Six

THE SANCTORALE, THOMAS OF WOODSTOCK'S ENGLISH BIBLE, AND THE ORTHODOX APPROPRIATION OF WYCLIFFITE TABLES OF LESSONS

Matti Peikola
University of Turku

I

In Knighton's *Chronicle*, the entries for the year 1388 include a list of twenty-five errors attributed to the Lollards.[1] The same list forms the backbone of a vernacular Wycliffite text known as *On the Twenty-Five Articles* — a series of propositions the Lollards were accused of holding, along with their responses.[2] On the basis of internal evidence, Anne Hudson has suggested that the tract may have been written sometime after the death of Urban VI (1389); she describes its views and argumentation as 'not extreme' among Wycliffite writings.[3] The writers of the tract adopt the voice of 'Cristen men' to respond to the propositions put to them by 'worldely prelatis at þo suggestione of frerus'.[4] Two of the propositions specifically concern the question of sanctity and the observation of saints' feasts in the calendar. First, in the eighth article the Lollards are charged with denying the efficacy of prayers addressed to saints and with refusing to recite the Litany; they are claimed to have affirmed that many of those 'whom we

---

[1] *Knighton's Chronicle 1337–1396*, ed. and trans. by Geoffrey Haward Martin, Oxford Medieval Texts, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), pp. 434–39. According to Knighton, the Lollards' assault on the Church with these and other *innumeris erroribus atque nequandis opinionibus* (innumerable errors and wicked beliefs) prompted the Lords and Commons in the Merciless Parliament of 1387–88 to petition the King to take action against their books: ibid., pp. 438–39.

[2] *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, ed. by Thomas Arnold (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1871), III, pp. 454–96. The text survives in a partly defective copy in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 273.

[3] *PR*, p. 210.

[4] *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, III, p. 455. On the Wycliffites' self-referential use of *Cristen men*, see Matti Peikola, *Congregation of the Elect: Patterns of Self-Fashioning in English Lollard Writings*, (Turku: University of Turku, 2000), pp. 244–48.

clepen seintis', and whose feasts are hallowed by the Church, are really in hell.[5] In the twentieth article, the charge put to the Lollards is their alleged view that the feasts of Stephen, Lawrence, Nicholas, Katherine, Margaret, and of other (unspecified) saints, are not to be observed, because it cannot be known whether these saints are saved or damned; the canonising of saints 'made by þo courte of Rome' is not to be believed or held good, the charge continues.[6]

In their response to the first charge, the Wycliffite writers of *On the Twenty-Five Articles* argue that there are millions more saints in heaven than those canonised in the calendar, and that since popes and prelates are generally corrupt and unfamiliar with the Bible and holy living, they may well err in choosing whom they canonise.[7] The writers point out that they themselves are fully certain of the sanctity of only those saints that are 'expressid in holy writte' — i.e. explicitly mentioned in the Bible; the sanctity of all the others is a matter of supposition for which evidence is required, for example concerning their holy life or the satisfaction of their sins at death.[8] Of the five individual saints singled out under the twentieth article, the writers are for this reason certain of the sanctity of the biblical Stephen only; the sanctity of Lawrence, Nicholas, Katherine, and Margaret is not to be taken as an article of faith. Yet the writers do not doubt that these four too are 'glorious seyntis'; in fact they suppose this to be the case. The situation is said to be quite different, however, for those ostensible saints who have lived more recently — especially if such persons did not speak out the truth when they saw the great heresies practised by 'worldely prelatis' and, thus, did not suffer persecution for doing so.

---

[5] *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, III, p. 466.
[6] Ibid., p. 489.
[7] Ibid., p. 467.
[8] Ibid., pp. 467–68. For Wycliffite ideas about *supposing* as an appropriate cognitive attitude to matters lying outside belief, see Fiona E. Somerset, 'Vernacular Argumentation in *The Testimony of William Thorpe*', *Mediaeval Studies*, 58 (1996), 207–41 (pp. 232–35).

Although 'þese late men' are now called saints, the writers emphasise that it cannot be known for sure whether they truly are in charity.[9]

On the Twenty-Five Articles is not alone in expressing such views on sanctity and the veneration of saints; similar themes and arguments are found in a number of other roughly coeval Wycliffite texts, including both tracts and sermons.[10] Perhaps the most unexpected context in which we find polemical Wycliffite comments on saints is the list of lessons for the Mass placed at the end of London, British Library, MS Egerton 618, an early manuscript of the Wycliffite Bible. In this chapter, I wish to consider the possibility that the concerns of the Egerton writer may reflect a broader change in the presentation and prominence of saints in the liturgical organisation of the Wycliffite Bible around the turn of the fifteenth century — a change which may indicate its appropriation by new readers, ones who did not share the critical position taken by the Wycliffites. The discussion of the topic is divided into three sections. Section II deals with MS Egerton 618, while in Section III the scope of the enquiry is extended to lists and tables of lessons found in other manuscripts of the Wycliffite Bible; finally, Section IV focuses on the implications of the findings for the transmission of the Wycliffite Bible.

---

[9] *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, III, p. 489.

[10] See for example *De apostasia cleri*, *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, III, p. 432; *De blasphemia, contra fratres*, ibid., p. 429; *Seven Heresies*, ibid., p. 446; *Vita sacerdotum*, ibid., p. 238; *The Clergy May Not Hold Property*, *The English Works of Wyclif hitherto Unprinted*, ed. by Frederic David Matthew, EETS OS 74 (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1902), p. 382; *How the Office of Curates Is Ordained of God*, ibid., pp. 153–54; *Of Dominion*, ibid., pp. 288–89. For a summary of similar views on saints in the Wycliffite sermon cycle, see *English Wycliffite Sermons*, ed. by Pamela Gradon and Anne Hudson, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983–96), IV (1996), pp. 66–67. See also Christina von Nolcken, 'Another Kind of Saint: A Lollard Perception of John Wyclif', in *From Ockham to Wyclif*, ed. by Anne Hudson and Michael Wilks (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987), pp. 429–43; *PR*, pp. 302–03.

II

Few manuscripts of the Wycliffite Bible have aroused as much interest as London, British Library, MSS Egerton 617–618 — a two-volume deluxe codex presumably once owned by Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester.[11] Following the Duke's death at Calais in September 1397 while awaiting trial for treason against his nephew Richard II, an inventory of his personal property at Pleshey castle was prepared by escheator Clement Spice.[12] In the inventory, the sections headed *Libri pro Capella* (books for the chapel) and *Livres de divers rymances et Estories* (books of various romances and histories) together list more than 120 books owned by the Duke. The item described under the second of these headings as *un bible en Engleys en ij grantz livres coverez de rouge quyr* (a Bible in English in two large books covered in red leather) is generally assumed to be the Egerton codex — an inference facilitated by the presence of Thomas of Woodstock's escutcheon in the borderwork at the beginning of the first

[11] See e.g. Sven L. Fristedt, 'A Weird Manuscript Enigma in the British Museum', *Stockholm Studies in Modern Philology*, New Series, 2 (1964), 116–21; Anthony Ian Doyle, 'English Books In and Out of Court from Edward III to Henry VII', in *English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages*, edited by Vincent John Scattergood and James W. Sherborne (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), pp. 163–81 (p. 168); Jenny Stratford, '"La Somme le Roi" (Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS. 570), the Manuscripts of Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of Gloucester, and the Scribe John Upton', in *Le statut du scripteur au Moyen âge: Actes du XIIe colloque scientifique du Comité international de paléographie latine (Cluny, 17-20 juillet 1998)*, edited by Marie-Clotilde Hubert, Emmanuel Poulle and Marc H. Smith (Paris: École des Chartes, 2000), pp. 267–82; Christopher de Hamel, *The Book: A History of the Bible* (London: Phaidon, 2001), pp. 173–74 and illustration on p. 167; Scott McKendrick and Kathleen Doyle, *Bible Manuscripts: 1400 Years of Scribes and Scripture* (London: The British Library, 2007), p. 139; Mary Dove, *The First English Bible: The Text and Context of the Wycliffite Versions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 246–47, *passim*.

[12] For a near-contemporary account of the Duke's death, see *The Chronicle of Adam Usk 1377–1421*, ed. by Chris Given-Wilson, Oxford Medieval Texts, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 32–33. The escheator's inventory has been edited by Viscount Dillon and W. H. St John Hope, 'Inventory of the Goods and Chattels belonging to Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, and Seized in His Castle at Pleshy, Co. Essex, 21 Richard II (1397)', *Archaeological Journal*, 54 (1897), 275–308. Books listed on the inventory have been discussed e.g. by Vincent John Scattergood, 'Literary Culture at the Court of Richard II', in *English Court Culture in the Later Middle Ages*, pp. 29–43 (pp. 34–35); Stratford, '"La Somme le Roi"', pp. 269–71.

volume.[13] At present the two volumes of the manuscript contain the biblical books from Proverbs to the end of the New Testament in the Earlier Version of the Wycliffite translation. Codicological evidence suggests, however, that they were once bound together as a single book.[14] On the basis of the fire damage suffered by fol. 2 of MS Egerton 617, Sven L. Fristedt has conjectured that the original first volume (cf. the wording in the Pleshey inventory) — from Genesis to Proverbs — may have been destroyed by fire at some point before the manuscript was purchased by the British Museum.[15]

MS Egerton 618 ends with a list of biblical lessons for the Mass.[16] The purpose of the text is spelled out in its opening rubric 'Heere bygynneþ þe kalendere to knowe alle þe gospels and pistlis of þe $$eer whan þei ben radde after salysburye vse'.[17] Although the hand of the 'kalendere' is very likely different from that of the main scribe of the manuscript who copied the biblical books, there are good reasons to consider that the text belongs to the original production phase of the manuscript and is not a later addition.[18] This is primarily suggested by the presence in it of corrections made by the main scribe (e.g. on fol. 163^v) and by the running head 'Apocalipsis et cetera', made in the same hand on the last leaf of the Apocalypse (fol. 159^v), indicating that more material was to follow immediately thereafter. There is also no quire

---

[13] London, British Library, MS Egerton 617, fol. 2^r. See further Fristedt, 'A Weird Manuscript Enigma'; Lucy Freeman Sandler, *Gothic Manuscripts 1285–1385*, 2 vols (London and Oxford: Harvey Miller and Oxford University Press, 1986), II, p. 165.

[14] See the evidence recorded by Fristedt, 'A Weird Manuscript Enigma', pp. 118–19.

[15] Ibid., p. 119.

[16] London, British Library, MS Egerton 618, fols 160^r–177^r. See Matti Peikola, '"First is writen a clause of the bigynnynge therof": The Table of Lections in Manuscripts of the Wycliffite Bible', *Boletín Millares Carlo*, 24–25 (2005–2006), 343–78 (pp. 364–65); Dove, *The First English Bible*, pp. 64–65, 141–42.

[17] MS Egerton 618, fol. 160^r. In quotations from manuscript sources, abbreviations have been silently expanded and puntuation has been modernised.

[18] The two textualis hands may be compared at the opening of the manuscript consisting of fols. 159^v (written by the main scribe) and 160^r (written by the second scribe). Distinguishing features between the hands include, for example, the grapheme *y*, which in the second scribe's hand is undotted and frequently has a tail ending in a curve to the right.

boundary between the Apocalypse and the list of lessons following it that would suggest a production break; the regular quire of eight leaves on whose second leaf the Apocalypse ends was evidently passed on to another copyist by the main scribe, who continued to supervise the work in the role of corrector.

In describing the Egerton manuscript for their 1850 edition of the Wycliffite Bible, Josiah Forshall and Frederick Madden noted that 'In the part of the Kalendar called the *proper sanctorum*, are introduced some remarks directed against the application of the lessons to the saints of the Romish church'.[19] The information is partly misleading, since the remarks actually occur in a section identified by its opening rubric on fol. 173^r as 'þe comoun sanctorum'; the section labelled as 'þe propre sanctorum' is found on fols. 170^r–173^r. Yet it is not difficult to see what may have prompted Forshall and Madden to describe the section as the Proper of Saints. Despite its rubric, the section is not arranged by the various general classes of saints which normally constitute the Common of Saints in liturgical manuscripts, such as 'Many Martyrs' or 'Confessor and Bishop'.[20] Instead, it lists the lessons for more than a hundred occasions celebrating individual saints in the Sarum Calendar, from the feast of St Nicholas to that of St Linus.

The 'remarks' to which Forshall and Madden refer form a polemical passage at the very beginning of the 'Common of Saints' on fols. 173^r–173^v. In terms of its presentation on the manuscript page, the passage has been formatted as a regular entry in the section: it has been interpolated into the entry for the feast of St Nicholas, and its text flow is interrupted by two

---

[19] *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and the New Testaments with the Apocryphal Books, In the Earliest English Versions Made from the Latin Vulgate by John Wycliffe and His Followers*, ed. by Josiah Forshall and Frederic Madden, 4 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1850), I, p. xliii.

[20] For the conventional structure of the Common of Saints in medieval Mass books, see Andrew Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A Guide to Their Organization and Terminology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), pp. 155–56.

Latin rubrics of similar appearance to those used elsewhere in the text for the opening words of the lessons (see Figure 1). These features suggest that the scribe was aware of the theologically controversial nature of the passage and wanted to avoid its accidental discovery by masking it as a normal entry in the text. The presence of one correction in the polemical passage entered by the main scribe (fol. 173[r]) probably means that the scribe who copied the list of lessons did not compose the passage himself but copied it from a now lost exemplar together with the rest of the text.

[FIGURE 1 removed for copyright reasons]

Figure 1. London, British Library, MS Egerton 618, fol. 173[r]. (c) British Library Board. All Rights Reserved (MS Egerton 618).

As illustrated in Figure 1, the passage begins after a pen-flourished paragraph sign at the bottom of the left-hand column of fol. 173[r]. It is preceded by the opening words of the epistle lesson read on the feast of St Nicholas, in Latin (in red ink) and in an English translation introduced with 'þat is to saye' (in text ink). The text of the pair of extra Latin rubrics placed at the middle of the interpolation in the right-hand column is also taken from Sarum epistle lessons; the first uses a non-initial phrase in the same epistle lesson for St Nicholas (*Non est inuentus similis*), whereas the second adopts the opening words of another similar Sarum lesson applicable to the feast of a confessor and bishop saint like St Nicholas (*Ecce sacerdos magnus qui in uita sua*).[21]

---

[21] *The Sarum Missal Edited from Three Early Manuscripts*, ed. by J. Wickham Legg (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916), pp. 234, 372–73.

Both lessons cited in the polemical passage are derived from the so-called *Laus patrum* section of Ecclesiasticus, which praises holy fathers of the past.[22] In addition to their visual effect as rubrics to regularise the layout of the page for the purpose of concealment, the citations also have a textual function: they provide the writer with a starting point for his criticism of the contemporary Church. The passage can be viewed as a Wycliffite commentary on the text of the lessons. It employs the voice of 'some men' to argue against the application of readings from the Old Testament to the praising of 'men and wommen now c[l]epid seyntis'.[23] According to the writer, such praise would be appropriate when directed at 'most holy fadris of þe holde lawe', as in the original context of the lessons in Ecclesiasticus.[24] The practice becomes doubtful, however, when the lessons are applied to people 'who wiþoute opyn renounsinge of her wordly glorie [...] regnyden lordis and ladies, boþe in name and in hauynge, undur colour of bischopis, abbatis, prioris, and abbassis and prioressis'.[25] This being the case, the writer advises his readers to use the Bible as the yardstick for deciding who are worthy of being praised with the lessons:

> Wherfore ennauntre we erre in þe si$$t of god in redinge þes lessouns after use of þe chirche nowe a dayes, it is no perel $$if we seeke holi writt to knowe of whome þes preisingis ben sayd, appliynge hem to þe same seyntis whome holy writ appreueþ. Men reden of mani seyntis nowe a days of whome lityll euidence of holynesse is knowen to þe reders or heerers.[26]

The polemical passage concludes with a challenge against priestly authority on biblical interpretation. Here the readers are encouraged to ask their priests to identify the people to whom the cited lessons and other similar readings found in the Common of Saints are actually applied

---

[22] Ecclesiasticus 44–50.

[23] MS Egerton 618, fol. 173ʳ. The manuscript reads 'chepid'. Although the Middle English verb *chēpen* had a rarely attested sense 'to accept or approve', a scribal error for *clēpen* 'to name, to call' seems a more probable interpretation; see *Middle English Dictionary*, available through the *Middle English Compendium* at http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/, s.vv. *chēpen* 3b, *clēpen* 2a. The entire text of the polemical passage has been published in Peikola, 'The Table of Lections', pp. 373–74.

[24] MS Egerton 618, fol. 173ʳ.

[25] Ibid., fol. 173ʳ.

[26] Ibid., fol. 173ʳ.

in the Bible. If the priests are unable to answer, and 'kunne not telle hem þe grounde', they show themselves to be 'disceyuours seruinge more for worldis goodis þan for helþe of soule'.[27] Since such priests are likely to be damned, the writer concludes that it is better for his audience to read the Bible themselves to find out the answer:

> And þerfore it is most sikir counseyl to men of good wille desiringe þat þe wille of god be fulfillid in erþe as it is in heuene þat þei seke þes þingis and lessouns in þe bible knowinge of whome þei ben radde, $$euinge principali þe preysinge of hem to holy fadris of þe lawe, whom god in oure bileue apreueþ sayntis worþi alle preisinge.[28]

On the whole, the view of saints expressed in the Egerton passage is very similar to that found in *On the Twenty-Five Articles* and the other early Wycliffite texts discussed in Section I. As it focuses specifically on problems concerning 'lessouns of þe comoun sanctorum', placing the polemical passage at the beginning of the Common of Saints was undoubtedly a deliberate choice.[29] In addition to biblical and early Christian saints, such as St Barnabas, St Lucy, and Sts Marcellinus and Peter, the Common of Saints in MS Egerton 618 notably also includes a number of more recently canonised saints, such as St Thomas (Becket) of Canterbury and St Swithun of Winchester. Together with St Hugh of Lincoln, these two are named by the Wycliffite writer of *The Clergy May Not Hold Property* as examples of saints whom 'couetous clerkis' cite as authorities for defending the temporal possessions of the Church. According to the writer, 'gabriel schal blow his horne' before the clerics can prove that these saints followed Christ's life and teaching, which for him would be the only possible criterion for accepting their authority.[30] Another early Wycliffite text expressing doubts about the sanctity of Becket is the *Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards* (1395), where 'trewe cristemen supposin þat þet poyntis of þilk noble man þat men clepin seyn Thomas, were no cause of martyrdom'; as in the Egerton

---

[27] Ibid., fol. 173[r].
[28] Ibid., fol. 173[v].
[29] Ibid., fol. 173[r].
[30] *The English Works of Wyclif*, p. 382.

passage, a clear distinction is drawn between true sanctity and being called a saint.[31] Although Wyclif himself had some positive things to say about Becket, the negative view of him represented by *The Clergy May Not Hold Property* and the *Twelve Conclusions* was to become increasingly common among Lollard communities during the fifteenth and early sixteenth century.[32]

In contrast to the Common of Saints, the Proper of Saints section which immediately precedes it in the Egerton manuscript contains a much more limited range of saints. A majority of the fifty-two entries listed there are associated with Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the apostles; the ten occasions which do not fall into these categories comprise the feasts of St George, the Translation of St Martin, the Seven Brothers, Sts Abdon and Sennen, St Cyriacus and his companions, St Lawrence (vigil, feast, octave), St Denis, and St Clement. This narrow conception of the Proper of Saints differs from that represented by the Sarum Missal and many later medieval Sarum lectionaries and lists of lessons in Latin, in which the section roughly corresponds to the Egerton Proper and Common of Saints taken together.[33]

To what extent does the apparent narrowing down of the Proper of Saints in MS Egerton 618 reflect Wycliffite views? The possibility that such concerns may have influenced the formation of the section is suggested above all by the presence of the polemical passage later in

---

[31] *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings*, ed. by Anne Hudson, Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978; revised ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), p. 27.

[32] For a discussion of Wyclif's opinions on Becket, see *PR*, pp. 302–03. Fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Lollard and Protestant views of Becket are discussed in John F. Davis, 'Lollards, Reformers and St. Thomas of Canterbury', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, 9 (1963), pp. 1–15. See also Margaret Aston, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1984), pp. 88, 95; *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings*, pp. 153–54. The Henrician measures to end the cult of Becket are in the focus of Robert E. Scully, S.J., 'The Unmaking of a Saint: Thomas Becket and the English Reformation', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 86 (2000), 579–602.

[33] *The Sarum Missal*, pp. 232–353; for Sarum lectionaries, see e.g. Oxford, Trinity College, MSS 23, 76, 77; for Latin lists/tables of lessons, e.g. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. D. 3. 2, MS Auct. D. 5. 9, MS Auct. D. inf. 2. 1, MS Rawlinson C. 147, MS Rawlinson G. 8.

the same text. Evidence from the Wycliffite sermon cycle points in the same direction. Pamela Gradon and Anne Hudson observe that in the manuscripts of the cycle the standard organisation of the Proper of Saints is drastically reduced from the usual Sarum one down to thirty-seven occasions, which include almost exclusively biblical saints; they associate this feature with Wycliffite ideas of saints and point out that a similar phenomenon characterises Wyclif's Latin sermons.[34]

On the other hand, the existence of completely orthodox Latin lists of Sarum lessons with a Proper of Saints resembling that of MS Egerton 618 suggests that a narrower conception of the section is also liturgically motivated.[35] It would seem that the 'proper' status of liturgical texts associated with certain occasions — usually ones of high rank in the Calendar — contributed to their selection for the shorter type of Proper of Saints.[36] In liturgical terms, texts which are specific to one occasion (or alternatively shared by a small number of occasions) are regarded as *proper*, to be distinguished from texts that are *common* to a larger number of occasions.[37] It may be observed, for example, that in the Sarum Missal seven of the ten occasions not associated with Christ, the Virgin Mary or the apostles in the Egerton Proper of Saints have one or more lessons unique to them and not shared by any other occasion.[38]

Although the role played by liturgical constraints on the formation of the Proper of the Saints in MS Egerton 618 should not be overlooked, it by no means precludes the possibility that

---

[34] *English Wycliffite Sermons*, I, p. 11; IV, p. 66; *PR*, p. 197.

[35] For example Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. D. 3. 6, MS Canon. Bib. Lat. 5, MS Douce 327.

[36] For the ranks of feasts in the Sarum Calendar, see John Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: A Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 53–54.

[37] The terms *proper* and *common* are discussed by Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office*, pp. 45–47.

[38] The seven occasions comprise St George, the Translation of St Martin, St Cyriacus and his companions, St Lawrence (feast and octave), St Denis, and St Clement. For the lessons, see *The Sarum Missal*, pp. 232–353, passim.

there may also have been theological concerns influencing its contents. Notably, none of the saints included in the section belong to the recently canonised 'late men' the Wycliffites found particularly loathsome. Like St Lawrence, other early Christian martyrs such as the Seven Brothers, St George, Sts Abdon and Sennen, and St Cyriacus and his companions were evidently also acceptable in the category of non-biblical saints whose sanctity could be supposed. The status of St George as the patron saint of England may have further contributed to his acceptability for the Wycliffites. In the Wycliffite tract *Of Prelates*, the positive image associated with the Englishness of St George is evident in the writer's choice to equate the deceitful adoption of the saint's escutcheon by the Scottish army to betray the English with the adoption of the name and status of Christ's apostles by 'anticristis prelatis' to deceive Christian people.[39]

Perhaps potentially the most controversial figure in the Egerton Proper of Saints is St Clement. Despite the positive reference by Paul in Philippians 4:3 to 'Clement and the rest of my fellow labourers, whose names are in the book of life', the papal status of Clement weighed in the Wycliffite perception of him.[40] His status in the early Church is explicitly brought up in the Wycliffite tract *The Church and Her Members*: 'þat man is out of resoun, þat trowiþ þat Clement in Petris tyme was more þan Joon evaungelist, or ony apostle þat lyvede wiþ him'.[41] Unlike most other popes, however, Clement is cited as an authority in Wycliffite texts, and his alleged decision to voluntarily resign from the papacy is viewed as an exemplary act.[42] The sole epithet 'martir' given to him in the Egerton Proper of Saints may suggest that the compiler of the text wanted to foreground the martyrdom of St Clement as the only reason why he should be

---

[39] *The English Works of Wyclif*, p. 99.
[40] Quoted from *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and the New Testaments with the Apocryphal Books*, IV, p. 426.
[41] *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, III, p. 342; see also p. 344.
[42] For the Wycliffite use of Clement as an authority, see *Fifty Heresies and Errors of the Friars*, *Select English Works of John Wyclif*, III, p. 371. Clement's resignation from the papal office is discussed in *De pontificum romanorum schismate*, ibid., p. 251.

honoured; in the calendar of Legg's edition of the Sarum Missal, for example, he is depicted as *pope* and martyr.[43]

III

Tables and lists of lessons, also known as *capitularia*, contain the opening and in many cases also the closing words of the lessons read at Mass.[44] They may be distinguished from lectionaries proper in the sense that they do not contain the full texts of the lessons; instead, they function as referential aids for the reader to easily locate the lessons in the biblical text. Owing to their referential nature, *capitularia* did not circulate on their own, but were characteristically appended to manuscripts of the complete Bible or parts of it.[45]

Although unique of its kind, the list of lessons in MS Egerton 618 is by no means the only representative of this genre in the manuscripts of the Wycliffite Bible. In fact, approximately 40 percent of the 250-odd surviving manuscripts contain such a text.[46] Textual relationships between the Wycliffite *capitularia* have not been comprehensively studied. Forshall and Madden printed them in 1850 as part of their edition of the Wycliffite Bible, but they relied on a small number of manuscript witnesses and did not comment on textual matters apart from recognising that there exist two major redactions — one corresponding broadly to the

---

[43] MS Egerton 618, fol. 173$^{\text{v}}$; cf. *The Sarum Missal*, p. xxxi.

[44] The foundational work on medieval Western *capitularia* is Theodor Klauser, *Das römische Capitulare Evangeliorum*, I: *Typen* (Münster in Westf.: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1935). See also Aime Georges Martimort, *Les lectures liturgiques et leurs livres* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1992).

[45] See, for example, the manuscripts listed in Klauser, *Das römische Capitulare Evangeliorum.*

[46] See further Peikola, 'The Table of Lections'; Dove, *The First English Bible*, pp. 58–62; Anne Hudson, 'Lollard Literature', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999–), II: *1100–1400*, ed. by Nigel J. Morgan and Rodney M. Thomson (2008), pp. 329–39 (p. 338).

Earlier Version in its readings, another to the Later Version.[47] The redactions are easily identified, for example by the different sets of referential letters of the alphabet used in them for the subdivision of biblical chapters.[48] Within both redactions there are several subgroups. Moreover, some *capitularia* differ so substantially from both redactions that they should rather be regarded as individual versions; the list of lessons in MS Egerton 618 belongs to this category.[49]

In addition to textual variation in the opening and closing words of the lessons and in the rubrics, the various subgroups of the Wycliffite tables of lessons are distinguishable by the number of sections they contain and the order in which these sections appear. There are characteristically either three or four sections present. In both cases, these comprise a section for the dominical and ferial lessons in the Temporale, typically placed at the beginning of the text, and a section for the lessons of the various commemorations (votive masses). As for the lessons in the Sanctorale, a relatively small number of the *capitularia*, including MS Egerton 618, contain separate sections for the Common and Proper of Saints; a majority are furnished with a single section for all the Sanctorale lessons.[50]

The distribution of the two types of *capitularia* differs markedly in the various manuscripts. Those with three sections always represent the later redaction and are almost

---

[47] *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and the New Testaments with the Apocryphal Books*, IV, pp. 683–98.

[48] See further Peikola, 'The Table of Lections', pp. 352–55.

[49] Peikola, 'The Table of Lections'; Dove, *The First English Bible*, pp. 58–61; Matti Peikola, 'Copying Space, Length of Entries, and Textual Transmission in Middle English Tables of Lessons', in *Scribes, Printers, and the Accidentals of Their Texts*, ed. by Jacob Thaisen and Hanna Rutkowska (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, forthcoming).

[50] See the preliminary list of the Wycliffite *capitularia* in Peikola, 'The Table of Lections', pp. 369–73.

invariably found in Later Version manuscripts.[51] The single Sanctorale section of these manuscripts typically opens with a rubric which identifies it as 'þe rewle of þe sanctorum boþe of þe propre & of þe comune sanctorum togidere'.[52] Despite the large number of tables of lessons containing a section of this type, there is surprisingly little variation in the occasions included in them. In their standard form they contain approximately 170 occasions, broadly corresponding to the contents of the Sarum Calendar and the Proper of Saints of the Sarum Missal. The wording of the rubric of the section containing the Proper and Common of Saints 'togidere' suggests that it has been put together by combining these two sections. Although feasts of the highest rank are often marked in this section by plain Lombardic initials (and/or paragraph signs), there is no systematic attempt to indicate to the reader which occasions and lessons belong to the Proper of Saints and which are derived from the Common of Saints.[53] The structure of the section thus does not respond to the Egerton writer's concern about applying the lessons of the Common of Saints to recently canonised saints of doubtful merit. On the contrary, it may be argued that the combined Sanctorale reflects a mainstream orthodox position as regards the veneration of saints.

The tables of lessons which contain separate sections for the Common and Proper of Saints include representatives of both redactions; they occur predominantly in manuscripts of the Earlier Version but are also found in some early copies of the Later Version, clearly suggesting that they generally belong to an earlier phase of transmission than those structured into three

---

[51] Apart from the manuscripts containing a table of lessons tailored to the Wycliffite translation of the gospel harmony *Oon of Foure,* I am aware of only two Earlier Version manuscripts with a three-section table: London, British Library, MS Royal 1 B VI and Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 145. In both manuscripts, the table is possibly a later addition.

[52] See, for example, Manchester, John Rylands University Library, MS English 80, fol. 15ᵛ.

[53] In manuscripts where initials or paragraph signs appear in the combined Sanctorale, the number of the occasions highlighted with them varies, but only rarely exceeds twenty-five. The highlighted occasions typically feature high-rank feasts in the Sarum Calendar, especially including ones associated with the Virgin Mary and the apostles.

sections.[54] Unlike MS Egerton 618, the Common of Saints in these tables consists, as a rule, of the general classes, without naming any individual saints to whom the lessons are to be applied. In the Proper of Saints, which represents the limited type found in the Egerton codex, the number of individual occasions varies to some extent among the manuscripts, ranging in those that I have examined in detail from thirty-eight to fifty-three.[55] Compared to the much more frequently attested combined version of the Sanctorale, the degree of variation is quite high. In general the tables representing the earlier redaction contain fewer occasions than those of the later one.

Thirty of the occasions are shared by all four-section *capitularia* examined: except for All Saints, St George, and St Clement, they are associated exclusively with Christ, the Virgin Mary, St Michael the Archangel, or the apostles.[56] In addition, twenty-nine other occasions are found in these separate Proper of Saints sections — again predominantly feasts, vigils, or octaves of biblical saints.[57] Some may well be accidental omissions by the scribe, such as Michaelmas in

---

[54] A similar arrangement of the lessons into four sections is also found in the Old Testament lectionaries appended to a number of the manuscripts of the Wycliffite Bible and in Wycliffite full missal lectionaries (*comites*) that consitute a self-standing codex. For these two types of lectionary, see Dove, *The First English Bible*, pp. 61–62 and 65–66 respectively.

[55] The quantitative data is derived from the following manuscripts: Dallas, Southern Methodist University, MS Prothro B-01 (later redaction); Dublin, Trinity College, MS 75 (earlier redaction), MS 76 (earlier); London, British Library, MS Additional 15,580 (earlier); Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Gough Eccl. Top. 5 (earlier), MS Hatton 111 (earlier); Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 4 (earlier); Philadelphia, Pennsylvania University Library, MS Codex 201 (earlier); Princeton, Princeton University, MS Scheide 12 (later); Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek, MS Guelf Aug. A. 2 (earlier). I have also examined a few other four-section tables, but since I have not had the chance to obtain a comparable set of quantitative data from them, they are not included in the counts of occasions; these tables comprise London, British Library, MS Lansdowne 407 (later redaction); Oxford, Brasenose College, MS 10 (later); Oxford, Oriel College, MS 80 (later).

[56] St Andrew (vigil, feast, octave), St Thomas the Apostle (feast), Candlemas, St Peter's Chair, St Matthias, the Annunciation, St George, Sts Philip and James, the Finding of the Cross, St John the Baptist (vigil, feast), Sts Peter and Paul (vigil, feast), the Commemoration of St Paul, St Mary Magdalene, St James (feast), St Peter in Chains, the Assumption (vigil, feast), St Bartholomew (feast), the Beheading of St John the Baptist, the Nativity of the Virgin (feast), the Exaltation of the Cross, St Matthew (vigil, feast), St Michael on the Mount, All Saints (feast), St Clement.

[57] St Nicholas, the Conception of the Virgin, St Thomas the Apostle (vigil), the Conversion of St Paul, St Gregory, St Mark, St Barnabas, the Translation of St Thomas Becket, St John the Baptist (octave), the Translation of St Martin, Sts Peter and Paul (octave), the Seven Brothers, St James (vigil),

Dublin, Trinity College, MS 75, or the vigil of All Saints in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Gough Eccl. Top. 5. The appearance of some occasions in some manuscripts alone may also reflect local variation within the Sarum rite or the compilers' devotional preferences.[58] While Wycliffite theology may possibly have influenced the omission of some non-biblical early saints from some of the tables, including St Nicholas, St Lawrence, and St Cyriacus and his companions, there is one occasion for which this explanation seems quite certain, namely, the Translation of St Thomas Becket on 7 July.[59] In the Proper of Saints sections examined, the occasion is (with one exception) found only in the *capitularia* which represent the later redaction. Even in this case, however, the manuscript in which the table appears contains a Later Version text.[60]

IV

Considering that the tables of lessons with four sections very probably represent an earlier phase of transmission than those with three sections, and that among the former material those belonging to the earlier redaction are probably also chronologically earlier, let us consider

Sts Abdon and Sennen, St Cyriacus and his companions, St Lawrence (vigil, feast, octave), the Assumption (octave), St Bartholomew (vigil), the Nativity of the Virgin (vigil, octave), Michaelmas, St Denis, St Luke, Sts Simon and Jude (vigil, feast), All Saints (vigil), All Souls.

[58] While minor variations existed within the Sarum rite even in the fifteenth century, their identification and interpretation is a complex task; see Nigel Morgan, 'Books for the Liturgy and Private Prayer', in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, pp. 291–316 (pp. 300–01).

[59] Although the Sarum Calendar contained two feasts for Becket, only the translation of his relics on 7 July was generally included in the Sanctorale sections of liturgical manuscripts organised according to the ecclesiastical year; the feast commemorating his martyrdom on 29 December was typically placed in the Temporale with other feasts of the Christmas season such as St Stephen Protomartyr and Holy Innocents (see Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office*, pp. 8–9).

[60] Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Gough Eccl. Top. 5 — a New Testament in the Later Version with a possible Lincolnshire provenance in the early fifteenth century. Since the manuscript represents the Later Version, the earlier redaction table of lessons it contains is incompatible with the biblical text, including the subdivision of the chapters. It is possible that in the absence of a more suitable later redaction copy, an exemplar of an earlier redaction table was obtained and modified to include the Translation of St Thomas Becket. The case calls for a closer textual scrutiny of the readings in the table.

the development of the tables with regard to their relationship to Wycliffite theology. The findings discussed in Sections II and III suggest that the general outline of this development was from tables of lessons which were more or less consonant with Wycliffite views to ones that conformed to orthodox ideas of saints and sanctity. The earliest Wycliffite *capitularia*, made to accompany manuscripts of the Earlier Version, contained a Common of Saints with general classes and a limited Proper of Saints without the translation of St Thomas Becket. When a new redaction of the four-section table of lessons was produced to be attached to some early manuscripts of the Later Version, Becket came to be included in the Proper of Saints. Finally, the separate sections on the Common and Proper of Saints were combined under a single Sanctorale by attaching lessons of the Common of Saints class to a large number of individual saints in the Sarum Calendar, including many recent saints whom the Wycliffites found theologically suspect. The whole process essentially presents itself as a gradual appropriation and theological modification of the originally Wycliffite tables of lessons by a new readership, which was ready to accept the constellation of saints presented in the Sarum Calendar without entering into a debate about the lack of biblical grounding for some of them.

Let us consider the process from the point of book production. Mary Dove has recently suggested that the presence of *capitularia* in copies of the Wycliffite Bible — often placed at the beginning of the volume — may have prompted the ecclesiastical authorities to view the manuscripts furnished with them as orthodox.[61] According to her, many of these books 'were apparently intended for devout readers who attended mass regularly, and some may have been used during mass'.[62] She envisages that the stationers who arranged the copying of the manuscripts were aware of this mode of use and therefore furnished the manuscripts with the

[61] Dove, *The First English Bible*, p. 58.
[62] Ibid., p. 67.

necessary tables and lists of lessons.[63] In the light of the present findings about the changing ideological leanings and shape of the Wycliffite *capitularia*, the scenario Dove proposes seems particularly applicable to the presumably London-Westminster based large-scale production of New Testaments during the first quarter of the fifteenth century.[64] These professionally produced and in many cases skilfully illuminated manuscripts characteristically have a Later Version text without any additional polemical Wycliffite items, and are often furnished with a table of lessons in English with a combined Sanctorale section, suggesting an orthodox readership. Although these three-section *capitularia* show very little variation in the repertory of saints included in their Sanctorale, several subgroups can be identified among them on the basis of the order of their main sections and textual variation in the rubrics and the incipits/explicits.[65] While the involvement of individual metropolitan stationers in the production of these manuscripts still remains to be ascertained, it may be speculated that the different subgroups originated as exemplars held by different stationers and were used by them to arrange successive copying. To verify this hypothesis, it should be established that the Later Version manuscripts furnished with *capitularia* belonging to one subgroup also share other production features, such as their scribes or decorators, and that there are other textual affiliations between them in addition to the tables of lessons.

---

[63] Ibid., p. 61.

[64] See Doyle, 'English Books In and Out of Court', p. 169; Anthony Ian Doyle, 'The English Provincial Book Trade before Printing', in *Six Centuries of the Provincial Book Trade in Britain*, ed. by Peter Isaac (Winchester: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1990), pp. 13–29 (p. 24); Anne Hudson, 'Lollard Book-Production', in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain 1375–1475*, ed. by Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 125–142 (p. 131); de Hamel, *The Book*, pp. 178–79; Matti Peikola, 'Aspects of *Mise-en-Page* in Manuscripts of the *Wycliffite Bible*', in *Medieval Texts in Context*, ed. by Graham D. Caie and Denis Renevey (London: Routledge, 2008), pp. 28–67.

[65] See Peikola, 'The Table of Lections', pp. 357–361; Dove, *The First English Bible*, p. 59n; Peikola, 'Copying Space'.

The prevalence of the four-section *capitularia* among the manuscripts of the Earlier Version and some early copies of the Later Version may mean that the makers and/or readers of these books were more likely to sympathise with Wycliffite views than those of the 'mass-produced' New Testaments. It may be observed, for example, that in two of the three manuscripts which contain the overtly polemical General Prologue to the Wycliffite Bible and are also furnished with a table of lessons, the table represents the earlier four-section type.[66] The changing shape of the *capitularia* from four constituent sections to three may reflect a profound change in the production of the Wycliffite Bible, whereby the Wycliffites or their sympathisers were no longer in a position to control the copying of the text and the supply of exemplars. Since the Wycliffite Bible evidently had a wide appeal to non-Wycliffite readers, the outlined process is hardly surprising in the context of medieval text production, where attempts to exert authorial control over the transmission of a work were characteristically doomed to fail.

Importantly, the changes in the structure and contents of the *capitularia* are to a certain extent paralleled by other changes in the manuscripts, for example as regards their *mise-en-page* and scribal collaboration; the nature of these changes generally suggests that during the earlier production phase(s) textual precision and theological concerns may have mattered above the presentation of the text and aesthetic qualities.[67] In addition to a new intellectual context, such changes may also reflect a new physical context of production for the manuscripts. One

---

[66] Princeton, Princeton University, MS Scheide 12 and Dublin, Trinity College, MS 75. The third manuscript containing both the General Prologue and a table of lessons is Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 147; its table contains a single Sanctorale section of the combined type. On palaeographical grounds it appears that one and the same scribe wrote the tables of MS Scheide 12 and Corpus Christi College, MS 147. Both manuscripts are copies of the whole Bible in the Later Version; other production similarities between them include their unusual collation in 12s. The Temporale sections of their tables are textually very closely affiliated (see Peikola, 'Copying Space'); further research is required to establish why their Sanctorale sections differ drastically.

[67] For these changes, see further Matti Peikola, 'Lollard(?) Production under the Looking Glass: The Case of Columbia University, Plimpton Add. MS 3', *Journal of the Early Book Society*, 9, (2006), 1–23; Peikola, 'Aspects of *Mise-en-Page*', passim.

possibility would be to link the changes to the early shift from provincial to metropolitan production envisaged by Ian Doyle: 'Although the prototypes of these books were probably written at Oxford and other places in the midlands, their multiplication could have got going in the metropolis in the 1390s'.[68] Since the metropolitan area itself provided many different contexts and networks for book production — some of which are known to have had Wycliffite associations — it is also not impossible that the proposed change took place there after the early shift from Oxford/the midlands had already occurred.[69] The plausibility of both scenarios should be investigated by comparing the production features (linguistic, textual, palaeographical, codicological, stylistic etc.) of the Wycliffite manuscripts with coeval manuscripts of verified Oxford/midlands and London origin.[70]

It remains to be assessed how MS Egerton 618 and its list of lessons relate to the stages of production outlined here. As already observed, the Egerton list is unique among its kind and cannot be placed into either of the two major redactions of the Wycliffite *capitularia*. Not only does it entirely lack the explicits of the lessons and the letters of the alphabet used for the subdivision of biblical chapters as found in most other tables of lessons, but on a number of occasions the incipits of the lessons themselves also differ substantially from those represented

---

[68] Doyle, 'English Books In and Out of Court', p. 169; see also Michael G. Sargent, 'What Do the Numbers Mean? A Textual Critic's Observations on Some Patterns of Middle English Manuscript Transmission', in *Design and Distribution of Late Medieval Manuscripts in England*, ed. by Margaret Connolly and Linne R. Mooney (York: The University of York, York Medieval Press, 2008), pp. 205–44 (pp. 214–15); Hudson, 'Lollard Literature', pp. 335–36.

[69] See Maureen Jurkowski, 'Lollard Book Producers in London in 1414', in *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson*, ed. by Helen Barr and Ann M. Hutchinson (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), pp. 201–26; Fiona Somerset, 'Censorship', in *The Production of Books in England 1350-1530*, ed. by Alexandra Gillespie and Daniel Wakelin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming). Linne R. Mooney emphasises that there were several categories of scribe working in the later medieval London area, see 'Locating Scribal Activity in Late-Medieval London', in *Design and Distribution*, pp. 183–204 (pp. 203–04).

[70] I am currently compiling a database of the production features of the manuscripts of the Wycliffite Bible.

by the two redactions. Although the text of the incipits is in general closer to the earlier redaction than the later one, there are instances where a uniquely attested reading found in the Egerton list of lessons does not correspond to any manuscript of the Earlier Version, including the corresponding passage in the biblical text of MS Egerton 618 itself.[71] As far as may be gleaned from the variants printed by Forshall and Madden, such readings do not seem to match the Later Version either.[72] The question whether the Egerton readings witness to an otherwise lost stage of the Wycliffite translation project, or whether they possibly represent some other independent textual source, cannot be pursued here; nonetheless, the uniqueness of the Egerton list of lessons may mean that the compiler for one reason or another had no access to an exemplar of the usual earlier redaction *capitularia*, whose readings would have corresponded better to the text of the biblical part of the manuscript. Had such a text been available — with a standard Common of Saints consisting of the general classes and a Proper of Saints without the translation of Becket — it would presumably have been preferable to the type which called for an interpolation to be theologically acceptable.

In any event, the lack of other copies of the Egerton list of lessons may indicate that it was tailor-made to accompany Thomas of Woodstock's great Bible and was not used thereafter as an exemplar for producing further copies. That the list was not copied by the main scribe of the manuscript suggests that it may have been acquired from another source than the exemplars used for copying the books of the Bible. This conclusion is supported by the textual mismatch between the incipits and the biblical part; it also suggests that if the list of lessons was tailor-

---

[71] *The Earlier Version of the Wycliffite Bible*, ed. by Conrad Lindberg, 8 vols, Stockholm Studies in English, 6, 8, 10, 13, 20, 29, 81, 87 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1959–1997), passim; variant readings for all the manusript witnesses are given in vols. VI–VIII only (from Baruch 3. 20 to the end of the New Testament).

[72] *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and the New Testaments with the Apocryphal Books*, passim.

made for the manuscript, its compiler did not have access to the text of the Earlier Version from which to obtain a set of matching incipits. While the polemical passage at the beginning of the Common of Saints shows that the compiler of the list had Wycliffite leanings, the liturgical knowledge required by the task makes it very likely that he was also a cleric.

Incidentally, the evidence provided by a uniquely surviving disputation between a friar and a secular cleric in an early fifteenth century anthology of Wycliffite writings indicates that Thomas of Woodstock had at least one secular cleric in his service with clearly Wycliffite sympathies.[73] The disputation is addressed to the Duke of Gloucester — characterised at the beginning of the text as the 'Moost worschipfulleste & gentilleste lord' — by a person identifying himself as '$$oure seruaunt'.[74] It is possible that the writer can be identified with the Wycliffite protagonist of the disputation, who is referred to as 'a seculer $$oure clerk'.[75] In a way characteristic of the Wycliffites, the secular cleric largely grounds his arguments on the authority of the Bible. Although the veneration of saints and the question of sanctity do not feature among the predominantly antifraternal topics of the disputation, the potentially unreliable status of non-biblical saints' lives is brought up by the secular cleric in his response to an argument from his opponent based on an event described in the Life of St Edward the Confessor.[76] Not unlike the compiler of the list of lessons in MS Egerton 618, who encourages his audience to make use of the Bible as the yardstick for determining the saints to whom honour

---

[73] Dublin, Trinity College, MS 244, fols 212^{v}–219^{r}. For the manuscript, see Ralph Hanna, III, 'Two Lollard Codices and Lollard Book-Production', *Studies in Bibliography*, 43 (1990), 49–62. The previously unpublished text is included in *Four Wycliffite Dialogues*, ed. by Fiona Somerset, EETS OS 333 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

[74] Dublin, Trinity College, MS 244, fol. 212^{v}. I am grateful to the Board of Trinity College for permission to quote from the manuscript.

[75] Ibid., fol. 212^{v}.

[76] The event, which involves the appearance of St John the Evangelist to King Edward in the guise of a pilgrim, is included in Aelred's *Vita Edwardi Regis*; see *Supplementary Lives in Some Manuscripts of the 'Gilte Legende',* ed. by. Richard Hamer and Vida Russell, EETS OS 315 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 22–23, 472.

is due, the secular cleric observes that even '$$if þat visyoun of seynt edward be soþ, it mote nede be vndirstonde acordauntlyche wiþ oure bileue'.[77]

The presence of the controversial passage in Thomas of Woodstock's copy of the Wycliffite Bible supports the idea of the Duke as a person favourable to the Wycliffites' cause. It also strongly suggests that the producers of the Egerton manuscript had contacts with writers or suppliers of polemical Wycliffite materials. Yet the uniqueness of the list of lessons in the manuscript may mean that the book was not made in a location where copies of the Earlier Version were more regularly produced at the time. In addition to the peculiar list of lessons, there are also other production features — such as its rich illumination and ink ruling — that set the book apart from the usual Earlier Version manuscripts.[78]

It has been observed that the Egerton Bible belongs stylistically to a group of manuscripts from the last decades of the fourteenth century that was very likely decorated by professional illuminators in London.[79] At least two other manuscripts in this group are also associated, through heraldic and textual evidence, with Thomas of Woodstock and his wife Eleanor de Bohun: Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS Adv. 18. 6. 5. (Latin Hours and Psalter of Eleanor de Bohun) and Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 570 (*La Somme le Roi* in French).[80] A direct production link within the group has been established by Lucy Freeman Sandler, who identifies the decorator of MSS Egerton 617–618 with the border artist of the Edinburgh

---

[77] Dublin, Trinity College, MS 244, fol. 218ʳ.

[78] See Peikola, 'Aspects of *Mise-en-Page*', pp. 39–41.

[79] Stratford, '"La Somme le Roi"', pp. 278–80; See also *The Vernon Manuscript: A Facsimile of Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS. Eng. Poet. a. 1., with an Introduction by A. I. Doyle* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1987), p. 8n.; Kathleen L. Scott, *Later Gothic Manuscripts 1390–1490*, 2 vols (London: Harvey Miller, 1996), II, p. 27.

[80] The Hours and Psalter of Eleanor de Bohun is discussed by Sandler, *Gothic Manuscripts*, II, pp. 163–65; for the Reims manuscript, see Stratford, '"La Somme le Roi"'.

manuscript.[81] Jenny Stratford's close analysis of the Reims manuscript suggests that it was written by someone called 'J. Upton', who signed his name at the end of the book on fol. 113$^{\mathrm{v}}$ before it was dispatched to be decorated.[82] According to Stratford, one of the potential candidates for the person behind the signature is John Upton, household treasurer to the Duke and — tantalisingly for the case at hand — perhaps also a clerk of his chapel at Pleshey.[83]

Although there is no direct evidence to connect Upton with MSS Egerton 617–618, the context of production Stratford envisages for Thomas of Woodstock's copy of *La Somme le Roi* may be directly relevant to our understanding of his English Bible as well. Like the Reims manuscript, the making of the Egerton codex was probably characterised by close contacts between members of the Duke's household at Pleshey, Essex, and members of the professional book trade in London. It remains a possibility that these contacts also mark the initial stages of the metropolitan phase of production for the Wycliffite Bible sometime before the autumn of 1397 — a phase that on the basis of the evidence provided by the lists of lessons in the manuscripts eventually seems to have become dominated by stationers serving a largely orthodox clientele.

---

[81] Sandler, *Gothic Manuscripts*, II, p. 164.
[82] Stratford, "'La Somme le Roi'", p. 267.
[83] Ibid., pp. 267, 281.