

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Alan J. Fletcher, 'The Manuscripts of John Mirk's *Manuale Sacerdotis*', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 19 (1988), 105-39

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123688&silos_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

The Manuscripts of John Mirk's *Manuale Sacerdotis*

Alan J. Fletcher

John Mirk, an Austin canon active in the late-fourteenth century and, as we know only from his *Manuale Sacerdotis*, a prior of the abbey of Lilleshall in Shropshire, has left three known works. Two of these are written in English; his sermon cycle generally known as the *Festial* and his *Instructions for Parish Priests*. His third work, in Latin, remains unprinted.¹ This third work, the *Manuale Sacerdotis*, deserves more attention than it has received, both because John Mirk himself was an author of influential pastoral literature (judging from the quantity of its surviving manuscripts, his *Festial* appears to have been the most popular sermon cycle of the fifteenth century²) and because the *Manuale* itself, while owing its parentage to an established tradition of pastoral aids, stands near the end of that tradition and is not wholly typical of its ancestors.³

The decree of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 which obliged every Christian to make an annual confession to his parish priest stimulated the production of a new body of pastoral literature.⁴ Already in the twelfth century a movement had begun for making the theology and the new learning of the schools accessible at a practical, pastoral level, and now the movement had received a powerful official sanction. Parish priests needed to be better equipped for the duties of the cure, and especially in respect of the sacrament of confession. Demands created by the Lateran decree were catered for by the composition of the thirteenth-century *Summae Confessorum*. Works were produced which gave the method of hearing confession in elaborate detail, down to the questions that the confessor should ask for each sin and the penances he should enjoin. The thirteenth-century *Summae* were mostly penitentials which covered their topic in exhaustively thorough detail, and such was their influence that it continued to be felt in the later works which largely superseded them.

This tradition lies behind Mirk's *Manuale Sacerdotis*, and ultimately accounts

for certain of the concerns that the *Manuale* has. But it is to the fourteenth-century manuals, themselves an extension and development of the scope of their thirteenth-century predecessors, that the *Manuale* is most closely akin. Like many of these manuals, although not in the same depth, the *Manuale* shows an acquaintance with the decrees of canon law pertaining to the conduct of priests alongside those of the regional and provincial legislations.⁵ The statement and interpretation of these decrees often form part of Mirk's narrative, and in several *Manuale* manuscripts the names of legislators are cited in the margins by the side of standard patristic *auctoritates*.⁶ Such an emphasis on canonical legislation can be seen particularly in William of Pagula's *Oculus Sacerdotis*, the work of a canonist with a strong sympathy for pastoral needs. It is no doubt largely on account of him and his powerful influence upon subsequent manual writing that Mirk also shared a concern for general ecclesiastical law. A second characteristic of the *Manuale* already seen increasingly in the fourteenth century is the emphasis laid upon correct liturgical procedure, especially in the celebration of the Mass. (This emphasis follows in the tradition of John Belet's *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, a work which Mirk may have been acquainted with.⁷) The *Sinistra Pars* of Pagula's *Oculus Sacerdotis* has undoubtedly influenced the content of the *Manuale*'s sections on the Mass, though Mirk does not frequently copy Pagula verbatim.⁸ For a final illustration of the *Manuale*'s links with the fourteenth century, there are its satirical tales and its biting anti-clerical criticisms. There is no need to see in these any sympathy in Mirk towards some of the favourite preaching themes of the friars.⁹ Certain fourteenth-century manuals, amongst which the *Memoriale Presbiterorum* is especially notable, did not fail to take the opportunity of pointing criticism at the Church even though they were produced under its aegis. Mirk's satire may derive equally well from a tradition of self-reproof which was established within the Church and which some of the earlier manuals embodied.

If his materials are traditional, Mirk's arrangement and selection of them are new and idiosyncratic. The *Manuale* is divided into five Books, the first of which aims at establishing the dignity which ought to surround the priesthood, and which contrasts that with the conduct of those who do not take their office seriously.¹⁰ "Ignorancia sacerdotum" is deplorable, and is seen primarily in terms of leading to a slur upon the honour due to the Sacrament. A blurring of the distinctions between clergy and laity provokes Mirk's criticism, which often takes the form of a contrast between the ideal and the culpable. Though he has outlined the behaviour of the good priest, there nevertheless exists the worldly priest whose only evidence of holy orders is his tonsure. Some even dress like the military and keep hunting dogs. Book II is to some extent an extension of the first, providing a valuable picture of

how the medieval priest was to look upon the world, and the particular virtues he had to possess. There are six of these, each of which is subdivided into its various aspects, and with these he will present before the laity an exemplary pattern of conduct. Book III continues to expand the six basic virtues. For example, "innocencia" (etymologized as "quasi non nocens") is a sorely needed virtue, since there are those who "ad altare accedentes, gladiolum suum evaginant quem ad finem altaris ponunt, cum quo ut dicunt iram suam dimitunt. Quem post dictam missam reassumunt simul cum ira sua pristina" [*Manuale*, Book III, chapter 2; "approaching the altar they unsheathe their sword which they place at the end of the altar, by which means, as they say, they dispatch their anger. After Mass has been said they at once take it up again with their former anger"]. Much of this Book concerns physical and spiritual chastity, and is illustrated by Mirk's characteristically sensational exempla.¹¹ The remainder of Book III and all of Book IV consist of instructions upon the Mass, how to deal with unforeseen eventualities such as the wine freezing solid in the chalice or a spider dropping into it. The final Book returns again to contrasts between worldly and spiritual behaviour, and concludes with a contemplation of the torments of hell and the delights of heaven.

By the time of its composition, possibly in the late-fourteenth or early-fifteenth century,¹² Mirk's Latin manual is thus to be seen as a further contribution to a species of pastoral literature that was already substantial. But why did the author think it necessary to add anything to a very well-worked field, if indeed there was anything left for him to add? It appears that it was Mirk's desire for practicability rather than innovation that led him to put the work together. He mentions that in view of the scarcity of books among priests, he was playing some part in providing them with a useful one, "non ex proprio ingenio exaratum, sed de flosculis sanctorum patrum congestum" [*Manuale*, Book V, chapter 2; "not tilled from my own ability, but garnered from the sentences of the holy Fathers"]. Being one of the shortest of the manuals, it not only stood to fulfill the physical requirements of the "Priest's Handbook", but also to contain, as Mirk saw them, the most important things necessary for a priest to know.¹³ He dealt with the practicalities of parish life most fully in his *Instructions*; the *Manuale* still has an eye to such practicality, but tends rather to be a work of exhortation to foster in the priest the correct attitudes to his vocation. Judged in the light of its thirteenth and fourteenth-century predecessors it might well appear eccentric; for example, it lacks the emphasis on confession and penance which is central to much of the thirteenth-century material, and the exposition of the six points of Pecham's programme which so frequently appears in fourteenth-century works.¹⁴ Much is omitted. Nevertheless, it is partly

in its somewhat peculiar selection of material that its interest lies. It may have been the novelty of the selection which helped commend the work to its fifteenth-century audience. Further, the *Manuale* may have been regarded by its author as only one part, possibly the last, in his total programme of pastoral publications. If this is the case, then the scope of the *Manuale* is only a part of the final comprehensiveness achieved by all three of Mirk's surviving works. It would not be just to estimate its scope in isolation from the *Festial* and the *Instructions*. Certainly its thirteen surviving manuscripts would seem to indicate that it was found to be useful, and that it enjoyed a moderate popularity.

The Manuscripts

T₁: Cambridge, Trinity College Library MS B.11.23

T₁ is a compact parchment text measuring 160mm x 103mm (115mm x 62mm) in a sixteenth-century leather binding, stamped with the cross saltire arms of the Neville family on the front and back cover.¹⁵ The written text averages thirty-three lines per page, and is decorated with blue capitals, generally two to three lines of text deep, which have been flourished with red pen strokes. The manuscript, written in the same hand throughout, is precisely datable from the scribe's note of f.77r at the end of the *Manuale*: "Explicit libellus dictus manuale sacerdotis scriptus per N.d. in fine Anni Domini 1474^{ti}". The scribe, one "N.d.", writes an Anglicana Formata script influenced by Secretary letter forms.¹⁶ The text is foliated consecutively in modern pencil in the top right-hand corner. Occasionally prick holes for an ink frame-ruling are visible in the right-hand margin; others have presumably been cropped during rebinding.

Other contemporary marginalia appear, such as that on f.77r: "C. et V. gret lettres of byse floryshid". The hand that wrote this is the same as the one responsible for a long account on the recto of the final endleaf which gives a list of expenses incurred in the production of a manuscript, such as parchment and decoration costs. The account can be shown to relate to T₁ itself. The inventory specifies eighteen quires of parchment. The manuscript is made up of seventeen regular alphabetically-signed quires of eight, which with the four flyleaves and four endleaves might be regarded as making eighteen quires of eight. (Catchwords are regular throughout the first sixteen quires also.) The scribe has charged for writing

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

over sixteen and a half quires. Possibly then the jottings on f.77r and the final endleaf are also in the hand of "N.d.", who may be a professional scrivener, seen here employing a less formal cursive to add up the cost of items in the book's production which will lead him to charge 9s 8d for it.¹⁷

The manuscript was one of Thomas Neville's donations to the college, as is recorded on an eighteenth-century printed slip which has been pasted to the third flyleaf.¹⁸ Though many of the manuscripts which he left came originally from Christ Church Canterbury, little is known about the sources of the rest. Alongside the *Manuale* (ff.1r-77r) there appears a short work entitled *Tractatus de Absolucionem* (ff.77v-104r), which opens with the well-known "Ignorancia sacerdotum", and there also appears a series of *narraciones* from the *Speculum Hereticorum* of Thomas Wygenhall (ff.104r-32v).¹⁹ When Leland was producing his work on British writers, he noted that one of the *Manuale* manuscripts "conjunxerat sub eisdem asscribis autorem alterum" ["had bound another author between the same covers"].²⁰ Tanner clarifies whom Leland had in mind when writing his "autorem alterum" by a cross-reference to Wygenhall.²¹ It may be that Leland had examined T₁ or knew of another with similar contents.

T₂: Cambridge, Trinity College Library MS B.11.24

T₂ contains two manuscripts bound together in a sixteenth-century leather binding which is stamped back and front with a gilded crest of John Whitgift.²² The final parchment folio of the manuscript bears three parallel indentations, about 40mm apart, at right angles to the spine. These were probably made by the thongs of an earlier, medieval binding. In size it is somewhat similar to T₁, measuring 164mm x 102mm (107mm x 72mm), with the number of lines per page varying approximately between twenty-three and twenty-eight. There is no apparent lateral pricking and no transverse guide-lines have been drawn in. The *Manuale Sacerdotis*, written on parchment throughout, occupies the first 96 folios (part A of the manuscript), and these are made up of eight regular quires of twelve. These have no visible quire signatures. Catchwords are frequent, and used not simply as markers of the last verso of a quire, but more extensively (for example, they appear on ff.1v, 2v, 3r and 3v, 4v, 6v, 7v, 8v, 11v, etc.). The scribe signs himself as "Johannes plenus Amoris" on f.96r. The second part of the manuscript, ff.1-32 (part B), is of parchment and paper, and is mainly in two other hands. Parts A and B have their own consecutive foliation systems in modern pencil in the top right-hand corner. The folios containing the *Manuale* are only partially rubricated; the large opening

capitals are left blank, and running headlines of the respective Books were meant to have been penned in at the top of each page. For lack of any clear evidence from which to ascribe a date, the hand employed by "Johannes plenus Amoris" on the *Manuale*, an Anglicana book hand with some admixture of Secretary letter forms, would seem to belong to the second half of the fifteenth century, and possibly to the third quarter.²³ It is very current and a little similar to the hand employed in the *Manuale* portion of the Digby manuscript described below.

Part B of T₂ contains work in English as well as in Latin. Lydgate's *Dietarium* (part B, f.26v) appears alongside a work on the Fifteen Signs before the day of Judgement (part B, f.27v).²⁴ This part of the manuscript reflects a more popular interest, and its exemplar was probably not that from which the *Manuale Sacerdotis* was also taken.²⁵

The early history of the manuscript cannot be ascertained. It is known that the donor, Archbishop Whitgift (Primate, 1583-1604), had many books originally from Christ Church Canterbury and a few from St Augustine's, and also many from the Cistercian house at Buildwas in Shropshire. Although these are the major sources of his books, T₂ cannot be definitely assigned to any of them.²⁶

P: Cambridge, Peterhouse MS 236

P is a parchment manuscript of ii + 157 folios in an eighteenth-century binding of thin white skin on cardboard.²⁷ The manuscript is in two parts, A and B, and each part has its own modern pencil foliation in the top right-hand corner. Part A, ff.1-104, contains a work on the Seven Deadly Sins and their remedies (ff.1r-36v), and an abridged copy of John of Mirfeld's *Florarium Bartholomei* (ff.36v-104v).²⁸ It is written by various scribes all in the fifteenth century.²⁹ After this, part B, ff.1-53, opens with the *Manuale Sacerdotis* (ff.1r-41v). Part B is in two hands; that of the scribe of the *Manuale*, who writes a Secretary book hand with some noticeable influence from Anglicana script,³⁰ and that of the scribe of the remainder of the manuscript (ff.42r-53r) which may be the hand of its fifteenth-century owner John Warkworth.³¹

The two parts of this manuscript must have been bound together at an early date, since a list of contents in a late fifteenth-century hand on the verso of flyleaf iii records the *Manuale Sacerdotis* and the other work in part B as following on immediately after part A. The hand of the *Manuale* scribe seems also to appear on ff.80r-95r of part A. Probably the two parts had already been bound together when

John Warkworth bought the manuscript. He has recorded his purchase on the leaf now acting as the front paste-down to the present binding: "Liber Magistri Johannis Warkeworth emptus Anno Domini 1463^o", which usefully places the text in time, and possibly in space. Although the full range of his movements is unknown, Warkworth was at Cambridge in 1463, where he had just been given a grace to incept in divinity "cum forma habita Oxoniae".³² If he had not brought it with him from Oxford, the book was perhaps bought locally in Cambridge from one of the bookshops that had flourished under the demands of the University.³³ It was later deposited in the college collection, in 1481 according to the old catalogue, with an injunction against its removal.³⁴ (Warkworth had become master of Peterhouse in 1473.) Its donation is recorded beneath the list of contents. The manuscript remained at Peterhouse until being transferred to the University Library this century.

P measures 221mm x 144mm (163mm x 97mm), and the *Manuale* is written with approximately forty lines per page. There is an ink-drawn writing frame, but no transverse writing lines have been drawn in. Folios 1-53 in part B are the leaves of seven quires, one to five being regular quires of eight, the sixth a quire of six and the seventh originally a quire of ten, but wanting one leaf before nine and with leaves nine and ten serving as a pastedown to the present binding. Quire signatures appear sporadically since the parchment has been cut back, and the catchwords survive only for quires one to five. The text of the *Manuale* is rubricated throughout, and is decorated with a blue capital flourished in red at the opening of each chapter, about two lines deep, apart from capital "I" which appears in the margin often to a depth of nine lines. At intervals, red and blue paraphs appear. The rest of part B of the manuscript (ff.42r-53r), which may have been written by Warkworth himself, has been left with spaces for subsequent rubrication. A much later hand, probably of the eighteenth century, is responsible for certain marginalia throughout the text, including the addition of "seu Enchiridion" next to the title *Manuale Sacerdotis* on the contents page. This addition is drawn from Bale, to whom the hand refers the reader in a further note at the bottom of the page.

Part B of the manuscript contains three other complete Latin works; the *Visio Beati Bernardi* (ff.43v-47r), the *Deieccio Ade de Paradiso* (ff.47r-50r) and the *De Assumpcione Beate Marie* (ff.50r-53r).³⁵ A fourth imperfect and unidentified passage appearing on f.42r-v gives words of exhortation for a priest to use when hearing confession.

U: Cambridge University Library MS Ff.i.14

U is a paper manuscript of vi + 209 + vi leaves in a binding which has been recently repaired but which incorporates on its back and front covers the remains of a blind-stamped leather binding, probably of sixteenth-century work.³⁶ Five parallel thong marks are lightly impressed on the recto of flyleaf iii and on the verso of endleaf iv, and thus reveal a little of the nature of the medieval binding, which was presumably of wooden boards. (These leaves are foliated respectively as f.1 and f.217.) It is foliated consecutively in modern pencil in the top right-hand corner. The dimensions of the manuscript are as follows: 199mm x 141mm (150mm x 96mm). Flyleaves i-ii are of paper and contemporary with the current binding, but iii-vi are of parchment (the modern foliation begins on flyleaf iii), and these contain a series of documents and notes. On the verso of flyleaf iii (f.1v) is written part of the account of a property demise in the region of York, which reappears on the recto of flyleaf vi (f.4r). In between on flyleaves iv-v (ff.2r-3v) there is an index to some work of canonical legislation pertaining to the conduct of clergy, in a late thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century script. On the verso of flyleaf vi is a list of the contents of the manuscript in a seventeenth-century hand. There is also a similar set of endleaves, i-iv of parchment (ff.214-17) and v-vi of paper. Endleaf i (f.214r) has a collection of biblical texts relating to food and drink in a hand similar to that of the main scribe, and at the top a short Latin verse on moderation at table. The verso of the leaf contains a document pertaining to Yorkshire, or with more precision, possibly to York and the East Riding of the county.³⁷

Apart from the work entitled *Remedia contra septem vicia* on f.213v,³⁸ the text is copied in the same hand throughout, by a certain Robert Wasselyn, who signs his name next to the explicits of several pieces, as for example at the end of the *Manuale* on f.178v: "Quod Robertus Wasselyn Capellanus".³⁹ Wasselyn writes an Anglicana book hand with some noticeable influence from Secretary script, and characteristic of the mid-fifteenth century.⁴⁰ The *Manuale Sacerdotis* text, found between ff.166r-78v, is decorated with each opening capital letter of each chapter rubricated alternately in blue or red. Sometimes these capitals are flourished with red lines which are confined closely to the edges of the letters. Generally the capitals are about two lines deep, apart from capital "I" which reaches down between seven to nine lines of text. An average number of lines per page is about thirty, and these are written in an ink-drawn writing frame. If the text was ever pricked laterally, no transverse guide lines were drawn in, neither are any holes now visible.

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

The quiring of the manuscript is generally quite regular, since from quire 3 onwards it is made up of gatherings of twelve. Quire 4 has remnants of signatures in the bottom right-hand corner of the first six folios, and catchwords appear at the end of quires 3, 4 and 5, though sporadically elsewhere. It is interesting to note that the first identifiable set of signatures, those found on quire 4, are part of a "b" quire (the "b" is quite clear in the bottom right-hand corner of f.36r). A full twelve folios back from quire 4, the whole of quire 3, must have been the "a" quire, and possibly as such marked the beginning of the scribe's composition. The *Speculum Christiani* opens quire 3. In this case, the material now contained on quires 1 and 2 would have had to have been added by him at a later stage. Such a view receives some support from the fact that MS Hatton 97, a text with which U is intimately connected, also opens with the *Speculum Christiani*.

Ha: Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 97

Ha is a compact paper and parchment text in a modern binding, comprising v + 125 + ii leaves. The first two of the five flyleaves and both of the endleaves are contemporary with the modern binding. The remaining three flyleaves are made up of various sixteenth-century documents, on parchment or paper. In the text itself, parchment is used for the inner and outer bifolia of each quire. A modern pencil foliation is added consecutively in the top right-hand corner of each folio.

It is difficult to determine precisely whether the work is in the same hand throughout, since there appears to be some difference between the script of the English and Latin text of the *Speculum Christiani* which begins the manuscript (ff.1r-33v) and the remainder of the manuscript which contains Latin works. However, it is possible that it is still the same scribe who, when adapting his Textura-based script to the English language, produced simply a script that was debased.⁴¹ The text is written within an ink-drawn writing frame, marked with transverse writing lines for which the pricking is visible on left and right margins of the bifolium, and has generally between thirty-one and thirty-nine lines per page. Not all of the chapter headings nor their initial capitals have been rubricated, and space is left for them to be filled in. The size of the manuscript is 191mm x 134mm (150mm x 92mm) and its collation is as follows: 1¹², 2¹⁴, 3-4¹⁶, 5-8¹², 9¹²⁺¹ (f.119), 10⁴, 11². There is no trace of signatures, but catchwords are often used. The text of the *Manuale*, extending from ff.109v-19r, is found mainly in quire 9, with a singleton, f.119, added to complete the *Manuale* text.

Nothing is known directly about the source of this manuscript apart from what it can tell itself. The last three flyleaves are made up of fragmentary deeds and an indenture which are related to the London area, and the indenture is dated to 1573. Quite possibly during an intermediary stage of binding Ha was somewhere in this region, but whether it is the place of ultimate origin is very doubtful. More useful in this respect is the connection existing between it and U. The content of these manuscripts, and the order in which it occurs, is practically identical, apart from the fact that Ha omits an item by Bonaventura on the Virgin (U, ff.117r-24r), a collection of excerpts entitled *De Diversis Notabilibus* (U, ff.125r-28r), and the rest of the material remaining in U after the item *De Duplici Oracione*.⁴² It is likely that they have the same exemplar lying ultimately behind both of them, now apparently lost, and which was circulating in the northeast part of the Midlands. Ha, like U, probably originated in this area.⁴³

The question remains as to when the manuscript was copied. The script is a Bastard Anglicana type, and probably of the second half of the fifteenth century.⁴⁴ It is likely that both Ha and U were copied at a similar time.

B₁: Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 549

B₁ is the largest of the *Manuale* manuscripts, and measures 244mm x 180mm (188m x 106mm).⁴⁵ It is made up of two parchment manuscripts, and in all comprises ii + 200 + i leaves. The first flyleaf and the endleaf are raised pastedowns. The continuous modern ink foliation added in the top right-hand corner is regular apart from the skipping of one folio after f.143. The binding of B₁ is fifteenth-century work, white hide on bevelled wooden boards which are fastened to the spine by four thongs. Originally the book was held shut by two clasps. There are three main hands employed in it. Folios 1r-17r appear to be in a Bastard Anglicana script of the second half of the fifteenth century, ff.17v-24r in a Secretary the style of which seems closer to the second quarter of the fifteenth century, though here in fact written in the second half, and ff.25r-198v (with the exception of material on ff.77v-79r), which make up the bulk of the text, in an Anglicana Formata hand of the third quarter of the fifteenth century.⁴⁶

From f.98r onwards, the traces of prick holes have been removed, but transverse guide lines are drawn in in a brown crayon, and occasionally appear in ink. The *Manuale* extends over ff.121r-81r, and has thirty-two lines of text per page. A plain red capital of two to three lines of text deep opens each chapter.

These capitals are thickly applied, and added separately from the general rubrication. The manuscript is made up of twenty-six quires, all of which are gatherings of eight, with the exception of quires 12 and 13 (ff.89-97), which are of four and five respectively (quire 13 wants three leaves before 1). Catchwords appear at the end of each quire with the exception of quires 3, 13, 14, 24, 25 and 26. A series of alphabetical quire signatures is employed between quires 4 to 11, and a fresh series is started between quires 13 to 22. They are not visible elsewhere.

B₁ was one of the library's earliest accessions, being given in 1602 by the Elizabethan antiquary Walter Cope. Pits mentions that the text of the "Manuale seu Enchiridion" was to be found in Walter Cope's library. There is a possibility that B₁ was the text he was describing, and that he knew it before the Bodleian acquired it.⁴⁷

The contents of this manuscript give a strong clue to its origin. Several treatises in it, such as the *Declaracio optima Regule Carthusie* (ff.25r-31r) or the *Tractatus contra eos qui dicunt quod Cartusienses faciunt contra caritatem propter hoc quod non comedunt carnes* [ff.85v-90v; "A treatise against those who say that Carthusians behave contrary to charity because they do not eat meat"], directly concern the Carthusian order, and are likely to have had little interest outside a charterhouse.⁴⁸ In fact, it happens that a few examples of the work of a monk of the London charterhouse of Sheen, one Stephen Doddesham, have survived, and with his Anglicana Formata type of script the hand of ff.25r-198v corresponds perfectly.⁴⁹ Doddesham is known to have been sent from Witham to Sheen, where he remained, shortly after 1469.⁵⁰ B₁ is probably to be assigned to some time after this date.

B₂: Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 632

B₂ is a parchment manuscript of ii + 121 leaves. Its two flyleaves are contemporary with its fifteenth-century binding of white leather on bevelled wooden boards, connected by four thongs which run at right angles to the spine.⁵¹ It has a consecutive modern ink foliation in the top right-hand corner of each folio. (The first leaf of the text has been foliated "iii", as if a flyleaf.) Two holes are bored at the bottom right-hand side of the front cover, probably to accommodate a chain plate. (In keeping with the early policy of the Bodleian Library, the chain was no doubt added whilst the text was in its custody.) Originally a fastening thong ran from the centre edge of the front cover round to a fastening stud, now lost, in the middle of the back cover. Three manuscripts appear to be bound up in it. The first two, ff.iii-

46 and 47-67, are eleventh-century work, and probably French.⁵² The third part, ff.68-120, containing the *Manuale*, which extends over ff.68r-98v, is closely written in a Secretary hand of the second half of the fifteenth century.⁵³ In the *Manuale* quires there are forty-four or forty-five lines per page, but the lines are more widely spaced subsequently. Pricking is visible at the edges of folios, and the text is written within a crayon-drawn writing frame. Dimensions are as follows: 211mm x 140mm (154mm x 105mm). The initial capital for each chapter, two to three lines of text deep, is plainly rubricated without flourishing.

The leaves on which the *Manuale* is written make up three quires which have discernible "a", "b" and "c" signatures. Their collation is as follows: 1¹¹ (ff.68-78; wants one leaf before 1), 2⁸, 3¹² (ff.87-98; wants one leaf before 1, one leaf before 2, one leaf before 4 and one leaf after 9). Folio 99r, which begins the fourth quire, has an "a" signature. Perhaps this might be taken as an indication that the exemplar for ff.68r-98v contained only a *Manuale* text. A reversion to an "a" signature after a sequence of "a", "b" and "c" at least suggests some pause in the composition. Catchwords appear at the end of quires 1, 2 and 4 in this third portion of B₂.

The two other items in this part of the manuscript are the *Liber de Musica Ecclesiastica* (the first book of Thomas à Kempis' *De Imitacione Christi*) on ff.111v-20v, and the short treatise called the *Speculum Sacerdotis* on ff.99r-111r (the names by which this work appears in its various manuscripts vary).⁵⁴ This *Speculum* text appears next to the *Manuale* in the Digby manuscript (D below).

The two medieval flyleaves contain documents which may be useful for identifying the region in which the text was rebound. The *Summary Catalogue* takes these flyleaves to contain an account of the temporalities of the Durham diocese. In addition, the deed written on the recto of flyleaf i and which continues on the verso of flyleaf ii relates to a similarly northern area.⁵⁵ Possibly there is evidence here for a northerly origin for this *Manuale* text.

D: Bodleian Library, MS Digby 75

D is a parchment and paper manuscript of ii + 243 + ii leaves in one of Kenelm Digby's bindings, stamped back and front with his gilded seal.⁵⁶ The fly and endleaves are contemporary with the current binding. It is foliated in modern pencil consecutively in the top right-hand corner of each folio. Three parts, A (ff.1-120 of paper), B (ff.121-61 of parchment) and C (ff.162-243 of paper) have been bound together in it. Part A seems to be written by two main scribes, the first appearing on

ff.1-66, the second on ff.67-107, the first again on ff.108-12 and the second again on ff.113-20. Some additions appear to have been made by the first scribe on f.120v. The style of the script which they use is very similar. On f.91v appears the rubricated date "Anno domini 1458", which may refer to the date when part A was copied. Most, if not all, of part B is written by the same hand, and this is also true of part C. The scripts of parts B and C have much in common, and may in fact be the work of the same scribe. They are of a very current Secretary type, with an admixture of a few Anglicana letter forms, and are probably of the second half of the fifteenth century.⁵⁷

The imperfect text of the *Manuale* is contained on the first three quires of part C, on ff.162r-206v. The collation of part C of the manuscript is as follows: 1¹³ (ff.162-74; wants one leaf before 1), 2-3¹⁶, || missing folios ||, 4-5¹², 6¹³ (ff.231-42; one leaf added after 12). Quires are provided with catchwords. The scribe has numbered the folios of each of the first three quires individually in the bottom right-hand corner. The collation of the remaining three quires depends in part upon the witness of post-medieval quire signatures (on ff.207r and 219r, just discernible at the foot of the page) which were probably added at the time of the current rebinding in the seventeenth century. The quire (or quires) to complete the *Manuale* has evidently been lost, though the binder has marked quire 3 as "15" (f.191r) and quire 4 as "16" (f.207r). If the quire went missing during the preparation of the current binding, those responsible have not acknowledged the fact.

The dimensions of part C are as follows: 210mm x 146mm (148mm x 94mm). The text, which averages about thirty-five lines per page, is written within a scored writing frame without transverse guide lines. Rubrication is very rarely employed, occurring when it does on the initial capital to each chapter (with a single exception on f.205r where it occurs within a chapter), and to a depth of two lines of text. Many spaces for rubricated initials have been left unfilled. This text of the *Manuale* is very much a working copy, and has been provided with a detailed system of source reference in the margins, especially to chapter numbers of biblical quotations, which none of the other extant manuscripts has. The appearance of such an apparatus alongside frequent footnotes in *distinctio* form (for example, on f.186r and v) betrays in the scribe, or in his exemplar, a rather academic interest in the disposition of the subject-matter on the page.⁵⁸

The contents of the manuscript, unlike those of any other, provide for a mixture of scientific, medical and theological interests. Part A contains mainly medical works. Part B is more varied, and includes a Middle English *Memento*

mori lyric (f.121r),⁵⁹ the *De Validis Mendicantibus* of Thomas Wilton (ff.122r-24v),⁶⁰ a *Tractatus de Dispositione Hominis secundum Constellationes* (ff.125r-38r),⁶¹ and various Latin poems (ff.138v-60v). Part C begins with the *Manuale Sacerdotis*, and contains also a copy of the *Sacerdotum Speculum* (ff.208r-23r). After this, part C contains mainly scientific and medical texts, such as a series of instructions for computing the dominical letter (ff.223r-30v) and medical receipts (ff.240r-41v).

The manuscript originally belonged to Thomas Allen, a great collector of mathematical and scientific works, from whom it passed into the hands of his pupil Digby.⁶² The ultimate source of D is unknown. The written dialect of the Middle English portions of part C displays strongly northern characteristics, though this need not necessarily indicate the region in which the manuscript was produced.⁶³

J: Bodleian Library, MS Jesus College 1

J is the smallest of the *Manuale* manuscripts, and was clearly designed as a *vade-mecum* volume. It is of parchment, of 135 + iii leaves (the last endleaf is a raised pastedown), and measures 136mm x 97mm (81mm x 62mm).⁶⁴ A modern pencil foliation runs consecutively in the top right-hand corner of each page, and is regular apart from the skipping of one folio between ff.94 and 95. It is in its original fifteenth-century binding of leather on boards, attached by three thongs. The hand, the same throughout, is a careful Anglicana Formata hand characteristic normally of the middle of the fifteenth century, but with certain features which shift it into the second half.⁶⁵ Occasionally a Textura type of script is used to display biblical quotations. The endleaves contain a few scribbled lines in contemporary and later hands, such as on the verso of endleaf ii (here may be found a sixteenth-century copy of a Latin verse which appears in a medieval hand at the bottom of f.104r, and also in a late fifteenth or early sixteenth-century pen-sketched Textura Quadrata type of script, embellished with strap-work and rubricated within the inscription "Liber Domini Daud"; apparently "Daud" was an early owner). The collation of the quires is straightforward. 1 to 16 are all of eight, being signed from "a" to "q",⁶⁶ and 17, signed "r", is of seven, wanting one leaf after 6. Catchwords appear regularly at the ends of quires, with the exception of quire 6.

The manuscript is carefully and well produced, and is decorated with blue capitals, two lines deep, which are encased in fine red pen flourishes. These often extend down the whole length of the writing frame. Such decoration is often

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

extended from the opening initial of a chapter to the beginning of sections within the chapter itself. The recto of ff.2-10, 12 and 15-16 contain the rubricated title "Manuale Sacerdotis" in the top right-hand corner. Red paraphs appear throughout the text, though they are more frequent in the earlier than in the later quires. Often they remain simply as a cue to the rubricator in the form of fine parallel strokes. The eighteen lines of text per page are largely consistent in number throughout the manuscript. These are contained within a crayon-drawn writing frame. The lateral pricking for the ruling of transverse guide lines is often visible in the margins.

It is not possible to be specific about the ultimate source of this text, but it may have existed at an earlier stage of its history, if not indeed been written, either in the western counties or even in Wales. Many of the college's library acquisitions have come as donations from this area, with which it has had traditional connections since being founded.⁶⁷ The college has few inventories, but Dr F. Mansell's account of college property which he drew up in 1649 before leaving office includes a certain "Liber Collectionum - Manuale Sacerdotis" as then being in the library's possession.⁶⁸ (The only other earlier account of library books has no sign of a *Manuale* in it, but this is only a list of the manuscripts in one man's donation.)⁶⁹

Apart from "Domini Daud", four other personal names are written in J, though none has yielded any further information for establishing its early whereabouts. One is written on the verso of endleaf ii in a sixteenth-century hand: "The above wrytting is the hand of William Jankyn". The other three are typically Welsh in character, though they may have been added while the manuscript was in the possession of Jesus College, and consequently reveal nothing about an earlier provenance.⁷⁰ On f.1r appears the name "Hugh Vaughan" in a sixteenth-century hand, and on f.45v, "R. ap Morgan", also in a hand of similar date. On f.104r, scribbled out but still just legible beneath, there appears "William David Morgan is the true owner of this booke" in a seventeenth-century hand.⁷¹ However, a westerly origin for the manuscript, though imprecise, remains a possibility.

H: British Library, MS Harley 5306

The ultimate location of H may be similar to that of J, since there is no good reason for doubting that it has been written by the same scribe. The manuscript is of parchment, comprising iii + 93 + iv leaves. Its current binding, with paper fly and endleaves, was added by the Library in 1965.⁷² The first folio appears to be the front pastedown of the original medieval binding, which was probably of leather on

boards. Its recto shows signs of having come in contact with six thongs, wood grain and leather. The foliation is in modern pencil, added consecutively in the top right-hand corner of each folio.

There are thirteen quires, all of eight except quires 4 and 9 (ff.26-27 and ff.60-61 respectively). Both of these consist of only two folios each, the outer bifolium of what in the case of quire 4 was a gathering of eight, and probably so too in the case of quire 9.⁷³ The text of the *Manuale*, ff.2r-60v, is consequently imperfect, lacking part of its central section and ending, which would have appeared on one of the missing folios of quire 9. Catchwords appear at the end of quires 1, 10, 11 and 12, and the quires have signatures apart from quire 5 and the defective quires 4 and 9, which may have originally had signatures that cropping of the manuscript during a rebinding has removed. A new series of signatures begins from quires 10-13, but cropping has either sheared through most of these or removed them completely. The use of a fresh series of signatures from quire 10 onwards suggests a distinct pause in the production of H. H is the only *Manuale* manuscript in which a *corrigitur* mark has been used. It appears regularly in the bottom left-hand corner of the last verso folio of quires 1-9, except at the end of quire 4 where cropping may have removed it, and sporadically throughout quires 10-13, at the bottom of ff.71r, 76v, 77v, 78r, 85v, 86r, 87r, 88r and 89r.

Apart from the *Manuale*, H contains portion of an unidentified theological work on f.61r-v (the portion includes part of a discussion on the process of transubstantiation) and on ff.62r-93v a copy of the *Elucidarium* of Honorius Augustodunensis.⁷⁴

The dimensions of the text are as follows: 236mm x 169mm (159mm x 103mm). The script is written within an ink-drawn writing frame ruled with transverse guide lines. There are regularly thirty-one lines of text per page. The initial capital of each chapter is decorated in blue to a depth of two lines of text, and is flourished with red pen strokes which often extend the whole length of the writing frame.

Various hands of a later date are found in the text, though none is likely to provide evidence for the early provenance of H. An erased mark of ownership on f.2r, now visible only under ultra-violet light, is unfortunately not fully legible. The hand, which may be of the sixteenth century, reads: "Liber Roberti Taylor curati de W<...> iuxta Pag<...>".⁷⁵ On f.1v, a small rectangular parchment label has been stuck to the centre of the page, bearing the unidentified name of "Richard Stoodley" in a seventeenth-century hand. Above this, in a hand of the same century, has been written "Manuali Sacerdotis Joannis Miraei Prioris di Lillishull. Floruit A.D. 1403. Vidi Pitsium". Throughout there appear marginal comments in pencil by a

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

Protestant annotator (as for example on f.50r, where he writes "o incredibile mendacium" next to a story of a Host miracle).

Y₁: York Minister Library, MS XVI.0.11

Y₁ is a parchment and paper manuscript in a leather binding added in 1882, containing vii + 168 + ii leaves. Its modern pencil foliation is written consecutively in the top right-hand corner of each folio. Its medieval binding was probably of leather on wooden boards, since f.168, which seems to have served as a pastedown to the original binding, has a stained margin running round its verso edges which may have been produced by the contact of the verso with a leather backing. The verso also bears the impression of three parallel thong marks and traces of wood grain. A green stain at the centre edge of the verso looks as if it may have been produced by corroded metal. If this is the case, then it may be evidence that a single clasp across the middle of the book held it shut. The first two flyleaves, like the two endleaves, are of paper and contemporary with the current binding. The remaining five flyleaves form part of an original unwritten quire of eight (the leaf now foliated as f.1 belongs to the last folio of this quire), now wanting one leaf before i and one leaf before iii. The parchment leaves are used to make up the inner and outer bifolia of each quire. The collation is as follows: 1-13¹², 14¹¹ (ff.158-68; wants one leaf before 11). No quire signatures are visible, but quires are regularly evidenced by catchwords.

Apart from a short item headed "Quinque sunt consideranda in celebracione misse" (f.1v), the rest of Y₁ is occupied by the *Manuale* alone (ff.2r-160r). The manuscript dimensions are as follows: 143mm x 100mm (85mm x 61mm). It is pricked for the construction of a crayon-drawn writing frame. There are a few traces of lateral pricking for the ruling of guide lines. These were drawn in, but subsequently erased. Both the depth and width of the frame tend to vary a few millimetres throughout. The scribe, who wrote in a mid fifteenth-century Secretary hand, is responsible for all of Y₁.⁷⁶ He employed a display script on chapter headings, and the opening capitals of chapters are plainly rubricated usually to a depth of two to four lines of text, with the exception of the letter "I" which is allowed to trail down the margin sometimes to a depth of nine lines.

A few notes and marginalia in later hands appear, but none offers clear evidence of the provenance of Y₁. On the recto of flyleaf v are a few notes in a seventeenth-century hand, possibly that of one Cuthbert Allin, concerning the nature

of the *Manuale Sacerdotis*, and notes in a sixteenth-century hand appear on the recto of flyleaf vi, which quote a sermon of St Augustine. On f.167r-v are copied theological notes in a sixteenth-century hand. In a seventeenth-century hand on the recto of flyleaf iii appears the inscription "Ex dono Cuthberti Allin" and a price mark of "2s 6d" in a sixteenth-century hand. Nothing appears to be known about Allin.⁷⁷ The greatest feature of significance in relation to the question of the ultimate origin of Y₁ is the appearance of the rubricated name "Kirkestall" after the explicit on f.160r.⁷⁸ However, there remains the question of its interpretation. It might refer conceivably either to the scribe's name or to the name of the place in West Yorkshire at which the text was kept or produced. Bearing in mind the common scribal habit of signing the personal name next to the explicit, the first possibility commends itself, and if this is correct, then the text could have been copied anywhere. Nevertheless, perhaps it is not entirely fortuitous that a text signed with a Yorkshire place-name turns up in a Yorkshire library.

Y₂: York Minster Library, MS XVII.L.8

Y₂ is a well produced parchment text of vi + 246 + ii leaves, whose first two paper flyleaves and endleaves are contemporary with the current leather binding which was added in 1822. The first and last of the parchment folios were once the pastedowns of a medieval binding. Six thong prints are clearly impressed on each of them, borders are visible where the parchment originally came in contact with a leather backing, and on the recto of the first leaf, traces survive of the grain of the wooden boards. On the verso of this leaf and on that of the second have been fixed printed paper labels declaring the Minster's ownership of Y₂ in 1751. A modern pencil foliation has been added consecutively in the top right-hand corner of each folio. It is regular, apart from the duplication of f.115. (The first six leaves of Y₂, including the first two flyleaves contemporary with the binding, are foliated i-vi; arabic foliation begins with the opening of the text, and continues throughout the rest of the volume, including the end leaves.)

A list of contents in a seventeenth-century hand, which appears on the verso of the third parchment leaf, includes the four longer items contained in Y₂, but omits the collections of sermon exempla at its beginning and end (ff.1r-8v; 237v-42r), and also a short collection of Sunday sermon themes on ff.128v-35r. All the pieces in Y₂ are in Latin. Apart from the *Manuale*, which extends from ff.9r-66r, there is a copy of the *Dieta Salutis* of William de Lavicia (ff.66v-128v; the tabula to this work

appears on ff.135v-37r), a copy of the *Elucidarium* of Honorius Augustodunensis (ff.137v-64r; it is attributed to St Anselm in the seventeenth-century list of contents), and selected Sanctorale and Temporale sermons of Jacobus de Voragine (ff.164r-237r).

The collation is as follows: 1¹² (ff.iii-8), 2-23⁸, 24¹⁰, 25-26⁸, 27-28¹², 29¹² (ff.234-45). Catchwords appear at the end of every quire except the first and last. Two alphabetical series of quire signatures are found, the first extending to quire 18 and a fresh series beginning in quire 19 and extending to the last quire. The dimensions of Y₂ are as follows: 188mm x 128mm (132mm x 91mm). Its writing frame is ink-drawn, and signs of lateral pricking occur sporadically throughout it. (Some of these prick holes were no doubt removed during rebinding.) Sometimes two pricking gauges were used, as for example on f.36r, where a wide one of 8mm appears, and to its left a smaller one, 3mm in width. In spite of this, no transverse guide lines have been drawn in, and the number of lines per page varies generally between twenty-seven and thirty. One hand is employed throughout, though its size and spacing occasionally varies, and offers an example of later Secretary, around the third quarter of the fifteenth century. It is probably the work of one "R. Martyn" whose name is written in various places in the manuscript (for example, on ff.128v and 135r).⁷⁹ Blue capitals flourished in red decorate the opening of each chapter, and these are usually two lines of text deep.

Various other post-medieval marginalia and annotations appear apart from the list of contents, for example some material in a sixteenth-century hand appearing on f.244r, and jottings on ff.242r and 245r. However, only the notes on the flyleaves are the ones recognizably pertinent to the history of Y₂. The recto of flyleaf vi records the donation of the book to the library by Thomas Comber, precentor of York Minster in 1688.⁸⁰ Y₂ was one in a series that he gave to the library. He acquired the text, how it is impossible to say, from Thomas Calvert, "ministri Evangelij in Eboraco 1664", whose name also appears on the recto of flyleaf vi.⁸¹ The leaf also bears the name of an "Edward Dimoke", unidentified, in a sixteenth-century hand. The name of one "Johannes Skynnere Capellanus" is visible under ultra-violet light at the end of the *Manuale* on f.66v and again on f.237r. The script is of the late fifteenth century, and it seems likely that Skynnere was one of the first owners of Y₂. Nothing is known about him.

C: Chicago University Library, MS 697

C is a paper manuscript of iii + 98 + i leaves in a modern binding added in 1964.⁸² Its modern pencil foliation is written consecutively in the top right-hand corner of each folio. The first flyleaf is of paper, post-medieval but earlier than the current binding. The next two flyleaves comprise a parchment bifolium, and the final endleaf is contemporary with the current binding. The previous binding of C had been eighteenth-century work, leather, and bearing the crest of one "T.. M.E." on its spine. The nature of the original medieval binding may have been leather on wooden boards; what appear to be thong marks are impressed on the recto of flyleaf ii. The collation of C has been confused during the 1964 rebinding. It is as follows: 1¹¹ (ff.1-11; wants one leaf before 1), 2⁹ (ff.53-61; wants one leaf before 8), 3¹² (ff.12-23), 4¹⁶ (ff.24-39), 5¹² (ff.40-51), bifolium (ff.52 and 62), 6-8¹² (ff.63-98). Quire 2 was originally of twelve; its outer bifolium (which now comprises ff.52 and 62) has been removed from it and bound in after quire 5. No quire signatures are visible, and catchwords appear at the end of quires 1 and 3-7.

C contains three works: the *Speculum Humane Salvacionis* with its index (ff.1r-62r), occupying the first five quires, the *Manuale Sacerdotis* (ff.63r-91v) and a series of *Versus Prophecie*, here ascribed to John of Bridlington but probably composed by John Erghom.⁸³ The dimensions of C in the *Manuale* portion are as follows: 210mm x 145mm (167mm x 105mm). It is pricked for the construction of a crayon-drawn writing frame. There are no traces of lateral pricking for the ruling of guide lines, and the text of the *Manuale* varies between forty-two to forty-five lines per page. Rubricated capitals appear to a depth of two to three lines of text, and their occasional flourishing can extend in the margin to a depth of up to six lines. Their appearance is very rare, except in the *Manuale* section. One scribe is responsible for copying the whole of C. He wrote a script which incorporates a mixture of Anglicana Formata and Secretary features, datable to the second half of the fifteenth century.⁸⁴ It seems most likely that the scribe, though he is responsible for all of C, produced it in two separate portions. There is a twofold reason for this. First, the verso of the last folio of the *Speculum Humane Salvacionis* (f.62v) is left blank, whereas in the second portion of C the scribe did not hesitate to begin the prophecies on the same folio and side (f.91v) as that on which the preceding *Manuale Sacerdotis* had come to an end. Second, although there is a variety of types of paper in each portion, none of the types of paper used in the first portion is found in the second.⁸⁵ It may be that the exemplar from which the *Manuale* was

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

copied did not also contain the *Speculum*.

There are several names in sixteenth-century hands written on the parchment flyleaves, though they would not appear to be especially useful in determining the early whereabouts of the manuscript. They include one Tho[mas] Martin who appears on the pastedown to the front inside cover, the names Robart Steuenson, Anthony Steuenson, Thomas Middeltcott, William Middeltcott and John Knott who appear on the recto of flyleaf ii (Anthony Steuenson appears again on the verso), and Robart James with John Knott once again on the recto of flyleaf iii. Of slightly more interest to the question of early provenance may perhaps be the inscription at the top of the verso of flyleaf iii: "Be it knowne vnto all men by this that I Thomas Steuenson of Algarkirke in the county of Lincoln yeman doe acknowleg my selfe to owe and am in debted vnto James Thacchar of Thurley Esq. in the county of Sussex: By me Edmund Hopkin". Of the two places mentioned here, Algarkirk in Lincolnshire is somewhat more prominent than "Thurly",⁸⁶ since it is the home of Thomas Steuenson whose memorandum this note either is or copies. Though it is impossible to be certain, the earliest ascertainable provenance for C may consequently be Lincolnshire. The manuscript changed hands several times between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries, and finally came to its current lodging in Chicago in 1923.⁸⁷

Conclusions

It may be possible now to draw together some conclusions from the manuscripts about the reception and dissemination of Mirk's manual. Its text appears normally to have been copied entire, but at least one abridged version survives (Ha, U). It was considered suitable for circulation by itself (J, Y₁) or more frequently it was anthologized (in all other manuscripts), though in some anthologies (T₂, B₂, H, C) it is possible that the exemplar from which it was copied contained it alone. The variety of content displayed by the anthologies suggests for the *Manuale* a reading public of varied interests and abilities. Some anthologies contain Latin and vernacular texts (T₂, U, Ha), the rest Latin, or for the most part Latin texts (T₁, P, B₁, B₂, D, H, Y₂, C), and while certain of these anthologies cater for a mixed interest (for example, D, containing medical, scientific and theological material), others cater for a more specialized one (for example, B₁, containing several items of

narrowly Carthusian material). The quality of the manuscripts also varies considerably. Some are carefully produced, probably by professional scribes with an eye to supplying the clerical book market (for example, T₁, J, H) and in one case (H) there is formal recognition in the use of the *corrigitur* mark that the text has been examined for errors. On the other hand the poorer quality manuscript is to be found (notably D) with signs of being a pragmatic, working copy written at speed, possibly for the personal use of the scribe himself. Although no definitive information is to be gleaned on the ultimate provenance of any manuscript, the circumstantial evidence suggests manuscript dissemination to have been generally wide, but also that almost half of the surviving manuscripts (U, Ha, B₂, D, Y₁, C) may have been concentrated in the north-eastern parts of England.⁸⁸ The only medieval owner of a copy of the *Manuale* that we know by name and about whom there is any substantial biographical information is John Warkworth (owner of P), no doubt a man of more distinguished career than a certain "Johannes Skynnere Capellanus" (possibly a fifteenth-century owner of Y₂), though men such as Skynnere were more likely to have been the recipients of the *Manuale* whom Mirk had originally envisaged.⁸⁹ Once again here in the matter of manuscript ownership, where it has been determinable, there is to be found a diversity of accomplishment and rank between its readers that was already suggested by the diversity of manuscript quality and content.

In conclusion, the survey of the manuscripts suggests that the *Manuale Sacerdotis* may indeed have been moderately successful, and that manuscript variety may be an additional witness to the circulation which it enjoyed. In the wake of the evident success of the *Festial*, it might be expected that any further work by the same author would find an audience which was wide and sympathetic. A manual in itself of modest size, and by comparison with earlier pastoral manuals of modest content, it nevertheless commended itself to its century, in some cases (notably J) perfectly fulfilling the physical requirements of ready portability that the word manual implies. "Have it frequently to hand", says Mirk to the vicar Dominus Johannis, its dedicatee, "vt libellum istum semel a te lectum in angulum camere non proicias et inter quisquillas domus dormire permittas, sed assidue illum legens, de manibus non dimittas ita vt ex vsuali illius in manibus deportacione, Manuale Sacerdotis nominare consuescas" [J, f.2v; "so that once you have read this little book, do not throw it away into a corner of your room and let it sleep amongst the household odds and ends, but reading it repeatedly do not let it out of your hands, so that by a wonted carrying of it in the hands, you may get used to calling it 'The Priest's Handbook'"]. The book-carrying priest would be seen to wear that literacy

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

which though not exclusively was still predominantly a clerical preserve, as he would wear his clerical garb itself.⁹⁰ The very act of carrying the book would distinguish the priest from the laity in a way which Mirk, fond of reminding his audience to be seen to be set apart through the sobriety of their dress, would altogether approve of. In other copies (for example, B₁) it is clear that the *Manuale*, no longer possessing the ready portability envisaged by its author, was also being made to serve a function somewhat different from that for which it was originally intended.⁹¹ The audience and the reception which came to embrace the *Manuale* evidently outstripped its author's expectations.

NOTES

¹ *Mirk's Festial*, ed. T. Erbe, EETS ES 96 (London, 1905); *Instructions for Parish Priests*, ed. G. Kristensson, Lund Studies in English 49 (Lund, 1974). An edition of the *Manuale Sacerdotis* has been produced by M.W. Washburn, "The Manuale Sacerdotis of John Myrc: An Edition", Ph.D. thesis (Chicago University, 1974). Unfortunately it is often unreliable. A new edition is currently being prepared by James Girsch, under the supervision of Leonard E. Boyle.

² Twenty-seven surviving manuscripts of the *Festial* in English are briefly described by M.F. Wakelin, "The Manuscripts of John Mirk's Festial", *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 1 (1967) pp.93-118. A further ten are discussed by A.J. Fletcher, "Unnoticed Sermons from John Mirk's Festial", *Speculum* 55 (1980) pp.514-22. I am grateful to M.F. Wakelin for subsequently drawing my attention to another manuscript with *Festial* connections, MS Cecil Papers 280, preserved at Hatfield House, and a Rogationtide sermon with *Festial* material in it, noticed by V. O'Mara, is noted in A. McIntosh and M.F. Wakelin, "John Mirk's Festial and Bodleian MS Hatton 96", *NM* 83 (1982) pp.443-50; see p.443, note 2.

³ On the history and development of this literature, see especially L.E. Boyle, "A Study of the Works attributed to William of Pagula", D.Phil. thesis, 2 vols. (Oxford University, 1956).

⁴ The historical background to the thirteenth-century pastoral literature is described in *Thomas de Chobham Summa Confessorum*, ed. F. Broomfield (Louvain and Paris, 1968) pp.xi-xxv.

⁵ Alongside references to the Hildebrandine Reforms, Mirk mentions legislations to be found "in constitutionibus Octoboni et aliis constitutionibus provincialibus" [*Manuale*, Book I, chapter 7; "in the constitutions of Ottobuono and in other provincial constitutions"].

⁶ Ottobuono, for example, appears alongside Augustine in the margins of some manuscripts.

⁷ Belet is referred to by Mirk in at least thirteen places in his *Festial* (see Erbe, *Mirk's Festial*, p.331, under "Jon Belet").

⁸ I have given only cursory attention to Mirk's sources, and their thorough investigation would throw light on the range of material that this prior of the canons of Lilleshall had at his disposal. However, a few observations may be made. Amongst the works available to Mirk when compiling the *Manuale* was probably a complete text of the *Oculus Sacerdotis* of William of Pagula. Mirk had incorporated much of its second part, the *Dextra Pars*, in his vernacular *Instructions*, and in

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

calling his source by the name of the first part of the work, the *Pars Oculi*, he possibly betrays that he knew that too. (See also Kristensson, *Instructions*, pp.11-12.) Similarities in expression and content between the *Manuale* and the third part of the *Oculus*, the *Sinistra Pars*, are sometimes very striking. It is this third part which Mirk has drawn most heavily upon, though in general his use of Pagula, which is comparatively small, is highly selective. Compare, for example, Book III, chapter 11 of the *Manuale* on the dangers which may occur during Mass celebration, such as the freezing or spilling of the wine, the falling of a spider or other poisonous thing into it, the sudden illness of the celebrant or the vomiting of the sacrament, with the *Oculus Sacerdotis, Sinistra Pars* (Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 11, ff.168rb-168vb). It may be of use to note that the following works, which share in the tradition represented by the *Oculus Sacerdotis*, may be eliminated as possible *Manuale* sources; the Bodleian Library shelfmark of the manuscript I have compared is given in parenthesis: the *Signaculum Apostolatus Mei* (MS Auctarium D.4.13), the *Tractatus de Penitentia* of John of Wales (MS Bodley 402), the *Speculum Lucidum* (MS Corpus Christi College 155), the *Pupilla Oculi* of John de Burgh (MS Bodley 424), the *Septuplum* of John Acton (MS University College 71), the *Regimen Animarum* (MS Hatton 11) and the *Speculum Iuniorum* (MS Bodley 767).

⁹ Much of their preaching was, of course, against the secular clergy. The heading of the section in the *Manuale* "as with the people, so with the priest" (Isaiah xxiv 2, Hosea iv 9; *Manuale*, Book I, chapter 13) is developed in a sermon on the theme "Sacerdotes sanctificentur" in the collection of the Franciscan Nicholas Philip (Bodleian Library, MS Lat. th. d. 1, f.87v), and Mirk's satirical episode of the rector's worldly-wise concubine who abandons him when he is dismissed from the Church on her account (*Manuale*, Book I, chapter 17) is preaching stock of a variety commonly associated with the friars. (See H.G. Pfander, "The Medieval Friars and some Alphabetical Reference Books", *MÆ* 3 (1934) pp.19-29.)

¹⁰ W.A. Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1955) pp.215-17, also provides a summary of the content of the *Manuale* with selected illustrative passages.

¹¹ Several of these exempla appear in English in the *Festial*. Compare, for example, the tale of the abbess who was chaste but whose thoughts were carnal, as was her conversation (Erbe, *Mirk's Festial*, pp.96-7; *Manuale*, Book III, chapter 6).

¹² The dating of the *Manuale* is problematic, but there are two reasons for suspecting that it might postdate the *Festial*. The writing of the *Festial* has recently been put somewhere between 1350 and 1390, probably towards the later end of that time-scale, by S. Powell, "A New Dating of John Mirk's *Festial*", *N&Q* n.s. 29 (1982) pp.487-9, and between 1382 and 1390 by A.J. Fletcher,

"John Mirk and the Lollards", *MÆ* forthcoming. Although it is impossible to know for a fact whether the *Manuale* may postdate the *Festial*, it might be noted that Mirk refers to himself in the preface of the *Manuale* as prior of the Lilleshall canons, a style which he does not use in the *Festial* preface. Further, if the dedicatee of the *Manuale*, one "Johannis de .S. vicario de .A.", proves to be John Sotton, who was appointed vicar of St Alkmund's, Shrewsbury, in 1414, the *Manuale* may even have been written sometime around that date (see Fletcher, "John Mirk and the Lollards", *MÆ* forthcoming).

13 In some ways the *Manuale* and the *Instructions* should be regarded as complementary. The *Instructions* are basic for a competent performance of parochial duties. The *Manuale*, however, is a more advanced and reflective work which, by the very fact of its composition in Latin, is intended in the first instance for a priest past the rudiments outlined in the *Instructions*.

14 The *Memoriale Presbiterorum* uses Pecham's programme in part (see M.J. Haren, "A Study of the Memoriale Presbiterorum, A Fourteenth-Century Manual for Parish Priests", D.Phil. thesis, 2 vols. (Oxford University, 1975) I, p.76). *Oculus Sacerdotis* also uses it (see Boyle, "William of Pagula", I, pp.315-26).

15 J.W. Papworth, *Ordinary of British Armorial*s (London, 1874) p.1058. The manuscript is briefly described in M.R. James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1900) pp.373-4. His reading of words on the final endleaf is not wholly accurate. The manuscript reads "vii^{xx} et xii gret byse lettres florysshid" and not "vii^{xx} et xii gret lettres lettres floryshid" as stated in the Catalogue. A plate of the script is available in S. Harrison Thomson, *Latin Bookhands in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1969) plate 108. There is no evidence for his ascription of the manuscript to "Lilleshall or Westderham". I am grateful to Rosemary Graham of Trinity College for verifying certain details of T₁ for me.

16 Compare M.B. Parkes, *English Cursive Book Hands, 1250-1500* (London, 1979) plate 6 (ii).

17 See H.E. Ball, "The Price of Books in Medieval England", *The Library*, Series IV, 17 (1937) pp.312-32. (It is interesting to note that some of the Cambridge Peterhouse manuscripts which have similar details of cost written into them at the back are associated with the book trade which flourished in response to the needs of the University.) I have not been able to identify "N.d." the scribe. I am grateful to Dr A.I. Doyle for also having made an attempt to do so.

18 On Thomas Neville, see *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 1917 following) XIV,

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

pp.302-3. (Henceforward referred to as *DNB*.)

¹⁹ On Wygenhall, see H.M. Colvin, *The White Canons in England* (Oxford, 1951) pp.323-4. He was active during the reign of Edward IV. His *Speculum* evidently antedates 1474.

²⁰ J. Leland, *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis* (Oxford, 1709) p.383.

²¹ T. Tanner, *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica* (London, 1748) pp.772-3.

²² The manuscript is briefly described in James, *Trinity College*, pp.374-5; on Whitgift, see *DNB XXI*, pp.129-37.

²³ Compare Parkes, *Book Hands*, plate 18 (i).

²⁴ For a list of manuscripts containing Lydgate's *Dietarium*, see *The Index of Middle English Verse*, ed. C. Brown and R.H. Robbins (New York, 1943) pp.131-2, item 824, and *Supplement to the Index of Middle English Verse*, ed. R.H. Robbins and J.L. Cutler (Lexington, 1965) pp.95-96, item 824.

²⁵ This is not to imply that the *Manuale* would not appear in such a context. It seems reasonable to infer this from the way in which the copying stops at the end of the *Manuale* on f.96r. If the *Manuale's* exemplar contained the material about to follow in the second part of the manuscript, there seems no reason why it should not have been copied on f.96v. The change from parchment to parchment/paper also suggests a pause in the process of compilation.

²⁶ Distinctive regional orthographies in the spelling system of the Lydgate scribe are few (his usage of *-gth*, *-3th* and *-th* spellings for the reflex of OE *-ht* has East Midland affinities), but these would in any case be of little value for firmly determining where the manuscript was produced.

²⁷ The manuscript is briefly described in M.R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Peterhouse* (Cambridge, 1889) pp.287-8. I am grateful to Mrs J.S. Cook of Cambridge University Library for her opinion on the date of the binding.

²⁸ P has not been noticed by P.H.-S. Hartley and H.R. Aldridge, *Johannes de Mirfeld* (Cambridge, 1936) pp.169-71.

29 James, *Library of Peterhouse* p.287, took them to be of the fourteenth as well as of the fifteenth centuries.

30 Compare Parkes, *Book Hands*, plate 11 (ii); the date of the *Manuale* portion of P would appear to be (s. xv med.).

31 The hand is very similar to the note of ownership written on the front paste-down. See below, p.111.

32 On John Warkworth, see *DNB* XX, pp.844-5; also, A.B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500* (Cambridge, 1963) pp.618-9.

33 One feature of the manuscript's production, an occasional pronounced orange tinge on the hair sides of the parchment, may associate it in fact with Oxford. See M.B. Parkes, "A study of certain kinds of script used in England in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and the origins of the 'Tudor Secretary' hand", B.Litt. thesis (Oxford University, 1958) pp.80-1.

34 The old catalogue is printed in James, *Library of Peterhouse* p.23.

35 The *Visio* does not appear to exist amongst the works of St Bernard and its incipit is not recorded in M. Vattasso, *Initia Patrum*, Studi e Testi 16 and 17 (Rome, 1906 and 1908); a second manuscript is recorded in B. Hauréau, *Initia operum scriptorum latinorum medii potissimum aevi* (Turnholt, n.d. [1974]) V, f.111v. A second manuscript of the anonymous *Deieccio* is given in Hauréau, *Initia* IV, f.307v. The *De Assumpcione* is not in Hauréau. Its opening words are a little reminiscent of sermon formulas: "Sciendum est, fratres karissimi, et omnibus exponendum fidelibus, quod post assumpcionem domini nostri Ihesu Cristi Saluatoris mundi cum magna gloria ad alta celorum, descendit angelus ad sanctam Mariam cum esset in templo Dei diebus ac noctibus vigilans" ["Dearest brothers, it is to be known, and explained to all the faithful, that after the assumption of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, with great glory into the heights of heaven, an angel came down to holy Mary when she was keeping watch day and night in God's temple"]. However, I have not found it amongst the Assumption Day sermons collected in J.B. Schneyer, *Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermones des Mittelalters* (Münster Westfalen, 1969 following).

36 The manuscript is briefly described in M.R. James, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1857) II, pp.295-300. There are two foliation systems in this manuscript, one of which is sporadic. I have chosen the top right-

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

hand foliation which is continuous and consequently my references do not correspond to those of James.

37 See, for example, endleaf ii^f: Cotyngham (=Cottingham, in East Riding or Northamptonshire); Wyrksall (=Worsall, in North Riding); Kyngeston super Hull (=Kingston-on-Hull, in East Riding). Also endleaf iv^f: Etton (=Etton, in East Riding or Northamptonshire); Sowth Dalton (=South Dalton, in East Riding).

38 This short work, in Latin verse and prose, which begins: "Vestio, poto, cibo, tectum do, visito, solvo" (a listing of the corporal works of mercy) is not recorded in M.W. Bloomfield, B.-G. Guyot, D.R. Howard and T.B. Kabcalo, *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100-1500 A.D.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979).

39 I am grateful to Dr A.I. Doyle for drawing my attention to the appearance of one Robert Wasselyn in the register of the members of the York Corpus Christi guild for the years 1446 and 1457 (see *The Register of the Guild of Corpus Christi in the City of York*, ed. R.H. Skaife, Surtees Society 57 (London, 1872) pp.45 and 59). F. Blomefield, *An Essay towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk* (London, 1805) II, p.344, records one Sir Robert Wasseleyn serving at the church of St Mary, Ellingham, Norfolk, from 1452. It appears that Wasselyn was active in and around the North East Midlands about the middle of the fifteenth century. The written dialect of the ME portions of the manuscript is wholly consonant with this area (see *Speculum Christiani*, ed. G. Holmstedt, EETS OS 182 (London, 1933) pp.lxi-lxii).

40 Compare Parkes, *Book Hands*, plate 3(i).

41 Holmstedt, *Speculum Christiani*, p.lxii, is too rigorous in his statement that two hands are employed. A fuller description may be found in F. Madan, H.H.E. Craster and N. Denholm-Young, *A Summary Catalogue of the Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1937) II, part 2, index number 4070, pp.826-7.

42 The material contained in the first two quires of U, as was shown earlier, was a subsequent addition by the scribe which may not have appeared in the exemplar from which the bulk of the manuscript was copied. For a list of the full contents of U, see James, *Library of the University of Cambridge* II, 295-300.

43 The written dialect forms of both Ha and U, though differing in detail, broadly represent a North East Midlands region. An analysis of the Ha language may be found in Holmstedt,

Speculum Christiani, pp.lxiii-lxiv.

44 Compare Parkes, *Book Hands*, plate 8(i).

45 A description is available in F. Madan and H.H.E. Craster, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1922) II, part 1, index number 2298, pp.295-7.

46 These datings, which completely revise those of the *Summary Catalogue*, follow Parkes, *Book Hands*, plates 8(i), 11(ii) and 6(ii) respectively. The first two hands are in fact probably very close in date, sometime during the third quarter of the century. The last word at the bottom of f.17r has been erased and corrected in the same hand as is responsible for ff.17v-24r, clearly proving that the script does not antedate that of the first folios.

47 J. Pits, *Relationum Historicum de Rebus Anglis* (Paris, 1619) p.577. The information is unique, and has not been gleaned from Bale or Leland.

48 See also H.G. Pfander, "Some Medieval Manuals of Religious Instruction in England and Observations on Chaucer's *Parson's Tale*", *JEGP* 35 (1936) p.252, footnote 24: "[MS Bodley 549] a manuscript clearly belonging to a house of English Carthusians".

49 With the exception of the hand which writes the vernacular material on ff.77v-79r; this scribe had already written in the quire before Stephen Doddesham picked it up. Doddesham is forced to fit his own text around that written by his predecessor. An example of Doddesham's work is available in Parkes, *Book Hands*, plate 6(ii).

50 He was professed at Witham in 1462. See A.I. Doyle, "A survey of the origins and circulation of theological writings in English in the fourteenth, fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries with special consideration of the part of the clergy therein", Ph.D. thesis, 2 vols. (Cambridge University, 1953) II, pp.187-8.

51 The manuscript is briefly described in Madan and Craster, *Summary Catalogue* II, part 1, index number 1957, p.133.

52 I follow Madan and Craster, *ibid.*

53 Compare Parkes, *Book Hands*, plate 13(i).

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

- 54 The same work appears as the *Sacerdotum Speculum* in MS Digby 75 (see below, p.118). Its known manuscripts are listed in Bloomfield, Guyot, Howard and Kabealo, *Incipits*, p.453, item 5269.
- 55 For example, the names of York (Eboracum, f.i r and perhaps Auckland (Aukla<nd>, f.ii v; the conjectured *nd* is obscured in the gutter of the binding) are mentioned, along with a William Pickering (Willelmo Pikeryngg, f.i r).
- 56 The manuscript is briefly described in G.D. Macray, *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae Pars Nona* (Oxford, 1883) cols.80-2.
- 57 See Parkes, *Book Hands*, plate 13(i).
- 58 Notes on the vogue for the *distinctio* can be found in G. Lacombe, "La vie et les oeuvres de Prévostin", *Bibliothèque Thomiste* 11 (1927) pp.117-20. See also R.H. and M.A. Rouse, *Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons: Studies on the Manipulus florum of Thomas of Ireland* (Toronto, 1979) pp.7-9, 69-70 *et passim*.
- 59 An eight-line lyric, unrecorded in Brown and Robbins, *Index* and Robbins and Cutler, *Supplement*.
- 60 On Wilton, see J.A. Weisheipl, "Repertorium Mertonense", *Mediaeval Studies* 31 (1969) p.222; D is noticed on p.224.
- 61 This manuscript is not noticed by L. Thorndike and P. Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits of Medieval Scientific Writings in Latin* (London, 1963) col.1395.
- 62 The extent of Allen's library in Digby's possession and donated by him to the Bodleian on December 30, 1634 is to be found in volume I of the library's *Liber Donationum*, pp.295-317. On Allen himself, see *DNB* I, pp.312-3, and A.G. Watson, "Thomas Allen of Oxford and his Manuscripts", in *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries*, ed. M.B. Parkes and A.G. Watson (London, 1978) pp.279-314.
- 63 There is not sufficient Middle English material in parts A and B from which the written dialect may be satisfactorily characterized. Part C contains many strongly northern forms. For example, occasional a spellings of the OE *ā* reflex, "mare" (<OE *mā*; f.207r); *u* spellings of the OE *ō* reflex, "rute" (<OE *rōt*; f.207r), "gude" (<OE *gōd*; f.207r); *qw*- spellings of the OE *hw*-

reflex, "quo" (<OE *hwā*; f.207r); *-and* forms of the present participial morpheme, "waxand" (f.207r); "sall" spellings of auxiliary SHALL (f.207v); *-es* forms of the third person singular present indicative, "comes" (f.207r); the third person singular present indicative of BE spelt "es" (f.207v), etc.

64 A brief description may be found in H.O. Coxe, *Catalogus Codicum MSS.* (Oxford, 1852) II, Jesus College Manuscripts, p.1.

65 Compare Parkes, *Book Hands*, plate 11(ii). The caligraphic decoration of top-line ascenders is rather a feature of scripts c.1460 onwards. I am grateful to Dr Parkes for his opinion of the J script.

66 I have presumed a quire "q"; no such signature is in fact visible.

67 For a general account of Jesus College library, see C.J. Fordyce and T.M. Knox, "The Library of Jesus College Oxford", *Oxford Bibliographical Society* 5 (1936-39) pp.53-115.

68 Jesus College archives, the *College Register of Dr F. Mansell* (1649), p.11.

69 On pp.42-3 of the first Jesus College register, 1602-1630. As one of the commissioners at the Dissolution, he visited many west country religious houses and gave some of their manuscripts to the college.

70 However, it might be noticed that J. Foster, *The Members of the University of Oxford 1500-1714* (Oxford, 1891-92), does not record any of these as having been a Jesus student.

71 Hugh Vaughan, of whom some connection with the Vaughan family of Hergest, great manuscript collectors, might be suspected, does not appear to relate to it. See *The Dictionary of Welsh Biography down to 1940* (London, 1959) pp.996-7.

72 With the exception of the first of the paper endleaves. This has been incorporated presumably from an earlier, though post-medieval, binding. The library has no record of the nature of the manuscript's binding before its replacement in 1965. Many Harleian manuscripts were rebound wholesale in the nineteenth century, and this was probably the fate of H. Any earlier binding would have been preserved by the library. A very brief description of H may be found in *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1808) III, p.259.

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

- 73 The fact that quire 4 was also of eight can be deduced from an estimation of the number of leaves necessary to cover the intervening length of text. By virtue of sheer regularity, quire 9 may have been of eight too. How many more quires have not survived after quire 9 it is not possible to say.
- 74 This work also appears in Y₂. See below, p.123.
- 75 Assuming that Pag<...> is a place name, either Pagham in Sussex or Paull (<Latin *Pagula*) in East Yorkshire might be possibilities, but the reading is too unhelpful to take us far.
- 76 Compare Parkes, *Book Hands*, plate 11(ii). However, there is very occasionally strapwork on top-line ascenders, which is somewhat more common in the second half of the fifteenth century.
- 77 I am grateful to the sub-librarian of York Minster Library, C.B.L. Barr, for having attempted to identify him. Mr Barr adds concerning Allin that "both the christian name and the surname make one think of Durham, and in view of the manuscript's northern provenance and present location, this would not be out of place" (private communication of December, 1976). Allin seems, therefore, to have been an early, and possibly northern owner of the manuscript.
- 78 The name appears as part of a rubricated explicit thus: "Explicit libellus dictus Manuale Sacerdotis Kirkestall".
- 79 The script approaches the formality of Parkes, *Book Hands*, plate 15(i). I have been unable to identify either Martyn or the place from which he apparently comes, "Twayfordton" (f.128v). However, the metallic hue of the ink and the pronounced orange tinge on some of the hair sides of the parchment are reminiscent of Oxford manuscripts (see M.B. Parkes, "A study of certain kinds of script used in England in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and the origins of the 'Tudor Secretary' hand", B.Litt. thesis (Oxford University, 1958) pp.80-1), and it may be that Y₂ is an Oxford production.
- 80 Details of his life are available in *DNB* IV.
- 81 Details of his life are available in *DNB* III. 1664 is a strange date to reconcile with the fact that he had been deprived of his living in 1662 and, having been expelled from the city, was living near Tadcaster.
- 82 I am grateful to Dr C. von Nolken and Dr R.W. Allison for providing all the information for

the description of C. A brief description is already provided in S. de Ricci and W.J. Wilson, *Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New York, 1935) I, pp.594-5.

83 See P. Meyvaert, "John Erghome and the Vaticinium Roberti Bridlington", *Speculum* 41 (1966) pp.656-64.

84 After Parkes. Dr Allison has informed me in a private communication that Parkes also considers the script to be "perhaps even a monastic hand, trying to preserve some conservative, even archaic, features".

85 A full account of the watermarks of C is given in M.J. Curley, "Versus prophetales propheta Johannis Bridlingtoniensis (The Prophecy of John of Bridlington): An Edition", Ph.D. thesis (Chicago University, 1973).

86 There may possibly be some error in the inscription. There is no "Thurly", or any name resembling it, to be found in Sussex. Thurleigh in Bedfordshire comes closest to "Thurly" in spelling, but the counties of Sussex and Bedfordshire are at a considerable distance from each other.

87 The various owners of C from the eighteenth to the early twentieth century are listed by De Ricci and Wilson, *Census* I, p.595.

88 The promotion and circulation of pastoral material in the north-east appears to have been considerable. J.H. Moran, *Education and Learning in the City of York* (York, 1979) p.36, shows how pastoral materials - sermons and manuals - formed a considerable portion of the books left in wills: "Discounting service books, these represented approximately 45% of all titles bequeathed, rising from about 15% at the end of the fourteenth century to 50%-60% between 1480 and 1510". It may be that the circulation of the *Manuale* in these parts reflects the establishment there of a tradition of the availability of pastoral literature. Perhaps there is no need to invoke the idea of Mirk having had some personal north-eastern connection (see G.R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1926) p.55).

89 Pantin, *The English Church*, pp.28-9, notes that Mirk envisages the handbook being used by "a 'hired man', working for an employer, whether as assistant to a priest or chaplain to a lord" (see also p.215). His evidence for this is based on the fact that the sketches of good and bad sacerdotal behaviour in Book I, chapter 11 of the *Manuale* are illustrated by reference to the lives of clerics of such a grade. Perhaps the dedicatee, "Johannis de .S., vicario de .A.", was himself a

Mirk's Manuale Sacerdotis

"hired man".

⁹⁰ On the rise of lay literacy at this date, see M. Aston, *Lollards and Reformers* (London, 1984) pp.101-33.

⁹¹ There is, for example, the possibility of monastic ownership and use of both B₁ and B₂.