morris 1867: 155-59, no.17.

18. Folios 59^{v}/5 - 65^{r}/11, [ ]**ich em nu alder þene ich wes a wintre 7 | a lare. Ich welde mare þene ich dede mi | wit ahte bon mare.** *Conduct of Life* . English verse, ends imperfectly. Ed. Morris 1867: 159-83, no. 18; Hall 1920: 30-46, no.8, ll. 1-270.

19. Folios 65^{v}/1 - 67^{r}/29, Iesu soð god. godes sone. iesu soð god. soð mon. mon | maidene bern. *An Orison of Our Lord*. English prayer, ends imperfectly. Ed. Morris 1867: 183-89, no. 19; Thompson 1958: 1-4.

2(b). Collation.

iii + 68 + iii (foliated i-iii 1a, 1, 2-68 - final fly sheets not foliated). **I^{12}** (folios 1a, 1, 2-11), **II^{14}** (folios 12-25), **III^{18}** (folios 26-43), **IV^{8}** (folios 44-51), **V^{8}** (folios 52-59), **VI^{8}** (folios 60-67). All quires are arranged with like surfaces facing and with hair on the outside.

2(c). Writing Grid.

The writing grid is 146-158mm (except at folio 59^{v} where it is 164) x 79-94mm. For the majority of the manuscript it is consistently 80-82mm – irregularities occur toward the end of the manuscript, where the grid increases to a width of up to 95mm in places.[54]

There are double binding lines throughout the manuscript with some text extending beyond the grid, especially in the final item, a later addition, where the grid is irregular, more faded and not as well drawn.

The writing grid is lineated in ink[55] for between 26 and 32 lines per page, with the average being 28.[56] The pricking and ruling for the writing grid is visible throughout the manuscript.[57]

[54] Folios 52^{r}-54^{v}: 95mm; folio 55^{r}: 90mm; folio 55^{v}: 94mm; folios 56^{r}-57^{r}: 92mm; and folio 60r: 75mm.
[55] The first few pages are also incised in drypoint as well as ink. See Wilcox 2000, p. 73 and Swan 2010.

2(d). Textual Presentation.

Most of the rubrics and Latin quotations are written in red throughout the manuscript by the main scribe, with the exception of Item I and some of Item 2 where they are black. Item 10 and 18 contain further rubrication, with certain capitals in English and the Latin name of each sin in Item 10 written in red, along with important English phrases in Item 18. There is often a space left for what is likely to have been a decorated initial letter at the beginning of each item that was never written (often the guide letters are evident).

2(e). Scribes.

The majority of the manuscript (folios 1^{r}-65^{r}) is written by one scribe, s.xii/xiii, with a later hand, s.xiii^{med,} being responsible for Item 19 on folios 65^{v}-67^{r}.[58]

Variations in orthography in the hand of the main scribe have suggested to Sisam that the manuscript contains materials that have been copied from, with the exception of the thirteenth century text, two different exemplars.[59] She contends that the scribe faithfully

---

[56] There are 28 lines per page at folios 1^{r}-1^{ar}, 2^{v}, 3^{v}-11^{r}, 12^{r}-13^{r}, 14^{v}-15^{r}, 16^{v}-25^{v}, 27^{v}-30^{r}, 31^{v}-32^{r}, 35^{v}-36^{r}, 37^{v}-38^{r} and 40^{v}-42^{r}. There are 27 lines per page at folios 1^{av}-2^{r}, 3^{r}, 11^{v}, 37^{r}, 39^{v}-40^{r}, 51^{v}-65^{r} (although, folio 65^{r} only has 11 lines written, the grid is set up for 27 lines). There are 29 lines at 13^{v}-14^{r}, 15^{v}-16^{r}, 26^{r}-27^{r}, 30^{v}-31^{r}, 32^{v}-34^{r}, 38^{v}-39^{r}, 42^{v}-43^{v} and 67^{r}. There are 30 lines per page at folio 66^{v}, There are 31 lines per page at folios 50^{v}-51^{r} and 65^{v}-66^{r}. There are 32 lines per page at folios 44^{r}-50^{r}.

[57] Swan believes the manuscript was 'Most likely ruled quire by quire, and in some places possibly opening by opening after quires assembled, since this would account for uneven number of lines across bifolia.' (Swan 2010).

[58] The main hand of this manuscript has been repeatedly dated to around 1200. A note inserted on a loose leaf at the back of the manuscript, and attributed by Sisam (Sisam 1951, p. 105 n. 2) to J. P. Gilson, Keeper of Manuscripts in the British Museum, 1923, records that:

on purely palaeographical grounds I should be disposed to date Lambeth MS 487 somewhere in the forty years 1185-1225 (fols 65b-67 later). The materials however for dating vernacular writing are so slight that any opinion must be tentative. I base the above mainly on the Latin scraps, the extent of which is small (Wilcox 2000, p. 72).

Ker states, in an unpublished reassessment of the main hand of this manuscript, that 'whether he was writing before or after 1200 who can tell? [...] I don't see why it shouldn't be before [...] there don't seem to be any features [...] which would suggest that a post-1200 date is likely' (Sarah M. O'Brien, 'An Edition of Seven Homilies from Lambeth Palace Library MS. 487' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 1985), p.1)

Swan confirms that the main hand is 'A very late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century hand with generally gothic features' (Elaine Treharne personal communication, reported in Swan, 'Mobile Libraries: Old English Manuscript Production in Worcester and the West Midlands, 1090-1215', in Wendy Scase (ed.), *Essays in Manuscript Geography: Vernacular Manuscripts of the English West Midlands from the Conquest to the Sixteenth Century* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), p. 413, n. 35, and reproduced in Swan 2010).

[59] Sisam 1951, p. 109.

transcribed his material alternately from two different manuscripts.[60] Sisam believes that items 1-5 and 9-13, which she names Group A, show certain orthographical characteristics, while Items 7, 8, 14-16, and the *Conduct of Life*, which she names Group B, show others.[61] However, Item 6, *The Lord's Prayer*, has features of orthography which it shares with both groups, although, she does assign it to Group B after providing the evidence for either reading. Sisam puts forward two alternatives for the transcription of the homilies and the *Conduct of Life*; the first is that the Lambeth scribe had before him a single manuscript written by two different scribes or, the second, that he had two manuscripts that he drew on alternately. She claims that the second is more likely with the scribes changing over mid-item.[62]

Sisam believes that the texts that are in Group A come from one manuscript and the texts in Group B come from another. The orthographical evidence suggests that the manuscript in which the Group A texts were found is older in origin than the manuscript that holds the group B texts. This is corroborated by the fact that included in Group A are Items 9 and 10, which are derived from Ælfric, with Item 11 including a further extract from Ælfric, and Item 2, which adapts a homily from Wulfstan.

Swan believes that instances of adaptation of the source material, specifically that of Ælfric, present in Lambeth, rather than being an attempt to make the homilies intelligible to a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century audience, more likely reflects 'the use of memoralized reproduction in at least one stage of the textual transmission process.'[63]

[60] Sisam 1951, pp. 106-107.
[61] Sisam 1951, p. 107.
[62] Sisam 1951, p. 109.
[63] Mary Swan, 'Preaching Past the Conquest: Lambeth Palace 487 and Cotton Vespasian A.XXII', in A. J. Heist (ed.), *The Old English Homily* (Turnohout, 2007), 403-423, p. 410.

2(f). Pagination and Foliation.

The manuscript is foliated in pencil i-iii on the flyleaves and then 1a, 1, 2-67 at the top right corner of the rectos in ink. The first folio was omitted and added as 1a, in pencil, after the mistake. The same pencilled hand repeats some of the numbering on the mending strip (see section on 'Condition'), such as on folio 4^{r} and folio 11^{r}. It is probable that the foliation was added after at least some of the mending strips as, at folios 9^{r} and 11^{r}, it is written on the strip itself rather than the original parchment. The quires are marked, incorrectly, in the bottom right corner of the recto which corresponds to the incorrect quiring described by James.[64]

2(g). Contemporary and later additions.

Various corrections are made to the manuscript in the hand of the main scribe by subpuncting, crossing through and supplying missing text in the margin.[65]

2(h). Provenance.

Very little can be determined about the provenance of this manuscript before the seventeenth century when it was donated to Lambeth Palace Library by Archbishop Richard Bancroft (Archbishop of Canterbury 1604-1610).[66] The manuscript was moved to Cambridge at some point between 1649 and 1664 where it received the shelf mark '#. C. Θ. 12' found on the inside cover.[67] On the manuscript's return to Lambeth it was catalogued a further three times and was given the shelf mark '4to 185', once more found on the inside cover.[68] Wilcox believes that the inclusion of Item 19, 'An Orison of Our Lord', 'might suggest suggest female ownership

[64] James collation reads: 1^{10} 2^{16} 3^{16} 4^{10} 5^{6} 6^{10} (wants 10). (James 1925, p. 673).
[65] These are detailed in Wilcox 2000, p. 74.
[66] It is listed in two catalogues of his manuscripts dated 15 October 1612. See, Hill 1970-72, p. 271 and Wilcox 2000, p. 73.
[67] Hill 1970-72, pp. 271-2.
[68] Hill 1970-72, p. 272.

of the book in the Middle Ages'[69] as it belongs to a body of religious literature 'written for (and perhaps, in some cases, by) devout women'.[70]

2(i). Binding.

The manuscript is sewn securely into a thick leaf of parchment with hairside out,[71] probably of the seventeenth century.[72] Two paper bifolia have been cut down to fit the manuscript and inserted to form the fly-leaves at folios i-ii and folios 69-70. They are taken from Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologica*, 2, ii, leaf sig. a, printed by Peter Schoeffer of Mainz in March 1467.[73] The leaves are bound upside down at folios i-ii and the correct way at folios 69-70.

2(j). Condition.

The folios have been fixed with mending strips, which run down the outside of the folios. The original width would have been *ca.* 127 – as at folios 1 and 2 where the mending strips are missing. That they were once present is indicated by the marks left on the parchment where they were attached. Other than this the condition of the manuscript is generally good.

2(k). Shelf Marks.

The marks '487' and '8' are written on the spine of the binding. On the inside cover of the manuscript there are two older shelf marks; '#. C. Θ. 12' and '4to 185'. Further shelf marks can be found in the margin of folio i^{r}.

[69] Wilcox 2000, p. 72.
[70] Thompson 1958, p. xv.
[71] Wilcox 2000, p. 75.
[72] Hill 1970-72, p. 271.
[73] Hill 1970-72, p. 272.

2(1). Surrogate Descriptions.

Hill 1970-72 makes additions to James 1925; James 1925; Swan 2010; andWilcox 2000.

3. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4

Parchment. s.xii^{in}/s.ii^{ex}/s.xiii^{in}. Size of Leaves: 115 x 90.

Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4 is a small composite manuscript made up of individual booklets, containing a mixture of twelfth- and thirteenth-century liturgical, theological and medical works as well as Latin and French satirical verse, which were brought together by the early fourteenth century.

3(a). Contents.

I. Folios 1^{r}-30^{v}, **VERE | DIGNVM** | et justum est. 'Tractatus super canonem Misse Thome de Stureya'.[74] Latin.

2. Six poems by the twelfth-century Canon, Gautier de Chatillon, written as prose. Latin and French.

i. Folios 31^{r}/1 - 32^{r}/3, **P**ropter syon non tacebo. sed ruinam rome flebo. Walther 14838. Strecker no. 2.

ii. Folios 32^{r}/3 - 35^{r}/20, **Alia.** | **M**ulti cum currentibus currunt ad coronam. | Juvenalisautumat sumere personam . Sed cum bene | nouerim pallada Latonam. Semper. ego. aud . t. n. | ne. reponam. Walther 1959, no. 11377. Ed. Strecker 1929, no. 4.

iii. Folios 33^{v}/20 - 35^{r}/20, **Alia.** | **M**ultiformus hominum fraus . 7 [in] iusticia. latalis | ambicio. furtum. lenocinia. Walther 1959, no. 11390. Ed. Strecker 1929, no. 5.

[74] This item, according to Hill 1970-72, p. 274:
Approximates to the treatise by Odo, Bishop of Cambrai 1105-†1113, extant with his preface in B.M. MS Royal 11 B ii (assigned by Ker (n. 6), p. 208, to Worcester), 181^{v}-195^{v}, and printed in J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, cxc, cols 1053-70. A version which, like item 1 above, lacks the preface – MS. Royal 8 A xxi (rejected by Ker (n. 6), p. 92, as a Gloucester book), 154^{r}-157^{v} – shows greater textual deviation.

iv. Folios 35^{r}/20 - 36^{v}/7, **Alia.** | **B**aculare sacrementum . nec recenter est inuentum. | nec sine misterio. Ab antiquo manus rata. scripto | legis figurata. baculi religio. Walther 1959, no. 2047. Ed. Strecker 1929, no. 12.

v. Folios 36^{v}/7 - 37^{v}/8, **Alia.** | **N**ostri moris esse solet. quando festum turbas olet. | loqui lingua clerici. Ne si forte quid dicamus unde | risum moueamus cachinnantur laici. Walther 1959, no. 12309. Ed. Strecker 1929, no. 1.

vi. Folios 37^{v}/8 - 38^{r}/25, **Alia.** | **A** la feste sui uenuz. Et ostendam quare. Singulorum | singulos mores explicare. Ed. Strecker 1929, no. 13.

3. Folios 38^{v} - 40^{r}, ¶Seneca. Certis ingeniis inmorari ⁊ in nutrici. 63 Sentantiae from Seneca. Individually marked with ¶, in red, or variants of, at beginning.[75] Latin.

4. Folios 40^{v}, Duas nativitates ueneramur in Christo. unam ex patre | ante secula. 13 lines of prose explaining the two, paternal and maternal, births of Christ. Latin.

5. Folios 41^{r} - 47^{v}, Twenty paragraphs of theological varia, divided into three parts. Includes the death of Isobeth, the insignia of the tribes of Israel, the power of the Cross, and the theological significance of gems. Latin.

   i. ¶Uenientes filii remmon berochite. recha ⁊ ba|nah ingressi sunt (begins on 41^{r}/1).

   ii. ¶Erubesce sidon ait mare. In sidone quippe | figuratur stabilitas (begins on 41^{v}/19).

   iii. ¶Modestia incessus uiri religiosi quibusdam cona|tibus exigit ut diligi etiam a nolente debeat (Part III: 42^{r}/9).

[75] According to Hill 1970-72, p. 274,
Sixteen are extant in the late 12th-century collection *Floregium Morale Oxoniense* (MS. Bodley 633, rejected by Ker (n. 6), p. 208, as a Worcester Book). Correspondences are given to page and line of C. H. Talbot's edition in *Analecta Mediavalia Nanurcensis.* Pt. 6 (1956): 38^{v}, paras. 1, 2; 39^{r}, paras 4, 9; 39^{v}, para. 6; Seneca, 'Moral Epistles to Lucilius', Talbot 50/7-8, 9, 109/20, 42/18, 122/20. 39^{v}, paras. 12-14; 40^{r}, paras. 1-4, 13; Publilius Syrus, Talbot 124/16, 118/7, 55/11, 62/5 and 157/7, 164/5, 64/13, 145/16, 61/4. 40^{r}, paras. 10, 12, 14; pseudo-Seneca, Talbot 127/14, 72/20, 65/6.

6. Folios 48^{r} - 95^{v}, **H**erbarum quasdam... 'Macer Floridus De virtutibus Herbarum'. A Catalogue of herbs and their supposed medicinal properties. Latin. A later hand gives the title 'Macer de virtutibis herbarum' on folio 48^{r}. Walther 1959, no. 7711.

[Item 6 is completed on folio 96^{r} in a different, later hand, leaving folio 96^{v} blank].

7. Folios 97^{r} - 110^{v}/9, **I**ch am elder þanne ic þes | a pintre ⁊ a lore | ic ealdi more þanne ic dede | mi þit oghte to bi more. '*Poema Morale'* or *Conduct of Life* IMEV 1272. DIMEV 2113. English. Ed. Zupitza 1878.

8. Folios 110^{v}/10, Virgo parens loquitur ⁊ mistica res aperitur | Se notat ⁊ natum verbis signisque notatum. 'Versus de Christo ⁊ matre eius.' Sixteen lines of Latin verse. Walther 1959, no. 20529.

[Folio 111^{r} blank]

9. Folios 111^{v} - 112^{r}, Si de leto stigmate. matra queam fari. | De pusillo temate. destino scrutari. | Promptus emtimemate. me cepit ortari | Rithmico poememate. (sic) parum spaciari. Latin verse. Walther 1959, no. 20529.

3(b). Collation.

ii (flyleaves) + vi (quire a) + 114 + 2 (stubs - part of final quire): foliated i-viii, 1-114. **a**^{6} (folios iii-viii), **b-c**^{8} (folios 1-16), **d**^{6} (folios 17-22), **e**^{8} (folios 23-30), **f-g**^{10} (folios 31-47 + 3 blank folios not numbered), **h-m**^{8} (folios 48-95), **n**^{12} (folios 96 + 11 blank folios not numbered), **o**^{16} (folios 97-112), **p**^{4} (folios 113-114 + 2 folios excised).

3(c). Writing Grid.

Digby should be considered a series of individual items brought together by a later compiler. The entirety of the first gathering, Quire a, has been left blank and un-ruled. Item I (folios 1^{r}-30^{v}) begins on the recto of the first folio of Quire b and concludes on the verso of the final folio of Quire e. The writing grid is *ca.* 90mm x 60mm, with little variation. The grid is ruled in single column with double bounding lines enclosing the grid at the inner and outer margins, with the right-hand margin often written over. The item is consistently ruled for 20 lines per page, with the exception of folio 1^{r} (19 lines) which begins the piece, and folio 30^{v} where five lines conclude the piece and where it is impossible, because of fading, to determine for how many lines the page was initially ruled. The remainder of folio 30^{v} has been left blank.

Items 2-4 (folios 31^{r}-40^{v}) are contained within Quire f and are all written in the same hand. These items occupy a similar size writing grid to Item I with the grid, however, enclosed by a single bounding line at each margin.[76] Throughout this quire, pricking is clearly visible at the outer edges of the folios for both horizontal and vertical lines.[77] The grid is ruled for 25 lines per page with text written above the top line. On folio 40^{r} the grid is ruled for 25 lines with only 22 lines being used to conclude Item 3, with the rest of the page left blank. Similarly, on folio 40^{v}, where Item 4 begins and concludes, only 13 lines of the ruled grid have been used, with the remainder left blank. The six poems which make up Item 2 are written continuously, one after each other, without a line gap. Item 3 begins on the first line of folio 38^{v}, and Item 4 begins and ends on folio 40^{v}.

Item 5 occupies the entirety of Quire g. The writing grid for Item 5 is consistently 80mm x 60mm, except at folio 45^{v} where it is 76mm x 60mm, and where there are only 18

[76] The pricking, however, is present for double bounding lines.
[77] The clearest example is at folio 32^{r}.

lines per page as opposed to the normal 19. The only other place where the text deviates from the more regular 19 lines per page is at folio 47^{v} where the text concludes after 17 lines, although the ruling for the additional two lines is present. The grid is not clear from the first folio of Quire g, although later folios do show a grid enclosed on both sides by sets of double bounding lines. The text often spills into the right hand ruled margin.

Item 6 begins on folio 48^{r}, the first folio of Quire h, and concludes on folio 95^{v}, the final folio of Quire m. The writing grid varies from 80-92mm x *ca.* 60mm; the grid is not always clear.[78] The grid is enclosed by two sets of parallel vertical bounding lines and is placed close to the gutter of the folio. The horizontal lines are extended from the grid to the outer edge of the folio where pricking is often visible.[79] Pricking is also often visible, for the vertical lines, at the head and foot of the folios. The main text is placed within the grid, whilst marginal glosses (in the same hand) are placed on the lines in the exterior space. On the verso of the folios the process is the reverse, with the glosses placed on the left hand side with the ruled grid, once more, set close to the gutter. The glosses often overlap the grid, which is never fully utilised.[80] The number of lines per page varies in number from 21 lines to 26 lines per page.[81] Item 6 has been completed on folio 96^{r} (the first folio of Quire n) in a later hand. Folio 96^{v} has been left blank and is followed by a further 11 blank folios completing Quire n.

Item 7 begins on folio 97^{r}, the first folio of Quire o, and runs until folio 110^{v}/9. The writing grid measures 102-105mm x 48-50mm. The grid runs down the centre of the folio to the very bottom with significant spaces left on either side. It is enclosed on either side by a single bounding line. Item 7 is written in half-lines with every initial letter of a couplet (every

[78] The best examples of its layout can be seen on folios 56^{r}-56^{v} and folio 95^{r}.
[79] See, for example, folio 95^{r}.
[80] See, for example, folio 95^{r}.
[81] Folio 48^{r} has 21 lines per page; folios 48^{v}-55^{v} have 23 lines per page; folios 56^{r}-63^{v}, 64^{v}-68^{v}, 69^{v}-77^{r}, 78^{r}, 79^{r}-87^{v} have 24 lines per page; folios 69^{r}, 78^{v}, 88^{r}-96^{r} have 25 lines per page; folios 64^{r} and 77^{v} have 26 lines per page.

4th line) capitalized and placed outside the grid. The text is written above the top line. Item 7 concludes on line 9 with the title for Item 8 following directly after on line 10. The *Conduct of Life* has 28 lines per page throughout, except at folio 110^{v} where it concludes on line 9 and is followed by a title for Item 8, a one line gap and then a further 16 lines, giving a total of 27 lines.

Item 8 ignores the left-hand vertical line of the previous item and begins close to the gutter of the folio. The item continues for a further 16 lines (main body of text) and almost to the bottom of the folio - although the final line is not written on. Folio 111^{r} is blank.

Item 9 begins on folio 111^{v} and concludes on the recto of the following folio. The writing grid is 98mm x *ca.* 80mm and is ruled for 26 lines, although there are only 14 lines of verse on folio 112^{r} spread across 17, as the writing often goes across two lines as the scribe becomes inconsistent. The grid is ruled from the left-hand edge of the folios to a vertical line that signifies the right hand edge of the ruled grid. Folio 112^{v} has been left blank.

Quire p, which is made up of two folios followed by two stubs, has been left blank except for the modern numbering at folios 113^{r} and 114^{r}.

3(d). Textual Presentation.

Item I begins with an enlarged, ornate and decorated letter D in blue with a red floral interior, red disks and red tendrils; the remainder of the word, 'DIGNVM', is capitalized and coloured green. Other 'key words' in the incipit are also capitalized and coloured green or red.[82]

[82] See VERE (Line 1) and GRATISS (line 7).

There are further occasional examples of rubrication and illuminated letters throughout this item.[83]

Initial letters of words beginning sentences are capitalized, single-line height, coloured red or green alternately, and set in the ruled left hand margin.[84] Later in the same item these initial letters alternate between red and blue,[85] alternate between red and black,[86] and are written in red only.[87] Some of the initial letters that begin sentences have also been given flourishes.[88] In addition, a considerable number of sentences throughout the item are underlined in red to draw attention to their significance.

Each of the Items 2i-2vi begin with an enlarged letter, two lines, in red, with tendrils and further examples of decoration extending from the ascenders or descenders.[89] Each of the items is linked by the word '*Alia*', written in red at the conclusion of the previous item, but corresponding to the next.[90] There are also three occasions within Items 2i-2vi where an enlarged terronian nota, touched red in two instances, can be found in the margin at the beginning of an item.[91] Further capital letters in Item 2i are also often touched red. At the conclusion to Item 2 (folio 38^{r}/25) 'explic' has been written in black ink and then crossed through in red.

---

[83] Folio 3^{v}/17-18: '**explpma | pyodus. incip. u.'** in red; folio 3^{v}/18: enlarged 'P', decorated and coloured green; folio 8^{v}/15 incipit in red; folio 8^{v}/16: enlarged 'I' in red with decorated tendrils; folio 26^{r}/16: half line gap, possibly left for an incipit that was never added; folio 26^{r}/16-17: enlarged, inset, 'h' in red; folio 29^{v}/5-6: enlarged, inset letter 'P' in red; folio 30^{r}/9: 'AMUS' is spread along the line in capitals; 30^{r}/10-11: enlarged letter 'S' in red.

[84] This continues throughout the item, although the writing is continuous so that the initial letter of a sentence often does not fall at the start of a new line, but still remains capitalized and coloured. There are occasions where initial letters have been added in black, most likely by mistake or because the rubricator has missed a guide letter, see, for example, folio 2^{v} Line 1, folio 23^{v} Lines 15, 16 and 17.

[85] Folio 19^{v}- folio 21^{r}; folio 22^{v} - folio 24^{r}; folio 25^{v} – folio 27^{r}; folio 28^{v} – folio 29^{v}.

[86] Folio 24^{v}.

[87] Folio 27^{v}, folio 28^{r}, and for part of folio 28^{v}.

[88] See, for example, 'U' on folio 6^{r} Line 1 and 'P' on Line 7; 't' on folio 12^{r} Line 19, and two examples of 'p' on Line 20; 'A' on folio 13^{r} Line 9 and 'p' on Line 20.

[89] Folio 31^{r}/1: 'P', extending above the top line and with the stem descending down the outside of the grid with a tendril extending from its finish that turns into a flourish of flowers; folio 32^{r}/4: 'M' set into the text at the left hand margin, with the left-hand leg and foot descending down the margin, finishing with a flourish; folio 33^{v}/20: 'M' set into the text at the left hand margin; folio 35^{r}/21: 'B' set into the text at the left-hand margin; folio 36^{v}/8: 'N' set into the text with a tale that runs down the margin; folio 37^{v}/9: 'A' set into the text with a foot that descends down the margin and ends with a flourish.

[90] Folio 32^{r}/3; folio 33^{v}/19; folio 35^{r}/20; folio 36^{v}/7; folio 37^{v}/8.

[91] Folio 33^{v}; the top right of folio 35^{r}; folio 36^{v} (not touched in red).

Each of the *sententiae* of Item 3, which begins on folio 38^{v}/1, begin with a paragraph mark '¶' or variant thereof, touched in red, with some of the capitals for this item also touched red. Item 4, which begins and ends on folio 40^{v} has no decoration or rubrication.

Item 5 is made up twenty paragraphs of theological *varia.* Each of these paragraphs begins with a capitalized initial letter, placed in the left-hand margin and a paragraph mark placed outside the grid to indicate each new beginning.[92]

Item 6, folios 48^{r}-95^{v}, begins with an enlarged letter 'H', three lines high, in red with an ascender reaching up the page. Further enlarged, usually of two lines, and coloured letters begin new sections throughout the item, alternating between either red and green, or red and blue, with further occasional decoration of ascenders and descenders. Marks for the rubricator can also be found accompanying many of these initial letters.[93] In addition to these initial letters, folio 48^{r} has variations on the paragraph mark written in the gutter of the folio. If not illuminated then the initial letter of each line is capitalized and placed similarly within the first set of vertical ruled lines.[94]

Item 7 begins with an enlarged letter 'I', positioned outside of the grid and running doen the folio, in red. Every initial letter of the couplet (every fourth line as the piece is written in half lines) is capitalized, touched red and set outside of the writing grid. The final line of the item, folio 110^{v}/9, is A~M~E~N, capitalized and spread across the line. Item 8 has no decoration or rubrication.

[92] These initials and paragraph marks can be located at: folio 41^{r}/1; folio 41^{v}/19; folio 42^{r}/9, 11, 14 and 18; folio 43^{v}/1 and 13; folio 44^{r}/16, folio 44^{v}/1, 8 and 12; folio 45^{r}/1, 6 and 12; folio 46^{r}/4; folio 46^{v}/6 and 16; folio 47^{r}/7; and folio 47^{v}/6.
[93] For example, 'H' on folio 52^{r}/14; 'N' on folio 55^{r}/12; 'M' on folio 57^{r}/13; 'Ỳ' on folio 58^{r}/13; 'I' on folio 76^{r}/1 etc.
[94] See the section on 'Writing Grid' for a description of the marginal glosses which are an integral part of the layout and presentation of this item.

Item 9 is made up of quatrains with the first and fourth lines linked by a wavy joining line in the same hand. Furthermore, the second and third lines of the quatrains are similarly linked by another pair of lines extending from the grid.

3(e). Scribes.

Digby contains eight hands according to Hill and corroborated by my own research:[95] Hand A writes Item 1; Hand B writes Items 2-4; Hand C writes Item 5, Hand D writes Item 6 which is completed by Hand E; Hand F writes Item 7; Hand G writes Item 8 and Hand H writes Item 9. Ker dates Hand D to the early twelfth century; Hand A to the late 12th century and the other six hands to the early thirteenth century.[96]

Each of the main texts within the manuscript occupies its own quire(s) with Items 8 and 9 being added to the blank folios left at the conclusion to Item 7. This, alongside the differing mis-en-page and the different scribes of the Digby Manuscript, suggests that the texts were not brought together until a later date. The individual texts should, therefore, be viewed, in the first instance, as pamphlets or individual units that have been brought together by a later compiler.

3(f). Pagination and Foliation.

The manuscript is numbered throughout in modern Arabic numerals beginning with the 2nd quire, Quire b, where Item I begins. The two parchment fly leaves and the first quire, Quire a, are marked with Roman numerals. An even later hand than that which was responsible for the modern pagination of the remainder of the manuscript completes the numbering on the blank folios 113-114.

[95] Hill 1970-72, p. 274.
[96] Hill 1970-72, p. 274.

3(g). Contemporary and later additions.

The manuscript is relatively unadorned with few contemporary or later additions. Those present are set out below:

A later hand, writing in black ink, gives Item I the title, 'Tractetus super canonem misse', with 'Thome de Stureya' written below this in brown ink.[97] There was originally text written in black ink at the top of folio 1^{r}, where Item I begins, but it has since been crossed through and is now illegible. The following quire marks are visible at the bottom, centre of the beginnings of gatherings: 'a' at folio 1^{r}; 'c' at folio 9^{r}; 'e' at folio 23^{r}; and 'f' at folio 31^{r}.

On folio 25^{r}, where damage has occurred to the manuscript, there is a mark placed next to the partly destroyed initial letter 'S'. The mark is repeated on the top-right of the folio with a letter 'S' below it, indicating to the reader that the damaged letter is 'S'.

At the top of folio 31^{r}, the beginning of Item 2, in brown ink, a later hand wrongly attributes the following item to: 'Gwaltirus mahap Archidiaconus Oxon.' Items 2i-2iii are heavily glossed and emended throughout in the same later hand.

3(h). Provenance.

Very little is known about the early provenance of Digby.[98] It would seem, from a comparison between the quiring and the contents - discussed previously, that independent works of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries were brought together in one volume.[99] It is certain that this volume of works was together and at Christchurch, Canterbury by the early

[97] See section on 'Provenance' for Thomas of Sturry.
[98] The following description of known provenance draws heavily on, and summarizes, the work of Hill 1970-72, pp. 275ff and Ker 1936, pp. 115-120.
[99] See also Hill 1970-72, p. 275.

fourteenth century at the latest as it is catalogued as being amongst the contents of one of Henry of Eastry's books.[100]

The first known owner of Digby was Thomas of Sturry (senior), whose name was added in brown ink to folio iv^{r}. Sturry entered Christ Church about the middle of the thirteenth century and was the sub-prior there by 1270,[101] although, it is unclear as to whether he himself collected the items contained within the manuscript or what their sources were.

It is Ker's opinion that a fragmentary version of the Early Middle English *Proverbs of Alfred*, MS Cotton Galba A. XIX, once formed part of Digby.[102] It would seem that the *Proverbs* were the final item in Digby until at least 1622, when they appear as part of the manuscript in Twyne's catalogue of Allen's manuscripts.[103] They are, therefore, likely to have become detached from Digby and formed part of Sir Robert Cotton's collection at some point between the creation of Twyne's catalogue in 1622 and Cotton's death in 1631.[104] The *Proverbs* were certainly not with Digby when it arrived, bound and stamped, at the Bodleian Library in 1634. The 'velam guilt' catalogue, which accompanied the manuscript to the Bodleian, MS. Digby 234a, p. 28, included the *Conduct of Life*, described as 'Rythmi quidam Anglosaxonica', and is followed immediately by the *Proverbs*, listed as 'Alfredi Regis Parabolae Saxonice'.[105] However, Gerard Langbaine, who collated the manuscript against Twyne's own description, at the time of arrival, added '[Non comparent.]' against the *Proverbs*. Hill, therefore, believes that the *Proverbs* probably reached Cotton about 1628 when Richard James became his librarian.[106]

[100] Hill 1977, p. 109.
[101] Hill 1970-72, p. 277.
[102] Firstly in Ker 1936, pp. 115-120, and then again in Ker 1964, p. 38, fn. 6, where he states that 'B.M., Cotton Galba A. xix and Bodleian, Digby 4 formed one volume.'
[103] See Ker 1936, p. 116, fn. 4, and Hill 1970-72, p. 275.
[104] Hill 1970-72, p. 275.
[105] Hill 1970-72, pp. 275-276.
[106] Hill 1970-72, p. 275.

Apart from this association Hill details three other connections between the *Proverbs of Alfred* and the *Conduct of Life*: Jesus includes both the *Proverbs* and the *Conduct* in the same hand; Maidstone MS. A 13 includes, on folio 93^{r}, a shortened version of the *Proverbs* and two lines from the *Conduct of Life*; and, the *Proverbs* in the Maidstone MS and Cambridge, Trinity College MS. B.14.39 and the *Conduct of Life* in McClean are associated with a series of Old English letter forms accompanied by their names.[107]

3(j). Binding.

The binding of Digby is seventeenth century[108] with two clasps attached to the upper board and two corresponding pins attached to the bottom. The manuscript is very tightly bound. The binding is stamped front and back with the arms of Sir Kenelm Digby.

3(h). Condition.

The manuscript is, on the whole, in a very good condition with very little in the way of holing, worming or tears. However, some limited holing and worming can be found at folio iii^{r}, folio 18^{r},[109] and folio 21^{r}.[110] The top-left corner of folio 28^{r} has been torn, destroying most of the first line.[111] The outer corners of Item I have been cut diagonally, but this is a stylistic feature rather than damage.

3(i). Shelf Marks

[107] Hill 1970-72, p. 278.
[108] Hill 1970-72, p. 273.
[109] A small hole, that does not interfere with the text, left of centre at the bottom of the folio with the reverse visible at 18^{v}.
[110] This is found at lines 15-17, with the scribe has written around the hole and the reverse on folio 21^{v}.
[111] A mark below the tear corresponds to a mark on the right of the folio where a later hand inserts the missing line by writing down the margin of the folio. On folio 28^{v} (the reverse) the same is true with the same later hand adding the missing line to the outer margin of Line 1.

There are several shelf marks and indications of ownership on the opening folios of the manuscript. On the inside front board there is the initials and numbers 'S.C 1605' printed on a modern label and affixed top-left. Located centrally on the upper half of the same board and written in black ink are the initials and number: 'K. D. 4'. Below this, written in pencil, is written 'MS. Digby 4.' A further pressmark, 'A.127.11', can be found at the top/centre of folio iii^{r}.[112] On folio i^{r}, in black ink, is written 'Thom: de Sturey', earliest known owner and sub-Prior of Christchurch toward the end of the thirteenth century,[113] and on folio ii^{r}, below the 'A. 127.11 ' pressmark, is written: 'Richard Late Warr' - partly erased but referring to Richard Lateware *c* 1563/4-1601, Fellow of St John's College, Oxford.

3(j). Surrogate Descriptions.

Hill 1970-72; Macray 1883.

[112] Digby 4 is item '11' in Bodl. MS. Wood F. 26, Brian Twyne's 'Catalogus Manusciptorum in Bibliotheca m^{ri} Tho: Allen Aulae Gloc: Oxon a^{o} D.^{o} 1622', p. 30, see also Hill 1970-72, p. 280, *n.* 28.
[113] See section on 'provenance', and Hill 1970-72, p. 280, *n.* 29.

4. British Library MS Egerton 613

Parchment. s. xiii and four folios of fragments s. xv^2. Size of Leaves: 220 x 145 as cropped.

British Library MS Egerton 613 is a composite manuscript containing English, Anglo-Norman, Continental French and Latin.

4(a) Contents.[114]

I. Folio 1^v, Somer is comen ȝ winter gon. *A Springtide Song of the Redemption*, *A Song on the Passion* or *An Easter Song*. English verse written in long lines. IMEV 3221. DIMEV 5051. Ed. Brown 1932: 108-113, no. 54; eds. Luria and Hoffman 1974: 199-201, no. 205; Ed. Morris 1872: 197-9, no.30; Ed. Sisam 1970: 17-19, no. 12. For description and commentary see Hill 1978a: 397.

2. Folio 2^r/1-20, Of on þat is so fayr and briȝt. *Of One that is so Fair and Bright* or *A Song to the Virgin*. English and Latin verse written in long lines. IMEV 2645. DIMEV 4198. Ed. Brown 1932: 24-27, no. 17. Ed. Morris 1872: 194-5, no. 28; Ed. Sisam 1970: 19-21, no. 13. For Description and commentary see Hill 1978a: 397.

3. Folios 2^r/21 - 2^v/12, [I] blessed beo þu lauedi ful of houene. *A Prayer to the Mother of Mildness* or *A Prayer to the Virgin*. English Verse written as prose. IMEV 1407, DIMEV2341. Ed. Brown 1932: 111-113, no. 55. Ed. Morris 1872: 196-6, no. 29. For Description and commentary see Hill 1978a: 397-398.

4. Folio 2^v/13-24, En une matine me leuoye. *Chanson amoureuse de Notre Seigneur*. Anglo-Norman verse written as prose. For Description and commentary see, Langfors 1917: 138; Vising 1923: no. 232; Legge 1963: 350-1, Hill 1978a: 398.

[114] Many of the English lyrics/verse (Items 1, 2 &3) in this manuscript have multiple published editions. This description gives reference to some of these, but the list is not comprehensive. A fuller bibliography can be found on the DIMEV, when searched for by either the number or the first line.

5. Folio 2^{v}/25-29, litel up it eniman. *Love Song of Our Lady*. English Verse written as prose. IMEV 1923. DIMEV 3138. Ed. Brown 1932: 236. For Description and commentary see Hill 1978a: 398.

6. Folios 3^{r}-6^{r}, [S]aluz e solaz en ihesu cryst. 'Salut et solace par l'amour de Jésu'. Anglo-Norman prose with Latin quotations and English phrases. DIMEV 6681. Ed. Hill 1978b: 492-501.

7. Folio 6^{v}/1-20, Costi Regis filia. tua te familia. *Catharina virgo pura*. Latin verse written as prose. Ed. H. A. Daniel, 1844: no. 266; S. Gaselee,1928: no. 77. For description and commentary see, Szövéry, 1964-65: 230; Hill 1978a: 398.

8. Folio 6^{v}/21-42, De une pucele | chanteray. *Prière à Sainte Catherine d' Alexandrie*. Anglo-Norman verse (carol) written as prose. Jeanroy, 1918: 23; Vising, 1923: no. 204; H. Spanke,1955: no. 1385a; Sonet, 1956: no. 2142; Sinclair, 1978: no. 2669. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 398.

9. Folios 7^{r}-12^{v}, Ic æm elder þan ic wæs. *Conduct of Life* . English verse. IMEV 1272. DIMEV 2113. Ed. Morris 1867, p. 288-295.

10. Folios 13^{r}-13^{v}/13, Ceo dist sainz Gregoires. kar mult est ma | ueis li conuers de mulz. *Dits moraux*. Eighteen pronouncements in French prose, attributed to great men, including Gregory, Augustine, David, Clement, Bede, Solomon, Jerome and Seneca. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 398.

11. Folios 13^{v}/14-21^{r}/11, **Ici commence la | reuelaciun** (Red, in outer margin). Cume ceo orient li iudeu que Ioseph aueit requis le | cors ihesu. *L'Évangile de Nicodème*. French prose. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 398-399.

12. Folios 21^{r}/12-25^{r}/7, **Ici comencet la ueniance de mort nostre | ¶ seignur** Quant tyberius fud emperes de rume. fud ihesus tra|iz par les iudeus. *La Venjance de Nostre Seignur*. French prose. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 399-400; Ford, 1993.

13. Folios 25^{r}/8-27^{v}/24, **Ici cumencet cum faitement la saincte croiz | fu troue | al mund de caluarie p[a]r heleine la reine.** (rubrication squeezed into outer margin) **D**eus cent aunz e trente apres la passiun nostre | seignur. *L'Invention de la Sainte Croix*. French prose. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 400.

14. Folios 27^{v}/25-29^{v}/9, **Ici comencet lestoire del exaltaciun de la sai |nte cruiz. E**N icel tens puis que costentins veu out le signe de | la cruiz. *L'Exaltation de la Sainte Croix*. French prose. Folio 28 is fragmentary, leaving 14 complete lines present on the recto and 13 on the verso. The item contains 77 complete lines, although it probably had approximately 115 when written. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 400-401.

15. Folio 29^{v}/10ff, **A**Nne e emerge furent sorurs. *La Legende des Trois Maries*. French prose. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 401-402; Hoops, 1925, 105-129.

16. Folio 30^{r}, **O**Re OEZ les quinze signes des iurz deuant le iuR de Juise. *Les Quinze Signes du Jugement Dernier*. French prose. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 402.

17. Folio 30^{v}, De la soryte Ne dige mye. *La Souris*. Anglo-Norman verse. For description with commentary, see Langfors, 1917: 85; Vising, 1923: no. 271; Hill 1978a: 402.

18. Folios 31^{r}-58^{v}, [Qui] bien comence 7 ben define. Guillaume le clerc's *Bestiaire*. French verse written in double column and illustrated throughout. Ed. Reinsch, *Bestiaire*; for description with commentary, see Langfors, 1917: 312; Legge, 1963: 207-8; Hill 1978a: 402.

19. Folios 59^{r}-64^{r}/7, **D**ame. amie. fille. sorur. *Les Quatre Titres d'une Nonne*. Anglo-Norman verse. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 402-404.

20. Folios 64[r]/9-70[v], Ich æm elder þen ich wes. *Conduct of Life* . English verse. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 404.

21. Folios 71-74. Twenty-three Medical Recipes. English prose with headings in a large script. For description and commentary see, Hill 1978a: 404. Recipes are as follows:

Folio 71[r]. 1. [F]Orto chace out þe goute in what so | euer he be. fro place to place.

2. [F]Or þe goute a medecyn.

3. [A]noþer medecyn for the same.

4. [A]noþer for þe same euelle.

Folio 71[v]. 5. [F]or a man þat hathe pe pestilence. e|velle. þat is þe boche.

6. [F]Or þe same anoþer.

7. [F]Orto breke a boche sodenly.

Folio 72[r]. 8. [F]Or þe ȝoluwold a medecyn.

9. [F]Or þe same euelle anoþer.

10. [F]Or þe same euelle anoþer.

11. [F]Or a man þat haþe þe palesye for a me|decyn þerfore.

Folio 72[v]. 12. [F]or þe same euelle anoþer.

13. [F]or þe same euelle a medecyn.

Folio 73[r]. 14. [F]Or scabbe on a mannes body. | ycheye sor 7 sal eþe awey. a me|decyn.

15. [F]Or ache in mannes shulderon or | in his armes or in his senues.
16. [F]Or scabbe an handes þorou claw|yns in a mannes slepe. a medecyn.

Folio 73v.

17. [F]or werton [*sic*] on mannes handes or | scabbe.
18. [F]Or swellying of nayles.
19. [F]Or sor þies þat greuen so|r. 7 listeþe men to goun 7 to wirche.
20. [A]nd þy þyes be swollen beneþ þe | kne or to broken.
21. [F]Or kneu þat be swollon harde.

Folio 74r.

22. [F]Or þe same euelle anoþer.
23. [F]Or to don awey anon þe quakyng of | þe feuer of a man or woman oþer |childe.

4(b). Collation.

Folios ix + 74 + ix (there is a stiffer leaf with marble patterning, corresponding to pastedowns, on either side of the fly-leafs). **I**^{6} (folios 1-6), **II**^{8} (folios 7-14), **III**^{6} (folios 15-20), **IV**^{8} (folios 21-28), **V**^{6} (folios 29-34), **VI-VIII**^{8} (folios 35-58), **IX**^{12} (folios 59-70), folios 71-74 are fragments, 130 x 95, pasted on to a paper strip, s.xix, 40mm wide. All quires are arranged with like surfaces facing, with flesh outside the first sheets of all quires.

4(c). Writing Grid.

Item I has 32 lines and occupies two thirds of folio 1^{v}. The writing grid for 1^{v} is 122mm x 105mm at the longest line (Line 31). There is no visible pricking or ruling on the folio and the text slopes from top-left to bottom-right – so that the word in final position is 10mm closer to the bottom of the folio than the word which begins the final line. The remainder of folio 1^{v} is left blank.

Folio 2^{r} has a total writing grid of 178mm x 110mm and has 36 lines. 98mm of this total (20 lines) is given over to Item 2, with a one line gap before Item 3 begins. The text of Item 3, which occupies 16 lines (76mm), expands along the line, so that there is a gradual slope of the text from top-left to bottom-right, causing the grid to be 6mm larger at the outer margin than at the inner. There are no physical signs of either ruling or pricking.

Folio 2^{v} has the concluding 12 lines of Item 3 and the entirety of Item 4 (12 lines) and Item 5 (five lines). The total writing grid for folio 2^{v} is 134mm x 105mm, with 29 lines in total, leaving about a third of the page (65mm) blank. Item 4 has a slight slope up and to the right which becomes significant by the end of Item 5, which is written in the same hand. There is no evidence of pricking or ruling.

Item 6 occupies folios 3^{r}-6^{r}, with a writing grid normally 155-168mm x 80-94mm.[115] Item 6 typically has 34 lines per page.[116]

Items 7 and 8 occupy folio 6^{v}. The writing grid totals 185mm x 100mm with 41 lines per page. 20 lines belong to Item 7, which has a writing area of 110mm x 90mm, and 21 lines, 75mm x 100mm, belong to Item 8. There is no gap between the end of Item 7 and the beginning of Item 8. The text for Item 8 runs up and to the right. The text on folio 6^{r} is

[115] Except at folio 6^{r} where the prose concludes and the grid is, therefore, smaller at 145mm.
[116] With the exception of folio 5^{v} which has 33 lines and folio 6^{r} where there are 29 lines plus a line gap followed by a two-line colophon.

surrounded by a double lined margin, ruled in plummet and not ink, which runs around the edge of the page, but does not extend to the inner margin or gutter.

Folios 7^{r}-12^{v}, which houses Item 9, has a writing grid of 176-185mm x 85-105mm,[117] and has between 30 and 36 lines per page.[118]

Folios 13^{r} -30^{r} (Items 10-16) have a reasonably regular writing grid of 178-182mm x 95-102mm.[119] The items written here have between 31 and 37 lines per page, with 33 being the more regular.[120] The ruled grid is occasionally visible.[121]

Folio 30^{v} (Item 17) has a writing grid of 150mm x 110mm containing 19 long-lines of Anglo-Norman verse. There are two line spaces left between lines 1 and 2, and lines 2 and 3. Pricking is visible in the outer margin. The lines for Item 17 usually have a mid-line punctum (except at lines 10, 17 and 18).

Item 18 occupies folios 31^{r}-58^{v} and is written in double column. It has a ruled grid (visible throughout) with double bounding lines at the inner and outer margins as well as down the centre of the page, dividing the columns. The grid varies little from 170-175mm x 100-105mm, with pricking visible in the outer margin throughout the item.

The item contains 35 brown ink drawings, set within a box with double framing lines, corresponding to the text. Each of these drawings take up 8-10 lines (10 being the norm) and are contained within the relevant column.[122] The number of lines per page for this item is between

[117] Folio 12^{v} is an exception to this as it contains the conclusion to the item and, therefore, the grid is only 151mm in length.
[118] Folios 10^{r}-11^{v} have 32 lines per page; folios 7^{r}-7^{v} and 9^{v} have 33 lines per page; folios 8^{r}-8^{v} and 12^{v} have 35 lines per page; folio 9^{v} has 36 lines per page and folio 12^{v} (conclusion) has 30 lines per page.
[119] With the exception of folio 13^{v} where it is slightly wider (110mm) and folio 30^{r} where item 16, which only has 24 lines, has the page to itself – resulting in a smaller grid with a length of 144mm.
[120] Folios 14^{r} and 29^{v} have 31 lines per page; folios 14^{v}, 20^{r}, 22^{r}-23^{r}, 25^{r}, 27^{r} and 29^{r} have 32 lines per page; folios 15^{r}-15^{v}, 16^{v}, 18^{v}-19^{r}, 20^{v}, 21^{v}, 24^{r}, 26^{v}, 27^{v} have 33 lines per page; folios 16^{r}, 17^{v}-18^{r}, 19^{v}, 24^{v}, 25^{v}-26^{r} have 34 lines per page; folio 21^{r} has 35 lines per page; folio 13^{v} has 36 lines per page; folio 13^{r} has 37 lines per page. Folio 28 has 14 full lines and 9 fragmentary lines on the recto and 13 full lines and 9 fragmentary lines on the verso due to damage to the folio.
[121] See, for example, folios 15^{v}, 16^{r}, 24^{r} and 25^{r}-26^{v}.
[122] Occasionally the frame of the illumination drops below the outer writing grid if at the conclusion of a column. See, folio 38^{r}.

38 and 44, with 40 being the normal.[123] Lines often extend into the margin or gutter and occasionally lines are written either above or below the ruled grid.

Folios 59^{r}- 70^{v} (Quire 9: Items 19 and 20) have a writing grid of 165-170mm x 120-125mm. The text is written in single column, framed by double bounding lines. For Item 19 there are 26 lines per page except at folios 60^{v} and 61^{r} where an extra line sits below the writing grid. Seven lines conclude the text on folio 64^{r} before the beginning of Item 20 after a one line gap filled with a red pattern acting as a division. Item 20 also has 26 lines per page until folio 65^{v} ff., where an extra line is added above the writing grid.

Folios 71^{r}-74^{v} are fragments, s.xix, measuring 130mm x 90mm, pasted on to a paper strip which measures 40mm wide.

4(d). Textual Presentation.

Items 1 and 2 have paragraph markings (//), in the outer margin, to indicate the beginning of each new quatrain.[124] Quatrains are also indicated by string or broken lines, in the first quatrain of folio 1^{v}, running from the final word or punctuation to a point (o) of the inner margin. Items 3-5 have no features of presentation that need further comment.

Item 6, folios 3^{r}-6^{v}, has several spaces left for rubricated or decorated letters which were never added, including a six line space for [S] at the beginning of the item.[125]

Item 9 begins on folio 7^{r} with an enlarged and decorated letter 'I' in red, which runs down the inside margin; following this illuminated letter, every second line of Item 9 (folios 7^{r}-12^{v}) begins with an enlarged and coloured letter, which alternates between being coloured red

[123] Folio 31^{r} has 39 lines; folios 31^{v}-34^{v} have 38 lines; folios 35^{r}-56^{r} have 40 lines; folios 56^{v}-57^{r} have 48 lines; folios 57^{v}-58^{r} have 44 lines; and folio 58^{v} has 42 lines per page.
[124] On folio 1^{v}, only the last two markings are clearly visible because of damage and repair to the outer margin.
[125] On folio 4^{r}/20, spaces have been left for [A] and [M], mid-text, with guiding letters present in the margin. Similar examples can be found at folio 5^{r}, Lines 14, 17, and 20, and folio 5^{v}, Line 25.

and green.[126] Throughout this item, ascenders for the letters b, d, and þ are often elaborated with flourishes.[127]

Items 9-16 are written by the same hand and many of the decorative features are the same throughout these items. Item 10, folio 13^{r}, begins with an enlarged and decorated letter 'C' in red. Many of the letters that begin lines are either red or green and the occasional letter has been touched in red. On folio 13^{v} decorative ascenders are present on the top line. On the same folio a decoration of weaved red and green has been used to fill the remainder of Line 13.

The incipits and explicits for Items 11-14 were added in red after the main body of the text, and into spaces that were not big enough to accommodate them. They, therefore, often spill into the margins or onto several lines above and below and often run into each other.[128]

Item 11 (folio 13^{v}) begins with an enlarged letter 'C' in red with green decoration. The remainder of the item has occasional letters in red and green at the beginning of sentences, with other letters in opening position touched red; these decorative letters are less frequent than in Item 10. Decorative ascenders are also present at folios 15^{v} (touched red), 16^{r} and 18^{v}.

Item 12 begins on folio 21^{r}/12 with a large (three line) letter 'O' in red, with a tail that is ornately decorated and runs for a further ten lines down the gutter of the folio. Another enlarged (2 lines) 'O' in red, and with an eight line decorative tale, begins Line 15 of 22^{v}. Further, occasional, enlarged, red letters are found within the text, in initial positions. The Item

[126] Guiding marks for the rubricator can be found at folios 8^{r}, 9^{r}, 9^{v}, 10^{r}, 10^{v}, 11^{v} and 12^{v}.
[127] Examples can be found on folios 7^{v}, 8^{r}, 8^{v}, 9^{r}, 9^{v}, 11^{v} and 12^{r}.
[128] The incipit for Item 11 has been squeezed into the outer margin of folio 13^{v}: '**Ici commence la | reuelaciun**'. The incipit for Item 12 has been squashed onto Line 11 and spills on to line 12 of folio 21^{r}: '**Ici comencet la ueniance de mort nostre | seignur**'; a mark, added by the rubricator, indicates that 'seignur' belongs to the line above. The explicit for Item 12 and the incipit for Item 13 run into each other as the space at folio 25^{r}/5-6 is not large enough. Two words of the incipit for Item 13 spill on to the end of Line 7 and the remainder is found in the outer margin of Line 8: '**Ici finist la ueniance | de la mort nostre seignur**', with the incipit for Item 13 beginning straight after, where it continues to be written in the margin: '**Ici cumencet cum faitement la saincte croiz | fu troue | al mund de caluarie p|ar heleine la reine'.** The incipit of Item 14 runs into the gutter of Line 24 on folio 27^{v}; the remainder is squeezed in, directly below it, after Line 1 of the item (Line 25 on the folio): '**Ici comencet lestoire del exaltaciun de la sai|nte cruiz**'. The explicit for this item spills over into the gutter of folio 29^{v} on Lines 9 and 10: '**Ici finist del exaltaciun de la sainte cr|uiz**'.

concludes on folio 25r/5 with 'Amen', containing a stretched N. Occasional red letters can also be found, in initial positions, throughout the text of Item 13, which begins on folio 25r/8.

Item 14 begins on Line 25 with an enlarged (two lines) letter E in red, with some further letters in red and green present throughout the item. Decorated ascenders can also be seen on the top line of folio 29v. Item 15 begins on folio 29v/10 with an enlarged (two lines) 'S' in red. Item 16 begins folio 30r with an enlarged (two lines) letter 'O' in red; on the same line there are examples of decorated ascenders reaching the top of the folio.

Item 18 is missing an enlarged letter 'Q' at the beginning of folio 31ra - a six line space has been left. None of the rubrication has been added and there are, therefore, spaces for letters of two lines in height throughout the text, especially below the line drawings that make up this item.

The line drawings are as follows:[129]

Folio 31vb/21-31	1. Knight on left pierces lion (right) through neck.
Folio 33ra/20-30	2. Hunter (right) pierces antelope (*Aptalops*), which has its horns caught in a tree (left), through flank.
Folio 33rb/23-32	3. Man (left) and woman (right) standing in flames - firestones (*Dous Perres*).
Folio 33vb/11-20	4. The Saw Fish (*Serre*), a winged beast standing vertically on waves (left). Two men rowing in boat (right).

[129] This account of the line drawings in Item 18 is an adaptation of that found in F. M. McCulloch, *Medieval Latin and French Bestiaries,* University of North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, XXXIII (1962), 28-9, 59-60, 57, n.36, and verified by myself with any additional notes added.

Folio 34^{rb}/3-12	5. Caladrius, a bird, perched by the head of a sick man in bed and looking towards him: another caladrius perched at his feet (right) looks away.
Folio 34^{vb}/1-10	6. Pelican in piety.
Folio 35^{rb}/27-36	7. Night Raven/Screech-owl (*Nicticorace, freseie*)
Folio 35^{vb}/2-10	8. Eagle (*Aigle*) with fish in its beak.
Folio 36^{rb}/13-20	9. Phoenix (*Fenis*) surrounded by flames.
Folio 36^{vb}/23-32	10. Pair of hoopoes (*Hupe*) plucked by young.
Folio 37^{rb}/3-10	11. Ant hill (*Formi*)
Folio 38^{rb}/32-40	12. Siren (*Sereine*) with harp (left) next to three figures in a boat.
Folio 38^{vb}/21-30	13. Hedgehog (*Heriçon*).
Folio 39^{rb}/9-17	14. Ibis (*Ybex*) feeding in water.
Folio 40ra/34-40(+1)	15. Fox (*Gupil*) on back feigning death: bird pecking in his mouth.
Folio 40va/29-38	16. Unicorn (*Unicorne*) lays his head in a maid's lap: hunter pierces him.
Folio 41^{rb}/21-30	17. Beaver (*Bevre*) biting off his own glands. Hunter with horn (left) and two hounds.
Folio 42ra/1-10	18. Hyena (*Hyaine*) with right paw raised.
Folio 42va/7-14	19. Hydrus (*Idrus*) devouring corpse. Crocodile (*Crocadrille*) entering Hydrus at mouth and exiting from anus.

Folio 43ra/21-30	20. Hunter with horn (left): goat (*buc/chevre*) on hill (right).
Folio 43vb/13-22	21. Wild Ass (*Asne salvage*).
Folio 44va/1-10	22. Ape (*Singe*) holding tool (left).
Folio 44vb/9-18	23. Heron/coot? (*Fulicia*) on floating nest. The bird is unnamed.
Folio 45rb/3-12	24. Panther (*Pantere*) amongst beasts.
	24a. In the upper/outer margin of folio 45r there can also be found a winged dragon – which also corresponds to the text.
Folio 46va/23-34	25. Man in ship and another on the back of a whale (*Cetus*).
Folio 47rb/20-28	26. Partridge (*Perdriz*).
Folio 47vb/23-32	27. Three weasels (*Belette*): two of them nose to nose and Asp (*Aspis*). Man watches (left).
Folio 49ra/3-12	28. Ostrich (*Ostrice*).
Folio 49rb/33-40	29. Two turtle-doves (*Turtre*) in a tree.
Folio 50ra/9-16	30. Stag (*Cerf*).
Folio 50va/23-31	31. Left blank at time, should have a picture of the Salamander (*Salamandre*) – writing added in a later hand.
Folio 51ra/12-20	32. Dragon watches doves (*Colom*) in Paradixion tree.

Folio 52^{vb}/33-40 33. Elephant (*Olifont*).

Folio 53^{vb}/33-40 34. Mandrake (*Mandragoire*).

Folio 54^{rb}/33-40 35. Diamonds (*Aimant*).

The initial letter 'D' of Item 19 on folio 59r is enlarged (3 lines), and written in red. There are two further examples of enlarged (two lines) illuminated letters later in this text: they are both 'A' and are found at folio 61^{v}/21 and folio 65^{r}/2. All letters in opening positions at the beginning of each line are capitalized, placed in the margin and touched in red. Items 19 and 20 are divided by a one line, red, floral decoration.

Item 20 begins on folio 64^{r} with an enlarged letter 'I' written in red which extends for 4 lines down and into the gutter of the folio. As in Item 19, each new line of folio 64^{r} begins with a capitalized letter in the margin which is touched in red. From folio 64^{v} onwards the opening character of every second line is placed in the margin and written in red rather than being touched red. There are several enlarged (2 lines) letters written in red present in this item;[130] however, from folio 68^{r} onwards it is very hard to see the rubrication due to the discolouring of the parchment.

4(e). Scribes.

There are ten main hands throughout Egerton. Hand 1 (s. xiii^{1}) writes Items 19 and 20 which occupy Quire 9 (folios 59^{r}-70^{v}), and it would appear that the material contained within this quire pre-dates the remainder of the manuscript.[131] This quire was possibly brought together with the other items in the manuscript at a date later than at the time of composition. The quire contains a copy of the *Conduct of Life*, of which there is already a version present in the

[130] 'Þ' at folio 64^{v}/23; 'G' at folio 68^{r}/4; 'A' at folio 68^{r}/19; 'þ' at folio 69^{v}/26; 'M' at folio 70^{r}/17.
[131] Hill 1978a, p. 395.

manuscript. In this quire there are two items which occupy the entire quire and the hand, which wrote these items, does not write anything else. The discolouring of the final folios, especially folio 70^{r}, suggests that it was, at some time, exposed or unbound.[132]

Hands 2-8 write the bulk of the remainder of the manuscript and have been dated to s. iii^{med}.[133] Hand 2 writes Item 9-16 on folios 7^{r}-30^{r}; hand 3 writes Item I on folio 1^{v}; hand 4 writes Item 6 on folios 3^{r}-6^{r}; hand five writes Item 7 on folio 6^{v}; hand 6 writes Items 18 on folios 31^{r}-58^{v}; hand 7 writes Item 2 on folio 2^{r}. There are also three later hands: hand 8 writes Item 3 on folio 2^{r-v}, and can be dated to s. xiii^{2};[134] hand 9 writes Items 4 and 5 on folio 2^{v}, and Item 8 on folio 6^{v}; and hand 10 writes Item 17 on folio 30^{v}. Both Hands 9 and 10 can be dated to s.xiii^{ex}.[135]

4(f). Pagination and Foliation.

The s.xix fly-leaves are not numbered. The parchment leaves of the manuscript are numbered in pencil throughout, on the top right recto of each folio, from 1-74 in modern Arabic numerals.

4(g). Contemporary and later additions.

On the inner margin of folio 1^{v}, slightly obscured by the tight binding, a hand, dated as s.xiv,[136] writes in blank ink, 'ne mytte hit and hu let þe te …| al of blod'. This corresponds with Lines 43 and 53 of the text which were erased. On folio 31^{r} another hand, in brown ink, adds ' Ky' for the first letters of the *Bestiaire*, where it had initially been left out.

[132] Hill 1978a, p.397.
[133] Hill 1978a, p. 395.
[134] Hill 1978a, p. 396.
[135] Hill 1978a, p.396.
[136] Brown 1932, p. 110.

Also contained on folio 1^{v} is the following notation to a bailiff of a grange in a small script of s.xiii/xiv:[137]

> In suo negocio per diem. tolle virgas. Ante festum sancti … per i diem Exon | … ad uendendum auenas ante festum sancti … per i diem … aduendum auenas in die sancti vincenti

On folios 1^{r}, 40^{r} and 50^{v} there can be found, in a large script of the same hand, s.xiv^{1} additions to the manuscript.[138] On folio 1^{r} there are twenty lines of prose, with four or five lines left at the bottom of the page, possibly for further additions. Hill suggests that the Latin, Anglo-Norman and English additions present on this folio, and which form this Country Calendar, suggest that the scribe was trying his hand in the three different languages.[139] Hill draws particular attention to the English rhyming proverb, '¶Leef hen. Whanne| hue Leyth // Loth whanne hue clok seyth' and to the (South) Western form *hue* of the third person nominative singular feminine pronoun.[140]

At the bottom of folio 40^{r} the same scribe has added, '¶Le Baucyn fet le dowere p(ur) veire | Et la Gopil trote apres // e le chace aueyre'. This couplet, written in Anglo-Norman, was probably prompted by the bestiary account on the same folio of the fox's trick of feigning death to catch birds.[141] On folio 50^{v} the same scribe writes in the ruled frame for Picture 33 of the bestiary, left blank at the time of production, directly proceeding the account of the Salamander, ' Quatuor ex purís | vítam ducunt elementis | Camalian talpa; | marís allec aeris sala | ¶ mandra;'.[142] According to Hill, between the

[137] The dating of the hand and the transcription of the text, which is much abbreviated and difficult to decipher, is taken from Hill 1978a, p. 405.
[138] For the dating of this hand, see Hill 1978a, p. 405.
[139] Hill includes a transcription of this addition in full in Hill 1978a, p. 405, with full commentary.
[140] Hill 1978a, p. 406.
[141] Hill believes that this couplet indicates direct or indirect acquaintance with the account of the rivalry between the fox and the badger in *De rerum Proprietatibus*, compiled about 1230 by the Franciscan Bartholomaeus Anglicus. See Hill 1978a, p. 407
[142] The scribal paragraph mark preceeding 'mandra' indicates that it belongs to the line above.

eleventh and fifteenth-centuries accounts were common, with variation, of the four creatures that draw their life from the elements: the chameleon (air), the mole (earth), the herring (sea) and the salamander (fire).[143]

Folio 30^{v} has pen-trials, numbered from 1-10 in a s.xiii^{ex}/xiv^{1} hand of faded brown ink.[144]

4(h). Provenance.

On folio ii^{r} there are ink and pencil notes, in the hand of Sir Frederick Madden, Keeper of Manuscripts from 1837 to 1866,[145] that state that Egerton was purchased at Sotherby's in May 1836, having previously belonged to a William Bentham of Gower Street. A pencilled note, slightly cropped, on the verso of the first folio, also in the hand of Madden, gives details on the date and source of purchase. It also gives details on the poor state of repair that the manuscript was in when acquired by the British Museum.

It is very difficult to make a statement, with any certainty, regarding the history of this manuscript before this May 1836 date. The scribes of quires two to eight overlap between quires, therefore suggesting that these quires were together as part of the volume in the thirteenth century. The later additions on folios 1^{r}, 40^{r} and 50^{v}, in the same hand, s.xiv^{1}, show that by the time that the additions were made the first quire was with the second to eighth quires.[146] The same hand that writes the later additions on Quire 1 is also evident in Quires 6 and 7.

Quire 9 contains one of the two versions of the *Conduct of Life*; the other version begins Quire 2. According to Hill's analysis, these items (9 and 20) 'are independent copies of the same

[143] Hill 1978a, p. 408.
[144] Hill 1978a, p. 405.
[145] This hand was identified by Dr. Willets, as published by Hill (Hill 1978a, p. 408).
[146] Hill 1978a, p. 409.

exemplar, and both show distinctive South-western linguistic features.'[147] However, additional evidence based on the content and the language of the manuscript points to the (South) West Midlands rather than to the South West.[148] Hill believes that the reason that both versions of the same text are included in the manuscript is to preserve Item 19, which is on the same quire and is in the same hand as the incomplete version of the *Conduct* which follows it.[149] Item 9, although later, is a more complete version of the text and is written in a more assured hand. Hill contends that Item 9 was copied in place of Item 20, implying that the ninth quire was also part of the thirteenth-century volume, and was therefore also brought together with the first quire by the mid-fourteenth century.[150]

The contents of Egerton suggest a compiler with an interest in Anglo-Norman devotional literature with continental French affiliations.[151] It is unclear, however, whether the manuscript, was ever in the hands of a female religious house or a male devotional community responsible for the wellbeing of their Sisters.[152]

4(i). Binding.

Tight; s.xix^{2} and s.xx$^{in.}$ Half-morocco.[153]

The notes, in ink and pencil, on ii^{r} and the s.xix flyleaves, would suggest that the manuscript was rebound shortly after the British Museum acquired it for their collection.[154] There are no records of binding work on manuscripts of the British Museum before the 1880s.

[147] Hill 1978a, p. 409.
[148] Hill points to the regional associations of the English proverb on folio 1^{r} and the addition on folio 50^{v} as further evidence of this point. She also cites the inclusion of the *Bestiaire* of Guillaume le clerc, who apparently lived in Coventry and Lichfield and the similarity between the content of Item 6 and contemporary devotional English prose as further evidence of a (South) West Midlands origin for the manuscript. (Hill 1978a, p. 409).
[149] Hill 1978a, p. 409.
[150] Hill 1978a, p. 409.
[151] See Hill 1978a, p. 409.
[152] Hill 1978a, p. 409.
[153] Hill 1978a, p. 395.
[154] Hill 1978a, p. 408.

The manuscript was partially re-covered in July, 1919, in half-morocco. It is possible to distinguish the s.xix[2] binding from the later re-cover, both on the spine and at the corners.[155]

The cover has been embossed with a coat of arms denoting the Egerton collection with the words *Sic Donec* (so far, so good) below.

4(j). Condition.

The amount of patching and mending strips that have been used on Egerton suggests that the manuscript was left a long time without repair.[156] The damage is as follows:

On the first folio the bottom outer corner has been torn away and patched with mixed parchment. The upper outer margin of folio 1 has also been patched on the verso. Folios 2-17 have been patched on their bottom-right corners. Staining on folio 2^{r}, corresponding to the section missing from folio 1 reinforces the assertion that the manuscript was a significant time without repair. The staining is substantial on the recto and verso of the first folio and the recto of the second. The damage to folios becomes less as folios 2-17 progress. Folio 14 is patched all the way down the outer margin. Folio 28 has suffered major damage with over half of the bottom section of the leaf missing entirely; a patch of 160mm x 140mm has been used to repair this folio.

There is also further minor damage throughout the remainder of the manuscript:
Folio 30, has a small patch at the bottom, outer margin. The bottom corner and outer margin of folio 31 has been patched on the verso. The bottom outer corner and lower outer margin of folio 32 has been patched on the recto. Folio 48 has had its bottom, outer corner and the mid to upper, outer margin patched on its recto. The outer margins of folio 51^{v} and folio 52^{r} have been

[155] Hill 1978a, p. 395.
[156] See also Hill 1978a, p. 397.

patched. Folio 53 has been patched on the verso of its lower outer margin and folio 54 has been patched on the recto of its lower outer margin.

Further minor patching can be found on the bottom-right corner of folios 56-59 and folios 62, 64 and 67. Much of the remainder of the manuscript, up to Quire 9, has very minor, almost imperceptible patching, throughout.[157] The final four folios of Quire 9 are stained, especially on the verso. Folios 69^{v} and 70^{v} are badly stained, with the text being difficult to read on folio 70^{v} because of the discolouring.

The last six folios of Quire 9 have suffered from worming as have the first leaves of the manuscript.

4(k). Shelf Marks.

Red stamps of the Egerton collection, British Museum are present at folio 1^{v} and at folio 74^{v}.

4(l). Surrogate Descriptions.

Hill 1978a.

[157] See folio 35^{v}, folio 36^{r}, folio 36^{v} and folios 40-47.

5. Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, Part II

Parchment. s.xiii^{ex}. Size of Leaves: 185 x 142 as cropped.

A tri-lingual anthology of individual texts from various sources. The codex contains a diverse range of texts written in English, ranging from secular debate to religious visions, lyrics, lives of saints and the *Conduct of Life.*

5(a). Contents.

I. Folios 144^{r}-155^{r}/5, **Ici cumence la passyun ihesu crist en engleys. Incipit prologus.** | Ihereþ nv one lutele tale. þat ich eu wille telle. | As we vyndeþ hit iwrite. in þe godspelle. *The Passion of Our Lord*. English verse. IMEV 1441. DIMEV 2431. Ed. Morris 1872: 37-57, no 1.

2. Folios 156^{r}-168^{v}/10^{b}, **Incip. alteracio inter filomenam 7 bubonem** | Ich wes in one sumere dale. | in one swiþe dyele hale. *The Owl and the Nightingale*. English verse. IMEV 1384, DIMEV 2307. Ed. Sisam 1970: 6-10.

3. Folios 169^{r}-174^{v}/26, **Tractacus quidam in anglico.** | Ich am eldre þan ich wes awinter and ek on lore. | Ich welde more þan ich dude. my wyt auhte beo more. *The Conduct of Life*. English verse. IMEV 1272, DIMEV 2113. Ed. Morris 1872: 58-71, no 2.

[the remainder of the folio has been left blank].

4. Folios 175^{r}-178^{v}/7, **Þ**eos holy gostes myhte | Vs helpe. and rede and dihte. | and wisse vs and theche. *The Wages of Sin* or *Sinners Beware*. English verse. IMEV 3607, DIMEV 5698. Ed. Morris 1872: 72-83, no 3.

5. Folios 178^{v}/8 - 179^{v}/21, **Incipit de Muliere samaritana.** | **Þ**o ihesu crist an eorþe was. Mylde weren his dede. | Alle heo beoþ on boke iwryten. þat me may heom rede. *The woman of Samaria*. English verse. IMEV 3704, DIMEV 5874. Ed. Morris 1872: 84-86, no 4.

6. Folio 179^{v}/22-25, **W**eole þu art awaried þing. vneuene constu dele. | Þu yeuest a wrecche weole y nouh. noht þurh his hele. | Wyþ freomen þu art ferly feid. wiþ sauhte 7 make heom sele. | Þe poure i londe naueþ no lot. wiþ riche for to mele. *Curse of Wealth* or *Fortune*. English verse. IMEV 3873, DIMEV 6182. Four lines, reproduced above. Ed. Morris 1872: 86, no 5.

7. Folio 179^{v}/26 - 180^{v}/4, **M**on may longe lyues wene. | Ac ofte him lyeþ þe wrench. *Memento Mori*, *Prepare for Death* or *Long Life*. English verse. IMEV 2070, DIMEV 3370. Ed. Hall 1920: 29; Ed. Morris 1872: 156-9, no 20.

8. Folio 180^{v}/5, **O**n hire is al my life ilong. | Of hwam ich wille synge. *An Orison to Our Lady*. English verse. IMEV 2687, DIMEV 4270. Finishes at the bottom of the folio imperfectly. Ed. Morris 1872: 159-62, no 21.

9. Folio 181r/1-7, Of þine swete words. ich am swiþe gled. | Ich am godes wenche. ful wel ich habbe i sped. *The Annunciation*. English verse, begins imperfectly. IMEV 877, DIMEV 1467. Ed. Morris 1872: 100, no 11. The missing opening of this verse is Item 19.

10. Folios 181^{r}/8 - 181^{v}/4, **Her bigynneþ þe vif Blyssen of vre leuedi seynte marie. | L**euedy for þare blisse. þat þu heddest at þu frume. *The Five Joys of Our Lady* or *The Five Joys of the Virgin*. English verse. IMEV 1833, DIMEV 3019. Ed. Morris 1872: 87-88, no 6.

11. Folios 181^{v}/5 - 182^{r}/9, **Hwon holy chireche is under uote. | H**wile wes seynte peter. i cleped symon. | Þo queþ vre louerd him to. þu schalt hoten ston. *Against Simony*. English verse. IMEV 4085, DIMEV 6528. Ed. Morris 1872: 89, no 7.

12. Folios 182^{r}/10 - 182^{v}/22, **Incipit die iudicii | H**wenne ich þenche of domes day. ful sore ich may adrede. *Doomsday*. English verse. IMEV 3967, DIMEV 6339. Ed. Morris 1872: 163-169, no 22.

13. Folios 182^{v}/23 - 184^{v}/26, Ihereþ of one þinge. þat ye owen of þenche. *On Death*. English verse. IMEV 3517, DIMEV 5640. Ed. Morris 1872: 169-185, no 23.

14. Folio 184^{v}/14, **H**wan þu sixst vn leode. king þat is wilful. *The Abuses of the Age* or 'Ten abuses'. English verse. IMEV 4051, DIMEV 6475. Ed. Morris 1872: 185, no 24.

15. Folios 185^{r}-185^{v}/23, **H**erkneþ alle gode men and stylle sitteþ adun. *A lutel soth Sermun* or *Little sermon against forbidden fruits*. English verse. IMEV 1091, DIMEV 1773. Ed. Morris 1872: 187-191, no 25.

16. Folio 185^{v}/24-29, **Incipit Antiphona | de sancto Thoma | Martyre in anglico**. [incipit added after the conclusion of the first three lines] **H**Aly thomas of heoueriche. All apostles | euerliche. *Antiphon of St Thomas the Martyr* or *Anthem to St Thomas of Canterbury*. English verse. IMEV 1223, DIMEV 2047.ed. Morris 1872: 90, no 8.

17. Folios 185^{v}/30 - 187^{r}/11, **H**wi ne serue we crist. and secheþ his sauht. | seoþþe vs wes at þe font. fulluht by tauht. *The Service of Christ* or *On Serving Christ*. English verse. IMEV4162, DIMEV 6672. Ed. Morris 1872: 90-92, no 9.

18. Folios 187^{r}/12 - 188^{v}/24, **Incipit quidam contus quem composuit frater Thomas de hales de | ordine fratrum minorum. ad instanciam cuiusdam puelle deo dictate. | A** Mayde cristes me bit yorne. | þat ich hire wurche a luue ron. *A Love Rune*, written by Thomas of Hales O.F.M. English verse. IMEV 66, DIMEV 104. Ed. Morris 1872: 93-99.

19. Folio 188^{v}/25, **Item cantus | F**Rom heouene in to eorþe. god gretynge he sende. | Bi on Archaungle. þat to marye wende. *Song of the Annunciation*. English verse. Ends imperfectly: the missing conclusion of this verse is Item 9. IMEV 877, DIMEV 1467. Ed. Morris 1872: 100, no 11.

20. Folio 189^{r}/1-5, Naueþ my saule. bute fur and ys | ⁊ þe lichome eorþe and treo. *Prayer for Salvation*. English verse. IMEV 2284.5, DIMEV 3676. Ed. Morris 1872: 100-101, no 12.

21. Folio 189^{r}/7-12, [H⟩wenne þin heou blokeþ. And þi strengþe wokeþ. *Signs of Death*. English verse. IMEV 4047, DIMEV 6462. Ed. Morris 1872: 101, no 13.

22. Folio 189^{r}/13-17, [V⟩yche day me cumeþ tydings þreo | For wel swiþe sore beoþ heo. *Three Sorrowful Tidings*. English verse. IMEV 695, DIMEV 1157. Ed. Morris 1872: 101, no 14.

23. Folios 189^{r}/19 - 192^{r}/9, **Incipiunt documenta Regis Aluredi** | **A**t seuorde séte þeyres monye. fele Biscopes and feole. bok | iléred. *Proverbs of Alfred*. English verse. IMEV 433, DIMEV 714. Ed. Morris 1872: 102-130, no 15.

24. Folios 192^{r}/10 - 193^{r}/9, **Tractatus quidam.** | **L**ouerd crist ich þe grete. þu art so mylde and swete. *Orison of our Lord* or *In Praise of Christ*. English verse. IMEV 1948, DIMEV 3190. Ed. Morris 1872: 139-141 no 16.

25. Folios 193^{r}/10 - 194^{r}/9, **Tractatus quidam**. | **Þ**eo soþe luue a mong vs beo. | wyþ vten euch endynge. *The Duty of Christians*. English verse. IMEV 3474, DIMEV 5479. Ed. Morris 1872: 141-144, no 17.

26. Folios 194^{r}/10 - 195^{r}/3, **Her bigyneþ þe syren. ⁊ þe hundreds of engelonde**. | **E**ngle lond is eyhte hundred My̆le long. from penwyþ | sterote. þat is fyfténe Mylen by yonde Mihhales steowe. *Shires and Hundreds of England*. English prose. IPMEP 163, IMEP VIII 38, ed. Morris 1872: 145-146, no 18.

27. Folios 195^{r}/5, Quando frumentum venditur pro xij. denariis. *Assize of Bread*. Latin. Hill 1966b, 204.

28. Folios 195^{v}-198^{r}/9^{b}, Ici commence de Tobye. *Vie de Tobye*, written by Guillame Le Clerc De Normandie. Anglo-Norman verse. Dean, no 468. Ed. Reinsch. Archiv 62 1879.

29. Folios 198[r]/10[b]-200[v], **Ici comencet les vnze peynes | de enfern les ques seynt pool Vist**. *St Paul's Vision of Hell* or *The XI Pains of Hell*. English Verse with Anglo-Norman prologue. IMEV 3828, DIMEV 6112. Ed. Morris 1872: 147-155, no 19.

30. Folios 201[r]-207[r], **Ici comence le Doctrinal**. *Doctrinal Sauvage*. Anglo-Norman verse. Dean, no 244.

31. Folios 207[v]-222[v], **Ici comence la vie | Dormaunz**. *Les set Dormanz*, written by Chardri. Anglo Norman verse. Dean, no 534.

32. Folios 223[r]-244[r], **Ici comence La vue seynt Josphay**. *Le vie de Seint Josaphaz*, written by Chadri. Anglo-Norman verse. Dean, no 532.

33. Folios 224[v], **Ici cumence le petyt ple. | le Juuencel e le veylard.** *Le Petit Plet*, written by Chadri. Anglo-Norman verse. Dean, no 265.

5(b). Collation.

Single paper paste-down + two vellum stubs and two paper flies preceed Part I.[158] Part II: **I[12]** (folios 144-155). **II[12]** (folios 156-167) '#2' written in modern black ink marks the beginning of the 2[nd] quire. **III[12]** (folios 168-179) **IV[12]** (folios 180-189) wants 2 and 11 (corresponding leaves of a bifolium), gaps in the text after folios 180 and 188. **V[12]** (folios 190-201) **VI[12]** (folios 202-213) **VII[12]** (folios 214-225) **VIII[12]** (folios 226-235) wants 4 and 9 (corresponding leaves of a bifolium) gaps in the text after folios 228 and 232 **IX[12]** (folios 236-247) **X[12]** (folios 248-257) wants 1 and 12 (corresponding leaves of a bifolium), gap in text after folio 247. Item concludes on 257[v], therefore, it might be assumed that the folio following 257 may have been blank anyway.

[158] Affixed to the first stub is a modern bifolium measuring 9.5mm x 6.5mm. This bifolium only has writing on the first recto – giving a modern shelf mark and an indication of where 'printed notices of this manuscript occur.'

The main body of the manuscript is divided into two unrelated parts. Part I contains a fifteenth-century chronicle of 144 folios, composed in Latin on paper. Part II has 114 parchment leaves. + 2 paper flies +2 vellum stubs. The last end stub has a gilt stamp from binder's waste, s.xvii.[159] The preceding stub is from the same book and shows signs of folding over the spine as do the first stubs which, according to Hill, were probably used to strengthen the spine.[160]

The quiring deviates from Gregory's Rule, that the flesh side forms the outer leaf of a quire. The manuscript normally has the fleshside facing fleshside and hairside facing hairside. The first quire has the fleshside as the outer leaf.[161]

5(c). Writing Grid.

The frame and the lines are ruled in dry point for 32 lines per folio The writing grid is around 140mm x 110mm when single column and 145mm x 60mm when double column. Writing is often found above the top line.

5(d). Textual Presentation.

Incipits are rubricated in the same hand as the main scribe. Initial letters are often red or blue and contained within the line or, frequently, of two lines, with tendrils and circles in red and blue. Item 4 (folios 175^{r}-178^{v}/7) is written in double column with couplet aa, in the left hand column, joined with b, in the right hand column, by rubricated braces.

[159] Hill 2003, p. 270.
[160] Hill 2003, p. 271.
[161] This is discussed in more detail in Hill 2003, p. 272.

5(e). Scribes.

One hand writes throughout. This hand has been dated by Hill to *c.* 1285-1300.[162]

5(f). Pagination and Foliation.

Part I has modern numbering from 1 to 143b (folio 143 occurs twice – now 143a and 143b) as well as the roman numbering lxix-ccxvi (numbered at time of production – at the top/centre of the recto of each folio) of the Latin chronicle. This numbering is continued in Part II to 262, in pen, although it is often crossed through. Modern Arabic numbering also begins Part II at 144 and runs to 257.

5(g). Contemporary and later additions.

The ink foliation (top right) has often been crossed through in pencil with a modern pencil foliation added from folio 144^{r}. On folio 144^{r} the Roman numeral 'II' has been added in black ink. On folio 155^{r}, under the final line of Item 1, a cursive hand in brown ink incorrectly glosses 'halewe. to her swete sune.' as 'Halleluja to her sweete son!' The rest of the folio is filled, in the same hand as the gloss, with the lines: 'On parte of a broaken leafe of this | MS. I found these verses written | whereby the Author may bee guest at. | (viz) | Magister Iohan eu greteþ of Guldenorddepo. | And lendeþ eu to Seggen. þat synge nul he no. | Ne on þisse wise he wille endy his song. | God Louerd of heuene. beo vs alle among. | AMEN.'[163] On folio 156^{r} couplet 3a and 4a have been underlined in brown ink. Further glosses and underlining, in the same brown ink, can be found on folio 159^{v}, 162^{r}, 162^{v}, 204^{r}, 247^{r}.

The words 'senche' and 'wole bi-þenche' have been added to the end of lines 29 and 30 of folio 173^{v} in a later hand. On folio 182^{v}, a later hand adds 'on þe lufthonde', after the conclusion

[162] Hill 2003, p. 271.
[163] This hand and that of the gloss cited previously have been consistently attributed to The Reverend Thomas Wilkins († 1699). See Hill 1975, and Hill 2003, pp. 275-276.

of Line 8 and 'nolde here' after the conclusion of Line 18. Possibly the same later hand adds ' colput dup ant gret' to Line 15 of 184^{v}; 'wedes' to Line 20 of 186^{r}; 'þouht' to Line 20 of 186^{v}; ' scarlat non' to the end of Line 2 of 187^{r}; 'Ro ne Rest' to Line 23 of 187^{r}; 'pris' to the end of Line 4 and 'y ros' to the end of Line 5 of 188^{v}; the writing of 'ing' is added to 'fast' of Lines 29 and 30 of folio 192^{r}; 'veylard' is added to the margin of Line 4a of folio 245^{v} and the same word is added between the columns of folio 247^{r} (underlined in brown ink). The signature of Thomas Wilkins, in black ink, follows Item 23 on folio 192^{r} and 'Tho Wilkins' in brown ink is added with his mark at folio 257^{v}.

5(h). Provenance.

It is unclear why the two parts of Jesus described above have been bound together. Hill conjectures that it is possible that they were brought together under the classification 'Legal and Historical', since 'Part I treats of the history of the English Kings while part II includes two important legal and historical texts': Item 26 *Shires and Hundreds of England* and Item 27 *Assize of Bread*.[164]

Hill dates the compilation of Jesus to the first half of Richard Swinfield's episcopacy at Hereford Cathedral between about 1285-1300[165] based upon its localisation in the region of Ledbury, Herefordshire[166] and the presence of Item 27 *Assize of Bread*.[167] The first known owner of the manuscript, with both parts likely together, is most probably Sir Thomas Ragland, the eldest son of Sir John Ragland, originally of Carnlwdd in Llanarvan,

[164] Hill *MÆ* 1966 p. 206.
[165] Hill 2003, p. 273.
[166] A. McIntosh, M. Benskin and M. L. Samuels (eds.), *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English,* 4 vols (Aberdeen 1986), III, 171 LP 7440.
[167] The "Assize" was a secular legal statute and was the subject of a dispute before and during Swinfield's episcopacy. See Hill, 2003, p. 273.

Glamorganshire knighted in 1513 and Lord of Redwick, Monmouthshire in 1520.[168] This is based on the writing of 'thys ys thomas ragland/ ys boke he that ste[leth] hym salbe/ hangyd by a crowke and thomas' within a gap on folio 109^{r}. This can be dated before 1547 as the same hand writes 'god saue the kynge and the quyne and thomas'; a reference to Henry VIII (1509-47).[169] The last private owner of the manuscript was the Reverend Thomas Wilkins (1625/6-1699), Rector of Llanvair, Llantrissant, who is the only person whose hand is present in both parts of the manuscript. Wilkins, who was a former student of Jesus College, donated the manuscript to the college between 1684 and 1689.[170]

5(i). Binding.

Binding of Mottled Calf was executed shortly before 9 January 1693.[171] It has a blind-tooled design, front and back, of two rectangles, formed by 3 line fillets, placed one inside the other. 3 lines extend from the inner rectangle, through the corners of the outer rectangle, to the corners of the binding. The manuscript would originally have had two fore-edge clasps, the straps now missing although the lower of the two anchor points and remnants of the original strap can be seen on the upper board and the corresponding catch plate/pin is still present on the lower board. The manuscript was re-backed s.xx.[172] A fragment of 1693 binding/spine has been attached to the end paste-down of the manuscript.

[168] Hill *MÆ* 1966, p. 209.
[169] See Hill *MÆ* 1966, p. 209.
[170] Hill 1975, p. 99.
[171] Hill 2003, p. 270.
[172] Hill 2003, p. 270.

5(j). Condition.

The leaves of the manuscript are generally in good condition. There is slight damage to the corners of folios 147 and 148. There is a small hole in the vellum (8mm x 7mm) of folio 154; the scribe writes around this hole at lines 12 and 13 of folio 154^{r}. There are 3 small holes in folio 159; the scribe writes around these holes at lines 17 and 18 of column b. There is a hole in the outer margin of folio 167^{r}; the 's' from the final word of Line 33 is written above the hole as a result. There is some discolouring to the top of folio 173^{v} and 174^{r} but the text is still legible. The top right corner is missing from folio 175^{r}. There is some tearing on folio 189. There is a hole (15mm x 15mm) at the bottom of folio 201^{r} and some small holes caused by worming on the final line. There are some small holes on folios 156, 231 and 251 which do not interfere with the text.

5(k). Surrogate Descriptions.

Hill 2003.

6. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS. McClean 123

The Nuneaton Codex

Parchment. s.xiii/xiv. Size of Leaves: 262 x 172.

6(a). Contents.

1. Folios 1[r]/1 - 7[va]/10, **[T]ractatus in lingua romana secundum dominum Robertum |grosseteste lincholiensem episcopum**. *Chasteau d'Amour*. Robert Grossteste. French verse after Latin rubric. For description and commentary see: Sinclair 1979: no. 5822; Legge 1963: 223-4; Thomson 1940: no. 113; Hill 2002: 195.

2. Folios 7[va]/13 - 9[rb]/9, [A]pres ceo deuez sauer quells sunt | les set prieres ke ostent touz maus | et purchacent tuz bens. E ces | set priers sunt contenu en la pa|ter noster. *Mirour de Seinte Églyse, chapter 17*. Prose Exposition of the Paternoster. French. For an edition of both the A and B texts of the *Mirrour de Sainte Églyse*, see Wilshere, p. vii, MS C1. Chapter 17, 46/3-54/156. For description and commentary, see: Sinclair 1979: no. 5431; Legge 1963: 211-12; Hill 2002: 196.

Folio 9[rb]/10-13, rubricated in red, **'Iste liber constat domine margarete | sylemon 7 discipulas suas. Et | post mortem suam. Couentu de | Nuneton'.**

3. Folios 10[ra]/27[vb], [E]nz le honor | de la trinite | Ai en corage | e en pense | De translater | le seinte letter | E del latin en romanz metre | Ceo est lestorie de ibseu crist. *L' Évangile de Nicodème* or *The Gospel of Nicodemus*, by Crestien.[173] French verse. Ed. Paris and Bos 1885: 1-69; for descriptions and commentary, see Langfors 1917: 128; Owen 1970: 98-101, 196.

[173] See James 1912, p. 264.

4. Folios 30^{r}/65^{v}, Qui ben commence | e ben define | Co est uerite | sewe e fine. Guillaume le clerc's *Bestiaire* or *The Bestiary of William the Norman*. Anglo-Norman verse. 37 illustrations in pencil throughout the text. For descriptions and commentary see: Langfors 1917: 312; Legge 1963: 207-8; McCulloch 1962: 58; Hill 2002: 196.

5. Folios 66^{r}–105^{r}. Et uenit et accepit de dextra sedentis in throno. *Apocalypse*. Latin prose with French verse translation. Bottom half of folios contain outline drawings, in pen and ink. Approx 74 drawings have been cut out – 17 remain. Six leaves are missing at the beginning (stubs visible). A description of the damage is contained later in this commentary. Folio 105 is blank on verso. For descriptions and commentary see: James 1912: 268-9; Legge 1963: 236-9; Morgan 1982-1987: 193-195.

6. Folios 106^{r}-107^{r}, Five antiphons. *Hours of the Virgin*:

i. Folio 106^{r}, O beata uirgo mariaquis | tibi digne ualeat

ii. Folios 106^{r}-106^{v}, Sub tuum presidium confugimus (with music on a five line stave)

iii. Folio 106^{v}, Admitte piisima dei genetrix (incomplete because of missing folio between 106^{v} and 107^{r});

iv. Folio 107r, ora pro nobis deum alleluya (begins imperfectly because of missing folio; with music on a five line stave);

v. Folio 107^{r}, Alma redempto|ris (with music on a five line stave).

[Folios 107^{v}-108^{v} ruled but left blank.]

7. Folios 109^{r}, **Seint Austin ecrist cest oreisun**. *Pseudo-Augustine Prayer*. Latin preceeded by a prose account in French of the prayer's protective virtues.[174] For description and commentary see: Hill 1972: 45-46; Sinclair 1979: no. 6525).

[Folio 109^{v} blank]

[174] See Hill 2002, p. 194.

8. Folios 110^{r}-113^{r}, **A**pres ceo deuez sauer. *Mirrour de Seinte Églyse*. Anglo-Norman with Latin rubrication. A second text of Item 2: *Exposition on the Paternoster* (Chapter 17). Followed, on folio 112ra line 22, by part of Chapter 5, written in Anglo-Norman.[175] Ces byens ȝ moz autres vus | ad fet vostre douz espouz. For an edition based on both the A and B texts of the *Mirrour de Sainte Églyse* see Wilshere, p. vii, MS C1. Chapter 17, 46/3-54/156, 12/57-16/121.

[Folio 113^{v} blank, except for the name John Eyton and the letter k]

[Folio 114^{r} blank]

9i. Folio 114^{v}, Explanation of Old English letters þorn, wen, yoȝ, and, with illustrations of their use in initial and final position:

þorn

þ þanne þo þider þe þu haueþ naueþ teþ goþ

wen

ƿ ƿinnan ƿepman ponie pende pele pope

yoȝ

ȝ ȝef ȝus ȝer ȝender draȝ sclaȝ arȝ marȝ

and

ȝ Williame ȝ Jon ȝ thomas ȝ symun ȝ þu ȝ ich.

9ii. Folios 115^{r}-120^{r}, Ich am elder þane ich ƿas. *The Conduct of Life*. English Verse. IMEV 1272, DIMEV 2113. Ed. Paues 1907: 227-337. Preceded on folio 115^{r} by two lines from 'The Wages of Sin': Þe holi gostes miȝte us alle helpe ȝ diȝte us ƿissie ȝ us teche y scilde us fram þe unƿiȝte bi dai ȝ bi niȝte þat þencheþ us biƿeche.

Folio 120^{r} Erased: Salue fac serum domine etc.

[175] See Hill 1972, p. 194.

6(b). Collation.

i + 122 + i, foliated in pencil (top right) from folio 1 on recto continuous. **I**^{12} (folios 1-9) wants three in 10th, 11th and 12th position, stubs visible after folio 9, **II**^{12} (folios 10-21), **III**^{8} (folios 22-29), **IV-VI**^{12} (folios 30-65), **VII**^{6} all excised, stubs visible between folios 65^{v} and 66^{r}, **VIII**^{8} (folios 66-73) quire numbered 7 in manuscript, **IX**^{8} (folios 74-81) quire not numbered in the manuscript, **X**^{8} (folios 82-89) quire numbered 9 in the manuscript, **XI**^{8} (folios 90-96) wants one in first position – stub showing between 89v and 90r; quire numbered 10 in the manuscript **XII**^{10} (folios 97-105) wants one in 6th position, stub showing between 101^{v} and 102^{r}; quire numbered 11 in manuscript, **XIII**^{4} (folios 106-108) wants one in the 2nd position, stub showing between 106^{v} and 107^{r}; quire numbered 12 in manuscript, **XIV**^{10} (folios 109-113) wants five in 6th-10th positions, stubs showing between folios 113^{v} and 114^{r}; quire numbered 13 in manuscript, **XV**^{12} (folios 114-122) wants three in 9th-11th positions, stubs showing between 121^{v} and 122^{r}; quire numbered 14 in manuscript .

The 122 folios are surrounded by modern flies and modern pastes. A pair of modern bifolio have been folded to form the flies and pastes at the beginning and end of the manuscript; the final paste is loose from the binding. Quires are marked in pencil – bottom right – on recto. Catch words, giving the first words of the following quire, are present in the inner margins of 21v, 41v, and 53v.

6(c). Writing Grid.

Item I (folios 1^{r}-7^{v}) and Item 2, with the exception of folio 1^{r}, occupy a writing grid of 188-192mm x 140-144mm, with triple vertical bounding lines creating a double margin on either side of the folio and down the centre of the folio. The pricking for these lines is visible

throughout this item at the top and bottom of the folios. Folio 1^{r} has a writing grid of 205mm x 140mm to accommodate the opening 32 lines. The frame does not have a central division as the first 16 lines, which are written in Latin and in red, are written in single column. The following 16 lines of folio 1^{r} are written as per the remainder of Item I but without the guidance of the interior division. The text often spills into the ruled band that signifies the conclusion of each column. Item I has 32 lines per page with the exception of folio 1^{v} where column a has an extra line written below the frame. Item 2 has 32 lines per page at folios 7^{v} and 9^{r} and 34 lines per page at folio 8^{r} and 8^{v}. On 7va/11 there is a two line gap which separates Item I and 2. On folio 9^{r} there is a one line gap at Line 10 column b followed by four lines of s.xiv^{2} red text linking the manuscript to Margaret Selman, who was Lady Prioress of Nuneaton Convent between 1367 and 1386.[176]

Item 3 (folios 10^{r}-27^{v}) has a writing grid of 178-180mm x 140mm per page ruled for 31 lines in double column, except at folio 10^{r} where the final two ruled lines are not used. The grid is created as per Items 1 and 2. There is a gap of eight lines, possibly for a drawing, at Line 7 of folio 10^{rb} and a gap of four lines at Line 15 on folio 16ra. Folios 28 and 29 are left blank.

Item 4 (folios 30^{r}-65^{v}) has a writing grid of 178-182mm x 145mm. It is, once more, written in double column, ruled with triple bounding lines at the margins and down the centre of the page. The item normally has 32 lines per page.[177] Gaps are left throughout the text for line drawings (typically eight lines, although occasionally seven). In some places the drawings have been added and in others the gap has been left blank. From folio 31^{r} onward slits are visible in the left hand gutter marking individual lines and from folio 32^{r} onward pricking is visible, at the top and bottom of the folios, marking the column widths for ruling.

[176] See Hill 2002, p. 201.
[177] The exceptions are: 29 lines per page at folios 30^{r}-30^{v} and folios 32^{r}-32^{v}; 30 lines per page at folios 31^{v}, 33^{r}, 36^{r}-37^{r} and folio 38^{v}; and 31 lines per page at folios 34^{r}, 35^{r} and 38^{r}.

Item 5 (folios 66^{r}-105^{r}) originally had pen drawings over graphite on the upper half of the folios with the text below.[178] The original miniatures occupied a frame of *ca.* 85 x 120, with double bounding lines that formed a small square in each corner. The writing grid, on the bottom half of both the rectos and versos of the folios, normally occupies an area of *ca.* 92mm x 126mm with 16 lines per page,[179] although, more often than not, the complete grid is not used.[180]

Item 6 (folios 106^{r}-108^{v}) has an initial ruled (crayon) grid of 170mm x 120mm, framed with double bounding lines on either side. It is ruled horizontally, with gaps between the lines alternating between 3mm and 6mm. Item 6 contains five antiphons set out as follows:

i). The first antiphon is written in single column, in a larger script, between the 6mm gaps, therefore, leaving a 3mm gap between each line. An incipit (in red) has been squeezed in at the end of the first four lines.

ii). For the second antiphon a five line stave has been drawn in red on top of the original grid, with gaps between lines set at 3mm apart. Musical noation has been recorded between the ruled lines which make up the staves. A one line gap of 3mm has been left between each stave. Within this gap the text which corresponds to the music has been inserted. Two five line staves and two lines of text complete folio 106^{r}. The second antiphon continues on folio 106^{v} with

[178] Only 17 out of the original 91 still remain – the rest have been cut from the manuscript, sometimes causing damage to the text below.

[179] With the exceptions of folio 92 where the grid is reduced to 82mm x 126mm and ruled for 15 lines per page on both the recto and verso and folio 102^{v} where the grid is enlarged to 105mm x 126mm and there is 18 lines per page.

[180] There are four lines per page at folio 87^{v} and folio 100^{r} (the first line is fragmentary); 5 lines per page at folios 72^{r}, 86^{r} (the first two lines are missing), 90^{v}, 93^{r} and 98^{v}; six lines per page at folios 72^{v}-73^{v}, 75^{v} (the first two lines are missing with the sixth running over onto a seventh), 79^{r} (the first four lines are missing), 80^{v} (the first line is fragmentary), 81^{v} (the first line is fragmentary), 82^{r} (the first line is missing), 82^{v} (the first line is missing and the second line is fragmentary), 88^{v} and 90^{r}; seven lines per page at folios 76^{v}, 79^{v}, 84^{r}, 87^{r}, 89^{r}, 91^{r}, 92^{r}-92^{v}, 95^{v} and 100^{v} (the first line is fragmentary); eight lines per page at folios 66^{v}-67^{r}, 68^{r}, 70^{v}, 77^{r} (the first line is fragmentary), 78^{r}-78^{v}, 83^{v}, 85^{r} and 101^{r} (the first line is fragmentary); nine lines per page at folios 71^{r}, 81^{r} (the first line is fragmentary), 83^{r}, 84^{v}, 85^{v}, 89^{v}, 93^{v} (the first line is fragmentary), 95^{r}, 97^{r}, 99^{v} and 101^{v} (the first line is missing); 10 lines per page at folios 67^{v}, 77^{v} (the first line is missing), 80^{r}, 86^{v} (the first two lines are missing), 88^{r}, 94^{v} (the first line is fragmentary), 97^{v}, 98^{r} (the first line is missing), 102^{r} and 104^{r}; 11 lines per page at folios 76^{r}, 94^{r} (the first line is fragmentary); 12 lines per page at folios 68^{v}-69^{r}, 70^{r}, 74^{v}-75^{r} (the first two lines are missing on 75^{r}), 96^{v} and 105^{r}; 13 lines per page at folios 69^{v} and 99^{r} (the first line is missing); 14 lines per page at folio 74^{r}; 15 lines per page at folios 66^{r}, 96^{r} and 103^{v}; 16 lines per page at folios 103^{r} and 104^{v}; and 18 line per page at folio 102^{v}.

three-and-a-quarter more lines of music followed by three-and-a-quarter more lines of text, set out as previous page.

iii). The layout for the third antiphon reverts to the grid used for the first antiphon, with the text written between the 6mm gaps and a 3mm gap left between written lines. This piece is incomplete as a folio is missing between folios 106 and 107.

iv) This antiphon begins incomplete due to a missing folio. All that remains is one-and-a-half lines of music and text – ruled, as previously described for the second antiphon, on a five-line stave with a 3mm gap for the text.

v). The final antiphon continues as Item 4, with a further six lines of music and corresponding text. Folio 107^{v} and both the recto and verso of folio 108 are blank but are ruled as described originally for this item.

Item 7 is found in its entirety on folio 109^{r}, taking up 25 lines of the 32 line grid. The grid is ruled for a single column of writing and measures 190mm x 120mm. Double lines at the margins mark the beginning and the end of the written line. Folio 109^{v} has been left blank and un-ruled.

Item 8 (folios 110^{r}-113^{r}) has a grid which measures 180mm x 130mm, ruled in crayon. Above and below this grid there is a small gap (10mm above and 25mm below) to a set of double lines which enclose the grid at top and bottom. Single lines form the exterior grid at the inner and outer margins. Two parallel lines run down the centre of the page dividing the grid into double column. Pricking for the four vertical lines can be seen at the top and bottom of the folios. The folios that contain this item are ruled for 26 lines per page. All of these 26 lines have been used except at folio 113^{r} where the text concludes, with only 17 lines of the first column being used.

Folio 113^{v} has been left blank except for the pen trials of John Eyton. It would appear that five folios have been excised between folios 113 and 114. Folio 114^{r} has been left blank. The verso of folio 114 (Item 9i) contains a small grid at the top of the page of 54mm x 140mm with the symbols for, and a description of, the Old English characters þorn (þ), wen (ƿ), yoȝ (ȝ), and (⁊).

Item 9ii (folios 115^{r}-120^{r}) is written in single column and occupies a writing grid of 190 x 145. The grid is ruled for 32 lines per page and these are all used except at folio 120^{r} where only 17 lines are required to conclude the item. Triple binding lines enclose the grid on both sides. Folios 120^{v}-121^{v} are left blank.

6(d). Textual Presentation.

Item I begins on folio 1^{r} with the first 16 lines written in red, and continues with the initial letters of each line of the remainder of folio 1^{r} enlarged, coloured red, and placed inside the triple vertical lines of the bounding lines.

A gap of six lines has been left at the beginning of Item 3 on folio 10^{r} for an enlarged letter 'E'.[181] Each new line of Item 3 begins with an enlarged letter in the margin, although these are sometimes missing. In addition, Item 3 also contains two breaks in the text which might possibly be for the addition of drawings which were never added.[182]

Item 4 is written in double column with each line starting with an enlarged capital placed within the margin; on folio 53^{v} these capitals have been touched red. The Bestiare contains 37 line drawings, in pencil, throughout the text; each drawing normally occupies eight

[181] The letter was never inserted by the rubricator, although the mark made by the scribe indicating that this addition should be made can quite clearly be seen in the gutter.
[182] The first is an eight line gap after Line 6 at folio 10^{rb}; the second is at folio 16ra where a four line gap is left after Line 14.

lines.[183] Some of the drawings, however, are set beside the wrong passages of text. An account of the line drawings, which includes the misplacement of the illustrations, is as follows:[184]

Folio 30ra/1-6	1. Initial. Christ blessing beasts and birds.
Folio 31ra/24-32	2. Man with shield charged with an escarbuncle pierces the neck of a lion on *R.* with spear.
Folio 32ra/11-19	3. Man with sword about to slay an antelope with its horns caught in a tree.
Folio 33ra/9-16	4. Man and woman standing in flames (*lapsides igniferi*).
Folio 33va/11-18	5. The *Serre*, a winged beast standing vertically on waves on *L.* Two men rowing in boat on *R.*
Folio 34ra/13-20	6. Chaladrius, a bird, perched by the head of a sick man in bed and looking towards him: another chaladrius perched at his feet on *R.* looks away.
Folio 34va/19-26	7. Pelican in piety.
Folio 35rb/27-31	8. Bird (ostrich) with two hoofs, between two fleurs-de-lys.
Folio 35va/1-8	9. Eagle with fish in its beak. This and the following illustrations are out of place and do not agree with the text.
Folio 35vb/19-26	10. Phoenix among flames, looking up.
Folio 36va/9-16	11. Hoopoe plucked by its young.

[183] With some variation between seven and nine lines.
[184] This account of the line drawings in Item 4 is an adaptation of that found in James 1912, pp. 267-268, verified by myself with any additional notes added.

Folio 37^{rb}/15-22	12. An ant hill (text relates to the hoopoe).
Folio 37^{vb}/11-17	13. Siren in water holds the stern of a boat on *R.* with two men in it (text relates to ants).
Folio 39^{rb}/16-23.	14. Tree (conventional), a hedgehog in the branches: another on its back below catching apples on its spines (text relates to Siren).
Folio 39^{vb}/22-28.	15. Bird (ibis) feeding in water (text relates to the hedgehog).
Folio 40^{rb}/27-31.	16. Fox on his back feigning death: bird pecking in his mouth.
Folio 40va/1-7	17. Unicorn lays his head in a maid's lap: hunter pierces him (text relates to the ibis).
Folio 41va/16-23	18. Beaver biting off his glands (text relates to the fox).
Folio 42^{rb}/1-8	19. Hyena devouring corpse in stone tomb (text relates to the unicorn).
Folio 43ra/18-24.	20. Hydrus enters the mouth of a horned crocodile (text relates to the beaver).
Folio 43^{vb}/17-24.	Blank. The illuminator here discovered his mistake.
Folio 44va/8-15.	21. Repetition of 20.
Folio 45^{rb}/ 8-14	22. Hunter with horn: antelope? with horn caught in a tree.

Folio 46^{rb}/22-29	23. Wild asses, one lying on its back bitten by another.
Folio 47ra/1-8	24. Ape with one young one in its arms and another on its back.
Folio 47^{rb}/16-22	25. Halcyon on floating nest.
Folio 47^{vb}/25-31	26. Panther, a crowned beast with wings and tail, in the midst of the other beasts.
Folio 49va/29-31	Three blank lines at bottom of column, probably because of drawing which begins column b.
Folio 49^{vb}/1-8	27. Man in ship: another lands on the back of the whale (aspidochelone) on which poles are erected and a pot hung from them.
Folio 50va/20-27	28. Nine partridges in three rows.
Folio 51^{rb}/9-16	29. Three weasels, two of them nose to nose: a man on *R.* watches.
Folio 52^{vb}/2-9	30. Ostrich looking at the Pleiades, a young one on *L.*
Folio 53^{rb}/24-31	31. Four doves in a tree.
Folio 54ra/8-15	32. Stag eating snake.
Folio 54^{vb}/9-16	33. Salamander (dragon-like) on *L.*: man (upper half only seen): tree on *R.*, probably an apple tree which the beast has poisoned.

Folio 55^{rb}/16-23	34. Dragon watching doves in a tree (Paradision).
Folio 57^{vb}/2-9	35. Elephant with castle on back.
Folio 58^{vb}/7-14	36. Mandrakes: two human figures growing in the ground. Tree on *L.*
Folio59^{ra}/20-27.	37. Christ in *C.* with book: two saintly figures on *L.*, on *R.* Text relates to the Diamond, which typifies Christ.

Item 5 (folios 66^{r}-105^{v}) once contained miniatures on the recto and verso of all its folios. The remaining pictures (19) were originally in pencil with pen added over the top of some. The following is a description of the pictures of Item 5:[185]

Folio 72r	1. John on *L.* beardless, with book. The second angel blows trumpet. A ship sinks into sea on *R.* Cloud above.
Folio 72v	2. The third trumpet. Star on *R.* sinking into rivers (four wavy streams, horizontal, with circles at one end to represent springs).
Folio 73r	3. The fourth trumpet. Sun and moon in cloud on *R.* Fire falls on two seated figures.
Folio 73v	4. John with staff. Eagle with scroll in cloud.
Folio 78r	5. John with staff. The two Witnesses lie side by side, their feet towards a gate on *R.* Behind

[185] This account of the line drawings in Item 5 is an adaptation of that found in James 1912, p. 268, verified by myself with any additional notes added.

them a battlemented wall, over which two men (one with a fiddle) look.

Folio 78v — 6. One witness with staff lies dead. The feet of two, ascending, in cloud above. City falls on *R.*: figures among the ruins.

Folio 89r — 7. Angel speaks from a gateway on *L.* Crowned figure in cloud with sickle; below, He reaps with sickle.

Folio 89^{v} — 8. Angel speaks from altar on *L*: angel gathers grapes with sickle: a winepress with a horned devil on it. On *R.* two horses' heads, and above, an angel speaking from a building.

Folios 89^{r} and ^{v} — 9 and 10. Fragments remain of feet and drapery.

Folio 91^{r} — 11. John on *L.* with staff. Angel pours vial (bottle) on five rivers (as in no. 2).

Folio 91^{v} — 12. John on *L.* Above him angel speaks out of cloud. On *R.* angel speaks out of altar with chalice upon it.

Folio 97^{r} — 13. In *C.* Christ in mandorla. Angel and eagle on *R.* and *L.* at top. On *L.* a group of kneeling figures: above them angel's head speaking out of a cloud. On *R.* a similar group, above them a long trumpet proceeding out of a cloud.

Folio 97^{v}	14. John on *L.* Four angels proceeding from clouds above blow trumpets.
Folio 102^{r}	15. *C.* Christ in mandorla: three nude figures on *L.*, two on *R.*
Folio 102^{v}	16. John on *L.* Christ in mandorla set against a building. An angel proceeds from it on *R.* speaking.
Folio 103^{r}	17. John writes at desk on *L.* Christ in mandorla on *R.*
Folio 103v	18. John on on the back of an angel who carries a long-necked vial. On *R.* a hill with a tree on it.
Folio 105^{r}	19. John with scroll kneels to nimbed beardless figure on a seat on *R.*

The Latin on folio 66^{r} (Item 5) begins with an enlarged and decorated letter E in blue with red decoration. The French translation, which follows on the same page, begins with an enlarged and decorated letter 'E' in red with blue decoration. Each of the following folios (recto and verso) have an enlarged and decorated letter of two-line height usually alternating between red and blue with the opposite colour usually being used for decoration.[186] In most cases the enlarged letter is 'E'.[187]

Item 6i (folio 106^{r}) begins with an enlarged 'O' in blue with decoration in red and blue around the letter, running along the top of the writing grid and down the inner margin for half

[186] Occasionally the same colour is used twice, as at folios 90^{v} and 91^{r}.

[187] With the exceptions of folios 69^{v}-70^{r} and folio 97^{v} where the letter is 'A'; folio 77^{r} where it is 'S'; folio 78^{v} where it is 'K'; and folio 105^{r} where it is 'T'. On folios such as folio 86^{v} it is impossible to tell what the letter might have been because the excision of the pictures on the upper half of the page has destroyed the first lines of the text and, therefore, the decorated letter. On folio 103^{v} there is no rubricated initial and on folio 91^{v} there is no writing at all.

a page, filling two full lines and two gap lines. An incipit (in red) has been squeezed in at the end of the first four written lines: it reads, **'hic incip|it officium | beate uirgi|nis'**. Items 6ii, 6iv and 6v all contain a line of music, written on a five-line stave, followed by a line of text. The five lines of the stave have been added in red after the initial grid was drawn. The notes of the music sit between the lines of the stave. The written text of Item 6ii begins with an enlarged letter 'S' in red and decorated in blue. Item 6iii begins with an enlarged 'A' in blue with decoration in both red and blue. Item 6v begins with an enlarged 'A' in red with blue decoration.

Item 7, on folio 109^{r}, begins with a French preface of 3 lines in red. The preface, which was added after the main body of writing, does not fit into the gap allowed for it and, therefore, spills over on to Lines 4 and 5. The first line of the prayer begins on Line 4 where the initial letter 'D' of 'Deus' is missing. It can be presumed from its position at the beginning of the prayer, the three-line gap that is present, and the mark left in the margin for the rubricator that this letter should have been enlarged, coloured and possibly decorated.

Item 8, folios 110^{r} -113^{r}, begins with an enlarged letter 'A' in blue which sits on the second line and extends above the top line. Latin sentences are written in red throughout the text to folio 112^{r} where Chapter 5 begins. This chapter begins on Line 22 of folio 112ra with an enlarged (two lines) letter 'C' written in blue. Two further enlarged letters (not coloured) can be found on folio 112^{v}.[188]

Item 9 (folios 115^{r}-120^{r}) has a clear grid with three vertical bounding lines enclosing it at either margin. Each new line of text for this item starts with a capitalized letter, touched in red, which sits inside the gap between the two inner vertical lines of the left-hand margin. Each line

[188] An enlarged letter 'G' takes up two lines beginning at Line 12^{a}, and an enlarged letter 'I' runs down the vertical division of the page for six lines from line 15^{b}.

ends with a minim height punctum which sits on the inner vertical line of the right-hand margin. A two-line space has been left at the beginning of the lines from "The Wages of Sin" for the letter 'Þ' which was never added, with a mark in the gutter present for the rubricator. On Line 3, the beginning of the *Conduct of Life,* the letter 'I' is missing from the text.[189]

6(e) Scribes.

The manuscript, apart from any later additions, is written in Gothic bookhand (textualis). Six hands, as Hill has previously demonstrated, are responsible for the manuscript.[190] Hand A writes Items 1 and 9; B writes Items 3 and 4; C writes Item 2; D writes Item 7; E writes Item 8; and scribe F writes Items 5 and 6. Scribes A, B, E and F wrote *ca.* 1300. Scribes C and D were writing slightly later *c.* s.xiv^{in}.

The Nuneaton Codex is a manuscript made up of seven booklets written by the four main scribes: A, B, E and F, with Scribes C and D writing later; these four scribes are responsible for individual items – there are no examples of a scribe swapping over mid-item. Scribes writing contemporaneously begin and finish their work on separate gatherings. The two examples of scribes, within this manuscript, starting a text on a gathering where another scribe has already written are at quire I and quire XIV; in both these instances scribes C and D, who have been dated to a period slightly later than the original scribes, were adding to the blank folios left within the booklets.[191]

[189] The indented position of the touched letters on the following two lines would suggest that the letter would have run down the ruled margin for a further two lines. Further missing letters, where a mark for the rubricator is present, are: 'Þ' at folio 115^{v}/1; 'Þ' at folio 116^{v}/3; 'O' at folio 117^{r}/21; and 'N' at folio 118^{r}/15.
[190] Hill 1965, p. 88.
[191] See Hill 2002, pp. 192-193.

The relationship between the items, foliation and gatherings is as follows:

Quire I^{12} contains the entirety of Item I (folios 1^{r}-7^{v}) in the hand of Scribe A and the entirety of Item 2 (folios 7^{v}-9^{r}) in the later hand of Scribe C; folio 9^{v} has been left blank and the three remaining folios of the gathering have been excised. Quire II^{12} and Quire III^{8} retain all of their folios and contain Item 3 (folios 10^{r}-27^{v}) in the hand of Scribe B; two blank folios are left at folios 28-29. Quires IV-VI^{12} contain Item 4 (folios 30^{r}-65^{v}) in the hand of Scribe B. Quire VII^{6} has been completely excised. Quires VIII-XI^{8} and quire XII^{10} contain Item 5 (folios 66^{r}-105^{r}) in the hand of Scribe F; folio 105^{v} has been left blank. Quire $XIII^{4}$ contains Item 6 (folios 106^{r}-107^{r}) in its entirety with folios 107-108^{v} ruled but left blank. Quire 14^{10} contains the entirety of both Item 7 (folio 109^{r}), in the later hand of Scribe D, and Item 8 (folios 110^{r}-113^{r}) in the hand of Scribe E; folio 113^{v} has been left blank except for the name John Eyton and the last five folios of the gathering have been excised. Quire 15^{12} contains the entirety of Item 9ii (folios 115^{r}-120^{r}) with Item 9i written on the verso of the first folio of the gathering (the recto is blank). The quire wants 3 in 9^{th} to 11^{th} positions (after the conclusion of the item) with the final folio (12^{th} position) being used as the original pastedown.

Hill suggests that 'the booklets, as is clear from the creased condition of their end leaves, remained unbound long enough for Item 2 and 7 to be added.'[192] In the case of quire I, Item 2 was added later on the blank folios to fill some space before the remainder of the folios were excised prior to binding. There does seem to be, according to Hill's explanation, some confusion over the addition of Item 7 and the make-up of the final two gatherings. Hill states:

> Item 8, originally a quire of eight, which shows the remains of the stab stitches which held together folios 110 to 113 and their conjugate stubs at head and tail, was inserted in a bifolium and the scribe wrote the symbols (Item 9a) inside its front

[192] Hill 2002, p. 193.

cover before he copied his exemplar. The end parchment leaf (folio 122) was used as the end pastedown, and the three preceding blanks were excised.[193]

It would seem that Hill is mistaken in this description by confusing, in part, quire XIV with quire XV. It is probable that quire XIV, which contains Item 8, was once a quire of eight. It would mean that scribe E was, in effect, writing on the first folio of the gathering rather than the second, a much more satisfactory reading, and that Scribe D wrote Item 7 on the first recto of a folded bifolium (folio 109[r]) which was placed around the original quire before binding.

Further evidence, such as the pricking/stab stitches present on folios 110 to 113 but not present on folio 109, the differences in writing grid, the absence of text on the verso of folio 109, also suggests that the quire was originally a quire of eight. It also highlights further the planned nature of this volume and solidifies the idea that binding took place after the later additions of Items 2 and 7. It is probable that the excision of blank folios took place just prior to binding and it should be noted that there are other blank folios in the manuscript where this item could have been added. However, the compiler/scribe decided to add a bifolium at the beginning of this quire rather than use one of the blank folios still present or one that is now excised. The importance of the position of Item 7 in relation to the other material around it is therefore highlighted. Assuming, therefore, that a bifolium was added around the original quire of eight, and the importance of Item 7 to other items in the group, then it would be unrealistic, considering the care that has been taken to excise other blank folios in the manuscript, and even in the same quire, to believe that the compiler would insert a blank folio at the beginning of this quire: the text of Item 7 must have been present before binding. In a similar respect, it can be assumed that Item 2 was written on the folios of quire 1 before binding. The excision of the

[193] Hill 2002, p.192.

folios that follow it in the manuscript would suggest that if it had not been present then the folios that it now occupies would also have been cut from the manuscript.

Hill claims, in the observations above, that the scribe wrote the symbols (Item 9a) inside the front cover of this bifolium (the one relating to Item 8) before copying his exemplar. However, the symbols relating to Item 9 are not present in this quire but in quire XV, which is a quire of 12. There is no reason to believe, although the main text does not begin until the recto of the second folio, that the outer bifolio of this gathering is a later addition to this quire. The symbols on the verso of the first gathering are in the same hand as the remainder of the quire and are, as Hill believes, a guide for scribe and reader.[194]

6(f). Contemporary and latter additions.

This manuscript is relatively unadorned with either contemporary or later additions. The following will be discussed in more detail in the section on 'Provenance'. On folio 1^{r} there is written, 'Iste liber constat Alicia sscheynton7 post eam conventu' and a separate (later) inscription in pencil 'gift of Mrs Lucy to John Gibson 8 Oct. 1853.' At the end of Item 2 (folio 9^{rb}) there are four lines of text which are written in red ink and have been dated by Hill to s.xiv^{2}.[195] These lines read, 'Iste liber constat domine margarete | sylemon 7 discipulas suas. Et | post mortem suam. Couentu de | Nuneton' and links the manuscript to Nuneaton priory where Margaret Selman was Lady Prioress between 2 January 1367 and October 1386.[196] On folio 113^{v} there is written the sixteenth-century name 'John Eyton Kt'.

[194] Hill 2002, p. 197
[195] Hill 2002, p. 200
[196] Hill 2002, p. 201.

6(g). Provenance.

The earliest known provenance of McClean is based on two *Ex Libris* inscriptions within the manuscript. The earlier of these, a colophon found separated from the main body of text by a line gap on 9^{rb}/10-13, and reproduced above in the section on 'Contemporary and Later additions', refers to Margaret Selman. According to James' research, 'Nuneaton in Warwickshire was a cell to the Abbey of Fontevraud, founded by Robert Bossu, Earl of Leicester, in Henry II's reign.'[197] Hill also notes that the position of the *Apocalypse*, immediately after the *Hours of the Virgin*, and written in the same hand, 'brings to mind the ideals of the Order of Fontevraud, Anjou.'[198]

The relationship between Mary and John is fundamental to the order which is founded upon the words that Christ spoke from the cross, commending the two to each other.[199] The religious houses, therefore, grew out of the mother-son relationship which gave the abbess superiority over the monks. The Abbess of Fontevraud would also have been responsible for appointing heads of dependent houses – such as those founded in England during the twelfth century.[200]

Hill makes an argument for the manuscript having once been at Amesbury and highlights the probability of a connection with a rich patron or patrons, possibly Edward I and Eleanor of Castile, whose daughter, Mary of Woodstock, was veiled there in 1285 at the age of 7.[201] The case for the manuscript having been commissioned by a wealthy patron for use by a devout lady novice at Amesbury is strengthened by its contents. The texts suggest to Hill a

[197] Montague Rhodes James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Manuscripts in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge: University Press*, (1912), p. 263.
[198] Hill 2002, p. 197.
[199] Hill 2002, p. 198.
[200] In her article, Hill details what little is known of the four dependant houses in England (Leighton Buzzard in Bedfordshire; Westwood, Worcestershire; Nuneaton, Warwickshire; and Amesbury, Wiltshire), Hill 2002, p..198 ff.
[201] Hill 2002, p. 199-200.

compilation that has been put together, selectively, perhaps by a cleric acting as a spiritual advisor, for a wealthy and educated lady.[202]

The positioning of the texts within the manuscript, as has been demonstrated earlier, appears to be important, giving further credence to the idea of a planned volume or at least a selective compiler. The selections are, as Hill demonstrates, 'of a moralising or meditative nature, and deal with individual spiritual welfare.'[203] *Chasteau d'Amour*, its title indicating its aristocratic and feudal tones,[204] was written by Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln and the first lecturer to the Franciscans at Oxford, who died in 1253, and has been described by Thomson as, 'an early allegory of the creation of the world and man, and man's fall and redemption'.[205] It contains, as one of its central themes, the courtly allegory of the body of the Blessed Virgin Mary as the Castle of Love.[206] It is, therefore, an apt choice for inclusion in a manuscript which, it would seem, was put together for private, female devotion.[207]

Furthermore, the *Mirrour de Seint Églyse*, of which there are two partial versions in the manuscript should, according to Hill, be considered a seminal text for nuns, which sets out 'how to live perfectly after the fashion of Hugh of St Victor'.[208] Written by St Edmund of Abingdon, and also known as the *Speculum Ecclesie*, the *Mirrour de Seint Églyse* was hugely popular and is extant in Latin, French and English. The *Mirrour* operates as a manual of didactic instruction, which reflects the systemisation of knowledge encouraged by the Fourth Lateran Council and the schools of the twelfth and thirteenth century. This idea of divisions and sub-

[202] Hill 2002, p. 197.
[203] Hill 2002, p. 195.
[204] A point expounded by Dominica Legge in her discussion of the possible patronage of the original text for the noble youths of De Montfort. M. D. Legge, *Anglo-Norman Literature and its Background* (Oxford, 1963), p. 223.
[205] S. H. Thomson, *The writings of Robert Grosseteste: Bishop of Lincoln 1235-1253* (London, 1940), p. 152.
[206] Hill 2002, p. 195.
[207] The original composition of the "Chasteau" can be placed somewhere in the years between 1215 and 1230 with no real certainty. It was, however, widely disseminated during the mid thirteenth century, and, in particular, the time directly after the death of Grossteste. It was translated from Anglo-Norman into Latin and into English. For a discussion on the dating of the "Chasteau" and for a list of manuscripts containing the work, see S. H. Thomson, pp. 152-154.
[208] Hill 2002, p. 196.

divisions in a much larger schema, present in the *Mirrour*, meant that an individual could choose beneficial and valuable parts in relation to particular needs, or that a compiler could make decisions relating to inclusion based on audience or the purpose of the manuscript. The two sections present in McClean - Chapter 17 is on the contemplation of God in scripture and a section of Chapter 5 on meditation about oneself - seem wholly appropriate for someone in need of guidance entering a penitential and pious life.

The presence of the *Apocalypse* within this manuscript, with its original 91 ink over graphite line drawings, is certainly suggestive of a wealthy patron. Legge's study, in relation to this text, states that:

> At first only the very rich could afford such books, but by the fourteenth century a rather cheaper range, expensive still but not in the same class, was being produced.[209]

The popularity of the *Apocalypse* exploded during the thirteenth century partly due its references to penitence and preachers, words with particular resonance at the beginning of the thirteenth century.[210] It became a popularised text of instruction for the laity during this period and definitely would not have been out of place within a manuscript compiled for an individual entering into religious instruction. The drawings and the text which corresponded to it would most certainly have served to focus the individual on personal meditation.

Hill further establishes the probable composition/compilation of the manuscript for a female recipient by indicating that in the *Pseudo-Augustine Prayer* the feminine form *pecacatari* is used - the intention being that this item was for the use of women.[211] The inclusion of the *Pseudo-Augustine Prayer* and *Hours of the Virgin* also suggests a probable link to continental France - once more strengthening an association, not only with Fontevraud, but

[209] Legge, *Anglo-Normaan Literature*, p. 237.
[210] Legge, *Anglo-Norman Literature*, p. 237.
[211] Hill 1972, p. 46.

also the royal family of Edward I. It should be added at this point that any link being suggested here or in Hill's study is circumstantial and is offered only as a possibility of provenance that should neither be fully adopted nor rejected. Hill states:

> I can find no evidence for or against my suggestion that Ms McClean 123, which belongs to Edward I's period of patronage of Amesbury, was commissioned by a wealthy patron for the individual use of a novice at Amesbury, either a daughter of the cloister or a more recent entrant in the early fourteenth century, for indoctrination in the rigid rule of Fontevraud.[212]

If, for the purposes of argument, it is accepted that McClean was once present at Amesbury, then Hill believes that it may have reached Nuneaton by means of the hierarchical relationship that would have been present between the mother house at Amesbury and the sister house at Nuneaton.[213]

The second *ex libris*, s.xv, can be found on folio 1^{r} and reads, 'Iste liber constat Alicia sscheynton et post eam conventu'. There is, at present, no information upon Alice Shenton, although Hill suggests that, although the convent is not stated, she might well have taken her name from Shenton in Leicestershire, about six miles from Nuneaton.[214]

On folio 113^{v} there is the sixteenth-century name 'John Eyton Kt' who, as yet, has not been identified. The next inscription is on folio 1^{r}, written in pencil and reads 'gift of Mrs Lucy to John Gibson 8 Oct. 1853.' According to Hill's research, Mrs Lucy was Mary Elizabeth, daughter of Sir John Williams, Bart, of Bodelwyddann, Flint, who married George Lucy of Carlecote, Warwickshire, in 1823.[215] The John Gibson of the inscription was the architect of Westminster who had some part in the designs for the Houses of Parliament.[216] Gibson died on

---

[212] Hill 2002, p. 200.
[213] Hill speculates further on this point and suggests that John of Gaunt, who was Eleanor of Castile's great-grandson, was a person ' in a position both to acquire and to donate the book.' Hill highlights Gaunt's links to both Amesbury, he was the nephew by marriage of Isabel of Lancaster, once Prioress of Amesbury, and Nuneaton, where he was patron from 1362. (Hill 2002, p. 201).
[214] Hill 2002, p. 203.
[215] For a fuller description of the Lucy ancestry see Hill 2002, pp. 204-205.
[216] Hill believes that the manuscript was given as a gift in appreciation for his services during the building of the church at Charlecote in memory of her husband between 5 April, 1850, and 2 February 1853. (Hill 1965, pp. 89-90).

23 December 1892 and the manuscript was sold as part of his library on 9 May 1893 by Christie, Manson & Woods.[217] In December of that year the manuscript was advertised in the sale catalogue of Bernard Quaritch, a well-known Picadilly book seller, as 'The Nuneaton Codex' and sold to Mr Frank McClean of Trinity College, Cambridge and Tunbridge Wells.[218] The manuscript, along with many other valuable books and items of art, was bequeathed to the Fitzwilliam Museum after McClean's death in November 1904.[219]

6(h). Binding.

The original binding is contemporary with the bringing together of the manuscript at the beginning of the fourteenth century. The manuscript was sewn on five double supports with chamfered oak boards, covered with red-dyed alum tawed skin. The original oak boards were retained when the manuscript was repaired in 1893. However the original covers, which were in disrepair, were replaced and covered by red-dyed goat skin. New parchment pastedowns and flyleaves were supplied at the time of repair. The single central strap, as well as the clasps, is missing.[220]

6(i). Condition.

The most significant damage to the manuscript is to Item 5, the *Apocalypse*. It would appear that six leaves are completely missing from the beginning of the item, and the item retains only 19 of the original pictures – the remainder having been excised from the

[217] Hill 2002, p. 204.
[218] Hill 1965, p. 90.
[219] Hill 2002, p. 204.
[220] Hill provides a description of the binding in Hill 2002, p. 191. A special thanks must be extended to the reading room staff of the Fitzwilliam Museum who provided me with a description of the manuscript, including the binding, which is as yet unpublished.

manuscript – leaving only the bottom half of the leaf, which contains the text.[221] Where drawings have been cut from the manuscript the text below is sometimes damaged.[222] There is further damage at folios 28 and 29 where pieces of parchment measuring *ca.* 200 x 75 have been torn from the bottom/outer corners of the folios; these folios are blank and so the text of the manuscript has not been affected. The manuscript has lost a total of twenty leaves with the seventh quire having been completely excised from the manuscript.[223]

The original end paste-down is now loose from the binding and has been replaced by a modern bifolium. The original leaf is stained and holed and carries the marks on its verso of the five binding strips from the wooden board that it was once pasted onto. There is a further hole on folio 38, measuring 8mm x 12mm, and situated 3mm in from the outer edge of the folio and 26mm from the bottom. The hole would have been present at the time of production and does not interfere with the text.

6(j). Surrogate Descriptions.

Hill 2002; James 1912.

[221] The following folios have had the top half of the page excised: folios 66-72, 74-77, 79-88, 90 (with some fragments of drawing remaining), 92-96, 98-101 and 104. The folios that have been left complete are folios. 72-73, 78, 89, 91, 97, 102-103 and 105.

[222] The first 4 lines of folio 69 (recto and verso) are fragmentary due to the cutting of the picture from the top half of the folio. This has led to a tear in the leaf which has been repaired, unsuccessfully, on the verso. Folio 70 is also damaged, meaning that the first two lines on both the recto and verso are fragmentary. A repair has, again, been attempted on a tear in the leaf. Folio 71 is missing its first line on recto and verso due to cutting. Folio 75 is missing the first two lines on recto and verso. Folio 77^{r} is missing its first line and most of the first line is missing from the verso. Folio 79 has suffered serious damage due to excision; only the last two lines of text remain on the recto and the last three on the verso. A split runs down the centre of the bottom half of the page due to the mutilation of the picture that was above. The verso of folio 80 has a first line that is only partially readable. Folio 81 has fragmentary first lines on both the recto and verso. Folio 82 is missing its first lines on both the recto and on the verso and the second line on the verso is also difficult to read because of mutilation. The first two lines are missing from both the recto and verso of folio 86. It would appear from the stub visible between folio 89 and folio90 that a folio has been completely excised from the manuscript at this point. The first line of folio 93^{v} is fragmentary, as are the first lines of writing on both the recto and verso of folio 94. Folios 98 and 99 have missing first lines on both their rectos and versos due to excision. Folios 100 and 101 have fragmentary first lines on their rectos and versos. A clear stub, with part of the writing grid visible on the recto as well as some of the red ink decoration of the rubricated letter, is visible between folios 101 and 102.

[223] Six stubs are visible between folios 65 and 66. A further folio is missing between folios 106 and 107 affecting the end of item 6iii (incomplete) and the beginning of 6iv (incomplete).

TEXTUAL HISTORY:

The Manuscripts, Reception and Possible Audiences

The *Conduct of Life* was copied and reshaped from *c.*1200 to 1300, and offers evidence of how such texts underwent modification over time as audiences and cultural contexts changed. The two earliest versions of the *Conduct of Life* are extant in two homiliaries. Lambeth and Trinity share similar material and contain primarily texts in English.[224] Until recently the wealth of material written in English in the period following the Conquest, to which the *Conduct of Life* and the homilies of Trinity and Lambeth contribute, has largely been characterised as belonging to a dying tradition, with scholars such as Scahill claiming that both Lambeth and Trinity:

> belong to another, dying cultural world, for in them English still has sufficient status to be the primary language of a manuscript, with some Latin and no French; and the prose homilies soon ceased to be copied.[225]

Scahill's view that homiliaries, such as Lambeth and Trinity, written in English in the post-Conquest period belong to a 'dying cultural world' typifies a historiography of English literature in which the conquest of 1066 imposes a fundamental break, relegating vernacular literature to subaltern status; this narrative has been largely overturned by trends in literary

[224] The Lambeth manuscript shares five Middle English homilies with the Trinity manuscript, in addition to the *Conduct of Life*, although the shared materials in both manuscripts, including the *Conduct of Life*, are not closely related, and probably go back to an older exemplar. For details see Margaret Laing, *Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval English* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 38.

[225] John Scahill, 'Trilingualism in Early Middle English miscellanies: languages and literature' in *Yearbook of English Studies,* n.s. 33 (2003), pp. 18-32.

studies that are encouraging scholars 'to step away from enshrining 1066 as a fundamental break between pre- and post-Conquest culture'.[226]

However, at its most extreme, some scholars tasked with writing an overview of written English after the Conquest have seen the period as no more than 'an incoherent, intractable, impenetrable dark age scarcely redeemed by a handful of highlights.'[227] Others, such as Christopher Cannon, see the importance of early Middle English writings only in signposting what is to come, insisting that 'what a particular writing should know best is that it is part of some larger "order".'[228] The English texts of the post-Conquest period always have, according to such academics, one eye on the later medieval period:

> Until the fourteenth century, in fact, English literature has seemed an 'unstable continuum', a shape in which the spaces between texts are more common---and therefore seem more definitive---than writings themselves.[229]

However, if the period is without shape for Christopher Cannon then that is because 'shape' for him appears to be defined by and is limited to the genre of medieval Romance or the writings of Chaucer.

What is overlooked in this approach is the materiality of the manuscript tradition, the wealth of writing in English during this period, and the interactions between the languages of England over a sustained period. Our understanding of the literature of the post-Conquest period cannot depend upon accepting the authority of a canon which relegates it to the position

---

[226] Elizabeth. M. Tyler, 'Introduction: England and Multilingualism: Medieval and Modern', in E.M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800-1250* (Turnhout, 2011), 1-14, p. 11; see also Elaine Treharne, *Living Through Conquest: The Politics of Early English, 1020-1220*, (Oxford, 2012); Mark Faulkner, 'Rewriting English Literary History 1042-1215', *Literature Compass*, 9 (2012), 275-91; Michael T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307* (Oxford, 1993);
[227] Thomas Hahn, 'Early Middle English' in D. Wallace, (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, (Cambridge, 1999), p.61
[228] Christopher Cannon, *The Grounds of English Literature* (Oxford, 2004), p. 49.
[229] Cannon, *Grounds of English Literature*, p. 19.

of mere prologue.[230] Treharne's critique of such implicit hierarchies and 'superficially imposed divisions ... [on] English literary and linguistic development', identifying in particular the texts of c.1060-c.1220' as poorly served by such periodisations, also notes the implicit valorisation of literary works understood as 'original', 'creative' and 'poetic' by the critical regimes of later centuries – regimes dictated by canons of taste and literary taxonomies that fail to comprehend the significance of much of the period's cultural production.[231]

Consequently, the *Conduct of Life* is absent from Cannon's description of the post-Conquest period, even though the number of versions of the text available, seven in six manuscripts, suggests that the text enjoyed considerable longevity. It was a work that was copied and reshaped throughout its history. Ignoring such scribal practices of copying and adaptation (discussed in my approach to this edition, pp.277-94), and considering the composition outside of its manuscript context, will inevitably leave lacunae in any analysis of literary history. In order to stabilise this continuum it is important to consider the historical context of production under which the *Conduct of Life* was written and rewritten.

During the Anglo-Saxon period developed an unparalleled tradition of vernacular writing.[232] By the time of the Norman Conquest, the written vernacular, functioning alongside Latin and occasionally entirely independently of it, was routinely used for both practical and literary purposes, and as the language of government.[233] After the Norman Conquest of 1066, however, English as a written language of governance was suppressed and the language itself

[230] For recent scholarship that challenges 'canonical periodisations', see Mark Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History 1042-1215*, p. 275; Tyler, 'England and Multilingualism', p. 11; Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, pp. 1-4, p. 95; and R. M. Stein, 'Multilingualism', in P. Strohm (ed.), Middle English (Oxford, 2007), pp. 28-30.
[231] Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, pp. 2-4, p. 95.
[232] See, for example, Turville-Petre, *Reading Middle English*, p. 6.
[233] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record:*, p. 23.

devalued by those who now held power.[234] By 1070 the issue of writs and legal documents in Old English had almost ceased.[235] The Norman suppression of the English language and of English-speaking elites was likely a response to the repeated rebellions in the years following the Conquest and the process of supplanting native land titles with estates awarded to supporters of William I. Clanchy concludes that 'Old English, which had symbolized accessibility and trustworthiness to Anglo-Saxons, may now have seemed to represent challenges to Norman authority'.[236] However, whilst the 'programmatic replacement of the native secular and religious elites', to use Faulkner's terms, did 'introduce French as a prestige language and shifted patronage away from English texts to French and Latin',[237] English remained the spoken language of the vast majority of the people; it remained the language of daily transactional business, and Norman elites would have needed, to some extent, to learn it.[238]

Some studies, including that of Begoña Crespo, have tended to focus on this orality of the vernacular during the period, arguing that 'the lack of literacy and the fact of being the language of a conquered people limited English to the lower ranks of society', and concluding that the language was 'reduced to a conversational, everyday language that was transmitted orally'.[239] Writing specifically about the twelfth century, Irvine similarly concludes that despite

[234] As a counterpoint, Ian Short believes that 'there is no direct evidence that English was in any way suppressed – this particular myth was fully articulated only in the fifteenth century'. (I. Short, *Patrons and Polyglots: French Literature in Twelfth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 1991) p. 247).
[235] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 24.
[236] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 24.
[237] Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History 1042-1215*, p. 282; see also Short, *Patrons and Polyglots*, p. 236
[238] Tim W. Machan, *English in the Middle Ages*: p. 74; Thorlac Turville-Petre, *Reading Middle English Literature* (Malden, MA, 2007), p. 7 and Bruce O'Brien, 'Translating technical terms in law-codes from Afred to the Angevins', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800-1250* (Turnhout, 2011) p. 73.
[239] Begoña Crespo, 'Historical background of multilingualism and its impact in English', in David Trotter (ed.), *Multilingualism in Late Medieval Britain* (Cambridge, 2000), 23-35, p. 24. Similarly, Machan states, 'Given the limitations of vernacular literacy, indeed, for the population at large English remained a largely oral language' (Machan, *English in the Middle Ages*, p.74).

there being 'at least two million speakers' of English, 'the range of its written survival is surprisingly narrow'.[240]

However, the number of extant manuscript versions of texts written in English in the period after the Conquest indicates a far more serious cultural role for the English language than this narrative of decline and suppression might suggest.[241] Orietta Da Rold asks the 'obvious question' – one, however, which has been largely overlooked – of 'what is the evidence for English manuscript production between 1100 and 1400?'[242] She concludes that it is 'greater than one may anticipate', demonstrating that there are: 'at least 32 manuscripts from the twelfth century, 116 from the thirteenth century and 74 from the fourteenth-century'. Furthermore, rather than being 'surprisingly narrow' in range, 'these manuscripts contain English texts of various kinds and forms, from secular to religious themes, from prose to poetry. They include law codes, administrative matters, science and medicine'. [243]

Faulkner, in his discussion of English literary history from 1042-1215, concludes from the number of texts written in English during this time that although patronage was 'redirected' toward productions in French (and to a lesser degree Latin), there 'indisputably remained an audience for writing in English'.[244] For Treharne, English emerges as a politicised language, with the production of English texts in the period following the Conquest a statement of a people 'that cannot be silenced'. She points to an 'authority and status', similar to the 'accessibility and trustworthiness' that Clanchy believed to be a challenge to Norman

[240] Short, *Patrons and Polyglots*, p. 247.
[241] For a list and descriptions of manuscripts containing English from the period 1060-1220 an excellent place to start is 'Portal to Manuscript Descriptions: List of Manuscripts', in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220* (http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220)
[242] Da Rold, 'Manuscript production before Chaucer: some preliminary observations', in O. Da Rold and E. Treharne (eds.), *Textual Cultures, Cultural Texts* (London, 2010), 43-58, p. 48.
[243] Da Rold, 'Manuscript production before Chaucer', p. 48.
[244] Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History 1042-1215*, p. 280. Also see Faulkner's discussion of texts written in English, including the *Poema Morale*, p. 277ff.

hegemony, demonstrated in the writings of 1020 to 1220 that has not, until recently, 'been accorded the same endorsement in the modern era'.[245] She concludes:

> The noiselessness of the Anglo Saxon in the years after 1066 is, rather, a construct of a modern academy focusing so intensely on sources it self-validates that it obfuscates other voices that have every reason to be considered viable witnesses.[246]

For both Faulkner and Treharne, the use of English in some texts like sermons and homilies 'was dictated by pragmatic concerns like the projected linguistic limitations of the intended audience'.[247] However, where Treharne sees the use of English as being 'motivated by a political desire to retain and promote native language and customs' and maintain a sense of identity through language, Faulkner is more cautious, arguing that 'there is no need to assume that reading English texts was a marker of English ethnic allegiance'.[248]

If there is any solid evidence in the manuscripts known to house the *Conduct of Life* for the English language as a locus of political resistance – or, perhaps more accurately, political mourning – it may be that identified by Treharne in the Trinity manuscript, where the text celebrating St Andrew mobilises metaphors of a sinking ship to signify the troubled nation.[249] It remains open to question whether the *Conduct of Life* itself contains any instances in which the use of English is similarly thrown into focus as a political gesture; such a use, in this text, remains a contextual rather than textual matter. However, socio-political complaint and resistance are arguably present in the sermon's structures of analogy and metaphor; Hill notes the use of the

[245] Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 9.
[246] Treharne, *Living Through Conques*t, p. 93.
[247] Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History*, p. 280.
[248] Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 112, p. 123 (Treharne is specifically speaking here about the West Midlands); Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History,* p. 280.
[249] Traherne, *Living Though Conquest*, pp. 154-5.

figures of sheriff, reeve and King as avatars of temporal power and its ability to dispossess, discipline and punish the individual subject, in the following lines:[250]

> For ne mai hit us binime, no king ne no syrreue. (50)
>
> Swines brade is wel swete, swo is of wilde diere;
> Ac al to diere he hit abuið þe ȝiefð þar for his swiere. (145-6)

What is certain is that in the period after the Conquest, English continued to be copied and adapted as a medium for preaching, teaching, and chronicling, with many Old English texts, such as those of Ælfric, being adapted for a new audience.[251] However, as Faulkner points out, there has been a tendency to treat, for example, twelfth-century homilies as 'debased copies of older works rather than texts in their own right'.[252] These texts have been largely overlooked as within modern scholarly hierarchies such utilitarianism has not been considered 'literary' enough.[253] This has led scholars such as Elizabeth M. Tyler to decry 'the study of vernacular literature' as having been 'more fully shaped by nineteenth-century nationalism than the study of history'.[254] Lerer establishes that 'from a codicological standpoint, this period is one of the most productive for the dissemination of Old English writing', but rather than focusing on 'a decline in the standards of an Anglo-Saxon practice', he encourages scholars to appreciate these products as attempts 'to reinvent the modes of Old English writing'.[255]

However, for Treharne, 'the longevity and similarity of both the form and the content of English manuscript production from the second half of the eleventh century until the

---

[250] Hill 1977, p. 122.
[251] See Elaine Treharne, 'Making their Presence Felt: Readers of Ælfric, *c.* 1050-1350', in E. Traherne and H. Magennis (eds.) *A Companion to Ælfric*,, Brill Companions to the Christian Tradition vol. 18 (Cambridge, 1999), 399-422; Mary Swan, '*Ælfric's Catholic Homilies* in the twelfth century', in M. Swan and E. Traherne (eds.), *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, (Cambridge, 200) 62-82; and George Younge on the reworking of the First and Second series of the *Catholic Homilies* in London, British Library MS Cotton Vespasian D. xiv (George Younge, 'An Old English Compiler and his Audience: London, British Library MS Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, fols 4-169', in *English Manuscript Studies, 1100-1700,* 17 (2013), 1-26).
[252] Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History*, p. 277.
[253] See Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 4, p. 95-97: and Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History*, p. 275.
[254] Tyler, 'England and Multilingualism', p. 8.
[255] Seth Lerer, 'Old English and its afterlife', in D. Wallace (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Literature*, *vol. 1: After the Norman Conquest* (Cambridge, 1999) 7-34, pp. 8-10.

beginning of the thirteenth', is not evidence of a 'lack of creativity of the manuscript compilers', but is a product of the 'essential functionalism and adaptability of the vernacular for a wide variety of contemporary purposes'.[256] Similarly, in communicating the work of the influential project 'English Manuscripts 1060-1220', Da Rold and Swan evidence 'over two hundred manuscripts in the Project's list, and over eight hundred texts in these which have pre-Conquest English roots'; yet, rather than seeing 'nostalgia' or 'antiquarianism' as the principal motivation for what might be considered a 'lack of originality', their work suggests that 'scribes and compilers, and presumably their intended readers, are not preoccupied by – and perhaps not aware of – a boundary between what we might label late Old English and early Middle English'.[257]

However, as my work on language has demonstrated, the *Conduct of Life* is a clear demonstration of the point at which literary and spoken languages meet, where processes of manuscript and oral transmission become interrelated in complex ways, and where the sermon form's imperative to communicate and exhort brings local variations in speech and dialect into contention with 'literary' imperatives of form, formality and replicability. Where contemporary scholars have identified the use of an 'antiquarianised' English as an expression of monastic reaction or resistance, as a vehicle for a politics of nostalgia – or, in Faulkner's analysis, the natural result of a 'pure' language being superseded by the process of hybridization and the emergence of a newly polyvocal living one – there is a sense in which a closer attention to form, purpose and the cultural contexts surrounding categories of the 'literary' might yield a more nuanced impression of the early Middle English literary field. The *Conduct of Life*'s variant copies demonstrate a close engagement with local dialect and

[256] Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 97.
[257] Orietta Da Rold and Mary Swan, 'Linguistic Contiguities: English Manuscripts 1060-1220', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800-1250* (Turnhout, 2011) 255-270, p. 256. For a discussion of the trend in modern scholarship to see these texts as nostalgic, antiquated and even eulogistic see Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, pp. 97-98.

speech patterns; it shows that an attention to texts written for specific kinds of performance, and to fulfil certain kinds of social purposes, might complicate historical narratives by which the Anglo-Saxon language and tradition becomes essentially moribund, an object for nostalgia rather than living application.

Both Trinity and Lambeth can be seen as examples of manuscripts which reflect very clearly an audience for liturgical texts in English; this, along with the occasions of the sermons, has suggested to Sisam that the Lambeth homilies were 'a specimen of the sermons a parish priest gave to his congregation at the end of the twelfth century'.[258] Items such as the *Pater Noster* and the expositions of the Apostles' Creed, along with a number of other items found in both manuscripts, would certainly have made suitable preaching material. The physical dimensions of both of these homiliaries also suggest manuscripts that could be carried quite easily.[259] In addition to this, folios 2^{r} to 9^{v} of Trinity, which contain the *Conduct of Life*, should be viewed as a self-contained unit.[260] Judging from the markings and soiling on the first quire of the Trinity manuscript, this gathering was once folded and kept separate from the rest of the codex.[261] It may be possible that it was carried by an individual to be copied from or read aloud from.

Neither manuscript has elaborate decoration or examples of costly production. Both manuscripts are relatively unadorned, with a utilitarian character about both that is manifest

[258]Celia Sisam, 'The Scribal Tradition of the 'Lambeth Homilies'.' *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 2 (1911), 105-113, p.105

[259] See the MSS description of Cambridge, Trinity College MS B 14 52 *pp.* George Younge also believes this to be the case of MS Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, stating that 'the compact size of the codex and its simple decorative scheme suggests that it was inexpensive to produce and designed to be portable'. (Younge, 'An Old English Compiler and his Audience'), p. 1. See also Treharne, who focuses on five manuscripts from the beginning to the middle of the twelfth century (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 302; London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. ix; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 303; and London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv) that have dimensions that show 'that all of these codices were conceived of as portable' (Elaine Treharne, 'The Production and Script of Manuscripts Containing English Religious Texts in the First Half of the Twelfth Century', in M. Swan and E. M. Treharne (eds.), *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), 11-40, p. 15).

[260] The reasons for considering this to be a self-contained unit are expounded in the manuscript description to Trinity, pp. 14-15.

[261] Treharne also notes this in her description of Trinity, stating: 'Quire 1 was folded on the vertical down the middle. The fold is from the last folio forwards; in other words, the outermost leaf when folded would be the closing folio. It thus formed a distinct textual unit.' Treharne 2010.

not only in the materials that they contain but also in the physical make-up and presentation of the codices. In these early manuscripts there is a balance between a clear, legible script for reading and a need to maximise the space on the page. The result of this in both cases is an uncomplicated hand, with moderate compression and limited interlinear space.

Although Bella Millett accepts Sisam's assertion that both Lambeth and Trinity were manuscripts designed for the purpose of preaching, she rejects the argument that they are typical of parish preaching at this time. She instead argues that the material in common between the manuscripts suggests that they might be seen as early vernacular versions of *pastoralia*, or at least a development in vernacular preaching that included an attempt at the 'sharing of good practice' across diocesan boundaries.[262] However, although some early use of the vernacular is acknowledged, the penitential *pastoralia* did not have much in the way of momentum before about 1260. It is a more likely premise that the Trinity and Lambeth manuscripts were witnesses to a continuation and the further development of a written tradition of vernacular composition rather than a reaction to papal developments brought about by either the Third or Fourth Lateran councils.[263] However, what is acknowledged in Millett's study is the limitation of the appellation 'lay audience' when it comes to this period. It is clearly possible to describe the *Conduct of Life*, in the context of the Trinity and Lambeth manuscripts, as a text for preaching, but who the audience for this text was, and how the text was received, remains unknown.[264]

Younge encourages us to assess the compilation of Old English homiliaries in the period following the Conquest 'on a case-by-case basis', agreeing with Conti that there appears to be 'no

[262] Bella Millett, 'The Pastoral Context of the Trinity and Lambeth Homilies', in W. Scase (ed.), *Essays in Manuscript Geography: Vernacular Manuscripts of the English West Midlands from the Conquest to the Sixteenth Century* (Turnhout, Belgium, 2007) 43-66, p. 61.

[263] From the eleventh century village priests became more common as the minster churches were supplemented and often replaced by a network of parish churches. See Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 243.

[264] Details of the form and content of the *Conduct of Life* will be discussed in the sections of this introduction focused on Structure and Prosody (pp. 193-209), and Sources and Analogues (pp. 210-76).

single overarching motivation' for their production.[265] In a chapter of *Living Through Conquest* entitled 'The Remains of Conquest', Treharne lists the extant English manuscripts from *c.*1100-1220, including Lambeth and Trinity, and concludes that:

> One thing seems certain: there is no single textual community for this diverse English corpus, no monolithic audience of illiterate lay people; rather, users of and audiences for the English texts copied during the twelfth century, and those copied in preceding centuries, varied according to specific historical moments, particular contexts, and multiple places.[266]

In his assessment of the materials contained within Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, Younge demonstrates that in this manuscript 'material is altered to suit the requirements of a linguistically and theologically unsophisticated audience'.[267] Supporting Treharne's arguments, he states that that the manuscript was probably intended for the use of '*conversi*, adult postulants to the monastic life from a clerical or lay background'.[268]

In a comparison of Cotton Vespasian D. xiv with Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 303, Younge concludes that the approach to Ælfric's homily on the Nativity of Paul is markedly different, with the compiler of Cotton Vespasian D. xiv extracting 'only the monastic element' where in CCC MS 303 a 'peroration' is inserted 'appropriate for a general audience'.[269] In addition, he notes that throughout Cotton Vespasian D. xiv Latin phrases are removed from the manuscript's sources, likely because 'its users lacked even a rudimentary grasp of the language'.[270] In comparison, Lambeth inserts Latin sentences into the sources of the Old English homilies providing, according to Swan, 'authoritative-sounding statements for translation into

---

[265] Younge, 'An Old English compiler and his audience', p. 4; Aidan Conti, 'The Circulation of the Old English Homily in the Twelfth Century: New Evidence from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343', in A. J. Kleist (ed.), *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, pp. 365-402, p. 369. See also Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History*, p. 278 for a summary of the possible audiences for homilaries during this period.
[266] Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 127.
[267] Younge, 'An Old English compiler and his audience', p. 7.
[268] Younge, 'An Old English compiler and his audience' pp. 5-7; E. M. Treharne, 'The Form and Function of the Twelfth-Century Old English *Dicts of Cato*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 102 (2003), 465-85. pp. 477-81.
[269] Younge, 'An Old English compiler and his audience', p. 10.
[270] Younge, 'An Old English compiler and his audience', p. 7.

English' that advance an argument for oral delivery.[271] Treharne notes the addition of Latin source material to the English explication also present in the homilies of Trinity, 'presumably to add authority and weight to the text'. The vernacular writings, she concludes, are 'validated by translation and source appearing together'.[272] This interaction between the vernacular and Latin, and the absence of it in the case of Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, reminds us that 'no one language could serve all the diverse purposes required because their struggle for dominance was still undecided'.[273]

In *The Grounds of English Literature*, Cannon acknowledges that the project of literature is only unstable when the 'complex, trilingual culture' of England in this period is ignored and that this shape (this absence) is also formed out of our own conception of what constitutes both 'history' and 'literature'. He essays, in the first two chapters of his book, a usable 'theory of form' in order to create links between what he erroneously considers to be 'individual' and 'isolated' texts, and by doing so, in his own words, 'thickening rather than advancing the general claim that early Middle English writing is richer than we have known.'[274]

This section began by arguing that, in the period following the Conquest, texts written in English might only be considered as individual or isolated if those writings that cannot be neatly categorised as 'literature' by modern scholarship are overlooked and removed from their place within literary history. In addition, it will continue by showing that to ignore the 'complex, trilingual culture' of England, and the English language's influence upon that culture is to artificially create more spaces between those texts written in English.

---

[271] Younge, 'An Old English compiler and his audience', p. 7; M. Swan, 'Preaching Past the Conquest: Lambeth Palace 487 and Cotton Vespasian A.XXII', in A. J. Hist (ed.), *The Old English Homily* (Turnhout, 2007), 403-423, pp. 407-9.
[272] Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 135.
[273] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 202.,
[274] Cannon, *Grounds of English Literature*, p. 13.

England was multilingual even before the conquest. Until the end of the middle ages the narrative of medieval Britain was one of a continuous arrival of people and their languages from the continent.[275] The English were constantly decoding and translating: whether it was orally between English and Welsh, Normans, Scots or Scandinavians, or in the written texts of Latin and the vernaculars.[276] As a result, as Faulkner puts it, 'Post-Conquest Britain was a tri-, even multilingual, society with a literature to match'.[277] However, the reality of a polyglot medieval England, whilst regularly recognised as being so, has not until recently received the full scholarly attention that it deserves.[278] Stein, writing in 2007, believes that this is because scholarship has rested on nineteenth-century teleologies by which 'all history is nothing but the history of modernity'. Modern university faculties and departments, still in hock to the ideologies of nationhood that structured disciplinary formation in the nineteenth century, organise themselves around the 'idea of national languages, national literatures, and national history' and, therefore, tend to construct European vernaculars as 'linguistically homogeneous entities'.[279] Recent scholarship has made some effort towards engaging with this legacy, with Da Rold, for example, suggesting that 'English in this period should be considered symptomatic of a multilingual production, rather than thought of as a marginalised output', and arguing that 'English texts might most usefully be studied along with Latin and French'.[280] This acknowledgement of the need to reconsider medieval linguistic contestation and pluralism has led to edited volumes such as Elizabeth Tyler *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in England, c.800-c.1250*, in which the editor's article on polyglot royal women in the period directly before and after the conquest states that:

[275] Tyler, 'England and Multilingualism', p. 2.
[276] O'Brien, 'Translating Technical Terms', p. 58.
[277] Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History*, p. 275.
[278] Stein, 'Multilingualism', p. 28.
[279] Stein, 'Multilingualism.' pp. 28-30.
[280] Da Rold, 'Manuscript production before Chaucer', p. 46.

> Recognition of the centrality of trilingualism to the vibrancy – intellectual, aesthetic, social and political – of the literary culture of Norman England now shapes the study of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[281]

Similarly, Faulkner notes that 'the twelfth century saw the transition from linguistic pluralism to multilingualism' and challenges literary historians to 'ask why some texts were written in English and not in French, Latin or any of the other languages available'.[282]

We have already seen in Trinity and Lambeth that Latin has been added to source material to validate and add gravitas to the English texts. In this, Treharne sees a possible awareness in the compiler of early Middle English homiliaries of 'newer developments' in scholasticism and an 'increased demand' for 'authoritative pastoral texts'.[283] In the post-Conquest period Latin occupied the highest position in the 'hierarchy of linguistic prestige',[284] and remained 'the principal language of record […] across the whole medieval millennium from 500 to 1500'.[285] The English language's relationship with Latin is more clearly defined and possibly less complicated than its relationship with the other vernacular: the language of the conquerors.

The composition of the Trinity and Lambeth manuscripts in English without any French is likely to be reflective of the very deliberate purpose and style of both of these homiliaries and the distinct traditions and audiences of each vernacular. To copy homilies in English during this period was a pragmatic linguistic choice to appeal to a pastoral need.[286] Treharne suggests that in the twelfth century Anglo-Norman literary production closely

[281] E. M. Tyler, 'Crossing Conquests: Polyglot Royal Women and Literary Culture in Eleventh-Century England', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800-1250* (Turnhout, 2011), 171-196, p. 173.
[282] Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History*, p. 279.
[283] Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 135.
[284] Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History*, p. 279.
[285] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 23.
[286] See Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History*, p. 278; and Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 112.

paralleled English, 'but the two appear never to have been in direct negotiation with one another' as the different vernacular materials never appear together in compilations.[287] Current research suggests that English manuscript production occurred almost entirely within the monastic institutions of the pre-conquest Benedictine reform group (Worcester, Rochester, Christ Church and St Augustine's, Canterbury, Winchester, and Peterborough) and may have been for in-house non-latinate audiences or for pastoral use of parish priests affiliated to these houses.[288] The French texts of this time, however, 'seem to have been written to order, many for female lay patrons, aristocratic in intended audience.'[289]

This may not be surprising considering that there was no significant penetration of French into the indigenous population.[290] This was not necessarily unique to England, as whilst there would have necessarily been interaction between lords and those who served them, domestically or administratively, 'nowhere in medieval Europe did the language of the ruling class become the predominant language of all its subjects'.[291] Consequently, Short asks how we account for the 'disappearance of English from the linguistic map of the twelfth century'.[292] In addressing this, firstly, it is worth cautioning against 'being prejudiced in favour of literacy', especially with regard to the early medieval period when even 'the most educated people did not often write'.[293] Ignorance and illiteracy are not synonymous during this period and it is only in the modern period that literacy has become an 'essential mark of civilization' that 'indexes an individual's integration into society'; as Clanchy states, 'it is language itself which

[287] Treharne, E. M., 'The vernaculars of medieval England, 1170–1350', A. Galloway (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Culture* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 221.
[288] See for instance, Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 131; and Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 214. It is also worth reading Clanchy's short section entitled 'The Anglo Saxon Heritage of Literacy' in the same book (pp. 30-35), for a cursory discussion of the geographical locations of writings composed in English before the Conquest as a point of comparison.
[289] Treharne, 'The Vernaculars of Medieval England' p. 222.
[290] Short, *Patrons and Polyglots*, p. 247.
[291] Serge Lusigna, 'French Language in Contact with English: Social Context and Linguistic Change (Mid-13th–14th Centuries)', in Jocelyn Wogan-Browne (ed.), *The French of England* (York, 2009), 19–30. p. 29.
[292] Short, *Patrons and Polyglots*, p. 247.
[293] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, pp. 7-8.

forms mentalities, not literacy'.[294] Secondly, as this study has demonstrated, the English population was not cut off from literate culture; with scholars such as Treharne, Younge, Da Rold, Swan, and others showing that, rather than disappearing, a rich tradition of English composition endured.

With both of these points in mind, it is important to acknowledge, as Treharne does, that:

> the majority of English books, as well as many Latin manuscripts, that survive from the end of the tenth to the end of the eleventh century belonged originally to those responsible for overseeing the provision for pastoral care; namely, the bishop or the abbot, or their own appointed delegate.[295]

An audience receptive to English was the largest of all audiences in England during this period and, therefore, the importance of manuscripts written in the native language should not be devalued. Finally, centres producing texts in English also appear to have been motivated by 'a political desire to retain and promote native language and customs, and to protect the interests of the dioceses, their churches and congregations'.[296] The choice of the English language and the exclusion of French in the homilies and sermons from this period need not be conceptualised as 'antagonistic',[297] but the lack of dialogue between the vernaculars might also reflect a statement of identity.[298]

The occurrence of the extant versions of the *Conduct of Life* in very different manuscripts is important not only for an investigation into this text's reception but also as a guide to the reception and changing dynamic of the written English language in this country from the end of the twelfth century. The inclusion of the verse-sermon in two homiliaries,

---

[294] See Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, pp. 7-9.
[295] Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 107.
[296] Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 112.
[297] Faulkner, *Rewriting English Literary History*, p. 280.
[298] Treharne, *Living Through Conquest*, p. 123.

composed primarily in English, is significant. The copying and adaptation of the *Conduct of Life* for a very different audience by the conclusion of its known transmission, at which point it is found in McClean, reflects not only a fluid attitude of scribes and compilers of this period toward the manuscript from which they are copying, but also mirrors a changing dynamic within the vernacular languages of the country.

By the thirteenth century, a traditional descriptive hierarchy of languages in England would have situated Latin above the two vernaculars, with Anglo-Norman operating as the language of prestige above English, which was the non-literary language of the peasantry. However, as Helen Fulton indicates, recent studies suggest 'a more complex linguistic environment' with considerable fluidity surrounding language choice.[299] For example, as Clanchy points out, 'Lawman procured books in Latin, French and English to write his version of the *Brut*'.[300] An individual conversant in Latin, English and French, if his account is to be believed, made a choice to write in English. Stein recognises this as a 'fissured' polyglot world of literary language, where 'no points of stability can be found within the fluid and shifting multilingual field'. He points to the making and remaking of *Ancrene Wisse* in English, French and Latin as an example demonstrating that none of the three main languages 'can be definitely attached either to a place of production or to a specific use'.[301]

Similarly, Wogan-Browne encourages us to avoid conceptualizing 'two separate vernacular languages and traditions', previously defined as the 'English of England and French of England', and dispose of ideas of a 'monoglot entity proceeding in organic linearity through

[299] Helen Fulton, 'Negotiating Welshness: mutilingualism in Wales before and after 1066', in E. M. Tyler (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800-1250* (Turnhout, 2011), 145-170, p. 157.
[300] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 206.
[301] Stein, 'Multilingualism', p.. 34.

time'.[302] By 1300, according to Clanchy, an educated layman such as Henry de Bray would have been conversant with writing in three literary languages – English, French, and Latin – and 'did not necessarily care whether sermons, songs, and tales he heard or read were new or old'.[303] However, whilst it is anachronistic to state that there was one identifiable language of the population, it is also wrong to assume that everyone was trilingual or even bilingual.[304] However, as Serge Lusignan has argued, 'We can confidently claim that nearly all authors of documents drafted in French, in England, between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries, had English as their mother tongue'.[305] What is clear is that from the thirteenth century there was a production of manuscripts that contained diverse texts written in more than one language – and, moreover, an audience for them.

Digby is a small composite manuscript with contents that should be viewed as separate, individual booklets which were brought together by the early fourteenth century. The manuscript contains a mixture of twelfth- and thirteenth-century liturgical, theological and medical works, as well as Latin and French satirical verse. The *Conduct of Life* is the only English composition in the manuscript, although Ker contends that BL MS Cotton Galba A. xix, a fragmentary version of the early Middle English *Proverbs of Alfred*, was once present in Digby.

A later composition of the *Conduct of Life* in a multilingual environment is found in Jesus a tri-lingual planned anthology with a single compiler/scribe copying individual texts from various sources. This manuscript contains both the *Conduct of Life* and the *Proverbs of Alfred* in the same hand, c. 1286-1300 (the only hand which writes throughout the manuscript),

[302] Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, 'General Introduction: What's in a name: the "French" of "England"', in J. *Wogan-Browne* (ed.), *The French of England* (York, 2009), 1-16, p. 5.
[303] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, pp. 110-11.
[304] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 205.
[305] Lusignan, 'French Language in Contact with English', p. 24.

and is probably the most well-known of the manuscripts under consideration here due to the inclusion of the secular debate poem *The Owl and the Nightingale*. The codex contains a large number of texts written in English verse. These items amount to a diverse range of works ranging from secular debate to religious visions, and lives of saints. The large number of religious lyrics present in the manuscript has led scholars such as R. H. Robbins to theorise that both Jesus and London, British Library, Cotton Caligula A.IX, which share material,[306] were compiled by the Friars as a repository of materials for preaching in the vernacular.[307] However, Cartlidge responds to this theory by demonstrating that the Middle English religious lyrics, which include the *Conduct of Life*, are in fact significantly outweighed, in volume, by three works ascribed to the poet Chadri, writing in Anglo-Norman.[308] These works by Chadri are, according to Cartlidge's analysis of their thematic content, didactic but at the same time 'light-hearted', frustrating any definitive identification of purpose or audience.[309] It should be said, however, that all of the twenty-one English lyrics in the Jesus manuscript are religious, concerning themselves with the necessity of repentance and contrition in anticipation of the Apocalypse, and that the prayer which concludes *The Passion of Our Lord* suggests composition, or at least transmission, within a religious order. Hill suggests that the material within Jesus was probably 'picked up in Religious Houses of the various Orders by one or more members of Swinfield's [Bishop of Hereford 1283-1317] familia who accompanied him on his diocesan travels.'[310]

[306] See Hill 2003, pp. 271-272.
[307] Rossell H. Robbins, 'The authors of the Middle English religious lyrics', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, n.s. 39 (1940), 230-238, p. 231.
[308] N. Cartlidge, 'The composition and social context of Oxford, Jesus College, MS 29 (II) and London, British Library, Ms Cotton Caligula A.ix', in *Medium Ævum* , 66 (1997), 250-269, p. 252.
[309] Cartlidge, 'The composition and social context of Oxford, Jesus College, MS 29 (II)', p. 254.
[310] Hill 2003, p. 274.

In a 2014 study, Susanna Fein demonstrates the textual contact between British Library, MS Harley 2253 and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 86 and scribe 1 of the Auckinleck manuscript. The study closely considers the literary culture of the West Midlands during this period and regards Harley 2253 and Digby 86 as being part of a 'continuum of literary book production' that also includes Cambridge, Trinity College MS B.14.39; London, British Library, MS Cotton Caligula A.ix; and Jesus.[311] This 'continuum' appears to have had religious houses at its foundations but was expanded over time to lay households, and produced five books that 'hold a fascinating degree of multilingualism, self-aware yet casually displayed'.[312] For instance, Da Rold notes that 'Scribe 1 of Digby 86 is someone who not only copied texts and tinted capitals in red, but also had a clear understanding and knowledge of literature in three languages, which does not correspond, perhaps, with modern expectations of the competencies that this scribe might expect to have had'.[313]

The works present in Jesus, especially when we consider the inclusion of such items as *The Owl and the Nightingale* (followed immediately in the manuscript by the *Conduct of Life*),[314] are very different in aim, style and register. Although some of the contents, such as the lyrics and the *Passion of Our Lord*, suggest a monastic background, and so it is likely that the manuscript was produced in a religious house of some kind, there is no clear proof that they were ever compiled for use within an institutional setting.[315] In fact the works are so varied that the manuscript does not fit any other specifically definable milieu. What the manuscript does

[311] Susanna Fein, 'The fillers of the Auchinleck Manuscript and the literary culture of the West Midlands', in C. M. Meale and D. Pearsall (eds.), *Makers and Users of Medieval Books: Essays in Honour of A. S. G. Edwards* (Cambridge, 2014), 60-77, pp. 61-62.
[312] Fein, 'The fillers of the Auchinleck Manuscript', p. 62.
[313] Da Rold, 'Manuscript production before Chaucer',.p. 54.
[314] *The Owl and the Nightingale* is a text that Cannon is gratefully able to disentangle from the manuscript and momentarily hold aloft, as according to him it 'is hard not to notice how perfectly this poem anticipates Chaucer's – even if it is impossible for Chaucer to have known it', Cannon, *The Grounds of English Literature,* p. 3. It might, however, be more productive to view *The Owl and Nightingale* within its manuscript context and ask how it anticipates the *Conduct of Life*.

[315] Cartlidge, 'The composition and social context of Oxford, Jesus College, MS 29 (II)', p. 258.

suggest, in these contexts, when compared to the only other manuscript written in one hand, Lambeth, is that not only was the scribe of Jesus, who it would seem was probably also the compiler, trilingual, but also that he felt that there was an audience for such an anthology of varied works. Cartlidge, therefore, encourages us to interpret it as '[an] illustration of the fluidity of the cultural and social identities in this period'.[316]

The placement of the *Conduct of Life* within what would appear to be a planned, trilingual anthology with an extensive range of material is indicative of the changes that had taken place in the period since the text's conception. The textual links of Jesus, with not only the more obvious BL MS Cotton Caligula A.IX, but also other similarly contemporaneous manuscripts, such as Oxford, Bodleian Library Digby MS 86, or British Library, MS Harley 978, should advance the idea that there was an extensive range of multi-lingual and multi-generic manuscripts dating from this period than more recent scholarship has perhaps acknowledged.[317]

Stein argues that a large number of manuscripts produced during the twelfth- and thirteenth-century in England 'cross linguistic boundaries in their contents while also crossing boundaries separating literary from non-literary, sacred from secular, serious from comic, popular from learned'.[318] These manuscripts demonstrate that 'such distinctions as public and private, ecclesiastical, or historical and literary' would have held less water with medieval compilers and audiences.[319] Stein concludes that the range of a trilingual compilation such as Harley 978 is 'quite characteristic for the period'.[320] A manuscript such as Jesus, therefore, and the placement of the *Conduct of Life* within it, might be seen as being typical of a culture that had room for, and drew richness from, a latitude for 'personal idiosyncrasy' that was only

[316] Cartlidge, 'The composition and social context of Oxford, Jesus College, MS 29 (II)', p. 262.
[317] See Treharne, 'The Vernaculars of Medieval England'.
[318] Stein, 'Multilingualism.', p. 31.
[319] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 4.
[320] Stein, 'Multilingualism.', p. 31.

possible in the production and compilation of writings by hand, before the imposed regularity of the printing press, and one that was open to continental influences yet more innovative, because of its place upon the fringes.[321] These manuscripts, in fact, render a cultural snapshot of England as, over the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it became an 'amalgam of Anglo-Saxon, French, and Latin culture ... a distinct entity rather than a mere accumulation of parts'.[322]

The two final manuscripts suggest, through their contents, different audiences than the manuscripts discussed previously. Egerton is a composite thirteenth-century manuscript containing English and Anglo-Norman verse, Continental French verse and prose, Latin verse and a piece of macaronic prose written in Anglo-Norman with Latin quotations and English phrases. The manuscript contains two versions of the *Conduct of Life* independently copied from the same exemplar. Included in this manuscript, alongside the *Conduct of Life*, are items suitable for the private devotion of an individual in a priory or religious house, such as the French prose apocrypha, the *Gospel of Nicodemus* and the *Invention of the Cross*, as well as the widely disseminated metrical *Bestiaire* composed by Guillaume le clerc.

McClean is also a manuscript where the contents suggest that it was compiled for an audience devoted to individual religious contemplation. It shares with Egerton both the *Bestiaire* and the *Conduct of Life* and similarly has a mixture of Latin prose, English verse, Anglo-Norman verse and prose, and Continental French verse. This manuscript, as is also suggested by the contents of Egerton, seems to have been selectively put together to aid an individual's spiritual welfare. For example, the *Mirrour de Seint Églyse*, originally addressed to a single male religious, became an exemplary text for nuns, a manual for conduct and a text for

[321] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, p. 5, p. 16, p. 85.
[322] Clanchy, *From Memory to written Record*. p. 5.

didactic instruction after the example of Hugh of St. Victor.[323] Similarly, the *Seven Prayers of the Pater Noster*, which focuses on the contemplation of God in scripture, concentrates in the second part on meditation leading to a knowledge of God.

McClean also contains Guillaume le clerc's *Bestiaire* and a version of the *Apocalypse*, written in Latin verse with a French verse translation.[324] The inclusion of both of these illuminated texts, and the meditative nature of the other material in the manuscript, has brought Hill to the conclusion that the manuscript was probably compiled on the instruction of a wealthy patron, probably for a devout lady novice.[325] Most significantly, the case for this being a selective compilation for private devotion is advanced by the earlier of the two *ex libris* inscriptions, of the mid-fourteenth century, which reads, 'Iste liber constat margarete sylemon et dicipulas suas. Et post morte*m* sua*m* Couentu de Nuneton' and firmly places the manuscript at Nuneaton Convent between the years of 1367-86 when Margaret Selman was Lady Prioress.[326]

Both McClean and Egerton are primarily written in French with some Latin and limited English. Although The *Conduct of Life* is the only piece of English writing present in McClean its presence in a trilingual manuscript for a known audience is significant. The inclusion of English in a manuscript belonging to someone of obvious wealth and standing represents a transformation from the *Conduct of Life*'s manuscript contexts in the Lambeth and Trinity homiliaries.

This shift could be seen as a response to a perceived need to produce more texts in English for the promotion of devotional education. However, the audiences of both Egerton and

[323] Hill 2002, p. 196.
[324] The text of the *Bestiaire* in both manuscripts is accompanied by line drawings, a description of which can be found in the description of the manuscript (pp. 79-85), and which demonstrates the increased resources and emphasis on the aesthetic that these later manuscripts have in comparison to the earlier codices which contain the *Conduct of Life*.
[325] Hill 2002, p. 197.
[326] This is expounded in more detail within the manuscript description p.91

McClean were certainly not lay audiences and the texts were created for private meditation rather than public performance.[327] It is also evident that the production of the manuscript has changed: the two scribes, changing over mid-line in the Trinity homilies, have been succeeded by planned volumes involving multiple scribes with, in the case of McClean, individual scribes writing on separate gatherings: the act of compilation was shared and is indicative of the social status of the manuscripts - missing from both Lambeth and Trinity. The physical size of the manuscripts that house the *Conduct of Life* has increased, with a sometimes lavish extravagance epitomized by the pen over graphite half-page drawings in McClean.[328] They are both more highly decorated, featuring scripts that are less compressed and page layouts that are less concerned with the maximisation of space.[329] The decorative presentation, undertaken perhaps as an act of contemplation, and certainly as a display of wealth, is favoured over the utilitarian functionality of the two earliest manuscripts.[330]

Both of these manuscripts (Egerton and McClean) are predominantly in the French language, but the presence of the English poems within manuscripts that are directed towards individuals - and, in the case of McClean, towards devout women, of substance and wealth - in itself indicates a shift in the cultural currency of the languages.

[327] For practices of private contemplation using texts, either through silent reading or vocal recitation, see Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, pp. 195-197.

[328] Item 5 in McClean, the *Apocalypse*, in Latin with a French translation, on folios 66^{r}-105^{v}, once contained miniatures on the recto and verso of all its folios. The remaining 19 pictures, the rest have been cut from the manuscript, sometimes causing damage to the text below, were originally in pencil with pen added over the top of some. A fuller description of these can be found on pp. 83-5.

[329] For example, the bottom half of the folios which contain the written parts of the *Apocalypse* are usually ruled for between 15-18 lines per page and yet more often than not the complete grid is not used. In fact, in a few cases as few as 4 or 5 lines are utilised – the usual being 7 or 8.

[330] For the reading strategies involved in the contemplation of images within manuscripts see Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record,* p. 196

A discussion of what I believe to be the key orthographical and phonological features of the texts of the *Conduct of Life* is given below and is followed by a summary table of all the features found in each of the texts. This discursive section is keyed to the summary table and to the section entitled 'Notes on Phonology and Dialects', found in the Appendix.

The Old English orthographical features are more regularly found in E2 than any other text,[331] and less regularly in J, a text that might be considered linguistically more modern. The *Conduct of life*, therefore, might offer an interesting example of diachronic change, as well as diatopic variation, in a text of more than one version.[332] Some examples that might evidence this:

1) The runic letter <þ> is found in initial position (§ 2) throughout all of the texts of the *Conduct of Life* (eg. T: *þan* Ω1). However, the OE usage of <ð> initially (§ 3) is regularly found in E2 (eg. *ðis* Ω30), alongside <þ>, and less regularly in E1 (*ðan* Ω72).[333] The graphs <ð> and <þ> are found in both medial and final position (sometimes written as <d> (§ 7) medially and finally, <h> (§ 8) finally, and <t> (§ 6) finally[334]) in most of the texts (§ 4) except for the two later ones: J, where <ð> is not present at all, and M, where <ð> only

[331] This is a feature regularly acknowledged by other scholars, most notably Betty Hill, Hill 1950, pp. 354-5.
[332] Margaret Laing, 'A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English: the value of texts surviving in more than one version', in Rissanen, M., Ihalainen, O., Taavitsainen, I. and Nevalainen, T. (eds.), History of Englishes: New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics (Berlin and New York, 1992), 566-81
[333] There are also rare occurrences of this, once only, in all of the other versions, except for J where the graph <ð> does not occur at all (T: *ðer* Ω223; L: *ðe* Ω70; and written as <d> in M and D: *darf* Ω44).
[334] The writing of <d> for <ð> is rare in TLDM and E2, but is a frequent occurrence in E1 (eg. mẏs liked Ω13, bi hoted Ω39 etc.); it does not occur at all in J. In D and E1 <h> is written for <þ>/<ð> in final position on two occasions in each (D: *þingh* Ω5 and *purh* Ω149; E1: *þinh* Ω5 and *hafh* Ω150). The writing of <t> for <ð> cannot be found in TDM; it is rare in L (eg. *þinchet* Ω10), occasional in E2 (eg. *sendet* Ω47), but frequent in E1 (*þinchet* Ω10 and Ω37, *det* Ω21 and Ω54 etc.). Of these occurrences, there are only three places where the writing of <t> is an example of dental assimilation brought about by the previous word. These are: *attere* L Ω132; *mid te* E2 Ω366; and *ȝ te* J Ω62 (the only place in the text of J where <t> is written for <ð>). In the other examples it is likely that the scribe is spelling the dental fricative with a dental stop in low-stress, final position.

occurs three times,[335] and only in final position (M: *plleð* Ω35; *peneð* Ω42; *habbeð* Ω184).[336] The writing of <th> (§ 5) is rare in all of the texts.[337]

2) The letter <þ> (§ 11) is retained, as the more regular form, in all texts except for J where <w> is normal and <þ> is found just once in *porie* Ω151;[338] the later stage development of writing <w> is rare in the remaining texts, and does not occur at all in E2.[339]

3) *Tironian et*, written <⁊> (§ 13), is found in all texts; however, the writing of *and* for <⁊> is found more regularly in J, where in the earlier texts its use is rare.[340]

4) The Old English ligature <æ> (§ 12) is regularly found in E2, alongside the newer spellings, with occasional examples in E1, and rare occurrences in T;[341] *æ* is not present in LDJM.

5) Both E1 and E2 have examples of the Old English prefix *ge* (§ 57): E1 *ȝe lad* Ω5; ȝe spinch Ω37 and ȝe spinch Ω203, and ȝe lome Ω48; E2 ȝe lome Ω48 and ȝe-sceafte Ω86. This is found alongside irregular use of *i* and *y* found in both Egerton texts and in the remaining manuscript versions.

6) Examples of OE *cw* (§ 20) are also found in E2: *cpeman* (Ω98), *cpemed* (Ω181), and *cpenche* (Ω261 and Ω262); in all other instances from E2, and most instances in the remaining manuscript versions, *qu* has been written.[342]

7) The retention of <c> for OE velar *c* might also give an indicator of diachronic change:

---

[335] With the exception of <d> for <ð> in *darf* Ω44 (see previous fn).

[336] T, L, E2 mostly have <ð> medially and finally, with some occurrences of <þ>; D has both <ð> and <þ> medially but always writes <ð> finally; E1 more often has <þ> medially but mostly has <ð> in final position.

[337] It is found in all texts in *sathanas* (Ω298), where it is probably as a result of Latin *satan* but also OF *sathanas*. It is found on three other occasions in T: *thurh* Ω42, *lothe* Ω62 and *methes* Ω379; twice in L: *pith* Ω227 and *lathed* Ω133, in the latter it represents <t> (from OE *lætan* rather than OE *læðan*); once in J: for medial <t> in *euethen*; and once in M: repeth Ω10.

[338] J also has capital <Vv> for <w> in *Vve* on three occasions (Ω170, Ω330 and Ω340).

[339] It is found most frequently in D (13 examples, eg. *wit* Ω2, *hwile* Ω41, *iwisse* Ω41 etc.) and T (11 examples, eg. *mowe* Ω30, *owen* Ω31, *wif* Ω32 etc.); it is found in three places in M (*yswinch* Ω37, *we* Ω170 and *wode* Ω360); once in L (swicen Ω108); and once in E1 (wilde Ω152).

[340] J writes *and* 122 times and *tironian et* 68; there are only two examples of *and* in T, four in L, eight in E2, sixteen in E1 and only one in M; D has no examples of *and*.

[341] There are fifty examples of <æ> in E2; ten in E1 (nine of these occur in the first 35 lines); and six in T.

[342] The exceptions are *ikuemde* (Ω284) and *kuenche* (Ω261) in D; ocquerne (Ω379) in E1; *acquerne* (Ω 379) in J; and *okerne* (Ω379) in M.

Before front vowels (§ 16) all of the texts furnish us with examples of a transition to <k> in instances such as *king* (T: Ω51) from OE *cyning*. However, elsewhere in the *conduct* of Life, both E texts write *cuðe/cuþe* (Ω102) and *cudde* (Ω200) from OE *cyþan* (Ω102), *cunne* (Ω318 and Ω352) from OE *cynn*, and *cunne(s)* (Ω213 and Ω376) from OE *cyn*. However, although the writing of <c> initially and before a front vowel is more regularly found in E1 and E2, it is also present, although much more rare, in all of the remaining manuscripts, except D, where <k> is always written. See, T: *cuðen* (Ω102); J: *cuþe* (Ω102) and *cudde* (Ω200); M: *cuþe* (Ω102); L: *cudde* (Ω200) and *cunne* (Ω213).

In medial position in T, the oldest known text of the *Conduct of Life*, there are still some examples of the retention of <c> (§ 22) in, for example, *mislicað* (Ω13), *bispicað* (Ω14), and *quica* (Ω199).[343] Further examples can be seen in: L *swicen* (Ω108) and E2 *licede* (Ω13). TE2E1M also share the reading *brecð/brecþ* (the only reading with <c> in E1 and M). However, in most instances the transition to <k> (§ 21) has been completed; the text of J, for example, has no instances of <c>, and always writes <k>, eg. *mýs-lýkeþ* (Ω13), *bi-swikeþ* (Ω14), quýke (Ω80 and Ω199) etc.

Before the consonant *n* the movement to <k> (§ 18) is found in all texts except for the oldest text T, and the more conservative E2 and E1: T *cnopeð* (Ω115) and (Ω142), and *icnopen* (Ω170) and (Ω399); E2: *cnapað* (Ω115), *icnapeð* (Ω142), and *icnape* (Ω170); E1 *cnaped* (Ω115), *icpopeð* (Ω142: probable mistake for *icnopeð*), *icnape* (Ω170), and *icnapen* (Ω399).

The retention of <c> in final position (§ 23) was retained later in the Middle English Period than <c> in other positions. As a result, the writing of <k> in final position (§ 24) is

[343] It is more usual for <c> to be written in T if the vowel that follows is <a> and not <e>. the transition to <k> is more likely in medial position before *e* where the vowel is not accented (atonic), eg. *speken* (Ω9), *likede* (Ω13), *siker* (Ω40, Ω42 and Ω43) etc.

only found in the two later texts: M has two examples of <k> in final position in *uolk* (Ω224) and *pork* (Ω267), where it is <c> at all other times; and J always writes <k> for OE *c*, eg. *werk* (Ω121 and Ω186), *þonk* (Ω72, Ω92, Ω115, etc.), *lok* (Ω74) etc., except for *bec* (Ω401).[344]

8) OE palatal c /tʃ/ (§ 28-§ 31) is mostly written <ch>, but there are some possible examples of /tʃ/with <c> found in some of the texts, with it more often present in E2: *ic* (more regular reading, with occasional *ich*), *elc* (Ω116 and Ω120, also *elch*, *ech*, *eche*, *æche*), *eure-elc* (Ω66 and Ω122), *spilc* (Ω81, also *spilche*), *hpilc* (Ω143) and *sellic* (Ω190); and E1: *ic* (usual form, with some *ich*), *elc* (Ω116 and Ω120, also *elch*, *ech*, *elche*, *eche*), *eure ilc* (Ω66 and Ω122), *æc/elc* (Ω167, Ω315 and Ω317); *spilc* (Ω81^{x2} and Ω123), *spulc* (Ω125) and *pilc* (Ω143). In the remaining manuscripts there are further examples in T: *ic* (twice Ω12 and Ω236, mostly *ich*), *afric* (Ω33, also *africh*) and *ispinc* (Ω37 and Ω331, also *ispinch*); L: *ispinc* (Ω37, Ω58 and Ω203), *hpice* (Ω143) and *sullic* (Ω190); D: *ic* (regular reading in D with some *ich*), *philce* (Ω137), *smac* (Ω292), *ispinc* (Ω203, also *ispinch*) and *lichamlice* (Ω415).[345] In the two later texts, J and M, OE palatal *c* /tʃ/ is never written as <c>.

9) OE *sc* (§ 35-§ 39), which becomes /ʃ/ by a process of monophonemization, is retained as the only form found in E2, eg. *sceal* (Ω317), *scule(n)* (Ω54, Ω94, Ω98^{x2} etc), *scolde* (Ω38 and Ω277), *fisces* (Ω85) etc. It is also the dominant form in E1, M and L, with the exception in E1 of *sæl* (Ω27), *sulle* (Ω94), *solde* (Ω38), *solden* (Ω48) and *fisses* (Ω85); in M of *schat* (Ω380) and *fish* (Ω85); and in L of *solde* (Ω51), *sunien* (Ω161), *sal* (Ω180), *schal* (Ω122) and

[344] There are examples in both L and J of <h> [x] being written for OE velar *c* in the *cj. ah*, a feature associated with the OE Anglian dialect (L: Ω17, Ω124 and Ω125; J: Ω43, Ω59 and Ω125); a further example of this in L might be evidenced in the writing <ch> in *ach* (Ω59 and Ω175). There are also limited examples of <ch> written for velar *c* in TLE2E1: T *spichen* (Ω108); L *perche* (Ω267), *p erch* (Ω113); E2 *peorche* (Ω11), mis lichet (Ω13), spunche (Ω267 and Ω332), *spichele* (Ω264), *ech* / *æch* (Ω3 and Ω28) and *Sspunch* (Ω332); E1 *perche* (Ω11); it is not clear from these examples whether the sound is /k/ or /tʃ/.

[345] In the above examples it is probable that *smac* is a variant in /k/, conceivable that *ispinc* is a variant in /k/, and possible that *afric*, *sullic*, *elc/ilc*, *spilc*, *spulc, hpilc/pilc*, *sellic* have /k/. I am thankful to the help of Dr Richard Dance for his help on this.

fisses (Ω85). Both T and D have <s> as the dominant reading, with the exception in T of *screnche* (Ω348), *scat* (Ω380) and *fisses* (Ω85); and in D of *scal* (Ω27), *iscop* (Ω86), *scete* (Ω380), *scrud* (Ω380), *schameð* (Ω174) and *shilde* (Ω314). Finally, in J the dominant reading is the more 'modern' <sch>, with the exceptions *scolden* (Ω280) and *fysses* (Ω85).

10) The text of E2 retains <ȝ> in medial position after a tonic vowel and after *l* and *r* (§ 43), for example *folgeþ* (Ω14), *mage* (Ω30),[346] *iboreȝe* (Ω174) etc., where J shows the fricative /ɣ/ labialized and vocalized to /ɣw/>/w/ <w> in *foleweþ* (Ω14), *mowe* (Ω30), *lowen* (Ω168) etc, with no instances of ȝ/ʒ written. This transition, according to Jordan, began *c.* 1200 in the South West Midlands, spreading later to the North Midlands and the North and was only found in writings of Kent around *c.* 1400.[347] It is not surprising, therefore, that, L, an early text, and D, a text with other prominent Kentish features, also show no examples of <w>, although in L <ie> is written in *fulieð* (Ω14) and <h> in *ahen* (Ω170).[348] It is more surprising, however, that M, a later text, also retains <ʒ> and does not write <w>. The text of T mostly retains <ȝ> but demonstrates an early movement to <w> in the writing of *mowe* (Ω30), *owen* (Ω31) and *drawen* (Ω48 and Ω50). Also of significance is that E1, which would have been copied from the same exemplar as E2, shows a movement to <w> in approximately half of the examples, suggesting that either the scribe of E1 'modernised' the text as he copied, or that the scribe of E2 deliberately archaicised his version of the text.

[346] At line Ω194 E2 also has *moȝhe*, where <ȝh> would still be velar.
[347] Jordan §186.
[348] The writing of <h> likely represents /ɣ/ and is a feature of the AB dialect.

11) All of the texts except for J retain <ȝ/ȝ> for /j/ in initial position (§ 45), except in T before /u/ in *jung* (Ω4)[349] and the writing in L of <g> in *Giue*.[350] J has later <ẏ> in all instances, for example, *ẏong* (Ω4), *ẏet* (Ω5), *ẏeuenesse* (Ω313) etc.

OE palatal ȝ /j/ before *i* (§ 45) is mostly retained in the texts of the *Conduct of Life* for the writing of ModE 'if'/OE *gif/gyf*,[351] with the exception of D where it is not present at all (for example, *ef* in Ω126^{x2}, Ω173, Ω225 etc); J where it is usually omitted but is <ẏ> in *ẏef* (Ω126, Ω334, and Ω348); and examples in L and E1 where <g> is written in *Gif* (L Ω173; E1 Ω334 and Ω345).[352]

In examples of OE *ȝ* following a front vowel but before a back vowel (§ 47), where in OE it would have been velar, the weakening of the end syllable to e /ə/ has likely resulted in a transition to a palatal, with evidence found of <i/ẏ> written in texts other than J, where <ẏ> is always written, and in E2, where it is never found: *eien* (T Ω76), *peien* (L Ω64), variants of *forpreien* (T Ω100) found in all texts except for E2,[353] *iseien* (T Ω101 and Ω102), *niseien* (T Ω105), *ne-i-seien* (E1 Ω105).

12) E2 retains the OE writing <hl> (§ 53) in *hlauord* (Ω81), *hlauerd* (Ω196) and *hlusten* (Ω237), where all of the other texts write <l> only, except for T *hlesten* (Ω237), *hleste* (Ω400) and D *hlesten* (Ω237).[354]

The writing of OE *hw* (§ 54) varies in the versions of the *Conduct of Life* but the <hw/hp> writing remains dominant in all texts except for M, with the exceptions being the

[349] This was common in the OE period where the palatal approximant <ġ> is often replaced by <i> before /u/.
[350] It is possible that this is the plosive /g/. influenced by the ON cognate with /g/, however, its position at the beginning of the line and resulting capitalization, alongside the utilization of <ȝ> /j/ for all other occurrences, suggests that this might reflect a feature of scribal practice rather than an indication of phonology and might, therefore, be read as /j/. In many twelfth-century manuscripts there is no separate capital *ȝogh*, with scribes using <G> instead.
[351] The loss of *ȝ* before *i* became more common in the fourteenth century.
[352] The writing of <g> here is probably also for /j/, and likely reflects scribal practice.
[353] This is an important example as it is in rhyming position and is a reading shared by all texts except for E2, the most conservative text. In the following line all of the texts apart from T and J write variants of *iseȝen/ẏseȝe*; this suggests that a transition to a palatal had already taken place even if it was not represented orthographically in examples such as the one found in L where *forp reien* is rhymed with *iseȝen*.
[354] There are no examples of <hr> written in any version of the *Conduct of Life.*

writing of <ph> in T *phile* (Ω314); <wh> in J *whon* (Ω213); <ph> in E2 *phet* (Ω92), *pheðer* (Ω136 and Ω249), *philce* (Ω137) and *phan* (Ω341); the frequent writing of <w> on its own in L *penne* (Ω36, Ω132 and Ω159), *pet/pat* (Ω80, Ω96 and Ω142), *u +per* (Ω90) and *pa-se* (Ω119); and <w> on its own in D *pile* (Ω22, Ω24, Ω28 etc) and *pat* (Ω155). In M the dominant reading is <ph> with <hu> written twice in *huat* (Ω96) and *huiche* (Ω143).

In medial position *h* in the combination <ht> (§ 55) is the regular reading in all texts except for M where <ʒt> is written exclusively: M *aʒte* (Ω2), *miʒte* (Ω16), *eʒte* (Ω42 and Ω56) etc. T writes <ht> exclusively, E2 has the exception *of-ðufte* (Ω286) and J *nought* (Ω189 and Ω336).[355] There is some variation in the remaining texts with L regularly writing <cht>, for example, *michte* (Ω19), *echte* (Ω43 and Ω56), *brichte* (Ω76) etc; E1 omits <h> in *nout* (Ω49, Ω199, Ω302 etc), *nopit* (Ω176), *vn-bout* (Ω60), *ritȝifnesse* (Ω73), writes <tt> in *britte* (Ω76), *dritte* (Ω115) and *ut-broutte* (Ω192), writes <tht> in *drithte* (Ω124), *lithte* (Ω77) and *mithten* (Ω251), and writes <ct> in *eicte* (Ω43); D writes <ȝht> in *oȝthe* (Ω2), *(h)eȝthe* (Ω43, Ω56), *eȝhte* (Ω282), <ch> in *tichede* (Ω283), <ðt> in *taðte* (Ω283), <ȝt> in *eȝte* (Ω332) and *bikaȝte* (Ω333)[356] and <hð/hþ> in *isihðe* (Ω297) and *isihþe* (Ω382).[357]

13) TLE2E1 retain the writing of <f> in initial position, where D demonstrates transition to voicing by frequently writing <v/u> when followed by a voiced element (§ 58): D *vele* (Ω9 and Ω10), *volȝeð* (Ω14), *uorȝiete* (Ω35).[358] Both of the later texts, J and M also have examples of <u/v> initially: J *veole* (Ω9), *vor* (Ω33, Ω35, Ω39 etc), *virst* (Ω38) etc; M *vele* (Ω9), *uorʒete* (Ω35), *uremde* (Ω35) etc.

[355] In the writing of *nought* in J it might be possible to see a later stage development.
[356] <ȝt> in *bikaȝte* (Ω333) comes from Old Northern French *cachier* which eventually replaced OE *læccan*, ME *lachan*. Hence the past tense is *cahte, cauhte, cauʒte, caught*, like *lahte, lauhte, lauʒte, laught* (OED).
[357] This is from OE *sihþ* where <ht> and <ʒt> in the other texts reflect a movement to <t>.
[358] The transition to voicing is a feature regularly associated with the dialect of Kent.

However, in medial position and between two voiced elements all texts demonstrate, with regular frequency, voicing [v] through the writing of <u/v>, for example E2 *heuene* (Ω28), *leoure* (Ω30), *aliue* (Ω33); however, this is not always consistently applied, especially in the earlier texts, see E2 *alife* (Ω24).

In final position <f> is always written in all texts for [f], for example, D *lif* (Ω5), *of* (Ω21[x2]), *pif* (Ω32) etc. In medial position and before the dental *d* it has been lost in all texts other than L where *hefde(n)* (Ω16, Ω52 and Ω144) can be found.

TRINITY

The Language of the *Conduct of Life* in T is generally accepted as being of Essex, although Samuels and Betty Hill suggest a London provenance, possibly 'influenced by immigration, perhaps from East Anglia'.[359] Laing (LAEME) places the text in west Essex.[360] The evidence below certainly supports localization to the South East Midlands.

Key features of T:

The rounding of OE *ā* (§ 69ff) to <o>, present throughout T (eg. *lore* Ω1, *one* Ω88, *non* Ω115 etc),[361] suggests a probable southern or midland form;[362] as does the writing of <oȝ> (*moȝe* Ω194 and *oȝen* Ω113, Ω118, Ω121 etc) and <ow> (*mowe* Ω30 and *owen* Ω31) for OE *ā* + /ɣ/ (§ 137), and <ow> (eg. *cnopeð* Ω115, *blopeð* Ω143, *sople* Ω143 etc) for OE *ā* + *w* (§ 138).[363] The

[359] Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p. 107.
[360] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.
[361] With the exception of *aquerne* Ω379, *bihat* Ω381, *hatere* Ω260 and *hat* Ω319 (*bihat* and *hat* are both contracted forms).
[362] See § 69; Jordan § 44 and Mossé § 27.
[363] Jordan §113 and §105. OE *ā* + /ɣ/ and OE *ā* + *w* joined the neutralizing to /ɔ:/ and gave /ɔu/ in most Southumbrian dialects at this time. The possible exceptions were northern parts of the Midlands and parts of the West, including the AB dialect. See also § Jordan 44 and Mossé § 27.

writing of *wur* < *weor* (*purðe* Ω149 and *purðen* Ω346) is another indicator of a southern or midland provenance.[364]

The writing of Old English *a* before a nasal (§ 60) as <a> (eg. *man* Ω21[x2], *þanc* Ω72, *þanne* Ω41 etc) suggests a probable localisation other than the West Midlands, where the back sound /ɔ/, written <o>, characteristic of the Anglian dialect in the OE period, was retained (with the inclusion of Worcester).[365] Before a lengthening group (§ 61), however, T also writes <o> (eg. *longe* Ω3, *pronge* Ω170, *honden* Ω83 etc),[366] another feature found in the writing of the West Midlands; although here it is likely that <o> in T is not a WML dialectal feature but was arrived at by way of *a*, which, before lengthening groups in the South and the Midlands, participated in the change from a > o /ɔ:/ (§ 69ff), as described previously.[367]

In addition to the above, OE *æ* (§ 63) mostly shows retraction to <a> (eg. *habbe* Ω3, *after* Ω29, *patere* Ω84 etc), a process that took place from around 1100 in areas other than the WML and Kent;[368] with OE *æ* + *ʒ* /j/ (§ 122), mostly written <ai> (eg. *mai* Ω17, *maiʒ* Ω90, *dai* Ω383 *daie* Ω82 etc).[369] Similarly, monophthongization and retraction to <a> is also found for OE *ea* (§ 86, §87 and § 88) before *r*, without lengthening, where it is always <a> (eg. *arʒe* Ω20, *þarf* Ω44, *arme* Ω238 etc.) and before *rd* and *rn*, where it is mostly <a> (*harde* Ω166, *hardne* Ω178, *hardde* Ω178 and *parnin* Ω237 and Ω239 and *parnie* Ω315).[370] In the same way, OE *ea* before *l*,

[364] For the *wur* group, see § 97, Campbell § 320, and Jordan §66, remark 3.
[365] Jordan § 30 and Mossé § 25.
[366] The writing of *hangeð* Ω323 likely reflects a borrowing from the North that prevailed during this period. Jordan § 31 and Mossé § 25.
[367] Jordan § 30 and Mossé § 25.
The exceptions in T are *sæd* Ω405 and *hpeðer* Ω249. Examples of <æ>, and the Norman writing <e> were also often found during the twelfth century, see § 63, Jordan § 30 and Mossé § 25.
[368] Jordan § 32 and Mossé § 24.
[369] The change of *æ* > *a* gave rise to the diphthong *ai*, later *ay* (especially in final position), except in the WM and Kent, where the movement from *æ* > *a* was not immediate and <e> writings are prominent with the later change of /ɛi/ > ai. (Jordan § 93). The exception in T is in the writing of *seiðð* Ω117, Ω119 and Ω140.
[370] Where OE *æ*, from Prim. Gmc. *a* (Campbell § 131, Campbell *fn* 1 of § 139, Campbell § 144), was broken to *ea* before *r* followed by a consonant, and was not already changed in OE by smoothing, it was simplified to *æ* around 1000 and then followed the transition to *a* (cf. § 63). During the eleventh century occasional eleventh century <æ> writings were found alongside traditional

without lengthening (§ 90), and OE ea after sc (§ 111 and § 112), are always <a> (eg. *al* Ω52, *falle* Ω327, *pallen* Ω42 etc and *sal* Ω317, *samie* Ω172, *safte* Ω86 etc), likely by the same process of monophthongization and retraction shown previously; however, since the undiphthongized Anglian form is also *a*, these final two examples tell us little dialectally.[371] However, OE *ea* before the combination *ld* (§ 91), which is mostly written <ea> (eg. *pealde* Ω2, *eald* Ω4, *fealde* Ω55 etc) and once <e> (*bihelden* Ω405), demonstrates a southern form (excluding Kent), retained into the fifteenth century in East Saxon (including Essex and London).[372] A further example of a possible Southern form (OE Saxon) in T can be found in the writing of <ei> (*heie* Ω363, Ω295, Ω171 and *iseih* Ω274) for OE *ea* before *h* combinations (§ 93).[373]

In addition to the probable Southern forms highlighted above, there are several possible EML dialectal features: OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff) is mostly written with 'unrounded' *e* (eg. *perke* Ω11, *perkes* Ω64 and *herte* Ω75), a process begun in the EML and Kent in the twelfth century.[374] In addition, OE *eo* from back mutation (§ 102, § 103 and § 104) is nearly always written as <e> (eg. *a* umlaut of *e*: *fele* Ω9, *brekeð* Ω93, *pele* Ω162 etc; *u* umlaut of *e*: *heuene* Ω28, *heueriche* Ω43, *pereldes* Ω330 etc).[375] Consistent with OE *ĕo*, the long diphthong *ēo* (§ 108) gives /ø:/, which is retained for longer in the WML and parts of the South but is unrounded to /e:/ in the EML and the

<ea>. The twelfth-century text of T demonstrates the writing of both <æ> and <ea> in the writing of (*midden*)*ærd* Ω202 and (*midden*)*eard* Ω145 and Ω207. The only other exception to the writing of <a> in T is the writing of <e> in *erninge* (Ω65).

[371] OE *ea* by breaking before *l* was found only in the Saxon and Kentish dialects; the Anglian dialect preserved *a* (Campbell § 143). However, unbroken Anglian *a* moved southwards into the living speech of Worcester and Gloucester during the OE period (Jordan § 61). OE *ea* after *sc* was 'smoothed' in some areas to *e* or *ē*, however, many Sax. dialects retained *ea* and *ēa*. (Jordan § 75). However, as Jordan argues, '[i]f one seeks to recognize OE dipthongizing in the reflection of ME dialects, one can no longer determine them on account of the ME falling together of *ea* and *æ*, as well as *ea* /æ:a/ and *æ*' (Jordan § 75). It is however possible to make some statement on dialect through the 'smoothed' forms *e or* ē, which are present in some Saxon dialects but not in the text of T.

[372] Jordan § 61. The two exceptions in T are <o> in *holde* Ω56 and <a> in *halt* (contracted form) Ω323 and Ω325.

[373] Saxon *e* is present in a limited area in the twelfth century and then more generally from the thirteenth century, followed by the front glide *i* (>*ei*) (Jordan § 63).

[374] This alone cannot be seen as a dialectal marker. Although the sound /ø/ was represented by the writing <eo> and Anglo-French <o> in the WML and parts of the South until around 1300, in the North 'unrounding' to *e* also took place, and smoothed forms of the Anglian dialect had *e* from OE (Jordan § 65). For OE breaking to *eo* from *e* see Campbell § 146 and § 147.

[375] The velar umlaut *eo* as a product of following back vowels was more likely in the Anglian and Kentish dialects. The EML dialect typically does not show this development, and where it might have taken place the sound was unrounded to *e* in eME. A similar unrounding was also found in the North. Jordan § 71 and 73. See also the dialect map in Jordan, p. 97. The only exceptions to <e> in T are *suster* Ω157 and Ω194, and *pude* Ω360, written under the influence of *w*: for the influence of *w* see Wright § 52.

North, and is regularly written in T with expected <e> (eg. *be* Ω2, *lef* Ω30, *frend* Ω31etc); [376] however, just as regularly, T also writes <ie> (eg. *bien* Ω402, *lief* Ω210, *friend* Ω231 etc), a form associated in ME with the dialect of Kent. This writing in T, with consideration of all other geographical indicators, might suggest a SEML form exhibiting some Kentish features.[377]

The most conclusive evidence however for a SEML localisation, and possibly that of Essex or London, comes from the regular writing in T of <a> for OE *ǣ₁* and *ǣ₂*.[378] The writing of <a> for *ǣ₁* (eg. *dade* Ω3, *rade* Ω4, *ofdrade* Ω166 etc)[379] on its own might suggest only a Saxon or EML form, as shortened *æ̆* also yields *a* in the these regions; however, both *ǣ₁* and *ǣ₂* became *ā* in a limited area of the SEML near London (including Essex), with this sound also found in London by the beginning of the thirteenth century. Therefore, although the examples of <a> writing for *ǣ₁* might be as a result of either shortened *æ̆* or of *ǣ₁* > *ā*, the writing of <a> for *ǣ₂* (eg. *mast* Ω7, *are* Ω129, *unhalðe* Ω17etc),[380] where in other regions the sound was narrowed to /ɛ:/ and /e:/, gives strong evidence for the provenance proposed above.

LAMBETH

It is generally agreed that this text has a WML dialect with some features of the 'AB' language, which are evident in the anaylsis that follows, with Samuels localizing it to the border of North Herefordshire and Shropshire[381] and Laing (LAEME), due to the close affinities in language it

[376] Jordan § 84.
[377] It is posited in Jordan that 'Frequent <ie> writings for *eo* in East Saxon Gospels, VV [Virtues and Vices] and TH [Trinity College Homilies] probably rest only on geographical influence of Kent' (Jordan § 85, *Remark 1*).
[378] See § 70-73; Campbell §128 and §197; Jordan § 49-50; and Mossé § 28.
[379] The exceptions being: <æ> in *læte* Ω357, <e> in *iseldðe* Ω16, *unsele* Ω208, *misdede* Ω216 and *mere* Ω406. For OE *þær* see § 77ff.
[380] The exceptions being: <æ> in *ænes* Ω192, <ea> in *hease* Ω307, and rare examples of <e> in *mene* Ω177 and *hete* Ω206 . For *ælc, elc* and *ylc* see § 81ff.
[381] Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p. 108.

has with that of the Worcester Tremulous Scribe and the other elements in common with the " AB" language, placing it in North West Worcestershire.[382]

Key features of L:

The text of L exhibits several Anglian dialectal forms: OE *eo* before *l*-combinations (§ 98) is written <o> (eg. *solf* Ω14 and *solue* Ω26 etc: Anglian /sølf/) one of many dialectal features L shares with J.[383] In addition, OE *ie* after *g* (§ 116) and OE *īe* after *g* (§ 117) are always written <e> (eg. *forgeteð* Ω39, *gefe* Ω46, *gelde* Ω46 etc and *get* Ω5), a form found in both the Anglian and Kentish dialects.[384] Another feature that might indicate the influence of the Anglian dialect on the text of L is the vocalization of OE ȝ /j/ to/i/ (§ 49) before *d* in the *pa.* form of the *OE* verb *secgan* (*seide* Ω136*, iseid* Ω148*, seiden* Ω234), a feature once again shared with J, where ȝ /j/ was lost before *d* with the lengthening of the previous vowel in the writings of the West Saxon dialect, and probably also that of Kent, during the OE period.[385]

L, however, has many forms associated with the WM, which often overlap with forms found in the South and SW: the writing of <e> (especially in *perke/perch/perc* Ω11, Ω113, Ω121 etc and *perkes* Ω64, Ω73, Ω116 etc)[386] for OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96) suggests a smoothed Anglian form; however, the writing of <o> in *horte* Ω118 preserves the /ø/ sound found for longer in the WML and parts of the South.[387] Similarly, OE *eo* resulting from the *u* umlaut of *e* (§ 102 and § 104) and the *a* umlaut of *e* (§ 102 and § 103) is regularly written as <o> (eg. *houene* Ω28, *porld* Ω162, *porldes* Ω282 etc and *fole* Ω9, *brokeð* Ω93 and *unfrome* Ω237), where *eo* by back mutation

[382] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.
[383] For the breaking of *e* to *eo* before *l*-combinations see Campbell § 146; for ME Angl. /sølf/ (written <seolf, solf>), see Jordan § 68
[384] OE e became ie (later i, y) after palatal c, g, and sc in WS, but remained e in Anglian and Kent. See, Wright § 91. Anglian *ġēt*, without dipthongization, from OE *ē* exhibits the same development as *ĕ*.
[385] Jordan § 192. The exception in L being *sede* Ω164
[386] Jordan (§ 65 *Remark 1.*) states that 'PM MSS Egerton 613 f.7 and Lambeth 487 still permit differentiation between Sax. *work* /wørk/ < *weorc* and Angl. smoothed *werk*.'.
[387] L also writes *herte* Ω75.

then follows the course described previously for *eo* by breaking.[388] OE *ēo* (§ 108) corresponds to short *ĕo* with the long diphthong giving the long /ø:/ sound, which gives longer resistance to unrounding in some areas of the WML and parts of the South than *ĕo*, but is unrounded to /e:/ elsewhere from the twelfth century. In L, therefore, both <eo> (*beo* Ω30, *seon* Ω19, *freond* Ω231 etc) and <o> (*bon* Ω2, *son* Ω167, *frond* Ω230 etc) are written.[389] Similarly, the *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109) is nearly always written <o> (eg. *frond* Ω192, *dore* Ω153, *node* Ω274 etc).[390]

OE *ēo* + *w* (§ 139) is written <o> in L (*ropen* Ω22and *sopen* Ω23), a form associated with the dialects of the West and the SW, with the *i*-umlaut also written with <o> (*untropnesse* Ω279).[391] Similarly, the velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105), which went to *eo*, is regularly written <o> (eg. *soððen* Ω9, *souene* Ω29, *binoþen* Ω89 etc), a form that, as above, was retained for longer in the West and SW, with unrounding to *e* taking place in all other areas.[392] A further example of a probable WM or SW form found in L is the writing of *em* (Ω1 and Ω4) for the *verb* OE *eom*, *eam*, *am* (§ 101).

This localization can be narrowed down to the WM through the following examples: OE *a* before a nasal (§ 60) and before a lengthening group (§ 61) are mostly written as <o> (eg. *mon* Ω33, *moni* Ω39, *þonke* Ω70 etc and *longe* Ω3, *pronge* Ω170, *honde* Ω83 etc).[393] In ME back /ɔ/ was retained only in the West Midlands (including Worcester), before nasals, before lengthening groups and with lengthening in open syllables; however, since *ā* (cf. § 69ff.), originating before lengthening groups in the South and the Midlands, participated in the change from ā > o /ɔ:/, the writing of <o> in L before *ng* and *nd* might demonstrate a Midland or Southern form – it having been retained in

[388] See Jordan § 71 and Jordan § 73. L also has *heuen* Ω43 and Ω64; *suster* Ω157 and Ω194 (*u* in *suster* is written under the influence of *w*, see Wright § 52); *fele* Ω175 and Ω219; and *pele* Ω162 and Ω233.
[389] The exceptions in L are *bið* Ω246, and *sec* Ω208 and *tening* Ω266.
[390] For the conditions of the *i*-umlaut of *ēo* see Campbell § 201. The only exception in L is *þestre* Ω77.
[391] OE *ēo* + *w* gave /ø:u/. This yielded /ø:/ in Western and Southwestern areas – a form retained into the fourteenth century. Other dialects, however, gave /ø:u/ > /eu/ (written <ew>) during the twelfth century (Jordan §109).
[392] Jordan §74. The exceptions in L are: *suðden* Ω216 (from lWS *syððan*) - it was usual for the velar umlaut to be lacking before dentals in West Saxon; *here* Ω251 and Ω259, *iclepede* Ω109 and *biclepie* Ω112; and (*be*)*nimen* Ω45 and *quike* Ω199.
[393] See Jordan § 30 and Mossé § 25. The exceptions in L are: *þanke* Ω254, *þanne* Ω21 and Ω169 and *manke* Ω71 and *prange* Ω220 and *prangepise* Ω49.

these areas as well as being /ɔ/ in the WML – and cannot, therefore, be seen as a clear geographical indicator.

The writing of OE y̆̆ (§ 67) as <u> (eg. *dude* Ω99, *gulte* Ω224, *muchel* Ω12 etc and *lutel* Ω47, *ihud* Ω12, *fure* Ω44 etc)[394] is another likely indicator of a WML provenance for L. This form was retained in the WML until about 1300, with unrounding reaching the West around the fourteenth century.[395] In addition, OE *æ* (§ 63) is mostly written as <e> (*hefde* Ω16, *efþ* Ω180, *elmesse* Ω29 etc), a form that was retained for longer in the WML and Kent.[396] The quality *a* was generalized in the thirteenth century in the WML and in the fourteenth century in Kent. It therefore provides a good example of topographically and chronologically graduated transition, especially when L (predominantly *e*, with some *a*)[397] is compared with the later J (almost exclusively *a*), considering that they share many other dialectal features. Further examples of the writing of WML <e> (eg. *mei* Ω17, *seiðe* Ω119, *dei* Ω165 etc)[398] can also be seen in the ME writings of OE *æ* + ȝ /j/ (§ 122), which follows the same path as OE *æ* (§ 63).[399] Similarly, OE *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 87 and § 88) – both without lengthening, and before *rd* and before *rn* - is nearly always *e* (eg. *erȝe* Ω20, *middenerd* Ω145, *erninge* Ω65 etc).[400] The writing of <e> here can once again be seen as a feature of the WM or Kentish dialects, where OE *ea* was simplified, around 1000, to *æ*, if not already 'smoothed' during the OE period, and subsequently followed the process described previously (§ 63).[401]

---

[394] For OE *y* L also regularly has writings with *i* (eg. *þingþ* Ω5, *afirst* Ω38, *king* Ω51 etc) and twice with *e* (*dede* Ω2 and *(vn)net* Ω5); for OE ȳ L has two occurrences of *i* (*litel* Ω12 and *hpi* Ω110).

[395] See Jordan § 39 and § 42 and Mossé § 29.

[396] See Jordan § 32 and Mossé § 24. In the WML and Kent the sound was closed to *e* (written <e> but sometimes <ea> in the WML) representing the more fronted sound. In the other areas *æ* was retracted to *a* from around 1100 although the writing <æ> (along with the Norman writing <e>) remained in the twelfth century. Preceding *w* (semi-vowel) accelerated the transition to *a* in areas other than Kent which lacked this influence.

[397] Although the more regular form is *e*, there are also examples of *a* in L: *habbe* Ω3, *pater* Ω151, *hpa*t Ω92 etc.

[398] The only exception in L is *mai* Ω36, Ω41 and Ω70.

[399] See Jordan § 93. For LWS *sǣde* / Anglian *sægde* see § 123.

[400] The only exceptions are *arme* Ω238 and *parni* Ω237.

[401] For the breaking of *æ* before *r* see Campbell § 131, Campbell *fn* 1 of § 139, and Campbell § 144. For resultant features of ME dialects see Jordan § 58.

However, OE *ea* before *ld* (§ 91) acts in a different way to all other instances of OE *ea*:[402] Saxon *ēa* becomes *ǣ* and subsequently ME *e* /ɛ:/; Anglian *ā* in the Midlands undergoes the change to *o* /ɔ:/ but remains *ā* in the North; in Kent *ēa* gives initial /jɛ:/ with the writing <ya> and <ia> found beside <yea> and <ea>, however, lengthening only occurred before intervocalic, and not final *ld*, with <a> often written in these instances.[403] For this discussion of L, however, it is important to note that while advancing Anglian /ɔ:/ is found in both Worcestershire and Gloucestershire the AB dialect consistently writes *a*;[404] this is the form that is mostly found in L (eg. *paldeð* Ω86, *ald* Ω4, *falde* Ω55 etc).[405]

A further example that possibly gives clearer criteria for indications of geographical location is the writing of OE *ā* (§ 69) as <a> in L (eg. *lare* Ω1, *ane* Ω88, *nan* Ω115 etc);[406] OE *ā* + /ɣ/ (§ 137) as *ag/ah* (*mage* Ω30, *agen* Ω31, Ω113, Ω118 etc and *ahen* Ω170);[407] and OE ā + w (§ 138) as *aw* (*mapen* Ω23 and *blapeð* Ω143) and *au* (*iknaupen* Ω170, *knauð* Ω115, *cnauð* Ω155 and *saule* Ω143).[408] OE *ā* was rounded to open [ɔ:], written <o>, beginning in the WS area and Kent at the start of the twelfth century and spread through the southern half of the Midlands by the second half of the century; in the thirteenth century it had reached most of the West. The writing of <a>, however, was preserved in areas of the WML at this time, and was a feature of the AB dialect. A comparison with J, however, a text which also preserves many of the AB dialectical features, indicates that the writing of <a> was greatly reduced almost a century later. In the final example given above, the writing of *aw* and *au* for OE *ā* + *w* cannot always so easily be used as an indicator of geographical location, as

[402] Including OE *ea* before *l* which generally gave *a* in all dialects: Anglian unbroken *a* and *a* < *ea* by way of *æ* in Saxon and Kentish (See, § 90, Campbell § 143, and Jordan § 61).
[403] See, Jordan § 61 and § 82.
[404] Jordan § 61: *Remark 1*
[405] With the exception of *pelde* Ω2 and *pelden* Ω56.
[406] Jordan § 44 and Mossé § 27 . The exception in L is *pori* Ω151. The writing of *enne* (Ω144) and *nenne* (Ω124) is likely as a result of *ǣ i*-umlaut of *ā* in the *acc. masc.*
[407] See Jordan § 113.
[408] See Jordan § 105.

in many dialects (including Kent and East Saxon) /ɔu/ or [ɑu] was widened to /au/ so the first component reverted to the /a/ quality, written <aw> or <au>.[409]

Further evidence of a WML form (and possible AB dialect) can be seen in L in the writing of <a> in *nalde* (Ω194, Ω195, Ω274 and Ω276) and *palde* (Ω17, Ω50, Ω200 etc) for OE *o* (§ 65).[410] This is, according to Jordan, as a result of a tendency in OE for opening of *o* between labials and liquids which resulted in <a> being written in the Mercian dialect as well as that of Northumbria. This was carried into the ME period with *a* forms reaching from the middle of Worcester and Hereford (including the AB dialect) up into southern Lancashire but also in the North including Scotland.[411]

Finally, the retention of <c> for OE velar *c* (§ 23 and § 24) in final position was extended for longer in the AB dialect,[412] and is almost always the form in L (*þonc* Ω72, *lac* Ω74, *perc* Ω133 etc). However, the writing of <c> is also found in many of the other texts of the *Conduct of Life* from this period that have no association with this region (eg. T and D) and might well reflect a period before transition to <k>. Conversely, the later text of J, which in other respects bears strong dialectal similarities to L, has only one instance where <c> is written (*bec* Ω401). This alone cannot therefore be seen as a clear dialectal indication of geographical situation. However, two of the exceptions to <c> in L are *ah* (Ω17, Ω124 and Ω125) and *ach* (Ω59 and Ω175), and exhibit a transition to the fricative in final position after an atonic vowel (/ax/ §. 26) – a feature retained from the OE Anglian dialect and found regularly in, and associated with, the ME AB dialect.[413]

---

[409] See Jordan § 105, *Remark 1.*
[410] See Jordan § 35. The writing of <a> is regular in these two examples but the text of L more regularly has <o> (eg. *biforen* Ω28, *borde* Ω273, *nolden* Ω251 etc).
[411] Jordan § 35.
[412] See Jordan § 178
[413] See Jordan § 178 *Remark 3.* Significantly, J also regularly writes. *ah* (Ω43, Ω59, Ω125 etc).

DIGBY

There is general agreement that the text of the *Conduct of Life* found in Digby contains strong Kentish features, which I evidence below. Hall locates the mansucript as being from Christ Church, Canterbury and suggests that it was probably copied there.[414] Samuels suggests that 'the language of D showed either two layers of copying (Kent + London *or* London + Kent), or possibly a single scribe writing in the dialect of an area of Kent or Surrey bordering on London, i.e. North-West Kent or North-East Surrey.'[415] Laing locates the language as being from West Central Kent (LAEME), arguing that the 'the language of the *Poema Morale* is clearly of Kent but seems to fit best somewhat to the west of Canterbury itself.[416]

Key features of D:

To begin with, OE *ea* before *l*, without lengthening (§ 90), is always written as <a> in D (eg. *al* Ω117, *ualle* Ω327, *palles* Ω42 etc). Breaking to *ea* only took place in the Saxon and Kentish dialects, with the Anglian dialect preserving *a*.[417] However, without following lengthening groups, *ea* went to *æ* around 1000 and from 1100 to *a*. Since *a* < *ea* falls together with unbroken Anglian *a*, the writing is generally the same in the whole area.[418] It is not possible, without further evidence, at this point to say whether *a* in D comes from breaking to *ea* or unbroken Anglian *a*. OE *ea* before *h* combinations (§ 93), on the other hand, gives <e> (*hege* Ω171 and Ω295, and *iseghð* Ω274); in the Saxon and Kentish dialects this was smoothed to *e* from around 900, where the Anglian dialect has smoothed *æ*. However, all of the versions of

[414] Hall, *Early Middle English, Notes*, p.313.
[415] Samuel's views are recorded in Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p.110.
[416] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.
[417] Campbell § 143.
[418] Jordan § 61.

the *Conduct of Life* have variants with *e*, so this alone gives little clue as to geography;[419] however, what is of interest is the lack of the front glide *i* (>ei) in D, a transitional sound which is lacking in the Kentish dialect.[420]

OE æ (§ 63) is more frequently written <e> (*hedde* Ω144, *elmesse* Ω29, *efter* Ω65 etc), this is probably as a result of a narrowing to an [ɛ] sound ('second fronting') found in the dialects of the WML and of Kent, where it is normally retracted to *a* from around 1100 in all other dialects. This more fronted sound was generalized to *a* in the thirteenth century in the WML and the fourteenth century in Kent.[421] A preceding *w* (semi-vowel) accelerated the transition to *a* in areas other than Kent which lacked this influence; significantly, D retains <e> after *w* in *peter* (Ω151 and Ω261), with <a> written only once in *pater* (Ω253). Similarly, the text of D furnishes us with examples of <e> in the writings of OE *æ* + ʒ /j/ (§ 122: *mei* Ω400, *seiðe* Ω117and *deie*) Ω165,[422] OE *ǣ*$_1$ (Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + ʒ/j/ (§ 124 and § 125: *mei* Ω194, *isein* Ω123, *isegen* Ω101 and *ne-isegen* Ω105),[423] and OE *ǣ*$_2$ + ʒ/j/ (§ 124 and § 126: *eiðer* Ω248),[424] once again forms associated with the WML and Kent.[425]

Many of the above examples are common to both the WML and Kent, but a form that is found almost exclusively in the SEML and Kent is also regularly found in D: OE *y̆* (§ 67) is mostly written <e> (*dede* Ω2, (*vn*)*net* Ω5 , *þenchen* Ω63 etc and *fere* / *ver* Ω44, Ω159, Ω161 etc,

[419] It is possible that the writing of <e> in all versions of the *Conduct of Life* might be as a result of Saxon or Kentish *e*, with the influence of the *e* forms spreading northward before being supplanted by the Anglian forms (Jordan § 63 *Remark 1*), and/or it is possibly as a result of the more fronted sound found in WML and Kentish texts, written <e>, from *æ*, probably with lengthening to /ɛ:/ (§ 63 and Jordan § 32)

[420] See Jordan § 32. This glide sound is found in TE2J .

[421] See Jordan § 32 and Mossé § 24. As well as the more frequent writings with <e>, there are also frequent *a* forms (*habbe* Ω3 *hadde* Ω16, *pater* Ω253 etc).

[422] See Jordan § 93: the more regular reading in D is with <a> (eg. *mai* Ω17and *dai* Ω383 etc).

[423] See Jordan § 96.

[424] See Jordan § 96: D also writes <a> in *aiðer* Ω63 and *aider* Ω317.

[425] OE *ǣ*$_1$ + ʒ/j/ and OE *ǣ*$_2$ + ʒ/j/ yielded /ɛ:i/ which shortened to /ɛi/ around 1200 and then took part in the development of /ɛi/ > ai in the second half of the thirteenth century. (Jordan § 96).

keðen Ω102 and *kedde* Ω200).[426] OE *y̆* was unrounded and lowered to *ĕ* in about 900 in the Kentish dialect. In ME this change was also found in the dialects of Sussex and Surrey (especially Essex and Suffolk), and was eventually also found in the City of London by the Middle of the fourteenth century.[427]

In addition to the above examples, there are examples of forms found in D that can be specifically localized to the dialect of Kent: OE *ea* before *ld* (§ 91) in D is written with a mixture of <ia> (*pialdeð* Ω86, *hialde* Ω56 and *bihialde* Ω299) and <ea> (*wealden* Ω56, *ealde* Ω324, *fealde* Ω55 etc), with occasional <a> (*alde* Ω298 and *halt* Ω323). The writing of <ia> in D reflects a special development in the Kentish dialect, where when the lengthening group *ld* follows *ēa* demonstrates a transfer of accent to /jɛ:/. This /jɛ:/ is more stable in initial position and is shown through the writing <ya> and <ia> (probably a continuation of OKent *ya*.) beside <yea> and <ea>.[428] Similarly, in the writing of OE *ēa* + *w* (§ 140) we can see the writing of <ia> (*viape* Ω109 and Ω361) alongside <ea> (*veape* Ω366).[429]

Furthermore, an important indicator of geographical location in D is demonstrated through the writing of OE *ēo* (§ 108) as a mixture of <i> (*bi* Ω2, Ω27, Ω100 etc) and <ie> (*bien* Ω40, *isien* Ω19, *lief* Ω74 etc), written alongside <e> (*ben* Ω44, *frend* Ω231, *isen* Ω392 etc) and occasional <eo> (*iseon* Ω297 and Ω398 and *deoflen* Ω100) and <o> (*dofles* Ω186). In Kent OE *ēo* underwent a special development in OE and had already gone to *īo*;[430] this went to *īe* in early ME. However, in final position the accent remained on the first component and as a result the

[426] There are several exceptions to the writing of <e> in D, including regular <i> (*þingð* Ω368, *kinges* Ω335, *afirst* Ω38 etc and *litel*/*litle* Ω12, Ω47, Ω62 etc, *hidden* Ω169 and *hpi* Ω110[x2]), alongside rarer occurrences of <u> (*muchel*(*e*)/*mutchel* Ω12, Ω63, Ω75 etc and *sunegeden* Ω271) for *y̆*.

[427] See Jordan § 39 and § 40 and Mossé § 29. However, Jordan § 40 *Remark 2* notes that it is also possible that *ī* (deriving from OE *y̆*) could also have produced *ē*, and that this might cause difficulty in the interpreting of form with *ē* outside of Kent.

[428] Jordan § 61 and § 82. It should also be noted that lengthening only occurred in Kentish before intervocalic, and not final *ld*, with <a> often being written in these instances (Jordan § 61); it is possible that the writing of <a> in the *contracted* form *halt* represents this.

[429] Kent first gave /jɛu/, where all other dialects yielded an/ɛu/ diphthong (Jordan § 107).

[430] See Jordan § 84 and § 85.

second often disappeared, therefore, we find *bī* in D.[431] In addition, <ie> (*riepen* Ω22 and *siepe* Ω23) is also written in examples where *w* follows (OE *ēo* + *w*: § 139).[432] For the *i*-umlaut of *ēo* in Kent *īo* developed like the same sounds without umlaut; therefore, in D we mostly find <ie> (*þiestre* Ω77 and Ω79, *þiesternesse* Ω292, *niede* Ω274 and *diere* Ω153 and Ω193).[433]

The final two examples that suggest a Kentish influence come from the consonants: the OE fricative /ɣ/ (§ 43) is retained and written <ȝ> (*volȝeð* Ω14, *hoȝeð* Ω52, *laȝe* Ω179 etc) in medial position, a form preserved in Kent into the fourteenth century, where all other dialects demonstrate a much earlier movement to /ɣw/ > /w/ <w>.[434] Finally, D regularly writes voiced [v] as <v/u> (§ 58) in initial position (*vele* Ω9, *volȝeð* Ω14, *vor* Ω17[x2] etc)[435] and in medial position between vowels or other voiced sounds (*himselue* Ω14, *biuore* Ω19, *euele* Ω20 etc).[436] The transition to voicing in initial position takes place in the South and SWML particularly in Kent;[437] elsewhere the spelling does not always reflect this. Similarly, it is more likely for a text from Kent to represent voiced [v] through the writing of <v> rather than the OE writing of <f>, used for both [f] and [v].

All of the above evidence indicates a probable localization of D to Kent.

The Egerton Texts

Both of the texts of the *Conduct of Life* in Egerton contain strong South-Western linguistic features, as evidenced below. Laing (LAEME) contends that the language of both versions is of

[431] See Jordan § 85.
[432] See Jordan § 109. The exception in D is *repen* Ω371.
[433] See Campbell § 201 and Jordan § 86. The exceptions in D are *deorlinges* Ω402 and *feond* Ω294 and *frend* Ω192 and Ω315.
[434] Jordan § 186. <ȝh> in *draȝhen* Ω50 is still velar.
[435] Less numerous, but still numerous, occurrences of <f> are also found: *for* Ω29, *fremde* Ω35, *finde* Ω55 etc.
[436] Rare instances of <f> are also retained: *deoflen* Ω100, *life* Ω120, *eftin* Ω410 etc.
[437] Jordan § 215 and Mossé p. 39.

south-west Worcestershire, with the text of E1 possibly being more northern.[438] Both texts, which were copied from the same exemplar, retain archaic grammar and orthography, with the scribe of E2 being more conservative than the scribe of E1.[439] This has led Laing to believe that the text of E2 may well be deliberately archaistic.[440]

This section will, therefore, view the key dialectal features of E2 and E1 comparatively. Both texts have forms associated with both the SW and the WML:

OE *y̆* (§ 67) is mostly written <u> in both E2 (*dude* Ω2, *gulte* Ω224, *muchel* Ω12 etc and *lutel* Ω212, *lute* Ω273, *hud* Ω78 etc)[441] and E1 (*dude* Ω2, *gulte* Ω224, *muchel* Ω12 etc and *lutel* Ω62, *hud* Ω78, *fure* Ω44 etc).[442] In OE this sound was the *i*-mutation of *u*. In the WML (excluding almost the whole of Lancashire) and the South-West *y̆* was retained into the ME period and was mostly written <u> but sometimes, when long, <ui> or <uy>. The /y/ sound (written <u>) is retained in the WML until about 1300. Unrounding also reaches the West around the fourteenth century.[443] The regular writing of <u> for OE *y̆* is a clear geographical indicator, likely placing both texts in either the SW or the WML.

In addition, both E2 and E1 preserve, with varying frequency, the close /ø/ sound for OE *eo* (§ 95), retained longest in the WML and part of the south (including the SW), where it was unrounded to *e* in EML, Kent and the North from the twelfth century, with the smoothed forms of the Anglian dialect having *e* from the late OE period.[444] Before *r*-combinations OE *eo*

[438] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.
[439] In addition to the examples provided here, see Hill, 'Notes on the Egerton *e* Text', pp. 353-357.
[440] Laing, 'The value of texts surviving in more than one version', p. 576.
[441] In E2, for OE *y̆* <i> is regularly written in *ðince* Ω63, *king* Ω51, *sticche* Ω198 etc; <y> is written once in *mẏchel* Ω14; and <e> twice in *iðencð* Ω212 and *unpenne* Ω219. In E2 for OE *y* <i> is written in *litel* Ω12, Ω62, Ω342 etc, *lite* Ω47 and *hpi* Ω110.
[442] In E1, for OE *y̆* <i> is regularly written in *þinchen* Ω63, *king* Ω51, *spilc* Ω81, etc, with <e> also written, more regularly than in E2, in *deden* Ω279, *euel* Ω265, *a-ferst* Ω38 etc.The more regular writing of <e> in E1 might well be as a result of unrounding due to the text's later date, a possibly more northern dialect, or a deliberate archaicising of the text by the scribe of E2. In E1 for OE *y* <i> is written in *litel* Ω12and *hpi* Ω110
[443] See Jordan § 39 and § 42 and Mossé § 29. OE *y̆* in the South-East including Kent was unrounded and lowered to *ĕ*, and in the North and the East-Midlands by unrounding it became *ĭ*, written <i> or <y>.
[444] See Jordan § 65.

(§ 96) is always written <eo> in E2 (*peorkes* Ω64, *heorte* Ω75, *steorre* Ω290 etc), with a mixture of <eo> (*peorkes* Ω267, *heorte* Ω75 and *steorre* Ω290) and <e> (*perche/perc* Ω11, Ω113, Ω116 etc and *perkes* Ω64 and Ω73) found in E1. The verb OE *eom*, *eam*, *am* (§ 101) provides us with a further probable SW/WML geographical indicator. In both E2 and E1 we find both *æm* (Ω1) and *eom* (Ω4). Although reflexes of the *eam* form are often also found in the SW, the reflex of *eom* found in both of the Egerton texts (*æm* Ω1) can be seen as geographical markers. The writing of *eom* Ω4 in the second writing of the verb in E2 and E1 strengthens a SW localisation of these texts.

In the instances from OE where breaking to *eo* before *l*-combinations occur (§ 98),[445] *eo* is retained in the Anglian dialects, later becoming smoothed *e*, with unrounded *e* becoming the dominant reading in most of the remaining areas. For example, in the *Conduct of Life* we find T: *self* Ω236 (unrounded) and L: *solf* Ω30 from the WML. In E2, however, and in some examples from E1, *sulf* /sylf/ is found (E2: *sulfne/sulue/sulf* Ω14, Ω33, Ω34 etc; E1: *sulfne/sulne* Ω14, Ω34, Ω112 and Ω116) from lWS *sylf/silf*, once more suggesting a SW influence. As in the previous examples, E2 more consistently has the more archaic variants, with <e> written twice only (*selue/self* Ω26 and Ω119); whereas E1 has many more examples with <e> (*selue/self* Ω26, Ω30, Ω33 etc) as well as <ue> (*suelf* Ω120 and Ω321) and <i> (*silf* Ω41).[446] It is possible that the writing of <e> in E1 represents 1) Smoothed Anglian *e*, as a result of the text's later date; 2) the influence of a more northern dialect upon the writing of E1; 3) the deliberate archaising of the spelling by the scribe of E2; or 4) the deliberate archaising of the exemplar that both E2 and E1 were copied from, with E1 'modernizing' some instances and not others.

[445] Breaking of *e* was regular only when [x] follows: *eolh*, *seolh* etc. and with the loss of [x], the inflected forms of these words (e.g. sēoles) – see Campbell § 146. See also Jordan § 68

[446] It is possible that *silf* is a reflex of lWS *sylf/silf* or that the writing of <i> rests on the development from *e*, according to the process described in § 64.3; a form more normally associated with the North.

The velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105) likely also went to *eo* everywhere in OE. In ME this gave /ø/, with unrounding to *e* taking place as previously described; the front round vowel /ø/, written <eo, o, oe, u, ue>, was retained longest in the West Midlands and Southwest.[447] In E2 <eo> and <u> (*seouene* Ω29, *bi-neoðen* Ω89, *heore* Ω104 etc, and *icluped* Ω109 and *bi-clupien* Ω112)[448] are regularly written; however, as in previous examples, the forms in E1 are less archaic with <e> (*bi-neþen* Ω89, *henne* Ω417, *here* Ω104 etc)[449] more regularly written alongside less frequent <eo> and <u> (*heore* Ω184, Ω237, Ω302 etc and *seouene* /*seoue* Ω29 and Ω149 and *hure* Ω272 and Ω287). In addition, in OE there was a lack of umlaut before a dental in the SW,[450] which means that *suððe* Ω122 and *syððen* Ω9 in E2 and *sutþe* /*suðþe* Ω122 and Ω216 and *sÿðen* Ω9 in E1 are likely as a result of lWS *syððan* – furthering the evidence for a SW localisation or influence.[451]

OE *ēo* (§ 108) yields long /ø:/, following a similar development to that of *ĕo* > /ø/, and gives longer resistance to unrounding in the WML and the South than short ĕo and is retained into the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.[452] Both E2 and E1 mostly retain the forms associated with the WMl and the South: E2 writes mainly <eo> (*beon* Ω40, *seon* Ω167, *freond* Ω31 etc),[453] with E1, once again showing more variance, writing <eo> (*beo* Ω125, *seon* Ω398, *freonde* Ω231 etc), <o> (*bo* Ω33 and *frond* Ω31), <ue> (*buen* Ω181 and *bue* Ω33), and <u> (*bud* /*buð* Ω24, Ω77, Ω295 etc), all forms indicating long /ø:/, written alongside regular instances of <e> (*ben* Ω2, *isen* Ω19, *leure* Ω30 etc) and two occurrences of <i> (*lif* Ω270 and *sic* Ω208).

[447] See Jordan § 74.
[448] E2 also has <i> written in (*be*)-*nime* Ω45 and *quike* Ω80.
[449] E1 also has <i> written in (*be*)-*nimen* Ω45 and *quike* Ω80.
[450] See Jordan § 74.
[451] E2 also has <i> written once in *siððe* Ω216.
[452] See Jordan § 84. In the EML and the North this was unrounded to /e:/, beginning in the twelfth century, where in Kent *ēo* had already gone to *īo* in OE, becoming *īe*, and with acccent shifting /je:/, in ME.
[453] With <e> written in *ben* Ω2; <ie> in *lief* Ω270; and <i> in *sic* Ω208.

Similarly, OE *ēo* + *w* (§ 139) is written retaining <eo> in E2 (*reope* Ω371 and *seopen* Ω23),[454] and in E1 (*seopen* Ω23); however, the movement /ø:u/ > /eu/ (written <ew>), which took place during the twelfth century in dialects other than the West and SW, is found in the writing of E1 (*reupe* Ω371 and for the *i*-umlaut in *untreunesse* Ω279).[455]

The writing of OE *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109) yields more complicated results in E2 and E1 but might also give further evidence of geography and variance. In E2 OE *i*-umlaut of *ēo* is written with a mixture of <eo> (*freond* Ω315, *deore* and *neode* Ω274) and <u> (*frund* Ω192 and Ω231, *fund* Ω294, *þustre* Ω77 and Ω79, *ðustrenesse* Ω292 and *dure* Ω153); where, in E2 it is written with <e> (*frend* Ω192, Ω231 and Ω315, *fend* Ω294 and *nede* Ω274), <u> (*þustre* Ω77 and Ω79, *þusternesse* Ω292, *durlinges* Ω402), <o> (*dore* Ω193), and <ue> (*duere* Ω153).[456] As in the short *i*-umlaut of *eo* (§ 100), *īo* was subject to *i*-umlaut in WS giving *ȳ* (and later *ī*) < *īe*.[457] In ME, dialects of the Southwest demonstrate traces of WS *ȳ*; the otherwise predominating *ēo* and Kentish *īo* developed like the same sounds without umlaut (cf, § 108). In E2 and E1 the writing of <u> is possibly from WS *ȳ* but could also possibly represent /ø:/ from *ēo*, a fotm retained longest in the WMl and South. Both <o> and <ue>, written in E1, are also associated with the South and WMl.

Further probable SW forms in E2 and E1 are evident in the *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *l* combinations (§ 92), where *ea* could be subject to *i*-umlaut in WS and Kent, and where Anglian dialects had the mutation of *a* in the same position.[458] In OE we find WS *ie* (later *i* and more frequently *y*), Anglian *æ* < unbroken *a* in Mercian / West Midland dialects (also penetrating into

[454] With <u> written once in *rupen* Ω22 and for the *i*-umlaut of *ēo* + *w* in *untrupnesse* Ω279.
[455] With <u> written once in *rupen* Ω22.
[456] For the nouns OE WS frēond and fēond, i-umlaut only took place in the pl. nom and pl. acc.
[457] Campbell § 201.
[458] Campbell § 200.

Gloucestershire and Worcestershire), and *e* in the North, EML and Kent.[459] In ME this gives *a* from Anglian *æ* in the WML (cf. L: *alder* Ω1) with lengthened *ǣ* /ɛ:/ written <e> (cf. L: *elde* Ω17 and Ω18); in the East Midland, Kentish and Northern Dialects *e* was retained (cf. T and D: *elder* Ω1 and *elde* Ω18); and in the Southwest /y/ was often written <u> with *i* current in Devon and Somerset.[460] In E2 SW <u> is written in *uldre* Ω337 and *ulde* Ω337, and <y> is written in *ylde* Ω18, alongside <e> in *elder* Ω1 and *elde* Ω17 and Ω338. E1, however, only writes the SW form *ulde* Ω390 once, with <e> written in *elder* /*eldre* Ω1 and Ω337 and *elde* Ω17, Ω18, Ω337 and Ω338 much more frequently, and the older form with <y> not present at all. Once again, the archaic forms are much more frequent in E2. In addition, E2 and E1 both demonstrate the /y/ reflex of unstable *i*, *y* < *ie* as *i*-umlaut of *ea* diphthongized by a palatal (after *c*) in the writing of *chule* Ω206 (§ 111 and § 113): a form found in scattered instances in the Southwest; the writing of <e> in the remaining readings (E2 and E1: *chele* Ω245[x2], Ω246 and Ω247 and *bicherd* /*bi-cherd* Ω333) likely represents OE *e* without diphthongizing, and might reflect the writing of an earlier exemplar.

In the same way that *i*-umlaut of short *ea* gave /y/ in the Southwest, /y:/, often written <u>, is characteristic in the Southwest for *i*-umlaut of *ēa* (§ 107). The /y:/ sound was repressed early in most areas (probably before the end of the OE period in living speech) and, aside from the remains of Southwestern *u* /y:/, Anglian ē prevails in the rest of the area. E2 and E1 nearly always retain the writing of <u> (E2: *ihurð* Ω91, *ihuren* Ω276 and *ilusd* Ω141; E1: *i-hurd* Ω91, *ihuren* Ω276, *a-luesd* Ω141 and *iluuet* Ω136), with the less frequent writing of <e> in E2 (*ileue* Ω50 and Ω183, *leueð* Ω136 and *temen* Ω113) and E1 (*ileued* Ω183, *ileue* Ω50 and *temen* Ω113)

[459] Jordan § 62.
[460] Jordan § 62.

featuring only in rhyming position and more likely a reflection of an earlier exemplar, and possibly representing the language of the original.[461]

Reflexes of OE *ie* after palatal *g* (§ 116) and *sc* (§ 118), written <i/y>, <ie> and <u> in E2 (*forȝitet* Ω39, *ȝieuen* Ω65, *for-ȝut* Ω26 etc, and *sculde(n)* Ω231, Ω314, Ω316 etc and *sculdeð* Ω362) and E1 (*forȝýtet* Ω39, *ȝieueð* Ω198, *ȝuue* Ω127 etc, and *sculde* Ω231, Ω314 and Ω348 and *sculdeð* Ω362),[462] are also features associated with the SW. OE *e* became *ie* (later *i, y*) after palatal *c*, *g*, and *sc* in WS, but remained *e* in Anglian and Kent.[463] Reflexes of OE *ie* or unstable *i*, *y* are found in the Southwest and in East Saxon, where the remaining regions have *e*.[464] Furthermore, for OE *īe* after *g* (§ 117), the forms of WS ġīet (gȳt), with dipthongization, and Anglian ġēt, without dipthongization, from OE *ē* exhibit the same development as ĕ. The writing of SW <u> and <ýe> in E2 (*ȝut* Ω304 and Ω310 and *ȝýet* Ω5) and <u> and <ue> in E1 (*ȝut* Ω310 and *ȝuet* Ω5)[465] demonstrate the reflex of /y/.

In addition to the SW forms highlighted, and those forms that could be either WML or SW, there are forms present in E2 and E1 that further suggest a localisation in the WML. Within these examples, however, there is evidence of either (or both) topographical or chronological differences between E2 and E1.

OE *æ* (§ 63), which was retracted to *a* from around 1100 in areas other than the WMl and Kent where the more fronted sound (written <e>, but sometimes <ea> in the WML) was retained for longer,[466] is mostly written as <e> (*hefð* Ω67, *elmesse* Ω29, *petere* Ω84 etc) in E2,

[461] Jordan § 83.
[462] E1 also writes *scilde(n)* Ω316 and Ω319 a form that might be considered SW or East Saxon, however, this is a reading found across all MSS and might reflect a standardized form across all dialects at this time or a form found in an earlier exemplar of all MSS.
[463] Wright § 91.
[464] Jordan § 83.
[465] E1 also has <e> written once in *ȝet* Ω304.
[466] The quality *a* is generalized in the thirteenth century in the WML and in the fourteenth century in Kent. See, Jordan § 32 and Mossé § 24.

with the older writing of <æ> (*æfter* Ω65 and Ω124 and *bæð* Ω229) also present.[467] In comparison, E1 does retain occasional <e> (*efter* Ω330, *pet/hpet* Ω24, Ω94, Ω103 etc, *peðer* Ω249, *sed* Ω405) and, on one occasion, WML <ea> (*beað* Ω229), but the writing of <a> (*habbe* Ω3, *almesse* Ω29, *after* Ω65 etc) is the more regular. Possibly of significance is the writing of <e> in *petere* /*peter* Ω84, Ω151, Ω203 etc in E2, when a preceding *w* (semi-vowel) accelerated the transition to *a* in areas other than Kent, where a change might have been expected and where E1 demonstrates transition to <a> *patere* /*pater* Ω84, Ω151, Ω203 etc. Similarly, OE *æ* + *ʒ* /j/ (§ 122) is nearly always written with <e> (*mei* Ω17, Ω22, Ω28 etc, *dei* /*deie* Ω141, Ω165 and Ω383 and *seið* Ω117) in E2, with <a> found only once (*saið* Ω140); whereas the WM forms are present in E1 with the occasional writing of <e> (*mei* Ω22, *seit* /*seid* Ω117 and Ω140), but the writing of <a> (*mai* Ω17, Ω36, Ω41 and Ω45 and *dai* Ω141, Ω165 and Ω383) is more frequent.[468]

When considering whether E2 and E1 are texts of the WML it is important to look at OE *a* before a nasal (§ 60), where by the late OE period the back sound /ɔ/, written <o>, was characteristic for the Anglian dialect while in the (West) Saxon geographical area it was written <a>. In ME back /ɔ/ was retained only in the WML (with the inclusion of Worcester) – before nasals, before lengthening groups and with lengthening in open syllables. The remaining territories, therefore the EML, South and North, have *a*.[469] For example, in L we have *mon* Ω33, *moni* Ω39, *þonke* Ω70 etc and even in later texts such as J we have *mon* Ω15, *monÿ* Ω39, *þonk* Ω72 etc. However, in E2 and E1 we always find <a> (E2: *manne* Ω21, *þanc* Ω72, *þanne* Ω2 etc and E1 *man* Ω21, *þanke* Ω70, *þanne* Ω41 etc). It is possible to see in L and J the remanence of a form confined to a small area of the WML (which includes the AB dialect), but there is evidence from ME dialectal maps that the writing of <o> before *m* or *n*, during this period, was also found in

[467] The writing of <a> is only found in *habbe*/*habb* Ω3, Ω5, Ω7 etc, *haf*ð Ω122, Ω150 and Ω181 and *hadde* Ω16.
[468] See Jordan§ 93.
[469] Jordan § 30 and Mossé § 25.

other WML areas, including Worcestershire and North Gloucestershire.[470] The writing of <a> here does not however negate the possibility that the texts were from south-west Worcestershire, as Laing believes, but strengthens a localisation with a more southern influence, possibly even Gloucestershire itself.

Furthermore, the writing of OE *a* before a lengthening group (§ 61) furnishes us with further examples of difference between E2 and E1. Once again, E2 always writes <a> (*lange* Ω3, *prange* Ω170, *hande* Ω83 etc), however, E1 has mostly <o> (*longe* Ω176, *stronge* Ω294, *honde* Ω83 etc) with <a> (*lange* Ω3, *hanged* Ω323 and *prange* Ω170) only occasionally found. It is possible to see in the writing of <o> in E2 a WML form, however, the writing of <o> in these instances are more likely to be as a result of a > *o* /ɔ:/ found in the South and the Midlands.[471] Rounding of *a* giving o /ɔ:/ began at the beginning of the twelfth century in the WS area, simultaneously probably in Kent. It spread in the second half of the twelfth century to almost the southern half of the Midlands, and almost the whole in the thirteenth century. During the thirteenth century it had reached most of the West.[472] Therefore, the writing of <o> in E1 might be seen as a result of the text's later date rather than a difference in geographical localization. Further examples can be seen in OE *ā* (§ 69) where E2 nearly always writes <a> (*ane* Ω88, *nan* Ω115, *lac* Ω74 etc), with <o> written twice only (*lore* Ω1 and *pori* Ω151); whereas, E1 more often writes <o> (*lore* Ω1, *one* Ω218, *non* Ω60^{x2} etc) with still frequent writings of <a> (*anne* Ω144, *nanne-mon* Ω124, *hatere* Ω260 etc). Considering the date of E2 and a likely SWML localisation (the AB dialect, however, did preserve <a>, but other dialectal evidence suggests that this is not the dialect of either E2 or E1) it is surprising to see such regular writing of <a>. It is possible, therefore, that the movement a > *o* /ɔ:/ had been completed in the dialect of the scribe of E2,

[470] See Jordan § 30 and Jordan Dialectal Map p.53.
[471] Jordan § 31 and Mossé § 25.
[472] Jordan §44 and Mossé § 27.

and that the scribe deliberately archaized his text, or, as the still frequent writing of <a> in E1 might attest, that the exemplar that E2 and E1 were copied from had <a> and that the scribe of E2 was a faithful copyist, where the scribe of E1 more often modernized his text.

Similarly, the difference between the writing of <a> in E2 and <o> in E1 for *ā* can be further evidenced in examples before *w* and before /ɣ/. As previously, OE *ā* + *w* (§ 138) and OE ā + /ɣ/ (§ 137) in E2 are mostly written with <a> (*icnape* Ω170, *blapeð* Ω143, *saple* Ω317 etc and *maȝe* / *maȝhe* Ω30 and Ω194 and *aȝe* / *aȝen* Ω31, Ω113, Ω118 etc), with <au> (*saule* Ω143) once and <o> (*mopen* Ω23) once; whereas, in E1 they are mostly written with <o> (*mopen* Ω23, and *moȝe* Ω30, *oȝe* Ω31 and *hope* / *ope* / *open* Ω118, Ω121, Ω170 etc) or <ou> (*soule* Ω143, Ω317 and Ω415 and *bloupet* Ω143, and *moupe* Ω194), with less frequent writings of <a> (*icnape* / *icnapen* Ω170 and Ω399 and *cnaped* Ω115, and *aȝe* Ω113 and *apene* Ω270).

Finally, there are numerous other examples where either E1 can be viewed as being progressive or E2 might be viewed as being archaistic. For example, E2 always retains the writing of <u> (*cume*/*cumen* Ω27, Ω164, Ω183 etc, *punien* Ω160, *grunde* Ω187 etc) for OE *u* (§ 68), where in E1 <o> is nearly always written in the verb *come* / *comen* Ω27, Ω164, Ω183 etc and *comeð* Ω74,[473] but <u> (*punien* Ω160, *grunde* Ω187, *sune* Ω195 etc) is retained in all other examples. However, this is probably consistent with other examples as, although in OE *u* was probably already open [u], the first examples of <o> written for *u* are only found in the second half of the twelfth century with <o> still scattered until the second half of the thirteenth century when the graphical substitution was brought about in imitation of AN <o> and for clarity in the neighbourhood of similarly formed letters like <m, n, u, v, w>.[474]

[473] <u> is written once only in *cume* Ω163.
[474] See Jordan § 37.

Another place where E1 appears to be more progressive than E2 is in the development and demonstration of glide-sounds. For OE *ā* + *h* (g) (§ 132) E2 writes *fah* Ω378 and *ah* Ω2 (without glide), where E1 has *fou* Ω378 (with glide) alongside more traditional *ah* Ω2. In OE *ǣ₂* + *h* (§ 132 and § 133), E2 writes *tehte* Ω283, *ehte* Ω56 and *ahte* Ω255 (without glide), where E1 has *auht* Ω255 and *tauhte* Ω283 (with glide), alongside *ehte* Ω56 and *eicte* Ω43. Finally, in OE *ō* + *h* (§ 134) E2 has *un-boht* Ω60, *bi-þoht* Ω8, *brohte* Ω192 etc (without glide), where E1 has *vn-bout* Ω60, *bi-þouhte* Ω159, *broutte* Ω192 etc (with glide), alongside *bi-þoht* Ω8.

JESUS

The language of this manuscript is WML and the text shares many of the forms found in the 'AB' dialect, as evidenced below, and also in Lambeth. Samuels locates the manuscript, specifically, to 'South-East Herefordshire, just north of Ross near the Worcestershire border'[475] with the LALME also adverting to the possibility of a Herefordshire dialect.[476]

Key features of J:

The text of J exhibits several Anglian dialectal forms: OE *eo* before *l*-combinations (§ 98) is written <eo> (eg. *seolf* Ω14 and *seolue* Ω30 etc: Anglian /sølf/), one of many dialectal features J shares with L.[477] In addition, OE *ie* after *g* (§ 116) and OE *īe* after *g* (§ 117) are always written <e> (eg. *for-ġet* Ω26, *ġefte* Ω46, *ġelde* Ω46 etc, and *ġet* Ω5, Ω304 and Ω310), a form found in both the Anglian and Kentish dialects.[478] Another feature that might indicate the influence of the Anglian dialect on the text of J is the vocalization of OE *ʒ* /j/ to/i/ (§ 49) before

[475] Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p. 110.
[476] Herefordshire. Linguistic Atlas Grid Reference: 372 244, LP 7440 (McIntosh, Samuels and Benskin 1986, p. 199).
[477] For the breaking of *e* to *eo* before *l*-combinations see Campbell § 146; for ME Angl. /sølf/ (written <seolf, solf>); see Jordan § 68.
[478] OE *e* became *ie* (later *i*, *y*) after palatal *c*, *g*, and *sc* in WS, but remained *e* in Anglian and Kent; see Wright § 91. Anglian *ġēt*, without dipthongization, from OE *ē* exhibits the same development as *ĕ*.

d in the *pa.* form of the *OE* verb *secgan* (*seýde* Ω136, *seide* Ω164 and *seýden* Ω148 and Ω234), a feature once again shared with L, where *ʒ* /j/ was lost before *d* with the lengthening of the previous vowel in the writings of the West Saxon dialect, and probably also that of Kent, during the OE period.[479]

J also has many forms associated with the WML, which might also be found in the South and SW: The writing of <e> (*werke* Ω11, Ω121, Ω186 etc and *werkes* Ω64, Ω108, Ω116 etc) for OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96) suggests a smoothed Anglian form; however, the writing of <eo> in *heorte* Ω75, Ω118, Ω300 and Ω320 and *steorre* Ω290 preserve the /ø/ sound found for longer in the WML and parts of the South.[480] In these areas this sound was retained until around 1300;[481] considering the later date of J this might be seen as a clear indicator of the localisation of this text or the exemplar from which it was copied. Similarly, OE *eo* resulting from the *u* umlaut of *e* (§ 102 and § 104) and the *a* umlaut of *e* (§ 102 and § 103) is regularly written as <eo> /ø:/ (*heouene* Ω28, Ω76, Ω83 etc and *heoueriche* Ω43, Ω66, Ω185 etc, and *veole/ ueole/ feole* Ω9, Ω10, Ω100 etc and *weole* Ω162, Ω233 and Ω386) and <o> (*world* and *worldes* Ω162[x2], Ω282, Ω330 etc), where *eo* by back mutation then follows the course described previously for *eo* by breaking.[482]

OE *ēo* (§ 108) corresponds to short *ĕo* with the long diphthong giving the long /ø:/ sound, which gives longer resistance to unrounding in some areas of the WML and parts of the south than *ĕo*, but is unrounded to /e:/ elsewhere from the twelfth century. In J, therefore, we found the almost

[479] Jordan § 192.
[480] Jordan § 65.
[481] Jordan § 65.
[482] See Jordan § 71 and Jordan § 73. J writes <e> once in *heuenliche* Ω99 for the *u*-umlaut of *e* and <u> in *suster* (*u* in *suster* is written under the influence of *w*,; see Wright § 52). J writes <e> twice for the *a*-umlaut of *e* in *wele* Ω380 and *brekeð* Ω93. For the condition in which back mutation occurred see Campbell § 205).

exclusive writing of <eo> (eg. beo Ω2, seon Ω167, leof Ω30 etc).[483] Similarly, the *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109) is always written <eo> (eg. *freond* Ω192, *feond* Ω294, *þeostre* Ω77etc).[484]

OE ē*o* + *w* (§ 139) is written <eo> in *reowe* Ω22 and *seowe* Ω23, a form associated with the dialects of the West and the SW, with <e> written once in *rewe* Ω371 and once in *untrewnesse* Ω279 (*i*-umlaut).[485] Similarly, the velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105), which went to *eo*, is regularly written <eo> (eg. *bi-cleopien* Ω112, *seoue* Ω149, *heore* Ω104 etc), a form that, as above, was retained for longer in the West and SW, with unrounding to *e* taking place in all other areas.[486]

This localization can be narrowed to the WM through the following examples: OE *a* before a nasal (§ 60) and before a lengthening group (§ 61) are mostly written as <o> (eg. *mon* Ω15, *monÿ* Ω39, *þonk* Ω72 etc and *longe* Ω3, *pronge* Ω170, *honde* Ω83 etc).[487] In ME back /ɔ/ was retained only in the WML (including Worcester) before nasals, before lengthening groups and with lengthening in open syllables; however, since *ā* (cf. § 69ff.) originating before lengthening groups in the South and the Midlands participated in the change from *a* > o /ɔ:/ the writing of <o> in J before *ng* and *nd* might demonstrate a Midland or Southern form where it was retained as well as being /ɔ/ in the WML, and cannot, therefore, be seen as a clear geographical indicator.

The writing of OE *y̆* (§ 67) as <u> (eg. *dude* Ω2, *þunchen* Ω63, *agult* Ω11 etc and *lutel* Ω12, *ihud* Ω12, *fure* Ω44 etc)[488] is another likely indicator of a WML provenance for J. This form was retained in the WML until about 1300, with unrounding reaching the West around the fourteenth century. [489] In addition, occasional <e> (*heuede* Ω16, *hedde* Ω144 and Ω156, *brek* Ω192 and *hweþer*

[483] The exceptions in J are *be* Ω260, *þeue* Ω44 and *sek* Ω208.
[484] For the conditions of the *i*-umlaut of *ēo* see Campbell § 201.
[485] OE ēo +w gave /ø:u/. This yielded /ø:/ in Western and Southwestern areas – a form retained into the fourteenth century. Other dialects, however, gave /ø:u/ > /eu/ (written <ew>) during the twelfth century (Jordan §109).
[486] Jordan §74. The exceptions in J are: *bi-neþen* Ω89, *icleped* Ω109 and *seþþen* Ω122, and (*by*)*nyme* Ω45, *quÿke* Ω80 and Ω199 and *nÿþe* Ω310.
[487] See Jordan § 30 and Mossé § 25. The exceptions in J are: *mannes* Ω31 and *þan*/*þane* Ω1, Ω2, Ω21 etc.
[488] For OE *y* J also regularly has writings with *i* / *y* (eg. *þinche* Ω123, *a-virst* Ω38, *kÿng* Ω227etc); for OE *ȳ* J has only occurrences of *i* (*hwi* Ω110[x2]).
[489] See Jordan § 39 and § 42; and Mossé § 29.

Ω249)[490] is still written for OE *æ* (§ 63), a form that was retained for longer in the WML and Kent.[491] The quality *a* was generalized in the thirteenth century in the WML and in the fourteenth century in Kent. It therefore provides a good example of topographically and chronologically graduated transition, especially when J (mostly *a*, with only occasional *e*) is compared with L (predominantly *e*, with some *a*), considering that they share many other dialectal features. Similarly <e> is written only in *seyþ* Ω117, Ω119 and Ω140, with <a> more regular in *may* Ω17, Ω19, Ω22 etc and *day* Ω141, Ω165 and Ω363, for ME writings of OE æ + ʒ /j/ (§ 122), which follows the same path as OE *æ* (§ 63),[492] where the text of L still retains the more regular writing of <e> (eg. *mei* Ω17, *seiðe* Ω119, *dei* Ω165 etc).[493] Similarly, OE *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 87 and § 88) without lengthening gives <e> (*erewe* Ω20) only once, with <a> (*þarf* Ω44 and Ω46, *arme* Ω238, *swarte* Ω293 and *narewe* Ω355) nearly always written. Before *rn*, <ea> *earnyng*e Ω65) is written only once, with <a> written in *warny/parny* Ω237, Ω239 and Ω315. Before *rd*, <e> is more regularly found in (*middel*)*erd*/ (*myddel*)*erd* Ω145, Ω202 and Ω207, alongside <a> in *harde* Ω178. These examples certainly suggest a WM dialect for J, but, when compared to L, where the forms are consistently written with <e>, a later date transition can also be recognized.[494]

Another example to emphasise the chronological, and possible topological, differences between J and L might be seen in their treatment of *ea* before *ld* (§ 91).[495] Anglian *ā* in the Midlands undergoes the change to *o* /ɔ:/; however, while advancing Anglian /ɔ:/ is found in both

[490] J, however, mostly writes <a> (*habbe* Ω3, *almes* Ω29, *after* Ω29 etc).
[491] See Jordan § 32 and Mossé § 24. In the WML and Kent the sound was closed to *e* (written <e> but sometimes <ea> in the WML) representing the more fronted sound. In the other areas *æ* was retracted to *a* from around 1100 although the writing <æ> (along with the Norman writing <e>) remained in the twelfth century. Preceding *w* (semi-vowel) accelerated the transition to *a* in areas other than Kent which lacked this influence.
[492] See Jordan § 93. For LWS *sǣde* / Anglian *sægde* see § 123.
[493] The only exception in L is *mai* Ω36, Ω41 and Ω70.
[494] OE *ea* was simplified, around 1000, to *æ*, if not already 'smoothed' during the OE period, and subsequently followed the process described previously (§ 63). For the breaking of *æ* before *r* see Campbell § 131, Campbell *fn* 1 of § 139, and Campbell § 144. For resultant features of ME dialects see Jordan § 58.
[495] Including OE *ea* before *l* which generally gave *a* in all dialects: Anglian unbroken *a* and *a* < *ea* by way of *æ* in Saxon and Kentish (See, § 90, Campbell § 143, and Jordan § 61).

Worcestershire and Gloucestershire the AB dialect consistently writes *a*.[496] This is the form that is mostly found in L (eg. *palde*ð Ω86, *ald* Ω4, *falde* Ω55 etc),[497] but in the writing of J the change to *o* /ɔ:/ is demonstrated (*wolde* Ω56, *old* Ω4, *folde* Ω55 etc).[498] In addition, the writing of OE *ā* (§ 69),[499] OE ā + /ɣ/ (§ 137),[500] and OE *ā* + *w* (§ 138)[501] gave a much clearer idea of the geographical location of L, as the retention of <a> demonstrated an expected WMl localisation and a likely association with the AB dialect. However, in J the writing of <a> was greatly reduced almost a century after L, with rounded open [ɔ:], written <o>, the regular form. Therefore, OE *ā* is mostly <o> (*lore* Ω1, *one* Ω216, *non* Ω60[x2] etc);[502] OE *ā* + /ɣ/ is always <o> (*mowe* Ω30 and *owe* / *owen* Ω31, Ω113, Ω118 etc); and OE *ā* + *w* is <ow> (*iknowe* Ω170, (*i*)*knowe*þ Ω115 and Ω142 *and blowe*þ Ω143) and <ou> (*soule* Ω143 and Ω317 and *soulen* Ω297), with <au> written once (*saule* Ω415).

Finally, however, there are some further features that L and J do share that might advance our analysis. Both texts vocalize OE palatal *ʒ* /j/ (§ 49) to /i/ before *d* (L: *seide* Ω136, *iseid* Ω148 and *seiden* Ω234; J: *seẏde* Ω136, *seide* Ω164 and *seẏden* Ω148 and Ω234),[503] a probable Anglian feature lost in the Saxon and Kentish dialects.[504] For the retention of <c> for OE velar *c* (§ 23 and § 24) in final position, retained longest in the AB dialect,[505] J once again demonstrates difference, with <c> (*bec* Ω401) only written once and <k> (*ek* Ω1, *werk* Ω121, *þonk* Ω72 etc) the regular reading, where L almost always has <c> (*þonc* Ω72, *lac* Ω74, *perc* Ω133 etc); however, both L and J also share examples of <h> [x] in final position (L: *ah* Ω17,

[496] Jordan § 61: *Remark 1.*
[497] With the exception of *pelde* Ω2 and *pelden* Ω56.
[498] With the exception of *welde* Ω2 and *welde*þ Ω404 and *hald* Ω323 and *palt* Ω86 (both words written with <a> are *contracted* forms of *verbs*).
[499] Jordan § 44; Mossé § 27.
[500] See Jordan § 113.
[501] See Jordan § 105.
[502] With <a> written in *namore*, *aquerne*, *bihat* (cont.), *hatture* and *hat* (cont.). It should be noted that many of these forms are shared with the other texts of the *Conduct of Life* and might reflect a common exemplar or a way of representing these words during this period that relies on other influences.
[503] L writes *sede* Ω164 once only.
[504] See Jordan § 191.
[505] See Jordan § 178.

Ω124 and Ω125; J: *ah* Ω43, Ω59, Ω125 etc) exhibiting a transition to the fricative in final position after an atonic vowel (/ax/ § 26) – a feature retained from the OE Anglian dialect and found regularly in, and associated with, the ME AB dialect.[506]

McCLEAN

The dialectal features of McClean are somewhat mixed and localization has, as a result, been difficult. Samuels believes the language to be of Essex with a western dialect layer,[507] while Jordan places it in Kent.[508] However, Laing's contention (LAEME) placing it in Central Gloucestershire has now generally been accepted, along with her belief that 'the apparently recalcitrant elements [were] perhaps ... current also in the SW Midlands at that time.'[509]

Key features of M:

Jordan's location of McClean to Kent is never elucidated, but it is probable that it stems from a combination of examples such as the following found in M: the OE fricative /ɣ/ (§ 43) is always written <ȝ> (*moȝe* Ω30, *oȝe* Ω31, *draȝe* Ω48 etc). The fricative /ɣ/ was labialized and vocalized to /ɣw/ > /w/ <w> from *c.* 1200, in medial position, after a tonic vowel. This began in the South West Midlands and spread to the North Midlands and the North. Kent, however, preserved the writing of <ȝ> throughout the 14th century.[510] It is surprising, therefore, considering the later date of M, to find a text outside of this area (Kent) that still retains writings with <ȝ>.

[506] See Jordan § 178 *Remark 3*.
[507] Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p. 110.
[508] Jordan, p. 10.
[509] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.
[510] Jordan §186.

In addition, OE *ēa* (§ 106) furnishes us with a mixture of variants, some of which might suggest a Kentish localisation; the ones important to this discussion concern the writing of <ȝe> in *ȝeþ-lete* Ω75, Ω157 and Ω270 and *ȝedi* Ω238 and possibly also <ie> in *lien* Ω65 and <ia> in *diaþe* Ω120.[511] The diphthong *ēa* /æːa/, follows a parallel movement to that of short *ĕa* (cf. § 87) and was monophthongized to *ǣ* around 1000 in most places. However, the Kentish dialect shows a special development in relation to *ēa*, with evidence of the writing of *ie* (like the development *ēo* > *īo*), indicating a narrowing of the first component. As a result of the lessening of sonority in this first component there is therefore often a transfer of accent to /jɛː/. These remained more often in initial position where the sound was more stable.[512] The writing of <ȝe> likely represents this, and possibly also <ie>, but as Jordan writes, 'naturally one must reckon with inconsistencies and transferences in the writing'.[513] For instance, the writing of <ȝe> is also found in E2 (*ȝedi* Ω238), at the same place as M, and <ie> for OE *ēa* is present in both E texts (E2: *ieþe* Ω299, *lien* Ω65, *briede* Ω198 etc; E1: *dieþe* Ω191, *unieþe* Ω363 and *lyen* Ω65), where neither text has any other strong Kentish features. It is possible that these readings might come from a now lost exemplar or that these features were also present outside of Kent in dialects of the SWMl. The writing of <ia> in *diaþe* Ω120 is more difficult and Jordan suggests that ME <ya> and <ia> occurring beside <yea, ea> can be seen as a continuation of Old Kent *ya*, and that in medial position /j/ was retained only after certain consonants, such as dentals, which favoured it.[514] This is of course possible in M but this is one example compared to many that suggest something different.

[511] However, McClean mostly writes <e> in eke Ω112, *vnneþe* Ω198, *deþe* Ω111 etc.
[512] Jordan § 82.
[513] Jordan § 82.
[514] Jordan § 82.

In addition to the above OE *ea* before *ld* (lengthening group. § 91) once again gives an example with <ʒe> (*ʒelde* Ω298 and Ω324). However, considering the discussion above, what is of more interest is the retention of <e> (*pelden* Ω56, *eld* Ω4, *felde* Ω55 and Ω260 etc) in M.[515] The writing of <e> suggests a southern form (/ɛ:/ < ea through <ea, e>), with the exception of Kent which normally has <ya> and <ia> written beside <yea> and <ea>, retained into the fifteenth century in East Saxon (including Essex and London),[516] where Anglian *ā* in the Midlands undergoes the change to *o* /ɔ:/ (advancing /ɔ:/ is found in both Worcester and Gloucester) while the North retains *ā* and the AB dialect writes *a*.[517] However, M does not retain East Saxon *ā* (found only in a small area of the EML and London) for either OE *ǣ₁* or OE *ǣ₂* (§ 70ff);[518] in both instances the reading is mostly <e> (*dede* Ω3, *rede* Ω4 *a-adrede* Ω166 etc and *mest* Ω7, *unhelþe* Ω17, *lest* Ω62 etc). The only writings of <a> (*ilad* Ω5, *ladde* Ω95 and *ani* Ω54), written with shortening, are found in OE *ǣ₂* and are shared in at least one other manuscript version, suggesting that they are forms common to more than one dialect, or that they are written under influence of a previous exemplar.

Finally in this section, the writing of OE *e* (§ 64) provides a further possible Kentish or East Anglian reading. M nearly always writes <e> (*bere* Ω98, *ende* Ω53, *felde* Ω360 etc) but has <i> in *sigge* Ω94 and Ω156.[519] In closed syllables there was an increased tendency from about 1200 for *e* to go to *i* under influence of apical sounds, with preference for this change, but not exclusively, in the North. This occurred before dentals, before covered *n*, and before palatals. According to Jordan, in Kent and East Anglia *i* appeared before /dʒ/ in *siggen* 'to say'.[520] It is

[515] <a> is also written in *halt* Ω323 and <ie> in *bihielde* Ω299.
[516] Jordan § 61.
[517] Jordan § 61 and § 82.
[518] Jordan § 50 and Mossé § 28: Remark IV.
[519] M also has angles and *anglene*, probably influenced by OF *anglene*, *angle.*
[520] Jordan § 33 and § 34.

possible that *sigge* does represent a Kentish form but it is also possible that this form was also in use outside of the Kentish and East Anglian dialects.

I believe that what Samuels claims to be a western dialect layer are actually more recognizable features of a SWM dialect in M. To begin with, M more regularly vocalizes OE palatal *ʒ* /j/ (§ 49) to /i/ before *d* (*seid* Ω164 and Ω234 and *ileid* Ω12),[521] a probable Anglian feature lost in the Saxon and Kentish dialects, and one that is shared with both J and L, both texts from the WML. For OE *a* before a nasal (§ 60) M mostly writes <a> (*man* Ω21[x2], *þanne* Ω41, *phane* Ω6 etc), but the writing of <o> in *þonke* Ω70 and Ω254 and *þonc* Ω72 and Ω92 suggest a possible WML influence, where in ME back /ɔ/ was retained for longest.[522] In addition, OE *a* before a lengthening group (§ 61) is nearly always written <o> (*longe* Ω3, *stronge* Ω294, *honde* Ω83), another feature found in the writing of the West Midlands; here, however, <o> in M might not represent a WML dialectal feature but rather a product of the text' s later date, as *a* before lengthening groups in the South and the Midlands participated in the change from *ā* > *o* /ɔ:/ (§ 69ff). [523]

OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff) is mostly written <o> (*porkes* Ω73, Ω113, Ω116 etc, *porc*/*pork* Ω186 and Ω267) with <u> (*purkes* Ω64 and *sturre* Ω290) written twice, and <e> (*herte* Ω75, Ω118 and Ω320) found on three occasions but always in the same word.[524] The /ø/ sound, written <o> in M, was a form retained until around 1300 in the WML and parts of the South. Unrounding to *e* began in the twelfth century in the EML, Kent and probably also the North – with the Anglian dialect having smoothed *e* from the late OE period.[525] It is possible,

[521] M writes *sede* Ω136 once.
[522] Jordan § 30; Mossé § 25.
[523] Jordan § 30; Mossé § 25. The only exception in M is the writing of <a> in *lange* Ω330.
[524] The writing of <u> in *purkes* Ω64 is possibly under the influence of *w* and may represent a Saxon form, see Jordan § 66: *Remark 3.* On two occasions the vowel is absent in M: *prke* Ω11 and *prc* Ω256.
[525] Jordan § 65.

however, that the writing of <o> in the above examples is under the influence of *w*, as the following might also attest: in OE *eo* (*a* umlaut of *e*: § 102 and § 103) /ø/ has been unrounded to *e*, written <e> (*vele*/*uele*/*fele* Ω9, Ω10, Ω100 etc, *brekeð* Ω93, *unureme* Ω237 and *pele*/*pel* Ω233, Ω330 and Ω380) in all instances, but in OE *eo* (*u* umaut of *e*: § 102 and § 104), although <e> (*heuen* Ω76 and Ω83, *heueneriche* Ω43 and Ω185, *heuenliche* Ω99 etc) is the regular form, there are several occurrences of <o> (*porld*/*uorld*, *porldes* Ω282, Ω330, Ω346 etc and *pode* Ω360) when preceeded by *w*.[526] However, it is possible that the predominant writing of <e> in the examples from *eo* (*a* umlaut of *e*) are due to a lack of back mutation, with this only taking place in the Anglian and Kentish dialects;[527] it is possible, therefore, that the readings in M are either developments associated with the later date of the text, an admixture of dialectal layers, or specific dialectal features of an area, possibly further South than the traditional area of the OE Anglian dialect.

While the writing of <o> in the examples from OE *ĕo* might prove inconclusive, possibly pointing to the influence of *w*, the regular writing of <eo> (*beo* Ω2 etc, *beoþ* Ω20, *iseo* Ω19 etc) for OE *ēo* (§ 108) certainly suggests at least a WMl or Southern admixture in the dialect of M. However, it should be noted here that the more dominant form in M is <e> (*ben* Ω44, *leue* Ω45, *frend* Ω31 etc), with <i> (*sike* Ω208) written once.[528] If a SWML dialect is accepted, the retention of the writing of <eo> /ø:/ might not be surprising in M as /ø:/ gives longer resistance to unrounding than *ĕo* /ø/ in areas of the WML and the South and, in some instances, was retained into the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, where in the EML and the North unrounding to /e:/ began in the twelfth century. The more dominant writing of <e> in

[526] <u> is also written in *suster* – probably under the influence of *w*.
[527] See Campbell § 205 for the conditions under which back mutation took place, and Jordan § 71 for a fuller explanation of the ME.
[528] The development of OE *ēo* is similar to that of *ĕo* > /ø/ (cf. § 95), with a special development taking place in Kent (cf. §) . See Jordan § 84.

all the previous examples might, therefore, be seen as the process of unrounding in M indicative of its later date, with the retention of <eo> for /o:/, an indicator of an older western or southern dialectal layer, or, if considered alongside other evidence from the text, confirmation of current dialect demonstrating later development and change.

Some of the strongest evidence for a possible SWML provenance for M is given by the regular writing of <u> (*dude*, *gulte*, *muchel* etc, and *fur*(*e*) and *cuþe*) for OE *y̆* (§ 67), a form retained in the WML until about 1300, and which is still found in Gloucestershire toward 1400.[529] However, in addition to the writings with <u>, there is also regular <e> (*misdede*, (*vn*)*net*, *þenche þ* etc and (*vn*)*hed*), especially in *y̆*, and regular <i> (*þinche*, *aurist*, *king*(*e*)*s*) etc and *litel* / *litle* and *lite*). The writing of <e> might point to a Kentish dialect or a dialect of the South East, with *y̆* unrounded and lowered to *ĕ* in Kent from around 900, and spreading to Sussex and Surrey, the SEML and the city of London in the ME period. However, evidence suggests that *ī* (deriving from OE *y̆*) could also give rise to *ē*.[530] In M the writing of <i> might also represent a Northern or EML dialectal feature, with instances of unrounding found in Northumbrian already in late OE, with this spreading into the NEML in the eME period. However, unrounding to *i* was also present in some West Saxon subdialects of the OE period and, in addition, the spread of *i* from the NEML had probably already reached the West in the fourteenth century.[531] The writing of <i> and <e> in M, therefore, cannot be seen as clear geographical determinants, where the writing of <u> points to a probable WML or SWML form. The forms other than <u> are possible representations of later unrounding, or are examples of forms long current in the dialect of that region.

[529] Jordan § 42.
[530] Jordan § 39 and § 42; Mossé § 29.
[531] Jordan § 39 and § 41; Mossé § 29.

Finally, throughout M there are further traces of SW and WML forms that suggest a SWML dialect or a proximity to the OE WS geographical area; for example, the writing of <u> (*suþþe* Ω216, *icluped* Ω109 and *hure* Ω104, Ω251, Ω259 etc) for velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105);[532] the writing of <u> (*ihurþ* Ω91) for *i*-umlaut of *ēa* (§ 107);[533] and the writing of <u> (*þusternesse* Ω292) for the *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109), which might represent WS *y* (§ 109) but also possibly /ø:/ from *ēo*.[534] However, there are instances where forms associated with a SWML dialect might be expected but are absent, such as: OE *æ* (§ 63), which is always <a> (*habbe* Ω3, *patere* Ω84, *phat* Ω80 etc) in M; and OE *ā* (§ 69), which is nearly always <o> (*lore* Ω1, *one* Ω381, *non* Ω115 etc). For these and other examples in M it is possible to see a more widespread generalization disrupting a more specific localization of the text. In the first example, <e, ea> was retained for longer in the WML and Kent but by the thirteenth century in the WML the quality *a* is mostly found.[535] In the second example, neutralization to *o* began at the beginning of the twelfth century in the WS area and probably around the same time in Kent, and had reached most of the West by the thirteenth century.[536] The writing of <a>, which was probably preserved in the Southumbrian region for longest in areas of the WML (including the AB dialect), the West, and the NEML became, by the fourteenth century, a dialectal criteria of the North.

[532] See, Jordan § 74. M also has <e> in *seue* Ω149, *binebe* Ω89, *selure* Ω278, *henne* Ω417; <a> in *hare* Ω184, Ω220, Ω272 and Ω358; <i> in *niþer* Ω359, (*bi*)*nime* Ω45, *siþþe* Ω9 and *quike* Ω80. The writing of <u> in *suþþe* Ω216 might also reflect the lack of unlaut before a dental in the SW.

[533] See Jordan § 83. The /y:/ sound was repressed early (probably before the end of the OE period in living speech) and, aside from the remains of Southwestern *u* /y:/ Anglian *ē* prevails in the rest of the area. The remaining readings are all written with <e>: *ȳleue* Ω250 and Ω183, *leueþ* Ω136, *teme* Ω113, *ilesed* Ω141.

[534] See Campbell § 201 and Jordan § 86. The <e> form is however overwhelmingly dominant: *frend* Ω192, *fend* Ω294, *dere* Ω153 etc.

[535] Jordan § 32; Mossé § 24.

[536] Jordan§ 44; Mossé § 27.

CONSONANTS

ITEM		TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
þ	Initially § 2	Nearly always: *þan, þeih, þincheð* etc	Nearly Always: *þan, þah, þingþ* etc	Nearly Always: *þanne, þȝh, þinȝh* etc	More Regular: *þen, þanne, þeh, þincð* etc	More Regular: *þænne, þanne, þech, þinh* etc	Always: *þan, þah, þinkþ* etc	Nearly always: *þe, þencheþ, þane* etc
	Medially § 4	Rare: *biþohte, oþer, ofþincheð* etc	Frequent (often before *final –e*): *iselþe, un-helþe, binoþen* etc	Interchangeable with ð:*oþer, sleuhþen, loþe*	Rare: *naþing, cuþe, nuþe, ẏ-selþe, unhelþe*	Usual: *iqueþen, cuþe, nuþe* etc	Nearly always: *seoþþe, cuþe, nuþe* etc	Always: *biþenche, biþoȝt, cuþe* etc
	Finally	Once: *deþ*	Less regular form: *þingþ, deþ, doþ* etc	Never	Rare: *folȝeþ, beoþ, deþ* and *recþ*	Rare: *olȝeþ, beoþ, deþ* and *be-þenþ*	Always: *þincheþ, foleweþ, bi swikeþ* etc	Nearly always: *þencheþ, þincþ, beoþ* etc
ð	Initially § 3	Once: *ðer*	Once: *ðe*	Once: *darf* (written *d*)	Frequent: *ði, ðe, ðer* etc	Occassional: *ðan, ðenne, ðe* etc	Never	Once: *darf* (written *d*)
	Medially § 4	Usual form: *cuðe, seðen, eiðer* etc	Most regular form: *iqueðen, soððen, kuðe* etc	Interchangeable with þ:*childe, iueðe, cuðe* etc	Usual: *iqueðen , sẏðð en, oðer* etc	Occasional: *sẏðen, laðe, baðe* etc	Never	Never
	Finally § 4	Usual form: *þincheð, ofðinkeð, mislicað* etc	Usual form: *mislekeð, fulieð, bispikeð* etc	Always: *ofþencheð, mislikeð, volȝeð* etc	Usual: *þincð, bispikeð, buð* etc	Usual: *bispikeð, buð, sendeð* etc	Never	Rare: *plleð, peneð* and *habbeð*

CONSONANTS

ITEM		TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
th	Initially § 5	Once: *thurh*	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never	Never
	Medially § 5	Rare: *lothe, methes and sathanas* (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 *Remark*)	Twice: *sathanas* (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 *Remark*) and *lathed* (here it represents *t* § 5)	Only in *sathanas* (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 *Remark*)	Only in *sathanas* (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 *Remark*)	Only in *sathanas* (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 *Remark*)	Twice: *sathanas* (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 *Remark*) and *euethen* (here it represents *t* § 5)	Only in *sathanas* (a reading it shares with all other MSS § 5 *Remark*)
	Finally § 5	Never	Once: *pith*	Never	Never	Never	Never	Once: *repeth*
d for *ð* § 7		Rare: *folȝed, haued, bed* and *ileued*	Rare: *cud, uneade* and *bernd*	Occasional: *darf, aider, vnnede, ded, deade, dead* and *eade*	Once: *ladliche*	Regular: *mỳs liked, bi hoted, haued* etc	Once: *lodliche*	twice: *lodliche* and *darf*
t for *ð* § 8		Never	Occasionally in low stress positions: *þinchet, hauet, seit, et lete* and *þunchet.* Once showing assimilation of *þ*: *attere*	Never	Occasionally in low stress positions: *þinchet, mís lichet, for ȝitet* etc Once showing assimilation of *þ*: mid te.	Frequent in low stress positions: *þinchet, det, pillet, habbet* etc	Once showing assimilation of *þ*: *7 te*	Never

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
h for *þ/ð* § 6	Never	Never	Twice: *þingh* and *purh*	Never	Twice: *þinh* and *hafh*	Never	Never
p / w § 11	Nearly always *p*, with rare *w*: *mowe, owen, wif, were* (twice), *wiue, drawen* (twice), *meward, wel* and *sowle*	Nearly always *p*, with *w* written once: *swicen*	The runic letter *p* (wynn) is retained throughout, with occasional examples of *w*: *wit, hwile, iwisse, weneð, wolde, wealde, workes, swo, willeð, wrecche, hwere, hwet* and *we*	Always *p*	The runic letter <p> (wynn) is retained throughout, with only one example of *w*: *wilde*	Nearly always *w*, with the runic letter *p* (wynn) only found once: pori *Vve* for *w* on three occasions	The runic letter <p> (wynn) is retained throughout, with only three examples of *w*: *yswinch, we* and *wode*
Old English *æ* § 12	Rare: *mæi, ængles, ænes, middenærd, læte* and *sæd*	Never	Never	Regularly found: *æm, pælde, ilæd, ær* etc	Occasionally found: *æm,* *þænne, pæs* etc	Never	Never
Tironian nota ⁊ § 13	Nearly always ⁊, with *and* written twice	Nearly always ⁊, with *and* written on three occasions	Always ⁊	Nearly always ⁊, with *and* written on eight occasions	Nearly always ⁊, with *and* being written occasionally (*sixteen times*)	Mostly *and* (122 times), with ⁊ written 68 times	Nearly always ⁊, with *and* written only once

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE velar *c* before front vowels § 16	Usually *k*: *king(e)/kinges, kedde, kenne(s)* *c*: *cuðen*	*k*: *king* and *kuðe* *c*: *cudde* and *cunne*	Always *k*: *king(e)/kinges, keðen, kedde* etc	Usually *c*: *cuðe, cudde, cunne* etc *k*: *king(e)/ kinges*	Usually *c*: *cuþe, cudde, cunne* etc *k*: *king(e)/ kinges*	Nearly always *k*: *king(e)/ kẏng, ikud, kunne* etc *c*: *cuþe*	Nearly always *k*: *king(e), kinges* and *kenne(s)* *c*: *cuþe*
OE velar *c* before back vowels § 17	Always *c*: *cunin, care, cunne(n)* etc	c: *cunne, cumen/come(n), cum/com* etc k: *kare, kon, kuðe* and *kumeð*	Mostly *c*: *cunne, cumð, come(n)* etc *k*: *kare* and *kan*	Mostly *c*: *cunne, cuþe, cumeð* etc *k*: *kinning, kare* and *kan*	Mostly *c*: *cunig, can, comeð* etc *k*: *kare* and *kan*	Mostly *c*: *con, cuþe, cumeþ* etc *k*: *konẏng* and *kunne(n)*	Mostly *c*: *cunin, care, cumþ* etc *k*: *kan* and *kunne*
OE velar *c* before the consonant *n* § 18	*c*: *cnoweð* and *(i)cnopen*	*k*: *knauð* and *(i)knaupen*	*k*: *(i)knopeð* and *(i)knapen/ (i)knopen*	*c*: *cnapað/ (i)cnapeð* and *(i)cnape*	*c*: *cnapad/ (i)cpopeð* and *(i)cnape(n)*	*k*: *knoweþ* and *(i)knowe*	*k*: *knopeþ, (i)knope* and *(bi)knope*
OE velar *c* before consonants other than *n* § 19	Always c: *(i)cleped, (bi)clepien, cliue, criste* etc	Always *c*: *(i)clepede, (bi)clepie* and *criste*	*c*: *(i)cleped, (bi)clepien* and *cliue* *ch*: *christ, christene* and *christendom*	Always *c*: *(i)clupede, cliue, criste* etc	Always *c*: in *(i)-clepede, cliue, criste* etc	Always *c*: *(i)clepede, (bi)-cleopien, criste* etc	Always *c*: *(i)clupede, clife,* and *criste*

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *cw* § 20	Always *qu*: *iqueme, quike, quenche* etc	Always *qu*: *iqueðen, quike, quenchen* etc	Mostly *qu*: *iqueðe, quike, quenche* etc *ku*: i*kuemde* and *kuenche*	*qu*: *iqueðen, quike* and *iquemde* *cw*: *cpeman* and *icpemed*	Always *qu*: *i-queþen, quike, aquenche* etc	Always *qu*: *queme, quýke, quenche* etc	Always *qu*: *queþeþ, ýqueme, quike* etc
OE velar *c* in medial position § 21 and § 22	Mostly *k*: *speken, perke, likede* etc Rare *c*: *mislicað, bispicað, brecð, quica* and *godcunnesse* (as a result of the compound *god* + *cunnesse*) Once *ch*: spichen	Nearly always *k*: *speke(n), perke, likede* etc Once *c*: *swicen* *ch*: *perche*	Nearly always *k*: *speke, porke, likede* etc Once *c*: *godcunnesse* (as a result of the compound *god* + *cunnesse*).	Nearly always *k*: *speke(n), bi-spikeð, siker* etc Rare *c*: *licede* and *brecð*	Nearly always *k*: *speke(n), likede, sclakien* etc Rare c: *brecð* and *godcunnesse* (as a result of the compound *god* + *cunnesse*) Once *ch*: *perche*	Always *k*: *eke, werke, speken* etc	Nearly always: *speke, prke, sclakie* etc Once *c: brecð*
OE velar *c* in final position § 23 and § 24	Always *c*: *ac, þanc/þonc, loc/lac* etc	Nearly always *c*: *þonc, lac, perc* etc *ch*: *perch* and *ach* *h*: *ah* (*ach* and *ah* demonstrate a transition to the fricative /ax/ §. 26)	Always *c*: *ec, ac, (i)þanc* etc	Always *c*: *ac, ec, þanc* etc	Always *c*: *ac, ec, þanc* etc	Nearly always *k*: *ek, werk, þonk* etc Once *c*: bec Once *h*: ah (demonstrating a transition to the fricative /ax/ §. 26)	Nearly always *c*: *ac, þanc, loc* etc *k*: *uolk* and *pork*

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
Old English palatal *c* /tʃ/ in initial position § 28	Always *ch*: *child(e), chilce, chele* etc	Always *ch*: child*(e), chep, chele* etc	Always *ch*: *child(e), chele, chilðe* etc	Always *ch*: *child(e), chilce, chule/chele* etc	Always *ch*: *child/childe, chilce, chule/ chele* etc	Always *ch*: *child/childe, chilce, chele* etc	Always *ch*: *child/childe, chilse, chele* etc
Old English palatal *c* /tʃ/ in medial position § 29	Always *ch*: *muchel(e), smeche, heueriche* etc *k*, probable /k/ in *mukel* where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected	Nearly Always *ch*: muchel(e), eche, *riche* etc Once *c*: *hpice* *k*: *smike* and *hpilke* where palatal /tʃ/ might have been expected	Nearly always *ch*: *muchel(e), diches, ponderlicheste* etc *c*: *phlice* and *lichamlice*	Nearly always *ch*: *muchel(e), smeche, lihtliche* etc *c*: *recþ*, probably /k/, where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected	Nearly always *ch*: *muchel(e), smeche, aquenche/ quenche(n)* etc *k* and *ck*: *smeke* and *recke*, probably /k/where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected	Nearly always *ch*: wurche*, muchel, riche* etc *k*: *smoke, rekþ* and *(i)swẏnk(e)* are variants with probable /k/ where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected	Nearly Awlays *ch*: *teche, muchel, liȝtliche* etc *c*: *recþ* is a variant with probale /k/ where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected
Old English palatal *c* /tʃ/ in final position § 30 and § 31	Nearly always *ch*: *ich, ech/elch, (i)spinch* etc *c*: *ic, afric* and *(i)spinc* (the last two are possible variants with /k/)	Nearly always *ch*: *ich, spich, pich* etc *c*: *sullic* and *(i)spinc* (these are possible variants with /k/)	Nearly always *ch: ich, ech, eurich* etc *c*: *ic* (this is the more regular reading in D), *smac* and *ispinc* (the last two are possible variants with /k/)	Mostly *ch*: *smech, ech, æurich* etc Regular *c*: *ic* (this the more regular reading in E2). The variants *elc, eure-elc, spilc, hpilc* and *sellic* are possible readings with /k/	Mostly *elch, æfrech, pich* etc Occasional *c*: *ic* (this is the more regular reading in E1). The variants *elc/eure-ilc, spilc, spulc* and *pilc* are possible readings with /k/	Nearly always *ch*: *ich, such, grimlẏch* etc Once *g*: *drung* where palatalization might be expected	Always *ch*: *ich, euerich, smich* etc

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *þyncan* and *þencan* § 32	*ch*: *þunche* and *þenchen* *ofðinkeð* is probably a variant with /k/	*ch*: *þunchen* and *þenchen* Palatalization is found in *þingþ* and *þingchþ*. *þincþ* is likely a variant with /k/ along with *þenke* and *þenkeð*	*ch*: *þenchen* and *þencheð* *þingh* and *þingð* also represent likely palatalization	*ch*: *ðinche* and *ðenche* *þincð/ðincð, of-þincð, iðencð and bi-þencð are* variants likely with /k/	*ch*: *þinchen* and *þenche* *þincð* are variants likely with /k/ Also: *þinh* and *be-þenþ*	*ch*: *þunchen* and *þenche* *þinkþ* and *biþenkþ* are are probably variants with /k/	*ch*: *þinche* and *þenche* *þincþ* and *of-þincþ* and *biþancþ* are probably variants with /k/
Old English *sc* /ʃ/ in initial position § 35ff	Nearly always *s*: *sal, syrreue, sop* etc *sc*: *screnche* and *scat*	Mostly *sc*: *scal, scop, sceafte* etc *s*: *solde, (bi) sunien* and *sal* *sch*: *schal.*	Mostly *s*: *sal, serreue, seafte* etc *sc*: *scal, iscop, scete* and *scrud sch*: *schameð sh*: *shilde*	Always *sc*: *sceal, scop, sceafte* etc	Mostly *sc*: *scal, scirreve, scop* etc *s*: *sæl, sulle, solde* and *solden*	Nearly always *sch*: *schal, schirreue, schop* etc Once *sc*: *scolden*	Nearly always writes *sc*: *scilde, scal, scerreue* etc Once *sch*: *schat*
Old English *sc* /ʃ/ in medial position § 38	*ss*: *fisses*	*ss*: *fisses*		*sc*: *fisces*	*ss*: *fisses*	*ss*: *fýsses*	
Old English *sc* /ʃ/ in final position § 39		*sc*: *uersc*	*s*: *fis*				*sh*: *fish*

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE [ts] §. 41	Usually c: *milce* Once *ch*: *milche*	Always *c*: *milce*	Always *c*: *milce*	Always *c*: *milce*	Always *c*: *milce*	Always c: *mẏlce*	Always *s*: *milse*
OE /g/ in initial position § 42	Before a consonant it is *g*: *grameð, grunde, glede* etc Before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* it is *g*: *god, gulte, goldes* etc By levelling it is *g* in *(bi)ginninge*	Before a consonant it is *g*: *gromeð, grunde, glede* etc Before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* it is *g*: : *god, gulte, golde* etc By levelling it is *g* in (*bi)ginnigge* and *gate*	Before a consonant it is *g*: *grameð, grunde, glede* etc Before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* it is *g*: *god, gelte, go* etc By levelling it is *g* in *(bi)ginninge*	Before a consonant it is *g*: *gramet, grunde, glede* etc Before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* it is *g*: *god, gulte, gaðe* etc By levelling it is *g* in *(bi)ginnige*	Before a consonant it is *g*: *gramet, grunde, glede* etc Before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* it is *g*: *god, gulte, gon* etc By levelling it is *g* in *(bi)ginninge*	Before a consonant it is *g*: *grimlẏch, grunde, grẏsliche* etc Before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* it is *g*: *god, agulte, go* etc By levelling it is *g* in *(bi)gẏnnẏnge*	Before a consonant it is *g*: *grameþ, grunde, glede* etc Before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* it is *g*: *(holi) gostes, god, gulte* etc By levelling it is *g* in *ginnigge*

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
The OE fricative /ɣ/ § 43	Mostly ȝ: *folȝeð, oȝen, luȝen* etc Occasional *w*: *mowe, owe* and *drawen* Also: *fueles*	Nearly always ȝ: *maȝe, aȝen, draȝen* etc. *h*: *ahen* Also: *fulieð*	Always ȝ: *volȝeð,hoȝeð, laȝe* etc	Nearly always ȝ: *folȝeþ, maȝe, aȝen* etc *ȝh*: *moȝhe*	Mixed *p* and ȝ: *drapen, hope, moupe* and *moȝe, aȝen, laȝes* etc	Always *w*: *folewe*þ, *mowe, owe* etc	Always ȝ: *moȝe, oȝe(n), draȝe* etc
OE Palatal ʒ /j/ in initial position § 45	Nearly always ȝ: *ȝiet, ȝeunge, forȝiet* etc *i* before /u/ in jung (see § 45.1)	Nearly always ȝ: *ȝung, ȝet, ȝunge* etc *g*: *Giue* (see § 45.2 and *Comment*)	Always ȝ: *ȝiung, ȝiet, vorȝet* etc	Always ȝ: *ȝýng, ȝýet, ȝuinge* etc	Always ȝ: *ȝung, ȝuet, for ȝut* etc	Nearly always *y*: *ýong, yet, for-ýet* etc but plosive /g/ in vn-for-gulde (see § 45.3 and *Comment*)	Always *ʒ*: *ʒung, ʒet, uorʒet* etc
	Initial <ȝ> is retained before *i* in *ȝief*	Initial *ȝ* is retained before *i* in *ȝef/ȝefe/ ȝif* but *g* in Gif (see *Comment* to § 45.4)	Initial *ȝ* is lost before *i* in *ef*	Initial *ȝ* is retained before *i* in *ȝif/ȝiefe*	Initial <ȝ> is retained before *i* in *ȝif* but *g* in *Gif* (see *Comment* to § 45.4).	Initial *ý* is usually omitted in *if* but is found once in *ýef*	Initial *ʒ* is retained before *i* in *ʒef*

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
ȝ after a front vowel but before a back vowel § 47	Nearly always demonstrates transition to a palatal through the writing of *i̇*: *eien, forpreien, iseien* and *niseien* *ȝ* retained in *peiȝen* (the writing of *ȝ* does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound)	More often *ȝ* retained: *eȝen, niseȝen and iseȝen* (the writing of *ȝ* in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound) Transition to a palatal is demonstrated through the writing of *i̇*: *peien* and *forpreien*	Mostly *ȝ*: *peȝe*, and *iseȝen* and *ȝh* in *eȝhen* (the writing of *ȝ* in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound) Transition to a palatal is demonstrated through the writing of *i̇*: *forpreien*	Always *ȝ*: *eȝen, peȝen, preȝen* etc (the writing of *ȝ* in these examples does not, however, negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound)	More often *ȝ*: *eȝen, peȝen* and *seȝen* (the writing of *ȝ* in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound) Transition to a palatal is demonstrated through the writing of *i̇*: *for-preien* and *ne-i-seien*	Always *ẏ*, demonstrating Transition to a palatal sound: *eẏen, weẏen, for-preẏe* etc	Nearly always *ȝ/ʒ*: *eʒen, peʒe, ne-seʒe and ẏseȝe* (the writing of *ȝ/ʒ* in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound) Transition to a palatal is demonstrated through the writing of *i̇*: *forpreie*
Palatal ʒ following a parasitic vowel § 48	*–iġ* is *i̇*: *ani, mani* and *eadi*	*–iġ* is *i̇*: *eni, moni* and *edi* but *g* is written in *anige*	*–iġ* is *i̇*: *ani, mani* and *eadi*	*–iġ* is *i̇*: *eni, mani* and *ȝedi*	*–iġ* is *i̇*: *ani, mani* and *æidi*	*–iġ* is *ẏ*: *enẏ, monẏ* and *edẏe*	*–iġ* is *i̇*: *holi, ani, mani* etc

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
loss of palatal ȝ /j/ before *d* § 49	Lost before *d* in *sade* and *saden*; vocalized to /i/ in *isaid* and *ileid*	Lost before *d* in *sede*; more regularly vocalized to /i/ in *seide, iseid* and *seiden*	Lost before *d* : *sede(n)* but vocalized to /i/ in *ileid*	Lost before *d* : *sede* and *ised* but vocalized to /i/ in *ẏ-leid*	Lost before *d*: *sede* and *ised* but vocalized to /i/ in *ẏ-leid*	Always vocalized to /i/ before *d*: *seẏde, seide* and *seẏden* and *i-leẏd*	Lost before *d* in *sede* but is more regularly vocalized to /i/ in *seid* and *ileid*
OE palatal gg /dȝ/ § 50	Frankish *gg*: *bugge* and *seggen* *g: abugeð, ligeð* and *legeð*	Frankish *gg*: *bugge* and *seggen* *ȝ*: *abuȝeð*	Frankish *gg*: *beggen, siggen* and *liggeð*	Frankish *gg*: *bigge, seggen, ligget* etc	Frankish *gg*: *biggen, seggen, ligget* etc	Frankish *gg*: *bugge, seggen, leggeþ* etc	Frankish *gg*: *bugge, sigge* and *leggeþ*
OE g in the group nȝ /ŋg/ § 51	Mostly *ng*: *longe, kinge, strengðe, prongpise* etc Devoicing to /ŋk/ before *ð* is found in *strencðe,* and to /ŋ/ before *p* in *pronpise*	Mostly *ng*: *longe, erninge, engles, tening* etc Devoicing to /ŋ/ before *d* found in *meind* *n* absent in *biginigge*	Nearly always *ng*: *longe, kinge, ȝiung* etc *nh*, probably /x/, written before *ð* in *strenhðe*	Mostly *ng*: *lange, kinge, strengðe* etc Devoicing to /ŋk/, written *nc*, before *ð* in *strencðe* and before *p* in *prancpise/ pranc-pise* *n* absent in *bi-ginige*	Nearly always *ng*: *lange/longe, king, strengþe* etc Devoicing to /ŋk/, written *nc*, before *þ* in *strencþ*	Nearly always *ng*: *longe, kinge, ẏong, wrongwise* etc Devoicing to /ŋ/ before *d* in *meẏnd*	Mostly *ng*: *longe/lange, pronge, kinge, reuing* etc Devoicing to /ŋk/, written *nc*, before *þ* in *sincþ* *n* regularly absent before *gg*: *poniegges, ernigge, endigge* etc

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE /h/ initially and before a vowel § 52	Always retained: *habbe, horde, his* etc	Mostly retained: *habbe, (child)-hade, (i)hud* etc Not found on three occasions: *abe, er* and *ordlinghes*	Always retained: *habbe, horde, his* etc	Always retained: *habbe, horde, his* etc	Mostly retained: *habbe, horde, his* etc Not found in *vnger*	Always retained: *habbe, horde, his* etc	Always retained: *holi-gostes, helpen, habbe* etc
	The OE weak neuter *pron. hit* is always *hit*	The OE weak neuter *pron. hit* is always *hit* *h* is added initially in *horþe*	The OE weak neuter *pron. hit* is always *hit* *h* is added initially in: *helde, hegҙhte, hogeð, hogҙen, herre*	The OE weak neuter *pron. hit* is always *hit*	The OE weak neuter *pron. hit* is most often *it* with occasional *hit* *h* is added initially in *heueninges* and *hope*	The OE weak neuter *pron. hit* is always *hit*	The OE weak neuter *pron. hit* is always *hit*
OE /h/ initially and before the consonant *l, n* and *r* § 53	Mostly without *h*: repen, louerd, raðer, *h* retained: hlesten/hleste (both in rhyming position)	Always without *h*: ropen, lauerd, raþer, lusten/ lesten	Nearly always without *h*: riepe/repen, louerd, raðer *h* retained: hlesten (in rhyming position)	Without *h*: rupen/reope, raðe, *h*: retained: hlauord (twice), hlusten	Always without *h*: rupen/reupe, louerd/lauerd, raþer, lusten/lesten	Always without *h*: reowe/rewe, louerd, ra þer, lusten/luste	Always without *h*: repe, louerd, ra þer, ileste,

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE /h/ initially and before the consonant *w* § 54	Nearly always *hp*: *hpile, hpat -hpare* etc. Once *ph*: *phile*	More often *hp*: *hpile, hpet/hpat, hpi* etc Written without *p* in *hom* Regularly written without *h*: *penne, pet/pat, pa-se* etc	Mostly *hw/hp*: *hpile, hpet/hpat/hwet, hper* etc Without *h*: pile (regularly) and pat	Mostly *hp*: *hpenne, hpile, hpet* etc ph: *phet, pheðer, philce, pheðer* and *phan*	Mostly without *h*: *pẏle/pile, pat/pet, par* etc *hp*: *hpile, hpat/hpet, hpi, hpa-se, hpeðer* and *elles-hpare*	Nearly always *hw*: *hwenne, hwile, hwat* etc Once *wh*: *whon*	Nearly always *ph*: *phane/ phanne, phat, phile* etc *hu*: *huat* and *huiche*
The writing of *h* in the combination *ht* § 55	*ht* is always retained: *mihte, aihte, unboht* etc	Mostly *ht*: *ahte, mihte, rihtpisnesse* etc Regular *cht*: *michte, echte, brichte, nocht, ut-brochte, ipichte, echte, hecht, tachte* Once *naut*	Mostly *ht*: *vnboht, rihtpisnesse, brihte* etc Regular *ȝht*: *oȝhte, heȝhte/ eȝhte* and *eȝhte* *ch*: *tichede* *ðt*: *taðte* *ȝt*: *eȝte* and *bikaȝte* (fromOld Northern French *cachier*) *hð/hþ*: *isihðe* and *isihþe* (from OE *sihþ*)	*ht* is almost always retained: *mihte, ehte, un-boht* etc *ft*: *of-ðufte*	Mostly *ht*: *ehte, mihte, nihte* etc Omission of *h*: *nout, nopit, vn-bout, ritȝifnesse* *tt*: *britte, dritte, ut-broutte* *tht*: *drithte, lithte, mithten* *ct*: *eicte*	*ht* is almost always retained: *mẏhte, aẏhte, vn-bouht* etc *ght*: *nought* (twice)	Always *ȝt*: *miȝte, diȝte, (un)piȝte* etc

CONSONANTS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
The velar fricative [x] and the palatal fricative [ç] in final position § 56	*h*: *oh, þeih, þeih, thurh, i-seih* and *i-noh* *ȝh*: *inoȝh* *ch*: *þurch* Before final –e, without /ç/ in *heie*	*h*: *þah* and *þurh* *ch*: *þach/þech* and *i-sech*	*h*: *þurh* and *i-noh* *ȝh*: *þeȝh/þaȝh* and *i-seȝh* *ch*: *þuch* Before final –e it is *ȝ*: *heaȝe* and *heȝe*	*h*: *ah, þeh/ðeh, þurh* and *i-seh* *ch*: *þurch* *ȝ*: *heaȝe/heȝe*	*h*: *ah, þurh* and *i-noh* *ch*: *þech* *i*: *þei* and *sei* *u*: *inou* Before final –e it is *ȝ*: *poȝe* and *heȝe*	*h*: *auh, þah/þeh, þurh, i-seẏh* and *i-nouh* Before final –e, without /ç/ in *heẏe*	*ȝ*: *þeȝ* and *þurȝ* Before final –e it is *ȝ*: *heȝe*
The OE Prefix *ge* § 57				Retained on two occasions: *ȝe-lome* and *ȝe-sceafte*	Retained on four occasions: *ȝe-lad, ȝe-spẏnch/ ȝe-spinch, ȝe-lome*		

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *a* in open syllables § 59	Always *a*: *habben*, *fare*, *naueð* etc	Always *a*: *habbe*, *faren*, *baþien* etc	Always *a*: *habbe*, *vare*, *baþien* etc	Always *a*: *habbe*, *faren*, *baðie* etc	Always *a*: *habbe*, *fared*, *baþien* etc	Always *a*: *habbe*, *vare*, *naueþ* etc	Always *a*: *habbe*, *faren*, *naueþ* etc
OE *a* before a nasal § 60	Always *a*: *man*, *þanc*, *þanne* etc	Mostly *o*: *mon*, *moni*, *þonke* etc *a*: *þanke*, *þanne* and *manke*	Mostly *a*: *man*, *þanc*, *þanne* etc *o*: *þonke* and *monke*	Always *a*: *manne*, *þanc*, *þanne* etc	Always *a*: *man*, *þanke*, *þanne* etc	Mostly *o*: *mon*, *monÿ*, *þonk* etc *a*: *mannes* and *þan/þane.*	Mostly *a*: *man*, *þanne*, *phanne* etc *o*: *þonke* and *þonc.*
OE *a* before a lengthening group § 61	Nearly always *o*: *longe*, *pronge*, *honden* etc *a*: *hangeð* (see § 61).	Mostly *o*: *longe*, *pronge*, *honde* etc *a*: *prange* and *prangepise.*	Always *o*: *longe*, *pronge*, *honde* etc	Always *a*: *lange*, *prange*, *hande* etc	Mostly *o*: *longe*, *strong(e)*, *honde* etc. *a*: *lange*, *hanged* and *prange.*	Always *o*: *longe*, *wronge*, *honde* etc.	Nearly always *o*: *longe*, *strong(e)*, *honde* *a*: *lange*.
OE *æ* § 63	Mostly *a*: *habbe*, *after*, *patere/pater* etc *æ*: *sæd* *e*: *hpeðer*	Mostly *e*: *hefde*, *efþ*, *elmesse* etc *a*: *habbe/abbe*, *pater/patere*, *hpat*, *fader* and *baþ*	Mostly *e*: *hedde*, *elmesse*, *efter* etc *a*: *habbe(n)*, *hadde*, *pater*, *hpat* and *vader/uader*	Mostly *e*: *hefð*, *elmesse*, *peter(e)* etc Occasional *a*: *habbe/habb*, *hafð*, and *hadde* *æ*: *æfter* and *bæð*	Mostly *a*: *habbe*, *almesse*, *after* etc Occasional *e*: *efter*, *pet/hpet*, *peðer*, *sed* *ea* once: *beað*	Mostly *a*: *habbe*, *almes/ almesse*, *after* etc Occasional *e*: *heuede*, *hedde*, *brek* and *hweþer*	Always *a*: *habbe*, *patere(s)*, *phat* etc

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *e* § 64	Nearly always *e*: *beren*, *ende*, *felde*, *strencðe/strengðe* etc *æ*: *ængles* *a*: *angles*^{x2} (probably influenced by OF *anglene*, *angle*)	Nearly always *e*: *beren*, *ende*, *strengþe* etc *ei*: *meind.* *u*: *sullic* (result of *WS syllic*)	Nearly always *e*: *bereð*, *ende*, *velde*, *strenhðe* etc *ai*: *maind* *i*: *siggen*	Always *e*: *beren*, *ende*, *felde*, *strencðe/strengðe* etc	Nearly always *e*: *beren*, *ende*, *felde*, *strengþe/strencþe* etc *ei*: *biende*	Nearly always *e*: *beren*, *ende*, *strengþe* etc *eo*: *seollich* (result of *WS syllic*)	Nearly always *e*: *bere*, *ende/end*, *felde*, *imengd* etc *i*: *sigge*^{x2} *a: angles* and *anglene*^{x2} (probably influenced by OF *anglene*, *angle*)
OE *o* § 65	Nearly always *o*: *bifore/biforen*, *bode*, *nolde* etc *a*: *sarege*	More often *o*: *biforen*, *borde*, *nolden* etc Regularly *a*: *nalde* and *palde*.	Always *o*: *biuore*, *bode*, *borde* etc	Always *o*: *bi-fore*, *bibode*, *borde* etc	Always *o*: *before*, *bode*, *borde* etc	Always *o*: *bi-fore*, *bode*, *borde* etc	Always *o*: *bifore*, *bode*, *nolde* etc

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *i* § 66	Mostly *i*: *bidden*, *child*, *finde(n)* etc *u*: *pulle*, *ofsprung* and *spuncheˇ* (for influence of *w* § 66.4) *e*: *ofspreng*, *þese*, *þesse*, *þesses*, (for neutralizing to *ĕ* § 66.3) The *neg.* forms of OE *willan* and *witan* (§ 66.6) are: *nele*, *nelle*, *nelleð* and *nesten*	Mostly *i*: *biden*, *child/childe*, *finde(n)* etc *u*: *pule*, *pulle*, *pulleð* (for the influence of *w* § 66.4) *e*: *þerde* (for neutralizing to *ĕ* § 66.3 The *neg.* forms of OE *willan* and *witan* (§ 66.6 and § 66.8) are: *nute* and *nusten*	Nearly always *i*: *bidde*, *child(e)*, *finden* etc. *e: ospreng* (for neutralizing to *ĕ* § 66.3) The *neg.* forms of OE *willan* and *witan* (§ 66.6 and § 66.10) are: *nele*, *nelle* and *nesten*	Mostly *i*: *bidde*, *child(e)* , *finde(n)* etc *y*: a-pyste *u*: *pule*, *pulle*, *pulleð* (for the influence of *w* § 66.4), The *neg.* forms of OE *willan* and *witan* (§ 66.6 and § 66.12) are: *nele*, *nelle* and *nuste(n)*	Mostly *i*: *bidde*, *child(e)* , *finde(n)* etc *y*: *ȝe-spyńch* *u: pule*, *pulle*, *pulled* (for the influence of *w* § 66.4) and *osprung* The *neg.* forms of OE *willan* and *witan* (§ 66.6 and § 66.12) are: *nuten* and *nuste(n)*	Mostly *iý*: *biden*, *child(e)*, *fýnde* etc (The writing of ý in J is orthographical rather than phonological) *u*: *osprung* The *neg.* forms of OE *willan* and *witan* (§ 66.6 and § 66.16) are: *nule*, *nulle* and *nuste(n)*)	Mostly *i*: *bidde*, *child(e)* , *finde* etc *u*: *pule* and *pulleþ* (for the influence of *w* § 66.4) *e: ofspreng* (for neutralizing to *ĕ* § 66.3) The *neg.* forms of OE *willan* and *witan* (§ 66.6 and § 66.18) are: *nele*, *nelle* and *neste*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *y* § 67	A mixture of *u* and *e*: *dude*, *þunche*, *gulteð* etc and *deden*, *euel*, *senne* etc. *i*: *þincheð*, *ðinkeð*, *king(es)*, *hpilch* and before *h* in *drihte(n)* and *tihte*	Mostly *u*: *dude*, *gulte*, *muchel* etc Regular *i*: *þingþ*, *afirst*, *king* etc *e*: *dede* and *(vn)net*	Mostly *e*: *dede*, *(vn)net*, *þenchen* etc *u*: *muchel(e)* / *mutchel* and *sunegeden* Regular *i*: *þingh*/*þingð*, *king(e)*, *afirst* etc	Mostly *u*: *dude*, *gulte*, *muchel* etc Regular *i*: *ðince*, *king(e)*, *sticche* etc *y*: *mẏchel* *e*: *iðencð*	Mostly *u: dude*, *gulte*, *muchel(e)* etc. Regular *i*: *þinche(n)*, *king(e(s)*, *spilc*, etc *e*: *deden*, *euel(e)*, *a-ferst*, *iþenchð* and *lest*.	Mostly *u*: *dude*, *þunchen*, *agult* etc. Regular *i/ẏ*: *þinche*, *a-virst*, *king(e)/kẏng* etc	A mixture of *u* and *e*: *dude*, *gulte*, *muchel* etc and *misdede*, *(vn)net*, *þencheþ* etc Regular *i*: and *þinche*, *aurist*, *king(e)s)* etc
OE *ẏ* § 67	*u*: *hudden*, *fur(e)* and *cuðen* *i*: *litel/litle* and *hpi* *e*: *here* and *kedde*	Mostly *u*: *lutel*, *ihud*, *fur(e)*, *cuðe* and *kudde* *i*: *litel/litle* and *hpi*	*e*: *fere/ver*, *keðen* and *kedde* *i*: *litel/litle*, *hidden* and *hpi*	*u*: *lutel*, *lute*, *hud*, *fur(e)*, *cuðe* and *cudde* *i*: *litel*, *lite* and *hpi*	*u*: *lutel*, *hud*, *fur(e)*, *cuþe* and *cudde* *i*: *litel* and *hpi.*	Nearly always *u*: *lutel/lutle*, *ihud*, *fur(e)*, *cuþe* and *cudde* *i*: *hpi*	*i*: in *litel/litle* and *lite* u: *fur(e)* and *cuþe* e: *(vn)hed*
OE *u* § 68	Always *u*: *cume(n)*, *punien*, *grunde* etc	Nearly always *u*: *cume(n)*, *punien*, *grunde* etc *o*: *come* (twice only)	A mixture of *u* and *o*: *cumen*, *punie*, *grunde* etc. and *come(n)*, *ponien*, *iponed* etc	Always *u*: *cume(n)*, *punien*, *grunde* etc	Mostly *u*: *punien*, *grunde*, *sune* etc. *o*: always in the verb *come(n)*, *comeð* etc.	Nearly always *u*: *cume(n)*, *punien*, *grunde* etc. *o*: *sone*	Mostly *o*: *come*, *ponie*, *poniegges* etc. *u*: *cumþ*, *grunde* and *bigunne*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ā* § 69	Mostly *o*: *lore*, *one*, *non* etc (for neutralization § 69.1ff) *a*: *aquerne*, *bihat* (*cont.*), *hatere* and *hat (cont.)*	Nearly always *a*: *lare*, *ane*, *nan* etc. *o*: *pori*	Nearly always *o*: *lore*, *one*, *non* etc (for neutralization § 69.1ff) *a*: *nammore and bihat (cont.).*	Nearly always *a*: *ane*, *nan*, *lac* etc *o*: *pori*	More often *o*: *lore*, *one*, *non* etc (for neutralization § 69.1ff) Frequent a: *anne*, *nanne-mon*, *hatere* etc	Mostly *o*: *lore*, *one*, *non* etc (for neutralization § 69.1ff) a: *namore*, *aquerne*, *bihat (cont.)*, *hatture* and *hat* (*cont.*)	Nearly always o: *lore*, *one*, *non* etc (for neutralization § 69.1ff) a: *namore* and *hatter*
OE *ǣ*$_1$ § 70ff	Mostly *a*: *dade*, *rade*, *ofdrade* etc. *æ*: *læte* e: *iselðe*, *unsele* and *mere*	Nearly always *e*: *dede*, *rede*, *adrede* etc *a*: *latheð*	Nearly always *e*: *dede*, *rede*, *adrede* etc *a*: *naddren*	Nearly always *e*: *dede*, *rede*, *adrede* etc *æ*: *forlæte*	Mostly *e*: *dede*, *rede*, *adrede* etc *a*: *vnisalþ*, *adrade*, *of-drad/of-drard* and *naddren* *ia*: *liache* *ea*: *un-sealþe*	Always *e*: *dede*, *rede*, *adrede* etc	Always *e*: *dede*, *rede a-adrede* etc
OE *ǣ*$_2$ § 70ff	Mostly *a*: *mast*, *ar/are*, *unhalðe* etc *æ*: *ænes* *ea*: *hease* *e*: *mene* and *hete*	Nearly always: *emest*, *un-helþe*, *lest* etc. *a*: *anige*	Nearly always e: *mest*, *unhelðe*, *lest* etc *a*: *ani/anie* and *ani-man*	Mostly *e*: *mest*, *unhelþe*, *lest* etc Regularly *æ*: *ær*, *æ urich*, *æure*, *æura-ma*, *ilæd*, *læde/læden* and *æniman*	Mostly *e*: *mest*, *un-helþe*, *lest* etc *æ*: *ær* and *æfrich* *ae*: *aer* *ea*: *teache* Often *a*: *ar*, *ani*, *ȝe-lad*, *ladde* and *lat*	Nearly always *e*: *mest*, *vnhelhþe*, *lest* etc *ea*: *ear* *a*: *ilad* and *lat*	Mostly *e*: *mest*, *unhelþe*, *lest* etc *a*: *ilad*, *ladde* and *ani*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ē* § 82	Always *e*: *he*, *deþ/deð*, *iqueme* etc (the writing of *doð* in T is by analogy)	Always *e*: *he*, *deþ/deð*, *iquemen* etc	Always *e*: *he*, *deð*, *ibet* etc (the writing of *doð* in D is by analogy and the writing of *hi* in D is the *pl.* form written for the *sg.*).	Nearly always *e*: *he*, *deþ/deð*, *cweman* etc *ie*: *dieð* eo: *beot*	Always *e*: *he*, *deþ/ded/det/deð*, *i-queme* etc	Always *e*: *he*, *queme*, *ibet* etc (the writing of *doð* in J is by analogy and the writing of *fem. heo* is for *masc.*)	Always *e*: *he*, *deþ*, *ẏqueme* etc (the writing of *doð* in M is by analogy)
OE *ī* § 83	Always *i*: *mine*, *þriste*, *hpile* etc	Always *i*: *mi*, *þriste*, *hpile* etc	Always *i*: *mi*, *þriste*, *pile/hpile* etc	Almost always *i*: *mi*, *hpile*, *þriste* etc. u: *spunes*	Almost always *i*: *mi*, *pile/hpẏle/pile*, *abit* etc *u*: *spunes*	Always *i/ẏ*: *mẏ*, *þriste*, *hwile/hwil* etc	Always *i*: *mi*, *þriste*, *hpile/huile/hpil* etc
OE *ō* § 84	Always *o*: *to*, *dome*, *boc* etc (the writing of *cam* in T is by analogy)	Always *o*: *to*, *dom(e)*, *boke(n)* etc	Always *o*: *to*, *dom(e)*, *boc* etc	Always *o*: *to*, *dom(e)*, *boc/boke* etc	Always *o*: *to*, *dom(e)*, *boc/boke* etc	Always *o*: *to*, *dome*, *boke* etc	Always *o*: *to*, *dome*, *boc* etc (the writing of *cam* in M is by analogy)
OE *ū* § 85	Always *u*: *nu*, *ure*, *þu* etc	Always *u*: *nu*, *ure/vre/hure*, *þu* etc	Always *u*: *nu*, *ure/vre*, *þu* etc	Always *u*: *nu*, *ure/vre*, *þu* etc	Always *u*: *nv/nu*, *ure/vre*, *þu* etc	Always *u*: *nu*, *ure/vre*, *þu* etc.	Always *u*: *nu*, *ure/vre*, *þu* etc

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ea* before *r*-combinations § 87ff	Without lengthening it is always *a*: *arȝe*, *þarf*, *arme* etc Before *rd* it is nearly always *a*: *harde*, *hardne* and *hardde* *æ*: *(midden)ærd* *ea*: *(midden)eard* Before *rn* it is *a*: *parnin* and *parnie* *e*: *erninge*	Without lengthening it is regularly *e*: *erȝe* and *þerf* *a*: *arme* Before *rd* it is always *e*: *(midden)erd(e)*, *herde* and *hernde* Before *rn* it is *e*: *erninge* and *pernin* *a*: *parni*	Without lengthening it is always *a*: *arȝe*, *þarf*, *arme* etc Before *rd* it is nearly always *a*: *harde*, *hardne* and *(midel)ard* *ea*: *(midden)eard* Before *rn a*: *parni* *ea*: *earninge*	Without lengthening it is regularly *æ*: *ærpe*, *nærepene* and *þærf* *ea*: *ðearf* and *earme* *ie ðierf* and *spierte* Before *rd* it is mostly *ea*: *(middan)-eard*, *(middle)eard* and *hearde* *a*: *hardne* *e*: *herde* Before *rn* it is *ea*: *earninge* *a*: *parnie/parine* *e*: *perni*	Without lengthening it is regularly *a*: *arȝe*, *sparte*, *narepe* and *þarf* *ea*: *earme* *e*: *þerf* Before *rd* it is more regularly *e*: *herde* and *(midden)erd* *ea*: *(midden)eard* a: *harde* Before *rn* it is *a*: *parnen* and *parnie* *e*: *erninge*	Without lengthening it is nearly always *a*: *þarf*, *arme*, *swarte* and *narewe* *e*: *erewe* Before *rd a*: *harde* and *e*: *(middel)erd/ mẏddelerd* Before *rn a*: *warnẏ/parnẏ* and *ea*: *earnẏnge*	Without lengthening it is always *a*: *arȝ*, *darf*, *suarte and narepe* Before *rd a*: *harde* and *hardne* and *e*: *(middel)erd* Before *rn a*: *parni* and *e*: *ernigge*
i-umaut of *ea* before *r*-combinations § 89ff	*e*: derne and erming *ie*: *smierte*	e: *derne* i: *smirte*	*a*: *arminges* *e*: *smerte* *ie*: *dierne*	*e*: *erminges* *u*: *durne* *eo*: *smeorte*	*e*: *derne* and *smerte*	*e*: *derne* *ea*: *earmẏnges*	*e*: *smerte* and *ermigges*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ea* before *l*, without lengthening (Anglian *a*) § 90	Always *a*: *al* and *alle*, *falle*, *pallen* etc	Nearly always *a*: *al* and *alle*, *palle*, *salt* etc. *ea*: *bi-fealt*	Always *a*: *al* and *alle*, *ualle*, *palles* etc	Considerable variation. More often *ea*: *eal* and *ealle*, *fealle*, *pealð* etc Several examples of *a*: *all(e)* and *al*, *palle and salt* *æ*: *æl*	Mostly *a*: *al* and *alle*, *falle*, *salt* etc *ea*: *ealle* and *eal(mihtes)* and *pealð*	Always *a*: *al* and *alle*, *falle*, *walles*	Always *a*: *al* and *alle*, *falle*, *palles* etc
OE *ea* before *ld* § 91ff	Mostly *ea*: *pealde*, *eald(e)*, *feald(e)* etc *e*: *bihelden* *o*: *holde* *a*: *halt*	Mostly *a*: *paldeð*, *ald*, *falde* etc. e: *pelde(n)*	A mixture of *ia* and *ea*, with occasional *a*: *pialdeð*, *hialde* and *bihialde; wealden*, *ealde*, *fealde* etc*; alde* and *halt.*	Regularly *ea*: *pealden*, *eald(e)*, *fealde* etc *æ*: *pælde* *a*: *halt*	Some variance. Regularly *ea*: *pealded*, *eald(e)*, *healde(n)* etc *æ*: *pælde* *e*: *pelden* and *felde* *a*: *palt* and *halt*	Regularly *o*: *wolde*, *old*, *folde* etc *e*: *welde* and *weldeþ* *a*: *hald* and *halt*	Mostly *e*: *pelden*, *eld*, *felde* etc. (for *ȝelde*, see § 91.2) *ie*: *bihielde* *a*: *halt*
i-umlaut of *ea* before *l* combinations (Angl. mutation of *a*) § 92ff	*e*: *elder* and *elde*	*e*: *elde* *a*: *alder*	*e*: *elder/eldre* and *helde/elde*	*e*: *elder* and *elde* *u*: *uldre* and *ulde* *y*: *ylde*	*e*: *elder /eldre* and *elde* *u*: *ulde*	Mostly *e*: *eldre/eldure* and *elde* *ea*: *ealde*	*e*: *elder* and *elde*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ea* before *h* combinations § 93	*ie*: *heie* and *iseih*	*e*: *isech*	*e*: *hegɛ* and *isegh*	*e*: *hegɛ* and *iseh* *ea*: *heagɛ*	*ei*: *heie*, *heigɛ* and *sei* *e*: *hegɛ*	*eẏ*: *heẏe* and *iseẏh*	*e*: *hezɛ*
i-umlaut of *ea* before *h*-combinations § 94	*i*: *mihte(n)* and *nihte*	*i*: *mihte(n)/michte* and *nihte* *a*: *mahte* (demonstrates a form of the *verb pa. 1st sg.* without *i*-umlaut: see § 94.1 *Comment*)	*i*: *mihte(n)* and *nihte*	*i*: *mihte(n)* and *nihte(s)*	*i/ẏ*: *mẏhte/ mihte(n)* and *nihte(s)*	*y/i*: *mẏhte(n)/ mihte* and *nẏhte(s)*	*i*: *mizte(n)* and *nihte*
OE *eo* before *r*-combinations § 96ff	Mostly *e*: *perke/perc*, *perkes* and *herte* ie: *hierte* o: *storre*	Mostly *e*: *perke/perch*, *perkes* and *herte* *o*: *horte*	*e*: *perc*, *perkes*, *sterre* and *herte* *o*: *porke/porc* and *workes/porkes* *ie*: *hierte*	Always eo *peorch(e)/peorc*, *peorkes*, *heorte* and *steorre*	*e*: *perche/perc* and *perkes* *eo*: *peorkes*, *heorte* and *steorre*	*e*: *werke* and *werkes* eo: *heorte* and *steorre*	*o*: *porkes*, *porc/pork* *u*: *purkes* (possible influence of *w* § 97) and *sturre* *e*: *herte*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
wur group § 97	*u*: *purðe* and *purðen* The *i*-umlaut of *eo* is e: *perest* and *pers(e)*	*u*: *purð* and *purðe* The *i*-umlaut of *eo* is *u*: *purst* and *purs*	*u*: *purðe* The *i*-umlaut of *eo* is e: *pers(e)*	*u*: *purðe* The *i*-umlaut of *eo* is *u*: *purs(e)*	*u*: *purþe* The *i*-umlaut of *eo* is *u*: *purst* and *purs(e)*	*u*: *wurþe* The *i*-umlaut of *eo* is *u*: *wurse*	M omits the vowel: *prþe* And in the *i*-umlaut of *eo*: *prst*, *prst* and *prs*
OE *eo* before *l*-combinations § 98	Always *e*: *self and selfe(n)*	Always *o*: *solf/solue*	Always *e*: *selue/self*	Mostly *u*: *sulfne/ sulue/sulf* *e*: *selue/self*	A mixture of *e* and *u*: *selue*, *self* and *suelf*; *sulfne/sulne* *i*: *silf*	Always *eo*: seolf/seolue	Always *e*: *selue/selfe*
OE *eo* before *ht* § 99	Always *i*: *unrihtpinesse*, *unriht*, *rihte* and *briht(e)*	Always *i*: *rihtpisnesse*, *unriht*, *rihte* and *bricht(e)*	Always *i*: *rihtpisnesse*, *unrihte*, *rihte* and *briht* and *fulbrihte*	Always *i*: *rihtpisnesse*, *unriht/un-rihte*, *rihte* and *briht(e)*	Always *i*: *rihtȝifnesse*, *vnriht*, *rithte and briht* and *britte*	Always *i/ẏ*: *rẏhtwisnesse*, *vnrẏht/vnriht*, *rẏte* and *briht(e)*	Always *i*: *riȝtpisesse*, *riȝte* and *briȝte*
i-umlaut of *eo* before *h* § 100	*i*: *ouer-sihð* and *þurh-sihð*	*i*: *ouer-sich* and *þurh-scihð*	*i:* þurhsiȝð *ie*: ouer-sieð	*i*: *ouersihð* and *ðurh-sihð*	*i*: *ouer-sihð* and *þurð-sihð*	*ẏ*: *ouer-sẏhþ* and *þurh-sẏhþ*	*i*: *ouersicþ* and *þurȝsicþ*
The *verb* OE eom, eam, am § 101	*eom* is *am*	*eom* is *em*	*eom* is *am*	*eom* is *æm* and *eom*	*eom* is *æm* and *eom*	*eom* is *am*	*eom* is *am*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *eo* (*a*-umlaut of *e*) § 102 and § 103	Always *e*: *fele*, *brekeð*, *pele* and *unfremu*	Regularly *o*: *fole*, *brokeð* and *unfrome* *e*: *fele and pele*	Always *e*: *vele/uele/fele*, *brekeð* and *pele*	Mostly *e*: *fele/uele*, *brekeð*, *pele* and *unfreme* *a*: *fale* *ea*: *feale* (possibly by association with the antonym *fēawe* § 103.4)	Mostly *e*: *fele/vele*, *brekeð* and *pele* *ea*: *feale* (possibly by association with the antonym *fēawe* § 103.5)	Regularly *eo*: *veole/ueole/feole* and *weole* *e*: *wele* and *brekeð*	Always *e*: *vele/uele/fele*, *brekeð*, *unureme* and *pele/pel*
OE *eo* (*u*-umaut of *e*) § 102 and § 104	Almost always *e*: *heuen(e)*, *heueriche*, *pereld(es)* etc. *u*: *suster* and *pude* (written under the influence of *w*)	Regularly *o*: *houen(e)* and *porld(es)* *e*: *heuen* *u*: *suster* (written under the influence of *w*)	Mostly *e*: *heuen(e)*, *heueriche*, *pereld(es)* and *perldliche* etc. *o*: *porld/poruld* and *porldes* and *pode* *u*: *suster* (written under the influence of *w*)	Regularly *e*: *heuen(e)*, *heuenriche*, *heuenliche* etc *eo*: *heouene* *o*: *poruld(es)* and *pode* *u*: *suster* (written under the influence of *w*)	Regularly *e*: *heuene* and *heuenliche* etc. *o*: *porld* and *porules/porlds* *u*: *suster* and *pude* (written under the influence of *w*)	Mostly *eo*: *heouene* and *heoueriche* etc Regular *e*: *heuenliche* *o*: *world(es)* *u*: *suster* (written under the influence of *w*)	Regularly *e*: *heuen*, *heueneriche*, *heuenliche* etc *o*: *porld/uorld*, *porldes* and *pode* *u*: *suster* (written under the influence of *w*)

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
velar umlaut *io* of *i* § 105	Mostly *e*: *seðen*, *seuene*, *bineðen* etc *i*: *(be)nime*, *quike/quica*, *silver* and *niðer*	Regularly *o*: *soððen*, *souene*, *binoþen* etc *u*: suððen (from lWS *syððan* § 105.3) *e*: *here*, *iclepede* and *biclepie* *i*: *(be)nimen* and *quike*	Mostly *e*: *seðe*, *seuene*, *bineþen* etc *i*: *hire*, *(be)nime*, *quike*, *siþen* and *niþer*	Regularly *eo*: *soððen*, *seouene*, *bi-neoðen*, *heore/heora* etc *u*: *icluped*, *bi-clupien* and *suððe* *ẏ*: *syððen* (*suððe* and *syððen* reflect a lack of umlaut before a dental in the SW (lWS *syððan* § 105.3) *i*: *(be)-nime* and *quike*	Regularly *e*: *bi-neþen*, *suefer*, *henne* etc *i*: *(be)-nimen* and *quike* *eo*: *heore* and *seouene/seoue* *u*: *hure*, *sutþe/suðþe* *y*: *sẏðen* (*sẏðen* and *sutþe/suðþe* reflect a lack of umlaut before a dental in the SW (lWS *syððan* § 105.3)	Regularly *eo*: *bi-cleopien*, *seoue*, *heore* etc *e*: *bi-neþen*, *icleped* and *seþþen* ẏ: *(by)nyme*, *quẏke* and *nẏþe*	*e*: seue, bineþe, selure, henne *a*: *hare* *u*: *suþþe*, *icluped* and *hure* *i*: *niþer*, *(bi)nime*, *siþþe* and *quike*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ēa* § 106	Regularly *ea*: *eaðe*, *deaðe*, *eadi* etc. *e*: *ec* and *eðlate* *a*: *brade* and *rauing*	Mostly *e*: *ec*, *chep*, *eðe* etc *ea*: *uneade* and *deaþe* (both in rhyming position and might reflect a feature of the text being copied)	Mixture of *e* and *ea*: *ec/ec*, *eðlete*, *vnnede*, *deðe/deð*, *bred/brede* and *lean*, *eaðe*, *eade*, *unneaðe*, *deaðe/deade*, *breade* and *eadi*	Mixture of *e*, *ea* and *ie*. *e*: *ech/ec*, *eð-late*, *uneðe* and *brede* *ea*: *eaðe*, *deað* and *reauing* *ie*: *ieþe*, *un-ieðe/unieþe*, *lien*, *briede* *ȝe*: *ȝedi* (see § 106.2)	Mostly *e*: *ec*, *eþe*, *deþe* etc Regularly *ie/ye*: *dieþe/dieð*, *unieþe* and *lyen* *æi*: *æidi*	Nearly always *e*: *ek/eke*, *eþe*, *deþe/deþ* etc *ea*: *lean*	A mixture of variants: *e*: *eke/ec*, *vnneþe*, *deþe* and *brede/bred* *ie*: *lien* ȝe: *ȝeþ-lete* and *ȝedi* (see § 106.2) *ia*: *diaþe*
i-umlaut of *ēa* § 107	Always *e*: *ileuen*, *hereð*, *temen* etc	Always *e*: *ileue(n)*, *alesed*, *iheren* etc	Nearly always *e*: *ileuen*, *alesd*, *temen* etc. *ie*: *ihiere*	Nearly always *u*: *ihurð*, *ihuren* and *ilusd* *e*: ileue, leueð and temen (*e* only written in rhyming position and, therefore, an unlikely representation of the dialect)	Nearly always *u*: *i-hurd*, *ihuren*, *a-luesd* and *iluuet* *e*: *ileued*, *ileue* and *temen* (*e* only written in rhyming position and, therefore, an unlikely representation of the dialect)	Always *e*: *ileue*, *here*, *teme* etc	Nearly always *e*: *ỳleue*, *teme*, *ilesed* and *leueþ* *u*: *ihurþ*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ēo* § 108	A mixture of *e* and *ie*: *be/ben*, *lef*, *frend* etc and *bien*, *lief*, *friend* etc	Mostly a mixture of *eo* and *o*: *bon/bo*, *son*, *frond* etc and *beo*, *seon*, *freond* etc *i*: *bið* *e*: *sec* and *tening*	A mixture of *i* and *ie* written alongside *e* and occasional *eo* and *o*: *bi*, *bien*, *isien*, *lief* etc and *ben*, *frend*, *isen* etc with *iseon*, *deoflen* and *dofles*	Mostly *eo*: *beo(n)*, *seon*, *freond* etc *e*: *ben* *ie*: *lief* *i*: *sic*	Retains *eo*, *o*, *ue* and *u* forms, alongside unrounded *e*. *eo*, *o*, *ue* and *u*: *beo/beo*, *seon*, *freond* etc; *buen* and *bue*, *bud/ buð*, *bo* and *frond* *e*: *ben/be*, *isen*, *leure* etc *i*: *lif* and *sic*	Mostly *eo*: *beo(n)*, *seon*, *leof* etc *e*: *be*, *þeue and sek*	Mostly *e*: *ben*, *leue*, *frend* etc Regularly *eo*: *beo*, *beoþ*, *iseo* etc *i*: *sike*
i-umlaut of *ēo* § 109	Mostly *ie*: *friend*, *fiend*, *þiesternesse* etc *e*: *frend and derlinges* *u*: *þuster* (possibly from WS *ȳ* (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /ø:/ from *ēo*)	Nearly always *o*: *frond*, *dore*, *node and* *þostre* *e*: *þestre*	Mostly *ie*: *þiestre*, *þiesternesse*, *niede* and *diere* *eo: deorlinges* and *feond* *e: frend*	A mixture of *eo*, and *u*. *eo*: *freond*, *deore* and *neode* u: *frund*, *fund*, *þustre*, *ðustrenesse and dure* (possiblyfrom WS *y* (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /ø:/ from *ēo*)	A mixture of *e* and *u*. *e*: *frend*, *fend* and *nede* *u*: *þustre*, *þusternesse*, *durlinges* (*u* possibly from WS *y* (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /ø:/ from *ēo*) *o*: *dore* *ue*: *duere* *e*: *nede*	Always unrounded *eo*: *freond*, *feond*, *þeostre* etc	Mostly e: *frend*, *fend*, *dere* etc *u*: *þusternesse* (possibly from WS *y* (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /ø:/ from *ēo*)

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ea* after *sc* § 111 and § 112	Always *a*: *sal*, *samie*, *safte* etc	Mostly *a*: *schal/ scal* and *scame þ* *e*: *sceft* *o*: *scome*	Mostly *a*: *sal*, *samien*, *schameð* etc e: *sel* (the more regular writing in this *verb*) and *scete* (*e* is possibly as a result of its position between palatal and dental consonants) *ea*: *seafte*	*ea*: *sceal* and *sceafte* *æ*: *scæl* *a*: *scal*, *scamian*, *scamet* and *scame* *ie*: *sciete*	Mostly *a*: *scal*, *scamien*, *scamet and scame* *æ*: *scæl/sæl* *ea*: *sceal* *e*: *scefte* and *sced* (*e* is possibly as a result of its position between palatal and dental consonants)	Always *a*: *schal*, *scal* and *schafte* etc	Nearly always *a*: *scal*, *scamie*, *schate* etc *e*: *scefte*
i-umlaut of *ea* after *c* § 111 and § 113	*e*: *chele* and *bicherd*	*e*: *chele*	*e*: *chele* and *bicherd*	*e*: *chele* and *bicherd* *u*: *chule*	*e*: *chele* and *bi-cherd* *u*: *chule*	*e*: *chele* and *bi-cherd*	*e*: *chele*
ēa after *g* § 111 and § 114	*ie*: *ȝier*	*e*: *ȝer*	*ie*: *ȝier*	*e*: *ȝer*	*e*: *ȝer*	*e*: *ẏer*	*e*: *ȝer*
OE *ie* after *g* § 116	Nearly always *ie*: *forȝiet*, *ȝielde*, *ȝieue* etc *e*: *ȝeue*	Always *e*: *forȝet*, *ȝefe*, *ȝelde* etc	Mostly *e*: *vorȝet*, *biȝete*, *ȝeue* etc Regular *ie*: *uorȝiete*, *ȝieue*, *ȝielde*, *ȝiefð/ȝief* and *(i)ȝieue*	Mostly writes *i/ẏ*: *forȝitet*, *ȝiue*, *ȝiueð* etc *u*: *for-ȝut* *ie*: *ȝieuen*	Mostly writes *i/ẏ*: *forȝẏtet*, *ȝẏue*, *ȝiued* etc *u*: *for-ȝut* and *ȝuue* *ie*: *ȝieueð*	Always writes *e*: *for-ẏet*, *ẏefte*, *ẏelde* etc	Always writes *e*: *uorȝet*, *ȝeue*, *biȝete* etc

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ie* after *g* § 117	*ie*: *ȝiet*	*e*: *ȝet*	*e*: *ȝet* *ie*: *ȝiet*	*ẏe*: *ȝẏet* *u*: *ȝut*	*ue*: *ȝuet* *u*: *ȝut* *e*: *ȝet*	*e*: *ẏet*	*e*: *ȝet*
OE *ie* after *sc* § 118	*i*: *silde* and *sildeð*	*i*: *scilde*	*i*: *isilde/shilde silden* and *silten*	*u*: *sculde(n)* and *sculdeð*	*u*: *sculde* and *sculdeð* *i*: *scilde(n)*	*i*: *schilde* *e*: *scheldeþ*	*i*: *(i)scilde and scildeþ*
OE *eo* after *ġ* § 119 and §120	*eu*: *ȝeunge* and *ȝeunger* *u*: *jung* *ieu*: *ȝieuð*	*u*: *ȝung* and *ȝunge*	*iu*: *ȝiung* *u*: *ȝungre* *eu*: *ȝeuȝeþ*	*ẏ*: *ȝẏng* *u*: *ȝunge* *eo*: *ȝeonger* *eu*: *ȝeuȝeþe*	*u*: *ȝung* *ui*: *ȝuinge* *eo*: *ȝeonger* and *ȝeoȝeðe*	*o*: *ẏonge* and *ẏonghede*	*u*: *ȝung* and *ȝunge*
OE *eo* after *sc*	*u*: *sulen/sulle(n)* *o*: *solde(n)* and *sop*	*u*: *sculen/scule* and *sculden* o: *solde* and *sop*	u: *sulle(n)* o: *sollen*, *solde(n)* and *sop*	u: *scule(n)* o: *scolde(n)* and *sop*	*u*: *sculle(n)/sculen/ sculled* o: *solde(n)/ scolde(n)* and *scop*	*u*: *schulle(n)/ schulleþ /schule(n)*, *schulde(n)* o: *scholde(n)/ scolden* and *schop*	*u*: *scullen* *o*: *scolde(n)* and *sop*
OE *æ* + *ȝ* /j/ § 122	Nearly always *ai*: *mai/maiȝ* and *dai/daie* *ei*: *seið*	Nearly always *ei*: *mei*, *seið/seit*, *bideiþ* and *dei* Rare *ai*: *mai*	Mostly *ai*: *mai* and *dai* Occasional *ei*: *mei*, *seið* and *deie*	Nearly always *ei*: *mei*, *dei/deie* and *seið* ai once only: *saið*	Mostly *ai*: *mai* and *dai* Occurrences of ei: *mei*, *seit/seid*	Nearly always *aẏ*: *maẏ* and *daẏ eẏ* once only: *seẏþ*	Nearly always *ai/aẏ*: *mai/maẏ*, *dai/daie* and *saiþ*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
LWS *sǣde* / Anglian *sægde* § 123	Mostly *a*: *sade(n) ai* once only: *isaid*	Mostly *ei*: *seide(n) e*: *sede*	Always *e*: *sede(n)*	Always *e*: *sede* and *ised*	Always *e*: sede *and* ised	Always *eẏ*: *seẏde(n)*	Nearly always *ei*: *seide* *e* once only: *sede*
OE *ǣ*$_1$(Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + ʒ/j/ § 124 and § 125	*ai*: *mai and grai wæi*: *mæi* *ei*: *iseie(n) and niseien*	*ei*: *mei* *eg*: *iseʒen and niseʒen*	*ei*: *mei* and *isein eg*: *iseʒen* and *ne-iseʒen*	*æi*: *mæi and græi ei*: *meie* *eg*: *(i)seʒen*	*ei/eẏ*: *mei/meẏ*, *grei and seie* *eg*: *seʒen*	*eẏ*: *meẏ*, *greẏ*, *seẏen* and *iseẏe*	*ei*: *mei* *eʒ*: *ẏseze* and *iseze*
OE *ǣ*$_2$+ ʒ/j/ § 124 and § 126	*ei*: *eiðer* *ai*: *aiðer*	*ei*: *eiðer*	*ai*: *aiðer/aider* *ei*: *in eiðer*	*æi*: *æiðer* *ai*: *aiðer*	*aẏ/ai*: *aẏþer/ aiþer*	*eẏ*: *eẏþer*	*ai*: *aiþer*
OE *e*+ ʒ/j/ § 127	*ei*: *eie*, *eiseliche*, *pei*, *peies*, *peiʒen*, and *treiʒes* *eg*: *peg*	*ei*: *peien* *eg*: *peges*	*ei*: *eie*, *eiliche and pei* *eg*: *egie*, *peges* and *pege*	*ei*: *eie*, *eisliche*, *pei* and *peies* *eg*: *peʒen* *æi*: *æie*	*ei*: *eie*, *eisliche*, *pei* and *peies* *eg*: *peʒen*	*eẏ/ei*: *eẏe*, *weẏ(e)* and *wei*	*eẏ/ei*: *eie*, *pei/peẏ eʒ*: *peze(s)*
OE *ē*+ ʒ/j/ §128 and § 129	*ei*: *forpreien* and *leie*	*ei*: *forpreien*	*ei*: *vorpreien* and *leie*	*ei*: *leie* *eg*: *for-preʒen*	*ei*: *for-preien* and *leie*	*eẏ*: *for-preẏ* and *leẏe*	*ei*: *forpreie* *eẏ*: *leẏe*
OE *ēa*+ ʒ/j/ § 128 and § 130	*ei*: *eien* and *raketeie*	*eg*: *egen*	*eg*: *egen and raketege* *eag*: *eagen*	*eg*: *egen/ege* and *raketege*	*ei*: *raketeie* *eg*: *egen*	*eẏ*: *eẏen* and *raketeẏe*	*eʒ*: *ezen(e)* and *raketeze*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ā* + *h (g)* § 132	*oh*: *foh* and *oh*	*ah*: *ahte* *ach*: *achten*		*ah*: *fah* and *ah*	*ah*: *ah* *ou*: *fou*	*ou*: *fou* *au*: *auh*	*az*: *faz* and *azte*
OE *æ₂* + *h* § 132 and § 133	*ai*: *aihte* and *taihte*	*e*: *echte* *a*: *tachte*	*e*: *hezhte* *a*: *taðte*	*e: tehte and ehte* *a*: *ahte*	*e*: *ehte* *ei*: *eicte* *au*: *auht* and *tauhte*	*aý*: *aýhte* *a*: *tahte*	*e*: *ezte* and *tezte*
OE *ō* + *h* § 134	o: *unboht*, *biþoht*, *brohte* etc	*o*: *unbocht*, *biþoht*, *brohte* etc	*o*: *vnboht*, *þohte*, *brohte* etc	*o: un-boht*, *bi-þoht*, *brohte* etc	*ou*: *vn-bout*, *bi-þouhte*, *broutte* etc *o: bi-þoht*	*ou*: *vn-bouht*, *bi-þouht*, *brouhte* etc	*o*: *unbozt*, *biþozt*, *brozte* etc
OE *a* + /ɣ/ § 136	*ag*: *lage/lages* *aw*: *drawen*	*ag*: *lage* and *dragen*	*ag*: *draghen*, *lage(n)* and *lage-lease*	*ag*: *dragan/ dragen*, *laghe*, *lage and lage-liese*	*ag*: *lage* *aw*: *drapen*, *lape* and *lape-lese*	*aw*: *drawen*, *lawes* and *lawe-leve*	*az*: *draze* and *laze*
OE *ā* + /ɣ/ § 137	*og*: *moge* and *ogen* *ow*: *mowe* and *owen*	*ag*: *mage and agen* *ah*: *ahen*	*og*: *moge and hogen/ogen*	*ag*: *mage/maghe* and *age(n)*	Mostly *og*: *moge and oge* *ow*: *hope/ope/ open* *oup*: *moupe* *ag*: *age* *ap*: *apene*	*ow*: *mowe* and *owe/owene*	*og*: *moze* and *oze(n)*

VOWELS

ITEM	TRINITY	LAMBETH	DIGBY	E2	E1	JESUS	McCLEAN
OE *ā* + *w*	Always *ow*: *cnopeð*, *blopeð*, *sople/sowle* etc	*aw*: *mapen* and *blapeð* *au*: *iknaupen*, *knauð /cnauð* and *saule*	*ow*: *(i)knopeð*, *knopen and blopeð* *oup*: *moupe* *ap*: *iknapen* *au*: *saule*	Mostly *ap*: *icnape*, *blapeð*, *saple* etc *au*: *saule* *op*: *mopen*	*op*: *mopen* *ou*: *soule* *oup*: *bloupet;* *ap*: *icnape(n) and cnaped*	*ow*: *iknowe*, *(i)knowe þ* and *blowe þ* *ou*: *soule* and *soulen* *au*: *saule*	*op*: *mopen*, *iknope*, *blope þ* etc *ou*: *soule* *au*: *saule*
OE *ēo* + *w*	*e: repen* and *sepen* the *i*-umlaut is *e: untrepnesse.*	*o*: *ropen* and *sopen* the *i*-umlaut is o: *untropnesse*	*e*: *repen* *ie*: *riepen* and *siepe*	*eo*: *reope* and *seopen* *u*: *rupen* the *i*-umlaut is *u*: *untrupnesse*	*eo*: *seopen* *u*: *rupen* *eu*: *reupe* the *i*-umlaut is eu: *untreunesse*	*eo*: *reowe* and *seowe* *e*: *rewe* the *i*-umlaut is *e*: *untrewnesse*	*e*: *repe* and *sepe*
OE *ēa* + *w*	*ea* on two occasions: *feape* *e* once: *fepe*	*ea* on two occasions: *feape* *e* once: *fepe* *a*: *scapeð*	*ea*: *veape* *ia*: *viape*	*ea*: *feape* *e*: *fepe* *ie*: *fiepe*	*e*: *fepe* *eu*: *feupe*	*e*: *fewe*	*e*: *uepe*

STRUCTURE AND PROSODY

In the section on Textual History, I argued that, in the context of a language and literary culture undergoing radical change and displacement, the *Conduct of Life* bears witness to the persistence of English literary forms and their adaptation to, and coexistence with, new forms of French and Latin literature. In this section, I show how, as a text designed and adapted for memorization, and with specific roles in a memorial culture, this longevity was assured, to an extent, by the *Conduct*'s mastery of verse form and homiletic tropology, and how it emerges as a sermon adapted precisely to its hortatory and contemplative function.

The strength of the *Conduct of Life*'s prosody may also go some way to explaining its longevity and the breadth of its dissemination. Like much of what is contained within the verse-sermon, the rhyme and metre of the *Conduct of Life* are designed to suit the purpose of the work itself. The structure of the verse form complements the content. The regular verse pattern of the *Conduct of Life* makes it ideal for memorising by a preacher, and also a female religious, as does the use of the couplets. Both of these might function within the *Conduct of Life* as mnemonic devices, which could aid a preacher in remembering and, therefore, delivering the sermon to its intended audience (*possibly* without having the codex before him). The strong divisions of half-line, full-line and rhymed couplet would not only aid performance but also ensure that a listening audience could access applicable parts if not the whole. The structure and formation of the verse is perfect for recall, with the strong stress system of the *Conduct of Life* having a similar cadence to song.

The specific verse form of the *Conduct of Life* is also an indicator of a literary culture in flux. That is not to overstate the verse-sermon's importance but rather to posit the *Conduct of Life*, and all its manuscript variants, as examples of how a text can represent not only linguistic change but also changes in form. The verse of the *Conduct of Life* is representative of a movement from

what had previously been a metrically uniform system for articulating verse to what had become polyphonous within two generations of Norman rule. The extraneous continental influences acting upon both metrics and rhyme and the re-emergence of the vernacular in written form make the *Conduct of Life* an ideal resource for the literary historian interested in the development of verse form.

Needless to say, the *Conduct* also owes a debt to the Old English oral tradition. There was in fact a protracted period of indebtedness to the Anglo-Saxon tradition that merges with the new influences of the post-Conquest period. Prior to the Norman Conquest of 1066 the verse form of the Anglo-Saxons was, with some variance, composed as either a long line divided into two halves or two short lines linked to one another by alliteration and stress. It was normal to have four stressed syllables in the long lines (two in the short lines) with two or three (no more) of these syllables being alliterated, for example:

> þrymful þunedest, ond ic ofþyrsted wæs (line 40)[537]
> [you were prominent, mighty, and I was very thirsty]

These lines have a natural pause for emphasis across the caesura.

Similarly, the *Conduct* maintains this strong break across the caesura, dividing the long lines into two half-lines or hemstitchs:

> To longe | Ich hab|be child | iben || a word|e and | a dade,
> Þeih Ich | bie a winter |eald, || to jung | Ich am || on rade. (3-4/Ω3-Ω4).
> [Too long have I been a child, in words and in deeds,
> Though I am old in years, I am too young in wisdom.]

It would appear that the author of the *Conduct* viewed each hemstitch as a strong, self-contained syntactical unit containing an independent clause which led in turn to a preservation of the full line as similarly 'complete' or end-stopped. This preservation of the integrity of the full line leads to a

[537] 'Soul and Body I' in *The Vercelli Book*, ed. G. P. Krapp (New York, 1932), p.55.

final pause at the end of each metrical and rhymed couplet. In comparison with this regimented parataxis the Old English poets often structured their verse by enjambing their full lines and making the mid-line break stronger than that found at the end line:

> Geofon yþum weol
> in wintrys wylm. Git on wæteres æht
> seofon niht swuncon. He þe æt sunde oferflat,
> hæfde mare mægen.[538] (*Beowulf* 515-18)
> [The sea welled up in waves,
> the surge of winter; the two of you toiled
> for seven nights in the water's power. He outdid you in swimming,
> had the greater might.]

While an indebtedness to Old English half-lines might be seen in the metrics of the *Conduct of Life* it should also be acknowledged that the verse form of the early Middle English period was being acted on by other factors than simply an emergence out of Old English.

Old English alliteration has been replaced structurally in the *Conduct of Life* by the use of end-rhyme. The *Conduct of Life* does, however, maintain some alliteration within its lines. Alliteration is used for emphasis, as in lines such as:

> He is buuen us and bineðen, biforen and bihinde (87/ Ω89)
> [He is above us and beneath, before and behind]

or

> Are deað and dom cumeð to his dure, he maiȝ him sore adrade (125/ Ω129)
> [Ere death and judgement come to his door, he may be sore afraid]

Within lines, such as the ones above, the stress is placed upon the alliterating syllables and is used at times of heightened emphasis. The use of alliteration in the *Conduct of Life*, as in other examples of early Middle English verse, is used with much more freedom than in Old English verse, where it is structurally necessary. A good example of how a scribe felt at ease in adapting the alliterative

[538] *Beowulf* ed. Kevin Kiernan (British Library, 2015), available at: http://ebeowulf.uky.edu/ebeo4.0/CD/main.html; accessed 1 April 2018.

qualities of the *Conduct of Life*, noted by Hill,[539] can be seen in two different variant readings of the same line within the verse-sermon. Line 300/Ω311 of Trinity reads, 'Ne sullen nafre cumen ut for peni ne for punde' [Nor shall they ever come out, for a penny nor for a pound], where, in all other manuscript witnesses it reads 'vor marke ne vor punde'.[540] It is impossible to state with any certainty whether 'peni' replaced 'marke' in this collocation at some point in the text's transmission or vice-versa, although according to Hill the former is the more likely. What it does indicate is that the scribe felt at ease with either creating or removing alliterative phrases and that their presence within the verse was ornamental rather than structural.

The abandonment of the extended syntactic complexity of Old English verse in favour of the strong syntactical units present in the *Conduct of Life* may seem regressive but it demonstrates a fluidity and freedom not present in the older literature. To speak of the verse form as being both confined by regimented clauses and showing greater fluidity and freedom might appear contradictory at first but early Middle English verse was not regulated by the use of alliteration, end rhyme or a strict adherence to word stress and metre. Friedlander proposes that the verse is 'both chaotic and monotonous, because it possesses stylistic variety but does not admit of systematic complication or "counterpointing."'[541]

Friedlander, furthermore, suggests that the use of rhyme in early Middle English was not a response to the influx of French verse post-Conquest, but was as a result of the growing influence of Latin, brought about by the weakening of the vigorous Germanic tradition at a time when changes in language made it syntactically viable or unavoidable.[542] The *Conduct of Life* adheres to this development whilst also still containing many of the elements of pre-Conquest verse, and has a

[539] Hill 1977, p. 104.
[540] This second reading is taken from D. All of the remaining manuscripts that have this reading (E2, E1 and J) agree with D on this with some orthographical variation.
[541] Carolyn VanDyke Friedlander, 'Early Middle English accentual verse', *Modern Philology*, 76 (1979), 219-230, p. 225.
[542] Friedlander, 'Early Middle English accentual verse', p.229.

vocabulary that is almost all derived from Anglo-Saxon, accommodated within a new structural form based upon the familiar septenarii of Goliardic song.[543]

Traditionally the Septenarius is a purely syllabic metre with seven feet. It can be found either with or without end-rhyme. The line is divided in two across a caesura, with the first section of the line having four strong stresses and the second three. The first half-line has a masculine ending and the second a feminine. The trochaic rhythm of the Septenarius is often turned into iambic by an additional syllable acting as prelude to either of the half lines: (x)x́xx́xx́xx́||(x)x́xx́xx́x̀. A regimented adherence to this structure can be found within the *Orrmulum*, which does not vary from this regularity of metre and strong stress rhythm, and becomes mechanical in its effect. A rigid adherence to this metre by the poet Orm has led scholars to judge the *Orrmulum* as being both tedious and soporific.[544] In the *Conduct of Life*, however, the lines are far less regimented and are regularly syncopated. Hall cites the influence of native prosody on the author of the *Conduct* as a possible reason for this variation.[545] As Hall makes apparent, a regular line, such as line 37/Ω38 in Lambeth and quoted below, is uncommon in the *Conduct of Life*:

> þe Món | þe wúl|e sík|er bón || to háb|ben Gód|es blíssè
> [The man who desires to make sure of God's bliss]

Arguably, the author of the *Conduct of Life* was less interested in the exactness of his metre than Orm. There is fluidity within the structure. Hall scans the first 30 lines of Lambeth (examples given below) demonstrating just how variable the metre can be.[546] As stated previously, the septenary line normally began with an extra anacrustic, unstressed syllable prefixed to it, but in the first 30 lines of the Lambeth version of the *Conduct of Life* this prelude is wanting on 10 occasions (lines: 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 14, 20, 24, 27, 28) as in:

---

[543] Jack. A. W. Bennett and Douglas Gray, *The Oxford History of English Literature: Middle English Literature 1100-1400* (Oxford, 1990), p.29.
[544] Bennett and Gray, *Middle English Literature: 1100-1400* , p. 29.
[545] J. Hall (ed.), *Selections from Early Middle English: 1130-1250: Part Two: Notes* (Oxford, 1920) p. 327.
[546] Hall, *Part Two: Notes* pp. 327-329

þénne ich | mé bi|þénche | wél || ful sáre | ich mé | adréde (6/Ω6).
[When I bethink me well on it, full sore I am in dread]

The prelude is wanting in the second half-line on twelve occasions (lines: 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 30) an example of which can be found at line 12 which reads:

þa múch|el fúl|iéð | his wíl || híne | sólf he bi|swíkeð (12/Ω14).
[He who follows his will greatly, he deceives himself]

As can be seen, there are 4 occasions listed above where the prelude is missing from both the first and second half-lines, such as:

élde | me ís | bistól|len ón || ér ich | hít | wíste (15/Ω18).
[Old age is stolen upon me before I knew it]

In one line the prelude is doubled so that the line reads:

Soht is þét | is óð|ers món|nes frónd || bétre | þén his | ázen (30/Ω31).
[He is a fool who is a better friend to others than to himself]

On three occasions (lines 15, 20 and 22) the unstressed foot of part of the line is missing:

ne lípnie ná | món | to múchel || to chíld|e né | to wíue (22/Ω25)
[Let no man trust too much to child nor to wife]

and sometimes it is of two syllables (lines 8, 12, 24, 26 and 29) as in:

for bét|ere is án | elmés|se bifóren || þénne | bóð efter | sóuene (26/Ω29)
[for one alms before is better than are seven after]

where it occurs three times.

Differences are also evident between manuscripts. If we compare the opening of three of the manuscripts we can see this in practice:

Ich ám | nu éld|er þán| Ich ẃas || a ẃin|tre *ánd* | a lórè (Trinity)

Ićh am | élder | þánę | Ich ẃas || of ẃin|tre *ánd* | of lórè (McClean)

Ićh am | élder | þánnę | ic ẃes
a ẃin|tre *and* | éc a lórè (Digby)

The above demonstrates how each redactor was responsible for adapting the metrics of the verse line within the framework of the septenary line. It is difficult to state with certainty whether one scribe

adapted his variant from another, or from an intermediate manuscript with a different line of descent from the original, but it does suggest that the scribes felt at ease with changing the metrics of the line and did not view the verse form as something fixed.

In general the verse of the Digby manuscript version of the *Conduct of Life* is the most regular but within its lines metrical variety is present.[547] Feminine endings before the caesura were not uncommon in the *Conduct*, as in:

> ic ealdi more, þanne ic *dede*
> mi wit oȝte to bi more. (Digby 3-4/Ω2)

See also: *iqueðe* 17, *muȝe* 41, 45, *stede* 51, *biuore* 55 (these are just a few examples of the many found within the *Conduct of Life*). In all of these cases, where a short vowel sound is followed by a consonant and then a further vowel, elision must take place in order to remove the lowering syllable and maintain the regularity of the beat. In such cases as the lines quoted above (Digby 3-4/Ω2) Fulk argues that, rather than representing a want of skill in the handling of the septenary, the joining of the second syllable of *dede* with the following unstressed word to form a weak position of two unstressed syllables is an example of Old English resolution: 'the survival of a property from earlier native verse.'[548]

Hiatus of *-e* at the end of words also regularly takes place mid-line, as in:

> he scal comen on *euelę* stede
> *butę* god him bi milde. (Digby 51-52/Ω27)

Elision also takes place in mid-line positions where a vowel follows a vowel in sequential syllables, as in *to iwisse* (Digby 76) *deðe oþer* (Digby 211) and *to alesen* (Digby 348). Syncopation of *e* also regularly occurs within single words of the *Conduct of Life* particularly when forming part of the

[547] Marcus uses the text of D for the basis of his critical edition and provides a close examination of the metrical variety found in the text: Hans Marcus, *Das Frühmittelenglische "Poema Morale"*, Palaestra, 194 (Leipzig, 1934)
[548] Robert. D. Fulk, 'Early Middle English evidence for Old English meter: resolution in *Poema Morale*', *Journal of German Linguistics*, 14 (2002), 331-355, p. 351.

inflexional endings *–est*, *-eð*, *-es*, *-ed*, *-en*, and especially when preceding the lowering at the conclusion of the first half-verse:

> Heuene ȝ earðe he *ouersiȩð* || his eȝhen beðful brihte (Digby 140-141/Ω76)
> se witnesse his selue *workȩs* || to aider hine sel driue (Digby 212-213/Ω121)

However, the *e* is usually voiced if it occurs at the end of the second half-line where it is necessary to complete the rhyme and emphasises the end-stop:

> Mest al, þet me likede þo
> nu hit me *mislekeð*
> se þe muchel volȝeð his iwil
> him selue he *biswikeð* (Digby 25-28/Ω13-Ω14)

and

> þo riche weneð siker bien
> þuch walles ȝ þurh *diches*
> se deð his heȝhte on sikere stede
> þet sent hi to heueriche (Digby 77-80/Ω42-Ω43)

The rhyme in the *Conduct of Life* preponderates on unstressed final *–e* or *–en*, as shown in many of the previous examples – the final stress normally being on the penult.

As stated previously, the half-lines and full-lines are broken into grammatical units. The caesura does not separate adjectives or prepositions from their corresponding noun, and there is a clear grammatical break or sentence separation between full-lines that did not exist in Old English verse. It would also appear that each verse pair is separated from the next by content.
The principle of end-rhyme and a clear formulaic lay-out informs the whole of the *Conduct of Life*. Within this lyrical framework, the *Conduct of Life* maintains the cadence formed by the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables as a structural device but not one that had to be adhered to with strict rigidity.

Like much of what is contained within the verse-sermon, the rhyme and metre of the *Conduct of Life* are designed to realize the aims of the work itself. The strong structure of the verse

form compliments the content. The rhyming couplets and definite end-stops coalesce with the author's use of sapiential phrases and maxims. There is an uncomplicated style with a clear intellectual and moral message. Each of the formulaic grammatical units discussed previously encompass, within a framework of accessible rhyme and metre, a clear message for salvation. The verse-sermon can be broken down grammatically, structurally and by theme for the purpose of spiritual edification of its audience. Each of these elements contained within the *Conduct of Life* is designed to complement the others and contribute to the overall purpose of the verse-sermon: the saving of the individual's soul.

Treharne says of the *Conduct of Life* that, 'the regular beat, like that of the *Orrmulum*, makes this an ideal rhythm for oral delivery.'[549] This 'regular beat' creates an oratorical quality through the alternation of trochaic and iambic half-lines within a structure of septenary rhyming couplets. It is, in part, this quality that suggests that the *Conduct of Life* was intended to form part of pastoral materials intended for a preacher to use whilst ministering to his congregation in the vernacular. The positioning of the *Conduct of Life* within two homiliaries, Lambeth and Trinity also supports this.

The seven strong stresses, with a caesura after the fourth, and the end line rhyming couplets, give this verse sermon its performative cadence; they also, however, serve another essential purpose for both preacher and audience - one of memorization. See below:

> Wel ľonge | ich ħab|be chīld |ibō̆n || a wo̅rd|e ént | a đede
> þah ich | bo̅ a | wī̆ntre |ā̆ld || to ȝung | ich ém | on ŕede (Lambeth 3-4/Ω3-Ω4)

The verse-sermon's survival has, in my opinion, more than a little to do with its regular metre and rhyme, as well as its reliance on stock-images of Heaven and Hell. This metrical frame-work housing themes that would be recognised instantaneously by a contemporary audience meant that

[549] Elaine. M. Treharne, *Old and Middle English: An Anthology*, (Malden, MA, 2004), p. 282.

the sermon would have been considered an easy choice for public performance and, as the later manuscripts testify, for private meditation. The dissemination of the text might, under these circumstances, be seen as reflecting how easy the *Conduct of Life* would have been to remember for a preacher, audience and/or devout novice.

The mise-en-page of the *Conduct of Life* in its variant forms might also be regarded as an aide to memorisation and recall. All of the versions of the *Conduct of Life*, except the one found in Lambeth, are written in single column, running down the centre of the folio, with clear line division.[550] This division occurs at the end of the full-line, except in the case of Digby which is presented in half-lines. All of the texts have key initial letters or words rubricated. In the versions present in Trinity and McClean each new line begins with an enlarged capital. This capital is touched red in McClean, and at the end of the line a minim height punctus divides the full-lines. In both the versions of the text found in Egerton the initial letter that begins a new couplet is rubricated. Similarly, in the variant from Digby, the letter which begins a new couplet is touched red and placed outside the written grid. As well as being decorative features of the page, these marks would have served as a way of emphasising the verse form and may also have provided memory aides for the reader. They compliment the divisions made by both rhyme and content and would aid in the remembrance of the verse-sermon. These marks and additions to the page should be seen as of a piece with the menometchnical innovations and visual grammar of the page studied by Mary Carruthers.[551]

In addition to this there is also evidence of mnemonic transmission within at least one witnesses of the *Conduct of Life* that might reflect a wider memorial culture regarding the

[550] The Lambeth version of the *Conduct of Life* is written out as prose in the Old English style of verse. I am thankful to Anthony Edwards for his helpful observations here.
[551] Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 80-121, 221-257.

dissemination of texts during this period.[552] In all but one of the versions of the *Conduct of Life,* the line variations may not be significant enough to contend that transmission and difference was anything other than by redaction, addition and adaptation of an exemplar.[553] McClean, however, is a witness that omits couplets,[554] makes additions to the text not found in any other manuscript[555] and repeatedly presents an order that varies significantly from the other manuscripts.[556]

What is more, the redactor of the *Conduct of Life* in McClean introduces, or copies from an exemplar, considerable verbal changes. This has led Paues to contend that the exemplar of the *Conduct of Life* in McClean or 'a copy not far removed from it',[557] was written from memory; and Hill comes to much the same conclusion, arguing that the text 'appears to have an oral tradition behind it'.[558]

Of these differences many are simple syntactical inversions that might be attributed to adaptation by a scribe or a difference in the exemplar being copied . For example, at line Ω185 McClean writes:

'Hi sculle to heueneriche fare' (McClean 166)

Where all of the remaining manuscripts write a variant of:

'To heueriche hie sulle fare' (Trinity 178).

---

[552] See Mary Swan, 'Ælfric's *Catholic Homlies* in the twelfth century' and Loredana Teresi, 'Mnemonic transmission of Old English texts in the post-Conquest period' in M. Swan and E. M. Treharne (eds.) *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2000).

[553] I am not entirely convinced by this, and the matter may warrant further investigation. A description of the line variations can be found preceding the *Combined Parallel Texts* section of this study and can be traced through that edition of the manuscript witnesses.

[554] McClean has 365 lines as compared to Trinity, the longest version, which has 400.

[555] Lines Ωi-Ωii, Ω106-Ω107 and Ω242-Ω243 are not found in any other manuscript.

[556] The text of McClean demonstrates regular instances of two or more couplets reversed, but in the same context as the other MSS, and also couplets presented in a different context to the other manuscripts. See Appendix 1 to Hill 1977, p. 141, and the Introduction to Combined Parallel Texts in this study.

[557] Anna C. Paues, 'A Newly Discovered Manuscript of the Poema Morale', *Anglia*, 30 (1907), 217-37, p. 225.

[558] Hill 1950, p. 352.

There are also one-word differences that might also be linked to a difference in exemplar or the possibility of 'preference' exhibited by the redactor.[559] For example, McClean writes 'Crist' where all of the remaining manuscripts have 'God' (Ω8), and 'godes riche' where it is a variant of 'heueriche' (Trinity) in all the other manuscripts(Ω66). Differences in word order and variance in line order, including what appear to be one-word substitutions, are not infrequent in the other texts of the *Conduct of Life*, but the volume of the differences is much greater in McClean.

However, there are also examples of more significant verbal difference in the version of the *Conduct of Life* found in McClean that suggest that *Conduct of Life* might have been available to a compiler from memory rather than from a written witness. A few of these are outlined below to illustrate my point. In line Ω183, McClean states, 'To þe dome hi sculle come' (McClean 160) where all the other manuscripts have a variant of 'Alle hie sulle þider cume' (Trinity 176). It is possible that the scribe of McClean felt that there was a need to clarify the text at this point, but it is clear from line Ω180 that the narrator is referring to the event of Judgement.

Line Ω235 is a further example of variance, with minor differences found between all of the texts; however, the general meaning of the line is retained: that the words of wise men (from the previous line) are written in a book that one may read. Nonetheless, in McClean the use of the past participle in 'ihurd rede', a variant not found in any of the other manuscripts, suggests that the audience have heard these words read to them. In Line Ω237 the writing of 'þis þord may [...] beo' instead of 'Ich can ben' (Trinity) is a similar example of a small difference that might indicate a text written from memory. The whole line reads 'Þis þord maẏ aiþer ȝef hi sculle beo lichames 7 saule leche',[560] and has a very different meaning to the other manuscripts. In addition, this variance produces a difficult metre unlikely to have been copied from a written version of the text.

[559] Hill considers the repetition and difference of usage throughout Trinity and both Egerton texts of the words 'mirth' and 'bliss' and considers whether these differences are to do with repetitive substitution based on rhetorical effect in Trinity or later 'preferred variation' by a redactor 'working over the common exemplar of the Egerton texts. (Hill 1977, p. 104).
[560] As compared to 'Ich can ben aiðer ȝief isal lichame 7 sople lache' in Trinity.

Therefore, the variation might be due to adaptation, embellishment or conscious choice, but it might also be due to imperfect recall.

In light of this study and the observations of Hill and Paues, the awkward phrasing of such lines as 'Huat sculle þe come to dome þar angles beþ adradde' (Ω96) and 'Ne mai no man deme þane man also riȝte' (Ω114) might similarly be attributed to the process of, and difficulty in, recall. In addition the line variance and significant omissions cited earlier might now be read in the same way.

This section has contended that the rhyme and metre of the verse-sermon, and the *mise-en-page* of the manuscripts, in combination with the structure and the formulaic grammatical units, made the *Conduct of Life* not only accessible to a listening audience but also a text that could have been memorised. The following section on the sources and analogues in the *Conduct of Life* demonstrates that the verse-sermon utilises gnomic sentiment and sapiential phraseology for the sermon's primary purpose: the salvation of its audience. However, the use of formulaic phrases would not only have made the verse sermon accessible to the audience but would also have served as mnemonic devices within the memorial culture of the post-Conquest period.

The use of 'stock images' and gnomic phrases within the text of the *Conduct of Life* should not only be considered as coming from a store house of material used in the production of the first text of the verse-sermon but should also be seen as being part of a culture of transmission and dissemination that was based on the memorial. In her study of memorial transmission in *Be Heofonwarum*, Teresi argues that the text's formulaic patterns 'act like versatile containers that can be filled with different adjectives and nouns, depending on the homilist's creativity'.[561] The variance within the verse sermon of McClean should also be seen as representing this 'filling' of the 'container' that is the verse-line of the *Conduct of Life.* However, it is not just in McClean where this variance takes place.

[561] Teresi, 'Mnemonic transmission', p. 112.

This modularity could function in a more straightforwardly intertextual way where the sermon drew upon scriptural and apocryphal materials, particularly where representations of the other world or scenes of Judgement were concerned.[562] For example, in lines Ω300 and Ω301 Trinity writes, 'Ne mai non herte hit þenche ne tunge hit ne mai telle | Hþu muchele pine ne hþu fele senden in helle', with little variance in the other manuscripts,[563] except in Jesus, which writes 'Ne maẏ non heorte hit þenche. ne no tunge telle. | hw muche pẏne. hw ueole ueondes. beoþ in þeostre helle'. The presence of the plural noun 'ueondes' and the adjective 'þeostre' changes the reading in this line, although the overall message of the line remains the same. The difference could be accounted for by way of adaptation of a known formula within the framework of the verse-line. Whether this difference occurs as a result of the redactor of Jesus, or a witness that Jesus is based on or not far removed, having changed the line or whether this was originally part of the verse-sermon it is not possible to say. It is also possible that the text of Jesus might have been taken down from memory; while other variants in the text may be read as supporting this view, the evidence is certainly not as compelling as in McClean. What is clear from this and the previous examples is that there is adaptability within the representation of these basic resources for the production of both sermons and homilies during this period.

In a final example of variance from McClean we find the lines 'Suines brede beþ þel suete ⁊ so hi beþ of þe dere | Al to dere he hi beiþ þat ȝefþ þar uore his suere' (Ω152-Ω153). In comparison Trinity writes, 'Spines brade is þel spete spo is of þilde diere. | Ac al to diere he hit abuið þe ȝiefð þar for his spiere' with little variation in the other manuscripts. The difference in the second half-line of Ω153 in McClean, once again, suggests that it was possibly taken down from memory. The themes are retained within the grammatical units of the line and half-line with the overall meaning still

[562] Teresi's study discusses how the text of *Be Heofonwarum* might have been made up from a 'common mnemonic repertoire' of the late Old English period and cites the apocryphal book of the *Visio Sancti Pauli* as one such source that might have contributed to this. Significantly, the *Visio Sancti Pauli* is a text that the following section, on the themes present within the text of the *Conduct of Life,* demonstrates had an influence upon the verse-sermon. (Teresi, 'Mnemonic transmission', p.114)
[563] This line is not present in either McClean or Lambeth.

retained (remembered) but the difference has an effect on the metre that is unlikely to have been present in the original written text. This line is seen by Hill as having 'special significance for a twelfth-century audience',[564] and represents a maxim that reflects contemporary concerns.

Whether through its gnomic appeal, its social valence, or its suitedness to the mobile forms of contemporary memorial culture – or perhaps a combination of these reasons – the same couplet appears in two other contemporary manuscripts. On folio 93[r] of Maidstone Museum MS A 13 the version of *The Proverbs of Alfred* includes two lines from the *Conduct of Life*,[565] close to the version found in the Lambeth manuscript, in a different hand, situated between the two inner of the three columns of the text: 'Spines brede is Spiþe Spete |so is pilde dure | al to dure he it a bihþ | Þe 3ifh þer fore is Spere'. Two further examples can be found incorporated into Latin sermons and written in the same hand. The first is found within column 2 of the inner margin of folio 46[v] and reads 'Swithe Swete is swines brede | so is of pilde dere | Al to dure þe Brede | he buth þe þift midt his owere'. The final occurrence forms part of the Latin text on folio 253[r], in column 1 and is part of the incipit: 'Swþe | swete is swines brede &c'.

These instances of lines found from the *Conduct of Life* further evidence the wealth of material that was available to scribes and compilers from memory in the post-Conquest period. In a discussion of the marginal re-use of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* within twelfth-century texts, Swan argues that 'snippets' from the homilies 'look more like the sort of snatches of memorable narrative and gnomic statement easily stored in the memory and recalled."[566] This description might also be easily applied to the lines found within Maidstone MS A 13. The variance within the versions of the line written in the same hand and within the same manuscripts also corroborates the contention that

[564] Hill states that '[t]he strict laws of the King's Forest, within whose boundaries whole villages were included, protected wild boar as well as venison, and the forests, the forest laws and the behaviour of the forest officals were a constant source of trouble. The relief given in the Forest Charter, which was issued in 1217, after the succession of Henry III, that "in future no one shall lose life or limb for our venison", (n.96. pp. 102, 104, 110,113), indicates that this proverbial couplet had a bitter origin.' (Hill 1977, p. 122).
[565] Maidstone Museum MS A 13, is a manuscript written in the hands of several s.xiii scribes. It has 252 leaves with mostly Latin contents. The manuscript, however shares *The Proverbs of Alfred* and *Long Life* with Oxford, Jesus College 29. See Betty Hill 'A Couplet from the *Conduct of Life* in Maidstone MS A 13', *Notes and Queries* 50 (2003), p. 377.
[566] Swan, 'Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*', p. 81.

the lines were often seen as, to use Teresi's terminology once again, 'versatile containers'; the sentiment of the line is remembered, *memoria ad res*, if the whole line is not memorised/recalled exactly.[567] This can be evidenced further by the presence of a version of the same line in another marginal gloss to a Latin sermon collection in Durham University Library, Cosin V.III.2 s.xiii^{in}, where at folio 127va the line is written 'suete bet swines brede ant of wilde dere. harde ye hus abiet hat haruore gift hiss swire.'[568] While there is no evidence that these lines were memorised or copied (with adaptation) from the *Conduct of Life*, it is likely that the composer of the verse-sermon new of these lines and inserted them into his text. It demonstrates that lines of couplets, found in the *Conduct of Life*, were circulating independently of the verse-sermon at this time and that, from the evidence, they should be considered as being part of a text hoard that could be called upon.

A final example of a couplet from the *Conduct of Life* circulating independently is found in London, British Library, Royal 7 C. s.xi^{1} where continuous interlinear gloss in English (s.xi^{med}) are found to the Defensor's *Liber scintillarum*. At the end of the *Liber Scintillarum* there are a number of scribbles on what was originally a blank page (folio 106^{v}). One of these scribbles, partly erased, corresponds to line Ω18-Ω19 and reads, 'elde me is bistolen on er [.....] Ne mæȝ ic ȝeseo before me [.....]'. A comparison with the corresponding lines found in the other manuscripts of the *Conduct of Life* gives no evidence that this was anything other than a close copy of a witness to the verse-sermon. It does, however, give an indication of the dissemination of the *Conduct of Life* and evidences the idea that end-rhymed couplets of the text were sometimes seen as independent units that could easily be removed from their context within the verse-sermon and used elsewhere.

As has been made explicit previously in this study, both the rhyme and metre of the *Conduct* would have made it ideal for oral delivery and would have aided remembrance for both preacher and audience. The strong divisions of half-line, full-line and rhymed couplet would not

[567] For the distinction between *memoria ad res* and *memoria ad verba*, see Carruthers, *The Book of Memory,* p. 86.
[568] Reproduced in Margaret Laing, *Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval English* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 121.

only aid performance but also ensure that a listening audience could access applicable parts if not the whole.

Sources and Analogues

Introduction

Written in the first person, the *Conduct of Life* represents the experiences and anxieties of an old man as he looks back upon his life and prepares for death. It contains themes reflective of earlier English literary and hortatory texts, such as the *ubi sunt*? motif, confessional topoi, didactic admonition, and metaphorical self-mortification. In addition, it draws on images of the Harrowing of Hell, of the Last Judgement and of Heaven and Hell that are not only representative of earlier visionary literature and literary tours of the otherworld but also draw upon a living tradition of homiletic prose and verse in the later Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman periods in England.

The Lament of the Old Man

The accounts of Heaven and Hell in *the Conduct of Life* [232-302/Ω239-Ω313 and 355-96/Ω367-Ω409 respectively] draw, as Betty Hill notes, on a 'large body' of Latin and English vision literature.[569] That such vision literature continued to be well employed, and even flourished, in the later Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman periods is well attested, although the legitimacy of such accounts of the other world has always been contentious amongst Church writers. Arguably, the most prominent account from this period is the *Visio Sancti Pauli*, possibly the most influential of the early Christian apocalypses other than the canonical book of Revelation.[570] Although the *Conduct of Life* does not draw directly upon the *Visio*, the *Visio* nonetheless functions as a convenient key by which to understand the generic and thematic constituents of the *Conduct of Life*, as a central source text of the tradition upon which the *Conduct* draws, and as an index to the '

[569] Betty Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century 'Conduct of Life', Formerly the 'Poema Morale' or 'a Moral Ode'', *Leeds Studies in English*, 9 (1977), 97-145, p. 120

[570] Casey contends that '[a]mong the many early Christian apocalypses none, except the canonical Revelation, exercised so important an influence on medieval literature and thought as the Apocalypse of Paul'. (R. P. Casey, 'The Apocalypse of Paul', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 34 (1933), 1-32, p. 1).

stock themes' or motifs that Hill identifies as distinguishing the genre. [571] Although it circulated widely in early long Latin and Greek forms and, according to Origen, found acceptance by the Church,[572] the *Visio* was discredited by Augustine; his objection to it was in part due to the *Visio*'s attempt to draw authority from 2 Corinthians, which states that such revelations are forbidden. Yet the *Visio*'s influence can still be found in the work of both the Blickling Homilist and Wulfstan, both of whom appear to know one of the long versions of the text and used it as if it were scripture.[573]

Ælfric also shows an awareness of the *Visio* but raises the same objections as Augustine.[574] However, while Ælfric challenged the *Visio*, and its foundation upon 2 Corinthians 12: 2-4, he did accept other visions, and in his *Catholic Homilies* he offers the vision of Fursey as an alternative and as the first of many exempla on the afterlife.[575] While some visions of the afterlife were discredited, the corpus as a whole contributed to a growing discussion as to what happened to body and soul at the time of death and in the post-mortem world. Foxhall-Forbes states:

> The incorporation of these kinds of visions into Aelfric's own careful explanation of the struggle at death indicates the extent to which he took for granted that this belief was part of orthodox Christian theology, and although these visions stood apart from sacred Scripture, clearly not all visions were suspect if they had significant authority.[576]

During the later Anglo-Saxon period and in the post-Conquest period, shorter Latin redactions of the *Visio* were also produced, which reshaped the older materials and added numerous interpolations. Significantly, nearly half of the extant manuscripts of these redactions are English, suggesting a particular popularity for the *Visio* in England.[577] Of these, it is Redaction iv that was

[571] Hill, 'The twelfth-century "Conduct of Life"', p. 119
[572] Martha Himmelfarb, *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature*, (Philadelphia, 1985), p. 18.
[573] See Theodore Silverstein, *Visio Sancti Pauli: The History of the Apocalypse in Latin together with Nine Texts* (London, 1935), pp. 7-9.
[574] Silverstein, *Visio Sancti Pauli,* pp, 7-9.
[575] Helen Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth in Anglo-Saxon England: Theology and Society in an Age of Faith* (Farnham, Ashgate, 2013), pp. 118-119.
[576] Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth in Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 120.
[577] Silverstein, *Visio Sancti Pauli*, p. 10.

the most popular and influential and which, it has been claimed, was formed in the British Isles under Celtic influence.[578] Significantly, a homily that draws on this redaction circulated with the *Conduct of Life*, as it is present in the Lambeth Homilies under the title 'In Diebus Dominicis'.

Although, as we will see, the similarities between the descriptions of the afterlife in the *Conduct of Life* and earlier and contemporaneous visionary literature yield rich comparisons through close analysis, the narrative technique of the *Conduct of Life* does not conform to the regular formula for visionary portrayals of the other world. Although it does have a first-person narrator who acts as a guide for the audience and urges them to repentance, he is at pains to state that he has never visited Hell: 'Nafre an helle Ich ne cam, ne cumen Ich þar ne reche' [Never in hell came I, nor care I to come to that place] (225/Ω232). The narrator is not a visionary, and nor is he re-telling the narrative of a visionary, as is necessarily part of the genre; he does show, however, on a number of occasions, knowledge of the traditions of visionaries, and even accepts their legitimacy and authority.[579] A familiarity with visionary texts or with visionary culture, on the part of both the narrator and (possibly more importantly) his audiences, is clear from line 141/Ω148, where he gives authority to what he is saying through those who have preceded him: 'Þat habbed isaid þe come þanne þe it wiste mid iwisse' [Those that have come from that place have said this; they knew it most certainly], with a literary tradition clearly highlighted later in the text when the narrator states 'Þeih Ich wille seggen eow þat wise men us saden | And a boc hit is write þar me hit mai rade' [Though I will say to you what wise men told us | And in a book it is written, where one may read it] (227-228/Ω234-Ω235).

Although the narrator in the *Conduct of Life* is not himself a visionary, his inclusion in the sermon does function as a pedagogic and hortatory device, similar to that of the visionary in the corpus of literature that he deliberately calls upon to give his warnings authority, and to teach the

[578] Charles D. Wright, *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 109.
[579] See also, Arnold Barel Van Os, *Religious Visions: The Development of the Eschatological Elements in Mediaeval English Religious Literature* (Amsterdam, 1932), p. 137.

penitential way by example and by foregrounding his own declining powers. At the beginning of the sermon the old man tells the audience that 'wel longe' [too long] has he been childlike in 'worde and a dade' [words and in deeds] (3/Ω3). Ideas of being a 'child' (3/Ω3), committing 'fele ȝeunge dede' [many childish deeds] (10/Ω10) or of sinful acts that befall to 'chilce' [childishness] (7/Ω7) are repetitive themes within the opening of the sermon. Throughout the text this mental state is juxtaposed against the decline of the body. The struggle between the spiritual and the physical is a continuous one for the narrator of the sermon. It is balanced neatly across the caesura of line 4/Ω4 which states: 'Þeih Ich bie a winter eald, to jung Ich am on rade.' [Though I am old in years, I am too young in wisdom.] For him age is a very real physical manifestation and one, it would seem, that it is relative to his spiritual status. In the lines 15-18/Ω16-Ω19 the narrator states:

> Ich mihte habben bet idon, hadde Ich þo iselðe;
> Nu Ich wolde, ac Ich ne mai, for elde and for unhalðe.
> Elde me is bistolen on ar Ich hit iwiste
> Ne mai Ich isien bifore me for smeche ne for miste. (15-18/Ω16-Ω19)
> [I might have done better, had I the discretion;
> Now I would, but I am unable through old age and ill-health.
> Old age is stolen upon me before I knew it,
> I may not see before me for smoke nor for mist.]

The above lines are suggestive, as is much of the remainder of the verse sermon, of another group of Christian writings extant in this period, whose themes ultimately deal with mutability and death and which at their extreme manifest themselves in the topoi of *memento mori* and *contemptus mundi*.[580]

The concerns about death, transience and contempt for this world, found in the *Conduct of Life*, are prominent in the twelfth-century determination for penitential self-awareness that asserted itself not only in Church writings but in a set of didactic texts that focused on the misery of this life. Two of the most influential Latin tracts that make use of *contemptus mundi* during this period are

[580] The influence of the *memento mori* and *contemptus mundi* topoi on the Middle English homiletic tradition is discussed in detail in the chapter on 'The Middle English Homiletic Poems on Death' in Takami Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory in Middle English Didactic Poetry* (Cambridge, 1997), 112-146

the pseudo-Bernardian *Meditationes piissimae de cognitione humanae conditionis* and Pope Innocent III's *De miseria condicionis humane* (1195). Such meditations 'were repeatedly quarried for sermons, reworked into Latin poems and translated into vernacular exhortations of the bleakest and minatory kind.'[581] Their influence on contemporary and later Middle English Lyrics is well attested,[582] and gives further historical context to the writing of the *Conduct of Life*, which, although it does not rely directly on either text, also places transience, a fear of death, contempt for this world and the need for a quick repentance at its didactic core. The narrator states that:

> Deað cam in þis middenærd þurh ealde deueles onde,
> And senne and sorezze and iswinch a watere and londe.
> Vre foremes faderes gult we abugeð alle,
> Al his ofsprung after him in harem is biualle,
> Þurst and hunger, chele and hete and alle unhalðe;
> Þurh deað cam in þis middeneard and oðer unisalðe (195-200/Ω202-Ω207)
> [Death came into this earth through the old devil's hand,
> And sin and sorrow, and toil on water and on land.
> We all suffer for our first father's guilt,
> All his offspring after him have fallen into harm,
> Thirst and hunger, cold and heat, old age and ill-health;
> Through him death came into this earth and other miseries]

The 'unisalðe' [miseries] (200/Ω207) described in this short section from the *Conduct of Life*, and the assignment of this suffering to 'Alle þo þe sprunge beð of Adam and of Eue' [All those who have sprung of Adam and of Eve] (175/Ω182) for 'Vre foremes faderes gult' [For our first father's guilt] (197/Ω204), is a well-known didactic formula intended to demonstrate the impotence of the individual within this earthly life. It is found throughout medieval penitential and homiletic literature, with multiple examples also found in both the Trinity and Lambeth Homilies. For example, in *De Sancto Andrea* from Trinity it is stated that 'on þisse liue we beð on balfulle swinche for adames gulte.' [In this life we are in sorrowful toil for Adam's guilt],[583] and in Lambeth's 'Hic

[581] Vincent Gillespie, 'Moral and Penitential Lyrics' in Thomas G. Duncan (ed.), *A Companion to the Middle English Lyric*, (Cambridge, 2005), 68-95, p. 70.
[582] See Gillespie, 'Moral and Penitential Lyrics', p. 70ff and Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 114ff
[583] Richard Morris, *Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century from the Unique Ms. B. 14. 52. in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge*, Early English Text Society o.s. 53 (London, 1873), p. 181.

Dicendum est de Quadragesima' it is said of the sinner who waits until he is old or sick before he repents that, 'Þus þe deofel wule bilesnien þe wreche. *and* ec we ileueð to soþe alswa redliche swa adam ure eldre feder us forgulte erest in to helle.' [Thus the devil will destroy the wretch, and that, we will believe assuredly, as quickly as Adam our forefather first doomed us by his trespass to hell].[584]

In addition, it is also a device that is developed and exploited in later medieval lyrics, most notably, *Lullay, lullay, litel child, why wepestou so sore?* , in which the defencelessness of a child against the suffering of the world and the consequences of original sin are communicated within the words of a mother:

> Deth shal comen with a blast
> out of a well dim horn,
> Adames kin adoun to cast –
> himself hath don beforn.
> Lullay, lullay, litel child,
> so we thee worth Adam,
> In the lond of paradis,
> through wikkednes of Satan. (53-60)
>]

Gillespie says of these lines that, 'the pity, sorrow and fear generated by such a poem provided the affective focal point for the didactic message that it is never too soon to start preparing for and thinking about the Last Things.'[585] In the *Conduct of Life* an emphasis is similarly placed, throughout the sermon, on the immediacy of the need to repent, most urgently in the lines:

> Þanne þe deað is at þe dure, wel late he biddeð ore;
> Wel late he lateð euel werc þan he hit ne mai don no more. (127-28/Ω132-Ω133)
> [When death is at the door, too late he prays for forgiveness;
> Too late he hates evil work when he may not to do it anymore.]

The *Conduct of Life*, consequently, shares many of the characteristics and themes that are found in contemporary and later Middle English lyrics on death, summarized by Matsuda in the following quotation:

---

[584] Morris, *Old English Homilies,* p. 23.
[585] Gillespie, 'Moral and Penitential Lyrics', 72

> They are hortatory poems with a homiletic function of making an audience realise the uncomfortable reality of ill-prepared death and the dreadful consequences of leading a sinful life. They draw the attention of the audience to various aspects of the precarious condition of man in this world, including the vileness of the body, the misery of the grave, the deceptiveness of the world, the mutability of life, the miserable birth of man, the certainty of death, and the dread of hell and the Last Judgement, reiterating all too common calls to swift repentance. For that reason, there is little room for philosophical reflection on the meaning of death.[586]

Matsuda goes on to say of the Middle English lyrics on death that 'the insignificance and vanity of worldly achievement can be evoked in the form of rhetorical questioning by the *ubi sunt* and *quid profuit* formulae'.[587] The narrator of the *Conduct of Life* equally emphasises the transience of earthly belongings through such questioning: 'Hwat sulle we beren us biforen, mid hwan sulle we iqueme, | We þe nafre god ne duden, þan hevenliche Deme?' [What shall we bear before us, with what shall we please (God), | We that never did good, to (please) the heavenly Judge?] (95-96/Ω98-Ω99). The author's intention is to highlight the need for individual repentance and his emphasis has always been on the ineffectual benefits of the wealth of this world. The above quotation is part of a movement in this sequence that is successful in portraying man's weakness when faced with the scene of Judgement.[588] The author achieves this through a series of rhetorical questions in which his use of the first person plural situates him within the general throng:

> Wi hwat sal us to rade
> We þe brekeð Godes has and gulteð swo ilome?
> Hwat sulle we seggen oðer don at þe muchele dome,
> We þe luueden unriht and euel lif ladden?
> Hwat sulle we seggen oðer don þar ængles beð ofdradde? (90-94/Ω92-Ω96)
> [Alas, what shall save us
> We who break God's behests and sin so often?
> What shall we say or do at the great doom,

[586] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 113.
[587] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, pp. 113-14.
[588] A similar contention is also made by Hill, 'The twelfth-century "Conduct of Life"', p. 118.

We who loved unright, and evil life led?
What shall we say or do, when the angels shall be in dread?']

He then moves the audience to a state of repentance in the subsequent lines by removing any other rational choice, invoking the ever-present shadow of death in order to emphasize once again the need for immediate repentance: 'Ac al his lif sal ben teald after his endinge. | ȝief þe endinge is god al hit is god and euel ȝief euel is þe ende.' [But all his life shall be judged after his ending (death); | If his end is good it is all good, and evil if evil is the end.] (120-121/Ω125-Ω126).

From the very first couplet of the *Conduct of Life*,[589] the certainty of death, the false vanity of this world and the need for repentance in view of the infernal consequences described later in the sermon, are ever-present. The first 150 lines of the *Conduct of Life*, therefore, have much in common with the loose narrative framework set up in medieval lyrics on death, such as the lament of the old man or a warning from the dead or from the figure of death himself, and although at first penitential in tone, becomes – much like the lyrics – a more general voice of warning.[590]

The author of the *Conduct of Life* creates a narratorial persona that is easily accessible to a listening audience (1-4/Ω1-Ω4): a visual reminder of what is at stake, an aged everyman figure lamenting his misspent youth and regretting his delay in repentance. As in the visionary material, widespread during the period, to which the descriptions of the otherworld in the *Conduct of Life* are clearly indebted – as will be shown later in this introduction – the narrator, like the visionary, acts as a guide to the audience, bringing them to a point of recognition and urging them to repent before it is too late (100/Ω103).

The narrator, like the figure of the old man in the medieval Laments, makes interjections throughout the sermon, personalising the narrative and creating a dialogue – frequently admonitory – with his audience. This dialogue endows the sermon with a performative quality, present not only

[589] 'Ich am nu elder þan Ich was a wintre and a lore, | Ich wealde more þan Ich dude, mi wit oh to be more' [I am now older in years and in learning, | I wield more than I did, my wit ought to be more.]
[590] See Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 118.

in the cadence and rhythm of its septenary rhyming couplets but also in the role of the preacher as guide, advocate and example.

Soul and Body

As the previous example demonstrates, the *Conduct of Life* is primarily concerned with the state of the soul before death as a determining factor in the destination of the soul post-mortem, and yet the focus of the audience, as they look upon the preacher or contemplate the words of the sermon, must necessarily be on the corporeal. Before them they have an individual – a physical presence if we accept the premise of the *Conduct of Life* as a text for preaching, and if not a purely figurative one – whose lament for his own spiritual neglect reflects his physical degeneration. For, he says, 'Þeih Ich bie a winter eald, to jung Ich am on rade' [Though I am old in years, I am too young in wisdom.] (4/Ω4); he acknowledges that he could have done more, and yet 'Nu Ich wolde, ac Ich ne mai for elde and for unhalðe' [Now I would, but I am unable through old age and ill-health.] (16/Ω 17). The narrator reminds us through his own person that all mankind is born astride the grave and that life is fleeting; however, this is coupled with an exhortation to immediate repentance and a good end to life as 'al his lif sal ben teald after his endinge. | ȝief þe endinge is god al hit is god and euel ȝief euel is þe ende' [all his life shall be judged after his ending (death); | If his end is good it is all good, and evil if evil is the end.] (120-21/Ω125-Ω126)

This emphasis on the body is a constant in the *Conduct of Life*, not only in the sections concerning the narrator but also in the sections concerning Hell and Heaven - as will be seen. In comparison, the *Conduct of Life* only makes two direct references to the soul. The first is in line 306/Ω317, where he states 'Ich can ben aiðer, ȝief Ich sal, lichame and sowle lache' [I can be both, if I am allowed, the body's and soul's leech]; and the last is in the final exhortation of the sermon in which he claims that God will bring those who are deserving to heavenly bliss: 'Þane he ure sowle

unbint of lichamliche bende' [When he our souls unbinds from the body's bonds] (398/Ω415). Significantly, both of these lines can also be read as making direct references to the body.

First, then, the preacher claims that he can, if permitted, be a leech for both the body and the soul. Hill argues that this line is 'a reference to the priest's power to save by instruction'.[591] This is one of only a few points at which the narrator interrupts the sermon and returns to the first person. It is seen by Hall as an indication that the writer might have been 'a priest with some knowledge of medicine.'[592] While this may be the case, the evidence is very limited and is based only on this line and on the earlier line concerning blindness. It is more likely that the author is using the metaphor of the 'lache' to reiterate his role as a preacher, to break the flow and bring the audience back to the immediacy of their surroundings as well as emphasizing his own redemptive function.

The use of the leech, or physician, for body or soul, or both, is a common formula in homiletic texts from this period. It is often applied to Christ himself. In 'In Die Natalis Domini' from Trinity, for example Christ is described as 'alre lechene leche. þe co*m* to helen þe wundes. þe þe deuel hadde on mancun broht' [the physician of all physicians, who came to heal the wounds that the devil had brought upon mankind].[593]

However, in *In Quadragesima* [Dominica II] from Trinity it is 'Þe heuenliche leche seinte poul' [The heavenly physician St. Paul] who 'nimeð geme of ure saule sicnesse.' [taketh heed of our soul's sickness],[594] and in *On Lofsong of ure Lefdi* it is 'Swete leafdi seinte marie' [Sweet Lady Saint Mary] who 'beo mi leche' [be my leech].[595] There are further examples in both Trinity and Lambeth

[591] Hill, 'The twelfth-century "Conduct of Life"', p. 118.
[592] Joseph. Hall (ed.), *Selections from Early Middle English: 1130-1250: Part Two: Notes* (Oxford, 1920), p. 349.
[593] Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 41. See also *The passion of our Lord* in Jesus (Morris 1872, p. 39): 'Swich leche bi-vore hym. ne com her neuer non' [There was never such a leech as he (Christ)], and *On Ureisun of oure Lourede* in Lambeth (Morris 1867, p. 187):

> min heoueneliche leche. þet makedest us of þi seolf se miti medicine. iblesed beo þu euer as mi trusts is þer to. hit beo mi lechunge hit beo mi bote.
> [My heavenly leech (physician), that for us makest of thyself so mighty a medicine, blessed be thou for ever! As my trust is thereto, let it be my healing, let it be my remedy.]

[594] Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 77.
[595] Morris 1867, p. 205.

where it is the priest who acts as leech or physician, usually in exhortations to confession. In *De confessione* from Trinity it is stated that:

> Ure saule is sore forwunded. for ech sẏnne is þe saule wunde. *and* p*r*est is saulene leche. […] for no man ne mai sẏnnes beten er þanne he hem forlete. *and* shewe em his p*r*est. *and* nime shrifte þeroffe.
> [Our soul is sorely wounded; for every sin the soul's wound; and the priest is a physician of souls; […] for no man may repent of his sins before he has foresaken them and has shown them to his priest and has been shriven thereof].[596]

The previous examples, taken from contemporaneous homilies, focus on the state of the soul by using language normally associated with the body, and the role of confession by the priest in achieving salvation. However, in the *Conduct of Life*, the redemption of both the body and the soul do appear to be related and almost inseparable, in what might be seen as the preacher's ability to reverse the parallelism of bodily and spiritual degeneration described earlier.

In line 398/Ω415, however, the realization of heaven post-mortem can only be accomplished, as far as the *Conduct of Life* is concerned, by the unbinding of the soul from the bonds of the body. According to the narrator, this can only be achieved by God himself. The soul/body dualism neatly (or not so neatly) presented in both of these lines - one of them advocating a mutual relationship in this world and the other a need, ultimately, for separation in the next - is a

---

[596] Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 57. See also *Hic Dicendum est de Quadragesima* (Morris 1867, p. 23) in Lambeth:

> Ne þe preost þe ne mei scrife bute þu wulle heo alforleten. Hu mei þe leche þe lechnien þa hwile þet iren sticat in þine wunde. Nefre.
> [The priest may not shrive thee, unless thou wilt entirely forsake thy sins. How may the physician heal thee whilst the iron sticketh in thy wound?]

and *De Natale Domini* (Morris 1867, 83) in Lambeth:

> Nu bihoueð þe forwu*n*ded wreche þet he habbe leche. we boð forwu*n*ded us bi-houed leche. Adam wes ilechned þurh god almihti solf. *and* us bi-houeð leche þurh p*r*estes muð. he weis his wunde mid wine. hwet is win in wunde ? Win makeð wunde smerte. Ah þe smertinge clenseð þe wu*n*de ? swa þ*e*t ho ne scal of þere wunde habbe nan oðer uuel. Al so hali sc*r*ift bið in mine ure wu*n*de hwan we scale festen. *and* fleis bileuen *and* ,uchel of ure [mine] wille for ure [mine] wrechede. Hwet is þ*e*t oli ? Oli haueð huppen him lihtnesse *and* softnesse *and* hele. Alse þu scalt habben hwe*n*ne þu hauest idon þi sc*r*ift of þine misdede þenne þu scalt habbe lihtnesse *and* softnesse *and* hele.
> [Now it behoveth the wounded wretch to have a physician (leech). We are wounded and stand in need of a leech. Adam was healed through God Almighty himself, and it behoveth us to be healed through the priest's mouth. He washed his wounds with wine. What is wine in a wound? Wine maketh the wound smart, but the smarting cleanseth the wound, so that it receives no further injury. Just so holy shrift shall be in our wounds when we fast and renounce the flesh and much of our will (lusts) on account of our sins. What is oil? Oil hath in itself the properties of lightness and softness and healing. Such shalt thou have when thou hast performed thy shrift of thy misdeeds, then shalt thou have lightness and softness and healing.]

complex area of theology which, as will be demonstrated, was heavily discussed and contested during the post-Conquest period. There are many examples within post-Conquest literature where the soul decries the body for its actions in life, suggesting that the body is acting against the helpless soul's desires. For example, in *Sinners Beware*, also present in Jesus, the narrator tells his audiences how the damned soul curses the body for all of its suffering:

> Þe saule seyþ to þe lychome.
> Acursed wurþe þi nome.
> Þin heaued *and* þin heorte.
> Þu vs hauest iwroht þes schome.
> And alle þene eche grome.
> Vs schal eu*er* smerte. (331-336)[597]
> [The soul says to the body,
> 'Accursed be thy name,
> your head and your heart.
> You have caused us this shame
> and all this eternal sorrow.
> We shall forever suffer'.]

A similar curse by the soul of the damned on the body that bore it in this life is found in *Death*, also from Jesus:[598]

> Þenne seyþ þe saule.
> wiþ sorie chere.
> Away þu wrecche fole baly.
> nv þu lyst on bere.
> Ich schal habbe for þe.
> feondes to i-vere.
> Away þat þu eure.
> to monne ischape were. (81-88)[599]
> [Then says the soul
> with a sorrowful expression,
> 'Away you miserable, foolish evil doer.
> Now you lie in your grave,
> I shall have because of you
> devils as companions.
> Away, that you ever
> wore the shape of a man'].

[597] Morris 1872, p. 83.
[598] An item Jesus shares with Cotton MS. Caligula A ix
[599] Morris 1872, p. 173.

In both Trinity and Lambeth we can find further laments, and also praise, made by the soul towards the body. Perhaps the most notable example can be found in *Sancto Andrea*, from Trinity, which contains the riposte of the soul to both the 'righteous body' to whom 'wo beð þe sowle þanne hie him shal forleten' [sorrowful shall the soul be when she must leave it], and the 'evil body' who ' loð is heo þe sowle. *and* hire þuncheð lang ⁊ þat hie on hi*m* bileueð' [loathsome is it to the soul, and it appears long for her to remain in it].[600] The section on the 'evil body' continues with a shocking lament against the body by the soul, which says:

> Aweilewei þu fule hold þ*at* ich auere was to be iteied. long habbe ich on þe wuned. swo wo is me þe hwile. for al þ*at* me was leof ⁊ hit was þe loð. þu ware a sele gief ich was wroð. To gode þu ware slau *and* let. *and* to euele spac *and* hwat. Al þ*at* good het. þe þuht[e] andsete. þ*at* forbode þe þuhte swete. Iuele wurmes mote þe chewe ⁊ swo we þe be þ*at* tu me [ne] rewe. for þine gulte ishal nu to pine. rotie mote þu to time.
> [Alas! thou foul abode, that I was ever tied to thee. Long have I dwelt in thee, and woe betide me the while! For all that was dear to me was distasteful to thee. Thou wast joyful if I was angry; thou wast slow and slack to [do what was] good, but quick and eager to [do] evil. All that God enjoined appeared hateful to thee, and what he prohibited appeared sweet to thee. May evil worms gnaw thee; so woe be to thee that thou didst not pity me; for thy faults I must now go into torment; mayest thou rot for ever!]

In this passage it is unequivocally the body that has brought the soul to this point with such devastating consequences; however, in praising the 'righteous body' the soul says 'þu ware me lastful on alle þo þe ich wolde. we ware onmode godes wille to done' [thou wert obedient to me in all that I wished. We were of one mind to do God's will]. These lines suggest, first, a constant conflict between the soul and body that cannot be simplified by presuming that the body is acting autonomously; and second, through the adjective 'lastful', that the soul has the ability to influence the actions of the body.

With this in mind, it is important to turn to scriptural authority in discussing this relationship. In Galatians 5: 16-17, Paul states that:

[600] Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 183.

> dico autem spiritu ambulate et desiderium carnis non perficietis | caro enim concupiscit adversus spiritum spiritus autem adversus carnem haec enim invicem adversantur ut non quaecumque vultis illa faciatis
> [I say then, walk in the spirit and you shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. | For the flesh lusteth against the spirit: and the spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary one to another: so that you do not the things you would.]

Paul continues by listing 'the works of the flesh', which include fornication, uncleanliness, wrath, quarrels, murders and drunkenness. He then tells of the 'fruit of the spirit' which includes charity, peace, goodness, mildness and chastity. Once again, on first reading it may seem that responsibility for all flagitious acts lies with the body but, on closer inspection, Verse 17 suggests that the spirit has at least the ability and moreover the responsibility to fight against the sins of the flesh.

The idea of culpability, or mutual responsibility, is further set out by Augustine, who was considered an influential guide to doctrinal practice during this period; he states in *City of God*, Book XIV, Chapter 3, that:

> Quod si quisquam dicit carnem causam esse in malis moribus quorumcumque vitiorum eo quod anima carne affecta sic vivit, profecto non universam hominis naturam diligenter advertit.
> [Now someone may contend that the flesh is the cause of every sort of vice in the case of bad morals on the ground that it is the influence of the flesh on the soul that makes the soul lead that kind of life. But if he does, surely he has not seriously considered the whole of man's natural being].[601]

For, according to Augustine, the reality is quite different:

> Nam corruptio coporis, quae adgravat animan, non peccati primi est causa, sed poena, nec caro corruptibilis animam peccatricem, sed anima peccatrix fecit esse corruptibilem carnem.
> [For the body's decay, which weighs down the soul, is not the cause of the first sin but the punishment for it, nor is it the flesh, which is subject to decay, that makes the soul sinful; it is the sinful soul that makes the flesh subject to decay].[602]

[601] Augustine, *City of God*, Volume IV: Books 12-15, trans. Philip Levine (Cambridge, MA, 1966), pp. 268-269.
[602] Augustine, *City of God*, pp. 270-271.

Suzannah Biernoff states that 'it is evident from Augustine's terminology that flesh refers to a condition of the mind or soul, as well as to a type of corporeal motivation or appetite.'[603] For Augustine, body and soul were not merely binary, but part of a divided self that coexisted as the 'inner' and 'outer' man; and this formula 'was widely used throughout the Middle Ages to evoke a sense of the self, fractured and polarised by sin.'[604] For example, to return to *On Lofsong of Ure Lefdi*, in Cotton Ms. Nero A xiv, the sinner lists his sins - which might be considered to be of both a physical and a spiritual nature – before concluding that he has:

> mid flesches fulðe ifuled me. þus ich am lodliche i-hurt ine licame. *and* ine soule ⁊ wið alle cunnes sunnen. for þauh þet werc nere I þe bodie ⁊ þe wil was in þe heorte.
> [with the filth of the flesh defiled myself. Thus I am loathsomely hurt in body and in soul with sins of all kinds; for though the work was not in the body the will was in the heart.]

For Augustine, and the later medieval thinkers influenced by his teachings, 'flesh' was more than just the body's physical existence; the idea of 'flesh' as something other than the simply material existence of matter complicates any dualistic idea of Body and Soul. For example, for the Cistercian St Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux from 1115 to 1153, the body is not necessarily deleterious, although he sometimes refers to it as a prison or tomb;[605] it is sin that is evil and the responsibility for this lies in the will (part of the soul).[606] However, as Caroline Walker Bynum argues, Bernard does see 'the change to which the body is subject [as] ... primarily negative: of itself body is more often subject to decay than to positive transformation,'[607] an idea borne out in the *Conduct of Life*, where the decline of the body ultimately cannot be halted even if the narrator had 'iselðe' [discretion] (15/Ω16), as 'Elde me is bistolen on ar Ich hit iwiste' [Old age is stolen upon me before I

[603] Suzannah Biernhoff, *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages* (Basingstoke, 2002), 23
[604] Suzannah Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages* (Farnham, 2002), p. 23.
[605] A similar idea of the imprisoned soul can be found in 'Discourse on Psalm cxix. 110': '*and* þe lichame þe sholde ben þe soule hihtliche bure. makeð hire to ateliche q*uarte*rne. [and he maketh the the body, that ought to be the soul's joyous chamber a horrible prison for her] (Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 213).
[606] Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336* (New York, 1995), p. 173.
[607] Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, p. 173.

knew it] (17/Ω18). The audience is, once again, returned to an inescapable movement toward the grave.

Guerric of Igny, the twelfth-century Cistercian Abbot,[608] states that 'we dwell to be sure in houses of clay, but what are of clay by reason of their material, come to be ivory through the virtue of continence.'[609] The body as 'ivory' is a reference to the post-resurrection body, but it is the idea of 'the virtue of continence' that is relevant to the idea of the worldly body at this point.

The mortification of the flesh is, as Biernoff argues, 'one of the most enduring images of medieval Christianity', with the flesh serving as 'an expression and externalisation of the debased human condition, bearing the hereditary imprint of sexuality and death'.[610] The body, represented in the *Conduct of Life* by the ageing process, illness and mortality, is, as discussed previously, ultimately tied in to original sin and to the Fall: as in Guerric's passage from 'clay' to 'ivory', the earthly is juxtaposed with the heavenly. However, the idea of living according to Augustine's 'inner man' in the twelfth century 'does not require the renunciation of the body, or of sensation, but their subjugation – or perhaps sublimation – to intellectual and spiritual goals.'[611]

Augustine, and consequently Bernard and the later medieval thinkers, did not conceive of the bodily sense organs as inherently bad: they were only harmful 'when the inner sense fails to control them.'[612] Similarly, the lack of 'iselðe' [discretion] (15/Ω16) shown by the narrator of the *Conduct of Life*, is a result of a spiritual immaturity or 'chilce' [childishness] (7/Ω7). Therefore, when the preacher states, 'Þe mu[c]hel folȝeð his iwil, himselfen he biswicað' [He who excessively follows his will, he deceives himself] (14/Ω14), he is ascribing to the soul a level of culpability that is, at the very least, commensurate with that demonstrated by the body. It would seem then that

[608] An introduction to Guerric and his sermons can be found in Monks of Mount Saint Bernard Abbey (eds. and trans.), *Guerric of Igny: Liturgical Sermons* (Spencer, Massachusetts, 1970), pp. vii-lxi.
[609] Guerric of Igny, *Sermon 26: The First Sermon of the Annunciation* in *Guerric of Igny: Liturgial Sermons*, vol. 2, pp. 34-38 (p. 37). Quoted in Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, p. 171.
[610] Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 23.
[611] Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 24.
[612] Eugene Vance, 'Seeing God: Augustine, Sensation, and the Mind's Eye', in Stephen G. Nichols, Andreas Kablitz, and Alison Calhoun (eds.), *Rethinking the Medieval Senses : Heritage / Fascinations / Frames* (Baltimore, 2008), 13-29 (p. 20).

the views of the author of the *Conduct of Life* concerning the roles of the soul and body are in general agreement with Augustine, that his emphasis on the degeneration of the body might be viewed as a punishment for sin, and that the responsibility for this degeneration lies ultimately – although, perhaps, not completely – with the soul.

Following from this, as Eugene Vance states, 'the inner sense, in turn, is not bad either, so long as it remains subordinate to the higher faculty of reason.'[613] A good example of how this complex relationship between body and soul is structured for a medieval audience is explicated in the early thirteenth-century homily *Sawles Ward* of MS Bodley 34.[614] 'Sawles Ward', based on the parable found in Mark 24: 43, builds upon the metaphor of a house (the body) which is under attack from the vices, who want to gain access to the precious treasure (the soul) contained within. However, the house is under the stewardship of the house-lord (Reason), who has to control his wife (Will), and his servants (the five senses) who are eager 'to cwemen wel þe husewife ær ȝein godes wille' [to please well the house-wife against God's will].

The house-lord must regularly chastise his wife and servants for leaving the house unguarded. However, the house-lord is assisted in watching over the servants by God's four daughters, the four cardinal virtues: 'warschipe' [Prudence]; 'gastelich strengðe' [Spiritual Strength]; 'meað' [Moderation]; and 'rihtwisnesse' [Righteousness]. The protection of the house is ultimately secured by Prudence (the door keeper). Prudence allows in two messengers. The first is Fear (messenger of death), who reminds them that death's 'wune is to cumen bi stale ferliche *and* unmundlunge hwen me least weneð' [custom is to come by stealth, suddenly and unexpectedly, when one least expects]; she also describes Hell and encourages them to be more steadfast. The second messenger is 'Love of Life' who, by describing Heaven, drives out the despair caused by Fear' s descriptions of a sudden death and Hell. 'Sawles Warde' elucidates, through the allegory of the

[613] Vance, 'Seeing God', p. 20.
[614] Morris, *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises* (1867), pp. 244-67. See also Emily Rebekah Huber and Elizabeth Robertson (eds.) *The Katherine Group MS Bodley 34* (Kalamazoo, MI, 2016), pp. 249-66.

castle, the complex relationship (the fractured self) between Body, Soul, Will, the senses, Reason, and God.

'Sawles Warde' is part of a set of texts collectively known as the Katherine Group.[615] These texts, along with the *Ancrene Wisse*, with which MS Bodley 34 is also closely associated, have a common interest in the experience of the female spiritual, and a focus upon how the female might protect her virginity. They are a set of didactic texts imagined and composed to give contemplative spiritual guidance to the individual in the face of external threats to both body and soul.

Guidance or Reason, for a twelfth- and thirteenth-century audience, is found through God; this reveals itself for the author of the *Conduct of Life*, and consequently for the text's audiences, as the difference between the 'brode strate' [broad street] (345/Ω357), which is 'ure wil' [our will] (345/Ω357), and the 'narewe pað' [narrow path] (349/Ω361), which is 'Godes has' [God's bidding] (349/Ω361). The narrow path is walked by 'þo þe hem sildeð ȝierne wið achen unðeawe' [they that shield themselves well from every vice] (350/Ω362) and 'goð uneaðe aȝien þe cliue and aȝien þe heie hulle' [go with difficulty along the cliffs and along the high hills] (351/Ω363). The idea of 'shielding' oneself against external influences is a reccurring message of the *Conduct of Life*. This reflects contemporaneous concerns that divine and demonic beings, acting 'upon the perceptive life of the inner sense',[616] could provoke bodily sensations from outside the soul, thus requiring a shield.

The 'sublimation' of the bodily senses, therefore, grants the individual a way to achieve spiritual accession. In *Estote Fortes in Bello*, found in Trinity, we see this most overtly in the extended use of military language to describe the necessarily repressive relationship of soul over body, if salvation is to be successfully achieved:

> Ðe liehame winneð toȝenes þe gost. *and* þe gost toȝenes þe lichame. *and* swo fliten *and* winnen bitwenen hem. þ*at* al þ*at* is on ulef *and* uqueme. hit is þ*at*

[615] The other texts are: *The Martyrdom of Sancte Katerine* [The Martyrdom of Saint Katherine]; *The Liflade ant te Passiun of Seinte Margarete* [The Life and Passion of Saint Margaret]; *The Liflade ant te Passiun of Seinte Juliene* [The Life and Passion of Saint Juliana]; and *Hali Meithhad* [Holy Maidenhood]

[616] Eugene Vance, 'Seeing God', p. 20.

> oðer iqueme. *and* on þis fihte is ech man stronge. þe awelt is lichame. and his wille binimeð. *and* wleneð his soule. *and* hire wille drigeð.[617]
> [The body warreth against the spirit and the spirit against the body, and so strive and contend with one another, so that all that is hateful and displeasing to the one is pleasing to the other. And in this conflict each man is strong who subdueth the body and restraineth his will and adorneth his soul and performeth her will.]

Indeed, drawing on thirteenth-century anthologies of model sermons used by Franciscan preachers, David D'Avray highlights that there was a 'widespread tendency to emphasize the positive significance of the body'. Similarly, Bynum argues that 'flesh functioned as an 'instrument of 'salvation', not an obstacle to salvation',[618] although it should be noted, as Biernoff does, that the part that the flesh takes in redemption and spiritual resurrection comes from its desire to transgress.[619] In *Sermo in Marcum viii. 34*, found in Trinity, the cross that the individual sinner is exhorted to bear is his own body. The substitution of the cross – normally a symbol for Christ's own bodily suffering, death and resurrection – for the body suggests that the individual must necessarily go through bodily hardship and death before physical and spiritual resurrection. This is achieved physically in the sermon by fasting:

> Þat is lichames helsing. Mannes lichame ihalsneð iwis. þenne me hine pined mid hunger. *and* mid þurste. *and* mid wecche. *and* mid swinche. *and* mid stiue wedes next þe liche *and* smerte smiten of smale longe ȝerden. *and* mid michele chele oðer wile. þos roden moten beren alle sinfulle men. þe wile mice habben of here sinnes.[620]
> [that is, leanness of body (flesh); man's body is truly emaciated when he is tormented by hunger, by thirst, by vigils, by labour, by stiff garments next to the body, and when he is smartly smitten by slender long switches, and sometimes by great cold. These crosses must all men bear who will have mercy for their sins].

[617] Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 189.
[618] Caroline Walker Bynum, 'Why all the fuss about the body? A medievalist's perspective', *Critical Inquiry*, 22 (1995), 1-33, pp. 14-15.
[619] Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 26.
[620] Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 207

The body, therefore, becomes a means of redemption through the imagery of the cross and the *Scala peccatorium* 'þat is sinfulle manne leddre. þe hi shulen one stien to heuene' [that is, the ladder of sinful men by which they shall ascend into heaven].[621]

In *Sermo in Marcum viii. 34*, in addition to the 'lichamliche rode' [bodily cross] the sinner must also 'carry' the 'gostliche rode' [spiritual cross]. This is, 'herte sor for mannes ȝene sinne *and* reuðe for his emcristenes wowe' ['heart-sorrow' for one's own sins and pity for one's fellow-Christian's woe].[622] This is followed by a discussion of the five senses as the entrance point of such sin through action and through thought, and an exhortation to individual repentance. Redemption, for a Middle English audience required the regulation, control or enclosure of the senses.

However, while it would be inaccurate to argue that the link between sin and illness (and the degeneration of the body) had not already been made before this period, and it is probable that the author of the *Conduct of Life* was using this link to emphasise the consequences of a sinful life,[623] the twelfth-century emphasis upon the denial of the body also gave the individual a way and a means to achieve salvation. In the lines 334-340/Ω346-Ω352 of the *Conduct of Life* the devil attacks through intoxication:

> Bute we wurðen us iwar þis wereld us wile drenchen,
> Mast alle men ȝieueð drinken of on euele senche;

---

[621] Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 207
[622] Morris, *Old English Homilies*, p. 207
[623] Hill states that:

> The belief is widespread in OE literature that the devil, through his arrows, afflicts Mankind with sinful thoughts and physical illness, and that the trials of the mind and body are directly related to the sins of the flesh.' (Hill, 'The twelfth-century "Conduct of Life"', p. 118).

Inversely, in the Old English saints' lives the failure of the body to decay post mortem was a sign of a successful spiritual life. Daniell and Thompson state in relation to St Cuthbert that:

> Cuthbert's first posthumous miracle was his failure to decay: this quality of incorruptibility becomes a feature of Anglo-Saxon saints' lives and is part of a widespread belief that death and decay were a punishment for Adam and Eve's fall. The process of decay almost always represents sin when they are discussed in Old English literature and, conversely, for a body to remain wholesome means that its inhabitant was a person of special virtue.

(Christopher Daniell and Victoria Thompson, 'Pagans and Christians: 400-1150', in Peter C. Jupp and Clare Gittings (eds.), *Death in England: An Illustrated History* (Manchester, 1999), 65-89, pp. 78-9)

However, Thompson believes that there is a reluctance to equate sin with disease for the living during the later Anglo-Saxon period. She claims that 'Ælfric sees sin as only one of many causes of illness, although he understands disease and cure both as coming ultimately from God.' (Victoria Thompson, *Dying and Death in Later Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2004), p. 96). She says of Wulfstan's approach to illness, which is based on the Book of Job, that, 'disease may be a measure of virtue as easily as sin'. (Thompson, *Dying and Death*, p. 97) By the later medieval period it would seem that this association was more developed.

⟨H⟩e sal him cunnen silde wel ȝief hit him nele screnche.
Mid Almihtin Godes luue ute we us biwerien
⟨W⟩ið þesses wreches woreldes luue þat hit ne muȝe us derien.
Mid almesse, mid fasten and mid ibeden werie we us wid senne,
Mid þo wapne þe God haued ȝieue alle mankenne. (334-340/Ω346-Ω352)
[But let us be aware that this world will intoxicate us,
Most all men it gives drink of an evil draught;
He shall seek to shield himself well if it will not deceive him.
With Almighty God's love let us defend ourselves
From this wretched world's love that it may not hurt us.
With alms, with fasts, with prayer let us defend ourselves from sin,
With the weapons that God has given to all mankind.]

Themes of eating and drinking, gluttony and indulgence are a major presence in the text of the *Conduct of Life*. They are representative of the earthly and therefore the transient, and they are linked to the body rather than to the soul. The sin is therefore to concentrate on 'þis wereld' [this world] (334/Ω346) that 'us wile drenchen' [will intoxicate us] and by doing so to drink 'of on euele senche' [of an evil draught] (335/Ω347). Lines such as 'Betere is wori water þan atter imengd mid wine.' [Better is dirty water than poison mixed with wine] (144/Ω 151) advocate a belief in self-denial that may be viewed as asceticism. To imbibe 'wori water' [dirty water] is to place the sanctity of the soul above the well-being of the body. The poison that is mingled with wine will corrupt the soul and must be shielded against. The narrator states that 'Mid almesse, mid fasten and mid ibeden werie we us wid senne,' [With alms, with fasts, with prayer let us defend ourselves from sin] (339/ Ω351). This again suggests a penitential practice that places an emphasis on the denial of the body.

Sight

To return to Lines 17-18/Ω18-Ω19 of the *Conduct of Life*, where it is stated, 'Elde me is bistolen on ar Ich hit iwiste | Ne mai Ich isien bifore me for smeche ne for miste' [Old age is stolen upon me before I knew it, | I may not see before me for smoke nor for mist]. Hill believes that the 'smeche' [smoke] and 'miste' [mist] of line 18/Ω19 'probably refer figuratively to the blinding of the sight by affection for the fleshly sins of this world' and cites an extract from *Gregory's Dialogue* to validate

her point.[624] Significantly, Psalm 6: 8 states, 'turbatus est a furore oculus meus inveteravi inter omnes inimicos meus' [My eye is troubled through indignation: I have grown old amongst all my enemies]. This portrayal of an individual struggling to achieve salvation, and the trope of the eye as a conduit through which sin enters the human subject, chimes closely with the *Conduct of Life.* Psalm 6 also draws a parallel between sight and old age; it states:

> miserere mei Domine quoniam infirmus sum sana me Domine quoniam conturbata sunt ossa mea | et anima mea turbata est valde et tu Domine usquequo | convertere Domine eripe animam meam salvum me fac propter misericordiam tuam | quoniam non est in morte qui memor sit tui in inferno autem quis confitebitur tibi (Psalm 6: 3-6)
> [Have mercy on me, O Lord, for I am weak: heal me, O Lord, for my bones are troubled. | And my soul is troubled exceedingly: but thou, O Lord, how long? | Turn to me, O Lord, and deliver my soul: O save me for thy mercy's sake. | For there is no one in death, that is mindful of thee: and who shall confess to thee in hell?]

The ultimate aim of this psalm is the salvation of the 'troubled' soul, as it is in the *Conduct of Life*. The consequences of sin manifest themselves as physical ailments; the speaker's 'bones are troubled'; he is 'weak'; his 'eye is troubled' and he has 'grown old'. Like the narrator of the *Conduct of Life*, his repentance serves an exemplary function:

> descedite a me omnes qui operamini iniquitatem quoniam exaudivit Dominus vocem fletus mei | exaudivit Dominus deprecationem meam Dominus orationem meam suscepit | erubescant et conturbentur vehementer omnes inimici mei convertantur et erubescant valde velociter (Psalm 6: 9-10)
> [Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity: For the Lord hath heard the voice of my weeping. | The Lord hath heard my supplication: the Lord hath received my prayer. | Let all my enemies be ashamed, and be very much troubled: let them be turned back, and be ashamed very speedily.]

As the above passages suggest, a link between sin and the degeneration of the body, including an individual's sight, was well established long before the *Conduct of Life* was written. However, during the twelfth century one's sense of sight became of increasing importance to medieval theological thought. Again, the motif of sight as occupying a middle ground between the

[624] Hill, 'The twelfth-century "Conduct of Life"', p., 117

body and soul, the sensual and spiritual (and partaking, therefore, in the degradation of both) derives at least partly from Augustine, who writes, 'let us use for preference the evidence of the eyes; this is the most excellent of the body's senses, and for all its difference in kind has the greatest affinity to mental vision [*visio mentis*].'[625] In her discussion of Augustine and his influence, Biernoff argues that 'sight was at once an extension of the sensitive soul towards an object, and the passage of sensible forms through the eye and into the brain.'[626] Sight, therefore, should be seen as an important link between body and soul; the 'outer' and 'inner' man; a complication in the binary – and a link between them. Vance argues that:

> The body's organs can sense nothing by themselves. For instance, sight is made possible by the bodily eye; but the act of seeing occurs only in the soul. Thus the faculty of sight, the phenomenon of seeing and the object seen are three separate and ontologically distinct components of a triad constituted by visual perception as a process.[627]

Sight is an important part of the fractured self that, as the following discussion will attest, needs to be sublimated for fear of sin; if sublimation is achieved, however, it also grants the individual the means of obtaining spiritual union with God.

Sight as 'an extension of the sensitive soul' is at the same time a means of procuring spiritual knowledge and a locus for sinful desire. For as Bernard says, 'it is sin alone which dulls and confuses the vision; nothing else seems to stand between the eye and the light, between God and man.'[628] In the *Conduct of Life* it is bodily vision that enshrouds the inner eye and leaves the narrator unable to see before him for 'smeche' [smoke] and 'miste' [mist]. The link between sight and knowledge and sight and sin is made explicit in Gerald of Wales' thirteenth-century guide for clergy, which dictates

[625] Eugene Vance, 'Seeing God', p. 17.
[626] Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 3.
[627] Eugene Vance, 'Seeing God', p. 17.
[628] St Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153), *On Conversion*, in *Bernard of Clairvaux*, *Selected Works*, trans. G. R. Evans (New York, 1987), p. 89. As quoted in Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 36.

that 'Eve would not have touched the tree […] unless she had first gazed upon it heedlessly'.[629] This emphasis upon sublimation and enclosure is further emphasised in other post-Conquest texts, such as the *Ancrene Wisse*, where it is stated that 'Hwen Þu bihaldest te mon, Þu art in Eue point: Þu lokest on Þe appel' [when you look at the man, you are in Eve's position: you are looking at the apple].[630] As Biernoff argues, 'eating the fruit becomes merely the outward sign of Eve's disobedience […] her fate - the fate of humanity – is sealed with a look'.[631] The guide in the *Ancrene Wisse* advises his readers to be 'truly enclosed' and be 'blind to the outside world', with the cloister acting like an architectural blindfold for the anchoress.[632] As the biographer of Stephen Obazine (d. 1158) states in a discussion of the spiritual benefit of physical enclosure for the nuns at Coyroux, ' how can one sin […] when the faculty of vision itself is enclosed?'[633]

However, the idea of sight, as has been anticipated throughout this discussion, becomes more than simply the physical act of seeing, and more than a sense that requires enclosure as a prophylactic against sin. Once more, Biernoff states that:

> The senses, then, are not just *enclosed* by the walls of a monastery or any other edifice: they can also be *closed*: averted from the world, turned inwards. This brings us closer to a psychological theory of enclosure, and to the possibility of being in the world while at the same time taking 'custody of the eyes'.[634]

The enclosure and censorship of the bodily senses became a means for motivating internal or spiritual sight; Peter Limoges (d. 1306) states that 'Man ought to shift his eye's gaze from exterior things to interior things.'[635] In *Sermo in Ps. cxxvi. 6*, from Lambeth, it is stated that:

---

[629] Gerald of Wales (c. 1145-c. 1223), *Jewel of the Church: a Translation of* Gemma Ecclesiastica *by Giraldus Cambrensis*, trans. J. J. Hagen, 2 vols (Leiden, 1979), 2: p. 182. As quoted in Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 42. On Gerald of Wales in general, See R. Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford, 1982)

[630] Bella Millett (ed.), *Ancrene Wisse: A Corrected Edition of the Text in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402, with Variants from Other Manuscripts*, vol. 1, EETS 325 (Oxford, 2005), pp. 21-22; Bella Millett, *Ancrene Wisse: Guide for Anchoresses: A Translation based on Corpus Christi College, MS 402* (Exeter, 2009), pp. 21-22.

[631] Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, pp. 42-43.

[632] Quoted in Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 115.

[633] Quoted, with further discussion, in Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 115.

[634] Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 120.

[635] Peter of Limoges, *De Oculo Morali*, quoted in Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 123.

> Þe rihtwise .Mon. þ*et* mid þe eȝene of his horte bihalt in to houene *and* sicð þe muchele blisse þ*et* he is to ileðed ⁊ him wile sone longe þiderward *and* hwenne he ne mei þider cume alse raðe se he walde ⁊ he send þider his hate teres.[636]
> [The righteous man, that with the eyes of his heart looks into heaven and seeth the great bliss to which he is invited, will soon long to go thitherward, and when he may not come thither as quickly as he would, he sendeth thither his hot tears].

What can and cannot be seen of Heaven in this life and the one that follows will be discussed in more detail later in this introduction, but it is important to demonstrate here, as I believe the above quotation does, that the act of 'seeing' could transcend the physical act; and that sight was, therefore, a sense that linked the physical world with the spiritual. The transference from 'exterior' to 'interior' spoken of by Peter Limoges is especially important during this period as a movement grew in literature and theological thought that placed a greater importance on the idea of self-examination as a means of attaining spiritual success.

It is important to note that Christianity before the twelfth century was already necessarily concerned with self-awareness and inner character as it developed into an 'interior' religion that required the believer to lay himself open to God and receive the Holy Spirit, resulting in an emphasis on the sin of the individual and his unworthiness.[637] However, from the ninth century there began, according to Matsuda, a development in private penance which led to 'a gradual shift of emphasis from penitential exercises to heartfelt repentance and auricular confession.'[638] Morris, in his discussion of Abelard (d. 1142), sees this as a rejection of 'external acts' and 'emotional gush' with an emphasis on true inner sorrow for sin.[639] Furthermore, as Matsuda notes in her discussion on the development of the state of purgatory, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries there was a shift from penance, which cannot be fulfilled in this lifetime, to post-mortem punishment and penitence, further encouraging the cultivation of self-knowledge as a means of scrutinizing one's conscience in

[636]Morris, *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises* (1867), p. 157.
[637] Colin Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual: 1050-1200* (Toronto, 1972), p. 10.
[638] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 14.
[639] Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual*, p. 73.

order to understand the sin one has committed.[640] This stress upon inner sorrow and self-examination led to the universal adoption of individual confession between 1000 and 1200, although it should be noted that it had already been present in some parts of the Church for centuries, with the fourth Lateran Council imposing annual confession as a minimal obligation upon every member of the Church in 1215. [641]

Matsuda correlates this emphasis on self-examination and auricular confession with a 'major literary effect' that ultimately sees 'the growth of the summas and manuals of confession as well as the manuals of religious instruction intended for both clergy and laity, undoubtedly assisted by the canons of the Fourth Lateran Council and of the Council of Lambeth (1281).'[642] More immediately, however, she also notes that 'the essential doctrine of confession and penance defined between 1070 and 1170 began to be adopted into the lives of ordinary people after 1170 through sermons and other didactic and homiletic treatises'.[643] This striving through self-examination for self-knowledge, which sees the adoption of 'confession and penance' into 'sermons and other didactic and homiletic treatises', also results in what Morris calls a 'desire for self-expression'. He states that '[w]e hear the authentic voice of the individual, speaking of his own desires and experiences. ...[O]ne field in which this [desire for self-expression] now became apparent was the sermon', agreeing with Matsuda that there was a 'huge increase both in the preaching and in the preservation of sermons' in the period from 1050-1200.[644]

One might go further than Morris does here, and note that the audience does not just 'hear the authentic voice of the individual', but also sees him in the *Conduct of Life* – whether that is physically, as the speaker stands before his audience, or meditatively, as the audience is encouraged

[640] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 23.
[641] Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual*, p. 73. See also Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 198, who states that 'it is also clear that the requirement of annual confession in 1215 was, in a sense, nothing new: frequent confession had been recommended for centuries, and authors urged that if possible people should make confessions more frequently than only once a year.'
[642] Matsuda shows that it was this adoption that sees 'Latin treatises on self-knowledge as pseudo-Bernardian *Meditationes piisimae de cognition humanae conditionis*, which was originally written for a monastic audience in the twelfth century, grew popular in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries'. (Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 23).
[643] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 24.
[644] Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual*, p. 67.

to contemplate the words on the page and the pictorial quality of each image with what Biernoff calls 'the medieval proclivity for looking beyond – literally seeing through – the sensible world to a parallel realm of unchanging and universal truths'.[645] Although bodily sight should necessarily be enclosed or regulated (taken custody of), 'spiritual vision' requires the individual to approach spiritual truths through the material world and corporeal sight; bodily sight is therefore legitimised as a 'necessary means to an immaterial, invisible end'.[646]

This 'approach' can be typified during this period by the emphasis upon the devotional image – specifically, an encouragement for the individual to meditate on the wounds of Christ and upon the Passion.[647] Redemption is achieved through the 'flesh' of an increasingly human incarnate figure of Christ and the idea of vision itself.[648] Vision, meditation and contemplation were used as a means to associate oneself with the nature of Christ's sufferings and an emergence of the idea of a closer more personal relationship with Christ and God. As Morris argues:

> The movement towards a more inward and compassionate devotion, in which the individual strove imaginatively to share in the pain of his Lord, became really strong in the eleventh century, and in the twelfth it governed much of the thought about the passion.[649]

This emphasis upon the personal relationship with God can be seen in the representation of what happened to the individual post-mortem and specifically the treatment of the Last Judgement. The twentieth century theologian and Jesuit Priest Henri de Lubac says of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries:

> The collective eschatology and the expectation of the final resurrection, whose outline was once so clear, are fading away. Within a framework which is still in general that of the church, the attention of the faithful is fixed less on the destiny of the church than on the destiny of each believer.[650]

---

[645] Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 125.
[646] Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 13.
[647] Discussed in detail in Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, pp. 133-64.
[648] Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 13.
[649] Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual*, p. 140.
[650] Quoted in Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual*, p. 146.

This is not to say that the idea of the Last Judgement was abandoned, which is certainly not the case, but that there appears to be a significant shift away from an approach that focuses on a general audience to one that accommodates an emphasis on the individual and the answers that each must make.[651] The *Conduct of Life* might well be read as a text which represents precisely this transformation.

Judgement, Purgation and Intercession

After the first fifty lines of the *Conduct of Life* there is a movement outward from personal reflection to a generalised diatribe on the transient nature of life and earthly goods. Maxims such as, 'Eðlate him ware al wele and erðeliche blisse | For to þe muchele blisse cume, þis murie mis iwisse.' [Worthless to him were all joy and earthly bliss, | For to come to that great bliss (heaven) is mirth indeed] (155-156/Ω162-Ω163) that express the transient nature of life that 'þe longe ne mai ilaste' [which may not last long] (319/Ω330) are reminiscent of the Old English poetic tradition. Similarly, indebtedness to Anglo-Saxon writings might also be seen in the scene of Judgement that follows this in the *Conduct of Life*. Foxhall-Forbes states, in relation to *Blickling Homily V*, that:

> The Last Judgement, at which the good and the wicked would finally be divided and placed in heaven and hell until the end of time, was one of the most popular topics of discussion amongst ecclesiastical authors in early medieval England, especially among the later Anglo-Saxon homilists.[652]

[651] Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual*, p. 146.
[652] Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 129

The *Conduct of Life* does not contain a description of the last days or the coming of the Antichrist nor does it parallel contemporary events with the signs that Judgement Day is imminent, motifs found in many Old English texts;[653] rather, the sermon concentrates on the scene of individual judgement. Mecklenburg and Mertens argue that:

> The view on the Judgement underwent considerable development in the course of the Middle Ages. A distinction came to be made between a general Last Judgement, at the end of time, of all those living or dead, and a particular judgement of every individual upon death. In general terms, emphasis shifted from the general Last Judgement to the particular Judgement.[654]

Scenes of individual judgement are also present in Old English literature: they can be found in *Vercelli Homily II* and *Vercelli Homily X*, amongst others, where it is the devil who acts as the accuser and prosecutor on Judgement Day.[655] Furthermore, the idea of the Judgement being played out like a court-room drama also has antecedent in Old English literature, most notably in *Vercelli Homily IV*, which is unique in that the post-judgement address of the soul to the body is dramatized in sensuous language in front of crowds of men, angels and demons.[656] Similarly, in the *Conduct of Life* we find the lines:

> Þar sulle ben deflen swo fele þat willeð us forwreien,
> Nabbeð hie no þing forȝieten of þat hie her iseien,
> Al þat hie iseien her hie willeð cuðen þare,
> Bute we haben hit ibet þe hwile we here waren.

[653] For example, Homily XV of the Vercelli Codex contains a description of the last days; Ælfric's preface to his first series of Catholic homilies contains a scene that portrays the coming of the antichrist; and parallels between contemporary events and the signs that Judgement Day is imminent can be found in Ælfric's Homily for the second Sunday in advent, which is based on St Gregory, where he claims that the earthquakes, hunger and pestilence are present in the world although the astronomical signs are yet to come, and in Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* where Wulfstan contends that the Viking attacks, which reached their peak in 1014, were divine retribution for the sins of the English nation.

[654] Michael Mecklenburg and Thom Mertens, 'Introduction: The Last Judgement in Medieval Sermons' in Thom Mertens, Maria Sherwood-Smith, Michael Mecklenburg, and Hans-Jochen Schiewer (eds.), *The Last Judgement in Medieval Sermons* (Turnhout, Belgium, 2013), p. xiv.

[655] Mecklenburg and Mertens elucidate in their study the various ways that the scenes of particular judgement are depicted in medieval literature with examples given of popular motifs of 'testing' divided into: 'the journey', 'the weighing of good and bad works upon scales', 'the book of life' and 'the bridge'. They cite the earliest example of the devil as an opponent in a trial being from Caesarius of Arles (d.542). (Mecklenburg and Mertens, pp. xiv-xviii).

[656] See Thompson, *Dying and Death*, p. 196.

Al hie habbeð on here write þat we misduden here
þeih we hes ne niseien hie waren ure iferen. (97-102/Ω100-Ω105)
[There shall be so many devils that will accuse us;
They have not forgotten anything of what they have seen here
All that they have seen here they will make known there.
Except we have repented it the while we were here.
They have all in their writing that we did wrong here,
Though we did not see them, they were our companions.]

Indeed, the early part of this scene is reminiscent of a legal court-room with the presence of 'ængles' [angels] (94/Ω96) who shall be in dread and the 'deflen' [devils] (97/Ω100) who will act as accusers with all of the sins of the individual written down (101/Ω104). However, in the *Conduct of Life*, although the accusations may be made by many devils, the Judgement will ultimately be an individual act, since 'Elch man sal þar biclepien himselfen and ec demen.' [Each man shall accuse and also condemn himself there] (107/Ω112). The scene continues with its legal imagery in the next line, where it states that 'His oȝen werc and his þanc to witnesse he sal temen.' [His own works and his thoughts for a witness he shall call.] (108/Ω113). The difference now is that the audience feels that the court-room has been closed off as the narrator re-establishes the personal relationship with God that infuses much of the text. The author moves from the inclusive pronoun 'we', through the rhetorical questions that establish a multitude of sinners, who will inevitably be damned, to the individual who 'sal himselfen demen to deaðe oðer to liue' [shall sentence himself to death or to life] (115/Ω120). The narrator acts as a guide, accompanying the audience only so far before, ultimately, leaving them alone to face God. He makes himself present at key moments, guiding the audience through the theology before withdrawing when the choices that are to be made are of an individual nature.

As has been demonstrated, scenes of individual judgement were frequently found before the twelfth century and can be partly attributed to the belief, in line with the New Testament, that the

good and the bad did not stay together after death.[657] Therefore, the soul faced 'an individual judgement immediately upon leaving the body', with this being, as Foxhall-Forbes writes, 'only a foretaste of the fate to come after the Last Judgement'.[658] However, by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, scenes of the General Judgement are greatly reduced in number. According to Veronica O'Mara's study of chiliastic literature, it is not possible to speak of 'original' twelfth- and thirteenth-century sermons dealing with the Last Judgement. O'Mara demonstrates that whilst 'some of the notions survive intact, overall the way in which the Judgement is used in Middle English is different', concluding that '[t]he most striking difference is that it is not dealt with as explicitly as in Old English, where we had a whole homily called "The End of this World is Nigh" and others labelled *Die iudicii*.'[659]

O'Mara believes that the decline in 'overt judgement preaching' is linked to changes in the pattern of preaching that sees a shift in importance from Rogationtide (which is associated with preaching about the Last Judgement) in Old English to a stress on Advent, Lent and Easter in Middle English.[660] Furthermore, she contends that Middle English preachers 'did not always need to engage in full descriptions of the events' because such details were already known to audiences through other texts, plays and wall paintings and consequently the Middle English homilist could easily reference the Last Judgement without full description.[661]

Whilst O'Mara's argument is important, the reduction in the number of sermons that contain descriptions of the Last Judgement can also be seen as resulting from a more inward devotion which focused upon the importance of the destiny of the individual as opposed to the general throng. In this respect the point at which the individual dies becomes the decisive moment

[657] Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xiv.
[658] Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 201.
[659] Veronica O'Mara points to only one ME sermon that is 'explicitly devoted to the four Last Things: *Sermon of Dead Men*'. (Veronica O'Mara, 'The Last Judgement in Medieval English Prose Sermons: An Overview' in Mertens *et al.* (eds.), *The Last Judgement in Medieval Sermons*, 19-44, p. 25).
[660] O'Mara, 'The Last Judgement', p. 26.
[661] O'Mara, 'The Last Judgement', p. 27, p. 36.

rather than the idea of a general resurrection. For instance, Morris observes that, at this time, while the Last Judgement was not denied, 'attention was concentrated upon one's personal answer and personal hope of heaven'.[662] As a result the deathbed became more important in the later medieval period and dying became an art (*artes moriendi*).[663]

Similarly, as I argue above, the *Conduct of Life* does not contain scenes of General Judgement. Instead, in keeping with the remainder of the sermon, the focus remains on the ultimate issue of choices made in this life (before death) through the scene of individual judgement, the individual's relationship with God, and ultimately the abodes of Hell and Heaven – entry to which is premised on the quality, good or bad, of the individual's death. Mecklenburg and Mertens argue that tropes of Judgement developed in such a way that it was 'increasingly seen as an instrument to compel people to live a virtuous life',[664] and that 'one's own death has a more realistic and immediate quality than the supposedly distant day of the General Judgement. […] For this reason, the emphasis shifted from the general Last Judgement to a particular judgement'.[665]

The conclusion to the section that is given over to Judgement Day in the *Conduct of Life* states that 'Are deað and dom cumeð to his dure, he maiȝ him sore adrade' [Ere death and judgement come to his door, he may be sore afraid] (124/Ω129). Death and Judgement are simultaneous for the audiences of the *Conduct of Life*. The emphasis for the author of the *Conduct of Life* is on the actions of the individual in this life. He urges them to repent before it is 'wel late' [too late] (127/ Ω132). The transience of earthly belongings is also emphasised in this section: the narrator states 'Hwat sulle we beren us biforen, mid hwan sulle we iqueme, | We þe nafre god ne duden, þan hevenliche Deme?' [What shall we bear before us, with what shall we please (God), | We that never did good, to (please) the heavenly Judge?] (95-96/Ω98-Ω99). There is no answer to this question as he affirms that, "Þanne þe deað is at þe dure, wel late he biddeð ore' [When death is at the door, too

[662] Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual*, p. 147.
[663] Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xviii.
[664] Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xxv.
[665] Mecklenburg and Mertens, p. xxv.

late he prays for forgiveness] (127/Ω132). Death's finality, in this sermon, becomes an argument for the necessity of repentance while life endures.

However, following the early Christian period, when it was considered that the end of time and the resurrection of the dead were imminent, the question of where souls spent their time between death and the general resurrection underwent considerable revision. Matsuda states that 'the concept of Purgatory reached a more or less fully developed form sometime in the eleventh or twelfth century, and was gradually adopted by the laity in the following centuries',[666] with it being the subject of a conciliar statement at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274. Matsuda also agrees, however, with the critics of Le Goff who contend that the concept of purgatory preceded its theological formalisation, and cites Southern's argument that 'the noun was introduced in the twelfth century simply for the sake of convenience […] the real growth of the doctrine may be found a century earlier than the date set by Le Goff'.[667] In fact, texts that discuss an *interim* between death and Judgement Day are found from the second century;[668] Foxhall-Forbes notes the appearance of conceptualisations of purgatory in Bede, Gregory of Tours, and the writings of Augustine and Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*.[669] From the second century the question was not

[666] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 1.

[667] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 5. Le Goff believed that Purgatory was 'born' towards the end of the twelfth century when it received the name 'purgatorium'. Le Goff also conceptualised it as a place rather than a state. For a detailed account of the development of Purgatory according to Le Goff, including the emergence of Purgatory in the twelfth century as a specific place, see Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, translated by Arthur Goldhammer (London, 1984). See also Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 203.

[668] Mecklenburg and Mertens (p. xix) argue that:

> Terullian (d. after 220) refers to this time inbetween death and the Last Judgement as an *interim*. In a discussion of the parable of Lazarus and the rich man (Luke 16. 19-31), he calls Lazarus's sojourn in the bosom of Abraham the *interim refrigerium* (the invigorating interim), while he describes that of the rich man as an *interim tormentum* (an interim of torment).

[669] Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 203. Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, (p. 5*ff*) similarly examines many earlier examples of the interim and charts their development through to a more fully realised conception of Purgatory, including: *Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas* (c.203), Drythelm in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (731), *Visio Wettini* (824), the 9th century *Visio Karoli Crassi*, Gervaise of Tilbury's *Otia imperialia* (1212-1214), Jacobus de Voragine's *Legenda Aurea* (c.1250), and the twelfth-century *Visio Tnugdali* and *Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii*. Matsuda argues that the early descriptions of the interim were for Le Goff, 'only an imperfect shadow of the doctrine of Purgatory when judged against its fully developed form.' Charting the early development of the interim, and later Purgatory, Matsuda writes that '[a]lthough there is no explicit biblical reference to Purgatory, the passage in 1 Corinthians 3.10-15 where it is stated 'ipse autem salvus erit sic tamen quasi per ignem' (3.15) was traditionally interpreted as referring to the idea of purification by fire after death.' (Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 6, p. 6ff).

whether a purging of the soul occurred at all after death, 'but rather when and how this purification took place, at the Last Judgement or immediately after death'.[670]

During the Anglo-Saxon period the fate of the soul post-mortem was clearly of concern to both lay and religious men and women. Foxhall-Forbes argues that although there are 'only a few Anglo-Saxon texts which explore Purgatory and the interim as significant topics in their own right, […] there are frequent references to the fate of the soul in the interim and the purging of sins after death, even if these are not discussed in so much detail (or so obsessively) as was the Last Judgement'.[671]

However, the shift in emphasis from the general to the individual judgement raised questions as to the doctrine of the reunification of body and soul. As concerns about the purgative punishments enacted upon the soul between the two judgements developed, an 'organised system of intercession', which exploited the traditional practice of praying for the dead, was established and ' performed by the living for the benefit of the dead as well as for themselves'.[672] Matsuda points to the *Visio Sancti Pauli* as a text that evidences an early 'idea of penance after death and its alleviation by intercession […] in the idea of the Sunday respite'.[673] By the seventh century, Isidore of Saville (d.636) adduced the purgation of sin in the post-mortem interim between death and the Last Judgement as a 'catholic' belief, 'in the sense that it was held universally',[674] with communal commemoration and prayer for the dead growing in significance within religious communities throughout the early Middle Ages.[675] In addition, from the ninth century onwards there is growing evidence of commemoration through special prayers, masses and almsgiving for those who had

[670] Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 204.
[671] Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 202.
[672] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 2. Foxhall-Forbes argues that, 'Prayer for the dead is found in early Jewish and Christian thought, perhaps without connection to the interim, but it still looks to a future time and is bound up with a desire for the forgiveness of sin.' (Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 205).
[673] The long Latin version was written no later than the early sixth century with the shorter redactions extant in manuscripts from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. (Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 36)
[674] Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 206.
[675] Foxhall-Forbes points to correspondences that passed between men and women in religious life, 'asking for masses and prayers to be said for each other or – more importantly in this context – for their dead friends and relatives', as increasing evidence of the importance of intercession. (Foxhall-Forbes, , *Heaven and Earth*, p. 211).

recently died, and special arrangements being made for liturgical commemorations through writs, wills, charters, and so on.[676]

However, the author of the *Conduct of Life* does not make a distinction between death and Doomsday. He does not state that there will be a double judgement; one at death and then a second at the world's end, and he does not make mention of any form of interim paradise between the time of death and Doomsday or of any means of post-mortem intercession. The text does not advocate the giving of gifts for the souls of the dead and the author does not recommend either the usual role of intercessional prayers in aiding the individual during the period between death and Doomsday. However, when viewed in the context of the sermon as a whole all of this is not so surprising.

It might be possible to read the *Conduct of Life* as a text written by an author who simply did not acknowledge the existence of Purgatory or any form of interim: for example, during the Anglo-Saxon period Archbishop Wulfstan denied the possibility of interim purgation.[677] However, the later date of the *Conduct of Life* suggests that this is extremely unlikely as by the time of Thomas Aquinas, after the composition of the *Conduct of Life,* Purgatory had long been established as 'a place of charity and purification' distinct from Hell where 'purgative punishment in Purgatory can be effectively reduced by intercession by the living',[678] with an apparent acceptance that 'practically all ordinary Christians are in turn expected to spend some time in Purgatory'.[679] A much more likely explanation is that any references to post-mortem penance or intercession were deliberately excluded from the sermon as their inclusion would have been detrimental to the impact and immediacy of the text's message.

By contrast, the transience earthly goods is given full scope as a homlietic subject. It would seem that the author takes his basic teaching from Matthew 6: 19-21, as is evident in the following lines:

[676] See Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, pp. 213-262.
[677] Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 207.
[678] See Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 18.
[679] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 23.

He deð his aihte an siker stede þe hit sent to heueriche.
For þar ne þarf he ben ofdrad of fure ne of þieue,
Þar ne mai hit him binime þe loðe ne þe lieuue, (42-44/Ω43-Ω45)
[He puts his treasure in a safe place who sends it to heaven,
For there he need not be afraid of fire nor of thief,
There may no one deprive him of it, the enemy nor the friend,]

The *Conduct of Life* is distinctive, however, in that it does not advocate gifts for the souls of the dead. The text is firmly situated in this life, recommending instead the giving of alms in the present:

Sende god biforen him man, þe hwile he mai, to hevene,
For betre is on almesse biforen þan ben after seuene. (27-28/Ω28-29)
[Man [should] send good before him, the while he may, to heaven,
For better is one alms before than are seven after.]

Foxhall-Forbes states that Old English texts were divided as to how they represent or do not represent the state of Purgatory and the impact that intercession might have:

> [H]omiletic and penitential texts underline the finality of death, and so the importance of completing penance and confession before there was no longer an opportunity for forgiveness of sins in this life, other texts witness to the high value of prayers and offerings made on behalf of the dead.[680]

The *Conduct of Life* falls into the first category of homiletic and penitential texts which contend that 'even if someone only turns to God on the last day of his life, that is enough: the crucial thing is that he should attempt to atone for his sins, or even simply express the desire to do so'.[681] The immediacy of a response is once again reiterated in the *Conduct of Life* when the narrator states:

Forþi [is] he wis þe bit and biȝiet and bet bifore Dome.
Þanne þe deað is at þe dure, wel late he biddeð ore; (126-127/Ω131-Ω132)
[Therefore he is wise that prays and obtains mercy and repents before the Doom.
When death is at the door, too late he prays for forgiveness]

[680] Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 203.
[681] Foxhall-Forbes, *Heaven and Earth*, p. 138.

It would appear that the emphasis on the finality of death, found in many Old English texts, was carried over into the Early Middle English period. In this regard there are parallels between my analysis of the *Conduct of Life* and Matsuda's research findings: both indicate that there were significant reservations about an over-reliance on purgatory and post-mortem intercession. For instance, Matsuda contends that the 'apparent denial of any assurance of salvation to those souls who died with a grave sin', found in Middle English visionary material such as the *Visio Tungdali,* functions as 'a didactic device intended to warn against excessive hope in post-mortem purgation' and to 'bring home the importance of alms and works of charity performed before death'. [682] As the idea of Purgatory grew, so did the fear that individuals would be over-optimistic and treat the opportunity offered by Purgatory to offset their previous sins as a substitute for acting well in this life. In both the late medieval didactic and homiletic writings on death that feature in Matsuda's work, and the *Conduct of Life*, we can therefore observe a resistance to purgatory and an emphasis on 'exhorting the reader to repent quickly so that he or she will be ready whenever death comes'.[683] According to Matsuda's research, this is especially the case in the Middle English lyrics on death, with which the *Conduct of Life* has much in common. At the centre of these lyrics and at the centre of the *Conduct of Life* is the dualism of heaven and hell, salvation and damnation. In these lyrics, '[p]urgatory was acknowledged, almost grudgingly, only after due emphasis had been placed on the severity of purgative punishment there';[684] in the *Conduct of Life* it is barely acknowledged.

A second point of importance in this respect is that the giving of wealth is linked in the *Conduct of Life* with the renunciation of kin. This is manifest in the lines which follow directly after those on the giving of alms quoted previously:

> Ne bie þe leuere þan þe self þi mæi ne þi mowe,
> Sot is þe is oðer mannes frend betere þan his owen.
> Ne hopie wif to hire were ne were to his wive,

[682] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 51.
[683] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 2.
[684] Matsuda, *Death and Purgatory*, p. 2.

Be for himself afric man þe hwile he beð aliue. (29-32/Ω30-Ω33)
[Prefer not to thyself thy kinsman nor thy kinswoman,
He is a fool that is a better friend to others than to himself.
Let no wife trust to her husband, nor husband to his wife,
Be every man for himself, the while he is alive.]

The lines within the *Conduct of Life* are deliberately broad and therefore inclusive of all potential audience members through the writer's use of gnomic phrases, and yet the narrator breaks through the general to emphasise the personal message of the text. The relationship that an individual has with God is a personal one, therefore:

Do al to Gode þat he muȝe ech, þe hwile he beð aliue.
Ne lipne no man to muchel to childe ne to wiue;
Þe þe him selfe forȝiet for wive oðer for childe
He sal cumen on evel stede, bute him God be milde. (23-26/Ω24-Ω27)
[Do all for God what he may, the while he is alive.
Let no man trust too much to children nor to wife (women);
He who forgets himself for wife or for child
He shall come into an evil place, unless God is merciful to him.]

Repentance and therefore salvation for a post-Conquest audience listening to the narrator of the *Conduct of Life* is a personal journey; the choices that are to be made are exclusive even when it comes to family. There is only one way to Heaven and that is to '⟨G⟩o we þane narewe pað and þene wei grene' [Let us go the narrow path and the green way] (343/Ω355). The author uses repetition of key themes throughout the text and says once more of the sinner that, 'Eðlate him ware wif and child, suster and fader and broðer.' [Worthless to him were wife and child, sister and father and brother] (150/Ω157).

As has been demonstrated, the idea of individual choices is reiterated throughout the text. The emphasis for the *Conduct of Life* is on an individual relationship with God. This is stressed in the section concerning individual judgement and the lines throughout the text that focus on intercession; ultimately, however, it is represented most fully in the text's portrayal of Heaven.

Heaven

Rather than relying on post-mortem intercession, the narrator of the *Conduct of Life* encourages his audiences to employ their money in worthwhile causes whilst on Earth, urging them to 'ȝieue hes for Godes luue' [give it away for God's love] (56/Ω57), and claiming that 'Al he hit sal eft finde þar, and hundredfealde more.' [They shall find it all there again, and a hundredfold more] (54/Ω55). Although the narrator's description of Heaven as a financial safe-house is in itself appealing, it works because of the audience's fears and grievances in this world. The sermon alludes to the exhortation in Matthew 6: 19-20 to lay up treasures in heaven, in the knowledge that they will be safe from this world's insecurities:[685]

> For þar ne þarf he ben ofdrad of fure ne of þieue,
> Þar ne mai hit him binime þe loðe ne þe lieuue, (43-44/Ω44-Ω45)
> [For there he need not be afraid of fire nor of thief,
> There may no one deprive him of it, the enemy nor the friend,]

In lines 48/Ω49 and 50/Ω51, again, we find similar threats to earthly wealth that are *not* present in Heaven but are reliant on the person's actions in this life:

> For þar ne sal me us naht binime mid wrongwise dome. (48/Ω49)
> [For there shall no one rob us with wrongful (unjust) judgements.]
>
> For ne mai hit us binime, no king ne no syrreue. (50/Ω51)
> [For no one may rob us of it, no king nor sherrif.]

As is demonstrated here, the *Conduct of Life* construes Heaven as an absence of negatives; an absence, in the first instance, of earthly affliction or complaint. Cavendish proposes that descriptions of Heaven take on this use of negatives because:

> Heaven is ultimately beyond the reach of imagination because it is a state of good without any admixture of evil, which is a condition foreign to human experience. As

[685] A similar idea is found in *De Octo Uiciis & de Duodecim Abusiuis Huius Seculi* in Lambeth:
> Eft þe ðe deleð elmessan for his drihtnes luuan ·ᐟ þe bihut his gold hord on heouene riche. þer nan þeof ne mei [his] maðmas forsteolan. ac heo beoð bi hundfalde ihalden him þer.
> [Again, he who gives alms for his Lord's love, hides his treasure in heaven, where no thief may steal away (his) treasures, but where they shall be an hundredfold preserved for him.] (Morris, *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises* (1867), p. 109).

> a result, it is frequently described in negatives. In heaven there is no death, sorrow or time, nor faith or hope, because they are no longer needed. There is no danger, violence, pain, disagreement or anxiety. Heaven contains only one pole of each of the pairs of opposites which make up life on earth.[686]

A good example of this is found in *On God Ureisun of Ure Lefdi* in Cotton MS. Nero A xiv which describes Heaven as a place:

> Þar ham neu*er* ne mei. snou. ne uorst iuerden.
> Þer ne mie non ualuwen. uor þer is eche sumer.
> Ne non liuiinde þing woe þer nis ne ȝeomer.
> Þer heo schulen resten þe her ðe doð wurschipe.
> ȝif heo ȝemeð hore lif cleane urom all quedschipe.
> Þer ne schulen heo ne schulen neu*er* karien ne swinken.
> Ne weopen ne muren ne helle stenches stinken. (38-44)[687]
> [Where never snow nor frost may hurt them,
> There may none fade, for there is eternal summer.
> No living thing there is weak or sorrowful.
> There they shall rest who here do honour thee,
> If they keep their life clean from evil;
> There they shall never sorrow nor toil,
> Nor weep, nor mourn, nor hell-stinks smell.]

We can also see this manifested in the lines of the *Conduct of Life* when the narrator says that 'Ne mai non euel ne non wane ben in Godes riche,' [No evil nor want may be In God's kingdom] (359/ Ω372).

As has been seen, the *Conduct of Life* places a particular emphasis on the transitory nature of earthly life and on wealth. These things are absent from the abode of the blessed. As the earliest part of this introduction has shown (pp. 210-230), the physical degeneration of the body in life is essential to an understanding of the *Conduct of Life* – especially in the description of the narrator, who is suffering from the harsh realities of old age. It is, therefore, not surprising that, in order to convey the didactic message of the sermon, Heaven is described in terms that negate this process. The narrator states: 'Þar is ȝieuð abuten elde and hale abuten unhalðe, | Nis þar sareȝe ne sor, non ne

[686] Richard Cavendish, *Visions of Heaven and Hell* (London, 1977), p. 59.
[687] Morris, *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises* (1867), p. 193.

nafre unisalðe' [There is youth without old age, and health without sickness, | There is no sorrow nor suffering, nor ever unhappiness] (377-378/Ω390-Ω391).

Once more, and finally, the appearance of the narrator is at the didactic core of the sermon, since he is the physical manifestation of what Heaven is not, whilst simultaneously engaged in making apparent what Heaven will be. Paradoxically, the rewards for the soul in heaven can only be described through the language and imagery of the absent body.[688] The didactic message is built upon contrast between this world and the next - a descriptive technique common to portrayals of Heaven, as will be shown. Ronald E. Pepin notes that Bernard's depictions are similarly built around contrasting the joys of heaven with the tears of this world – 'nunc tibi tristia, tunc tibi gaudia' [now you have sorrows, then you will have joys] – and argues that 'there is nothing unique about Bernard's depiction of celestial bliss. His material is drawn from conventional lore about heaven as found in sacred scripture and in writers who preceded him in the tradition'.[689] It is a formula that is maintained in the homiletic tradition of the post-Conquest period – with a very good example of a similar descriptive passage concerning heaven to the one found in the *Conduct of Life*, which relies upon contrast between the earthly and the celestial, found in *In Die Dominica* of Lambeth:

> þer scal beon worldwunne ⁊ wið-uten pouerte. fulle ⁊ wið-uten hungre. hele ⁊ wið-uten unhele. reste ⁊ wið-uten swinge. blisse ⁊ wið-uten sarinesse. Iv3eðe ⁊ wið-uten elde. Lokinge ⁊ wið-uten winkunge. song ⁊ wið-uten lisse. smelli*n*ge ⁊ mid swetnesse. and dunge ⁊ wið-uten p*r*ikunge.[690]
> [There shall be worldly weal without poverty, fullness without hunger, health without infirmity, rest without toil, bliss without sorrow, youth without old age, sight without sleepiness, song without cessation, smelling with sweetness, and service without weariness.]

[688] Jan Swango Emerson makes similar observations about Marcus' description of Tundale. She states that 'Marcus cannot explain the nature of the other-world body with which he is so fascinated. He admits that the experiences he describes are so remarkable he must utilize imagery to help us, who are still bound by our earthly bodies, to understand.' (Jan Swango Emerson, 'Harmony, Hierarchy, and the Senses in the *Vision of Tundal*', in Jan Swango Emerson and Hugh Feiss (eds.), *Imagining Heaven in the Middle Ages: A Book of Essays* (New York, 2000), 3-46, p. 11).
[689] Ronald E. Pepin, 'Heaven in Bernard of Cluny's *De contemptu mundi*' in Jan Swango Emerson and Hugh Feiss (eds.), *Imagining Heaven in the Middle Ages: A Book of Essays* (New York, 2000), 101-118), p.102.
[690] Morris 1867, pp. 143-145.

In line 373/Ω386 of the *Conduct of Life* the narrator, still maintaining his descriptions through the use of negation of what is harsh in this world, states that, 'Þar is wele abuten wane and reste abuten swunche.' [There is joy without want, and rest without toil.] The idea of Heaven being a place of 'reste' is common in such descriptions, as it is in *On God Ureisun of Ure Lefdi* and *In Die Dominica*. It is ultimately linked with the idea of the eternal Sabbath and such New Testament lines as Revelation 14: 13. In Hebrews 4: 4 the link is made between the eternal rest of the blessed and the Book of Genesis, stating, 'dixit enim quondam loco de die septima sic et requievit Deus die septima ab omnibus operibus suis' [For in a certain place he spoke of the seventh day thus: And God rested the seventh day from all his works].[691] A similar rest is then promised to those who qualify for Heaven in Hebrews 4: 9-10.

The link between the story of Creation and that of the Apocalypse is significant. It is through the fall of Adam, which takes place in the Book of Genesis, that the transitory afflictions of an earthly life, described in the *Conduct of Life*, were brought about. Heaven is often described in terms that are reminiscent of Eden. This is because Eden is an idealised earthly paradise and a place of human happiness and innocence. Cavendish makes a more specific link between the fall of Adam and the idea of hard labour:

> Although Adam is put in Eden 'to till and keep it', the story implies that his work was easy and pleasant, for when God expels Adam and Eve from the garden for eating the forbidden fruit, Adam is condemned to hard agricultural labour, to which he had evidently been a stranger before.[692]

A good example of how the Fall is represented as imposing labour and toil upon Adam (and resultantly all mankind), from a contemporary manuscript, is found in 'De Initio Creature', an adapted version of Ælfric's *First Series of Homilies [Catholic Homilies I]: De Initio Creaturae*, where God says to Adam:

---

[691] Paul draws here on Genesis 2: 2.
[692] Cavendish, *Visions of Heaven and Hell*, p. 37.

> þu scealt mid ærfeðnesse þe metes tylian. *and* se eorðe his awírgid on þine weoreu*m*. sýlðe þornes *and* bre*m*bles. Þu éart of eorðe ȝenume. *and* þu awénst to eorðe. Þu æart dust. *and* þu awénst to duste. […] Ada*m* þa wes wniende on þeses life mid ȝeswínce.
> ["thou shalt with toil earn thy meat; and the earth is accursed through thy works and shall yield thee thorns and brambles. Thou art taken from earth and thou shalt turn to earth. Thou art dust and thou shalt turn to dust." […] Adam was then dwelling in this life in toil]

Although the *Conduct of Life* does not describe Heaven in physical details that are reminiscent of Eden, it does lay a particular emphasis on the rest that will be achieved there by those who qualify. The author of the *Conduct of Life* also makes the link between Adam's first sin and the ailments of life. It is worth repeating here Lines 197-200/Ω204-Ω207 and contrasting them with the two lines that follow (201-202/Ω208-Ω209) as they describe the cyclical nature of the narrative of salvation history, where the language used to describe the prelapsarian state is the same as that used in depictions of Heaven (the line describes a counter-factual but could equally be applied to both prelapsarian earth or Heaven itself); that language is necessarily constructed from the negation of the corporeal world:

> Vre foremes faderes gult we abugeð alle,
> Al his ofsprung after him in harem is biualle,
> Þurst and hunger, chele and hete and alle unhalðe;
> Þurh deað cam in þis middeneard and oðer unisalðe
> Nare no man elles dead ne sic, ne unsele
> Ac mihte libbe afremo a blisse and an hale. (197-202/Ω204-Ω209)
> [We all suffer for our first father's guilt,
> All his offspring after him have fallen into harm,
> Thirst and hunger, cold and heat, old age and ill-health;
> Through him death came into this earth and other miseries
> Not any man else was dead or sick, nor miserable,
> But might live evermore in bliss and health.]

The emphasis placed on 'reste abuten swunche' [rest without toil] (373/Ω386) links the hereafter with the story of Creation, returning the blessed to the relationship with God that Adam shared.

As I note in p. 218 the *Conduct of Life* only makes two direct references to the 'soule'. The first instance, a reference to the narrator in the corporeal world, was discussed in 'Soul and Body' (pp. 218-230); the second is important to this discussion as it concerns the body and soul in the post-mortem state of Heaven. This reference is part of the final exhortation that God may bring us to ' þare blisse' [that bliss (the heavenly state)] (397/Ω414) '⟨Þ⟩ane he ure sowle unbint of lichamliche bende.' [When he our souls unbinds from the body's bonds] (398/Ω415). As noted earlier (p.225), Guerric's evocation of the body as 'ivory' refers specifically to the body's state after resurrection; a state whose achievement may be dependent upon exercising 'the virtue of continence' in life.[693] The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 formalised the doctrine of the resurrection of the body thus: 'all rise with their individual bodies, that is, the bodies which they now wear';[694] the council's evident anxiety to stipulate what will happen to the bodies of individuals at the Final Judgement so categorically and vociferously suggests how contentious an issue this was.[695] To some writers and theologians, particularly Cistercians such as Bernard of Clairvaux and William of St. Thierry, there was a 'profound sense of the person as psychomatic unity and of the earthly body as a means to glory and ecstasy'; for such thinkers the body and soul was a partnership that shares labour in life and therefore, also, rewards in heaven.[696] A contemporary homily which illuminates this narrative is *An Bispel*, from MS. Vespasian A 22, which states:

> *and* þa*n* lat me þa sawle to merchestowe. þ*at* his se morȝemete si blisse þe he hað an þar sawle. þat wite ȝe wel. nan halege nað his fulle blisse er he underfó adomes deíe his licame. þ*at* wrð se fulle mete. þa*n* se mann mid sawle *and* mid licame und*er*fangð sicernesse of écer blisse.[697]
> [and then the soul is led to the festival hall; that is the morning-meat, the bliss that he hath in the soul; for ye know well that no holy man hath his perfect bliss ere he receive again his body at doomsday, that shall be the perfect meat when the man with the soul and body shall receive the assurance of eternal bliss.]

[693] Guerric of Igny, *Sermon 26,* p. 37
[694] Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, p. 154.
[695] This point is discussed in detail in Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 121ff.
[696] Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, p. 166
[697] Morris 1867, p. 239.

This verse foresees a reunification of body and soul in order to achieve heavenly bliss.

By contrast, in the *Conduct of Life* the resurrection of the body is absent from the description of the heavenly state. This is in part due to the telescoping of the post-mortem period within the text: as I have noted, the text does not contain a description of the Last Judgement, rather, it concentrates on the personal judgement that takes place immediately after death, and the need for a quick repentance. As a result, a discussion of the resurrection of the body becomes less important than the didactic message of the sermon as a whole. The wording of the line maintains a polarity between body and soul that is found throughout the verse sermon, which the author of the text would surely have felt muddied by a considered discussion of the reuniting of the two halves of the whole in Heaven. Throughout the *Conduct of Life* the body is considered corrupt and contemptible through its descriptions of transitory life, the visual representation of the failing health of the narrator, and, as we shall see, through the language used in the descriptions of Hell.

Such utilisation of the binaries of body and soul are common to texts that have *contemptus mundi* at their didactic core. Emerson says of the *Vision of Tundale* that:

> Marcus's hellish images of digestion, decay, decomposition, and partition all disappear in his paradise. In Bynum's terms, Marcus moves away from biological process, from digestion and decomposition, and moves body into soul.[698]

In the *Conduct of Life*, similarly, there is a rejection of the bodily and the corporeal world through the language of negation in its description of Heaven. Emerson continues by noting that the blessed that Tundale encounters in Heaven 'lack the dangerous senses of taste and touch, that is, those relating to eating and sexuality, or in other words, to need or desire.' In contrast, however, both the *Vision of Tundale* and the *Conduct of Life* do privilege one sense above all others in their discussion of Heaven: the sense of sight.

[698] Emerson, 'Harmony, Hierarchy, and the Senses', p. 4.

In Line 370/Ω383 God is described as 'soð sunne and briht and dai abute nihte.'[699] [true sun and bright, and day without night]. This is a continuation of the narrative that contrasts the corporeal with the celestial and a furtherance of the absence of negatives. Light, which is intrinsically linked with the sense of sight and is, therefore, an extension of the 'sensitive soul' (discussed on p.232), takes on a privileged celestial status in the *Conduct of Life*. In comparison, desires and senses that are linked to the body, such as those associated with drinking and eating, are absent from the rewards of heaven: 'Ne sal þar ben bread ne win, ne oðer kennes este' [There shall be no bread nor wine, nor other kinds of delights] (363/Ω376). The reasoning given in the *Conduct of Life* is that 'God one sal ben ache lif and blisse and ache reste' [God alone shall be eternal life and bliss and eternal rest] (364/Ω377), with Heaven ultimately represented as the spiritual realisation of the relationship of the individual with God. This is achieved specifically through the transcendental power of sight, which with it brings knowledge – an idea which will be explored in the remainder of this section.

The idea of continuous light in Heaven found in the *Conduct of Life* can also be seen in post-Conquest visionary material, such as *St. Brendan's Voyage* where The Land of Promise of The Saints is described in Edenistic terms and as being without night and with a light that always shone.[700] Furthermore, in another account from the period, the *Monk of Evesham's Vision*, the visionary is led through the various levels of Hell before entering the realms of the blessed where he gives an account of the celestial light, which he describes as a supernatural heightening of his own sense of sight:

> hoc enim [non solum] verbis exprimere, sed nec mente sufficio recordari. Splendor ille blandus et coruscus sic intuentem in se rapiebat, sic nitoris immensitate super se

[699] The authority upon which the above line is drawn is Isaiah 60: 19-20.
[700] Eileen Gardiner (ed.) *Visions of Heaven and Hell Before Dante* (New York, 1989), p. 125. It is never stated that this island is Heaven or represents it. However, the Edenic backdrop, the continuous light, which represents the presence of Christ, and the statement that the island will be returned to at some point in the future but only by the elect, strongly suggest that the audience should believe that it is.

> efferebat, ut nihil in ejus comparatione esse crederem, quicquid me contigit eatenus inspexisse; nam splendor ille, quamvis inæstimabilis esset, intuentis tamen non reverberabat, sed potius acuebat obtutum; inferius autem intuenti nihil aliud occurrebat nisi lux et murus, ut dictum est, crystallinus.[701]
>
> [But how glittering was the inconceivable brightness, or how strong was the light which filled all those places, let no one ask of me, for this I am not able to express in words, nor even to recollect in my mind. That soft and glittering splendour so dazzled my eyes, that I could think of nothing to be compared to it which I had ever seen before; for that brightness, inconceivable as it was, did not blind the eye-sight, but rather sharpened it; and as I looked on it, nothing else met my sight than the light and the wall of crystal before mentioned.][702]

The visionary in the above text is at pains to state that what he saw was not actually 'cælum cælorum'[703] [the Heaven of Heavens]. The true Heaven is saved only for those who have genuinely qualified for entrance by their acts in this life, death and individual judgement. The monk of Evesham continues:

> In hac tamen visione tantum lætitiæ et gaudii, tantum jucunditatis animo conepi et exultationis, ut quicquid humana explicari potest industria minus sit ad exprimendum cordis mei gandium, quod ibidem percepi.[704]
> [In this vision, however, I conceived in my mind so much delight and joy, so much happiness and exultation, that whatever can be explained by human ingenuity would fail to express the delight of my heart which I there felt.][705]

This instance of the inexpressibility of Heaven and the claim that what is being seen is not actually the true heavenly realm is a common theme in visionary literature. Robert Easting contends that within the corpus of visionary works there is:

> a careful insistence about what is *not* seen or what *cannot* be recounted, either because the visionary is not permitted to see heaven proper, or because there is a strict obligation placed on visionaries not to speak of such divine mysteries as they *are* allowed to

[701] Rogeri de Wendover, *Chronica, sive Flores Historiarum*, ed. Henricus O. Coxe. 3 vols. (London, 1842), vol. 3, p. 115.
[702] *Roger of Wendover's Flowers of History comprising The History of England from the Descent of the Saxons to A.D. 1235*, formerly ascribed to Matthew Paris, trans. J. A. Giles (London, 1849). Vol. 2, Part 1, pp. 162-163.
[703] Rogeri de Wendover, *Chronica, sive Flores Historiarum*, p. 116.
[704] Rogeri de Wendover, *Chronica, sive Flores Historiarum*, p. 116.
[705] *Roger of Wendover's Flowers of History*, p. 163.

> witness, or because heaven is, strictly speaking, beyond imagination and verbalization.[706]

As has been discussed earlier (pp. 210-12), there was a certain amount of scepticism about visionary material and accounts of Heaven. Although 2, Corinthians 12: 2-4 is the basis for many such visionary accounts, it comes with the disclaimer that what is seen or heard 'is not granted to man to utter.' This generally led to a cautious approach, on the part of the visionary, to descriptions of the heavenly realm. Paul also states in 1 Corinthians 2: 9, drawing from Isaiah 64: 4:

> sed sicut scriptum est quod oculus non vidit nec auris audivit nec in cor hominus ascendit quae praeparavit Deus his qui diligent illum
> [But, as it is written: *That eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him.*]

There is therefore an inexpressibility topos associated with descriptions of Heaven that is found in the *Conduct of Life* when the narrator says, 'Ne mai hit nafre no man oðer seggen mid iwisse | Hwu muchele murihðe habbeð þo þe beð in Godes blisse!' [Nor may any other man ever say it with certainty, | How much mirth those have that are in God's bliss.] (395-396/Ω408-Ω409). Similar lines are found in contemporary homilies, such as *On God Ureisun of Ure Lefdi*:[707]

> Ne mei non heorte þenchen ne nowiht arechen
> Ne no muð imelen ne no tunge tegen.
> Hu muchel god ðu ȝierkest wið-inne paradise.
> Ham þet swinkeð dei *and* niht iðine seruise.[708]
> [No heart may think nor aught imagine (reach),
> Nor no mouth utter, nor tongue teach,
> How much good thou preparest within Paradise,
> For them that work day and night in thy service.]

For the narrator of the *Conduct of Life* the true essence of Heaven is spiritual rather than physical. As well as rejecting the bodily sensations of eating and drinking, the narrator states that there will be no need for clothing or material wealth:

---

[706] Robert Easting, 'Access to Heaven in Medieval Visions of the Otherworld', in Carolyn Muessig and Ad Putter (eds.), *Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages* (London, 2007), 75-90 (p. 76).
[707] See also *Sinners Beware* (Morris 1873, p. 73): 'Ne may no tunge telle. | þe blisse þat þer is euere' [No tongue may tell of the eternal-bliss of heaven] (lines 38-39) and *A prayer to the Virgin* (Morris 1872, 196): 'And send me in-to þat blisse þat tunge ne mai tellen.' [And send me into that bliss that no tongue may tell] (line 12).
[708] Morris 1867, p. 193, lines 47-50.

> Ne sal þar ben foh ne grai, ne cunin ne ermine,
> Ne aquerne, ne methes chele, ne beuer, ne sabeline.
> Ne sal þar ben naðer scat ne srud, ne wereldes wele none. (365-367/Ω378-Ω379)
> There shall be no spotted nor grey [fur], nor rabbit nor ermine [fur],
> Nor squirrel, nor martin, nor beaver, nor sable.
> There shall be neither sheet nor shroud, nor any world's wealth.

For the narrator and his audiences Heaven is more than an improved revision of earthly life; it is the personal relationship and the perfect union that the individual has with God. The *Conduct of Life* accomplishes this through the sense of sight, 'the most excellent of the body's senses', when he says that, 'Þar me Drihte self isien swo se is, mid iwisse! | He one mai and sal al ben angles and manne blisse! [There the Lord himself shall be seen as he is, most certainly. | He alone may and shall be the bliss of all the angels and men.] (379-380/Ω392-Ω393).

The most important biblical passage with regard to seeing God is included in Christ's Sermon upon the Mount (Matthew 5: 8), in which he preaches: 'beati mundo corde quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt' [Blessed are the clean of heart: for they shall see God]. It is usually believed that this vision of God is to occur post mortem, since, in Exodus 33: 20, God tells Moses, 'rursumque ait non poteris videre faciem meam' [And again he said: Thou canst not see my face: for man shall not see me and live]. This, once more, has led those who have written visionary texts to either insert the appellation that what is really being seen is not actually Heaven or to shy away from a description altogether. Easting states that:

> For many visionary soul-journeyers following in what Zaleski calls the Drythelm 'line', heaven itself is not accessible either because they are not really dead, though they appear to be; or they 'really' are dead, but are not yet sufficiently pure to encounter heaven and are therefore sent back to amend their lives, and to warn others to do likewise.[709]

It follows, therefore, that if Heaven is sight of God, then it is not possible for a visionary to have access to this place and return to a living state. However, there are a number of passages from the

[709] Easting, 'Access to Heaven in Medieval Visions of the Otherworld', 79

Bible that make this a challenging area of theology.In Genesis 32: 30, Jacob claims to have seen God 'face to face' and that his 'soul has been saved'. Isaiah also claims to have had a vision of God.[710] However, there are New Testament passages that contend that there is no possibility of seeing God even within the heavenly state, including John 1: 18 which states, 'Deum nemo vidit umquam unigenitus Filius qui est in sinu Patris ipse enarravit' [No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him].[711]

The distinction between the two kinds of vision, the one possible in this life (*in via*) and that found in heaven (*in patria*), and the question of whether the true essence of God could be comprehended in the afterlife led to considerable debate during the medieval period.[712] It may be stated with some confidence that the ascendant view in the post-Conquest period would have been in line with Augustine: a full vision of God is not possible in this life, but would be possible in the next. Hugh of St. Victor states that:

> The blessed will see God and all knowledge in a single glance […]. In their vision of God there will be no medium or theophany; God will be known face to face.[713]

Having said this, McGinn contends that the 'visionary explosion in Western mysticism and … revival of Dionysianism' also suggest that during this period what was seen of God in Heaven and during this earthly life was by no means settled; McGinn continues by stating that, in the twelfth century, a 'new wave of visions began that featured frequently repeated raptures to a supernatural

---

[710] Isaiah 6: 5.

[711] For a full exposition of the *Visio Dei*, see Bernard McGinn, '*Visio Dei*: Seeing God in Medieval Theology and Mysticism', in Carolyn Muessig and Ad Putter, (eds.) *Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages* (London, 2007), 15-33. McGinn also gives other examples from the New Testament that similarly deny the vision of God; these are John 6: 46; 1 John 4: 12; Matthew 11: 27; 1 Timothy 6: 16.

[712] This debate is summarized in McGinn, who divides the theologians into two different schools of thought. The first is headed by Augustine who held a belief that only the true satisfaction of the heavenly vision would be found in the after-life, although he advocated that an imperfect vision of the Lord was possible, to those who were granted it, in this life. The second group, which includes figures such as Gregory of Nyssa and Dionysius, advocated a position where God's essence could not be seen in this or the after-life. Gregory distinguishes between God's divine essence and His divine energies. The energies are a manifestation of his wisdom and can be seen in the corporeal world. Gregory also advocates that the heavenly state achieved with God is not a full union that entails omnipotence but rather a knowledge of oneself which reflects the Archetype. (McGinn, '*Visio Dei*', pp. 16-18).

[713] Hugh of St Victor, *On Love: A Selection of Works of Hugh, Adam, Achard, Richard, and Godfrey of St Victor*, trans. Hugh Feiss (Turnhout, 2011), p. 149.

realm and encounters with heavenly figures, often of a direct and transformative and therefore mystical character'.[714] For instance, twelfth-century visionary material often involved descriptions of Heaven by individuals who were then returned to life, which laid claim to a level of insight that previous material had been anxious to avoid. In the *Vision of Tundale*, 'unusual knowledge was given to Tundale so that he also no longer had to ask about anything anymore, since he knew openly and wholly everything that he desired.'[715] There is a totality of insight in this passage that is suggestive of the post-mortem happiness of Heaven that becomes central to Thomas Aquinas' idea of the abode of the blessed a century later.[716]

Such was the debate about what was possible to see in this life and the next that twelfth century theologians such as Richard of St. Victor felt the need to set out more clearly the different types of vision possible in this life and in Heaven:

> There are four kinds of vision: (1) to see with bodily eyes the things of this world; (2) to see mystical meaning contained in visible things (e.g., the burning bush); (3) to see with the eye of the heart likenesses in visible things which lead one to knowledge of invisible things; (4) to contemplate heavenly things without any mediating figures of visible things. The vision of heaven is an instance of the fourth kind.[717]

The *Conduct of Life*, it would seem, is a text whose representation of Heaven abandons traditional descriptions of Heaven as a celestial city or an edenic paradise in favour of a state in which the souls of the blessed are able to obtain knowledge of everything through the sight of God. Van Os states that this feature is not present in earlier Anglo-Saxon writing, highlighting the regular occurrence of it in later writings.[718] In the *Conduct of Life,* although all of the blessed will share in the beatific

[714] McGinn, '*Visio Dei*', p. 20.
[715] Gardiner, *Visions of Heaven and Hell Before Dante*, p. 192.
[716] For a full discussion of Thomas Aquinas and Beatitude, see Lawrence F. Hundersmarck, 'Thomas Aquinas on Beatitude,', in Jan Swango Emerson and Hugh Feiss (eds.), *Imagining Heaven in the Middle Ages: A Book of Essays* (New York, 2000), 165-184.
[717] Richard of St Victor, *On Love: A Selection of Works of Hugh, Adam, Achard, Richard, and Godfrey of St Victor*, trans. Hugh Feiss (Turnhout, 2011), p. 280.
[718] Van Os, *Religious Visions*, p. 160.

vision, the level of their inclusion is dependent upon their earthly acts. The narrator of the *Conduct of Life* states:

> And þeih ne bed here eien naht alle iliche brihte,
> Hi nabbeð naht iliche muchel alle of Godes lihte;
> On þesse liue he naren naht alle of ore mihte,
> Ne þar ne sullen habben God alle bi one wihte.
> Þo sullen more of him isien þe luueden hine more,
> And more icnowen and ec witen his mihte and his ore. (381-386/Ω394-Ω399)
> [And yet their eyes shall not be all alike bright,
> They have not all equal amount of God's light;
> In this life they were not all of one virtue,
> Nor shall they there have God all by one measure.
> Those shall see more of him who loved him more here,
> And know more and also learn of his might and of his mercy.]

What is being created is a multi-layered Heaven. This is not uncommon in descriptions of Heaven that take a topographical form, but in the *Conduct of Life* the Heaven being described is an abandonment of all that is corporeal and the emphasis is on the spiritual actualisation of the physical act of seeing.[719] Through the sense of sight, a multilayered transcendental heaven is revealed. McGinn claims that:

> Precisely why the early Christians placed such emphasis on seeing God may have much to do with their cultural milieu in which the visual was so strongly privileged.[720]

Early theologians such as Clement of Alexandria, McGinn points out, held the belief therefore that the beatific vision of God in Heaven was prepared for in this life by imperfect sight. This returns us to line 18/Ω19 of the *Conduct of Life* where the narrator says, 'Ne mai Ich isien bifore me for smeche ne for miste.' [I may not see before me for smoke nor for mist]. This is a very real, physical condition for the narrator, linked to the sinful state of the soul, but it also emphasises the transition that will be made by the blessed in the achievement of Heaven. The impossibility and failure of the corporeal vision in this world is juxtaposed against the spiritual realities of the sight of God in the

[719] In the *Vision of Tundale* there are three enclosures separated by three walls. The central one might be described as Heaven.
[720] McGinn, '*Visio Dei*', p. 17.

final section of the sermon. In 1, Corinthians 13: 12, Paul says, 'We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known.' [Should be in Latin with Translation] The heavenly sight is not just the physical act of looking, it is knowledge and is beyond the earthly. It is therefore only when God 'ure sowle unbint of lichamliche bende' [our souls unbinds from the body's bonds] (398/Ω415) that such 'blisse' may be experienced.

Hell

In contrast to Heaven, Hell in the *Conduct of Life* is conceptualised as a state visited upon the bodily senses rather than upon the soul: those senses whose obsolescence is in some ways the foundation of the experience of heaven are returned to the soul in hell with redoubled intensity.[721] The verse sermon mobilises instantly recognisable images in its representation of Hell. At the beginning of this Introduction, in a discussion of the influence of the *Visio Sancti Pauli* upon later medieval descriptions of Hell, I stated that the *Conduct of Life* drew on a 'storehouse' of motifs and used ' stock themes' in its descriptions; this final section will discuss how these 'stock themes' are arranged around and enacted upon the body of the sinner. In an early study of the *Conduct of Life*, Van Os says of the verse sermon that:

> This monitory poem describes the torments of hell, together with the tormented, tormentors, instruments of torment and tormenting conditions in hell. […] The torments are of the traditional kind; so is the list of tormented sinners and the instruments of torment.[722]

Though the torments of Hell may be of a 'traditional kind' the *Conduct of Life* deploys them as part of a recognisable formula that is intended to elicit a reaction from its audiences that will lead them

[721] Emerson notes something similar in the description of hell found in the *Vision of Tundale* (Emerson, 'Harmony, Hierarchy, and the Senses in the *Vision of Tundal*', p. 4ff).
[722] Van Os, *Religious Visions*, p. 137.

to repentance. Therefore, in the *Conduct of Life*, as in all representations of Hell throughout Christian theology, when the salvation of the soul is at stake,

> [t]he worst that can befall man is only the worst that he can imagine in his separate environments. Basically, Hell had to be as terrifying as imagination could make it.'[723]

Because of the difference in descriptive detailing of the scenes of Heaven and Hell, it is often the case that Hell is more extensively treated than Heaven, and this is true of the *Conduct of Life*. Its reliance on known and very real elements of life, such as pain and suffering, gives the authors of such texts a greater range of, and liberality with, the material from which to work, although – as will be seen – there is always an emphasis on inexpressibility. Heaven is often envisioned as being beyond human comprehension, and any attempt to render it imaginatively is undertaken tentatively, or without explicitly naming it. Hell, however, is a very real actualisation of pains and torments based upon the realities of physical hardship in this life. Heaven is portrayed as an absence of all that is suffered on earth, and those sufferings are magnified in descriptions of Hell. The description of Heaven naturally comes second in the *Conduct of Life*, as it does in other descriptions of the afterlife, as it is reliant on and defined by what it is not. However, for the purposes of this discussion, it seemed prudent to end this introduction with a discussion of how the senses most associated with the body are utilised in the description of Hell found within the *Conduct of Life*.

Possibly the most recognisable of the elements of infernal torture in the *Conduct of Life* is the author's use of fire. The fire of Hell, in the *Conduct of Life*, is used as a deterrent to those who have not given due consideration to their actions in this life. The use of fire at **152-154/Ω159-Ω161** and **251-253/Ω260-Ω262** is reliant upon the association of a known fear with a torment that goes beyond the earthly: a fire that cannot be 'quenche' [quenched] (**152/Ω159**) and that is 'hundredfeald

[723] Lauran Paine, *The Hierarchy of Hell* (London, 1972), p. 11.

hatere þan be ure' [a hundredfold hotter than ours is] (251/Ω260). The torment plays on the fear of corporeal punishment and pain, as this is the most effective way of achieving repentance in this world. However, the formula used is one that extends the torment of what is real to a place where the fire can burn in a 'supernatural' way: a hundred times hotter than earthly fire, and is unquenchable. Paine says of Hell that although it was often said to be inhabited by what is truly unimaginable, this could not be the case:

> …[T]he restrictions of the imagination could not – and still cannot – conceive of anything completely and truly imaginary; everything man conceives is from his personal prison – his earth-mind.[724]

Where heaven is constructed around an 'absence of negatives', Hell, in the *Conduct of Life*, takes the most negative elements of what is present within the sections concerned with this transitory life (the *contemptus mundi*) and multiplies them: these are necessarily enacted upon the body.

Heat is not the only natural element acting upon the bodies of the damned in the *Conduct of Life*. It is alternated with images of freezing cold in 138/Ω143 and in 236-240/Ω245-Ω249, where it reads:

> ⟨H⟩ie fareð fram hate [to] chele, fram chele to hate;
> ⟨Þ⟩an hie beð in þe hate - chele hem þuncheð blisse,
> ⟨Þ⟩an hie cumeð eft to chele of hate hie habbeð misse!
> ⟨E⟩iðer doð \hem/ wo inoh, nabbeð hie none lisse;
> ⟨N⟩iten hweðer hem doð wers to nafre non wisse. (236-240/Ω245-Ω249)
> [They go from heat to cold, from cold to heat;
> When they are in the heat - cold seems bliss to them,
> When they come again to the cold they miss the heat.
> In both they suffer woe enough, they have no peace;
> They know not with any certainty which is worse.]

Although scriptural authority for the alternation of heat and cold (236/Ω245) is established in Job 24: 19 several studies have suggested that strong motifs of cold and frost were more prominent

[724] Paine, *The Hierarchy of Hell*, p. 11.

within descriptions of Hell in places where the climate itself reflected such a hardship.[725] It is perhaps, therefore, unsuprising to find such conceptions in the *Conduct of Life*, which was written in a place and at a time where the physical hardship of a harsh winter, and the possible threat of death brought about by the cold, were more realistic fears.

Furthermore, Healey argues for the existence of a tradition in Anglo-Saxon literature - possibly based upon the *Visio Sancti Pauli* – which locates Hell and Heaven on a north-west/south-east axis, citing two passages from *Genesis B* that situate the location of Lucifer in the North and West.[726] Wright concurs that, '[t]he location of hell in the north is commonplace' and suggests that the long versions of the *Visio Sancti Pauli* and several of the redactions suggest a north or north-west direction.[727] Wright also, in a section that suggests a possible influence of the *Visio Sancti Pauli* upon *Blickling Homily XVI*, notes that the trees in the homily are frosty and not fiery, as they are in the *Visio Sancti Pauli*. He proposes that:

> the change from fiery to icy trees is a logical corollary of the northern setting of the punishment in the homily, and it is characteristic of hell that fire and ice are coexisting (sometimes alternating) torments.[728]

The movement from burning heat to freezing cold in the *Conduct of Life* also has an antecedent in the *Vision of Drythelm* where a great valley is described with destructive flames on the one side and hail mixed with snow on the other. Souls are described as being moved as if by a violent storm from one side to the other: at first to avoid the heat and then to escape the excessive cold. The similarity between this scene and the one in the *Conduct of Life* (236-238/Ω245-Ω247)

[725] See, for instance, Van Os, *Religious Visions*, p. 90, where he states that 'the torment of extreme cold had rather a stronger hold upon the imagination of the northern race of Englishmen than upon that of more southerly peoples'.
[726] Antonette Di Paolo Healey, *The Old English Vision of St. Paul* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1978), p. 55.
[727] Wright, *The Irish Tradition*, p. 129.
[728] Wright, *The Irish Tradition*, p. 131.

suggests that the author was aware of this text, or an intermediate text that drew on Bede, for his description of the torments of Hell.[729]

The pairing of heat with cold is also regularly found in contemporary descriptions of hell from this period and would appear to be a recurring motif present in such portrayals. Two similar descriptions of the alternation of heat and cold to those found in the *Conduct of Life* and in the *Vision of Drythem* are also found in *Sawles Warde* and *Vices and Virtues*. In *Sawles Warde*, for example, it is stated:

> þer is remu*n*ge iþe brune. *ant* toðes hechelunge iþe snawi weattres. ferliche ha flutteð from þe heate ⁊ in to þe chele. Ne neau*er* nuten ha of þeos twa ⁊ hweðer ham þuncheð wurse. for eiðer is unþolelich. ant iþis ferliche mong þe leat*er*e þurh þe earre derueð þe mare.
>
> [There is shrieking in the flames, and chattering of teeth in the snowy waters. Suddenly they flit from the heat into the cold, nor ever do they know of these two which is worse for them, for each is intolerable. And in this marvellous mingling the latter through the former tormenteth the more].[730]

Further examples from the period suggest that the pairing of the two elements had become an accepted part of the topography of Hell. For instance, in *Death*, found in both Cotton MS. Caligula A. ix and Jesus, the Soul exclaims that because of the Body's actions, 'ich schal bernen in fur. | and chyueren in yse' [I shall burn in fire and shiver in ice].[731] Similarly, in *Sinners Beware*, which follows the *Conduct of Life* in Jesus, cold and heat are once again paired and are followed quickly after by another coupling of torments typical of descriptions of hell, including the *Conduct of Life*: hunger and thirst. *Sinners Beware* reads:

> Her is chele and hete.
> And hunger vnmete.
> And þurst elles to kene. (49-51)
> [There is cold and hete
> and immeasurable hunger
> and thirst beyond cruel.]

[729] Hill 1972, p. 120 also draws a comparison between this section from Bede and line 244/Ω253.
[730] Morris 1867, p. 251.
[731] Morris 1878, p. 177.

In comparison, the *Conduct of Life* states that punishment by 'hunger and þurst euel two iferen' (233/Ω240) [hunger and thirst, two evils together] will be suffered by those that 'ware mete niðinges here' (234/Ω241) [were meat-miserly here]. The use of measure-for-measure punishment – assigning specific torments to a particular group based on the sins that they have committed in this life: perpetual hunger and thirst for those who sinned through gluttony – illustrates the connection between all three realms: on earth (transitory), in heaven (spiritual reward), and in hell (physical punishment). It illustrates how themes (and images) are repeated and reinforced, interlinked and interlaced, throughout the *Conduct of Life*. This facilitates the didactic message of the sermon, which is reliant upon the cyclical nature of Salvation History and the dualistic approach of punishment and reward in the afterlife, through the use of the physical and the use of the spiritual.

In the *Conduct of Life* it is stated that:

> Vre foremes faderes gult we abugeð alle,
> Al his ofsprung after him in harem is biualle,
> Þurst and hunger, chele and hete and alle unhalðe. (197-199/Ω204-Ω206)
> [For our first father's guilt we all suffer,
> All his offspring after him are fallen into harm,
> Thirst and hunger, cold and heat, and all illness.]

The sermon establishes how the earthly suffering of 'Þurst and hunger' [thirst and hunger] were brought into the world by Adam's sin.[732] In establishing a period of time when, and a reason why, such hardships came into the world, the narrator alludes to a period before such conditions were present and by doing so helps to describe the afterlife. Thirst and hunger (and heat and cold) are very physical conditions enacted upon the body. Therefore, in Heaven they are absent: 'þar nis hunger, ne þurst' (327/Ω338) [there is no hunger or thirst], as the body is absent; whereas, in Hell they are exaggerated and distorted, 'Swo þat he witen þat here pine sal nafre habben ende!' (294/Ω 305) [As they know that their pain shall never have an end!]. However, it is not the descriptions of the heavenly abode or of hellish punishments that are at the sermon's didactic core, but the

[732] It should be noted that alongside 'Þurst and hunger' we find 'chele and hete'.

individual's actions in this life. Both versions of the afterlife (Heaven and Hell) work in comparison with the living world: it is the gluttony of those who were meat-miserly (234/Ω241) and who had a 'ful wombe' [full stomach] and 'lihtliche speken of hunger and of fasten' (147/Ω154) [speak lightly of hunger and fasts], that will lead them to the punishments in hell; and it is the protection afforded by 'almesse' [alms], fasten [fasting], and 'ibeden' [prayers] (339/Ω351) that will lead the sinner to heaven. The sinner is, therefore, didactically returned to his actions in this life.

The lines quoted previously (236-240/Ω245-Ω249), upon the transition between heat and cold, are followed in the sermon by:

> ⟨H⟩ie walkeð afre and secheð reste, ac hie hes ne muȝen imeten,
> ⟨F⟩or þi þe hie nolde, þe hwile hie mihten here, senne beten;
> ⟨H⟩ie sec\h/eð reste þar non nis, ac hie hies ne muȝen ifinden,
> ⟨A⟩c walkeð weri up and dun, se water doð mid winde. (241-244/Ω250-Ω253)
> [They ever walk and seek rest, but they cannot find it,
> Because they would not, while they could here, repent of their sins;
> They seek rest where there is none, and they cannot find it,
> But walk weary up and down, as water doth (tossed) with the wind.]

Hell is described in terms that suggest not only physical pain and suffering but also constant activity. Hill describes the Hell of the *Conduct of Life* as depicted in terms that suggest not only physical pain and suffering but also 'activity', 'timeless movement' and 'ceaseless wandering'.[733] Once again the pre-fall state, the transitory world, and the abodes of the afterlife can be compared and contrasted through the repetition and re-appropriation of themes concerning activity and rest (the physical and the spiritual). Initial (worldly) activity was brought about by Adam, who moved humanity out of the earthly paradise and into the transitory world. Heaven is described as a place of 'reste abuten swunche' [rest without toil] (373/Ω386) where activity is replaced by knowledge of God ('reste') – descriptively achieved through the negation of the earthly 'swunche' [toil]; Hell is an exaggerated, frenzied and never-ending exaggeration of the earthly, where 'reste' cannot be achieved even though it is always sought. A similar contemporary example of continuous torment

[733] Hill 1972, p. 120.

without rest is found in *The XI Pains of Hell*, also found in Jesus, where, after a description of the tortures found in Hell, the narrator says of the guilty soul: 'Naueþ heo neuer reste ne ro' [it never has rest nor peace].

This whole sequence (236-244/Ω245-Ω253) in the *Conduct of Life*, therefore, communicates the essence of everlasting torment. It contains the *poena sensus*, or the pain of sense, which is usually inflicted upon the body by the torment of fire,[734] as it is in the above description where it is alternated with extreme cold, but it also encompasses the *poena damni*, pain of loss, which manifests itself in the eternal search for, and inability to find, 'reste'. The idea of 'reste' represents, as was discussed earlier, not only the cessation of the physical hardship of Hell but also the spiritual fulfilment achieved in Heaven. Therefore, seeking 'reste þar non nis' [rest where none is] (243/Ω252) is indicative of 'the desolation of God's abandonment, which is eternal.'[735] The *poena damni* and the *poena sensus* are considered to be the 'basic anguish of the damned, with the *poena damni* being the worst'.[736]

However, in these lines the idea of God's abandonment has been made physical. The narrator once again employs a punishment that is linked to the worldly sin, as it is those who were inconsistent in their spiritual life (internally wandering) that are emphasized as receiving no 'reste' in hell: the spiritual movement of the individual in life has been turned into a physical act of torture in Hell, as the sinner who now knows what he wants cannot ever achieve it. Similarly, we find further examples in the *Conduct of Life* of specific torments inflicted upon the bodies of the sinner, reserved for the 'prude' [proud], 'niðefule' [envious] and the 'evele swiken' [evil deceivers] who are torn and gnawed upon by 'naddren and snaken, eveten and fruden' [adders and snakes, lizards and frogs] (277-278/Ω288-Ω289): their bodies are physically attacked and devoured by the animals of hell. In Emerson's analysis of the *Vision of Tundal* she highlights that it is the senses of taste and

[734] Paine, *The Hierarchy of Hell*, p. 30.
[735] Paine, *The Hierarchy of Hell*, p. 31.
[736] Paine, *The Hierarchy of Hell*, p. 31.

touch that are utilized in Tundale's Hell because they are 'those senses that need cleansing most'; as the above has demonstrated, the narrator of the *Conduct of Life* describes Hell in a similar manner.[737] The sinner in Hell will be deprived of food and drink where in life he had been gluttonous, and will be eaten for all eternity by the beasts that dwell there. Swanson notes of the sinners in hell that 'their sense of taste and touch are literally turned inside out… [They] do not eat; they are devoured'.[738]

Hell as a place where the sinner is digested is a common motif in literature, sermons and illuminations contemporary with the *Conduct of Life*. For example, *In Epiphania Domini*, also found in Trinity, the sinner makes an exhortation to God asking that the storm does not sink him, 'ne þ*at* þe deuel me swelge. ne þ*at* þe pit tune ouer me his muð' [nor the devil swallow me, nor the pit to close its mouth over me].[739] In addition, the presence of animals that gnaw at the flesh is also commonplace and is found throughout the homiletic literature of the period, with a particularly detailed description found in *The XI Pains of Hell*:[740]

> Vvrþer þer beoþ olde men.
> Þat amo*n*g neddre*n*. habbeþ heore den.
> Heo*m* heo to-stynge þ vychon.
> *And* freteþ heore fleys. to þe bon.
> *And* neddr*en* sukeþ heore brayn (175-179)
> [Further on there are old men
> that among the snakes have their home.
> The snakes sting them
> and gnaw their flesh to the bone
> and adders suck their brains].

And when this act of digestion is completed, 'he beoþ al in on' [they become whole again], so that the torture can continue for all eternity.

The continuous activity and never-ending torments of hell are also denoted by the sounds of the tormented, with the pairing of 'woning and wop' [wailing and weeping] (235/Ω244) of those

[737] Emerson, 'Harmony, Hierarchy, and the Senses', p. 4.
[738] Emerson, 'Harmony, Hierarchy, and the Senses', p. 4.
[739] Morris 1867, p. 43.
[740] For further examples see also: *On the Lord's Day*, p. 42, *Sinners Beware* (lines 52-54), *Death* (lines 153-54), *Dominica Prima in Quadragesima* (Morris, *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises* (1867), p. 33), and *De Defunctis* (Morris 1867, p. 173).

in hell contrasted with the 'angles songe' [angels' song] (355/Ω367) of Heaven. This pairing of the cries of the sinners is a convention that is found in other contemporaneous texts and suggests a 'stock' means of representing the sounds of hell that might have been called upon during this period. Ferdinand Holthausen demonstrates this in his notes to *Vices and Virtues*, a text that has many motifs common to both that text and the *Conduct of Life*, by showing that the combination of 'wop and woninge' found in that text is also found as 'wóp and wánung' in Wulfstan (139/3) and 'Be Dómes Daeȝe' (201), 'wop and wonynge' in 'Sinners Beware' (p.74/55), and as 'waning and wop' in the 'Poema Morale'.[741]

All of the sins and punishments considered so far, and the senses connected to them, are associated with the flesh of the corporeal world. As has been demonstrated, these sins and senses can be found in the narrator's descriptions of the transient world and are either perverted through the tortures of hell or are made absent in the description of Heaven. As has also been seen, the physicality of hell should be read, moreover, as a demonstration of the abandonment of God – the lack of 'reste' denoting an absence of salvation and the eternal search for the now unachievable state of Heaven. Biernoff states that 'in the Middle Ages the flesh signified humanity's inherence in the material world and alienation from God';[742] the reliance on the flesh in hell, for the punishment of sinners, demonstrates a continuation of this without end.

The final sense to be considered in this section of the Introduction is sight. I have already noted, in pp. 230-237, the centrality of sight in medieval culture and its privileged status within the *Conduct of Life*. Sight in this world has the ability to connect (de-fracture) the self and bridge the gap between body and soul; it is an extension of the sensitive soul – a sense by which one may come closer to an understanding of God in this life, but it should also be guarded against (enclosed) as it is

[741] F. Holthausen, ed., *Vices and Virtues, Being A Soul's Confession of its Sins, with Reason's Description of the Virtues. A Middle-English Dialogue of about 1200 A.D., Edited with an Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Glossary, from the Stowe MS 240 in the British Museum*, vol. 2, Early English Text Society o.s. 159 (Oxford, 1888), p. 161.
[742] Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment*, p. 67.

a vulnerable point at which sin might enter. Sight is ultimately linked to knowledge and is, therefore, a way of achieving, describing and understanding paradise. Where all of the other senses are heightened or perverted in Hell, the sense of sight is dimmed or withdrawn.

Hell is therefore a place of darkness. It is a place where, 'Afre þar is euel smech, þiesternesse and eie; | Nis þar nafre oðer liht þan þe sparte leie' [There is ever evil smoke, darkness and awe; / There is never other light than the gloomy frames] (281-282/Ω292-Ω293). Even the flames are gloomy, a common motif in descriptions of Hell where the 'fire is black or dark fire, burning without giving light and emitting blinding and smothering smoke.'[743] The removal of the sense of sight is also the removal of any sense of consolation or hope. It is necessary at this point to return to the line concerning the narrator from earlier in the sermon, where he states 'Ne mai Ich isien bifore me for smeche ne for miste' [I may not see before me for smoke nor for mist] (18/Ω19). The parallels of blinding by smoke on earth and in hell are important to an understanding of the sermon as a whole, as the degeneration of the body and the physical sense of sight are transferred out of the transitory world and made eternal in hell. The physical blinding of the narrator in life should be juxtaposed against the spiritual redemption of inner sight, brought about by repentance and confession, as a means to spiritual and Heavenly accession; but it should also be read against the eternal damnation of the smothering smoke in hell and the abandonment by God – as sight is linked to knowledge of God through the eye of the heart and the beatific vision. To be blind in hell is to be abandoned: physical sight and physical blinding in life are temporary, but the beatific vision of Heaven and the abandonment of hell are eternal.

It follows that if Hell is a manifestation of the worst extremities that can be suffered by the body in this life, it is also the absence of the extraneous influences that give a sense of time and place and therefore security. The narrator says of Hell that 'Nafre sunne þar ne sineð ne mone ne storre'

[743] Cavendish, *Visions of Heaven and Hell*, p. 113.

[Never shines there the sun, nor moon nor stars] (279/Ω290). The sun and the stars are also the means of measuring the time on earth. Once again, the absence of them in Hell emphasises the eternity of the damnation to which the souls are subjected. The lack of the celestial bodies in Hell therefore signifies the absence of God, the *poena damni,* as 'He is soð sunne *and* briht *and* dai abute nihte.' [He is true sun and bright, and day without night] (370/Ω383). Once more the idea of eternity is expressed through the absence of what constitutes earthly time. If there is no day and if there is no night then it follows that there is no succession of seasons or years.

Conclusion

In conclusion, and to return to the manuscript context and longevity of the *Conduct of Life*, the verse-sermon in Lambeth and Trinity as a tool for moral instruction would have been ideal for a preacher – its lucidity, like that of modern *aide-memoires*, is its chief value when judged in its historical context. In the later manuscripts, McClean and Egerton, the text has been placed alongside other devotional material for the contemplation of a female novice. This movement from public performance to contemplative study may initially seem an unexpected and unlikely development for a text devised for preaching, but if considered in the light of the previous discussion on memory, I hope that it is possible to see how the *Conduct of Life* might achieve both purposes and thus give some idea of the sources of its longevity. In both of the later manuscripts, the *Conduct of Life* contains the same mnemonic features of rhyme and metre, as well as being pictorial in detail – whilst maintaining the coherently organised themes. The inclusion of the *Conduct of Life* in a codex intended for contemplative study could be seen as representing an adoption by a more elite culture, or at least one that is now more inclusive of the vernacular, without any alteration to the fundamentally memorial function of the text itself. For the preacher, his audience and the novice reading the text of the *Conduct of* Life, the aim of remembrance and meditation is the same, and the rhyme, metre and pictorial quality serve the same purpose.

The ultimate aim of the *Conduct of Life* is to bring the listener to a specific realisation and to repentance before it is too late. This is achieved through the assertion and the repetition of phrases that are intended to admonish the audience into choosing the spiritual world over the juxtaposed corporal world. In this regard, the *Conduct of Life* has many similarities with contemporaneous lyrics and homiletic texts that focus on the death of the individual and on the art

of dying well, and which have the salvation of the soul at their didactic core. In addition, the *Conduct of Life* is part of a tradition that places an emphasis on the transitory nature of this world through topoi such as the *momento mori* and *contemptus mundi*, which function as pedagogic tools by which to warn the individual to repent before it is too late.

The focus in the *Conduct of Life* upon the individual at the time of death, rather than on the more traditional portrayals of a general judgement, reflects a broader theological movement that places an increasing emphasis on self-examination and penitential self-awareness. This is most prominently evidenced by the growth in importance of auricular confession and the accompanying summas and manuals of instruction. The use of the narrator himself is a didactic means of reinforcement and schooling. He has many similarities with the visionary, acting as a guide to heaven and hell, and the figure of the old man from contemporaneous lyrics, who laments his own life choices and urges repentance before it is too late. However, he is also a means of redemption that might absolve the sins of the individuals through their own confession.

The result of the choice faced by the individual is the difference between an eternity of spiritual heaven and a very physical hell – where the benefits of an uninhibited, indulgent life on earth are juxtaposed with the negative physical ramifications of such a choice. The physicality of hell as opposed to the spirituality of heaven is used to highlight the transience of this life. The poet himself says that the audience should always be aware of 'Hwu litle hwile we bieð her, hwu longe elles hware,' [How little while we are here, how long elsewhere] (331/Ω342). Heaven and Hell are depicted as opposing polarities; if Hell is the extreme of all that is negative in life, then Heaven is the opposite – a negation of any kind of suffering. Hell is firmly based on the corporeal and Heaven the spiritual.

The inclusion of the narrator grounds the text and gives a focus to what is being preached. He is a physical embodiment of what is at stake. His body is the representation of the transience of life and is therefore synonymous with the choices that are to be made. Upon his form the audience

can see their own debate between soul and body played out. However, the *Conduct of Life* focuses on the sense of sight as a means to de-fracture the divided self. Associations are drawn between the degeneration of the narrator's sight and the transience of this world and the sin that may lead the individual to damnation. However it is the redemptive quality of repentance that will ultimately reverse the diminishing vision of the narrator, ultimately granting him a redefined idea of what 'sight' is through the beatific vision.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES and EDITORIAL POLICY

Introduction

Discussing his own edition of the Middle English Prose *Brut* for EETS, John J. Thompson recently reflected on the question of why an editor would choose to produce an edition of a text that had been edited before, noting that:

> one must always consider seriously whether the editorial effort required is worth it, or whether the long and arduous hours of preliminary research necessary to achieve a new edition might not more profitably be spent on some other kind of textual and codicological study.[744]

This is a sentiment with which it can sometimes be tempting to agree. In their introduction to the collection in which Thompson's warning appeared, Gillespie and Hudson write, in an excursus on lexicography, that '[many critics] have regarded the editor's activity as similarly without value to any save himself'. The persistent suspicion of editors, they continue, as scholars consumed by their own self-indulgence and given to producing work of no original value, has led to the circulation of 'dark rumours' that 'certain faculties at certain universities will not accept an edition as a suitable fulfilment of the requirement for a doctorate'.[745]

Melodramatic as these reflections are, they do raise questions that any editor producing a new edition of a medieval text is bound to consider. Why do we need new editions of old texts? What is the purpose of this 'new' edition? How does an editor (this editor) make the decisions that he does concerning methodology, selection of variants and apparatus? And how are these decisions justified and evidenced? As Thompson says, any edition's methodology and purpose must be declared 'clearly and unambiguously' in its introduction, and I will endeavour here to do just that.[746]

---

[744] John J. Thompson, 'Why Edit the Middle English Prose *Brut*? What's (Still) in It for Us?', in *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Vincent Gillespie and Anne Hudson (Turnhout, Belgium, 2013), p. 445.
[745] Vincent Gillespie and Anne Hudson, 'Introduction', in *Probable Truth*, p. 1.
[746] John J. Thompson, 'Why Edit the Middle English Prose *Brut*? What's (Still) in It for Us?', p. 445.

The *Conduct of Life* has been edited before as extracts, as complete individual texts, as conflated texts, as a composite text (based on the then known six versions of the verse sermon), as texts in parallel, and as a searchable electronic resource.[747] Why, then, is another edition of the *Conduct of Life* necessary, or even desirable? Gillespie and Hudson defend the honour of editing as an academic task as such:

> the critic can, if the evidence is too elusive, confused, or incomprehensible, redirect his track to circumvent the problem, [but] there is no escape from the demand to make the edited text comprehensible and transparent – the text sets the problem which cannot be avoided.[748]

This is not a reason in and of itself to produce a new scholarly edition of a work that has already been edited before - to claim that it is might be to risk self-indulgence - but as studies into early-Middle English textual relationships and manuscript studies advance, so must the editions that support such critical thinking. In creating a new edition of the *Conduct of Life* I have had to consider my own approach to the question of what a text is, how textuality can be represented, and what media or apparatuses might represent that most clearly and completely. Concentrating first on the theoretical co-ordinates and methodological choices of my own edition, I will then gesture towards some of the ways in which I believe that the text's full complexity and significance is no longer fully served by previous editions.

The Lachmannian stemmatic approach to the editing of Middle English, almost exclusively employed during the nineteenth and much of the twentieth century, relies on the evidence of non-authorial errors in surviving witnesses to establish the archetype, or, if the archetype cannot be established, the closest or most representative witness to the now lost archetype. The principle being that these non-authorial errors can demonstrate a relationship between two or more witnesses based on the errors of a scribe or from damage caused to the manuscript, from which a *stemma* or family

[747] For a full list see, pp. 1-3.
[748] Vincent Gillespie and Anne Hudson (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), p. 1.

tree can be determined; witnesses, therefore, that demonstrate exclusive descent from another manuscript within that structure can be eliminated.[749] This approach to the editing of Middle English reflects the techniques traditionally employed by the editor of classical works, where the editor attempts to 'reverse the process of transmission and restore the words of the ancients as closely as possible to their original form'.[750]

Whether this process itself furnishes the best method of finding a text which approximates most closely to an assumed authorial intention may be another matter: Rosamund Allen, for instance, has demonstrated that the establishment of familial groups through 'inaccurate readings' in stemmatics means that 'a rogue late, unrelated, manuscript deriving from a lost ancient but *accurate* copy will not be highlighted'.[751] Beyond methodological issues, the recensionist assumption of an original, singular authorial text, which can be distinguished from scribal texts, is in itself somewhat problematic, not least in its implicit assumption that authorial and scribal roles are fully distinguishable. As Paul Meahan points out, 'critics have become sceptical about the ability to discern authorial intent and to access an idealised precise text'.[752] However, the need to isolate some shadow of single authorial intention remains something of a necessity in fixing a text's singular existence, however qualified the search is; many editors and critics alike are still, in Allen's words, ' left with the uneasy feeling that we ought to be searching for a set of readings which at least approximates to what the author wrote'.[753] Similarly, Nicolas Jacobs believes that 'the original

[749] Douglas Moffat and Vincent P. McCarren, 'A Bibliographical Essay on Editing Methods and Authorial and Scribal Intention', in *A Guide to editing Middle English*, ed. Douglas Moffat and Vincent P McCarren (Michigan, 1998), p. 27.
[750] L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 2nd edn. (London, 1974), p. 212.
[751] Rosamund Allen, 'Editing sole attestation in selected Middle English textual traditions', in V. Gillespie and A. Hudson (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 293-311, p. 294.
[752] William Paul Meahan, 'Editing Middle English', <http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cpercy/courses/6361 meahan.htm> [Last accessed 13/07/2017]
[753] Allen, 'Editing Sole Attestation', p. 294.

version of a literary work acquires a de facto authority by the mere fact of the author's having troubled to compose it'.[754]

Though it now appears to be well established that 'the recension […] is a conclusion resulting from scholarly judgement or conjecture' and cannot be achieved, editors such as Jacobs believe that 'if it is possible to assert with some plausibility what the reading from which the variants derive is likely to have been, it is an abdication of editorial judgement to refrain from suggesting it'. He concludes by stating that 'the possibility of being wrong is the inevitable price of saying anything of more than trivial interest or significance'.[755]

Whilst acknowledging that an approach that seeks to establish an authoritative text based upon the intentions of the author is 'arguably appropriate' for some medieval vernacular works, such as Chaucer, Millett demonstrates, through three separate case studies of early Middle English textual transmission, that 'other medieval vernacular works suggest less concern for the textual integrity of the original work, and a less clearly-marked distinction between the functions of author and scribe'.[756] The stemmatic recensionist approach to editing as the 'science of discovering error in texts and the art of removing it',[757] as Housman once described it, accepts a modern conception of ownership and authorship for the text that privileges the original as authority and does not take into consideration the fluidity of the early Middle English manuscript tradition. As Wogan-Browne, Watson, Taylor and Evans show in their introduction to a more recent anthology of literary theory concerning writings in the vernacular:

> Our own categories and models for authorship do not often overlap with what can be deduced from Middle English terminology and practice. The relatively rare word *writere* in Middle English is as likely to indicate the scribe as the composer of a literary work; the term *poet* is not in widespread use before the fourteenth century; and the

[754] Nicolas Jacobs, 'Kindly light or foxfire? The authorial text reconsidered', in V. P. McCarren and D. Moffat (eds.) *A Guide to Editing Middle English* (Ann Arbor, 1998), 3-14, p. 9.
[755] Nicolas Jacobs, 'A Kindly Light or Foxfire?', p. 13.
[756] Bella Millett, 'What is *Mouvance*?' in *Wessex Parallel Web Texts* (Southampton, 2003), <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/~wpwt/mouvance/mouvance.htm> [Last accessed: 13/07/2017]
[757] A. E. Housman, 'The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism', *The Classical Papers of A. E. Housman: Volume III: 1915-1936*, ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (Cambridge, 1972), p. 1058.

> term for composers and compilers of narrative verse, *maker*, has not survived in any specifically literary sense.[758]

Here, Wogan-Browne *et al* present an understanding of the process of composition and production of manuscripts in Middle English that challenges the philosophy that privileges the authority of authorship, reflected in many of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century approaches to textual scholarship and editorial theory - which can be accounted for by modern ideas of the author but cannot be transferred to the Middle English period. Similarly, Matthew Fisher sees this approach to scholarship and editing as being derived from 'a definition of medieval authorship that axiomatically excludes scribes' by silently assigning them a 'fixed and stable intention': to create an accurate, truthful or faithful copy.[759] As Fisher contends, the 'scribal intentionality is excluded by the very vocabulary of textual scholarship and editing' which requires it to speak to the intentions of the author and, therefore, the constructed idea of an authoritative text 'framed within a reductive binary of error and accuracy'.[760]

These developments in how a growing number of textual scholars and editors now approach the manuscript witnesses of Middle English texts have been heavily influenced by the earlier scholarship of both Zumthor and Cerquiglini. Zumthor uses the term *mouvance* to describe textual mobility (variance) in anonymous medieval French poems. His scholarship demonstrates that, in late-medieval texts of French poets where the author was named, the manuscript witnesses were relatively fixed ('accurate' scribal copies were produced); but in the more common anonymous poems, where the author was not known, textual variation was much more likely.[761] These differences between witnesses ranged from changes to the wording

---

[758] Nicholas Watson, Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, Andrew Taylor and Ruth Evans (eds.), *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280-1520* (Exeter, 1999), p. 4.
[759] Matthew Fisher, 'When variants aren't: authors as scribes in some English manuscripts', in V. Gillespie and A. Hudson (eds.), *Probable Truth*, p. 207.
[760] Fisher, 'When Variants aren't', p. 207.
[761] Paul Zumthor, *Toward a Medieval Poetics*, translated by P. Bennett (Minneapolis, 1992) pp. 40-76 (p. 47).

or the dialect of the text to more substantial rewritings and rearrangements of whole sections of text.

Zumthor, therefore, argues that an editorial approach that attempts to reconstruct the author's original as the *only* authentic version of the text is anachronistic, since early Medieval texts written in the vernacular were 'not normally regarded as the intellectual property of a single, named author, and might be indefinitely reworked by others'.[762] These re-workings represent different 'textual states' that reflect 'the essential mobility of the medieval text'.[763] Consequently, Zumthor suggests that modern scholarship needs to redefine the concept of a medieval 'work' (*oeuvre*) so that it is no longer 'identified with the archetype in the traditional editorial diagram of relationships, the *stemma*', but reflects 'the complex unity constituted by the collectivity of its material versions'.[764]

Zumthor's study of medieval French poetics emphasises *mouvance* as a product of the ' continuing interaction between written and oral culture at each stage of transmission'.[765] Zumthor believes that some texts were more likely to introduce variability than others based on both their orality and anonymity. Stephen Morris describes these works that are 'more readily subject to the linguistic fluidity to which [Zumthor] refers' as 'utilitarian texts', and places sermons within this category.[766] Such fluidity appears to be borne out by the present study of an early Middle English verse sermon with multiple adapted witnesses and strong evidence of an oral tradition behind its production, performance and transmission.

Subsequent scholarship, particularly that of Cerquiglini, builds on this work and demonstrates that such fluidity is not wholly restricted to the 'intervocal' transformations

[762] Millett, 'What is *Mouvance*?'.
[763] Millett, 'What is *Mouvance*?'.
[764] Millett, 'What is *Mouvance*?'.
[765] Millett, 'What is *Mouvance*?'.
[766] Stephen Morrison, 'What is scribal error, and what should editors do (or not do) about it?' in V. Gillespie and A. Hudson 9eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013) 261-275, p. 263.

(*mouvance*), confirmed by Zumthor's work, but can be more broadly established in the *variance* of 'intertextual' transmissions within the medieval manuscript tradition. Cerquiglini establishes that the formulation of modernity's conception of what constitutes a 'text', or at least 'the notion of a reliable text', is 'interdependent with the printing industry's reaching a state that finally provides satisfaction'; the printing press fixed 'the desire of the author […] within the two-dimensional limits of the page', where it could be reproduced 'in its integrity' .[767] This is solidified, he argues, at the beginning of the nineteenth century when 'the idea of literary property acquired the force of law' and 'every text was first of all something belonging to the person who conceived it: origins and paternity'.[768] During the nineteenth century, philologists set themselves on a positivist course and saw the need to establish editing as a 'scientific' pursuit that would 'provide itself, through a process of reduction, with an object that was stable, simple, regular, and homogenous'.[769] This was achieved initially through the Lachmannian assumption that copyists 'were only guilty of mistakes' and that 'these errors represented degradation' and could be eliminated through *recensio*.

However, as Cerquiglini argues, 'the author is not a medieval concept',[770] and the variability of the literary work in the Middle Ages demonstrates that 'meaning was to be found everywhere, and its origin was nowhere': the continual rewriting of a work was probably more important than 'the fact that one hand was the first'.[771] Machan agrees that 'manuscript copies proliferated diversely, and individual copies underwent alteration without the stabilizing and provident influence of a modern editor', and similarly finds that the advent of print was essential to the standardization of the authorial text as one that is

[767] Bernard Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology*, translated by Betsy Wing (London, 1999), p. 2.
[768] Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant*, p. 8.
[769] Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant*, p. 58.
[770] Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant*, p. 8.
[771] Cerquiglini, *In Praise of the Variant*, p. 33.

authoritative.[772] This was, Machan contends, in conjunction with a humanist framework that affirms the 'lexical' and the 'idealist' – 'lexical in the sense that words are privileged over their material manifestation and idealist in the sense that the essential intended work has priority over a text that might have appeared at a specific moment in a specific document'.[773]

Machan argues that for those responsible for transmitting Middle English it was more important to convey the underlying ideas of a work (*res*) rather than accurately copying the words and rhyme (*verba*). Whilst a fluidity in precise verbal form appears to be well accepted in current scholarly thinking about the transmission of Middle English, Daniel Wakelin argues, whilst acknowledging the importance of Machan's work, that rather than having no 'expectation of the possibility of textual correctness or incorrectness', as Machan asserts, Middle English scribes would regularly *correct* texts.[774] Wakelin makes the point that whilst Machan has demonstrated that 'users of Middle English were sometimes more interested in the contents of a text (*res*), such corrections remind us that at other times they were interested in its wording (*verba*)'.[775]

Whether Middle English scribes were only interested in the text's content and overall message in their re-workings or whether they also on occasions 'acted more like editors' – sometimes 'correcting' a text and other times 'thinking precisely about not varying wording' - as Wakelin asserts,[776] the evidence suggests that both are true in different contexts. It is important to conclude that an editorial policy that privileges an idea of the original as authority and ignores the multiplicity of meaning within the manuscript culture of the period is wholly anachronistic and flawed. As Stephen G. Nichols states:

---

[772] Tim William Machan, *Textual Criticism and Middle English Texts* (Charlottesville, 1994), pp. 15-16 (p. 13).
[773] Machan, *Textual Criticism,* p. 12.
[774] Machan, *Textual Criticism*, p. 153; Daniel Wakelin, 'Editing and correcting', pp. 242-243. Wakelin further notes that 'it is important to be clear that to identify scribes or readers correcting manuscripts is not the same as identifying correct*ness* in the resulting texts in any particular lection.' (p. 246).
[775] Wakelin, 'Editing and correcting', p. 258.
[776] Wakelin, 'Editing and correcting', p. 258.

> It [philology] joined forces with the mechanical press in a movement away from the multiplicity and variance of a manuscript culture, thereby rejecting, at the same time, the representation of the past which went along with medieval manuscript culture: adaptation or *translatio*, the continual rewriting of past works in a variety of versions, a practice which made even the copying of medieval works an adventure in supplementation rather than faithful imitation.[777]

With this in mind, Gillespie and Hudson conclude in their introduction that 'there seems to be a consensus that the Lachmannian stemmatic approach to editing should be abandoned as an unattainable ideal', and then proceed to ask the most important of questions: 'what should be put in its place?'[778]

This is not a new question, of course, and it is one that any editor of a Middle English *work*, such as the *Conduct of Life* – with multiple witnesses - must grapple with. The present edition of the *Conduct of Life* presents the verse-sermon in three different ways. First, it provides the reader with a diplomatic edition of each manuscript witness to the *work*. These diplomatic editions take a non-interventionist editorial strategy in their presentation and should be read in conjunction with the full manuscript descriptions presented within the introduction. This edition's examination of the codicological differences between the manuscripts of the *Conduct of Life* demonstrates how each new copying of the text appropriates new 'spaces' for reception and audience. The physical make-up of the manuscripts which contain the verse sermon indicates how the text has been recontextualized by its contexts and circumstances, with each version of the *Conduct of Life* occupying a different physical space. As Andrew Taylor reminds us, 'medieval texts need to be read with a full sense of their "situatedness", the medieval books in which they survive – each of them different and each of them differently interesting – must be given proper attention'.[779] Similarly, Meahan urges editors of medieval texts to 'recognise their texts as rhetorical pieces designed to represent a specific moment in medieval culture', arguing that 'the idea of independent, separately titled texts in any codex

[777] Stephen G. Nichols, 'Introduction: Philology in a Manuscript Culture', *Speculum*, 65 (1990), 1-10, p. 2.
[778] Gillespie and Hudson, 'Introduction', *Probable Truth*, p. 5.
[779] Andrew Taylor, 'Authors, Scribes, Patrons and Books', in Wogan-Browne *et al*, *The Idea of the Vernacular*, p. 35

manuscript is not a product of Old or Middle English literature, but rather a post-Romantic idea imported by the reader'.[780]

Douglas Moffat and Vincent P. McCarren claim that 'only a purely transcriptional or diplomatic edition of a single manuscript might not appear at least to gesture toward an original composition lying somewhere behind the surviving copy'.[781] Therefore, the *Conduct of Life* should be viewed as having been created as a series of individual texts, which might be individually analysed, because each is different, particularly within its specific physical and historical moment. As has been established, to consider the *Conduct of Life* as a single *work* is anachronistic; however, whilst Moffat and McCarren are surely correct, a diplomatic edition can only give what Millett calls a series of 'snapshots freezing a single point of textual development'.[782] Whilst the *Conduct of Life* exists individually as a 'witness' recorded in a manuscript, with all of the relations and interactions present within that codex, it also 'exists outside and hierarchically above its textual manifestations'.[783] A redefined idea of a 'work' (*oeuvre*) is not one that ignores the processes that brought the individual 'witness' into being; it is one that engages with the fluidity and collectivity of those witnesses through the variants present within the different manuscript versions. The *work* is, therefore, without fixed shape and is made unstable through its transmission.

For this reason, to offer a scholarly reader only the diplomatic editions of the *Conduct of Life* would be to ignore much of what makes it a 'work'. The present edition therefore presents the *Conduct of Life* in two further ways that provide the reader with the variants as found in the diplomatic editions, but in formats that more clearly display the similarities and differences between the witnesses: a Parallel Text Edition and a Critical Edition. A comparison of both of these approaches, including the advantages and disadvantages of each, will be discussed now.

---

[780] Meahan, 'Editing Middle English'.
[781] Moffat and McCarren
[782] Bella Millett, 'Mouvance and the medieval author: re-editing Ancrene Wisse', in A. J. Minnis (ed.), *Late-Medieval Religious Texts and their Transmission: Essays in Honour of A.I. Doyle* (Cambridge, 1994) 9-20, p. 18.
[783] Zumthor, *Toward a Medieval Poetics,* p. 47.

The Critical Edition uses the witness present in the Trinity manuscript as a representative of the textual tradition for the *Conduct of Life*. Trinity is the earliest known version of the *Conduct of Life*; however, the decision to use it as the representative witness is not based not on its age but on the fullness of the witness and the relative consistency of both the ordering of the lines and the syntax found within those lines, in comparison with the remaining witnesses.[784] Ralph Hanna states that 'all medieval editing generally responds to W. W. Greg's theory of "copy-text"'; that some single witness is allowed to provide the ongoing local forms of the text, its 'accidentals' - by which Hanna broadly means spelling forms and dialect.[785] For Greg, the accidentals within the copy text should, as Hanna phrases it, 'reflect authorial dialect at least generally'.[786] From this point of departure for the editor the accidentals are accepted, with the value of the substantives free to be tested. Hanna states more than once that 'the copy-text never should determine the edited textual substantives, but simply provide a convenient form through which to present these'.[787] However, the present edition does not find agreement with this statement: whilst each of the substantives has been closely examined, I have, once again, decided on a non-interventionist approach and do not deviate from Trinity, even if what might be considered a 'better reading' is found in another manuscript version. However, I have emended T when the sense seems to me to require it, or when I believe that the understanding of the reader will be facilitated by it.

My work here bears many similarities to d'Avray's study of French marriage sermons and Bella Millett's EETS edition of *Ancrene Wisse*[788] – both of which choose a single witness and edit it ' in the light of the tradition as a whole, correcting where necessary, and recording significant textual

[784] A more detailed explanation can be found within the introduction to the Parallel Text Edition found on pp. 501-4
[785] Ralph Hanna, 'Editing texts with extensive manuscript traditions', in V. Gillespie and A. Hudson (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013),, 111-130, p.114.
[786] Hanna, 'Editing texts', p. 114.
[787] Hanna, 'Editing texts', p.114.
[788] D. L. d'Avray, ed. *Medieval Marriage Sermons: Mass Communication in a Culture without Print* (Oxford, 2001); Bella Millett (ed.), *Ancrene Wisse: A Corrected Edition of the Text in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402, with Variants from Other Manuscripts*, vol. 1, EETS 325 (Oxford, 2005).

variations and revisions in other MSS in the *apparatus criticus*'.[789] D'Avray states of his choice of text that it is 'not a "best manuscript", though it would be perverse not to choose a good one'.[790] Similarly, Millett says of her choice of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402 as her 'base text' that it is 'a relatively correct text incorporating some interesting revisions', providing a 'vantage-point' from which to survey earlier and later developments in the work.[791] In the same way, the present edition's decision to use Trinity is not because I believe that it is the 'best text' or the closest to the original but is because I believe that from it the reader might more easily gain a perspective from which to view the other witnesses and the tradition as a whole.

By choosing Trinity as 'copy text' I have reduced the amount of editorial interventions within the edited text and also those which are presented as variants within the *apparatus criticus*. I am aware that by choosing Trinity as my 'copy text' I am privileging, for this edition only, the readings found within this text over all of the other manuscript readings. Furthermore, I acknowledge here that to fully reconstruct the remaining texts from the variants in the *apparatus criticus* would be impossible: the necessary constraints of the *apparatus criticus* create an unavoidable tension for both editor and reader. It is the convention of EETS editions, for example, that manuscripts that agree with the lemma are not cited, but this might not always be completely informative. The absence of a sigla may not always mean complete agreement: as Susan Powell acknowledges, 'a manuscript may have a lacuna at this point or may be imperfect: this may not be evident, since the entry which indicates the manuscript's absence at this point may be placed several places earlier'.[792]

In a critical edition the editor is only recording substantive variation in the *apparatus criticus*, and not the accidentals. Tanselle argues that '[the] explicit recognition that the comparison

[789] Millett, 'What is *Mouvance*?'.
[790] d'Avray, *Medieval Marriage Sermons*, p. 40.
[791] Millett, 'What is *Mouvance*?'.
[792] Susan Powell, 'In praise of the variant: why edit critically? A pragmatic viewpoint', V. Gillespie and A. Hudson (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 275-292, p. 281.

of readings, leading to inferences about the relationships of the texts, must involve analysis of physical evidence as well as literary analysis: examination of the physical features of a document is relevant not only to dating the document but also to evaluating the readings in the text contained in that document'.[793] Further, he argues, in addition to the variations in substantive reading between witnesses, the 'physical evidence' and 'historical background' can also serve 'in the tentative establishment of the relationships among the texts'.[794] A part of establishing this 'physical evidence' is a closer consideration of the accidentals. Tanselle states that he is 'not suggesting that scribal punctuation, abbreviations, and spelling necessarily ought to be preserved in a critical text', but that 'they should certainly be taken seriously as part of the textual evidence present in manuscripts; they may point to how the text was understood at a particular time'.[795] Similarly, I have concluded that to include all of the variations - including accidentals - of the *Conduct of Life* within the *apparatus criticus* of this edition would be almost impossible: the complexity and size of the *apparatus* would make it inaccessible to the reader, and yet to ignore them completely would be an intellectual abdication.

All of these accidentals can be found in the diplomatic editions of the individual texts which retain the letterforms, capitalisation, punctuation, word-divisions and dialectal features of each manuscript witness, but, as stated previously, what is missing from an analysis of these individual witnesses is a means of showing the relationships between the variants that are present within these witnesses: the substantive ones can be discovered in the *apparatus criticus* of a critical edition, but this is not possible for all of the accidentals. If the primary interest of the study lies in limning the relationships between the witnesses, and not in an ambition to reconstruct an archetype or to produce a new version of an old text, then reproducing the witnesses in parallel is an opportunity

[793] G. Thomas Tanselle, 'Classical, Biblical and Medieval textual criticism and modern editing', *Studies in Bibliography*, 36 (1983), 21-68, p. 39.
[794] Tanselle, 'Classical, Biblical and Medieval textual criticism', p. 39.
[795] Tanselle, 'Classical, Biblical and Medieval textual criticism', p. 41.

that provides the researcher with a wealth of information that is not present in a critical edition, and can only be accessed with difficulty in a comparative study of diplomatic editions.

Significant attention has been given throughout this study to the linguistic and dialectal differences between the manuscript witnesses.[796] As I hope the discussion of the Editorial Policy and Guiding Principles associated with this study demonstrates, this reflects the fluid and non-hierarchical nature of the Middle English textual tradition. This scribal fluidity is particularly clear in the dialectal variation found in all of the witnesses to the *Conduct of Life*.

Wogan-Browne *et al* state that the 'unstable and highly localized' dialects of English 'often had to be translated from one dialect to another', concluding that 'the vernacular came to stand for fluidity and instability, as against the stability of Latin'.[797] Similarly, Blake agrees that 'the absence of a standard [in English] meant that scribes were usually more than just copyists', with texts being ' rewritten to make them more suitable for other dialects or for later stages of the language' – both observations that are given clear demonstration in the *Conduct of Life*.[798] Blake sees in this fluidity of dialect an increased importance in establishing an idea of original dialect – once more anchoring the text to its beginnings – while Fisher is more concerned with how 'variants can record the labour of a medieval scribe' and how such dialectal transformations by scribes 'leave evidence in different ways than do other scribal alterations, whether textual or visual'.[799]

As I hope has been demonstrated throughout this discussion, my own views have more in common with those of Fisher, and I seek to emphasise in this edition, to use Wakelin's terms, 'how scribes altered the dialectal colouring of things they copied'.[800] By arranging the texts of the *Conduct of Life* in parallel it is possible to see more easily the distinctiveness of each witness. As

[796] A summary of the dialectal features of each witness is found in the introduction to each of the diplomatic editions with a further discussion of the language of the *Conduct of Life* found in the Introduction to this study.
[797] Wogan-Browne *et al*, *The Idea of the Vernacular*, p.11.
[798] N. F. Blake, 'Reflections on the editing of Middle English texts', in V. P. McCarren and D. Moffat (eds.), *A Guide to Editing Middle English* (Ann Arbor, 1998), 61-78, p. 66.
[799] Blake, 'Reflections on the editing of Middle English texts', p. 66; Matthew Fisher, 'When variants aren't', p. 207, p. 213.
[800] Wakelin, 'Editing and correcting', p. 241.

Marie Stansfield states in a discussion of her own policy in editing the *Brut*, the parallel-text format 'provided a strong visual prompt where there were variations to consider and also allowed for an easy word-by-word comparison wherever this appeared appropriate'.[801] As Stansfield concludes, the parallel-text format is 'very effective in illustrating less obvious differences […] as well as the more striking differences in content' and is, therefore, very 'helpful for any close analysis of linguistic or dialectal variation between texts'.[802]

However, one of the main criticisms of the parallel-text edition, as Moffat and McCarren conclude, is the 'awkwardness of presentation'.[803] A further criticism that is commonly levelled at this type of edition, and is presented here by Powell, is that, 'in collations the evidence is buried deep and requires a determined pickaxe to dig out'.[804] Both of these criticisms have some validity, but they are also associated with the misguided idea that editors of both parallel and diplomatic editions are not actually editing.[805] Powell concludes that 'it is not enough to provide collations and then sit back';[806] this edition is, I hope, an attempt to rise to the implicit challenge of this argument.

This edition of the *Conduct of Life* presents each witness in three formats, either in full or as variants forming a part of the critical apparatus. The reader is encouraged to undertake an holistic approach to this study and use the different presentations interactively: the parallel-text edition and the critical edition are keyed to each other using the sigla '**Ω**' for ease of reference. Each of the different editions is supported by critical notes that cover language, dialect, scribal practice, manuscript features, variance, themes and sources – appended to the edition that best creates the

[801] Marie Stansfield, 'Parallel texts and a peculiar *Brut*: a case study', in V. Gillespie and A. Hudson (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 465-480, p. 473.
[802] Stansfield, 'parallel texts and a peculiar *Brut*', p. 473.
[803] D. Moffat and V. McCarren, 'A bibliographical essay on editing methods and authorial and scribal intention', in *A Guide to editing Middle English*, ed. Douglas Moffat and Vincent P McCarren (Michigan, 1998), 25-60, p. 40.
[804] Powell, 'In Praise of the variant' p. 280.
[805] See Rosamund Allen's discussion, for instance, on producing a diplomatic edition, where she asks 'is this actually editing? The editor's duty is to edit, we were trained to believe' (Allen, 'Editing sole attestation', p. 296); and Jennifer Fellows, who defends the parallel-text edition but in doing so considers the criticisms of it, stating that 'all too often the editor is seen as abrogating certain functions and leaving the reader to make the decisions and choices that should have been made for him/her: ceases to edit' (J. Fellows, 'Author, Author, Author...: An apology for parallel texts' in V. P. McCarren and D. Moffat (eds.), *A Guide to Editing Middle English* (Ann Arbor, 1998), 15-24, p. 22).
[806] Susan Powell, 'In Praise of the Variant', p. 280.

space for their demonstration – as well as being supported by introductory essays that consolidate and contextualise these findings. Stansfield states that 'problems would arise in attempting to present in printed form more than two witnesses in a parallel-text format',[807] and they do: reading the *Conduct of Life* linearly from start to finish would be a somewhat challenging task, but when read in combination with the other editions of the work it becomes a powerful scholarly tool of evidence for *mouvance* and variance.

In her essay 'The Architecture of Old English Editions', Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe states that 'the walls of an edition […] are both limits and interfaces' that 'shape space and, in creating insides and outsides, shape communities of use'.[808] O'Keefe examines how the 'structures of editions', the internal and external walls, 'construct readers as relatively passive or active'; she determines that the 'mode' of reading editions is one of 'radial reading': it is 'non-linear, in that it requires abstraction from the text at hand, is start and stop, and involves consultation outside the text'.[809] It is the ' architecture' of the edition that gives directions to the user for their radial reading of the text.

One might ask why, considering the potential for hyperlinking data sets through digital media, variance in the *Conduct of Life* was not shown through some kind of simultaneous conglomerate electronic edition? O'Keefe considers that the digital humanities bear the potential for a 'reimagination of the relationship between editor and reader';[810] electronic editions have the potential to position readers 'within the walls of the edition where radial reading in every direction is expected and enabled'.[811] Such potential is also recognised by Stansfield, who concludes that in instances where there are more than two witnesses, digital editions' usefulness might be proved in

[807] Marie Stansfield, 'Parallel texts and a peculiar *Brut*', p. 473.
[808] Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, 'The architecture of Old English editions', in *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Vincent Gillespie and Anne Hudson (Turnhout, Belgium, 2013), 73-90, p.73
[809] O'Brien O'Keeffe, 'The architecture of Old English editions', p. 77.
[810] O'Brien O'Keeffe, 'The architecture of Old English editions', p. 79.
[811] O'Brien O'Keeffe, 'The architecture of Old English editions', p. 90.

allowing readers 'to select different pairs or small groups of versions to view together for textual or dialectal comparison'.[812]

There are a number of reasons why I elected not to produce an electronic edition, whilst also acknowledging that an interactive electronic scholarly edition of the *Conduct of Life* would be a worthwhile future project. Both Cerquiglini and McGann argue that the flexibility that electronic editions provide, through hypermedia and advanced innovative presentation, may see the book superseded by the computer for scholarly editions.[813] McGann argues for what he calls 'the decentred text', where the single authoritative text, imposed upon the scholarly community by the physicality of the book, is replaced by a platform, or multiple platforms, where authority can be 'dispersed non-hierarchically across multiple forms of the work'.[814] However, Millett demonstrates through an assessment of a number of electronic projects that 'problems with technology and impact constitute particularly serious threats to its [the electronic edition's] sustainability'.[815] More recently, Gillespie and Hudson have identified an inherent danger in 'the relative instability and even impermanence of the electronic medium: the rapid sophistication of computer equipment makes the eventual irretrievability of entered material a real, and damagingly immediate, likelihood'.[816]

If the longevity of electronic editions has been called into question, individuals' and institutions' ability to secure the funding with which to maintain and produce them remains a serious challenge – especially for editions with a relatively small community of end-users. Three reports published by JISC between 2008 and 2011 suggested that academics should adopt a more 'entrepreneurial' mindset when it came to the sustainability of web-based digital projects: Millett's somewhat tongue-in-cheek reaction points out that:

---

[812] Stansfield, 'Parallel texts and a peculiar *Brut*', p. ????

[813] A summary of their theories can be found in 'Whatever happened to Electronic Editing? Bella Millett'p.41ff or found in more detail in McCann 'The Rationale of Hypertext' and Cerquilini…

[814] Bella Millett, 'Whatever happened to electronic editing?', in V. Gillespie and A. Hudson (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 39-54, p.42

[815] Millett, 'Whatever happened to electronic editing?', p. 46.

[816] Gillespie and Hudson, 'Introduction', *Probable Truth*, p. 8.

> it is hard to see how even the most efficient market research and project management could convert (say) a seven-manuscript hypertext edition of the *Poema Morale* into the new Facebook, and the attempt would arguably be misconceived; editions of this kind are essentially – as Eric Dobson said of the EETS series of diplomatic editions of *Ancrene Wisse* – *in usum editorum philologorumque*, valuable primarily as a foundation for further research.[817]

My study of the *Conduct of Life* has been set down on paper for a radial reader who can, if they want, cross-reference from text to text and from the text to the introduction; they can also consider the manuscript witness in each historical moment, or compare variants and consider the fluidity of the work as it moves through the tradition. Alternatively, the reader may accept my own interpretation of the text of Trinity in the critical edition, and consider the content of a verse sermon that continues to be overlooked by scholars despite its longevity and multiple manuscript witnesses.

[817] Millett, 'Whatever happened to electronic editing?', p. 51.

The Format of this Edition: T as Copy Text

This edition takes T as its copy text. T is the most complete text of the *Conduct of Life*, preserving readings that are found in no other witness; it is also the closest to the original in date. All abbreviations and contractions have been silently expanded in accordance with the scribe's practice where the same or similar words have been written out in full. Tironian 'et' has been printed as *and*, where the diplomatic editions retain the occasions where the *nota* is used. The letter form ꝑ has been written as w, including in the apparatus. This edition does not differentiate between yogh (ȝ) and insular G (ᵹ): in all instances yogh is used (these differences are represented in the diplomatic editions for all texts) Manuscript i/j and u/v are retained, as well as þ (thorn), ð (eth) and the rare instances of æ (ash).

Word division has been regularized, and punctuation and capitals introduced according to modern usage. Accent marks and manuscript punctuation are not reported, but can be found with the manuscript word division and capitalization in the diplomatic editions. Illumination is not presented but might be reflected in capitalization. Scribal emendation/self correction of T is accepted and noted in the remarks to this edition. Further elucidation of any scribal emendation/self correction for T and for all other texts can be found in the diplomatic editions. Later glosses and additions to the manuscripts are not reproduced here but are found in the diplomatic editions to the text.

This edition reproduces the spelling of the text of T, rare or unique spellings, inflections and syntax being retained wherever there appears to be any justification for them; interlineations in T are shown within the text (through the use of \ /) but are not regularly referenced in the notes, unless additional commentary is needed: further elucidation can also be

found within the diplomatic edition for each text. The emendations made to this text by me are conservative and are only made when the evidence to suggest an alternative reading is overwhelming, or when the manuscript witness is judged to be defective. However, I have not hesitated to amend T in these instances when the sense seems to me to require it or when I believe that the understanding of the reader will be facilitated by it.

Where T has been emended then [] are used to demonstrate this in the text with a note present in the apparatus, for example: 14 mu[c]hel] muhel (*scribal error?*). The exception to the use of [] for emendations is the *1st person sg. pron.*, which has been expanded silently to Ich, although such occurrences of expansion are given in the notes; these examples are almost exclusively where it is cliticized with the following word, for example:

Text: Ich dude

Apparatus: Ich dude] idude

Such instances as the above for the other MS versions are not specifically highlighted in the notes to this edition, but the original word-division for each text can be found in the diplomatic editions.

Dialectal difference is not noted in this edition and can be seen more clearly in the parallel texts. The apparatus contains all substantive variants (those which have a separate entry in the OED or MED). A good example here is the use of se in T or in any other variant, usually D, for *demonstratives* or *relatives*; in these instances it has not been judged to be a different reading from the more modern þe, þo etc. and, therefore, is not noted in the apparatus. The form of the variant is that of the first manuscript cited and implies nothing about the exact forms in the manuscripts indicated by subsequent sigla, for example: 2 wealde] ealdi DM (where it is eldi in M). The order of manuscripts is given TLDE^{2}E^{1}JM. The variant, when given, is that

found in the manuscript and not an emended version as might be discussed in the diplomatic edition to this text. As T is the copy text it has not been necessary to give the sigla for T after the *lemma* when an emendation has been made by myself to the original manuscript reading or when a more general note on T is necessary, for example 263 wreche men] wrechemen *prec. a letter exp.*, unless the omission of the sigla might lead to some confusion, for example 333 [we]] *om.* TDM, or 357 last] *noun in* E^2E^1M *where it is an adv in* TDJM

I have made every attempt to keep clauses and related parts of speech together in the notes to this addition, for example: 1 a lore] ec a lore D, ek on lore J, of lore M, where it might also have been written: 1 and] *add* ec DJ a^2] on J, of M; this seems logical to me but does, however, constitute an editorial choice in how variants are represented.

In addition to the previous, the following conventions have also been used in the text and in the apparatus:

om. omitted, where the *lemma* is present in T but omitted/not present in the manuscript of at least one other witness, for example: 1 nu] *om.* DE^2E^1JM; it can be assumed from this example that *nu* is not only present in T but also in L.

line om. line omitted, where the line in T is not present in one or more of the other manuscripts, for example: 13 *line om.* M

add(s) add(s)/is present after the *lemma* in at least one other witness, for example: 10 ido] *adds* and M

trs. transpose(s): usually this is a reference to adjacent words where the words are 'reversed' or 'swapped', for example 6 biðenche me] *trs.* LDE^2E^1JM; but it is sometimes a pair of nouns '*trs. nouns*', for example 199 þurst and hunger] *trs.*

nouns D (where the reading in D is a variant of hunger and þurst) or phrase(s) '*trs. phrs*', for example 274 mid ... helle] *trs. phrs.* M (where the reading in M is in helle mid him): see also *before* and *after*.

before / *after* — the reading is before/after; this is used throughout the notes to indicate the position of a word in a variant where *trs.* does not adequately express the positioning within the line, for example: 18 isien ... me] me *before* iseo M, where the reading in M is me iseo bifore. In addition, both are also used to help indicate the nature of manuscript features (typically corrections) made to words, phrases and individual letters, for example 16 unhalðe] e *subp. after* l *in* un helþe L.

prec. — the reading precedes, for example 92 don] *prec. two or three words exp.*

foll. — the reading follows, for example 111 werkes] *foll.* werhes *canc.* (*crossed through*) L

canc. — cancelled, usually by being *crossed through*, for example: 2 wit] ich *canc.* (*crossed through*) wit *written in margin* (*later hand?*) L; but also, occasionally, by *underlining,* for example 207 muȝe] *prec.* rewen *canc.* (*by underlining*).

subp. — subpuncted, for example: 16 unhalðe] e *subp. after* l *in* un helþe L

exp. — expunged, for example: 31 ne[2]] *prec. by* ne *exp.* (*very faint*)

eras. — erasure, for example: 25 oðer] *over eras.* E[2]

illeg. — illegible, for example: 14 folȝeð] þ *in* folȝeþ *written over something now illeg.* E[2]

line trs. — line transposed: this line occurs in a different order/place in at least one other manuscript, for example: 83 and 84 *line trs.* D, where the order in D is reversed.

couplet trs. couplet transposed: the order of the couplets is reversed in the stated manuscript, for example: 43-44 *couplet trs.* 45-46 D (D81-88 *dip.*, D43-44 and D41-42 *reg.*, Ω44-Ω47 *parallel*). Bracketed numbers refer to the line numbering in both the diplomatic edition (*dip.*) and the parallel text edition (*parallel*); in both L and D there is also a regularized number (*reg.*), as both of these texts (one written as prose and the other in half lines) have been written out in long lines (*parallel*) for the purpose of comparison.

int. interlineated, for example: 38 bih\o/teð] a *subp.* with o *int.*

] separates the *lemma* from the manuscript reading, e.g.

⟨ ⟩ angle brackets enclose letters or words that are illegible in the manuscript of T as the result of physical damage. The nature of this damage (e.g. cropping) will not be commented on within the notes to this edition but can be found in the diplomatic editions.

[ ] square brackets enclose letters or words that are not in the manuscript, and are either emendations or words supplied conjecturally to make sense of the line, as indicated in the apparatus.

\ / indicate interlineations, in either the text of T, where it is included in the main body of text but not usually in the apparatus, for example: \we solden/ (47), or of a variant, where it is only shown in the apparatus, for example: 4 Þeih] Þa\h/ L

A **bold** font indicates illumination or rubrication.

Ich am nu elder þan Ich was a wintre and a lore, f. 2[r]
Ich wealde more þan Ich dude, mi wit oh to be more.
To longe Ich habbe child iben a worde and a dade,
Þeih Ich bie a winter eald, to jung Ich am on rade.
Vnnet lif Ich habbe ilad, and ȝiet me þincheð Ich lade;
Þan Ich biðenche me þar-on, wel sore Ich me adrade.
Mast al Ich habbe idon is idelnesse and chilce.
Wel late Ich habbe me biþohte, bute me God do milce.
Fele idel word Ich habbe ispeken seðen Ich speken cuðe.
And fele ȝeunge dade idon, þe me ofðinkeð nuðe. Ω10
Alto lome Ich habbe igult a werke and a worde.
Alto muchel Ic habbe ispend, to litel ileid on horde.
Mast al þat me likede ar nu, hit me mislicað.
Þe mu[c]hel folȝeð his iwil, himselfen he biswicað.
Ich mihte habben bet idon, hadde Ich þo iselðe;
Nu Ich wolde, ac Ich ne mai for elde and for unhalðe.
Elde me is bistolen on ar Ich hit iwiste
Ne mai Ich isien bifore me for smeche ne for miste.
Arȝe we beð to don god, to iuel al to þriste; Ω20
More eie stondeð man of man þan him do of Criste.
Þe wel ne deþ þe hwile he mai, wel ofte hit sal him rewen,
Þan alle men sulle ripen þat hie ar sewen.
Do al to Gode þat he muȝe ech, þe hwile he beð aliue.
Ne lipne no man to muchel to childe ne to wiue;

The *Conduct of Life* in Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS. McClean 123 is prefaced by two lines from *The Wages of Sin* (numbered Ωi and Ωii in the *Parallel Text Edition*) and reproduced below. These lines are very similar to the first six lines of the version found in Oxford Jesus College MS 29, item 4, which follows the *Conduct* on the same quire.

[Þ]e holi gostes miȝte us alle helpe and diȝte us wissie and us teche.
Ý scilde us fram þe unwiȝte bi daie and bi niȝte þat þencheþ us biþeche.

[Þ]e] Þ *added from the guide letter in the margin*

1 Ich] I *om. in* [I]ch: *guide letter present in margin* M nu] *om.* DE^{2}E^{1}JM a^1] of M a lore] ec a lore D, ek on lore J, of lore M 2 wealde] ealdi DM Ich^1 dude] idude Ich^2] *foll.* ihc *subp.* L wit] ich *canc.* (*crossed through*) wit *written in margin* (*later hand?*) L to] *om.* LM more] þe more M 3 To] Wel LDE^{2}E^{1}J worde] werke J, wordes M a^1] on D, of M a dade] on dede D, ech a dede E^{2}E^1, eke on dede J, of dede M 4 Þeih] þa\h/ L Ich bie] ibie a] on D, of JM on] a E^2, at *foll.* to (*subp.*) E^1, of M 5 Ich lade] ilade 6 Ich biðenche] ibiðenche biðenche me] *trs.* LDE^{2}E^{1}JM þar-on] þar on, wel LD, *om.* E^{2}E^{1}JM wel] ful LJ Ich me] ime 7 Mast al] mest al þet LDE^{2}E^{1}J, mest what þat M is idelnesse and chilce] bi fealt to child hade L 8 Wel] to DM me ... milce] God me nu rede L, god me don milce D, god do me mẏlce J, me crist do milse M 9 ispeken] iqueðen LDE^{2}E^1 10 And] *om.* L ȝeunge] euele D ido] *adds* and M ofðinkeð] reweth M 11-12 *found after* 27-28 L (L29-32 *dip.*, L27-28 *reg.*, Ω11- Ω12 *parallel*) 11 lome] muchel M Ich] *foll.* ih *subp. and canc.* (*crossed through*) L a^1] on DJ, of M a^2] o L, on DJ, of M and] *add* ec E^{2}E^1 12 Ic] *foll.* ih *subp. and canc.* (*crossed through*) L ileid] ihud L 13 *line om.* M Mast] Best J ar] þo D 14 *line om.* M Þe] se þe D mu[c]hel] muhel (*scribal error?*) folȝeþ] þ *in* folȝeþ *written over something now illeg.* E^2 himselfen] him selfen J *adds line*: Mon let þi fol lust ouer go. and eft hit þe likeþ (J15 Ω15) 15 habben bet] *trs.* M idon.] *adds* ȝef M hadde Ich] *trs.* M Ich] \ic/ E^2 þo] þer E^1, enẏ J 16 ac] and JM Ich ne] ine and] ne DE^{2}E^{1}JM unhalðe] e *subp. after* l *in* un helþe L 17 me is] *trs.* J bistolen] istolen M on] up on M ar] er þan JM 18 Ne mai ich] Þat ich ne mai M isien ... me] me *before* iseo M isien] bi seo J bifore me] *trs.* J 19 god] *add* and LE^2 to^2] \to/ E^2, *om.* J, of M 20 *L has the pl. form throughout this line where it is sg. in all others* stondeð] stent E^{2}E^1 man^1] men L man^2] monne L him] hom L do of] to J 21 D *and* L *agree on the 3rd pl. form throughout this line where it is 3rd sg. in all other texts* Þe] Þo þet D, Þ *om. in* [Þ]e: *guide letter present in margin* M deþ] doð LD hwile] hwile þe L he mai] ho muȝen LD wel ofte] *om.* JM, sore M wel] *om.* D hit] *om.* E^1 sal him] *trs.* DE^{2}E^1 him] *om.* L, ham D rewen] sore reowe J 22 alle men] ȝe L, hi DE^{2}E^{1}M sulle ripen] *trs.* J, mawen sculen and repen LDE^{2}E^1, sculle mowe and ripe M þat] þer E^2, þer þe E^1 ar] her þan D 23 do] don E^{2}E^1, dod J, doþ M al] he L, ech D, ec E^{2}E^1, *om.* J he^1] hi D, ȝe E^{2}E^{1}JM he^2] hi D, ȝe E^{2}E^{1}JM beð] bo LM, bieð D, buð E^{2}E^{1}J 24 lipne] leue D, hopie E^{2}E^1, trust M no man] noman

f. 2^{v}

Þe þe him selfe forȝiet for wive oðer for childe
He sal cumen on evel stede, bute him God be milde.
Sende god biforen him man, þe hwile he mai, to heuene,
For betre is on almesse biforen þan ben after seuene.
Ne bie þe leuere þan þe self ne þi mæi ne þi mowe, Ω30
Sot is þe is oðer mannes frend betere þan his owen.
Ne hopie wif to hire were ne were to his wiue,
Be for himself afric man þe hwile he beð aliue.
Wis þe himselue biðencheð þe hwile he mot libben,
For sone willeð him forȝiete þe fremde and þe sibbe.
þe wel ne doð þe hwile he mai ne sal he þan he wolde.
For manimannes sore iswinc habbeð ofte unholde.
Ne solde no man don a furst ne laten wel to done,
For mani man bih\o/teð wel þat hi forȝieteð sone.
þe man þe wile siker ben to habben Godes blisse, Ω40
Do wel himself þe hwile he mai, þanne haueð hes mid iwisse.
Þe riche men weneð siker ben þu\r/ch wallen and thurh dichen;
He deð his aihte an siker stede þe hit sent to heueriche.
For [þar ne] þar\f/ \he/ ben ofdrad of fure ne of þieue,
Þar ne mai hit him binime þe loðe ne þe lieuue,
Þar ne þarf he habben care of here ne of ȝielde:
Þider we sendeð and ec bereð to litel and to selde.
Þider \we solden/ drawen, and don wel ofte and ilome;
For þar ne sal me us naht binime mid wrongwise dome.

f. 3^{r}

Þider we solde ȝierne drawen, ȝie me ileuen, Ω50

25 þe þe] þe LE^{2}E^{1}J, man þat M oðer] ne L, *over eras.* E^{2} 26 him God] *trs.* DJM 27 *line om.* M sende] sendeð L sende] *add* sum LD, æch sum E^{2}E^{1}, vch sum J him] eow L man] *om.* LE^{2}E^{1}J he mai to heuene] ȝe ben aliue E^{1} he mai] ȝe muȝen L, *om.* D 28 *line om.* M for] *om.* E^{2}J ben] boð LJ seuene] vẏue E^{1} 29 *line om.* D ne^{2}] *om.* E^{2}E^{1}JM 30 *line om.* D sot] for sot E^{1} oðer] oðer\s/ L betere] more J 31 hopie] lipnie LJ, trust M wif] no wif J ne^{2}] *foll.* ne *exp.* (*very faint*) 32 be for himself] biuore him do wel M himself] him self afric] ech LJ hwile] \h/wile L he beð] þet he bo L, hi bieð D, he beo E^{2}E^{1}, he is M 33 wis] wis is LDE^{2}E^{1}, þis is J, uor he \is/ wis M þe^{1}] *adds* to L himselue] him selue, hine DM biðencheð] þench L hwile he] hwile þe L, hwile þet he DE^{1}M 34 for] so M sone willeð him] sone *and* hine *trs.* D 35 þe] se þet D, Þ *om. in* [Þ]e: *guide letter present in margin* M ne doð] nule do J he^{2}] *om.* L, \he/ E^{2}M 36 for] *om.* LE^{2}E^{1}JM habbeð ofte] *trs.* J ofte] *adds* alle E^{1} 37 solde] scal L noman] no man laten] slawen LE^{2}D, sclakien E^{1}JM 38 bih\o/teð] a *subp.* with o *int.* þat] he E^{1}, and M forȝieteð] forȝet wel DM 39 þe] ac þilke M wile siker] *trs.* E^{2} siker ben] *trs.* M 40 do wel himself þe hwile] do eure god þer hwile himself] him self hwile] *adds* þet L hes] he his L, he hit DJE^{1}, he E^{2}M 41-42 *lines trs. as marked in the margin* J 41 þe] þes LE^{2}E^{1}JM men] *om.* D (riche *functions as a noun*) siker ben] *trs.* LE^{2}EM, to beon sẏker J 42 he deð] þe deð L, se deð D, ah heo doþ J, ac þe deþ M his] heore J aihte] *om.* E^{2} þe] he LM hit] *om.* E^{2} sent] sendeþ J 43-44 *couplet trs.* 45-46 D (D81-88 *dip.*, D43-44 and D41-42 *reg.,* Ω44-Ω47 *parallel*) 43 for [þar ne] þar\f/ \he/ ben ofdrad] for þar\f/ \he/ ben ofdrad] *the line begins incorrectly; the interlinear corrections made at the time do not correct the text completely. The text of* T *is partially corrected with the interlinear insertion of* \f/ *and* \he/, *in a different hand, but it has been corrected here to give a clearer reading* for] *om.* D he] man D, *om.* E^{2} ofdrad] adred J, afered M þieue] þe\v/e *with* u *subp. after* e^{1} 44 mai hit] þerf he L hit] *om.* D him] *om.* E^{2}J 45 habben care] beon ofdred J here] ȝefe LDJ, wẏfe E^{2}E^{1}, ȝunge M ȝielde] childe E^{2}E^{1}, ȝelde M (this is likely to be the *adj.* from OE *eald* rather than from the *noun* OE *gield*) 46 we sendeð] he sent L and ec bereð] suuel and bred E^{1} ec] solf LDE^{2}J, us self M 47-48 *couplet trs.* 49-50 M (M45-46 and M43-44 *dip.,* Ω48-Ω51 *parallel*) 47 *line om.* D solden] sculen L drawen and don wel ofte and ilome] bere and draȝe ofte and wel ẏlome M and^{2}] *add* wel E^{2}E^{1} 48 for þar ne sal me us naht binime] ne maẏ þer non hit vs bẏnẏmen J, þar ne miȝte me hit us binime M wrongwise] wronge E^{1}, none wronge M dome] ne mid woȝe E^{1} 49 we] ȝe LM solde] sculen L, scolde (*pa. 2nd pl. as opposed to pa. 1st pl.*) M ȝierne drawen] alle don M ȝierne] alle, *om.* J drawen] *add* and don E^{1}J me] god L

For ne mai hit us binime, no king ne no syrreue.
Al þat beste þat we habbeð her, þider we solde sende,
For þar we mihte finden eft, and habben abuten ende.
Se þe her doð ani god for ⸢to⸣ haben Godes ore
Al he hit sal eft finde þar, and hundredfealde more.
Se þe aihte wile h⸢o⸣lde wel þe hwile hes muȝe wealden,
Ȝieue hes for Godes luue, þanne doð hes wel iheladen.
For ure swinch and ure tilðe is ofte wuned to swinde
Ac al þat we ȝieueð for godes luue, al we hit sulen eft finden.
Ne sal þar non euel ben unboht, ne god unforȝolden: Ω60
Euel we doð al to muchel, and god lasse þan we solden.
Se þe mast doð nu to gode, and se last to lothe,
Eiðer to litel and to muchel hem sal þunche boðe.
Þar me sal ure werkes weiȝen bifore þan heuen Kinge
And ȝieuen us ure werkes lean after ure erninge.
Africh man mid þat he haueð mai bugge heueriche:
Þe þe more haueð and þe þe lasse, boðe iliche;
Alse on mid his peni se oþer mid his punde.
Þis is þet wunderlukeste ware þat ani man funde,
And se þe more ne mai don mid his gode iþanke, Ω70
Alse wel se þe þe haued goldes fele manke.
And ofte God can more þanc þan þe him ȝieueð lasse;
Al his werkes and his weies is milce and rihtwinesse.

Litel loc is Gode lef þe cumeð of gode wille, f. 3ᵛ
And eðlate muchel ȝieue þan his herte is ille.
Heuene and erðe he ouersihð his eien beð ful brihte.

50 for] *om.* M *add* þer DE^2E^1JM ne[1]] *om.* D mai] *adds* þet L hit] ⸢hit⸣ E^1 us binime] ou binimen LE^1, bi nimen eow (*prec. a letter exp.*) E^2 no[1]] *om.* LM, þe E^2E^1J ne no syrreue] ne reue L, ne ⸢h⸣is serreue D, ne se ireue E^2, ne þe scirreve E^1J 51 al] *om.* DE^2 beste] faireste M we] *over erasure* E^2, man M habbeð] hefden LE^2, hoȝeð D, haueþ M her] *om.* LDE^2E^1JM þider] to gode M we] he M, *add* hit LM 52 for] *om.* M we mihte] we hit michte LE^2J, we muȝen hit D, we it muwen E^1, he hit miȝte M habben] *adds* euere M, *adds* ·o· J 53-54 *couplet trs.* 55-56 M (M51-52 and M49-50 *dip.*, Ω54-Ω57 *parallel*) 53 se þe] þo þe L, he þat J, þe man þat M her ... god] ani god *before* doþ her (*trs.*) M for] *om.* DJ to] *om.* LE^2M 54 al] *om.* M he ... þar] þar *before* he M hit] *om.* J eft finde] *trs.* LM eft] *om.* DE^2E^1J 55 se þe] þe man þe M aihte ... wel] his eȝte wel wile wite M h⸢o⸣lde] a *subp.* with o *int.* muȝe] mei E^2E^1JM, mot D hes] he ... es LE^2E^1, hi DM, he... him J 56 hes[1]] hi DJ, he M þanne ... ihealden] eft heo hit scullen a finden E^1 (*eyeskip*) doð] beþ M hes[2]] he hi DE^2J 57 *line om.* M for] *om.* LDE^2E^1J ofte] *om.* J 58 *line om.* M ac ... ȝieueð] ach þet þe we doð L, ac þet we doð E^2E^1, Ah heo þat hit ẏeueþ J al ... eft] *trs. phrs.* eft we sollen hit al D, eft we sculen al L (*omits* hit), eft we hit sculen E^2E^1 (*omits* al), eft hit mowen J 59-60 *found after* 64 M (M57-58 *dip.*, Ω60- Ω61 *parallel*) 59 þar] *om.* LDE^2E^1JM ne[2]] *add* nan LDE^2E^1JM unforȝolden] unȝulde M 60 and] *om.* DJM 61 se[1] þe] þo þe (*pl.*), þe man þat M nu] her mest M se[2]] se þet DE^2E^1J, alþre M 62 hem sal þunche] scal þunchen eft hom LDE^2E^1, schal þunchen heom ef J, hit schal him þunche M boðe] to baþe J 63 þar] whane M bifore] to uore M þan] *om.* E^2J 64 werkes] swinkes LE^2E^1JM 65 africh] ech L, eure elc E^2E^1, ac euerich M heueriche] godes riche M 66 þe þe] þe LJ more ... lasse] lesse and se þet more D, þe riche and þe poure boþe J boðe iliche] baþe hi muȝen iliche L, here aider iliche D, baðe mei iliche E^2E^1, ah nouht alle ilẏche J 67 alse on] alse LE^2, he alse E^1, þe pour M, ase wel þon M peni] p⸢e⸣nie L se oþer] alse oðer L, se þe oþer E^2E^1, þe riche J, alse þe oþer M 68 þis] þet LDE^2E^1J wunderlukeste] alþre beste M ware] chep L, ȝare E^1 ani man] euer was JM funde] efre funde LDE^2E^1 69 *line om.* J more] namore *after* ne mai M don] *adds* do hit L, *adds* bute E^1 70 *line om.* J þe þe] ðe E^2E^1, he þat M haued] *adds* of M manke] marke E^2 71 and] vor M ofte] *om.* E^1 God] ⸢god⸣ E^2 þanc] *foll by* ð *subp.* E^1 (*this is the initial letter of the following word*) þan þe ... ȝieueð] ẏe þat ẏueþ him J, him þat ȝefþ M 72 al] and L, ȝef M and[1]] *adds* alle D weies] ẏeftes J milce] *om.* J, mihte D and] is in J rihtwinesse] ritȝifnesse (*sic*) E^1 73 *no variation in this line* 74 and ... ȝieue] and lutel he let on muchel wowe J ȝieue] *adds* of L, *adds* of him M þan his] þan þe LE^2E^1D, þer þe J, þat his M 75 ouersihð] ouer sihð ful brihte] swa brichte LE^2E^1J, wel briȝte M *foll. in all other* MSS *by a line not present in* T. *The line in* L is: sunne and mone and houen fur boð þestre aȝein his lihte: *the variants in the other texts* (*against* L) *are*: and[1]] *om.* E^2E^1 houen fur] alle sterren D, dei and fur E^2E^1, heuene and fur J, sterre and fur M boð] is M aȝein] on D, to ȝeanes E^2E^1M

Nis him no þing forholen, swo muchel is his mihte,
Ne bie hit no swo derne idon ne on swo þuster nihte,
He wot hwat þencheð and hwat doð alle quike wihte. Ω80
Nis louerd swilch is Crist, ne king swilch ure Drihte,
Boðe ȝiemeð þe his bien bi daie and bi nihte. 80
Heuene and erðe, and al þat is, biloken is in his honden,
He doð al þat his will is a watere and a londe;
He makeð þe fisses in þe sa þe fueles on þe lofte;
He wit and wealdeð alle þing and he sop alle safte.
He is ord abuten ord, and ende abuten ende, 85
He is one afre on eche stede wende þar þu wende;
He is buuen us and bineðen, biforen and bihinde,
Þe Godes wille doð aihware he maiȝ him finde. Ω90
Elche rune he hereð, and he wot alle dade,
He þurhsihð elches mannes þanc. wi hwat sal us to rade 90
We þe brekeð Godes has and gulteð swo ilome?
Hwat sulle we seggen oðer don at þe muchele dome,
We þe luueden unriht and euel lif ladden?
Hwat sulle we seggen oðer don þar ængles beð ofdradde?
Hwat sulle we beren us biforen, mid hwan sulle we iqueme, 95
We þe nafre god ne duden, þan heuenliche Deme?

f. 4^{r} Þar sulle ben deflen swo fele þat willeð us forwreien, Ω100
Nabbeð hie no þing forȝieten of þat hie her iseien,
Al þat hie iseien her hie willeð cuðen þare,
Bute we haben hit ibet þe hwile we here waren. 100
Al hie habbeð on here write þat we misduden here,

76 *line om.* M no þing forholen] noht forholen nihud LE^{2}E^{1}, ec noþing uorhole D, for hole nowiht. ne ihud J is] boð LDE^{2}E^{1}J 77 *line om.* M ne bie hit no] nis hit ne LE^{2}E^{1}, nis noþing D, nis no J derne] dur\n/e E^{2}, *adds* dede J idon] *om.* L ne^{2}] *om.* J on] *om.* L 78 hwat^{1} þencheð and hwat^{2} doð] *trs.* deð *and* ðenchet (hwat^{2}] *om.*) E^{2}E^{1}, and walt what doþ and queþeþ M hwat^{1}] \hwet/ E^{2} 79 nis] *add* na LDE^{2}E^{1}JM louerd] d *written over* t E^{1} swilch] swich se LE^{2}E^{1} crist] ċst ne] *adds* no D ure] is D 80 *line only present in* T 81 and al þat is biloken is] god almiȝti halt al M þat] þ *in* þet *is written over another letter* E^{2} is^{2}] *om.* E^{2}E^{1} 82 his] *foll.* is *subp.* L a watere] awatere watere] sae D and] *add* ec DJ a londe] alonde 83 and 84 *line trs.* D makeð þe fisses] makede fisses LE^{2}E^{1}J, wrohte fis D, scuppeþ þe fish (*sg.*) M þe^{2}] and LDE^{2}E^{1}J fueles] foȝel (*sg.*) M on] bi M þe^{3}] *foll.* þe (*ditt.*) *canc.* (*by crossing through*) L lofte] lifte LDE^{2}E^{1}JM (*words are cognate but have a different root*) 84 wit] witeð D and wealdeð alle] alle kennes M wealdeð] walt E^{1}J and^{2}] *om.* DM he] *om.* LJ safte] ȝe sceafte E^{2} 85 he ... ende^{2}] he wes erest of alle þing. and euer bẏþ buten ende J abuten^{1}] albuten (*sic*) D abuten^{2}] albuten (*sic*) D he] and he M 86 is one] *trs.* LDE^{2}E^{1} one afre] *om.* J afre on eche] in eueriche M þar] war E^{1}J, whider M 87 us] *after* biforen J,*om.* M and^{1}] *adds* he is M biforen] *adds* vs J and^{2}] *adds* ec D 88 þe] þe þe LE^{2}E^{1}J, se man þet DM Godes wille doð] *trs. phrs.* L doð] ðe (sic) E^{1} aihware he maiȝ him] aihwar *after* hine D aihware] eiðer E^{2}E^{1}, oueral M he] *om.* J maiȝ him] *trs.* M him] hine DM 89 he^{1}] god M and] *om.* JM he^{2}] *om.* LD, þe J, god M alle] eche DM 90 þurhsihð] þurh sihð mannes] *om.* D wi] *om.* E^{2}E^{1}M 91 we þe] þo þe E^{1}J brekeð] *foll.* hesne D has] hesne D, isest (*scribal error?* i[h]est?) M 92 we] hi E^{1} don] *prec. two or three words exp.* at þe] áte muchele] heaȝe DM 93 *line om.* D we þe] þa þe LE^{2}E^{1}J luueden unriht] her habbeþ a gult M luueden] luueþ J euel lif laden] heore lif. vuele ledeþ J lif] *adds* her M ladden] n *subp. after* ladde E^{1} 94 *line om.* D we] ho LE^{2}E^{1}, *om.* J seggen oðer don] come to dome M þar] þen þe L beð ofdradde] bon of dred L, heom drede J J *adds line*: Crist for his muchele mẏhte. hus helpe þenne and rede (J95/Ω97) 95 *line om.* D Hwat] W*om. in* [W]hat: *guide letter* (wynn) *present in margin* M us biforen] *trs.* LE^{1} us] *om.* E^{2} we^{2}] *adds* him E^{1} iqueme] iq\e/me 96 *line om.* D *line found after* 93 J (J93 *dip.*, Ω99 *parallel*) we þe] þo þe L nafre] non M duden] habbeþ ẏdo M deme] demeþ (*sic*) J 97 ben deflen] *trs.* D deflen] sco *subp. after* deofles E^{1} þat] and M 98 nabbeð] and nabbeð L no þing] nowiht J of] of al LE^{2}E^{1}, her M her] *om.* LDE^{2}JM 99 hie iseien] we misduden LDE^{2}E^{1}JM hie] ho hit LJ, hit E^{2}E^{1}, hi hit us M 100 *line om.* L haben hit] hit habbe her hwile] *adds* þat M here] \h/er E^{1} 101 *no variation in this line*

þeih we hes ne niseien hie waren ure iferen.
Hwat sullen horlinges don, þes wichen and þe forsworene?
Wi swo fele beð icleped swo fewe beð icorene?
Wi hwi waren hie biȝiete, to hwan waren hie iborene, 105 Ω110
Þe sulle ben to deaðe idemd and afremo forlorene?
Elch man ⸢sal⸣ þar biclepien himselfen and ec demen.
Hic oȝen werc and his þanc to witnesse he sal temen.
Ne mai him noman alse well demen, ne alse rihte;
For non ne cnoweð hine alse wel buten one Drihte. 110
Elch man wot himself best his werkes and his wille:
Se þe last wot he seið ofte mast; se þe it al wot is stille.
Nis no witnesse alse muchel se mannes oȝen hierte:
Hwo se seið þat hie beð hol, himself wot his smierte.
Elch man sal himselfen demen to deaðe oðer to liue; 115 Ω120
Þe witnesse of his oȝen werc to oðer þan hine sal driue.
Al þat afri man haueð idon seðen he cam to manne
Swo he hit iseie a boc iwrite, he sal hit þenche þanne;
Ac drihte ne demeð no man after his biginninge,
Ac al his lif sal ben teald after his endinge. 120

ȝief þe endinge is god al hit is god and euel ȝief euel is þe ende. f. 4ᵛ
God ȝieue þat ure ende be god and ȝieue þat he us lende.
Se man þe nafre nele don god, ne nafre god lif lade,
Are deað and dom cumeð to his dure, he maiȝ him sore adrade

102 hes] *om.* L, it E^1J, *add* nusten LDE^2E^1JM ne niseien] *om.* J M *adds two lines:* Iesu Crist, Seinte Marie sone, us alle helpe and rede | and euermore ẏscilde us vram evele ẏuerrede. (M95 and M96/Ω106 and Ω107) 103 scullen] *adds* þo D swichen] swikele DE^1 and] *om.* E^2E^1 104 wi swo[1]] swiþe J swo[1]] *om.* L fele beð[1]] *trs.* L icleped] *add* and LDJ swo[2]] *om.* J fewe beð[2]] lut L beð[2]] bed, *om.* D 105 hwi waren[2]] what scolde M hie] ⸢heo⸣ J biȝiete] *adds* and D, heẏhte *subp.* in J *with* ẏete *added to the right-hand margin* to] *om.* JM hwan waren] what scolde M hwan] hwi DJ, w *subp. before* hwon L waren[2] hie] *om.* D 106 idemd] ẏdo M 107 elch] ac euerich M þar ... himselfen] *trs. phrs.* LD, him ðer bi clupien E^2, him seolue schal her bicleopien J, him selue scal bichipie (*sic?*) M himselfen] him selfen and ec demen] and bidemen L, bitelle and deme D, and ech sceal him demen E^2 108 hic oȝen] al his M werc] werkes JM þanc] þouht JM to witnesse] þar to M he sal] *om.* D, hit schal J temen] demen L 109-116 *line order different in* M: 109-112 *is* M107-110 *dip.* (Ω114-117 *parallel*); 113-114 *is* M105-106 *dip.* (Ω118-119 *parallel*); 115-116 *is* M103-104 *dip.* (Ω120- 121 *parallel*) 109 him] *om.* M alse well demen] deme so wel J alse well] *om.* M ne alse] ne swo DE^2, iwis. ne al so J, þane man also M 110 for] not M ne cnoweð] his workes M cnoweð] cwa *canc.* (*crossed through*) *before* cnaweð E^1 hine] *om.* JM alse] swo DE^2E^1JM wel] ȝere L, *adds* his þonk J buten] so wot M one] vre JM, *adds* ure D 111 man] ech mon LDE^2E^1J, euerich M wot himself] *trs.* M himself] him self werkes] *foll.* werhes *canc.* (*crossed through*) L, weorch E^2E^1 112 se þe] he ðe E^2, þat J, ac þe þat M last wot] *trs.* M he] *om.* LDE^1M seið] biseiþ L se þe it] se þit, þe hit L, and se þet DM, and þe þe it E^1, and he þat J al wot] *trs.* E^2 al] *om.* E^1 113 mannes oȝen] is þe mannes M mannes] monne⸢s⸣ L 114 hwo se] þeȝh ȝwo D, hwa ⸢se⸣ E^1, for so J, þe man þat M seið] sigge DE^2E^1 þat ... hol] þat vnhol is J, þat he is lame M himself] himself, *add* he DM wot his smierte] hwat him smeorteþ J wot] *add* best LE^2E^1 his] þe M 115 elch] eurich DM sal ... demen] sel *after* demen D, scal *after* him selue M himselfen] him selfen, him D 116 of] *om.* D his] *foll.* is *subp.* oȝen] selue D, *om.* M werc] workes DM to oðer þan hine] hine þer to L, to aider hine D, to oðer ðis him E^2E^1, þer to him J 117 *line om.* M al] and al J afri] ech LD, eure elc E^2E^1, euer (*adv.*) J 118 *line om.* M swo] sculde L, swich DE^2E^1, al so J he] *om.* DE^2E^1 iseie] sechen L, were D, si E^2 a boc] aboc he ... þenche] isien he sel hit D, hit schal him þinche J hit[2]] *om.* LE^2 119 ac ... noman] ne schal nomon beon ẏdemed J ac] *om.* D drihte] drit⸢h⸣te E^1, crist M no man] noman after] bi D biginninge] ginnigge M 120 ac ... teald] ah dom schal þolẏen vẏch mon J ac] *om.* D al] *om.* E^1 his lif sal ben] *trs. phrs.* M ben] ⸢beo⸣ E^2 teald] suilch L, swich E^2E^1 after] boð L, se buð E^2E^1, suich is M 121 ȝief] ac ȝif E^2E^1 þe endinge] þet L, se ende DE^2E^1J, his ende M is god[1]] his uuel LDE^2E^1JM is god[2]] is uuel LDE^2E^1JM and] *om.* J, *adds* al E^1 euel[1]] god LDE^2E^1JM ȝief] *adds* vs J euel[2]] god LE^2E^1JM, *om.* D is þe ende] his ende L, is þenne E^2, is ende E^1, ende J, beoþ his ende M 122 God ȝieue] Iesu crist leue M þat[1]] vs J be] *om.* J and ȝieue] and wite LDE^2E^1J, hwider J þat] hwet D lende] lenne E^2 123 se man þe] ac þe þat M nafre[1] ... god[1]] uuel (*sic?*) don na god L, nele do na god E^2E^1, nele neuere no god do M ne] *prec.* ure *subp.* E^1 nafre[2]] *om.* M lif] *adds* her M 124 are] þat J and dom] *om.* J to] æt E^2 he ... sore] sore *before* he mai M him] *om.* E^2E^1M

Þat he ne muȝe þanne bidden ore, for þat itit ilome; 125 Ω130
Forþi [is] he wis þe bit and biȝiet and bet bifore Dome.
Þanne þe deað is at þe dure, wel late he biddeð ore;
Wel late he lateð euel werc þan he hit ne mai don no more.
Senne lat þe and þu nah him, þan þu hit ne miht do no more;
Forþi he is sot þe swo abit to habben Goddes ore. 130
Þeih hweðere we hit leueð wel, for Drihte self hit sade,
Elche time sal þe man ofþunche his misdade,
Oðer raðer oðer later, milce he sal imete.
Ac þe þe her naueð ibet, muchel he haued to bete.
Maniman seið hwo reche pine þe sal habben ende: 135 Ω140
'Ne bidde Ich no bet bie Ich alesed a domesdai of bende?'
Litel wot he ⸢h⸣wat is pine, and litel he cnoweð
Hwilch hit is þar sowle wunieð, hwu biter wind þar bloweð;
Hadde he ben þar on oðer two bare tiden.
Nolde he for al middeneard þe þridde þar abiden. 140
Þat habbed isaid þe come þanne þe it wiste mid iwisse:
'Wo wurðe soeȝe seue ȝier for seuenihte blisse,
And ure blisse þe ende haueð for endelease pine!' Ω150
Betere is wori water þan atter imengd mid wine.
Swines brade is wel swete, swo is of wilde diere; 145
Ac al to diere he hit abuið þe ȝiefð þar for his swiere.
Ful wombe mai lihtliche speken of hunger and of fasten,
Swo mai of pine þe not hwat is pine þe sal ilasten.

125 þanne] *om.* J bidden ore] *trs.* D þat] hit E^2E^1 itit] bilimpeð D 126 forþi] for þi, *om.* D, ði E^2E^1 he] *om.* J [is] *found in* LDE^2E^1JM bit and biȝiet and bet] biet and bit and bet L, bit and bete and bet D, beot and beat. and bit E^2, bit ore. and bet J, ore bit and bet M bifore] *adds* þe J 127 þanne] vor whanne M þe[1]] *om.* LDE^2E^1JM is at] and dome comeþ to M at þe[2]] ate þe[2]] his E^2M wel] to DM 128 wel] to DM he lateð] uorlet þet D euel werc] þat vuel J werc] workes M þan] þe LDE^2E^1M he] *om.* LDE^2E^1M hit ne mai] hit *after* mai L hit] *om.* JM mai] *adds* hi M don no more] do *written in the main hand and the rest completed in another hand with* r *in* more *corrected from* n in don na more E^2 no more] nomore 129 *line om.* LE^2 (*added to the bottom of the folio in* E^2) *line is very different in* J: Bilef sunne hwil þu myht. and do bi godes lore senne] whane senne M þan] and M þu[2] ... more] þu ne miht hi do more D, þus ne miht do no more E^1, þu ne miȝt do namore M 130 *line om.* LE^2 (*added to the bottom of the folio in* E^2) *line is very different in* J *and* M: and do to gode hwat þu myht. if þu wilt habben ore J, To longe he abit þat suo abit to bidde cristes ore M forþi] for þi, *om.* D is] *om.* D 131 þeih hweðere] þet achten L, swo ileuen D, for J, ac naþeles M hit leueð] to leuen L, hit muȝen D wel] *om.* DM for] for ure L, and J 132 elche] a hwilke LE^2E^1, on hwiche DJ, of whiche M time] ⸢time⸣ E^2 sal þe] se eure L, se þe D, se eure ðe E^2E^1J, þat M ofþunche] of þunche, of þinchþ LDE^2E^1JM (*with* g *subp. after* n *in* L) 133 oðer ... later] *trs. phrs.* E^2E^1 imete] *prec.* Ac þ *exp.* 134 ac þe þe] ac we (*sic*) þet L, ah he þat J, ac who so M her naueð ibet] þer naf nicht ibet L, naueð hier naht ibet D, nafð naht ibet E^2, nout naued ibet E^1J, noþing her naueþ ibet M muchel] wel muchel LE^2E^1 haued] sceal E^2E^1 to] *om.* E^2E^1 135 maniman] sum man D, ac mani man M mani] *prec.* seid *canc.* (*crossed through*) E^1 reche] rechð LDE^2JM pine] of pine LDE^2E^1JM ende] *foll.* h *subp.* L 136 bidde] recche DM Ich] *adds* bote D no bet] *om.* DM, *adds* bute J bie ich] *trs.* J ich] *om.* LE^2E^1 alesed a domesdai] *trs. phrs.* M of bende] ut of bende M 137 litel] o. lite M wot he] *trs.* LD is pine] *trs.* D is] *foll.* h *subp.* litel] lite pine M he[2]] *add* hit LE^1J cnoweð] *prec.* hwil *exp.*, scaweð L 138 hit] hete LDE^2E^1J, pine M is þar] *om.* M sowle] þa saule LDJM wunieð] þoleþ M þar[2]] her E^1 139 hadde he] if he hedde D, vor hadde he M ben þar] *trs.* DM , iwuned þer J on oðer] enne dei oðer LE^2E^1J, *om.* M two] vnneþe one J bare] *om.* DJ 140 Nolde ... al] vor all þat gold of M Nolde] *prec. two letters exp.* al middeneard] almidden eard al] *adds* þe J þe þridde] an oþer J þar] he nolde M *followed by two lines in* J: Swiþe grimlÿch stench þer is and wurþ wÿþ vten ende. | And hwo þe enes cumeþ þer vt maÿ he never þenne wende. (J141-J142/Ω146-Ω147) 141 habbed isaid] seden DJ, siggeþ M þe] þo þet DJM come þanne] weren þer JM þe it] þit, heo hit J, *om.* M wiste] and wite hit M 142 wo wurðe] þer wurh D, uuel is E^2E^1, þer þurh J soreȝe] pinie E^2E^1, þe sorȝe M, *add* of JM seuenihte] ore niȝte M 143 and] in L, *om.* D, vor M ure] for þe J for] *om.* JM endelease] ende lease, *adds* is þe J 144 is] were drinke D water] *add* drunch LE^2JM (k *written over another letter in* idrunke E^2), to drinke E^1 145 is[1]] beþ M wel] swiðe LDE^2E^1, *om.* J swete] *add* and M is[2]] hi beþ M of] *add* þe JM wilde] *om.* M 146 ac] *om.* LDJM abuið] te *subp. after* u *in* abuh L 147 ful ... lihtliche] ful wombe *after* lihtliche mai (*trs.*) D fasten] þurste D 148 not ... ilasten] ne cnauð þe scal a ilesten L, not wat is pine. þet eure mo sel leste D, naht nat. hu pine sceal alesten E^2, naht not. hu hi scullen ilesten E^1, not hwat hit is. þat euer mo schal lesten J, not what hie is þat euere scal ilaste M

Hadde [he] fonded sume stunde he wolde seggen oðer: f. 5[r]
Eðlate him ware wif and child, suster and fader and broðer.
Al he wolde oðer luker don and oðer luker þenche,
Þan he biðohte an helle fur þat nowiht ne mai quenche;
Afre he wolde her in wo and in wane wunien. Ω160
Wið þan he mihte helle fur biflen and bisunien.
Eðlate him ware al wele and erðeliche blisse
For to þe muchele blisse cume, þe is murie mis iwisse.
Ich wulle nu cumen eft to þe Dome, þe Ich eow ar of sade:
On þe daie and on þe Dome us helpe Crist and rade!
Þar we muȝen ben sore offerd and harde us ofdrade;
Þar elch sal al isien him biforen his word, and ec his dade;
Al sal þar ben þanne cuð þat men luȝen her and halen,
Al sal þar ben þanne unwrien þat men her hudden and stalen.
We sullen alre manne lif icnowen alse ure oȝen: Ω170
Þar sullen efninges ben to þe here and to þe loȝe;
Ne sal þeih no man samie þiar ne þarf he him adrade
ȝief him her ofþincheð his gult and bet his misdade;
For hem ne sameð ne ne grameð þe sulle ben iboreȝe
Ac þe oðre habbeð same and grame, and oðer fele soreȝe.
Þe Dom sal ben sone idon; ne last hit nowiht longe.
Ne sal Him no man mene þar of strencðe ne of wronge.
þo sulle habben hardne dom þe here waren hardde,
Þo þe euel hielden wreche men and euel laȝe arerde.
Elch after þat he haueð idon sal þar ben þanne idemd: Ω180

149 hadde [he] fonded] hadde fonded hadde] hefð (*sic*) L [he]] his E^2 sume] one M stunde] hwile E^1 wolde] *add* al LDE^2E^1J oðer] anoþer M 150 eðlate him ware] and lete for crist. beo J and[1]] *om.* L child] chi\l/d E^1 suster and fader and] suster. feder and LM, suster. vader. moder and D, fader. suster. and J 151 *line om.* E^2M wolde] *adds* and L oðerluker] oþer DJ 152 *line om.* E^2M an] of D nowiht] no wiht, noþing DJ 153 afre] eft D, eueremore M he wolde] *om.* M her in wo] *trs. phrs.* E^2E^1, in bonen beon J wane] wope D, wawe E^2, pine E^1M, godnesse J wunien] *prec.* wið þan he mihte *exp.* 154 wið þan] wið þet þe L (þet *prec.* me *canc.* (*crossed through*)) E^2E^1M he] *om.* LE^2E^1 fur] pine LE^2E^1M biflen] euer fleon J, ule M he] *om.* LE^2E^1 155 *line om.* M eðlate] and lete J him ware] sker J al wele] al world wele LDE^2E^1, al þes worldes weole J erðeliche] werldliche D, eal eordliche E^2E^1, þes worldes J blisse] *om.* E^1 156 *line om.* M *the line shows great variation in* J: wiþ þat he mẏhte to heouene cumen. and beo þer mẏd iwisse. þe] þet L blisse] merhðe DE^2E^1 cume] cumen (*inf.*) L þe is] þis, is L murie] murþe LDE^2, heuenriche E^1 mid iwisse] *om.* E^1 157 *both* J *and* M *show significant variation:* Ich wile eu seggen of þe dome. as ich eu er seẏde J, [O]f þe dome we wlleþ speke of whan ich ȝo er seide M (O *om. in* [O]f: *guide letter present in margin*; we *foll.* ich *canc.* (*crossed through*)) eft] *foll.* est *subp.*, *om.* D eow ar] *trs.* L ar of] *trs.* D ar] *om.* E^2 158 on] at M þe] þat E^1 on] at LE^2E^1, *om.* M us helpe crist] *trs.* M 159 þar] *om.* D, *prec. a space left of about three letters* J ben sore] bon eþe LE^2E^1, eaðe ben D, beon JM offerd] of dredde E^2E^1 harde] sore J ofdrade] adreden LE^2E^1M, mai ondrede D 160 elch] he L, eueriche man M scal al] *om.* M al] *om.* DE^2E^1J isien him biforen] sien *after* biuoren D, ẏsicþ biuore M him biforen] *trs.* E^1 word] werkes DM ec] *om.* DM 161 þar ben þanne] þar *and* þanne *trs.* D þar ben] *trs.*E^2JM þar] *om.* E^1 þanne] *om.* M cuð] ikud J, vnhed M þat ... halen] her þat we hele M (hele *foll.* un *subp. and canc.* (*crossed through*)) þat] þer L halen] stelen LDE^2E^1J 162 þar ben] *trs.* E^2E^1JM þar] *om.* D ben þanne] *trs.* D þanne] *om.* E^2E^1M þat men her hudden and stalen] þet men wruȝen her and helen LE^2E^1, þet men her hidden and helen D, þat men her wrien and helen J, her þat man luȝe and stele 163 we] þar we M sullen] e *written over* i *in* sculen L alre manne] aches mannes M icnowen] *adds* þer E^1 164 efninges ben] *trs.* J to[1]] *om.* LDE^2E^1JM heie] riche LJ to[2]] *om.* LDE^2E^1M, ek J 165 *line om.* J þeih] *om.* LM no man] nan E^2, him naȝt M samie] smakie (*sic?*) L adrede] ondrede D 166 *line om.* J ȝief ... ofþincheð] he þe ofþuȝte her M 167 *line om.* J for] *om.* DM hem] him M ne[2] ne[3]] ne E^2, ne him ne M iboreȝe] e *subp. after* u *in* iboruwene E^1 168 *line om.* J ac] *om.* D þe oðre] þoðre and ... soreȝe] þat sculle beon forlorene E^1 oðer fele] *trs.* D oðer] oft L 169 *line om.* M sal] þal (sic) ben sone] *trs.* LE^2E^1 last] lesteð D nowiht] no wiht 170 *line om.* M him ... mene] non him bimene D no man] noman 171-174 and 175-176 *trs.* M (M161-164 and M159-160 *dip.*, Ω178- Ω183 *parallel*) 171 þo] hi M hardne] r *written over* b D 172 þo þe] þet DE^2M wreche] poure M arerde] redde L 173 *line om.* J elch] ec L, end E^2, ac E^1, euerich M after þat] after þan þe E^1M idon] *add* he E^1M þar] *om.* D ben þanne] *trs.* D ben] *om.* L þanne] *om.* E^2E^1M

Bliðe mai he þanne ben þe God haueð wel iquemd.
Alle þo þe sprunge beð of Adam and of Eue
Alle hie sulle þider cume, for soðe we hit ileued.

f. 5^{v} Þo þe habbed wel idon after here mihte
To heueriche hie sulle fare forð mid ure Drihte;
Þo þe deueles werkes habeð idon, and þarinne beð ifunde,
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem into helle grunde,
Þar hie sulle wunien abuten ore and ende.
Brecð nafre eft crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellich þeih hem be wo and þeih hem be uneaðe; Ω190
Ne sal nafre eft Crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Ænes Drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte;
Himself he þolede deað for hem; wel diere he hes bohte.
Nolde hit moȝe don for mai, ne suster [for] broðer,
Nolde sune don for fader; ne no man for oðer.
Vre alre Louerd, for his þralles, ipined he was a rode;
Ure bendes he unbond and bohte us mid his blode.
We ȝieueð uneaðe for his luue a steche of ure breade.
Ne þenche we naht þer sal deme þa quica and þe deade.
Muchel luue he us kedde, wolde we hit understonde. Ω200
Þat ure elderne mi\s/d\u/den we habeð euel an honde.
Deað cam in þis middenærd þurh ealde deueles onde,
And senne and soreȝe, and iswinch a watere and londe.
Vre foremes faderes gult we abugeð alle,
Al his ofsprung after him in harem is biualle,
Þurst and hunger, chele and hete and alle unhalðe;
Þurh deað cam in þis middeneard and oðer unisalðe,

174 *line om.* LJ bliðe] welle bliþe M þanne] *om.* M god] *adds* her M wel] *om.* DE^{1}M 175 þo þe] þat euere M sprunge beð] beoþ icumen J, ỳsprungen is M 176 alle ... þider] to þe dome hi sculle M sulle] e *written over another letter, now illeg. in* sculen L þider cume] *trs.* L for soðe] to soþe D, and so J we] ȝe DM, *adds* owen J hit] muȝen D 177 habbed wel idon] gode iserued habbeð M 178 to ... sulle] *trs. phrs.* M hie] *om.* E^{2} fare] *om.* E^{1} 179 þo þe] þe oþre þat þe M deueles ... idon] habbeð *before* doules L, wrohten dofles werc D, nabbeð god idon E^{2}E^{1}, habbeð feondes werk idon J and] *adds* weren D beð] *om.* D, eo *written over two letters in* beoþ J 180 hie] þo D fare ... hem] falle swiðe rađe E^{2}E^{1}, falle adun mid him M fare] *prec. one letter exp.* hem] him *foll.* him *subp.* (*ditt.*) L into] in to helle] hele (*sic*) M 181 þar] þar inne E^{1}, and þare M sulle wunien] *trs.* E^{2} abuten] ai buten D, a and buten E^{2}, .o. buten J, euermore bute M ore and] *om.* E^{2}M 182 brecð] ne brekeþ LDE^{2}E^{1}JM nafre] nought J eft Crist] *trs.* J eft] *om.* L Crist] drihte L, iesus M dure] gate L, *om.* M for] to DE^{1}J lesen hem] ham to bringe ham ut M 183 *line om.* M nis no sellich] is hit wonder D and ... uneaðe] he mawe wunẏe eþe J and] ne D þeih] *om.* LE^{2}E^{1} 184 *line om.* M ne] *om.* E^{2}, nele E^{1}J sal] þoleð D, *om.* E^{1}J eft] *om.* E^{2}E^{1} crist] drihten D þolien] *om.* D for] to DJ 185 drihten] ure loured M brac] *adds* and D he] *om.* D 186 he^{1}] *om.* D hem] vs JM hes] us E^{1}JM 187 moȝe ... mai] nomon do for me J, fader do for þe sune M moȝe] mei L suster [for] broðer] suster broðer [for]] *adds* þe M 188 nolde] ne M, *add* hit LDE^{2}E^{1}JM sune ... fader] moȝe uir þe mei M ne] *om.* E^{2} 189-190 *couplet trs.* 191-192 M (M177-178 and M175-176 *dip.*, Ω196-199 *parallel*) 189 alre] *om.* DE^{1}M his] vs J þralles] wiales D ipined] ipines D he] *om.* LDE^{2}E^{1}JM a rode] arode, on þo rode DM 190 and] he D 191 we ȝieueð uneaðe] *trs. phrs.* M we] and we J for] fo (*sic*) E^{2} 192 ne þenche we] we *before* ne þencheþJ, lite we þencheþ M naht] *om.* M þar þat] þet he LDE^{2}E^{1}JM þa] *om.* DE^{2} quica] q̣ca, quikewe (*sic*) M and] *adds* ek J þe] *om.* DE^{2} 193 luue ... wolde] he dude for ure loue ȝef M us kedde] *trs.* D hit] þet E^{2} understonde] unstonde *with* der *inserted into the right-hand margin* D 194 þat] ac þat þe M mi\s/de\u/den] e *subp.* with u *int.* we habbeð euel] harde we habbeð D, we habbeþ harde J, we hit habbeþ wel harde M an] en (*sic*) E^{2} 195 ealde] þes LDJM, þe ealde E^{2}E^{1} 196 and] *om.* M senne] sake L and^{3}] *adds* in M iswinch] muchel a watere] awatere, on se D and^{4}] ec E^{1} 197 *line om.* M *there are no variants in this line* 198 *line om.* ML al] and D ofsprung] i *written over* e *in* ospring D after] efer (*sic*) D is] bieð D biualle] ifalle J 199 þurst and hunger] *trs. nouns* D hunger] huger (sic) D chele and hete] *trs. nouns* D and alle] helde and L, ecðe and al D, eche and eal E^{2}E^{1}, ache and JM 200 þurh] *add* him LJ deað] *om.* J and] *add* manie M

Nare no man elles dead ne sic, ne unsele
Ac mihte libbe afremo a blisse and an hale.

Litel lac is Gode lief þe cumeð of gode wille, Ω210 f. 6r
And eðlate muchel ȝieue þan his herte is ille.
Litel hit þuncheð maniman, ac muchel was þe senne
For hwan alle þolieð deað þe comen of here kenne.
For senne, and ec ure oȝen, us muȝe sore ofþunche;
For senne we libeð alle her in soreȝe and in swunche,
Seðen God nam swo mukel wrache for one misdede.
We þe swo ofte misdoð, we muȝen us eaðe ofdrade.
Adam and al his ofspreng for one bare senne
Was fele hundred wintre an helle a pine and unwenne.
Þo þe ladeð here lif mid unrihte and mid wronge, Ω220
Bute hit Godes milce do hie, sulle wunie þar longe.
Godes wisdom is wel mulchel, and alsse is his mihte,
Ac nis his mihte nowiht lasse, ac biðer ilke wihte.
More he one maiȝ forȝieue þan alle folc gulte cunne:
Self deuel mihte habben milce, ȝief he hit bigunne.
Þe þe Godes milche secð iwis he mai hes finden;
Ac helle king is oreleas wið þo þe he mai binden.
Se deð his wille mast, he sal habbe werest mede:
His bað sal be wallinde pich, his bed barnende glede.
Werse he doð his gode wines þan his fiendes. Ω230
God silde alle Godes friend wið swo euele friende.

201 nare ... elles] Elles *before* nere M no man] noman no] *om.* E^2 ne^2] *add* nan LE^2E^1J unsele] vnvele D, vn ysalþe *with* ysalþe *canc.* (*crossed through*) and ẏsele *written in the right-hand margin* E^1, vnhele J 202 a bliss] abliss a] mẏd J an] mẏd J hale] wele 203-204 *repeats that found at* 73-74 *and are not found in any of the other* MSS 205-206 *found after* 193-194 M (M181-182 *dip.*, Ω212-213 *parallel*) 205 litel] and lite M hit] *om.* E^2E^1M maniman] *prec.* v *subp.* E^1, ani man M ac] al D, hu E^2E^1M muchel] lite M 206 for] þurȝ M hwan] *adds* we M all þolieð] *trs.* DE^1M here] þo DE^2, adammes M 207 *line om.* M here] vre J senne] \sẏnne/ E^1 ec] *prec.* hore *subp.* L, *om.* E^2J oȝen] *om.* D, sor J us muȝe sore] sare us mei LDE^2E^1, vs maẏ sore J muȝe] *prec.* rewen *canc.* (*by underlining*) 208 *line om.* M for] þurh L, for in E^1, in J libeð ... soreȝe] alle hier in sorȝe bieð D her] *om.* LE^2E^1J in^1] and J 209-210 *couplet trs.* 211-212 M (M191-192 *and* M189-190 *dip.*, Ω216-219 *parallel*) 209 seðen] hwenne J, and suþþe M nam] *om.* D, dude M wrache] *adds* dede D, c *subp. after* c in wreche E^2, \wreche/ M 210 we^1] \we/ E^2 swo ... misdoð] swa muchele and swa ofte mis doð L, gelteð ofte and muchel D, swa muchel and oft mis doð E^2, so muchel and swa oft misdoð E^1, ofte mẏs doþ J, so ẏlome and ofte abulteþ her M we ... ofdrade] hwat sal us to rede D, wel sore we maie a drede M we^2] *om.* E^2E^1 us eaðe] *trs.* L, vs sore E^1J ofdrade] adrede LE^2E^1JM (ad\r/ede E^1) 211-212 *follow* 201-202 in M (M189-190 *dip.*, Ω208-209 *parallel*) 211 al] *om.* LDE^2E^1JM ofspreng] *adds* al D bare] þare (*sic*) L 212 was] weren DJM wintre] ȝer D an helle] *om.* J a] *om.* LDE^2M pine] *om.* D unwenne] an unwunne LDE^2E^1JM 213 þo þe] and þa ðe E^2E^1JM ladeð] ledden L lif] *prec. a space but no evidence of exp.* unrihte] werre M 214 Godes] gode\s/ L milce] l *written over a letter, possibly* d L do] *prec.* n *subp.* L, beo J hie] *om.* E^2E^1 sulle] *om.* J wunie] bon LDE^2E^1M, beoþ J þar] *add* wel LDE^2E^1JM 215 wisdom] milce D wel] swo D and] *prec. two or three letters exp.* alsse] so M is] beþ M 216 ac] and LE^2E^1, *om.* DJM his] him D mihte] milce LE^2E^1J, no þing D nowiht lasse] naut lesse L, litlende D, no lasse M ac] þane was þo M, *adds* al J ðer ilke] emliche D, one J 217 more ... maiȝ] more *after* mai D 218 self deuel] *trs. and after* se D, *trs.* E^1, *after* þeẏh J, *after* þe M self] *om.* E^2 bigunne] bidde gunne E^1 219 þe þe] þeþe, hwo swo D, þe man þe M iwis he] he iwis L mai hes] *trs.* L, hit scal M 220 oreleas] ore leas, swiþe hard D wið ... binden] wið ða þe mei binde *written over eras.* E^2 221 *and* 222 *trs.* J (J217 *and* J218 *dip.*: *the text has been marked for trs. by the scribe and, therefore, the line order has been accepted in* J) 221 *the line is squeezed into the right hand margin of* E^2 *with some of the text lost through crop. It has been reconstructed as* þe ðe deð his wille mest [he] | haueð [werse] | m[ede] se] þe þe LDE^2E^1JM, *adds* eure D mast] best M werest] *before* he M sal] *om.* LE^2E^1M habbe] haueð LE^2E^1M, him D 222 bað] be\a/ð E^1 pich] *om.* L bed] bað L, *adds* scab (*scribal error?*) bon L 223 *line om.* J he doð] *adds* he deþ (*ditt.*) M wines] frond L his^2] *add* fulle LE^2E^1, loðe D 224 *line om.* J God ... friend] isilde us eure drihte crist D, Iesu crist us iscilde alle M friend] *add* a LE^2E^1 wið] t *written over* d *in* wiht E^1, fram M swo] swilche LDE^2E^1M euele] loðe D, *om.* LE^2E^1

Nafre an helle Ich ne cam, ne cumen Ich þar ne reche,
Þeih Ich aches woreldes wele þare mihte feche,
Þeih Ich wille seggen eow þat wise men us saden
And a boc hit is write þar me hit mai rade;

f. 6^{v} Ic wille seggen hit þo þe hit hemself nesten,
And warnin hem wið here unfreme ȝief hie me willeð hlesten.
Vnderstandeð nu to meward, eadimen and arme,
Ich wille tellen eow of helle pine and warnin eow wið harme.
An helle hunger and þurst euel two iferen; Ω240
Þos pine þolieð þo þe ware mete niðinges here.
Þar is woning and wop, after ache strate;
⟨H⟩ie fareð fram hate [to] chele, fram chele to hate;
⟨Þ⟩an hie beð in þe hate - chele hem þuncheð blisse,
⟨Þ⟩an hie cumeð eft to chele of hate hie habbeð misse!
⟨E⟩iðer doð ⸢hem⸣ wo inoh, nabbeð hie none lisse;
⟨N⟩iten hweðer hem doð wers to nafre non wisse. Ω250
⟨H⟩ie walkeð afre and secheð reste, ac hie hes ne muȝen imeten,
⟨F⟩or þi þe hie nolde, þe hwile hie mihten here, senne beten;
⟨H⟩ie sec⸢h⸣eð reste þar non nis, ac hie hies ne muȝen ifinden,
⟨A⟩c walkeð weri up and dun, se water doð mid winde.
⟨Þ⟩at beð þo þe waren her an þanc unstedefaste
⟨A⟩nd þo þe Gode biheten aihte and hit him ilaste,

225-226 in J (J143-144 *dip.,* Ω232-233 *parallel*) *follow two lines found only in that MS* (J141-142 *dip.,* Ω146-Ω147 *parallel*), *and which are found much earlier in* J (*after* 139-140, J139-140 *dip.*, Ω144-145 *parallel*) 225 Nafre] N *om. in* [N]euere: *guide letter present in margin* M an ... cam] Ich *before* on DJ Ich ne] ine ne[1]] *om.* L cumen ... ne[2]] þer ne come L, þer to cume ne J, neuere come ne M ne[2]] *prec. a letter exp.* 226 aches] alle DJM, *add* þes JM þare] þer inne DE[2]E[1]M (inne *foll. a letter exp.* M) mihte] me mahte L, wende DMJ feche] to vecche J 227 þeih ... eow] also ich hit telle J þeih ich wille] þeð *after* Ich wille D þeih] þet L, ac þeȝ M ich] his L seggen eow] seggen on L, ȝo telle M þat] as JM us] me M 228 [a] boc] boc, on heore boke J hit is write] hit writen L, hit stant iwrite D, hi hit write E[2], hit iwrỳten is J þar ... rade] and alle we muȝen hit rede D, and ȝe hit habbeþ ihurd rede M þar] þat J me] *om.* L, ⸢me⸣ hit mai] *trs.* LE[2]E[1]J 229 ich] and ich M wille seggen hit] hit *before* wille LDE[2]E[1]M wille] *om.* J seggen hit] *trs.* J seggen] telle M þo þe] heom þe E[1], for heom þat J, us þat M hit hemself] *trs.* E[2]E[1], er þis J, hit er M hemself] hem self 230 and] *om.* L hem] us M here] *prec. a letter exp.*, *om.* JM unfreme] vnwines D, hearme E[1]J hie] ȝe M 231 Vnderstandeð] Vn⸢der⸣stondeð D meward] me LDE[2]E[1]JM arme] areȝe M 232 ich] and ich M wille ... pine] wille of helle pine warni ȝeu D wille tellen eow] ou *before* wille M tellen eow] *trs.* J eow[1]] LE[2]E[1] and ... harme] fram harme D eow[2]] *om.* J, us M wið] of J 233 an helle] þar J, *add* his LDE[2]E[1]JM (his *foll.* is *subp. in* L) þurst] *add* wel M euel two] *trs.* L 234 pine] *om.* L þolieð] sculle þolie M þo þe] þa L, þer þat JM (þa⸢t⸣ J) mete niðings] meteniðings, me⸢te⸣niþings D mete] maket L, *om.* M *adds two lines in* M: Þe hadde þis worldes eȝte and faste gunne hielde | And hi nolde helpe þar of þe hungri ne þe chielde. (M216-M216/Ω242-Ω243) 235 woning] sorinesse D wop] wow L after ache] in eueriche M strate] streche L 236 hate[1] [to] chele[1]] hate chele, hete to hete L, hete in to chele D, hete to þe chele E[1]M hate[1]] ⸢hete⸣ E[2] chele[1]] *adds* and D fram[2] ... hate[2]] and hech to frure þe wreche L chele[2]] *adds* in D to[2]] *add* þe E[1]JM 237 beð ... hate] bieð *after* hete D beð] cumeþ J þe] *om.* JM hate] *add* þe LDE[2]E[1]JM chele ... blisse] chelecheð (*sic*) blisse E[2] hem] *om.* E[1] blisse] lỳsse 238 cumeð ... chele] to chele cumeð D, beoþ in þe chele M to] *adds* þe L of] *adds* þar M 239 and 240 *trs.* M 239 eiðer] hi L doð ... inoh] *trs.* LDE[2]E[1]JM nabbeð] *add* hi LDE[2]E[1]J (⸢h⸣i E[1]), ne habbeð hi M lisse] blisse LD, *foll.* b *exp.* E[2] 240 niten ... wers] niteð hi hwer hi wonieð mest D niten] *add* hi LE[1], heo nuten J, *adds* hi neure M to] mid LDE[2]E[1]J 241 secheð reste] reste secheð D hie] ⸢ho⸣ L muȝen] o *subp. after* m *in* muȝen L hes] *om.* LDE[2]E[1]M 242 for þi þe] vor DJ, for þi E[1], vor þan þe M hie] *om.* E[2] þe[2]] *om.* E[2]J hwile] *om.* D, *adds* þet L senne] sennen (*pl.*) DJM 243 non nis] *trs.* L ac] for þi LJ, for D, þi E[2], ac þi E[1], and M hie ... ifinden] ne muȝen hi es finden L, hi ne muȝen iuinde D, ne muȝen hi finde E[2]J, ne muwen ifinde E[1], ne muȝe non þar finde M 244 weri] þar boþe J mid] *adds* þe M 245 beð] seden D an ... unstedefaste] mid hwom me heold feste J an] of M 246 and[1]] *om.* M þo þe] to E[2], þo E[1] gode biheten] *trs.* D, bihete iesu crist M aihte] heste L, wel J, *om.* DM and[2]] *add* nolden LDE[2]E[1]JM hit] *om.* M him] *om.* LDE[2]E[1]J ilaste] ileste LDE[2]E[1]JM (n *subp. after* ilaste E[1])

⟨A⟩nd Þo þe god werc bigunnen and ful endin hit nolden,
⟨N⟩u waren her and nu þar, and nesten hwat he wolden,
⟨Þ⟩ar is pich þat afre walleð þar sulle wunien inne.
⟨Þ⟩o þe ladeð here lif on werre and an unwinne. 250
⟨Þ⟩ar is fur þat is hundredfeald hatere þan be ure; Ω260
⟨N⟩e mai hit quenche salt water; ne auene stream ne sture;
⟨Þ⟩is is þat fur þat afre barneð, ne mai hit nowiht quenche.
⟨Þ⟩ar inne beð þe was to lef wreche men to swenche,

Þo þe swikele men and ful of euele wrenchen, 255 f. 7r
And þo þe mihten euel don and lief hit was to þenchen.
Þe luueden rauing and stale, hordom and druken,
And an defles werkes bliðeliche swunken;
Þo þe waren swo lease men þat me hes ne mihte leuen,
Medȝierne domes men and w⟨r⟩onwise reuen; 260
Þo þe oðer mannes wif was lief her oȝen eðlate, Ω270
And þo þe sunegeden muchel on druken and on ate;
Þe wreche men binomen here aihte and leide his on horde,
Þe litel lete of Godes bode and of Godes worde,
And þe his oȝen nolde ȝieue þar he iseih þe niede 265
Ne nolde ihere godes men þan he sat at his biede;
Þo þe þas oðer mannes þing leuere þan hit solde
And waren al to gradi of siluer and of golde;
Þo þe untrewnesse deden þan þe he solden ben holde

247 and] *om.* LDE^{2}E^{1}M god ... bigunnen] agunne *before* godes D god (*adj. ModE* good)] godes (*poss. noun ModE* God's) D werc] were J ful endin hit] hit *before* fulendi D 248 nu] þe E^{1}, and M waren] witen L and^{1}] *om.* J nu] while M, *adds* were J and^{2}] heo J nesten hwat] deden þat D nesten] mesten *with a minim subp.* hwat] w *written over* h *in* hwet E^{2} 249 þar is] þat ich J, *adds* þat M pich ... walleð] bernunde pich L þar sulle] hore saule L, þat sullen DE^{1}M, þat heo schulle J wunien inne] baþien inne LDE^{2}E^{1}, habbe þere J, þe beo inne M 250 ladeð] ledden LDE^{2}E^{1}M here] uuel E^{2}E^{1} on werre] in werre L, in wele D, in feoht E^{2}, in feoh E^{1}, vnwreste J, mid werre M and an unwinne] and in winne L, and in winne L, and in senne D, end in iginne E^{2}E^{1}, and eke false were J, and mid ẏwinne and] *prec. a letter exp.* 251-252 *couplet trs. with* 253-254 E^{1} (251-252 *and* 249-250 *dip.*, Ω260-Ω263 *parallel*) 251 is^{1}] *adds* þat M þat is] þis, an J be] is D, *om.* E^{2}M 252 ne ... salt water] mot hit noþer aquenche M salt water] no weter D, no salt water J ne^{2} ... sture] ne uersc of þe burne L ne^{2} auene] nauene E^{2}E^{1} ne^{2}] *om.* DM 253 þis] þer DE^{1}, þat JM þat^{1}] *om.* DE^{1} ne ... quenche] þat noþing ne mot aquenche M nowiht] no wiht, nawhiht hit L, hit no þing D, hit nawiht E^{2}E^{1}, hit nomon J 254 þar ... lef] þe sculle beo inne þe were lef M þar inne] her inne E^{2}E^{1} beð ... lef] sendeð þo þet loueden D þe] þa þe L, þeo. þat J was to lef] her wes leof J wreche] c *written over* r *in* wrecche E^{2}, poure JM 255 *line om.* M þo þe] and þo þet D, *add* weren LDE^{2}E^{1}J 256 *line om.* M and^{1}] *om.* LE^{2}E^{1} þo þe] *add* ne E^{2}E^{1}J euel] vnriht D and^{2}] þe þe L lief hit was] *trs.* was hit leofJ hit was] *trs.* E^{1} hit] *om.* E^{2}, *adds* hem D 257 þe] þo þet DE^{1}J, and þe þe M rauing] tening L, hordom D stale] *add* and DJM hordom and druken] unmetliche drunke M hordom] reauinge D 258 an defles] on þos loþes diefle D, a on ðes deofles E^{2}, þe on þes deofles E^{1}, ec in þes deueles M werkes] weorc E^{2}M bliðeliche] to bleðeliche D, suo bleþeliche M 259 swo] *om.* D lease] lele (*sic*) L men] *om.* LE^{2}E^{1}JM þat] *om.* D me hes] mes me ... mihte] *trs. phrs.* D, ham *after* miȝte M 260 medȝierne] and medeȝierned D 261 þo þe] þet LE^{2}E^{1} oðer ... lief] oþres wif haueden lief D, wes leof *before* oþer J, was oþre mannes wiues lef M wif] ⟨wif⟩ E^{2} was] *prec. two letters exp.*, *om.* L lief] *add* and DJ eð] *om.* J 262 and] *om.* LE^{2} þo þe sunegeden muchel] þe ðe sunegude muchel E^{2}, þe þat sunegeþ ofte J, senegede bluþeliche M ate] mete J 263 þe] þeo þat JM wreche men] wrechemen *prec. a letter exp.*, wrecche E^{2}E^{1}, poureman M binomen] bẏnẏmeþ J here aihte] his ehte LE^{2}J, his god D, *om.* M leide his on] leiden huere on E^{1}, hit leẏþ an J, leide in hare M on] om *with third minim subp.* D 264 þe] and JM litel] lute E^{2} of^{1}] on J bode] borde L, bibode E^{2}, hest M of^{2}] *om.* L godes] his swete D 265 *line om.* M and] *om.* J þe] þo þe LDJ, of E^{1} his oȝen] almes J J *adds line*: Ne his poure kunesmen, at him ne mẏhte nouht spede, (J258/Ω275) 266 *line om.* M ne] þe þat J men] sonde LE^{2}E^{1}J þen] þer DE^{2}E^{1}J sat ... biede] hit herde bode L at] *om.* E^{2}E^{1} 267 *line om.* D þo þe] and J was] is L, *adds* leof J þing] god M hit] beon J, him M 268 *line om.* D al to] alto, to L 269 *line om.* D þo þe] and þa þe LE^{2}E^{1}, and luueden J, and M untrewnesse] untruw⟨n⟩esse E^{2}, vnriȝwisnesse M deden] *om.* J þan þe] ȝam E^{1}, þat J, þar M solden] scu⟨l⟩den L, ahte E^{2}E^{1}

And leten al þat hie solden don, and deden þat hie wolden;
Þo þe waren ȝietceres of þis wereldes aihte
And dude al þat þe loðe gost hem tihte to and taihte;
And al ⸢þo⸣ þe ani wise deuel iquemde:
Þo beð mid hem in helle fordom and demde,
Bute þo þe ofðuhte sore here misdade
And gunne here gultes bete and betere lif lade.
Þar beð naddren and snaken, eueten and fruden
Þe tereð and freteð þo euele swiken, þe niðfule and þe prude!
Nafre sunne þar ne sineð ne mone ne storre;
Þar is muchel Godes hete and muchel godes oerre!

f. 7ᵛ

Afre þar is euel smech, þiesternesse and eie;
Nis þar nafre oðer liht þan þe sparte leie.
Þar ligeð ateliche fiend in stronge raketeie:
Þat beð þo þe waren mid god, angles swiðe heie.
Þat beð ateliche fiend and eiseliche wihten:
Þo sulle þe wreche sowle isien þe sinegeden þurh sihte!
Þar is se loðe sathanas and belzebub se ealde:
Eaðe he muȝen ben sore ofdrad þe sullen hes bihealde.
Ne mai non herte hit þenche, ne tunge hit ne mai telle
Hwu muchele pine ne hwu fele senden in helle.
Of þo pine þe þar bieð nelle Ich eow naht lie.
Nis hit bute gamen and glie of þat man mai here drie
And ȝiet ne doð hem naht alse wo in þe loðe bende,
Swo þat he witen þat here pine sal nafre habben ende!
Þar beð þe haðene men þe waren laȝelease,

270 Ω280 290 Ω290 300 Ω300

270 *line om.* D and] *om.* M al] *om.* LE²E¹JM wolden] ne scholden J J *adds line*: heo schulleþ wunẏen in helle. þe ueondes onwolde (J264/ Ω281) 271-272 *follow* 263-264 M (M243-246 *dip.,* Ω272-273 *and* Ω282-283 *parallel*) 271 þo þe] and þo þet D waren ȝietceres] weren eure L, witteres E², were gaderares J waren] n *subp. after* e¹ in weren L of] abuten L 272 al] *om.* E²E¹J þe] ⸢te⸣ E² hem] *om.* L tihte] hechte L to and] *trs.* E², and ec E¹ to] *om.* J 273 and al] *om.* M ani] mẏd dusẏe J, in alle M deuel] þo diefle DM, *adds* er D, her E²E¹JM (⸢her⸣ E²) iquemde] iquende (*sic*) L, m *subp. after* e² E¹, iquemeþ J 274 *final line in* L beð ... helle] sullen ben voð mid him M beð] *add* nu LE²E¹J mid ... helle] in helle wiþ him J, *trs. phrs.* M demde] fordemet LDE²E¹JM (n *subp. after* e² *in* for dempde E¹) 275 ofðuhte] vor þuhte D, osþuȝte (*sic*) M, *adds* ham D, her J sore here misdade] here sennen and here misdeden D sore] *adds* her E¹ 276 gunne here gultes] gunnen *after* gultes JM gultes] sennes D bete] lete J lade] to lede J 277 *line om.* M and²] *adds* ec D 278 *line om.* M þe] þer J þo] þo þet D swiken] spekeð DJ, speke E²E¹ niðfule] on⸢d⸣fulle D 279-282 *follow* 285-286 M (M259-262 *dip.,* Ω290-293 *parallel*) 279 ne storre] ne no sterre D 280 þar is] eure þar is M oerre] *foll. a letter exp. in* eorre E² 281 euel] muchel JM smech] *adds* and M 282 nis] ne com M þan] bute J, *adds* of M þe swarte] þiester D 283 ligeð] lẏþ J, beoþ M ateliche] ladliche E²E¹M, þe lodliche J 284 þat] þos M beð] is J waren] wes J angles swiðe] on heuene wel E²E¹, in heouene swiþe JM heie] h *written over another letter* 285 þat] þer DE²E¹JM ateliche] grisliche M eiseliche] grẏsliche J, aterliche M 286 þo] þas E², þer J, þe M wreche] arme D sowle] *om.* E²E¹ isien] i fon E² sinegeden] gelten D þurh] bi J, mid M 287 is] *prec. two letters exp.* E² *there is no variation in this line* 288 eaðe] welle sore M sore] *om.* DE²E¹JM ofdred] ofherd D, adred J, afered M sullen hes] sullen hine D, hine scule E²E¹, heom schulde J suiche sculle M 289 *line om.* M ne²] *adds* no DE¹J hit] *om.* DE²E¹J ne³]*om.* DJ mai²] *om.* DJ, can E²E¹ 290 *line om.* M ne] and DE¹, *om.* J fele] *adds* ueondes J senden] bieð DJ in] *adds* þeostre J 291-292 *found after* 153-154 M, *much earlier in the* MS (M143-146 *dip.,* Ω160-161 *and* Ω302-303 *parallel*) 291 of] wið DE², for al J, vor of M þar bieð] her is J naht] noþing M 292 of] al DE²E¹J, her M þat] þat þat M man] flesh M mai here] *trs.* D here] *om.* M 293 *line om.* M and ȝiet] ac ȝet E¹, *om.* D naht] noþing DJ alse] swo DE²E¹J 294 *line om.* M swo] *om.* E², bute E¹, ase J he] *om.* J witen] niten D, ⸢witeð⸣ E¹ þat²] *om.* J sal nafre habben] ne sal habben D, ne scal neure habben E¹, ne schal habbe non J habben] *a letter has been underlined and exp. after* habbe E² 295 *line om.* M laȝelease] laȝe lease, lawe leve (*sic – a later hand corrects* leve *by writing* s *above*) J

Þe nes naht of Godes bode no of Godes hease.
Euele Cristene men hie beð here iferen:
Þo þe here Cristendom euele hielden here!
And ȝiet he beð a werse stede a niðer helle grunde, Ω310
Ne sullen nafre cumen ut, for peni ne for punde!
Ne mai hem noðer helpe þar ibede ne almesse,
For naht [hie] solden bidde þar or ne forȝieuenesse!
Silde him elch man, þe while he mai, wið þos helle pine
⟨And⟩ warnie his frend þar wið, swo Ich habbe ido mine.
⟨Þ⟩o þe silde hem ne cumen, Ich hem wille tache;
⟨I⟩ch can ben aiðer, ȝief Ich sal, lichame and sowle lache.

Late we þat God forbet alle mankenne; f.8r
And do we þat he us hat and silde we us wid senne;
Luue we God mid ure herte and mid al ure mihte Ω320
And ure em cristen alse us self swo us tached drihte.
Al þat me radeð and singed bifore Godes borde,
Al hit hangeð and halt bi þese twam worde.
Alle godes laȝes hie fulleð, þe newe and þe ealde,
Þe þe þos two luues halt and wile hes wel healde.
Ac hie bieð wel arefeð heald swo ofte we gul\t/eð alle:
For hit is strong te stonde longe, and liht hit is to falle.
Ac Drihte Crist ȝeue us strengðe stonde þat we moten
And of alle ure gultes ȝieue us cume to bote.
We wilnieð after wereldes wele, þe longe ne mai ilaste, Ω330
And leȝeð mast al ure swinc on þing unstedefast.
Swunke for godes luue half þat we doð for eihte
Nare we naht swo ofte bicherd ne swo euele bikeihte!
ȝief we serueden God half þat we doð for erminges

296 *line om.* M þe nes] þer D, þe heom nas E^1 bode] bi bode E^2, forbode J 297 *line om.* M hie ... iferen] beoþ þer heorure nere J 298 *line om.* M hielden] heo\l/de E^2 *there is no variation in this line* 299 *line om.* M and] *om.* E^2E^1J beð] beoð *foll. a letter exp.* E^2 a werse] awerse a niðer] aniðer, on ðere E^2E^1 300 *line om.* M sullen] *add* hi DE^2E^1J ut] up E^1J peni] marke DE^2E^1J 301 *line om.* M hem] *om.* J noðer help þar] noiþer *after* þer J ibede] bene D 302 *line om.* M naht ... þar] nis naðer inne helle E^2E^1J naht [hie] solden] naht solden, naht hi solden D 303 silde] nu schilde J elch man] ech D, euerich man M þe while he mai] *om.* M þe] *om.* J wið] of E^2E^1 þos helle] þo helle DM, þe ilke J 304 and] *om.* M warnie] *add* ech DE^2E^1J, euerich man M þar wið] *om.* JM swo] and suo M habbe] wille DM (E^1 *also writes* wulle, *but this has been crossed through with* \habbe/ *int.*) ido] *om.* DE^2E^1J, do M 305 þo þe] and þe þat M ich] ham M 306 ich ... lichame] þis word maẏ aiþer ȝef he sculle beo lichames M aiðer] *om.* E^2E^1 ich sal] isal 307 God] *foll. the letter* w *exp.* *there is no variation in this line* 308 and] *om.* M we þat] wel swo D he] god M silde we] warin us DM 309 we] *om.* DM ure[1]] *om.* M 310 and] *om.* J emcristen] nexte M alse] swo D, eal E^2, al suo M swo] for so J tached] lereð D, lerde E^2E^1J, het ure M 311 radeð] ret DE^2E^1 and] *add* eal þet me E^2 312 halt] bi halt E^2E^1 þese] þe ilke M 313 alle] *om.* D, and alle M godes] godel (*sic*) newe] *add* laȝe M and] *add* ek J (k *written over another letter*) ealde] *pec. by* h *subp.* D 314 þe þe] þeþe, þet DJM, he þe E^1 þos ... halt] haueþ þeos ilke two luuen J, laȝe uelleþ M halt] haueð DE^2E^1 wile hes wel] wile *and* wel *trs.* DE^2E^1J wile] can M 315 hie ... heald] soþ ich hit eu segge J, strong hie is to ẏhelde M wel arefeð heald] harue ihialde wel D wel] wunder E^1E^2 swo] *om.* J we] *om.* E^2 gul\t/eð] d *subp. with* l *int.* 316 for] *om.* M hit is strong] strong *before* hitJM longe] veste D hit] *om.* E^2 317 ac] *om.* D drihte] *om.* M crist] *add* he E^2E^1 ȝeue us] *trs.* DJM strengðe] *om.* D, his miȝte M moten] n *subp. after* e *in* mote E^1 318 gultes] vallen D, sunnen JM ȝieue us] he one us D, unne us E^2E^1 (\unne/ E^2), vs lete J, leue us M cume] *add* to DE^2JM 319 wele] aẏhte J ne mai] nele DM 320 legeð mast al] leggeð almest D, leggeð eal E^2E^1, mest leggeþ J, leggeþ muchel M unstedefaste] unste\de/feste E^2 321 swunke ... luue] if þat we swunken for gode J swunke] *add* we DE^2E^1M half þat] swo D, alse M 322 nare] ne beo E^2, ne were E^1 naht] *om.* D, noþing M ofte] *om.* E^1 bicherd] forgelt M swo euele] *om.* M bikeihte] bẏ þouhte J, bipeȝte M 323 ȝief] and ȝef M serueden] wolden herie D half þat] swo DE^2E^1J, alsuo M for] *om.* DE^2E^1JM erminges] erninges E^1

We mihten habben more an heuene þa ȝierles 7 kinges!
Ne muȝe we werien naðer ne wið þurst ne wið hunger
Ne wið elde, ne wið deað, þe elder ne þe ȝeunger!
Ac þar nis hunger, ne þurst, deað, ne unhalðe, ne elde.
Of þesse riche we þencheð to ofte, of þare al to selde.
We solden biþenchen us wel ofte and ilome
Hwat we beð to hwan we sullen and of hwan we come.
Hwu litle hwile we bieð her, hwu longe elles hware,
Hwat we muȝen habben her and hwat we findeð þare.

f. 8v

ȝief [we] waren wise men þus we solden þenchen.
Bute we wurðen us iwar þis wereld us wile drenchen,
Mast alle men ȝieueð drinken of on euele senche;
⟨H⟩e sal him cunnen silde wel ȝief hit him nele screnche.
Mid Almihtin Godes luue ute we us biwerien
⟨W⟩ið þesses wreches woreldes luue þat hit ne muȝe us derien.
Mid almesse, mid fasten and mid ibeden werie we us wid senne,
Mid þo wapne þe God haued ȝieue alle mankenne.
⟨L⟩ate we þe broðe strate and þane weȝ bene
⟨Þ⟩e lat þe nieðe dai to helle of manne, me mai wene.
⟨G⟩o we þane narewe pað and þene wei grene,
⟨Þ⟩ar forð fareð wel litel folc, and eche is fair and isene.
⟨Þ⟩e brode strate is ure wil, þe is loð te læte;
⟨Þ⟩o þe folȝeð here iwil, hie fareð bi þare strate.
⟨H⟩ie muȝen lihtliche cumen mid þare niðer helde
⟨Þ⟩urh one godelease wude to one bare felde.
⟨Þ⟩a narewe pað is Godes has, þar forð fareð wel feawe;

324 we ... heuene] we mihten richer bi mid him D, mare we hedden en heuene E^2, more we haueden of heuene E^1, we mihte habbe more of heouene J, we miȝte in heuene habbe al so muche M þa] ase M and] oþer DE^1JM, her and E^2 325 *line om.* M we] we us D, hi E^2, hi her E^1, *om.* J werien naðer] biwerien her D, werien heom E^2E^1, nought werỳen heom J ne] *om.* DE^2E^1J þurst] chele. wið þurste E^2E^1, chele M 326 *line om.* M ne wið elde] ne wid elde ne wið elde (*ditt.*) ȝeunger] ỳonge 327 *line om.* M ac] *om.* D deað] ne dieð E^2E^1J ne[1]] *om.* D 328 *line om.* M of ... ofte] to ofte man bicareð þis lif D riche] world J to[1]] *om.* E^2E^1J of þare] and þet D, and of þere E^2E^1, and þer of J al to] alto, to E^2E^1 329-330 *found after* 338-339 M (M288-292 *dip.*, Ω340-341 *and* Ω351-352 *parallel*) 329 scolden] *add* ealle E^2E^1 biþenchen us] *trs.* DE^2E^1JM wel] bet D, *om.* E^2E^1M and] *add* wel DE^2E^1JM ilome] ilomo (*sic*) 330 beð] *adds* and E^1 hwan] whar of M 331 *line om.* M *there is no variation in this line* elles] elle⟨s⟩/ E^2 332 *line om.* M *the line in* J *is different to that found in any other* MS: And after gode wel wurche þenne ne þuruue noht kare. (J326/Ω344) muȝen] muȝer D we findeð þare] vinden þere DE^2, elles hware E^1 333-336 *found after* 329-330 (*lines that are also trs.*) M (M293-296 *dip.*, Ω345-348 *and* Ω340-341 *parallel*) 333 [we]] *om.* TDM, re *subp. after* we (*the next word is* were) E^1 þus] ðis E^2E^1 334 bute] and bute M þis] þe M us wile] *trs.* E^2 drenchen] adrenche DM, for drenche E^2E^1J 335 *line om.* D alle] *om.* M hit] he E^2E^1J euele] deofles E^2E^1JM senche] *om.* J: [senche] *has been added after the line-end in a later hand* 336 *line om.* D hit] he E^2E^1J nele screnche] *om.* J: [wile bi þenche] *has been added after the line-end in a later hand* 337-340 *found after* 323-324 M (M285-290 *dip.*, Ω349-352 *and* Ω334-335 *parallel*) 337 mid] vor DM almihtin] al mihtin biwerien] werie JM 338 wið] *om.* D þesses] þe M luue] wele M ne muȝe us derien] vs ne derỳe JM ne] E^2 339 almesse ... ibeden] uastinge elmesse and mid ibede D, festen ælmes and ibede E^2, mid fasten. and almesse. and ibede E^1J, mid almesse mid ibede M we] *om.* M 340 god] *adds* almiȝti M haued] *om.* M ȝieue] biȝiten E^2, biteȝte M, ỳ⟨e⟩/uen J alle] *om.* E^2, to alle J mankenne] man kenne 341 bene] *prec. five words in a smaller script, exp.*, benne *with* n *subp. after* n^1 D, grene J 342 lat] ledeð D dal] *om.* J manne] folke J, mankenne M, *add* and DE^2E^1JM me mai] mo ich DE^2E^1J, mor þast ich M 343 go] nime M pað] wei DE^2E^1J, *adds* and J grene] so schene J 344 wel] *om.* DE^2E^1J and] ac DE^2E^1 eche] þet DJM, hit E^2E^1 is fair isene] wel eþ sene J, þe worlde on sene M 345 þe[2]] he M is] us is D, is us E^2E^1JM te] for to E^1 læte] forlæte E^2 346 folȝeð here iwil] al volȝeð here hiwil D, eal folȝeð his iwill E^2E^1J, folȝeþ al hare wil M here iwil] hiwil hire *marked in MS for trs.* D hie] *om.* E^2E^1, he J bi þare] þo brode DJ, bi ðusse E^2E^1, mid þe ilke M 347 *line om.* J cumen] vare D, gan E^2E^1M niðer] under E^2 348 *line om.* J þurh one] þurȝut þe M in] in to DE^2E^1M (⟨into/ E^2) one] þe M 349 það] wei DE^2E^1J þar] þat J, ac þare M

⟨Þ⟩at beð þo þe hem sildeð ȝierne wið achen unðeawe.
⟨Þ⟩os goð uneaðe aȝien þe cliue and aȝien þe heie hulle;
⟨Þ⟩os leten al here iwil for godes luue to fulle.
⟨G⟩o we alle þane wei, for he us wile bringe
Mid þo feawe faire men bifore þe heuen kinge,
⟨Þ⟩ar is alre blisse mast, mid angles songe!
⟨Þ⟩e is a þusend wintre þar, ne þuncheð hit him naht longe;

Þe last haueð blisse, he haueð swo muchel þat he ne bit no more. Ω370 f. 9[r]
Þe þat blisse forgoð, hit sal him rewen sore!
Ne mai non euel ne non wane ben in Godes riche,
Þeih þar ben wuniinges fele, elch oðer uniliche.
Sume þar habbeð lasse blisse and sume þar habbeð more,
Elch after þat he dude her, after þane þe swanc sore.
Ne sal þar ben bread ne win, ne oðer kennes este,
God one sal ben ache lif and blisse and ache reste.
Ne sal þar ben foh ne grai, ne cunin ne ermine,
Ne aquerne, ne methes chele, ne beuer, ne sabeline.
Ne sal þar ben naðer scat ne srud, ne wereldes wele none. Ω380
Al þe blisse þe me us bihat al hit sal ben God one;
Ne mai no blisse ben alse muchel se is Godes sihte!
He is soð sunne and briht and dai abute nihte.
He is aches godes ful, nis him no wiht uten.
Nones godes hem nis wane þe wunieð him abuten;
Þar is wele abuten wane and reste abuten swunche.
Þe muȝen and nelleð þider cume, hit hem mai ofþunche:

350 þat] and þis M hem sildeð] hier ham silten D, scildeþ ham her M ȝierne] *om.* DM, wel J achen] euerich M 351 *line om.* D uneaðe] *om.* M, *add* to E^1 uneaðe] *prec.* cliue *canc.* (*by underlining*) þe[1]] *adds* heȝe M cliue] c *written over another letter* E^1 352 *line om.* D þos] hi M leten] leteð E^2E^1JM, *adds* awei J here] *add* aȝen E^2E^1M for] *om.* M luue] hese E2E^1, hestes JM 353 þane wei] in þilke paþ M and] *om.* D, and M 354 feawe faire] *trs.* E^1 þe] *om.* DE^2E^1J 355 alre] *om.* M blisse] merȝþe DE^2E^1J (þ *written over* k in D) 356 *line om.* J þe is] se þet is DM, þe þis E^1 is] *om.* E^1 a ... þar] uele hundred wintre þar M þusend] þusen\t/ E^1 hit] *om.* E^2E^1 naht] *add* to E^2E^1 J *adds line*: wel edẏ wurþ þilke mon. þat þer bẏþ vnderuonge (J348/Ω369) 357-358 *found after* 361-362 M (M315-318 *dip.*, Ω370-371 *and* Ω374-375 *parallel*) 357 þe] se þet DE^2E^1, and þe þat M last haueð] *trs.* M last] *noun in* E^2E^1M *where it is an adv in* TDJM blisse] *om.* E^2E^1M, murehþe J he] *om.* E^2E^1, he he *ditt.* M swo] sswo: *foll.* bli *exp.* (*eyeskip*) þat he] *om.* DJ bit] biddeð D, *adds* he J 358 þe þat] hwo so JM, *adds* let M blisse] þo blisce DJM forgoð] let vor þos D, for ðas forlet E^2E^1, for þisse forẏet J (þ\isse/ *with* are *subp. after* þ), uor þes M sal him] *trs.* D, him mei E^2E^1, maẏ him M 359 ne] *om.* M euel] pẏne J, hunger M godes riche] heueriche D, heouene riche J 360 þeih] *om.* M ben] beoð E^2E^1M elch] and J, and ech M 361 ar] *om.* J blisse] merȝþe DE^2E^1JM þar] *om.* E^2E^1J 362 elch] *om.* E^2E^1, eure M after þat] efter þan þet D, æfter ðan þe E^2E^1, after þat þat M he] *om.* E^2, hi E^1 dude] *foll.* b *subp.* M her] *om.* D, *adds* and J after þane þe] efter þet DJ, efter ðan þet E^2, of þat þe M swanc] he swanc DE^2M, hi E^1J 363 sal] wrþ J ben] *om.* J bread] ne bried E^2, noþer bred M oðer] nones J kennes] kenne M 364 one] *om.* M ache] eueriches M and[1]] *om.* M and[2]] *om.* J ache] eke M 365 *line om.* D ne ... ben] þer nẏs nouþer J, ne scal þar beo noþer M ne[2]] *om.* M ermine] \er/mine E^2 366 *line om.* D ne] *om.* M aquerne ... metheschele] acquerne ne martes cheole E^2E^1, oter ne acquerne J, okerne ne martin M ne[3]] *om.* JM 367 ne ... scrud] ne þer ne wurþ ful iwis J naðer] *om.* DE^2E^1 ne[3]] *om.* J 368 al] ac D blisse] merȝþe DE^2E^1J hit] *om.* D sal ben] is J sal] *prec. a letter exp.* 369 *line om.* M ne mai] nis þer J blisse] merȝþe DE^2E^1J ben] *om.* J alse] swo DE^2E^1J 370 *line om.* M *there is no variation in this line* 371 *line om.* DM no wiht uten] na wið uten E^2, noþing ȝit vten E^1, nowiht wiþ vte J 372 *line om.* DM nones ... nis] nones godes *after* his heom (*trs.*) J nones godes] na god E^2E^1 hem nis] nis him E^2E^1 þe ... abuten] 7 rest bute swynke *canc.* (*crossed through: eye-skip*) *with* \þ/at wuneþ hẏm abute *added to the bottom of the fol.* J 373 *line om.* M wane] gane E^2, grame E^1 374 *line om.* M *final line in* E^2 þe] se þet D, hwo J muȝen] mai DE^2E^1J and ... cume] *trs. phrs.* J nelleð] nele DE^2E^1J hit] sore hit hit (*ditt.?*) D, sore hit E^2E^1 hem mai] hit sel D, him sceal E^2E^1, schal hẏm sore J ofþunche] vorþenche D

Þar is blisse abuten treiȝe and lif abuten deaðe,
Þo þe afre sulle wunie þar, bliðe hie muȝe ben eaðe;
Þar is ȝieuð abuten elde and hale abuten unhalðe, Ω390
Nis þar sareȝe ne sor, non ne nafre unisalðe;
Þar me Drihte self isien swo se is, mid iwisse!
He one mai and sal al ben angles and manne blisse!

f. 9^{v} And þeih ne bed here eien naht alle iliche brihte,
Hi nabbeð naht iliche muchel alle of Godes lihte;
On þesse liue he naren naht alle of ore mihte,
Ne þar ne sullen habben God alle bi one wihte.
Þo sullen more of him isien þe luueden hine more,
And more icnowen and ec witen his mihte and his ore.
On him hie sulle finden al þat man mai to hleste, Ω400
⟨O⟩n him he sullen ec isien al þat hie ar nesten.
⟨C⟩rist sal one bien inoȝh alle his derlinges;
⟨Þ⟩e one is muche more and betere þan alle oðer þinges!
⟨I⟩noh he haueð þe hine haueð þe alle þing wealdeð.
⟨O⟩f him to isiene nis non sæd, swo fair he is to behelden.
⟨G⟩od is swo mere and swo muchel in his godcunnesse
⟨Þ⟩at al þat elles was and is, is fele werse and lasse;
⟨N⟩e mai hit nafre no man oðer seggen mid iwisse
⟨H⟩wu muchele murihðe habbeð þo þe beð in Godes blisse!
⟨T⟩o þare blisse us bringe God, þe rixleð abuten ende,
⟨Þ⟩ane he ure sowle unbint of lichamliche bende.
⟨C⟩rist ȝieue us laden her swilch lif and habben her swilch ende,
⟨Þ⟩at we moten þider cumen þane we henne wende.
AMEN

375 *line om.* M treiȝe] teone J abuten] wiþ vte J 376 *line om.* M þo þe] þet DE^{1} afre] *om.* J hie ... eaðe] hi bieð and eade D, muwen ben eþe E^{1}, mvwen heo beon eþe J 377 *line om.* M hale] elde D 378 *line om.* M nis þar] þer nẏs J sareȝe] so\re/we E^{1} sor non] *trs.* J non] *om.* E^{1} ne^{2}] *om.* J nafre] non D, neure nan E^{1}J unisalðe] vnhelþe J 379 *line om.* M þar] seoþþe J me] *add* sel DE^{1} self] *om.* DJ swo se] swa E^{1}J, *add* he DE^{1}J 380 he] þat he M one] *om.* M and ... angles] beon and schal. englene J, and wule beo anglene M and manne] *om.* M 381 *line om.* J and] ac M, *om.* D bed] bi D here] ure M alle] *om.* M 382 *line om.* JM hi nabbeð] *trs.* D, ði nabbed hi E^{1} muchele] *om.* E^{1} 383 *line om.* J on þesse liue] ne in þis worlde M liue] \liue/ E^{1} he] we D, *om.* E^{1} 384 *line om.* J ne] *om.* M sullen] *add* hi DE^{1}, naȝt M bi] mid M 385 þo] hi M more of him] more *after* him J isien] wite M þe] *adds* her J luueden hine] *trs.* DJ, *adds* her E^{1} 386 more] *om.* M icnowen] iseon J, biknowe M ec] *om.* DE^{1}JM witen] isien DM (ẏseo *foll.* b *subp.*) mihte] milce JM 387 *line om.* M mai] *adds* þer D to] *om.* J 388 *line om.* M on] and on J him ... ec] liue boc hi sullen D, hali boc he sculle E^{1}, lẏves bec J (c *written over another letter in* bec) al] *om.* D hie ar] her hi D, hi her E^{1}J nesten] ne wisten D 389 *line om.* M crist] *adds* seolf J sal one] *trs.* DJ inoȝh] *adds* to J his] *om.* J 390 *line om.* M þe] he DE^{1}J oðer] wordliche J 391 *line om.* M he haueð^{1}] hi habbeþ J haueð^{2}] habbeþ J wealdeð] haueð on wealde D 392 *line om.* M of] *om.* J nis non sæd] murie hit is J swo ... bihelden] wel h\e/m is þe hine bi healdeð (i *subp. after* h *with* e *int.* in h\e/m) E^{1} 393 *found after* 367-368 M (M323-325 *dip.*, Ω404 *and* Ω380-381 *parallel*) mere] swete J 394 *line om.* M þat^{1}] *om.* J elle was] he wes D, is E^{1}, wes J is^{1}] al þet wes J fele] *om.* E^{1}, wel J werse] *adds* þenne he E^{1} 395 *line om.* M nafre] *om.* DJ no man] noman oðer] hit J seggen] *adds* ne wẏten J 396 þo] heo J godes] heuene J D *adds four lines*: Vten eftin þiderward mid aldre ȝernuolnesse | And vorsen þisne midelard mid his pouernesse | Ef we vorsieð þis loþe lif vor hevenriche blisce | þanne selð us Crist þet eche lif to medes on ecnesse (D375-378/Ω410-413) 397 us bringe] *trs.* J rixleð] lesteþ J, *adds* aẏ M 398 lichamliche] licames E^{1} 399 ȝieue ... lif] vs lete such lif lede J, us leue lede suich lif M her] *om.* D her^{2}] *om.* DM 400 þider] to him JM wende] *add* amen E^{1}JM 401 **AMEN**] *written on previous line in* E^{1}JM J *adds two lines*: Bidde nu we leoue freond. ẏonge and ek olde. | þat he þat þis wrẏt wrot. his saule beo þer atholde. Amen. (J389-399/Ω419-420)

Notes:

1-4: The deliberately ethopoeiac character of this first-person narrator is introduced. The narrator's inclusion grounds the text and provides a focus for the sermon. He would be a physical example of what is at stake. His body is the representation of the transience of life and is therefore identified with the choices that are to be made

Age and wisdom are juxtaposed in these first lines and the narrator is found wanting on account of age. The idea of being childlike, as a sinner, is introduced. The idea of being a 'child' or 'childlike' are repetitive themes within the opening of the sermon (Lines **3**, **4**, **7** and **10**)

3-6: A similar construction is found in *An Orison of our Lady*: 'To longe ich habbe sot ibeo | Wel sore ich me adrade' (Morris 1872 no 21/31-32).

6: The consequences of an idle life are foreshadowed through the narrator's own '**adrede**'.

7: The 'sin' of being as a 'child' or '**chilce**' is once-more repeated. The author contrasts the old age of the speaker with the immaturity of his actions.

8: Repentance is insufficient without God's mercy.

9: The sin of being '**idel**' is repeated (Line 6) but this time through sinful speech.

10: The theme of the sinner acting as a child is repeated (lines 3, 4 , 7), as is the need for individual repentance. A similar construction is found in *A Prayer to our Lady*: '*and* wel feole sunne ido þe me ofþincheð nuðe.' (Morris 1872 no 27/31)

11: A similar construction is found in *A Prayer to our Lady*: 'Ifurn ich habbe isunehed mid worke *and* mid worde.' (Morris 1872 no 27/21)

12: The author of the *Conduct of Life* focuses on the transience of earthly life throughout the text (see lines 43-44 and Matthew 6: 19-21). A similar construction is once more

found in *A Prayer to our Lady*: 'muchel ich habbe ispend : to lite ich habbe an horde.' (Morris 1872 no 27/24)

13: A change has been effected in the speaker. The narrator demonstrates a movement from one state to another.

14: The audience is instructed that he cannot trust his own will as it is deceptive. It is not enough for an individual to live his life how he wants.

15-16: Through these lines the author demonstrates an ironical view of life and cautions against it: if he had the ability or willingness to discriminate between right and wrong when younger he might have lived a more productive life. However, this skill seems to be a learnt capacity that comes with age - a period in life when one has less dynamic ability to affect one's surroundings. For the narrator, age is a very real physical manifestation and one, it would seem, that is relative to his spiritual status.

17: Serves as an expression of the transience of life. That old age may always seem a long way off but is not, adds to the urgency of his message.

18: The failing eyesight of the narrator can be seen as both physical and metaphorical (see also the notes to lines 1-4). The narrator's vision is clouded by smoke which can be read both as the failing of his sight and also the approaching smoke of hell. It should also be read in relation to the beatific vision at the end of the text (379-380).

This study believes, as does Hill, that the 'smeche' and 'miste' of line 18 'probably refer figuratively to the blinding of the sight by affection for the fleshly sins of this world'. Hill goes on to cite an extract from *Gregory's Dialogue* to validate her point.[818]

[818] Hill 1977, p. 117.

19-20: The idea that evil is more alluring than good is conveyed and that men concentrate too much on this world without looking ahead to the next.

21-22: This elementary Christian principle has its basis in Galatians 6: 8. Although the *Conduct of Life* draws on other idioms, maxims or sapiential phraseology in its creation, it is this central theme that informs the sermon as a whole.

24-25: Repentance and salvation is a personal journey; the choices that are to be made are exclusive even when it comes to family; the idea is promoted that everyone is responsible for their own actions and that the personal relationship that an individual has with God is above that of family (wife and children).

27-28: The *Conduct of Life* is distinctive in that it does not recommend gifts for the souls of the dead. The text is firmly situated in this life and the giving of alms in the present rather than any form of intercession for the afterlife.

30-34: The giving of wealth in the previous lines is linked in the *Conduct of Life* with the renunciation of kin (see also lines **23-24**).

36: Hall believes that the possible source of this line is Psalm 108: 11.[819]

41-42: Heaven is described as a financial safe-house so as to play upon the audience's fears and grievances in this world. The text states that the person who lays up his wealth in Heaven through alms-giving does so with the knowledge that it will be safe from this world's insecurities (See also lines **43-44**)

43-44: Heaven is described as an absence of negatives; an absence, in the first place, of earthly affliction (in this case the threat of fire and theft). It is reliant on what the audience fear most in this world rather than a description of a geographical place. This is because it is beyond the reach of imagination. It can only be described in terms of the

[819] J. Hall, *Selections from early Middle English, 1130-1250: Notes*. (Oxford, 1920), p.332.

human condition and therefore is represented by what it is not rather than what it is. (This is a formula that re-occurs throughout the sermon at lines **48**, **50**, **359** and **373-374**) Heaven and Hell are depicted as opposites: if Hell is the extreme of all that is negative in life, then Heaven is the opposite – a negation of any kind of suffering. Hell is firmly based on the corporeal and therefore Heaven manifests itself as the spiritual.

A major emphasis in the *Conduct of Life* is on the transience of earthly wealth. It would seem that the author of the *Conduct of Life* takes his basic teaching for these lines from Matthew 6: 19-21.

48: We find, once again, similar threats to earthly wealth that are *not* present in Heaven but are reliant on the person's actions in this life.

50: Once more, as in **48**, heaven is described as an absence of an earthly threat. The chapter from Matthew which informs the lines **43-44** continues here :

> Nemo potest duobus dominis servire aut enim unum odio habebit et alterum diligent aut unum sustinebit et alterum contemned non potestis Deo servire et mamonae (6:24)
> [No man can serve two masters. For either he will hate the one, and love the other; or he will sustain one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon.]

The divided allegiance to two masters, one spiritual and one a false god of avarice, is also present in the text of the *Conduct of Life* and it would seem that the author is attributing the role of Mammon to the authorities at local and national level – highlighting a friction between Church and the baronial system of governance. Hill claims that line **50** 'reflects the unjust seizure of worldly goods by the king and his sherriff'.[820] It would seem that the author is juxtaposing the giving of wealth to those who govern with the giving of alms to the Church. The figure of the sheriff or reeve

[820] Hill 1977, p. 122.

becomes in many eleventh- and twelfth-century homilies a symbol of earthly power, 'unscrupulous and extortionate, whose iniquities and severities are roundly condemned by the preacher'.[821]

70: 'manke': either **a.** A money of account used in various parts of western Europe between the 8th and 12th centuries, and in England equivalent to thirty silver pence, two and a half twelve-pence shillings, or six five-pence shillings. Also: (the name of) a coin of this value. **b.** A unit of weight (esp. of gold) equivalent to the weight of thirty silver pence.[822] OE *mancus*. The mancus was 'not current coin but merely money of account'.[823]

82: **watere ... londe**. This is a common formula[824] also found in *The Passion of our Lord*, 'Vor hi by-nomen him saulen in water. *and* in londe.' (Morris 1872 no 1/682) and *Doomsday*, 'Boþe in þe water *and* in þat lond:' (Morris 1872 no 22/13)

92-136: This section of the text concentrates primarily on the representation of individual judgement. The author concentrates on the ultimate result of choices made in this life through his description of Hell and Heaven, which follow. The idea of individual choices is reiterated throughout the text. The emphasis for the author of the *Conduct of Life* is on an individual relationship with God and this is emphasized in the section concerning individual judgement.

92-96: The movement in this sequence is successful in portraying man's weakness when faced with the prospect of Judgement Day. The author achieves this through a series of rhetorical questions which once more include himself in his audience. Through the

[821] Hill 1977, p. 122.
[822] "mancus, n." *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, March 2014. Web. 22 April 2014.
[823] Herbert A Greuber, *Handbook of the Coins of Great Britain and Ireland in the British Museum* (London 1899), introd. p. ix. See also J. Hall, *Selections from early Middle English, 1130-1250: Notes*. (Oxford, 1920), p.334.
[824] See Hall, *Selections from early Middle English, Notes* p.335.

personal pronoun '**we**',[825] the narrator, once more adopts the same struggles and sins as his audience.

94: See note to lines **97-102**.

92-93: The transience of earthly belongings is once more emphasized in this section (see note on individual judgement, lines **92-136**).

97-102: These lines are similar to those found in *Vercelli Homily ii* and *Vercelli Homily x* in that it is the devil himself who acts as the accuser and prosecutor on Judgement Day. The Final Judgement being played out like a court-room drama also has antecedents in Old English literature, most notably in *Vercelli Homily IV*. However, although the accusations in the *Conduct of Life* may be made by many devils, the Judgement will ultimately be an individual act (see note to **107**).

100: the use of the *pp.* **ibet** and the *pa.* tense **waren** alongside the *pron second sg.* **we** is essential to a reading of the text at this point: the narrator has already established himself as part of the audience through the use of the inclusive *pron* **we** (see note to lines **92-96**) and the use of rhetorical questions which drive the narrative forward and call upon the audience to examine themsleves in light of the judgement to come. This is followed in the text by a comparison with a list of the truly sinful and the question: **Hwat sullen horlinges don, þes wichen and þe forsworene?** (line **103**). The preacher draws the audience into a position of association and, therefore, of choice. They can either be part of the 'we' and therefore acknowledge their sins and be brought to repentance or be part of the group whose sins are extreme and **Þe sulle ben to deaðe idemd and afremo forlorene** (line **106**). In fact, the preacher has made the choice for them. The use of the past tense in line **100** suggests that the preacher assumes that no

[825] See Hill 1977, p. 119.

one would make a choice other than repentance. He has brought the audience with him to a point where their assumed wills have become merged with his; they cannot escape the rationality of such a choice because he cannot.

105-106: These lines are reminiscent of Jeremias 20: 18.[826]

107-116: The trial and judgement is personal and the responsibilty is individual: a key theme throughout the sermon. The scene continues with its legal imagery (see note to lines **97-101**) in line **107** and **108**. The narrator acts as a guide taking the audience so far, accompanying the reader/listener but ultimately leaving them alone to face God.

124-129: The author does not make a distinction between death and Doomsday. As discussed in relation to the lines **92ff.**, the text does not advocate the giving of gifts for the souls of the dead and the author does not recommend either the role of intercessory prayers. The emphasis for the author of the *Conduct of Life* is on the actions of the individual in this life.

131-132: This is probably a reference to Isaiah 55: 7.

137: Hell is represented in terms of inexpressibility. The torments and terrors of Hell are so horrible that human beings cannot do justice to them in their descriptions. (Compare notes to lines **289-290**).

138: Images of suffering through cold would possibly have had more of a resonance for this audience than for one from a more temperate climate.

139-140: The emphasis in the *Conduct of Life* is on the eternity of the punishments in hell, which parallel the themes of the transience of this earthly life described elsewhere in the text. The author continuously juxtaposes the temporary pleasures of this life with the never-ending tortures of Hell, in order to reiterate his message of penitence. Lines

[826] See Hill 1977, p. 119.

139-140 emphasise not only the pain and torments but also our inability in this life to comprehend them.

141: This line appears to be present at this point within the verse sermon in order to give authority to the descriptions that have preceded it - through an implied familiarity with visionary texts and with visionary culture, written or oral, not only by the author, but also by his audience.

142: This line implies that, once in Hell, the soul would perform any required action to be granted a respite from the torture. This is a conception that is most recognisably found in the *Visio Sancti Pauli* where Paul secures a weekly respite for the damned on Sunday. However, it is also a motif found in other texts such as *Vercelli Homily IX* where the sinner would rather hang from a tree on the cliff-side for seven-thousand years rather than return to Hell. It is also apparent in the *Nauigatio s. Brendani* where Judas's 'break' from hell is to crouch on a rock in the middle of the sea, which, as he tells St Brendan, is a relief from the harsher torments of Hell.

143: The author of the *Conduct of Life* returns to the reality of this world in this line, convincingly inverting the choice, which has been removed from those already in Hell.

144: Suggests an earthly example of how to avoid an eternity of damnation. Line **144** advocates a belief in self-denial that may be viewed as asceticism (see also line 335). The sanctity of the soul is placed above the well-being of the body (see also line 339).

145-146: These lines appear to demonstrate contemporary concerns, possibly relevant to the audience of the *Conduct of Life*. These lines are examined closely by Hill.[827]

[827] Hill 1977, p.122.

150: These lines may be linked to the renunciation of kin in lines **23-25** and the giving of alms in lines **29-34**. They focus on the individual nature of repentance and salvation; for the author what is at stake is the salvation of one's soul and either an eternity of bliss or damnation. The lines are consistent with the idea of individual contrition advanced throughout the sermon.

151-152: These lines suggest, not only a punishment familiar to the audience, as the narrator urges them to contemplate a concept or a pain already known to them, but also one that is beyond their imagination as the pain is unending; a torment that cannot be '**quenchen**' (See also line **251**).

153: **wo ... wane**: Hall evidences this as a formal combination giving a further example of its use from *Saint Juliana*.[828]

155-156: Maxims such as the ones that are present in these lines, and line **319**, that express the transient nature of life, are reminiscent of the Old English poetic tradition.

161-162: See 1 Corinthians 4: 5.

168: **same and grame**: the same combination is found in *Sinners Beware*, 'Þu vs hauest iwroht þes schome. | And alle þene eche grome.' (Morris 1872 no /332)

175-176: For a discussion of the re-appropriation of the Old Testament figure of Adam, Salvation History, the Harrowing of Hell and ideas of transience see notes to lines **182-186** and **197-202**.

177-181: Life is presented as a journey with two possible outcomes and two different 'guides'. The decisions are to be made in this world.

180: References to '**helle grunde**' are similarly found in *Quadragesima Sunday* (Morris 1868 no 2/8 and 35)

[828] See Hall, *Selections from early Middle English, Notes* p.339.

182-186: The author of the *Conduct of Life* weighs the love and sacrifice of Christ against the actions of Satan who is responsible for the sinful state of mankind. He achieves this by relating how Christianity has transformed and redeemed the Old Testament figure of Adam through the Passion and through the popular medieval idea of the Harrowing of Hell. The eternity of hell for the sinner is therefore reinforced by the statement that is made in line **182** of the *Conduct of Life*, the idea that choices that are made now are final.

197-202: The author of the *Conduct of Life* also makes the association between Adam's first sin and the ailments of life. (See also notes to the Harrowing **182-186**).

199: The absence of these torments (hunger and thurst) in heaven are subsequently found in line **325**, 'ne þið þurst ne þið hunger'. The pairing of torments, according to Teresi's study of *Mnemonic transmission of Old English texts*, 'such as hunger and thirst, or cold and heat is a popular descriptive pattern, at least as far as anonymous homilies are concerned.' She goes on to contend that these 'lists of statements' are close to the modes of oral tradition'.[829] A similar pairing is found in *The Passion of Our Lord* where it is 'Þurst. and hunger. chele. and hete. þis beoþ strong pyne.' (Morris 1872 no 1/9)

225: Although similarities can be demonstrated between the *Conduct of Life* and much of the visionary material in circulation at this time, including the use of a first person narrator who acts like a guide for the audience urging them to repentance, this line states that the narrator has not visited hell personally. That he makes this statement is noteworthy in distancing the *Conduct of Life* from visionary literature.

[829] Her discussion is in relation to the anonymous homily *Be Heofonwarum* and focuses on the possibility of mnemonic transmission within this text. Teresi, *Mnemonic transmission of Old English texts*, pp. 111-112.

227-228: A literary tradition for visions of Hell is clearly highlighted in these lines. Books are used as authority and a familiarity with this tradition is firmly established (see also lines **141** and **225**). See also a similar line in *The Passion of Our Lord*, 'Hit is write in þe bok. þer me hit may rede.' (Morris 1872 no 1/131)

233-234: In the *Conduct of Life* the sin of gluttony warrants a special punishment commensurate with the act. Throughout the text food and drink are emphasised as sins associated with the body and fasting is a key component, during this period, in maintaining a penitential life-style that may ensure salvation. It should not be surprising therefore that commensurate punishment has been reserved in hell for those who did not observe strict practice in this life.

236-238: Scriptural authority for the alternation of heat and cold is established in Job 24: 19:

> 'ad nimium calorem trangmseat ab aquis nivium et usque ad inferos peccatum illius'
> [Let him pass from the snow waters to excessive heat, and his sin even to hell.]

The imagery is very similar to the *Vision of Drythelm*:

> Wes gehweðer manna saula full, þa wrixendlice on tua healfe gesegene weeran, swa swa mid unmætnesse miceles stormes, worpene beon. Þonne hio þæt mægn þere unmetan hætton áarefnan ne mehtan, þonne stældan heo eft earmlice in middel þæs unmætan ciles. 7 mid þy heo ðær nænige reste gemetan mihtan, þon*ne* stældon heo eft in middan þæs byrnendan fyres 7 ðæs unadwæscedan leges.[830]
> [Both were full of men's souls, which seemed to be cast to either side in turn, as though by the overpowering violence of a great storm. When they could not endure the force of the excessive heat, they sprang away in their misery into the midst of the excessive cold. And when they could find no rest there, they sprang back into the midst of the burning fire and the unquenchable flame][831]

See also lines **138** and **244**, and the note to line **199** for the pairing of torments.

241: The idea of walking and seeking rest in this line is ultimately tied to Luke 11: 24.

---

[830] *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of The English People* ed. with trans. and introduction Thomas Miller, EETS 95, 2 vols. (London, 1890) Vol. 1, [book 5, ch. XIII] p. 424, ll. 26-32
[831] *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of The English People*, 425 ll. 26-32

243-244: These lines contain the punishment for the sins that occur in lines **245** and **248** and reflect a correlation between punishment and sin (see notes to lines **233** and **234** for the progressive ideas of this text in regard to commensurate punishment). The spiritual movement of the individual in life (lines **245-248**) has been turned into a physical act of torture in Hell. In both the earthly realm and in Hell the emphasis is on movement. On earth those accused of this sin knew not what they desired and yet in Hell it has become intensely clear that what is being sought is 'reste' (see also 241) and therefore God (*poena sensus*) but this is no longer an option for them. The choice is one that is made in this life.

Hill draws a comparison between line **244** and the section from Bede referenced previously[832] (lines **236-238**) which reports that the souls of the damned are tossed '**se water doð mid winde**.' The movement of the souls is similar to the idea in the Vision of Drythelm of the souls being moved as if by a violent storm. (See also line **138**)

244-245: The ultimate source for these lines is James 1: 6 and 8.

245-248: For those who in their thoughts were '**unstedefaste**' (line **245**), made vows to God and would not perform them (line **246**) and who began good works and would not complete them (line **247**), the punishment is to reflect the crime. Line **248** proposes that in life they went here and there and didn't know what they wanted. In Hell the punishment is constructed around a similar idea of movement (See lines **243-244**).

251-253: The author is exploiting the established fears of his audience; he is taking a concept of pain already known to them and multiplying it. The unquenchable fire of Hell has antecedent in both the Old and New Testaments. Isaiah 66 locates this fire in an

[832] Hill 1977, p.120.

earthly scene of punishment and judgement. Mark 9: 42-47, however, moves this source of unquenchable pain to a place beyond this life (See lines **151-152**)

254: Hall sees in this line a possible 'reminiscence of the Anarchy'.[833]

277-278: It is the animal inhabitants of Hell, which '**tereð and freteð**', that are to punish those who speak evil (deceivers), the envious and the proud. The author, once again, reserves specific punishments for those who have sinned in a particular way (See notes on lines **232-234**, **243-244** and **245-248** for notes on commensurate punishment in the *Conduct of Life*)

279: The absence of the sun and the stars equates to the absence of the means of measuring time on earth, emphasising the eternity of damnation and the absence of God, the *poena damni,* as '**He is soð sunne and briht and dai abute nihte**' (line **370**).

280: The Old Testament association between the fires of Hell and God's anger, the *poena sensus,* (for example, Isaiah 66: 15-16) is made in the *Conduct of Life* at this line. (See lines **251-253**)

281-282: Hell is a place of darkness. It is a place where even the flames are gloomy, a common motif in descriptions of Hell where the 'fire is black or dark fire, burning without giving light and emitting blinding and smothering smoke'.[834] The removal of the sense of sight is also the removal of any sense of consolation or hope (See line **279**).

285-287: Those who have sinned through sight will also suffer a torment that reflects their earthly action, for they will see '**ateliche fiend**' and '**eiseliche wihten**' including '**se loðe sathanas**' and '**belzebub se ealde**' (See notes on lines **232-234**, **243-244**, **245-248**, **277-278** for notes on commensurate punishment in the *Conduct of Life*). This punishment

[833] Hall, *Selections from early Middle English, Notes* p.346
[834] Cavendish, p.113

of sin is of particular importance to the *Conduct of Life* as it links the idea of sight with the Devil. For '**se ealde**', see also Apocalypse 20: 2.

289-290: The 'tunge' not being able effectively to articulate damnation has antecedents in earlier visions[835] including the redactions of the *Visio Sancti Pauli*. It was also a comon formula within post-Conquest texts such as in *Death* where it is written 'Ne myhte no tunge telle. þat euer wes ibore. þe stronge pyne of helle.' (Morris 1872 no 23/173). Further comments on the inexpressibility of hell can also be found in the notes to line **137**.

292: The combination **'gamen and glie'** is also found in *On Orison of our Lady*, 'Ileued ich habbe gomen and gleo.' (Morris 1872 no 21/33).

299: This line suggests a multi-layered hell, with specific torment reserved for '**Evele Cristene men'** (line **297**).

Ω311-Ω313: The immediacy of action is emphasized throughout the *Conduct of Life*; the giving of alms after death cannot buy freedom from the sufferings of hell.

303-306: In these lines the narrator of the *Conduct of Life* adapts martial language as a way of defending oneself against sin. This is one of only two direct references to the soul in the *Conduct of Life*; the second is at line **398**. There is however an emphasis on the somatic throughout the text. Line **306** has led Hall to discuss whether the writer might be a 'a priest with some knowledge of medicine', although he concludes that he might only be 'asserting the claim of Christianity to benefit the body as well as the soul.' [836] Hill sees the line as 'a reference to the priest's power to save by instruction'.[837]

[835] See, for instance, Teressi, 'Mnemonic Transmission of Old English Texts', p. 112, for her discussion of this inexpressibility *topos* in relation to *Be Heofonwarum.*
[836] J. Hall, ed. *Selections from Early Middle English: 1130-1250: Part Two: Notes*, (Oxford, 1920), p. 349.
[837] Hill 1977, p.118.

309-312: These lines are ultimately derived from Matthew: 22: 40.

319-320: The transience of life is once more foregrounded. From a Christian perspective, awareness of transience has always been an aspect of eschatology, as it is in the *Conduct of Life.*

330: The idea of a journey and the choices made by the individual are questioned. (See note to line **319**).

331: The author highlights the transience of this life in comparison with the eternity of the afterlife.

334–335: The devil attacks by means of intoxication. Themes of eating and drinking, gluttony and indulgence are a major presence in *Conduct of Life* and are representative of the earthly and therefore the transient. (Compare with line **144**).

336-338: Although the preacher of the text believes he can '**tache'** (line **305**) the audience how to shield themselves against **helle pine** (line **303**), ultimately salvation is secured through the protection of Almighty God. The metaphor of battle is once more employed in these lines. The ultimate source for these lines is probably Psalm 90: 4-8.

339: This again suggests a penitential practice that places an emphasis on the denial of the body in preparation for judgement (See lines **144**, **334–335**).

340: See lines **336-338**.

341-343: These lines and many of the images contained within the following section are ultimately derived from Matthew 7: 13

359: Heaven is once more described in terms of what it is not (See lines **43-44**).

365: For the combination **'foh ne grai'**, see also *The Passion of Our Lord*, 'Ne hedde he none robe. of fowe. no of gray.' (Morris 1872 no 1/66).

370: The authority upon which this line is drawn is Isaiah 60: 19-20. (Compare line **279**). The idea of continuous light in Heaven can also be found in post-Conquest visionary material, including in the final book, The Land of Promise of The Saints, of *St. Brendan's Voyage* and in the The Third Place of Glory of the *Monk of Evesham's Vision*.

373: The narrator continues to use negation of what is harsh in this world as a means of describing Heaven (see lines **43-44**, **48**, **50**, **359**) The idea of Heaven being a place of 'reste' is common in such descriptions. It is ultimately linked with the idea of the eternal Sabbath and such New Testament lines as Revelations 14:13 and Hebrews 4: 9-10 and Genesis 2:2 from the Old Testament.

377-378: The *Conduct of Life* places a particular emphasis on the transitory nature of earthly life and on wealth. These are absent from the abode of the blessed. The physical degeneration of the body in life is essential to an understanding of the *Conduct of Life,* especially in the description of the narrator, who is suffering from the harsh realities of old age. It is, therefore, not surprising that Heaven is described in terms that negate this process (see lines **43-44**, **48**, **50**, **359**, **373**).

379-380: For the author of the *Conduct of Life* the true essence of Heaven is the beatific vision. Importantly, for this discussion, the Beatitudes state that: 'Blessed are the clean of heart: for they shall see God' (Matthew 5: 8). It is usually believed that this vision of God is to occur post mortem as, in Exodus 33:20, God tells Moses, 'And again he said: Thou canst not see my face: for man shall not see me and live.' The *Conduct of Life*, it would seem, is a progressive text that, in its representation of Heaven, abandons traditional descriptions of Heaven as a City

or a Garden Paradise in favour of the souls of the blessed obtaining knowledge of everything through the sight of God.

The author of the text has focused throughout on the sensory – in particular the visual. He draws the association between the degeneration of the narrator's sight with the transience of this world and the sin that may lead the individual to damnation. However, it is the redemptive quality of repentance that ultimately reverses the diminishing vision of the narrator. His diminished sight acts equally as a metaphor for faith, ultimately granting him a redefined idea of what 'sight' is through the beatific vision.

381-386: Although all of the blessed will share in the beatific vision, the level of their inclusion is dependent upon their earthly acts. What is being created is a multi-layered Heaven.

395-396: There is an 'inexpressibility topos' in medieival literature associated with descriptions of Heaven that can also be found in the *Conduct of Life*. The true Heaven, it would seem, is saved only for those who have genuinely qualified for entrance by their acts in this life, death and individual judgement.

Glossary

This Glossary is not a complete presentation of the words in the manuscripts of the *Conduct of Life* but rather aims to include all words that might cause difficulty for the reader. The glossary is keyed into the critical text.

The Headwords are arranged alphabetically; *æ* and *þ, ð* and *ȝ* are treated as separate entries after *a*, *t* and *g* respectively.

A

A(N) *prep.* in: Ω1, Ω3, Ω4 etc.
ABIT *verb pr. 3rd sg. (contracted)* abide: Ω135.
ABUGEÐ *verb pr. 1st pl.* pay for, suffer: Ω204.
ABUIÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* buys: Ω153.
ABUTEN *prep.* without: Ω87.
AC *conj.* but, and: Ω17.
ACHE *adj.* everlasting, eternal: Ω375.
ACHE *adj.* each: Ω244; **ACHEN** *adj.* each: Ω361; **ACHES** *adj. poss.* each: Ω233.
AFRE *adv.* ever: Ω88.
AFREMO *adv.* evermore: Ω111, Ω209.
AFRIC *adj.* every: Ω33. **AFRICH**: Ω66.
AIHTE *noun* possessions, wealth: Ω43, Ω254, Ω282.
AIHWARE *adv.* everywhere: Ω90.
ALDRADE *verb 1st sg. pr.* to fear greatly: Ω6.
ALD see **ELD.**
ALDER see **ELDER.**
ALESED *verb pp.* released, delivered: Ω141.
ALMESSE *noun* alms: Ω29, Ω312.
ALSE *adv.* as: Ω68; **ALSSE** *adv.* also: Ω222.
ALTO *adv.* all too: Ω11.
ANGLES *noun pl.* angels: Ω295.
AQUERNE *noun* squirrel: Ω377.
AR *adv.* previously: Ω13.
ARE *cj.* ere, before: Ω129.
AREFEÐ-HEALD *adj. pl.* difficult to hold (**AREFEÐ** *adj.* difficult + **HEALD** *noun* hold): Ω 326.
ARERDE *verb pa. 3rd pl.* set up, founded, established: Ω179.
AR3E *adj. pl.* afraid: Ω20.
ARME *adj. pl.* poor, needy: Ω238.
ATE *noun* eating: Ω271.
ATELICHE *adj. pl.* horrible: Ω294, Ω296.
ATTER *noun* poison, venom: Ω151.

Æ

ÆNES *adv.* once: Ω192.

ÆNGLES *noun pl.* angels: Ω96.

B

BARNEÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* burns: Ω262.
BEDE (**IBEDE**) *noun pl.* prayers, supplications: Ω312.
BENDE *noun pl.* bonds: Ω141, Ω189, Ω197.
BENE *adj.* good, fair, pleasant: Ω352.
BESTE *noun* best: Ω52.
BET *verb pr. 3rd sg. (contracted form)* amends, repents: Ω131, Ω173.
BET *adv.* better: Ω16.
BEÐENHCHE *v, pr. 1st sg* think of, consider, remember, 'bethink': Ω6;
BIÐOHTE *verb pp* repented, bethink: Ω8.
BEUER *noun* beaver: Ω377.
BIEDE *noun* table: Ω275.
BICHERD *verb pp. pl.* led astray, mislead: Ω333.
BICLEPIEN *verb inf.* accuse: Ω112.
BIFLEN *verb inf.* flee, avoid, shun: Ω161.
BIȝIET *verb pr. 3rd sg.* acquire, obtain [mercy]: Ω131.
BIȝIETE *verb pp. pl.* conceived: Ω110.
BIHETEN *verb pa. 3rd pl.* promised, vowed: Ω254; **BIHAT** (*cont.*) *verb pr. 3rd sg.*: Ω379.
BIHOTEÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* promises: Ω39.
BIKEIHTE *verb pp. pl.* trapped, ensnared: Ω333.
BILOKEN *verb pp.* enclosed: Ω83.
BINIME *verb inf.* deprive, take away: Ω45,
BINOMEN *verb pa. 3rd pl.* deprived of: Ω272.
BISTOLEN *verb pp.* stolen: Ω18.
BISUNIEN *verb inf.* shun, avoid: Ω161.
BISWICAÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* cheat, betray, deceive: Ω14.
BIWERIEN *verb inf.* defend or protect (oneself): Ω348.
BIT *verb pr. 3rd sg.* (*contracted form*) prays: Ω126; **BIT** *verb pr. 3rd sg.* asks: Ω368.
BIUALLE *verb pp.* fallen: Ω205.
BLISSE *noun* bliss Ω209.
BLIÐE *adj.* blithe, happy: Ω181.
BLOWEÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* blows: Ω143.
BOC *noun* book: Ω123; Ω235.
BODE *noun pl.* commands, orders: Ω307.
BOHTE *verb pa. 3rd sg.* bought: Ω193.
BENDE *noun pl.* bonds: Ω413.
BOREȝE (**IBOREȝE**) *verb pp. pl.* sheltered, saved, protected: Ω174.
BOTE *noun* help: Ω329.
BRECÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* break: Ω189.
BRADE *noun* bread (flesh): Ω152.
BREADE *noun* bread: Ω198.
BRODE *adj.* broad: Ω352.
BUGGE *verb inf.* buy: Ω66.
BUTE *cj.* but, except: Ω27.
BUUEN *prep.* above: Ω89.

C

CHELE *noun* cold: Ω206.
CHILCE *noun* childishness: Ω7.
CLIUE *noun* cliff: Ω362.
CORENE (**ICORENE**) *verb pp. pl* chosen: Ω109.
CUNIN *noun* rabbit: Ω376.
CUNNE *verb pr. 3rd pl.* can: Ω224.
CUÐ *adj.* known, (clear, plain, evident): Ω168.
CUÐE *v pp 1st sg.* can: Ω9.
CUÐEN *verb inf.* show: Ω102.

D

DADE (see also **DO(N)**) *noun* deed, from experience: Ω3.
DEFLEN *noun pl.* devils: Ω100; **DEFLES** *noun poss.* devil's: Ω267.
DEME *noun* judge: Ω99; **DEMDE** (**IDEMD**) *verb pp. pl.* sentenced, condemned, doomed: Ω111, Ω285, **IDEMÐ** *verb pp.* judged: Ω180
DERIEN *verb inf.* hurt, harm, injure: Ω349.
DERLINGES *noun pl.* darlings: Ω400.
DERNE *adv.* secretly: Ω79.
DEÞ see **DO(N)**
DICHEN *noun pl.* ditches: Ω42.
DIERE *noun* deer: Ω152.
DIERE *adv.* dear: Ω153, Ω193.
DO(N) *verb* to do, make, cause: Ω8; **DEÐ** *verb pr. 3rd sg.* do: Ω22, Ω43; **DUDE** *verb pa*: Ω2; **DON** *verb pp*: Ω7.
DOMES-MEN *noun pl.* judges: Ω269.
DURE *noun* door: Ω189.
DRAWEN *verb inf.* draw: Ω48.
DRENCHAN *verb inf.* poison, intoxicate: Ω345.
DRIE *verb inf.* endure, undergo, suffer: Ω303.
DRIHTE *noun* lord, ruler, chief: Ω81, **DRIHTEN**: Ω192.
DURE *noun* door: 129.

E

EADI *adj. pl.* rich, wealthy: Ω238.
EALD *adj.* old: Ω4; **EALDE** Ω298.
EAÐE *adv.* easily: Ω217.
EC *adv.* also, moreover: Ω47, Ω214, Ω397.
ECH *pron.* each: Ω24.
EFNINGES *noun pl.* equals, the same: Ω171.
EFT *adv.* again, once more: Ω53.
EIE *noun awe, fear*: Ω21, Ω292.
EISELICHE *adj. pl.* fearful, terrible: Ω296.
ELCHE *adj.* each: Ω91.
ELDE *noun* old age: Ω18.
ELDER *comp.*, older: Ω1.
ELDERNE *noun pl.* elders: Ω201.
EOW *pron. 2nd pl.* you: Ω164.
ENDE-LEASE *adj.* endless: Ω150.
ERNINGE *vbl. noun* earning, (what we deserve): Ω65.
ERMINGES *noun pl.* wretches: Ω334.
ERÐELICHE *adj.* earthly: Ω162.
EST *noun* pleasure, enjoyment: Ω376.
EÐLATE *adj.* worthless : Ω75; *adj. pl*: Ω157.
EUETEN *noun pl.* lizards, salamanders, newts: Ω288.

F

FARE *verb inf.* travel, go: Ω185.
FECHE *verb inf.* fetch: Ω233.
FELE *adj. pl. acc,* many: Ω9. *pron. pl.* **FELE**: Ω71.
FEREN (**IFEREN**) *noun pl.* companion: Ω105.
FEAWE *pron. pl.* few: Ω360.
FISSES *noun pl.* fish: Ω85.
FOH *adj.* part-coloured, variegated, spotted or streaked: Ω376.
FOL3EÐ *verb pr. 3rd. sg.* follow: Ω14.
FONDED *verb pp.* experienced: Ω156.
FOR *prep.* for: Ω17.

FORDON *verb pp. pl.* ruined, disgraced, undone: Ω285.
FOREMES-FADERES *noun poss.* forefather's: Ω204.
FORHOLEN *verb pp.* hidden, concealed: Ω78.
FORLORENE *verb pp. pl.* damned, lost: Ω111.
FORSWORENE *noun pl.* perjured: Ω108.
FORÐ *adv.* forth, movement forward: Ω185.
FORWREIEN *verb inf.* accuse, denounce: Ω100.
FOR3IET *verb pr. 3rd sg.* (*contracted form*) forget: Ω26.
FREMDE *adj* as *noun* stranger, foreigner, not of kin: Ω35.
FRETEÐ *verb pr. 3rd pl.* gnaw, consume, torture by gnawing: Ω289.
FRUDEN *noun pl.* frogs or toads: Ω288.
FUELES *noun pl.* fowl: Ω85.
FURE *noun* fire: Ω44, **FUR**: Ω159, Ω262.
FURST *noun:* delay, postpone: Ω38.

G

GLIE *noun* glee, entertainment, play: Ω303.
GODCUNNESSE *noun* divinity, divine nature or power: Ω404.
GOLDE *noun gold*: Ω71.
GRADI *adj. pl.* greedy: Ω278.
GRAI *adj.* grey: Ω376.
GRAMEÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* anger, grief: Ω174.
GRUND *noun* ground: Ω187.
GULT *verb pp.* sinned: Ω11; **GULTEÐ** *verb pr. 1st pl.* sin: Ω93.

3

3EUNGE *adj pl. acc.* childish: Ω10; **JUNG** *adj.* young: Ω4.
3IE *pron. 2nd pl.* you: Ω50
3IELDE *noun* tax, tribute: Ω46.
3IEMEÐ *verb pr. 3rd pl.* heed, consider, cure: Ω82.
3IERLES *noun pl.* earls: Ω335.
3IERNE *adv.* enthusiastically, eagerly, willingly: Ω50.
3IET *adv.* still, yet: Ω5.
3IETCERES *noun pl.* an avaricious, covetous person, miser: Ω282.
3IEUE *verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg.* give: Ω127, Ω414.

H

HABBE *verb pr 1st sg.*, have: Ω7; **HAUEÐ** *verb pr. 3rd sg.* have: 41.
HALE *noun* health, well-being: Ω209.
HALEN *verb pa. 3rd pl.* concealed, hid, kept secret: Ω168.
HAREM *noun* harm: Ω205.
HARDNE *adj.* hard: Ω171.
HAS *noun* bidding, command: Ω93, Ω360.
HAT *verb pr. 3rd sg.* bid, command: Ω319.
HATERE *adj. comp.* hotter: Ω260.
HAÐENE *adj. pl.* heathen: Ω306.
HEALDEN (**IHEALDEN**) *verb inf.* hold: Ω57; **HIELDEN** *verb pa. 3rd pl.*: Ω179.
HEASE *noun pl.* bidding, command: Ω307.
HEIE *adj. as noun pl.* high (rich/important): Ω171.
HERE (**IHERE**) *verb inf.* hear: Ω276.
HERE *noun* payment, wages: Ω46.
HEUENRICHE *noun* the Kingdom of Heaven: Ω43.
HIT *pron. 3rd sg.* it: Ω13.
HIE *pron. 3rd pl.* they: Ω23.
HINE *pron. 3rd sg.* him: Ω115, Ω402.
HLESTEN *verb inf.* listen: Ω237; **HLESTE** *verb inf.* listen: Ω398.
HOLDE *adj. pl.* loyal to a king or master, faithful to Christ: Ω279.
HOPIE *verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg.* hope: Ω32.

HORDOM *noun* whoredom: Ω266.
HORLINGES *noun pl.* fornicator, adulterer: Ω108.
HULLE *noun* hill: Ω362.
HUDDEN *verb pa. 3rd pl.* concealed: Ω169.
HUNDREDFEALDE *adv.* hundred times: Ω55.
HWEÐERE *cj.* whether: Ω136.
HWILCH *adj.* which: Ω143.
HWILE (**ÞE –HWILE**) *cj.* while: Ω22, Ω24.

I

ICH *personal pro. 1st sg. nom.* I: Ω1, Ω2, Ω3, etc.
IDEL *adj. pl. acc*, vain, futile: Ω9.
IFEREN *noun pl.* companions, servants: Ω240.
ILKE *demon. adj.* the same Ω223.
ILLE *adj.* ill: Ω75.
IUEL (**JUEL**) *noun* evil: Ω20.
IWISSE *noun* (with **mid**) certainty: Ω165.

J

JUEL see **IUEL**

K

KEDDE *verb pa. 3rd sg.* made known, shown, revealed: Ω200.
KENNE *noun* kin: Ω213; **KENNES** *noun poss.*: Ω376.

L

LAC *noun* offering, sacrifice, gift: Ω210
LOC Ω74.
LACHE *noun* leech: Ω317.
LADEN *verb inf.* lead, carry: Ω414; **LADE** *verb inf.* lead: Ω287. **LAD, LADE** *verb pp,* led: Ω5; **LADEÐ** *verb pr. 3rd pl.* leads: Ω220.
LATEN *verb inf.* to grow late: Ω38.
LASSE *adv.* less: Ω61.
LAST *noun* least: Ω62, Ω117.
LAȝE *noun pl.* laws: Ω179, **LAȝELEASE** *adj. pl.* lawless: Ω306.
LÆTE *verb inf.* leave behind: Ω356.
LEAN *noun* reward, recompense (specifically in regard to one's eternal damnation or salvation): Ω65.
LEASE *adj. pl.* false, untrue: Ω268.
LEF *adj.* prized, approved: Ω74.
LEGEÐ *verb pr. 1st pl.* lay: Ω331.
LEID *verb pp.* placed, laid: Ω12.
LEIE *noun* fire, firelight: Ω293.
LENDE *verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg.* bring [to heaven], cause to come [to heaven]: Ω127.
LESEN *verb inf.* set free, deliver, release: Ω189.
LEUEN (**ILEUEN**) *verb inf.* believe: Ω50; **LEUED** (**ILEUED**) *verb pr. 1st pl.* believed: Ω183.
LICHAME *noun poss.* body's: Ω317; **LICHAMLICHE** *adj. pl.* bodily, corporeal, physical: Ω415.
LICHE (**ILICHE**) *adv.* alike, the same: Ω67, Ω392.

LIBBE *verb inf.* live: Ω209.
LIEUE *adj as noun* friend, beloved, dear one: Ω45.
LIEF *adj.* beloved: Ω210, Ω270.
LIGEÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* resides: Ω294.
LIBBEN *verb inf.* live: Ω34
LIHTLICHE (**LIHT+LICHE**) *adv.* lightly: Ω154.
LIPNE *verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg.* rely, trust: Ω25.
LISSE *noun* love, kindness, mercy: Ω248.
LOC see **LAC**
LOFTE *noun* sky, atmosphere: Ω85.
LOME *adv*, frequently: Ω11, **ILOME**: Ω48.
LONDE *noun* land: Ω84.
LORE *noun*, learning, knowledge: Ω1.
LOTHE *noun* harm, evil: Ω62.
LOUERD *noun* lord: Ω81.
LOÐ *adj.* loth: Ω356; **LOÐE** *adj. as noun* enemy, foe: Ω45.
LO3E *adj. as noun pl.* low (poor): Ω171.
LU3EN *verb pa. 3rd pl.* lied: Ω168.

M

MAI *noun* kinsman: Ω194.
MAN-KENNE *noun* mankind: Ω351.
MANKE *noun pl.* unit of weight (esp. of gold): Ω71.
MANNE *noun* man: Ω121.
MAST *adj.,* most: Ω7.
ME *indef. pron.* man: Ω49; **MES**: *indef. pron. 3rd pl.* one, person, man: Ω268.
MEDE *noun* reward: Ω228.
MED3IERNE *adj. pl.* greedy for bribes, desirous of power: Ω269.
MENE *verb inf.* complain, lament: Ω177.
MENGD (**IMENGD**) *verb pp.* mixed, blended: Ω151.
METE (**IMETE**) *verb inf.* meet: Ω138.
METHES CHELE *noun* see the notes to parallel text for this. Probable reading is 'the red fur of the marten' Ω377.
MID *prep.* with: Ω41.
MIDDENEARD (**MIDDEN+EARD**) *noun* earth, world (middle region between heaven and hell): Ω145, **MIDDENÆRD** Ω202.
MIHTE *noun* might: Ω78.
MILCE *noun acc.,* mercy, compassion: Ω8.
MISDEED *noun pl.* misdeeds: Ω137;
MISDEDE *noun* misdeed: Ω216.
MISDUDEN *verb pa. 1st pl.* amiss, wrong: Ω101.
MISLICAÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* dislike, displeases: Ω13.
MISTE *noun* mist: Ω19.
MO3E *noun* kinsman: Ω194.
MONE *noun* moon: Ω279.
MUCHEL *adj.* great, much: Ω12, Ω222; adv. much: Ω14.
MU3E *verb subj. pr. 3rd sg.* may: Ω24, Ω56.
MURIE *adj.* merry: Ω163.
MURIHÐE *noun* mirth: Ω407.

N

NABBEÐ *verb pr. 3rd pl.* have not: Ω393.
NADDREN *noun pl.* adders: Ω288.
NAFRE *adv.* never: Ω99, Ω128, Ω189.
NAHT *adv. neg.* not: Ω49; **NAH** *adv. neg. not*: Ω134.
NAREN *verb pa. 3rd pl.* were not: Ω394;
NARE *verb sbj. pa. 3rd sg.* Ω208.
NAÐER *cj.* neither: Ω378.
NAUEÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* (*cont. neg.* form of have) have not: Ω139.
NELE *verb pr. 3rd sg.* will not: Ω128;
NELLEÐ *verb pr. 3rd pl.* will not: Ω385.

NESTEN *verb pa. 3rd pl.* knew not: Ω236, Ω399; **NES** *v pa. 3rd sg.* be not/knew not: Ω307.

NEWE *adj. pl.* new: Ω324.
NIEDE *noun* need: Ω274.
NISEIEN *verb pa. 1st pl.* saw not, did not see: Ω105.

NIÐER (**A+NIÐER**) *adj.* nether, lower or bottom part: Ω310.
NIÐFULE *adj. pl.* envious, malicious, spiteful, wicked: Ω289.
NOLDE *verb pa. 3rd sg.* would not: Ω194, Ω195.
NOWIHT *adv. neg.* not Ω223.
NU *adv.* now: Ω1; **NUÐE**: Ω10.

O

OERRE *noun* anger, wrath: Ω291.
OFDRAD *verb pp.* afraid: Ω44;
OFDRADDE *verb pp. pl.* afraid: Ω96.
OFFERD *verb pp. pl.* feared, terrified: Ω166.
OF-ÞUNCHE *verb inf.* repent: Ω137
ON *adj.* one: Ω29 (preceding a vowel).
ONDE *noun* spite, hatred: Ω202
ORD *noun* beginning: Ω87.

ORE *noun* mercy, pardon, forgiveness: Ω54, Ω188; **ORE-LEAS** *adj.* merciless: Ω227.
OÐER *cj.* or: Ω26; **OÐER** *pron. pl.* others: Ω175.
OÐERLUKER *adv. comp.* in a different way, differently, otherwise: Ω158.
OƷEN *adj.* own: Ω113, Ω170.

P

PENI *noun* penny: Ω68, Ω311.
PINE *noun* torture, pain: Ω140.

PRUDE *adj. pl.* proud: 289.
PUNDE *noun* pound: Ω68, Ω311.

Q

QUENCHE *verb inf.* quench: Ω159.
QUEME (**IQUEME**) *verb inf.* please, placate (god): Ω98. **QUEMD** (**IQUEMD**) *verb pp.* pleased (god): Ω181. **QUEMDE** (**IQUEMDE**) *verb pa. 3rd pl.* pleased: Ω284.
QUIKE *adj. pl.* quick, living: Ω80, **QUICA**: Ω199.

R

RADE *noun* counsel, advice, wisdom, learning, intelligence, sense, reason: Ω4, Ω92.
RAKETEIE *noun pl.* chains, fetters: Ω294.
RAÐER *adv.* (*comp.*) sooner: Ω138.

RAUING *verb (verbal noun)* robbing, plundering, pillaging: Ω266.
RECHE *verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg.* care, heed, but also recite, tell, say and unfold the meaning of, explain, interpret: Ω140.

REWEN *verb inf.* rue: Ω22; Ω358.
REUEN *noun pl.* reeves.
RICHE *noun* dominion, kingdom: Ω370.
RIPEN *verb inf.* reap: Ω23.
RIHTWINESSE *noun* righteousness: Ω73.
RIXLEÐ *noun* reigns (of God who rules over heaven -spiritual): Ω412.
RODE *noun* cross: Ω196.
RUNE *noun* utterance, whisper: Ω91.

S

SA *noun* sea: Ω85.
SABELINE *noun* the fur of the sable: Ω377.
SAFTE *noun pl.* creation, creatures: Ω86.
SADE *verb pa. 3rd sg.* said: Ω136; **SADEN** *verb pa. 3rd pl.* said: Ω234.
SAL *verb pr. 3rd sg.* shall: Ω22.
SAMIE *verb* inf. shame: Ω172. **SAMEÐ** *verb pr. 3rd sg.* shame: Ω174.
SÆD *noun* weariness: Ω403.
SCAT *noun* sheet: Ω378.
SCRENCHE *verb inf.* shrink: Ω347.
SECÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* seek: Ω226.
SEGGEN *verb inf.* say: Ω94.
SEUE *adj. num.* (*quant. card.*) seven: Ω149.
SELDE *adv.* seldom: Ω47.
SELÐE *noun* fortune, blessing, discretion: Ω16.
SELLICH *noun* wonder: Ω190.
SENCHE *noun* drink: Ω346.
SENNE *noun* sin: Ω134.
SEÐEN *conj.* since: Ω9; Ω122.
SEWEN *verb pa. 3rd pl.* sown: Ω23.
SIBBE *noun* relative, kinsman: Ω35.
SIC *adj.* sick: 208.
SIKER *adj. pl.* safe, free from danger: Ω:42.
SILDE *verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg.* shield: Ω231;
SILDEÐ *verb pr. 3rd pl.* shield: Ω361.
SINEÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* shines: Ω290.
SMECHE *noun* smoke: Ω19; **SMECH** *noun* smoke: Ω292.
SNAKEN *noun pl.* snakes: Ω288.
SOLDE *verb pt. 3rd sg.* shall: Ω38;
SOLDE(N) *verb pt. 2nd sg.* shall: Ω48, Ω50.
SONE *adv.* soon: Ω35.
SOP *verb pa. 3rd sg.* shaped, created: Ω86.
SORE *adj.* sore, painful, distressing: Ω37;
SORE *adv.* sorely, bitterly: Ω166.
SORƷE *noun* sorrow: Ω149, *noun pl.* Ω175.
SOT *noun* A foolish or stupid person, a fool: Ω30.
SOWLE *noun* soul: Ω143; **SOWLE** *noun poss.* soul's: Ω317.
SPEKEN *verb inf* to speak: Ω9; **SPEKEN** *verb 1st sg. pp* , to say in spoken words: Ω9.
SPEND *verb 1st sg. pp.* spent: Ω12.
SPRUNGE *verb pp. pl.* sprung: Ω182.
SRUD *noun* shroud: Ω378.
STALE *noun* stealing: Ω266.
STECHE *noun* fragment, piece: Ω198.
STEDE *noun* place, space, locality: Ω27.
STILLE *adj.* still Ω117.
STONDEÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* stand: Ω20.
STORRE *noun* star: Ω290.
STRATE *noun* street: Ω244, Ω352.
STRENCÐE *noun* strength, force, anger: Ω177.
STUNDE *noun* a time, a while, a short time: Ω156.
SULLE *verb pr. 3rd pl.* shall: Ω23.
SUNEGEDEN *verb pa. 3rd pl.* sinned: Ω271; **SINEGEDEN**: Ω297.
SUNNE *noun* sun: Ω290.
SWARTE *adj.* dark, black: Ω293.
SWENCHE *verb inf.* afflict, oppress, trouble: Ω263.
SWICHEN *noun pl.* traitors, deceivers (often used to describe Satan): Ω108;
SWIKEN *noun pl.* traitors, deceivers: Ω289.
SWIERE *noun* neck: Ω153.

SWIKELE *adj. pl.* deceitful, treacherous: Ω264.
SWILCH *adj.* such: Ω81.
SWINC (**ISWINC**) *noun* toil, work: Ω37; **SWINCH** : Ω58 (**ISWINCH**) Ω203; **SWUNCH** Ω215; **SWINC** Ω331; **SWUNKE** *verb pa. 1st pl.* worked: Ω332; **SWANC** *verb pa. 3rd sg.* worked, toiled: Ω373.
SWINDE *verb inf.* dwindle away, vanish, disappear: Ω58.
SWINES *noun poss.* swine's: Ω152.
SWIÐE *adv.* very, much, exceedingly: Ω295.
SWO *adv.* so: Ω78, Ω70.
SWUNCHE see **SWINC**.
SYRREUE *noun* sheriff: Ω51.

T

TACHE *verb inf.* teach: Ω316, **TACHED** *verb pr. 3rd sg.* teach: Ω321.
TAIHTE *verb pa. 3rd sg.* taught: Ω283.
TEALD *verb pp.* told: Ω125.
TEMEN *verb inf.* produce, summon: Ω113.
TEREÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* tear: Ω289.
TIHTE *verb pa. 3rd sg.* attracted, enticed, allured: Ω283.
TILÐE *noun* labour, work: Ω58.
TIT (**ITIT**) *verb pr. 3rd sg.* happens, befalls: Ω130.
TREI3E *noun* suffering, pain, grief: Ω386.

Þ

ÞANC *noun* thank: Ω72; **ÞANKE** (**IÞANKE**) *noun* thanks, gratitude, will: Ω70.
ÞANC *noun* thought: Ω254.
ÞARF *verb pr. 3rd sg.* need: Ω44.
ÞE *pron. rel.* which: Ω10; who: Ω14 (sometimes preceded by the *dem.* **se** or **þe** indication of grammatical gender: he who – relative construction)
ÞENCHE *verb 1st pl.* think: Ω199.
ÞESSES *adj. poss. (dem.)* this: Ω349.
ÞEIH *conj.*, though, even though: Ω4; though Ω136.
ÞIDER *adv.* thither, unto that place: Ω47.
ÞIESTERNESSE *noun* darkness: Ω292.
ÞIEUE *noun* thief: Ω44.
ÞRISTE *adj.* bold: Ω20
ÞO *def. art. acc.* the: Ω16.
ÞOLIEN *verb inf.* suffer: Ω191.
ÞUNCHE *verb inf.* seem, appear: Ω63; **ÞINCHEÐ** *pr. 3 sg. & impers.* (it) seems, *me* ~ it seems to me, appears to me: Ω5
ÞURCH and **ÞURH** *prep.* through: Ω42
ÞUSTER *adj.* dark: Ω79.

U

UNBINT *verb inf. pr. 3rd sg.* unbinds: Ω413.
UNBOHT *verb pp.* unpaid for: Ω60.
UNBOND *verb pa. 3rd sg.* unbound, loosened: Ω197.
UNEAÐE *adv.* grievous Ω190.
UNFOR3OLDEN *verb pp.* unrewarded: Ω60
UNFREME *noun* hurt, misery, loss: Ω237.

UNHALÐE *noun* want of health, weak or poor health: Ω16, Ω338, Ω388; *noun pl.* : Ω206.
UNHOLDE *noun pl.* unfaithful, false, hostile: Ω37.
UNILICHE *adj.* unlike: Ω371.
UNISALÐE *noun pl.* unhappiness, miseries: Ω207, Ω389.
VNNET *acc. Adj.*, Useless, unprofitable: Ω5. [OE *un-nyt*]
UNRIHT *noun* wickedness, evil: Ω95.
UNSELE *adj.* misery: Ω208.
UNSTEDEFASTE *adj.* un-steadfast: Ω254.
UNTREWNESSE *noun* absence of trueness, falsity: Ω279.
UNÐEAWE *noun* vice: Ω361.
UNWENNE *noun* : sorrow, distress, misery, suffering: Ω219.
UNWRIEN *verb pp.* exposed, discovered: Ω169.
URE *pron. 1st pl.* our: Ω65.
UTE *verb sbj. pr. 1st pl.* let us: Ω348.

V

VELE and **VEOLE** see **FELA**

VNNET, VNNED see **UNNET**

W

WALLEN *noun pl.* walls: Ω42
WALLINDE *verb* (*pr. part.*) *as adj.* welling up (boiling): Ω229.
WANE *noun* misery, woe: Ω160.
WAPNE *noun pl.* weapons: Ω351.
WARE *noun* stock, goods (specifically that which God offers: heaven and salvation): Ω69.
WARNIN *verb inf.* warn: Ω237;
WARNIE *verb sbj. pr. 3rd sg.* warn: Ω315.
WAS *verb AN 1st sg. pret.,* was: Ω1.
WATERE *noun* water: Ω84.
WEALDEN *verb inf.* command, possess: Ω56; **WEALDE** *verb pr 1st sg.*, wield, occupy, to have power over, possess: Ω2;
WEALDEÐ *verb pr. 3rd sg.* rules: Ω402.
WEL *adv.* very, really: Ω6.
WEIES *noun pl.* ways: Ω73.
WEIGHEN *verb inf.* weigh: Ω64.
WELE *noun* worldly riches: Ω233.
WENDE *verb imp.* Ω88; **WENDE** *verb sbj. pr 1st pl.* Ω415.
WERE *noun* man, husband: Ω32.
WERELDES *noun poss.* world's: Ω282, Ω378.
WERIEN *verb inf.* defend, protect, ward off: Ω336; **WERIE** *verb sbj. pr. 1st pl.* defend, protect: Ω350.
WERKES *noun pl.* work: Ω64. **WERC** *noun* work: Ω113.
WERSE (**A+WERSE**) *adj.* worse: Ω310.
WEȝ *noun* way: Ω352.
WIHTE *noun pl.* living creatures, beings: Ω80; **WIHTEN** *noun pl.* demons: Ω296.
WIL *noun* will: Ω14.
WILLEÐ *verb pr. 3rd pl.* will: Ω100.
WIND *noun* wind: Ω143.
WINES *noun pl.* friends: Ω230.
WINTRE *noun pl.* winters, *i.e.*, years: Ω1.
WIT *noun*, mind, wisdom, understanding: Ω2.
WISSE (**IWISSE**) *noun* certainty: Ω41.
WISTE (**IWISTE**) *verb pt. 1st sg.* had knowledge, knew: Ω17.
WIÐ-ÞAN *cj.* with that: Ω161.
WIUE *noun* wife: Ω25.
WOLDE *verb pa. 1st sg.* would: Ω17.

WOMBE *noun* belly: Ω154.
WONING *noun* (*verbal noun*) wailing, moaning, lamentation: Ω244.
WOP *noun* weeping: Ω244.
WORDE *noun pl.* words: Ω3.
WORELDES *noun poss.* world's: Ω233.
WORI *adj.* dirty, turbid (**WORI WATER**: well water, dirty water): Ω151.
WOT *verb pr. 3rd sg.* knows: Ω80.
WRACHE *noun* vengeance, retribution, punishment: Ω216.
WRECHE *adj. pl.* wretched: Ω179, Ω272.
WRENCHEN *noun pl.* deceptions, tricks: Ω264.
WRITE *noun* writing: Ω101; **WRITE** (**IWRITE**) *verb pp.* written: Ω123, Ω235.
WRONG *noun* wrong: Ω177.
WRONGWISE *adj.* unjust, wrongful: Ω49; *adj. pl* : Ω269.
WUNDERLUKESTE *adj. superl.* most wonderful: Ω69.
WUNIEN *verb inf. dwell, live, remain, endure, be accustomed to*: Ω160, Ω188; **WUNED** *verb pp.*: Ω58; **WUNIEÐ** *verb pr. 3rd sg.* :Ω143; **WUNIINGES** *noun pl (verbal noun)* dwellings: Ω371

Introduction to Diplomatic Editions

Every attempt has been made to avoid editorial interference in the presentation of these transcriptions. The letter-shapes, including the use of capitals, and punctuation are presented, as far as is practicable, as would be found in the manuscripts themselves, with notes added to the commentary that might inform the reader of any further significant features. In addition, word division has not been regularized, as it is in the Copy Text based on T, and accent marks are found in both the text and in the accompanying notes.

The now obsolete letter forms þ (thorn), ƿ (wyn), ð (eth), æ (ash) ȝ (yogh) or ᵹ (insular form), have been retained. It is often customary for editors of Old and Middle English texts to use **w** for ƿ, to ease the process of reading the text but, as the aim of these transcriptions is to balance understanding and reading against an accurate representation of the manuscript page, ƿ has been retained here where it has been replaced with **w** in the Copy Text based on T. For the purpose of this section of the study it is essential to acknowledge where ƿ is used and where **w**; the transition to **w** itself being an important marker. Similarly, this section of the study differentiates between **g,** the insular form ᵹ and its descendent ȝ. Manuscript *i/j* and *u/v* are retained

Each line of script is given a separate line in the transcription and, as far as it has been possible to do so, the page layout has been reproduced to represent the writing grid. For instance, the text of Lambeth has been written out as it is in the manuscript (as if prose), where, in the Parallel Text Edition, when comparison is essential and this layout is not conducive to the overall purpose, it has been edited so that it matches the rhyming couplets of the other manuscript versions. The *mise-en-page* of each transcription does reflect that of the manuscript itself; the most obvious examples of this being L and D, where L is written as prose and D is

written as half-lines. However, after some consideration of what is accepted by the modern scholarly reader, and what is standard in such editions, I felt that it was unnecessary to give each new *recto* and *verso* a new page as I had initially intended. Therefore, the *folio* and line numbering, present throughout, are my own and are added as an aid to the reader.

Abbreviations are normally silently expanded, except for ⁊ (Tironian 'et') for English *and*. However, the treatment of abbreviations specific to each manuscript is discussed within the introduction to the individual transcription. Later glosses to the texts will not be dealt with in the text but will be noted in the commentary. Rubrication is indicated in the text by a bold font, but does not usually receive separate attention in the apparatus; illumination, similarly, is represented in the text, where possible, and more often also receives commentary in the apparatus – especially in instances where the transcription cannot adequately represent the manuscript. Interlineations are shown within the text (through the use of \ /) and further elucidation can also be found within the apparatus. Scribal emendation/self correction of the manuscripts is accepted and described more fully in the apparatus.

In addition, the conventions used previously in the text of T as Copy Text, which are taken from EETS, are retained (see p.) unless stated above. The necessary differences in convention and representation between the editions of the *Conduct of Life* (the edition of T as Copy Text; the Diplomatic Editions; and the Parallel Text Edition) are intended to focus the reader on, and highlight, different aspects of the *Conduct of Life*, and different scholarly ways in which to approach the text; this has been discussed in detail in the Introduction (p.).

Cambridge, Trinity College MS B 14 52, folios 2^{r}-9^{v}

Transcription of Cambridge, Trinity College MS B 14 52, folios 2^{r}-9^{v}

MS *Pointing: Minim-height punctus at the end of lines throughout, with the following exceptions:* Lines 5, 15, 17, 19, 27, 29, 31, 33, 65, 67, 73, 78, 79, 81, 85, 87, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 99, 103, 104, 109, 112, 113, 117, 119, 124, 132, 134, 135, 137, 143, 147, 149, 151, 153, 155, 158, 163, 167, 169, 170, 171, 173, 175 177, 179, 183, 185, 187, 189, 191, 195, 197, 198, 201, 203-207, 209, 213, 217, 219, 221, 223, 225, 227, 229, 231, 235, 237, 244, 245, 248, 249, 257, 258, 261, 265, 267, 271, 273, 275, 277, 278, 281, 283, 285-287, 289-291, 293-295, 297, 299, 301, 305, 307, 309, 311-313, 315, 317, 319, 322-326, 329, 331, 333, 334, 335, 337, 341, 343, 345, 347-349, 351, 353, 354, 357, 359-363, 365, 368, 375, 377, 379, 381-383, 385-387, 392, 393, 395, 396 and 398
Line 399 has the punctus elevatus ⁝ at the line end.

A punctus can also be found after: **hunger**: line 199; **þurst**: line 327; **almesse**: line 339; and **pil**: 345.

Capitalization occurs frequently at the beginning of lines with Initial letters for each new line placed inside the margin; these occurrences will be indicated in the text but not in the accompanying notes.

Abbreviations are not frequent and are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below: **mãi** expanded to **mæi**: line 9; **ernīge** expanded to **erninge**: line 64; **c᷒i᷑st** expanded to **crist**: lines 79 and 317; **iq᷒e᷑me** expanded to **iqueme**: line 95; **hī** expanded to **him**: lines 124 and 129; **adā** expanded to **adam**: line 175; **q᷒i᷑ca** expanded to **quica**: line 192; **nā** expanded to **nam**: line 209; **frā** expanded to **fram**: line 236.

Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

The Language of the *Conduct of Life* is generally accepted as being of Essex with M. L. Samuels and Betty Hill, however, suggesting a London provenance, possibly 'influenced by immigration, perhaps from East Anglia.[838] Laing (LAEME) places the text in west Essex.[839] The evidence below certainly supports a localization to the South-East Midlands.

The runic letter <þ> (*þorn*) is written in initial position in all instances in T (§ 2.1): **þan**, **þeih**, **þincheð** etc., except for **ðer** (§ 3.3). In medial and final position <ð> is usual: **cuðe**, **seðen**, **þincheð**, **mislicað** etc. (§ 4.1) with very rare <þ>: **oþer** and **deþ** (§ 4.1). T writes *th* in **sathanas**, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 *Remark*) and in **thurh**, **lothe** and **methes** (§ 5). The graph <d> is written in place of <ð> on four occasions(§ 7.1): **folȝed**, **haued**, **bed** and **ileued**. The double fricative [ðð] is simplified in **seðen** (§ 10.1).

The runic letter <ƿ> (wynn) is retained throughout T with limited examples of <w> (§ 11.1 and § 11.2): **mowe**, **owen**, **wif**, **were** (*twice*), **wiue**, **drawen** (*twice*), **meward**, **wel** and **sowle**. The Old English ligature <æ> is rarely found (*six occasions*) in T (§ 12.3): **mæi**, **ængles**, **ænes**, **middenærd**, **læte** and **sæd**. T writes the Tironian nota <⁊> (§ 13.1)with **and** being written on only two occasions (§ 13.2).

Insular ȝ is retained in T alongside Caroline *g* (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): **grameð**, **grunde**, **glede** etc.and before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* (§ 42.2): **god**, **gulte**, **goldes** etc. and by levelling in (**bi**)**ginninge** (§ 42.3). The fricative /ɣ/ has been labialized and vocalized to /ɣw/ > /w/ <w> (§ 43) in **mowe**, **owe** and **drawen** (§ 43.2) but <ȝ> is retained in all other places including further occurances of **oȝen** and

[838] Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p. 107.
[839] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.

moȝe with <ȝ> (§ 43.1). T preserves <ȝ > for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): **ȝiet**, **ȝeunge**, **forȝiet** etc. but writes <i> before /u/ in **jung**. Initial <ȝ> is retained before *i* in **ȝief** (§ 45.4). T demonstrates transition to a palatal (§ 47ff) in **eien**, **forpreien**, **iseien** and **niseien** with <ȝ> retained in **peiȝen**. The continuation of the OE movement *ig > i* (§ 48) in **ani**, **mani** and **eadi** is further demonstrated in T. Palatal ȝ /j/ is lost before *d* (§ 49)in **sade** and **saden** but has been vocalized to /i/ in **isaid** (§ 49.1). Late OE /dȝ/, written <cȝ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in **bugge** and **seggen** and <g> in **abugeð**, **ligeð** and **legeð** (§ 50). The OE group nȝ /ŋg/ is written <ng> (§ 51 and § 51.1): **longe**, **kinge**, **strengðe**, **prongpise** etc. with devoicing to /ŋk/ before <ð> in **strencðe** (§ 51.2) and to /ŋ/ before <p> in **pronpise** (§ 51.3).

In initial position /k/ is normally written as <k> before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in **king**(**e**)/**kinges**, **kedde**, **kenne**(**s**) etc. but it is <c> in **cuðen**. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is always <c> in **cunin**, **care**, **cunne**(**n**) etc. Before <n> (§ 18) it is <c> in **cnoweð** and (**i**)**cnopen** and before other consonants (§ 19) it is always <c> in (**i**)**cleped**, (**bi**)**clepien**, **cliue**, **criste** etc. T writes <qu> (§. 20) for OE *cw* in **iqueme**, **quike**, **quenche** etc. T writes <k> in medial position for OE velar *c* thoughout the text: (§. 21 and §. 21.1): **speken**, **perke**, **likede** etc. with rare occurances of <c> (§. 22 and §. 22.1) found in: **mislicað**, **bispicað**, **brecð**, **quica** and **godcunnesse** (as a result of the compound **god** + **cunnesse**) and one example of <ch> (§. 25 and §. 25.2) in **spichen**. However, <c> is always retained in final position (§. 23 and §. 23.1): **ac**, **þanc/þonc**, **loc/lac** etc. with no evidence of <k>.

The regular form of /tʃ/ in T is <ch> (§. 27, §. 28.1, §.29.1 and §. 30.1): **child**(**e**), **chilce**, **muchel**(**e**), **smeche**, **ech/elch**, (**i**)**spinch** etc and in **þunche** (§. 32 and §. 32.1) and **þenchen** (§. 32 and §. 32.2) etc. with <c> /tʃ/ (§. 31 and §. 31.1) written twice only in **ic**; the occasional writing of <c> in **afric** and (**i**)**spinc** are possible variants with /k/ (§. 31.1). T also writes <k>, probable /k/,

in **ofðinkeð** and **mukel** where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected (see notes at §.32, §. 32.3, §. 33 and §. 33.1).

T nearly always writes <s> (§. 36.1) for /ʃ/ (§. 34) in initial position: **sal**, **syrreue**, **sop** etc., however, <sc> (§. 35.1) is written in **screnche** and **scat**. In medial position /ʃ/ is <ss> in **fisses** (§. 38). OE [ts] is usually written <c> in **milce** but is<ch> on one occasion in **milche** (§. 41).

T always writes OE unvoiced [f] as <f> in initial position in **fele**, **folȝed**, **for** (§ 58 and § 58.1) etc., in final position in **lif**, **of**, **self** (§ 58.2) etc. and in medial position where it is adjacent to one unvoiced sound: **ofte**, **after**, **lofte** (§ 58.2) etc. However, voicing is regularly demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.3) through the writing of <v>/<u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in **juel**, **aliue**, **piue** etc. with some instances of <f> still retained: **him-selfen**, **biforen**, **afric** etc. The writing of <f> has disappeared before *d* in **hadde** (§58.4).

In T OE *a* in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): **habben**, **fare, naueð** etc. and <a> before a nasal (§ 60 and § 60.1) in **man**, **þanc**, **þanne** etc. Before a lengthening group, OE *a* is mostly <o> (§ 61 and § 61.1): **longe**, **pronge**, **honden** etc. but <a> in **hangeð**. In T OE *æ* shows retraction to <a>, an expected feature of an EML text, in most examples (§ 63 and § 63.1): **habbe**, **after**, **patere/pater** etc. with one instance of <æ> in **sæd** and <e> in **hpeðer**. OE *e* is always <e> in T (§ 64 and § 64.4): **beren**, **ende**, **felde**, **strencðe/strengðe** etc. the writing of <æ> in **angles** and <a> in **angles** is probably influenced by OF *anglene, angle.* OE *o* is nearly always written as <o> in T (§ 65.1 and § 65.3): **bifore/biforen**, **bode**, **nolde** etc. with <a> written once in **sareȝe**. OE *i* is mostly <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.5) in **bidden**, **child**, **finde(n)** etc. with occasional <u> in **pulle**, **ofsprung** and **spunche** (see § 66.4 for the influence of *w*) and <e> in **ofspreng**, **þese**, **þesse**, **þesses**, **nele**, **nelle**, **nelleð** and **nesten** (§ 66.5, § 66.6 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to *ĕ*). For OE *y,* T has a mixture of <u> and <e>, a possible indicator of the SEML dialect, writings (§ 67ff and § 67.5): **dude**, **þunche**,

gulteð etc. with **deden**, **euel**, **senne** etc. with occasional <i> in **þincheð**, **ðinkeð**, **king(es)**, **hpilch** and before *h* in **drihte(n)** and **tihte**. OE *y* (§ 67 and § 67.6) is <i> in **litel/litle** and **hpi;** <u> in **hudden**, **fur(e)** and **cuðen**; <e> in **here** and **kedde**. T retains <u> for OE *u* (§ 68 and § 68.1) throughout the text: **cume(n)**, **punien**, **grunde** etc.

T writes <o> for OE *a*, as a result of neutralization, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.4): **lore**, **one**, **non** etc. with rare <a> found in **aquerne**, **bihat** (*cont.*), **hatere** and **hat** (*cont.*). In T OE $æ_1$ is mostly written as <a>, a feature of the SEML (§ 71, § 73 and § 76): **dade**, **rade**, **ofdrade** etc. and <æ> in **læte**, with <e> written in **iselðe**, **unsele** and **mere** (for OE *þær* see § 77ff). OE $æ_2$ is nearly always written as <a> (§ 72ff, § 73 and § 80.1): **mast**, **ar/are**, **unhalðe** etc. with <æ> written in **ænes**, <ea> in **hease** and rare examples of <e> in **mene** and **hete** (for *ælc, elc* and *ylc* see § 81ff). OE $ē$ is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.1): **he**, **deþ/deð**, **iqueme** etc (the writing of **doð** is by analogy, see § 82.1). OE $ī$ is always <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.3): **mine**, **þriste**, **hpile** etc. OE $ō$ is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.1): **to**, **dome**, **boc** etc. (the writing of **cam** is by analogy, see § 84.1). OE *u* is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.1): **nu**, **ure**, **þu** etc.

In T OE *ea* (§ 86 and §87ff) before *r* , without lengthening, is <a> (§ 88.1 and § 88.2): **arȝe**, **þarf**, **arme** etc.; before *rd* (§ 88.2) it is <a> in **harde**, **hardne** and **hardde** with <æ> (§ 87.4) retained in (**midden**)**ærd** and <ea> (§ 87.5) in (**midden**)**eard**; before *rn* (§ 88.4) <a> is written in **þarnin** and **þarnie** with <e> found in **erninge**. The *i*-umaut of *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <e> (§ 89.4) in **derne** and **erming** but <ie>, a likely SEM form, in **smierte** (§ 89.4 and § 89.2). OE *ea* before *l*, without lengthening (Anglian *a*), is always <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.4): **al** and **alle**, **falle**, **pallen** etc.; before *ld* it is mostly written <ea> (§ 91.3), a form retained in East Saxon (see § 91.2): **pealde**, **eald(e)**, **feald(e)**, with <e> in **bihelden**, <o> in **holde** (see § 91.1) and <a> in **halt**. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *l* combinations (Angl. mutation of *a*) T has <e> in **elder** and **elde** (§ 92ff and § 92.4). OE *ea* before *h* combinations is

written with the front glide <ei> (§ 87.3, § 93.2 and § 93.3) in **heie** and **iseih**. The *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *h*-combinations is always <i> in **mihte(n)** and **nihte** (§ 94.1 and § 94.2).

For OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.3) T writes mostly smoothed <e> in **perke/perc**, **perkes** and **herte** with <ie> in **hierte** and <o> in **storre**. The *wur* group (§ 97 and § 97.3) is <u> in **purðe** and **purðen** but for the *i*-umlaut of *eo* it is <e> in **perest** and **pers(e)**. OE *eo* before *l*-combinations is <e> (EML § 98ff and §98.4) in **self** and **selfe(n)**. OE *eo* before *ht* is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.2) in **unrihtþinesse**, **unriht**, **rihte** and **briht(e)** and <i> for the *i*-umlaut (§ 100ff and § 100.4) in **ouer-sihð** and **þurh-sihð**. OE – WS *eom* is **am** (chiefly Angl. *eam* § 101). OE *eo* (*a*-umlaut of *e*) is always <e> in T (§ 102ff and § 103.1): **fele**, **brekeð**, **pele** and **unfremu**. OE *eo* (*u*-umaut of *e*) is almost always <e> (§ 102ff and § 104.1) in **heuen(e)**, **heueriche**, **pereld(es)** etc. with <u> written under the influence of *w* in **suster** and **pude.** The velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105ff) is mostly <e> in T (§ 105.4): **seðen**, **seuene**, **bineðen** etc with <i> in **(be)nime**, **quike/quica**, **silver** and **niðer**.

In T OE *ēa* (§ 106ff and § 106.3) is regularly written <ea>: **eaðe**, **deaðe**, **eadi** etc. alongside <e> in **ec** and **eðlate** and <a> in **brade** and **rauing**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēa* (§ 107.1 and § 107.2) is always <e> in **ileuen**, **hereð**, **temen** etc. OE *ēo* (§ 108ff and § 108.3) is a mixture of <e> and <ie> (§ 108.2): **be/ben**, **lef**, **frend** etc alongside **bien**, **lief**, **friend** etc. The *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109 ff) is mainly <ie> (§ 109.4) in **friend**, **fiend**, **þiesternesse** etc., with <e> in **frend** and **derlinges** and <u>, possibly from WS *y* (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /ø:/ from *ēo*, in **þuster**.

In T OE *ea* after *sc* (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.2) is always <a> in **sal**, **samie**, **safte** etc. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* after *c* (§ 113.2) T writes <e> (see § 113.1) in **chele** and **bicherd.** OE *ēa* after *g* (§ 114) is <ie> in **ȝier.** For OE *ie* after *g* (§ 116.1) T nearly always <ie> (East Saxon § 115.1): **forȝiet**, **ȝielde**, **ȝieue** etc. with <e> written once in **ȝeue**. Similarly, for OE *ie* after *g* T writes <ie> in **ȝiet** (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE *ie* after *sc* (§ 118.2) T writes <i> in **silde** and **sildeð**. OE *eo* after *ġ* (§ 119.1 and §120.1)

is <eu> in **ȝeunge** and **ȝeunger**, <u> in **jung** and <ieu> in **ȝieuð**. OE *eo* after *sc* (§ 121.1) is written as either <u> in **sulen/sulle(n)** or <o> in **solde(n)** and **sop**.

OE *æ + ȝ* /j/ is nearly always <ai> in T (§ 122.1 and § 122.2) in **mai/maiȝ** and **dai/daie**, with <ei> written in **seið**. LWS *sǽde* / Anglian *sægde* (§ 123 and §123.1) is mostly <a> in **sade(n)** with <ai> once in **isaid**. OE *ǣ1* (Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + *ȝ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.1) is <ai> in **mai** and **grai** with <æi> in **mæi** and <ei> in **iseie(n)** and **niseien**. OE *ǣ2* + *ȝ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.1) is <ei> in **eiðer** and <ai> in **aiðer**. OE *e* + *ȝ*/j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.2) is <ei> in **eie**, **eiseliche**, **pei**, **peies**, **peiȝen**, and **treiȝes** with <eȝ> in **peȝ**. OE *ē* + *ȝ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.1) is <ei> in **forpreien** and **leie**. OE *ēa* + *ȝ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.1) is <ei> in **eien** and **raketeie**. OE *a̋* + *h (g)* (§ 132.1 and § 132.2) is <oh> in **foh** and **oh**. OE *ǣ2* + *h* (§ 132.1 and § 133.1) is <ai> in **aihte** and **taihte**. OE *ō* + *h* (§ 134.1 and § 134.2) is always <o> in **unboht**, **biþoht**, **brohte** etc. OE *a* + /ɣ/ (§ 136.1 and § 136.2) is <aȝ> in **laȝe/laȝes** but the movement to /au/, written <aw> is demonstrated in **drawen**. OE *a* + /ɣ/ (§ 137.1 and § 137.2) is <oȝ> (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in **moȝe** and **oȝen**, with the movement to /ɔu/, written <ow>, demonstrated in **mowe** and **owen**. OE *a* + *w* (§ 138.1 and § 138.2) is always <o> before *w* (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in **cnopeð**, **blopeð**, **sople/sowle** etc. OE *ēo* + *w* (§ 139.1 and § 139.2) is <e> in **repen**, sepen; the *i*-umlaut is <e> in **untrepnesse**. OE *ēa* + *w* (§ 140.1 and § 140.2) is <ea> on two occasions in **feape** and <e> once in **fepe**.

Ich am nu elder þan ich þas a þintre ⁊ a lore. f. 2r
Ich þealde more þan idude mi þit oh to be more.
To longe ich habbe child iben a þorde ⁊ a dade.
Þeih ibie a þinter eald to jung ich am on rade.
Vnnet lif ich habbe ilad ⁊ ȝiet me þincheð ilade
Þan ibiðenche me þar on þel sore ime adrade.
Mast al ich habbe idon is idelnesse ⁊ chilce.
Þel late ich habbe me biþohte bute me god do milce.
Fele idel þord ich habbe ispeken seðen ich speken cuðe.
⁊ fele ȝeunge dade idon þe me ofðinkeð nuðe.
Alto lome ich habbe igult a þerke ⁊ a þorde.
Alto muchel ic habbe ispend to litel ileid on horde.
Mast al þat me likede ar nu hit me mislicað.
Þe mu[c]hel folȝed his ipil him selfen he bispicað.
Ich mihte habben bet idon hadde ich þo iselðe
Nu ich þolde ac ine mai for elde ⁊ for unhalðe.
Elde me is bistolen on ar ich hit ipiste
Ne mai ich isien bifore me for smeche ne for miste.
Arȝe þe beð to don god to juel al to þriste
More eie stondeð man of man þan him do of criste.
Þe þel ne deþ þe hþile he mai þel ofte hit sal him repen.
Þan alle men sulle ripen þat hie ar sepen.
Do al to gode þat he muȝe ech þe hþile he beð aliue.
Ne lipne noman to muchel to childe ne to þiue.

Þe þe him selfe forȝiet for þive oðer for childe f. 2v
He sal cumen on euel stede bute him god be milde.
Sende god biforen him man þe hþile he mai to heuene
For betre is on almesse biforen þan ben after seuene.
Ne bie þe leuere þan þe self ne þi mæi ne þi mowe
Sot is þe is oðer mannes frend betere þan his owen.
Ne hopie wif to hire were ne were to his wiue
Be for him self afric man þe hþile he beð aliue.
Þis þe him selue biðencheð þe hþile he mot libben
For sone pilleð him forȝiete þe fremde ⁊ þe sibbe.
þe þel ne doð þe hþile he mai ne sal he þan he þolde.
For mani mannes sore ispinc habbeð ofte unholde.
Ne solde noman don a furst ne laten þel to done.
For mani man bih\o/teð þel þat hi forȝieteð sone.
þe man þe þile siker ben to habben godes blisse.
Do þel him self þe hþile he mai þanne haueð hes mid ipisse.

1 Ich] *initial letter* I *is rubricated and enlarged to 22mm so that its tale runs four lines down the margin* 4 jung] *the* j *is long* i *dotted* 14 mu[c]hel] muhel (*scribal error? see* Lines 24, 60, 62 etc.. *where it is* muchel) 19 juel] *the* j *is long* i *dotted* 31 ne] *prec. by* ne *(ditt.) eras.* 33 mot] *diac. above the* o: mót 38 bihoteð] a *subp. with* o *int.*

Þe riche men peneð siker ben þu⸌r⸍ch pallen ⁊ thurh dichen.
He deð his aihte an siker stede þe hit sent to heueriche.
For þar⸌f⸍ ⸌he⸍ ben ofdrad of fure ne of þieue.
Þar ne mai hit him binime þe loðe ne þe lieuve.
Þar ne þarf he habben care of here ne of ȝielde
Þider pe sendeð ⁊ ec bereð to litel ⁊ to selde.
Þider ⸌pe solden⸍ drawen ⁊ don pel ofte ⁊ ilome.
For þar ne sal me us naht binime mid prongpise dome.

f. 3r Þider pe solde ȝierne drawen polde ȝie me ileuen.
For ne mai hit us binime no king ne no syrreue.
Al þat beste þat pe habbeð her þider pe solde sende.
For þar pe mihte finden eft ⁊ habben abuten ende.
Se þe her doð ani god for⸌to⸍ haben godes ore.
Al he hit sal eft finde þar ⁊ hundredfealde more.
Se þe aihte pile holde pel þe hpile hes muȝe pealden.
ȝieue hes for godes luue þanne doð hes pel ihealden.
For ure spinch ⁊ ure tilðe is ofte puned to spinde.
Ac al þat pe ȝieueð for godes luue al pe hit sulen eft finden.
Ne sal þar non euel ben unboht ne god unforȝolden.
Euel pe doð al to muchel ⁊ god lasse þan pe solden.
Se þe mast doð nu to gode ⁊ se last to lothe.
Eiðer to litel ⁊ to muchel hem sal þunche boðe.
Þar me sal ure perkes peiȝen bifore þan heuen kinge.
⁊ ȝieuen us ure perkes lean after ure erninge.
Africh man mid þat he haueð mai bugge heueriche
Þe þe more haueð ⁊ þe þe lasse boðe iliche.
Alse on mid his peni se oþer mid his punde
Þis is þet punderlukeste pare þat ani man funde.
⁊ se þe more ne mai don mid his gode iþanke.
Alse pel se þe þe haued goldes fele manke.
And ofte god can more þanc þan þe him ȝieueð lasse.
Al his perkes ⁊ his peies is milce ⁊ rihtpinesse.

f. 3v Litel loc is gode lef þe cumeð of gode pille
⁊ eðlate muchel ȝieue þan his herte is ille.
Heuene ⁊ erðe he ouer sihð his eien beð ful brihte.
Nis him no þing forholen spo muchel is his mihte.
Ne bie hit no spo derne idon ne on spo þuster nihte.
He pot hpat þencheð ⁊ hpat doð alle quike pihte

41 þurch] r *int.* 42 aihte] *underlined with* goode *int.* (*later hand: possibly 16th-century; responsible for three English glosses in the* Conduct of Life *and more in the homilies*) 43 þarf he] f *and* he *int.; this is only a partial correction as the text should read:* For þarf ne þarf he ben ofdrad 47 pe solden] *int. in the same hand* 53 for⸌to⸍] to *int.* ore] *underlined by glossing hand and* favoor, grace *added to the right-hand margin* 55 holde] a *subp. with* o *int.* 64 lean] *underlined by glossing hand and* dezervinge *added to the right-hand margin* 65 Africh] *underlined but not glossed* 70 manke] *underlined and glossed* manke, mancus; *this is not the same hand as the older glosses (previously noted)* 73 loc] *diacrit. above the* o: lōc 77 ne[2]] *wear, possibly from folding, has made the* n *difficult to read*

Nis louerd spilch is crist ne king spilch ure drihte
Boðe ȝiemeð þe his bien bi daie ⁊ bi nihte.
Heuene ⁊ erðe ⁊ al þat is biloken is in his honden
He doð al þat his pill is apatere ⁊ alonde.
He makeð þe fisses in þe sa þe fueles on þe lofte.
He pit ⁊ pealdeð alle þing ⁊ he sop alle safte.
He is ord abuten ord ⁊ ende abuten ende
He is one afre on eche stede pende þar þu pende.
He is buuen us ⁊ bineðen biforen ⁊ bihinde
Þe godes pille doð aihpare he maiȝ him finde.
Elche rune he hereð ⁊ he pot alle dade
He Þurh sihð elches mannes þanc pi hpat sal us to rade.
Þe þe brekeð godes has ⁊ gulteð spo ilome
Hpat sulle pe seggen oðer don ate muchele dome
Þe þe luueden unriht ⁊ euel lif ladden
Hpat sulle pe seggen oðer don þar ængles beð ofdradde
Hpat sulle pe beren us biforen mid hpan sulle pe iqueme
Þe þe nafre god ne duden þan heuenliche deme.

Þar sulle ben deflen spo fele þat pilleð us forpreien. f. 4ʳ
Nabbeð hie no þing forȝieten of þat hie her iseien.
Al þat hie iseien her hie pilleð cuðen þare
Bute pe haben hit ibet þe hpile pe here paren.
Al hie habbeð on here prite þat pe misduden here.
þeih pe hes ne niseien hie paren ure iferen.
Hpat sullen horlinges don þe spichen ⁊ þe forsporene
Þi spo felebeð icleped spo fepe bed icorene
Þi hpi paren hie biȝiete to hpan paren hie iborene.
Þe sulle ben to deaðe idemd ⁊ afremo forlorene.
Elch man \sal/ þar biclepien him selfen ⁊ ec demen.
Hic oȝen perc ⁊ his þanc to pitnesse he sal temen.
Ne mai him noman alse pell demen ne alse rihte
For non ne cnopeð hine alse pel buten one drihte.
Man pot him self best his perkes ⁊ his pille.
Se þe last pot he seið ofte mast se þit al pot is stille
Nis no pitnesse alse muchel se mannes oȝen hierte
Hpo se seið þat hie beð hol him self pot his smierte.
Elch man sal him selfen demen to deaðe oðer to liue.
Þe pitnesse of his oȝen perc to oðer þan hine sal driue.
Al þat afri man haueð idon seðen he cam to manne
Spo he hit iseie abóc iprite he sal hit þenche þanne.
Ac drihte ne demeð noman after his biginninge
Ac al his lif sal ben teald after his endinge.

81 biloken] *wear, possibly from folding, has made the word, especially the letters* il, *very difficult to read* 92 don] *foll. by eras. of two or three words* ate] *diacrit. above the* a 94 Hpat] H *partially destroyed by cropping: still legible* 95 Hpat] H *partially destroyed by cropping: still legible* 96 Þe] Þ *partially destroyed by cropping: still legible* 107 \sal/] *int.* 108 Hic] *mistake for* His? 118 abóc] *diacrit above* o

f. 4^{v}

Ȝief þe endinge is god al hit is god. ⁊ euel ȝief euel is þe ende.
God ȝieue þat ure ende be god ⁊ ȝieue þat he us lende.
Se man þe nafre nele don god ne nafre god lif lade.
Are deað ⁊ dom cumeð to his dure he maiȝ him sore adrade
Þat he ne muȝe þanne bidden ore for þat itit ilome.
For þi he pis þe bit ⁊ biȝiet ⁊ bet bifore dome.
Þanne þe deað is ate dure pel late he biddeð ore.
Þel late he lateð euel perc þan he hit nemai don nomore.
Senne lat þe ⁊ þu nah him þan þu hit ne miht do no more:
For þi he is sot þe spo abit to habben goddes ore.
Þeih hpeðere þe hit leueð pel for drihte self hit sade.
Elche time sal þe man of þunche his misdade
Oðer raðer oðer later milce he sal imete.
Ac þe þe her naueð ibet muchel he haued to bete
Maniman seið hpo reche pine þe sal habben ende
Ne bidde ich no bet bie ich alesed a domesdai of bende.
Litel þot he \h/þat is pine ⁊ litel he cnopeð
Hpilch hit is þar sople punieð hpu biter pind þar blopeð.
Hadde he ben þar on oðer tpo bare tiden.
Nolde he for almidden eard þe þridde þar abiden.
Þat habbed isaid þe come þanne þit piste mid ipisse.
Þo purðe soreȝe seue ȝier for seuenihte blisse.
⁊ ure blisse þe ende haueð for ende lease pine
Betere is þori þater þan atter imengd mid pine.
Spines brade is pel spete spo is of pilde diere.
Ac al to diere he hit abuið þe ȝiefð þar for his spiere.
Ful þombe mai lihtliche speken of hunger ⁊ of fasten
Spo mai of pine þe not hpat is pine þe sal ilasten.

f. 5^{r}

Hadde [he] fonded sume stunde he polde seggen oðer
Eðlate him pare pif ⁊ child suster ⁊ fader ⁊ broðer.
Al he polde oðerluker don ⁊ oðerluker þenche
Þan he biðohte an helle fur þat no piht ne mai quenche.
Afre he polde her in þo ⁊ in þane punien
Þið þan he mihte helle fur biflen ⁊ bisunien.
Eðlate him pare al pele ⁊ erðeliche blisse
For to þe muchele blisse cume þis murie mid ipisse.
Ich pulle nu cumen eft to þe dome þe ich eop ar of sade.
On þe daie ⁊ on þe dome us helpe crist ⁊ rade
Þar þe muȝen ben sore offerd ⁊ harde us ofdrade.
Þar elch sal al isien him biforen his þord ⁊ ec his dade.
Al sal þar ben þanne cuð þat men luȝen her ⁊ halen.

133 imete.] *foll. by* Ac þ *eras., which begins the next line* 137 hpat] h *int.* is] *prec. by* h *subp.* cnopeð] *foll. by* hpil *eras., which begins the next line* 140 Nolde] *foll. by two letters eras.* 147 Ful] F *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 148 Spo] S *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 149 he] *om.* 153 punien] *foll. by* þið þan he mihte *eras., which begins the next line* 157 Ich] *prec. by* *the figura: ꝑ in the left-hand margin: possible paraph mark? It is unclear if it is in the main scribe's hand* cumen] *foll. by* est *subp. and rewritten as* eft

Al sal þar ben þanne unprien þat men her hudden 7 stalen.
Þe sullen alre manne lif icnopen alse ure oȝen
Þar sullen efninges ben to þe heie 7 to þe loȝe.
Ne sal þeih no man samie þiar ne þarf he him adrade.
Ȝief him her ofþincheð his gult 7 bet his misdade.
For hem ne sameð ne ne grameð þe sulle ben iboreȝe
Ac þoðre habbeð same 7 grame 7 oðer fele soreȝe.
þe dom [s]al ben sone idon ne last hit no piht longe
Ne sal him noman mene þar of strencðe ne of pronge
þo sulle habben hardne dom þe here paren hardde
Þo þe euel hielden preche men 7 euel laȝe arerde.
Elch after þat he haueð idon sal þar ben þanne idemð
Bliðe mai he þanne ben þe god haueð pel iquemd.
Alle þo þe sprunge beð of adam 7 of eue
Alle hie sulle þider cume for soðe pe hit ileued.

Þo þe habbed pel idon after here mihte f. 5v
To heueriche hie sulle fare forð mid ure drihte.
Þo þe deueles perkes habeð idon 7 þar inne beð ifunde
Hie sulle fare forð mid hem in to helle grunde.
Þar hie sulle punien abuten ore 7 ende.
Brecð nafre eft crist helle dure for lesen hem of bende.
Nis no sellich þeih hem be þo 7 þeih hem be uneaðe
Ne sal nafre eft crist þolien deað for lesen hem of deaðe.
Ænes drihten helle brac his frend he ut brohte
Him self he þolede deað for hem pel diere he hes bohte.
Nolde hit moȝe don for mai ne suster broðer
Nolde sune don for fader ne no man for oðer.
Vre alre louerd for his þralles ipined he þas a rode
Ure bendes he unbond 7 bohte us mid his blode.
þe ȝieueð uneaðe for his luue a steche of ure breade
Ne þenche pe naht þar þat sal deme þa quica 7 þe deade.
Muchel luue he us kedde polde pe hit understonde.
Þat ure elderne mi\s/d\u/den pe habeð euel an honde.
Deað cam in þis middenærd þurh ealde deueles onde
7 senne 7 soreȝe 7 ispinch a patere 7 londe.
Vre foremes faderes gult pe abugeð alle
Al his ofsprung after him in harem is biualle
Þurst 7 hunger. chele 7 hete 7 alle unhalðe.
Þurh deað cam in þis middeneard 7 oðer unisalðe.
Nare noman elles dead ne sic ne unsele
Ac mihte libbe afremo ablisse 7 an hale.

169 sal] þal 180 fare] *foll. by one letter eras.* 194 mi\s/d\u/den] s *and* u *int. with* e *subpunc. after* d 195 middenærd] æ *is* a *with small* e *attached to the top of the ascender*

f. 6r

Litel lac is gode lief þe cumeð of gode pille
⁊ eðlate muchel ȝieue þan his herte is ille
Litel hit þuncheð maniman ac muchel pas þe senne
For hpan alle þolieð deað þe comen of here kenne
Here senne ⁊ ec ure oȝen us muȝe sore of þunche
For senne pe libeð alle her in soreȝe ⁊ in spunche.
Seðen god nam spo mukel prache for one misdede
Þe þe spo ofte misdoð pe muȝen us eaðe ofdrade.
Adam ⁊ al his ofspreng for one bare senne.
Þas fele hundred pintre an helle a pine ⁊ unpenne.
Þo þe ladeð here lif mid unrihte ⁊ mid pronge
Bute hit godes milce do hie sulle punie þar longe.
Godes pisdom is pel mulchel ⁊ alsse is his mihte
Ac nis his mihte nopiht lasse ac bi ðer ilke pihte.
More he one maiȝ forȝieue þan alle folc gulte cunne
Self deuel mihte habben milce ȝief he hit bigunne.
Þeþe godes milche secð ipis he mai hes finden
Ac helle king is ore leas pið þo þe he mai binden.
Se ded his pille mast he sal habbe perest mede
His bað sal be pallinde pich his bed barnende glede.
Þerse he doð his gode pines þan his fiendes
God silde alle godes friend pið spo euele friende.
Nafre an helle ine cam ne cumen ich þar ne reche
Þeih ich aches poreldes pele þare mihte feche.
Þeih ich pille seggen eop þat pise men us saden
⁊ boc hit is prite þar me hit mai rade.

f. 6v

Ic pille seggen hit þo þe hit hem self nesten
⁊ parnin hem pið here unfreme ȝief hie me pilleð hlesten.
Vnderstandeð nu to meward eadi men ⁊ arme
Ich pille tellen eop of helle pine ⁊ parnin eop pið harme.
An helle hunger ⁊ þurst euel tpo iferen.
Þos pine þolieð þo þe pare meteniðinges here.
Þar is poning ⁊ pop after ache strate
⟨H⟩ie fareð fram hate [to] chele fram chele to hate.
⟨Þ⟩an hie beð in þe hate chele hem þuncheð blisse
⟨Þ⟩an hie cumeð eft to chele of hate hie habbeð misse.
⟨E⟩iðer doð ⸢hem⸣ þo inoh nabbeð none lisse.
⟨N⟩iten hpeðer hem doð pers to nafre non pisse.
⟨H⟩ie palkeð afre ⁊ secheð reste ac hie hes ne muȝen imeten.
⟨F⟩or þi þe hie nolde þe hpile hie mihten here senne beten.
⟨H⟩ie sec⸢h⸣eð reste þar non nis ac hie hies ne muȝen ifinden.

207 muȝe] *foll. by* repen*canc. by underlining* 213 lif] *foll. by a space but no evidence of eras.* 215 ⁊] *foll. by two or three letters eras.* 225 ne] *foll. by a letter eras.* 230 here] *foll. by a letter eras.* 234 Þos] Þ *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 235 Þar] Þ *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 236 ⟨H⟩ie] *crop.* hate [to] chele] hate chele 237 ⟨Þ⟩an] *crop.* 238 ⟨Þ⟩an] *crop.* 239 ⟨E⟩iðer] *crop.* ⸢hem⸣] *int.* 240 ⟨N⟩iten] *crop.* 241 ⟨H⟩ie] *crop.* 242 ⟨F⟩or] *crop.* 243 ⟨H⟩ie] *crop.* sec⸢h⸣eð] h *int.*

⟨A⟩c palkeð peri up ⁊ dun se pater doð mid pinde
⟨Þ⟩at beð þo þe paren her an þanc unstedefaste
⟨⁊⟩ þo þe gode biheten aihte ⁊ hit him ilaste.
⟨⁊⟩ þo þe god perc bigunnen ⁊ ful endin hit nolden.
⟨N⟩u paren her ⁊ nu þar ⁊ nesten hpat he polden
⟨Þ⟩ar is pich þat afre palleð þar sulle punien inne
⟨Þ⟩o þe ladeð here lif on perre ⁊ an unpinne.
⟨Þ⟩ar is fur þis hundredfeald hatere þan be ure
⟨N⟩e mai hit quenche salt pater ne auene stream ne sture.
⟨Þ⟩is is þat fur þat afre barneð ne mai no piht quenche.
⟨Þ⟩ar inne beð þe pas to lef preche men to spenche.

Þo þe spikele men ⁊ ful of euele prenchen. f. 7ʳ
⁊ þo þe mihten euel don ⁊ lief hit pas to þenchen.
Þe luueden rauing ⁊ stale hordom ⁊ druken
⁊ an defles perkes bliðeliche spunken.
Þo þe paren spo lease men þat mes ne mihte leuen
Medȝierne domes men ⁊ p\r/onpise reuen.
Þo þe oðer mannes pif pas lief her oȝen eðlate
⁊ þo þe sunegeden muchel on druken ⁊ on ate.
Þe preche men binomen here aihte ⁊ leide his on horde.
Þe litel lete of godes bode ⁊ of godes porde.
⁊ þe his oȝen nolde ȝieue þar he iseih þe niede
Ne nolde ihere godes men þan he sat at his biede.
Þo þe pas oðer mannes þing leuere þan hit solde.
⁊ paren alto gradi of silver ⁊ of golde.
Þo þe untrepnesse deden þan þe he solden ben holde.
⁊ leten al þat hie solden don ⁊ deden þat hie polden.
Þo þe paren ȝietceres of þis pereldes aihte
⁊ dude al þat þe loðe gost hem tihte to ⁊ taihte.
⁊ al \þo/ þe ani pise deuel iquemde
Þo beð mid hem in helle fordon ⁊ demde.
Bute þo þe ofðuhte sore here misdade
⁊ Gunne here gultes bete ⁊ betere lif lade.
Þar beð naddren ⁊ snaken. eueten ⁊ fruden
Þe tereð ⁊ freteð þo euele spiken þe niðfule and þe prude
Nafre sunne þar ne sineð ne mone ne storre.
Þar is muchel godes hete ⁊ muchel godes oerre.

Afre þar is euel smech þiesternesse ⁊ eie f. 7ᵛ
Nis þar nafre oðer liht þan þe sparte leie.
Þar ligeð ateliche fiend in stronge raketeie
Þat beð þo þe paren mid god angles spiðe heie.

244 ⟨A⟩c] *crop.* 245 ⟨Þ⟩at] *crop.* 246 ⟨⁊⟩] *crop.* 247 ⟨⁊⟩] *crop.* 248 ⟨N⟩u] *crop.* nesten] *written mesten with a minim subpunc.* 249 ⟨Þ⟩ar] *crop.* 250 ⟨Þ⟩o] *crop.* ⁊] *foll. by a letter eras.* 251⟨Þ⟩ar] *crop.* 252 ⟨N⟩e] *crop.* 253 ⟨Þ⟩is] *crop.* 254 ⟨Þ⟩ar] *crop.* 260 p\r/onpise] r *int.* 261 pas] *foll. by two letters eras.* 263 men] *foll. by a letter eras.* 273 \þo/] *int.* 284 heie] h *written over another letter*

Þat beð ateliche fiend ⁊ eiseliche pihten
Þo sulle þe preche sople isien þe sinegeden þurh sihte
Þar is se loðe sathanas ⁊ belzebub se ealde
Eaðe he muȝen ben sore ofdrad þe sullen hes bihealde.
Ne mai non herte hit þenche ne tunge hit ne mai telle
Hpu muchele pine ne hpu fele senden in helle
Of þo pine þe þar bieð nelle ich eop naht lie
Nis hit bute gamen ⁊ glie of þat man mai here drie.
⁊ ȝiet ne doð hem naht alse po in þe loðe bende
Spo þat he piten þat here pine sal nafre habben ende
Þar beð þe haðene men þe paren laȝe lease
Þe nes naht of godes bode ne of godes hease.
Euele cristene men hie beð here iferen
Þo þe here cristendom euele hielden here.
⁊ ȝiet he beð aperse stede aniðer helle grunde
Ne sullen nafre cumen ut for peni ne for punde.
Ne mai hem noðer helpe þar ibede ne almesse
For naht solden bidde þar ore ne forȝieuenesse.
Silde him elch man þe phile he mai pið þos helle pine.
⟨⁊⟩ parnie his frend þar pið spo ich habbe ido mine.
⟨Þ⟩o þe silde hem ne cumen ich hem pille tache
⟨I⟩ch can ben aiðer ȝief isal lichame ⁊ sople lache.

f. 8r

Late pe þat god forbet alle mankenne
⁊ do pe þat he us hat ⁊ silde pe us pid senne.
Luue pe god mid ure herte ⁊ mid al ure mihte
⁊ ure emcristen alse us self spo us tached drihte.
Al þat me radeð ⁊ singed bifore godes borde
Al hit hangeð ⁊ halt bi þese tpam porde
Alle gode[s] laȝes hie fulleð þe nepe ⁊ þe ealde
Þeþe þos tpo luues halt ⁊ pile hes pel healde.
Ac hie bieð pel arefeð heald spo ofte pe gul\t/eð alle
For hit is strong te stonde longe ⁊ liht hit is to falle.
Ac drihte crist ȝeue us strengðe stonde þat pe moten
⁊ of alle ure gultes ȝieue us cume bote.
Þe pilnieð after pereldes pele þe longe ne mai ilaste
⁊ legeð mast al ure spinc on þing unstedefast.
Spunke for godes luue half þat pe doð for eihte.
Nare pe naht spo ofte bicherd ne spo euele bikeihte
Ȝief pe serueden god half þat pe doð for erminges
Þe mihten habben more an heuene þa ȝierles ⁊ kinges
Ne muȝe pe perien naðer ne pið þurst ne pið hunger

292 mai] *foll. by the letter* g *eras.* 300 Ne] N *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* ut] *diacrit. above* u 301 Ne] N *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 302 For] F *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 303 Silde] S *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 304 ⟨⁊⟩] *crop.* 305 ⟨Þ⟩o] *crop.* 306 ⟨I⟩ch] *crop.* 307 god] *prec. by the letter* þ *eras.* 313 gode[s]] godel 315 gul\t/eð] d *subpunc. after* l *with* t *int.*

Ne pid elde ne pið deað þe elder ne þe ȝeunger
Ac þar nis hunger ne þurst. deað ne unhalðe ne elde.
Of þesse riche þe þencheð to ofte of þare alto selde.
Þe solden biþenchen us þel ofte ⁊ ilom[e]
Hpat þe beð to hpan þe sullen ⁊ of hpan þe come.
Hpu litle hpile þe bieð her hpu longe elles hpare
Hpat þe muȝen habben her ⁊ hpat þe findeð þare.

Ȝief paren pise men þus þe solden þenchen f. 8v
Bute þe purðen us ipar þis pereld us pile drenchen
Mast alle men hit ȝieueð drinken of on euele senche
⟨H⟩e sal him cunnen silde wel ȝief hit him nele screnche.
Mid al mihtin godes luue ute þe us biperien
⟨Þ⟩ið þesses preches poreldes luue þat hit ne muȝe us derien.
Mid almesse. mid fasten ⁊ mid ibeden perie þe us pid senne.
Mid þo papne þe god haued ȝieue alle man kenne.
⟨L⟩ate þe þe brode strate ⁊ þane peȝ bene
⟨Þ⟩e lat þe nieðe dal to helle of manne me mai pene.
⟨G⟩o þe þane narepe pað ⁊ þene pei grene
⟨Þ⟩ar forð fareð þel litel folc ⁊ eche is fair ⁊ isene
⟨þ⟩e brode strate is ure pil. þe is loð te læte
⟨Þ⟩o þe folȝeð here ipil hie fareð bi þare strate.
⟨H⟩ie muȝen lihtliche cumen mid þare niðer helde
⟨Þ⟩urh one godelease pude to one bare felde
⟨Þ⟩a narepe pað is godes has. þar forð fareð þel feape
⟨Þ⟩at beð þo þe hem sildeð ȝierne pið achen unðeape.
⟨Þ⟩os goð uneaðe aȝien þe cliue ⁊ aȝien þe heie hulle
⟨Þ⟩os leten al here ipil for godes luue to fulle.
⟨G⟩o þe alle þane þei for he us pile bringe
Mid þo feape faire men bifore þe heuen kinge
⟨Þ⟩ar is alre blisse mast mid angles songe.
⟨Þ⟩e is a þusend pintre þar ne þuncheð hit him naht longe.

Þe last haueð blisse he haueð sspo muchel þat he ne bit no more f. 9r
Þe þat blisse forgoð hit sal him repen sore.
Ne mai non euel ne non pane ben in godes riche
Þeih þar ben puniinges fele elch oðer uniliche
Sume þar habbeð lasse blisse ⁊ sume þar habbeð more
Elch after þat he dude her after þane þe spanc sore

326 ne pid elde] ne pid elde ne pið elde (*ditt.*) 329 ilome] ilomo 336 ⟨H⟩e] *crop.* 337 Mid] M *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* ute] *diacrit. above* u 338 ⟨Þ⟩ið] *crop.* 339 Mid] M *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 340 Mid] M *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 341 ⟨L⟩ate] *crop.* bene] *foll. by five words, in a smaller script, eras.* 342 ⟨Þ⟩e] *crop.* 343 ⟨G⟩o] *crop.* 344 ⟨Þ⟩ar] *crop.* 345 ⟨Þ⟩e] *crop.* 346 ⟨Þ⟩o] *crop.* 347 ⟨H⟩ie] *crop.* 348 ⟨Þ⟩urh] *crop.* 349 ⟨Þ⟩a] *crop.* 350 ⟨Þ⟩at] *crop.* 351 ⟨Þ⟩os] *crop.* uneaðe] *foll. by* cliue *canc. by underlining* 352 ⟨Þ⟩os] *crop.* 353 ⟨G⟩o] *crop.* 354 Mid] M *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 355 ⟨Þ⟩ar] *crop.* 356 ⟨Þ⟩e] *crop.* *written at the bottom of the folio in a different hand is:* ⟨ ⟩emen kastinice ⁊ a sarum suplicauit amicus meus adikici 357 sspo] *prec. by the letters* bli *eras.; the scribe fails to ersase the final* s *and therefore* spo *is* sspo

Ne sal þar ben bread ne þin ne oðer kennes este
God one sal ben ache lif ⁊ blisse ⁊ ache reste.
Ne sal þar ben foh ne grai ne cunin ne ermine
Ne aquerne ne metheschele ne beuer ne sabeline.
Ne sal þar ben naðer scat ne srud ne pereldes þele none.
Al þe blisse þe me us bihat al hit sal ben god one
Ne mai no blisse ben alse muchel se is godes sihte.
He is soð sunne ⁊ briht ⁊ dai abute nihte.
He is aches godes ful nis him no þiht uten.
Nones godes hem nis þane þe þunieð him abuten.
Þar is þele abuten þane ⁊ reste abuten spunche.
Þe muȝen ⁊ nelleð þider cume hit hem mai ofþunche.
Þar is blisse abuten treiȝe ⁊ lif abuten deaðe
Þo þe afre sulle þunie þar bliðe hie muȝe ben eaðe.
Þar is ȝieuð abuten elde ⁊ hale abuten unhalðe
Nis þar sareȝe ne sor non ne nafre unisalðe.
Þar me drihte self isien spo se is mid ipisse
He one mai ⁊ sal al ben angles ⁊ manne blisse.

f. 9ᵛ

⁊ þeih ne bed here eien naht alle iliche brihte
Hi nabbeð naht iliche muchel alle of godes lihte
On þesse liue he naren naht alle of ore mihte
Ne þar ne sullen habben god. alle bi one þihte.
Þo sullen more of him isien þe luueden hine more
⁊ more icnopen ⁊ ec þiten his mihte ⁊ his ore
On him hie sulle finden al þat man mai to hleste
⟨O⟩n him he sullen ec isien al þat hie ar nesten.
⟨C⟩rist sal one bien inoȝh all his derlinges.
⟨Þ⟩e one is muche more ⁊ betere þan alle oðer þinges.
⟨I⟩noh he haueð þe hine haueð þe alle þing þealdeð.
⟨O⟩f him to isiene nis non sæd spo fair he is to bihelden
⟨G⟩od is spo mere ⁊ spo muchel in his godcunnesse
⟨Þ⟩at al þat elles pas ⁊ is is fele perse ⁊ lasse.
⟨N⟩e mai hit nafre noman oðer seggen mid ipisse
⟨H⟩þu muchele murihðe habbeð þo þe beð in godes blisse
⟨T⟩o þare blisse us bringe god þe rixleð abuten ende.
⟨Þ⟩ane he ure sowle unbint of lichamliche bende
⟨C⟩rist ȝieue us laden her spilch lif ⁊ habben her spilch ende.
⟨Þ⟩at pe moten þider cumen þane pe henne pende.
A M E N

368 sal] *foll. by a letter eras.* 382 Hi] H *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 383 On] O *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 384 Ne] N *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 385 Þo] Þ *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 387 On] O *partially destroyed by crop.: still legible* 388 ⟨O⟩n] *crop.* 389 ⟨C⟩rist] *crop.* 390 ⟨Þ⟩e] *crop.* 391 ⟨I⟩noh] *crop.* 392 ⟨O⟩f] *crop.* 393 ⟨G⟩od] *crop.* 394 ⟨Þ⟩at] *crop.* 395 ⟨N⟩e] *crop.* 396 ⟨H⟩þu] *crop.* 397 ⟨T⟩o] *crop.* 398 ⟨Þ⟩ane] *crop.* 399 ⟨C⟩rist] *crop.* 400 ⟨Þ⟩at] *crop.* 401 **A M E N**] *large display capitals, touched red, with gaps left between the letters*

London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487, folios 59^{v}-65^{r}

Transcription of London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487, fols. 59v-65r

MS *Pointing: The text of L is more heavily punctuated than any of the other versions of the Conduct of Life. This is because the verse-sermon has been written out as prose, in order to maximise the writing space, and, therefore, necessitates such divisions that might normally, in the other versions of the text, be made apparent through the mise-en-page. The original line division has been reproduced here in an attempt to provide a better understanding of its original context, whereas, it has been changed elsewhere in this edition (pp.) for ease of reading. The scribe of L uses both punctus and punctus elevatus. These occurrences are represented in the following trancription (pp.) but will not be pointed out in these notes.*

Capitalization is sporadic; usually occurring, but not always, after a punctus. Capitalization will be indicated in the text but not in the accompanying notes.

Abbreviations are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:

Throughout the text **þ** *has been expanded to* **þet** *at* lines: 7, 11, 22 (x2), 23, 28, 33, 36, 45, 58, 59 (x2), 67, 76, 79 (x2), 84, 92, 93, 102, 109, 110, 111, 112, 117, 127, 135, 136, 137 (x2), 140 (x2), 144, 148, 156[2], 171, 173, 175, 181, 194, 214, 216, 250, 268, 277, 279, 280, 287, 289, 292, 295, 299[2] and 301. *There are only four occasions where* **þet** *is written out, and they are at* lines: 63, 130, 156[1] and 299[1].

iq\e/ðen expanded to **iqueðen**: line 10; **c\i/ste** expanded to **criste**: lines 20, 91, 176 and 205; **eft** expanded to **efter**: lines 29, 75, 133 and 259; **bet\e/** expanded to **betre**: line 34; **.M.** expanded to **Mon**: lines 36, 44, 119, 121, 123, 128, 130, 133, 137 and 146; **.M.** expanded to **Men**: line 44; **þene** expanded to **þenne**: line 71; **þuchen** expanded to **þunchen**: line 73; **sune** expanded to **sunne**: lines 86/87, 225 and 228; **q\i/ke** expanded to **quike**: lines 90 and 214; **laud** expanded to **laured**: lines 91

and 201; **scule** expanded to **sculen**: lines 117 and 201; **bideme** expanded to **bidemen**: line 119; **mo ne** expanded to **monne**: line 131; **sume** expanded to **summe**: line 162; **þenche** expanded to **þenchen**: line 168; **adrede** expanded to **adreden**: line 177; **me** expanded to **men**: line 179; **þane** expanded to **þanne**: line 180; euenigges expanded to **eueningges**: line 183; **frod** expanded to **frond**: line 206; **sust** expanded to **suster**: line 209; **undstode** expanded to **understonde**: line 215; **pate** expanded to **pater(e)**: lines 218 and 270; **þucheð** expanded to **þuncheð**: line 224/225; **sprug** expanded to **sprung**: line 232; **habbe** expanded to **habben**: line 240; **ifiden** expanded to **ifinden**: line 242; **bernide** is expanded to **berninde**: line 245; **vndstondeð** expanded to **vndersondeð**: line 254/255; **q\e/nchen** expanded to **quenchen**: line 278; **quechen** expanded to **quenchen**: line 280/281; **ho** expanded to **hom**: line 287; **progpise** expanded to **prongpise**: line 288; **mones** expanded to **monnes**: lines 289 and 295.

Rubrication is regularly employed throughout this text, including the opening pair of couplets and individual words and phrases later in the text. These are indicated through a bold font in the transcription.

The scribe regularly uses an oblique stroke between the two parts of the same word when split across lines. Instances of this are indicated in the text by the symbol ´; where it is not present and is warranted, the symbol [-] *has been inserted into the text. Neither will be commented on in the notes that follow.*

Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

It is generally agreed that this text has a WML dialect with some features of the "AB" language, which are evident in the anaylsis that follows, with M. L. Samuels localizing it to the

border of North Herefordshire and Shropshire[840] and Laing (LAEME), due to the close affinties in language it has with that of the Worcester Tremulous Scribe and the other elements in common with the "AB" language, placing it in North West Worcestershire.[841]

The runic letter <þ> (*þorn*) is written in initial position in all instances in L (§ 2.2): **þan**, **þah**, **þingþ** etc., except for **ðe** (§ 3.3). In medial position L mostly writes <ð> (*eth*): **iqueðen**, **soððen**, **kuðe** etc. (§ 4.2). However, there is also regular writings of <þ> (often before *final –e*) in: **iselþe**, **un-helþe**, **binoþen** etc. (§ 4.2). In final position L also mostly writes <ð>: **mislekeð**, **fulieð**, **bispikeð** etc. with <þ> less regularly found: **þingþ**, **deþ**, **doþ** etc. (§ 4.2). The interchangeabilty of <þ> and <ð> is demonstrated in **baþ** and **bað** which appear in the same line (Ω229). L writes <th> (§ 5) in **sathanas**, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 *Remark*) and in **þith** and **lathed** (here it represents <t>: see § 5). In L <þ> is written where <h> might normally be expected on one occasion in **þurþ;** this might be a scribal error for *ȝ* or, alternatively, it is possible that this is a genuine varant reading of this word (see § 6.3). The graph <d> is written for <ð> on three occasions, in: **cud**, **uneade** and **bernd** (§ 7.2) and conversely, <ð> is mistakenly written for <d> in **hefð** (§ 7.7). There are also rare occurances of the dental stop /t/ written for <ð>/<þ> in low stress positions (§ 8 and § 8.1): **þinchet**, **hauet**, **seit**, **et lete** and **þunchet** and, on one occasion, assimilation of <þ> (§ 8 and § 8.1) in **attere**.

The runic letter <ƿ> (wynn) is retained throughout L with only one example of <w> (§ 11.1 and § 11.3) found in **swicen**. L writes the Tironian nota <⁊> (§ 13.1)with **and** being written on only three occasions (§ 13.3).

Insular *ȝ* is retained in L alongside Caroline *g* (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): **gromeð**, **grunde**, **glede** etc.and before the OE back-

[840] Hill 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p.108.
[841] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.

vowels *a, o, u* (§ 42.2): **god**, **gulte**, **golde** etc. and by levelling in (**bi**)**ginnigge** and **gate** (§ 42.3). The movement to <w> is not present in L, which retains <ȝ> for the fricative /ɣ/ (§ 43.4) in **maȝe**, **aȝen**, **draȝen** etc. and <h> in **ahen** (§ 43.5) – a feature of the AB dialect. L preserves <ȝ > for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): **ȝung**, **ȝet**, **ȝunge** etc. but writes <g> in **Giue** (see § 45.2 and *Comment*) Initial <ȝ> is retained before *i* in **ȝef/ȝefe/ȝif** (§ 45.4) but writes <g> in **Gif** (see *Comment* to (§ 45.4). L demonstrates transition to a palatal (§ 47ff) in **peien** and **forpreien** with <ȝ> retained in **eȝen**, **niseȝen** and **iseȝen** (the writing of <ȝ> in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound. See § 47.3). The continuation of the OE movement *iġ > i* (§ 48) in **eni**, **moni** and **edi** is further demonstrated in L but <g> is written in **anige**. Palatal ȝ /j/ is lost before *d* (§ 49)in **sede** but is more regularly vocalized to /i/ in **seide**, **iseid** and **seiden** – a probable Anglian feature (§ 49.2). Late OE /dʒ/, written <cȝ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in **bugge** and **seggen** but <ȝ> in **abuȝeð** (§ 50). The OE group nȝ /ŋg/ is written <ng> (§ 51, § 51.4 and § 51.7): **longe**, **erninge**, **engles**, **tening** etc. with devoicing to /ŋ/ before <d> in **meind** (§ 51.5) and omission of <n> in **biginigge** (§ 51.7).

In initial position /k/ is written as <k> before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in **king** and **kuðe** but it is <c> in **cudde** and **cunne** . Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is written <c> in **cunne**, **cumen/come**(**n**), **cum/com** etc. but <k> is found in **kare**, **kon**, **kuðe** and **kumeð**. Before <n> (§ 18) it is <k> in **knauð** and (**i**)**knaupen** but before other consonants (§ 19) it is always <c> in (**i**)**clepede**, (**bi**)**clepie**, and **criste**. L writes <qu> (§. 20) for OE *cw* in **iqueðen**, **quike**, **quenchen** etc. L writes <k> in medial position for OE velar *c* thoughout the text: (§. 21 and §. 21.2): **speke**(**n**), **perke**, **likede** etc. with only one occurance of <c> (§. 22 and §. 22.2) found in **swicen**. However, <c> is retained in final position (§. 23 and §. 23.2): **þonc**, **lac**, **perc** etc. with no evidence of <k>. L writes <ch> (§. 25 and §. 25.2) in both **perch** and **perche** as well as in **ach**. The writing of <ch> in

ach and <h> in **ah** demonstrate a tranistion to the fricative /ax/ (§. 26 and §. 26.1) – a feature it shares with J and that is associated with the OE Anglian dialect.

The regular form of /tʃ/ in L is <ch> (§. 27, §. 28.2, §. 29.2 and §. 30.2): **child**(**e**), **chep**, **muchel**(**e**), **eche**, **ich**, **spich** etc and in **þunchen** (§. 32 and §. 32.5) and **þenchen** (§. 32 and §. 32.6) etc. with <c> /tʃ/ (§. 31 and §. 31.2) written once in **hpice**, however,the occasional writing of <c> in **sullic** and (**i**)**spinc** are possible variants with /k/ (§. 31.2). In addition, L also demonstrates palatalization in the variants **þingþ** and **þingchþ** (§. 32.6) where **þincþ** (§. 32.1 and §. 32.7) is likely to be a variant with /k/ along with **þenke** and **þenkeð** (§. 32.1 and §. 32.9). L also writes <k> in **smike** and **hpilke** where palatal /tʃ/ might have been expected (§. 33 and §. 33.2).

L mostly writes <sc> (§. 35.2) for /ʃ/ (§. 34) in initial position: **scal**, **scop**, **sceafte** etc. with <s> (§. 36.2) written in **solde**, (**bi**) **sunien** and **sal** and <sch> (§. 37.1) written in **schal**. . In medial position /ʃ/ is <ss> in **fisses** (§. 38) and in final position <sc> in **uersc** (§. 39). OE [ts] is always written <c> in **milce** (§. 41).

L always writes OE unvoiced [f] as <f> in initial position in **ful**, (**bi**) **fealt**, **fole** (§ 58 and § 58.5) etc., in final position in **lif**, **of**, **hine solf** (§ 58.6) etc. and in medial position where it is adjacent to one unvoiced sound: **oft/ofte**, **efter**, **lifte** (§ 58.6) etc. However, voicing is regularly demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.7) through the writing of <u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in **aliue**, **piue**, **him-solue** etc. with some instances of <f> still retained: **bifore**(**n**), **ufele/vfel**, **ȝefe** and **efre** etc. The writing of <f> remains before *d* in **hefde**(**n**) (§58.8).

In L OE *a* in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): **habbe**, **faren**, **baþien** etc. but before a nasal there is evidence of West Midland /ɔ/, written <o> (§ 60 and § 60.2) in **mon**, **moni**, **þonke** etc. alongside a limited writing of <a> in **þanke**, **þanne** and **manke**. Before a lengthening group,

OE *a* is mostly <o> (§ 61 and §61.2): **longe**, **pronge**, **honde** etc. but <a> in **prange** and **prangepise**. L mostly writes WML <e> for OE *æ* with a mixture of <a> (§ 63 and § 63.2): **hefde**, **efþ**, **elmesse** etc. with **habbe/abbe**, **pater/patere**, **hpat**, **fader** and **baþ**. OE *e* is almost always <e> in L (§ 64 and § 64.4): **beren**, **ende**, **strengþe** etc. with <ei> in meind. The writing of <u> in **sullic** is a result of *WS syllic*. The dominant reading for OE *o* in L is <o> (§ 65.1 and § 65.4): **biforen**, **borde**, **nolden** etc., however, the writing of <a>, a feature of the AB dialect (§ 65.2), is regularly found in **nalde** and **palde**. OE *i* is mostly <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.7) in **biden**, **child/childe**, **finde(n)** etc. with <e> written once only in **þerde** (§ 66.7 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to *ę̀*) and occasional <u> in **pule, pulle**, **pulleð** (see § 66.4 for the influence of *w*) and **nute** and **nusten** (a probable feature of the AB dialect see § 66.8). For OE *y,* L has mostly <u> (§ 67ff and § 67.7), a feature of WML texts: **dude**, **gulte**, **muchel** etc. with regular writings of <i> also found: **þingþ**, **afirst**, **king** etc. and <e> only twice in **dede** and (**vn**)**net**. OE *y* (§ 67 and § 67.8) is, once again, mostly <u> in **lutel**, **ihud**, **fur(e)**, **cuðe** and **kudde**; with <i> written in **litel/litle** and **hpi**. L almost always retains <u> for OE *u* (§ 68 and § 68.2) throughout the text: **cume(n)**, **punien**, **grunde** etc except in two instances of **come** where the transition to <o> is demonstrated.

L writes <a> for OE *ā*, a feature of the AB dialect, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.5): **lare**, **ane**, **nan** etc. with <o> only present in **pori.** In L OE *ǣ1* is written <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): **dede**, **rede**, **adrede** etc. with <a> (§ 75.3) written once only in **latheð** (for OE *þær* see § 77ff). OE *ǣ2* is nearly always written as <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) **mest**, **un-helþe**, **lest** etc. with <a> (§ 79.7) only present on one occasion in **anige** (for *ǣlc, elc* and *ylc* see § 81ff). OE *ē* is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.2): **he**, **deþ/deð**, **iquemen** etc . OE *ī* is always <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.4): **mi**, **þriste**, **hpile** etc. OE *ō* is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.2): **to**, **dom(e)**, **boke(n)** etc. OE *u* is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.1): **nu**, **ure/vre/hure**, **þu** etc.

In L OE *ea* (§ 86 and §87ff) before *r* (§ 88.5) is regularly <e> (§ 88.1 and § 88.5ff), a likely feature of the AB dialect: **erȝe** and **þerf**, with <a> written in **arme**; before *rd* (§ 88.6) in (**midden**)**erd**(**e**), **herd**e and **hernde**; before *rn* (§ 88.7) in **erninge** and **pernin**, with <a> in **parni.** The *i*-umaut of *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <e> (§ 89.5) in **derne** but <i>, a likely SWM form, in **smirte** (§ 89.5). OE *ea* before *l* (Anglian *a*), without lengthening, is nearly always <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.5): **al** and **alle**, **palle**, **salt** etc. with <ea> written once in **bi-fealt** (see § 90.3); before *ld* it is mostly written as <a> (§ 91.1, § 91.2 and § 91.4): **paldeð**, **ald**, **falde** etc. with <e> written in **pelde**(**n**). For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *l* combinations (Angl. mutation of *a*) L has <e> in **elde** and <a> in **alder** (§ 92ff and § 92.5). OE *ea* before *h* combinations is <e> (§ 87.3, § 93.1 and § 93.4) in **isech**. The *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *h*-combinations is always <i> in **mihte**(**n**)/**michte** and **nihte** (§ 94.1 and § 94.3: for the writing of <a> in **mahte** see § 94.1 *Comment*).

For OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.4) L writes mostly smoothed <e> in **perke/perch**, **perkes** and **herte** with <o> in **horte**. The *wur* group (§ 97 and § 97.4) is <u> in **purð**, **purðe** and for the *i*-umlaut of *eo* it is <u> in **purst** and **purs** (see note to § 97.4). OE *eo* before *l*-combinations is <o> (Angl. § 98ff and §98.5) in **solf/solue**. OE *eo* before *ht* is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.3) in **rihtpisnesse**, **unriht**, **rihte** and **bricht**(**e**) and <i> for the *i*-umlaut (§ 100ff and § 100.5) in **ouer-sich** and **þurh-scihð**. OE – WS *eom* is **em** (SW form § 101). OE *eo* (*a*-umlaut of *e*) is regularly WML <o> (§ 102.3 and § 103.2) in **fole**, **brokeð** and **unfrome** alongside <e> in **fele** and **pele**. OE *eo* (*u*-umaut of *e*) is regularly WML <o> (§ 102.3 and § 104.2) in **houen**(**e**) and **porld**(**es**) alongside <e> in **heuen** with <u> written under the influence of *w* in **suster.** The velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105ff) is regularly written as <o> (WML and SW form) in L (§ 105.5): **soððen**, **souene**, **binoþen** etc, with <u> written in **suððen** (from lWS *syððan,* see § 105.3) alongside <e> in **here**, **iclepede** and **biclepie** and <i> in (**be**)**nimen** and **quike**.

In L OE *ēa* (§ 106ff and § 106.4) is mostly <e>: **ec**, **chep**, **eðe** etc., with <ea> written in **uneade** and **deaþe** (both of these instances of <ea> are found in rhyming position and might reflect a feature of the text being copied). The *i*-umlaut of *ēa* (§ 107.1 and § 107.3) is always <e> in **ileue(n)**, **alesed**, **iheren** etc. OE *ēo* (§ 108ff and § 108.4) is mostly a mixture of <eo> and <o>, forms associated with the WML and the South (§ 108.1): **bon/bo**, **son**, **frond** etc alongside **beo**, **seon**, **freond** etc. with <i> in **bið** and <e> in **sec** and **tening**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109 ff) is mainly <o> (§ 109.5), WML and Southern form (§ 109.1 and § 108) in **frond**, **dore**, **node** and **þostre**, with <e> in **þestre**.

In L OE *ea* after *sc* (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.3) is <a> in **schal/scal** and **scameþ**, with <e> in **sceft** and <o> in **scome**. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* after *c* (§ 113.3) L writes <e> (see § 113.1) in **chele**. OE *ēa* after *g* (§ 114) is <e> in **ȝer**. For OE *ie* after *g* (§ 116.2) L nearly always writes <e> (Anglian § 115.1): **forȝet**, **ȝefe**, **ȝelde** etc. Similarly, for OE *ɪe* after *g* L writes <e> in **ȝet** (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE *ie* after *sc* (§ 118.3) L writes <i> in **scilde**. OE *eo* after *ġ* (§ 119.1 and §120.2) is <u> in **ȝung** and **ȝunge.** OE *eo* after *sc* (§ 121.2) is written as either <u> in **sculen/scule** and **sculden** or <o> in **solde** and **sop**.

OE *æ* + *ʒ* /j/ is nearly always <ei> (WM § 122.1) in L (§ 122.3) in **mei**, **seið/seit**, **bideiþ** and **dei**, with <ai> written on rare occasions in **mai.** LWS *sǣde* / Anglian *sægde* (§ 123 and §123.2) is mostly <ei> in **seide(n)** with <e> once in **sede**. OE *ǣ₁* (Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.2) is <ei> in **mei**, with <eȝ> in **iseȝen** and **niseȝen**. OE *ǣ₂* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.2) is <ei> in **eiðer**. OE *e* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.3) is <ei> in **peien** with <eȝ> in **peȝes**. OE *ē* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.2) is <ei> in **forpreien**. OE *ēa* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.2) is <eȝ> in **eȝen**. OE *ā* + *h (g)* (§ 132.1 and § 132.2) is <ah> in **ahte** and <ach> in **achten**. OE *ǣ₂* + *h* (§ 132.1 and § 133.2) is <e> before *ch* in **echte** and <a> before *ch* in **tachte**. OE *ō* + *h* (§ 134.1 and § 134.3) is always <o> in **unbocht**, **biþoht**, **brohte** etc. OE *a* + /ɣ/ (§ 136.1 and § 136.3) is <aȝ> in **laȝe** and **draȝen**. OE *ā* + /ɣ/

(§ 137.1 and § 137.3) is <a> (a feature of the AB dialect, see § 69) before <ȝ> in **maȝe** and **aȝen** and before <h> in **ahen**. OE *ā* + *w* (§ 138.1 and § 138.3) is regularly <a> (a feature of the AB dialect, see § 69) before *w* in **mapen** and **blapeð** and in the combination <au> in **iknaupen**, **knauð/cnauð** and **saule**. OE *ēo* + *w* (§ 139.1 and § 139.3) is <o> (WM form cf. § 108.1) before *w* in **ropen**, **sopen**; the *i*-umlaut is <o> in **untropnesse**. OE *ēa* + *w* (§ 140.1 and § 140.2) is <ea> on two occasions in **feape** and <e> once in **fepe**. OE *ēa* + *w* (§ 140.1 and § 140.3) is <a> in **scapeð**.

ich em nu alder þene ich þes apintre ⁊ f. 59ᵛ
a lare. Ich þelde mare þene ich dede mi
[þit] ahte bon mare. Þel longe ich habbe child
ibon a þorde ⁊ a dede þa⸗h/ ich bo a þintre ald to
ȝung ich em on rede. Vnnet lif ich habbe
iled. ⁊ ȝet me þingþ ilede. þenne ich me bi þen/
che þel ful sare ich me adrede. mest al þet ich ha[-]
bbe idon bi fealt to child hade. þel late ich abbe
me bi þocht :/ bute God me nu rede. Fole idel þord
ich habbe iqueðen soððen ich speke kuðe. Fole ȝun/
ge dede idon :/ þe me of þinchet nuðe. Mest al þet
me likede er nu :/ hit me mislekeð. þa muchel
fulieð his pil :/ hine solf he bispikeð. Ich mihte
habbe bet idon. hefde ich þe iselþe. Nu ich þalde
ah ich ne mei :/ for elde ⁊ for un helþe. Elde me
is bistolen on. er ich hit þiste. ne michte ich
seon bi fore me. for smike ne for miste. Erȝe
þe beoð to done god. ⁊ to ufele al to þriste. Ma/
re eie stondeð men of monne þanne hom do
of criste. þe þel ne doð þe hþile þe ho muȝen. þel
oft hit schal ropen :/ þenne ȝe mapen sculen
⁊ repen þet ho er sopen. Do he to gode þet he mu/
ȝe þe hþile þet he bo aliue. ne lipnie na mon to

muchel to childe ne to þiue. þe him solue f. 60ʳ
forȝet for þiue ne for childe :/ he scal cu/
men in uuel stude bute him God bo mil[-]
de **Sendeð** sum god bi foren eoþ. þe hþile
þet ȝe muȝen to houene. for betere is an el[-]
messe biforen :/ þenne boð efter souene. Alto
lome ich habbe igult a þerke ⁊ o þorde.
Alto muchel ich habbe ispent. to litel
ihud in horde. Ne beo þe loure þene þe solf.
ne þin mei. ne þin maȝe. Soht is þet is oðer⸗s/
monnes frond betre þen his aȝen. Ne lipnie
þif to hire pere. ne pere to his þiue bo for
him solue ech. Mon. þe ⸗h/þile þet he bo aliue.
þis is þe to him solue þench þe hþile þe
[he] mot libben. for sone þule hine forȝeten þe
fremede ⁊ þe sibbe. þe þel ne deð þe hþile
he mai :/ ne scal þenne he þalde. Monies
monnes sare ispinc habbeð oft un holde.
Ne scal na mon don afirst. ne slapen þel

2 **ich**] *prec. by* ihc *subp.* 3 **þit**] **ich** *has been canc.* (*crossed through*) *with* **þit** *added to the left hand margin as an emendation, possibly in a different hand* 4 **þa⸗h/**] **h** *int.* 15 un helþe] e *has been subp.* after l 30 ich] *prec. by* ih *subp. and canc.* (*crossed through*) 32 ich] *prec. by* ih *subp. and canc.* (*crossed through*) 33 oðers] s *int.* 36 hþile] h *int.* 38 he] *om.*

to done. For moni mon bihateð þel þe hit
forȝeteð sone. Þe. Mon. þe þule siker bon to
habben Godes blisse. do þel him solf hþile þet
he mai ⁊ þenne haueð he his mid iþisse. þes
riche. Men. peneð bon siker þurh palle ⁊ þu[-]
rh diche. þe deð his echte on sikere stude he
hit sent to heuenriche. For þer ne þerf
he bon of dred of fure ne of þoue þer ne

f. 60ᵛ þerf he him binimen þe laðe ne þe loue.
þer ne þerf he habben kare of ȝefe ne of
ȝelde. þider he sent. ⁊ solf bereð to lutel ⁊
to selde. **þider þe sculen draȝen** ⁊ don þel
ofte ⁊ ilome. for þer ne scal me us naut
binimen mid þrangþise dome. þider
ȝe sculen ȝorne draȝen. palde ȝe god ile⁄
ue. for ne mei þet hit ou binimen king
ne reue. Al þet beste þet þe hefden þider þe hit.
solde senden for þer þe hit michte finden
eft. ⁊ habben buten ende. þo þe er doð eni
God for habben godes are. al he hit scal fin⁄
den eft þer ⁊ hundred fald mare. Þe þet
echte þile halden þel hþile þe he muȝe es
þelden. Giue hies for godes luue ⁊ þenne
deþ hes þel ihalden. **Vre spinc ⁊ ure tilþe is**
ofte iponed to spinden. Ach þet þe þe doð for
godes luue ⁊ eft þe sculen al finden. Ne scal
nan ufel bon unbocht. ne nan god unfor⁄
ȝolden. vfel þe doþ al to muchel. ⁊ god lesse
þenne þe sculden. Þo þe mest doð nu to gode.
⁊ þe lest to laðe. Eiðer to lutel ⁊ to muchel
scal þunchen eft hom baþe. Þer me scal ure
þerkes þeien bi foran þe heuen king. and
ȝeuen us ure spinkes lan efter ure erninge.
Ech mon mid þet he hauet. mei buggen houe[-]
ne riche. þe mare haueþ ⁊ þe þe lesse ⁊ baþe hi

f. 61ʳ muȝen iliche. Alse mid his p\e⁄nie alse oðer mið his
punde. þet is þe punderlukeste chep ⁊ þet eni mon efre
funde. ⁊ þe ðe mare ne mai don ⁊ do hit mid his gode
þonke. Alse þel se þe þe haueð golde fele manke. ⁊
oft god kon mare þonc þen þe him ȝeueð lesse. ⁊
his þerkes ⁊ his peȝes his milce. ⁊ rihtþisnesse. **lu**[-]
tel lac is gode lof ⁊ þet kumeð of gode þille. ⁊ ecle⁄

52 ne of] neof *with an oblique stroke above the line and one below showing where the words should be separated* 78 penie] e *int.*

te muchel ȝeue of þan þe herte is ille. Houene ⁊
horþe he ouer sich. his eȝen boð spa brichte. Sun´
ne ⁊ mone ⁊ houen fur boð þestre aȝein his lih´
te. Nis him noht forholen nihud. spa muchele
boð his mihte. nis hit ne spa derne ne spa þostre
nihte. he pat pet þenkeð ⁊ hpet doð alle quike pih´
te. **Nis na lauerd spich se is crist.** ne king spuch
ure drihten. Houene ⁊ orðe ⁊ al þet is biloken is
in his honde. he deð al þet his pil is ·´ a pettre ⁊
alonde. He makede fisses in þe se ⁊ fuȝeles in
þe lifte. he pit ⁊ paldeð alle þing ⁊ scop alle
scefte. he is hord buten horde ⁊ ende buten en[-]
de. he ane is eure an ilche stude pende þer þu
pende. he is buuen us ⁊ binoþen. biforen ⁊ bi[-]
hinden. þe þe deð godes pille uper he mei him
finden. **Helche rune he iherð** ⁊ pat alle deden.
he þurþ sicheþ uches monnes þonc. Þi hpat
scal us to rede. Þe þet brokeð godes hese ⁊ gulteð
spa ilome. hpet scule pe seggen oðer don et þe
muchele dome. Þa þe luueden unriht ⁊ ufel lif

leden. Þet sculen ho seggen oðer don ·´ þen
þe engles bon of dred. **hpet sculen pe beren**
biforen us mid hom scule pe iquemen. þo
þe neure god ne dude þe houenliche deme.
þer sculen bon doule spa fole þet pulleð us for
preien. ⁊ nabbeð hi naþing forȝeten of al þet
ho iseȝen. Al þet pe misduden her ·´ ho hit pul´
leð kuðe þere. Al ho habbeð in hore prite ·´ þet pe
misduden here. þach pe nusten ne niseȝen ·´
ho peren ure ifere. **Hpet sculen ordlinghes**
don. þa swicen ⁊ ta forsporene hpi boð fole
iclepede. ⁊ spa lut icorene. pi hpi peren ho
biȝeten to hpon peren ho iborene. þet sculen
bon to deþe idemet. ⁊ eure ma forlorene.
Ech .Mon. scal him solue þer biclepie ⁊ bidemen.
his aȝen perch ⁊ his þonc te pitnesse he scal
demen. ne mei him na .Mon. alsa pel demen
ne alspa rihte for nan ne knauð him ase
ȝere ·´ buten ane drihte. Ech .Mon. pat him[-]
solue best ·´ his perkes. ⁊ his pille. þe
ðe lest pat biseiþ ofte mest ·´ þe hit al pat is
stille. nis nan pitnesse alse muchel se monne\s/
aȝen horte. pa se seið þet he bo hal. him solf pat

f. 61v

93 is] *prec. by* is *subp.* 95 þe] *prec. by* þe (*ditt.*) *canc.* (*by crossing through*) 117 hpon] *prec. by* p *subp.* 123 perkes] *prec. by* perhes *canc.* (*crossed through*) 126 monnes] s *int.*

best his smirte. **Ech .Mon. scal hm solf demen**
to deðe oðer to liue. þa pitnesse of his aȝen
perch ⁊ hine þer to scal driue. Al þet ech .Mon.
haueð idon soðden he com to monne sculde he

f. 62[r] hit sechen o boke ipriten he scal iþenchen
þenne. Ah drihten ne demeð nenne .Mon. efter
his biginnigge. Ah al his lif scal bon suilch
boð his endinge. **ȝef þet his uuel al hit is**
uuel ⁊ God ȝefe god his ende. God ȝeue þet ure
ende bo god. ⁊ pite þet he us lende. þe .Mon. þet [nule]
don na god. ne neure god lif leden. er deð ⁊ dom
come to his dure he mei him sare adreden.
þet he ne muȝe þenne biden are. for þet itit ilome
For þi he is pis þe biet ⁊ bit ⁊ bet bi fore dome.
penne deð is attere dure pel late he biddeþ
are. pel late he latheð uuel perc ⁊ þe ne mei
hit don ne mare. þet achten pe to leuen pel.
for ure drihten solf hit seide. A hpilke time
se eure .Mon. of þinchþ his mis dede. Oþer ra´
þer oðer later ⁊ milce he scal imeten. Ac [þ]e
þet þer naf nocht ibet ⁊ pel muchel he haueð
to beten. **Moni mon seit hpa rechð of pi**[-]
ne þe scal habben ende. Ne bidde ich na
bet bo alesed a domes dei of bende. lutel he
pat pet is pine. ⁊ lutel he hit scapeð hpice he´
te is þer þa saule puneð hu biter pind þer
blapeð. hefde he bon þer enne dei oðer tpa
bare tide ⁊ nolde he for al middenerd þe þerdde
þer abiden. þet habbeð iseid þet comen þonen
þa hit pisten mid ipissen. pa purð sorȝe se´
ueȝer. for souenihte blisse. [⁊] **hure blisse þe**

f. 62[v] **þe ende haueð.** for endelesse pine. betere is po[-]
ri pater drunch ⁊ þen atter meind mid pine.
Spines brede is spiðe spete. spa is of pilde dore.
alto dore he is abuh ⁊ þe ȝefð þer fore his
spore. ful pombe mei lihtliche speken of hun[-]
ger. ⁊ of festen ⁊ spa mei of pine þe ne cna´
uð [pine] þe scal a ilesten. [Hefde] he ifonded summe
stunde ⁊ he polde al seggen oðer. Et lete him
pere pif. child. suster. feder ⁊ broðer. **Al he**
palde ⁊ oðerlucker don ⁊ oðerlucker þenchen.

137 nule] uuel biden are] bidenare *with an oblique stroke above the line and one below showing where the words should be separated* 141 **biet**] *probable textual corruption?* of þinchþ] g*subp.* after n 147 þe] pe 150 ende] *prec. by* h *subp.* 158 ⁊] **in** 162 abuh] te *subp.* after u 165 pine] *om.* hefde] hefð

Þenne he bi þohte on helle fur þe napiht
ne mei quenchen. Eure he palde her inne
pape 7 ine pene punien :- Þið þet þe mihte
helle pine bi flien 7 bi sunien Et lete him pe-
re al porld pele 7 orðliche blisse. for to þet much-
ele blisse cumen is murþe mid ipisse. Ipule-
nu cumen eft to þe dome þet ich er op of sede
A þa dei 7 at ta dome us helpe crist 7 rede. þer
pe muȝen bon eþe offered 7 herde us adreden.
þer he scal al son him biforen his pord 7 ec
his deden. Al scal þer bon þenne cud þer men
luȝen her ent stelen. Al scal þer bon þanne
unpron :- þet men pruȝen her 7 helen. Þe sc-
ulen alre monne lif iknaupen alse ure
ahen. þer sculen eueningges bon þe riche
7 þe laȝe. Ne scal na mon [skamie] þer ne
þerf he him adreden. Gif him her of þincþ

his gult 7 bet his misdede. For him ne scameþ f. 63r
ne ne gromeð þe sculen bon iborȝen. **Ach þoþre**
habbeþ scome 7 grome 7 oft fele sorȝe. **þe dom**
scal sone bon idon ne lest he napiht lon[-]
ge. ne scal him na mon mene þer of streng-
þe ne of pronge. þe sculen habbe herdne
dom þa her peren herde. þa þe uuele hol-
den preche men 7 uuele laȝe re[r]de. Ec efter
þet he efþ idon sal þer þenne [be] idemet. **Alle þa**
þi sprunge boþ of adam 7 of eue. Alle hi
scul[e>*]n cumen þider for soðe pe hit ileueð.
þa þe habbeð pel idon efter hore mihte. to
houene riche hi sculen faren forð mid ure
drihte. þa þe habbeð doules perc idon. 7 þer
inne bo ifunde. hi sculen faren forð mid
him in to helle grunde. þer hi sculen
punien a buten are 7 ende. Ne brekeþ ne
ure drihte helle gate for lesen hi of bende.
Nis na sullic þech hom bo þa 7 hom bo un
eade. Ne scal neure eft crist þolie deþ for lesen.
hom of deaþe. Enes drihten helle brec his frond
he ut brochte. him solf he þolede deð for him.
pel dore he hom bohte. Nalde hit mei do for
mei. ne suster for broðer. nalde hit sune do for

171 þet] *foll. by* me *canc.* (*crossed through*) 181/182 sc-ulen] e *written over* i 184 skamie] smakie *scribal error? If it is from OE* smacian *then the sense is missing* 193 re[r]de] redde (*shoulde rhyme with* herde *of prev.*) 194 be] *om.* 196 sculen] e *written over another letter, now illegible* 201 him] *prec. by* him *subp.* (*ditt.*)

fader. ne na mon for oðer. **vre alre lauerd** for
his þrelles ipined þes a rode. vre bendes he
unbon ⁊ bohte us mid his blode. Þe ȝeueð

f. 63ᵛ uneðe for his luue a stuche of ure brede. Ne þen[-]
ke þe noht þet he scal deme þa quike ⁊ þa dede. Mu[-]
chele luue he us cudde. palde þe hit understonde
þet ure eldre misduden ·ᐟ þe habbeð uuele on
honde. Deþ com in þis middenerde þurh þes
doules honde. ⁊ sake ⁊ sorȝe ⁊ spinc a patere
⁊ a londe. **vre forme fader** gult. þe abuᐟ
ȝeð alle. þurst ⁊ hunger. chele ⁊ hete. helde
⁊ unheleðe. þurh him deð com in þis midde[-]
nerd ⁊ oðer uniseleðe. Nere na mon elles
ded ne sec ne nan unsele. ac mihten libᐟ
ben eure ma a blisse ⁊ a hele. lutel hit þunᐟ
cheð moni mon. ac muchel þes þa sunne.
for hþam all þolieð deð þe comen of hore
cunne. **Hore sunne** ⁊ ec ure aȝen
sare us mei of þinche. þurh sunne þe libbeð
alle in sorȝe ⁊ in spinke. Suðden God nom
spa muchele þrake for are misdede ·ᐟ þe þe
spa muchele ⁊ spa ofte mis doð. þe muȝen
eðe us adrede. Adam and his of sprung for are
[b]are sunne. þes fele undret þintre an hel[-]
le pine ⁊ an unþunne. þa þe ledden hore lif
mid unriht ⁊ mid þrange. buten hit gode\s/
milce do ho sculen bon þer þel longe. Godes
þisdom is þel muchel ⁊ alspa is his mihte
⁊ nis his milce naut lesse. ac bi þan ilke
ipichte. **Mare he ane mei** for ȝeuen. þen

f. 64ʳ al folc gulte cunne. Sulf douel mihte habben
milce. ȝif he hit bigunne. þa þe godes milce
secheð ·ᐟ he ipis mei ha ifinden. Ac helle king
is are les þith þa þe he mai binden. þe þe deþ
is þille mest ·ᐟ he haueð þurst mede. His baþ
scal bon þallinde. his bað sca[l] bon berninde
glede. **Þurst he deþ his gode frond** ·ᐟ þenne
his fulle fond ·ᐟ God scilde alle godes frond. a þih

222 na mon] namon *with an oblique stroke above the line and one below showing where the words should be separated* 227 ec] *foll. by* hore *subp.* 230 þe þe] þeþe *with an oblique stroke above the line and one below showing where the words should be separated* 233 [b]are] þare, *scribal error?* 235 godes] *final* s *int. to fit within the writing-grid* 236 milce] l *written over a letter, possibly* d do] *foll. by* n *subp.* 244 baþ] *cross bar through the ascender* þ: *scribal error?* 245 scal] scab, *scribal error?* helle] *foll. by* is *subp.*

spilche freonde. Neure in helle hi com. ne þer
ne come reche. þach ich elches porldes pele.
þer me mahte feche þet his pulle seggen on.
þat pise men us seiden. ⁊ aboken hit priten
þer mei hit reden. Ich hit pille seggen þan
þe hit hom solf nusten. parni hom pið hore
unfrome. ȝif ho me pulleð lusten. vnderston´
deð nu to me edi men ⁊ arme. Ich pulle tel´
len of helle pin ·˙· ⁊ pernin op pið herme.
In helle his hunger ⁊ þurst ·˙· tpa uuele
iuere. þas þolieð þa peren maket niþin´
ges here. **þer is paning and pop**. efter eche
streche. ho fareð from hete to hete. ⁊ hech
to frure þe preche. þenne hi bið in þere he´
te ·˙· þe chele him þunchet blisse. þenne hi
cumeð eft to þe chele ·˙· of hete hi habbeð
misse. hi hem deð pa inoch nabbeð hi nane
blisse. **Nute hi hpeþer hom deþ þurs** mid
neure nane pisse. hi palkeð eure ⁊ secheð reste

ac ⸢ho⸣ ne muȝen imeten. For þi þe ho nolden þe f. 64ᵛ
hpile þet ho mihten here sunne beten. ho secheð
reste þer nis nan. for þi ne muȝen hi es fin´
den. Ac palkeð peri up ⁊ dun ·˙· se pater deþ mid
pinde. þo boð þa þe peren her a þanke unste[-]
defeste. ⁊ þa þe gode biheten heste ⁊ nolden hit
ileste. þa þe god perc bigunnen ⁊ ful enden
hit nolden. **Nu piten her.** ⁊ nuðe þer. ⁊ nu[-]
sten. hpat hi polden. þer is bernunde pich
hore saule to baþien inne. þa þe ledden here
lif in perre ⁊ in pinne. þer is fur þet is undr´
et fald hattre. þene bo ure. Ne mai quenchen
salt peter ne uersc of þe burne. þis is þet
fur þet efre bernd ne mei napiht hit quen[-]
chen. Þer inne boð þa þe pas to lof preche
men to spenchen. þa þe peren spikelemen
⁊ ful of uuel prenchen. þa þe mihten uuel
don. þe þe lef hit pes to þenchen. þe luue´
den tening ⁊ stale. hordom ⁊ drunken ⁊
a doules perche bliþeliche spunken. Þa
þe peren spa le[s]e þet me hom ne mihte ileuen.
Med ierne domes men. ⁊ prongpise reuen.
þet oðer monnes pif lof. his aȝen et lete. þo
þe sungede muchel ·˙· a drunke ⁊ an ete. þe

267 ho] *int. after* ac 267 muȝen] o *subp. after* m 287 le[s]e] lele, *scribal error?*

preche mon binom his ehte. ⁊ leide his on
horde. þet lutel let of godes borde. ⁊ godes por´
de. ⁊ þo þe his aȝen nalde ȝeuen þer he isech

f. 65r þe node. Ne nalde iheren godes sonde. þen[-]
ne he hit herde bode. þe þet is oðers monnes
þing. loure þene hit sculde. ⁊ peren to
gredi of solure ⁊ of golde. ⁊ þa þe untro´
pnesse duden þon þe ho scu\l/den bon holde ⁊
leten þet ho sculden don. ⁊ duden þet ho pol´
den. Þa þe peren eure abuten þisse porl[-]
des echte. ⁊ duden al þet þe laþe gast hechte
to ⁊ tachte. ⁊ alle þe þen anigepise doulen
iquemde. Þa boð nu mid him in helle
fordon ⁊ fordemet.

298 sculden] l *int. after* u 300 peren] n *subp. after* e 303 iquemde] iquende, *scribal error?* 304 fordemet] *final* t *has a flourish*
The verse sermon ends imperfectly. The remainder of the folio is left blank

Oxford, Bodleian Library
MS Digby 4
folios 97^{r}-110^{v}

Transcription of Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4 fols. 97r-110v

MS *Pointing: the text of* D *has less pointing then the other versions of the* Conduct of Life. *This is probably due to the text being written out in half-lines, each long-line being divided at the caesura. The line-breaks within the mise-en-page act as a guide to reading. The half-lines are retained here, but the text is adapted, for ease of reading in the parallel text edition,* (*see pp.*). *The scribe of* D *uses the punctus sparingly, and most often at the end of a quatrain. These occurrences are represented in this edition but will not be referred to in the notes.*

There are rare occasions where the punctus is found at neither the end of the full-line or half-line: **pine**: line 280; **suster** and **vader**: line 284; **hauene** and **stream**: line 484;

Capitalization occurs only at the beginning of each quatrain ('littera notabilior') and initial characters usually sit in the double ruled lines outside of the main writing grid. These occurrences will be reflected in the text but not in the accompanying notes, except in exceptional circumstances, such as **Ic** *in Line 1 - where the initial letter occupies six lines of the margin.*

Abbreviations are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:

Throughout the text **þ** *has been expanded to* **þet** at lines: 13, 20, 25, 41, 44, 45, 49, 54, 61, 62, 65, 72, 73, 80, 93, 101, 107, 113, 114, 121, 123 (x2), 127, 128, 129, 131, 138, 167, 173, 178, 180, 181, 186, 195, 207, 208, 211, 217, 227, 229, 233, 234, 235, 239, 240, 243, 254, 265 (x2), 266, 269, 276, 279, 280, 288, 296, 298, 306, 308, 318, 326, 327, 329, 332, 333, 337, 341, 367, 392, 399, 405, 420, 421, 434, 438, 447, 469, 471, 473, 477, 478, 479, 481, 485, 487, 489, 491, 493, 497, 501, 503, 509, 513, 515, 517, 521, 527, 539 (x2), 544, 548, 553, 556, 559 (x2), 562, 567, 581, 585, 593, 599, 606, 610, 647, 651, 658, 659, 667 (x2), 675, 677, 679, 687, 688, 695, 703, 726, 730, 732, 737,

738, 743 (x2), 748, 755, and **þat** at line 155. *There are ten occasions where* **þet** *is written out, they are found at* lines: 134, 291, 371, 476, 628, 644, 656, 707, 758, 763, *and once occasion where* **þat** *is written out at* line 153.

pint\e/n expanded to **pintren**: line 7; **sten** expanded to **steren**: line 143; **xi** expanded to **christ**: line 151; **bn** expanded to **ben**: line 223; imaigd expanded to **imaingd**: line 272; **hung\e/** expanded to **hungre**: line 278; **sust** expanded to **suster**: line 284; **g\a/með** expanded to **grameð**: line 317; **bn** expanded to **ben**: lines 318, 330 and 331 ; **g\a/me** expanded to **grame**: line 319; **eft** expanded to **efter**: lines 329 and 687; **asprugen** expanded to **asprungen**: line 333; **c\i/st** expanded to **crist**: line 347; **unstode** expanded to **understonde** (**der** *inserted into the right-hand margin*: *see notes*): line 370; **xistene** expanded to **christene**: line 565; **xistendom** expanded to **christendom**: line 567; **xist** expanded to **christ**: line 605; and **hung** expanded to **hunger**: line 625.

Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

There is general agreement that the text of the *Conduct of Life* found in Digby contains strong Kentish features, which I evidence below. Hall locates the mansucript as being from Christ Church, Canterbuy and suggests that it was probably copied there.[842] Samuels suggests 'that the language of D showed either two layers of copying (Kent + London *or* London + Kent), or possibly a single scribe writing in the dialect of an area of Kent or Surrey bordering on London, i.e. North-West Kent or North-East Surrey.'[843] Laing locates the language as being from West Central Kent (LAEME) stating that the 'the language of the *Poema Morale* is clearly of Kent but seems to fit best somewhat to the west of Canterbury itself.[844]

[842] Hall, *Early Middle English, Notes*, p.313.
[843] Samuel's views are recorded in Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p.110.
[844] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.

The runic letter <þ> (*þorn*) is written in initial position in all instances in D (§ 2.3): **þanne**, **þeȝh**, **þinȝh** etc., except for **darf** (§ 3.3). In medial position <ð> (often before *final -e*) and <þ> are interchangable (written a comparable number of times): **oþer**, **sleuhþen**, **loþe** etc. and **childe**, **iueðe**, **cuðe** etc. (§ 4.3). In final position D always write <ð>: **ofþencheð**, **mislikeð**, **volȝeð** etc. The only occurance of <th> (§ 5) in D is in **sathanas**, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 *Remark*). D writes <h> for <þ>/<ð> on two occasions in **þinȝh** and **þurh** (§ 6.1). There are occasional writings of <d> for <ð> in D (§ 7.3): **darf**, **aider**, **vnnede**, **ded**, **deade**, **dead** and **eade.** The double fricative [ðð] is simplified in **siþen** and **seðe** (§ 10.2).

The runic letter <ƿ> (wynn) is retained throughout D with occasional examples of <w> (§ 11.1 and þ§ 11.4): **wit**, **hwile**, **iwisse**, **weneð**, **wolde**, **wealde**, **workes**, **swo**, **willeð**, **wrecche**, **hwere**, **hwet** and **we**. D writes the Tironian nota <⁊> (§ 13.1) throughout this text (§ 13.7) there are no instances of **and** being written.

Insular ȝ is retained in D alongside Caroline *g* (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): **grameð**, **grunde**, **glede** etc.and before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* (§ 42.2): **god**, **gelte**, **go** etc. and by levelling in (**bi**)**ginninge** (§ 42.3). The movement to <w> is not present in D, which retains <ȝ> for the fricative /ɣ/ (§ 43.6) in **volȝeð**,**hoȝeð**, **laȝe** etc – the Kentish dialect preserved <ȝ> in this position into the fourteenth century (§ 43.6). D preserves <ȝ > for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): **ȝiung**, **ȝiet**, **vorȝet** etc. Initial <ȝ> is omitted before *i* in **ef** (§ 45.4). D demonstrates transition to a palatal (§ 47ff) in **forpreien** with <ȝ> retained in **peȝe**, and **iseȝen** and <ȝh> in **eȝhen** (the writing of <ȝ> in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound. See § 47.3). The continuation of the OE movement *ig > i* (§ 48) in **ani**, **mani** and **eadi** is further demonstrated in D. Palatal ȝ /j/ is lost before *d* (§ 49)in **sede**(**n**). Late OE /dʒ/, written <cȝ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in **beggen**, **siggen, liggeð** (§ 50). The OE group nȝ /ŋg/ is written <ng> (§ 51,

§ 51.8 and § 51.10): **longe**, **kinge**, **ȝiung** etc. with <nh>, probably /x/, written before <ð> in **strenhðe** (§ 51.9).

In initial position /k/ is always written as <k> before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in **king**(**e**)/**kinges, keðen**, **kedde** etc. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is mostly written as <c> in **cunne**, **cumð**, **come**(**n**) etc. but <k> is found in **kare** and **kan**. Before <n> (§ 18) it is <k> in (**i**)**knopeð** and (i)**knapen**/(**i**)**knopen** but before other consonants (§ 19) it is <c> in (**i**)**cleped**, (**bi**)**clepien** and **cliue** and <ch> (§ 19.7) in **christ**, **christene** and **christendom**. D writes <qu> (§. 20) for OE *cw* in **iqueðe**, **quike**, **quenche** etc. but writes<ku> in ikuemde and kuenche (§. 20.3 and §. 20.4). D writes <k> in medial position for OE velar *c* thoughout the text: (§. 21 and §. 21.1): **speke**, **porke**, **likede** etc. with the only occurance of <c> (§. 22 and §. 22.3) being the result of the compound **godcunnesse** (**god** + **cunnesse**). However, <c> is always retained in final position (§. 23 and §. 23.3): **ec**, **ac**, (**i**)**þanc** etc. with no evidence of <k>.

The regular form of /tʃ/ in D is <ch> (§. 27, §. 28.3, §.29.3 and §. 30.3): **child**(**e**), **chele**, **muchel**(**e**), **diches**, **ech**, **eurich** etc and in **þenchen**, **þencheð** (§. 32, §. 32.10 and §. 32.12) etc. with **þinȝh** and **þingð** also representing likely palatalization (§. 32.11). The rare writing of <c> /tʃ/ (§. 31 and §. 31.3) is present as the more regular spelling of the *pron 1st sg.* **ic** and is found also in **phlice** and **lichamlice**. However, the writing of <c> in **smac** and **ispinc** represent possible variants with /k/ (§. 31.3).

D mostly writes <s> (§. 36.3) for /ʃ/ (§. 34) in initial position: **sal**, **serreue**, **seafte** etc., however, <sc> (§. 35.3) is written in **scal**, **iscop**, **scete** and **scrud** and <sch> (§. 37.2) in **schameð** and as <sh> in **shilde**. In final position /ʃ/ is <s> in **fis** (§. 39). OE [ts] is always written <c> in **milce** (§. 41).

D regularly writes voiced [v] as <v>/<u> in initial position in **vele**, **volȝeð**, **vor/uor** (§ 58 and § 58.9) etc. with less numerous <f> also written regularly in **for**, **fremde**, (**a**)**first** etc. In final position <f> is retained in **lif**, **of**, **pif** (§ 58.10) etc and in medial position when adjacent to one unvoiced sound: **ofte**, **ȝiefð**, **lefte** (§ 58.10) etc. Voicing is also regularly demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.11) through the writing of <v>/<u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in **himselue**, **bivore**(**n**), **euele** etc. with rare instances of <f> still retained: **doeflen**, **dofles/defles/diefle** , **life** and **eftin**. The writing of <f> has disappeared before *d* in **hadde/hedde** but is retained in **hauede** (§58.12).

In D OE *a* in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): **habbe**, **vare**, **baþien** etc. and <a> before a nasal (§ 60 and § 60.3) in **man**, **þanc**, **þanne** etc., with two rare occurrences of <o> found in **þonke** and **monke**. Before a lengthening group, OE *a* is is always <o> (§ 61 and §61.3): **longe**, **pronge**, **honde** etc. D mostly writes Kentish <e> for OE *æ* with a mixture of <a> (§ 63 and § 63.3): **hedde**, **elmesse**, **efter** etc. with **habbe**(**n**), **hadde**, **pater**, **hpat** and **vader/uader**. OE *e* is nearly always <e> in D (§ 64 and § 64.6): **bereð**, **ende**, **velde**, **strenhðe** etc. with <ai> in **maind** and the writing of <i> (Kentish form) in **siggen**. OE *o* is always written <o> in D (§ 65.1 and § 65.5): **biuore**, **bode**, **borde** etc. OE *i* is nearly always <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.9) in **bidde**, **child**(**e**), **finden** etc. with <e> written in **ospreng** and in **nele**, **nelle** and **nesten** (§ 66.9, § 66.10 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to *ĕ*). For OE *y*, D has mostly <e> (§ 67ff and § 67.9), a feature of the Kentish dialect: **dede**, (**vn**)**net**, **þenchen** etc. with <u> written in **muchel/muchele/mutchel** (see note at § 67.9) and **suneȝeden** and <i> written in **þingh/þingð**, **king**(**e**), **afirst**, **spich**(**ne**), **drihte/drihten**, **hpich**, **pinne** and **tichede** OE *y* (§ 67.10) is <e> in **fere/ver**, **keðen** and **kedde** with<i> in **litel/litle**, **hidden** and **hpi**. D writes a mixture of <u> and the later writing of <o> for OE *u* (§ 68 and § 68.2) throughout the text: **cumen**, **punie**, **grunde** etc. and **come**(**n**), **ponien**, **iponed** etc.

D writes <o> for OE *ā*, as a result of neutralization, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.6): **lore**, **one**, **non** etc. with rare <a> found only in **nammore** and **bihat** (*cont.*). In D OE *ǣ1* is written <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): **dede**, **rede**, **adrede** etc. with <a> (§ 75.2) written once only in **naddren** (for OE *þær* see § 77ff). OE *ǣ2* is nearly always written as <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) **mest**, **unhelðe**, **lest** etc. with rare <a> (§ 79.6) written in **ani/anie** and **ani-man** (for *ǣlc, elc* and *ylc* see § 81ff). For the writing of the *adv.* **ones** in D see § 79.9. OE *ē* is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.3): **he**, **deð**, **ibet** etc (the writing of **doð** is by analogy and the writing of **hi** is the *pl.* form written for the *sg.*, see § 82.3). OE *ī* is always <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.5): **mi**, **þriste**, **pile/hpile** etc. OE *ō* is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.3): **to**, **dom**(**e**), **boc** etc. OE *u* is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.1): **nu**, **ure/vre**, **þu** etc.

In D OE *ea* (§ 86 and §87ff) before *r*, without lengthening, is always <a> (§ 88.1 and § 88.8): **arȝe**, **þarf**, **arme** etc.; before *rd* (§ 88.9) it is <a> in **harde**, **hardne** and (**midel**)**ard** with <ea> (§ 87.5) in (**midden**)**eard**; before *rn* (§ 88.4) <a> is written in **þarni** with <ea> (§ 87.5) found in **earninge**. The *i*-umaut of *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <a> (§ 89.6) in **arminges** , <e> (§ 89.6) in **smerte** and <ie> (§ 89.6) in **dierne.** OE *ea* before *l* (Anglian *a*), without lengthening, is always <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.6): **al** and **alle**, **ualle**, **palles** etc.; before *ld* Kentish features (§ 91.2) are demonstrated through the writing of <ia> in **pialdeð**, **hialde** and **bihialde** alongside <ea> in **wealden**, **ealde**, **fealde** etc., with two occurrences of <a> present in **alde** and **halt**. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *l* combinations (Angl. mutation of *a*) D always has <e> in **elder/eldre** and **helde/elde** (§ 92ff and § 92.6). OE *ea* before *h* combinations is <e> (§ 87.3, § 93.1 and § 93.5) in **heȝe** and **iseȝh**. The *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *h*-combinations is always <i> in **mihte**(**n**) and **nihte** (§ 94.1 and § 94.4).

For OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.5) D writes smoothed <e> in **perc**, **perkes**, **sterre** and **herte** with <o> present in **porke/porc** and **workes/porkes** and <ie> in **hierte**. The *wur* group (§ 97 and § 97.5) is <u> in **purðe** but for the *i*-umlaut of *eo* it is <e> in **pers**(**e**). OE *eo*

before *l*-combinations is <e> (Kent § 98ff and §98.4) in **selue/self**. OE *eo* before *ht* is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.4) in **rihtþisnesse**, **unrihte**, **rihte** and **briht** and **fulbrihte** and <i> for the *i*-umlaut (§ 100 and § 100.6) in **þurhsiȝð** but <ie> in **ouer-sieð**. OE – WS *eom* is **am** (chiefly Angl. *eam* § 101). OE *eo* (*a*-umlaut of *e*) is always <e> in D (§ 102ff and § 103.3): **vele/uele/fele**, **brekeð** and **þele**. OE *eo* (*u*-umaut of *e*) is mostly <e> (§ 102ff and § 104.4) in **heuen**(**e**), **heueriche**, **þereld**(**es**) and **þerldliche** etc. but <o> in **þorld/þoruld** and **þorldes** and **þode** with <u> written under the influence of *w* in **suster.** The velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105ff) is mostly <e> in D (§ 105.6): **seðe**, **seuene**, **bineþen** etc with <i> in **hire**, (**be**)**nime**, **quike**, **siþen** and **niþer**.

D contains a mixture of <e> and <ea> for OE *ēa* (§ 106ff and § 106.3): **ec/ec**, **eðlete**, **vnnede**, **deðe/deð**, **bred/brede** and **lean**, **eaðe**, **eade**, **unneaðe**, **deaðe/deade**, **breade** and **eadi**.E2 The *i*-umlaut of *ēa* (§ 107.1 and § 107.4) is nearly always <e> in **ileuen**, **alesd**, **temen** etc. with <ie> written in **ihiere**. OE *ēo* (§ 108ff and § 108.5) is a mixture of Kentish <i and ie> written alongside <e> and occasional <eo> and <o> : **bi**, **bien**, **isien**, **lief** etc. alongside **ben**, **frend**, **isen** etc., with **iseon**, **deoflen** and **dofles**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109 ff) is mainly <ie> (Kentish form § 108.2 and § 109.6) in **þiestre**, **þiesternesse**, **niede** and **diere**, with <eo> in **deorlinges** and **feond** and <e> in **frend**.

In D OE *ea* after *sc* (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.4) is mostly <a> in **sal**, **samien**, **seafte** etc. with <e>, however, the more regular writing in **sel** and also present in **scete** (<e> is possibly as a result of its position between palatal and dental consonants). For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* after *c* (§ 113.4) D writes <e> (see § 113.1) in **chele** and **bicherd**. OE *ēa* after *g* (§ 114) is <ie> in **ȝier**. For OE *ie* after *g* (§ 116.3) D mostly writes <e> (§ 115.1): **vorȝet**, **biȝete**, **ȝeue** etc. however, <ie> is regularly written in **uorȝiete**, **ȝieue**, **ȝielde**, **ȝiefð/ȝief** and (**i**)**ȝieue**. Similarly, for OE *ie* after *g* D writes <e> in **ȝet** and <ie> in **ȝiet** (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE *ie* after *sc* (§ 118.3) D writes <i> in **isilde/shilde**, **silden** and

silten. OE *eo* after *ġ* (§ 119.1 and §120.3) is <iu> in **ȝiung** , <u> in **ȝungre** and <eu> in **ȝeuȝeþ**. OE *eo* after *sc* (§ 121.3) is written as either <u> in **sulle**(**n**) or <o> in **sollen**, **solde**(**n**) and **sop**.

OE *æ* + *ʒ* /j/ is mostly <ai> in D (§ 122.1 and § 122.4) in **mai** and **dai**, with <ei> (Kentish § 122.1) written occasionally in **mei**, **seið** and **deie** . LWS *sǣde* / Anglian *sægde* (§ 123 and §123.3) is always <e> in **sede**(**n**). OE *ǣ*$_1$ (Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.3) is <ei> in **mei** and **isein** with <eȝ> in **iseȝen** and **ne-iseȝen**. OE *ǣ*$_2$ + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.3) is <ai> in **aiðer/aider** and <ei> in **eiðer**. OE *e* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.4) is <ei> in **eie**, **eiliche** and **pei**, and <eȝ> in **eȝie**, **peȝes** and **peȝe**. OE *ē* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.3) is <ei> in **vorpreien** and **leie**. OE *ēa* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.3) is <eȝ> in **eȝen** and **raketeȝe**, with <eaȝ> still present in **eaȝen**. OE *ǣ*$_2$ + *h* (§ 132.1 and § 133.3) is <e> before *ȝh* in **heȝhte** and <a> before *ð* in **taðte**. OE *ō* + *h* (§ 134.1 and § 134.4) is always <o> in **vnboht**, **þohte**, **brohte** etc. OE *a* + /ɣ/ (§ 136.1 and § 136.4) is <aȝ> in **draȝhen**, **laȝe**(**n**) and **laȝe-lease**. OE *ā* + /ɣ/ (§ 137.1 and § 137.2) is <oȝ> (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in **moȝe** and **hoȝen/oȝen**. OE *ā* + *w* (§ 138.1 and § 138.4) is <o> before *w* (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in (**i**)**knopeð**, **knopen** and **blopeð** and in the combination <ou> before *w* in **moupe** but it is written as <a> before *p* in **iknapen** and in the combination <au> in **saule**. OE *ēo* + *w* (§ 139.1 and § 139.4) is <e> before *w* in **repen** but <ie> (Kentish cf. 108.2) in **riepen** and **siepe**. OE *ēa* + *w* (§ 140.1 and § 140.4) is <ea> in **veape** but <ia> (Kentish cf. § 106.2) in **viape**.

Ic am elder þanne ic pes f. 97r
a pinter 7 ec a lore
ic ealdi more þanne ic dede
mi wit oȝhte to bi more
Þel longe ic habbe child ibien
on porde 7 on dede
þeȝh ic bi on pintren eald
to ȝiung ic am on rede
Vnnet lif ic habbe iled
7 ȝiet, me þinȝh, ic lede
þanne ic mebiþenche pel
pel sore ic me adrede
Mest al, þet ic habbe idon
idelnesse 7 childe
to late ic habbe me biþoȝt
bute god me don milce.
Vele idel pord ic habbe iqueðe
siþen ic speke cuðe
7 vele euele deden idon
þet me ofþencheð nuðe
Alto lome ic habbe igelt
on porke 7 on on porde
al to muchel ic habbe ispent
to litel ileid on horde.
Mest al þet me likede þo
nu hit me mislikeð
se þe muchel volȝeð his ipil
himselue he bispikeð.

Ic miȝte habbe bet idon f. 97v
hadde ic þo iselðe
nu ic polde ac ic ne mai
vor helde ne uor unhelðe.
Elde me is bistolen an
er ic hit ipiste
ne mai ic isien biuore me
vor smeche ne uor miste.
Arȝe pe bieð to donne god
to euele al to þriste
more eie stondeð man of man
þanne him doð of criste.
Þo þet pel ne doð þer pile hi muȝe
ofte hit ham sel riepe
þanne hi moupe sulle 7 ripe

1 Ic] *initial letter* I *is enlarged and occupies six lines of the margin*

þet hi her þan siepe.
Do ech to gode þet hi muȝe
þer pile hi bieð aliue
ne leue no man to muchel
to childe ne to piue.
Se þet hine selue vorȝet
vor piue oþer uor childe
he scal comen on euele stede.
bute god him bi milde.
Sende sum god biuoren him
man þet pile to heuene
for betere is on elmesse biuore
þanne ben efter seuene.

f. 98r

Ne hopie pif to hire pere
ne pere to his piue.
bi for him selue eurich man
þer pile hi bieð aliue.
Pis is þet hine biþencheð.
þo hpile þet he mot libbe
vor hine pilleð sone uorȝiete
þo fremde 7 þo sibbe
Se þet pel ne deð þe pile he mai
ne sal he þanne he polde.
vor manies mannes sore ispinch
habbeð ofte unholde.
Ne solde noman don afirst
ne sleuhþen pel to donne
for mani man bihoteð pel
þet hit forȝet pel sone.
Se man þet pile siker bien
to habbe godes blisce
do eure god þer hwile he mai
þanne haueð he hit to iwisse.
Þo Riche weneð siker bien
þurh palles 7 þurh diches.
se deð his heȝhte on sikere stede
þet sent hi to heueriche.
Þer ne darf he habben kare
of ȝieue ne of ȝielde
þider pe sendeð 7 selue bereð
to litle 7 to selde.

f. 98v

Þer ne darf man ben ofdred
of fere ne of þieue
þer ne mai him naht binime

se loþe ne se lieue.
Þider þe solden alle dragȝhen
wolde ȝe me ileuen
for þer mai hit us binime
ne king ne \h/is serreue.
Þet beste þet þe hogeð.
Þider þe solde senden.
for þer þe mugen hit finden eft.
7 habben buten ende.
Se þe her deð ani god
to habbe godes ore
al he hit sel finde þer
7 hundred fealde more.
Se þet eghte pile hialde þel
þe hpile þe hi mot wealde
ȝieue hi for godes loue
Þanne deð he hi þel ihialde.
Vre ispinch 7 ure itilðe
is ofte iponed to aspinde.
ac þet þe doð for godes loue
eft þe sollen hit al vinde
Ne sel non euel bien vnboht.
ne no god unforgolde.
euel þe doð al to muchel
god lesse þanne þe solde.

Se þet mest deð nu to gode f. 99r
7 se þet lest to loðe
aider to litel 7 to muchel
sal þenchen eft hem boðe.
Þer me sal ure þerkes þegȝe
biuore þe heuene kinge
7 ȝieuen us ure workes lean
efter ure earninge.
Eurich man mid þet he haueð
mai beggen heueriche
se þet lesse 7 se þet more
here aider iliche.
Al suo on mid his panie
swo oþer mid his punde
þet is si ponderlicheste þare
þet ani man eure vonde.
7 se þet more ne mai don
mid his gode þonke

92 his] h *int.*

al spo pel spo se þet haueð.
goldes vele monke.
⁊ ofte god can more þanc
þan þe him ȝiefð þet lesse
alle his porkes ⁊ alle his peȝes
is mihte ⁊ rihtpisnesse.
Litel loc is gode lief
þet cumð of gode ipille
⁊ eðlete muchel iȝeue
þanne si hierte is ille.

f. 99v

Heuene ⁊ erðe he ouersieð
his eȝhen beð fulbrihte
sunne ⁊ mone ⁊ alle sterren
bieð þiestre on his lihte.
Nis him ec noþing uorhole
spo muchel bieð his mihte.
nis noþing spo dierne idon
ne on spo þiestre nihte.
He pot hpet þencheð ⁊ hpet doð
alle quike pihte
nis no louerd spich is christ
ne no king spich is drihte.
Heuene ⁊ erðe ⁊ al þat is
biloken is on his honde
he deð al þat his pille is
on sae ⁊ ec on londe.
He piteð ⁊ pialdeð alle þing.
he iscop alle seafte
he prohte fis on þer sae
⁊ foȝeles on þar lefte.
He is ord abuten orde
⁊ ende abuten ende
he one is eure on eche stede
pende þer þu pende
He is buuen us ⁊ bineþen
biuoren ⁊ ec bihinde.
se man þet godes pille deð.
he mai hine aihpar uinde.

f. 100r

Eche rune he iherð.
⁊ pot eche dede
he þurhsiȝð eches iþanc
pai hpat sel us to rede.
Þe þet godes hesne brekeð

161 abuten] albuten 162 abuten] albuten

⁊ gelteð spo ilome
hpet sulle pe siggen oðer don
at to heaȝe dome.
Þer sulle deoflen bi spo uele
þet willeð us vorpreien
nabbeð hi no þing uorȝete
of þan þet hi iseȝen.
Al þet pe misdeden hier
hi pilleð keðen þere.
bute pe habben hit ibet
þer hpile pe hier pere.
Al hi habbeð on her prite
þet pe misdeden hiere
þeȝh pe hi nisten ne iseȝen
hi peren vre iueren.
Hpet sulle þo horlinges don
þo spikele ⁊ þo vorsporene
apei spo uele beð icleped
⁊ spo viape icorene
Þei hpi peren hi biȝete
⁊ to hpi iborene
þet sullen ben to deaðe idemd
⁊ euer mo vorlorene.

Ech man sel himselue þer f. 100ᵛ
biclepien bitelle ⁊ deme
his oȝen perc ⁊ his iþanc
to pitnesse teme.
Ne mai him no man al spo pel
demen ne spo rihte
vor non ne knopeð hine spo pel
bute one ure drihte.
Ech man pot him selue best
his porkes ⁊ his pille
se þet lest pot seið ofte mest
⁊ se þet al pot is stille.
Nis no pitnesse al spo muchel
spo mannes oȝen hierte
þeȝh ȝpo sigge þet he bi hol
him self he pot his smerte.
Eurich man him demen sel
to deðe oþer to life
se pitnesse his selue porkes
to aider hine sel driue

215 his] *prec. by* is *subp.*

Al þet ech man haueð idon
seðe he com to manne.
spich hit þere on boc iprite
isien he sel hit þanne.
Drihte ne demeð nenne man
bi his biginninge
al his lif sel ben iteald
bi his endinge.

f. 101r

Ef se ende is euel hit is al euel
7 god ef is se ende
God ȝeue þet ure ende bi god
7 þite hþet he us lende.
Se man þet neure nele don god
ne neure god lif leden
er deð 7 dom come to his dure
he mai him sore adreden.
þet he þanne ore bidde ne muȝen
vor þet bilimpeð ilome
he is þis þet bit 7 bete
7 bet biuoren dome
þanne deað is at þare dore
to late he biddeð ore
to late uorlet þet euele þorc
þet hit ne mai don nammore
Senne let þe 7 þu nah hoe
þanne þu ne miht hi do more
he sot þet spo abit
to habben godes ore
Spo ileuen þe hit muȝen
vor drihten self hit sede
on hþiche time se þe man
ofþencheð his misdede.
Oþer raðer oþer later
milce he sel imeten
ac se þ(et) naueð hier naht ibet
muchel he haueð to beten.

f. 101v

Sum man saið hþo reȝh of þine
þet sel habben ende
ne recche ic bote bi ic alesd
on domes dai of bende.
Litel he þot hþet þine is.
7 litel hi iknopeð

223 lif sel] sel lif *trs.: words are marked with two oblique strokes signifying rev.*

hpich hete is þer þe saule poneð
hu biter pind þer blopeð.
Ef he hedde þer ibie.
on oþer tpo itide
nolde he uor al middeneard
þo þridde þer abiden.
þet seden þo þet comen þannes
þet hit pisten mid ipisse
þer purh sorȝe seue ȝier
vor seuenihte blisce.
Vre blisce þet ende haueð
vor endelese pine
betere pere drinke pori peter
þanne atter imaingd mid pine.
Spines brede is spiþe spete
spo is of pilde diere
al to diere he hi beið
þet ȝief þeruore his spiere.
Lihtliche mai ful pombe speke
of hungre ⁊ of þurste
spo mai of pine þet not pat is
pine. þet eure mo sel leste.

Hauede he uonded sume stunde f. 102r
he polde siggen al oþer
eðlete him pere pif ⁊ child
suster. vader. moder ⁊ broðer.
Al he polde oþer don
⁊ oþerlaker þenche
þanne he þohte of helle ver
þet noþing ne mai quenche.
Eft he polde her on po
⁊ on pope punie
pið þet he moste helle uer
biflien ⁊ bisunie.
Eðlete ham pere al perldes pele
⁊ perldliche blisce
for to þare muchele merhðe come
þet is merhðe mid ipisse
Ic pille nu come to þon dome
þet ic ȝeu of er sede
on þan deie ⁊ on þan dome
vs helpe crist ⁊ rede.
Þe muȝen eaðe ben ofherd
⁊ harde vs mai ondrede
þer ech sel him biuoren sien

his perkes ⁊ his dede.
Al sel þanne bi þer cuð
þet men hier luʒen ⁊ stelen
al sel þanne ben vnproʒe
þet men her hidden ⁊ helen.

f. 102v

Þe sullen alre manne lif
iknapen spo ure hoʒen
þer sullen eueninges ben
þo heʒe ⁊ þo loʒe.
Ne sel þeð no man samien þer
ne darf he him ondrede
ef him her ofþencheð his gelt
⁊ beteð his misdede.
Ham ne schameð ne ne grameð
þet sullen ben iborʒe
þoðre habbeð same ⁊ grame
⁊ fele oþre sorʒe.
Se dom sal ben sone idon
ne lesteð he noht longe
ne sal non him bimene þer
of strenhðe ne of pronge.
Þo sullen habbe hardne dom
þet her peren harde
þet euele hielden wrecche men
⁊ euele laʒen arerde
Ech efter þet he haueð idon
sal þanne ben idemeð
blþe mai he þanne ben
þet gode haueð iquemed
Alle þo þet asprungen bieð
of adame ⁊ of euen
alle hi sullen þider cumen
to soþe ʒe muʒen ileuen.

f. 103r

þo þet habbeð pel idon
efter hire mihte
to heueneriche hi sullen vare
vorð mid ure drihte
Þo þet prohten dofles perc
⁊ peren þer inne iuonde
þo sullen vare vorð mid him
into helle grunde.
Þer hi sullen ponien ai

325 hardne] r *written over* b

buten ore ⁊ ende
ne brekeð neure eft crist helle dure
to alesen hi of bende.
Is hit ponder þaȝh hem bi þo
ne þaȝh hem bi vnnede
ne þoleð neure eft drihten ded
to lesen hi of deade
Ones drihten helle brec
⁊ his frend hut brohte
him self þolede deð for ham
þel diere he hi bohte.
Nolde hit moȝe do vor meie
ne suster vor broþer
nolde hit sune do vor vader
ne no man vor oþer.
Vre louerd vor his piales
ipines þes on þo rode
vre bendes he vnband
he bohte us mid his blode.

Þe ȝeueð unneaðe uor his loue f. 103v
a stecche of ure breade
ne þenche þe naht þet he sel
demen quike ⁊ deade.
Muchel loue he kedde us
polde þe hit understonde
þet ure eldren misdeden
harde þe habbeð on honde.
Deað com on þis midelard
þurð þes defles onde.
⁊ senne ⁊ sorȝe ⁊ ispinc
on se ⁊ on londe.
Vres uormes uader gelt
þe abeggeð alle.
⁊ his ospring efer him
on harme bieð biualle.
Huger ⁊ þurst hete ⁊ chele
ecðe ⁊ al unhelðe
þurh deað com on þis midelard
⁊ oþer vniselðe
Nere no man elles dead
ne siec ne vnvele
ac mihte libben euer mo

370 understonde] der *inserted into the right-hand margin. An oblique stroke above* n *corresponds with a similar stroke in the margin, indicating where the letters should be inserted* 379 ospring] i *written over* e 381 Hu[n]ger] Huger

on blisce ⁊ on hele.
Litel hit þencheð manie men
al muchel þes si senne
vor hþi þolieð alle dead
þet comen of þo kenne.

f. 104r

Here senne ⁊ ec vre
sore us mai ofþenche
for senne þe alle hier
in sorȝe bieð ⁊ in spinche.
Seðe God spo muchele preche
dede vor one misdede
þe þet gelteð ofte ⁊ muchel
hþat sal us to rede.
Adam ⁊ his ospreng
al vor one bare senne
þeren vele hundred ȝer
on helle ⁊ on unþenne.
Þo þet ledeð here lif
mid unrihte ⁊ mid þronge
bute hit godes milce do
hi sulle bi þer þel longe.
Godes milce is spo muchel
⁊ al spo is his mihte.
nis him no þing litlende
ac bi emliche þihte.
He one mai more vorȝeue
þanne al uolc gelte cunne.
se deuel self mihte habbe milce
ef he hit bigunne.
Hþo spo godes milce secð
ipis he hi mai vinde.
ac helle king is spiþe hard
þið þo þet he mai binde.

f. 104v

Se þet eure deð his pille mest
he sal him þerse mede
his behð sal bi þallinde þich.
his bed berninde glede.
Þers he doð his gode þine
þanne his loðe viende
isilde us eure drihte crist
þið spiche loðe frende.
Neure ich on helle ne com
ne comen ic þer ne recche.
þeh ich alle þerlde þele

þer inne pende vecche.
Ich pille þeð siggen ȝeu
þet pismen us sede
⁊ on boc hit stant iprite
⁊ alle þe muȝen hit rede.
Ich hit pille siggen þan
þet hit ham selue nesten
⁊ parni hi pið here vnþines
ef hi me pilleð hlesten.
Vn⸌der⸍stondeð nu to me
eadi men ⁊ arme
ich pille of helle pine
parni ȝeu ⁊ fram harme.
In helle is hunger ⁊ þurst
euele tþo iueren
þos pine þolieð þo þet peren
me⸌te⸍niþinges hiere.

Þer is sorinesse ⁊ þop f. 105r
efter eche strete
hi uareð vram hete in to chele
⁊ fram chele in to hete.
Þanne hi in þare hete bieð
se chele ham þencheð blisce
þanne hi to chele cumeð
of hete hi habbeð misse
Eiðer ham deð þo inoh
nabbeð hi none blisce
niteð hi hþer hi ponieð mest
mid neure none ipisse
Hi palkeð eure ⁊ reste secheð
ac hi ne muȝen imeten
vor hi nolden þo hi mihte
hire sennen ibeten
Hi secheð reste þer non nis.
for hi ne muȝen iuinde
ac palkeð peri up ⁊ dun
spo pater doð mid pinde.
Þet seden þo þet pere her
on þonke unstedeueste
⁊ þo þet biheten gode
⁊ nolden hit ileste
Þo þet agunne godes perc
⁊ hit fulendi nolde

441 **V**nderstondeð] der *int. and marked for insertion* 448 meteniþings] te *int. and marked for insertion*

nu peren hier ⁊ nu þer
⁊ deden þet hi polde

f. 105v

Þer is pich þet eure palð
þet sullen baþien inne
þo þet ledden here lif
in pele ⁊ in senne.
Þer is ver þet is hudred fealde
hotter þanne is vre
ne mai hit kuenche no peter
hauene. stream. ne sture.
Þer is ver þet eure brenneð
ne mai hit no þing quenchen
þer inne sendeð þo þet loueden
precche men to spenchen.
⁊ þo þet pere spikele men
⁊ ful of euele prenchen
⁊ þo þet mihte vnriht do
⁊ lief hit hem pes to þenche.
Þo þet louede hordom ⁊ stale
⁊ reauinge ⁊ drunke
⁊ on þos loþes diefle perkes
to bleðeliche spunke.
Þo þet peren lease men
ne mihte me hem ileuen
⁊ medeȝierned domesmen
⁊ prangpise ireuen.
Þo þet oþres pif haueden lief
⁊ here oȝen eðlete
⁊ þo þet spiþe seneȝeden
on drunke ⁊ on hete.

f. 106r

Þe precche man binam his god
⁊ leide hit on horde
þe litel let of godes bode
⁊ of his spete porde.
⁊ se þet his oȝen nolde ȝeuen
þer he iseȝh þo niede
ne nolde ihiere godes men
þer he set at his biede.
⁊ þo þet peren ȝetseres
of þise porldes eȝhte
⁊ deden al þet se loþe gost

485 Þer] Þþer *originally the letter* þ *was miswritten within the main body of the text when it should have been an enlarged capital, as it begins a quatrain. A different hand adds* Þ *within the ruling for the 'litterae notabiliores'* 506 on] om *with third minim subp.*

ham tichede to ⁊ taðte.
⁊ alle þo þet anie pise
þo diefle er ikuemde
þo sullen ben voð mid him
vordon ⁊ vordemde.
Bute þo þet vor þuhte ham
here sennen ⁊ here misdeden
⁊ gunnen here sennes beten
⁊ betere lif leden.
Þer bieð naddren ⁊ snaken
eueten ⁊ ec fruden
þo tereð ⁊ freteð þo þet euel spekeð
þo on\d/fulle ⁊ þo prude.
Neure sunne þer ne sinð
ne mone ne no sterre
þer is muchel godes hete
⁊ muchel godes herre.

Eure þer is euel smac f. 106ᵛ
þiersternesse ⁊ eȝie
nis þer neure oþer liht
þanne þiester leie.
Þer liggeð attliche feond
in stronge raketeȝe
þet bieð þo þet peren mid gode
engles spiþe heȝe.
Þer bieð atteliche vend
⁊ eiliche pihte
þo sulle þo arme saule iseon
þet gelten þurh isihðe.
Þer is se loðe sathanas
⁊ belzebub se alde.
eaðe hi muȝen bi ofherd
þet sullen hine bihialde.
Ne mai non herte hit iþenche
ne no tunge telle
hu muchele pinen ⁊ hu uele
bieð inne helle.
Þið þo pinen þet þer bieð
nelle ich ȝeu noht lieȝen
nis hit bute gamen ⁊ glie
al þet man her mai drieȝen.
Ne doð ham noþing spo þo
on þo loðe bende

528 ondfulle] d *int. and marked for insertion*

spo þet hi niten þet here pine
ne sal habben ende.

f. 107r

Þer bieð þo heþene men
þet peren laȝelease
þer naht of godes bode
ne of godes hesne.
Euele christene men
hi bieð here iuere
þo þet here christendom
euele hielden hiere.
7 ȝet hi bieð on perse stede
in niþer helle grunde
ne sulle hi neure comen ut
vor marke ne vor punde.
Ne mai ham noþer helpe þer
bene ne elmesse
vor naht hi solden bidde þer
ore ne ȝeuenesse.
Shilde him ech þe hpile he mai
pið þo helle pine
7 parni ech his frend þer pið
spo ich pille mine.
Þo þet silden hem ne cunne
ich ham pille teche
ich kan bien aider ef ich sal
lichames 7 saule leche.
Lete pe þet god vorbiet
alle mankenne
7 do pel spo he us hot
7 parni us pið senne.

f. 107v

Louie god mid ure hierte
7 mid al ure mihte
7 ure emcristene spo us self
spo us lereð drihte.
Al þet men ret 7 singð
biuoren godes borde
al hit hongeð 7 halt
bi þise tpam porde.
Godes laȝe he uoluelð
þo niepe 7 þo ealde.
þet þos tpo loue haueð

586 and 587 *these lines have been trs. according to the letters* a *and* b *marked in the margin* 598 ealde] *prec. by* h *subp.* 599 þet] Þ *has been placed in error in the ruled grid for capitalized initials when it does not begin a quatrain; it is not a capital and is not touched red*

7 þel hi þile healde
Ac hi bieð harue ihialde þel
spo ofte þe gelteð alle
vor hit is strang to stonden veste
7 liht hit is to ualle.
Drihte christ us ȝieue
stonde þet þe mote
7 of alle ure vallen
he one us come to bote.
Þe pilneð efter þerldes þele
þet longe nele ileste
7 leggeð almest ure ispinch
on þinge vnstedeueste
Spngke þe vor godes loue
spo þe doð vor eȝte
nere þe so ofte bicherd
ne spo euele bikaȝte.

Ef þe polden herie gode f. 108r
spo þe doð arminges
þe mihten richer bi mid him
þanne eorles oþer kinges.
Ne muȝen þe us biperien her
þið þurste ne þið hungre
ne þið elde ne þið deað
se eldre ne se ȝungre.
Þer nis hunger ne þurst
deað hunhelðe ne elde
to ofte man bicareð þis lif
7 þet al to selde.
Þe solden us biþenche bet
ofte 7 þel ilome
hþet þe bieð. to hþam þe sulle
7 of hþam þe come.
Hu litle hþile þe bieð hier
hu longe elles hwere
hþet we muȝer habben hier
7 hþet vinden þere.
Ef þere þise men
þus þe solden þenche
bute þe purðe us iþer
þis porld us þile adrenche.
Vor almihti godes luue

625 Þer] Þþer *originally the letter* þ *was miswritten within the main body of the text when it should have been an enlarged capital as it begins a quatrain. A different hand adds* Þ *within the ruling for the 'litterae notabiliores'* 631 hwet] h *has been placed in error in the ruled grid for capitalized initials when it does not begin a quatrain; it is not a capital and is not touched red*

ute pe us biperien
þises precches perldes loue
þet hi ne muȝen us derien.

f. 108v

Mid uastinge elmesse 7 mid ibede
perie pe us pið senne
mid þo pepnen þet god haueð
iȝeuen al mankenne.
Lete pe þo brode strete.
7 þane pei bene
þet ledeð þo niȝende del to helle
of men 7 mo ich pene.
Go pe þane narepe pei
7 þane pei grene
þer uorð vareð litel volc
ac þet is vair 7 scene.
Si brode strete is ure ipil
þet us is loð to lete
þo þet al volȝeð hire hipil
hi vareð þo brode strete.
Hi muȝen lihtliche vare
mid þare niþerhelde
þurð one gutlease pode
in to one brode velde.
Se narepe pei is godes hesne
þer vorð vareð pel viape
þet bieð þo þet hier ham silten
pið echen vnþeape.
Go pe alle þane pei
he us pile bringe
mid þo veape vaire men
biforen heuenkinge.

f. 109r

Þer is alþer merȝþe mest
mid englene songe
se þet is a þusend pintre þer
ne þingð hit him naht longe.
Se þet lest haueð blisce he heð spo muche
ne biddeð he no more
se þet þo blisce let vor þos
hit him sel repen sore.
Ne mai non euel ne no pane

650 bene] n *subp. after* e 659 hire hipil] //hipil //hire: *two oblique strokes preceding both* hipil *and* hire *mark them for trs.*
673 merȝþe] þ *written over* k] *glossed* Ioy *in the left hand margin in a later hand*

bi in heueriche
þeȝ þer bi poniinge vele
ech oþer vniliche.
Sume þer habbeð lesse merȝþe
7 sume þer habbeð more
ech efter þan þet he dede
efter þet he spanc sore.
Ne sel þer bi bred ne pin
ne oþer kennes este
God one sel bi eches lif
7 blisce 7 eche reste.
Ne sal þer bi scete ne scrud
ne porldes pele none
ac si merȝþe þet men us bihat
al sal ben god one.
Ne mai no merȝþe bi spo muchel
spo is godes isihþe
hi is soð sune 7 briht
7 dai bute nihte.

Þer is pele bute pane f. 109v
7 reste buten ispinche
se þet mai 7 nele þider come
sore hit sel vorþenche.
Þer is blisce buten treȝe
7 lif buten deaðe
þet eure sullen punie þer
bliðe hi bieð 7 eade.
Þer is ȝeuȝeþe buten elde
7 elde buten vnhelðe
nis þer sorȝe ne sor non
ne non vniselþe.
Þer me sel drihten isen
spo ase he is mid ipisse
he one mai 7 sel al bien
engles 7 mannes blisce.
Þah ne bi here eaȝen naht
al iliche brihte.
nabbeð hi naht iliche muchel
alle of godes lihte
On þise liue þe nere noht
alle of one mihte
ne þer ne sullen hi habben gode

704 hit] hit hit (*ditt.*) 722-723] alle [...] gode: *a small hole in the parchment means that these lines are slightly indented*

alle bi one rihte.
Þo sullen more of him iseon
þet hine luuede more
⁊ more iknopen ⁊ isien
his mihte ⁊ his ore.

f. 110r

On him hi sullen vinden al
þet man mei þer to lesten
in liue boc hi sullen isien
þet her hi ne pisten.
Crist one sel ben inoh
alle his deorlinges
he one is muchele more ⁊ betere
þanne alle oþre þinges.
Inoh he haueð þet hine haueð
þet alle þing haueð on pealde
of him to isien nis non sed
spo vair he is to bihialde.
God is spo mere ⁊ spo muchel
in his godcunnesse
þet al þet he pes ⁊ is
is vele perse ⁊ lesse.
Ne mai hit no man oþre
siggen mid ipisse
hu muchele merȝþe habbeð þo
þet bieð in godes blisce
Vten eftin þiderpard
mid aldre ȝernuolnesse
⁊ vorsen þisne midelard
mid his pouernesse
Ef pe vorsieð þis loþe lif
vor heuenriche blisce
þanne selð us crist þet eche lif
to medes on ecnesse.

f. 110v

To þare blisce us bringe god
þet rixeð buten ende.
þanne he ure saule vnbint
of lichamlice bende.
Crist ȝeue us lede spich lif
⁊ habbe spichne ende
þet pe moten þider cumen
þanne pe hennes pende
A-M-E-N

765 *the verse-sermon concludes with stretched majuscules; between each is a waved filler line*
The remainder of the folio is filled with Latin verse.

London, British Library
MS Egerton 613,
folios 64^{r}-70^{v}

Transcription of London, British Library MS Egerton 613, folios 64^{r}-70^{v}

MS *Pointing: E2 has regular pointing with the punctus usually occurring at the end of each half-line (mid-line), with occasional exceptions. These occurences, which are represented in the text, will not be listed in the notes.*

A punctus can also be found after: **sunne**, **mone** and **dei.**: line 76; **deð**: line 79; **eorðe**: line 81; **eal**: line 112; **cume**: line 124; **seið**: line 133; **suster**: line 148; **sunne** *and* **sorȝe**: line 192; **síc** 197; **pine**: line 206; **hér**: line 242; **á**: line 252; **tereð**, **freteð** *and* **fulle**: line 272; **ulde**: line 320; **dieð**: line 321; **aquierne**: line 360; and **murhðe**: line 363.

The initial letter of each couplet, after the first folio, is distinguished from the rest of the text by being coloured red and contained within a specially-ruled parallel column. They are often faded and sometimes illegible. I have given them as capitals in my transcription, although they are not always capital in shape, to distinguish them, as was intended, from the rest of the line. Exceptions will be noted in the commentary. The alternate lines begin with a miniscule and are indented. The first recto differs from the rest of the text, as only the first initial letter is enlarged and coloured red. All of the following letters which begin lines, regardless of whether they begin a couplet or not, are capitalized and touched red.

Abbreviations are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:

Throughout the text **þ** *has been expanded to* **þet** *at* lines: 51, 82, 98, 99, 101, 114, 122, 139, 157, 158, 169, 188, 189, 190, 221, 247, 266, 278, 286, 288 $^{(x2)}$, 301, 302, 305 $^{(x2)}$, 311, 315, 332, 336, 344, 351 and 356.

There are only seven occasions where **þet** *is written out, and they are at* lines: 13, 68, 81, 122^{2}, 253 and 264.

hi expanded to **him**: lines 26, 27, 32, 40, 77, 107, 109, 110, 111, 114, 115, 116, 148, 151, 156, 161, 162, 166, 182, 194, 223, 268, 297, 330, 350, 352, 365, 366$^{(x2)}$ and 368; **na** expanded to **nan**: lines 37 and 166; **ma** expanded to **man**: lines 38, 184 and 199; **co** expanded to **com**: lines 117, 191, 196 and 219, ; **pet** expanded to **peter**: line 142; **heo** expanded to **heom**: lines 179$^{(x2)}$, 180, 182, 224, 233, 234, 266, 287, 295, 299, 319 and 344; **come** expanded to **comen**: line 200; **na** expanded to **nam**: line 203; **fra** expanded to **fram**: line 230; **cume**: expanded to **cumen**: line 294;

The scribe of this text uses oblique strokes above vowels as markers of length. However, the frequency of these marks is unusual and not altogether regular – although some patterns can be seen.[845] *All of these instances will be shown in the text and in the notes.*

Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

Both of the texts of the *Conduct of Life* within Egerton contain strong South-Western linguistic features, as evidenced below. Laing (LAEME) believes the language of both versions is of south-west Worcestershire with the text of E1 possibly being more northern.[846] Both texts, which were copied from the same exemplar, retain archaic grammar and orthography, with the scribe of E2 being more conservative than the scribe of E1.[847] This has led Laing to believe that the text may well be deliberately archaistic.[848]

In initial position, E2 mostly has the runic letter <þ> (*þorn*) (§ 2.4): **þen**, **þanne**, **þeh**, **þincð** etc., however, <ð> is also frequently written (§ 3.1): **ðis**, **ðe**, **ðer** etc. In medial and final position <ð> (*eth*) is mostly written (§ 4.4): **iqueðen**, **sẏððen**, **þincð**, **bispikeð** etc. with rare <þ>(§ 4.4): **naþing**, **cuþe**, **nuþe**, **ẏ-selþe**, **unhelþe** and **folgeþ**, **beoþ**, **deþ** and **recþ**. The only occurance of <th> (§ 5) in E2

[845] These marks are discussed by Hill in 'Notes on the Egerton *e* Text', pp. 355-357.
[846] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.
[847] In addition to the examples provided here, see Hill, 'Notes on the Egerton *e* Text', pp. 353-357.
[848] Margaret Laing, 'The value of texts surviving in more than one version', p. 576

is in **sathanas**, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 *Remark*). The graph <d> is written for <ð> once only in **ladliche** (§ 7.6), a reading shared with both J and M.There are occasional occurances of the dental stop /t/ written for <ð>/<þ> in low stress positions (§ 8 and § 8.2): **þinchet**, **mís lichet**, **forȝitet** etc. and, on one occasion, assimilation of <þ> (§ 8 and § 8.2) in **mid te**.

The runic letter <ƿ> (wynn) is retained throughout E2 without any examples of <w> (§ 11.1 and § 11.5). The Old English ligature <æ> is regularly found in E2 (§ 12.1):**æm**, **pælde**, **ilæd**, **ær** etc. E2 writes the Tironian nota <⁊> (§ 13.4)with rare **and** being written on only eight occasions (§ 13.2).

Insular ȝ is retained in E2 alongside Caroline *g* (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): **gramet**, **grunde**, **glede** etc.and before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* (§ 42.2): **god**, **gulte**, **gað** etc. and by levelling in (**bi**)**ginnige**. The movement to <w> is not present in E2, which retains <ȝ> for the fricative /ɣ/ (§ 43.7) in **folȝeþ**, **maȝe**, **aȝen** etc. and <ȝh> in **moȝhe** (§ 43.7). E2 preserves <ȝ > for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): **ȝẏng**, **ȝẏet**, **ȝuinge** etc. Initial <ȝ> is retained before *i* in **ȝif/ȝiefe** (§ 45.4). E2 retains <ȝ> in **eȝen**, **peȝen**, **preȝen** etc. where all other MSS demonstrate a transition to a palatal, in at least one instance, through the writing of <i> (the writing of <ȝ> in these examples does not, however, negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound. See § 47.3). The continuation of the OE movement *ig > i* (§ 48) in **eni**, **mani** and **ȝedi** is further demonstrated in E2. Palatal ȝ /j/ is lost before *d* (§ 49)in **sede** and **ised** (§ 49.4). Late OE /dʒ/, written <cȝ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in **bigge**, **seggen**, **ligget** etc. The OE group nȝ /ŋg/ is written <ng> (§ 51, § 51.11 and § 51.14): **lange**, **kinge**, **strengðe** etc. with devoicing to /ŋk/, written <nc>, before <ð> in **strencðe** (§ 51.12) and before <p> in **prancpise/pranc-pise** (§ 51.15); <n> is absent in **bi-ginige** (§ 51.13). The OE prefix *ge* is retained on two occasions in E2 in **ȝe-lome** and **ȝe-sceafte** (§ 57).

In initial position <c> for /k/ is retained before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in **cuðe**, **cudde**, **cunne** etc. with <k> only found in **king(e)/kinges**. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is mostly written as <c> in **cunne**, **cuþe**, **cumeð** etc. but <k> is found in **kinning**, **kare** and **kan**. Before <n> (§ 18) it retains <c> in **cnapað/(i)cnapeð** and **(i)cnape** as it is before all other consonants (§ 19) in **(i)clupede**, **cliue**, **criste** etc. E2 writes <qu> (§. 20) for OE *cw* in **iqueðen**, **quike** and **iquemde** but retains the OE form <cw> in **cpeman** and **icpemed**. E2 writes <k> in medial position for OE velar *c* thoughout the text: (§. 21 and §. 21.4): **speke(n)**, **bi-spikeð**, **siker** etc. with rare occurances of <c> (§. 22 and §. 22.4) found in: **licede** and **brecð**. However, <c> is always retained in final position (§. 23 and §. 23.4): **ac**, **ec**, **þanc** etc. with no evidence of <k>. The writing of <ch> for velar *c* is most frequently found in E2 (§. 25 and §. 25.3): **mis-lichet**, **spunche**, **spichele** and **ech/æch**.

The regular form of /tʃ/ in E2 is <ch> (§. 27, §. 28.4, §.29.4 and §. 30.4): **child(e)**, **chilce**, **muchel(e)**, **smeche**, **ech**, **æurich** etc and in **ðinche** (§. 32 and §. 32.13) and **ðenche** (§. 32 and §. 32.15) etc. with <c> /tʃ/ (§. 31 and §. 31.4) regulalrly written in **ic**; the occasional writing of <c> in **elc**, **eure-elc**, **spilc**, **hpilc** and **sellic** are possible variants with /k/ (§. 31.4). E2 regularly writes <c> in **þincð/ðincð**, **of-þincð**, **iðencð** and **bi-þencð**, variants likely with /k/ (see §. 32.1, §. 32.14 and §. 32.16); the writing of <c>, probably /k/, is also found in **recþ** where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected (see §. 33 and §. 33.4).E2 always writes <sc> (§. 35.4) for /ʃ/ (§. 34) in initial position: **sceal**, **scop**, **sceafte** etc. and in medial position in **fisces** (§. 38). OE [ts] is always written <c> in **milce** (§. 41).

E2 always writes OE unvoiced [f] as <f> in initial position in **fele/fale**, **folȝeþ**, **for** (§ 58 and § 58.13) etc., in final position in **lif**, **of**, **sulf** (§ 58.14) etc. and in medial position where it is adjacent to one unvoiced sound: **him-sulfne**, **oft**, **æfter** (§ 58.14) etc. However, voicing is regularly

demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.15) through the writing of <v>/<u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in **him-selue**, **uuel**, **heuene** etc. with some instances of <f> still retained: **be-fore(n)/bi-foren**, **alife**, **pife/pẏfe** etc. The writing of <f> has disappeared before *d* in **hadde/hedde** (§58.16).

In E2 OE *a* in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): **habbe**, **faren**, **baðie** etc. and <a> before a nasal (§ 60 and § 60.4) in **manne**, **þanc**, **þanne** etc. Before a lengthening group, OE *a* is always <a> (§ 61 and § 61.4): **lange**, **prange**, **hande** etc. E2 mostly writes WML <e> for OE *æ* with a mixture of <a> (§ 63 and § 63.4): **hefð**, **elmesse**, **peter(e)** etc. with <æ> in **æfter** and **bæð** and <a> in **habbe/habb**, **hafð**, **haueþ/haueþ** and **hadde**. OE *e* is always <e> in E2 (§ 64 and § 64.7): **beren**, **ende**, **felde**, **strencðe/strengðe** etc. OE *o* is always written <o> in D (§ 65.1 and § 65.5): **bi-fore**, **bibode**, **borde** etc. E2: OE *i* is mostly <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.11) in **bidde**, **child(e)** , **finde(n)** etc. with <y> written in **a-pyste** (§ 66.11) and occasional <u> in **pule**, **pulle**, **pulleð** (see § 66.4 for the influence of *w*) and **nuste(n)** (probable WML form, see § 66.6 and § 66.12) and <e> in **nele** and **nelle** (§ 66.14 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to *ę̀*). For OE *y,* E2 has mostly <u> (§ 67ff and § 67.11), a feature of WML texts: **dude**, **gulte**, **muchel** etc. with a significant number of <i>/<ẏ> writings also present: **þincð/ðincð**, **michel(e)/mẏchel, king(e)** and <e> written once in **iðencð**. OE *y* (§ 67.15) is <u> in **lutel**, **lute**, **hud**, **fur(e)**, **cuðe** and **cudde** and <i> in **litel**, **lite** and **hpi**. E2 retains traditional <u> for OE *u* (§ 68 and § 68.4) throughout the text: **cume(n)**, **punien**, **grunde** etc.

E2 writes mostly <a> for OE *ā*, probably the most conservative of the MSS, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.6): **ane**, **nan**, **lac** etc. with <o> only present in **pori.** In E2 OE $æ_1$ is written <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): **dede**, **rede**, **adrede** etc. with OE *æ* (§ 75.4).retained in **forlæ te** (for OE *þær* see § 77ff). OE $æ_2$ is regularly written <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) **mest**, **unhelþe**, **lest** etc. with OE *æ* (§ 79.1) a regular feature in this text: **ær**, **æurich**, **æure**, **æura-ma**, **ilæd**, **læde/læden** and **æniman**(for *ælc, elc* and *ylc* see § 81ff). OE *ē* is nearly always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.4): **he**, **deþ/ded**,

cweman etc with <ie> written in **dieð** and <eo> written in **beot**. OE *ī* is mostly <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.6): **mi**, **hpile**, **þriste** etc. but <u> is written in **spunes** (§ 83.2). OE *ō* is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.4): **to**, **dom**(**e**), **boc/boke** etc. OE *u* is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.4): **nu**, **ure/vre**, **þu** etc.

In E2 OE *ea* (§ 86 and §87ff) before *r* , without lengthening (§ 88.11), is regularly written with OE <æ> (§ 88.1 and § 87.5): **ærpe**, **nærepene** and **þærf**, with traditional <ea> (§ 87.5 and § 88.1) found in **ðearf** and **earme** and fronted <ie> (§ 87.5) in **ðierf** and **spierte**; before *rd* (§ 88.12) it is mostly <ea> in (**middan**)**-eard**, (**middle**)**eard** and **hearde,** with <a> in **hardne** and <e> found in **herde**; before *rn* (§ 88.13) <ea> is once more written in **earninge**, <a> in **parnie/parine** and <e> in **perni**. The *i*-umaut of *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <e> (§ 89.7) in **erminges** but <u>, from WS /y/, in **durne** (§ 89.7 and § 89.3) and <eo>, a SW form, in **smeorte** (§ 89.7). There is considerable variance in E2, the most conservative version of the text, for OE *ea* before *l*, without lengthening (Anglian *a*), which is regularly written <ea> (§ 90ff and § 90.4): **eal** and **ealle, fealle, pealð** etc. with <æ> written in **æl** and several examples of <a>: **all**(**e**) and **al**, **palle** and **salt**; before *ld* the writing of <ea> (§ 91.2 and § 91.6) is regular: **pealden**, **eald**(**e**)**, fealde** etc. with <æ> written in **pælde** and <a> written in **halt**. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *l* combinations (Angl. mutation of *a*) E2 has <e> in **elder** and **elde** (§ 92ff and § 92.7) but presents SW forms with the writing of <u> in **uldre** and **ulde** and <y> in **ẏlde**. OE *ea* before *h* combinations is mostly <e> (§ 87.3, § 93.1 and § 93.6) in **heȝe** and **iseh**, with <ea> in **heaȝe**. The *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *h*-combinations is always <i> in **mihte**(**n**) and **nihte**(**s**) (§ 94.1 and § 94.5).

For OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.6) E2 always writes <eo> (a form retained longest in the WML and the South § 96.1 and § 96.2) in **peorch**(**e**)**/peorc**, **peorkes**, **heorte** and **steorre**. The *wur* group (§ 97 and § 97.6) is <u> in **purðe** and for the *i*-umlaut of *eo* it is <u> in **purs**(**e**) (see note to § 97.6). OE *eo* before *l*-combinations is twice <e> (§98.4) in **selue/self** but mostly <u> (SW § 98ff and §98.7). OE *eo* before *ht* is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.5) in **rihtpisnesse**, **unriht/un-rihte**, **rihte** and **briht**(**e**) and <i> for the *i*-umlaut (§ 100 and § 100.7) in **ouersihð** and **ðurh-**

sihð. OE – WS *eom* is **æm** and **eom** (SW form § 101). OE *eo* (*a*-umlaut of *e*) is mostly <e> in E2 (§ 102ff and § 103.4): **fele/uele** , **brekeð**, **pele** and **unfreme** with <a> written in **fale** and <ea> in **feale** (possibly by association with the antonym *fēawe*, see § 103.4). OE *eo* (*u*-umaut of *e*) is regularly <e> (§ 102ff and § 104.4) in **heuen**(e), **heuenriche**, **heuenliche** etc. with <eo> (WML form) present in h**eouene** and <o> written in **poruld**(**es**) and **pode** with <u> written under the influence of *w* in **suster.** The velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105ff) is regularly written as <eo> (WML and SW form) in E2 (§ 105.7): **soððen**, **seouene**, **bi-neoðen**, **heore/heora** etc, the writing of <u> and <ẏ> in **suððe** and **syððen** demonstrates the lack of umlaut before a dental in the SW (lWS *syððan*, see § 105.3); <u> is also written in **icluped** and **bi-clupien** alongside <i> in (**be**)-**nime** and **quike**.

For OE *ēa* (§ 106ff and § 106.4) E2 contains a mixture of variants with <e> in **ech/ec**, **eð-late**, **uneðe** and **brede**, <ea> in **eaðe**, **deað** and **reauing** and <ie> (see § 106.2) in **ieþe**, **un-ieðe/unieþe**, **lien**, **briede** and <ȝe> (see § 106.2) in **ȝedi**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēa* (§ 107.1 and § 107.5) is nearly always SW <u> (see § 107.1) in **ihurð**, **ihuren** and **ilusd** with <e> only written in rhyming position (see § 107.1), therefore, an unlikely representation of the dialect, in **ileue**, **leueð** and **temen.** OE *ēo* (§ 108ff and § 108.6) is mostly written <eo> in E2, a form associated with the WML and the South (§ 108.1): **beo**(**n**), **seon**, **freond** etc. with <e> written once in **ben**, <ie> in **lief** and <i> in **sic**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109 ff) is a mixture of <eo>, associated with the South and the WML, and <u> (§ 109.7): **freond**, **deore** and **neode** and <u>, possiblyfrom WS *y* (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /ø:/ from *ēo*, in **frund**, **fund**, **þustre**, **ðustrenesse** and **dure**.

In E2 OE *ea* after *sc* (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.5) is <ea> in **sceal** and **sceafte**, <æ> in **scæl**, <a> in **scal**, **scamian**, **scamet** and **scame** with <ie> written once in **sciete**. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* after *c* (§ 113.5) E2 writes <e> in **chele** and **bicherd** but SW <u> (see § 113.1) in **chule**. OE *ēa* after *g* (§ 114) is <e> in **ȝer**. For OE *ie* after *g* (§ 116.4) E2 mostly writes SW <i>/<ẏ> (§ 115.1) and **forȝitet**,

ȝiue, ȝiueð etc with <u> **for-ȝut** and <ie> in **ȝieuen** (both also likely SW forms). Similarly, for OE *ɪe* after *g* E2 writes SW <ẏe> in **ȝẏet** and SW <u> in **ȝut** (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE *ie* after *sc* (§ 118.4) E2 writes SW <u> in **sculde(n)** and **sculdeð**. OE *eo* after *ġ* (§ 119.1 and §120.4) is <ẏ> in **ȝẏng**, <u> in **ȝunge**, <eo> in **ȝeonger** (see § 119.1) and <eu> in **ȝeuȝeþe**. OE *eo* after *sc* (§ 121.4) is written as either <u> in **scule(n)** or <o> in **scolde(n)** and **sop**.

OE *æ + ʒ* /j/ is nearly always <ei> (WM § 122.1) in E2 (§ 122.5) in **mei**, **dei/deie** and **seið** with <ai> written on one occasion in **saið**. LWS *sǣde* / Anglian *sægde* (§ 123 and §123.4) is <e> in **sede** and **ised**. OE *ǣ1* (Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.4) is <æi> in **mæi** and **græi** with <ei> in **meie** and <eȝ> in (**i**)**seȝen**. OE *ǣ2* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.4) is <æi> in **æiðer** and <ai> in **aiðer**. OE *e* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.5) is <ei> in **eie**, **eisliche**, **pei** and **peies** with <eȝ> in **peȝen** and <æi> in **æie**. OE *ē* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.4) is <ei> in **leie** and <eȝ> in **for-preȝen**. OE *ēa* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.1) is <eȝ> in **eȝen/eȝe** and **raketeȝe**. OE *ā* + *h (g)* (§ 132.1 and § 132.2) is <ah> in **fah** and **ah**. OE *ǣ2* + *h* (§ 132.1 and § 133.4) is <e> in **tehte** and **ehte** and <a> in **ahte**. OE *ō* + *h* (§ 134.1 and § 134.5) is always <o> in **un-boht**, **bi-þoht**, **brohte** etc. OE *a* + /ɣ/ (§ 136.1 and § 136.5) is <aȝ> in **draȝan/draȝen**, **laȝhe**, **laȝe** and **laȝe-liese**. OE *ā* + /ɣ/ (§ 137.1 and § 137.5) is <a> (a WML feature in this text, see § 69) before <ȝ> in **maȝe/maȝhe** and **aȝe(n)**. OE *ā* + *w* (§ 138.1 and § 138.5) is <a> (WML, see § 69) before *w* in **icnape**, **blapeð**, **saple** etc., with <au> written in **saule** and <o> before *p* in **mopen**. OE *ēo* + *w* (§ 139.1 and § 139.5) is <eo> (WM/Southern form cf. § 108.1) before *w* in **reope** and **seopen** and <u> in **rupen**; the *i*-umlaut is WS <u> (§ 109.1) in **untrupnesse**. OE *ēa* + *w* (§ 140.1 and § 140.5) is <ea> in **feape**, <e> in **fepe** and <ie> in **fiepe**.

Ich æm elder þen ich þes. ápintre and a lore f. 64r
Ic pælde more þanne ic dude. mí þít ah to ben more
Þel lange ic habbe child íbeon. á þeorde ⁊ ech a dede
Þeh ic beo apintre eald. tu ȝỳng i eom á rede
Vn nut lif ic habb ilæd. ⁊ ȝỳet me þincð ic léde
Þanne ic me bi þenche. þel sore íc me adrede
Mest al þat ic habbe ỳdon. ỳs idelnesse and chilce.
Þel late ic habbe me bi þoht. but me god do milce.
Fele ỳdele þord ich habbe iqueden. sỳððen ic speke cuþe
And fale ȝunge dede ido. þe me of þinchet nuþe
Al to lome ic habbe a gult. a þeorche ⁊ ec a þorde
Al to muchel ic habbe íspend. to litel ỳ leid an horde
Mest al þet me licede ár. nu hit me mis lichet
Þe mỳchel folȝeþ hís ỳ þíl. hím sulfne he bi spikeð
Ich mihte habbe bet ídon. hadde \ic/ þo ỳ selþe
Nu íc polde ac ic ne mei. for elde ne for unhélþe
Ỳlde me ís bi stolen on. ár ic hít á þyste
ne mihte íc íseon be fore mé. for sméche ne for míste

Ærþe pé beoþ to done gód. ⁊ \to/ ỳfele al to þriste f. 64v
more æie stent man óf manne. þanne hỳm dó of criste
Þe pél ne deþ þe hpile he mei. pél óft hit hỳm scæl rupen
þænne hỳ mopen sculen ⁊ ripen. þer hi ær seopen
Don ec to gode pet ȝe muȝe. þa hpile ȝe buð alífe
ne hopie no man to muchel to childe ne to pífe
Þe hím selue for ȝut for pife. oðer for childe
hé sceal cume án uuele stede bute him god beo milde
Send æch sum gód bí foren him. þe hpile he mei to heuene
betere is án elmesse bi fore. þenne beon æfter seouene
Ne beo þe leoure þene þe sulf. þi mæi ne ði maȝe
sót is ðe is oðres mannes freond. betere þene his aȝe
Ne hopie pif to hire pere. ne per to his pife
beo for him sulue æurich man. þe hpile hé beo alíue
Þis ís þe hím sulfne bi þencð. þe hpile he móte libbe.
for sone pulleð hine for ȝíte ðe fremde ⁊ þe sibbe
Þe pél ne deð þe hpile hé mei. ne sceal \hé/ hpenne he polde.
manies mannes sare ispinch. habbeð óft unholde

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
1 ápintre 2 mí, pít 3 child, íbeon, ápeord 4 árede 5 iláed, léde 6 íc 10 ídó, ófþinchet 12 íspend 13 ár, mís lichet 14 hís, ỳ pil, hím sulfne 15 ídon 16 íc, unhélþe 17 ís, ár, hít, ápỳste 18 íc, íseo, mé, sméche, míste 19 Ærþe, pé, gód 20 óf, dó 21 pél[1], pél[2], óft, scæl 23 alífe 24 pífe 25 hím selue 26 hé, án 27 gód, bí foren 28 án, æfter 29 sót 32 hé, alíue 33 Þis, ís, hím sulfne, móte 34 for ȝíte 35 pél, hé, \hé/ 36 íspinch, óft

1 **I**ch] **I** *is an enlarged coloured capital which fills one line above and one line below its own line. Each of the initial letters of the following lines of this fol., regardless of whether they begin a couplet or not, are capitalized and touched red, except for* ne (line 18) 14 folȝeþ] þ *written over something now illegible* 15 ic] *int. after* hadde 19 to] *int. after* ⁊ 23 **D**on] **D** *very faint but still legible* 25 oðer] *over eras.* 26 uuele] *foll. by a letter eras.* 29 **N**e] **N** *very faint but still legible* 31 **N**e] **N** *very faint but still legible* 33 **Þ**is] **Þ** *very faint but still legible* 35 **Þ**e] **Þ** *very faint but still legible* hé] *int. after* sceal 36 íspinch] initial letter is i-longa

Ne scolde nanman don á furst. ne slapen pel to done.
for mani man bi hateð pél. þe hít forȝitet sone
Þe man ðe siker pule beon to habbe godes blisse
do pel himsulf þe hpile he mei. ðen haueð hé míd ipisse
Þes riche men peneð beo siker. þurh palle end þurch diche
he deð his á sikere stede. þé sent to heueneriche
For ðer ne ðierf beon óf dréd. óf fure ne óf þeoue
þer ne mei hí bi níme. ðe laðe ne ðe leoue

f. 65r **Þ**ar ne þærf hé habbe kare óf pÿfe ne óf childe
þuder pe sendet ⁊ sulf bereð. to lite ⁊ to sélde
þider pé scolden draȝan ⁊ don. pél oft ⁊ pel ȝe lome
For þer ne sceal me us naht bi níme. mid prancpíse dome
Þider pé scolden ȝeorne draȝen. polde ȝe me íleue
for ðere ne mei hit bi nímen eop þe king ne se íreue
Þet betste þet pé hedde. þuder pé scolde sende
For þer pe hit mihte finde éft. ⁊ habbe bute ende
Þe ðe hér deð eni gód. for habbe godes are
eal he hít sceal finde ðer. ⁊ hundred fealde more
Þe ðe ehte pile healden pél. þe hpile he mei his pealden
ȝiue his for godes luue. þenne deð hé his pél ihealden
Vre ispinch ⁊ ure tilðe. is óft ípuned to spinden
ac ðet pé doð for godes luue. éft pé hit sculen áfinden
Ne sceal nan uuel beon un bóht. ne nan gód un for ȝolde
uuel pe doð eal to michel. ⁊ gód lesse þenne pe scolde
Þe ðe mest deð nu to gode. ⁊ ðe þe lést to laðe
æiðer to litel ⁊ to michel sceal ðinche eft hím baðe
Þer me sceal ure peorkes peȝen. be foren heue kinge
⁊ ȝieuen us ure spinches líen æfter ure earninge
Eure élc man mid þan ðe haueð mei bigge heueriche
þe ðe mare hefð ⁊ ðe þe lesse. baðe mei iliche
Ealse mid his penie. se ðe oðer mid his punde
þet his ð punder lukeste pare. ðe æniman æure funde
And þe ðe mare ne mei dón. mid hís god iþanke
eal se pel se ðe haueð goldes feale marke

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
37 áfurst 38 wél, hít 40 hé, míd 42 ásiker, þé 43 óf[1] dréd, óf[2], óf[3] 44 hí, biníme 45 hé, óf[1], óf[2] 46 sélde 47 wé, wél 48 biníme, prancpíse 49 wé, íleue 50 bi nímen, íreue 51 wé[1], wé[2] 52 éft 53 hér, gód 54 hít 55 wél 56 hé, pél 57 óft, ípuneð 58 pé, éft, pé, áfinden 59 bóht, gód 60 gód 61 lést 62 hím 64 líen 65 Eure élc 69 dón, hís

37 **N**e] **N** *very faint but still legible* 41 **Þ**es] **Þ** *is an enlarged coloured capital which fills four lines* 43 For] F *has been placed in the left hand margin because of the descender of* **Þ** (line 41) 44 mei hí] meihí: *words separated by two strokes above and below* 47 þider] þ *should be a rubricated majuscule as it begins a couplet* 48 **F**or] **F** *is rubricated when it should be indented* 50 eop] *foll. by a letter eras.* 51 pe] *over eras., causing the* p *and* e *to be spaced further apart than usual and linked with joining strokes* 52 **F**or] **F** *should not be a rubricated majuscule as it does not begin a couplet* 54 hundred fealde] ed *of* hundred *has been squeezed onto the line prec.* fealde: *a break between the two words is indicated by two vertical lines above and below the line*

And óft \god/ kan mare þanc ðan ðe hím ȝíuet lesse f. 65v
eal hís þeorkes 7 hís þeies ís milce 7 rihtþisnesse
Lite lác is gode leof. ðe cumeð óf gode ipille
7 eð lete muchel ȝíue ðenne ðe heorte is ille
Heuene 7 eorðe he oue[r] sihð. his ége̅n beoð spo brihte
Sunne. mone. dei. 7 fur. bið þustre to ȝeanes his lihte
Nis him naht for hole. ni húd. spa michel bið his mihte
nis hit na spá dur\n/e idón. né aspa þustre nihte
Hé pát \hpet/ ded. 7 ðenchet. ealle quike pihte
nis na hlauord spilc se ís crist. na king spílch ure drihte
Heouene 7 eorðe. 7 eal þet is. bi loken in his hande
he ded eal þet his pille ís. ápétere and á lande
He makede fisces in ðe sé. 7 fuȝeles in ðe lufte
he pít 7 pealdeð ealle ðing. 7 hé scop ealle ȝe sceafte
He is ord abuten ord. 7 ende abuten ende
hé ane is æure en elche stede. pende þer þu pende
He is buuen us 7 bi neoðen. bi foren 7 bi hinde
þe ðe godes pille ded. eiðer he mei hím finde
Elche rune hé ihurð. 7 he pat ealle dede
he ðurh sihð ealches mannes ðanc. phet sceal us to rede
Þe ðe brekeð godes hése. 7 gultet spa ilome
hpet scule pé seggen oðer don. æt ðe muchele dome
Þa ða luueden unriht. 7 uuel líf ledde
hpet scule hí segge oðer dón. ðer engles beoð of dredde
Hpet scule pé béren bi foren. mid hpan scule pe cpeman
pé þe næure gód ne duden. þe heuenliche démen
Þer scule beon deofles spa uéle. ðe pulleð us for preȝen

nabbeð hí naþing for ȝýte. óf eal þet hí iseȝen f. 66r
Eal þet pé mís dude hér. hit pulleð cuðe þære
buten pé habbe hit íbét. ðe hpile pé her pére
Eal hi habbet an heore íprite. þet pé misdude here
þeh pé hi nuste ne niseȝen. hi péren ure íuere
Hpet sculen horlinges dó. þe spíkene þe for sporene
pí spa fele beoð icluped. spa fepe beoð ícorene
Þi hpí pere hí bi ȝíte. to hpan pere hí íborene
þe scule beon to dieðe ídemd. 7 eure ma for lorene
Elch man sceal him ðer bi clupien. 7 ech sceal him demen
hís aȝe peorc 7 his iðanc. to pitnesse he sceal temen

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
71 óft, hím, ȝíuet 72 hís[1], hís[2], ís 73 lác, óf 74 ȝíue 75 éȝen 77 húd 78 spá, ídon, né 79 Hé, pát 80 ís, spílch 82 ís, ápétere, álande 83 sé 84 pít, hé 86 hé 88 hím 89 hé 91 hése 92 wé 93 líf 94 hí, dón 95 pé, béren 96 pé, gód, démen 97 uéle 98 hí[1], óf, hí[2] 99 pé, mís dude, hér 100 pé[1], pé[2], íbét, pére 101 íprite, pé 102 pé, péren, íuere 103 dó, spíkene 104 pí, ícorene 105 hpí, hí, biȝíte, hí, íborene 106 ídemd 108 hís

71 god] *int. after* óft 75 oue[r] sihð] r *almost entirely eras.* 78 durne] e *int. after* r 79 hpet] *int. after* pát 81 þet] þ *written over another letter*

Ne mei him na man eal spa pel demen ne spa rihte
for nán ni cnapað him spa pel bute ane drihte
Elc man pát him sulf bétst. his peorch ⁊ hís ípille
he ðe lest pát he seið ófte mest. ðé ðé hit pát eal. is stille
Nís nan pitnesse eal se muchel. se mannes aȝe heorte
hpá se segge þet hé beo hál. him sélf pát betst hís smeorte
Elc man sceal him sulf demen. to dieðe. oðer to líue
þe pitnesse óf hís peorc. to oðer ðis. him sceal dríue
Eal ðet eure elc man hafð ídó. suððe he com to manne
spilc hít si abóc ípriten. he sceal iðenche ðenne
Ac drihte ne demð nanne man. æfter his bi gínnige
ac al his líf sceal ⸢beo⸣ spich. se buð hís endinge
Ac ȝíf þe ende ís uuel. eal hit is uuel. ⁊ gód ȝíf gód ís þenne
god ȝẏue þet ure ende beo gód. ⁊ pít þét hé us lenne
Þe man þe nele dó na god. ne neure god líf læden
ær dieð ⁊ dom cume. æt his dure. he mei sare ádreden

f. 66v

[Þ]et hé ne muȝe ðenne bidde áre for hit ítít ílome
ði he is pis ðe beot ⁊ beat. ⁊ bit be foren dome
[Þ]en⸢ne⸣ deað ís æt his dure. pel late he biddeð are
pel late he leteð uuel peorc. þe hít ne mei don na mare
[Þ]éh pheðer pé hít íleueð pel. for drihte sulf hit sede.
a philce ⸢tíme⸣ se eure ðe man óf ðinchet his mís dede
[O]ðer later oðer raðe milce he sceal ímeten
ac ðe þe nafð naht íbet. pel muchel he sceal beten
[M]ani man seið. hpá récþ óf píne. ðe sceal habbe ende
ne bidde ich na bet beo ílusd. a domesdei of bende
[L]utel pát hé hpét ís píne. ⁊ litel he ícnapeð
hpilc héte ís ðer saule puneð. hu biter pinde þer blapeð
[H]edde hé ibeon ðer anne dei. oðer tpa bare tide
nolde hé for æl middan eard. ðe ðridde þere abide
[Þ]et habbet ísed þe come ðanne. þet piste mid ipisse

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
110 nán 111 pát, bétst, hís, ípille 112 pát[1], ófte, ðé ðé, pát[2] 114 hpá se, hé, hál, him sélf, pát, hís 115 líue 116 óf, hís, dríue 117 ídó 118 hít, abóc, ípriten 119 æfter, bigínnige 120 líf, hís 121 ȝíf, ís, uuel, gód, ȝíf, gód, ís 122 ȝẏue (*the y is dotted with the accent stroke added above it*), gód 123 dó, líf 124 ádreden 125 hé, áre, ítít, ílome 127 ís 128 hít 129 pé, hít, íleueð 130 ⸢tíme⸣, óf þinchet, mís dede 131 ímeten 132 íbet 133 hpá, récþ, óf, píne 134 ílusd 135 pát, hé, hpét, ís, píne, ícnapeð 136 héte, ís 137 hé 138 hé 139 íseð

118 ípriten] i *is written long like a* j 120 beo] *int. after* sceal 121 Ac] A *has been written to the left of the area ruled to house it* 125 [Þ]et] Þ *ill. faded* 127 [Þ]enne] Þ *ill. faded*] ne *int.* 128 don na mare] do *is written in the main hand; the rest is completed in another hand with* r *in* mare *corrected from* n 129 [Þ]éh pheðer] Þ *ill. faded* 130 tíme] *int. after* philche 131 [O]ðer] O *ill. faded* 133 [M]ani man] M *ill. faded* 135 [L]utel] L *ill. faded* 137 [H]edde] H *ill. faded* 139 [Þ]et] Þ *ill. faded*

***** ***þe ⁊ þu *** hi þanne þu hi ne miht | do ** **** . for þi he is sot ** *** **** ** habbe | godes are *is added to the bottom margin, to follow on from* 151, *in the same hand that makes the additions to* 128. *A transcription has been attempted here, but the text is mostly erased and difficult to read. These two lines are present in the main text of* E[1], T and D. M *has the first line and a variant of the second.* J *has variants of both of these lines.* L *does not have these lines.*

uuel is pinie seoue ȝer. for seoue nihtes blisse
[A]nd ure blisse þe ende hafð. for endeliese píne
betere is þori þeter ídrunke. þene atter ímenȝ mid píne
Spunes brede is spuðe spete. spa ís óf þilde deore
ac al to dure he hí bíȝð. ðe ȝífð þer fore is spéore
[F]ul þambe mei liht liche speken. óf hunger 7 festen
spa mei óf pine þe naht nát. hú píne sceal alesten
Hedde hís á fanded sume stunde. he þolde eale segge oðer
eð lete him pére píf 7 child. suster. 7 feder 7 broðer
Eure he þolde ínne þá her. 7 ínne þape þunien
þið ðan þe mihte helle píne bi fleon 7 bi scunien
[E]ð lete him pére eal þoruld péle. 7 eal eordliche blisse

for to ðe muchele murcðe cume. ðis murhðe mid ipisse f. 67r
Ich þulle nu cumen éft to ðe dome. þe ich eop óf sede
on þe deíe 7 æt þe dome. us helpe crist 7 rede
þer þe maȝen beon eðe óf dredde. 7 herde us ádrede.
þer elch sceal seon him bi foren. his þord 7 ec his dede
Eal sceal beon ðer ðenne cuð. þet man luȝen hér 7 stelen
eal sceal beon ðer unpriȝen. þet men priȝen her 7 helen
Þe sculen ealre manne líf ícnape. eal spa ure aȝen
ðer sculen euenínges beon þe heȝe 7 laȝen
Ne sceal þeh nan scamian ðer. ne ðearf he him adrede
ȝíf him her óf þincð his gult. 7 bet his misdede
For heom ne scamet ne gramet. ðe scule beon iboreȝe
ac þe oðre habbet scame 7 grame 7 oðer fele sorȝe
þe dom sceal sone beon ídon. ni lest he napiht lange
ne sceal him nan me mene ðer óf strencðe ne óf prange
þa sculen habbe herdne dóm. þe here pere hearde
þe uuele heolde precche men. 7 uuele laȝhe arerde
End éfter þet hé hauet ídon. scal ðer beon ídemed
bliðe mei hé ðenne beon. þe god háfð pel ícpemed
Eælle ða þe isprungen beoð óf adam 7 óf eue
ealle hi sculen ðuder cume. for soðe pé hit ilene
Þa ðe habbeð pel ídon. éfter heore mihte
to heuenriche scule faren forð mid ure drihte
Þá ðe nabbeð god ídón. 7 ðer inne beoð ífunde
hi sculen falle spíðe raðe in to helle grunde

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
141 píne 142 ídrunke, ímeng, píne 143 ís, óf 144 hí, bíȝð, ȝífð, spéore 145 óf 146 óf, nát, hú, píne 147 hís, áfande 148 pére, píf 149 ínne, pá, ínne 150 píne 151 pére, poruld péle 153 éft, óft 154 deíe, æt 155 óf dredde, ádrede 157 hér 159 líf, ícnape 160 euenínges 162 ȝíf óf þincð 165 ídon 166 óf[1], óf[2] 167 dóm 169 éfter þet, hé, ídon, ídemed 170 hé, háfð, ícpemed 171: óf[1], óf[2] 172 pé 173 ídon, éfter 175 Þá ðe, ídon, ífunde 176 spíðe

141 [A]nd] A *ill. faded* 142 ídrunke] k *written over another letter; the limbs of the letter descend below the line* 143 Spunes] S *very faint but still legible* 134 [F]ul] F *ill. faded* 147 Hedde] H *very faint but still legible* 149 Eure] *E very faint but still legible* 151 [E]ðlete] E *ill. faded*

Þer hi punie sculen á 7 buten ende
ne brecð neure éft crist helle dure. for lése hí óf bende

f. 67v

Nis na sellich ðeh heom beo þá. 7 heom beo un íeðe
sceal neure crist ðolie dieð. for lese heom óf dieðe
Enes drihte helle bréc. his frund hé ut brohte
hím sulf he þolede dieð for heom. þel deore he us bohte
Nolde hit maȝhe do for mei. ne suster for broðer
nolde hít sune do for feder. ne naman for oðer
Vre ealre hlauerd for his ðreles. íþíned þés á rode
ure bendes hé unband. 7 bohte us mid his blode
Þé ȝiueð unéðe fo his luue. a sticche óf vre briede
ne ðenche þe naht þet he sceal deme quike 7 diede
Muchele luue he us cudde. polde þe þet understande
þet ure ældrene mis dude. þé habbet uuel en hande
Dieð com on þis middeleard. ðurh þe ealde deofles ende
7 sunne. 7 sorȝe. 7 ispinch. ápétere 7 alande
Vres formes federes gult. þe abigget alle
eal his óf spring efter him. en hearme is bi fealle
Þurst. 7 hunger chule. 7 héte. eche. 7 eal unhelðe
ðurh dieð com in ðis middeneard. 7 oðer uniselðe
Nere man elles died. ne síc. ne nan un sele
ac mihten libben æure ma. a blisse 7 on héle
Lutel iðencð mani man. hu muchel þés þe sunne
for hpán ealle ðolieð dieð. þe comen óf þe cunne
Heore sunne 7 ure aȝen sare us mei óf ðinche.
for sunne þé libbeð alle hér. á sorȝen 7 a spinche
Siðde god nam sá michele preche for ane misdede
þé ⸢þe⸣ spa muchel 7 óft mis doð. muȝen us eaðe ádrede
Adam 7 hís óf spring. for ane bare sunne

f. 68r

þés fele hundred þintre. an helle þine. 7 á inpunnc
And þa ðe ledeð heore líf. mid un riht 7 prange
buten hit godes milce do scule beo ðer þel lange
Godes þisdom ís þel muchel. 7 eal spa is his mihte
7 nis his milce naphiht lesse. ac bi ðes ilke þihte
Mare he ane mei for ȝiuen. ðenne eal folc gulte cunne
deofel mihte habbe milce. ȝíf hé hit bigunne
Þe ðe godes milce séchð. íþís he mei hís finde

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
177 á 178 éft, lése, hí, óf 179 þá, uníeðe 180 óf 181 bréc, hé 182 hím sulf 184: hít 185 íþíned, þés, árode 186 hé 187 þé, unéðe, óf 190 þé 192 ápétere 194 óf spring 195 héte 197 síc 198 héle 199 þés 200 hpán, óf 201 óf ðinche 202 þé, hér, ásorȝen 203 sá, préche 204 þé, óft, ádrede 205 hís, óf spring 206 þés, á 207 líf 209 ís 212 ȝíf, hé 213 séchð, íwis, hís

203 préche] c *has been subp.* after c 204 þe] *int. after* þé 211 **M**are] M *is so faded that it is difficult to determine* 213 **ipis**] i *is* i-longa

ac helle king ís are líes. pið ða þe he mei binde
Þe ðe deð hís pille mest [he] | haueð [perse] | m[ede]
hís bæð sceal beo peallende pich. his béd. burnende glede
Þurse hé deð his gode pínes. þenne his fulle feonde
god sculde ealle godes frund. á pið spiche freonde
Neure an helle ic ne com. ne cume ic ðer ne recche
ðeh ich æches poruld péle. ðer ínne mihte fecche
Þeh ich pulle seggen eop. þet píse men us sede
7 aboke hí hít príte. þer \me/ mei hit rede
Ich hit pulle segge þam. þe him sulf hit nusten.
7 parnie heom pið heora unfreme. ȝíf hi me pulle hlusten
Under standeð nu to me. ȝedi men 7 earme
Ich pule telle óf helle pine. 7 parine eop pið hearme.
On helle is hunger 7 ðurst. uuele tpa ifere
þas pine ðolieð þa þe pere mete niðinges hére
Þer is panunge 7 póp. efter éche stréte
hí fareð fram \héte/ to chele. fram chele to hete
Þenne hi beoð in ðe héte. þe chelecheð blisse
Þenne hí cumeð éft to chele. óf hete hi habbeð misse
Aiðer heom dieð pá ínoh. nabbet hẏ nane lisse

nuten pheðer him deð purs mid nane ípisse f. 68v
Hí palkeð eúre 7 secheð reste. ác hi ne muȝen ímete
for þi ði nolden hpile hi mihten heore sunne bete
Hí secheð reste ðer nan nis. þi ne muȝen hi finde
ac palkeð peri up 7 dun. se peter deð mid pinde
Þís beoð þa ðe pére hér. áðanke unstedefeste
7 to gode be héten áht. 7 nolde hit ileste
Þá þe gód peorc bigunne. 7 ful endien hit nolde
nu peren hér. 7 nuðe ðer. 7 nuste hpet ho polde
Þere ís pích ðe æure pealð. þer scule baðie ínne
þa þe ledde úuel líf. in feoht end in ígínne
Þér is fur ðe is hundred fealde hattre ðen ure
ne mei hit cpenche salt peter. nauene striem ne sture
Þis ís þet fur ðe éure burnð. ne mei hít naphít cpenche
hér inne beoð þe pes to leof. precche men to spenche
Þa ðe pére spichele men. 7 ful óf uuele prenche

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
214 ís, líes 215 hís 216 hís, béd 217 hé, pínes 218 á 220 péle, ínne 221 píse 222 hí, hít, príte 224 ȝíf 226 óf 228 hére 229 póp, éche, stréte 230 hí, \héte/ 231 héte 231 héte 232 hí, éft, óf 233 pá, ínoh 234 ípisse 235 Hí, éure, ác, ímete 237 Hí 239 þís, pére, hér, áðanke 240 be héten, áht 241 gód 242 hér 243 ís, pích, æure 244 úuel, líf 245 Þér 247 ís, éure, hít, naphít 248 hér 249 pére, óf

214 pið ða þe he mei binde] *written over eras.* 215 Þe ðe deð hís pille mest [he] | haueð [perse] | m[ede]] *the text, written in the same hand, has been squeezed into the right margin immediately after* lines 214–216; *some of the text has been lost through crop., and has been reconstructed here* 222 me] *int.* after þer 225 **U**nder standeð] **U** *is enlarged and coloured with a depth of two lines* 230 héte] *int. after* fram 233 lisse] *prec. by* b *eras.* 234 ípisse] *the* i *is long like a* j 242 hpet] p *written over* h 248 precche] c *written over* r

þa ðe ne mihte uuel don. ⁊ leof þes to ðenche
Þe luuede reauing ⁊ stale. hordom ⁊ drunke
⁊ á. on ðes deofles þeorc. bliðeliche spunche
Þa ðe pere spa lease. þet me hi ne mihte ileue
med ȝeorne domes men. ⁊ pranc pise íreue
Þe oðres mannes \pif/ þes lief. his aȝen eð lete
þé ðe suneȝude muchel a drunken ⁊ en ete
Þé precche be nam his ehte. ⁊ leide hes en horde
þe lute lét óf godes bibode. ⁊ of godes porde
End te his aȝen nolde ȝíuen. þer he iseh þe neode
ne nolde ihuren godes sande. þer hé sette his beode

f. 69r

Þá ðe þes oðres mannes ðing. leoure þenne hit scólde
⁊ peren eal to gredi óf seoluer end óf golde
End þa ðe untrup\n/esse dude þam ðe hí ahte beon holde
⁊ leten ðet hí scólden don. ⁊ dude þet hi polde
Þa ðe pitteres óf ðis poruldes ehte
⁊ dude þet \te/ laðe gast heom tihte ⁊ to tehte
End ealle þa ðen eni píse deoflen \hér/ iquemde
þa beoð nu mid him an helle fordon ⁊ fordemde
Bute þá þe óf ðufte sare heore mis dede
⁊ gunne heore gultes beten ⁊ betere líf læde
Þer beoð neddren ⁊ snaken. éuete ⁊ frute
þa tereð. ⁊ freteð. þe uuele speke. þe nið fulle. ⁊ te prute
Neure sunne ðer ne scínð. ne mone ne steorre
þer is muchel godes hate. ⁊ muchel godes eorre
Æure ðer ís uuel sméch. ðusternesse ⁊ eie
nis ðer neure oðer líht. ðene þe spierte leie
Þer ligget ladliche fund. in strange raketeȝe
þet beoð þa ðe pére mid gode on heuene pel heȝe
Þer beoð ateliche fund. ⁊ eisliche pihte
þas scule þa precche í fon. þe sunneȝede ðurh sihte
Þer is ðe laðe sathanas. ⁊ belzebud sé ealde
eaðe hi muȝen beo óf dréd. þe híne scule bi healde
Ne mei nan heorte hit íðenche. ne tunge ne can telle
hu muchel píne na hu uele sunden ínne helle
Þið þa pine ðe þer beoð. nelle ich eop naht leoȝen
nis hit bute gamen ⁊ gléo. eal þet man mei hér dreoȝen
End ȝut ne deð heom naht sa pá. ín ða laðe bende

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
252 á 254 íreue 256 þé ðe, éte 257 Þé 258 lét, óf 259 ȝíuen 260 hé 261 Þá ðe, scólde 262 óf[1], óf[2] 263 hí 264 hí, scólden 265 óf 266 to téhte 267 píse, \hér/ 269 þá þe, óf ðufte 270 líf 271 éuete 273 scínð 275 ís, sméch 276 líht 278 pére 280 ífon 281 sé 282 óf dréd, híne 283 íðenche 284 píne, ínne 286 gléo, hér 287 pá, ín

255 pif] *int. after* mannes 263 untrupnesse] n *int.* after p 266 te] *int. after* þet 267 hér] *int. after* deoflen 274 eorre] *prec. by a letter eras.* 281 is] *foll. by two letters eras.*

þet hí piteð þet heore píne sceal neure habbe ende f. 69v
[Þ]ar beoð þa heðene men. þé pære laȝe liese
þe nes naht óf godes bi bode. ne óf godes hese
[V]uele cristene men. hí beoð heore ifere
þa ðe heore cristen dom. uuele heo⸢l⸣de hére
[Ȝ]ut hí beoð á purse stede. on ðere helle grund
ne scullen hí neure cumen út. for marke ne for punde
[N]e mei heom naðer helpen þer. íbede ne elmesse
for nis naðer inne helle. áre ne forȝiuenesse
Sculde him éch man ðe hpile hé muȝe óf ðas helle pine
7 perni ech hís freond þer pið spa ich habbe mine
þá ðe sculden heom ne cunne. ich heom pulle teche
ich kan beon ȝief ich sceal. lichame 7 saple leche
[L]éte pé þet god for but. ealle manne cunne
7 do pé þet hé us hét. 7 sculde pé us pið sunne
Luuie pe god mid ure heorte. 7 mid al ure mihte
7 ure émcristen eal us sulf. spa us lerde drihte
Eal þet me ræt 7 eal þet me singð. bi fore godes borde
Eeal hít hanget 7 bi halt. bi ðisse tpam porde
alle godes laȝe he fulð. ðe nipe 7 ða ealde
þe ðe ðas tpa luue hafð. 7 pel hi pule healde
Ac hí beoð punder earueð healde. spá ófte gulteð ealle
fór hít ís strang to strande lange. 7 líht ís to fealle
Aac drihte crist hé ȝíue us strengðe. stande þet pé mote
7 óf ealle ure gultes ⸢unne⸣ us cume to bote
Þé pilnieð éfter poruld péle. ðe lange ne mei leste
7 leggeð eal ure ispinch. ón ðinȝe unste⸢de⸣feste

Spunche pé for godes luue. healf þet pé doð for æhte f. 70r
ne béo pé naht spá óf bicherd. ne sa uuele bi kehte
Ȝif pé serueden gode spa pé doð ermínges
mare pé hedden en héuene. ðenne eorles hér 7 kinges
Né muȝen hí perien heom pið chele. pið þurste ne pið hunger
ne pið ulde. ne pið deaðe. þe uldre ne ðe ȝeonger
Ac ðer nis hunger ne ðurst. ne dieð. ne unhelðe ne elde
of þisse riche pé ðencheð ófte. 7 of þere to selde

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
288 hí, píne 289 þé, pære 290 óf[1], óf[2] 291 hí 292 hére 293 hí, á 294 hí, út 295 íbede 296 áre 297 éch, hé, óf, pí ne 298 hís 299 Þá ðe 301 Léte, pé 302 pé, hé, hét; pé 304 ém cristen 305 ræt 306 hít 307 níþe 308 tpá, háfð, hí 309 hí, spá, ófte 310 fór, hít, ís, líht, ís 311 hé, ȝíue, pé 312 óf 313 pé, éfter, péle 314 ón 315 pé[1], pé[2] 316 béo, pé, spá, óf 317 pé[1], pé[2], ermínges 318 pé, héuene, hér 319 Né, hí 322 pé, ófte

288 habbe] *foll. by a letter underlined and eras.* 291 [V]uele] V *ill. faded* 292 heolde] l *int. after* o 293 [Ȝ]ut] Ȝ *ill. faded* beoð] *prec. by a letter eras.* 295 [N]e] N *ill. faded* 306 **E**eal] **E** *is incorrectly enlarged and coloured. It is most likely caused by the line opening with the same word as the line that precedes it* 307 alle] a *should be an enlarged and coloured letter; this probably follows from the error in the previous line, where the initial letter is mistakenly enlarged and coloured* 312 unne] *int. after* gultes 313 **Þ**e] **Þ** *is enlarged and coloured with a depth of two lines* 314 unstedefeste] de *int. after* e[1]

Þe scolden ealle us biðenche ófte. ⁊ pél ilome
hpét pé beoð to phán pé scule. ⁊ óf hpán pé come.
Hú litle hpíle pé beoð hér. hú lange elle\s/ hpáre
hpét pé muȝe habben hér. ⁊ hpét finde þere
ȝíef pé pere pise men. ðis pé scolde ðenche
bute pé purðe us íper. ðeos poruld pule us for drenche
Mest ealle men he ȝíueð drinche. óf ane deofles scenche
hé sceal him cunne sculde pél. ȝif hé híne nele screnche
Mid ealmihtiȝes godes luue. ute pé us bi perien
pið ðises precches poreldes luue. þet hé maȝe usderien
Mid festen ælmes ⁊ ibede. perie pé us pið sunne
Mid ða pepne ðe god haueð. biȝíten man cunne
Léte pé þe brade strét. ⁊ ðene pei bene
þe let þet niȝeðe dél to helle óf manne. ⁊ ma ich péne
Gá pé ðene nærepne pei. ⁊ ðene pei grene
ðer forð fareð litel folc. ac hit is feir ⁊ scéne
Þe brade strét is ure ípill. ðe ís us lað to forlæte
þá ðe eal folȝeð hís ípill. fareð bi ðusse stréte
Hí muȝen lihtliche gán mid ðere under hulde

f. 70v ðurh ane godlíese pode \into/ ane bare felde
[Þ]e nærepei ís godes hése. ðer forð fareð pél fiepe
þet beoð ða ðe heom sculdeð ȝéorne pið æche un ðeape
[Þ]as gað uníeðe ȝeanes ðe clíue aȝean þe heaȝe hulle
ðas leteð eal heore aȝen píll. for godes hése to fulle
[G]a pé alle þene pei. for he us pule bringe
mid te feape feire men. be foren heuen kinge
[Þ]er is ealre murhðe mest. mid englene sange
ðe ís aþusend pintre ðer. ne ðincð him naht to lange
[Þ]e ðe lest haueð hafð spa michel þet hé ne bit namare
þe ða blisse. for ðas forlét hít him mei reope sare
[N]e mei nan uuel ne napane beon inne godes riche
ðeh þer beoð pununges fele. æch oðer uniliche
Sume ðer habbeð lesse murhðe. ⁊ sume habbeð mare
æfter ðan þe dude hér. efter ðan þet he spanc sare
[N]e sceal ðer beon ne bried ne pín. ne oðer cunnes este

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels – this folio is very faded and it is possible that some of the strokes are no longer visible:
323 pé, ófte, pél 324 hpét, pé, phán, pé, óf, phán, pé 325 Hú, hpíle, pé, hér, hú, elle\s/ hpáre 326 hpét, pé, hér, hpét 327 ȝief, pé[1], pé[2] 328 pé, íper 329 ȝíueð, óf 330 hé, pél, hé, híne 331 pé 333 pé 334 biȝíten 335 Léte, pé, strét 336 dél, óf, pé ne 337 Gá, pé 338 scéne 339 Þé, strét, ípill, ís, forlæte 340 þá ðe, hís, ípill, stréte 341 hí, gán 343 ís, hése, pél 344 ȝé orne, æche 345 uníeðe, clíue 346 píll, hése 347 pé 350 ís 351 hé 352 for lét, hít 356 hér 357 pín, éste

Nearly all of the initial letters on this folio are so faint that they are impossible to read or are absent altogether. I have included them in the following notes conjecturally.
325 elles hpáre] s *int.* after elle 331 **M**id] **M** *is an enlarged coloured capital which fills two lines* 334 **M**id] **M** is *incorrectly enlarged and coloured* 342 pode] o *is difficult to read because of a hole in the folio* into] *int. after* pode 343 [Þ]e] Þ *ill. faded* 345 [Þ]as] Þ *ill. faded* 347 [G]a] G *ill. faded* 349 [Þ]er] Þ *ill. faded* 351 [Þ]e ðe] Þ *ill. faded* 353 [N]e] N *ill. faded* 355 **S**ume] **S** is very faint and difficult to read 357 [N]e] N *ill. faded*

god ane sceal beo eche líf. ⁊ blisse. ⁊ éche reste
[N]e sceal ðer beo fah ne græi. ne kuning ne ⸌er⸍mine
ne aquerne. ne martes cheole. ne beuer né sabeline
[N]e sceal ðer beo sciet ne scrud. ne poruld pele nane
eal þe murhðe þe me us bi hat. al hít sceal beo god ane
[N]e mei na murhðe. beo spa muchel. se is godes sihte
[h]e ís soð sunne ⁊ briht. ⁊ dei ábuten nihte
[H]e is ælches godes ful. nis him na pið uten
na god nis him pane þe punieð him abuten
[Þ]er is péle ábute gane. ⁊ reste abuten spinche
þe mei ⁊ nele ðider cume. sare hit him sceal óf ðinche

The following words have an oblique stroke above the vowels:
358 líf, éche 360 né 362 hít 364 ís, ábuten 367 péle, ábute 368: óf ðinche

359 [N]e] N *ill. faded* 359 ermine] er *int. after* ne 361 [N]e] N *ill. faded* 363 [N]e] N *ill. faded* 364 [h]e] h *om.* 365 [H]e] H *ill. faded* 367 [Þ]er] Þ *ill. faded*

The text ends imperfectly after line 368

London, British Library
MS Egerton 613,
folios 7^{r}-12^{v}

Transcription of London, British Library MS Egerton 613, fols. 7r-12r

MS *Pointing:* E1 *has irregular pointing. The punctus, when used, is normally found mid-line but is more often absent. These occurences of pointing, which are represented in the text, will not be listed in the notes. However, other instances of puntuation are noted below. A punctus can be found after*: **sunne**, **mone** and **dai**: line 76; **be ȝit**: line 126; **Þurst**, **hunger**, **chule**, **hete** *and* **eche**: line 199; **sic**: 201; **hordom**: 255; **pine** 288; **chele** and **þurst**: line 323; **beð**: line 328; **faste** and **almesse**: line 337; **haueð**: line 355; **blisse**: line 362; and **purse**: line 392.

Capitalization is regular at the beginning of each couplet – with each of the initial letters being enlarged and coloured. The initial letters alternate in colour between red and green: the first new couplet on the folio always beginning with a red capital, except at 11^{v} *where the order is reversed. These occurrences will be shown in the text but not referred to in the accompanying notes, apart from when demonstrating something exceptional. Most initial letters of a couplet are contained within the writing grid of their own line, with exceptions being noted by line number.*

Abbreviations are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:

Throughout the text **þ** *has been expanded to* **þet** *at* lines: 114, 161, 225, 282, 292, 319, 348 and $392^{(x2)}$. *There are only two occasions where* **þet** *is written out, and they are at lines*: 122 and 268.

i queme expanded to **i quemen**: line 95; **heo** expanded to **heom**: lines 228, 303, 323, 348; **mupe** expanded to **mupen**: line 323; **cune** expanded to **cunne**: line 334; and **no** expanded to **non**: lines 357 and 367.

Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

Both of the texts of the *Conduct of Life* within Egerton contain strong South-Western linguistic features, as evidenced below. Laing (LAEME) believes the language of both versions is of south-west Worcestershire with the text of E1 possibly being more northern.[849] Both texts, which were copied from the same exemplar, retain archaic grammar and orthography, with the scribe of E2 being more conservative than the scribe of E1.[850]

E1 more often writes the runic letter <þ> (*þorn*) in initial position(§ 2.5): **þænne**, **þanne**, **þech**, **þinh** etc., with occasional occurances of <ð> (§ 3.2): **ðan**, **ðenne**, **ðe** etc. In medial position <þ> is usual(§ 4.5): **iqueþen**, **cuþe**, **nuþe** etc. with occasional <ð>(§ 4.5): **sẏðen**, **laðe**, **baðe**. In final position it is mostly <**ð**> (§ 4.5): **bispikeð**, **buð**, **sendeð etc.**, with rare <þ> (§ 4.5): **folȝeþ**, **beoþ**, **deþ** and **be-þenþ**. The only occurance of <th> (§ 5) in E1 is in **sathanas**, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 *Remark*). E1 writes <h> for <þ>/<ð> on two occasions in **þinh** and **hafh** (§ 6.2) and, conversly, <ð> is written where <h> might normally be expected once only in **þurð**; this might be a scribal error for *ȝ* or, alternatively might be a genuine variant form of this word (§ 6.3). The graph <d> being written for <ð> is a regular feature of the writing in E1 (§ 7.4): **mẏs liked**, **bi hoted**, **haued** etc. There are also frequent occurances of the dental stop /t/ written for <ð>/<þ> in low stress positions (§ 8 and § 8.3): **þinchet**, **det**, **þillet**, **habbet** etc. The double fricative[ðð] is simplified in **sẏðen** (§ 10.3).

The runic letter <ƿ> (wynn) is retained throughout E1 with only one example of <w> (§ 11.1 and § 11.6) found in **wilde**. The Old English letter ligature <æ> is occasionally found in E1 (§ 12.2): **æm**, **þænne**, **pæs** etc. E1 writes the Tironian nota <⁊> (§ 13.1) throughout this text, with **and** being written occasionally (*sixteen times*)(§ 13.5).

---

[849] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.
[850] In addition to the examples provided here, see Hill, 'Notes on the Egerton *e* Text', pp. 353-357

Insular ȝ is retained in E1 alongside Caroline *g* (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): **gramet**, **grunde**, **glede** etc.and before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* (§ 42.2): **god**, **gulte**, **gon** etc. and by levelling in (**bi**)**ginninge**. The movement to <w> is present in about half of the occurances for the fricative /ɣ/: **drapen**, **hope**, **moupe** (§ 43.9) - with the remainder retaining <ȝ> (§ 43.8): in **moȝe**, **aȝen**, **laȝes** etc. E1 preserves <ȝ > for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): **ȝung**, **ȝuet**, **for ȝut** etc. Initial <ȝ> is retained before *i* in **ȝif** (§ 45.4) but writes <g> in **Gif** (see *Comment* to § 45.4). E1 demonstrates transition to a palatal (§ 47ff) in **for-preien** and **ne-i-seien** with <ȝ> retained in **eȝen**, **peȝen** and **seȝen** (the writing of <ȝ> in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound. See § 47.3). The continuation of the OE movement *ig > i* (§ 48) in **ani**, **mani** and **æidi** is further demonstrated in E1. Palatal ʒ /j/ is lost before *d* (§ 49)in **sede** and **ised** (§ 49.5). Late OE /dʒ/, written <cʒ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in **biggen**, **seggen**, **ligget** etc (§ 50). The OE group nʒ /ŋg/ is written <ng> (§ 51, § 51.16 and § 51.18): **lange/longe** , **king**, **strengþe** etc. with devoicing to /ŋk/, written <nc>, before <þ> in **strencþ** (§ 51.17). The OE prefix *ge* is retained on four occasions in E1 in **ȝe-lad**, **ȝe-spẏnch/ȝe-spinch**, **ȝe-lome** (§ 57).

In initial position <c> for /k/ is retained before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in **cuþe**, **cudde**, **cunne** etc. with <k> only found in **king**(**e**)/**kinges**. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is mostly written as <c> in **cunig**, **can**, **comeð** etc. but <k> is found in **kare** and **kan**. Before <n> (§ 18) E1 retains <c> in **cnapad**/(**i**)**cpopeð** and (**i**)**cnape**(**n**) as it is before all other consonants (§ 19) in (**i**)-**clepede**, **cliue**, **criste** etc. E1 writes <qu> (§. 20) for OE *cw* in **i-queþen**, **quike**, **aquenche** etc. E1 writes <k> in medial position for OE velar *c* thoughout the text: (§. 21 and §. 21.5): **speke**(**n**), **likede**, **sclakien** etc. with rare occurances of <c> (§. 22 and §. 22.5) found only in: **brecð** and the compound **godcunnesse** (**god** + **cunnesse**) and <ch> (§. 25 and §. 25.4) on one occasion in **perche**.

However, <c> is always retained in final position (§. 23 and §. 23.5): **ac**,**ec**, **þanc** etc. with no evidence of <k>.

The regular form of /tʃ/ in E1 is <ch> (§. 27, §. 28.5, §. 29.5 and §. 30.5): **child**(**e**), **chilce**, **muchel**(**e**), **smeche**, **elch**, **æfrech** etc and in **þinchen** (§. 32 and §. 32.17) and **þenche** (§. 32 and §. 32.19) etc. with <c> /tʃ/ (§. 31 and §. 31.5) the usual form in **ic**. However, the occasional writing of <c> in **elc**/**eure**-**ilc**, **spilc**, **spulc** and **pilc** are possible variants with /k/ (§. 31.5). E1 also writes <c>, probable /k/, in **þincð** (§. 32.1 and §. 32.18), <k> in **smeke** and <ck> in **recke** where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected (see notes at §. 33 and §. 33.5).

E1 mostly writes <sc> (§. 35.5) for /ʃ/ (§. 34) in initial position: **scal**, **scirreve**, **scop** etc. with <s> (§. 36.4) written in **sæl**, **sulle**, **solde** and **solden**. In medial position /ʃ/ is <ss> in **fisses** (§. 38). OE [ts] is always written <c> in **milce** (§. 41).

E1 writes OE unvoiced [f] as <f> in initial position (§ 58 and § 58.17) in **fele**, **folȝeþ**, **for** etc. in all instances except three: **vẏue**, **vele** and (**i**)-**vere**. In final position <f> is retained in **lyf**, **of**, **self** (§ 58.18) etc. and in medial position when adjacent to one unvoiced sound: **himsulfne**, **oft**/**ofte**, **after** (§ 58.18) etc. However, voicing is regularly demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.19) through the writing of <v>/<u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in **himselue**, **vuel**, **aliue** etc. with some instances of <f> still retained: **be**-**fore**(**n**)/**bi**-**foren**, **a**-**life**, **pife**/**pẏfe** etc. The writing of <f> has disappeared before *d* in **hadde** (§58.20).

In E1 OE *a* in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): **habbe**, **fared**, **baþien** etc. and <a> before a nasal (§ 60 and § 60.5) in **man**, **þanke**, **þanne** etc. Before a lengthening group, OE *a* is mostly <o> (§ 61 and § 61.5) in **longe**, **strong**(**e**), **honde** etc. but <a> in **lange**, **hanged** and **prange**. E1 mostly writes <a> for OE *æ* (§ 63 and § 63.5): **habbe**, **almesse**, **after** etc. with the occasional writing of WML <e> and <ea> still found in **efter**, **pet**/**hpet**, **peðer**, **sed** and **beað**. OE *e* is nearly

always <e> in E1 (§ 64 and § 64.8): **beren**, **ende**, **felde**, **strengþe/strencþe** etc., with <ie> written in **biende**. OE *o* is always written <o> in E1 (§ 65.1 and § 65.7): **before**, **bode**, **borde** etc. E1: OE *i* is mostly <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.13) in **bidde**, **child**(**e**) , **finde**(**n**) etc. with <y> written in **ȝe-spẏnch** (§ 66.13) and occasional <u> in **pule**, **pulle**, **pulled** (see § 66.4 for the influence of *w*), **osprung** and **nuten** and **nuste**(**n**) (probable WML form, see § 66.6 and § 66.14) and <e> in **nele** and **nelle** (§ 66.14 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to *ĕ*). For OE *y,* E1 has mostly <u> (§ 67ff and § 67.13), a feature of WML texts: **dude**, **gulte**, **muchel**(**e**) etc. However, there are significant number of writings of <i>/<ẏ> also present: **þinche**(**n**), **kinge**(**s**), **spilc** etc. and <e> in **deden**, **euel**(**e**), **a-ferst** and **lest**. OE *y* (§ 67.15) is <u> in **lutel**, **hud**, **fur**(**e**), **cuþe** and **cudde**, with <i> in **litel** and **hpi**. E1 retains <u> for OE *u* (§ 68 and § 68.5) throughout the text: **punien**, **grunde**, **sune** etc., except in the writing of the *verb* **come**(**n**), **comeð** etc. where the usual form is with later <o>.

In E1 there is more evidence of<o> for OE *ā*, as a result of neutralization, than in E2 (§ 69ff and § 69.7): **lore**, **one**, **non** etc. with <a> still found iregularly in **anne**, **nanne-mon**, **hatere** etc. In E1 OE *ǣ1* is mostly written <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): **dede**, **rede**, **adrede** etc., however, <a> (§ 75.1) is regularly written in **vnisalþ**, **adrade**, **of-drad/of-drard** and **naddren**, with <ia> (§ 75.5) in **liache** and <ea> (§ 75.6) in **un-sealþe** (for OE *þær* see § 77ff). OE *ǣ2* is mostly written as <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) **mest**, **un-helþe**, **lest** etc. with <æ> (§ 79.2) written in **ær** and **æfrich**, <ae> written in **aer** and <ea> (§ 72.1 and § 79.8); however, the writing of <a> (§ 79.3) is regularly found in E1: **ar**, **ani**, **ȝe-lad**, **ladde** and **lat** (for *ǣlc, elc* and *ylc* see § 81ff). OE *ē* is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.5): **he**, **deþ/ded/det/deð**, **i-queme** etc. OE *ī* is almost always <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.7): **mi**, **hpile/hpẏle/pile**, **abit** etc. with <u> written in **spunes** (§ 83.2). OE *ō* is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.5): **to**, **dom**(**e**), **boc/boke** etc. OE *u* is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.5): **nv/nu**, **ure/vre**, **þu** etc.

In E1 OE *ea* (§ 86 and §87ff) before *r*, without lengthening (§ 88.14), is regularly <a>: **arȝe**, **sparte**, **narepe** and **þarf** with traditional <ea> (§ 87.5 and § 88.1) found in **earme** and <e> in **þerf**; before *rd* (§ 88.15) it is more regularly <e> in **herde** and (**midden**)**erd** with <ea> also written in (**midden**)**eard** and <a> in **harde**; before *rn* (§ 88.16) <a> is written in **parnen** and **parnie** with <e> found in **erninge**. The *i*-umaut of *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <e> (§ 89.8) in **derne** and **smerte**. OE *ea* before *l*, without lengthening (Anglian *a*), is mostly <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.8): **al** and **alle**, **falle**, **salt** etc., however, <ea> (§ 90.3) is written in **ealle** and **eal**(**mihtes**) and **pealð**; before *ld* there is some variance, with the writing of <ea> (§ 91.2 and § 91.7) regular in **pealded**, **eald**(**e**), **healde**(**n**) etc. and <æ> in **pælde**, <e> in **pelden** and **felde** and <a> in **palt** and **halt**. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *l* combinations (Angl. mutation of *a*) E1 writes mostly <e> in **elder /eldre** and **elde** (§ 92ff and § 92.8) but has SW <u> in **ulde**. OE *ea* before *h* combinations is <e> in **heȝe** and shows transition to the front glide sound, written <ei> (§ 87.3, § 93.2 and § 93.7) in **heie**, **heiȝe** and **sei**. The *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *h*-combinations is always <i>/<ẏ> in **mẏhte/mihte**(**n**) and **nihte**(**s**) (§ 94.1 and § 94.6).

For OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.7) E1 writes smoothed <e> in **perche/perc** and **perkes** but <eo> (a form retained longest in the WML and the South § 96.1 and § 96.2) is retained in **peorkes**, **heorte** and **steorre** . The *wur* group (§ 97 and § 97.7) is <u> in **purþe** and for the *i*-umlaut of *eo* it is <u> in **purst** and **purs**(**e**) (see note to § 97.7). OE *eo* before *l*-combinations is <e> (§ 98ff and §98.8) in **selue**, **self** and **suelf**, with <i> in **silf** (see § 98.2) and SW <u> in **sulfne/sulne**. OE *eo* before *ht* is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.6) in **rihtȝifnesse**, **vnriht**, **rithte** and **briht** and **britte** and <i> for the *i*-umlaut (§ 100 and § 100.8) in **ouer-sihð** and **þurð-sihð**. OE – WS *eom* is **æm** and **eom** (SW form § 101). OE *eo* (*a*-umlaut of *e*) is mostly <e> in E1 (§ 102ff and § 103.5): **fele/vele** , **brekeð** and **pele** with <ea> in **feale** (possibly by association with the antonym *fēawe*, see § 103.5). OE *eo* (*u*-umaut of *e*) is regularly <e> (§ 102ff and § 104.5) in **heuene** and **heuenliche** etc. with <o> written in **porld** and **porules/porlds** and <u> written under the influence of *w* in **suster** and

þude. The velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105ff) is regularly written <e> in E1 (§ 105.8): **bi-neþen**, **suefer**, **henne** etc., alongside <i> in (**be**)-**nimen** and **quike**; however, <eo> (WML and SW form) is found in **heore** and **seouene/seoue** with <u> (WML and SW form) in **hure** and the writing of **sÿðen** and **sutþe/suðþe** reflecting a lack of umlaut before a dental in the SW (lWS *syððan*, § 105.3).

In E1 OE *ēa* (§ 106ff and § 106.7) is mostly written as <e>: **ec**, **eþe**, **deþe** etc. but <ie> (see § 106.2) is regularly found in **dieþe/dieð**, **unieþe** and as <ẏe> in **lyen** and <æi> in **æidi**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēa* (§ 107.1 and § 107.6) is nearly always SW <u> (see § 107.1) in **i-hurd**, **ihuren**, **a-luesd** and **iluuet** with <e> only written in rhyming position (see § 107.1), therefore, an unlikely representation of the dialect, in **ileued**, **ileue** and **temen.** E1 retains <eo, o, ue and u>, forms associated with the South and WML (§ 108.1), alongside unrounded <e>: **beo/beo**, **seon**, **freond** etc., **buen** and **bue**, **bu** and **buð**, **bo** and **frond** alongside **ben/be**, **isen**, **leure** etc., with <i> in **lif** and **sic**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109 ff) is a mixture of <e> and <u> (§ 109.7): **frend**, **fend** and **nede**, and <u>, possibly from WS *y* (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /ø:/ from *ēo*, in **þustre**, **þusternesse**, **durlinges** with <o> in **dore** and <ue> in **duere** (both also associated with the South and WML) and <e> in **nede**.

In E1 OE *ea* after *sc* (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.6) is mostly <a>: **scal**, **scamien**, **scamet** and **scame**, with <æ> in **scæl/sæl**, <ea> in **sceal** and <e> in **scefte** and **sced** (<e> is possibly as a result of its position between palatal and dental consonants). For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* after *c* (§ 113.6) E1 writes <e> in **chele** and **bi-cherd** but SW <u> (see § 113.1) in **chule**. OE *ēa* after *g* (§ 114) is <e> in **ȝer**. For OE *ie* after *g* (§ 116.5) E1 mostly writes SW <i>/<ẏ> (§ 115.1) and **forȝẏtet**, **ȝẏue, ȝiued** etc with <u> **for-ȝut** and **ȝuue** and <ie> in **ȝieueð** (both also likely SW forms). Similarly, for OE *ie* after *g* E1 writes SW <ue> in **ȝuet** and SW <u> in **ȝut** with <e> in **ȝet** (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE *ie* after *sc* (§ 118.5) E1 writes SW <u> in **sculde** and **sculdeð** and <i> in **scilde**(**n**). OE *eo* after *ġ* (§ 119.1 and

§120.5) is <u> in **ȝung,**<ui> in **ȝuinge** and <eo> in **ȝeonger** and **ȝeoȝeðe** (see § 119.1). OE *eo* after *sc* (§ 121.5) is written as either <u> in **sculle(n)/sculen/sculled** or <o> in **solde(n)/scolde(n)** and **scop**.

OE *æ + ʒ* /j/ is mostly <ai> in E1 (§ 122.1 and § 122.6) in **mai** and **dai** with occurrences of <ei> (WML) written in **mei**, **seit/seid** . LWS *sǣde* / Anglian *sægde* (§ 123 and §123.5) is <e> in **sede** and **ised**. OE *ǣ1*(Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.5) is <ei>/<eẏ in **mei/meẏ**, **grei** and **seie** with <eȝ> written in **seȝen**. OE *ǣ2* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.5) is <aẏ>/<ai> in **aẏþer/aiþer**. OE *e* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.6) is <ei> in **eie**, **eisliche**, **pei** and **peies** with <eȝ> in **peȝen**. OE *ē* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.5) is <ei> in **for-preien** and **leie**. OE *ēa* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.5) is <ei> in **raketeie** and <eȝ> in **eȝen**. OE *ā* + *h (g)* (§ 132.1 and § 132.2) is <ah> in **ah**, with the glide sound /u/, written <ou>, present in **fou**. OE *ǣ2* + *h* (§ 132.1 and § 133.5) is <e> in **ehte** and <ei> before *c* in **eicte**; tha glide sound /u/, written <au> is present in both **auht** and **tauhte**. OE *ō* + *h* (§ 134.1 and § 134.6) in E1 almost always demonstrates the glide sound /u/, written <ou>, in **vn-bout**, **bi-þouhte**, **broutte** etc. with <o> written before *h* once in **bi-þoht**. OE *a* + /ɣ/ (§ 136.1 and § 136.6) is <aȝ> in **laȝe** but the regular form demonstrates the movement to /au/, written <aw>, in **drapen,** **lape** and **lape-lese**. OE *ā* + /ɣ/ (§ 137.1 and § 137.6) is mostly <o>, written before *ȝ*, in **moȝe** and **oȝe** but demonstrating the movement to /ɔu/, written <ow>, in **hope/ope/open** and with the glide sound written <ou> before *p* in **moupe**; however, <a> (a WML feature in this text, see § 69) is also found before *ȝ* in **aȝe** and before *p* in **apene**. OE *ā* + *w* (§ 138.1 and § 138.6) is <o> before *w* in **mopen**, with the <ou> combination present in **soule** and before *w* in **bloupet**; however, <a> before *w* is also present in **icnape(n)** and **cnaped**. OE *ēo* + *w* (§ 139.1 and § 139.6) is <eo> (WM/Southern form cf. § 108.1) before *w* in **seopen**, <u> in **rupen** and <eu> (§ 139.1) in **reupe**; the *i*-umlaut is <eu> in **untreunesse**. OE *ēa* + *w* (§ 140.1 and § 140.6) is <e> in **fepe** and <eu> in **feupe**.

Ic æm elder þænne ic þas. a þinter and a lore f. 7r
ic þælde more þanne ic dude. mi þit ah to ben more
Þel lange ic habbe child iben. a þorde 7 ec a dede
þech ic beo a þintre eald. to ȝung ic eom at rede
Vnnvþt lyf ic habbe ȝe lad. 7 ȝuet me þinh ic lede
þanne ic me bi þanche. þel sore ic me adrede
Mest al þat ich habbe ẏdon ẏs idelnesse and chilce
þel late ic habbe me bi þoht. bute me god do milce
Fele ẏdele þord ic habbe i queþen sẏðen ic speke cuþe
and fele ȝuinge deden i do þat me of þinchet nuþe
Al to lome ic habbe a gult a þerche 7 ec a þorde
al to muchel ic habbe i spend. to litel ẏ leid an horde
Mest al þat me likede ar. nu it me mẏs liked
þe muchel folȝeþ his ẏ þil. him sulfne he bi spikeð
Ic mẏhte habbe bet i don hadde ic þer ẏ selþe
nu ic þolde ac ic ne mai. for elde ne for un helþe
Elde me is bi stolen on. ar ic hit a þuste
ne mẏht ic isen be fore me. for smeke ne for mẏste
Arȝe þe beoþ to done god to vuele al to þriste
more eie stont man of manne. þanne him det of criste
Þe þel ne deþ þe hþile he mei þel oft hẏm scæl rupen
þenne hẏ moþen sculen 7 ripen. þer þe hi ar seoþen
Don ec to gode þet ȝe muȝe þa hþile ȝe buð a life
ne hopie no man to muchel to childe ne to þẏfe
Þe him selue for ȝut for þẏfe oþer for childe
he sal comen on vuele stede bute hẏm god be milde
Sende ec sum god be foren hẏm þe þẏle ȝe ben aliue
for betere his on almesse before þanne ben after vẏue
Ne beo þe leure þan þi self þi mei ne þi moȝe
for sot ẏs þat ẏs oþer mannes frond betre þan his oȝe
Ne hopie þif to hẏre þere ne þere to his þife
bue for him selue afrech man þe þẏle he bo alife
Þis is þe him sulf be þenþ þa hþile þe he mot libbe

for sone þillet him for ȝẏten þe fræmden and þo sibbe f. 7v
Þe þel ne deþ þe þile he mai ne scal he þanne he þolde
mani mannes sor ȝe spẏnch habbet ofte alle vn holde
Ne solde no man don a ferst. ne sclakien þel to done
for mani man bi hoted þel he it forȝẏtet sone
Þe man þe þule siker ben to habbe godes blisse
do þel him silf þe þile he mai þanne haued he it mid ẏþisse
Þos Riche men þened ben sikere þurh þalles 7 þurh diche
he ded his eicte on sikere stede þe hi send to heuene riche

1 Ic] I *is an enlarged red capital which fills six lines of the left-hand margin* 4 eom] *foll. by* to *subp.* 29 mei] i *is* i-longa
34 sibbe] b^{2} *has a pen flourish from the ascender* 36 mani mannes] s *has a pen flourish from the ascender*

For þer ne þarf he ben of drad of fure ne of þe⸢v⸣e
þer ne mai it hẏm bi nimen þe loþe ne þe leue
Þer ne þerf he habbe kare of piue ne of childe
þider þe sendeð suuel and bred to lutel and to selde
Þider þe solden drapen and don þel oft ⁊ þel ȝe lome
for þer ne scal me us nout binimen mid pronge ne mid poȝe
Þider þe scolde ȝerne drapen ⁊ don polde ȝe me ileue
for þer ne mai ⸢hit⸣ ou bi nimen þe king ne þe scirreve
Al þat beste þat þe habbet þider þe scolde sende
for þer þe it muþen finden eft ⁊ habben abuten ende
Þe þe her det ani god for to habben godes ore
al he it scal finden þer. ⁊ hundred felde more
Þe þe ehte pile healden þel þe pile he mai his pelden
ȝiue his for godes luue eft heo hit scullen a finden
Vre ispinch ⁊ ure tilþe is ofte ipuneð to spinden
ac þat þe dot for godes luue eft þe it scullen a finden
Ne scal non vuel ben vn bout ne non god vn for ȝolde
vuel þe doð al to muchel ⁊ god lasse þanne þe scolde
Þe þe mest deð nu to gode ⁊ þe þe lest to laðe
aẏþer to lutel ⁊ to muchel scal þinchen eft hẏm baðe
Þer me scal vre þerkes þeȝen bi foren þen heuene kinge
⁊ ȝiuen us ure spinches lẏen after vre erninge
Eure ilc man mid þan þe he haueð mai biggen heueriche
þe þe more haueð ⁊ þe þe lasse. boþe mai iliche

f. 8r

He alse mid his penie se þe oþer mid his punde
þat is þe punder likeste ȝare þat eni man eure funde
And þe þe more ne mai don bute mid his gode þanke
al se þel se þe haueð goldes feale manke
And god can more þanc ðan þe him ȝiued lesse
al his þerkes ⁊ his þeies is milce ⁊ ritȝifnesse
Lutel loc is gode lef þat comeð of gode pille
⁊ eð lete muchel ȝẏue ðenne ðe heorte is ille
Heuene ⁊ erþe he ouer sihð. his eȝen beð so britte
sunne. mone. dai. ⁊ fur bud þustre to ȝenes his lithte
Nis him nout for hole ni hud so muchel bet his mihte
nis it no so derne i don. ne a spa þustre nihte
He þot þat deht ⁊ þenchet alle quike pihte
nis no louerd spilc se is crist. na king spilc vre drihte
Heuene ⁊ herþe ⁊ al þat is be loken in his honde
he ded al þat his pilles is a patere ⁊ a londe

43 þeve] u *is subp. after* e[1] *with* v *int.* 50 hit] *int. after* mai 52 ende] d *has a pen flourish from the ascender* 56 eft heo hit scullen a finden] *the scribe is mistaken in his transcription of the second half of this line. It would appear that his mistake is caused by an eye-skip to the ending of line 58. The end of line 56 should be* healden *(or a form thereof) to rhyme with* pelden (Line 55): *see notes in parallel texts (see p.)* 67 mid[1]] d *has a pen flourish from the ascender* se] s *has a pen flourish from the ascender* 71 þanc] *foll. by* ð *subp.; this is the initial letter of the following word* 80 louerd] d *written over*

He makede fisses inne þe see ⁊ fuɡeles inne þe lofte
he pit ⁊ palt alle þing ⁊ he scop alle scefte
He is ord abuten orde ⁊ ende abuten ende
he one is eure on elche stede pende par þu pende
He is buuen vs ⁊ bi neþen bi foren ⁊ bi hinde
þe þe godes pille ðe eiðer he mai him finde
Elche rune he i hurd ⁊ he pot alle dede
he þurð sihð elches mannes þanc pat scal us to rede
Þo þe brekeð godes hese ⁊ gultet so ilome
pet sulle hi seggen oþer don. at þe muchel dome
Þo þe luueden vnriht ⁊ vuel lif ladde
pat scullen he seggen oþer don þar engles bed of dredde
Hpat sculle pe beren bi foren us mid pan sculle pe him i quemen
pe þe neure god ne duden þe heuenliche demen
Þer sculle ben deofles spo fele þe pulled us for preien
nabbet hi noþing for ɡẏte of al þat hi ere seɡen
Al þat pe mis duden her hit pullet cuþe þere
buten pe habben it ibet þe pile pe \h/er pere
Al hi habbet an here i prite þat pe mis duden here

þei pe it nusten ne i seien hi peren vre i fere f. 8v
Hpet scullen horlinges do. þe spikele þe for sporene
pi spo fele beod i cleped spa feupe beod i corene
Þi hpi pere he bi ɡite to pan pere hi i borene
þe sculle ben to deþe i demd ⁊ eure mo for lorene
Elch man scal him sulne þar bi clepiean ⁊ ec demen
his aɡe perc ⁊ his iþanc to pitnesce he scal temen
Ne mai hẏm na man al spa pel demen ne al sa rithte
for nan ni cnaped him spa pel buten one dritte
Elc man pot him sulue best his perc ⁊ his i pille
þe þe lest pot seit ofte mest ⁊ þe þe it pot is stille
Nis no pitnesse al so muchel so mannes hope heorte
hpa \se/ segge þet he beo al him self pat best his smerte
Elc man scal him suelf demen. to deþe oþer to liue
þe pitnesse of his ope perc to oþer ðis him scal driue
Eal þat eure ilc man haued i do sutþe he come to manne
spilc hit seie on boc ipriten. he scal it þenche þanne
Ac drit\h/te ne demed nanne man after his bi ginninge
ac his lif scal beo spulc se bued his endinge
Ac ɡif þe ende is euel al it is uuel ⁊. al god ɡif god is ende
god ɡuue þat ure ende beo god. ⁊ pite þet he us lende
Þe man þe nele do no god ne neure god lif leden

93 ladde] *foll. by* n *subp.* 97 deofles] *foll. by* sco *subp.* 100 her] *int. before* er 102 nusten] s *and* d *have pen flourishes from their ascenders* 110 cnaped] *prec. by* cpa *canc.* (*crossed through*) 114 hpa se] se is *int. after* hpa 119 drithte] h *int.* after t[1] 123 ne] *foll. by* ure *subp.*

aer ded ⁊ dom come to his dure he mai sore a dreden
Þat he ne mupe þenne bidde ore. for it itit ilome
þi he is þis þe bit. ⁊ be ȝit. ⁊ bet be fore dome
Þenne ded is ate dure. þel late he biddet ore
þel late he leted vuel þeorc. þe hit ne mai do na mare
Sunne let þe ⁊ þu naht hire þanne þus ne miht do no more
for þi he is sot þe spa abit to habbe godes hore
Þeh hþeðer þe it iluuet þel. for drihte sulf hit sede
a þulche time so eure þe man of þinchet his mis dede
Oþer later oþer raþer milce he scal i meten
ac þe þe nout naued ibet þel muchel he scal beten
Mani man seid þo recke of þine þe scal habben ende
ne bidde ic no bet beo a lused a domesdai of bende

f. 9r

Lutel þat he hþat is þine ⁊ lutel he it icþopeð
þilc hete is þer soule þunet hu biter þind her bloupet
Hadde he ibeon þer anne dai. oþer tþa bare tide
nolde he for al middan eard. þe þridde þer abide
Þat habbet ised þat comen þanne þit þuste mid ipisse
uuel is þine seoue ȝer for seoue nihtes blisse
And ure blisse þe ende hafh. for endeliese þine
betre is þori þater to drinke þenne atter i meng mid þine
Spunes brede is spuþe spete so is of wilde dere
ac al to duere he i buȝhed. þat ȝiued þere fore his spere
Ful þombe mai liht liche speken of hunger ⁊ of fasten
spa mai of þine þe naht not. hu hi scullen ilesten
Hadde he ifonded sume hþile. he þolde al seggen oþer
eð late him pere þif. ⁊ chi\l/d. suster. ⁊ fader. ⁊ broþer
Al he þolde oþerluker don ⁊ oþerluker þenche
ȝanne he bi þouhte on helle fur þe nopiht ne mai aquenche
Eure he þolde inne þa her. ⁊ inne þine þunien
þid þan þe mihte helle þine bi fluen ⁊ bi scunien
Eð lete him pere al þoruldes þele. ⁊ al eordliche
for to þe muchele murcð cume þat is heuenriche
I þulle nu comen eft to þe dome þat ic eop er of sede
on þat dai ⁊ at þe dome. us helpe crist ⁊ rede
Þþer þe maȝen beon eðe of drad ⁊ harde us adrade
þer elc sceal i seo bi foren him. his þord ⁊ ec his dede
Eal scal ben þanne cud. þet man luȝen her ⁊ stelen
Al scal ben þer vnþrien. þat men þruȝen her ⁊ helen
Þe scullen alre manne lif icnaþe þer al so vre oþe
þer sculle heueninges ben þe heiȝe ⁊ þe louȝe
Ne scal þei noman scamien þer. ne þerf he him adrede
ȝif him here of þinched his gult. ⁊ beted his misdede

135 Mani] *foll. by* seid *canc.* (*crossed through*) 137 is] s *has a pen flourish from the ascender* 144 meng] g *has a pen flourish from the ascender* 150 child] l is *int. after* i

For heom ne scamet ne ne gramet þe sculle beon iborupene
ac þe oþre habbet scame ⁊ grame þat sculle beon forlorene
Þe dom scal sone ben idon. ne last he nopit longe
ne scal him noman mene þer of strengþe ne of prange
Þo scullen habbe hardne dom. þe here peren herde
þa þe euele heolden preche men ⁊ vuele laȝes rerde

Ac after þan þe he haued idon. he scal þer beon idemed f. 9v
bliþe mai he þanne buen. þe god haued iquemed
Alle þo þat isprunge beð of adam ⁊ of eue
Ealle he sculle þuder come. for soþe pe it ileued
Þo þe habbed pel idon. after heore mihte
to heuenriche he scullen. ford mid ure drihte
Þo þe nabbeð god idon. ⁊ þer inne beð ifunde
he sculle falle spiþe raþe in to helle grunde
Þar inne he scullen punie buten ore ⁊ ende
ne brecð neuereuft crist helle dure to lese hem of bende
Nis no sellic þei heom beo po. ⁊ hem beo vneþe
nele neuerit crist þolie deð. for lesen heom of dieþe
Enes drihte helle brac. his frend he ut broutte
him self he þolede dieð for hom. pel dore he us bouhte
Nolde it moupe don for meẏ. ne suster for broþer
nolde it sune don for fader. ne noman for oþer
Ure lauerd for his þreles. ipined pas on rode
ure bends he unbond. ⁊ bouht us mid his blode
Þe ȝieueð vneþe for his luue asticche of vre brede
ne þenche ⸢pe⸣ nout þat he scal deme þo quike ⁊ to dede
Muchele luue he us cudde. polde pe it understonde
þat vre eldrene mis duden pe habbet vuele an honde
Dieð com in þis middenerd. þurh þe ealde deofles onde
⁊ sẏnne ⁊ sorȝe ⁊ ȝe spinch. a patere ⁊ ec alonde
Vres formes faderes gult. pe abigget alle
al his of sprung after hẏm in herme is bi falle
Þurst. ⁊ hunger. chule. ⁊ hete. eche. ⁊ al unelþe
þurh dieð com in þis middenerd. ⁊ oþer vnisalþe
Niere no man elles died. ne sic. ne non vn ẏsele
ac mihten libbe eure mo a blisse ⁊ on hele
Lutel iþenchð mani man hu muchel pes þe sẏnne
for þan þolieð alle died þe comen of here cunne
Here ⸢sẏnne⸣ ⁊ ec vre open. sore us mai of þinche

For in sẏnne pe libbet alle in sorepen ⁊ in spinche f. 10r
Suðþe god nam spa muchele preche for ane misdede

167 iborupene] e *subp. after* u 173 he[2]] h *has a pen flourish from the ascender* 192 pe] *int. after* þenche 201 vn ẏsele] ysalþe *canc.* (crossed through) *and replaced with* ẏsele, *added in the right-hand margin* 203 man] *foll. by* v *subp.* 205 sẏnne] *int. after* Here 206 For] F *enlarged and coloured, when it does not begin a couplet, with a pen flourish from ascender*

þe þat so muchel ⁊ spa oft mis doð muȝen vs sore adrede
Adam ⁊ his of spring for one bare sunne
þas fele hundred þintre in helle in pine ⁊ in vnþunne
And þo þe leded here lif mid vnriht ⁊ mid þronge
bute it godes milce do sculle beo þer þel longe
Godes þisdom is þel muchel. ⁊ al spa is his mihte
⁊ nis his milce naþiht lasse. ac bi ðes ilke þihte
More he one mai for ȝiuen. þenne alfole gulte cunne
Deofel suelf mihte habbe milce. ȝif he it bidde gunne
Þe ðe godes milce sechð. iþis he mai is finde
ac helle king is oreles. þið þa þe he mai binde
Þe ðe deð his þille mest. he haueð þurst mede
his be\a/ð scal beo þallinde þich. his bed berninde glede
Þurs he deð his gode þines. þene his fulle feonde
god sculde alle godes frend a þiht scuche freonde
Neure on helle ic ne com ne comen ic þer ne reche
ðeh ich elches þurldes þele. þer inne mihte fecche
Þeh ic þulle seggen eoþ þet þise men us sede
and aboke it is i þrite. þer me mai it rede
Ic it þulle segge heom þe hem self it nusten
⁊ þarnen heom þit heore hearme. ȝif hi me þulled lusten
Vunderstondet nu to me. æidi men ⁊ earme
Ic þulle telle of helle pine. ⁊ þarnie oþ þið herme
On helle is vnger ⁊ þerst. vuele tuo ifere
þos pine þolied þo. þe þere mete niþinges here
Þor is þoninge ⁊ þop after eche strete
hi fared fram hete to þe chele. fram chele to þe hete
Þanne hi beod in þe hete. þe chele ðinchet blisse
þenne hi comeð eft to chele. of hete hi habbed misse
Aiþer hem deð þa inou. nabbet \h/i none lisse

f. 10v

nuten hi peþer heom ded þurst. mid neure non ipisse
Hi þalked eure ⁊ sechet reste. ac hi ne muȝen imeten
for þi hi nolden þo þile hi mithten here sunne beten
Hi seched reste þer non nis. ac þi ne mupen ifinde
ac þalked þeri up ⁊ dun. al se þater deð mid þinde
Þis beod þo þe þeren her. on þonke vn stedefaste
⁊ þo god bi heten auht. ⁊ nolden it ilaste
Þo ðe god þeorc bi gunne. ⁊ ful enden hit nolden
þe þeren her ⁊ nuþe þer. ⁊ nusten þet he þolden
Þere is þich þat eure þealð. þat sculle baþien inne
þo þe ladde vuel lif. in feoh end in iginne

208 adrede] r *subp. after* e 213 **G**odes] **G** *enlarged and coloured capital which takes up two lines in depth rather than the more regular one* 216 **D**eofel] **D** *enlarged and coloured, when it does not begin a couplet* 220 beað] a *int. after* e 222 piht] t *written over* d 229 **V**nder stondet] **V** *enlarged and coloured capital which takes up two lines in depth rather than the more regular one* 230 **I**c] **I** *enlarged and coloured, when it does not begin a couplet* 237 hi] h *int. before* i 244 ilaste] n *subp. after* e

Þer is fur þat eure barnð. ne mai hit napiht quenche
her inne beod þe þes to lef. precche men to spenche
Þer is fur þat is undredfelde hatere þanne beo vre
ne mai it quenchen salt þater. nauene strien ne sture
Þo þe þere spikele men. ⁊ fulle of vuele prenche
þo þe ne mihte euel don. ⁊ don lef þas it to þenche
Þo þe luueden reuing ⁊ stale. hordom. ⁊ drunke
⁊ þe on þes deofles þeorkes bliþeliche spunke
Þo þe þere so lease. þat me hi ne mihte ileuen
med ȝeorne domes men. ⁊ prancþise reuen
Þe oþre mannes þif þes lif. his aþene eð lete
⁊ þo þe sunegede muchel. on drunke ⁊ on ete
Þe precchen bi nemen hure ehte. ⁊ leiden huere on horde
þe lutel leten of godes bode. ⁊ of godes þorde
And of his open nold ȝiuen. þer he sei þe nede
ne nolde ihuren godes sonde þer he sette his beode
Þo þe peren oþeres mannes þinc. leure þanne it scolde
⁊ peren al to gredi. of suelfer ⁊ of golde
And þo þe vntreunesse deden. ȝam hi ahte ben holde
⁊ leten þat hi scolde don. ⁊ duden þet hi polde
Þo þe ȝýsceres peren of þis poruldes ehte

⁊ dude þat þe loþe gost. hem tihte ⁊ ec tauhte
And alle þo ðen eni þise. deoflen her iquemde
þo beoð nu mid him an helle for don ⁊ for dempde
Bute þo þe ofþouhte sore. her here mis deden
⁊ gunnen hure gultes beten. ⁊ betere lif leden
Þeor beð naddren ⁊ snaken. eueten ⁊ frude
þa tered ⁊ freteð þe uuele speken. þe nihtfulle ⁊ þe prute
Neure sunne þer ne scinð. ne mone ne steorre
þer is muchel godes hete. ⁊ muchel godes ȝeorre
Eure þer is vuel smech. þusternesse ⁊ eie
nis þer neure oþer liht. þanne þe sparte leie
Þer ligget laðliche fend. in stronge raketeie
þet buð þe þe þere mid gode. on heuene þel heie
Þer buð ateliche fend. ⁊ eisliche þihte
þos sculle þa precchen i son. þe sunege þurð sihte
Þer is þe loþe sathanas. ⁊ belsebuc þe ealde
Ieþe he mupen ben of drard. þe hine sculled bi helde
Ne mai non heorte it þenche. ne no tunge ne can telle
hu muchele þine. ⁊ hu vele. senden inne helle
Of þo þine þe þere bued. nelle ic hou nout leioȝen
nis it bute gamen ⁊ gleo. al þat man mai here dreoȝen
Ac ȝet ne deð heom nout so þo. in þo loþe biende

f. 11r

271 iquemde] m *subp. after* e 272 dempde] n *subp. after* e 286 **I**eye] **I** *enlarged and coloured, when it does not begin a couplet*

bute þat hi \piteð/ þet heore pine. ne scal neure habben ende
Þer buð þo heþenemen. þe pere lape lese
þe heom nas nout of godes bode. ne of godes hese
Vuele cristenemen. hi bud here i vere
þo þe heore cristen dom. vuele heolden here
Gut hi bud a purse stede. on þere helle grunde
ne sculle hi neure comen vp. for marke ne for punde
Ne mai heom noþer helpen þer. i bede ne almesse
for nis noþer inne helle. ore ne forgiuenesse
Sculde him elc man þe pile he mai. of þos helle pine

f. 11v

And parnie æc his frend þer pid. so ic \habbe/ mine
Þo þe scilden heom ne cunnen. ic heom pulle teache
ich kan beo gif i scal. lichame 7 soule liache
Lete pe þat god for bet. alle mancunne
7 do pe þat he us hat. 7 scilde pe us pid sunne
Luuie pe god mid vre heorte. 7 mid al vre mihte
7 ure emcristene alse us suelf. spa us lerde drihte
Al þat me rat 7 singð. be fore godes borde
al it hanged 7 bi halt. bi þisse tpam porde
Alle godes lape he fulð. þe nepe 7 þe ealde
he þe þos tpa luue haued. 7 pel hi pule healde
Ac hi buð punder erued helde. spa ofte pe gulted alle
for it is strong to stonde longe. 7 liht it is to falle
Ac drihte crist he giue us strencþe. stonde þat pe mote
7 of alle vre gultes unne us come bote
Ꝑe pilnied efter porldes pele. þe longe ne mai ileste
7 leggeð al ure ispinch. on þinge un stede faste
Sspunch pe for godes luue. half þet pe doð for ehte
ne pere pe nout spa bi cherd. ne spa vuele bi cauhte
Gif pe serueden god. so pe doð erninges
more pe haueden of heuene. þanne eorles oþer kinges
Ne mupen hi her perien heom pid chele. pid þurst. ne pid hunger
ne pid elde ne pid deð. þe eldre ne þe geonger
Ac þer nis hunger ne þurst ne deð. ne unhelþe ne elde
of þisse riche pe þenchet oft. 7 of þere to selde
Ꝑe scolden alle us bi þenche oft 7 pel ilome
hpet pe beð. 7 to pan pe sculle. 7 of pan pe come
Hu lutel pile pe beð her. hu longe elles pare
hpat pe mugen habben her. 7 hpet elles hpare
Gif pe pere pise men. þis pe scolden iþenche
bute pe purþe us ipar. þes porld us pule for drenche
Mest alle men he giued drink. of one deofles scenche

292 piteð] piteð *int. after* hi 302 And] A *enlarged and coloured, when it does not begin a couplet* parnie] a *has a pen flourish* habbe] pulle *canc.* (crossed through) with habbe *int.* 315 mote] n *subp. after* e 317 Ꝑe] Ꝑ *enlarged and coloured capital which takes up two lines in depth rather than the more regular one* 331 pe] re *subp.* after pe; *the next word is* pere

he sceal him cunne sculde pel. ȝif he him nele screnche f. 12r
Mid ealmihtes godes luue. vte þe us bi perien
þid þes precches porldes luue. þat he ne mape us derien
Mid fasten. ⁊ almesse. ⁊ ibede perie þe us þid sunne
mid þo pepnen þe god haued ȝiuen alle mancunne
Late þe þe brode stret. ⁊ þe pei bene
þe lat þe niȝeðe del to helle of manne. ⁊ mo ic þene
Go þe þene narepe pei. ⁊ þene pei grene
þer forð fareð lutel folc. ac it is feir ⁊ scene
Þe brode stret is vre ipil ðe is us lod for to leten
þe ðe al foleped his pil. fared bi þusse strete
Hi mupen lihtliche gon. mid ðere nuðer hulde
ðurh ane godliese pude. in to ane bare felde
Þe narepei is godes hes þer forð farð pel feupe
þet buð ða þe heom sculdeð ȝeorne. þid elche un ðeape
Þos goð un ieþe to ȝeanes þe cliue aȝean þe heȝe hulle
þos leteð al here aȝen pil. for godes hese to fulle
Go þe alle þene pei. for he us pulle bringe
mid þo faire fepe men. be foren heuene kinge
Þer is alre meruþe mest. mid englene songe
þe þis a þusen\t/ pintre þer. ne þincð him noht to longe
Þe þe lest haued. haueð so muchel þat he ne bit no more
þe ðe blisse for ðos for lat. it him mai reupe sore
Ne mai non vuel ne non pane. beon inne godes riche
ðeh þer beð punienges fele. elc oþer vn iliche
Sume þer habbet lasse murhðe. ⁊ sume habbed more
after þan þe hi dude her. after þan þe hi sponke sore
Ne scal þer ben bred ne pin. ne oþer cunnes este
god one scal beo eche lif. ⁊ blisse. ⁊ eche reste
Ne scal þer beo fou ne grei. ne cunig ne ermine
ne ocquerne ne martes cheole. ne beuer ne sabeline
Ne scal þer beo sced ne scrud. ne poruld pele none
al þe murhðe þe me us bi hat. al it scal beo god one
Ne mai non murhðe beo so muchel. so is godes sihte
he is soð sunne ⁊ briht. ⁊ dai a buten nihte

He is elches godes ful. nis him noþing ȝit vten f. 12ᵛ
no god nis him pane. þe punied him abuten
Þer is pele abute grame. ⁊ reste abuten spinche
þe mai ⁊ nele þider come. sore it him scal ofþinche
Þer is blisse abuten treȝe. ⁊ lif abuten deaþe
þe eure scullen punien þer. bliþe mupen ben eþe

335 **M**id] **M** *enlarged and coloured capital which takes up two lines in depth rather than the more regular one* 344 Quare de wulua eduxisti | me *is inserted in the right hand margin in a different hand from the main text. It is followed by what appears to be musical notation and* domine non dignus*in the same hand as previously and some pen trials* 349 cliue] c *written over another letter* 354 þusent] t *int.* after n

Þer is ȝeoȝeðe bute ulde. ⁊ hele abuten vn helðe
nis þer so\re/þe ne sor. ne neure nan vn sealþe
Þer me scal drihte sulf i seon. spa he is mid ipisse
he one mai ⁊ scal al beo. engle ⁊ manne blisse
And ðeh ne beod heore eȝe naht. alle iliche brihte
ði nabbed hi nouht iliche. alle of godes lihte
On þisse \liue/ hi neren nout. alle of one mihte
ne þer ne scullen hi habben god. alle bi ore ȝihte
Þo scullen more of him seon. þe luuede him her more
⁊ more icnapen ⁊ ipiten. his mihte ⁊ his ore
On him hi scullen finden al þat man mai to lesten
hali boc hi sculle iseon. al þat hi her nusten
Crist scal one beon inou. alle his durlinges
he one is muchele mare ⁊ betere. þanne alle oþer þinges
Inoh he haued þe hine haueð. þe alle þing pealded
of him to sene nis no sed. þel h\e/m is þe hine bi healdeð
God is so mere ⁊ spa muchel. in his godcunnesse
þet al þet is ⁊ al þat þes is þurse. þenne he ⁊ lesse
Ne mai it neure no man oþer segge mid ipisse
hu muchele murhðe habbet þo. þe beod inne godes blisse
To þere blisse us bringe god. þe rixlet abuten ende
þenne he vre soule vnbint. of licames bende
Crist ȝyue us leden her spilc lif. ⁊ habben her spilc ende
þat þe moten þuder come. þanne þe henne þende. ameN

376 sorepe] re *int. after* so 381 liue] *int. after* þisse 390 hem] i *subp. after* h *with* e *int.* 395 To] T *enlarged and coloured capital which takes up two lines in depth rather than the more regular one* 398 ameN] *final letter* N *is capitalized*

Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, folios 169^{r}-174^{v}

Transcription of Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, folios 169^{r}-174^{v}

MS Pointing:

The text of J *has regular pointing. Punctus are written at the end of each line and half line and are not noted in the apparatus. However, instances when the punctus is missing or in other circumstances of use are listed below. The scribe of J also regularly writes the punctus elevatus: instances of this are shown in the text but not noted below unless they do not occur at the end of the line or half-line.*

A punctus is present after the following words in neither an end-line or half-line position: **elde**: line 17; **childe**: line 25; **wiue**: line 26; **þarf**: line 44; **ẏefte**: line 46; **king**: line 51; **poure**: line 68; **werkes**: line 71; **sunne**, **mone** and **heuene**: line 75; **nowhiht**: line 76; **þencheþ**: line 78; **king**: line 79 **eorþe** and **is**: line 80; **watere**: line 81; **þurhsyhþ**: line 89; **swiken**: line 103; **bi cleopien**: line 107; **iwis**: line 109; **vuel**: line 121; **bet**: line 126; **bet**: line 136; **hunger**: line 151; **pyne**: line 152; **crist**, **fader** and **suster**: line 154; **strengþe**: line 170; **sunne**, **sorewe** and **watere**: line 194; **hunger** and **hete**: line 197; **seorewe**: line 204; **kyng**: line 216; **telle**: line 219; **boke**: line220; **her**: line 240; **pych**: line 241; **strém**: line 244; **reving** and **hordom**: line 249; **drunken**: line 254; **bẏ nẏmeþ**: line 255; **sat**: line 259; **seoluer**: line 261; **fordon**: line 268; **neddren**: line 271; **mone**: line 273; **pyne**: line 284; **marke**: line 294; **euen cristen**: line 304; **newe**: line 307; **half**: line 315; **deþ**: line 321; **beoþ**: line 324; **festen**: line 333; **folke**: line 336; **þeo**: line 342; **murehþe**: line 349; **konyng**: line 357; **oter**: line 358; **sunne**: line 362;

The punctus is not present, where it would be expected, after: **wes**: line 1; **for ẏete**: line 35; **weẏen**: line 64; **her**: line 237; **bẏ gunne**: line 239; **gost**: line 266; **men**: line 346; **wone**: line 351;

Capitalization occurs frequently at the beginning of lines; these occurrences will be indicated in the text but not in the accompanying notes. Capitalization in the middle of the line will also be shown in the text but not in the notes. Enlarged and coloured capitals occur at the beginning of some lines, often at six-line intervals. These will be indicated in bold in the text but not in the notes.

Abbreviations are silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:

þ *has been expanded to* **þat** at lines: 123, 166, 177, 272, 278[1], 280, 288, 299 and 354[2], but is mostly written out as **þat**: 7, 10, 13, 23, 24 etc. On two occasions **þ** *has been expanded to* **þer**: 138 and 163, but is mostly written out as **þer**: 44, 49, 51, 53, 55 etc.

ī has been expanded to **in**: line 42, 198, 264, 268, 278, 284 and 384; **loud** expanded to **louerd**: line 79 and 187; **neu** expanded to **neuer**: line 93, 123, 142, 143, 182, 232, 294 and 370; **mones** expanded to **monnes**: line 114; **eu** expanded to **euer**: lines 117, 132, 152, 158, 200, 233, 241 and 245; **g᷑i᷑mlych** expanded to **grimlych**: line 141; **sume** expanded to **summe**: line 153; **leue** expanded to **leuere**: line 260; **mo** expanded to **mon**: line 286 and 383; **heo** expanded to **heom**: line 287; **c᷑i᷑st** expanded to **crist**: line 311; **Am** expanded to **Amen**: 388 and 390.

Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

The language of this manuscript is West Midland and the text shares many of the forms found in the "AB" dialect, as evidenced below, and also in Lambeth. Samuels locates the manuscript, specifically, to 'South-East Herefordshire, just north of Ross near the Worcestershire border'[851] with the LALME also believing a Herefordshire dialect is probable.[852]

The graph <ð> does not occur at all in J where it is always written <þ> (§ 1, § 2.6, § 3.3 and § 4.6), except for very rare <th> (§ 5) in **sathanas**, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 *Remark*) and once for medial <t> in **euethen**. The graph <d> is written for <ð> once only in **lodliche** (§ 7.6), a reading shared with both E2 and M. The writing of <t> for <þ> in **7 te** demonstrates assimilation of þ (§ 8 and § 8.4).

J always writes <w> (§ 11.1), with the runic letter <ƿ> (wynn) only found once in **ƿorie**. J writes <vv> for <w> in **Vve** on three occasions (§ 11.8), always at the beginning of a line. J mostly writes **and** (122 times) throughout this text with the Tironian nota <⁊> written 68 times (§ 13.1).

Insular *ȝ/ʒ* is not present at all in the writings of J (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position is established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): **grimlẏch**, **grunde**, **grẏsliche** etc.and before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* (§ 42.2): **god**, **agulte**, **go** etc. and by levelling in (**bi**)**gẏnnẏnge** (§ 42.3). The movement to <w> has been completed in J, which writes <w> for the fricative /ɣ/ throughout the text (§ 43.10): **foleweþ**, **mowe**, **owe** etc. J writes <ẏ> for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1) throughout the text: **ẏong**, **yet**, **for-ẏet** etc. but writes plosive /g/ <g> in **vn-for-gulde** (see § 45.3 and *Comment*) Initial <ẏ> is usually omitted in **if** (§ 45.4) but is found once in **ẏef**. J is the only text which demonstrates transition to a palatal in all examples (§ 47ff): **eẏen**,

[851] Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p. 110.
[852] Herefordshire. Linguistic Atlas Grid Reference: 372 244, LP 7440 (McIntosh, Samuels and Benskin 1986, p. 199).

weẏen, **for-þreẏe** etc. The continuation of the OE movement *ig > i* (§ 48), written <ẏ>, in **enẏ**, **monẏ** and **edẏe** is further demonstrated in J. Palatal ȝ /j/ is vocalized to /i/ before <d> (§ 49) in **seẏde**, **seide** and **seẏden** – a probable Anglian feature (§ 49.6). Late OE /dʒ/, written <cȝ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in **bugge**, **seggen**, **leggeþ** etc. The OE group nȝ /ŋg/ is written <ng> (§ 51, § 51.19 and § 51.21): **longe**, **kinge**, **ẏong**, **wrongwise** etc. with devoicing to /ŋ/ before <d> in **meẏnd** (§ 51.5).

In initial position /k/ is nearly always written as <k> before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in **king**(**e**)/**kẏng**, **ikud**, **kunne** etc. but it is <c> in **cuþe**. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is mostly written <c> in **con**, **cuþe**, **cumeþ** etc. but <k> is found in **konẏng** and **kunne**(**n**). Before <n> (§ 18) it is <k> in **knoweþ** and (**i**)**knowe** and before other consonants (§ 19) it is always <c> in (**i**)**clepede**, (**bi**)-**cleopien**, **criste** etc. J writes <qu> (§. 20) for OE *cw* in **queme**, **quẏke**, **quenche** etc. J writes <k> in medial position for OE velar *c* thoughout the text: (§. 21 and §. 21.6): **eke**, **werke**, **speken** etc. with no occurances of <c> (§. 22 and §. 22.6). J also writes <k> in final position (§. 24 and §. 24.1), the only text of the *CL* to regularly do so: **ek**, **work**, **þonk** etc. with <c> written on only one occasion (§. 23.6) in **bec** and <h> in **ah**. The writing of <h> in **ah** demonstrate a tranistion to the fricative /ax/ (§. 26 and §. 26.2) – a feature it shares with L and that is associated with the OE Anglian dialect.

J always writes <ch> for /tʃ/ (§. 27, §. 28.6, §. 29.6 and §. 30.6): **child**(**e**), **chilce**, **muchel**, **riche**, **ich**, **such** etc and in **þunchen** (§. 32 and §. 32.21) and **þenche** (§. 32 and §. 32.23) etc. with <k>, probable /k/, written in **þinkþ** (§. 32.1 and §. 32.22) and **biþenkþ** (§. 32.1 and §. 32.24). J also writes <k>, probable /k/, in **smoke**, **rekþ** and (**i**)**swẏnk**(**e**) where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected (see notes at §. 33 and §. 33.6).

J nearly always writes <sch> (§. 37.3) for /ʃ/ (§. 34) in initial position: **schal**, **schirreue**, **schop** etc., with only one exception, <sc> (§. 35.6) is found in **scolden**. In medial position /ʃ/ is <ss> in **fẏsses** (§. 38). OE [ts] is always written <c> in **mẏlce** (§. 41).

J mostly writes OE unvoiced [f] as <f> in initial position (§ 58 and § 58.21) in **ful**, **feole**, **foleweþ** etc., however, vocalization is regularly demonstrated through the writing of <v> in **veole**, **vor** , **virst** etc (§ 58.21). In final position <f> is retained in **of**, **lif**, **seolf** (§ 58.22) etc. and in medial position when adjacent to one unvoiced sound: **eft**, **after**, **lufte** (§ 58.22) etc. However, voicing is regularly demonstrated (§ 58 and § 58.23) through the writing of <v>/<u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in **him-seolue**, **heuede**, **bivoren** etc. with only two instances where <f> is still retained: **bi-fore** and **deofles** (§ 58.23) etc. The writing of <f> has disappeared before *d* in **hedde** (§ 58.24).

In J OE *a* in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): **habbe**, **vare**, **naueþ** etc. but before a nasal there is evidence of West Midland /ɔ/, written <o> (§ 60 and § 60.6) in **mon**, **monẏ**, **þonk** etc. alongside a limited writing of <a> in **mannes** and **þan/þane**. Before a lengthening group, OE *a* is always <o> (§ 61 and § 61.6): **longe**, **wronge**, **honde** etc. J mostly writes <a> for OE *æ* (§ 63 and § 63.6): **habbe**, **almes/almesse**, **after** etc. with the occasional writing of WML <e> still found in **heuede**, **hedde**, **brek** and **hweþer**. OE *e* is almost always <e> in J (§ 64 and § 64.9): **beren**, **ende**, **strengþe** etc. with the writing of <eo> in **seollich** a result of *WS syllic*. OE *o* is almost always written <o> in D (§ 65.1 and § 65.8): **bi-fore**, **bode**, **borde** etc. with the writing of <eo> in **seorewe** influenced by OE *soerȝean* (Jordan § 35: Remark 3). J: OE *i* is regularly <i>/<ẏ> (§ 66ff and § 66.15. The writing of ẏ in J is orthographical rather than phonological) in **biden**, **child(e)**, **fẏnde** etc. with occasional <u> in **osprung** and **nule**, **nulle** and **nuste(n)** (a probable feature of the AB dialect see § 66.16). For OE *y,* J has mostly <u> (§ 67ff and § 67.15), a feature of WML texts: **dude**, **þunchen**, **agult** etc. with regular <i>/<ẏ> writings also present: **þinche**, **a-virst, king(e)/kẏng**. OE *y* is

always <u> in **lutel/lutle**, **ihud**, **fur(e)**, **cuþe** and **cudde**, with <i> only present only once in **hpi**. Despite the later date of J, in comparison nearly all the other MSS, <u> is nearly always written for OE *u* (§ 68 and § 68.6): **cume(n)**, **punien**, **grunde** etc., with <o> only present once in **sone**.

J writes <o> for OE *ā*, as a result of neutralization, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.9): **lore**, **one**, **non** etc. with rare <a> found in **namore**, **aquerne**, **bihat** (*cont.*), **hatture** and **hat** (*cont.*). In J OE *ǣ₁* is always written as <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): **dede**, **rede**, **adrede** etc (for OE *þær* see § 77ff). OE *ǣ₂* is nearly always written <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) **mest**, **vnhelhþe**, **lest** etc. with <ea> (§ 72.1 and § 79.8) written in **teache** and rare <a> (§ 79.4) written in **ilad** and **lat** (for *ǣlc, elc* and *ylc* see § 81ff). OE *ē* is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.6): **he**, **queme**, **ibet** etc (the writing of **doð** is by analogy and the *fem.* **heo** is written for *masc.*, see § 82.6). OE *ī* is always <i>/<ẏ> (§ 83.1 and § 83.8): **mẏ**, **þriste**, **hwile/hwil** etc. OE *ō* is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.1): **to**, **dome**, **boke** etc. OE *u* is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.1): **nu**, **ure/vre**, **þu** etc.

In J OE *ea* (§ 86 and §87ff) before *r*, without lengthening, is mostly <a> (§ 88.1 and § 88.17): **þarf**, **arme**, **swarte** and **narewe**, with <e> found once in **erewe** ; before *rd* (§ 88.18) <a> is written in **harde** but <e> in **(middel)erd/mẏddelerd**; before *rn* (§ 88.19) <a> is written in **warnẏ/parnẏ** with traditional <ea> found in **earnẏnge**. The *i*-umaut of *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <e> (§ 89.9) in **derne** and with <ea> found in **earmẏnges**. OE *ea* before *l* (Anglian *a*), without lengthening, is always <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.9): **al** and **alle**, **falle**, **walles** etc. before *ld* the writing of <o> (see § 91.1 and § 91.8) has become regular in **wolde**, **old**, **folde** etc. with <e> found in **welde** and **weldeþ** and <a> in **hald**. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *l* combinations (Angl. mutation of *a*) J has <e> in **eldre/eldure** and **elde** (§ 92ff and § 92.9) but writes <ea> in **ealde**. OE *ea* before *h* combinations shows transition to the front glide sound, written <eẏ> (§ 87.3, § 93.2 and § 93.8), in **heẏe** and **iseẏh**. The *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *h*-combinations is always <y>/<i> in **mẏhte(n)/mihte** and **nẏhte(s)** (§ 94.1 and § 94.7).

For OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.8) J writes <e> in **werke** and **werkes** with late evidence of <eo> (WML) found in **heorte** and **steorre**. The *wur* group (§ 97 and § 97.8) is <u> in **wurþe** and for the *i*-umlaut of *eo* it is <u> in **wurse** (see note to § 97.8). OE *eo* before *l*-combinations is <eo> (Angl. § 98ff and §98.9) in **seolf/seolue**. OE *eo* before *ht* is always <i> (§ 99.1 and § 99.7) in **rẏhtwisnesse**, **vnrẏht/vnriht**, **rẏte** and **briht**(**e**) and <i> for the *i*-umlaut (§ 100 and § 100.9) in **ouer-sẏhþ** and **þurh-sẏhþ**. OE – WS *eom* is **am** (chiefly Angl. *eam* § 101). OE *eo* (*a*-umlaut of *e*) is regularly WML <eo> (§ 102.3 and § 103.6) in **veole/ueole/feole** and **weole** alongside rare occurrences of <e> in **wele** and **brekeð**. OE *eo* (*u*-umaut of *e*) is regularly WML <eo> (§ 102.3 and § 104.6) in **heouene** and **heoueriche** etc., alongside <e> in **heuenliche** and <o> in **world**(**es**), with <u> written under the influence of *w* in **suster.** The velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105ff) is regularly written as <eo> (WML or SW form) in J (§ 105.9): **bi-cleopien**, **seoue**, **heore** etc, alongside <e> in **bi-neþen**, **icleped** and **seþþen** and <ẏ> in (**by**)**nyme**, **quẏke**. and **nẏþe**.

In J OE *ēa* (§ 106ff and § 106.8) is nearly always written as <e>: **ek/eke**, **eþe**, **deþe/deþ** etc. with <ea> in **lean**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēa* (§ 107.1 and § 107.7) is always <e> in **ileue**, **here**, **teme** etc. OE *ēo* (§ 108ff and § 108.8) is mostly <eo>, a form associated with the WML and the South (§ 108.1) alongside occasional <e>: **beo**(**n**), **seon**, **leof** etc. with <e> in **be**, **þeue** and **sek**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109 ff) is always unrounded <eo> (§ 109.9), WML and Southern form (§ 109.1 and § 108) in **freond**, **feond**, **þeostre** etc.

In J OE *ea* after *sc* (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.7) is always <a> in **schal**, **scal** and **schafte** etc. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* after *c* (§ 113.7) J writes <e> in **chele** and **bi-cherd**. OE *ēa* after *g* (§ 114) is <e> in **ẏer**. For OE *ie* after *g* (§ 116.6) J always writes <e> (Anglian § 115.1): **for-ẏet**, **ẏefte**, **ẏelde** etc. Similarly, for OE *ɪe* after *g* J writes <e> in **ẏet** (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE *ie* after *sc* (§ 118.6) J writes <i> in **schilde** with <e> in **scheldeþ**. OE *eo* after *ġ* (§ 119.1 and §120.6) is <o> in **ẏonge** and

ẏonghede. OE *eo* after *sc* (§ 121.6) is written as either <u> in **schulle(n)/schulleþ/schule(n)**, **schulde(n)** or <o> in **scholde(n)/scolden** and **schop**.

OE *æ + ʒ* /j/ is nearly always <aẏ> in J (§ 122.1 and § 122.7) in **maẏ** and **daẏ**, with <eẏ> written once in **seẏþ**. LWS *sǣde* / Anglian *sægde* (§ 123 and §123.6) is always <eẏ> in **seẏde(n)**. OE *ǣ₁*(Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.6) is <eẏ> in **meẏ**, **greẏ**, **seẏen** and **iseẏe**. OE *ǣ₂* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.7) is <eẏ> in **eẏþer**. OE *e* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.7) is <eẏ>/<ei> in **eẏe**, **weẏ(e)** and **wei**. OE *ē* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.6) is <eẏ> in **for-preẏ** and **leẏe**. OE *ēa* + *ʒ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.6) is <eẏ> in **eẏen** and **raketeẏe**. OE *ā* + *h (g)* (§ 132.1 and § 132.2) has the glide sound /u/, written <ou> in **fou** and <au> in **auh**. OE *ǣ₂* + *h* (§ 132.1 and § 133.6) is <aẏ> in **aẏhte**, with <a> in **tahte**. OE *ō* + *h* (§ 134.1 and § 134.7) in J always demonstrates the glide sound /u/, written <ou>, in **vn-bouht**, **bi-þouht**, **brouhte** etc. OE *a* + /ɣ/ (§ 136.1 and § 136.7) demonstrates the movement to /au/, written <aw> in **drawen**, **lawes** and **lawe-leve**. OE *ā* + /ɣ/ (§ 137.1 and § 137.2) in J demonstrates the movement to /ɔu/, written <ow> (for the writing of <o>, see § 69), in **mowe** and **owe/owene**. OE *ā* + *w* (§ 138.1 and § 138.7) is mostly <o> before *w* (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in **iknowe,** **(i)knoweþ** and **bloweþ**, with the <ou> combination present in **soule** and **soulen** but <au> in **saule**. OE *ēo* + *w* (§ 139.1 and § 139.7) is <eo> (WM form cf. § 108.1) before *w* in **reowe** and **seowe**, with <e> written in **rewe**; the *i*-umlaut is <e> in **untrewnesse**. OE *ēa* + *w* (§ 140.1 and § 140.7) is <e> in **fewe**.

Ich am eldre þan ich wes a winter and ek on lore. f. 169r
Ich welde more þan ich dude. mẏ wẏt auh to beo more.
wel longe ich habbe child ibeo. a werke and eke on dede.
þah ich beo of wẏnter old. to ẏong ich am on rede.
vnned lif ich habbe ilad. and ẏet me þinkþ ich lede.
hwenne ich me biþenche. ful sore ich me adrede.
Mest al þat ich habbe idon. is idelnesse and chilce.
wel late ich habbe me bi þouht. bute god do me mẏlce.
veole idel word ich habbe ispeke. seoþþe ich speke cuþe.
and feole ẏonge deden ido. þat me of þincheþ nuþe.
Al to lome ich habbe agult. on werke and on worde.
Al to muchel ich habbe i spend. to lutel i leẏd an horde.
Best al þat me likede er. nv hit me mẏs lẏkeþ.
þe muchel foleweþ his wil. him seolue he bi swikeþ.
Mon let þi fol lust ouer go. and eft hit þe likeþ.
Ich mẏhte habbe bet i do. heuede ich enẏ selhþe.
Nv ich wolde and i ne maẏ. for elde. ne for vnhelhþe.
Elde is me bi stolen on. er þan ich hit wiste.
Ne maẏ ich bi seo me bi fore. for smoke ne for mẏste.
Erewe we beoþ to donne god. vuel al to þriste.
More eẏe stondeþ mon of mon. þan him to crẏste.
Þe wel ne doþ hwile he maẏ. hit schal him sore reowe.
hwenne alle men repen schule. þat heo ear seowe.
Dod to gode þat ẏe muwen. þe hwile ẏe beoþ alẏue.
Ne lipne no mon to muchel. to childe. ne to wẏue.
þe him seolue for ẏet. for wiue. oþer for childe.
he schal cumen on vuele stude. bute god him beo Milde.
Sende vch sum god bivoren him. þe hwile he maẏ to heouenes.
Betere is on almes bi uoren. þane beoþ after seouene.
Ne beo þe leouere þan þi seolf. þi meẏ ne þi mowe.
Sot is þat is oþer mannes freond. more þan his owe.
Ne lipne no wif to hire were. ne were to his wẏue.
Beo vor him seolue vẏch mon. þe hwile he beoþ alẏue.
Þis is þat him seolue biþenkþ. þe hwile he mot libbe.

vor sone willeþ him for ẏete þe fremede and þe sibbe. f. 169v
þe wel nule do hwile he maẏ. ne schal he hwenne he wolde.
Monẏ monnes sore iswẏnk. ofte habbeþ vnholde.
Ne scholde nomon don a virst. ne slakien wel to donne.
vor monẏ mon bihoteþ wel. þat hit for ẏeteþ sone.
Þe mon þat wile sẏker beo. to habbe godes blẏsse.
Do wel him seolf þe hwile he maẏ. þenne haueþ he hit mẏd iwisse.

tractatus quidam in anglico *has been inserted in the top margin* 7 Mest] M *enlarged coloured capital taking up two lines* 11 lome] *diac. above* o 20 god] *diac. above* o 22 Þe] Þ *guide letter in the left-hand margin*

þeos riche men weneþ to beon sẏker. þurh walles ⁊ þurh diche.
Ah heo doþ heore aẏhte in siker stude. þat sendeþ hit to heoue riche.
vor þer ne þarf. he beon adred. of fure ne of þeue.
þar ne may hit bynyme. þe loþe ne þe leoue.
Þer ne þarf he beon of dred. of ẏefte. ne of yelde.
þider we sendeþ and seolf bereþ. to lutel and to selde.
þider we schulde drawen and don. wel ofte and ilome.
Ne maẏ þer non hit vs bẏnẏmen. mẏd wrongwise dome.
þider we schulden drawen and don. wolde ẏe me ileue.
vor þer ne maẏ hit vs bẏ nẏme. þe king. ne þe schirreue.
Al þe beste þat we habbeþ. þider we schulde sende.
vor þer we hit mẏhte vinden eft. ⁊ habben ·o· buten ende.
He þat her doþ enẏ god. to habbe godes ore.
Al he schal vẏnde þer. an hundred folde more.
þe þat aẏhte wile holde wel. þe hwile he maẏ him wolde.
ẏeue hit for godes luue. þenne doþ he hit wel iholde.
vre swẏnk ⁊ vre tẏlehþe. is iwuned to swẏnde.
Ah heo þat hit ẏeueþ for godes luue. eft hit mowen ivẏnde.
Ne schal non vuel beon vn bouht. ne no god vn vor gulde.
Vuel we doþ al to muchel. god: lasse þane we scholde.
þe þat mest doþ nv to gode. ⁊ te þe leste to laþe.
Eyþer to lutel and to muchel. schal þunchen heom ef to baþe.
Þer me schal vre werkes weẏen bẏ vore heouene kinge.
And ẏeuen vs vre swẏnkes lean. after vre earnẏnge.
Everuẏch mon mẏd þat he haueþ. maẏ bugge heoueriche.
þe riche and þe poure boþe. ah nouht alle ilẏche.
þe poure. mẏd his penẏe. þe riche mẏd his punde.
þat is þe wunderlicheste ware. þat euer was ifunde.
ȝ ofte god con more þonk. ẏe þat ẏueþ him lasse.

f. 170r

Alle his werkes. ⁊ his ẏeftes. is in rẏhtwisnesse.
Lvtel lok is gode leof. þat cumeþ of gode wille.
ȝ lutel he let on muchel wowe. þer þe heorte is ille.
heouene ⁊ eorþe he ouer sẏhþ. his eẏen beoþ so brihte.
Sunne. ⁊ mone. heuene. ⁊ fur. beoþ þeostre aẏeẏn his lẏhte.
Nis him for hole nowiht. ne ihud. so muchele beoþ his mẏhte.
Nis no so derne dede idon. in so þeostre nẏhte.
he wot hwat þencheþ. ⁊ hwat doþ. alle quẏke wẏhte.
Nis no louerd such is crist. ne king. such vre drẏhte.
Heouene ⁊ eorþe. and al þat is. biloken is. in his honde.
he doþ al þat his wille is. a watere. and eke on londe.
he makede fẏsses in þe sea. and fuweles in þe lufte.
he wit and wald alle þing. and schop all schafte.
he wes erest of alle þing. and euer bẏþ buten ende.

42 and 43 *these lines have been trs. according to the letters* a *and* b *written in the margin* 51 schirreue] *diac. above* e 62 gode] *diac. above* o 72 lok] *diac. above* o

he is on ewiche stude. wende hwer þu wende.
he is buuen and bi neþen. bi voren vs and bi hinde.
þe þat godes wille doþ. ichwer maẏ him fẏnde.
Hvẏch rune he iherþ. þe wot alle dede.
he þurh sẏhþ. vẏch monnes þonk. wẏ hwat schal vs to rede.
þe þat brekeþ godes hes. and gulteþ so ilóme.
hwat schulle we seggen oþer don. at þe muchele dome.
þe þat luueþ vnrẏht. and heore lif. vuele ledeþ.
we þat neuer god ne duden. þen heueneliche demeþ.
hwat schulle seggen oþer don. þer engles heom drede.
Crist for his muchele mẏhte. hus helpe þenne and rede.
Hwat schulle we beren vs bivoren. Mid hwan schulle we queme.
þe schule beon deoulen so veole. þat wulleþ vs for wreẏe.
Nabbeþ heo nowiht for ẏete. of al þat heo iseẏen.
Al þat we mẏsduden here. heo hit wulleþ cuþe þere.
Bute we habben hit ibet. þe hwile we her were.
Al heo habbeþ in heore wrẏte. þat we mẏsduden here.
þah we hit nusten. heo weren vre i fere.
Hwat schulleþ horlinges don. þe swiken. and þe forsworene.
Swiþe veole beoþ icleped. and fewe beoþ icorene.
waẏ hwi were ⸢heo⸣ bi ẏete. hwi weren heo iborene.
þat schulle beo to deþe idemed. and euer more forlorene.

huẏch mon him seolue schal her. bi cleopien. and ek deme. f. 170v
his owene werkes and his þouht. to witnesse hit schal teme.
Ne maẏ him nomon deme so wel. iwis. ne al so rẏhte.
for non ne knoweþ so wel his þonk. bute vre drẏhte.
vẏch mon wot him seolue best. his werkes and his wille.
þat lest wot he seẏþ ofte mest. ⁊ he þat al wot is stille.
Nis no witnesse al so muchel so monnes owe heorte.
for so seẏþ þat vnhol is. him seolue hwat him smeorteþ.
Vẏch mon schal him seolue deme. to deþe oþer to lẏue.
þe witnesse of his owe werk. þer to him schal drẏue.
⁊ al þat euer mon hafþ idon. seþþen heo com to monne.
Al so he hit iseẏe on boke iwrẏten. hit schal him þinche þenne.
Ne schal nomon beon ẏdemed. after his bigẏnnẏnge.
Ah dom schal þolẏen vẏch mon. after his endinge.
If þe ende is vuel. al hit is vuel. god ẏef vs god ende.
God ẏef vs vre ende god. hwider þat he vs lende.
Þe mon þat neuer nule do god. ne neuer god lif lede.
þat deþ cume to his dure. he maẏ sore adrede.

90 ilome] *diac. above* o 92-96 *these lines are out of order and the scribe has made a mistake as a result.* Line 94 *should follow* line 92 *with* drede *rhyming with* ledeþ *(more correct version:* dradde *and* ladde). *Instead the scribe has added* þ *to* deme (93) *to rhyme with* ledeþ – *which it follows.* Line 96 *should follow* line 93 *(rhyming* deme *and* queme*).* Line 95 *has been added at this point to try to rectify a spoiled rhyme scheme. This line is adapted from a line found later in the verse-sermon* 105 heo] *int. after* were ẏete] heẏhte *has been subp. with* ẏete *added to the right-hand margin, marked for trs.*

þat he ne Muwe bidden ore. for þat itẏt ilome.
vor þi is wis þat bit ore. and bet. bi vore þe dome.
hwenne deþ is at þe dure. wel late he bit ore.
wel late he leteþ þat vuel. þenne he ne maẏ do na more.
Bilef sunne hwil þu myht. and do bi godes lore.
and do to gode hwat þu myht. if þu wilt habben ore.
For we hit ileueþ wel. and drẏhten seolf hit seẏde.
on hwiche tẏme so euer þe mon. of þincheþ his mẏsdede.
oþer raþer oþer later. Milce he schal ẏ mete.
Ah he þat nouht naueþ ibet. muchel he haueþ to bete.
Monẏ mon seẏþ hwo rekþ of pẏne. þat schal habben ende.
Ne biddeich no bet. bute ich beo. ilesed a domes daẏ of bende.
Lutel wot he hwat is pẏne. ⁊ lutel he hit iknoweþ.
hwich hete is þar þe soule wuneþ. hw bitter wẏnd þer bloweþ.

f. 171r

hedde he iwuned þer enne daẏ. oþer vnneþe one tẏde.
Nolde he for al þe middelerd. an oþer þer abẏde.
Swiþe grimlẏch stench þer is. ⁊ wurþ wẏþ vten ende.
⁊ hwo þe enes cumeþ þer. vt maẏ he neuer þenne wende.
Neuer ich in helle ne com. ne þer to cume ne recche.
þah ich al þes worldes weole. þer wende to vecche.
þat seẏden þeo þat weren þer. heo hit wisten mẏd iwisse.
þer þurh seorewe of seoue ẏer. for soue nẏhtes blẏsee.
⁊ for þe blẏsse þat ende haueþ: endeles is þe pyne.
Beter is porie wateres drung. þane atter meẏnd mẏd wẏne.
Swẏnes brede is swete. so is of þe wilde deore.
Al to deore he hit buþ. þat ẏeueþ þar vore his sweore.
ful wombe maẏ lihtliche speken. of hunger. and of festen.
so maẏ of pẏne. þat not hwat hit is. þat euer mo schal lesten.
hedde he ifonded summe stunde. he wolde seggen al oþer.
⁊ lete for crist. beo wif ⁊ child. fader. suster. and broþer
Al he wolde oþer don. ⁊ oþerluker þenche
hwenne he biþouhte on helle fur. þat noþing ne maẏ quenche.
Eure he wolde in bonen beon. ⁊ in godnesse wunẏe.
wiþ þat he mẏhte helle fur. euer fleon and schonẏe.
⁊ lete sker al þes worldes weole. ⁊ þes worldes blẏsse.
wiþ þat he mẏhte to heouene cumen. ⁊ beo þer mẏd iwisse.
Ich wile eu seggen of þe dome. as ich eu er seẏde.
on þe daẏ and on þe dome. vs helpe crẏst and rede.
þer we Muwen beon aferd. and sore vs of drede.
þer vẏch schal seon him bi fore. his word and ek his dede.
Al schal beon þer þeonne ikud. þat er men lowen and stelen
Al schal beon þer þeonne vnwrien. þat men her wrien ⁊ helen.
Vve schulleþ alre monne lẏf. iknowe al so vre owe.

125 ilome] *diac. above* o 134 ibet] *diac. above* e 163 þer] *foll. by a space left of about three letters*

þer schulle beon euenẏnges. þe riche and ek þe lowe.
þe dom schal beon sone idon. ne lest he nowhiht longe.
Ne schal him nomon menen þer. of strengþe. ne of wronge.

þeo schullen habbe harde dom. þat er weren harde. f. 171v
þeo þat vuele heolde wrecche men. and vuele lawe arerde.
Alle þeo þat beoþ icumen. of adam and of eve.
Alle heo schule þider cumen. and so we owen hit ileue.
þeo þat habbeþ wel idon. after heore Mihte.
To heoueriche heo schulle vare. forþ mẏd vre dryhte.
þeo þat habbeþ feondes werk idon. ⁊ þer in beoþ ifunde.
heo schulle fare forþ mẏd him᷑ in to helle grunde.
Þer ho schulle wunẏen .o. buten ore and ende.
Ne brekeþ nought crist eft helle dure. to lessen heom of bende.
Nẏs no seollich þeh heom beo wo. he mawe wunẏe eþe
Nul neuer eft crist þolẏe deþ. to lesen heom of deþe.
Enes drihte helle brek. his freond he vt brouhte.
him seolue he þolede deþ for vs. wel deore he vs abouhte.
Nolde hit nomon do for me. ne suster for broþer.
Nolde hit sone do for vader. ne nomon for oþer.
Vre alre louerd for vs þrelles. ipẏned wes on rode.
Vre bendes he vnbond. ⁊ bouhte vs mẏd his blode.
And we ẏeueþ vnneþe. a stucche of vre brede.
we ne þencheþ nouht þat he schal deme. þe quẏke ⁊ ek þe dede.
Muchel luue he vs cudde. wolde we hit vnderstonde.
þat vre elderne mẏs duden. we habbeþ harde on honde
Deþ com i þis Middelerd. þurh þe deofles onde.
⁊ sunne. ⁊ sorewe. ⁊ muchel swẏnk. a water. ⁊ a londe.
Vre forme faderes gult. we abuggeþ alle.
Al his ofsprung after him. in harme is ifalle.
Þurst and hunger. chele. and hete. ache and vnhelþe
þurh him com in þis mẏddelerd. ⁊ oþe vnẏselẏþe.
Nere nomon elles ded ne sek. ne non vnhele.
Ah mẏhten libben euer mo. mẏd blẏsse and mẏd wele.
Lutel hit þincheþ monẏmon. ah muchel wes þe sunne.
for whon alle þolieþ deþ. þat comen of heore kunne.
Vre sunne and vre sor. vs maẏ sore of þunche.

In sunnen we libbeþ alle. ⁊ seorewe. and in swẏnke. f. 172r
hwenne god nom so muche wreche. for one mẏsdede.
We þat ofte mẏs doþ. we mowen vs sore adrede.
Adam ⁊ his ofsprung. for ore bare sunne.
weren feole hundred wẏnter in pyne. ⁊ on vnwunne.
And þeo þat ledeþ heore lif. mẏd vnriht ⁊ mẏd wronge.

177 beoþ] eo *written over two letters*

Bute hit godes mẏlce beo. he beoþ þar wel longe.
Godes wisdom is wel muchel. ⁊ al so is his mẏhte.
Nis his mẏlce nowiht lasse. ah al bẏ one wẏhte.
More he one maẏ for ẏeue. þan al volk agulte kunne.
þeẏh seolf deouel mẏhte habbe mẏlce. If he hit bi gunne.
Þe þat godes mẏlce sekþ. iwis he hit maẏ fẏnde.
Ah helle kẏng. is ore les. wiþ þon þat he maẏ bẏnde.
þe þat doþ his wille mest. he schal habbe wrst mede.
His baþ schal beo wallẏnde pich. his bed bernẏnde glede.
Also ich hit telle as wẏse men vs seẏden.
And on heore boke. hit iwrẏten is. þat me maẏ hit reden.
Ich hit segge for heom. þat er þis hit nusten
And warnẏ heom wiþ harme. if heo me wulleþ lusten.
Vnderstondeþ nv to me. edẏe men and arme.
Ich wille ou telle of helle pẏne. and warnẏ of harme.
þar is hunger and þurst. vuele tweẏe ivere.
þeos pẏne þolieþ þer. þa⸌t⸍ were mete nẏþinges
þar is wonẏing and wop. after vlche strete.
ho vareþ from hete to chele. from chele to þar hete
Hwenne heo cumeþ in hete. þe chele heom þincheþ lẏsse.
þenne heo cumeþ eft to chele. of hete heo habbeþ mẏsse.
Eẏþer heom doþ wo ẏ nouh. nabbeþ heo none lisse.
heo nuten hweþer heom doþ wurse. mẏd neuer none iwisse.
heo walkeþ euer and secheþ reste. ah heo hit ne muwe imete
for heo nolde hwile heo mẏhten. heore sunnen ibete.
Heo schecheþ reste þer non nẏs for þi ne muwen hi finde.
Ah walkeþ þar boþe vp and dun. so water doþ mẏd winde.

f. 172v

þis beoþ þe þat weren her Mid hwom me heold feste.
And þeo þat gode bi heẏhte wel. and nolden hit ileste.
And þeo þat god were bẏ gunne and ful endẏ hit nolden.
Nv were her. nv were þer. heo nuste hwat heo wolden.
Þet ich pẏch. þat euer walleþ. þat heo schulle habbe þere.
þeo þat ledeþ heore lẏf vnwreste. and eke false were.
þar is fur an hundred folde. hatture þan be vre.
Ne maẏ hit quenche no salt water. ne auene strem. ne sture.
þat is þet fur þat euer barnþ. ne maẏ hit nomon quenche.
þar inne beoþ þeo. þat her wes leof. poure men to swenche.
Þeo þat were swikelemen. and ful of vuele wrenche.
And þeo þat ne mẏhte vuele do. ⁊ was hit leof to þenche.
þeo þat luued reving. and stale. ⁊ hordom. ⁊ drunken.
And on deoules werke. bluþeliche swunken.
þeo þat were so lese. þat me heom ne mẏhte ileuen.

217 and 218 *these lines have been trs. according to the letters* a *and* b *written in the margin* 226 þat] t is *int. after* a 233 imete] *diac. above* e[1] 244 strem] *diac. above* e 251 ileuen] *diac. above* e[1]

Med ẏorne domes men. and wrongwise reuen.
Þe þat wes leof oþer mannes wif. ⁊ his owe leten
And þe þat sunegeþ ofte. on drunken. and on mete
þeo þat wrecche men bẏnẏmeþ. his eẏhte. ⁊ hit leẏþ an horde.
And lutel let on godes bode. and of godes worde.
þeo þat almes nolde ẏeue þere he iseẏh þe neode.
Ne his poure kunesmen. at him ne mẏhte nouht spede.
Þe þat nolde here godes sonde. þar he sat. at his borde.
⁊ was leof oþer mannes þing. leuere þan beon schulde
⁊ weren al to gredi. of seoluer. and of golde.
⁊ luueden vntrewnesse. þat heo schulden beon holde.
⁊ leten þat hi scolden do. and duden þat heo ne scholden.
heo schulleþ wunẏen in helle. þe ueondes onwolde.
Þe þat were gaderares. of þisse worldes aẏhte.
And duden þat þe loþe gost heom tẏcede and tahte.
And alle þeo þe mẏd dusẏe wise. deouele her iquemeþ.
þeo beoþ nv in helle wiþ him. fordon. and for demde.

Bute þeo þat of þincheþ her. sore heore mẏsdede. f. 173r
⁊ heore gultes gunnen lete. and betere lif to lede.
Þer beoþ neddren. ⁊ snaken. euethen and fruden.
þer tereþ and freteþ. þat vuele spekeþ. þe nẏþfule ⁊ þe prude.
Neuer sunne þer ne schineþ. ne Mone. ne steorre.
þer is muchel godes héte. ⁊ muchel godes eorre.
Euer þar is muchel smech. þeosterness and eẏe.
Nis þer neuer oþer lẏht. bute þe swarte leẏe.
Þer lẏþ þe lodliche ueond. in stronge raketeẏe
þat is þe þat wes mẏd god. in heouene swiþe heẏe.
þer beoþ ateliche ueondes. ⁊ grẏsliche wẏhtes.
þer schule þe wrecche soulen iseon. þat sunegeden bi sihtes.
þer is þe loþe sathanas. ⁊ beelzebub þe olde.
Eþe heo mwue beon adred. þat heom schulde biholde.
Ne maẏ non heorte hit þenche. ne no tunge telle.
hw muche pẏne. hw ueole ueondes. beoþ in þeostre helle
for all þe pyne þat her is. nulle ich eu nouht lẏe.
Nis hit bute gome and gleo. al þat mon maẏ her dreẏe.
⁊ ẏet ne doþ heom noþing so wo. in þe loþe bende.
Ase þat witen heore pẏne. ne schal habbe non ende.
Þar beoþ þe heþene men. þat were lawe le[s]e.
þet nes nouht of godes forbode. ne of godes hese.
Vuele cristenemen. beoþ þer heorure nere.
þeo þat heore cristendom. vuele heolden here.
ẏet heo beoþ a wrse stude. anẏþe helle grunde.

253 leten] *diac. above* e[1] 261 gredi] *diac. above* e[1] 263 leten] *diac. above* e[1] 274 hete] *diac. above* e[1] 289 lese] leve *a later hand corrects* leve *by writing* **s** *above*

Ne schullen heo neuer cumen up:˘ for marke. ne for punde.
Ne maẏ helpe þer. nouþer beode ne almesse.
for nẏs noþer in helle. ore ne ẏeuenesse.
Nu schilde him vẏch mon hwile he maẏ. wiþ þe ilke pẏne.
And warnẏ vich his freond. so ich habbe mẏne.
þeo þat schilde heom ne kunnen. ich heom wille teche.
Ich con beon eẏþer if ich schal. lẏcome and soule leche.

f. 173v **L**ete we þat god forbed. alle mon kunne.
And do we þat he vs hat. ⁊ schilde we vs wiþ sunne.
Luuẏe we god mẏd vre heorte. ⁊ mẏd alle vre mẏhte.
Vre euen cristen. as vs seolf. for so vs lerede drẏhte.
Al þat me redeþ and sẏngeþ. bi voren godes borde.
Al hit hongeþ and hald. bi þisse twam worde.
Alle godes lawe he fulleþ. þe newe. ⁊ ek. þe olde.
þat haueþ þeos ilke two luuen. ⁊ wel heom wile atholde.
Ah soþ ich hit eu segge. ofte we agulteþ alle.
for strong hit is to stonde longe. ⁊ lẏht hit is to falle.
Ah drẏhten crist vs ẏeue strengþe. stonde þat we mote.
And of alle vre sunnen. vs lete cume to bote.
Vve wilneþ after worldes aẏhte. þat longe ne maẏ ileste.
And mest leggeþ vre swẏnk. on þing vnstudeueste.
If þat we swunken for gode. half. þat we doþ for eẏhte.
Nere we nouht so ofte bi cherd. ne so vuele bẏ þouhte.
ẏef we seruede god. so we doþ earmẏnges.
we Mihte habbe more of heouene. þan eorles oþer kẏnges.
Ne mowe nought werẏen heom. wiþ chele ne wiþ hunger.
Ne wiþ elde ne wiþ deþe. þe eldure ne þe ẏonge.
Ah þer nẏs hunger ne þurst. ne deþ. ne vnhelþe ne elde.
Of þis world we þencheþ ofte:˘ and þer of al to selde.
Vve schulde vs bi þenche. wel ofte and wel ilome.
hwat we beoþ. to hwan we schulen. ⁊ of hwan we comen.
hw lutle hwile we beoþ here. hw longe elles hware.
⁊ after gode wel wurche. þenne ne þuruue noht kare.
If we were wẏse men. þus we schulde þenche.
Bute we wurþe vs iwar. þes world vs wile for drenche.
Mest alle men he ẏeueþ drẏnke. of one deofles [senche]
he schal him cunne schilde wel. ẏef he him [wile bi þenche]
Mid almẏhtẏes godes luue. vte we vs werie.
wiþ þeos wrecche worldes luue. þe heo vs ne derẏe.

f. 174r Mid festen. and almesse and beoden. were we vs wiþ sunne.
Mid þe wepnen þat god haueþ ẏ\e/uen. to alle mon kunne.

307 ek] k *written over another letter* 329 senche] *added after* deofles *in a different but contemporary hand* 330 wile bi þenche] *added after* him[2] *in a different but contemporary hand* 334 ẏeuen] e[1] *int. after* ẏ

Lete we þeo brode stret. and þene weẏ grene.
þat lat þe nẏeþe to helle. of folke. and mo ich wene.
Go we þene narewe weẏ. þene weẏ so schene.
þer forþ fareþ lutel folk. and þat is wel eþ sene.
þe brode stret is vre wil. þat is vs loþ to lete.
þe þat al feleweþ his wil:˙ he fareþ þe brode strete.
Þe narewe weẏ is godes heste. þat forþ fareþ wel fawe.
þat beoþ þeo. þe heom scheldeþ wel. wiþ vẏch vnþewe.
þeos goþ vnneþe aẏeẏn þe cleo. aẏeẏn þe heẏe hulle.
þeos leteþ awei al heore wil. for godes hestes to fullen.
Go we alle þene wei. for he vs wile brẏnge.
Mid þe fewe feẏremen bẏuoren heouene kinge.
þer is alre Murehþe mest. mẏd englene songe.
wel edẏ wurþ þilke mon. þat þer bẏþ vnderuonge.
þe lest haueþ murehþe. he haueþ so muche. ne bit he namore.
hwo so þeo blisse for þisse forẏet. hit maẏ him rewe sore.
Ne maẏ no pẏne ne no wone beon in heouene riche.
þah þer beon wonẏnges feole. and oþer vnẏliche.
Summe habbeþ lasse Murehþe. ⁊ summe habbeþ more.
vẏch after þat he dude her. ⁊ after þat heo swunken sore.
Ne wrþ þer bred ne wẏn. ne nones kunnes este.
God one schal beon eche lif. ⁊ blisse eche reste.
Þer nẏs nouþer fou ne greẏ. ne konẏng. ne hermẏne.
Ne oter. ne acquerne. Beuveẏr ne sablẏne.
Ne þer ne wurþ ful iwis. worldes wele none.
Al þe Murehþe þat me vs bihat:˙ al hit is god one.
Nis þer no Murehþe so muchel. so is godes sẏhte.
he is soþ sunne. and briht. and daẏ bute nẏhte.
He is vẏche godes ful. nẏs him nowiht wiþ vte.
Nis heom nones godes wone:˙ þa\t/ wuneþ hẏm abute.

þer is weole bute wone. and reste bute swẏnke. f. 174v
hwo maẏ þider cume and nule. hit schal hẏm sore of þinche.
þer is blẏsse bute teone. and lif wiþ vte deþe.
þeo þat schulle wunẏe þer. bliþe mvwen heo beon eþe.
Þer is ẏonghede buten ealde. and hele buten vnhelþe.
þer nẏs seorewe ne no sor. neuer non vnhelþe.
Seoþþe me drẏhten iseo. so he is mẏd iwisse.
he one maẏ beon and schal. englene and monne blisse.
Þeo schulen of him more iseon. þat her him luuede more.
And more iseon and iwyten. his Milce and his ore.
On him heo schullen fẏnden. al þat mon maẏ luste.
⁊ on lẏves bec iseon. al þat heo her nusten.

337 narewe] *written, by the main hand, into a space too small for it* 350 þisse] are *subp. after* þ *with* isse *int.* 364 þat wuneþ hẏm abute] ⁊ rest bute swynke *canc.* (*crossed through*); *these words begin the following line* (*eyeskip*). þat wuneþ hẏm abute *is added to the bottom of fol., with* t *int. after* þa 376 bec] c *written over another letter*

Crist seolf on schal beon. i nouh to alle derlinges
He one is more and betere. þan alle wordliche þinges.
Inouh hi habbeþ þat hẏne habbeþ. þat alle þinges weldeþ.
him to seonne murie hit is. so faẏr he is to biholde.
God is so swete ⁊ so muchel. in his godnesse.
Al þat wes ⁊ is. is wel wurse and lasse.
Ne maẏ nomon hit segge. ne wẏten mẏd iwisse.
hu muchele Murehþe habbeþ heo. þat beoþ in heuene blisse.
To þare blisse bringe vs god. þat lesteþ buten ende.
hwenne he vre saule vn bind. of lichomliche bende.
Crist vs lete such lif lede. ⁊ habbe her such ende.
þat we mote to him cume. hwenne we heonne wendeþ Amen.
Bidde nu we leoue freond. ẏonge and ek olde.
Þat he þat þis wrẏt wrot. his saule beo þer atholde. Amen.

Cambridge,
Fitzwilliam Museum
MS McClean 123
folios 115^{r}-120^{r}

Transcription of Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123, folios 115^{r}-120^{r}

MS *Pointing: The text of* M *is without regular pointing at mid-line or end-line. Any occurrence of punctuation, therefore, is shown below as well as in the text*: *A punctus is present after the following words*: **sonne**, **mone**, **sterre** and **fur**: line 70; **child** and **suster**: line 142;

Regular capitalization occurs at the beginning of each line and will not be commented on in the notes to the text unless it differs from the norm; that is, where an enlarged or coloured letter is present, or a capital is missing when expected.

Abbreviations, which are very rare in M, *have been silently expanded in the text but are listed in full below:* þ *has been expanded to* **þat** on only six occasions, at lines: 167, 298$^{(x2)}$, 312, 316 and 317.*The more regular form in* M*, however, is to have* **þat** *written out in full*: ii, 7, 10, 20, 21 etc. *Other than the above, there are only two further occurances of abbreviations in the text:* **pate** expanded to **patere**: line 184; **ponige** expanded to **poninge**: line 217;

Orthography, Phonology and Dialect:

The dialectal features of Fitzwilliam MS McClean 123 are somewhat mixed and a localization has, as a result, been difficult. M. L. Samuels believes the language to be of Essex with a western dialect layer,[853] whereas Jordan places it in Kent.[854] However, the current belief by Laing (LAEME) that places it in Central Gloucestershire has now generally been accepted,

[853] Hill, 'The Twelfth-Century *Conduct of Life*', p. 110.
[854] Richard Jordan, p.10.

with the belief that 'the apparently recalitrant elements perhaps having been current also in the SW Midlands at that time.'[855]

The graph <ð> is very rare in M. It is written three time in final position (§ 4.6): **plleð**, **peneð** and **habbeð** and once in inital position, where it is written as <d> (§ 3:3): **darf**. The letter <ð> does not occur in the list of Runic/Old English letters at the beginning of the text of M, where <þ> does (§ 4.6). M writes <th> (§ 5) in **sathanas**, a reading it shares with all other MSS (see § 5 *Remark*) and once in **repeth**. The graph <d> is written for <ð> on two occasions (§ 7.6),: **lodliche**, a reading shared with both J and M, and **darf**.

The runic letter <ƿ> (wynn) is retained throughout M with only three examples of <w> (§ 11.1 and § 11.7): **yswinch**, **we** and**wode**. M writes the Tironian nota <⁊> (§ 13.1) throughout this text with only one occurance of **and** being written(§ 13.6).

Insular *ȝ* is retained in M alongside Caroline *g* (§ 14.1). OE /g/ in initial position was established as <g> before a consonant (§ 42.1): **grameþ**, **grunde**, **glede** etc.and before the OE back-vowels *a, o, u* (§ 42.2): (**holi**) **gostes**, **god**, **gulte** etc. and by levelling in **ginnigge** (§ 42.3).

The movement to <w> is not present in M, which retains <ȝ> for the fricative /ɣ/ (§ 43.11) in **moȝe**, **oȝe**(**n**), **draȝe** etc. M preserves <ȝ> for /j/ in initial position (§ 45 and § 45.1): **ȝung**, **ȝet**, **uorȝet** etc. Initial <ȝ> is retained before *i* in **ȝef** (§ 45.4). M demonstrates transition to a palatal (§ 47ff) in **forpreie** with <ȝ> retained in **eȝen**, **peȝe**, **ne-seȝe** and **ẏseȝe** (the writing of <ȝ> in these examples does not negate the possibility of a transition to a palatal sound. See § 47.3). The continuation of the OE movement *ig > i* (§ 48) in **holi**, **ani**, **mani** etc is further demonstrated in M. Palatal ȝ /j/ is lost before *d* (§ 49)in **sede** but is more regularly vocalized to

[855] *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325,* compiled by Margaret Laing [http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme2/laeme2.html]. Edinburgh: Version 3.2, 2013, © The University of Edinburgh.

/i/ in **seid** (§ 49.7). Late OE /dʒ/, written <cʒ>, is written with Frankish <gg> in **bugge**, **sigge** and **leggeþ** (§ 50). The OE group nʒ /ŋg/ is written <ng> (§ 51, § 51.22 and § 51.25): **longe/lange**, **þronge**, **kinge**, **reuing** etc. with devoicing to /ŋk/, written <nc> before <þ> in **sincþ** (§ 51.25); M regularly omits <n> before <gg>(§ 51.23): **poniegges**, **ernigge**, **endigge** etc.

In initial position /k/ is nearly always written as <k> before a front vowel (§ 16.1 ff.) in **king**(**e**), **kinges**, **kenne**(**s**) but it is <c> in **cuþe**. Before a back vowel (§ 17) it is mostly written <c> in **cunin**, **care**, **cumþ** etc. but <k> is found in **kan** and **kunne**. Before <n> (§ 18) it is always <k> in **knopeþ**, (**i**)**knope** and (**bi**)**knope** andbefore other consonants (§ 19) it is always <c> in (**i**)**clupede**, **clife**, and **criste**.

M writes <qu> (§. 20) for OE *cw* in **queþeþ, ẏqueme**, **quike** etc. M writes <k> in medial position for OE velar *c* throughout the text: (§. 21 and §. 21.7): **speke**, **þrke**, **sclakie** etc. with only the one occurance of <c> (§. 22 and §. 22.7) found in **brecð**. However, <c> is retained in final position (§. 23 and §. 23.7): **ac**, **þanc**, **loc** etc. in all but two examples; with <k> written in **uolk** and **þork** (§. 24 and §. 24.2).

M always writes <ch> for /tʃ/ (§. 27, §. 28.7, §. 29.7 and §. 30.7): **child**(**e**), **chilse**, **teche**, **muchel**, **ich**, **euerich** etc and in **þinche** (§. 32 and §. 32.25) and **þenche** (§. 32 and §. 32.27) etc. with <c>, probable /k/, written in **þincþ** and **of-þincþ** (§. 32.1 and §. 32.26) and **biþancþ** (§. 32.1 and §. 32.28). M also writes <c>, probable /k/, in **recþ** where palatal /tʃ/ might be expected (see notes at §. 33 and §. 33.7).

M nearly always writes <sc> (§. 35.7) for /ʃ/ (§. 34) in initial position: **scilde**, **scal**, **scerreue** etc., with only one exception, <sch> (§. 37.4) is written in **schat**. In final position /ʃ/ is <sh> in **fish** (§. 39). OE [ts] is always written <s> in **milse** (§. 41) where all other MSS have <c>.

M sometimes writes OE unvoiced [f] as <f> in initial position and sometimes voiced [v] as <u>/<v> (§ 58 and § 58.25): **fram**, **fele**, **for** etc. but **vele**, **uor**, **uorȝet** etc. In final position <f> is retained in **of**, **lif**, **self** (§ 58.26) etc. and in medial position when adjacent to one unvoiced sound: **ofte**, **eft**, **after** (§ 58.26) etc. However, voicing is normal (§ 58 and § 58.27) through the writing of <v>/<u> between vowels or other voiced sounds in **him-seolue**, **euel**, **aliue** etc. with only one instance of <f> being retained in **bifore** etc. The writing of <f> has disappeared before *d* in **hadde** (§ 58.28).

In M OE *a* in open syllables is always <a> (§ 59): **habbe**, **faren**, **naueþ** etc. and <a> before a nasal (§ 60 and § 60.7) in **man**, **þanne**, **þhanne** etc., with rare occurrences of <o> found in **þonke** and **þonc**. Before a lengthening group, OE *a* is almost always <o> (§ 61 an § 61.7): **longe**, **strong(e)**, **honde** etc. but <a> in **lange**. M always writes <a> for OE *æ* (§ 63 and § 63.7): **habbe**, **patere(s)**, **þhat** etc. OE *e* is nearly always <e> in M (§ 64 and § 64.10): **bere**, **ende/end**, **felde**, **imengd** etc. with <i> in **sigge** (usually a Kentish or East Anglian form) in **siggen**, <a> in **biþancþ** and <a> also in **anglene** (this is probably under the influence of OF *angele, angle*). OE *o* is always written <o> in < (§ 65.1 and § 65.9): **bifore**, **bode**, **nolde** etc. M: OE *i* is mostly <i> (§ 66ff and § 66.17) in **bidde**, **child(e)** , **finde** etc. with occasional <u> in **þule** and **þulleþ** (see § 66.4 for the influence of *w*) and <e> in **ofspreng** and **nele**, **nelle** and **neste** (§ 66.17, § 66.18 and § 66.3 for neutralizing to *ĕ*). For OE *y,* M writes a mixture of <u>, <e> and <i> (§ 67ff and § 67.17): **dude**, **gulte**, **muchel** etc., **misdede**, **(vn)net**, **þencheþ** etc. and **þinche**, **aurist**, **king(e)s**) etc. OE *y* is <i> in **litel/litle** and **lite**, <u> in **fur(e)** and **cuþe** and and <e> in **(vn)hed**. M demonstrates transition to <o> for

OE *u* on most occasions (§ 68 and § 68.7): **come**, **ponie**, **poniegges** etc. with occasional <u> still written in **cumþ**, **grunde** and **bigunne**.

M writes <o> for OE *ā*, as a result of neutralization, throughout this text (§ 69ff and § 69.10): **lore**, **one**, **non** etc. with rare <a> in **namore** and **hatter**. In M OE *ǣ1* is always written as <e> throughout the text (§ 71 and § 74ff): **dede**, **rede a-adrede** etc (for OE *þær* see § 77ff). OE *ǣ2* is written <e> (§ 70, § 72ff and § 74ff) **mest**, **unhelþe**, **lest** etc.with rare <a> (§ 79.5) written in **ilad**, **ladde** and **ani** (for *ælc, elc* and *ylc* see § 81ff). OE *ē* is always <e> (§ 82 and § 82.7): **he**, **deþ**, **ẏqueme** etc (the writing of **doð** is by analogy, see § 82.1). OE *ī* is always <i> (§ 83.1 and § 83.9): **mi**, **þriste**, **hpile/huile/hpil** etc. OE *ō* is always <o> (§ 84 and § 84.1): **to**, **dome**, **boc** etc. (the writing of **cam** is by analogy, see § 84.1). OE *u* is always <u> (§ 85 and § 85.1): **nu**, **ure/vre**, **þu** etc.

In M OE *ea* (§ 86 and §87ff) before *r*, without lengthening, is always <a> (§ 88.1 and § 88.20): **arȝ**, **darf**, **suarte** and **narepe**.; before *rd* (§ 88.21) it is <a> in **harde** and **hardne** but <e> in (**middel**)**erd** ; before *rn* (§ 88.22) <a> is written in **parni** with <e> found in **ernigge**. The *i*-umaut of *ea* before *r*-combinations (§ 89ff) is written <e> (§ 89.10) in **smerte** and **ermigges**. OE *ea* before *l* (Anglian *a*), without lengthening, is always <a> (§ 90ff and § 90.10): **al** and **alle**, **falle**, **palles** etc.; before *ld* <e> is mostly written (§ 91.9) **pelden**, **eld**, **felde etc.** (for the writing of <ȝe> at the beginning of **ȝelde**, see § 91.2), with <ie> written in **bihielde** and <a> in **halt**. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *l* combinations (Angl. mutation of *a*) M has <e> in **elder** and **elde** (§ 92ff and § 92.10). OE *ea* before *h* combinations is <e> (§ 87.3, § 93.1 and § 93.9) in **heȝe**. The *i*-umlaut of *ea* before *h*-combinations is always <i> in **miȝte**(**n**) and **nihte** (§ 94.1 and § 94.2).

For OE *eo* before *r*-combinations (§ 96ff and § 96.9) M writes <o> in **porkes**, **porc/pork**, <u> in **purkes** (possible influence of *w*, see § 97 and § 97.9) and **sturre** with <e> in **herte**. OE *eo* before *l*-combinations is <e> (§ 98ff and §98.4) in **selue/selfe**. OE *eo* before *ht* is always <i> (§ 99.1

and § 99.8) in **riȝtpisesse**, **riȝte** and **briȝte** and <i> for the *i*-umlaut (§ 100ff and § 100.10) in **ouersicþ** and **þurȝsicþ**. OE – WS *eom* is **am** (chiefly Angl. *eam* § 101). OE *eo* (*a*-umlaut of *e*) is always <e> in M (§ 102ff and § 103.1): **vele/uele/fele**, **brekeð** and **unureme**. OE *eo* (*u*-umaut of *e*) is regularly <e> (§ 102ff and § 104.7) in **heuen**, **heueneriche**, **heuenliche** etc. with <o> written in **porld/uorld**, **porldes** and **pode** with <u> written under the influence of *w* in **suster.** The velar umlaut *io* of *i* (§ 105ff) in M (§ 105.10) is <e> in **seue**, **bineþe**, **selure**, **henne**; <a> in **hare**; <u> in **suþþe**, **icluped** and **hure** and <i> in **niþer**, (**bi**)**nime**, **siþþe** and **quike**.

For OE *ēa* (§ 106ff and § 106.9) M contains a mixture of variants with <e> in **eke/ec**, **vnneþe**, **deþe** and **brede/bred** with <ie> (see § 106.2) in **lien** and <ȝe> (see § 106.2) in **ȝeþ-lete** and **ȝedi** and <ia> (see § 106.2) in **diaþe**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēa* (§ 107.1 and § 107.2) is nearly always <e> in **ẏleue**, **teme**, **ilesed** etc., with <u> written in **ihurþ**. OE *ēo* (§ 108ff and § 108.9) is mostly <e> with some <eo> writings present, a form associated with the WML and the South (§ 108.1): **ben**, **leue**, **frend** etc. with **beo**, **beoþ**, **iseo** etc. and <i> in **sike**. The *i*-umlaut of *ēo* (§ 109 ff) is mainly <e> (§ 109.10) in **frend**, **fend**, **dere** etc. with <u>, >, possibly from WS *y* (§ 109.2) but also possibly representing /ø:/ from *ēo*, written once in **þusternesse**

In M OE *ea* after *sc* (§ 111, § 112ff and §112.8) is nearly always <a> in **scal**, **scamie**, **schate** etc. with <e> written once in **scefte**. For the *i*-umlaut of *ea* after *c* (§ 113.8) M writes <e> in **chele**. OE *ēa* after *g* (§ 114) is <e> in **ȝer**. For OE *ie* after *g* (§ 116.7) M always writes <e> (Anglian § 115.1): **uorȝet**, **ȝeue**, **biȝete** etc. Similarly, for OE *ɪe* after *g* M writes <e> in **ȝet** (§ 117.1 and § 117.2). For OE *ie* after *sc* (§ 118.7) M writes <i> in (**i**)**scilde** and **scildeþ**. OE *eo* after *ġ* (§ 119.1 and §120.7) is <u> in **ȝung** and **ȝunge**. OE *eo* after *sc* (§ 121.1) is written as either <u> in **scullen** or <o> in **scolde**(**n**) and **sop**.

OE *æ + ȝ* /j/ is nearly always <ai>/<aẏ> in M (§ 122.1 and § 122.8) in **mai/maẏ**, **dai/daie** and **saiþ** LWS *sǣde* / Anglian *sægde* (§ 123 and §123.7) is <ei> in **seide** with <e> once in **sede**. OE *ǣ1* (Angl. Kent, <e> /e:/) + *ȝ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 125.7) is <ei> in **mei**, <eȝ> **ẏseȝe** and **iseȝe**. OE *ǣ2* + *ȝ*/j/ (§ 124.1 and § 126.7) is <ai> in **aiþer**. OE *e* + *ȝ*/j/ (§ 127.1 and § 127.8) is <eẏ>/<ei> in **eie**, **pei/peẏ** with <eȝ> in **peȝe(s)**. OE *ē* + *ȝ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 129.7) is <ei> in **forpreie** and <eẏ> in **leẏe**. OE *ēa* + *ȝ*/j/ (§ 128ff and § 130.7) is <eȝ> in **eȝen(e)** and **raketeȝe**. OE *ā* + *h (g)* (§ 132.1 and § 132.2) is <aȝ> in **faȝ** and **aȝte**. OE *ǣ2* + *h* (§ 132.1 and § 133.7) is <e> before *ȝ* in **eȝte** and **teȝte**. OE *ō* + *h* (§ 134.1 and § 134.8) in M is <o> before *ȝ* in **unboȝt**, **biþoȝt**, **broȝte** etc. OE *a* + /ɣ/ (§ 136.1 and § 136.8) is <aȝ> in **draȝe** and **laȝe**. OE *ā* + /ɣ/ (§ 137.1 and § 137.8) is <oȝ> (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in **moȝe** and **oȝe(n)**. OE *ā* + *w* (§ 138.1 and § 138.8) is mostly <o> before *w* (for the writing of <o>, see § 69) in **mopen**, **iknope**, **blopeþ** etc, with the <ou> combination present in **soule** but <au> written on three occasions in **saule**. OE *ēo* + *w* (§ 139.1 and § 139.8) is <e> before *w* in **repe** and **sepe**. OE *ēa* + *w* (§ 140.1 and § 140.8) is <e> in **uepe**.

.þorn. f. 114v

.þ. þanne. þo. þider. þe. þu. haueþ. naueþ. teþ. goþ.

.wen.

.ƿ. ƿimman. ƿepman. ponie. pende. pele. pope.

.yoȝ.

.ȝ. ȝef. ȝus. ȝer. ȝender. draȝ. sclaȝ. arȝ. marȝ.

.and.

. ⁊. williame. ⁊ Jon ⁊ thomas. ⁊ symun. ⁊ þu. ⁊ ich.

i [Þ]e holi gostes miȝte us alle helpe ⁊ diȝte us ƿissie ⁊ us teche f. 115r
ii Ẏ scilde us fram þe unƿiȝte bi daie ⁊ bi niȝte þat þencheþ us bipeche
[I]ch am elder þane ich pas of pintre ⁊ of lore
Ich eldi more þan ich dude mi ƿit aȝte beo þe more
To longe ich habbe child ibeo of pordes ⁊ of dede
Þeȝ ich beo of ƿintres eld to ȝung ich am of rede
Vnnet lif ich habbe ilad ⁊ ȝet me þinch ich lede
ƿhane ich me biþenche ƿel sore ich me a drede
Mest ƿhat þat ich habbe ido is idelnes ⁊ chilse
To late ich habbe me biþoȝt bute me crist do milse
Vele idele pordes ich habbe ispeke siþþe ich speke cuþe
⁊ fele ȝunge dede ido ⁊ þat me repeth nuþe
Al to muchel ich habbe a gult of prke ⁊ of porde
Al to muchel ich habbe ispend to litel ileid on horde
Ich miȝte bet habbe ido ȝef ich hadde þe selþe
Nu ich polde ⁊ ich ne mai for elde ne for unhelþe
Elde me is istolen up on erþan ich hit ƿiste
Þat ich ne mai me iseo bifore uor smiche ne for miste
Arȝ ƿe beoþ to donne god of euel al to þriste
More eie stondeþ man of man þan him do of criste
[Þ]e ƿel ne deþ þe ƿhile he mai sore hit scal him repe
ƿhane hi sculle mope ⁊ ripe her þat hi er sepe
Doþ al to gode þat ȝe muȝe þe ƿhile ȝe beþ aliue
Ne truste noman to muchel to childe ne to ƿiue
Man þat hine selue uorȝet uor ƿiue oþer uor childe
Ne scal come in euele stede bute god him beo milde
Ne beo þe leuere þane þi self þi mei ne þi moȝe

The verso of f. 114^{v} *is dedicated to the reproduction and explanation of the Old English letters and the Tironian nota for 'et', probably as an aid to the reader, suggesting that these letters and symbols were not in common usage at the time of the text being copied into this manuscript. The scribe includes examples of usage alongside an explanation of the letters and symbols.*
wen] *in spelling the letter,* w *is used rather than* ƿ williame] *the letter* w *is used rather than* ƿ *the remainder of the folio is left blank* i Þe] Þ *om.; a two-line space has been left with a guide letter present in the margin* 1 Ich] I *om.; a single line space has been left with a guide letter present in the margin* 19 Þe] Þ *om.; a two-line space has been left with a guide letter present in the margin*

Sot is þat is oþre mannes frend betere þane his oȝe
Ne trust þif to hire þere ne þere to his þiue
Biuore him do þel euerich man þe þhile he is aliue
Uor he ⸢is⸣ þis þat hine biþancþ þe þhile þat he mot libbe
So sone þlleð hine uorȝete þe uremde ⁊ þe sibbe

f. 115v

[Þ]e þel ne deþ þe þhil he mai ne scal he þhane ⸢he⸣ polde.
Manies mannes sor yswinch habbeþ ofte unholde
Ne scolde noman don auirst ne sclakie þel to done
Vor mani man bihoteþ þel ⁊ hit forȝet þel sone
Ac þilke man þat þle beo siker to habbe godes blisse
Do þel himself þe þhile he mai þanne haueþ he mid ẏþisse
Þis riche men peneð beo siker þurȝ palles ⁊ þurȝ diche
Ac þe deþ his eȝte in sikere stede he hit sent to heueneriche
Vor þar ne darf he ben afered of fure ne of þeue
Þar ne mai hit him binime þe loþe ne þe leue
Þar ne darf he habbe care of ȝunge ne of ȝelde
Þider þe sendeþ ⁊ us self bereþ to litel ⁊ to selde
Þider ȝe scolde alle don polde ȝe me ẏleue
Þar ne miȝte me hit us binime king ne no scerreue
Þider þe scolde bere ⁊ draȝe ofte ⁊ þel ẏlome
Þar ne miȝte me hit us binime mid none pronge dome
Al þat faireste þat man haueþ to gode he hit scolde sende
Þar he hit miȝte me hit finde. eft ⁊ habbe euere bute ende
Þe man þe his eȝte þel þile þite þe þhile he mai þelde
ȝeue he uor godes loue þanne beþ hi þel ihelde
Þe man þat ani god doþ her uor habbe godes ore
Þar he hit scal finde eft and hundredfelde more
Þe man þat deþ her mest to gode ⁊ alþre lest to loþe
Aiþer to litle ⁊ to muchel hit scal him þinche boþe
Þhane me scal ure purkes þeȝe to uore þe heuenkinge
⁊ ȝeue us ure suinches lien after ure ernigge
Ne scal non euel beo unboȝt ne no god unȝulde
Euel þe doþ al to muchel god lasse þane þe scolde
Ac euerich man mid þan þe he haueþ mai bugge godes riche
Þe þe more haueþ ⁊ þe þat lasse boþe iliche
Ase þel þon mid his penie alse þe oþer mid his punde
Þis is þat alþre beste þare þat euere þas ifunde

f. 116r

⁊ þe þat ne mai namore do mid is gode þonke
Also þel so he þat haueþ of godes fele monke
Vor ofte god kan more þonc him þat ȝefþ lasse
ȝef his þorkes ⁊ his þeȝes is milse ⁊ riȝtþisnesse
Litel loc is gode lef þat cumþ of gode pille

29 is] *int. after* he[1] 31 Þe] Þ *om.; a two-line space has been left with a guide letter present in the margin* he] *int. after* þhane

7 ȝeþ lete muchel ȝeue of him þat his herte is ille
Heuene 7 erþe he ouersicþ his eȝene beþ pel briȝte
Sonne. 7 mone. sterre. 7 fur. is þestre to ȝenes his liȝte
He pot 7 palt phat doþ 7 queþeþ alle quike piȝte
Nis no louerd suich is crist no king suich is ure driȝte
Heuene 7 erþe god almiȝti halt al in his honde
He deþ al þat his pille is a patere 7 a londe
He scuppeþ þe fish in þe seo þe foȝel bi þe lefte
He pot alle kennes þing he scop alle scefte
7 he is ord bute ord 7 end bute ende
He is one in eueriche stede pende phider þu pende
He is boue 7 he is bineþe biuore 7 bihinde
Þe man þat godespille deþ oueral he hine mai finde
Eche rune god ihurþ god pot ache dede
He þurȝsicþ aches mannes þonc phat scal us to rede
Þe þat brekeþ godes i[h]est 7 gulteþ suo ẏlome
Phat sculle pe sigge oþer do atte heȝe dome
Þe þat her habbeþ a gult 7 euel lif her ladde
Huat sculle pe come to dome þar angles beþ adradde
Phat sculle pe bere us biuore mid pham sculle pe ẏqueme
Þe þat non god ne habbeþ ẏdo þe heuenliche deme
Þar sculle beo deueles suo fele 7 pulleþ us forpreie
Ne habbeþ hi noþing forȝete her þat hẏ ẏseȝe
Al þat pe misdude her hi hit us pilleþ cuþe þare
Bute pe hit habbe her ibet þe phile þat pe here pere
Al hi habbeþ in hure prite þat pe misdede here
Þeȝ pe hi neste ne ne iseȝe hi pere ure ẏfere

Iesu crist seinte marie sone us alle helpe 7 rede f. 116v
7 euermore ẏscilde us uram euele ẏuerrede
[Þ]hat sculle horlinges do þe suike 7 þe forsuorene
Api so fele beoþ icliped so uepe beoþ ẏcorene
A pi phat scolde hi biȝete phat scolde hi ẏborene
Þat sculle beo to deþe ẏdo 7 eueremore uorlorene
Ac euerich man him selue scal bic[l]ipie 7 eke deme
Al his porkes ȝ his þoȝt þar to he scal teme
Euerich man him selue scal deme to diaþe oþer to liue
Þe pitnesse of his porkes to oþer þan him scal driue
Nis no pitnesse al so muchel so is þe mannes herte
Þe man þat saiþ þat he is lame himself he pot þe smerte
Ne mai no man deme þane man also riȝte
Not non his porkes so pel so pot ure driȝte
Euerich man himself pot best his porkes 7 his pille
Ac þe þat pot lest saiþ ofte mest 7 þe þat al pot is stille

83 ihest] isest, *scribal error?* 97 Þhat] Þ *om.; a two-line space has been left with a guide letter present in the margin* 101 biclipie] bichipie, *possible corruption?*

Ac crist ne demeþ nanne man after his ginnigge
Ac al scal beo his lif iteld suich is his endigge
ȝef his ende is euel al hit is euel ⁊ god ȝef god beoþ his ende
Iesu crist leue þat ure ende beo god ⁊ pitie þat he us lende
Ac þe þat nele neuere no god do ne god lif her lede
Ere deþ ⁊ dome come to his dore sore he mai adrede
Þat he ne muȝe þanne bidde ore uor þat itit ilome
Vor þi he is pis þat ore bit ⁊ bet biuore dome
Vor phanne deþ ⁊ dome comeþ to his dore to late he biddeþ ore
To late he leteþ euele porkes þat ne maẏ hi do namore
Þhane senne let þe ⁊ þu naȝt hi ⁊ þu ne miȝt do namore
To longe he abit þat suo abit to bidde cristes ore
Ac naþeles pe hit ileueþ uor driȝten self hit sede
Of phiche time þat man of þincþ his misdede
Oþer raþer oþer later milse he scal ẏmete
Ac pho so noþing her naueþ ibet muchel he haueþ to bete

f. 117r Ac mani man saiþ pho recþ of pine þat scal habbe ende
Ne recche ich beo ich a domesdai ilesed ut of bende
O. lite pot he phat is pine ⁊ lite pine he knopeþ
Huiche pine þe soule þoleþ hu biter pind þar blopeþ
Vor hadde he þar ibeo tuo bare tide
Vor al þat gold of midelerd þe þridde he nolde abide
Þat siggeþ þe þat pere þar ⁊ pite hit mid ipisse
Þo prþe þe sorȝe of seueȝer uor ore niȝte blisse
Vor ore blisse þat ende haueþ endeles pine
Betere is pori pateres drinch þane atler imegd mid pine
Suines brede beþ pel suete ⁊ so hi beþ of þe dere
Al to dere he hi beiþ þat ȝefþ þar uore his suere
Vul pombe mai liȝtliche speke of hunger ⁊ of uaste
Suo mai of pine þat not phat hie is þat euere scal ilaste
Hadde he ẏfonded one stunde he polde sigge anoþer
ȝeþ lete him pere pif ⁊ child. suster. vader ⁊ broþer
Eueremore her in po ⁊ in pine ponie
Þiþ þan þe he miȝte helle pine ule ⁊ ẏsconie
Vor of þar pine þat þar beoþ nelle ich ȝo noþing leȝe
Nis hit bute game ⁊ gleo her þat þat flesh mai dreȝe
[O]f þe dome pe plleþ speke of phan ich ȝo er seide
At þan daie ⁊ þan dome crist us helpe ⁊ rede
Þar pe muȝe beo afered ⁊ harde us adrede
Þar eueriche man ẏsicþ biuore his porkes ⁊ his dede
Al scal beo þar vnhed her þat pe hele
Al scal beo þar unpriȝe her þat man luȝe ⁊ stele
Þar we sculle aches mannes lif iknope ase ure oȝe

147 Of] O *om.; a single line space has been left with a guide letter present in the margin* pe] *prec. by* ich *canc.* (*crossed through*) phan ich] phanich, *with two vertical strokes indicating word division* 151 hele] *prec. by* un *subp.* and *canc.* (*crossed through*)

Þar sculle euenigges beo þe heȝe ⁊ þe loȝe
Ne scal him naȝt scamie þar ne darf he him adrede
He þe ofþuȝte her his gult ⁊ bette his misdede
Him ne scameþ ne him ne grameþ þat scal beo iboreȝe
Ac þe oþre habbeþ scame ⁊ grame ⁊ oþre fele soreȝe

Al þat euere ẏsprungen is of adam ⁊ of eue f. 117v
To þe dome hi sculle come forsoþ ȝe hit ẏleue
Hi sculle habbe hardne dom þat here pere harde
Þe euele helde poure men ⁊ euele laȝe arerde
Euerich after þan þe he haueþ ido he scal þar beo ẏdemed
Þelle bliþe mai he beo þat gode her haueþ iquemed
Þo þat gode iserued habbeð after hare miȝte
Hi sculle to heueneriche fare uorþ mid ure driȝte
Þe oþre þat þe deueles porc habbeþ ido ⁊ þar inne beoþ ifunde
Hi sculle falle adun mid him into hele grunde
⁊ þare hi sculle ponie euermore bute ende
Ne breceþ neuere eft iesus helle for ham to bringe ham ut of bende
Enes ure loured helle brac his frend he ut broȝte
Himself he þolede deþ for us pel dere he us boȝte
Nolde hit fader do for þe sune ne suster uor þe broþer
Ne hit moȝe uor þe mei ne noman uor oþer
Vnneþe pe ȝeueþ for his loue a stecche of ure brede
Lite pe þencheþ þat he scal deme þe quikepe ⁊ þe dede
Vre loured uor his þreles ipined pas on þe rode
Vre bendes he unbond ⁊ boȝte us mid his blode
Muchel he dude for ure loue ȝef pe hit polde understonde
Ac þat þe ure eldringes misdede pe hit habbeþ pel harde on honde
⁊ lite þencheþ ani man hu lite pas þe sunne
Þurȝ phan pe þolieþ alle deþ þe come of adammes kunne
Deþ com in þis midelerd þurȝ þes deueles onde
Sunne ⁊ soreȝe ⁊ in suinch a patere ⁊ a londe
Þurst ⁊ hunger. chele. ⁊ hete. eche. ⁊ unhelþe
Þurȝ deþ com in þis midelerd ⁊ manie oþre unselþe
Elles nere noman died ne sike ne unsele
Ac miȝte libbe euermore in blisse ⁊ in hele
Adam ⁊ his ofspreng uor ore bare sunne
Þere uele hundred pintre in helle pine ⁊ in unpenne

⁊ suþþe god dude so muchel \preche/ uor ore misdede f. 118r
Þe þat so ẏlome ⁊ ofte agulteþ her pel sore pe maie a drede
⁊ þe þat ledeþ hare lif mid perre ⁊ mid ẏpronge
Bute hit godes milse do hi sculle beo þar pel longe

170 ham ut] hamut, *with two vertical strokes indicating word division* 191 preche] *int. after* muchel

Godes pisdom is pel muchel ⁊ so beþ his miȝte
Nis his miȝte no lasse þane pas þo bi þan ilke piȝte
More he one mai uorȝeue þane al uolk gulte kunne
Þe selue deuel miȝte habbe milse ȝef he hit hadde bigunne
Þe man þe godes milse isecþ ipis he hit scal finde
Ac helle king is oreles piþ þan þat he mai binde
Þe þat deþ his pille best prst he haueþ mede
His baþ scal beo pallinde pich his bed berninde glede
Þrst he deþ his godewines þane his fulle uende
Iesu crist us iscilde alle fram suiche euele frende
[N]euere in helle ich ne com ne neuere come ne recche
Þaȝ ich al þes porldes pele þar inne pende uecche
Ac þeȝ ich plle ȝo telle ase pise men me seide
⁊ on boc hit is iprite ⁊ ȝe hit habbeþ ihurd rede
⁊ ich hit plle telle us þat hit er neste
⁊ parni us piþ unureme ȝef ȝe me plleþ ileste
Vnderstondeþ nu to me ȝedi men ⁊ areȝe
⁊ ich ou pille telle of helle pine ⁊ parni us piþ harme
In helle is hunger ⁊ þurst pel euele tuo iuere
Þos pine sculle þolie þar þat pere niþinges here
Þe hadde þis porldes eȝte ⁊ faste gunne hielde
⁊ hi nolde helpe þar of þe hungri ne þe chielde
Þar is poninge ⁊ pop in euerliche strete
Hi uareþ uram hete to þe chele uram chele to þe hete
Þhane hi beoþ in hete þe chele ham þincheþ blisse
Þhane hi beoþ in þe chele of þar hete hi habbeþ misse
Neteþ hi neure phaþer ham doþ prs to neuere non ẏpisse
Aiþer ham doþ þo inoȝ ne habbeþ hi none lisse

f. 118v

Hi palkeþ euere ⁊ secheþ reste ac hi ne muȝe ẏmete
Vor þan þe hi nolde þe huile hi miȝte hure sennes bete
Hi secheþ reste þar non nis ⁊ hi ne muȝe non þar finde
Ac palkeþ peri vp ⁊ dun suo pater doþ mid þe pinde
Þos beoþ þe þat pere her of þonke unstedeuaste
Þe þe bihete iesu crist ⁊ nolde him ẏlaste
Þe þat god prc bigunne ⁊ fulendi hit nolde
⁊ pere her ⁊ phile þar ⁊ neste huat hi polde
Þar is þat pich þat euere palþ þat sculle þe beo inne
Þe þat ladde hure lif mid perre ⁊ mid ẏpinne
Þar is þat fur þat is hundredfelde hatter þane vre
Mot hit noþer aquenche auene strem ne sture
Þat is Þat fur Þat euere barnþ þat noþing ne mot aquenche
Þe sculle beo inne þe pere lef poure men to suenche

203 he deþ] he deþ he deþ, *ditt.* 205 Neuere] N *om.*; *a two-line space has been left with a guide letter present in the margin* 206 inne] *prec. by a letter eras.*

⁊ þe þe louede reuing ⁊ stale ⁊ unmetliche drunke
⁊ ec in þes deueles pork suo bleþeliche sponke
Þe þe pere so lese þat me ne miȝte ham ẏleue
Medȝerne domesman ⁊ prongepise reue
Þe þe pas oþre mannes piues lef his oȝen ȝeþ lete
⁊ seneȝede bluþeliche on drunke ⁊ on ete
Þe þat poureman binome ⁊ leide in hare horde
⁊ litel lete of godes hest ⁊ of godes porde
Þe þe pere ȝeseres of þisse porld este
⁊ dude al þat þe loþe gost hem tiȝte to ⁊ teȝte
Þe þe pas oþre mannes god leuere þan him scolde
⁊ pere al to gredi of selure ⁊ of golde
⁊ vnriȝpisnesse dude þar hi scolde beo holde
Lete phat hi scolde do ⁊ dude þat hi ne scolde
Þe þat in alle pise þe deuele her iquemde
Þo beoþ in helle mid him uor done ⁊ uor demde
Bute þe þat o[f]þuȝte sore hure misdede
⁊ hure gultes gunne bete ⁊ betere lif lede

Þar beoþ lodlich fend in stronge raketeȝe f. 119r
Þos beoþ þe þat pere mid gode in heuene spiþe heȝe
Þar beoþ grisliche fend ⁊ aterliche piȝte
Þe sculle þe precche saule iseo þat seneȝede mid isiȝte
Neuere sunne þar ne scinþ ne mone ne sturre
Euere þar is muchel godes hate ⁊ muchel godes erre
Euere þar is muchel smich ⁊ þusternesse ⁊ eie
Ne com þar neuere oþer liȝt þane of þe suarte leẏe
Þar is þe loþe sathanas ⁊ belzebuc þe ȝelde
Þelle sore hi muȝe ben afered þat suiche sculle bihielde
Scilde him euerich man piþ þe helle pine
Þarni euerich man his frend ⁊ suo ich pulle do mine
⁊ þe þat scilde ham ne cunne þis ham pile teche
Þis pord maẏ aiþer ȝef hi sculle beo lichames ⁊ saule leche
Lete pe þat god forbet alle mankinne
Do pe þat god us het ⁊ perie us piþ senne
Louie god mid herte ⁊ mid al ure miȝte
⁊ ure nexte al suo us self suo us het ure driȝte
Al þat me redeþ ⁊ sincþ biuore godes borde
Al hit hongeþ ⁊ halt bi þe ilke tuam porde
⁊ alle godes laȝe he felþ þe nipe laȝe ⁊ þe ȝelde
Þe þis laȝe uelleþ ⁊ can hi pel ẏhelde
Ac strong hie is to ẏhelde so ofte pe agelteþ alle
Strong hit is to stonde longe ⁊ liȝt hit is to falle
Ac crist us ȝeue his miȝte stonde þat pe mote
⁊ of alle ure sunne leue us come to bote

238 suo bleþeliche] *there is a part of a letter present between these two words; difficult to read* 253 ofþuȝte] osþuȝte

Þe pilnieþ after porldes pel þat lange nele ileste
7 leggeþ muchel ure suinch in þing unstedeuaste
Suonke pe uor godes loue alse pe doþ uor ezte
Nere pe noþing suo ofte forgelt ne bipezte
7 zef pe seruede gode alsuo pe doþ ermigges
Þe mizte in heuene habbe al so muche ase erles oþer kinges

f. 119v Vor almizti godes loue pute pe us perie
Þiþ þe precche porldes pele þat hie us ne derie
Mid almesse mid ibede perie us piþ senne
Mid þe pepne þat god almizti bitezte alle mankenne
Þe scolde us biþenche ofte 7 pel ẏlome
Þhat pe beþ to phan pe sculle 7 phar of pe come
zef pere piseman þus pe scolde þenche
7 bute pe prþe us ipar þe uorld us ple adrenche
Mest manne hie zeueþ drinch of one duole scenche
He scal him cunne scilde pel zef hie him nele screnche
Lete pe þe brode strete 7 þane pei bene
þat let þat nizende del to helle of mankenne 7 mor þast ich pene
Nime pe þane narepe paþ 7 þane peẏ grene
Þar forþ farþ pel litel folc 7 þat is þe porlde on sene
Þe brode stret is ure pil he is us loþ to lete
Þe þat folzeþ al hare pil hi fareþ mid þe ilke strete
Hi muze liztliche go mid þar niþer helde
Þurzut þe godlese wode in to þe bare felde
Þe narepe paþ is godes heste ac þare uorþ uareþ pel uepe
7 þis beoþ þe þat scildeþ ham her piþ euerich unþepe
Þos goþ azenes þe heze clif azenes þe heze hulle
Hi leteþ al hure oze pil godes hesne to felle
Go pe alle in þilke paþ 7 he us pule bringe
Mid þe uepe uaire men biuore þe heuenkinge
Þar is blissene mest mid anglene songe
Þe þat is uele hundred pintre þar ne þincþ hit hi nazt longe
Mai non hunger ne no pane beo in godesriche
Þar beoþ poniegges fele 7 ech oþer unliche
Sum þar haueþ lasse murcþe 7 sum þar haueþ more
Euere after þat þat he dude her of þat þe he bisuanc sore
7 þe þat haueþ lest he haueþ suo muche þat he ne bit nammore
Hpo se let þe blisse uor þes hit scal him repe sore

f. 120r Ne scal þar beo noþer bred ne pin ne oþre kenne este
God scal beo eueriches lif blisse 7 eke reste
Ne scal þar beo noþer foz ne grei cunig ne ermine
Okerne ne martrin beuer ne sabeline

316 dude] *prec. by* b *subp.* 317 lest he haueþ] lest he he haueþ, *ditt.*

Ne scal þar beo noþer schat ne scrud ne porldes pele none
Al þe blisse þat me us bihot al hit scal beo god one
God is suo mer ⁊ suo muchel in his godnesse
Þat he mai ⁊ pule beo anglene blisse
Ac þez ne beoþ ure ezene alle iliche brizte
Ne in þis porlde nere nazt alle of one mizte
Þar ne sculle nazt habbe god al mid one pizte
Hi sculle more of him pite þe louede hine more
⁊ biknope ⁊ ẏseo his milse ⁊ his ore
To þare blisse us bringe god þat ricscleþ aẏ bute ende
Þhane he ure saule unbint of lichamliche bende
Crist us leue lede suich lif ⁊ habbe suicchne end
Þat þe mote to him come phane þe henne pende Amen

331 ẏseo] *prec. by* b *subp.*

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources

Cambridge, Trinity College MS B. 14. 52

London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 487

Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Digby 4

British Library MS Egerton 613

Oxford, Jesus College MS 29, Part II

Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123

Scripture

Weber, R. and Gryson, R. (eds.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Stuttgart, 2007)

Martin, G. (ed. and trans.), *The Holy Bible: Douay-Rheims Version: the Old Testament first published by the English College at Douay, A.D. 1609, and the New Testament first published by the English College at Rheims, A.D. 1582: with annotations and references by Bishop Richard Challoner* (London, 2003)

Secondary works

Allen, R., 'Editing sole attestation in selected Middle English textual traditions', in Gillespie, V., and Hudson, A. (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 293-311

Amodio, M. C., *Writing the Oral Tradition: Oral Poetics and Literate Culture in Medieval England* (Notre Dame, 2005)

Anon., *List of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum 1836-1840* (London, 1843)

Augustine, *City of God*, Volume IV: Books 12-15, translated by Philip Levine (Cambridge, MA, 1966)

Baker, P. S., *Introduction to Old English* (Oxford, 2004)

Bartlett, R., *Gerald of Wales 1146-1223* (Oxford, 1982)

Bennett, J. A. W., *The Oxford History of English Literature: Middle English Literature, 1100-1400*, edited and completed by Gray, D. (Oxford, 1990)

Bennett, J. A. W. and Smithers, G. V. (eds.) *Early Middle English Verse and Prose* (Oxford, 1968)

Biernoff, S., *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages* (Farnham, 2002)

N. F. Blake, 'Reflections on the editing of Middle English texts', in McCarren, V. P., and Moffat, D. (eds.), *A Guide to Editing Middle English* (Ann Arbor, 1998), 61-78

Boyle, L. E., 'The Fourth Lateran Council and Manuals of Popular Theology', in Heffernan, T. J. (ed.), *The Popular Literature of Medieval England* (Knoxville, 1985), 30-43

Brown, C., *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century* (Oxford, 1932)

Brown, M. P. and Lovett, P., *The Historical Source Book for Scribes* (London, 1999)

Burrow, J. A. and Turville-Petre, T. (eds.), *A Book of Middle English,* 3rd edn. (Oxford, 2005)

Burrow, J. A., 'Chaucers's Prosody', *Cambridge Quarterly*, 5 (1971), 389-93

Bynum, C. W., *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336* (New York, 1995)

Bynum, C. W., 'Why all the fuss about the body? A medievalist's perspective', *Critical Inquiry*, 22 (1995), 1-33

Caie, G. D., 'The manuscript experience: what medieval vernacular manuscripts tell us about authors and texts', in Renevy, D. and Caie, G. D. (eds.), *Medieval Texts in Context* (London, 2008), 10-27

Campbell, A., *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1991)

Cannon, C., *The Grounds of English Literature* (Oxford, 2004)

Cartlidge, N., 'The composition and social context of Oxford, Jesus College, Ms 29(Ii) and London, British Library, Ms Cotton Caligula A.Ix.', *Medium Ævum*, 66 (1997), 250-269

Carruthers, M. J., *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1990)

Cavendish, R., *Visions of Heaven and Hell* (London, 1977)

Cerquiglini, B., *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology*, translated by Betsy Wing (London, 1999)

Clanchy, M. T., *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307* (Oxford, 1993)

Clemens, R., and Graham T., *Introduction to Manuscript Studies* (Ithaca, 2007)

Clemoes, P. (ed.), *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series Text*, Early English Text Society, supplementary series 17 (Oxford, 1997)

Conti, A., 'The circulation of the Old English homily in the twelfth century: new evidence from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343', in A. J. Kleist (ed.), *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation* (Turnhout, 2007), 365-402

Crespo, B., 'Historical background of multilingualism and its impact in English', in Trotter, D. A. (ed.), *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain* (Cambridge, 2000), 25-36

Cross, J. E., 'Vernacular sermons in Old English', in B M. Kienzle (ed.), *The Sermon* (Turnhout, 2000), 561-96

d'Avray, D.E, (ed.) *Medieval Marriage Sermons: Mass Communication in a Culture without Print* (Oxford, 2001)

Daniel, H. A., *Thesaurus Hymnologicus : Sive Hymnorum Canticorum Sequentiarum Circa Annum Md Usitatarum Collectio Amplissima* (Leipzig, 1841)

Daniell, C., *Death and Burial in Medieval England, 1066-1550* (London, 1997)

Daniell, C. and Thompson, V., 'Pagans and Christians: 400-1150', in Jupp, P. C. and Gittings, C. (eds.), *Death in England: An Illustrated History* (Manchester, 1999), 65-89

Da Rold, O., and Swan, M., 'Linguistic contiguities: English manuscripts 1060-1220', in Tyler, E. M. (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800-1250* (Turnhout, 2011), 255-270

Davidson, C., *The Iconography of Heaven* (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1994)

Davidson, C., and Seiler, T. H., *The Iconography of Hell* (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1992)

Dean, R. J. and Boulton, M. B. M., *Anglo-Norman Literature: A Guide to Texts and Manuscripts* (Michigan, 1999)

Derolez, A., *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books: From the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2003)

Dresher, B. E. and Lahiri, A., 'Main Stress Left in Early Middle English', in Fortescue, M., Jensen, E. S., Mogensen, J. E., and Schøsler, J. E. (eds.), *Historical Linguistics 2003: Selected papers from the 16th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Copenhagen, 11-15 August 2003* (Philadelphia, 2003), 75-85

Dronke, P., 'The Completeness of Heaven', in Muessig, C. and Putter, A. (eds.), *Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages* (London, 2007), 44-56

Easting, R., 'Access to Heaven in medieval visions of the Otherworld', in Muessig, C. and Putter, A. (eds.), *Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages* (London, 2007), 75-90

Evans, G. R. (ed. and trans.), *Bernard of Clairvaux*, *Selected Works* (New York, 1987)

Elliott, J. K. (ed.), *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford, 2006)

Emerson, J. S., 'Harmony, hierarchy, and the senses in the *Vision of Tundal*', in Emerson, J. S. and Feiss, H. (eds.), *Imagining Heaven in the Middle Ages : A Book of Essays* (New York, 2000), 3-46

Emerson, J. S. and Feiss, H. (eds.), *Imagining Heaven in the Middle Ages : A Book of Essays* (New York, 2000)

Evans, R., Taylor, A., Watson, N., and Wogan-Browne, J., 'The notion of vernacular theory' in Watson, N., Wogan-Browne, J., Taylor, A., and Evans, R. (eds.), *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280-1520* (Exeter, 1999), 314-30

Fein, S., 'The fillers of the Auchinleck Manuscript and the literary culture of the West Midlands', in Meale, C. M. and Pearsall, D., (eds.), *Makers and Users of Medieval Books: Essays in Honour of A. S. G. Edwards* (Cambridge, 2014), 60-77, pp. 61-62.

Faulkner M., 'Rewriting English Literary History 1042-1215', *Literature Compass*, 9 (2012), 275-91

Fellows, J., 'Author, Author, Author...: An Apology for Parallel Texts' in McCarren, V. P. and Moffat, D., (eds.), *A Guide to Editing Middle English* (Ann Arbor, 1998), 15-24

Feiss, H. (ed.), *On Love: A Selection of Works of Hugh, Adam, Achard, Richard, and Godfrey of St Victor* (Turnhout, 2011)

Ford, A. E., *La Vengeance De Nostre-Seigneur: the Old and Middle French Prose Versions* (Toronto, 1993)

Foxhall-Forbes, H., *Heaven and Earth in Anglo-Saxon England: Theology and Society in an Age of Faith* (Farnham, Ashgate, 2013)

Friedlander, C. V., 'Early Middle English accentual verse', *Modern Philology*, 76 (1979), 219-230

Fulk, R. D., 'Early Middle English evidence for Old English meter: resolution in *Poema Morale*', *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*, 14 (2002), 331-355

Fulton, H., 'Negotiating Welshness: mutilingualism in Wales before and after 1066', in Tyler, E. M., (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800-1250* (Turnhout, 2011), 145-170

Furnivall, F. J., *Early English Poems and Lives of the Saints* (Berlin, 1862)

Gardiner, E., *Medieval Visions of Heaven and Hell: A Sourcebook* (New York, 1993)

--- *Visions of Heaven and Hell Before Dante* (New York, 1989)

Gaselee, S. (ed.), *The Oxford Book of Medieval Latin Verse* (Oxford, 1928)

Gatch, M. McC., 'Perceptions of eternity', in Gatch, M. McC. (ed.), *Eschatology and Christian Nurture: Themes in Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Religious Life* (Aldershot and Vermont, 2000)

Gillespie, V., 'Moral and Penitential Lyrics' in Duncan, T. G. (ed.), *A Companion to the Middle English Lyric* (Cambridge, 2005), 68-95

Gillespie, V., and Hudson, A. (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013)

Monks of Mount Saint Bernard Abbey (eds. and trans.), *Guerric of Igny: Liturgical Sermons* (Spencer, Massachusetts, 1970)

Hahn, T., 'Early Middle English', in Wallace, D. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge, 1999)

Hall, J. (ed.), *Selections from Early Middle English: 1130-1250: Part One: Text* (Oxford, 1920)

--- (ed.), *Selections from Early Middle English: 1130-1250: Part Two: Notes* (Oxford, 1920)

Hanna, R., 'Editing texts with extensive manuscript traditions', in Gillespie, V., and Hudson, A. (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 111-130

Healey, A. D., *The Old English Vision of St. Paul* (Cambridge, MA, 1978)

Herbert, M. and McNamara, M. (eds.), *Irish Biblical Apocrypha: Selected Texts in Translation* (Edinburgh, 1989)

Hickes, G., *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus Gramatico-Criticus et Archaelogicus* (Oxford, 1705)

Hill, B., 'Notes on the Egerton *e* Text of the 'Poema Morale'', *Neophilologus*, 66 (1950), 352-9

--- 'An Edition of the Early Middle English *Poema Morale* with Introduction and Commentary' (D.Phil thesis, Oxford, 1958)

--- 'The History of Jesus College, Oxford Ms. 29', *Medium Ævum*, 32 (1963), 203-13

--- 'Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum Ms. McClean 123', *Notes and Queries*, 12 (1965), 87-90

--- 'Trinity College Cambridge Ms B. 14. 52, and William Patten', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 4 (1966), 192-200

--- 'Early English Fragments and Mss Lambeth Palace Library 487, Bodleian Library Digby 4' in *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, Literary & Historical Section*, 14 (1972), 271-80

--- 'Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum Ms. McClean 123: Addenda', *Notes and Queries*, 19 (1972), 45-46

--- 'Oxford, Jesus College Ms. 29: Addenda on Donation, Acquisition, Dating and Relevance of the " Broaken Leafe" Note to 'the Owl and the Nightingale", *Notes and Queries*, 22 (1975), 98

--- 'The Twelfth-Century 'Conduct of Life', Formerly the 'Poema Morale' or 'a Moral Ode", *Leeds Studies in English*, 9 (1977), 97-145

--- 'British Library Ms. Egerton 613 - I', *Notes and Queries*, 25 (1978), 394-409

--- 'British Library Ms. Egerton 613--Ii', *Notes and Queries*, 27 (1978), 492-501

--- 'A Manuscript from Nuneaton: Cambridge Fitzwilliam Museum Ms McClean 123', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 12 (2002), 191-205

--- 'A Couplet from the *Conduct of Life* in Maidstone MS A 13', *Notes and Queries*, 50 (2003), 377

--- 'Oxford, Jesus College Ms 29, Part Ii: Contents, Technical Matters, Compilation, and Its History to c.1695', *Notes and Queries*, 50 (2003), 268

--- 'The Writing of the Septenary Couplet', *Notes and Queries*, 52 (2005), 296

Himmelfarb, M., *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Philadelphia, 1983)

Holthausen, F., *Vices and Virtues, Being A Soul's Confession of its Sins, with Reason's Description of the Virtues. A Middle-English Dialogue of about 1200 A.D., Edited with an Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Glossary, from the Stowe MS 240 in the British Museum*, vol. 2, Early English Text Society o.s. 159 (Oxford, 1888)

Huber, E. R., and Robertson, E. (eds.) *The Katherine Group MS Bodley 34* (Kalamazoo, MI, 2016)

Hundersmarck, L. F., 'Thomas Aquinas on Beatitude', in Emerson, J. S. and Feiss, H. (eds.), *Imagining Heaven in the Middle Ages: A Book of Essays* (New York, 2000), 165-184

Irvine, S., 'The compilation and use of manuscripts containing Old English', in Swan, M., and Treharne, E. M. (eds.), *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), 41-61

Ivy, G. S., 'The Bibliography of the Manuscript-Book', in Wormald, F., and Wright, C. E. (eds.), *The English Library before 1700* (London, 1958), 32-65

Jacobs, N., 'Kindly Light or Foxfire? The Authorial Text Reconsidered', in McCarren, V. P. and Moffat, D. (eds.) *A Guide to Editing Middle English* (Ann Arbor, 1998), 3-14

James, M. R., *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge: A Descriptive Catalogue. Vol. 1: Containing an Account of the Manuscripts Standing in Class B* (Cambridge, 1900)

--- *A Descriptive Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Manuscripts in the Fitzwilliam Museum* (Cambridge, 1912)

Jeanroy, A., *Bibliographie Sommaire Des Chansonniers Français Du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1918)

Jordan, R., *Handbook of Middle English Grammar Phonology*, translated and revised by E. J. Crook (The Hague, 1974)

Jupp, P. C., and Gittings, C. (eds.), *Death in England: An Illustrated History* (Manchester, 1999)

Kato, T., *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, available at: http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220/

Keller, W. and Hoops, J., *Probleme Der Englischen Sprache Und Kultur : Festschrift Johannes Hoops* (Heidelberg, 1925)

Ker, N. R., 'The Scribes of the 'Trinity Homilies'', *Medium Ævum*, 2 (1932), 138

--- 'Ms. Cotton Galba A. XIX: The Proverbs of Alfred', *Medium Ævum*, 5 (1936), 115-120

--- *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957)

Kerby-Fulton, K., Hilmo, M. and Olson, L., *Opening Up Middle English Manuscripts: Literary and Visual Approaches* (Ithaca, 2012)

Kienzle, B. M., 'Introduction', in Kienzle, B. M. (ed.), *The Sermon* (Turnhout, 2000), 143-174

Kiernan, K. (ed.), *Beowulf*, available at: http://ebeowulf.uky.edu/ebeo4.0/CD/main.html (British Library, 2015)

Kim, H. C. (ed.), *The Gospel of Nicodemus: Gesta Salvatoris* (Toronto, 1973)

Kleist, A. J. (ed.), *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation* (Turnhout, 2007)

Koenig, V. F., '*La Génealogie Nostre Dame* and the Legend of the Three Marys', *Romance Philology*, 14 (1961), 207-215

Krapp, G. P. (ed.), *The Vercelli Book* (New York, 1932)

Laing, M., *Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval English* (Cambridge, 1993)

Laing, M., 'A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English: the value of texts surviving in more than one version', in Rissanen, M., Ihalainen, O., Taavitsainen, I. and Nevalainen, T. (eds.), *History of Englishes: New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics* (Berlin and New York, 1992), 566-81

Laing, M. and McIntosh A., 'Cambridge, Trinity College, Ms 335: Its Texts and Their Transmission' in Beadle, R., and Piper, A. J. (eds.), *New Science out of Old Books: Studies in Manuscripts and Early Printed Books in Honour of A. I. Doyle* (Aldershot, 1995), 14-47

Laing, M. and Lass, R., *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English, 1150-1325*, available at: http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html (Edinburgh, 2007)

Langfors, A., *Les Incipit Des Poèmes Français Antérieurs Au XVIe Siécle* (Paris, 1917)

Le Goff, J., *The Birth of Purgatory*, translated by A. Goldhammer (London, 1984)

Legge, M. D., *Anglo-Norman Literature and Its Background* (Oxford, 1963)

Lerer, S., 'Old English and its afterlife', in Wallace, D. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Literature, vol. 1: After the Norman Conquest* (Cambridge, 1999) 7-34

Lewin, H., *Das Mittelenglische Poema Morale* (Halle, 1881)

Lusignan, S., '*French language* in *contact* with English: Social Context and Linguistic Change (Mid-13th–14th Centuries)', in J. *Wogan-Browne* (ed.), *The French of England* (York, 2009), 19–30

Machan, T. W., *Textual Criticism and Middle English Texts* (Charlottesville, 1994)

Matsuda, T., *Death and Purgatory in Middle English Didactic Poetry* (Cambridge, 1997)

Marcus, H., *Das Frühmittelenglische "Poema Morale"*, Palaestra, 194 (Leipzig, 1934)

McCarren, V. P. and Moffat, D., 'A bibliographical essay on editing methods and authorial and scribal intention', in McCarren, V. P., and Moffat, D. (eds.), *A Guide to Editing Middle English* (Ann Arbor, 1998), 25-57

Macray, W. D., *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae*, 9 (Oxford, 1883)

McCulloch, F., *Mediaeval Latin and French Bestiaries* (Chapel Hill, 1962)

McGinn, B., '*Visio Dei*: Seeing God in medieval theology and mysticisim' in Meussig, C., and Putter, A. (eds.), *Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages* (London, 2007), 15-33

--- *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1979)

McIntosh, A., 'A new approach to Middle English dialectology', *English Studies*, 44 (1963), 1-11

McIntosh, A., Benskin, M., and Samuels, M. L. (eds.), *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English* (Aberdeen 1986)

Marcus, H., *Das Frühmittelenglische "Poema Morale"* (Leipzig, 1934)

Mayhew, A. L. and Skeat, W. W., *A Concise Dictionary of Middle English from A.D. 1150 to 1580* (Oxford, 1888)

Meahan, W. P., *Editing Middle English*, available at: http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cpercy/courses/6361meahan.htm

Meale, C. M., and Pearsall, D. (eds.), *Makers and Users of Medieval Books: Essays in Honour of A. S. G. Edwards* (Cambridge, 2014)

Mecklenburg, M., and Mertens, T., 'Introduction: The Last Judgement in medieval sermons' in Mertens, T., Sherwood-Smith, M., Mecklenberg, M., Schiewer, H. (eds.), *The Last Judgement in Medieval Sermons* (Turnhout, 2013)

Muessig, C. and Putter, A. (eds.), *Envisaging Heaven in the Middle Ages* (London, 2007),

Meyer, P., 'Version Anglo-Normande en vers de l'Apocalypse', *Romania*, 25 (1896), 180-81

Millett, B., *Hali Meidhad*, Early English Text Society, o.s. 284 (London, 1982)

--- 'The pastoral context of the Lambeth and Trinity Homilies', in Scase, W. (ed.), *Essays in Manuscript Geography: Vernacular Manuscripts of the English West Midlands from the Conquest to the Sixteenth Century* (Turnhout, 2007), 43-64

--- '*Mouvance* and the medieval author: re-editing *Ancrene Wisse*', in Minnis, A. J. (ed.), *Late-Medieval Religious Texts and their Transmission: Essays in Honour of A.I. Doyle* (York, 1994), 9-20

--- (ed.), *Ancrene Wisse: A Corrected Edition of the Text in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402, with Variants from Other Manuscripts*, vol. 1, Early English Text Society, o.s. 325 (Oxford, 2005)

--- *Ancrene Wisse: Guide for Anchoresses: A Translation based on Corpus Christi College, MS 402* (Exeter, 2009)

--- 'Whatever happened to electronic editing?', in Gillespie, V., and Hudson, A. (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 39-54

Minnis, A. J. (ed.), *Late Medieval Religious Texts and their Transmission: Essays in Honour of A. I. Doyle* (Cambridge, 1994)

Moffat, D. (ed.), *The Old English Soul and Body* (Woodbridge, 1990)

Moffat, D., and McCarren, V., ' A bibliographical essay on editing methods and authorial and scribal intention', in Moffat, D., and McCarren, V. (eds.) *A Guide to Editing Middle English*, (Michigan, 1998), 25-60

Moore, S., 'The manuscripts of the *Poema Morale*: revised stemma', *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, 54 (1930), 269-87

Morgan, N. J., *Early Gothic Manuscripts II, 1250-1285: A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles,* Vol. 4 (London, 1988)

Morris, C., *The Discovery of the Individual: 1050-1200* (Toronto, 1972)

Morris, R., *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises* Early English Text Society o.s. 29, 34 (London, 1867)

--- *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises (Sawles Warde, and Þe Wohunge of Ure Lauerd: Ureisuns of Ure Louerd and of Ure Lefdi, &c.) of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (London: 1868).

--- *Old English Homilies of the Twelfth Century from the Unique Ms. B. 14. 52. in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge*, Early English Text Society o.s. 53 (London, 1873)

--- *An Old English Miscellany containing a Bestiary, Kentish Sermons, Proverbs of Alfred,*

Religious Poems of the Thirteenth Century (London, 1892)

Morrison, S., 'What is scribal error, and what should editors do (or not do) about it?' in Gillespie, V., and Hudson, A. (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 261-275

Mossé, F., *A Handbook of Middle English*, translated by J. A. Walker (London, 1991)

Muessig, C., 'Sermon, Preacher and Society in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Medieval History*, 28 (2002), 73-91

Murray, R.W., 'Syllable Cut Prosody in Early Middle English', *Language*, 76 (2000), 617-654

Nichols, S. G., 'Introduction: Philology in a Manuscript Culture', *Speculum*, 65 (1990), 1-10

O'Brien, B., 'Translating technical terms in law-codes from Afred to the Angevins', in Tyler, E. M. (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800-1250* (Turnhout, 2011)

O'Brien, S. M., 'An edition of seven homilies from Lambeth Palace Library MS. 487' (D.Phil thesis, University of Oxford, 1985)

O'Brien O'Keeffe, K., *Visible Song: Transitional Literacy in Old English Verse,* Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England: 4 (Cambridge 1990)

--- 'Editing and the material text', in Scragg, D. G., and Szarmach, P. E. (eds.), *The Editing of Old English: Papers from the 1990 Manchester Conference* (Cambridge, 1994)

--- 'The Architecture of Old English Editions', in Gillespie, V., and Hudson, A. (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 73-90

Orchard, A., 'Oral Tradition', in O'Brien O'Keeffe, K. (ed.), *Reading Old English Texts* (Cambridge, 1997), 101-123

Owen, D. D. R., *The Vision of Hell: Infernal Journeys in Medieval French Literature* (Edinburgh, 1970)

Paine, L., *The Hierarchy of Hell* (London, 1972)

Paris, G. and Bos, A. (eds.), *Trois Versions Rimes De L'évangile De Nicodème Par Chrètien, Andrè De Coutances et Un Anonyme* (Paris, 1885)

Parkes, M. B., *Their Hands before Our Eyes: A Closer Look at Scribes: The Lyell Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford, 1999* (Aldershot, 2008)

Patch, H. R., *The Other World: According to Descriptions in Medieval Literature* (London, 1950)

Paues, A. C., 'A newly discovered manuscript of the *Poema Morale*', *Anglia – Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie,* 30 (1907), 227-237

Pepin, R. E., 'Heaven in Bernard of Cluny's *De contemptu mundi*', in Emerson, J. S. and Feiss, H. (eds.), *Imagining Heaven in the Middle Ages: A Book of Essays* (New York, 2000), 101-118

Powell, S., 'In praise of the variant: why edit critically? A pragmatic viewpoint', in Gillespie, V., and Hudson, A. (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 275-292

Raby, F. J. (ed.), *The Oxford Book of Medieval Latin Verse: Newly Selected* (Oxford, 1974)

Robbins, R. H., 'The authors of the Middle English religious lyrics', in *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, n.s. 39 (1940), 230-238

Rogeri de Wendover, *Chronica, sive Flores Historiarum*, ed. by Henricus O. Coxe. 3 vols. (London, 1842)

Roger of Wendover's Flowers of History comprising The History of England from the Descent of the Saxons to A.D. 1235, formerly ascribed to Matthew Paris, trans. J. A. Giles (London, 1849)

Richards, M. P., *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* (London, 1994)

Roberts, J. A., *Guide to Scripts Used in English Writings up to 1500* (London, 2005)

Saintsbury, G., *Historical Manual of English Prosody* (London, 1919)

Scahill, J., 'Trilingualism in Early Middle English miscellanies: languages and literature', *Yearbook of English Studies,* 33 (2003), 18-32

Scase, W. (ed.), *Essays in Manuscript Geography: Vernacular Manuscripts of the English West Midlands from the Conquest to the Sixteenth Century* (Turnhout, 2007)

Schmidt, G. D., *The Iconography of the Mouth of Hell: Eighth-Century Britain to the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1995)

Scragg, D. (ed.), *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, Early English Text Society o.s. 300 (Oxford, 1992)

Shaw, J., 'The influence of canonical and episcopal reform on popular books of instruction', in Heffernan, T.J. (ed.), *The Popular Literature of Medieval England* (Knoxville, 1985), 44-60

Short, I., *Patrons and Polyglots: French Literature in Twelfth-Century England* (Woodbridge, 1991)

Silverstein, T., *Visio Sancti Pauli; the History of the Apocalypse in Latin, Together with Nine Texts* (London, 1935)

Sinclair, K. V., *Prières En Ancien Français. Nouvelles Références, Renseignements Complémentaires, Indications Bibliographiques, Corrections et Tables Des Articles Du Répertoire De Sonet* (Hamden, Conneticut, 1978)

--- *French Devotional Texts of the Middle Ages: A Bibliographic Manuscript Guide* (Westport, Connecticut, 1979)

Sisam, C., 'The Scribal Tradition of the 'Lambeth Homilies'' *Review of English Studies*, 2 (1951), 105-133

Sonet, J., *Repertoire D'incipit De Priéres En Ancien Français* (Geneva, 1956)

Southern, R. W., *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford, 1970)

Spencer, H. L., 'Middle English sermons', in Kienzle, B. M. (ed.), *The Sermon* (Turnhout, 2000), 597-637

Marie Stansfield, 'Parallel texts and a peculiar *Brut*: a case study', in Gillespie, V., and Hudson, A. (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 465-480

Stein, R. M., 'Multilingualism', in Strohm, P. (ed.), *Middle English* (Oxford, 2007), 23-37

Strecker, K., *Moralisch-Satirische Gedichte Walters von Chatillon* (Heidelberg, 1929)

Swan, M., 'Aelfric's *Catholic Homilies* in the twelfth century' in Swan, M., and Treharne, E. M. (eds.), *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), 62-82

--- 'Mobile libraries: Old English manuscript production in Worcester and the West Midlands, 1090-1215', in Scase, W. (ed.), *Essays in Manuscript Geography* (Turnhout, 2007), 29-42

--- 'Preaching past the Conquest: Lambeth Palace 487 and Cotton Vespasian A.XXII', in Hist, A. J. (ed.), *The Old English Homily* (Turnhout, 2007), 403-423

--- 'Homilies: London, Lambeth Palace 487', in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, edited by Orietta Da Rold, Takako Kato, Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne (University of Leicester, 2010), available at http://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.Lamb.487.htm

Szövéry, J., *Die Annalen Der Lateinischen Hymendichtung* (Berlin, 1964-65)

Tanselle, G. T., *A Rationale of Textual Criticism* (Philadelphia, 1989)

--- 'Classical, Biblical and Medieval textual criticism and modern editing', *Studies in Bibliography*, 36 (1983), 21–68

Taylor, R., 'Authors, scribes, patrons and books', Watson, N., Wogan-Browne, J., Taylor, A., and Evans, R. (eds.), *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280-1520* (Exeter, 1999)

Teresi, L., 'Mnemonic transmission of Old English texts in the post-Conquest period' in Swan, M. and Treharne, E. M. (eds.), *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), 98-116

Thompson, V., *Dying and Death in Later Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2004).

Thomson, S. H., *The Writings of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, 1235-1253* (Cambridge, 1940)

Von Tischendorf, C., *Evangelia Apocrypha; Adhibitis Plurimis Codicibus Graecis Et Latinis Maximam Partem Nunc Primum Consultis Atque Ineditorum Copia Insignibus* (Lipsiae, 1876)

Trahern, J. B., 'Fatalism and the Millennium', in Godden, M., and Lapidge, M. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature* (Cambridge, 1986)

Treharne, E. M., 'Making their presence felt: readers of Ælfric, *c.* 1050-1350', in Traherne, E. M., and Magennis, H., (eds.) *A Companion to Ælfric*, Brill Companions to the Christian tradition vol. 18 (Cambridge, 1999), 399-422

--- 'The production and script of manuscripts containing English religious texts in the first half of the twelfth century', in Swan, M., and Treharne, E. M. (eds.), *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), 11-40

--- 'The form and function of the twelfth-century Old English *Dicts of Cato*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 102 (2003), 465-85

--- *Old and Middle English c.890-C.1400: An Anthology*, 2nd ed. (Malden, MA, 2004)

--- 'Homilies; *Poema Morale*: Cambridge, Trinity College, B. 14. 52', in *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220*, edited by Orietta Da Rold, Takako Kato, Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne (University of Leicester, 2010), available at https://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.CTC.B.14.52.htm

--- 'The vernaculars of medieval England, 1170–1350', in Galloway, A. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Culture* (Cambridge, 2011)

Turville-Petre, T., *Reading Middle English Literature* (Malden, MA, 2007)

Tyler, E. M. (ed.), *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c.800-1250* (Turnhout, 2011)

Vance, E., 'Seeing God: Augustine, sensation, and the mind's eye', in Nichols, S. G., Kablitz, A., and Calhoun, A. (eds.), *Rethinking the Medieval Senses: Heritage / Fascinations / Frames* (Baltimore, 2008), 13-29

Van Os, A. B., *Religious Visions: The Development of the Eschatological Elements in Mediaeval English Religious Literature* (Amsterdam, 1932)

Vising, J., *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature* (London, 1923)

Wakelin, D., 'Editing and correcting', in Gillespie, V., and Hudson, A. (eds.), *Probable Truth: Editing Medieval Texts from Britain in the Twenty-First Century* (Turnhout, 2013), 242-243

Wallace, D. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Literature*, *vol. 1: After the Norman Conquest* (Cambridge, 1999)

Walther, H., *Initia Carminum ac versuum medii aevi posterioris Latinorum* (Göttingen, 1959)

Warton, T., *The History of English Poetry I* (London, 1774)

Watson, N., Wogan-Browne, J., Taylor, A., and Evans, R. (eds.), *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280-1520* (Exeter, 1999)

Watson, N., 'The Politics of Middle English Writing', in Watson, N., Wogan-Browne, J., Taylor A. and Evans R. (eds.), *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory 1280-1520* (Exeter, 1999), 331-52

Wells, J. E., *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400* (New Haven, 1916)

Wilcox, J., 'Wulfstan and the Twelfth Century', in Swan, M., and Treharne, E. M. (eds.), *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), 83-97

--- *Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials* (Arizona, 2000)

Wilshere, A. D. (ed.), *Mirrour De Seinte Églyse* (London, 1982)

Wilson, R. M., 'The provenance of the Lambeth Homilies, with a new collation', *Leeds Studies in Kindred Languages,* 4 (1935), 24-43

Wenzel, S., *Preachers, Poets and the Early English Lyric* (Princeton, 1986)

Wimsatt, J., 'Rhyme, the icons of sound, and the Middle English *Pearl*', *Style*, 30 (1996), 189-230

Wogan-Browne, J. (ed.), *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England* (York, 2009)

Wright, C. D., *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature* (Cambridge, 1993)

Wright J., and Wright, E. M., *Old English Grammar* (London, 1914)

Wright, T., *St. Patrick's Purgatory: An Essay on the Legends of Purgatory, Hell, and Paradise, Current During the Middle Ages* (London, 1844)

Younge, G., 'An Old English compiler and his audience: London, British Library MS Cotton Vespasian D. xiv, fols 4-169', in *English Manuscript Studies, 1100-1700,* 17 (2013), 1-26

Zumthor, P., *Speaking of the Middle Ages*, translated by S. White (London, 1986)

--- *Toward a Medieval Poetics,* translated by P. Bennett (Minneapolis, 1992)

Zupitza, J., 'Zum Poema Morale', *Anglia – Zeitschrift für englische Philologie*, 4 (1878), 6-32